To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: September 18, 2009 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
    Adopted Amendments to the Town of Lake Clarke Shores Comprehensive Plan
    DCA Reference No. 09-1ER

Background

On June 9, 2009, the Town of Lake Clarke Shores adopted text and Future Land Use Map amendments to the Town Comprehensive Plan. The majority of the text amendments, to all elements of the plan, were to implement the recommendations of an Evaluation and Appraisal Report that was adopted by the Town on August 23, 2006 and found sufficient by the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) on December 29, 2006. Additional amendments were to incorporate the Town’s Water Supply Facility Work Plan into the comprehensive plan.

The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) reviewed the amendments at a regular meeting held on March 20, 2009. The DCA issued an Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report on the proposed amendments on April 3, 2009.

Evaluation

A. TCRPC Report

The TCRPC report contained two comments/recommendations for modification. They were that the Town should:

1) make a stronger commitment to provide affordable housing opportunities for the workforce, including ensuring that a proportion of all future residential development in mixed use overlay areas be affordable to low and moderate income; and
2) clarify new Policy 4.9.6 to require mitigation when access and connectivity is not feasible for development along Forest Hill Boulevard.

B. DCA ORC Report

The DCA Report of April 3, 2009 had two objections. The objections are shown in Attachment A.
C. Town Response

1. To TCRPC Comments/Recommendations for Modification

   The Town response to the TCRPC Comments/Recommendations is shown in Attachment A.

2. To the DCA ORC Report

   The Town’s response to the DCA objections and comments is shown in Attachment B.

Conclusion

For information only.

Attachment
Stephanie Heidt

From: Kevin McGinley [lrmgi@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2009 2:57 PM
To: Mary Pinkerman
Cc: Hess, Terry; sheidt@tcrpc.org; jhattonlcs@bellsouth.net
Subject: Re: FW: Adopted Amendments to the Town Comprehensive Plan

Mary:

The Town elected not to specifically address the two referenced TCRPC comments:

1. The Town is primarily a single-family residential community, as reflected on the Future Land Use Map, and there is little potential for that to change, with the exception of any future redevelopment activity along Forest Hill Boulevard. It is therefore concluded that the affordable housing policies in the Plan represent the most appropriate for the Town's existing and future circumstances. The Town does support a regional approach to providing affordable housing (Policies 5.5.1, 5.5.2 and 5.5.4). Further, due to the fact that a majority of the parcels eligible for mixed-use development along Forest Hill Boulevard are small with specific development intensities determined by the application of land development regulations, it is concluded that requiring a minimum percentage of affordable units is not practical, and may actually inhibit mixed-use development proposals.

2. Similarly, public transit and connectivity will be encouraged by the Town along Forest Hill Boulevard. However, due to the size and shape of many of the parcels, the Town is not in the position to require additional exactions of property owners that may jeopardize or inhibit mixed-use development proposals. At this time, the Town wishes to encourage mixed-use development; not discourage it by adding to development costs.

If you have any additional questions or comments, please contact this office,

Jim Fleischmann
Town Planning Consultant

--

Jim Fleischmann, Vice President
Land Research Management, Inc.
2240 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard,
Suite 103
West Palm Beach, FL 33409
Phone: (561) 686-2481

---------- Original message from "Mary Pinkerman" <mpinkermanlcs@bellsouth.net>:

Here is the email as discussed.

Mary

From: Joann Hatton [mailto: jhattonlcs@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2009 8:56 AM
To: 'Mary Pinkerman'; 'Jo Plyler'; Jim Fleischmann
Subject: FW: Adopted Amendments to the Town Comprehensive Plan

Hi Jim...Please respond to this.

7/21/2009
From: Terry Hess [mailto:thess@tcrpc.org]
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2009 2:18 PM
To: jhattonics@bellsouth.net
Subject: Adopted Amendments to the Town Comprehensive Plan

Ms. Hatton,

I am currently reviewing the adopted amendments to the Town Comprehensive Plan (DCA Ref. # 09-1ER). Although I have not yet received a copy of the correspondence from the DCA indicating that the adopted amendment materials provided by the Town are complete; I expect to receive that correspondence soon. The report that is prepared for the Regional Planning Council Board on adopted amendments is generally very brief and there is no action taken by the Board. However, I must indicate in the report how the local government responded to the DCA ORC Report (which you have provided) and to the comments/recommendations for modification made by the TCRPC. The TCRPC has two comments/recommendations for modification in its report dated March 20, 2009. The comments had to do with affordable housing and with access and connectivity along Forest Hill Boulevard.

In the materials provided with the amendments, I did not find any indication that the Town had addressed the TCRPC comments/recommendations. If the Town discussed and/or addressed those recommendations, please let me know. Otherwise, I will indicate in my report that the Town did not address the TCRPC recommendations. You have no statutory responsibility to respond to the TCRPC comments/recommendations, but I am required by our Board to indicate if and how the local government responded. Thanks for your assistance.

Terry L. Hess, AICP
Deputy Director
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
I. CONSISTENCY WITH CHAPTER 163, F.S., AND RULE 9J-5, F.A.C.

The amendment contains the Town's EAR based amendments, 10-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan and its annual Capital Improvements Element update. The EAR based amendment includes policy changes to Future Land Use, Transportation, Housing, Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Stormwater Management, Potable Water and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge, Coastal Management, Conservation, Recreation and Open Space, Intergovernmental Coordination, and Capital Improvements and Elements. The Town of Lake Clarke Shores proposed amendments address issues raised in the Town's Evaluation and Appraisal Report, address statutory changes, and update the goals, objectives and policies of the comprehensive plan. The Department has identified the following objections and comments to the proposed comprehensive plan amendment.

OBSESSIONS AND RESPONSES

CONSERVATION ELEMENT

Objection 1: Policy 7.11.1 related to water conservation does not identify the water conservation programs the Town will coordinate with the Village of Palm Springs and Palm Beach County. Nor does the Policy include specific programs and guidelines how the Town will coordinate with Palm Beach County and Village of Palm Springs to implement these water conservation measures.

Recommendation: Policy 7.11.1 should be revised to identify the water conservation programs to be implemented by the Town and to implement these water conservation programs, include the specific programs and activities the Town intends to coordinate with Palm Beach County and the Village of Palm Springs.

Response: Policy 7.11.1 is revised to read as follows: **Policy: 7.11.1 Coordinate with the Village of Palm Springs and Palm Beach County to implement potable water conservation programs established as part of their Water Supply Facilities Work Plans and Consumptive Use Permits. Specific areas of coordination will include:**

- Encouraging residents and businesses to participate in water conservation programs by publishing conservation measures in The Shore Lines (Town newsletter).
• Requiring the use of water-efficient landscaping in all new development and redevelopment activities.

• Enforcement of the South Florida Water Management District’s lawn and landscape irrigation rule, which limits irrigation to two days per week, as may be revised.

• Requiring functioning rain-sensor devices on all new automatic irrigation systems.

• Adoption of graduated water use rates enacted by the Village of Palm Springs and Palm Beach County as a means of reducing consumptive water use rates.

• Continuing the leak detection and repair program for all Town-owned potable water distribution facilities.

• Promote water conservation through enforcement of the Florida Building Code which requires such items as low-volume commodes, water flow restrictions for showers, and spigots and similar devices in all new construction and renovations.

10-YEAR WATER SUPPLY FACILITIES WORK PLAN

Objection 1: The Town of Lake Clarke Shores has not included data and analysis regarding the bulk sales agreements the Town has with the Village of Palm Springs and the City of Lake Worth to demonstrate that water supply from the Village and the City will be available through the 10-year planning timeframe of the Water Supply Plan.

Recommendation: The Town of Lake Clarke Shores needs to revise its Water Supply Plan to include information about the bulk sales agreements Lake Clarke Shores has with the Village of Palm Springs and the City of Lake Worth. The data and analysis should include the expiration dates of the agreements, the amount of water Palm Springs and Lake Worth will provide to Lake Clarke Shores, and whether the amount of water is sufficient to meet the future demands in the areas served by the water suppliers.

If the agreements are due to expire within the next 10 years, the Town should include data and analysis regarding renewing the agreements or if the agreements will not be renewed, include data and analysis discussing the actions that will be undertaken by the Town to provide potable water in the areas currently being served by Palm Springs and Lake Worth. Include any needed capital improvements to be implemented by the Town in the next five years in a financially feasible schedule of capital improvements.

Response: The Ten-Year Water Supply Facilities work Plan has been revised to include section B.8. Service Agreements (Ref: Attached revised pages). The section discusses the agreements that the Town has (existing, pending, or expired) with Palm Beach County, Palm Springs and Lake Worth. Also (Ref: page 16 of the revised Ten-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan), the Town proposes to add Policies 6.6.6 to 6.6.8 to the Infrastructure Element directing the Town to execute and maintain appropriate interlocal agreements establishing potable water service areas and bulk-purchase arrangements as follows:
Add Policy 6.6.6: The Town shall execute and maintain service area agreements with the Village of Palm Springs and Palm Beach County for the provision of potable water services in Town Service Areas A and B (i.e. those areas where potable water distribution systems are owned and operated by Palm Springs and Palm Beach County, respectively, and billed on an individual basis), as defined on Map 1 of the Lake Clarke Shores Ten-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan.

Add Policy 6.6.7: The Town shall execute and maintain a service area agreement with Palm Beach County for the identification of an exclusive service area located in the unincorporated area known as the “Town Southern Service Area”, as defined on Map 2 of the Lake Clarke Shores Ten-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan.

Add Policy 6.6.8: The Town shall execute and maintain bulk purchase agreements with the Village of Palm Springs and the City of Lake Worth, or their assigns, for the purpose of providing a potable water supply source to Service Area C, as defined on Map 1 of the Lake Clarke Shores Ten-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan, and the unincorporated area known as the “Town Southern Service Area”, as defined on Map 2 of the Lake Clarke Shores Ten-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan. The bulk purchase agreements shall specify the number of gallons of water to be provided in order to meet current and future demands, as defined in the Town’s Ten-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan and the Lake Worth Ten-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan.

It should be noted that not all of the existing and proposed agreements are “bulk-sale” agreements; rather, they are more generally termed “service area” agreements. The above policies are oriented to implementing bulk-sale agreements, where appropriate, while maintaining service area agreements.

**COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**

**TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT**

Comment 1: Revised Policy 4.3.2 adopting the Metropolitan Planning Organization’s 2020 Long Range Plan references an outdated document rather than the current 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan.

Revise Policy 4.3.2 to reference the Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Palm Beach 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan and include the author and date/edition of the document being adopted by reference. Documents adopted by reference and subsequently revised, will need to be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan through the plan amendment process.

Response: Policy 4.3.2 revised to state “...2030 Long Range Transportation Plan (Palm Beach County Metropolitan Planning Organization; 2008).
CONSERVATION ELEMENT

Comment 1: Revised Policy 7.3.5 proposes to delete the reference to the Florida Game and Freshwater Fish Commission official list of threatened and endangered wildlife. As proposed to be revised, the Policy refers to an unspecified "Official" list.

Policy 7.3.5 should be revised to reference threatened and endangered wildlife as listed by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWCC) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Response: Revised Policy 7.3.5 to reference the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWCC) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service official listings.

