

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE FORT PIERCE CITY PLANNING BOARD HELD ON TUESDAY, JULY 12, 2005, IN THE CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBERS (due to anticipated seating accommodations for the public), 100 NORTH U.S. 1, FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA.**

Members present: Donald Bergman (Chair), Sonja Gates (Vice Chair), Jeremiah Johnson, Thomas Knott, Charlie Harris, Robert Poitier, Pamela Williams, and Chuck Enns, and Margaret Benton.

Members absent: New Member: Misty Minton

Citizens and Staff present:

Alexi Howk  
John Toole  
Xavier F. Aguirre  
Jack Cahill  
Mike Monti  
Al Brodeur  
Richard Allen  
Mac McCarty  
Alberto Ramudo  
Jorge L. Bouza  
John Honea  
Douglas Davis  
Rudd Jones  
Laura Mitzo  
Joe Solovey  
Buzz Smyth  
Patrick Pecunia

David Recor, Deputy City Manager  
Travis Gibbons, Planner  
Jim Walker, Assistant City Attorney  
Hector Arias, City Engineer  
Dianna D. Rose, Administrative Secretary

Meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. (**Agenda Item #1**).

Secretary proceeded with roll call and consideration of absences. (**Agenda Item #2**).

Ms. Rose stated – The new member, Misty Minton, called and stated that she would be out of town.

Mr. Bergman lightly stated – Well, that’s a good start.

Light laughter from the Board.

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, everyone is here except for our new member, so we have no consideration of absences.

**Agenda Item #3 – Consideration of Minutes of June 14, 2005.**

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Bergman continued – Has everyone had a chance to review the minutes from the June 14, 2005 meeting? Are there any comments or corrections that need to be made?

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 14, 2005. Seconded by Mr. Johnson. Unanimously approved by voice vote.**

**Agenda Item #4 – Old Business**

**a. Site Plan w/Conditional Use – Ocean Park** – Approval for the construction of a 5-story, 64-unit condominium building. Generally located on the northwest corner of South Ocean Drive & Crestview Drive. Owner Tricon Development, Inc., applicant is Ocean Park Development, Inc., applicant is Ocean Park Development, and representative is Culpepper & Turpening, Inc. **Status** – Applicant resubmitted revised site plans and will be presenting at the August Planning Board meeting. Mr. Bergman asked – Do I understand that that’s going to be on next month’s meeting, Travis?

Mr. Gibbons stated – That’s correct, Mr. Chairman. It’s an update just to let you know that they’ve resubmitted their applications and look forward to it next month.

Mr. Bergman stated – Alright, thank you. So, there’s nothing there. And we have a tabled item from the June 14 meeting.

**b. Tabled from June 14 meeting – Amendment to Approved Site Plan – St. Lucie Court** - Approval of an amendment to a Planned Unit Redevelopment (PUR). Located at 301 South Ocean Drive. Owner/applicant is Richard Allen, President of Gallery 34949, and representative is Thomas Lucido & Associates.

Mr. Bergman stated – Before we have staff’s report, I have to excuse myself. We are involved directly with this project. So, I’m going to have a seat out there and I’m going to pass the gavel to Mrs. Gates.

**Staff Report** – Mr. Gibbons stated – The amendment to the PUR...it’s to an approved PUR. The project has been redesigned to a standpoint to satisfy staff. The architectural features have been upgraded from the previous approved PUR. They’ve also incorporated the parking for the project. It was designed to be on St. Lucie Court. And that’s going to be future public parking for the City of Fort Pierce. They’ve incorporated all of that now into the site plan. The actual flow of the parking area as well, based on the old site plan, is better. It’s a better design. And even though there are some issues with the units per acre, that will be addressed at the Commission. It is an approved PUR currently. And staff recommends approval to the amendment.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay, thank you. I believe we have both the original and the updated version...am I correct here?

Mr. Gibbons stated – Yes you should.

Mrs. Gates continued – Okay. So everybody should have had a chance to review the revisions. Are there any questions for the staff from the Board?

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Knott asked – Travis, was this one of the ones we last month they had requested or delayed because of the transportation study or...?

Mr. Gibbons stated – It wasn't based on the transportation study. It was based on Fire Department comments that the Fire Department had rejected the site plan. And at that point, we felt that it should be tabled. But they've met those conditions with the Fire Department now; and that's why it's back before you.

Mr. Knott continued – Okay. I see some of the traffic...

Mr. Gibbons stated – They had already previously submitted that.

Mr. Knott asked – So, we're all set on this?

Mr. Gibbons – Correct.

Mr. Knott continued – Now I remember this. Now it all has been taken care of then...all of the questions from the review committee?

Mr. Gibbons – Correct.

Mr. Knott – Alright, thank you.

Mr. Gates asked – Any further questions for staff? Is there anyone here to speak in favor of this request?

Mr. Brodeur stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm with Thomas Lucido & Associates. I'd like to go back in time with this project for a moment. This was a PUR that was approved last year prior to the hurricanes. And it was the applicant's intent, at the time, to utilize the existing structures there that are on site that you see in those photos. He was going to use the foundation walls because at that time they were structurally sound. And we designed the site plan around that existing building. So, obviously a couple of hurricanes came through and compromised the structures enough so that we could no longer could do that. And we decided at that time that now that we're not basically confined to those existing walls, we could make the site plan a little bit better. So, we made a few changes before...as you can see on the before, we had a drive-thru here and it really wasn't necessary to have a curb cut here. And D.O.T. wasn't really happy with having a curb cut so close to St. Lucie Court...(inaudible?) So, we took the opportunity to come back for an amendment of an existing PUR. It's zoned PUR right now. And we're just looking for an approval for an amendment to a previously approved site plan. Another couple of changes that have been done is before we were utilizing some of our required parking on the street. Staff told us that that was not acceptable. Those were public parking spaces and we couldn't utilize them for our required... So we redesigned the site plan so that we would provide enough on site. There wasn't enough room so we actually had to reduce the retail in our last submission so that we would have enough parking...enough room on site to provide all the parking requirements on site. This is basically retail on the first floor. Commercial office on the second. And then above that four (4)

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

stories, 45 ft. Above that will be three (3) condos facing the water utilizing the Key West Style of architecture...we discussed that. And then there are four (4) units back here with two-car garages. That's basically the design and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Mrs. Gates asked – Okay, are there any questions for Mr. Brodeur from the Board?

