<u>RECORD AND REPORT</u>
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
2005-2006 ZONING HEARINGS
Thursday, December 14, 2006 at 9:30 a.m.
360 South County Road, Palm Beach
Town Council Chambers

I **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**: Chairman Robertson called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

PRESENT: Harrison M. Robertson, Chairman
Lowry M. Bell, Jr. Secretary
Nancy M. Murray, Member
Elizabeth S. Murphy, Member
John H. Schuler, Member
Alan S. Golboro, Member
William M. Guttman, Alternate Member
Walter Anthony Dowell, Alternate Member
Leslie A. Shaw, Alternate Member
Veronica Close, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building
Paul W. Castro, Zoning Administrator
John C. Randolph, Town Attorney

ABSENT: Peter S. Broberg, Member (Unexcused)

RECORDING SECRETARY: Cynthia M. Delp

II **INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Mrs. Delp delivered the invocation and all joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

III **CONSENT AGENDA**

A. <u>MINUTES: DECEMBER 6, 2006</u>
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MOTION BY MR. SCHULER FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GOLBORO.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
(Please note that Mrs. Murray abstained from voting as she did not attend the meeting of December 6, 2006. Mr. Guttman voted in place of Mr. Broberg. Mr. Dowell voted in place of Mrs. Murray.)

IV **REGULAR AGENDA**

A. Old Business: None

1. Study Item 1. Study the point of measurement for height, overall height and cubic content ratio (where applicable) on lots along the Atlantic Ocean and Lake Worth and lots below the minimum flood elevation.

This item was deferred from the December 6, 2006 meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission, with the understanding that staff would contact the architects and attorneys who typically practice in Palm Beach to invite them to attend this meeting to provide feedback to the Commission relative to the proposal. Staff made those contacts via phone and fax. It should be noted that several architects and attorneys were in attendance.

Mr. Castro had fully explained this study item at the December 6th meeting. Today, with the professionals present, Mr. Castro used a model of a home at the end of Cherry Lane, along the lake, to illustrate his point. He explained that the proposal is intended to provide a more flexible standard which is consistent with the types of situations where the Town Council had granted relief in the past. The proposal would allow for a point of measurement of the highest crown of the road (fronting the lot), or, the existing grade of the middle of the lot, whichever is higher. Mr. Castro noted, as he did last month, that the resulting buildings, with the new language in place, will appear larger from Lake Worth. Mr. Castro commented that the proposal, in his opinion, would not result in any drainage problems as most of the lakefront properties drain toward the lake.

Mr. Bell stated that the Commission voted in favor of the proposal last month, but he requested that the architects and attorneys provide their input.

Mr. Golboro stated that he had been concerned about the bulk of the buildings which would result from this proposal. He stated that he walked along Ridgeview Drive since the last meeting, and saw that the houses are already built this way. As such, and since this would help to reduce the number of variances sought and granted, Mr. Golboro stated he was in favor of the proposal, as presented. Mr. Castro responded, "Staff felt this was the appropriate provision relative to the change of grades and what is being built in the middle streets as well, based on the highest crown of the road."

Mr. Shaw asked Mr. Castro to consider inclusion of a rear building height plane into the language of the proposal. Mr. Castro responded that the Planning and Zoning Commission could make this recommendation, but staff did not study that.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION OF STAFF RELATIVE TO POINT OF MEASUREMENT FOR LAKE HOMES, AS STATED ON PAGE 8 OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2006 MINUTES.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GUTTMAN.

Mr. Schuler asked Mr. Castro about the impact of the proposal on ceiling heights of homes. Mr. Castro responded that the proposal does not change the height of the homes in the R-A or R-B Zoning Districts; it merely affects the point where measurement begins.

