



**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DRAC)
MINUTES OF THE TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 2015 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
PZ&B – VISTA CENTER
2300 NORTH JOG RD., WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33411
2ND FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM (VC-2E-12)
Time: 1:00 pm to 2:00 pm**

PREPARED BY ZONING DIVISION STAFF

Members Present –

Gladys DiGirolamo – GL Homes - Vice Chair
Collene Walter - UDKS
Autumn Sorrow – G²HO
Michelle Hoyland - Wantman Group

Zoning/Engineering/Planning -

Maryann Kwok - Chief Planner
Wendy Hernandez - Zoning Manager, Community Development Section (CD)
William Cross - Principal Site Planner, Code Revision Section
Carrie Rechenmacher - Sr. Site Planner, Community Development Section (CD)
Roger Ramdeen – Sr. Site Planner II, CD Section
Jan Rodriguez - Sr. Site Planner, AR Section
Lauren Dennis - Site Planner II, Code Revision Section
Diego Penaloza - Site Planner I, CD Section

1. MODIFICATIONS TO BCC/ZC APPROVALS - 2.D.1.G.1.A & 2.D.1.G.1.B

Relocation of building square footage and Increases in building square footage:

Collene suggested that the relocation provision should not apply to a single owner / single entity (no single user) such as a school which may be comprised of multiple 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. We did use other examples of CLF, places of worship where these facilities could be run under an organization. Collene suggested the concept of a bubble plan for these plans and commercial plans similar to a Master Plan for a PUD.

Lauren presented a graphic showing how square footage could be relocated in a multiple use scenario. The DRAC members did not seem to have issue with the existing language related to multiple uses.

Increases in square footage through DRO (2.D.1.G.1.b) to allow more square footage to be added through DRO above the 5%/5,000 square feet was also discussed. However, no specific numbers were discussed.

Bill requested DRAC participants to provide examples from other jurisdictions where similar flexibility from Board (e.g. Commission) approvals are permitted. Collene mentioned that the City of WPB allows for standards to be built into an approval (i.e.

Outlet Malls).

Additionally, discussed outdoor uses such as daycare play areas, athletic fields, with general consensus that those uses may be subject to different standards.

Finally, discussed the need to ascertain if there are any issues with relocating “uses” noting that Schools have gyms, classrooms, offices, etc. and perception for switching those around may be considered differently than just moving the same use around a site.

Maryann reiterated what items the BCC/ZC reviews and approves. DRAC members suggested revisiting what site elements and configuration the Board reviews and approves.

2. EXPEDITED ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATIONS - 2.D.1.G.2

They also brought up the 5% increase indicating that it may be burden to go back to Full DRO for modification of something that is internal to a PUD. The discussion was to change the ZAR thresholds to exempt clubhouses in recreation pods of a PUD which were not subject to BCC approval from the maximum 2500 square foot limitation as the trips are internal to the PUD. as well as the limitation that it 2500.

Michelle Hoyland from Wantman mentioned her concerns of one of her projects, using the example of an expansion of a recreational facility, etc and whether the 2500 square foot limitation was cumulative.

Staff advised that the PPM 029 and 049 was being revised to exclude accessory non-residential structures that do not trigger Concurrency impact, etc.