



DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DRAC)

January 24th, 2020 @ 2 – 4 PM

**PZ&B – VISTA CENTER, 2300 NORTH JOG RD.,
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33411
2ND FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM (VC-2E-12)**

ADD & DELETE AGENDA

3) Staff Items:

Revised 3) b. and 3) e.

b. Final Version of Sufficiency Checklist – **Monica** (~~Attachments 3A and 3B~~) to be discussed under 3)e.ii

e. ERM/Zoning Coordination 2020 - **Maryann**

i. Minutes of ERM/Zoning Coordination meeting (Attachment 4);

ii. Revised Sufficiency Checklist - update requested by ERM (Attachment 5 to be handout at the meeting)

4) General:

Added 4) b. and relocated ADJOURN to 4) c.

a. Topics for next meeting – **Gladys**

b. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

c. ADJOURN



DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DRAC)

January 24th, 2020 @ 2 – 4 PM

**PZ&B – VISTA CENTER, 2300 NORTH JOG RD.,
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33411
2ND FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM (VC-2E-12)**

AGENDA

1) Review Minutes – Gladys

- November 1, 2019 Minutes (*Attachment 1*)

2) Member Items:

- a. Discuss the Community Residential Housing code, it is my understanding they have or are hiring a consultant?
- b. What is the process that Zoning utilizes to review Building Permits? Is there a timeline? How do the permits get routed?
- c. Monument Signs – does the Regulating Plan need to match exactly the SF included on the permit? For instance if the regulating plan shows the SF of the sign face at 24 SF and building permit comes in at 23.54 SF, should that trigger a ZAR?
- d. Staff still not citing ULDC sections when issuing comments.
- e. Agencies still not finalizing comments before due date.
- f. Calculation of Time Extension Fees - \$88 for a TE letter. Agent recently asked for a TE for 6 months because they had a couple FDOT issues come up that we needed a couple months to work out. When they received the TE letter they were charged 6 times \$88 fee.
- g. Waiting on agency sign off for final certification even if they had no issues during the process.
- h. Discuss Tree Disposition plans and Vegetation Review Process. – Agents are submitting tree disposition tables and plans with Rezoning/DOA/Cond Use applications, and getting some review comments, usually from ERM, then when they submit the same documents for final approvals, we get a whole new list of issues from both ERM and Landscape as if the plans were not ever reviewed before. Please provide update on current coordination between Landscape and ERM during the entitlement processes, and for the vegetation barricade permit process.

3) Staff Items:

- a. DRAC 2020 Task List – **Jon** (*Attachment 2*)
- b. Final Version of Sufficiency Checklist – **Monica** (*Attachments 3A and 3B*)
- c. ULDC Round 2020 Overview – **Wendy**
- d. ULDC Art. 2.C, Administrative Processes Amendment Status – **Monica**
- e. ERM/Zoning Coordination 2020 – **Maryann** (*Attachment 4*)
- f. CD/AR Intake/Resubmittal Appointment Procedures and Timeliness – **Bill**

4) General:

- a. Topics for next meeting – **Gladys**
- b. ADJOURN



DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DRAC)
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2019 2:00 PM-4:00 PM
PZ&B – VISTA CENTER
2300 NORTH JOG RD., WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33411
HEARING ROOM CHAMBER (VC-1E-60)

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER: At 2:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present: Gladys DiGirolamo, Lauren McClellan, Pat Lentini, Bill Whiteford, Scott Mosolf, Kevin McGinley.

Interested Parties: Evelyn Pacheco, Yoan Machado.

County Staff: Zoning Division: Jon MacGillis, William Cross, Monica Cantor, Wendy Hernandez, Adam Mendenhall, Ryan Vandenburg, Donna Adelsperger, Jerome Ottey.

AGENDA

MEMBER ITEMS

1. Review Minutes

August 16, 2019 Minutes (Attachment 1) - Motion to approve minutes without any modification was motioned by Lauren McClellan and seconded by Bill Whiteford.

2. DRO Issues

a. Must be based upon ULDC requirements and must provide specific ULDC citations in description.

Gladys DiGirolamo opened the discussion by stating that some staff are putting in DRO Certification comments into ePZB issues without citing the ULDC article of the Code.. Bill Cross agreed with Gladys's comment and advised DRAC Members that Staff should be referencing the Code whenever a certification issue is made. He added that staff should reference the title also as this will help agents find the location of the reference in the Code. Monica Cantor acknowledged this ongoing issue needs to be addressed with all Planners for consistency. She also stated there is a monthly Interpretation Meeting with the Zoning Director to get clarification on any "interpretation" of Code provisions and applicability. Also, Administrative Review and Community Development staff meet each week with the Zoning Director and Deputy Director to address certification and comments on projects to ensure consistency.

Gladys DiGirolamo noted that even when there is already an interpretation of the Code, some staff keep asking for the same requirement to be shown on the site plan even when it is not applicable. For example, Pedestrian Circulation to be provided for a Recreation Pod event when it is determined this requirement is for Commercial Pod of a PUD or commercial parcels.

Bill Whiteford recommended that staff need to be clearer when specifying if it is a simply a Code requirement versus a suggested change staff would like to see made. This way the applicant and staff can have a dialogue on those changes staff would like to to accommodated or addressed in the design.

b. If Staff has preferences regarding justification, site plan, etc. then those can be comments.

Bill Cross stated Agents have to comply with certain standards in the Code based on the type of application. In certain cases, the justification can be very specific or broad depending on the Agent write up. Staff will, however, make recommendations on how a standard should be addressed in the Justification Statement. Staff stated that this topic of Justification Statement has been addressed with DRAC in the past. Staff came up with a DRAFT example for Agents to use. There is no single solution for all applications. Applicants need to use good judgment and work with the Project Manager (PM), if there are any issues with how it is submitted. If it is a well written justification, Bill said the PM will also cite some of the text in their Staff Report write up.