Comment 2: Policy 7.4.5 has been revised to delete the reference to the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission but has not been replaced with an agency the Town intends to coordinate with to develop strategies to improve fish habitat in Lake Clarke Shores. Policy 7.4.5 should be revised to include an agency with whom the Town will coordinate to improve the fish habitat of Lake Clarke Shores. The Department recommends reinstating the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission as the entity for this coordination.

Response: Revised Policy 7.4.5 to reference the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWCC).

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

Comment 1: Policy 8.2.1 states "Establish Level of Service Standards for recreation as provided by State of Florida, Department of Community Affairs". The Department of Community Affairs does not establish recreation level of service standards. Since Policy 8.3.1 establishes a LOS standard of 2 acres per 1000 population for land and 25 acres per 1000 population for water, Policy 8.2.1 can be deleted.

Response: Policy 8.2.1 has been revised to read "Reserved", to be held for future use, as needed.
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT AND ANNUAL UPDATE OF THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT & THE 5-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN

Comment 1: The CIP should include publicly funded projects, regardless of funding agency, and privately funded projects needed to achieve and maintain adopted LOS standards. This would include improvements in the Florida Transportation Department's Adopted Work Program, the Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Transportation Improvement Program, and Palm Beach County's CIP. There also should be coordination relating to improvements in the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan. The Town should examine these documents to ensure the appropriate projects are included in the comprehensive plan CIP.

Response: These documents were reviewed, and all appropriate projects have been included in Table 10-1B.

Comment 2: Policy 10.1.9 can be deleted since it is same as Policy 10.1.5.

Response: Policy 10.1.9 has been deleted.

II. CONSISTENCY WITH CHAPTER 187, F.S.: The proposed amendment is inconsistent with the following provisions of Chapter 187, F.S., the State Comprehensive Plan:

Section 187.201 (4), Housing, Policies (b) 1, 2, and 3: Increase the supply of safe, affordable, and sanitary housing for low-income and moderate-income persons and the elderly;

Section 187.201(7), Water Resources, Policies (b) 3, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 14: Ensure that new development is compatible with existing local and regional water supplies, protect aquifers, and promote water conservation;

Section 187.201(15), Land Use Policy (b) 1: Promote state programs, investments, and development and redevelopment activities which encourage efficient development and occur in areas which will have the capacity to service new population and commerce;

Section 187.201(16), Urban and Downtown Revitalization; Use existing infrastructure to accommodate growth in an orderly, efficient, and environmentally acceptable manner;

Section 187.201(17), Public Facilities: Protect the substantial investments in public facilities that already exist and plan for and finance new facilities to serve residents in a timely, orderly, and efficient manner;

Section 187.201(19), Transportation: Direct future transportation improvements to aid in the management of growth and develop a state transportation system that integrates highway, air, mass transit, and other transportation modes; and

Section 187.201(25), Plan Implementation, Policies (b) 1, 3 and 5: Ensure that local plans implement and accurately reflect State goals and policies.

Response - Consistency with Chapter 187, F.S.: By addressing the objections noted in Section I, inconsistencies with Chapter 187, Florida Statutes are addressed.
To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: September 18, 2009 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
Adopted Amendments to the City of Lake Worth Comprehensive Plan
DCA Reference No. 05-1

Background

On February 1, 2005, the City of Lake Worth adopted three amendments to the Future Land Use Map of the City Comprehensive Plan. Due to an oversight, the adopted amendments were not submitted to the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) for a compliance review. The City is now seeking a compliance review by the DCA.

The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) reviewed the proposed amendments at a regular meeting held on December 17, 2004. The DCA issued a letter in lieu of an Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report on December 30, 2004.

Evaluation

A. TCRPC Report

The TCRPC Report included no objections to the proposed amendments. However, Council had three comments, all having to do with the Citizens’ Master Plan for the Park of Commerce (see Attachment A).

B. DCA ORC Report

The letter of December 30, 2004 indicated that the DCA had determined the amendments would not be formally reviewed for consistency with Chapter 163, Florida Statutes or Rule 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code. The ORC report was waived.

C. City Response

1. To TCRPC Comments/Recommendations for Modification

No response received.

2. To the DCA ORC Report

No response necessary.
Conclusion

For information only.

Attachment
Excerpts from TCRPC report on City of Lake Worth
Comprehensive Plan Amendments (DCA Ref# 05-1)
Approved at December 17, 2004 Council Meeting, Agenda Item 5F

1. In Amendment 2004-36, the City proposes to redesignate 59 acres of land that currently have a range of industrial, residential, and commercial FLUM designations, to Industrial. The City’s Industrial FLUM designation does not allow residential uses. The Citizens’ Master Plan for the Park of Commerce calls for a mix of workforce/affordable housing within the park. Also, there are no provisions for a mix of uses in the City’s Industrial FLUM designation. The Citizens’ Master Plan clearly identifies locations where property and business owners expressed a desire to allow for mixed use development.

City staff has indicated that the City has never adopted the Citizens’ Master Plan for the Park of Commerce. However, the City has initiated steps that will result in changes to the comprehensive plan and zoning code. A new zoning district is anticipated for the Park of Commerce. If the comprehensive plan and zoning code are modified so that the recommendations of the Citizens’ Master Plan can be carried out, then the concerns expressed above would be addressed. Currently, however, the City’s Industrial FLUM designation does not appear to allow for the necessary flexibility to allow the recommendations of the plan to be carried out.

2. The new zoning district to be drafted for the Park of Commerce should contain provisions for building siting, building height, parking, and street types as recommended in the master plan.

3. The City has not adopted the Citizens’ Master Plan as a component of or overlay to its comprehensive plan. However, the City has referenced the recommendations contained in the plan in its decision making process. The City should adopt a comprehensive plan policy to support the recommendations of the Citizens’ Master Plan and commit to using the plan as a guide for ensuring that the vision of the citizens is considered during the preparation of the new codes that will guide the development/redevelopment of the Park of Commerce.
To:              Council Members  

From:           Staff  

Date:           September 18, 2009 Council Meeting  

Subject:        Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review  
                 Adopted Amendments to the Martin County Comprehensive Plan  
                 DCA Reference No. 09-1  

Background  

On August 13, 2009, Martin County adopted amendments to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and to the Urban Service Boundary Map of the County Comprehensive Plan. The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) reviewed the proposed amendments at a regular meeting held on June 19, 2009. The Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) issued a letter in lieu of an Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report on June 23, 2009.  

Evaluation  

A. TCRPC Report  

The TCRPC report contained two comments/recommendations for modification. The first was to establish a link between the Sunset Ridge FLUM amendment property and the supermarket center. The second was to ensure that the Okeechobee Waterway FLUM amendment parcel was developed in the form of new neighborhoods.  

B. DCA ORC Report  

The letter of June 23, 2009 indicated the DCA had no objections to the proposed amendments and that the letter served as the ORC Report.  

C. County Response  

1. To TCRPC Comments/Recommendations for Modification  

   The County response is included as Attachment A.  

2. To the DCA ORC Report  

   No response necessary.
Conclusion

For information only.

Attachment
Terry Hess, AICP
Deputy Director
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
421 SW Camden Ave.
Stuart, FL 34994

Re: Response to TCRPC comments on DCA No. 09-1.

Dear Mr. Hess:

Attached please find staff response to comments provided by the TCRPC in review of Martin County Comprehensive Plan Amendments DCA #09-1.

If you have any questions, please contact me at the above address, telephone (772) 288-5495, FAX (772) 288-5960, or email nikkv@martin.fl.us.

Yours sincerely,

Nicki van Vondo
Growth Management Director

NvV/RWL/jvs
Response to Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council Comments  
DCA # Martin County 09-1  
Prepared by the Martin County Growth Management Department  
August 20, 2009

TCRPC Comment #1: Sunset Ridge (CPA 09-1). A link, parallel to US 1, connecting the site to the adjacent neighborhood center should be established consistent with Policy 7.1.3.1.

Staff Response to TCRPC Comment # 1:  
The applicant states that they do not own or control the property needed to make this happen. However, during PUD negotiations, Martin County staff was able to secure pedestrian walking paths and connecting driveways to the adjacent properties that provide reasonable access to the shopping center to the south.

TCRPC Comment #2: Tesoro Groves (CPA 09-2). In order to ensure the land use changes requested further the goals of the SRPP, the development pattern of the Okeechobee Waterway parcel should be in the form of new neighborhoods consistent with Regional Goals 2.5 and 6.1; Strategies 2.5.1 and 6.1.1; and Policies 4.1. 1.1, 6.1.1.1,6.1.1.2,7.1.3.1, to.1.1.1, and 12.1.1.2.

Staff Response to TCRPC Comment # 2:  
Staff agrees with TCRPC comments. The applicant has provided the following response: “The applicant generally concurs with all of the RPC’s comments and recommendation regarding Tesoro Groves with the understanding that none of their comments affect the pending CPA applications. A specific development plan will depend on future market conditions and there is no intent to development the property in the near future. To the extent Martin County’s land development regulations will permit a mix of uses and densities as suggested by the RPC’s comments, the applicant will agree to consider a traditional neighborhood development pattern when the property becomes ripe for development.”
To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: September 18, 2009 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
Adopted Amendments to the Town of Palm Beach Comprehensive Plan
DCA Reference No. 09-1ER (formerly 08-1ER)

Background

On April 15, 2009, the Town of Palm Beach adopted text amendments to all elements of the Town Comprehensive Plan. The amendments were pursuant to the recommendation of Evaluation and Appraisal (EAR) Report adopted by the Town on December 12, 2006 and found sufficient by the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) on April 2, 2007.

The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) reviewed the proposed amendments at a regular meeting held on October 17, 2008. The DCA issued an Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report on the proposed amendments on November 21, 2008.

Evaluation

A. TCRPC Report

The TCRPC Report contained no comments/recommendations for modification. The amendments were considered to be consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

B. DCA ORC Report

The DCA Report contained fourteen objections. The objections are shown in Attachment A.

C. Town Response

1. To TCRPC Comments/Recommendations for Modification

   No response necessary.

2. To the DCA ORC Report

   The Town responses is shown in Attachment A.

Conclusion

For information only.

Attachment
RESPONSE TO ORC REPORT FROM DCA REGARDING THE TOWN’S PROPOSED EAR-BASED AMENDMENTS

OBSJECTIONS

General Objection #1: The Town has not established the appropriate short (five-year) and long term (10-year) planning time frames in the proposed revisions to the comprehensive plan. As a result, the data and analysis to evaluate the adequacy of existing facilities and the need for new or expanded facilities to meet projected growth is incomplete.

Response: The planning time frames used were those done with the creation of the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR), which was completed in 2006. We have updated the planning time frames to reflect the adoption date (2009) of the EAR-based amendments, therefore the 5-year planning time frame extends to 2014, and the 10-year planning time frame extends to 2019. Furthermore, population projections through 2019 have been included, and the data and analysis for each of the comprehensive plan elements was reviewed and updated, when applicable, to reflect the change to the planning time frames, and ensure that the demands of future Town residents are met.

Future Land Use Objection #1: The Town did not include an Existing Land Use Map.

