

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
Growth Task Force
2004

FINAL REPORT



Presented To:
Indian River County
Board of County Commissioners

July 6, 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW.....	1
GROWTH TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	3
COMMENTS.....	12
MINUTES OF FINAL GROWTH TASK FORCE MEETING JUNE 5, 2004.....	15

OVERVIEW

The Growth Task Force was created as a response to a community concern for controlled growth and development in Indian River County. The group met three times to review data and specific Land Development Regulations for the purpose of identifying critical controlled growth issues for our community. In the pages that follow, there are 81 Task Force Recommendations and 28 Comments for consideration by the Board of County Commissioners.

Following each recommendation are the tallied votes (yes, no, or unsure) of the 30 members of the Task Force. Unanimous and strong majority of yes votes clearly depict a recommendation worthy of action. Please note that a “no” vote could be against the issue, but in many cases a “no” vote was cast due to a portion of the recommendation that was undesirable, already in place, or the way the recommendation was written. Therefore, important recommendations are present with mixed votes from Task Force members.

Before looking at specific trends and priority outcomes, it should be noted that the Task Force consistently expressed confidence in County Staff who handle the LDR enforcement with developers. The process of negotiations with developers was reinforced as a process which contributes positively to the quality of our community. In addition, the Task Force viewed the upcoming Visioning Process (with Comp Plan evaluation and update), as a critically important activity to which most planned to be actively involved.

Through the efforts of this Task Force, there are now 30 residents with a working knowledge and understanding of LDRs, who should be utilized to help our community tackle the growth issues in our future.

The following areas are noted as key priorities from the standpoint of this Facilitator:

- * The County should actively pursue advanced right-of-way acquisition. (Item 2)
- * The County should maintain existing satisfactory level of service standard for roads and traffic management. (Item 5)
- * The County should make sure traffic impact fees are adequate. (Item 6)
- * The County should adopt corridor plan requirements extensively, along many thoroughfares. The same standards should be coordinated with the other municipalities in the County for standardization. Older buildings should be made to be brought up to standards within set timeframes. (Item 16, 17, 18, 19)

- * The County should require underground electrical service drops for new homes, prevent “double poling” on any street, and require electrical substations to be fully landscaped. (Item 20, 21, 22)
- * Create an LDR requirement for increased buffering/opaque feature requirements for multi-family projects. (Item 26, 72, 74, 79)
- * Eliminate small lot subdivision process for all but affordable housing projects, and consider sidewalk and recreation are requirements for affordable housing small lot subdivisions. (Item 30)
- * Establish a county-wide growth management plan that applies within the unincorporated area and the cities. (Item 67, 68)
- * Focus not only on gross acreage for recreational concurrency, but the actual distribution of facilities and recreation opportunities (where the homes are now and where they will be in five years). (Item 70, and 71)
- * Do not move the urban services boundary. (Item 3) Although this item had mixed votes, this was an issue where there was agreement with the group at this time. The “no” votes were indicative of resisting a commitment for the unknown future.

To the Reader: Please do not limit your review of this Task Force report to this summary sheet only. The body of this report contains many excellent recommendations to enact for the greater good of our beloved community.

To Commissioner Caroline Ginn and the Board of County Commissioners: I thank you for the opportunity and honor to assist as Facilitator of this team of caring local residents.

To Task Force Members: Thank you for your time and commitment to our community. It was not an easy task, and in some cases not what you were expecting.

Good job.

With sincere appreciation, David Sullivan.

GROWTH TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Traffic Concurrency: 910, especially 910.09(4) pp 12-14, 910.10 pp 17-18 and 910.11(1) pp 18-19. Florida Statutes 163.3180

1. Ask property owners living on corridors slated for future right-of-way road expansion to consider selling their property to the County at the same price per acre as that offer by a developer or an investment company, possibly this could be recorded on each of the pieces of property, so when the site came up for sale the County would have first rights to buy it at the pre-development price. **(6 yes, 18 no, 1 unsure)**
2. The County should take a proactive response to road concurrency, and get ahead of the curve on right-of-way acquisition, using as many revenue streams as possible to help achieve that goal. **(23 yes, 2 no)**
3. Do not move the urban services boundary. **(18 yes, 8 no)**
4. Implement the Comp. Plan (i.e. build roads required by the Comp. Plan). **(21 yes, 5 no, 1 unsure)**
5. Do not reduce level of service in traffic concurrency. **(25 yes, 2 no)**
6. Make sure traffic impact fees are adequate to meet the needs of the Comprehensive Plan. **(27 yes, 0 no - UNANIMOUS)**

Traffic Management & Design: 952.12 – 952.17 pp 24-32

7. Increase the Level of Service to Level C. **(2 yes, 23 no, 2 unsure)**
8. Any new development should be required to maintain the Level of Service of the adjacent roadway that existed prior to that development. **(1 yes, 23 no, 1 unsure)**
9. Require left turn lanes at entrances of all developments of 15 units or more. **(13 yes, 12 no, 1 unsure)**
10. Consider frontage roads when possible. **(14 yes, 12 no, 1 unsure)**
11. Make the transportation improvement fit into the environment, versus altering the environment to accommodate transportation improvements, specifically increased buffering and enhanced pedestrian and bicycle paths. **(19 yes, 4 no, 2 unsure)**

12. Right and left and stacking turn lanes should be mandated at subdivisions from arterial or collector roads. **(14 yes, 10 no, 2 unsure)**

13. Modify the section on gates to promote secondary accesses for gated communities, and not just for emergency vehicles. **(12 yes, 13 no, 1 unsure)**

Building Setbacks: 901 pg 41 and 911.06 pp 7-46

14. Have parking lots incorporated on the first floor of buildings for possible credits for increased heights. **(1 yes, 24 no)**

Aesthetics/Corridor Plans: (buildings, utilities, signs, landscaping, public and private improvements) 911.18 – 911.21 pp 56-134. Also: SR60 and Wabasso Corridor Plans

15. Where required, require landscaped medians, which would mean building future roadways that drained to the outside so there would be a raised median. **(18 yes, 2 no, 6 unsure)**

16. Adopt existing Corridor Plan LDRs for most of the grids running throughout the County, as per the attachment in the backup on file. **(21 yes, 0 no, 5 unsure)**

17. If the County decided to go forward with the extension of the Corridor Plans, they should work in conjunction with the other municipalities and try to get them to follow through with a similar plan for consistency when going from the unincorporated area to the municipalities. **(26 yes, 0 no – UNANIMOUS)**

18. Set stricter standards about the types of commercial building the County will allow. **(24 yes, 2 no, 1 unsure)**

19. Require some of the older development on U.S. Highway 1 and in Corridor Plans to comply with the new regulations within a certain amount of time. **(23 yes, 3 no)**

Utility Alternatives in Cost Aesthetics

20. Require customer service drop to be underground for all new homes. **(26 yes, 0 no – UNANIMOUS)**

21. Pass an ordinance to prevent utilities from double poling on a single street. **(26 yes, 0 no – UNANIMOUS)**

22. Require substations to be fully landscaped. **(25 yes, 1 no)**

Traffic Impact Analysis: 952.07 pp 1 – 18

23. Create a three year roadway capital budget to be tied to the discount fees paid, as recommended and as finally approved by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), to be re-budgeted every three years. The start of this would be related to the other study going on by the Metropolitan Planning Organization to come up with the estimated roadway transportation requirements in the County for the long term. If the accumulated impact fees as budgeted turn out to be too small over time, the discount schedule could be revised downward and no new construction would be permitted if the budget did not cover the minimum service requirements to the affected roadways. **(11 yes, 12 no, 3 unsure)**

Affordable Housing

A. Subdivisions: 913

24. Keep RM-10 zoning only for affordable/subsidized housing. **(20 yes, 3 no, 2 unsure)**

25. Instead of 3, 6, 8 and 10 units per acre, allow 2, 4, 6 and 8 units per acre on rezoning. **(13 yes, 10 no, 3 unsure)**

B. Site Plans: 914

26. Create an LDR requirement that provides an appropriate buffer for multi-family or higher density projects, per staff recommendation (Corridor Plan). **(26 yes, 0 no – UNANIMOUS)**

27. Review the entire site plan process with the intention of streamlining the process, specifically increasing the coordination between local, State and Federal agencies. **(5 yes, 8 no, 11 unsure)**

28. Create an expedited permit process specifically for affordable housing projects which meets the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. **(1 yes, 12 no, 10 unsure)**

C. PD's: 915

29. Create a Statement of Philosophy to accompany the LDR's when provided to a developer. This document will include the expectations of our community, including the Corridor Plan requirements, pictures of acceptable public exposure, green space, connectivity, frontage roads, setbacks, buffers, etc.