Yoan Machado said that staff issues made on the previous round of comments are still showing up with the old issues date. He added that staff is not resolving and

closing out the original issue when Agents re-submit but are adding new text to the old issue. Adam Mendenhall advised that staff actually modify the original issue to add clarity to applications when the Agent's resubmittal does not adequately address the original issue. Pat Lentini recommended that staff make additional certification issues based on the Agent's response with a date, noting what has been resolved and what still needs to be addressed. To make the process simpler and avoid confusion. Bill Whiteford suggested that staff directly contact the Agent by phone to have a more in depth discussion about the issue. He recommends more one and one contact between staff and agent. Kevin McGinley agreed but went further to say that Agents should also take responsibility and contact staff if there is need for clarification of staff issues and comments.

Lauren McClellan brought up the issue of other Agencies are not finalizing their comments before the final day for comments. Jon MacGillis directed that Agents should contact the Directors of those agencies and question the status of their applications. He did also state that reviewers from other Agencies may be out of office or overwhelmed with the number of applications they have to review.

3. Sufficiency Review

- a. 30 days? 15 days? 10 days?
- b. New checklists

Monica Cantor requested the Chair to discuss this topic under Staff Items below so this item was re-ordered.

4. ZAR Process

a. A majority of applications are being deemed insufficient at time of initial submittal.

Gladys asked the DRAC Members if this was still an issue with anyone present at meeting and most members said no. Kevin said staff are good with contacting him by phone or email and explaining what needs to be addressed. Donna noted that the naming of plans is the biggest issue with insufficiency for Zoning Agency Review (ZAR) applications, as the naming for ZAR plans are different from the naming for Full DRO and Public Hearing plans. She also noted other requirements such as the submission of a clouded and non-clouded plan, as being the most challenging for Agents. Bill Whiteford proposed that if staff identifies certification issues in the initial sufficiency review, they should make it known to the Agents as soon as possible. Some PMs are better than others to contact Agents, but that might have to do with workloads and missed calls.

b. Minor site plan amendments required due to building permit comments.

Gladys Digirolamo stated that recently the ZAR applications have been taking a longer time to get approved. She provided an example of one of her projects where Building staff was requiring her to amend the Site Plan to reflect an inconsistency on the street name, which was spelt incorrectly. She recommended a simpler process be established in which the review time would be completed in a much shorter time with a reduced fee as the fee for the ZAR process are too much for such a minor amendment(s). Monica Cantor stated that PPM ZO-O-29 has been recently amendment with input from DRO Task Team Members to add new items to the list of amendments that do not or do have to be shown on the approved Plans. The revised PPM was send by email to all DRAC Members in late October before it was signed by the Zoning Director. The revised PPM is in effect and can be found on the Zoning Web Page with other Zoning PPMs.

c. Only reviewing affected area

Gladys pointed out that Agency staff continue to make certification issues outside the "affected area" that is made by red clouds on ZAR plans. Donna advised DRAC Members that DRO staff has to review the Site Plan as a whole as in certain occasions, Agents have made changes beyond the affected area, thereby altering the affected area they designated on the plan. Jon MacGillis stated that this has been discussed at many prior DRAC meetings, with explanations given of the affected area versus the impacted area. The Applicant establishes the affected area and staff confirms it to be accurate based on application request(s), if it is not, the PM should be in contact with the Applicant to notify them if the affected area must be expanded to include other impacted areas of the plan. Monica Cantor stated all applications are different and each application is reviewed on a case by case basis. She gave an example of an application requesting to amend parking which triggered further changes to foundation planting.

d. Distribution list for review – how are ZAR applications assigned to DRO agencies

Monica Cantor explained that applications are distributed to other agencies based specifically on the amendment identified in the applications. She gave examples of what staff looks at in order to make the judgment call on what agencies see what amendments, for example:

Traffic - increase in square footage, changes to parking, changes to vehicular circulation etc.

Health - applications involving Daycares

Land Development - changes to drainage easements or access points

Parks and Rec - changes to the Rec Pod

As it relates to applications sent to Land Development, Adam and Donna stated that they usually consult with Land Development staff prior to adding them to the review list to confirm if they would need to review the modification(s) or not. Adam further stated that he takes this step to confirm with Agency staff their need to review the application since some agencies have fees that would have to be added to the application prior to deeming it sufficient.

5. Landscape Comments

a. Requiring ZAR applications, including Tree Disposition Plans.

Lauren McClellan stated that she had a specific application where the Landscape Inspector observed there were more trees on site than shown on the approved Tree Disposition Plan. She said the process now requires her to amend the Tree Disposition Plan, through ZAR, to match what is currently on site. She asked if there was any alternative method that could be implemented (ie simple correction by staff on plan) to avoid the ZAR process. Bill Whiteford proposed that staff themselves put a note on the approved plan with the Tree Disposition Chart. This would direct staff to the changes included on the Landscape Plan to see the changes and the status of trees in the field. Staff did not provide any alternative to the ZAR process at this time, but can look into the process.

b. Comments being raised late in review process.

Lauren McClellan wants staff to address a specific application where landscape certification issues are added very late in the review process. Jon MacGillis said ERM and Zoning have been diligently working on coordinating vegetation comments as early in the process as possible. The review process is constantly being refined to ensure no surprises for the Applicant or staff with regards to impacts of preservation on the site design. DRAC Members said they are not really experiencing this issue and perhaps Lauren's identified issues is application specific.

c. Zoning vs. ERM trees and impacts on tree disposition plans.

As stated above under b, Jon MacGillis followed up that there is ongoing internal coordination meetings related to vegetation analysis, and also meetings with applicants. Preservation recommendations and conditions are ongoing between ERM and Zoning. Jon MacGillis stated that the goal is to eliminate any confusion related to whose trees they are in terms of ERM or Zoning. The goal is to get comments to PM to put in ePZB before certification.

