RECORD AND REPORT
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
2005-2006 ZONING HEARINGS
Tuesday, July 18, 2006 at 9:30 a.m.
360 South County Road, Palm Beach
Town Council Chambers

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**: Chairman Robertson called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Harrison M. Robertson, Chairman
Peter S. Broberg, Member
Nancy M. Murray, Member
Elizabeth S. Murphy, Member (arrived after roll call & before approval of the minutes)
John Schuler, Member
Alan S. Golboro, Member
William M. Guttman, Alternate Member (present by telephone)
Walter Anthony Dowell, Alternate Member (present by telephone)
Leslie A. Shaw, Alternate Member (present by telephone)
Veronica Close, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building
Paul W. Castro, Zoning Administrator
Timothy M. Frank, Planning Administrator
William F. Brisson, Brisson Planning Solutions (Zoning Consultant)

ABSENT: Lowry M. Bell, Jr., Secretary (Unexcused)
John C. Randolph, Town Attorney

RECORDING SECRETARY: Cynthia M. Delp

2. **INVOCATION**: By Mrs. Delp

3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

4. **PROOF OF PUBLICATION**: Ms. Close stated that the material to be discussed at this meeting has been advertised, but the Town has not received the proof back from the newspaper.

5. **PROCEDURES FOR INPUT BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC**: Mr. Robertson stated that the public will be asked to speak at the end of the proceedings. He also stated that he would call upon each of the members participating by telephone at the appropriate times.

Mr. Robertson acknowledged Councilman Bill Brooks and Councilman Richard Kleid in the audience.

6. **APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES FROM APRIL 18, 2006 MEETING**:

MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES BY MR. GOLBORO.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SCHULER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

At this point, Mr. Robertson stated that Item 8 would be heard next, leaving Item 7, the Evaluation and Appraisal Report for later in the meeting.

8. **PRESENTATION OF PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF URBAN PLANNING**

Ms. Close welcomed the commission to this summer meeting. She invited Mr. Frank to review, via a slide presentation, information regarding comprehensive planning activities in the town, and how the Evaluation and Appraisal Report fits into the process. Ms. Close explained that the document which had been previously distributed to the members, *Evaluation and Appraisal Report of the Town of Palm Beach Comprehensive Plan 2006* is a first draft of that report. She encouraged members to note any additions/corrections needed and forward those to Mr. Frank. She asked the members to limit today's discussion to substantive issues rather than style, grammar or spelling issues.

Mr. Frank stated that the first Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) in the State of Florida was prepared for the Town of Palm Beach by the Garden Club in 1929, and it was a very forward-looking plan. This 1929 plan contributed greatly to the beauty and composure which still exists in the town. The following is a statement from that plan:

"...one attractive and well managed public bath and beach, the concentration of general traffic upon a limited number of streets, beautification without a special reference to main arteries of travel and a system of leisurely convenient byways free from automobiles, punctuated with gardens. This is a plan which will localize recreation seeking crowds, discourage trespassing, and provide safety and quiet for the residents of Palm Beach."

Mr. Frank briefly discussed the history of planning, noting that in 1954, the federal government started to fund comprehensive plans. He reviewed national and Florida pertinent legislation. In 1985, the Growth and Management Act, F.S. 163, directed that all municipalities in Florida were required to have Comprehensive Plans. Rule 9J-5 prescribes how a Comprehensive Plan is to be written. The State of Florida has mandated that Comprehensive Plans must have measurable goals and objectives. Mr. Frank explained that in the forty-nine other states, a comprehensive plan has a twenty-year vision with zoning ordinances serving as legal acts to implement the Comp Plan. In Florida, however, the Comprehensive Plan takes the lead role. Whatever is included in the Comp Plan must be respected in the zoning ordinances and land development regulations. He theorized that if something was lacking in Florida Comp Plans, it might be in the area of long range planning. The Town has established its Strategic Plan to cover long range goals, supplementing the Comp Plan.