See attachment #2 for a sample of what the Town of Jupiter provides, as per the copy of file in the Commission office. **(17 yes, 7 no, 2 unsure)**

30. Eliminate small lot subdivision process for all but affordable housing projects, based on Ch. 420 F.S. definitions. **(24 yes, 1 no, 1 unsure)**
31. Hire or contract design and landscape architects, civil and traffic Engineers, and an environmental specialist to review all PD's and assist County staff in guaranteeing the highest quality projects. **(7 yes, 14 no, 4 unsure)**
32. Manage what is happening outside of the Urban Service Area with 5 and 10 acre lots. Higher development density standards are needed to avoid sprawl, inefficiency in the delivery of services and preservation of open spaces. **(5 yes, 19 no, 2 unsure)**
33. Eliminate right-of-way density credit for all but affordable housing. **(11 yes, 7 no, 7 unsure)**
34. Provide more incentive for developers to use the PD process and/or increase standard subdivision LDR requirements to equal or exceed those included in the PD regulations. **(16 yes, 3 no, 5 unsure)**
35. Require at least two full entry/exits for each PD with monument signage. **(2 yes, 18 no, 5 unsure)**
36. There must be connectivity, both vehicle and pedestrian, between PDs and adjoining developments. **(19 yes, 5 no, 1 unsure)**
37. Perimeter buffers will be a minimum of 30 feet and be fully planted with drought tolerant plant material so as to screen the development fully at the time of project development. **(6 yes, 14 no, 6 unsure)**
38. Buffers along roads will have berms, to be fully planted with drought tolerant plant material to an initial height of 8 feet. Canopy trees must be included within the buffer. **(6 yes, 14 no, 6 unsure)**
39. Streets shall provide curbs, be lighted (100 foot intervals), with right-of-way equal to 55 feet, and meander where possible. This will include curb-to-curb width of 35 feet, parkways on both sides of 5 feet and sidewalks on both sides of 5 feet. **(1 yes, 20 no, 3 unsure)**
40. On lots less that 1 acre, adequate storm drains will be provided in lieu of swales. **(22 yes, 3 no, 1 unsure)**

41. Lakes will have created or natural wetland buffers. **(15 yes, 11 no)**
42. A minimum lot size of 7,000 square feet is required on the perimeter of the PD. Smaller interior lots may be allowed as a trade-off for additional open space. **(18 yes, 6 no)**
43. Open space within a residential PD shall be a minimum of 50% of the project site. **(14 yes, 10 no)**
44. Each primary house structure on a block or within 300 feet on adjoining blocks, front, back or side, shall have significant differentiation from all other primary structures. There may be a common building style, but all buildings will have significant variation in façade, design and elevation. **(12 yes, 13 no, 1 unsure)**
45. Garage doors may not face the street. **(5 yes, 20 no, 1 unsure)**
46. Driveways shall cover no more than 35% of the front yard. **(11 yes, 12 no, 2 unsure)**
47. At least two 12 foot canopy trees shall be required on all individual lots. Use of draught tolerant plant materials other than sod shall be encouraged. **(9 yes, 10 no, 6 unsure)**
48. All front yard shrubs and other front landscaped areas in PDs shall be located on berms so as to reduce the view of the house from the public street. **(1 yes, 24 no, 1 unsure)**
49. Mechanicals and trash receptacles shall be screened from view from the public right-of-way and adjacent neighbors. **(20 yes, 4 no, 1 unsure)**
50. The developer shall post a 10-year bond equal to 20% of the common area landscape cost to cover the cost of landscape replacement within the first 10 years of the development. **(5 yes, 21 no)**
51. All developments must have a complete set of Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions (CC&R) outlining the rules for maintenance of common and private areas, landscape replacement and HOA fees to accomplish this. **(12 yes, 11 no, 3 unsure)**

**D. Small Lot Subdivisions and Accessory Dwelling Units: 971.49(9)
pp38.4 and 39 972.41(10) pp 38.5 and 38.6**

52. Although both sidewalks and recreation areas are desirable, they should be at the developers' option, in order to maintain the affordability of the housing units being offered. **(2 yes, 23 no, 1 unsure)**

Tree Protection and Land Clearing: 927

53. Add to Section 927.06 Exemptions: new paragraph #4 (re-number remaining paragraphs): “The removal, pruning, trimming or alteration of any tree or vegetation when necessary to ensure safety and efficiency of flight operations and to protect the public using any airport in the incorporated and unincorporated areas of Indian River County. This includes, but is not limited to, any tree or vegetation which penetrates or otherwise impedes navigable airspace as provided under Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations Part 77, or which obstructs air traffic control of aircraft under Federal Aviation Administration regulations.” **(24 yes, 1 no, 1 unsure)**
54. The County Utilities Department should remove the sewer fee portion for a water line established to support tree location. **(22 yes, 1 no, 3 unsure)**

Open Space: 901, p34; 911.06 – 911.13 pp7-46 for PD’s 915.18 pp11-12.1

55. Afford more open space up front where commercial areas abut PD and residential developments to get additional pedestrian traffic and walking paths and cut down on vehicular traffic. **(15 yes, 7 no, 4 unsure)**
56. Have open space LDR’s reflect two scales – one for public view and one for inside the PD or subdivisions. **(10 yes, 7 no, 8 unsure)**
57. Revise the list of what is categorized as open space for PD’s. **(Suggest workshop or committee) (16 yes, 8 no)**

Non-Traffic Concurrency (Water and Sewer, Drainage, Parks): 910

58. The informal or courtesy concurrency reviews for fire protection, emergency services, and law enforcement be expanded to include personnel and equipment needs at the point of impact of development. **(10 yes, 4 no, 8 unsure)**
59. The County should utilize its jurisdictional authority and make fire protection, emergency services and law enforcement, with standards for personnel and equipment, a formal aspect of concurrency review – rather than an informal courtesy – and require concurrency in these areas for the granting of development permits. **(10 yes, 11 no, 3 unsure)**
60. Component facilities and services for future growth should be made a part of the written concurrency analyses of submitted to the County Commissioners. This will enable both the Commissioners and the public to fully understand

and appreciate the cumulative impact of development and rezoning on County facilities and services. **(19 yes, 0 no, 3 unsure)**

61. The Infrastructure System Summary By Facility should be modified as follows:

- Document capacity demand relative to action thresholds and the action to be taken as a consequence.
- The expanded report should be published regularly (monthly or quarterly) in newspapers and on the County website to inform the public of the impacts of growth on services and facilities and on the planned and pending improvements to accommodate growth. **(13 yes, 6 no, 4 unsure)**

Uplands and Wetlands Protection: 928 (wetlands and deepwater habitat) 929 (upland habitat)

62. Develop an overarching plan to protect the wetlands/uplands by identifying and assessing areas of unique value (areas of concern) and calling them out in the code. Write LDRs to protect and provide incentives for the preservation of uplands. **(11 yes, 2 no, 10 unsure)**

63. Review the current protections provided by St. Johns River Water Management District (St. Johns) and determine if additional regulations are required to assure that the wetlands and uplands in the County are protected. Consider developing LDRs to augment St. Johns. **(13 yes, 7 no, 3 unsure)**

64. Develop a new policy to assure wetlands/uplands are maintained after the development has been completed. Require a detailed maintenance plan and a performance bond to assure the development is properly maintained. **(12 yes, 8 no, 3 unsure)**

65. Review the current buffer requirements for adequacy. Consider the elimination of variable buffers. **(14 yes, 2 no, 3 unsure)**

Growth Information and Analysis: How will we not become like South Florida?