6. Staff Training – seeing an inconsistency in reviews and issues

Gladys DiGirolamo was not sure which DRAC Member added this topic. DRAC members asked if new staff get comprehensive and consistent training before being assigned applications. Bill Cross stated that Zoning Division have a very comprehensive training program for all staff. Training for all new staff must be successfully completed prior to their one year probation period ending. DRAC Members said they were glad to hear staff and trained since they did not know this was being done. They said it is important all Planners have consistent training so Planners in all Sections when reviewing plans and drafting comments they are doing it consistently. . Sometimes one Planner will require modifications that another will not. Jon MacGillis said Bill Cross and Monica Cantor will continue to monitor the Planners' comments, conditions in ePZB for accuracy and ensure there is consistency with Division policies and procedures.

7. PAC

a. Timing of submittal of applications; based on date of intake or sufficiency

Gladys DiGirolamo said this was added late to the Agenda. She wanted clarification from a prior document released by the Zoning staff after the Industry Meeting this summer that said the timing of submittal of Concurrent Type 2 and Type 3 applications was changing. The submittal of the Building and Land Development applications was noted on the document to be only after the Zoning

staff was found the Zoning application sufficient and no longer based on intake date. The current process requires the submittal Building and Land Development applications to be submitted within 10 days of submitting the Zoning Applications. Jon MacGillis said he had an internal meeting with Zoning and Land Development to discuss the process. A suggestion was made by Zoning staff to change the intake of Building and LD application after Zoning finds their applications sufficient, this would reduce the number of changes currently required to address plat modifications. After much discussion, it was agreed there will be **No need to change** the current practice, since it is working.

STAFF ITEMS

1. DRAC 2019 Task List – Jon (Attachment 2)

Jon MacGillis referred to the 2019 DRAC Task List and stated all open tasks have been addressed. DRAC Members agreed and thanked staff for their follow up on the prior open tasks.

2. Follow up on items discussed on 8/16 related to HB 7103 – Jon/Monica/Bill (Handout)

Monica Cantor clarified that starting on January 1, 2020, staff will be determining sufficiency within 21 calendar days after submittal which corresponds to 15 working days. She noted that the Zoning calendar is already reflecting such dates. This modification allows DRO applications to submit at least 4 times or 3 for PH applications.

Gladys DiGirolamo mentioned the need to address the request from Survey to submit and updated boundary survey when the Master Plan was submitted. She noted that this is not needed when the Master Plan does not include changes to the boundary or the development acreage. Monica Cantor noted that staff is having internal discussions about that issue to coordinate with Survey staff. Gladys DiGirolamo requested to include in that discussion for Public Hearing applications with limited request such as the modification of a Condition of Approval.

Monica Cantor indicated that warning letters for applications approaching the 120 calendar days are now delivered for agents to start keeping better track of their review time.

3. Final Version of Sufficiency Checklist - Monica (Attachments 3A and 3B)

Monica Cantor clarified that the Sufficiency Checklists are available on the Zoning Web Page. She reminded members that the Checklists are effective on November 1, 2019, therefore other agencies involved in the sufficiency determination will be making their decision which will be added to the sufficiency determination letter. It was noted that starting next year, staff will be making the sufficiency determination part of the DRO meeting's agenda. Jon MacGillis reminded members that the DRO meetings are Webcasted live and you can find the link on the Zoning Division Main webpage. She also noted that the DRO meeting was changed in 2020 to be the 2nd Tuesday of the month instead of the 1st one for better timing between the different applications.

4. ULDC Amendment Update – Wendy

- a. Status of ULDC Supplement 26
- b. 2019-02 Round Adoption January 30, 2020

Wendy Hernandez provided an update on Supplement 26, 2019-01 Round adopted in August. She said staff is currently proofing the final Articles for publishing and printing in late November.

She also provided an update on 2019-02 by stating the final LDRAB Meeting for this Round is November 13, 2019 at 2 p.m. The LDRAB packet is online for anyone to view. She said the Phase 2 of Parking amendments will be on this LDRAB agenda and staff did convene an Industry Meeting to discuss the final DRAFT but only 2 persons attended.

Landscape Service will be scheduled for adoption on November 24, 2019. The BCC gave staff direction at the 1st Reading to make some minor amendments to the ordinance. Also, they directed staff to prepare a Memo of options on how to deal with the Landscape Service use in AGR Preserves and Code Enforcement Fines that are accruing on these properties. This topic will be discussed at the BCC Zoning Hearing on December 19, 2019.

GENERAL

1. TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING

Monica Cantor presented the 2020 meetings calendar and 4 meetings were established on January 24, May 15, August 7 and November 6. No new items were added to discuss at the next meeting.

2. ADJOURN

The DRAC meeting adjourn at 3:47 p.m.