Mr. Frank stated that the Town's Comp Plan "translates the vision of the Town and the concrete goals, objectives and policies." The Comp Plan is composed of several elements which form a comprehensive policy statement for the town. Zoning is the implementation mechanism for the plan. The Comp Plan includes principles, guidelines and standards which are to be met, and it is based upon written and graphic material and data. The Town's Comp Plan is developed collaboratively with the citizens. The Town's original Comp Plan under F.S. 163, from 1989, has been updated three or four times since. The Comprehensive Plan and its Supporting Documents go hand in hand. While the Supporting Documents contain all of the support materials and data, they are available, but not officially adopted. The Comprehensive Plan, itself, is an official legal document of the Town, adopted by the Town Council and then reviewed and ratified by the State of Florida. Mr. Frank briefly reviewed the required elements within the Comp Plan, and they are as follows:

Future Land Use	Transportation	Housing
Utilities/Infrastructure	Conservation	Coastal Management
Recreation and Open Space	Historic Preservation	
Intergovernmental Coordination		

(* and certain other optional elements: Arts & Culture, Community Design, Transit, Economic Development, Public Buildings, Redevelopment, & Safety)

Mr. Frank displayed the Town's Future Land Use Map. He noted that the Town's Zoning Map must be consistent with the Future Land Use Map. He also quoted from the Comp Plan, under Future Land Use, Objective #2: "To maintain the character of the town as a predominantly residential community with town-serving businesses and support services."

Moving to the Transportation Element, Mr. Frank stated that most roads in the town are at level of service D, which is near failing. Southern Boulevard, State Road A1A, and Cocoanut Row are at Level E, Failing. Despite these ratings, however, the town does not want to widen its roads. As such, the town deliberately permits poor levels of service, and uses police department services to move traffic. New construction cannot reduce the existing level of service, per the Comp Plan.

Housing: Objective #2: "Prevent the Town's housing stock from deteriorating to a sub-standard condition." This statement within the Comp Plan offers the town the "police power" to ensure the housing is in good condition. Objective #5: "Prevent increases in the number of sub-standard housing units through rehabilitation or demolition."

Infrastructure: Mr. Frank noted that flooding conditions have improved greatly over time. The original plan required a 1" water retention on properties, while the updated plan has doubled that requirement.

Coastal Management/Conservation: Objective #5: "The Town shall protect and restore its beaches and dunes."

Recreation/Open Space Element: "Public access shall be maintained to all town recreational facilities." This includes access to the beaches. "The Town will ensure its continued municipal relationship between public and private sectors."

Intergovernmental Coordination: Objective #5: "Prevent increases in the number of sub-standard housing units through rehabilitation or demolition." In conjunction with this, Mr. Frank discussed the availability of work force housing on the island. He stated that "we actually have four times as many of these housing units as the statistics say that we need."

Capital Improvements: "The Town adopts an annual budget, identifying expenditures and necessities of the policies in the Plan." Florida statutes require that funding be made available to accomplish the goals and objectives as stated in the Comp Plan. Objective #2: "The Town will not expend funds to subsidize development in the coastal, high-hazard area."

Historic Preservation: Objective #1: "It will preserve, protect, and enhance the historic and pre-historic resources of the town." The Town already has a Landmarks Preservation Commission and an LPC ordinance in place. All undeveloped lands are required, by the Comp Plan, to be tested for any pre-historic resources. Mr. Frank anticipated an ordinance to that effect in the near future.

Updating the Comprehensive Plan involves responding to new legislative initiatives; review of the Capital Improvement Element; Review of the Matrix (a tool unique to the Town which is used to track the goals and objectives of the Comp Plan.); conduct the Evaluation and Appraisal Report; and, local review. Comprehensive Plans of the future will be value-driven, thematic based, developed collaboratively with the citizens, technologically applicable, and will involve greater intergovernmental coordination. Mr. Frank stated that all of the county's municipalities grouped together to form a county-wide planning agency, IPARC (Intergovernmental Plan Amendment Review Committee), which is composed of the planning directors for each municipality. IPARC is backed up by Issues Forum, a group of elected officials, two from each municipality.

Mr. Shaw, participating by phone, stated that he did not have the benefit of the slide presentation which Mr. Frank provided. Mr. Frank will e-mail the slide presentation to him and to Mr.

Guttman who also requested the information.