66. Verify that our population projections reflect the arrival of national developers, retiring baby boomers and South Florida emigrants. **11 yes, 9 no)**

67. Collaborate with cities and town to maintain aggregate County data on Pipeline, zoning, LDRs and other development matters. **(19 yes, 2 no)**

68. Coordinate with cities and towns to establish County-wide plans for managing growth. **(22 yes, 0 no – UNANIMOUS)**
69. Address the annexations issue immediately: investigate chartering the County and purchase land strips to protect unincorporated areas. **(9 yes, 10 no, 1 unsure)**

Non-Traffic Concurrency (Water and Sewer, Drainage, Parks): 910

70. Develop a timeline for having park facilities in place as the demand comes on line, including identifying the cost and availability of funding. **(18 yes, 0 no, 1 unsure)**
71. Focus not only on gross acreage for recreation concurrency, but the actual distribution of facilities and recreation opportunities (where the homes are now and where they will be within the next five years). Concurrency information should be refined to reflect probable recreational use areas or zones of need. For example, what are opportunities for recreation within; (a) one-half mile; (b) one mile, etc. of a developing or developed area. **(19 yes, 0 no – UNANIMOUS)**

Landscaping: 926

Perimeter Buffers: 926.08 pp 6-10 and 911.06 – 911.13 pp

72. Amend the LDRs to place required buffer strips in separate landscape tracts and apply setbacks measured from the tract boundary. **(17 yes, 0 no, 2 unsure)**
73. Change buffers to a minimum of 35 feet. **(8 yes, 9 no, 2 unsure)**
74. Remove Type D buffers completely. **(18 yes, 0 no, 2 unsure)**
75. Trees should be larger and more mature – 15 feet at planting. **(5 yes, 13 no, 1 unsure)**
76. Shrubs should be a minimum of 4 feet. **(1 yes, 14 no, 2 unsure)**
77. Use plants that attract symbiotic bugs that control pests and use less pesticides. **(13 yes, 2 no, 2 unsure)**
78. Adopt Sebastian's (or similar) tree ordinance for individual single family units. **(15 yes, 5 no)**

79. Reduce number of options for buffers (currently 15). Eliminate type C & D on all arterial and collector roads. **(15 yes, 0 no, 5 unsure)**

Building Height: 901 pg 8.1, 911.06 -911.13 pp 7-46 and 911.15(1) pp 46.7-46.8

80. No exceptions to height limitation other than those exceptions that are already in place. **(12 yes, 4 no, 3 unsure)**

Zoning: 911.09

81. Increase the minimum width of parking stalls to 10 feet for 90 degree parking, and don't allow compact stalls. **(14 yes, 2 no, 1 unsure)**

COMMENTS

The following comments began as preliminary recommendations, but were pulled by consensus for various reasons, including being more generic or involving issues unrelated to LDRs.

- C1. Developers must maintain at least a D rating on all roads impacted by their projects.
- C2. The County, developers, and FPL should work collaboratively to design a plan to educate the general public on where the transformer box can be located.
- C3. Incorporate the County's Corridor Plans into the City of Vero Beach's visioning process.
- C4. Require poles to be concrete, armless construction when you have overhead power lines.
- C5. Start dressing up some of the existing roadway systems with median strips and other landscaping along the County's more prominent roadways.
- C6. Any new LDR created should include a study of the increased costs to a project.
- C7. Encourage putting the open space up front between the entrance area and where the homes are located.
- C8. Encourage having more common open space between developments.
- C9. Use extra gas tax dollars for advance right-of-way acquisition.
- C10. Current plans and efforts underway to evaluate the qualitative impacts of growth on wastewater and drainage should be accelerated and, once adequate standards and measurements are available these standards and measures should be included formally in the CMS and review process.
- C11. An evaluation of the adequacy of staff resources dedicated to the concurrency review process and the workloads imposed by the process should be conducted to ensure the quality of future concurrency reviews and compliance. If the evaluation concludes that resources area

COMMENTS - (continued)

inadequate or workloads are too great, action should be taken either to increase staff or reduce workloads.

- C12. Educate the public and developers as to the intent and purpose of the LDRs and the County's commitment to their enforcement.
- C13. Eliminate the fee in lieu of policy. If this is not politically possible, apply mitigation based on a priority basis and only use when there is no other alternative and the wetlands are of questionable value.
- C14. Be prepared to train County staff or hire qualified staff to assure that our wetlands/uplands are protected.
- C15. Avoid rubber stamping the St. Johns recommendations.
- C16. Institute a land acquisition program soliciting tax deductible contributions from wealthy benefactors to purchase development rights on agricultural lands.
- C17. Develop a method encouraging developers to purchase development rights on agricultural land, consolidate the development with higher density on less land allowing the remaining land to stay undeveloped.
- C18. Add a design requirement to our Land Use Density regulations. Enforce lower visual density.
- C19. Use public funds only for their stated purpose.
- C20. Encourage developers to set aside tracts of land to serve the recreational needs of the area.
- C21. Encourage cluster housing on sites to accommodate more green areas including drainage areas, i.e. ponds.
- C22. Explore the possibility of multi-use, such as storm water retention and recreation, on large tracts.
- C23. The County with other governmental bodies should take the lead in cleaning up water placed in the Indian River Lagoon, preferably with grants from outside resources including impact fees if outside funds are not available.

COMMENTS - (continued)

- C24. Explore major canals storage capacity and use existing right-of-ways through agreements with the water management districts. Some canal right-of-ways may be grossly underutilized and water storage can be increased in those canal rights of way.
- C25. Recommend shade trees of 15 feet on the interior of parking lots.
- C26. Review points and credits system to close loopholes.
- C27. Check Martin County LDRs for increased enforcement and standards.
- C28. Review allotted parking spots for multi-family housing. Recommend having 2 parking spaces for a 1-bedroom apartment/condo, 2^{1/2} spaces for 2-bedroom apartment/condos, and 3 parking spaces for 3 bedroom apartment/condos.

GROWTH TASK FORCE

The Growth Task Force (GTF) met at 8:00 a.m. on Saturday, June 5, 2004 in the Alston Room at the Conference Center at Dodgertown, 3901 26th Street, Vero Beach, Florida.

Present were William Beardslee, Jr., Mary Berrigan, Chester Clem, Clete Deller, Robert Jackson and Tim Zorc, Commissioner Tom Lowther's delegates; George Blythe, Dan Corrigan, Adriene Cuffe, Dolf Kahle, Gene Waddell and Freddie Woolfork, Commissioner Ken Macht's delegates; Andy Bowler, Bob Bruce, Elwood Holzworth, Ericson Menger and Kenneth Miller, Commissioner Art Neuberger's delegates; Mark Brackett, John Little, Jay Smith, Tom Trolle, Gene Winne and Grant Withers, Commissioner Caroline Ginn's delegates; Maureen Cummings, Cathy Fulton, Bill Glynn, Donna Keys and Beth Mitchell (11:45 a.m.), Commissioner Fran Adams' delegates.

Absent were Richard Oujevolk, Commissioner Art Neuberger's delegate and Tony Gaskew, Commissioner Fran Adams' delegate (both excused).

Also present were Dr. David Sullivan, Facilitator; Joseph Baird, County Administrator; Bob Keating, County Community Development Director; Stan Boling, County Planning Director; Gary Wheeler, Linda Connors, Walter Perner, Robert MacGowan, Tom Wright, Dian George and Frank Coffey, Interested Citizens; Henry Stephens, Press Journal; Kimberly Massung, Executive Aide to the Commission and Reta Smith, Assistant to the Executive Aide.

Welcome – Commission Chairman Caroline D. Ginn

Commissioner Ginn was absent, so Dr. Sullivan welcomed the members and Mr. Woolfork led them in a prayer. Dr. Sullivan stated there had been some discussion about having a writing meeting on June 19th, but he felt this would not be necessary because the members would have a copy of the draft proposal by June 18th and would have one week to return any changes and comments and return it to him. He clarified those changes would be incorporated into the final draft to be presented to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC).

Approval of Minutes of May 15, 2004

Mr. Withers noted the minutes of the last meeting stated Mr. Keating had said concurrency was not a growth control process. He pointed out in LDR Chapter 910 on page 910/2 it said: "The implementation of this concurrency management system will serve as the principal mechanism for ensuring that growth is managed in a manner consistent with the provisions of the comprehensive plan". Mr. Withers wanted to clarify concurrency was a tool for growth management.

ON MOTION BY Mr. Glynn, SECONDED BY Ms. Fulton, the Committee voted unanimously (27-0) to approve the minutes of May 15, 2004 as presented.

Roll Call

The secretary called the roll. Dr. Sullivan related there were a few people who were unable to be present for today's meeting, adding Ms. Mitchell would be attending this afternoon's session.

Remaining LDR Presentations and Recommendations

Growth Information and Analysis: How Will We Not Become Like South Florida?