Mr. Johnson stated – You stated that there were some additional parking spaces added. Is that in addition to what we have that was submitted or is that the total...17 that is depicted on your drawing?

Mr. Brodeur stated – When it was first approved...when we said parking required...parking provided, basically some of those included spaces on the street.

Mr. Johnson – Right.

Mr. Brodeur continued – At our last technical review meeting staff said that it would be requirement that we met all needs on site. So, we were actually two (2) spaces on site insufficient of the parking. We were using these (referring to renderings) as required. But since those were partially in the right-of-way, we were told that that was not allowed. So we reduced the retail space so that we would be able to meet the on-site parking requirements.

Mr. Johnson stated – Okay. So those improvements that are made on the street...is that by your client or is that going to be something that's in coordination with the City?

Mr. Brodeur stated – That's something our client is discussing with the CRA. The CRA has some improvements proposed there. That was stated to our client before that director quit. So, we're not sure where they are with that right now. Like I said, we're not doing the improvements at this time. I'm proposing we couldn't use them as required spaces.

Mr. Johnson stated – Right. Okay, thank you.

Mr. Arias stated – Madam Chair, I have a question. The improvements on St. Lucie Court...is that going to be sent to me with all the engineering drawings and everything together with that?

Mr. Brodeur stated – Again, we're not proposing to do the spaces...

Mr. Arias stated – I understand that. But I think that we talked about this before. That the developer was going to be considering improving some improvement to the St. Lucie Court. You just said that you talked to CRA...

Mr. Brodeur stated – Yes, he is because it's obviously in his best interest that it looks a lot better....

Mr. Arias stated – They talked to the CRA but we need to have this incorporated into the engineering drawings if I may...if everything is decided to be done that way. Alright? Thank you.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mrs. Gates asked – Are there any further questions for Mr. Brodeur? Okay, thank you very much. Is there anyone here to speak against this request? I don't think so. I'll entertain a motion on this item.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. KNOTT TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN. Seconded by Mr. Harris. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

Mrs. Gates stated to the applicant – Okay, your request has been approved. And it will go to the City Commission. And I think, Mr. Brodeur, I don't know where you are here, but would you please make sure that Mr. Arias gets what he has asked for please before the day of the City Commission so that he can review that?

Mr. Brodeur – Yes.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay, thank you very much, and good luck.

Position of Chair goes back to Mr. Bergman at this point.

**Agenda Item #5 – New Business**

**a. Site Plan – Citrus Avenue Project** - Approval for the construction of a two-story office building. Generally located on the north side between 6<sup>th</sup> & 7<sup>th</sup> Street on Citrus Avenue. Owner/applicant is Frank Fee, LLC, and representative is Fred Jones Jr., of Rudd Jones P.E. & Associates, P.A.

**Staff Report** – Mr. Gibbons stated – This is for a 15,000 sq. ft. office building on Citrus Avenue between 6<sup>th</sup> & 7<sup>th</sup> Street. This is a design that is more in the urban approach to construction of this project. The applicant has worked with staff, with Ramon Trias, with the architecture of the building. And they are requesting to place the building within the required setbacks and they're also shy four (4) spaces of parking space. But they have applied for a variance to the front yard, and they have also applied for a variance to the parking. The design is modern. It matches the urban principles of planning. And it's a good project. And staff recommends approval with the conditions of the variance being approved.

Mr. Bergman asked – Is there a reason that it didn't get the variance before the site plan?

Mr. Gibbons stated – No. It's running concurrent with it. It will be scheduled for the August Board of Adjustment before it gets to the City Commission.

Mr. Bergman stated – Okay. Were there any questions of staff from the Board? Alright, hearing none, we'll open the public hearing. Is there anyone here who wishes to speak on this project?

Mr. Doug Davis stood and introduced himself and stated – Good evening, I'm with Richard Davis Construction. We've been hired by a partnership of (Berger, Tumes, Elam, Gaines & Frank?) in conjunction with Fee, Koblegard, and Deross, who are developing the parcel. And we've been hired to design it. I've also hired as my civil engineer, Rudd Jones, who is with me tonight. And (Donato?) &

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Associates is our architect of which the packet reflects the architecture of the building and the civil design of the project site. In essence, as mentioned by staff, a two-story, 15,000 sq. ft. professional office. A tenant on the upper floor, a tenant on the ground floor. And with that, I don't know if there's much else to say other than to answer your questions if you have them.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any questions of the applicant?

Mr. Johnson stated – I see on the site plan it shows a covered parking area. Are there two (2) sections of covered parking where it incorporates 10 spaces or is it just the 5?

Mr. Davis stated – There are two (2) covered parking areas, each has five (5) spaces underneath for a total of 10 covered parking spaces.

Mr. Johnson stated – Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any other questions of the applicant? Guess not, you're getting off easy.

Mr. Knott added – Yeah, it seems like a nice looking building. It's going to be a real asset for that part of the downtown...that area right there. That's a nice commitment in there.

Mr. Davis stated – Thank you. Well, the owners have made the commitment and they want to do it nice. So, I'm pleased to work with someone that desires to do that in downtown.

Mr. Knott stated – Just a question. Doug, are those folks all going to move into these...are they going to be their offices now or what?

Mr. Davis stated – This will be their personal offices. (Speedy Fees?) will take the ground floor and Gary Berger will take the second floor.

Mr. Knott continued – Will they have any offices or just them...I mean just those two (2)?

Mr. Davis stated – There is one space that is probably maybe a quarter of the ground floor that's undeveloped that will be lease space for them.

Mr. Knott – Okay.

Mr. Davis continued – Adjacent to (Speedy Fees?) space.

Mr. Knott continued – How were you able to ...did everything work out okay with the trees and ...is that where they had some nice trees on that lot?