Architect Ames Bennett stated that Mr. Castro had clearly explained the proposal. Mr. Bennett noted his approval of the proposal, as one which is friendly to owners and architects. He recommended that it be passed, as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Castro continued with the Study Item as it relates to oceanfront properties. He explained that in the R-B, R-A, and some parts of the R-AA Zoning Districts, when a homeowner wishes to build east or partially east of the Coastal Construction Line, the Florida Building Code requires that the house be built with the bottom of the grade beam at elevation 15.4 ft. NGVD (National Geodetical Vertical Datum). The proposal is to establish an elevation of 15.4 ft. NGVD, (or whatever the minimum grade beam height is, as established by the Florida Building Code), plus 2 ft. (to allow for the floor slab), or 17.4 feet NGVD, as a point of measurement for oceanfront properties. The establishment of the minimum grade beam height elevation is to protect the home from anticipated wave heights during a storm event. Mr. Castro added that there are some situations, south of Southern Boulevard in the estate section, where the actual grade of the property could be at elevation 20 ft., higher than the proposed minimum. The Florida DEP requires that an owner cannot "remove" fill from a property, but can "move" fill from one location on the site to another. Staff feels this proposal is a flexible standard and would provide the relief that many residents have previously had to request from the Town Council.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION OF STAFF RELATIVE TO POINT OF MEASUREMENT FOR OCEANFRONT LOTS, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

Mr. Guttman questioned how many variances would become unnecessary through implementation of this proposal. He asked whether staff could draft guidelines which add an element of flexibility to the proposal. Mr. Castro responded that the proposal would probably provide a solution to 60% of the variances of this type which have been requested in the past. The other 40% involve situations where owners want their homes even higher than the new proposal would allow. Mr. Castro noted that this proposal will not solve every situation, but he recommended that the Commission adopt this proposal. Mr. Castro added that if a smaller addition is being added to the house, (up to 800 sq. ft.), it can be built at the elevation of an existing home. So, for example, if a home is built at 23 ft, an addition of 800 sq. ft. could be added at the elevation of the existing home.

Mr. Guttman stated he would like to hear from the architects present.

Attorney Ron Kolins addressed the Commission. He began by commending staff on the lakefront proposal, already approved, and the oceanfront proposal, under discussion. He viewed the proposals as “an attempt to recognize reality, and allow people to do things that circumstances really do require without having to come to the Town Council and ask for variances.” He made two points: (1) If there are homes built higher than the 17.4 ft. NGVD threshold proposed, and they are destroyed, those owners should be allowed to rebuild at the previous height of their homes. As such he recommended adding language to grandfather the previous height.

Mr. Castro responded that this is already possible under present code provisions, if the house is destroyed by more than 50%. The home can be rebuilt on the same footprint, and to the same size and height.

(2) Relative to moving dirt on a site, Mr. Kolins commented that the DEP will only allow movement of dirt seaward of the Coastal Construction Line, and even with that, may say “no” to the dirt movement due to turtles, etc. As such, he recommended that language be added to allow building to 17.4 ft. NGVD unless the DEP will not allow an owner to move that dirt seaward of the Coastal Construction Line. If that is the case, the owner would be allowed to build higher so the building is over the dune, not behind it.

Architect Eugene Lawrence stated that he supports the proposal with one exception. He advocated that the extra 2 ft. measurement be increased to 3 ft. to include not only the slab, but also the grade beam which has a depth of 2 ft. itself, i.e., 15.4 ft. plus 3 feet. He also felt the proposal should include consideration of the grade of the land.

Mr. Castro was not in favor of the including the grade of the land into the proposal, but was in favor of adding language relative to allowing building higher, if an owner is prevented from moving dirt by the DEP, as Mr. Kolins presented.

Architect Jeffery W. Smith stated that his firm usually designs in accordance with the neighboring properties, i.e., an average of the neighbors’ heights. He maintained that no person would want to buy an oceanfront property and not take advantage of the existing dune height for storm protection. As such, there will still be a need for variances, but a lesser amount of relief will typically be sought, with the new proposal.