Mr. Robertson questioned funding requests from the Police Department and the Fire Department. Ms. Close responded that all of the physical functions of the government are included in the Comp Plan. Whenever the Town identifies its needs, this will be included in the Comp Plan as a goal and objective, and the plan's Capital Improvement element will earmark the necessary funds. Staffing needs, not necessarily included in the Capital Improvement Plan, are decided by the local governing body.

In response to a question from Mr. Guttman, Mr. Frank stated that the most current version of the Comp Plan is from 1997.

9. PRESENTATION OF UNDERGROUND UTILITIES - PROGRESS REPORT BY THOMAS BRADFORD, DEPUTY TOWN MANAGER

Mr. Bradford stated that he has been assigned to oversee the proposed town-wide underground utilities project. He explained that underground utilities affect several elements of the Comp Plan as well as the Strategic Plan. Mr. Bradford recalled that the subject of underground utilities had been discussed as far back as 1982, when he was previously employed by the town. He noted that in 1982, the zoning code was amended to require all new construction and any properties renovated in excess of 50% of the value of the property to provide for underground service for the secondary service.

Mr. Bradford provided a lesson in terms relative to underground utilities for the benefit of the commission. He explained that power is generated at the plant and then transmitted via transmission lines to sub-stations. Burying transmission lines is a very costly venture. Five sub-stations service the island feeding power to distribution lines. There are two types of distribution lines...the primary distribution line (typically the line which runs along the rear easements between two properties) and the secondary distribution line (the line leading from the primary distribution line into the house). Secondary distribution lines have been required to be underground since 1982.

Mr. Bradford stated that in the summer of 2003, the Town Council asked staff to have an engineering firm analyze the Town's electrical system and arrive at a cost to bury all of the lines. The engineer's report, from December of 2003 (presented to the community in 2004) broke the roads down into State roads and town roads. Staff ultimately recommended that all State roads and all major north/south town roads be considered for burial. The estimate for this work was $22,000,000. This proposal, which would have only buried State roads and "some" town roads was rejected by the Town Council on the grounds that it was inequitable to those residents who did not live along those major north/south arteries.

With the hurricanes of 2004 and 2005, and the long periods of power outages endured by the residents, the subject of burying the lines came to the forefront again. The project would entail the burial of all of the major utility systems on the island, i.e., Adelphia or Comcast, Bell South, and FP&L. Mr. Bradford reported that it would cost 49.8 million dollars to bury all of these lines, in all areas of the town. This includes primary and secondary service lines. Mr. Bradford indicated that it appears that the Town would absorb the cost of secondary service into the homes, unless there are unusual circumstances at a given property. Currently, the Town plans to pay for this work through general obligation bonds, which are tax deductible bonds. A referendum has been discussed for February 6, 2007 to ask the voters to approve the project, and the necessary financing. This would be a ten year project. The Town Council has tentatively approved that this work could occur all year round. The cost to an individual homeowner would be $318.00 per million dollars of taxable value, per year, to have the lines buried. While most residents have lines in the rear easements of their back yards, the proposal would include moving those utility lines to the front of the properties, either in the right of way or in 10 ft. front yard easements. Easements are needed for transformers and switch cabinets. The plan includes having transformers (4 ft. wide and 26"-30" tall) placed on the property line which divides two properties, with half of the transformer and transformer pad on one neighbor's property, and the other half on the adjacent neighbor's property. If not located in this fashion, transformers and switch cabinets can also be placed in the right of way. This equipment in the front of properties would have to be screened at the property owner's expense.

Mrs. Murray commented that it is interesting that burying the utility lines was part of the original 1928 Town plan.

Mr. Golboro acknowledged that this work will have to be done in phases. He asked Mr. Bradford how many homes would be included in the Phase I portion of the project. Mr. Bradford's answer was 181 homes. Mr. Golboro then asked about access to the rear easements. Mr. Bradford responded that several methods can be used, i.e., trenching with a backhoe or ditch witch, hand digging, or more probably via directional drilling, which costs more, but is less disruptive. Mr. Bradford projected that provided there are no hurricanes, it would take 10-12 months to complete the Phase I process.