Mr. Davis stated – There was one huge oak. I think it's shown on the plan as a 48 in. diameter oak. And then there's another tree that they, I believe, identified ...we did converse with the urban forester and had them work with us on that...I think they said it was a ficus that wraps a palm tree. And the oak

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

tree was heavily damaged during the hurricanes and was not recommended to be preserved. We did have an original design that showed the parking that accommodated the oak being kept, which caused the traffic aisle that goes from 6<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> to actually take a sweep around. And the parking has a sweep. But when the urban forester took a look at it, he said that that tree was subject to insect problems and it had been horribly damaged. They've cut it back and trimmed it back, but it's in bad disrepair right now. So he didn't suggest we design around it.

Mr. Knott - Okay.

Mr. Davis added – The ficus will remain. And all of the cabbage palms will be relocated by spade. We're going to create them. I think, on Lucido's drawing you'll see that there's a palm hammock we're going to create along the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor there where we're actually going to locate the underdeveloped portions of the property and drop them in.

Mr. Knott stated – It would be nice to hide that dumpster area...is that what that's for?

Mr. Davis – Yes, sir.

Mr. Knott continued – There are a lot of mature cabbage palms on this side. So we're going to preserve all of them and cluster them.

Mr. Knott stated – That's good. Glad to see that.

Mrs. Gates stated – I don't have a question other than I think it's a good looking project. I think, whether you meant to do this or whether it's just by accident, but when I first looked at it last week, it was kind of reminiscent of the historical school that's in the same neighborhood so to speak. I don't know if that was an intention. But as soon as I looked at it, it reminded me of the Delaware Avenue school. And I think that's good to have this kind of architecture over in that area. And I just wanted to compliment you on such a nice project.

Mr. Davis stated – Thank you. (Haden?) Curtis is our project designer with (Donato?) & Associates. Of course, we met with Ramon on the front end. And we're familiar with the neighborhood. So, we wanted it to blend.

Mrs. Gates stated – Well, it does...it will. Thank you.

Mr. Bergman stated lightly – Tell Haden he needs to center his main cupola over his entrance.

Light laughter from Board members.

Mr. Bergman added – He's off about two (2) feet.

Mrs. Gates agreed – Yeah, a little bit.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Bergman asked – Alright, are there any other questions of the applicant? Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on this project? If not, we'll close the public hearing. I'll entertain a motion from the Board.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MRS. GATES TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN. Seconded by Mr. Enns.**

Mr. Bergman asked – Is there any discussion on the motion?

Mr. Knott stated – Perhaps subject to the staff's recommendation to the variance, you may want to include that in the motion.

Mrs. Gates stated – Oh, right. I will include that.

**MOTION RESTATED**

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MRS. GATES TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN WITH THE CONDITION THAT THEY ARE APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR THE LACK OF FOUR (4) PARKING SPACES AND THE SETBACK. Seconded by Mr. Enns. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

Mr. Bergman stated to the applicant – Good luck with your variance. You'll probably be at the City Commission, I guess, maybe in August...September.

Applicant stated – August I hope.

Mr. Bergman – Good luck.

**Agenda Item #5b. – Site Plan with Conditional Use – Diamond Dunes** – Approval for the construction of a 23-unit town home project with 8 of the units east of the Coastal Construction Line. Generally located between Porpoise & Frances Avenue on the east and west side of South Ocean Drive. Owner is Elizabeth Bowser, of Ocean Front Land, LLC, applicant is Ocean Drive East/West, LLC, and representative is Thomas Lucido & Associates.

**Staff Report** – Mr. Gibbons stated – This is for construction for a townhouse project on the east and west sides of A1A. The conditional use is for construction east of the Coastal Control Line. The project consists of three (3) five (5)-unit buildings on the west side of A1A, and eight (8) units on the eastern side. Amenities have been included for the project...pools on both sides and the cabana. The applicant has met all density regulations for the R-4A zoning. It's under eight (8) units...it's under eight (8) units. It's actually at 6.6 units per acre. And it has been conceptually approved by staff. We do recommend an approval based on a variance for the rear yard setback that would be on A1A...it's at 17 ft. and for this district it requires 20 ft.

Mr. Bergman stated – Alright, thank you. Are there any questions of staff from the Board?

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Enns stated – I have one, Mr. Chairman. A proposed dune crossover...isn't that necessary? Did they have the crossover....or are they just proposing it since there's actually no dune there now.

Mr. Gibbons stated – Well, it's a proposed dune crossover. But of course, that would also be required for DEP. They would have to get their permitting for that as well. And according to the environmental regulations, they would have to follow that. But I haven't seen the dune...I don't know how much of a dune is left.

Mr. Enns asked – Do they have that DEP permit yet?

Mr. Gibbons stated – Not that I have seen, no. But it would be required at building permit time.

Mr. Bergman asked – Travis, do you know if they have addressed the Solid Waste pick-up?

Mr. Gibbons stated – Yes they have. That was an issue at the Technical Review meeting for the dumpster locations. And they've been working with the Solid Waste on those.

Mr. Bergman asked – Have they resolved that? Because I don't see...I mean I see one (1) dumpster on the west side but I don't see anything on the east.

Mr. Gibbons stated – The last time I spoke with Solid Waste and Harold, it's been approved . They've worked out to have, from what I was told, the dumpster location was going to have the enclosures, and then on the other side they were going to have the pick-up for trash cans because there was only eight (8) units.

Mr. Bergman asked – Was Sue (from Solid Waste) happy with how they were going to facilitate that? Because it looks to me like they would have to take eight (8) cans and stick them out in front of the driveway blocking that entrance.

Mr. Gibbons stated – From what she (Sue) was saying, based on the fact that it's only eight (8) units and the shortness of the drive lot, it wouldn't be an inconvenience for the driver, it would be simple enough for them to do. And the canisters would be stored in the garage.

Mr. Bergman asked – So, they're going to just store them out front and the truck is going to go up and down in front of the units?

Mr. Gibbons stated – Just during trash collection day, they would take it out and then it would be stored back in the garage.

Mr. Bergman – Okay.

Mr. Enns asked – And that would happen both on the east and west side, Travis?

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Gibbons stated – On the west side it would be done through the dumpster location. They wouldn't have individual pick-up.

Mr. Knott stated – Travis, on the variance. You don't have it outlined in your staff report.

