

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE FORT PIERCE CITY PLANNING BOARD HELD ON TUESDAY, AUGUST 10, 2004, 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 (Chairman)(arrived at 7:15 p.m.), Sonja Gates (Vice Chair), Tom Knott, Pam Williams, Margaret Benton, Harriett Brenner, Chuck Enns, Charlie Harris, Jeremiah Johnson, and Robert Poitier.

Members absent: None...everyone present.

Citizens and Staff present:

Roy O. Lim	Ramon Trias, AICP, Director of Development
Greg Celentano	Wendy Clark, Planning Coordinator
Bruce Moia	Jim Walker, Assistant City Attorney
Edward Geiger	Dianna D. Rose, Secretary
Rob Norris	
Jim Forbes	
Stefan Mathes	
Butch Terpening	
Philippe Jeck	
Mason Sampson	
Jay Messel	
Vicky Tillman	
Bud Tillman	

Meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m. (**Agenda Item #1**).

Secretary proceeded with roll call (**Agenda Item #2**)

Mrs. Gates chaired the Board until Mr. Bergman arrived at 7:15 p.m.

There were no absences.

Approval of Minutes of PB Meeting held July 13, 2004 – (Agenda Item #3)

Mrs. Gates asked – Are there any corrections or additions to these minutes?

Ms. Benton stated –Madam Chair, on page 4 of the minutes, I just asked that they record the correct spelling of Benton.

Ms. Rose (secretary) stated – I apologize for that.

Ms. Benton stated – That’s okay, I understand. Thank you.

Mrs. Gates asked – Are there any further corrections or additions to these minutes? If not...

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS CORRECTED. Seconded by Mr. Harris. Unanimously approved by voice vote.

Agenda Item #4 – Site Plan – Ft. Pierce Commerce Park – Approval of a warehouse facility known as Ft. Pierce Commerce Park. Located on Enterprise Road. Owner is Fred Keller, and applicant/representative is Richard Ahrens of Ahrens Companies.

Staff Report – Ms. Clark stated – This item has been before the Planning Board previously. After such meeting, it has been scheduled for City Commission, in which it had been tabled several times. At the last City Commission meeting they had recommended that it go back before the Planning Board for any recommendations the Board may have.

Mrs. Gates (Vice Chair standing in for Don Bergman until he arrives) stated – Okay, thank you very much. Are there any questions for the staff from the Board members please?

Mr. Knott asked – I would just like to ask the staff if they've had the opportunity to review the landscaping architectural design we're being asked to comment on? And if it is satisfactory to you?

Mr. Trias – No.

Mr. Knott – Okay.

Mr. Trias continued – Clearly this is what it is. It's a warehouse. It's very minimal in its design. The applicant has made an attempt to enhance the project somehow and that's very good and proper. But this being what it is, it appeared to me in the Commission meeting that the City Commission was ready to approve it. And it was just a matter of Commission Becht believing that there was time to submit this back to the Planning Board for your review, to give an opportunity to have a discussion about this. I think the main issue here is simply I am concerned that in the recent past the City Commission has approved projects and then wonder why the projects were being built. Well, I want to make it very clear on the record that this is what it is. It's a warehouse, it's minimal in its design, and frankly, once the warehouse begins construction that is what we're going to see. And I think that we have the opportunity to make whatever comments we want to make, as staff or as Planning Board tonight. And I fully expect that this will be approved by the City Commission the second meeting of August...next Monday.

Mrs. Gates asked – Okay, is there any further questions for staff from the Board?

Mrs. Brenner asked – Ramon, what is the distance to the nearest R-4 residential area from this property?

Mr. Trias stated – It's right adjacent to it.

Mrs. Brenner asked – It's basically adjacent?

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Trias stated – It IS adjacent to it, yes.

Mrs. Brenner – Okay, thank you.

Mrs. Gates asked – Is there any further questions for staff?

Mrs. Brenner asked – I would like to ask staff, what is your primary concern? Is the fact that the building itself is unrelieved by any kind of architectural enhancements? Or is it the fact that the planting are not up to what we would have expected?

Mr. Trias stated – Yes, this a very low-end building. It's a metal building. It really doesn't have any architectural features. The landscape is minimal, negligible in any sense of the word. The activities are going to be fairly intense, in the sense that first this project was represented as a warehouse, then it became a place where there would be some manufacturing, and some other activities. So, the project basically is designed to be what the applicant intends to make happen in that site and as such it is what it is. In terms of design quality it's probably something that could be enhanced. How to enhance it? Well, clearly some projects in the past we've had ones that had metal buildings and attempted to add perhaps some masonry details at the base of the building. That is not unusual in these types of buildings. Perhaps a lesser number of buildings were allowed for additional landscaping and lesser impact of the project. Those are some of the design features that could be incorporated into this project at this site plan level.