Mr. Bradford stated that the option has been made available, due to code changes, to forego copper wiring in favor of aluminum for secondary service. If a homeowner wanted copper wiring, however, that homeowner would incur additional costs. The Town will pay for secondary service lines in aluminum, and this is part of the approximately $50,000,000 cost estimate (stated earlier as 49.8 million) for the project.

Mr. Golboro asked if FP&L will add to their own staff to ensure that the underground line projects are completed within a reasonable amount of time. Mr. Bradford responded that the utility companies have stated they will not add additional staff to accomplish the work. Any disruption to the normal workload, like hurricanes, will hamper these efforts. Mr. Bradford noted that many cities in the State of Florida will be undertaking undergrounding in the next decade. He felt that FP&L would ultimately be forced to contract additional work forces in order to meet the undergrounding demands.

Mr. Schuler asked a question about whether the town will be able to give the residents some idea about an approximate date the work will begin in their neighborhoods. Mr. Bradford responded that all that is known at this time is that Phase I will affect all areas south of Sloan's Curve and North of Onondaga, and this is provided the referendum passes. As soon as that work begins, the Phase 2 area will be identified. Mr. Schuler stressed the importance of keeping the residents informed.

Mr. Golboro wondered if it would be better to work on the north/south roads before the cross streets. Mr. Shaw commented that the north/south streets generally have a better infrastructure than the cross streets and he felt it would be better to begin work on the east/west lines and streets, the "weakest link" so to speak. Mr. Bradford responded that Mr. Shaw is correct that certain lines/poles are newer than others. He stated that he had toured the island yesterday with a consultant and it was evident that the distribution infrastructure is "in bad shape." Mr. Bradford stated, "the rear yard easements are pitiful, and something really needs to be done to improve the adequacy of the utility infrastructure in this community."

Mr. Guttman asked Mr. Bradford to clarify the cost estimates involved with the project. Mr. Bradford also noted that the Town will bear the cost of boring from the front yard to the rear yard easement, but costs for disruptions to the lawn and/or shrubs have not been included in the cost estimates, especially because non-intrusive methods like directional boring will most likely be used. Property owners would be responsible for planting and irrigating around transformers and switch cabinets.

Mr. Golboro, noting that much of the North end was out of power for more than two weeks, wondered if FP&L has given a reason for the long outage. Mr. Bradford responded that he had heard that it was very difficult to work within the overgrown rear easements; that the workers had to deal with residents who were upset about having to allow workers access to their properties to work on the rear easements; and, also because the workers were shocked about the system in this town which they regarded as "third world." Mr. Golboro requested that the question be answered with a technical response. Mrs. Murray, a North end resident, stated that she was not out of power for two weeks, so the long outages were spotty. She also stated that one of the workers had told her that they could not imagine that accidents had not occurred because the system is in such bad shape. Mr. Bradford noted that the consultant who toured the island with him yesterday stated that, "it's a miracle that no one has been electrocuted."
Ms. Murphy suggested that the reason for the outages may have been "that the cash cow died," referring to the fully depreciated lines and poles.

Mr. Robertson thanked Mr. Bradford for an excellent presentation.

7. EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT (EAR) - PRESENTATION OF DRAFT REPORT BY STAFF

Mr. Frank, discussing the appraisal of the 1997 Comp Plan, referred the commission to the last page of the report. Mr. Frank noted that all of the goals and objectives listed in the previous matrix have already been achieved during the 5-7 years since the last plan was adopted. The 1997 plan also included matrix items which are scheduled for annual review, and it is those which are reflected on the last page of the EAR report. Mr. Frank briefly reviewed the annual matrix items shown on that page as listed below:

1. Review structural conditions in areas subject to deterioration.
2. Conduct windshield survey of structural conditions of housing.
3. Review element for consistency with DOT Five-Year Transportation Plan and MPO plans.
4. Continue sea turtle nesting studies.
5. Inspect public access facilities.
6. Inspect public recreation facilities in Town, but not under Town jurisdiction, for access impediments.
7. Schedule staff workshop to identify and resolve private sector recreational issues.
8. Publish hurricane evacuation precautionary information during hurricane season (June-Nov.)