Mr. Gibbons stated – That's correct. After I wrote the staff report, actually it was beyond my eyesight. I couldn't see it. It was very small. And I finally saw the 17 and I noticed that and I advised the applicant of the decision.

Mr. Knott asked – And what is it supposed to be?

Mr. Gibbons stated – It supposed to be 20 ft.

Mr. Knott continued – What is the elevation? Is this the one on the west side that backs up to A1A...is that the one that's...?

Mr. Gibbons – Correct.

Mr. Knott continued – Do you have any pictures of what the elevation looks like back there?

Mr. Gibbons asked – You have the ones that were provided?

Mr. Knott stated – Yes. We have them...yes....

Mr. Gibbons stated – That's what was provided to me. The applicant has elevations.

Mr. Knott stated – I'm just curious...since it was a little bit closer to A1A...well, we get that in a minute then. The other item was ...Hector, you can probably answer this one for me. Is Hernando...is that a paved section of Hernando, or is that the old dirt part back there on the west side of their project?

Mr. Arias stated – I believe it's paved. The one that you are talking about is Granada...that's way down there.

Mr. Knott asked – So, it is paved?

Mr. Arias stated – Yes, Hernando is paved...Granada is the one that is dirt.

Mr. Knott – Alright.

Mr. Arias added – We haven't come across a hump yet.

Mr. Knott stated – Yes, okay. I think that's all I have right now...thank you.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any other questions of staff? Alright, if there are no questions for staff, we'll open the public hearing for anyone who wishes to speak on this project.

Mr. Al Brodeur stood and introduced himself once again and stated – I'm with Thomas Lucido & Associates. Quite a few questions have arisen already, so I would like to discuss those. I first would like to hand out these elevations.

Mr. Knott asked – Are these the same ones that we got in our packet?

Mr. Brodeur – No.

Mr. Knott asked – Oh, this is the A1A one?

Mr. Brodeur – Yes. Now basically this is a town home development. The elevation that you're looking at right now is facing A1A. And we designed these buildings so that they would actually be double frontage so that when you're going down A1A it looks like the front of the building. When you come in here (referring to renderings) and you go to your garage, that also looks like the front of the building. So, it's a better design aesthetically. You see right here, this is basically the elevation for A1A.

Mr. Knott – Okay.

Mr. Brodeur continued – So, that when you're driving down the road, you see front doors. Obviously there's no habitable space on the first floor because of the Coastal Construction Line goes to right here (referring to renderings), and that's why we're applying for the conditional use. So, there will be some parking, which is permitted by DEP, and a front door entrance, staircase, and you go right up to the second floor where the first habitable space would be. As requested, the dune crossover, that is a requirement. And this will require DEP approval after City approval. And DEP wants local approval first before they'll accept any application. And that DEP process will involve not only a dune crossover but a dune restoration plan, which we will be working on. That will involve replanting of native grasses and everything ...that will all will be a requirement of DEP with this. As for the dumpster, Solid Waste, we did have a dumpster proposed here, and Solid Waste Department agreed that curbside would be fine. They had no problem with it. It gave us more pervious area. We would have a dumpster right out front by the buildings. This exceeded the capacity of allowing for curbside; that's why we had a dumpster here. Basically these elevations facing Hernando will also look like this on the front of the buildings going down Hernando. We wanted to be consistent with the charrettes since this is a newly proposed project. It's within the 8 units per acre...it's 6.6 units per acre...45 ft. We didn't want to stir the pot. We're trying to be consistent with the charrette. I'd like to go over a few of the details. This is another redevelopment project. Right now there are rentals along Frances Avenue...concrete block, one-story rentals. They're actually going to be demolished tomorrow as required by the City. This is a new redevelopment project. The 17 ft. is something that I wasn't even aware that that was a problem until today just before this meeting. Maybe we put it on there too small, I don't know. I discussed with our client right after hearing that from Travis today. What would be their preference to apply for a variance or just reduce the building width and move it back three (3) feet inside? It would be easier to just move the building back three (3) feet. And if that's a condition upon approval then we're fine with that.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Again, that was just raised an hour ago. I didn't know that was a problem. But again, as a condition of approval there's plenty of room to just move the building back three (3) feet and comply with that 20 feet. I'd be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Mr. Enns stated – The east elevation of the east building, is that the same as this elevation?

Mr. Brodeur stated – No, did you get distributed a copy of that? Because it was submitted.

Mr. Enns asked – Is that the one that is on the last page?

Mr. Brodeur stated – Let me see. That's it.

Mr. Enns asked – This is the east elevation?

Mr. Brodeur stated – Right.

Mr. Enns – Okay.

Mr. Brodeur continued – No. I'm sorry. That is the west elevation of the east parcel. That is the ocean side. That's the east parcel that is the facing west elevation of the east parcel.

Mr. Enns and Mrs. Gates asked – Where's the east elevation?

Mr. Brodeur stated – That's this (referring to the renderings).

Mrs. Gates asked – That's the east?

Mr. Brodeur stated – This is the east elevation of the west parcel.

Mr. Enns asked – Okay, but where's the east elevation of the east parcel?

Mr. Brodeur stated – I don't know if we have that. The architect is here.

Mr. Jorge L. Bouza stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm here with Alberto Ramudo with Icon Design. We're the architects on the project. What we did on the elevation was to create a standard there for both the east and the west side. And they both reflect pedestrians that is going to be created along A1A. They're both going to have the same height...three (3) story town homes; except on the east side it's two 4-unit buildings. The fact that we had lower density than what we were permitted allowed us to break the buildings into two (2) to create vistas across from the west side of A1A onto the east side. Now basically the elevation represents a style which is a seaside Spanish Mediterranean. And it's going to be consistent on both the east and west side of the development. On the east portion of the parcel on the ocean side, we're going to have the same style except that there we're going to reflect garage doors that are against A1A because what we can do on the west side is create a double elevation. One of the concerns that we had when in meetings with the City was that we don't create a back yard to A1A.

## **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

What we did here was we created an entryway and an arcade. We overhung the second and third floor of the buildings and created like an arcade along A1A for the first floor of the development, creating the entry doors and then the louver sections for the garages on the first floor. And basically it's a representation of how's it's going to be for the whole development for the full five (5) buildings. We stayed below the 45 ft. maximum allowable. And the density is less than what's allowable. And again, we tried to create vistas from the west side tying both projects towards the east side of A1A and the ocean.