Mrs. Brenner asked – If I recall, is this the property that we had a little difficulty with...the egrets...the turning radius on the trucks?

Mr. Trias stated – No, I think that was another warehouse.

Mrs. Brenner stated – Oh. I looked at it and couldn't decide if that would be a problem. So, if we were to recommend that it came back to you for a site plan review, would that be appropriate for us to do?

Mr. Trias stated – I think this is not before you in the official capacity of the site plan process. Basically, the way I understand what the Commission requested is, is that you provide whatever valuable input you can today and it's for their benefit...some additional comments that they requested. I don't think this Board has the authority to deny or approve the project. It's not before you in that capacity. It's more like a special request by the City Commission. That's the way I understand it anyway.

Mrs. Brenner – Thank you.

Mr. Knott asked – Ramon, was the site plan before us here with these landscaping and other features...were they on the original plan or are these a results of the Commission?

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Trias stated – There seems to be some additional landscaping...it's hard to tell, but there appears to be some attempt to improve the project. And that's what they submitted recently to the City Commission.

Mr. Knott asked – So, they have made an attempt to...

Mr. Trias added – They have made an attempt...yes.

Mr. Knott stated – Alright. Given that this is in an industrial zoning, other than the R-4 that abuts on the west side, is that normally something we would concern ourselves with architecturally? Is there something in the ordinance that says...?

Mr. Trias stated – Clearly we have a range of possibilities in terms of architectural design in any project. And there are some industrial parks, such as, for example, Crossroads, which are designed at a high level of quality, in terms of building and landscape design and so on. And then there are others that are less geared toward design issues. I don't think the Code makes that a requirement to do at a higher level of quality. But part of the process that we go through is that discussion...discussion of quality and how to enhance it etc. I think there has been some improvement. I think clearly this is not a high-end industrial park. That's the best way I can describe what we have seen.

Mr. Knott stated – One other question for staff. I noticed there is a phase III...a 6 ft. privacy wall. Is that something that was added as a result of the Commission rebuttal, or has always been on there?

Mr. Trias stated – It may be...I don't recall.

Mr. Knott – Okay.

Ms. Benton stated – I understand this was sent back by Mr. Becht...?

Mr. Trias – Yes.

Ms. Benton asked – Did you get a sense that when they asked for comments they wanted to know if we think it's sufficient as is, or whether they're fishing for more landscaping in the plans?

Mr. Trias stated – Clearly I can't speak for the Commission. It just appeared to me that they needed more information or they thought your opinion to be valuable, so that's why they sent it back to you.

Mrs. Gates asked – Are there any other questions? Mr. Walker, I have a question. Since this is not before us and we've already voted on it once, are we here to vote on this again?

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Attorney Walker stated – Madam Chair, if I may, it is my sense that the Planning Board has previously offered a recommendation that no new recommendation is being requested.

Mrs. Gates – Okay.

Attorney Walker continued – However, certain changes have been made apparently since the Planning Board originally passed this on through to the Commission. The Commission is cognizant of the fact that there is a considerable body of planning expertise on the Board with architects, contractors, and engineers. And that therefore in the event anyone on the Board has any informal thinking after looking at this plan and wishes to offer those thoughts on the record for the purposes of the minutes, I understand it's that sort of informal feedback that the Commission is looking for, as opposed to a formal recommendation.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay. Then I do not need to open it up to the public for any public hearing, correct?

Attorney Walker stated – I think that is true, Madam Chair.

Mrs. Gates stated – Thank you. I just wanted a clarification. Are there any other comments about this project?

Mr. Knott stated – I think I've answered my own question. I see on the drawings here that they have clouded their revisions. If you'll look on sheet 200 for example, they have clouded what they have done as a result of the City Commission revision. So, I've answered my own question. By looking on there you can see the landscaping or phase I, they've added a privacy fence. They've got a cloud around that verbiage and the landscaping, evidently that has been added. I'm just assuming that's what it is. That was the question I had for staff. The applicant has indicated the changes by putting a cloud around them. So, it would appear that they have made the effort to buffer that residential lot along the west side.

Mrs. Gates asked – Okay, are there any further comments or questions on this issue?

Mr. Johnson asked – Was there an elevation plan right down there on the floor?