Mr. Frank proceeded with the portion of the process which identifies new issues for inclusion in the new Comp Plan. He stated that he used the issues identified by the Strategic Planing Board approximately two years ago as a foundation for this portion of the EAR.

Mr. Shaw, prior to Mr. Frank beginning his presentation of the Major Issues reflected in the EAR, asked several questions. He questioned how the population per household increases from 1.81 to 2.32 in the season, since most seasonal visitors are single persons or couples. He noted a reference to the land use from 1986 and another from 2006, and found it hard to believe that there is not a greater increase in commercial space within that 20 year period. Thirdly, with regard to the Breakers PUD, he noted a discrepancy in the number of dwelling units stated in two different areas of the report, 149 dwelling units vs. 251 units. Mr. Shaw also voiced his concern with the problem of how to deal with parking issues in the town.

(Let the record show that Ms. Murphy left the meeting at this point, 11: 25 a.m., and returned at 11:55 a.m.)

With regard to Mr. Shaw's questions, Mr. Frank and Mr. Brisson attempted to respond. Mr. Frank stated that the 1.81 figure is a census figure, while the 2.32 represents a seasonal projection, appreciating the fact that during the season, residents frequently have visitors. Mr. Shaw questioned the accuracy of this. Mr. Brisson responded that these figures were also reflected in the 1997 plan. Staff felt no need to change the figures, since the population of the town is essentially "static," as there is very little room for growth. Regarding the question about commercial area, Mr. Brisson responded that "there have been no other lands that were not previously used for commercial that have been converted to commercial". There may have been increases in density of commercial space, but not acreage. Regarding the Breakers PUD dwelling units, Mr. Brisson stated that he will look into the discrepancy.

Mr. Golboro asked a question about riparian rights relating to PUD's. Mr. Castro stated that there are no riparian rights to develop over Lake Worth. Mr. Frank responded that the Comp Plan clearly states that the areas over Lake Worth are in a conservation zone, which allows no density.

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Frank to continue with his presentation of the Major Issues, as listed in the report. Mr. Frank read each of the major issues and called for any comments or concerns from the commission after each was read.

Issue #1: Drainage LOS (Infrastructure/Drainage and Capital Improvements Elements)

> No additional comments/concerns expressed.

Issue #2: Underground Utilities (Infrastructure Element)

> Mr. Golboro asked if the Town has considered using the almost potable water (fresh water from the deep water stream) offered by the two clubs, the Everglades Club and the Palm Beach Country Club, in an emergency situation. This water would just need to be chlorinated. Ms. Close responded that this is really a Public Works question. Staff will discuss possibly inserting this into the Comp Plan with Public Works. Mr. Frank noted that Special Topic #5, included in the EAR, concerns alternative and traditional water supply projects for regular and emergency needs.

Issue #3: Preservation of Residential Neighborhoods (Future Land Use Element)

> Mr. Frank read the following question to the commission, which is not included in the EAR. "By the end of the 2008/2009 zoning season, the Town shall have developed zoning regulations intended to address the consensus of the express wishes of the residents of the different geographic areas in the town that are zoned R-B. Such regulations may include the subdividing of the R-B district into smaller zoning districts or overlay districts, flexible or alternative development standards, or other innovative measures appropriate to the task." He asked for the recommendation of the commission.
>
> Mr. Dowell asked Mr. Frank to be specific. Mr. Guttman stated that he did not believe that the Town Council authorized the Planning and Zoning Commission to pursue the subdivision of the R-B district. Ms. Close stated that the Town Council authorized staff to do a very limited study of only certain areas in the R-B district, namely the Sea Streets, Ibis Isle and Everglades Island. Since the Town Council has also asked staff to look at variance approval standards in a limited way, Ms. Close stated that staff will re-work this section to include the Town Council's most recent action. Mr. Guttman stated that he is still not sure whether the Town Council or the community wants this, and he took issue

with some of the text in this section of the EAR. Again, Ms. Close responded that staff will re-work this section of the EAR.

Issue #4: Shoreline Protection/Submerged Lands (Future Land Use and Coastal Management/Conservation Elements

Mr. Frank stated that Public Works will be providing more data relative to this section of the EAR, but it is essentially complete in its current form.