Mr. Trolle gave a PowerPoint presentation reviewing information contained in his handout, a copy of which is on file in the Commission office. He mentioned County agriculture was suffering and citrus and other agricultural people were having a very tough time making a living economically, and in many cases the development of their lands was the only alternative they had, which played heavily on the growth projections for the County.

Mr. Trolle detailed why he did not think we would become like South Florida. He felt County residents were not informed on planning and controls that existed in the County, and thought we had a detailed and comprehensive planning system and he was quite impressed by what he had recently found out. He pointed out the Urban Services Area boundary was much closer to the Atlantic Ocean than most of the counties to the south and we had an excellent traffic matrix.

Mr. Trolle showed population and age comparisons between Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, Palm Beach and Broward Counties in the years between 1980 and projected in 2030, and reviewed other comparison data between the same counties, as contained in his report on file. Mr. Trolle thought it was interesting to note that the average width of the Urban Service Area in Indian River County was about 5 miles from the Atlantic Ocean, whereby Martin and Palm Beach Counties were 9 miles wide, and St. Lucie County's Urban Service Area had recently been widened from 5 miles to 10 miles.

Mr. Trolle looked at the numbers he had come up with on residential units in the pipeline, as contained in his presentation on file in the Commission office. His recommendations were:

- Verify that our population projections reflect the arrival of national developers, retiring baby boomers and South Florida emigrants.
- Collaborate with cities and towns to maintain aggregate County data on permit pipeline, zoning, LDR and other development matters.
- Coordinate with cities and towns to establish county-wide plans for managing growth.
- Address the annexation issue immediately: investigate chartering the County and purchase land strips to protect unincorporated areas.
- Do not allow any change to the Urban Service Area boundary.
- Support the environmental land program.
- Institute a land acquisition program soliciting tax deductible contributions from wealthy benefactors to purchase development rights on agricultural land.
- Develop a method encouraging developers to purchase development rights on agricultural land, consolidate the development with higher density on less land, allowing the remaining land to stay undeveloped.
- Develop a county-wide effort to educate our citizens on the growth problems to ensure general support for our growth management programs.

Mrs. Berrigan reviewed her report, a copy of which is on file in the Commission office. She felt most methods of controlling growth were already in place, but needed adherence by those entrusted with our public welfare and vigilance by citizens to ensure their adherence. Mrs. Berrigan recommended:

- Holding the Urban Service Area boundary.
- Abolish annexation.

- Promote education of the populace through the media and well-advertised public forums.
- Make sure elected officials perform as promised in their campaign speeches.
- Use public funds only for their stated purpose.

Landscaping: 926

Mrs. Cummings passed out some information on growth in Florida and population statistics on Indian River County, a copy of which is on file in the Commission office. She gave a PowerPoint presentation on landscaping, and a copy of this is also on file.

Mrs. Cummings had the following recommendations:

- Buffers should be a minimum of 35 feet.
- The minimum height requirements should be 15 feet for trees and 4 feet for shrubs.
- Make sure irrigation systems are not activated when it has been raining.
- Utilize drought resistant plants and trees.
- Use plants needing less fertilizer and attracting symbiotic bugs to control pests – avoiding use of pesticides.
- Mandatory preservation of natural landscaping.
- Where preservation of natural landscaping is not possible, mature trees must be planted before building begins.
- All parking lots must have shade trees planted at least 15 feet in height.
- All these regulations must be fully enforced, with no exceptions for points system and credits.

Mrs. Cummings opined individual property rights needed to be balanced by the responsibilities of individual landowners to their communities and their descendents. She felt a landowner's decisions and actions affected their neighbors' property rights and enjoyment of the County. She added the governing bodies needed to stick with the rules and enforce them, and stand up and be counted when it came time to say no.

Mr. Smith read information contained in his handout entitled An Analysis of Indian River County LDR 926 and Comparison with the City of Vero Beach Ordinance Chapter 72, a copy of which is on file in the Commission office. He recommended the following:

- Review, revise and perhaps add to the unwanted tree index and include unwanted shrub and ground cover types.
- Include listing of desirable trees and approved shrubs, grass and ground cover.
- Types of buffer strips that should be absolute are between Developments, Subdivisions and PDs facing roadways. The requirement should be at least 20 feet wide (30 feet if vegetation only) and can consist of fence, concrete wall, berm or a combination thereof. Facing the road, the fence, wall or berm must be landscaped. This requirement should not be waived by planning staff or the Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) during site planning. To override the requirement for this kind of buffer between the development and the roadway, a super vote of the County Commission should be necessary.

Mr. Smith thought the Planning Department of the County appeared to have an awful lot of power to forgive and forget, and he thought perhaps this should be looked at again.

Ms. Keys mentioned one of the P&Z members had requested something be specifically added to the landscape recommendations, i.e. that the buffers not be in the setbacks. Dr. Sullivan asked Ms. Keys to put it in writing and it would be included in the recommendations.

The status of the Tree Ordinances was discussed.

Dr. Sullivan advised additions to the recommendation list could occur today, so if anyone wanted to add something they didn't do last week or if an item had been omitted from their notes, they should get it in while it was being brought together during the lunch break.

At 9:12 a.m. the members took a break, and the meeting reconvened at 9:25 a.m.

Mr. Keating outlined what would be going on with the visioning process, noting this would be an extensive process, lasting 6 to 8 months. He advised the next set of activities to occur would be a set of geographic workshops during the week of July 26, 2004. He affirmed he had a list of all the people of the GTF and would be sure to notify the members individually of what was going on, and encouraged their attendance and input at this and other workshops.

A discussion followed.

Perimeter Buffers: 936.08 pp 6-10 and 911.06 – 911.13

Mr. Miller noted there were currently four different types of buffers: A, B, C and D with fifteen different configurations, some of which were pretty slim. He mentioned type D buffers had huge holes and a lot of small plants, and he agreed all walls should be landscaped on the exterior.

Mr. Boling explained years ago the only requirement with subdivisions was for a berm or a wall, and no required landscaping. He related there was a new requirement passed in January, 2004 that landscaping be part of the subdivision buffering requirements, as well as PDs.

Mr. Miller talked about buffers on various developments he had observed in the area. He thought there ought to be some formal way whereby everyone would be forced to comply with landscape maintenance.

A discussion followed about buffering at The Palms of Vero.

Mr. Boling advised the P&Z and staff had initiated a corridor plan-type of change to multi-family developments, such as The Palms of Vero, to require an opaque feature with landscaping in front of it. He mentioned this had been drafted but had not gone through because staff felt there might be a supporting recommendation from the GTF for that type of change. Mr. Boling stated staff had been in contact several times with the developer of The Palms of Vero to do some screening of the air conditioning units or the back patio area, but there were no requirements for them to do anything extra.

Non-Traffic Concurrency (Water and Sewer, Drainage, Parks): 910

Mr. Clem reviewed the information contained in his handout, a copy of which is on file in the Commission office. He felt recreation should be looked at more definitively insofar as where the needs were and what was being proposed. He suggested looking at South County for need and quality in recreation, including walkways, picnic areas and other more intensive types of recreation. Mr. Clem suggested more arm twisting on developers would seem to be in order to set aside tracts of land to serve the recreational needs of the area.

Mr. Clem went over the data on stormwater drainage, sanitary sewer, potable water and solid waste contained in his report. He recommended the following:

- Focus not only on gross acreage for recreation concurrency, but the actual distribution of facilities and recreation opportunities – where the homes are and where they will be within the next five years.
- More picnic areas with walking paths and basic playground areas would suffice for the short haul where recreation shortages exist.
- Concurrency information should be refined to reflect probable recreational use areas or zones of need. For example, what are opportunities for recreation within: (a) one-half mile; (b) one mile, etc. of a developing or developed area.
- Older subdivisions should be brought up to present standards before building permits are issued, not only for drainage but water, sewer and roads.
- The County, with other governmental bodies, should take the lead in cleaning up water placed in the Indian River, preferably with grants from outside resources including impact fees if outside funds are not available.
- Encourage cluster housing on sites to accommodate more green areas, including drainage areas, i.e. ponds, etc.
- Expand major canals storage capacity and use existing right-of-ways through agreements with the water management districts. Some canal right-of-ways may be grossly underutilized and water storage can be increased in those canal rights of way.
- Encourage the possibility of multi-use for large tracts. If land is needed for recreation, perhaps a tract can be located to fulfill the need for drainage (storm water) retention and recreation in the same area.