Response: The Existing Land Use Map was in the process of being digitized at the time, and was inadvertently left out of the previous transmittal. We have now included this map, which shows the existing land uses within the Town, and the natural features that exist in the Town, including waterbodies and shore lines.

Future Land Use Objection #2: The Town did not include specific intensity standards for land use designations other than residential. Without intensity standards for non-residential development, the maximum development potential cannot be determined.

Response: The last comprehensive plan amendments done by the Town in 2003 included intensity standards for non-residential development; however, this material was not incorporated into the previous transmittal to DCA. The Future Land Use Element has been revised to include this previously approved language that details intensity standards for non-residential development.
Future Land Use Objection #3: A Future Land Use Map series has been included, but the Town has not identified the future year the map is intended to represent. The long term planning time frame needs to be a minimum of 10 years from adoption of the updated comprehensive plan. Since it is anticipated that the Town will adopt these revisions to the comprehensive plan in 2009, the 5-year and 10-year planning times should be 2014 and 2019, respectively.

Response: The Future Land Use Map series has been updated to reflect the 2014 five-year planning time frame and the 2019 ten-year planning time frame.

Transportation Objection #1: An Existing Transportation Map is included, but is inadequate. The transportation map does not include a date. Additionally, the map does not include the following information: limited and controlled access facilities; public transit routes or service areas; public transit routes or terminals; public transit rights-of-way and exclusive public transit corridors; significant bicycle and pedestrian ways; the existing functional classification and maintenance responsibility for all roads; the number of through lanes for each roadway; designated local and regional transportation facilities critical to the evacuation of the coastal population; existing peak hour and peak direction levels of service and capacity of significant parking facilities with duration limitations if applicable.

Response: The Existing Transportation Map series has been revised to include the current date/year (2009), and all other required information.

Transportation Objection #2: A Future Transportation Map is included but the Town has not identified the future year it is intended to represent. The long term planning time frame needs to be a minimum of 10 years from adoption of the updated comprehensive plan. Additionally, the map does not include the following information: limited and controlled access facilities; public transit routes or service areas, public transit routes or terminals; public transit rights-of-way and exclusive public transit corridors; significant bicycle and pedestrian ways; the existing functional classification and maintenance responsibility for all roads; the number of through lanes for each roadway; designed local and regional transportation facilities critical to the evacuation of the coastal population; existing peak hour and peak direction levels of service and capacity of significant parking facilities with duration limitations if applicable.

Response: The Future Transportation Map series has been revised to include the long-term planning time frame (2019), and all other required information.
Transportation Objection #3: The Town eliminated all policies under Objective 4 that address the need for coordination between the Town and responsible governmental agencies external to the Town regarding transportation impacts to the Town consistent with the Town’s effort to manage traffic congestion on its roadways.

Response: The policies in Objective 4 have been revised and put back into the comprehensive plan, and detail how the Town will continue to coordinate with outside agencies to ensure intergovernmental coordination regarding traffic impacts within the Town. The following are the revised policies (added language in blue):

**POLICY 4.1**

The Town will coordinate with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Palm Beach County, West Palm Beach and other communities to minimize transportation impacts to the Town through participation in the Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and its respective committees.

**POLICY 4.2**

The Town will coordinate directly with FDOT to mitigate traffic impacts on SR 80 and other regionally significant roads leading to Palm Beach.

Transportation Objection #4: The Transportation Element indicates a level of service standard for State Road A1A that is inconsistent with the level of service set by Palm Beach County. The Town indicates that the level of service for State Road A1A is “E,” however the County lists it as “D.” Additionally, the County and the Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization have constrained the roadway to a maximum of two through lanes.

Response: The level of service for SR A1A listed in Policy 2.1 must remain at “E,” because this is the current level of service for a portion of the road. Policy 2.1 has been revised though to include Palm Beach County and the Palm Beach County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) along with FDOT to ascertain the appropriate methodology to determine an appropriate level of service for SR A1A (and other similar roads). If a level of service different than “E” is deemed to be appropriate, then the Town will amend its Comprehensive Plan to reflect this. However, if the level of service “E” is found to be appropriate, then the Town will coordinate with the County and the MPO so that their plans reflect this. Policy 2.1 has been revised as follows:

**POLICY 2.1**
The Town shall use the following two-way peak-hour, peak-season level of service (LOS) standards for facilities and segments listed below, effective one year from adoption of this element.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY OR SEGMENT</th>
<th>&quot;LOS&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) SR A1A</td>
<td>&quot;E&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Royal Poinciana Way</td>
<td>&quot;D&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Cocoanut Row/Bradley Place from to Seabreeze to north of Royal Poinciana Way</td>
<td>&quot;E&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Southern Boulevard</td>
<td>&quot;E&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) All other roadways</td>
<td>&quot;D&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within one year following adoption of this Plan, the Town will contact the [Florida FDOT, Palm Beach County and the MPO](http://www.palmbeachcounty.org) for the purpose of determining an appropriate methodology for determining the level of service on roadways in the Town where there are no traffic signals. The purpose of this effort will be to develop a constrained roadway strategy for SR A1A and Southern Boulevard within the Town.

---

**Housing Objection #1:** The policies that address affordable housing are inadequate. The Town relies on the private sector to provide housing for low and moderate-income households through the open market and provision of on-site housing for domestic employees. Florida Administrative Code requires the Town to create and maintain affordable housing for all current and anticipated future residents of the jurisdiction as well as provide adequate sites and distribution of housing for very-low-income, low-income, and moderate-income households.

**Response:** Florida Administrative Code says that the Town’s Housing Element must ensure the creation and/or preservation of affordable housing; it does not say that the Town must create the affordable housing. While the Town does rely on the private sector to provide affordable housing to meet the Town’s needs, the Town also encourages (Policy 10.1) and monitors (Policies 10.2 & 10.3) this to ensure that the affordable housing needs are being met by the private sector. Historically, over the past 20 years, the private sector has provided affordable housing units that far exceed the demands within the Town.

As stated in the data and analysis portion of the Housing Element, the Town anticipates an increase of only 15 very-low to moderate-income households over the next ten year period. The private sector
construction activity is anticipated to create 130 new housing units over the next 10 years, and each new housing unit built will generate approximately 1.09 units of on-site living accommodations for domestic employees; therefore, approximately 141 very-low to moderate income units will be created by the private sector over the next 10 years, which will more than satisfactorily address the needs of an additional 15 very-low to moderate income households anticipated over the same time period.

This analysis and subsequent policies were developed as a result of the 1989 Stipulated Settlement Agreement between the Town and DCA (DOAH CASE NO. 89-7028). The same type of analysis and policies were done in the Town’s last EAR-based amendment process (1997), which were found to be in compliance by DCA. Furthermore, the use of accessory dwelling units such as housing for domestic employees has been encouraged by the State of Florida since 2004 when the Florida Legislature revised the Growth Management Act of 1985 to include a section (§163.31771, F.S.) to promote the use of accessory dwelling units as an affordable, rental option for very-low, low-, and moderate-income residents.

It is the Town’s position that the stated goals, objectives and policies in the Housing Element meet or exceed the affordable housing requirements found in Chapter 163, Florida State Statutes and Chapter 9J-5 of the Florida Administrative Code, and no changes are necessary. However, the Town will continue to diligently monitor this situation (Policies 10.2 & 10.3), and will make any necessary adjustments to the comprehensive plan if the affordable housing situation within the Town changes (Policy 10.4).

Coastal Management & Conservation Objection #1: The Town does not address limiting development within the Coastal High Hazard Area, and has eliminated the policies under Objective 14, which previously addressed this issue.

Response: The policies in Objective 14 have been revised and put back into the comprehensive plan, and detail what techniques the Town will use to limit development in the Coastal High Hazard Area. The following are the revised policies (added language in blue):

POLICY 14.1

The Town will limit residential development within the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA).

POLICY 14.2

The Town will limit public building and infrastructure investment in the CHHA.

POLICY 14.3
City-funded public facilities shall not be built in the coastal high hazard area, except for purposes of public safety and/or access, enhancement of water-related activities or significant resource protection.

POLICY 14.4

The Town will not permit density increases in the CHHA for redevelopment and new development unless such requests are consistent with this Comprehensive Plan.

Coastal Management & Conservation Objection #2: The Town has identified the entire Town limits as Coastal High Hazard Area. This definition and delineation is out-of-date and does not meet the current definition of the CHHA as contained in Section 163.3178(2)(h), F.S., which defines the CHHA as “[t]he area below the elevation of the category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (SLOSH) computerized storm surge model.” The statute requires that no later than July 1, 2008, local governments shall amend their future land use map and coastal management element to include the new definition of coastal high-hazard area and to depict the coastal high hazard area on the Future Land Use Map.

Response: The correct boundaries of the CHHA are now included in the Future Land Use Map series, and the new CHHA definition has been added to the Coastal Management Element and the Future Land Use Element.

Intergovernmental Coordination Objection #1: The Town fails to address the need for coordination with responsible external governmental agencies regarding transportation impacts consistent with the Town’s effort to manage traffic congestion on its roadways. The Town eliminated the policies under Objective 7 which previously addressed this issue.

Response: The policies in Objective 7 have been revised and put back into the comprehensive plan, and detail how the Town will continue to coordinate with outside agencies to ensure intergovernmental coordination regarding traffic impacts within the Town. The following are the revised policies (added language in blue):

POLICY 7.1
The Town will coordinate with the FDOT, Palm Beach County, West Palm Beach and other communities to minimize transportation impacts to the Town through participation in the MPO and its respective committees.

POLICY 7.2

The Town will coordinate directly with FDOT to mitigate traffic impacts on SR 80 and other regionally significant roads leading to Palm Beach.

Capital Improvements Objection #1: The Town did not use the correct planning time frame in the 5-Year Schedule of Capital Improvements.

Response: The correct planning time frame (2008/2009 - 2012/2013) has been added to the 5-Year Schedule of Capital Improvements.

Capital Improvements Objection #2: The Town’s Capital Improvement Element is inadequate for the following reasons:

- Funding sources are not identified on a year by year basis and there is no indication of whether the funds are committed or planned. Revenue sources must be committed for the first three years of the schedule and can be committed or planned revenue sources for years four and five;
- According to the Town, none of the projects listed in the schedule are required to achieve or maintain level of service standards. However, the Town did not provide data and analysis to demonstrate how it is attaining and maintaining its adopted level of service standards for concurrency related services; and
- The Town did not provide adequate detail in the project descriptions regarding the location of the projects.