Issue #5: Traffic and Parking (Transportation and Capital Improvement Elements)

This element includes a statement from the Strategic Plan. Data and analysis from Public Works has not yet been received. Mr. Frank stated that while the town has not yet been significantly impacted by the increased density in the City of West Palm Beach, that impact is anticipated in the future.

Mr. Golboro suggested that the Town's outdated parking meters be changed to a more modern system. Mr. Castro commented that there is a move toward a kiosk system. Mr. Golboro noted that in Miami, a money card system is available.

Mr. Golboro also mentioned the circle at the Southern Boulevard Bridge. He suggested that the FDOT modify the signal light system in that area so that when the traffic moves off the island, vehicles would have the benefit of a synchronized series of green lights to move the traffic all the way through and off the island. Secondly, he recommended that the City of West Palm Beach replace and enforce a No Left Turn at the west end of the Southern Boulevard Bridge, especially during the hours of 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. This would help travelers driving north/south through that area, and would also help the poor level of service rating which currently exists for this stretch of road.

Issue #6A: Safety Issues Abandoned Boats in Lake Worth (Not a Comprehensive Plan Issue)

Mr. Frank stated that this is more an enforcement issue than a planning issue, but it is conservation related as it deals with protecting the water.

Issue #6B: Safety Issues - Disaster Management (Coastal Management/Conservation Element)

Mr. Frank is working with the Town Manager's office to update this section of the EAR. It will ultimately include all of the new recommendations and policies which were put into effect as a result of the hurricanes.

Issue #7: Royal Poinciana Way - Future Redevelopment/C-PC (Future Land Use Element)

The Royal Poinciana Plaza is the only C-PC zoned area of town. The EAR, regarding this issue, is designed to be proactive rather than reactive. It recommends an evaluation of the area, recognizing that redevelopment is likely in the future, and suggests Town-sponsored design charrettes.

Mr. Robertson felt that the town should take the initiative in making plans for Royal Poinciana Plaza. Ms. Close stated that this item was brought to the Town Council's attention as a zoning study item, and the Town Council asked staff to continue to look at Royal Poinciana Way and the commercial areas to the north, but because of the current lawsuit involving the Royal Poinciana Plaza, the Town Council asked staff to hold off looking at the C-PC district. She felt it should be kept in the Comp Plan as a long-term issue. Mr. Robertson reiterated that the town should come up with its own plan for Royal Poinciana Plaza, and asked what is being done in that regard. Mr. Frank reminded the commission that the Comprehensive Plan designates this area as commercial only. Therefore, a zoning change could not be approved for mixed use (residential and commercial) because that is inconsistent with the Comp Plan. Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Frank directly if he, the Town Planner, was going to propose a revision to the Comp Plan which would allow mixed use for the Royal Poinciana Plaza. Ms. Close responded stating that the Comp Plan will reference Royal Poinciana Plaza, but the Town Council has not authorized staff to proceed with recommendations for the site in light of the lawsuit.

Mr. Guttman added that due to the lawsuit, the town should not suggest mixed use or any other character for Royal Poinciana Plaza at this time. It should, however, be made clear that the Town is in favor of having town-sponsored review of the land use of the Royal Poinciana Plaza rather than reviewing one which is developer driven. Mr. Guttman had written some comments in this regard which he will forward to Mr. Frank.

Mr. Frank noted that the intersection of Royal Poinciana Way, Cocoanut Row and Bradley Place are already at service level E, i.e., failing. Adding residential or increasing commercial density in this area would further negatively impact these roads. All of this would have to be analyzed under any proposal for redevelopment of the site.

Ms. Murphy agreed that the town should be pro-active with regard to the Royal Poinciana Plaza, but in conjunction with the plaza, three other projects should be simultaneously analyzed, i.e., the 2010 rebuilding of the Flagler Memorial Bridge, the tunnel project to connect Bradley Park with Royal Poinciana Plaza, and a master garden plan for Bradley Park.

Special Topic #1: Pre-Historic Resource Ordinance (Historic Preservation Element0

The Comp Plan already requires that undeveloped land be tested for pre-historic resources, and this testing is ongoing. Mr. Frank noted that an ordinance is forthcoming relative to this subject, and has already been submitted to the Town Attorney for review.

