



**INFILL/REDEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION ADVISORY BOARD (LDRAB)
MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 2, 2009 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

PREPARED BY ZONA CASE, ZONING TECHNICIAN

On Wednesday, September 2, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. the Infill/Redevelopment Subcommittee met in the Second Floor Conference Room (VC-2E-12), at 2300 North Jog Road, West Palm Beach, Florida.

A. CALL TO ORDER

1) Roll Call

Maryann Kwok, Chief Planner of Zoning called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m., and called the roll.

Members Present – 4

Wendy Tuma – Chair
Joni Brinkman – Vice Chair/LDRAB
Chris Roog – Gold Coast Builders Assoc.
Bradley Miller – Planner

Zoning Staff Present:

Maryann Kwok
William Cross
Wendy Hernandez

Other Staff:

Edward Nessenthaler – Planning
Houston Tate – OCR
Gerry Gawaldo – Palm Tran

Members Absent – 13

Joanne Davis – LDRAB/BCC Dist. 1
David Carpenter – LDRAB/BCC Dist. 2
Barbara Katz – LDRAB/BCC Dist. 3
Jim Knight – LDRAB/BCC Dist. 4
Jose' Jaramillo – LDRAB/AIA
Jeff Brophy – ASLA
Steven Dewhurst – LDRAB/AGCA
Wes Blackman – LDRAB/PBC Plan Cong.
Edward Wronsky – AIA
Katharine Murray – LUAB
Ken Tuma – Engineer
Rick Gonzalez – Architect
Nancy Lodise – Interested Citizen

Other:

Thuy Shutt – WCRA
Anthea Gianniotis – TCRPC

2) Amendments to September 2, 2009 Agenda

Wendy Tuma asked if anyone had any amendments to the September 2, 2009 Agenda. There were no Amendments.

3) Motion to Adopt September 2, 2009 Agenda

Wendy Tuma made the motion to adopt the September 2, 2009 Agenda, Joni Brinkman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously **(4-0)**.

4) Motion to Adopt the August 5, 2009 and August 19, 2009 Minutes (*EXHIBIT A*)

Maryann Kwok advised that the minutes of the prior meetings will be presented at the September 16, 2009 meeting.

B. IRO UPDATES (*EXHIBIT B*)

Maryann Kwok convened the meeting and expressed appreciation for the time and effort that the Subcommittee Members have contributed to this project. She said that Bill Cross and her were doing their best to make the language clearer and more user-friendly and requested that members review pages 1 through 5 again. She hoped that they would complete review of pages 6 through 20 at this meeting.

Maryann Kwok informed members that the date for the 2nd workshop with the BCC was changed from September 29th to September 22, 2009, at 2:00 pm. This is a follow-up to the March 24th workshop. The venue will be 301 N. Olive Avenue.

Maryann Kwok gave an update to the committee on the last meeting. She said there were four unanswered questions. One related to the context of the IRO and whether this is too large an area. But, she continued, this is an optional code and District 1 does not have a large commercial area. There is a high concentration of commercial corridors in Districts 2 and 3. She further stated that the question on parking can be solved by using the Westgate code with the allocation of 1.5 space per unit for residential. There are a lot of uses that go through the Administrative approval and DRO systems and the list could be expanded and small steps taken, highlighting certain uses and following the form based code.

Maryann Kwok went on to report that staff had already met with and discussed the IRO with some Commissioners, namely Santa Maria, Vana, Taylor, and Abrams. The reactions of those Commissioners with whom they had met were overall positive and encouraging. Meetings with Commissioners Marcus and Aaronson are going to be scheduled in the near future.

Christopher Roog inquired whether the Commissioners had expressed concerns about density. Maryann Kwok said that there has always been concern that we give away too much density and worry about the impact, but that the nature of the comments were general and not negative.

C. REVIEW OF IRO DRAFT

Bill Cross welcomed everyone to the meeting and began review of the IRO draft by advising that there were no major changes to the section on Purpose and Intent. He further advised that there was a minor change to the section on Applicability, which was done to make the language clearer.

He directed the committee's attention to Table 3.B.16.C, IRO FAR Increase, and noted that the FAR for an IRO project with a CH or CL FLU may now be increased up to 1.0. There were questions on the definition of "Non-Retail" in the note in the Table, and after a brief discussion by members, Bill Cross said that "Non-Retail" could be interpreted as offices, personal services, etc. but he would get an interpretation from Planning as this term is used in their Comprehensive Plan.

Responding to questions on "Green" in the Table, Bill Cross explained that this terminology ties in with Architectural amendments to the Code that are currently being processed in Round 1 Amendments and using the terminology will be an incentive to do "Green". Maryann Kwok was of the opinion that a reference to Article 5.C, Architectural Guidelines, should be made.

Referring to the section on Pre-Application Conference, Bill Cross stated that IRO and LCC projects will be mandated to have a pre-application conference at which applicants are informed about the types of plans and what information is required to be shown on them. Maryann Kwok said that when the Code is revised, Article 2, Plan Requirements, will clearly state what plans are required for LCC and IRO. The committee discussed at length, the new list of requirements for plans and the different types of plans and Bradley Miller questioned the purpose of the Final Master Plan. He said that under the present system two types of plans are being reviewed at different times and suggested that it would be a much simpler process whereby once the BCC approves the Master Plan then the site plan can be done. Bill Cross and Maryann Kwok agreed with Bradley Miller that this would be a good step in simplifying the process.