Mr. Castro suggested, then, that 18 feet might be the appropriate number, rather than 17.4 feet. He noted, in agreement with Mr. Smith, that quite often the Town Council will look at the height of the neighboring houses when reviewing these variances. He stated that perhaps staff could look into adding language relative to review of height of neighboring houses. So, the person would be allowed to build at the height required by the State, or by review of the houses on either side, whichever is higher.

Mr. Smith noted that there are oceanfront properties with homes constructed 100% west of the Coastal Construction Line. Mr. Castro responded that these homes would have to be built according to the code. If that is the case, Mr. Smith stated that it would be like putting the house in a hole. Both Mr. Smith and Mr. Castro agreed that this is a complicated issue.

Mr. Guttman recommended that staff re-visit this issue in light of the comments made relative to assessing the height of the immediate neighbors and Mr. Kolin's comments. He asked to see revised language. Mr. Castro agreed that this should be studied further by staff, and then be submitted to the Commission for further consideration.

MOTION BY MR. GUTTMAN TO DEFER CONSIDERATION OF POINT OF MEASUREMENT REGULATIONS FOR OCEANFRONT PROPERTIES FOR FURTHER STUDY.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. MURRAY.

Mr. Shaw commented that the application to the State (DEP) is filed by the person who requests a variance, and so much relies upon the State's response to that application. He stated it is crucially important how, within the DEP application, the applicant demonstrates clearly and emphatically that there is no way they can work around removing or modifying the height of the dune. The Town Council and other boards and commissions rely highly upon the State's determination, which is simply accepted by the Town. He questioned whether the Town should accept the State's determination without question, without knowing how strongly the applicant has petitioned.

Ms. Close responded that staff checks with the state to determine whether the letter was written asking the State to allow them to build at a certain height, or whether the State has required building at the minimum. This verification occurs prior to Town Council review. Secondly, she suggested that the point of measurement for oceanfront properties be added to the list of zoning study items to be discussed at a future meeting. Mr. Guttman, as the maker of the motion, stated that Ms. Close's suggestion was fine with him.

Mr. Kolins, as one who files applications to the State, clarified that the State does not tell an owner what height they must build to, rather, they tell you that you have to meet the Florida Building Code's 15.4 ft. height. Other than that, the applicant must provide an engineer's stamped and sealed plan of the dune, the sand, removal or addition of fill, etc., and then the State reviews that plan. As such, he felt that Mr. Shaw's concern was really not an issue.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Lawrence requested that staff and the Commission look at establishing a basic datum for interior lots, which is now set at the crown of the road or at 7.5 feet. Mr. Castro responded that changing this would change the whole complexion of the North end, and staff never contemplated making such a comprehensive change affecting all of the interior lots. Mr. Lawrence responded that if your land is higher, the owner loses a substantial amount of cubic content under the current regulations. Mr. Castro replied that if the Planning and Zoning Commission wishes to consider this, it would have to be added to next year's study items.

Mr. Castro continued by explaining the third part of this Study Item, which was previously recommended for approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission, for the benefit of the architects and attorneys present. In situations where a home is at an elevation below 7.0 feet NGVD or below, the owner is limited in trying to improve the home by not being able to spend more than 50% of the value of the home in any one given year. As such, the Commission recommended that if someone wanted to raise their house up to meet the minimum flood elevation, and they were in a required setback, they could still do it without the need for a variance. They could, in fact, add additions onto the house, second floor additions, provided that the addition met the lot, yard and bulk requirements, as it relates to lot coverage and setbacks. That provides the ability for a property owner to make significant changes to the property, and raise the house up, if they want to, without having to tear down and start from scratch. This would not allow a person to tear down the house and build it in the same footprint, but it would allow a person to at least raise an existing, nice house up to the minimum floor elevation and add additions provided they met the Town's code requirements.

