



## Memorandum #2

Date:	11/15/19
To:	Howard Brown, Village Manager
From:	Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc. (CGA) Team
Subject:	Staff Kickoff Meeting
Project:	Land Development Regulations (LDRs)
CC:	Village Council, members of the Indiantown community

On 11/15/19, the CGA project team met with Village staff to formally kickoff the technical preparation process of the LDRs. The following members of the staff attended the meeting:

- Daniel Eick
- Bill Archebelle
- Wade Vose
- Luis Perez
- Susan Gooding-Liburel
- Howard Brown
- Alys Osterman
- Betsy Marzan
- Sharon Slade
- Ann Jones for Bonnie Landry

Village staff have unique insight and experience using the Village codes. For example, staff members such as (but not limited to) the Planning Director, Public Works Director, and Village Attorney gain their exceptional knowledge and understanding from a near-daily use of the code to help make determinations and recommendations about development proposals. They, along with others, are responsible for managing the development review and approval process and for advising decision-makers based on the degree of alignment of development proposals with the Village "vision," consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, and compliance with the regulations. As such, staff are considered one of the "Power User" groups of the LDRs. Therefore, the input of this Power User group is very important.

The meeting agenda started with administrative and logistical topics related to the process scope and schedule. Subsequently, discussion was opened around a series of questions designed to enable the CGA team to better understand staff's goals and concerns about opportunities and challenges for the development of the LDRs. This memorandum summarizes and identifies key discussion issues,



**1) What would you like to accommodate or create in the new code?**

- Ease of use for the staff; excellence in communicating regulatory information within and outside the community
- A streamlined development process. There should be fewer barriers than those posed in the current (Martin County) code.
- Martin County's code is far more cumbersome than the FL Administrative Code. The existing processes should not be used, they are far too complex for a community such as Indiantown.
- The new code needs to be easy to understand to laypeople, whether locals or "out-of-towners."
- The LDC should be simple and user-friendly and support the types of growth at the types of locations envisioned in the comprehensive plan.
- The new code should be concise but comprehensive.

**2) What challenges or impediments do you foresee to achieving these outcomes?**

- Getting caught
- Council will be challenged in serving as conduits of information to the residents throughout this process. Need to stay on message. (Note: CGA will assist with some of the messaging and communications).
- Indiantown Company, a private water and wastewater utility, will need to be able to seamlessly transition from private to public and integration into the code. (The permitting process is currently through the utility. There are different sets of rules for privately-owned and publicly-owned utilities, so this will be a challenge).
- The downtown area needs to be better defined and find its identity.
- While the CRA tax increment finance (from Martin County) is no longer functional, the CRA zoning overlay still exists, and it isn't easy to understand. What to do with this needs to be decided.
- Managing the process to appropriately balance the needs and expectations of all the stakeholder groups, while moving the project forward, will be taxing.
- Appealing equitably to both local and outside developers.
- Historically, Martin County has been known as a slow-growth or no-growth community. The Village may or may not get pushback from the County on certain changes that better align with its vision of long-term steady growth.
- Removing or at least reducing "factionalism" and ensuring the process remains and is correctly communicated as transparent and inclusive.



### 3) Are there any communities (peer or not) with codes that might be precedents for Indiantown?

- Port St Lucie (larger size and more urbanized).
- Fellsmere (similar in size and character aspirations)
- City of Pensacola

### 4) What are some “must haves”?

- Sign ordinance (Note: Martin County Code is content-neutral already, but not otherwise a good fit for Indiantown)
- Lighting requirements: Warfield is DOT and photometrics are currently required on site plans.
- Address golf carts and bicycles in parking regulations
- Address annexation process, with guidelines/considerations such as cost-benefit criteria

### 5) What should the treatment of corridors and density be?

- Form more important than density, but height can be a controversial issue
- Generally, building heights above 4 stories are not favored (Note: 4 is the max in the current code), but there are nuances to the Village where this might need to be reviewed. (For example, is a height bonus appropriate in certain circumstances to achieve certain conditions? Are there any areas of the Village where it might be appropriate to allow more height for good reasons?).
- Incentives for sustainability should be considered.

### Miscellaneous Comments

- *Permeability:* Flooding does not happen along Warfield but all other roads. Village currently implements 1 ft above BFE. Acceptable responses: turf blocks ok, but pervious concrete or pavers are not (durability issues).
- *Wetlands:* The preference for addressing the presence of wetlands is to take a mitigation approach. Staff would like to see the code follow the SFWMD minimum regulations.
- *Fees in Lieu:* There seems to be consensus on this as a preferred approach to offer developers an option to providing on site landscape or sidewalk improvements in certain circumstances. Consider establishing Landscape and Sidewalk Funds for developer contributions, when appropriate.
- *Subdivisions:* Subdivision regulations different from Martin County's are needed.