Special Topic #2: Town-wide beautification (Future Land Use, Intergovernmental Coordination, Capital Improvements and Transportation Elements)

Mr. Frank reported that the DOT has agreed to join the Town and fund a test area from Royal Palm Way to Worth Avenue along County Road. This has already been reviewed by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. It will include treatment of the crosswalks, signage improvements, clutter clean-up, etc.

Special Topic #3: Implementation of Town's Concurrency Management System (Concurrency Management and Capital Improvement Elements)

Mr. Brisson stated that this section is in response to State legislation which requires that the Town describes the Concurrency Management System in the town and how it is implemented. Traffic count data is also supplied.

Mr. Robertson questioned the water. It had been suggested that the town develop its own water supply by use of a reverse osmosis plan. Mr. Frank believed that this study was pre-empted due to a change in the Mayor of West Palm Beach. Mr. Frank discussed the West Palm Beach offer to replace the entire water system in the town over a 5-7 year period. After the replacement is complete, the Town would be free to negotiate with West Palm Beach, Palm Beach County, Riviera Beach, or Lake Worth for future water contracts. Mr. Guttman commented that this will produce a very competitive environment, and will work to supply cost effective potable water to the Town residents.

Mr. Golboro stated that the town uses two mains to move sewage to West Palm Beach. He questioned the condition and capacity of the mains, repair time, and emergency capability. Staff will seek answers to these questions within their annual correspondence to the county, as required by the Comp Plan.

Special Topic #4: Coordination of the Comprehensive Plan with existing public schools- (Public School Facilities Element)

Mr. Frank noted that Palm Beach County is the first county in the State of Florida where all municipalities have agreed to a county-wide concurrency plan for schools. This has been operational for the past 3 years. IPARC put this plan together, and it is used as a model for the rest of the state. If a school exceeds its capacity by more than 115% of the design size, then development permits or building permits cannot be issued in the area of the school until the school is brought up to capacity. Since Palm Beach County, under school concurrency, has built schools based upon need rather than politics, permitting has never been shut down.

Special Topic #5: Evaluation of the Town's success in identifying & implementing alternative and traditional water supply projects to meet Town's water supply needs (including emergency supply) - (Infrastructure/potable water, Intergovernmental Coordination and Capital Improvement Elements)

Staff is awaiting input from Public Works on this issue.

10. COMMENTS OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION AND THE PLANNING ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR

Ms. Close thanked staff for their work on this rough draft EAR Report. Staff hopes to have the revised EAR ready for the October meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Castro stated that on July 11, 2006, the Town Council approved the 2006/2007 zoning calendar and the list of study items. Copies of these will be sent to the members

Ms. Close stated that the Planning Zoning and Building Department added a budget item for training of board and commission members. The Town Council did not approve it this year, but encouraged members to attend local training sessions. Ms. Close announced that the state planning seminar will be held at the end of September on Marco Island, and staff has information for any member who would like to attend.

11. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Mr. Sam Boykin commended the Planning and Zoning Commission on a short and efficient meeting, and noted his agreement with the matters discussed. Mr. Boykin strongly urged the Planning and Zoning Commission to do whatever is required to maintain Palm Beach as a residential community vs. a commercial community, and set priorities accordingly.

12. ANY OTHER ITEMS

Ms. Murphy noted that the land use atlas at the beginning of the draft is twenty years old. She hoped it could be changed to a more current version. Ms. Close responded that the existing land use atlas is available on the Town's GIS system. She also stated that the town has sought proposals for a new computer system, and those interviews will occur shortly. She hoped that by August or September new graphics might be available as a great improvement to the existing.

Mr. Castro reminded the commission that the October 2006 meeting date is Tuesday, October 3, 2006. At that time, the revised EAR will be presented. Meetings after that will be held on Tuesday, December 5, 2006 and Wednesday, December 6, 2006, along with the transmittal of the

Record and Report on Thursday, December 14, 2006. The calendar will be provided to the members.

13. **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION BY MR. SCHULER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 12:25 P.M.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. BROBERG.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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