Vote on Everything?

The Palm Beach Post wrote that Amendment 4 would lead to ballots "filled with jargon-laden, irrelevant junk."

And according to the Orlando Sentinel, the cost of voting on everything would "soar into the millions."

But some wonder what ballots in Florida would actually look like under Amendment 4.

Now, there's no need to wonder. If Amendment 4 had been adopted in 2005, the taxpayers of Orange City, Volusia County would have paid to put almost 500 technical planning updates on the ballot. We researched all of the amendments made to the City's comprehensive plan and reviewed state records to put together a sample ballot. The next page shows page 40 of the ballot. Please visit the campaign’s website (http://florida2010.org/home.php) for more information. To see the full ballot, click here.
To vote, fill in the circle next to your choice. Use ink or pencil. If you make a mistake, don't hesitate to ask for a new ballot. If you erase or make other marks, your vote may not count.

Amendment #410
Technical Revision to Policy 1.3.1 Exploring Additional Financing Mechanisms

The proposed amendment requires the City to continue to invest in financing mechanisms such as impact fees and other forms of development assessments that ensure future growth and development to pay its proportionate share of the costs of providing facilities and services.

FOR
AGAINST

Amendment #411
Technical Revisions to Objective 1.4 on Fiscal Resources for Needed Capital Improvements for Future Development

The proposed amendment requires the City to continue to invest in fiscal resources to ensure the provision of needed capital improvements for future development and shall not issue future development bonds when such development requires capital improvements for which sufficient funding does not exist.

FOR
AGAINST

Amendment #412
Technical Revisions to Policy 1.4.3 Issuing or Incurred Additional Debt

The amendment requires the City to continue to follow the criteria for issuing or incurring any additional debt as stated in the City's charter including Section 44 (Municipal Borrowing). The proposed technical revision deletes the verbatim language of Section 44.

FOR
AGAINST

Amendment #413
Technical Revisions to Objective 1.5 on Concurrency Management on Facilities and Services

The proposed amendment requires the City's adopted procedures and policies for concurrency management to ensure that facilities and services are available, subject to concurrency management and to serve planning for the proposed development.

FOR
AGAINST

Amendment #414
Technical Revisions to Policy 1.5.1 on Concurrency Management Provisions in Capital Improvement Element

Summary: The amendment requires the following facilities to be subject to the LDC's, Ordinance No. 157, concurrency management provisions and those that are stipulated herein; roads, public water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, and recreation. The LOS standards for each of these facility categories are listed in Policy 1.1.3 of this section. The proposed technical amendment inserts the City's LDC, Ordinance No. 157.

FOR
AGAINST

Amendment #415
Technical Revisions to Policy 1.5.2 on Concurrency Management Test in Capital Improvement Element

The concurrency management provisions of the LDC, Ordinance No. 157, stipulated herein will be applied to proposed development and the City shall issue Development Orders only when there is sufficient capacity from all facilities to serve the project at the adopted LOS standards. Available capacity will be determined by adding any approved capacity to that existing from the design capacity of the facility, the remaining is the capacity available to serve proposed projects.

FOR
AGAINST

Amendment #416
Technical Revisions to Policy 1.5.3 on Details of Proposed Developments

The proposed amendment requires each proposed development or application for a development order or permit to clearly identify the intensity (type of land use), the intensity of use (commercial, industrial, multifamily, residential, etc.), the intensity of use (commercial, industrial, multifamily, residential, etc.), the intensity of use (commercial, industrial, multifamily, residential, etc.), and the intensity of use (commercial, industrial, multifamily, residential, etc.).

FOR
AGAINST

Amendment #417
Technical Revisions to Policy 1.5.4 on Concurrency Requirements in Capital Improvement Element

The proposed amendment requires that all developments meet the requirements of concurrency except for those developments that exempt as described in Policy 1.5.5. The standards set forth in Policy 1.5.4 meet the requirements for concurrency as outlined in Rule 19-5 of the Florida Administrative Code.

FOR
AGAINST

Amendment #418
Technical Revisions to Policy 1.5.5 on Concurrency Testing

The proposed amendment, through the City's LDC, Ordinance No. 157, exempts certain developments from concurrency testing. These include developments that have been approved prior to the effective date of the LDC, that have received final site plan approval prior to the effective date, that have received final site plan approval prior to the effective date, that have received final site plan approval prior to the effective date, that have received final site plan approval prior to the effective date, and all vacant single-family, double, and single-family attached dwellings that have been determined to be owned and occupied prior to the effective date.

FOR
AGAINST

Amendment #419
Technical Revisions to Policy 1.5.6 on Exempted Properties in Policy 1.5.5

The proposed amendment requires properties exempted by Policy 1.5.5, to have facility capacity available for such properties during the planning period unless previous agreements provide for an earlier expiration date.

FOR
AGAINST
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