Response: The Capital Improvements Element has been revised to address the issues stated. General descriptions of project locations are detailed in the data and analysis. Funding for all projects will come from the general fund, except where indicated in the 5-Year Schedule of Capital Improvements table under “Offsetting Revenues,” and a note to this effect has been added to the table. A second note has been added to the 5-Year Schedule of Capital Improvements table that states that all funds are committed through FY 2011, while the funds for FY 2012 and FY 2013 are planned. Furthermore, the data and analysis includes greater explanation as to how current LOS standards are being maintained, and the rationale for selecting and prioritizing the projects listed in the Schedule of Capital Improvements.
The following is the added and revised language that will be included in the data and analysis section of the Capital Improvements Element:

**SUMMARY OF BUDGETED CAPITAL ITEMS**

Table VIII-1 sets forth the Town’s proposed Schedule of Capital Improvements (SCI) and budget for FY 2008 (carry-over) through FY 2013. This program and budget reflect the needs identified in the various Elements of the Comprehensive Plan as well as other capital needs identified by the Town. No projects or needs have been identified that are necessary to maintain the Town’s various levels of service. The Town also has no level of service deficiencies. Because of the very limited anticipated growth in the Town over the next five to ten years (as shown in the population projections found in the Future Land Use Element), most of the existing infrastructure can continue to support the needs of the Town’s residents. Many of the projects identified in the Schedule of Capital Improvements are those needed for maintenance of the infrastructure to further ensure that the adopted LOS standards are met or exceeded, and the Town is taking a pro-active approach to address these matters rather than waiting until the infrastructure maintenance becomes critical.

The exception to this are the drainage improvement projects, which have been done and continue to be done in order to improve the LOS for drainage in the Town, which was one of the special items of concern raised in the Town’s most recent Evaluation and Appraisal Report. In 2003 the Town increased the on-site drainage retention requirement from the first inch of rainfall to the second inch of rainfall in order to reduce the potential for flooding. The drainage projects listed in the Schedule of Capital Improvements are a very high priority, and will work well with the new on-site retention requirement to further reduce the potential for flooding, and improve the LOS for drainage.

Other activities which will be undertaken within the next five years are not listed because they are subject to funding from other sources (such as the Florida Department of Transportation) or because their costs do not qualify as capital expenditures.

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**Storm Water Drainage Improvements**

FY09 will complete the projects proposed for the seventh year of the original 10-year, north-end drainage program. The FY09 projects include the design and construction of improvements to Tangier Avenue and No. Lake Way between El Dorado Lane and Plantation Road and interim renovations to the D-9 (Mediterranean) pump station. There are monies available to address any unanticipated storm pump structure rehabilitation needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>$3,302,000*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget Impact</td>
<td>There will be no increase to personnel. Operating costs associated with this project should minimally increase (Repairs and Maintenance &lt; $5,000 annually.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sanitary Sewer Improvements (Including Force Main Rehabilitation)
This program allows for general improvements to the sanitary sewerage system. These improvements will include replacement of collection system lines, lining of existing mains, and unscheduled emergency repairs at major and minor pumping stations. This project also includes a multi year program to systematically replace an aging force main system and install air release valves as necessary. There is an intent to replace existing expelsior and ejector stations with new submersible pump stations.

Public Works will be constructing a booster pump station utilizing in-line variable speed pumps to eliminate the need for use of the West Palm Beach Central Pump Station. This will eliminate the operation and maintenance costs at the Central Pump Station and the Town will operate and maintain its own pump station. This project includes monies to fund planned or emergency repairs of the Town’s sewage force main and its sewage facilities shared with the City of West Palm Beach, which leads to the regional sewage treatment facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>$2,016,000*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget Impact</td>
<td>There will be no increase to personnel. Operating costs associated with this project should minimally increase (Repairs and Maintenance &lt; $5,000 annually.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Streets and Roads
Funds were allocated for the purpose of rehabilitating Town maintained bridges and to continue the annual $500,000 Town-wide milling and resurfacing program as well as milling and resurfacing No. Lake way from Garden Avenue and Onondaga Avenue for $107,000. Included within these funds is $451,000 for street lights and decorative improvements along SR A1A between Southern Blvd and Royal Palm Way and for street lights along SR A1A from Lake Avenue south to the southerly Town limit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>$1,178,000*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget Impact</td>
<td>There will be no increase to personnel. Operating costs associated with this project should minimally increase (Repairs and Maintenance &lt; $5,000 annually.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undergrounding Utility Lines (throughout Town)
Funds were allocated for the purpose of facilitating the Town’s on-going investigation of the feasibility of converting aerial utility lines to underground service. Funds may be used for demonstration projects, engineering studies, special counsel expenses and for other purposes to facilitate a more reliable utility service delivery system for Town residents and business owners.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Operating Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refurbish Memorial Fountain at Town Hall (360 S. County Road)</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>There will be no increase to personnel. Operating costs associated with this project should minimally increase (Repairs and Maintenance &lt; $5,000 annually.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Main Improvements WPB</td>
<td>$580,000*</td>
<td>There will be no increase to personnel. Operating costs associated with this project should minimally increase (Repairs and Maintenance &lt; $5,000 annually.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fuel Tank Replacement Program
These funds will allow for the continuation of improvements to the Town’s fuel tanks and/or piping to remain in compliance with state regulations. The following is a list of the fuel tanks that are to be replaced (including their locations):

1) A-42 Wastewater Pump Station - 3001 South Ocean Boulevard
2) A-6 Wastewater Pump Station - 300 South Lake Drive
3) A-7 Wastewater Pump Station - South County Road at Island Road
4) A-39 Wastewater Pump Station - 2171 South Ocean Boulevard
5) A-41 Wastewater Pump Station - 2500 South Ocean Boulevard
6) A-43 Wastewater Pump Station - 3400 South Ocean Boulevard
7) S-2 Master Pump Station - 9 Lake Trail
8) D-4 Stormwater Pump Station - 445 North Lake Way
9) D-9 Stormwater Pump Station - West-end of Mediterranean
10) D-10 Stormwater Pump Station - 1060 North Lake Way
11) D-12 Stormwater Pump Station - 269 Seminole (Wetwell @ Everglades)
12) D-15 Stormwater Pump Station - 420 South Lake Drive
13) Police Station - 360 South County Road
14) Fire Station #1 - 355 South County Road
15) Fire Station #2 - 300 North County Road
16) Fire Station #3 - 2185 South Ocean Boulevard
17) Town Hall - 360 South County Road
18) Public Works - 951 Old Okeechobee Road (West Palm Beach)
19) Par 3 Golf Course - 2345 South Ocean Boulevard
20) Seaview Tennis Center - 340 Seaview Avenue

Project Budget
Operating Budget Impact

$1,964,000*
There will be no increase to personnel. Operating costs associated with this project should minimally increase (Repairs and Maintenance < $5,000 annually.)

North Fire-Rescue Station
These funds will allow for construction of a traffic signal and the continuation of a two-year program to replace windows.

Project Budget
Operating Budget Impact

$199,200*
There will be no increase to personnel. Operating costs associated with this project should minimally increase (Repairs and Maintenance < $5,000 annually.)

*Includes FY08 Estimated Carry-over Budget
### Five-Year Schedule of Capital Improvements (SCI)
**FY 2009 - FY 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Budget - Project Description</th>
<th>FY08 Carry-over Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Year 1 FY2009</th>
<th>Year 2 FY2010 Subtotal</th>
<th>Year 3 FY2011</th>
<th>Year 4 FY2012</th>
<th>Year 5 FY2013</th>
<th>Five Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water System</td>
<td>2,027,000</td>
<td>1,275,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>7,702,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvements</td>
<td>1,530,000</td>
<td>775,000</td>
<td>2,311,000</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>5,491,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate Storm Pump Structures</td>
<td>401,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,791,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer System</td>
<td>881,000</td>
<td>1,125,000</td>
<td>2,016,000</td>
<td>1,025,000</td>
<td>1,025,000</td>
<td>1,025,000</td>
<td>6,116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvements</td>
<td>662,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>1,412,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>4,402,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force Main Rehabilitation</td>
<td>239,660</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>364,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>884,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPB Central Pump Bypass &amp; Reserve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab Sanitary Sewer Pumping Station</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Roats</td>
<td>871,000</td>
<td>607,000</td>
<td>1,178,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>3,175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milling &amp; Resurfacing Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>607,000</td>
<td>607,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,207,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lights SRA1A Lake Ave South (1)</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorative Street Lights</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bury FPL Overhead Lines</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbish Memorial Fountain</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Main Improvements WPB (2)</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Tank Replacement Program (3)</td>
<td>1,964,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,964,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,964,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fire-Rescue Station</td>
<td>114,200</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>199,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>199,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Windows</td>
<td>114,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Installation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 - Warrant Study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 - Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,323,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,392,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,715,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,975,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,175,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,175,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,215,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Offsetting Revenues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offsetting Revenues</th>
<th>FY2009</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>1,525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPB - Water Main Improvements (2)</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assessment Revenue</td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Enterprise Fund - Transfer for Fuel Tanks (3)</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT - Street Lights SRA1A Lake Ave South (1)</td>
<td>295,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offsets</td>
<td>1,575,000</td>
<td>875,000</td>
<td>825,000</td>
<td>775,000</td>
<td>725,000</td>
<td>4,480,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Expenditure/Transfer from General Fund**

| Net Expenditure/Transfer from General Fund | 1,817,000 | 2,100,000 | 2,360,000 | 2,400,000 | 2,450,000 | 4,880,000 |

**Note #1:** All monies to come from the General Fund, except where indicated under "Offsetting Revenues."

**Note #2:** Monies for FY 2009 through FY 2011 are committed funds; monies are planned for FY 2012 and FY 2013.
COMMENTS

Future Land Use Comment #1: The Town should consider adding minimum densities/intensities for each land use designation. Minimum thresholds help direct growth and encourage development activities that will support transit and other modes of transportation.

Response: Densities for residential land uses and intensities for non-residential land uses are now included in the Future Land Use Element.

Future Land Use Comment #2: The Town included Policy 8.7 to address the preservation of recreational and commercial working waterfronts as required by Florida Statute 163.3177 and 163.3178. To strengthen the preservation of recreational and commercial working waterfronts the Town should consider referencing or including Objective 1 and accompanying policies from the Recreation and Open Space Element in the Coastal Management and Conservation Element as well as the Future Land Use Element.

Response: Objectives and policies have been added to the Future Land Use Element (Objective 14 and subsequent policies) and Coastal Management & Conservation Element (Objective 18 and subsequent policies) as follows (added language in blue):

OBJECTIVE 14

Public access shall be maintained to all recreational facilities, including recreational and commercial working waterfronts as defined in F.S. 342.07, under the jurisdiction of the Town of Palm Beach.

POLICY 14.1

The Town of Palm Beach shall identify inadequate access to its recreation facilities within one year of the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan EAR-Based amendments.

POLICY 14.2

The Town of Palm Beach shall continue to implement corrective measures on all access points identified as inadequate.

POLICY 14.3

The Town will, on an annual basis, inspect public access points at public facilities located within the Town of Palm Beach, but not under the Town's jurisdiction, to identify any impediments to access. It will notify respective governing agencies of impediments within three months of their identification.
POLICY 14.4

Pursuant to F.S. 163.3177 & 163.3178, the Town shall devise regulatory incentives and criteria that encourage the preservation of recreational and commercial working waterfronts as defined in F.S. 342.07.

OBJECTIVE 18

Public access shall be maintained to all recreational facilities, including recreational and commercial working waterfronts as defined in F.S. 342.07, under the jurisdiction of the Town of Palm Beach.

POLICY 18.1

The Town of Palm Beach shall identify inadequate access to its recreation facilities within one year of the adoption of this Comprehensive Plan EAR-Based Amendments.

POLICY 18.2

The Town of Palm Beach shall continue to implement corrective measures on all access points identified as inadequate.