DRAFT

Complete

Pending

Task	Details	Lead	Status	Date Initiated	Initiated by	Date Completed
Calendar- Variance Deadlines	Resubmitted Dates and Comment Deadlines and applications do not give enough time to address issues	Wendy-CDR	Finalizing	5/11/2012	Colleen Walter	11-14-14 CLOSED Discussed with DRAC-2015 Calendar out and Wendy said implemented changes. 10-21-14 Dates reflected on 2015 Calendar. Discussed at August DRAC Meeting. 8-12-14 Wendy to discuss with DRAB on 8-15-14 some suggested changes to Type II Standalone Variances. 5-5-14 No changes - staff has not had time to discuss internally. 1/31/2014- to discuss again at DRAC meeting. Staff have issue with variance deadlines. Dec 20 meeting. Staff finalize if any changes possible to calendar for 2013 Effective 1/1/2013
Information on a Master Plan	Inconsistent requirements for information on a Master Plan. Some information may not be necessary. Involves Survey, DL, Planning and Zoning	Wendy/MMK	Closed	5/11/2012	Gladys DiGirolamo	11-14-14 CLOSED Discussed with DRAC and agreed changes to Tech Manual will address this matter. 10-31-14 Title 2 of Tech Manual has been modified to remove information we no longer require on the Master Plan. Hopefully, this will address this task. Updated Tech Manual tentatively scheduled for publishing Dec 2014. -12-14 Wendy and Maryann reviewed all the requests from Agents with regards to amount of detail being shown on Master Plan. Met with Joanne Keller and are recommending changes to Tech Manual to clarify what needs to be on Master Plan. Will review at the 8-15-14 DRAC Meeting 5-8-14 This is on hold until CD Staff is able to hire additional staff to complete task. 1-29-14: Maryann/CD Staff to convene one additional meeting on Tech Manual, Title 2 changes. 8-13-13: task still pending; drafted modifications to the Technical Manual; 06-07-13 Wendy said she met in last month with several DRAC members to address their concerns with too much information on Master Plan. Working on draft to reflect changes agreed to and once done will send out to Committee for review. Then the Technical Manual will be update. 8-13-13 Subcommittee need to discuss Tech Manual changes. Staff to finalize the proposed changes prior to next DRAC meeting. 10-22-13: Wendy: Information on Master Plan-Maryann and Wendy convened a Task Team which some of the DRAC members participated on. Staff would like another meeting to follow up on the suggested changes. The changes involve coordination between Zoning and Land Development on what needs to be on the plans.
Architecture Review	Report on direction of the BCC at the May 22 Hearing. Will elevations be required for all application at time of public Hearing	Wendy	Closed	5/9/2014	Scott Mosolf	11-14-14 CLOSED-Monica gave overview of proposed 2014-02 ULDC code amendment going for adoption Jan 2015. 10-31-14 Arch Subcommittee convened and made recommendations for Code Amendment. ZC will review draft code language at Nov ZC Hearing. DRAC to review amendments at Nov 14 Meeting. LDRAB to review changes at Nov 12 Meeting. 8-12-14 BCC directed staff to convene a LDRAB Subcommittee to review the Arch Guidelines for submittal requirements. The first meeting of Subcommittee is September 10, 2014 from 1:30 to 3:00 at Vista Center
Regulating Plan and Tech Manual Updates	Maryann to finish her ongoing meetings with industry and staff are update Title 2	Maryann	Closed	5/9/2014	Bradley Miller	11-14-14 CLOSED-Reviewed changes to Tech Manual and agreed this task has been addressed. Reviewed Tech Manual to be published Dec 2014. 10-31-14 Staff made significant changes to Title 2 to address this topic. Staff will review the changes at the Nov 14 DRAC Meeting for final input 8-12-14 At the DRAC Meeting on 8-15-14 Wendy will address the proposed changes staff are working on.

		Complete		Pending			
Task	Details	Lead	Status	Date Initiated	Initiated by	Date Completed	
Subdivision Plan	Subdivision Plan submittal with Master Plan as part of the Off the BCC Plan process	Jon	Closed	5/9/2014	Gladys DiGirolamo	11-14-14 CLOSED-Testing this new process and agreed to implement January 2014. 10-31-14 Wendy and Joanne to give update on TEST application they have been processing. 8-12-14 Jon met with Gladys to discuss her inquiry in more detail. We agreed that we could test a project with Zoning and Land Development to see if this could work. If we have no issues we can report back on possible implementation date.	
ePZB Project History Screen	8-15-14 DRAC requested access to ePZB Project History Screen	Jon	Closed	2/15/2015	DRAC	06-20-15 CLOSED-Implement and released to Public 05-28-15 Implemented in Winter 2015 to public. Still working on other enhancements but that will be finalized till late 2015. 11-14-14 ISS gave DRAC a demo on new screen. DRAC did not suggest any changes. Screen needs to be signed off by PZB Management in Nov 2014 then ISS will finalize the screens. Expected Jan 2014 release to public. 10-31-14 ISS will give a demo on new screen they created under eZINFO for the public to view historical information for current and historical applications. DRAC will be provided opportunity to see screens and give input before moved to production. 8-21-14 ISS yes it can be done but would require programming and a priority. We can discuss at a future Zoning ePZB Meeting. 8-15-14 Can public access ePZB Project History on applications?	
Subdivision Plan submitted with final Subdivision Plan for non-residential	11-14-14 Request to process Plat and Final Subdivision Plan concurrent.	Joanne K and Jon MacGillis	Closed	Processing	Jeff B	11-12-2015- CLOSED- This allows an Applicant to submit the subdivision plans at same time as off the board Master Plan, but follows the regular DRO time schedule. 8-13-15 Project was on DRO 8-12-15. Subdivision and plat was approved at meeting. Amending PPM 41 to reflect changes to the type 3 concurrent review process. 5-29-15 DRAC Meeting-discussed that GL Homes has application in process to truth the residential subdivision plan to the plat. Hopefully, this process will work and if no issues we can establish a date to implement fully in Summer 2015. 04-15-15 Agents and Staff have 3 projects we are processing to do final testing of new process for residential projects. Also, Maryann send modified Policy and Procedural Memo to DRAC in early 2015 for comments so updates can be finalized. 11-14-14 Jeff B raised issue of changing existing process by allowing applicant to submit for Plat and Final Subdivision at same time. Save time and reduce the amount of DRO Agency Amendments. Jon agreed in 2015 to setup meeting with Land Development and Zoning and DRAC Members to discuss merits of request.	