B. New Business

1. Schedule for completion of the Royal Poinciana Way Study.

Ms. Close stated that staff has compiled a conceptual outline of the Royal Poinciana Way Study. She clarified that the study includes the Royal Poinciana Way corridor, the east end of that corridor, the Breakers PUD, Royal Poinciana Plaza, Sunrise Avenue, Sunset Avenue, and perhaps, Bradley Park.

Ms. Close explained that at today's meeting, the following actions are anticipated:

1. Review the schedule
2. Confirm the title for the project
3. Review proposed scheduling of community participation
4. Review stakeholders

At this point, Ms. Close continued with a Power Point presentation to outline the schedule related to this study, beginning with the present and continuing through to May 2008, at which time there should be final adoption of Comprehensive Plan Amendments and Zoning Code Amendments. Ms. Close showed examples of the types of graphics and virtual tours which will be available for the community vision meetings.

(Staff's Power Point presentation is included in these minutes at the request of the Commission, and it is as follows:)

ROYAL POINCIANA AREA PLANNING STUDY

"Conduct an intensive community consensus-building process to create a vision for the future of the Royal Poinciana gateway to the Town."

Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
December 14, 2006

Review Schedule

Confirm Title for project

Review proposed scheduling of Community Participation Process

Review Stakeholders

Town Council Meeting
January 9, 2007

Meet Planning Consultants

Review Project Schedule and Process

Schedule for Study
January 1, 2007 – March 9, 2007

- **Preparation of presentation materials**
  - **History of Area**
  - **Existing conditions**
    - **Land use**
    - **Infrastructure**
    - **Condition of Structures**
    - **Current Use Agreements/Vested rights**
    - **Municipal Services**
  - **Current zoning code provisions**
    - **Maximum buildout**

Schedule for Study
January 1, 2007 – March 9, 2007

Preparation of presentation materials (con't)

- **FDOT - bridge**
- **Comprehensive Plan Goals and Objectives**
- **Reports from Experts**
  - **Economic Considerations**
  - **Types of urban designs/urban forms**
  - **Illustrations**
  - **Cultural Amenities**

Schedule for Study
January 1, 2007 – March 9, 2007

Community Notice

- **Media Releases**
- **Invitations to stakeholders**
- **Distribution of Notices**
- **Published Ads**
- **Announcements at meetings**
- **Civic Associations** **Municipal meetings**
- **Business Associations** **Cultural Organizations**

STAKEHOLDERS/INVITEES

PROPERTY OWNERS
RESIDENTS
ELECTED/APPOINTED OFFICIALS
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS
BUSINESSES
FDOT
WEST PALM BEACH
DCA
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
NEIGHBORING MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENTS

Schedule for Study
January 1, 2007 – March 9, 2007

Prepare meeting venue/logistics

- **Identify Location(s)**
- **Coordinate with venue**
- **Coordinate with P & ZC/Experts**
- **Provide presentation materials**
- **Provide/setup A/V Equipment**
- **Provide refreshments as needed**

Schedule for Study
March 12, 2007 – April 6, 2007
Conduct Community Visioning Process
- Informal "Meet/Greet" – all participants
Welcome and Introductions
Objective
Visioning Process
Schedule

Schedule for Study
March 12, 2007 – April 6, 2007
Conduct Community Visioning Process
- "Where are we?"
Inventory of existing land use
Aerials and virtual tour
Comprehensive Plan – current Goals/Objectives
Zoning Code – current regulations/maximum buildout

Schedule for Study
March 12, 2007 – April 6, 2007
Conduct Community Visioning Process
- "Where are we?" (Con't)
Property Valuation
Building Age/Condition
Architectural/Historic significance
Approved Future Development
Current/future market indicators

Schedule for Study
March 12, 2007 – April 6, 2007
Conduct Community Visioning Process
- Creating a Vision
Interactive Design Studio
Consensus-building exercises
Website Forums
- Urban Form, architectural and landscape design

Schedule for Study

March 12, 2007 – April 6, 2007

Conduct Community Visioning Process

- Summary and Review

"Did we get it right?"