Mr. Withers reviewed his presentation on Concurrency Management System (CMS), a copy of which is on file in the Commission office. His recommendations were:

- Fire protection, emergency services and law enforcement can and should be included officially in the CMS and made part of the formal review process to ensure these essential services are available concurrent with the impacts of development. Lack of capacity of those services should be a basis to deny a development permit.
- An evaluation of the adequacy of staff resources dedicated to the concurrency process and workloads should be conducted to ensure the quality of future concurrency reviews and compliance. If the evaluation

concludes that resources are insufficient or workloads are too great, action should be taken to increase staff or reduce workloads.

- Data on remaining capacities in component facilities and services for future growth should be made part of the written concurrency analysis of development plan and rezoning requests submitted to the County Commissioners. This will enable both the Commissioners and the public to understand the cumulative impact of such requests on County facilities and services.
- Qualitative assessments of the impact of development plans and rezonings on wastewater and drainage should be made part of the CMS to ensure that proposed plans or zoning changes do not degrade the quality of wastewater and drainage entering the ecosystem.
- The Infrastructure System Summary By Facility report should include information on drainage impacts. It should also reflect capacity demand relative to action thresholds and action being taken as a consequence.
- The Infrastructure System Summary By Facility should be published on a quarterly basis to inform the public of the impacts of growth on County facilities and services and to raise awareness of planned or pending improvements to the system to accommodate growth.
- The concurrency database should be expanded to include data on capacities and demand for other critical facilities and services, such as fire protection and emergency services, once these other services are included in the CMS.
- Concurrency elements in the Comprehensive Plan must be included in the overall review of the plan, in particular the process for projecting concurrency requirements based on future growth assumptions.

Mr. Zorc wondered if Mr. Withers would consider adding the true demand component of fire protection, emergency services and law enforcement, because looking at the last 100 residential first and the age of the structure, he thought 85 to 90% were typically structures 10 years or older. He felt looking at the demand for resources, it was typically applied to older, existing structures and the newer structures' demand would be potentially less than existing stock because of safety codes, etc.

A discussion ensued.

Mr. Baird reported there was a plan for emergency services the County was working on right now with a consultant, and he maintained everyone was very much in the loop. He disclosed how the County was working on stormwater protection, the South County Park and a new South West County Park.

Mr. Clem thought it was important to take into consideration the age of the people who would be living in the vicinity of a proposed park, since retirees would have different needs and interests than families with young children.

A discussion followed about stormwater and the protection of the Indian River Lagoon.

Uplands and Wetlands Protection: 928 (wetlands and deepwater habitat) 929 (upland habitat)

Mr. Holzworth commented the County had done a lot with regards to wetlands and acquiring lands to protect our wetlands, buffers and uplands. He referred to his handout, a copy of which is on file in the Commission office. Mr. Holzworth recommended the following:

- Hire additional staff to work on wetland and upland protection.
- Have a committee review the appropriate chapters.
- Have planners and/or appropriate staff amend the chapters to include additional measures to protect and conserve.
- Educate both the public and the developers as to the intent and purpose of the LDRs and the County's commitment to their enforcement.

Mr. Deller passed out a copy of his presentation, and a copy is on file in the Commission office. He said he had talked to 17 people and read the LDRs on uplands and wetlands of 9 counties and Indian River Shores and Vero Beach. He felt Martin County had the strongest LDRs in this regard, and thought the problem was because Indian River County let St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) tell them what to do. Mr. Deller pointed out the most successful counties had very strict regulations and forced things in the negotiations, rather than having weak standards and everyone making the minimum.

Mr. Deller reviewed the information contained in his handout, and had the following recommendations:

- Eliminate the fee in lieu of policy, or if this is not politically possible, apply mitigation based on a priority basis and only use fee in lieu of when there is no other alternative and the wetlands are of questionable value.

- Develop an overarching plan to protect the wetlands/uplands by identifying and assessing areas of unique value (areas of concern) and calling them out in the code. Write LDRs to protect and provide incentives for the preservation of uplands.
- Review the current protections provided by SJRWMD and determine if additional regulations are required to assure that wetlands and uplands are protected. Consider developing LDRs to augment the SJRWMD requirements.
- Be prepared to train County staff or hire qualified staff, to assure that our wetlands/uplands are protected.
- Avoid “rubber stamping” the SJRWMD recommendations.
- Consider developing a policy (in addition to the protections provided by SJRWMD) to assure that wetlands/uplands are maintained after the development has been completed. Consider requiring a detailed maintenance plan and a performance bond to assure that the development is properly maintained.
- Review the current buffer requirements to determine if they are adequate (the buffer required In Indian River County is less than most other counties). Consider the elimination of variable buffers.

Mr. Keating agreed the County relied on SJRWMD with regards to wetlands, and he thought they dealt very effectively with everything other than small isolated wetlands, which was the only place the County got involved. He detailed a lot of those small wetlands were of poor quality and many times you were dealing with a situation where you could not even have a development unless you allowed the wetland to be impacted. Mr. Keating advised in these instances the County required mitigation in the form of littoral zones and stormwater tracts.

Mr. Keating recalled when the County was doing its Comprehensive Plan in 1989 and 1990, the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council had a policy of protecting 25% of all native uplands and were encouraging its members to incorporate that. At that time, Indian River County said it did not want to make developers set aside 25%, but would reduce it to 15% and initiate a conservation land referendum bond program. He reported about 30% of the County was in conservation land, which was significantly higher than St. Lucie and Martin counties in both uplands and wetlands. Mr. Keating maintained the County had taken the initiative to work with State and Federal agencies to leverage the bond money for purchase of conservation lands.

Mr. Keating discussed protection for estuarine wetlands and the dune system.

Mrs. Berrigan suggested Indian River County take a look at Martin County's LDRs and blend them in with ours.

A lengthy discussion ensued.

Ms. Keyes had some recommendations she wanted to add to the overall list, and Dr. Sullivan told everyone to turn their recommendations in to the secretary before lunch.

Dr. Sullivan recalled at the first meeting the members had put forth some ideas of what they thought would be the recommendations, and he had written them down but had not gone over them at the time. He pulled out the sheets with the recommendations and said he would put them on the wall over the lunch hour. The predicted recommendations were:

1. Revisit and update the Comprehensive Plan.
2. Open space.
3. Workforce housing opportunities.
4. Tree preservation and addition.
5. Roads and traffic (level of service).
6. Revisit Urban Service Area boundary.
7. Rate of Growth (+/-).
8. Water use/availability.
9. Enforce the "up to" zoning regulations with a downward bias.
10. Balance in Land Use.
11. Height and Density.
12. Proactive right-of-way Acquisition (Committee?).
13. Appropriate impact fees (+alternate: home sale transaction fee)
14. Concurrency/Infrastructure.
15. New relationship between roads (transportation) and stormwater management.
16. Positive interaction between residential development and required services.
17. Allow for single-family low income housing.
18. Road right-of-way and median beautification.
19. Land Purchase - \$50 million bond.
20. Focus on available Federal and State grants.
21. Insist on underground utilities.
22. Purchase future right-of-way property at current prices.
23. Increase landscape and buffer requirements.

24. Increase drainage requirements to protect Lagoon and the Sebastian River.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 11:30 a.m. and reconvened at 1:10 p.m.

Dr. Sullivan passed out a list of the proposed recommendations to each of the GTF members, and asked those present to raise their hands when voting either yes, no or unsure.

Mr. Smith was not present for the afternoon session.

Traffic Concurrency: 910, especially 910.09(4) pp 12-14, 910.10 pp 17-18 and 910.11(1) pp 18-19. Florida Statutes 163.3180

1. Ask property owners living on corridors slated for future right-of-way road expansion to consider selling their property to the County at the same price per acre as that offer by a developer or an investment company, possibly this could be recorded on each of the pieces of property, so when the site came up for sale the County would have first rights to buy it at the pre-development price. **(6 yes, 18 no, 1 unsure)**
2. The County should take a proactive response to road concurrency, and get ahead of the curve on right-of-way acquisition, using as many revenue streams as possible to help achieve that goal. **(23 yes, 2 no)**
3. Do not move the urban services boundary. **(18 yes, 8 no)**
4. Implement the Comp. Plan (i.e. build roads required by the Comp. Plan). **(21 yes, 5 no, 1 unsure)**
5. Do not reduce level of service in traffic concurrency. **(25 yes, 2 no)**
6. Make sure traffic impact fees are adequate to meet the needs of the Comprehensive Plan. **(27 yes, 0 no - UNANIMOUS)**

Traffic Management & Design: 952.12 – 952.17 pp 24-32

7. Increase the Level of Service to Level C. **(2 yes, 23 no, 2 unsure)**
8. Any new development should be required to maintain the Level of Service of the adjacent roadway that existed prior to that development. **(1 yes, 23 no, 1 unsure)**
9. Require left turn lanes at entrances of all developments of 15 units or more. **(13 yes, 12 no, 1 unsure)**
10. Consider frontage roads when possible. **(14 yes, 12 no, 1 unsure)**
11. ~~Developers must maintain at least a D rating on all roads impacted by their~~ projects. **(For Comment Only)**

Mr. Zorc left the meeting at 1:48 p.m.