Mr. Enns stated – Once again, the east elevation of the east building is going to look like that? (referring to renderings).

Mr. Bouza stated – That is correct. What you see here is a three (3)-story town home. On the second and third level is the living area. And the first level is the ground floor or the garage level. It's the same concept on the east side. Now what you're going to be seeing from A1A is the same entrance elements...arches...except we'll have the garage doors on that elevation, in order to have access for each individual unit. Each unit itself will have the capability of actually parking three (3) vehicles within the envelope of the unit plus what can be accepted outside as parking.

Mr. Bergman stated – I have a couple of questions. One, your west elevation, I'm sure this is the first time we've seen this, but your footprint on your site plan does not match your elevation.

Mr. Bouza stated – Okay, that's a five (5)-unit building on the west side.

Mr. Bergman stated – I know, but your building on the west side is shown as a rectangle; that is not a rectangle. You have cantilevers, you've got balconies, and you've got covered areas.

Mr. Bouza stated – Well one of the reasons that we did...we thought that we had the setback at 15 and went to 17...we're creating the floor plans...we're bringing the balconies in two (2) feet and we have three (3) ft. overhang on the balconies. So, it's basically a five (5) ft. balcony...two (2) ft. are into the envelope of the building and three (3) ft. overhang out. Now, if you see the roof line, what we did is ...this is one (1) individual unit, the second unit, the third, fourth, and the fifth. What we did is that we did do a relief on the unit in order to create these three (3) units so that it's not all one plate. So, we had a relief on this member and a relief on this member. But the balconies themselves don't come out five (5) ft. They only come out about three (3) ft., and we created dimensions into the ...

Mr. Bergman stated – I understand that. But that is not what is shown on your site plan. Your site plan shows a rectangular building. There's no relief shown anywhere on that site.

Mr. Bouza stated – No. Well the site plan, when we developed the elevations, we had, you know...to the envelope of the building, so there's going to be some play, you know, with the architecture...

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, I want to see it because if you're already encroaching into the required yard setback, I want to see how much more you're going to try and steal with these projections.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Bouza stated – Well, no. I don't think the intent was to steal anything...(inaudible?) There was an encroachment there. But you can see that we have plenty of room here. This driveway that we have here, we can certainly take the area that we need to bring this building back another two (2) ft. or even three (3) ft. We certainly have the area within this median to create that. That's why we're rebuilding it to come through a variance for what we need to satisfy the Planning Department for. This median center here, which is 11 ft...almost 12 ft. We know that we can take it from this area and bring the buildings in to accommodate the design that we have.

Mr. Bergman asked – What about your building heights? Typically we want to see what your average roof height is. I don't have any indication of that.

Mr. Bouza stated – The peak of the roof here was 42 ft.

Mr. Bergman stated – Okay. What about on the other side?

Mr. Bouza stated – It's the same...(inaudible?) We're certainly in most cases, below the permitted height of 45 ft. of four (4) stories.

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, you have a nice photograph in here of a building, I guess, that is similar to this, but it's really not an elevation indicating any floor to floor heights or your roof heights, which, I think, typically staff likes to see...and I especially like to see.

Mrs. Gates asked – Al (Brodeur), if you take three (3) ft. back, is that going to do anything to the, for example, some of the bigger trucks and things...service trucks that have to go into here and turn?

Mr. Brodeur stated – No. I'm trying not to resent the mention of the stealing of the three (3) ft.

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, I'm sorry...that wasn't the right word.

Mr. Brodeur continued – This has been through technical review for a couple of weeks. And if staff had written to us that this 17 ft. was not proper and it was required 20, we would have submitted that 20 ft. the next day. There's plenty of room to move this back if we have to reduce the building by three (3) ft. We'd be happy to do that, if that's a condition upon approval. Again, and Don (Bergman), you know this is conceptual, I mean, it has to go through the approval process before we can have an exact, but this is the style. This is what we're going for.

Mr. Bergman stated – Al, my point with this is we do the same thing with our plans is that if we know there's some movement in the building we try to show it on the site plans so we have an idea of what the ultimate size of those units are going to be; especially on the east side where it looks like you have ...you could have a couple of feet setback. It probably wouldn't make as much of a difference if we weren't so tight on the site already, where we're already encroaching into the required setback. But when you have a rectangular building indicated, and you do have some movement, it might be a two (2) projection plus the balconies projecting out beyond that, I think you only allow, what?...30 inches into

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

the required setback with the projections? Those are some of the kinds of things that we want to see, especially when you're tight on the site.

Mr. Brodeur continued – We're not going to exceed these lines. You want some play in the building to add some architectural features so that when people walk into...the first floor is basically unusable space except for a garage. You can't have any habitable space there. So, aside from the garage, it would make better sense and give them more breathing room if the front door is inside the building a little bit so that you...

Mr. Bergman stated – You don't have to explain it to me, I think the elevations are really nice. It's a very attractive building. But what I'm saying is that elevation does not match what's on your site plan in terms of a footprint.

Mr. Alberto Ramudo stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm from Icon Design. In reference to the answer of your shifting of the building; within the setback lines of that rectangle of the overall building, we're staying within those setback lines...in so-called 17 or 20 ft. setback to the street. Within that setback line, we have shifted the buildings, two (2) units forward two (2) ft. and the other units are three (3) ft. At no time is the building going to protrude beyond the so-called rectangle line of the setback lines.

Mr. Bergman – Okay.

Mr. Ramudo continued – And again, that's all just to give the architectural style of the building some play to keep it from looking like a plain façade. And that's the reason for the shift of two (2) ft.

Mr. Bergman stated – I understand the reason for it. I wanted to see how it was represented on the site as to whether it further encroached into the setback or if it actually...like I said, you were adjusting it within the footprint that you have.

Mr. Ramudo stated – Correct. It will stay within the footprint. It will not go beyond the setback line.

Mr. Bergman – Right.

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman. Al, what is your schedule of construction, assuming you get your approvals in the next couple of months?