- Graphics/virtual tours

- photorealistic demonstrations

Schedule for Study

April 6, 2007 – April 20, 2007

Preparation of Results for Consideration by Planning & Zoning Commission

April 23, 2007 – May 4, 2007

Review and consideration by Planning & Zoning Commission

Schedule for Study

May 7, 2007 – May 11, 2007

Revision to Final Recommendations for consideration by Town Council

May 13, 2007 – May 31, 2007

Review and direction by Town Council

June 1, 2007 – September 30, 2007

Development of possible land use plan map and text amendments to Comprehensive Plan

Development of zoning code modifications and design guidelines as necessary

Schedule for Study

June 1, 2007 – September 30, 2007

Examples of types of changes (based on results)

placement and orientation of buildings

attractive, walkable street environments

creative parking requirements

pedestrian linkages to various land uses

creation of an architectural theme

provision of mixed-use buildings

Schedule for Study
October, 2007

Review of Comprehensive Plan Amendments by
Planning & Zoning Commission

November, 2007

Review of Comprehensive Plan Amendments by
Town Council
Transmittal to DCA

Schedule for Study
December, 2007

Review of Zoning Code Amendments by Planning
& Zoning Commission

January, 2008

Review of Zoning Code Amendments by
Town Council

Schedule for Study
March - May, 2008

Final Adoption of Comprehensive Plan Amendments
Final adoption of Zoning Code Amendments
Submission of Site Plan Review, Special Exception Applications as desired by Owners/Applicants

-

Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
December 14, 2006

Confirm Title for project: "Royal Poinciana Area Planning Study"

Review proposed scheduling of Community Participation Process

Review Summary List of Stakeholders

ROYAL POINCIANA AREA PLANNING STUDY

"Conduct an intensive community consensus-building process to create a vision for the future of the Royal Poinciana gateway to the Town."

(*End of Power Point Presentation*)

The Commission began to brainstorm for a title of the study. Ms. Close mentioned various names which had already been suggested: Royal Poinciana Way/Plaza Study, Royal Poinciana Corridor Study, Northern Gateway Study, etc. She asked for suggestions from the Commission.

Ms. Murphy offered her comments/questions: (1) She hoped that Bradley Park would be included in the study, and mentioned that she would like to see the Garden Club do plans to re-do Bradley Park since it is such an important gateway to the Town. (2) She was interested in construction of "the Markin tunnel," which she envisioned as an illuminated cobblestone pathway connecting Bradley Park to the Royal Poinciana Plaza. (3) She questioned how far east the visioning will go. (4) Ms. Murphy stressed the importance of the skyline of the north side of Royal Poinciana Way. (5) She was pleased with the increased information which will be available on the Town's website, as described by Ms. Close during the Power Point presentation. (6) She suggested the following study title: "Planning Town of Palm Beach's Northern Gateway Study".

Mr. Shaw hoped that the scope of the visioning process will include the Post Office and will continue North from there. He was not sure if it would go as far North as Sunrise, although he hoped it would. As far as the title is concerned, Mr. Shaw stated he would appreciate if the words "Way" and "Plaza" are not included, but recommended that "Planning" be included. Mr. Shaw applauded the timetable presented by staff as "the first aggressive and precise plan to get something accomplished." He asked about the level of involvement of the Planning and Zoning Commission in this process for the next twelve month period.

Ms. Close stated that staff anticipates that the Planning and Zoning Commission will champion the study. While staff will assume responsibility for the visioning process, Ms. Close hoped that the Planning and Zoning Commission would be present and visible through all points of the process. As the schedule has not been finalized, staff will get back to the Commission with specific dates. Ms. Close appointed an administrative oversight committee composed of Deputy Town Manager Tom Bradford, Mr. Leslie Shaw, and a staff member of the Planning and Zoning Department to insure that the planning consultants and staff are proceeding with the schedule; have not missed any steps; have incorporated all comments; and, have provided all information according to the schedule.