POLICY 18.3

The Town will, on an annual basis, inspect public access points at public facilities located within the Town of Palm Beach, but not under the Town's jurisdiction, to identify any impediments to access. The Town will notify respective governing agencies of impediments within three months of their identification.

POLICY 18.4

Pursuant to F.S. 163.3177 & 163.3178, the Town shall devise regulatory incentives and criteria that encourage the preservation of recreational and commercial working waterfronts as defined in F.S. 342.07.

Future Land Use Comment #3: The Town added Policy 9.2 in the Future Land Use Element and Policy 1.6 to the Historic Preservation Element to address the adoption of a “pre-historic preservation ordinance” by the end of 2008. The ordinance would be designed to protect
archaeological resources by regulating construction activities. The Town should consider calling this new ordinance an “archeological” preservation ordinance.

Response: The term “Pre-historic” has been changed to “Archeological” in Policy 9.2 in the Future Land Use Element, and in Policy 1.6 of the Historic Preservation Element. The revised policies are as follows (revisions in blue):

POLICY 9.2

By December 2008, Town shall adopt an pre-historic archaeological preservation ordinance to protect pre-historic resources or sites of archaeological significance with specific guidelines regulating construction activities. Concurrently, community awareness shall also be advanced to educate the public about the advantages of having an pre-historic archaeological preservation ordinance.

POLICY 1.6

By December 2008, Town shall adopt an pre-historic archaeological preservation ordinance to protect pre-historic resources or sites of archaeological significance with specific guidelines regulating construction activities. Concurrently, community awareness shall also be advanced to educate the public about the advantages of having an pre-historic archaeological preservation ordinance.

Transportation Comment #1: The Town did not include any policies to address bicycle and sidewalk improvements along State Road A1A. The Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization’s 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan includes bicycle and sidewalk improvements along State Road A1A, which should be addressed in the Town’s plan. The Town should consider adding or enhancing existing objectives and policies to include pedestrian, bicycle, and mass transit activities, including interconnectivity with other municipalities.

Response: Several policies have been added under Objective 3, and include the following (new language in blue):

POLICY 3.4

The Town will coordinate with the MPO, FDOT, and PalmTran to ensure that pedestrian, bicycle, and mass transit connections are provided within the Town. The Town will also seek enhancement grants through the MPO, FDOT, and other available sources to fund bicycle and pedestrian improvements within the Town, as opportunities arise.

POLICY 3.5
The Town will coordinate with the City of West Palm Beach and the City of Lake Worth to ensure interconnectivity with these jurisdictions in terms of pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

**POLICY 3.6**

The Town will work with the MPO/State Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator to promote public education of the benefits of walking and bicycling through distribution of available on-line and printed materials.

Transportation Comment #2: As portions of the Town redevelop, the Town should consider adding an objective and accompanying policies to incorporate safety guidelines into the design of the street network. Safety techniques should be incorporated into the design of the street network, particularly in its accommodation of pedestrian and bicycle circulation and transit use.

Response: Objective 1 and the policies under this objective address safety in the design of streets. Language has been added to make it clear that safely designed streets will include the safety of not only motorists, but also the safety of cyclists and pedestrians, particularly when they interact with motorists. The revised language is in blue below:

**OBJECTIVE 1**

By year-end 2006, The Town shall continue to correct traffic operational deficiencies and undertake other needed measures, identified in this Element, that are necessary to the provision of a safe, convenient, and energy efficient, multimodal transportation system, including providing for protection of existing and future rights-of-way from building encroachment. Design of the multimodal transportation system will be done to ensure the safety of not only motorists, but also the safety of cyclists and pedestrians, particularly where they interact with motorists.

**POLICY 1.1**

Continue to enforce zoning provisions regarding walls, hedges, and fences at intersections to minimize sitesight visibility hazards for motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians.

Infrastructure Comment #1: New Policy 12.3 states that the Town is working with its water supplier, the City of West Palm Beach, to develop a 10-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan. The work plan and related amendment were due in August of 2008. The Town should complete the work plan and submit it to the Department for review as soon as possible.
Response: The Town is currently working with the City of West Palm Beach to finalize the 10-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan, and anticipates this work to be done shortly.

Infrastructure Comment #2: The Town should include a policy to update the 10-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan within 18 months of the South Florida Water Management District adoption of the *Lower East Coast Water Supply Plan Update*. The District updates the plan every five years.

Response: Policy 12.3 addresses the Town updating the 10-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan 18 months after the South Florida Water Management District adopts the Lower East Coast Water Supply Plan Update. However, Policy 12.3 has been revised to make it clear that the Town will continue to do this to address future 5-year updates by the SFWMD. The policy now reads (revisions in blue):

**POLICY 12.3**

Presently, the Town is coordinating with SFWMD to develop a 10-year work plan that takes account of the Lower East Coast (LEC) Regional Water Supply Plan. The Town shall send a letter to SFWMD with identified projects for future water supply needs of the Town. Projects must be selected from the LEC Regional Water Supply Plan or must be prior approved by SFWMD. The Town will coordinate with its water supplier, i.e. the City of West Palm Beach, in this regard. The Town shall address future updates by SFWMD within 18 months of adoption by SFWMD of a new LEC Regional Water Supply Plan.

Consistency with Chapter 187, F.S.: The proposed amendment is inconsistent with several sections of the State Comprehensive Plan; however, by addressing the objections listed previously, these inconsistencies can be addressed.

Response: The Town has sufficiently addressed the objections and comments raised regarding its proposed EAR-based amendments.
To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: September 18, 2009 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
Adopted Amendments to the Town of Sewall’s Point Comprehensive Plan
DCA Reference No. 09RWSP-1

Background

On June 23, 2009, the Town of Sewall’s Point adopted text amendments to several elements of the Town Comprehensive Plan. The purpose of the amendments was to incorporate the Town’s Water Supply Facilities Work Plan (WSFWP) into the comprehensive plan and to make other amendments regarding water supply facilities planning requirements.

The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) reviewed the proposed amendments at a regular meeting held on April 17, 2009. The Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) issued an Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report on the amendments on May 15, 2009.

Evaluation

A. TCRPC Report

The TCRPC report contained two comments. The first comment recommended that the Town clarify whether the WSFWP was a ten year plan or a 20 year plan. The second comment recommended a clarification of new Policy 9.5.

B. DCA ORC Report

The DCA Report contained four objections relating to the following:

1. the lack of a policy to address water supply concurrency requirements;
2. the absence of a policy to adopt the Martin County 20-Year WSFWP;
3. confusion regarding the length of period that the WSFWP would apply; and
4. the lack of policies identifying water conservation strategies that will help the Town meet level of service standards for potable water.
C. Town Response

1. To TCRPC Comments/Recommendations for Modification

   Although the Town did provide a formal response to the two TCRPC comments/recommendations, the Town made changes to the policies as recommended by the TCRPC.

2. To the DCA ORC Report

   The Town letter of June 29, 2009 (see Attachment A) summarizes the changes made prior to adoption to address the DCA objections.

Conclusion

For information only.

Attachment
June 29, 2009

Department of Community Affairs  
Attn: Mike McDaniel, Chief  
Office of Comprehensive Planning  
255 Shumard Oak Blvd.  
Tallahassee, FL. 32399-2100

RE: Town of Sewall’s Point Comprehensive Plan Amendment (DCA No. 09RWSP-1)

Dear Mr. McDaniel,

In response to your correspondence of May 15, 2009, regarding the Town’s Water Supply Facilities Work Plan, I wish to advise you that all of the recommendations and comments outlined in your report have been made, and am enclosing the Town’s updated Water Supply Facilities Work Plan. Outlined below are the sections in which changes have been made to address the recommendations made in your report.

- 1) Potable Water Element

Policy 1.2 has been changed to reflect prior to building permit approval the town, in conjunction with Martin County Utilities will insure adequate water service will be available to the development prior to certification of occupancy being granted.

Policy 2.2 provides for the adoption of the Martin County 20-year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan by the Town.

The Town has updated its policies to reflect a 20 year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan time frame, as was recommended by our agency.
• 2) Conservation Element

Policy 2.4 has been updated to include specific policies on conservation measures the Town has taken, or will be undertaking in order to achieve its LOS of 100 gallons per capita per day.

In addition, the following corrections have been made to be consistent with Chapter 187, F.S., and the State Comprehensive Plan.

• Potable Water Element, Policy 1.2 has been amended to ensure that new development is compatible with existing local and regional water supplies; protects aquifers; and promotes water conservation.
• Potable Water Element, Policy 1.2 has been amended to require the directing of development to areas that have the land and water resources, and service capacity to accommodate growth.
• Capital Improvements Element, Policy 2.6 (6) has been amended to create partnership among state government, local governments, and the private sector which will identify and build needed public facilities.
• Intergovernmental Relations Element, Goal: has been amended to encourage greater cooperation between, among, and within all levels of Florida Governments.
• Intergovernmental Relations element, Policy 1.3 has been added to ensure local plans implement and accurately reflect the States goals and policies.

In addition, enclosed is a CD of the Plan, along with a copy of the attendance sheet of the meeting on June 23, 2009; no one from the public requested information on the Town’s Water Supply Facilities Work Plan. Finally, enclosed is a copy of ordinance # 348, which authorizes the submittal of the plan to your agency.

Please contact me if you require any additional information.

Sincerely,

Robert Kellogg
Town Manager

Enclosures:
To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: September 18, 2009 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
Adopted Amendments to the City of South Bay Comprehensive Plan
DCA Reference No. 09RWSP-1

Background

On July 7, 2009, the City of South Bay adopted text amendments to several elements of the City Comprehensive Plan. The amendments were to address statutory requirements on water supply planning.

The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) reviewed the amendments at a regular meeting held on April 17, 2009. The Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) issued a letter in lieu of an Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report on May 22, 2009.

Evaluation

A. TCRPC Report

The TCRPC report contained no comments/recommendations for modification. The amendments were considered consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

B. DCA ORC Report

The letter of May 22, 2009 indicates that the DCA had no objections to the proposed amendments and the letter served as the ORC Report.

C. City Response

No response necessary.

Conclusion

For information only.
To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: September 18, 2009 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
Adopted Amendments to the St. Lucie County Comprehensive Plan
DCA Reference No. 03-2

Background

On December 16, 2003, St. Lucie County adopted one amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the County Comprehensive Plan. The amendment was for a 46.6 acre property (Known as JIT Investment Company) at the intersection of Kings Highway and Angle Road. The designation on the property was changed from Commercial to Industrial. Due to an oversight, this amendment was not previously submitted to the DCA for a compliance review. The County is requesting a compliance review at this time.

The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) reviewed the proposed amendment at a meeting held on October 17, 2003. The Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) issued an Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report on November 23, 2003.

Evaluation

A. TCRPC Report

The TCRPC report had no objections or comments pertaining to the JIT Investment Company property amendment.

B. DCA ORC Report

The ORC Report contained no objections or comments on the JIT Investment Company amendment.

C. County Response

No response necessary.