Mr. Brodeur stated – Well, as soon as this is approved by the City, we will be applying with the DEP and we're anticipating from past experience that that takes anywhere from 5 to 7 or 8 months for approval. They're (DEP) so jam packed there. After that, we may also anticipate maybe 2 to 3 months review ...

Mr. Knott asked – So, about a year or somewhere around there?

Mr. Brodeur – Yes.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Knott continued – The reason I was asking ...you show a dashed line here for your sidewalk...

Mr. Brodeur stated – Yes, that was done for a reason.

Mr. Knott added – Well, I'm hoping that it's working with Mr. Arias here on the A1A improvements.

Mr. Brodeur stated – That dotted line ...I didn't want to make it look like we were trumping that, that is D.O.T./A1A sidewalk.

Mr. Knott asked – So, you're working with ...

Mr. Arias added – Yes, you have to work with my office. We have preliminary plans in that area for a sidewalk there and it would have to be compatible with that.

Mr. Brodeur stated – Yes. That's what we based this on. That's why dotted like that...The sidewalks along here (referring to renderings), these are solid lines because our client is actually making those improvements all the way around the perimeter of the property. The dotted lines are the A1A/D.O.T. improvements ...we didn't want to be misleading. And then those sidewalks, basically again, we didn't want this to become like a 20 ft...15 ft. back yard. So these are front doors. ...The sidewalks are pedestrian friendly right from the public sidewalk right onto the front door.

Mr. Knott stated – So, along Frances and Hernando, you all are going to construct those sidewalks...is that right?...that's part of your work?

Mr. Brodeur – Yes.

Mr. Knott – Okay, thank you.

Mrs. Gates stated – I have a question. Mr. Brodeur, I don't see any floor plans here, but are these going to have elevators in them?

Mr. Brodeur – Yes.

Mr. Bouza added – Yes. We plan to offer them as an option for an elevator...

Mrs. Gates asked – So, each unit can have an elevator if they choose to?

Mr. Bouza – That's correct.

Mrs. Gates – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions for the applicant?

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Johnson stated – I was looking at the drainage plan here. It looks like there are three (3) dry retention areas and one kind of an exfiltration trench-type design...is that correct? Is it going to accommodate the existing site? And what's on the east side to accommodate that drainage?

Mr. Bouza stated – Well, both sites are independent. They've been calculated independently. The east side has retention drainage, where we have sufficient enough of the area to have retention...on site there that's an actual retention area, not a filtration. And on the west side we have a similar situation with the calculations where we have a retention area...not along A1A because that was a concern of staff....(inaudible?).

Mr. Johnson stated – Okay. And on the west side, there are just three (3) dry retention areas...is that correct?

Mr. Bouza – Yes.

Mr. Johnson – Okay.

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman, just one more question. Mr. Brodeur, I see a gate on the entrance on the west units there. On the east there it's not going to be gated...is this correct?

Mr. Brodeur stated – There wasn't enough room for stacking. So, it wasn't an option.

Mr. Knott stated – But you have enough cuing room on that one for people to turn around if they can't get in?

Mr. Brodeur – Yes.

Mr. Knott – Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any other questions? Alright, thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on this project?

Mr. Jack Cahill stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm with the South Beach Association. Quite frankly we're very much in favor of this project. It meets the density and height limitations and we're very much in favor of it. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bergman asked – Is there anyone else who would like to speak? If not, we will close the public hearing.

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman, let me ask a question before we make the motion. Did I understand that they do not need the variance? Staff had recommended that they had to get a variance for the setback, but they can work it out internally and no variance will be required for the setback?

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Gibbons stated – If you’re going to make a recommendation on that, to go ahead and request the applicant to make the change to move it the three (3) feet, and then we will review it internally before it gets sent to Commission and make sure it’s in compliance.

Mr. Knott continued – Or perhaps we just say that they either correct it internally or obtain a variance then?

Mr. Gibbons – Yes.

Mr. Knott – Okay.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. KNOTT TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN WITH CONDITIONAL USE WITH THE CONDITION THAT THEY MUST CORRECT THE REAR YARD DEFICIT ON THE A1A WEST UNITS, OR APPLY FOR A VARIANCE. Seconded by Mr. Poitier. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

Mr. Bergman stated – Okay, you will be notified when this goes to the City Commission.

Mr. Bouza – Thank you very much.

Mr. Knott added – Nice project...it’s good!

**Agenda Item #5c. – Subdivision – Gator Lake Estates** – Approval to subdivide a parcel of land into 12 separate lots. Generally located on the southeast corner of Edwards & Selvitz Road. Owners/applicants are John Toole and John Honea.

**Staff Report** – Mr. Gibbons stated – The applicants are proposing for an estate density type of subdivision off of the corner of Edwards Road and Selvitz. It is a newly annexed property and it is going to be based on the R-1, Single Family zoning district. The maximum per unit for that is four (4) units; they are proposing 1.5 units per acre for this project. All lots within the subdivision meet or exceed the requirements for the R-1 zoning designation. And staff recommends approval to the preliminary plat.

Mr. Bergman stated – Alright, thank you. Are there any questions of staff from the Board? Okay, no questions. We can open the public hearing. Is there anyone here who would like to speak on this subdivision application?

Mr. Xavier F. Aguirre stood and introduced himself and stated – I’m with associated engineers and surveyors. I’m here to answer any questions you might have regarding the preliminary plat.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any questions of the applicant?

Mr. Johnson stated – Looking at the plan. Could you give me an approximate distance from the access driveway to Selvitz Road, which would be to the west? I think I understand. I just want clarification

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

that the lots are approximately 98...94 ft. wide. And I think I can go off that, but if you would clarify that please.

Mr. Aguirre stated – Yeah, setbacks we will follow are right out of the Code...plain and simple. Nothing is disapproved by the Planning Department.

Mr. Johnson continued – Okay, and the distance from Selvitz Road to the proposed asphalt entryway is a sufficient amount of distance?

Mr. Aguirre asked – From Selvitz Road?

Mr. Johnson – That's correct. The western side of the property.

Mr. Arias added – Mr. Chairman, it's almost 400 ft....it's more than adequate.