Mr. Robertson noted his preference for keeping the word "Plaza" in the title of the study, since the Plaza is the most interesting part of the study.

Mr. Guttman disagreed with the Chairman regarding inclusion of the word "Plaza" as the study is not solely focused on the Plaza. He noted that if the Royal Poinciana Plaza is ultimately landmarked, that would affect the architectural look of Royal Poinciana Way. He also thought it would be worthwhile for the Breakers to disclose design plans for their PUD.

Ms. Murray noted her concern regarding the four week period from March to April, as shown in the schedule, where she understood Ms. Close to say that the planners would be meeting individually with stakeholders. Ms. Close responded that there will be the opportunity for individual input within the course of three meetings to be held within 1-2 weeks. Mrs. Murray commented that she was startled by the tone of the neighborhood meetings to discuss the neighborhood CCR, and recommended that these visioning sessions occur in a very controlled setting where people are free to give their opinions, but where order and decorum are maintained. Ms. Close replied that staff anticipates some dissension and disagreement, but the planning consultants are well-versed in building consensus within the community.

In response to Mr. Guttman's earlier comment, Ms. Close informed the commission that the Breakers will fully participate in the visioning process, and will be prepared to disclose their plans for their PUD development.

Mr. Bell supported Ms. Murphy's title suggestion of "Northern Gateway Study" together with adding "Planning" to the title. He did not feel it should include any reference to the Royal Poinciana Plaza.

Ms. Murphy agreed that the word "Plaza" should be left out of the title. She was happy to hear of the Breakers anticipated involvement in the visioning process, and recalled her previous suggestion for the Breakers to re-create a shaded path from the ocean to the lake on their property. If the Breakers would be concerned about carving out a piece of the golf course, as she was told by a member of the Town Council and a member of the Landmarks Preservation Commission, she hoped that some Town-owned land could be offered to the Breakers to make up for the path land, which would be a "public or semi-public green space that is shaded and soft on the feet." Ms. Murphy felt this would be a "magical" addition to the Town.

Ms. Close confirmed that the Post Office will be included in the study, but she was not sure which properties to the north would be included. Ms. Murphy was in favor of the study including properties are far north and east as the Paramount.

Mr. Guttman shared Mrs. Murray's concern about the visioning meetings, and asked to hear from the consultants about how they would build neighborhood consensus. Ms. Close stated that more information will be available within the next month. Mr. Guttman requested a copy of the Power Point presentation or any other list of planned activities which affect the Planning and Zoning Commission. (Included in these minutes.)

Mr. Shaw asked for a definition of stakeholders. Ms. Close read the list included in the Power Point presentation. Mr. Shaw suggested that, perhaps, a separate meeting could be held only for the affected property owners since their concerns are different than the concerns of the general public.

Mrs. Murray asked Ms. Close to define town-serving. Ms. Close responded that town serving refers to residents, employees who work in the Town, and hotel occupants.

This concluded the Staff's presentation. Ms. Close encouraged members to e-mail her with any suggestions related to this process, either now or as the study proceeds.

2. Introduction of the Town's Planning Consultants, Iler Planning Group and Calvin Giordano & Associates.

Ms. Close stated that both planning consultant groups were present today. She noted that they have significant expertise in planning and urban design activities, landscape design and architecture. Staff is in the process of completing final contract negotiations with the consultants. No specific assignments have been given to the consultants to date.

Ms. Close introduced Mr. John Downes, Executive Vice President of Calvin Giordano and Associates who will oversee the project. Mr. Downes, in turn, introduced Shelley Eichner, Vice President, who will function as the head planner with regard to the contract, and Gianno Feoli, an architect and a registered landscaped architect.

