



**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DRAC)
Minutes for Special Meeting 7-17-15
DRO Agency Review Process
PZ&B – VISTA CENTER
2300 NORTH JOG RD., WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33411
2ND FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM (VC-2E-12)
Time: 10:00 am to 11:00 pm**

PREPARED BY ZONING DIVISION STAFF

1. CALL TO ORDER.

Chairperson Gladys DiGirolamo called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m

Members Present

Gladys DiGirolamo – GL Homes -- Chair
Pat Lentini – GHO-Vice Chair
Jeff Brophy - Land Design/Wantman
Dan Siemsen - GHO
Christi Tuttle - Miller Land Planning
Yexsy Schomberg - Coteleur & Hearing
Joni Brinkman - Urban Design Kilday Studio

Zoning/Engineering/Planning

Jon MacGillis - Director, Zoning
Maryann Kwok - Deputy Director, Zoning
Wendy Hernandez - Zoning Manager, Community Development Section (CD)
Joanne Keller - Director, Land Development
William Cross - Principal Site Planner, Code Revision Section
Alan Seaman, Principal Site Planner, AR/PI Section
Jan Rodriguez, Senior Site Planner AR/PI Section
Carolina Valera, Site Planner II, AR/PI Section
Adam Mendenhall, Site Planner I, AR/PI Section
Daniel Greenberg, Site Planner I, AR/PI Section
Ann DeVeaux, Zoning Tech, AR/PI Section

AGENDA

A. AR/PI AND SUBMITTAL HURDLES

Alan began the meeting discussion by explaining that this Special DRAC meeting was requested to review the DRO Administrative Review process with Zoning Staff. Staff prepared a PowerPoint presentation outlining the process and some of hurdles that can prolong the DRO Agency Review process. Alan showed a slide that demonstrated what issues typically delay the application review by percentages. He focused on the items that needed to be addressed by Agents since greater than 70 percent of delays in

the application process were attributed to Agents. Gladys DiGirolamo asked whether Staff's findings applied to both DRO Agency Reviews and Zoning Reviews. Alan clarified that the hurdles pertain mostly to Agency Reviews. Zoning Reviews did not present any significant issues.

B. OVERVIEW OF DRO ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND EXPLANATION OF HOW STAFF DETERMINE IF ZONING REQUEST IS ZONING, AGENCY OR FULL REVIEW-WENDY/ALAN

Staff presented an example of Agency Review where changes were made from the original to subsequent submittals that led Staff to have to review the project outside the affected area which resulted in additional comments from review agencies. Gladys questioned why the submittal was determined to be an Agency Review instead of Zoning Review requiring review by multiple agencies when the proposed site plan amendments were minor. Carolina commented on an example of a project that had missing graphics and site data and more changes than the submitted request. Dan Greenberg clarified that reviewing outside of the requested changes slows down the process and the only reason Staff would review outside is because of drastic differences between the original and submitted plans. Dan Siemsen expressed concerns associated with projects necessitating review by several agencies that have previously reviewed the project. Maryann Kwok explained the importance of increasing the quality of work submitted and how it would affect overall efficiency. Therefore, an agreement is needed as to what staff is looking at so that other departments are not making comments on items such as overlapping buffers for example. Gladys stated that the re-submittal involved insignificant changes, i.e., missing labels to a fence, but did acknowledge that because she submitted three different versions, that staff's reason for looking outside of the "affected area" was justified. Alan said missing or altered items on the subsequent plan submittals cannot be ignored by Staff and Adam Mendenhall reiterated that missing items such as graphic notations and tabular information only raises awareness of other potential changes the applicant may have made without identifying it for Staff.

C. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS-ATTENDEES

Discussion ensued regarding pre-submittals and re-submittals. Gladys inquired about the benefit of contacting reviewing agencies prior to submittal to determine if their review is needed. Jon MacGillis commented that the question arises if the modifications being submitted to the Agencies are the same modifications being submitted to Staff and that the DRO Officer's responsibility is to ensure Agencies that need to review proposed plan amendments are notified and whether Staff should make the determination. Dan Siemsen indicated that his office typically meets with Staff prior to application submittal to determine which Agencies require review and it does save on time. Joni Brinkman questioned if the submission of the application could be done at the time of the pre-application meeting. Alan responded no, since the most submissions are done electronically and pre-application meetings are not done by all of the Agents.

D. FOLLOW-UP ON THIS TOPIC, IF SO IDENTIFY AND ESTABLISH DEADLINES-JON

Alan highlighted another area of Agent's concern is the length of time it takes for a plan to be approved. He gave a detailed overview of the 15-day approval process and explained that re-submittals reset the original 15 calendar-day review time frame. Staff explained that resolving any issues up front can help avoid or reduce re-submittals. Dan Greenberg explained that Staff does not reject submittals when inconsistencies are apparent and offered assurance that Staff is reviewing plans, identifying issues up front and notifying the Applicant/Agent immediately. Gladys stated that a Zoning Review takes more than three days to review. Alan mentioned complexity of the request can also increase review

time. Highlighted below are the issues and recommendations discussed by Staff and Industry:

STAFF:

- *Quality of submissions:* Clearly identify what is being changed;
- *Quality of Plan:* Difficult to review: Staff will work with Agent if digital is unavailable;
- *Fees:* Explanation given how determined, fee invoice forwarded immediately and plans distributed to Agencies once fees are paid;
- *Justification Statement:* Make request on the Supplemental Application consistent with amendments clouded on plan; Attach a brief narrative clearly outlining each request and which plans are modified. A separate Justification Statement is not required for Zoning Reviews;
- *Volume of documents submitted for review is time prohibitive.* Avoid submitting unnecessary documents in review. Use checklist as guide;
- *Sufficiency Review:* Alan have Staff complete in three days;
- *Red clouded revisions:* Keep as red for easy identification of changes; easy to follow;
- *Revision clouds taken off 2nd & 3rd submittals:* revision clouds must be shown on all re-submittals;
- Revised PPM 20-0-29 (Plan requirements) - Dan to email PPM to DRO Agents.

INDUSTRY:

- *Quality of County's PDF poor;* requires program other than AutoCAD for minor changes; extensive time: Staff is looking into other alternatives for better quality which will be discussed with the Zoning Director, i.e., Mom & Pop submittals;
- *File size too large:* Notify Staff for possible suggestions;
- *Excessive documents required for review:* All documents on checklist required. If not needed, staff will remove from checklist;
- *Naming Convention:* Gladys questioned impact on Agency & Zoning Reviews. Staff confirmed impact. Updated standards will be posted to the web on Wednesday.

There was discussion regarding plats, comments and the necessity of a review by Land Development (LD) if the Agent has letter from LD stating that plat comments are due and the changes that should be made. Gladys stated if the change is incorrect LD will kick it back. Alan responded that Staff needs to have a record of who made the decision and Staff would rather wait until all plat comments are completed eliminating the need to amend the site plan more than once. Alan added the final plat review could trigger another review if the plat comments require the site plan match the plat comments and waiting until all comments are completed would reduce re-submittals. Gladys expressed her approval of the DRO Type II and Type III concurrent subdivision and plat review process.

E. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:06 a.m.