Mr. Johnson – Okay.

Mr. Bergman added – Yeah, it's got to be close to 400 ft.

Mr. Arias stated – I have a question for the applicant. Just a minor question. How are you going to connect the retention area to Edwards Road? Do you show that in the plat? I don't see anything there. I'm pretty sure you will.

Mr. Aguirre asked – Would that be required to be shown on the plat? That for sure will be shown on the engineering plan.

Mr. Arias stated – It doesn't matter because you're going to submit engineer drawings and you're going to have to have it.

Mr. Aguirre – That is correct.

Mr. Arias stated – I just wanted to make sure that you understand.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any other questions for the applicant?

Mr. Knott asked – Are these half-acre lots? Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Aguirre stated – A little bit below half acre. That was the initial concept; but things have changed along the way.

Mr. Knott asked – Will you be getting water and sewer from the City of Fort Pierce? Is this correct?

Mr. Aguirre stated – As far as sewer, I believe we're going to have to go with on-site systems...but water is close by.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Knott continued – Okay. But you will get the water from the Utilities Authority then?

Mr. Aguirre – Yes.

Mr. Knott continued – I wasn't paying attention...Mr. Arias was asking about...I was looking for an outfall too. Where do you outfall from this...? Where does your drainage go?

Mr. Aguirre stated – It is my understanding that there are existing catch basins...that would have to be studied yet; but there are existing catch basins on Selvitz Road.

Mr. Knott stated – Selvitz?...I think that's a swale drainage along there.

Mr. Arias added – I think it's going to have to connect to the Edwards Road system.

Mr. Aguirre – Okay.

Mr. Knott added – It must have to go to Edwards...that's a swale out there too isn't it? There are no catch basins out there is there?

Mr. Arias stated – Well, that will be for the engineers to....They're going to have to be creative.

Mr. Knott stated to the applicant – The City Engineer is very easy to work with...you won't have any problem. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any other questions for the applicant? Alright, thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on this project? If not, we'll close the public hearing.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO APPROVE THE SUBDIVISION. Seconded by Mr. Harris.**

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bergman stated lightly – Now what?!

Light laughter.

Mr. Knott asked – Mr. Walker, will this be back before us again? This is just the preliminaries...is this correct? I believe that's the procedure.

Mr. Arias added – Yes. Then they will have to submit the construction drawings.

Mr. Knott – Yes.

Mr. Arias continued – Then we will have to approve that, and then they have to build it.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Knott – Right.

Mr. Arias continued – And then they have to bring the final plat. If they want to have the final plat approved, then they're going to have to bond the project. Because once you approve the final plat, then they can sell lots. So, we have to make sure that the project is either bonded or built.

Mr. Knott continued – Okay. So, one way or another Planning Board will get to see this again? Is this correct?

Mr. Arias asked – The final plat?

Mr. Gibbons stated – The final plat will be reviewed at the City Commission.

Attorney Walker stated – I believe that is correct, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Knott – Okay.

Mr. Arias added – My department...we'll always be controlling that. When we receive the final plat for approval, we will see if the project has been built or it has to be bonded.

Mr. Knott – Okay.

Mr. Arias continued – And then it depends on which one...and then we will proceed accordingly.

Mr. Knott stated – Thank you. That's all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bergman stated lightly – Thank you for keeping it brief.

Mr. Knott – You're welcome.

Mr. Bergman stated – If there's no other discussion could we have roll call please?

**Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

Mr. Bergman stated to the applicants – You will be notified when this goes to the City Commission.

**Agenda Item #5d. – Waiver of Distance – Al's Bait & Tackle** – Approval to waive the distance requirement between places of business selling alcoholic beverages (beer and/or wine), in order to obtain a 2-COP license for the consumption and selling of those said beverages. Located at 658 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. Owner/applicant is Harold (Buzz) Smyth.

**Staff Report** – Mr. Gibbons stated – This is for the Al's Bait & Tackle. The applicant has requested a 2-COP license for the establishment. They're keeping the bait and tackle open, but they're also incorporating the dining aspects. They've met all of the requirements of the permanent kitchen

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

facilities...the 35 seats. And then also they have adequate parking and landscape. And they've upgraded the facilities. And staff recommends approval to the 2-COP.

Mr. Bergman stated – Thank you. Are there any questions of staff from the Board?

Mr. Johnson asked – Mr. Chair, they're doing this all within the confines of the existing structure? Is that correct?

Mr. Gibbons stated – Yes. They've added the outside seating. And then they've also placed, I believe, a couple of extra accessory structures on the property as well. And those have been approved.

Mr. Johnson – Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions of staff? Alright, hearing none, we'll open the public hearing to anyone that wishes to speak.

Mr. Harold (Buzz) Smyth stood and introduced himself and stated – I own Al's Bait & Tackle. And I would be glad to answer any questions you have.

Mrs. Gates asked – This is outdoor dining then?

Mr. Smyth stated – Yes, ma'am, it is. Out back we have a sandbar and grill out back. And we'd like to sell beer and wine. We already sell beer and wine, but in order to sell it on premises, we need the COP.

Mr. Enns asked – That's to consume it right, Buzz?

Mr. Smyth – Yes, sir. We already sell, we just want to be able to consume it. The place is actually pretty nice. We've been toying with this a lot, because it's always been Al's Bait & Tackle, so we didn't want to change the name. It's been that way since 1941. And so we have the bar and grill, which is out back, which we've now set up seating and we've put in sand...it's a sand bar. If anybody has ever been to Captain Hiram's or something like that, that's what we're modeling it after. And as some of you already know, we applied for some exterior bathrooms. It's kind of a prerequisite to what we're doing now. But that has been approved and we are applying for a permit for that to put in the exterior bathrooms. And it's really a cool place. And if any of you have an opportunity to come by, it is open for breakfast, lunch, and dinner. And it's going to be a really neat place for everybody to kind of come and enjoy it. We have the tiki torches on...music playing Jimmy Buffet; we want him to come by once in awhile.

Mr. Bergman stated – I'm curious to see what your menus have on them with that kind of a name.