Mr. Guttman asked the consultants what communities they have done planning work for which is most comparable to the Town of Palm Beach. Ms. Eichner responded that they have worked on visioning and creation of master plans for Sunny Isles Beach (Dade County), and Indian Creek Village.

Ms. Close introduced Henry Iler, the President of Iler Planning Group. Mr. Iler stated that he has a Masters Degree in Urban Planning and will oversee the project. He explained that planning, urban design, landscape architecture, comprehensive plans, land development codes, and how all these work together is their business. All of the people who will be working on this project have Masters Degrees in Urban Planning, with undergraduate degrees in architecture or business. Nilsa Zacarias, an architect with a Masters in Urban Planning, will serve as the project manager. Marty Schneider specializes in comprehensive planning. Brandon Schaad specializes in urban design and comprehensive planning. Mr. Iler stated that his firm did a master planning charrette for North Bay Village and they are currently in the process of doing the comprehensive plan amendments to implement the vision. They completed the urban design plan for the City of Ft. Lauderdale, as well as a master planning process for Marco Island. He looked forward to working with the Town of Palm Beach.

V COMMENTS OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION AND PLANNING ZONING & BUILDING DIRECTOR

Mr. Bell asked whether a motion is required to establish the title of the study. Ms. Close responded that she has noted the comments of the Commission thus far, and if the Commission would like, staff will develop an appropriate title based on those comments. Mr. Randolph responded that no motion is necessarily required.

Mr. Golboro stressed the importance of planning for park land in the course of future land planning, rather than continuing a focus on development or re-development.

Regarding the title, Mr. Schuler stated that the term "Northern Gateway" is insufficient to describe the study. He felt the area should be more defined so people understand. Mr. Robertson agreed, noting that "gateway" is inappropriate within the title.

Mr. Shaw requested that the Commission consider development of standards relative to how long hurricane shutters can be in place. He recommended it as a future study item. Ms. Murphy agreed that shutters are a problem, especially since property owners are staying away from the storm scene longer. The shutters, left on too long, become an eyesore to the residents who are here.

Ms. Murphy recommended a title of "Royal Poinciana Planning Study" as a comprehensive title.

Mr. Golboro stated that staff has a phenomenal undertaking ahead with the study, but will also undergo a renovation and possible move. This must also be taken into consideration when evaluating the Commission's expectations of staff. He suggested that the Planning and Zoning Commission assist staff with the budget and modernization of the department. Ms. Close responded that the PZ&B staff hopes to function even better with more space. Computerization will be greatly improved, but the conversion will be difficult. It should serve to relieve staff members of mundane tasks. We look forward to nearly paperless Occupational Licensing. The staff is also excited about website interactivity to reduce visits and phone calls to the department.

Mr. Randolph reminded the Commission that although no motion is required for the title of the study, staff needs clear direction.

Mrs. Murray suggested a title of "Planning for Town Areas Surrounding the North Bridge."

Ms. Murphy asked whether, with new computerization, it is possible to see plans for projects requiring Town Council approvals on the Town's website. Ms. Close responded that staff can look into this, but this could not be immediately available.

Ms. Close suggested the title of "Royal Poinciana Area Planning Study".

MOTION BY MS. MURPHY TO APPROVE THE TITLE OF "ROYAL POINCIANA AREA PLANNING STUDY."

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GUTTMAN.

MOTION CARRIED 4-3, WITH MR. BELL, MR. SCHULER AND MR. ROBERTSON VOTING AGAINST THE MOTION.

VI **PUBLIC COMMENT**

No further remarks from the public were heard.

VII **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION BY MRS. MURRAY TO ADJOURN AT 11:40 A.M.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. BELL.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission will be held on Tuesday, January 23, 2007 at 9:30 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 South County Road, Palm Beach.

Respectfully submitted,

Harrison Robertson, Chairman	**Lowry Bell, Secretary**
Town of Palm Beach	**Town of Palm Beach**
Planning and Zoning Commission	**Planning and Zoning Commission**

cmd