Development Review Advisory Committee (DRAC)
2019/2020 Tasks

Complete

Pending

Task	Details	Lead	Status	Date Initiated	Initiated by	Date Completed
Relocation of Bldg sq. ft. and Increase in Bldg sq. ft.	4-15-15 Special DRAC Meeting	Alan, Bill, Wendy, MMK, Jon	Closed	1/28/2016	DRAC	02-01-16 2015-02 BCC adopted amendment to increase building by 50% provided complies with all other DRO thresholds. 11-12-2015- Pending code amendment review. 8-11-15 2015-02 Round-incorporating changes to ULDC Article 2 to address relocation of sq/ft and increase in square foot for single building. Staff will bring DRAFT to August 21, 2015 DRAC Meeting 5-29-15 DRAC Meeting-request for update on next step. Lauren said staff will process ULDC code amendment for the 2015-02 ULDC Round of Amendments. She went over the adoption Hearings of January 2016. 4-14-15 Special DRAC meeting. Possibly in the 2015 Round-2 Amendments. Collene suggested that this should not apply to a single owner/single entity (not single user) such as a school which could may be comprised of a multiple of uses affiliated with the school, and since it's under one campus, she thought that it is a reasonable request to amend the above language. She suggested items under Art. 2.D.1.G.1.a criteria should be revised to not apply to these sites as well changes to 2.D.1.G.1.b to allow additional square footage above the 5%/5,000 square feet. We did use other examples of CLF, places of worship where these facilities could be run under an organization . Additionally, Collene suggested the concept of a bubble plan for these plans and commercial plans similar to a Master Plan for a PUD.
Review DRO Administartive Review what goes to Zoning vs. Agencies	5/29/2015	Alan/Jon	Closed	5/29/2015	Gladys DiGirolamo	11-12-2015 There are pending Code amendments related to recreation club house changes that can be processed through ZAR/ZZR review. 7-17-15 Special DRAC Meeting today. Alan gave presentation on the DRO Agency Review Process and identified reasons for delay in processing applications. Staff responded to questions about the review, fees, resubmittals, etc. Minutes will be posted on the Zoning Web Page under Press Release by end of July 2015. 5-29-15 Gladys requested meeting with DRAC members who want to attend, Alan and Wendy to discuss process to understand what has to go to full Zoning vs. Agency and or full DRO.
Planning Condition on Workforce Housing	8/21/2015	Bryan Davis	Closed	8/21/2015	Colleen Walter	02-05-15 at DRAC Meeting today we discussed that Planning will get the Plat Book and Page Number on the WFH recordation and simply go into ePZB and close out the ePZB Condition and put the Book/Page in reason for closing condition. Since no one from Planning was at DRAC Jon sent email to Bryan as this being his direction 02-01-16 Need further clarification on issue from Collene in order to ensure we address this issue. 11-12-2015 Staff is reviewing request and coordinating with ISS.
Design Guidelines	8/21/2015	Jon MacGillis	Closed	8/21/2015	Jon MacGillis	CLOSED: July adoption of round 2016-01 remove Design Guidelines from ULDC. 7-11-16: 2016-01 Removing Deign Standards and in 2016-02 Removing requirement for Regulation Plan, unless submitted as a BCC Condition. 05-06-16: Review final drafts ULDC & Tech Manual updates. 02-01-16 Design Guideline Task Team met once in 2015. Made some progress identifying what is in Code in terms of Regulating Plan vs Guidelines. Meeting 2 is scheduled for 2-3-16 to review other jurisdiction examples as well as a DRAFT Chapter for Design Guidelines in the Tech Manual. 11-12-2015 Staff is gathering information from the municpalitis for Jon to analyze, a second meeting has not been set up to date. 9-15-2015- Design Guidelines task team 1st meeting.

		Complete		Pending			
Task	Details	Lead	Status	Date Initiated	Initiated by	Date Completed	
DRO Concurrent Review Process Type II and Type III PPM ZO-O-041	Report on revisions to current PPM ZO-O-041 to clarify procedures for Concurrent Review application with and without PAC	Maryann/Wendy	Closed	5/29/2015	Gladys DiGirolamo	CLOSED 08-31-16 Provided Training 101 for the changes to the DRO Concurrent Review process. 7-11-16: Done-we need to go over the DRO Concurrent Review and PAC updates. 05-06-16: Review PPM with DRAC to get input; include Building, LD Staff in discussion. 02-02-16- (WH) 4 projects went through process; 1 concurrent went through smoothly; 3 stayed in the system longer than 6mths. There is a 5th project recently accepted in our system and we are testing it. 11-12-2015- Still under review. Projects staff have had in are all running differently and not concurrently. 7-12-15 Staff and DRAC Members have had several meetings to further refine process. Maryann and Wendy are updating the current PPM on this process and will provide a update at the DRAC August 21 Meeting.	
Administrative Review (ZAR/ZZR) DRO Online Submittal	9/13/2016	Alan/Jon	Closed	5/29/2015	Colleen Walter	2-8-17-New Online system implented and applicant using it. 9-13-16 Online application submittal process was available for applicant's use. Few minor changes but overall a good rollout. 7-11-16: Alan will give update on Task related on Online Submittal timeline (hopefully release in August) 05-06-16: ISS still reviews new ePZB screens. Zoning to update DRAC on timeline for release. 02-01-16 ISS still in final programming stage of the online submittal modules. Have had numerous meetings with staff to ensure key features are added to address both staff and industry requests. Expect to release for industry testing in April 2016. 11-12-2015- Currently in the programming stages with the ISS Division. Not finalized to date 8-12-15-ISS Staff to attend August 21 DRAC Meeting to provide members a demo on the new DRO Agency Review screens they are working on for Zoning. 5-29-15 Request by DRAC Members for a Demo on the new Online DRO Administrative Process. Alan to take lead on setting up demo.	
Regulation Plan - Remove requirement from ULDC- made it optional	Regulating Plan	Jon/ Bill	Closed	5/29/2016	Gladys DiGirolamo	2-27-17 Closed - Ord 2017-002 removes the requirement for Regulation Plan and makes it optional. 2016-02 Removing requirement for Regulation Plan, unless required as a BCC Condition.	
Consent Forms	Authorization for each application	Jon/ Wendy	Closed	9/23/2016	Colleen Walter	3-7-17-County Attorney's office stated the forms have to be updated with each application we cannot use blank authorization. 9-23-16 Colleen asks if Consent Forms can be submitted as a blanket consent. PM says that it is only valid for the specific project or 1 year from signing. Staff will discuss.	
Certification comments-request code section in comment	Cited specific code section in each certification issue so clear for applicant on requirement	Wendy	Open	6/9/2017	Damian Brink	10/1/17 Staff PM's have been reminded to do this when preparing comments. Supervisors will monitor successful implementation. 9/1/17: Project Manages have been instructed to provide code sections in their comments. Monitor this to confirm compliance. We ask Agents to also site sections of code in their response when appropriate.	
Application Justification Statement	Provide example of what an acceptable Justification Statement would be.	Wendy	Open	6/9/2017	Kevin McGinley	10/1/17 - Provide DRAC members with handout what a good "Justification Statement" should include. Also, went over it at Oct. DRAC meeting. 9/1/17-Memo from Wendy included on DRAC Sept 15 Agenda with key points to include in a complete Justification Statement. 6/9/17-Request if staff can provide bullets on what are key components of an acceptable "Justification".	
Survey Comments	Survey adding a lot of comments to ePZB recently can they attend next DRAC Meeting?	Glenn Mark	Open	6/9/2017	Yeksy Schomberg	10/1/17: Discussed at Oct. LDRAB with Glenn Mark surveying. Addressed DRAC member question. Jan 2018 Zoning will require electronic signature for surveys. 9/1/17- Survey invited and confirmed attendance at Sept 15 DRAC Meeting. 6/9/17-Request Survey staff attend Sept DRAC Meeting to discuss number of DRO comments on applications and level of specificity	