Mr. Smyth stated – It's actually very simple. We are serving right now. We've been serving food for some time now. If anybody remembers the sandwich market and deli on North Second...that's Second Street Station...that's the menu that we actually have right now. We have an application for a grill. We'll be having steaks, hamburgers, things like that we'll be serving right there too. So, it's all outside. It's all pretty cool.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Enns asked – Buzz, are the bathrooms already in place?

Mr. Smyth stated – We currently are operating with the existing bathrooms that are there that were ‘grandfathered’ in with that. But simply we know when everybody is having a couple of beers and a glass of wine, it’s nice to have several bathrooms there for people to utilize. And so we want to make it convenient. Right now they kind of have to walk up and come around and buy some tackle, go to the bathroom and go back out.

Mr. Enns added – Like the old tiki bar out at the end where you had to walk across the bar to the ...

Mr. Smyth – Exactly.

Mrs. Gates stated – This came before historic preservation, and I want you all to know the pictures of the second floor are fabulous.

Mr. Smyth – Thank you.

Mrs. Gates continued – And I hope you’re going to keep it in the same vein, I think, as you said?

Mr. Smyth – Oh yes.

Mrs. Gates continued – And it’s just so reminiscent of the late 40’s and...

Mr. Smyth added – Everything that we’ve been doing, in fact, a lot of the artifacts that people are bringing by, we’re trying to implement most of that. Some of the pictures that people are bringing by. We’re being really creative. And whenever you stop by there one day you’ll see.

Mrs. Gates asked – Do you still have the awnings?

Mr. Smyth stated – Yes, ma’am. And as a matter of fact, the sandblasting guy brought them back to me and said he wasn’t going to be able to sandblast them. So, right now we’re trying to figure out another method to clean them up so that we can get them back on. They were supposed to be re-installed this week. And unfortunately he was not able to do that sandblasting on them.

Mr. Bergman asked – Too light of a gauge?

Mr. Smyth stated – You know, I was thinking that, because that light aluminum...the tamber that comes up and over. So we’re thinking about using chemicals with just a pressure washer and try to get the old paint off. Because we want them to be operable, we don’t want them just to be ...

Mr. Bergman added – See if somebody can glass bead them...it’s a lot less harsh than sandblasting.

Mr. Smyth – Really?

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Bergman added – I use it on intake manifolds all the time.

Mr. Smyth stated – I'm thinking that maybe some kind of chemical to maybe loosen it up and then the pressure washer just to knock it off...because really we only need to knock a certain amount off of it in order to get them to start sliding and start operating correctly. And then we'll paint them the color we want to paint them on there.

Mr. Bergman – Alright, well good luck with that. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak? We'll close the public hearing and entertain a motion from the Board.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO APPROVE THE WAIVER OF DISTANCE. Seconded by Mrs. Gates. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

Mr. Bergman stated to the applicant – Buzz, you will be notified when this goes to City Commission. Good luck.

**Agenda Item #5e. – Annexation – Salvation Army** – Approval of annexation of property identified as having contiguous municipal boundaries of Fort Pierce generally located at the corner of South U.S. #1 & South Market Avenue. Owner/applicant is Salvation Army.

**Staff Report** – Mr. Gibbons stated – Well, like it says in the staff report...it is contiguous and staff recommends approval.

Mr. Bergman asked – Is there anyone here to speak on the annexation request? Okay, is there anyone who wishes to speak at all?

No one was present.

Mr. Bergman continued – Okay, we'll close the public hearing, and entertain a motion.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. POITIER TO APPROVE THE ANNEXATION. Seconded by Mr. Harris. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

**Agenda Item #5f. – Annexation – Edwards Preserve** – Approval of annexation of property identified as having contiguous municipal boundaries of Fort Pierce. Generally located on Old Edwards Road. Owner/applicant is Charles Crooks.

**Staff Report** – Mr. Gibbons stated – Same as the other...it's contiguous. And staff recommends approval.

Mr. Bergman stated – Alright, thank you. And we'll open up the public hearing for this as well if there's anyone who wishes to speak on this annexation. And apparently not.

Mr. Knott asked – Mr. Chairman, just one thing. Is this voluntary or is this a ...?

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Gibbons – Yes.

Mr. Knott continued – So they'll have some plans that will coming in ...?

Mr. Gibbons stated – Yes. Probably the next submission.

Mr. Knott – Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bergman stated – Alright, I'll entertain a motion.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO APPROVE THE ANNEXATION. Seconded by Mr. Poitier. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

**Agenda Item #6 – Other Business**

**a.** A new member appointed to the Planning Board, Mrs. Mary (Misty) Minton, of 2513 South Indian River Drive, effective June 20, 2005.

Mr. Bergman stated – Under Other Business, you saw in the letter, and I think Dianna (Rose) mentioned that we have a new member, Mrs. Mary Minton of 2513 South Indian River Drive. And I believe she is taking Mrs. Brenner's position...is that correct?

Members stated yes.

Mr. Bergman continued – And I guess she's out of town. We'll have to hit her up for a good excuse next month.

**b.** Annual City Commission Workshop invitation.

Mr. Bergman stated – And I believe there's a notice of the Annual City Commission Workshop, I think that's tomorrow and Thursday?

Mr. Arias added – Tomorrow a meeting at 12 (noon) at Panther Woods.

Mr. Bergman asked – Do we know what is being discussed?

Mr. Arias stated – We have agendas...maybe you can stop by the office of the City Manager and pick up a copy.

**Agenda Item #7 – Discussions**

Mr. Bergman asked – Alright if there's nothing else. Mr. Walker, do you have anything? How's your leg doing?

Attorney Walker stated – The leg's doing fine, thank you for asking, Mr. Chair.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 12, 2005.**

Mr. Bergman asked – When are you going to start walking normal again? And get off those crutches?

Attorney Walker stated – It looks like at least one to three weeks of further non-weight bearing.

Mr. Knott added – You must have really hurt that leg.

Mr. Bergman added – I can relate to that.

Mr. Bergman asked – Hector, did you have anything?

Mr. Arias – No.

Mr. Bergman asked – Travis?

Mr. Gibbons – No.

Mr. Bergman stated – Alright, if there's nothing else, we are adjourned. Thank you all very much.

**Adjournment of meeting at 8:25 p.m.**