12. Make the transportation improvement fit into the environment, versus altering the environment to accommodate transportation improvements, specifically increased buffering and enhanced pedestrian and bicycle paths. **(19 yes, 4 no, 2 unsure)**
13. Right and left and stacking turn lanes should be mandated at subdivisions from arterial or collector roads. **(14 yes, 10 no, 2 unsure)**
14. ~~Update design features for internal circulation, and AutoTurn software should be considered for ingress and egress. (Deleted)~~
15. Modify the section on gates to promote secondary accesses for gated communities, and not just for emergency vehicles. **(12 yes, 13 no, 1 unsure)**

A. Building Height: 901 pg 8.1, 911.06 -911.13 pp 7-46 and 911.15(1) pp 46.7-46.8

B. Building Setbacks: 901 pg 41 and 911.06 pp 7-46

16. Have parking lots incorporated on the first floor of buildings for possible credits for increased heights. **(1 yes, 24 no)**
17. ~~Demand more from developers insofar as design, etc. is concerned. (Deleted)~~

Aesthetics/Corridor Plans: (buildings, utilities, signs, landscaping, public and private improvements) 911.18 – 911.21 pp 56-134. Also: SR60 and Wabasso Corridor Plans

18. The County, developers and FPL should work collaboratively to design a plan to educate the general public on where the transformer box can be located. **(For Comment Only)**
19. Where required, require landscaped medians, which would mean building future roadways that drained to the outside so there would be a raised median. **(18 yes, 2 no, 6 unsure)**
20. Adopt existing Corridor Plan LDRs for most of the grids running throughout the County, as per the attachment in the backup on file. **(21 yes, 0 no, 5 unsure)**
21. If the County decided to go forward with the extension of the Corridor Plans, they should work in conjunction with the other municipalities and try to get them to follow through with a similar plan for consistency when going from the unincorporated area to the municipalities. **(26 yes, 0 no – UNANIMOUS)**
22. Set stricter standards about the types of commercial building the County will allow. **(24 yes, 2 no, 1 unsure)**
23. ~~The County and the developers and FPL work collaboratively to design a plan that would educate the general public on where the transformer box can be located. (Refer to #18)~~

24. Require some of the older development on U.S. Highway 1 and in Corridor Plans to comply with the new regulations within a certain amount of time. **(23 yes, 3 no)**
25. ~~Incorporate the County's Corridor Plans into the City of Vero Beach's visioning process. **(For Comment Only)**~~

Utility Alternatives in Cost Aesthetics

26. ~~Pass an ordinance requiring new subdivisions to put all the utilities underground. **(Deleted)**~~
27. Require customer service drop to be underground for all new homes. **(26 yes, 0 no – UNANIMOUS)**
28. Pass an ordinance to prevent utilities from double poling on a single street. **(26 yes, 0 no – UNANIMOUS)**
29. Require substations to be fully landscaped. **(25 yes, 1 no)**
30. ~~Require poles to be concrete, armless construction when you have to have overhead lines. **(For Comment Only)**~~

Traffic Impact Analysis: 952.07 pp 1 – 18

31. A three year roadway capital budget to be tied to the discount fees paid, as recommended and as finally approved by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), to be re-budgeted every three years. The start of this would be related to the other study going on by the Metropolitan Planning Organization to come up with the estimated roadway transportation requirements in the County for the long term. If the accumulated impact fees as budgeted turn out to be too small over time, the discount schedule could be revised downward and no new construction would be permitted if the budget did not cover the minimum service requirements to the affected roadways. **(23 yes, 12 no, 3 unsure)**
32. ~~Start dressing up some of the existing roadway systems with median strips and other landscaping along the County's more prominent roadways. **(For Comment Only)**~~

Affordable Housing

A. Subdivisions: 913

33. Keep RM-10 zoning only for affordable/subsidized housing. **(20 yes, 3 no, 2 unsure)**
34. Instead of 3, 6, 8 and 10 units per acre, allow 2, 4, 6 and 8 units per acre on rezoning. **(13 yes, 10 no, 3 unsure)**
35. ~~Have small lot subdivisions go under the Planned Development (PD) process. **(Deleted – See #44)**~~

36. ~~The proposed price range of houses in small lot subdivision should not be more than a certain percent of the affordable target housing value. (Deleted)~~

B. Site Plans: 914

37. Create an LDR requirement that provides an appropriate buffer for multi-family or higher density projects, per staff recommendation (Corridor Plan). **(26 yes, 0 no – UNANIMOUS)**
38. ~~Any new LDR created should include a study of the increased costs to a project. (For Comment Only)~~
39. ~~Create an architectural review committee for projects that are located in areas of mixed use throughout the County. (Deleted)~~
40. ~~Provide a developer with options of either stricter buffer requirements or an architectural review. (Deleted)~~
41. Review the entire site plan process with the intention of streamlining the process, specifically increasing the coordination between local, State and Federal agencies. **(5 yes, 8 no, 11 unsure)**
42. Create an expedited permit process specifically for affordable housing projects which meets the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. **(1 yes, 12 no, 10 unsure)**

C. PD's: 915

43. Create a Statement of Philosophy to accompany the LDR's when provided to a developer. This document will include the expectations of our community, including the Corridor Plan requirements, pictures of acceptable public exposure, green space, connectivity, frontage roads, setbacks, buffers, etc. See attachment #2 for a sample of what the Town of Jupiter provides, as per the copy of file in the Commission office. **(17 yes, 7 no, 2 unsure)**
44. Eliminate small lot subdivision process for all but affordable housing projects, based on Ch. 420 F.S. definitions. **(24 yes, 1 no, 1 unsure)**
45. ~~Provide staff with necessary software and training to assist in project design and development. (Deleted)~~
46. Hire or contract design and landscape architects, civil and traffic Engineers, and an environmental specialist to review all PD's and assist County staff in guaranteeing the highest quality projects. **(7 yes, 14 no, 4 unsure)**
47. ~~Eliminate "fee in lieu of" standards for wetlands and natural uplands. (Refer to Wetlands Section)~~
48. Manage what is happening outside of the Urban Service Area with 5 and 10 acre lots. Higher development density standards are needed to avoid sprawl, inefficiency in the delivery of services and preservation of open spaces. **(5 yes, 19 no, 2 unsure)**

49. Eliminate right-of-way density credit for all but affordable housing. **(11 yes, 7 no, 7 unsure)**
50. ~~Treat collector roads and major arterials as corridors. Plan project design and require concurrency accordingly. **(See #20 and #21)**~~
51. Provide more incentive for developers to use the PD process and/or increase standard subdivision LDR requirements to equal or exceed those included in the PD regulations. **(16 yes, 3 no, 5 unsure)**
52. ~~Require predictability and consistency in all levels of the County government planning and approval process. **(Deleted)**~~
53. ~~Adopt a Style and Design Code for residential development to be a part of the PD LDRs. **(See #43)**~~
54. Require at least two full entry/exits for each PD with monument signage. **(2 yes, 18 no, 5 unsure)**
55. ~~Turn-in lanes and stacking areas shall be required for entry and exits of PDs on collector roads (should apply to all development types). **(Deleted)**~~
56. There must be connectivity, both vehicle and pedestrian, between PDs and adjoining developments. **(19 yes, 5 no, 1 unsure)**
57. Perimeter buffers will be a minimum of 30 feet and be fully planted with drought tolerant plant material so as to screen the development fully at the time of project development. **(Combined with #58) (6 yes, 14 no, 6 unsure)**
58. Buffers along roads will have berms, to be fully planted with drought tolerant plant material to an initial height of 8 feet. Canopy trees must be included within the buffer. **(Combined with #57) (6 yes, 14 no, 6 unsure)**
59. Eliminate the use of Type C and D buffers and Type B 20 foot wide buffers. Require the use of Type A buffers (LDR 926.08). **(Hold for Section on Buffers)**
60. Streets shall provide curbs, be lighted (100 foot intervals), with right-of-way equal to 55 feet, and meander where possible. This will include curb-to-curb width of 35 feet, parkways on both sides of 5 feet and sidewalks on both sides of 5 feet. **(1 yes, 20 no, 3 unsure)**

The meeting recessed at 3:15 p.m. and reconvened at 3:25 p.m.