Development Review Advisory Committee (DRAC)
2019/2020 Tasks

Complete Pending

Task	Details	Lead	Status	Date Initiated	Initiated by	Date Completed
Abandonment	Process involved when the resolution is abandoned through the BCC, even though the "Use" has been abandoned.	Jon/Wendy	Closed	1/26/2017	Kevin McGinley	5/3/19: Zoning staff addressed in 2018 with new whereas clause in the Resolution on carry prior Site Plan forward to DRO. 1/26/17: When the resolution is abandoned through the BCC, even though the use has been abandoned; Wendy conveyed the Site Plan is abandoned with the resolution. Through discussion, it was determined there needs to be more research conducted and reviewed with Zoning Staff and code on how to make this process simpler. Bill said he heard Kevin's concerns and internally staff will be working to address it. At the next DRAC Meeting staff will have an update
eZINFO Enhancment Screens for Staff, DRO Agents and DRO Agency Staff.	2019 enchancements done to: Online submittal screens, log in to eZINFO, created dashboard for Agents to see all apps in system, ehanced comment/condition screen and status of certification	Jon/Agents	Done	5/2/2019	Jon MacGillis	6/5/19 - Enhancements completed by Sanjeev and Lois. Training done by Donna on this day. Additional issues identified at the training session included: print comments letter, reference # in ZAR apps, show PM on comment screen and showing application by company. 5/3/19-Email from Jon to key DRAC Members who volunteered to do testing of enhanced screens they have until May 15 to provide input. 5/2/19 Training session 101 with Staff and Interested Parties to unveil enhancements to screens. Some of enhancements requested by DRAC Members others identified by Zoning staff to address ongoing input by Interested Parties.
Bonafide Ag Application	- Right to Farm Bonafide Ag-if classification is granted but the Zoning review process requires a DRO or Cond Use-does that exempt you from review process. - Apply for a building permit but do not have the Ag Exemption from Tax Collector Office how do you proceed.	Jon/Kevin	Open	5/3/2019	Kevin McGinley	8/12/19: Phone conversation between Kevin and Monica to indicate that staff did not receive the list of questions pertaining to this topic. Followed up with an e-mail on the same date. He is OK removing the item from this agenda. He is getting more familiar with the Agricultural exemptions and requirements which may end up having questions for the County attorney to respond if necessary. 5/3/19: Follow-up from Jon to Kevin email sent suggesting a separate meeting to address this issue. Jon requested from Kevin bullet points on his need for direction and follow-up with Kevin accordingly.
Type II - Stand Alone Variance	Timeline is now 5 months	Bill Cross	Closed	5/3/2019	Collene Walter	10/22/19 New calendar for 2020 should address no additional time to the overall review process. 5/3/19 Gladys and Lauren presented the comment from Collen to Zoning Staff during DRAC meeting.
PCN on Site Plan	Is it still needed on the S	Monica/Adam	Closed	5/3/2019	Gladys DiGirolamo	10/22/19: staff determined PCNs are necessary on site plans when doing researchs. Staff still will be required to have PCNs on Site Plans. 5/3/19: Is the PCN still needed on the Site Plan when there are still a lot of changes and issues.

**PBC ZONING DIVISION
PUBLIC HEARING AND FULL DRO⁽⁴⁾ APPLICATIONS
SUFFICIENCY CHECKLIST**

[Updated 10/21/19] **EFFECTIVE 11/1/2019**

All required application forms, plans and related documents submitted to the Zoning Division, are reviewed by the Project Manager (PM) for sufficiency. The assigned PM shall utilize the Reasons for Insufficiency (listed below) to determine whether or not an application is sufficient.

1. An Insufficient application shall not be accepted and an Insufficiency Letter will be sent to the Applicant/Agent by Staff identifying the required corrections.
2. The Resubmittal dates are shown on the Annual Zoning Calendar.
3. The first two Resubmittals are free. Additional fees will be charged on the third and subsequent resubmittal. Time extension for insufficient applications are applicable as contained in Art. 2.B.2.B.4 and Art. 2.C.2.B.4.
4. DRO Administrative Modifications that are not submitted on-line are subject to the following, where applicable.