Conclusion

For information only.
To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: September 18, 2009 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
Adopted Amendment to the Village of Tequesta Comprehensive Plan
DCA Reference No. 09-2

Background

On July 9, 2009, the Village of Tequesta adopted one amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the Village Comprehensive Plan. The amendment was for a parcel along the south side of County Line Road, west of Old Dixie Highway.

The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) reviewed the amendment at a regular meeting held on June 19, 2009. The Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) issued a letter in lieu of an Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report on June 16, 2009.

Evaluation

A. TCRPC Report

The report included one comment/recommendation for modification indicating the Village should ensure that the location and design of new residential units on the property be compatible with the existing land use on surrounding properties.

B. DCA ORC Report

The letter of June 16, 2009 indicated that the DCA had no objections to the proposed amendment.

C. Village Response

1. To TCRPC Comments/Recommendations for Modification

   Village staff indicated that the Council comment/recommendation was provided to local officials prior to adoption of the amendment. The Village shares the TCRPC concern regarding compatibility. Although no development plans have been submitted to date, the Village will ensure through the development review process that any future plans are compatible with existing development.

2. To the DCA ORC Report

   No response necessary.
Conclusion

For information only.
To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: September 18, 2009 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
Adopted Amendments to the Village of Tequesta Comprehensive Plan
DCA Reference No. 09-RWSP1

Background

On July 9, 2009, the Village of Tequesta adopted text amendments to several elements of the Village Comprehensive Plan. The amendments were to carry out statutory requirements regarding water supply facility planning.

The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) reviewed the proposed amendments at a regular meeting held on June 19, 2009. The Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) issued an Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report on the proposed amendments on June 12, 2009.

Evaluation

A. TCRPC Report

The report contained no comments/recommendations for modification. The amendments were considered to be consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

B. DCA ORC Report

The ORC Report contained three objections. The objections are shown in Attachment A.

C. Village Response

1. To TCRPC Comments/Recommendations for Modification

   No response necessary.

2. To the DCA ORC Report

   The Village responses to the DCA objections are shown in Attachment A.

Conclusion

For information only.

Attachment
Executive Summary

ADOPTED REVISIONS TO THE TEQUESTA
10-YEAR WATER SUPPLY FACILITIES WORK PLAN AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
TO ADDRESS DCA AND REVIEW AGENCY COMMENTS

Adoption Hearing – July 9, 2009

VILLAGE RESPONSES TO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
ORC REPORT

This Summary is in response to Objections 1 through 3 of the ORC Report dealing with water supply planning.

Note: Underlines and strikethroughs in this document reflect only those changes made between the transmittal and adoption hearings.

Objection 1 – As identified in the South Florida Water Management District’s letter dated May 22, 2009, the Village has not coordinated with the Town of Jupiter, Jupiter Inlet Colony, portions of Martin County and unincorporated Palm Beach County, the Rolling Hills Subdivision, and Jonathan Dickinson State Park to ensure that correct population projections have been obtained from these areas to accurately determine the future water supply projections for the service area.

Response:

Village of Tequesta - Water Service Area Total Population Served (June 11, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Total</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>11946</td>
<td>12631</td>
<td>13128</td>
<td>13544</td>
<td>13912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tequesta Responses to WSP ORC
July 8, 2009
The document has been revised throughout the text and tables to reflect revised population figures and associated water usage.

**Objection 2** — The Village’s Work Plan includes two water system improvement projects that will be needed in the next five years. However, these projects are not included in the Village’s Five-Year Schedule of Capital Improvements.

**Response:**

Add Water Supply Facilities related Improvements to both the Village of Tequesta Five Year Capital Improvement Schedule 2008-2013 and the Village of Tequesta 5 Year Capital Summary Fiscal Years 2010-2014 and include costs for each fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Phase 3 RO 1.2 MGD Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.2M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Wellhead piping and appurtenances and installation of raw water main</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objection 3** — The proposed amendment does not address the requirements of Section 163.3180(2)(a), F. S., pertaining to water supply concurrency.

**Response:**

Revise Capital Improvements Element Policy 1.4.5 as follows:

Policy 1.4.5: Appropriate mechanisms will be developed and adopted with the South Florida Water Management District, the Loxahatchee River District, Palm Beach County, and Martin County, Jupiter Inlet Colony, Jupiter Island, Rolling Hills Subdivision and Jonathon Dickinson State Park in order to assure that adequate water supplies are available to all water users. Prior to approval of a building permit or its functional equivalent, the Village of Tequesta shall consult with the Village’s Water Utilities Department to determine whether adequate water supplies to serve the new development will be available no later than the anticipated date of issuance of a certificate of occupancy. Furthermore, the City will be responsible for monitoring the availability of water supplies for all water
users and for implementing a system that links water supplies to the permitting of new development.

COMMENTS

The ORC report also contained one comment. Comments are advisory in nature and do not form bases of a determination of non-compliance.

OTHER REVISIONS

The following revisions to the Plan have been made to clarify wording, improve/strengthen the policy or correct typographical errors:

Section 2.1 Add references to Jupiter Island and its population as necessary.

Clarity throughout that this is a 10-Year Plan.

Section 3.1 Add new paragraph as follows: “The population estimates for the Village of Tequesta serving areas in Martin County differ slightly from those that are contained in the 2006 Upper East Coast Water Supply Plan Amendment. This population analysis has a conservative bias for the planning horizon. Through future updates of both the Upper East and Lower East Coast Water Supply Plans along with the updates of all other water supply permits, these numbers will be more formally coordinated.”

Section 3.3 Add Level of Service standards found on page CL-7 of the Comprehensive Plan.

Section 3.4 Amend Table 3-1 based on population projections agreed to by SFWMD.

Add footnote to Table 3-1 – “Water supply is projected to be more than sufficient to meet demand within the water service area.”

Figure 3.1 Remove Jupiter Lighthouse area within the Town of Jupiter from the Service Areas Boundary Map.

Table 5-1 Revise Table to reflect new population projections.

Section 5.2 Revise Intergovernmental Coordination Element Policy 1.5.3 as follows:

Policy 1.5.3: The Village shall continue to coordinate the planning of potable water and sanitary sewer facilities, water supply sources (including reuse and conservation), demands, other services and level-of-service standards at least annually with the government jurisdictions located within its water
To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: September 18, 2009 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
Adopted Amendments to the Village of Wellington Comprehensive Plan
DCA Reference No. 09-1ER

Background

On July 14, 2009, the Village of Wellington adopted text amendments to all of the elements of the Village Comprehensive Plan. The amendments were to implement the recommendations of an Evaluation and Appraisal Report that was adopted by the Village on May 22, 2007 and found sufficient by the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) on July 30, 2007.

The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) reviewed the proposed amendments at a regular meeting held on February 20, 2009. The DCA issued an Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report on the proposed amendments on February 27, 2009.

Evaluation

A. Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) Report

The TCRPC report contained six comment/recommendations for modification pertaining to the Future Land Use, Housing and Conservation Elements (see Attachment A).

B. DCA ORC Report

The DCA ORC Report of February 27, 2009 contained seventeen objections which are shown in Attachment B.

C. Village Response

1. To TCRPC Comments/Recommendations for Modification

Several of Council’s comments are addressed by the Village in its Response to the DCA ORC Report. In response to Council’s comments with respect to the Future Land Use Element, the Village has revised Objectives 1.6, 1.7, and 1.8 to indicate the Village shall coordinate corridor planning along State Road 7. However, the Village did not address Council’s comment with respect to affordable housing on this corridor.
With respect to Council comments on the Village addressing the shortage of workforce housing with policies that implement programs and incentives, the Village has revised Objective 1.2 to address the provision of adequate sites for very low, low and moderate income households and facilitate development of affordable and workforce housing for current and projected populations needing such housing.

Council comment indicated that the deletion of Objective 1.1 would not be consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan which calls for a range of housing types and affordabilities in proximity to employment and services. The Village indicated in its response to the DCA ORC that this objective has been returned to its original language, and revised to reflect current market conditions. Since housing units are provided by the private sector and not the Village, the Village indicates that underlying policies of this objective identify specific programs and activities to address the provision of housing types to meet all the existing and anticipated populations of the Village.

Relative to Council comment on best management practices, the Village revised the policy as recommended.

2. To the DCA ORC Report

The Village’s response to the DCA objections and comments is shown in Attachment B.

Conclusion

For information only.

Attachments
Excerpts from TCRPC report on Village of Wellington
Comprehensive Plan Amendments (DCA Ref# 09-1ER)
Approved at February 20, 2009 Council Meeting, Agenda Item 5R

Comments/Recommendations for Modification

Future Land Use Element

1. Under the Subject of Annexation and Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Issues, Objectives 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 all address corridor planning on the State Road 7 Corridor. Revisions made to Objectives 1.7 and 1.8 would result in a lack of clarity regarding the Village’s intent. The Village is encouraged to consolidate and simplify these objectives to clearly indicate the City’s intent for corridor planning and redevelopment. Consistent with the Village EAR, a policy should be added to indicate the Village will encourage/require affordable housing for the workforce in the State Road 7 Corridor.

Housing Element

2. Despite the decline in housing prices in recent months, adequate and affordable housing for the workforce remains a key growth management issue. Council has recommended that all local governments in the Region review their Housing Element policies to ensure there is adequate support for programs and strategies to facilitate the development of housing units that are affordable to the workforce. Since each local government is different, they should utilize the appropriate set of regulations, incentives and programs that will be most effective given local conditions.

Unlike several other local governments in Palm Beach County, the Village of Wellington did not consider workforce housing to be a major issue to be evaluated in the EAR. It was identified as an issue, however, and the EAR indicated that the Housing Element should be amended to address the provision of workforce housing in or adjacent to Wellington. The EAR did not provide an up-to-date assessment of the availability of affordable housing for the workforce, or indicate how current shortages would be addressed or future needs would be met. In the review of the EAR, Council encouraged the Village to adopt clear policies and standards for the provision of affordable housing; and to consider policies to require the provision of affordable housing as a condition of approval for development and redevelopment.

A review of the proposed amendments to the Housing Element indicates that the Village has not proposed new objectives or policies to address affordable housing for the workforce. Narrative proposed as a revision to Objective 1.2 indicates that market conditions make the provision of low and moderate income housing within the Village difficult, and that those needs have been met in locations largely outside the Village. New Objective 1.3 indicates that the existing workforce housing in the Village will be preserved by market forces and the Village’s stringent aesthetic standards. No new policy language is proposed that would indicate specifically how the current shortage of affordable housing for the workforce will be addressed or how future needs will be met.
The shortage of housing affordable to meet the needs of the workforce in Palm Beach County has been well documented. While those needs may vary somewhat from community to community, it is time for local governments to implement specific programs and strategies to meet these needs. As soon as possible, the Village should clearly indicate, in policy, what programs will be implemented, what incentives will be offered and what tools will be utilized to ensure that at least a proportion of all new housing will be affordable to the workforce, and how existing affordable housing shortages will be addressed. An entire tool box of programs and strategies (accessory dwelling units, reduction of regulatory barriers, inclusionary zoning, density bonuses, community land trusts, impact fee assistance, trust funds, etc) is available. The Village needs to select those tools that are appropriate, include them as implementing policies in the comprehensive plan, and move forward to address the workforce housing problem.