61. On lots less than 1 acre, adequate storm drains will be provided in lieu of swales. **(22 yes, 3 no, 1 unsure)**
62. Lakes will have created or natural wetland buffers. **(15 yes, 11 no)**
63. ~~Parkway landscape which includes canopy trees at 25 foot centers will be required. **(Deleted)**~~
64. A minimum lot size of 7,000 square feet is required on the perimeter of the PD. Smaller interior lots may be allowed as a trade-off for additional open space. **(18 yes, 6 no)**

- 65. Open space within a residential PD shall be a minimum of 50% of the project site. **(14 yes, 10 no)**
- 66. Each primary house structure on a block or within 300 feet on adjoining blocks, front, back or side, shall have significant differentiation from all other primary structures. There may be a common building style, but all buildings will have significant variation in façade, design and elevation. **(12 yes, 13 no, 1 unsure)**
- 67. Garage doors may not face the street. **(5 yes, 20 no, 1 unsure)**
- 68. Driveways shall cover no more than 35% of the front yard. **(11 yes, 12 no, 2 unsure)**
- 69. ~~The minimum front yard setback will be 25 feet. (Deleted)~~
- 70. At least two 12 foot canopy trees shall be required on all individual lots. Use of draught tolerant plant materials other than sod shall be encouraged. **(9 yes, 10 no, 6 unsure)**
- 71. All front yard shrubs and other front landscaped areas in PDs shall be located on berms so as to reduce the view of the house from the public street. **(1 yes, 24 no, 1 unsure)**
- 72. Mechanicals and trash receptacles shall be screened from view from the public right-of-way and adjacent neighbors. **(20 yes, 4 no, 1 unsure)**
- 73. The developer shall post a 10-year bond equal to 20% of the common area landscape cost to cover the cost of landscape replacement within the first 10 years of the development. **(5 yes, 21 no)**
- 74. All developments must have a complete set of Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions (CC&R) outlining the rules for maintenance of common and private areas, landscape replacement and HOA fees to accomplish this. **(12 yes, 11 no, 3 unsure)**

D. Small Lot Subdivisions and Accessory Dwelling Units: 971.49(9)
pp38.4 and 39 972.41(10) pp 38.5 and 38.6

- 75. ~~Require that some portion (say 30%) of the small lot subdivision project be set aside for affordable single family units. (Deleted)~~
- OR**
- 76. ~~Require that all small lot subdivision projects be allocated for affordable units within a designated geographic district, in the M1 and M2 density residential areas, which are zoned for 6 units per acre or higher density. (Deleted)~~
- 77. Although both sidewalks and recreation areas are desirable, they should be at the developers' option, in order to maintain the affordability of the housing units being offered. **(2 yes, 23 no, 1 unsure)**
- 78. ~~Create "Affordable Housing Zones" that would allow for less stringent development requirements (i.e. small lot subdivisions). (Deleted)~~
- 79. ~~Small lot subdivisions should no longer be permitted on land zoned for single family homes, outside of possible future "Affordable Housing Zones". (Deleted)~~

Tree Protection and Land Clearing: 927

80. The removal, pruning, trimming or alteration of any tree or vegetation when necessary to ensure safety and efficiency of flight operations and to protect the public using any airport in the incorporated and unincorporated areas of Indian River County. This includes, but is not limited to, any tree or vegetation which penetrates or otherwise impedes navigable airspace as provided under Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations Part 77, or which obstructs air traffic control of aircraft under Federal Aviation Administration regulations. **(24 yes, 1 no, 1 unsure)**
81. The County Utilities Department should remove the sewer fee portion for a water line established to support tree location. **(22 yes, 1 no, 3 unsure)**

Open Space: 901, p34; 911.06 – 911.13 pp7-46 for PD's 915.18 pp11-12.1

82. Afford more open space up front where commercial areas abut PD and residential developments to get additional pedestrian traffic and walking paths and cut down on vehicular traffic. **(15 yes, 7 no, 4 unsure)**
83. ~~Encourage putting the open space up front between the entrance area and where the homes are located. **(For Comment Only)**~~
84. ~~Encourage having more common open space between developments. **(For Comment Only)**~~

Ms. Mitchell left the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

85. Have open space LDR's reflect two scales – one for public view and one for inside the PD or subdivisions. **(10 yes, 7 no, 8 unsure)**
86. ~~More common space with trees and green space, and cut down on the percentage of water for open space. **(Deleted)**~~
87. Revise the list of what is categorized as open space for PD's. **(Suggest workshop or committee) (16 yes, 8 no)**

Providing Infrastructure: Advance Right-of-way Acquisition

88. ~~Use the community matrix to move forward on advance right of way incrementally. **(Deleted – Covered in #2)**~~

Mr. Menger left the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

89. ~~Use extra gas tax dollars for advance right-of-way acquisition. **(For Comment Only)**~~

Non-Traffic Concurrency (Water and Sewer, Drainage, Parks): 910

90. The informal or courtesy concurrency reviews for fire protection, emergency services, and law enforcement be expanded to include personnel and equipment needs at the point of impact of development. **(10 yes, 4 no, 8 unsure)**
91. ~~The Sheriff's department needs to be brought on line and included in the concurrency review process. (Deleted)~~

At this point in the proceedings, Dr. Sullivan asked the members how many of them wanted to stay and finish up today. **(18 yes, 6 no)** It was decided to continue until all the recommendations had been addressed.

92. The County should utilize its jurisdictional authority and make fire protection, emergency services and law enforcement, with standards for personnel and equipment, a formal aspect of concurrency review – rather than an informal courtesy – and require concurrency in these areas for the granting of development permits. **(10 yes, 11 no, 3 unsure)**
93. ~~Current plans and efforts underway to evaluate the qualitative impacts of growth on wastewater and drainage should be accelerated and, once adequate standards and measurements are available these standards and measures should be included formally in the CMS and review process. (For Comment Only)~~
94. ~~An evaluation of the adequacy of staff resources dedicated to the concurrency review process and the workloads imposed by the process should be conducted to ensure the quality of future concurrency reviews and compliance. If the evaluation concludes that resources area inadequate or workloads are too great, action should be taken either to increase staff or reduce workloads. (For Comment Only)~~
95. Component facilities and services for future growth should be made a part of the written concurrency analyses of submitted to the County Commissioners. This will enable both the Commissioners and the public to fully understand and appreciate the cumulative impact of development and rezoning on County facilities and services. **(19 yes, 0 no, 3 unsure)**
96. The Infrastructure System Summary By Facility should be modified as follows:
97. Document capacity demand relative to action thresholds and the action to be taken as a consequence. **(13 yes, 6 no, 4 unsure)**
98. ~~Expand the report to include data on other critical facilities and services, such as fire protection and law enforcement, once these are included formally in the CMS. (Deleted)~~
99. The expanded report should be published regularly (monthly or quarterly) in newspapers and on the County website to inform the public of the impacts of growth on services and facilities and on the planned and

pending improvements to accommodate growth. **(13 yes, 6 no, 4 unsure)**

Uplands and Wetlands Protection: 928 (wetlands and deepwater habitat)
929 (upland habitat)

100. ~~Have committee review the chapters. Include additional measures to protect and conserve. **(Deleted)**~~
101. ~~Educate the public and developers as to the intent and purpose of the LDRs and the County's commitment to their enforcement. **(For Comment Only)**~~
102. ~~Eliminate the fee in lieu of policy. If this is not politically possible, apply mitigation based on a priority basis and only use when there is no other alternative and the wetlands are of questionable value. **(For Comment Only)**~~
103. Develop an overarching plan to protect the wetlands/uplands by identifying and assessing areas of unique value (areas of concern) and calling them out in the code. Write LDRs to protect and provide incentives for the preservation of uplands. **(11 yes, 2 no, 10 unsure)**

Ms. Fulton left the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

104. Review the current protections provided by St. Johns River Water Management District (St. Johns) and determine if additional regulations are required to assure that the wetlands and uplands in the County are protected. Consider developing LDRs to augment St. Johns. **(13 yes, 7 no, 3 unsure)**
105. ~~Be prepared to train County staff or hire qualified staff to assure that our wetlands/uplands are protected. **(For Comment Only)**~~
106. ~~Avoid rubber stamping the St. Johns recommendations. **(For Comment Only)**~~
107. Develop a new policy to assure wetlands/uplands are maintained after the development has been completed. Require a detailed maintenance plan and a performance bond to assure the development is properly maintained. **(12 yes, 8 no, 3 unsure)**
108. Review the current buffer requirements for adequacy. Consider the elimination of variable buffers. **(14 yes, 2 no, 3 unsure)**

Mr. Little left the meeting at 4:55 p.m.