REASONS FOR INSUFFICIENCY				
ZONING (Z)				
Sufficient?		Item #	Description	Clarification/Comment
No	Yes			
A. Any one of the following items shall result in an application being deemed insufficient; AND/OR listed in B.				
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Failure to meet with Staff for a Pre-Application Conference (PAC) or Pre-Application Appointment (PAA) before submitting an application that required a PAC or PAA [Article 2.J] .	Unless addressed in a separate meeting and agreed upon by both parties that this meeting would suffice; or, due to scheduling conflicts that Zoning Director confirms a meeting cannot be arranged in time for the applicants submittal schedule.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Missing, incomplete or inconsistent information on the documents: Forms, Plans, Justification Statement and/or supporting documents.	Missing required forms consistent with the application request(s) [Application checklist and naming guide]
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Forms and Plans are not legible.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Missing request or incorrect requests based on the submitted documents.	Incorrect requests that are not in compliance with Article 4, Use Regulations. (e.g. approval process inconsistent with the Use Matrix, exceeds the BCC/DRO Threshold or it is a prohibited use.)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Missing Frontage and Access as required in specific sections of Art. 3 and Art. 4.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Shared parking must have Traffic sign off before submittal.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Missing Consent	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Missing Disclosure Forms (Public Hearing applications only).	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Fees not consistent with the number of request(s).	
B. Five or more of the items below results in an application being deemed insufficient:				
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Missing or incorrect Property Control Number(s) (PCN).	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Incorrect or Inconsistent Square Footage (Related to building or overall site) or density.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Wrong FLU designation and/or Zoning District or the two are inconsistent throughout documents submitted.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Minimum buffer widths not identified.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Surrounding properties or structures within 100 feet of subject site not identified.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Uses and accessory uses not identified, are not correct or incomplete.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Dimensions and/or acreage on Survey and Site Plan do not match.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Status of all previous Conditions of Approval and/or compliance with time and events not addressed	Mark Conditions as Completed, Ongoing, etc. in the pdf version of the Resolution.
LAND DEVELOPMENT (LD)				
Sufficient?		Item #	Description	
No	Yes			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Drainage statement missing or not electronically signed and sealed.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Self-signed drainage statement does not have a valid signature report.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Point of legal positive outfall and drainage basin in drainage statement not identified.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Peak hour turning movements and ADT for existing and proposed driveways (for subdivision plans at the proposed right of way intersections) not shown.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Dimensions missing:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From centerline of right-of-way to property line 	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driveway width, throat, radius returns 	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property line (bearings and distances) 	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centerline geometrics (subdivision plan only) 	

**PBC ZONING DIVISION
PUBLIC HEARING AND FULL DRO⁽⁴⁾ APPLICATIONS
SUFFICIENCY CHECKLIST**

[Updated 10/21/19] **EFFECTIVE 11/1/2019**

PLANNING (P)			
Sufficient?		Item #	Description
No	Yes		
		1	Proposed square footage or density exceeds maximums allowed by the Comprehensive Plan (and there is no FLUA amendment)
		2	Incorrect or inconsistent density/intensity as it relates to existing and proposed building square footage or overall site and as summarized in Justification Statement or application materials.
		3	Workforce Housing Program (WHP) Letter of Determination from the Planning Division missing.
		4	Prior Land Use Ordinance's with conditions and applicable plans missing.
		5	Completed Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) forms with accurate number of TDR's and corresponding pricing missing or blank.
SURVEY (S)			
Sufficient?		Item #	Description
No	Yes		
		1	Boundary Survey not electronically signed and sealed.
		2	Boundary Survey and/or Title Information more than 12 months old.
		3	Boundary Survey not provided or does not reflect the title information.
TRAFFIC (T)			
Sufficient?		Item #	Description
No	Yes		
		1	Traffic Statement/Study missing or not electronically signed and sealed.
COUNTY ATTORNEY (CA)			
Sufficient?		Item #	Description
No	Yes		
		1	Missing, incomplete, improperly signed and notarized, or illegible Warranty Deed.
ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (ERM)			
Sufficient?		Item #	Description
No	Yes		
		1	Vegetation Survey missing; if property supports existing native vegetation [Art. 7.E.1-3, Existing Native Vegetation] [Relates to response in Section 8 of the General Application form].
HEALTH DEPARTMENT (HD)			
Sufficient?		Item #	Description
No	Yes		
		1	Missing a letter related to Dust Control to the Health Department (if new construction is proposed).
		2	Missing a letter from Utilities Staff to the Health Department stating the distance to the nearest water and wastewater service pipe and type (gravity, force main, etc); or missing a copy of the utility bill if the site is connected to water and wastewater.
		3	The applicant did not have a meeting with the Health Department for the proposed Day Care.
PROPERTY AND REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT (PREM)			
Sufficient?		Item #	Description
No	Yes		
		1	Planned Unit Development (PUD) has 2% Civic: 1) Required and shown on the Plan(s); 2) Not required (State reasons); or 3) Already Provided (state reasons) in Justification Statement.

**APPLICATION SUFFICIENCY CHECKLIST
ZONING AGENCY REVIEW (ZAR) ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATIONS**

(Updated on 10/07/19)

All required application forms, plans and related documents (Documents) submitted to the Zoning Division, are reviewed by the Project Manager (PM) for sufficiency. The assigned PM shall utilize the Reasons for Insufficiency below to determine whether or not an application is sufficient.