3. Objective 1.1, which currently calls for the Village to assist the private sector in providing new development that would result in a variety of housing types, sizes and costs, is to be deleted. It is to be replaced by a narrative regarding recent permitting and construction of new units. This language does not constitute an objective. Furthermore, the deletion of the existing language is not considered consistent with the SRPP which calls for a range of housing types and affordabilities in proximity to employment and services (Regional Goal 2.2) and to ensure that all areas have a reasonable mix of housing, employment opportunities and services (Strategy 2.2.1).

4. Policy 2.2.2.1 of the SRPP indicates that local governments should carefully assess their existing housing stock and their existing needs during the preparation of the EAR. The Village has not provided such an assessment. The Village has indicated the affordable housing for the workforce has been provided in locations largely outside the Village. A current assessment should be prepared so that conclusions can be made based on up-to-date information. This assessment should include those areas outside the Village where needs are being met.

5. Objective 1.2, which currently indicates the Village will provide adequate sites for current housing for the very low, low and moderate income households has been modified. Language regarding very low, low and moderate income households has been replaced with the term workforce housing. However, workforce housing is not defined. The Village should define workforce housing. Furthermore, the Village EAR suggests that the Village anticipates workforce housing can be provided during the redevelopment of the State Road 7 Corridor, the redevelopment of the Town Center and neighborhood revitalization. However, no policies are proposed to clearly indicate this is Village policy. Such policies would be appropriate, under this objective, or elsewhere in the comprehensive plan.

Conservation Element

6. Proposed Policy 1.2.13 regarding best management practices to improve water quality should be revised to indicate it is Village policy. It currently reads as a statement of past accomplishments.
I. Consistency with Chapter 163, F.S., and Rule 9J-5, F.A.C.

The Village of Wellington proposed amendments address issues raised in the Village’s Evaluation and Appraisal Report, address statutory changes, and update the goals, objectives and policies of the comprehensive plan. The amendment also includes the Village’s proposed annual update to the Capital Improvements Element. The Department has identified the following objections and comment to the proposed comprehensive plan amendment:

I. OBJECTIONS

A. General

Objection 1: The Village has not established the appropriate short (five-year) and long term (10 year) planning time frames in the proposed revisions to the comprehensive plan. As a result, the data and analysis to evaluate the adequacy of existing facilities and the need for new or expanded facilities to meet projected growth is incomplete.

Recommendation: Revise the data and analysis to include planning time frames of at least five years subsequent to the adoption of the revised comprehensive plan and for a minimum overall time frame of 10 years. Since it is anticipated that the Town will adopt these revisions to the comprehensive plan in 2009, the five and ten year planning times should be 2014 and 2019, respectively. Additionally, the Town needs to revise its population projections to include the year 2019 and revise the data and analysis in each of the comprehensive plan elements to evaluate the impacts this anticipated growth will have on the Town’s roads, housing, infrastructure, recreation, and the need and timing of capital improvements to meet the demand created by the Town’s future residents.

Village of Wellington Response: A new introduction to the Comprehensive Plan has been created and is included as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Table 1.1 of the Introduction contains revised annual population projections through 2019.

Data for levels of service has been added to all elements where required. Table 1.1 of the Capital Improvement Element has been added and lists all projects, necessary to meet future demand with funding sources.
B. Future Land Use Element

Objection 1: The Village did not include an Existing Land Use Map or map series.

Recommendation: Include an Existing Land Use Map or map series for 2009. The map or map series should include the following: Existing Land Use Designations; public buildings and grounds; existing and planned public potable waterwells and wellhead protection areas; beaches and shores including estuarine systems; rivers, lakes, bays, floodplains and harbors; wetlands; minerals and soils; and indicate the generalized uses of land adjacent to its boundaries.

Village of Wellington Response: A Land Use Map Series has been added to the Future Land Use Element. Maps have been provided depicting: public buildings and grounds; existing and planned public potable waterwells and wellhead protection areas; floodplains; wetlands; minerals and soils; and the generalized uses of land adjacent to its boundaries.

Objection 2: A Future Land Use Map has been included, but it is not adequate. The Village has not identified the future year it is intended to represent.

Recommendation: Revise the Future Land Use Map to identify the future year it is intended to represent. The long term planning time frame needs to be a minimum of 10 years from adoption of the updated comprehensive plan. Since it is anticipated that the amendments will be adopted in 2009, the long term planning time frame should be 2019.

Village of Wellington Response: The Future Land Use Map has been revised and relabeled to represent the long term planning time frame to be 2019. The Future Land Use Map is included as part of the Land Use Map Series of the Land Use Element.

Objection 3: Population projections for the short and long-term planning time frame have not been included.

Recommendation: Revise the Future Land Use Element’s Data and Analysis to include population projections for the short and long term planning time frame. The long term planning time frame needs to be a minimum of 10 years from adoption of the updated comprehensive plan. Since it is anticipated that the amendments will be adopted in 2009, the planning time frames should be 2014 and 2019 respectively.

Village of Wellington Response: Revised annual population projections from 2009 through 2019 have been included in Table 1-1 of the Introduction.

Objection 4: The Village identified the development of a master plan to coordinate land-use planning and transportation planning for the State Road 7 corridor as a major issue in the Evaluation and Appraisal Report. The amendment proposes revisions to Objectives 1.6, 1.7, and 1.8 of the Annexation and Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Issues section of the Future Land Use
Element, which address corridor planning on State Road 7. However, the proposed revisions to Objectives 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 state the current status of corridor planning on State Road 7 and annexation. The objective revisions are not written as objectives. The Objectives do not establish the specific intermediate end result to be achieved and mark progress toward meeting the goal and revise the policies to include specific programs and activities to be undertaken by the Village to address corridor planning on State Road 7 and annexation.

**Recommendation:** Revise these objectives to establish the specific intermediate end result to be achieved and mark progress toward meeting the goal and include or revise the policies to include specific programs and activities to be undertaken by the Village to clearly indicate how the Village is going to participate in the implementation of the State Road 7 Corridor Master Plan and to identify how the Village will coordinate annexation issues.

**Village of Wellington Response:** Future Land Use Element Objectives 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 have been rewritten as objectives. Objective 1.8 states: “The Village shall strive to help create a multi-jurisdictional replacement plan for the defunct Palms West Corridor Study to coordinate development along State Road 7. The Village has been coordinating with other government agencies to evaluate land use and transportation planning within the SR7 corridor, which is primarily the Village’s Future Annexation Area” Additionally Land Use Element Policy 1.8.2 has been added to strengthen the Village’s commitment to corridor planning on State Road 7. Policy 1.8.2 states: “If unable to develop a multi-jurisdictional SR 7 Corridor Plan within one year of the effective date of this plan, the Village shall consider preparation of a SR 7 Corridor Master Plan limited to Village municipal boundaries.”

The State Road 7 Corridor Study was initiated by the Village in 2006 in conjunction with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, Palm Beach County, the Village of Royal Palm Beach, and the City of Greenacres. This was an attempt to establish an acceptable level of service in an area that included more than 150 parcels and more than eight miles of shared roadway. The corridor study, a requirement of the county’s comprehensive plan, was conducted over a period of approximately 24 months. Ultimately the proposed study was not transmitted by the county to DCA, due to concerns by the county and Royal Palm Beach regarding the potential for a CRALLS (Constrained Roadway at Lower Level of Service) designation for the entire corridor.

The corridor study was one of the three major actions identified in the EAR approved by DCA. Based upon the action by Palm Beach County and Royal Palm Beach, the Village does not have an adopted corridor to include within its revised Comprehensive Plan.

The Village recognizes the importance of a SR 7 Corridor Study Master Plan to the development of the community and has made the creation of a SR7 Master Plan a priority. The Village is prepared to develop a SR7 Master Plan independently of other jurisdictions however the Village shall also continue to encourage multi-jurisdictional cooperation in the development of a SR 7 Corridor Study Master Plan.
C. Transportation Element

Objection 1: An Existing Transportation Map or map series has not been included.

Recommendation: Include an Existing Transportation Map or map series for 2009. The map or map series should include: limited and controlled access facilities and significant parking facilities; the general location of the public transit system including public transit routes or service areas, public transit terminals or transfer stations, and public transit right-of-ways and exclusive public transit corridors; significant bicycle and pedestrian ways; the existing functional classification and maintenance responsibility for all roads; the number of through lanes for each roadway; the major public transit trip generators and attractors; and existing peak hour and peak direction levels of service.

Village of Wellington Response: Four maps containing the DCA recommended data have been added to the Existing Transportation Map series as Exhibit “A”.

Objection 2: A Future Transportation Map is included, but is inadequate. The Village has not identified the future year it is intended to represent.

Recommendation: Revise the Future Transportation Map to include the future year that the map is intended to represent. The long term planning time frame needs to be a minimum of 10 years from adoption of the updated comprehensive plan. Since it is anticipated that the amendments will be adopted in 2009, the long term planning time frame should be 2019. Additionally, the transportation map or map series must include the proposed location of the public transit system including public transit routes or service areas, public transit terminals or transfer stations, and public transit right-of-ways and exclusive public transit corridors; proposed significant bicycle and pedestrian ways; the maintenance responsibility for all roads; the projected number of through lanes for each roadway; and projected peak hour and peak direction levels of service.

Village of Wellington Response: Four maps containing the DCA recommended data have been added to the Existing Transportation Map series as Exhibit “A”. The Villages Directional Analysis was completed in 2006. This data from the requested projections was computed using these figures.

Objection 3: Data and analysis analyzing the Roadway Level of Service performance of the roadways within the Village was not included. Additionally, the transportation system needs have not been projected through the five-year planning time frame.

Recommendation: Revise the Transportation Element to include data and analysis analyzing the Roadway Level of Service performance of the roadways within the Town and to project the transportation system needs through the five-year planning time frame. Any transportation improvements needed in the next five years to maintain or achieve roadway level of service standards need to be included in a financially feasible Schedule of Capital Improvements.
**Village of Wellington Response:** Data and analysis for a Roadway Level of Service performance of the roadways within the Village has been included as Exhibit “B” of the Transportation Element. The data and analysis time frame included is 2006, 2011 and 2025.

**Objection 4:** The EAR recommended that a policy be added to require the completion and implementation of a State Road 7 Corridor Master Plan to coordinate land-use and transportation planning along the State Road 7 corridor. No objective or policy has been added to address this recommendation.

**Recommendation:** Include a policy to require the completion and implementation of a State Road 7 Corridor Master Plan to coordinate land-use and transportation planning along the State Road 7 corridor.

**Village of Wellington Response:** Future Land Use Element Objectives 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 have been rewritten as objectives. Objective 1.8 states: “The Village shall strive to help create a multi-jurisdictional replacement plan for the defunct Palms West Corridor Study to coordinate development along State Road 7. The Village has been coordinating with other government agencies to evaluate land use and transportation planning within the SR7 corridor, which is primarily the Village’s Future Annexation Area.” Additionally Land Use Element Policy 1.8.2 has been added to strengthen the Village’s commitment to corridor planning on State Road 7. Policy 1.8.2 states: “If unable to develop a multi-jurisdictional SR 7 Corridor Plan within one year of the effective date of this plan, the Village shall consider preparation of a SR 7 Corridor Master Plan limited to Village municipal boundaries.”