The Regulating Plan requirements were discussed and Joni Brinkman expressed confusion about the requirement of a Master Sign Plan. She asked under what circumstances this would be required. Bill Cross said that if a project is required under Article 8, Signage, to have a Master Sign Plan then the project cannot be exempt. The matter was discussed and Joni Brinkman suggested that the words "if applicable" be added to "Master Sign Plan".

Building placement, as a requirement in the pre-application conference, was discussed and Bill Cross said that it is important to know where a building will be located in relation to street, parking area in relation to the street, loading and service functions.

Bill Cross referred the committee to page 25 of the Exhibit that had a Table, "LCC Waivers" that was blank. He explained that the Zoning Director, Jon MacGillis held the view that there should be a Waiver process that would lessen the necessity for so many variances. He requested input from the members as to other development standards which could be addressed through a Waiver process.

Turning to General Standards – Transect Zones, Bill Cross directed attention to Table 3.B.16.E, IRO TZ Standards, and pointed out that the Table shows a minimum setback from abutting residential of 300' but this will be reduced to 200'. He also said that a provision had been made for exception if you are less than 1 acre surround by commercial uses. He expressed the opinion that this will encourage joint projects.

Bill advised that there were no major changes to the Street Classification section.

With regard to Building Placement Maryann Kwok referred to Table 3.B.16.E Building Placement. She said that building placement depends on the type of R-O-W. Wendy Tuma stated that setbacks are also in Table 3.B.16.G and questioned how one would know which of the two Tables would be applicable. She recommended that the minimum setback, Item D "Between rear parking and alley" be changed from 3ft to 4ft.

The committee discussed the Table and Anthea Gianniotis expressed the view that some clarification was needed as there was some confusion. Maryann Kwok said that consideration could be given to taking out the Chapter on Placement and extracting the necessary parts and placing them in the Transect Chapters. In responding, Bill Cross said he did not wish to lose the language on Building Placement. He went on to say that it is critical that that information be on the Preliminary Master Plan because that plan is presented to the BCC. Gerry Gawaldo speaking on behalf of Palm Tran said that a 5ft setback poses a problem as it would never be possible to have a bus stop if there is only a 5ft setback.

Street Classification

To discuss with Land Development. Bill Cross and Maryann Kwok to follow-up with land development re boundary plat?? (Not clear on this)

Wendy Tuma questioned the necessity for the stipulations in the section on "Secondary Entrance". Bill Cross said that it was not desirable to have a large main entrance facing a parking lot or other area and a small entrance at the front of the building. He was of the opinion that the main entrance should be at the street.

Anthea Gianniotis proposed a change in the section on Block Structures, namely to reduce from >5 to >4 the acreage criterion for new blocks. She said she wished to have "Perimeter intersections" explained and Bill Cross offered an explanation.

With reference to the Table - General Building Configuration PDRs, Wendy Tuma asked how many units are in the 32ft listed under "Individual Building Length". Bill replied that there are two units to the 32ft length. Anthea Gianniotis inquired about the 30ft requirement for a Courtyard building and expressed the view that there should be more flexibility as long as it meets minimum requirements. Bill Cross responded by saying that 30ft qualifies the building as a "Courtyard Building" and anything less would be just a building that has a courtyard.

In discussing Building Height and Use, Wendy Tuma said she was not clear about building height requirements. Bill explained that the heights listed refer to the first floor only and there are no height restrictions above the first floor. Wendy Tuma suggested that it be spelled out in the Code.

With regard to the Table - "Townhouse Building Height and Use" Bill Cross explained that civic buildings are not allowed in the core but civic uses are. Wendy Tuma suggested that "Core" be taken out of this Table.

Bradley Miller referred to the IRO Permitted Use Schedule and suggested that IRO uses be added to the existing Use Matrix so that there is one set of tables. Bill Cross and Maryann Kwok promised to look at the possibility of doing it.

Bill Cross advised that the IRO will be reviewed at LDRAB in October and that the revised draft of the URA will be sent on November 4 to members of the committee for review. Members inquired about the next meeting and expressed the desire to have presentations in paper form and not PowerPoint presentations. Bill Cross and Maryann concurred and said they would convey this to the Planning Staff and advise them that all tables and naming conventions should be consistent.

D. URA UPDATES

Bill updated the members on the following meeting dates:

- LDRAB – November 18, 2009 (backup for IRO and WFH)
- 2nd Subcommittee meeting – November 4, 2009 (to be scheduled)
- LDRAB – December 9, 2009 – (URA) - This will also convene as LDRC.

E. ULDC AMENDMENT ROUND 2009-02 SCHEDULE

- LDRAB – November 18, 2009 (backup for IRO and WFH)
- 2nd Subcommittee meeting – November 4, 2009 (to be scheduled)
- LDRAB – December 9, 2009 – (URA) - This will also convene as LDRC.

F. NEXT MEETING TOPICS

The Members agreed to start the review at the section on Streetscape, Landscape and Usable Open Space Standard at the next Infill Redevelopment Overlay meeting.

- Next IR Subcommittee meeting – October 7, 2009
- 2nd IR Subcommittee Special meeting – Sept 16, 2009 (scheduled)
- First LDRAB – October 21, 2009 (scheduled)

G. ADJOURNMENT

The Infill/Redevelopment Subcommittee meeting adjourned at 4:15pm.

U:\Zoning\CODEREV\2009\LDRAB\Sub-committees\Infill\9-2-09\Minutes\9-2-09 IRO Minutes - Draft1.doc