1. An insufficient application shall not be accepted and a rejection notice will be sent to the Applicant/Agent identifying the required corrections.
2. Weekly on-line resubmittals are available between Monday 5:00 p.m. to Tuesday 11:59 a.m. (1)

REASONS FOR INSUFFICIENCY			
Sufficient?		Step 1 – Primary Details	Description
No	Yes		
		Property Control Number (PCN) Information:	Missing or incorrect PCN
		Applicant Information:	Incomplete or incorrect Applicant information
		Agent Information:	Incomplete or incorrect Agent information
		Step 2 – Request Details	
		Request Summary:	Missing information or summary provided does not relate to the Request(s)
		Current Resolution(s) for Project:	Incorrect or missing Resolution Number(s)
		Submitted Plans and Number of Modifications or Variance Request:	Incorrect Plan Type is selected (must be consistent with the approved Plan noted in ePlans)
			Incorrect Exhibit Number or Page Number (must be consistent with the approved Plan noted in ePlans)
			Multiple requests are entered in the same-modification request. (Every request shall be entered individually in this field)
			Proposed modification(s) exceeds the threshold of the ULDC Table 2.C.5.B – Administrative Modifications to Prior Development Orders (DOs) or Conditions of Approval
			Proposed variance(s) exceeds the Variance Request Limitations indicated in Article 2.C.5.D.3. of the ULDC
		Concurrency:	The request includes square footage increase or a new use which impacts concurrency. Applicant checked “No”
			Concurrency Table information is incomplete or inconsistent with the proposed request
		Step 3 - Documents	
		Attachments (Plans, Studies and Forms):	Missing or incomplete Forms (such as, Consent form, Affidavit of Completeness and Accuracy, Warranty Deed, etc.) as applicable
			Missing applicable Plans (such as, Final Site Plan, Final Subdivision Plan, Final Sign Plan, etc.) associated to the request. (Note: Plans that have multiple pages must be submitted as a set, even if some of the pages have no proposed modifications)
			Forms, Plans or supporting documents have illegible information
			Provided Plans by the Applicant are degraded in quality or legibility over the official Zoning Plans on the Zoning webpage
			Documents are not labeled consistent with the Zoning Naming Guide
			Document attached is inconsistent with the document type selected
			The area of modification is not within the provided PCN (1)
			Plans are not identifying proposed changes with red clouds (1)
			Stamp boxes have not been cleared of text on all pages (1)
			Provided Survey, Traffic Study or Drainage statement is not electronically signed and sealed per the Technical Manual.

(1) Not required for Type 1 Variances

ERM and Zoning Coordination Meeting on Vegetation

1. Sufficiency Checklist and Sufficiency Review

Under the new application Sufficiency Checklist in Zoning Website (see link below), the Zoning Director instructed staff to remove vegetation survey as a submittal requirement. However, ERM requires the veg survey as a submittal requirement, and the Industry has been made aware of this since July/August this year, and we had several opportunities to show this list to the agents/interested party before we finalized it.

[http://discover.pbcgov.org/pzb/zoning/PDF/Checklists/DRO_and PH Sufficiency Checklist.pdf](http://discover.pbcgov.org/pzb/zoning/PDF/Checklists/DRO_and_PH_Sufficiency_Checklist.pdf)

The responsibility now lies on ERM to ensure the Veg Survey is submitted (please also clarify whether that will include the tabular list?) and then look at **Art.14.C.1.B.1.b)**. **ERM also wants the Vegetation Chart to complete the Survey.**

- b. *An application shall not be deemed complete until the application fee and all information necessary to fully understand the extent, nature and potential impacts of a proposed project are received by ERM and approved by ERM prior to the scheduled DRO meeting. Any additional information for an application deemed insufficient at DRO meeting will not be approved until the next scheduled DRO meeting. Such information may include, but is not limited to: [Ord. 2008-040]*

2. Redundancies of the Vegetation Survey (Art.7.E & Technical Manual) and Vegetation Plan (Art.14.C)

ERM already has a lot of requirements in **Art.14.C.1.B.1, Requirements and Process - Approval of Development Order for Commercial Projects,.....Projects Requiring DRO Review and and in the Zoning Application General Form 1.**

- 5) *Identification of the type and location of native vegetation in the vicinity of, and likely to be affected by the project; [Ord. 2008-040]*
- 6) *An Incorporated Vegetation Plan which graphically depicts the location and field tag number for each native tree and palm to remain undisturbed on the parcel during construction and the natural life of the vegetation. The Incorporated Vegetation Plan may also be required to be incorporated as a feature of the site plan; [Ord. 2008-040]*
- 7) *A numbered tabular list of all native trees/palms surveyed, indicating the type of tree/palm the DBH or height of clear trunk if palm, and whether the parcel owner proposes to keep the tree/palm in place, relocate it, offer it for surplus, remove it or mitigate for its removal; [Ord. 2008-040]*

ERM indicated that they do not mind Art.14.C repeating Art.7.E so long the Code language is consistent and not in conflict.

3. Numbered Tabular list (Art.14.C) and Vegetation Disposition Chart (Art.7.E)

The question is who will verify what is shown on the list or chart is correct. This question came from Zoning because during site visits, they found what were indicated on the Chart is not all

correct. As a result, they want to proposed Code Amendment requiring a certified arborist to verify the information on the Vegetation Chart is accurate.

Applicants told Zoning that the Surveyors whom they hired may only be able to specify the location and/or height of vegetation. However, they would need to have an arborist or some professionals who know their trees/palms/pines to complete the Chart. Zoning has a registered Landscape Architect and three certified Arborists on staff.

4. Site Visit and Pre-application Appointment (PAA)

Art.7.E requires the applicants to contact ERM/Zoning for a PAA before they submit the application. But we also allow them a second opportunity to meet with staff prior to the issuance of the first set of DRO comments. This code language now seems to conflict with the Sufficiency Checklist. Therefore, we need to reach an agreement with ERM and maybe we can create a PPM to provide us some guidelines before the code is fixed.

5. Art.7.E also asked for Preliminary proposed grades

Without the preliminary proposed grades in areas where the existing vegetation to be preserved, how do we know they could be saved?

Occasionally, this has not been required or made as a certification issue by staff during the review. We need to discuss the merit of this code requirement in our meetings. The preliminary grades are under ERM Analysis in the Zoning General Application Form 1.

6. Conditions of Approval

Staff indicated that for whatever reasons vegetation committed to be preserved or relocated during the Public Hearing time were removed, eliminated ...etc. at Off The Board time.

Highly recommended that once the Vegetation Chart is finalized, and both parties/Agents reached an agreement, we should impose a condition of approval. You may add some flexibility in a condition if a tree dies out of natural disaster or disease over time of the development stage.