Please see response to Future Land Use Element Objection 4 on Page 3 of this ORC response which summarizes recent efforts to update and adopt the SR 7 Corridor Study.

**Objection 5:** The EAR recommended the addition of a policy to support the extension of Lyons Road by Palm Beach County to serve as a reliever road for State Road 7. No policy was added to address this recommendation.

**Recommendation:** Include a policy to support the extension of Lyons Road by Palm Beach County to serve as a reliever road for State Road 7.

**Village of Wellington Response:** The Village has added Policy 1.10.4 to the Transportation Element which reads: “The Village shall continue to support the proposed extension of Lyons Road by Palm Beach County to serve as a reliever road for State Road 7.”

D. **Housing Element**

**Objection 1:** The Village revised Objective 1.1 to remove language addressing the provision of housing types to meet the housing needs of all existing and anticipated populations of the Village pursuant to Florida Statute 163.3177(6)(f). The revised language is not written as an objective to
provide direction regarding the provision of housing within the Village, but rather a description of the housing status of the Village.

**Recommendation:** Revise Objective 1.1 to establish the specific intermediate end result to be achieved and mark progress toward meeting the goal and revise the policies to include specific programs and activities to be undertaken by the Village to address the provision of housing types to meet the housing needs of all existing and anticipated populations of the Village.

**Village of Wellington Response:** Objective 1.1 has been returned to original language with the exception of the target of 300 new units per year being revised to read “50-100”. This reflects current market conditions and appears as an objective. This objective provides direction regarding the provision of housing within the Village.

The private sector, not the Village actually provides housing units. The private sector will provide those units for which “need” is expressed via the private market. Achievement of this objective is measured by the implementation of the related policies and is designed to facilitate the workings of the private market and encourage creation of a wide range of housing units.

Housing Element Policies 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4 and 1.1.5 each describe specific programs and activities to be undertaken by the Village to address the provision of housing types to meet the housing needs of all existing and anticipated populations of the Village.

**Objection 2:** The Village revised Objective 1.2 to replace the provision of housing for the very low, low, and moderate income households with provision of “workforce” housing. Workforce housing does not include the same income levels as very low and low income families.

**Recommendation:** Include a new objective to establish the specific intermediate end result to be achieved and mark progress toward meeting the goal and policies to include specific programs and activities to be undertaken by the Village to address affordable housing for very-low, low, and moderate income households equitably distributed within the Village.

**Village of Wellington Response:** Objective 1.2 has been revised to address the provision of adequate sites for very low, low, and moderate income households and facilitate development of affordable and workforce housing for all current and anticipated future residents who might need such housing.

The related policies for Objective 1.2 are designed to facilitate the workings of the private market. Housing Element Policies 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 1.2.5 and 1.2.6 each describe specific programs and activities to be undertaken by the Village to address the provision of housing types to meet the housing needs of all existing and anticipated populations of the Village.

**Objection 3:** The Village stated, in the Evaluation and Appraisal Report, that workforce housing could be provided during the redevelopment of the State Road 7 Corridor, the redevelopment of the Town Center, and through neighborhood revitalization. However, no policies to achieve the provision of workforce housing have been added.
**Recommendation:** Include policies with specific programs and activities to be undertaken by the Village to ensure the provision of workforce housing within the Village.

**Village of Wellington Response:** The Redevelopment of the State Road 7 Corridor has been addressed in the Future Land Use Element, specifically by Objectives 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 as well as newly created Land Use Element Policy 1.8.1. Policy 1.8.1 is intended to strengthen the Village’s commitment to corridor planning on State Road 7.

As described in the responses to Objections 1 and 2, the private sector, not the Village actually provides housing units. The Village has implemented specific policies to facilitate the workings of the private market and encourage creation of a wide range of housing units.

Please see response to Future Land Use Element Objection 4 on Page 3 of this ORC response which summarizes recent efforts to update and adopt the SR 7 Corridor Study.

E. **Infrastructure Element**

**Objection 1:** The Village included their 10-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan as a Sub-Element of the Infrastructure Element. The Village previously submitted this same Work Plan and the Department issued an Objections, Recommendations and Comments Report for the Work Plan on December 1, 2008. The Village is working to address the Objections raised by the Department and the South Florida Water Management District, but these issues have not yet been resolved. The department incorporates its objections as outlined in our Objections, Recommendations, and Comments Report.

**Recommendation:** The same recommendations as identified in the department’s Objections, Recommendations, and Comments Report are incorporated by reference in this report. The Village needs to resolve the issues identified in the 10-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan Objections, Recommendations, and Comment Report issued by the Department prior to adopting the 10-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan.

**Village of Wellington Response:** As a result of extensive work with their representatives, we believe that all issues have been resolved with South Florida Water Management District and the Village has adopted its 10-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan.

The Village’s 10-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan is included as a sub-element of the Infrastructure Element.
F. Conservation

Objection 1: The Evaluation and Appraisal Report recommended that the Conservation Element be amended to address the following:

- Preservation of the exiting tree canopy in the Village;
- Increased percentages of native vegetation in all new development;
- Potential expansion of the planting requirements for all public properties and rights-of-way, including the use of more native, drought-tolerant plant materials; and
- Potential for use of green building technologies and sustainable development techniques.

No policies were added to address these issues.

Recommendation: Include policies to address the preservation of the exiting tree canopy in the Village; increased percentages of native vegetation in all new development; potential expansion of the planting requirements for all public properties and rights-of-way, including the use of more native, drought-tolerant plant materials; and potential for use of green building technologies and sustainable development techniques.

Village of Wellington Response: As stated in Conservation Element Policy 1.3.4 of the Village’s Comprehensive Plan, the Village has adopted Ordinance 2004-11, the primary goal of which is to preserve existing vegetation to the greatest extent possible, to promote the planting of native, drought resistant species and to require mitigation where preservation is not possible. The Ordinance has been incorporated into the Village’s Land Development Regulations (LDR) as Chapter 7.3.

The LDR:

- Preserves the existing tree canopy by requiring tree preservation, minimum amounts of trees for property and the requirement of tree removal permits and mitigation standards (Section 7.3);
- Increases percentages of native vegetation in new non-residential locations requiring more than six trees, by requiring a minimum of 50% of all trees in development to be classified as native and drought tolerant (Section 7.3.6.D);
- Increases percentages of native vegetation in new non-residential locations by requiring a minimum of 50% of all shrubs in development to be classified as native and drought tolerant (Section 7.3.6.E);
- Increases percentages of native vegetation in residential locations by requiring a minimum of 50% of plants and vegetation be selected from the Village’s Preferred Species list which includes native and drought resistant species (Section 7.3.B).

Additionally:

- Policy 1.3.10 had been added to the Conservation Element. This requires the Village, by 2010 to evaluate the feasibility of increasing the requirement for native, drought-tolerant plant materials for all landscaping.
In order to address potential for use of green building technologies and sustainable development techniques:

- Objective 1.6 has been added to the Conservation Element stating that "The Village shall monitor future technological development in order to ensure the Village remains informed of energy conservation and alternative energy technologies and is able to benefit from the maximum available incentives, rebates or grants." Policies 1.61 and 1.62 have been added to address green building. These policies discuss the requirement of municipal buildings to be constructed shall, at a minimum, be LEED certified or other green building rating systems, as required by Florida Statute Section 163.3177 and the use of incentives for private construction of buildings constructed to LEED or equivalent standards. Currently the Village is processing Ordinance 2009-12 which will allow buildings constructed to LEED Silver or better standards to qualify for the Village’s Expedited Permitting Program.

- The Village is in the process of creating a Sustainable Communities Element for its Comprehensive Plan and is striving to incorporate it into the Comprehensive Plan in 2010. The Village plans to develop additional goals, policies and objectives to address the potential for use of green building technologies and sustainable development techniques.

G. Intergovernmental Coordination

Objection 1: The Evaluation and Appraisal Report recommended that the Intergovernmental Coordination Element be amended to address water supply planning, the State Road 7 Corridor Master Plan and coordination with the City of Greenacres to resolve overlapping annexation areas. The Village added Objective 1.4 which states that the Village shall implement polices related to annexation and multiple jurisdiction planning for the State Road 7 Corridor as provided in Objective 1.6 of the Land Use Element. However, Objective 1.6 and the accompanying polices of the Land Use Element have not been revised as part of the amendment package to address the State Road 7 Corridor Master Plan and annexation planning issues.

Recommendation: Revise the objective to establish the specific intermediate end result to be achieved and mark progress toward meeting the goal and revise the policies to include specific programs and activities to be undertaken by the Village to address the address the State Road 7 Corridor Master Plan and annexation planning issues as recommended in the Evaluation and Appraisal Report.

Comment: The Village should consider including a policy in the Intergovernmental Coordination Element for coordinating with the Department of Transportation and Palm Beach County regarding the concurrency management systems to incorporate greater protections for the functions of the Strategic Intermodal System.
**Village of Wellington Response:** Policy 1.4.1 has been added to read “The Village shall strive to coordinate with the Department of Transportation and Palm Beach County to incorporate greater protections for the functions of the Strategic Intermodal System.”

Future Land Use Element Objectives 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 have been rewritten as objectives. Objective 1.8 states: “The Village shall strive to help create a replacement plan for the defunct Palms West Corridor Study to coordinate development along State Road 7. The Village has been coordinating with other government agencies to evaluate land use and transportation planning within the SR7 corridor, which is primarily the Village’s Future Annexation Area.” Additionally Land Use Element Policy 1.8.2 has been added to strengthen the Village’s commitment to corridor planning on State Road 7. Policy 1.8.2 states: “If unable to develop a multi-jurisdictional SR 7 Corridor Plan within one year of the effective date of this plan, the Village shall consider preparation of a SR 7 Corridor Master Plan limited to Village municipal boundaries.”

Please see response to Future Land Use Element Objection 4 on Page 3 of this ORC response which summarizes recent efforts to update and adopt the SR 7 Corridor Study.

**********************************************************************************************************************************************************************************************************

**H. Capital Improvements Element**

**Objection 1:** The Village’s Capital Improvements Element is inadequate for the following reasons:

- The Village did not include a Five Year Schedule of Capital Improvements. All the Capital Improvements Projects are presented as part of the Revenue Tables;
- The Village did not include project descriptions with adequate detail regarding location and whether the projects are needed to achieve or maintain level of service standards; and
- The Village has not indicated whether the funds shown in the revenue tables are committed or planned.

**Recommendation:** The Town should include a financially feasible Five-Year Schedule of Capital Improvements to correctly reflect the Village’s Capital Improvements Program. Additionally, the Town should identify which projects, if any, are needed in the next five years. The Town should include a project description and general location and identify whether the projects are needed to achieve or maintain level of service standards or to meet future demand. The Town should identify funding sources on a year by year basis and indicate whether the funds are committed or planned. Revenue sources must be committed for the first three years of the schedule and can be committed or planned revenue sources for years four and five.

**Village of Wellington Response:** Table 1.1 has been revised and includes

- A Five Year Schedule of level of service Capital Improvements.
- Project descriptions with location.
- Indicates whether the funds shown in the revenue tables are committed or planned.