Growth Information and Analysis: How will we not become like South Florida?

109. Verify that our population projections reflect the arrival of national developers, retiring baby boomers and South Florida emigrants. **11 yes, 9 no)**
110. Collaborate with cities and town to maintain aggregate County data on Pipeline, zoning, LDRs and other development matters. **(19 yes, 2 no)**
111. Coordinate with cities and towns to establish County-wide plans for managing growth. **(22 yes, 0 no – UNANIMOUS)**
112. Address the annexations issue immediately: investigate chartering the County and purchase land strips to protect unincorporated areas. **(9 yes, 10 no, 1 unsure)**
113. ~~Do not allow any change to the Urban Service Area boundary. (Deleted)~~
114. ~~Support the environmental land program. (Deleted)~~
115. ~~Institute a land acquisition program soliciting tax deductible contributions from wealthy benefactors to purchase development rights on agricultural lands. (For Comment Only)~~
116. ~~Develop a method encouraging developers to purchase development rights on agricultural land, consolidate the development with higher density on less land allowing the remaining land to stay undeveloped. (For Comment Only)~~

Mrs. Cuffe and Mr. Miller left the meeting at 5:04 p.m.

117. ~~Add a design requirement to our Land Use Density regulations. Enforce lower visual density. (For Comment Only)~~
118. ~~Increase landscaping/buffer requirements for new projects. (Deleted)~~
119. ~~Establish regulations to require maintaining landscaping on high density projects. (Deleted)~~
120. ~~Develop a County wide effort to educate our citizens on the growth issues to generate support for our growth management programs. (Deleted)~~
121. ~~Hold the Urban Service Boundary. (Deleted)~~
122. ~~Abolish Annexation. (Deleted)~~
123. ~~Promote education of the populace through the media and well-advertised public forums. (Deleted)~~
124. ~~Make sure elected officials perform as promised in their campaign speeches. (Deleted)~~
125. ~~Use public funds only for their stated purpose. (For Comment Only)~~

Non-Traffic Concurrency (Water and Sewer, Drainage, Parks): 910

- ~~126. Review land/sites available for recreation and which geographic area they will serve. (Deleted)~~
- ~~127. Review activities needed based on population and the makeup of that population. (Deleted)~~
128. Develop a timeline for having park facilities in place as the demand comes on line, including identifying the cost and availability of funding. **(18 yes, 0 no, 1 unsure)**
- ~~129. Encourage developers set aside tracts of land to serve the recreational needs of the area. (For Comment Only)~~
- ~~130. Encourage cluster housing on sites to accommodate more green areas including drainage areas, i.e. ponds, etc. (For Comment Only)~~
- ~~131. Explore possible purchase of lands for water storage at the South County line in cooperation with St. Lucie County. (Deleted)~~
132. Explore the possibility of multi-use, such as storm water retention and recreation, on large tracts. **(For Comment Only)**
133. Focus not only on gross acreage for recreation concurrency, but the actual distribution of facilities and recreation opportunities. Where the homes are and where they will be within the next five years. Concurrency information should be refined to reflect probable recreational use areas or zones of need. For example, what are opportunities for recreation within; (a) one-half mile; (b) one mile, etc. of a developing or developed area. **(19 yes, no 0 – UNANIMOUS)**
- ~~134. Older sub-divisions should be brought up to present standards before building permits are issued. Not only drainage but water, sewer and roads.~~
- ~~135. The County with other governmental bodies should take the lead in cleaning up water placed in the Indian River Lagoon, preferably with grants from outside resources including impact fees if outside funds are not available. (For Comment Only)~~
- ~~136. Encourage cluster housing on sites to accommodate more green areas including drainage areas, i.e. ponds, etc. (Deleted)~~
- ~~137. Explore major canals storage capacity and use existing right-of-ways through agreements with the water management districts. Some canal right-of-ways may be grossly underutilized and water storage can be increased in those canal rights of way. (For Comment Only)~~
- ~~138. Encourage the possibility of multi use for large tracts. If land is needed for recreation, perhaps a tract can be located to fulfill the need for drainage (storm water) retention and recreation in the same area. (Deleted)~~

Landscaping: 926

Perimeter Buffers: 926.08 pp 6-10 and 911.06 – 911.13 pp

139. Amend the LDRs to place required buffer strips in separate landscape tracts and apply setbacks measured from the tract boundary. **(17 yes, 0 no, 2 unsure)**
140. ~~Landscape all walls. (Deleted)~~
141. ~~Require maintenance of landscape. (Deleted)~~
142. Change buffers to a minimum of 35 feet. **(8 yes, 9 no, 2 unsure)**
143. Remove Type D buffers completely. **(18 yes, 0 no, 2 unsure)**
144. ~~Review points and credits system to close loopholes. (For Comment Only)~~
145. Trees should be larger and more mature – 15 feet at planting. **(5 yes, 13 no, 1 unsure)**
146. Shrubs should be a minimum of 4 feet. **(1 yes, 14 no, 2 unsure)**
147. ~~Recommend shade trees of 15 feet on the interior of parking lots. (For Comment Only)~~
148. Use plants that attract symbiotic bugs that control pests and use less pesticides. **(13 yes, 2 no, 2 unsure)**
149. Adopt Sebastian's (or similar) tree ordinance for individual single family units. **(15 yes, 5 no)**
150. ~~Set strict and detailed objective standards and enforcement for maintenance of buffers beyond the 10 month period after construction. (Deleted)~~
151. ~~Create liens on subdivisions to enforce and pay for maintenance. (Deleted)~~
152. ~~Require houses to face the roadways. (Deleted)~~
153. ~~Provide increased setback from roadway and allow (or require) perimeter roads, bike paths, increased trees and fences, jogging paths. (Deleted)~~
154. ~~Require open space at subdivision entrances and increased landscaping. (Deleted)~~
155. ~~Do not allow berms on both sides of a roadway over long distances. (Deleted)~~
156. Check Martin County LDRs for increased enforcement and standards. **(For Comment Only)**
157. Reduce number of options for buffers (currently 15). Eliminate type C & D on all arterial and collector roads. **(15 yes, 0 no, 5 unsure)**
158. ~~Require all buffer walls to be landscaped on roadway side. (Deleted)~~
159. ~~Enforce/require maintenance of buffers by HOA. (Deleted)~~
160. ~~County should install buffers on road rights of way when taking property for widening of roads. (Property owners option to accept.). (Deleted)~~

Zoning: 911.09

161. ~~Recommend a corridor plan be required for all County roads scheduled for improvement. (Deleted)~~
162. ~~State Road 60 Corridor Plan standards for our main corridors should be consistent with our County roads, as well as Oslo Road. (Deleted)~~
163. ~~Once a “residentially zoned district” provides “transitional justification” there be a moratorium on any future rezoning and land designation change of the residentially zoned district which was used as the justification. This will preclude future encroachment into existing residential subdivisions in the County where residential zoning districts exist. In this case, the existing residentially zoned district surrounding the rezoning of CH to CG cannot be rezoned from RM-3 or RS-6. (Deleted)~~
164. No exceptions to height limitation other than those exceptions that are already in place. **(12 yes, 4 no, 3 unsure)**
165. ~~Review allotted parking spots for multi-family housing. Recommend having 2 parking spaces for a 1-bedroom apartment/condo, 2^{1/2} spaces for 2-bedroom apartment/condos, and 3 parking spaces for 3 bedroom apartment/condos. (For Comment Only)~~
166. Increase the width of parking stalls to 10 feet and don't allow compact stalls for off street parking spaces. **(14 yes, 2 no, 1 unsure)**

Dr. Sullivan thanked everyone for being a part of the GTF and promised they would be receiving a copy of the recommendations for review before they were submitted to the BCC.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:51 p.m.