

EXHIBIT A

ELECTRIFIED FENCE SUBCOMMITTEE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION ADVISORY BOARD (LDRAB)

SUMMARY OF THE JANUARY 7, 2013 MEETING

On Monday, January 7, 2013, a LDRAB Subcommittee meeting was held at the Vista Center, Kenneth Rogers Hearing Room, VC-1W-47, at 2300 North Jog Road, West Palm Beach, Florida.

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Roll Call

The meeting commenced at 3:05 p.m.

2. Introduction of Members, Staff and Interested Parties

LDRAB Subcommittee Members: Frank Gulisano, Barbara Katz, and Lori Vinikoor

Interested Parties: Deputy Sheriff Karl Martin, and Thuy Shutt.

Applicant: Chris Barry, Agent/Representing Electric Guard Dog.

County Staff: Richard Gathright, Bryan Davis, William Cross, Gail Vorpagel, Melissa Matos and Scott Rodriguez.

3. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda proposed.

4. Adoption of December 12, 2012 Meeting Summary

The Subcommittee accepted the summary with no changes.

B. REVIEW OF PROPOSED CODE LANGUAGE

Ms. Vinikoor commented that the proposed language clearly identifies the applicant's and staff's position. Ms. Vinikoor suggested that the committee go over the proposed language in a general fashion as opposed to line-by-line. Ms. Katz and Mr. Gulisano agreed.

Mr. Cross acknowledged that there were general philosophical differences between the applicant's proposed use of electrified fencing and staff concerns for safety and potential appearance of blight when used in certain areas of the County. Mr. Cross suggested that the subcommittee provide specific recommendations when applicable and otherwise advise of their recommendations regarding differing perspectives. Mr. Cross also advised that it was anticipated that the applicant would request postponement from the January to February LDRAB meeting date, to allow them to meet with the Westgate Board. Mr. Barry confirmed the postponement.

Additional detailed discussion ensued and included:

- Accessory outdoor storage uses: Staff noted that existing regulations prohibited storage within setbacks and addressed screening.
- Mechanical equipment: Similar screening requirements exist; however, there may be a need to address a loophole regarding height of screening, which might not correlate to the minimum height of the required non-electrified exterior fencing.
- URAO, IRO, LCC, TMD and WCRAO limits: Advised that certain form based or mixed use developments would require certain prohibitions on electrified fencing.
- Building related requirements: Advised that additional language would be forthcoming from the acting Building Official.
- Exterior fence/wall issues: No significant concern with existing requirements.

EXHIBIT A

- Public warning signage: Noted that wording or symbols would be deferred to building permit approval.
- Height and prohibition within building setbacks:
 - 1) Applicant reiterated proposal to allow electrified fencing within setbacks. Staff pointed out that the proposed list of “uses” where the fencing would be used included residential and other non-residential districts.
 - 2) Screening: Applicant objects to staff position to require compliance with Art. 7, Landscaping. (Editor’s note: Applicant revised application on January 24, 2013 and February 6, 2013, to require compliance with Art. 7, Landscaping in certain situations).
 - 3) Variance option: Mr. Barry acknowledged staff position that where non-conforming buffers existed, variance relief would be required.
- Hours of operation: Staff advised that subcommittee that some other jurisdictions had included regulations on hours of operation to require that electrified fencing be turned off during business hours. While an interesting point, all agreed that this should be left to the property owner to regulate.
- Closing comments on screening: Staff reiterated that proposed screening in buffering would not address all situations, and that additional provisions may be required to ensure that there were no loopholes.

Subcommittee consensus was that no further meetings were required. The subcommittee understands the applicant’s request, staff’s position, generally agree with staff, and understand that additional revisions/compromises may occur prior to LDRAB.

C. LDRAB MEETING

Originally scheduled for January 23, 2013, as noted above the applicant anticipated submitting a request to postpone to the February 27, 2013 meeting.

D. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.