Mr. Trias stated – Yes. And picked up the elevation plan and placed it on the easel.

Mr. Johnson – Thank you.

Mr. Johnson stated – I have a couple of statements. Based on what I see on the landscape plan sheet 200. It looks like they have the detention area landscaped somewhat, what we would call the northeast corner...that would face DiGiorgio Road. It doesn't appear that there's any landscaping on the northwest side over there. I think that would be a

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

recommendation on my part to include some landscaping along that edge because we're not sure what's going to happen to that parcel that's up in that northwest corner. I know the owner might have a future use for that or a plan but some kind of buffer should be in that place. The other thing I see is...I work in what you would call a warehouse district in Port St. Lucie off Bayshore Blvd., and a lot of the buildings and architecture down there are mixed. Some of the metal buildings are starting to look older; I'm with Mr. Trias a little bit, I like the mason construction with a deco block or something of that sort. And I think you could solve that in two ways. On the north elevations you could do some kind of a Deco block architecture, which would be toward DiGiorgio. Then also, I think on Enterprise Road where the main thoroughfare is, would be the front elevation. I think it would be a recommendation on my part that some kind of a stucco detail or deco block be added to enhance the look of the project.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay, thank you.

Mr. Johnson – Thank you.

Mrs. Brenner stated – As a follow-up to Mr. Johnson's comment, the chain-link fence...we have seen good use made of site obscuring fencing by either the weaving or some other form of fence so that it wouldn't be so anesthetically pleasing if you will.

Mrs. Gates asked – Anyone else? Okay, if there's no other observations or questions, then I think we can send this back to the City Commission with staff approval.

Mr. Trias added – They will be sent back to the City Commission period.

Mrs. Gates stated – Thank you.

Mrs. Brenner stated – Before you do that, I'm sorry, but nobody made any comment about plantings. I would like to hear some of our architectural members talk about some plantings. It seems to be fairly bare.

Mrs. Gates stated – I think Mr. Johnson did make a recommendation on the perimeter, but I don't know about the building itself. Does anybody have any comments on that...the particular landscaping she's questioning around the buildings?

Mr. Enns stated – Madam Chair, they show plantings on the front building facing Enterprise Road. Now, they've got this thing phased, and they don't show it on any of the rest of them. I don't know if they plan on as they do these other buildings, do they plan on landscaping it or are we just taking the front elevation that they have there is only going to be on the front building that faces the Enterprise Road.

Mrs. Gates asked – Which sketch are you on please?

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Enns stated – Page 200. They don't signify the first building, I assume it's building A. But if you notice when you get to Building B, there in front of the twin parking areas they show no landscaping whatsoever.

Mr. Trias stated – I assume your recommendation that the landscaping be in every building?

Mr. Enns – Yes.

Mr. Trias stated – That's a good suggestion. I suppose the applicant intended that, but it's good to say it on the record.

Mrs. Brenner – Thank you.

Mrs. Gates asked – Okay, anybody else? Okay, we'll give this back to the City Commission and let them work with it.

Agenda Item #5 – Site Plan w/Conditional Use – Grand Royale Apartments – To allow the construction of a multi-family development with a bonus density award known as Grand Royale Apartments. Located at 625 Tumblin Kling Road. Owners/applicants are Roy & Nelyn Lim.

Staff Report – Ms. Clark stated – The project includes 20 multi-family units on 1.9 acres. The applicant is requesting a bonus density award, which is justified by increased landscaping and architectural design. And staff is recommending approval.

Mrs. Gates asked – Okay, are there questions on this item for the staff?

Mrs. Brenner asked – Is it 20 or 21?

Ms. Clark stated – It's 20.

Mrs. Brenner asked – It was not 19 + 2 as one sheet says?

Ms. Clark stated – Right, this application has revised several times, but as you look at your site plan it's definitely 20 units.

Mrs. Brenner – Thank you.

Mrs. Gates asked – Are there any other questions for staff?

Mr. Johnson asked – Wendy, this has been reviewed by the Utilities Authority also?

Ms. Clark – Yes.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Johnson stated – Okay, and they're okay with it? It seems as though they're constructing a back lot sewer to serve the property, and I didn't that the Utilities Authority would go for that. And if they made no additional comments there's nothing you can do but...

Ms. Clark stated – Yes, it was reviewed by FPUA. I don't have any written comments, which would indicate that they did not have any issues or objections to it.

Mr. Trias asked – What is your recommendation?

Mr. Johnson stated – Well, I recommend they move the sewer from the back of the property to the front, just because of access purposes; unless the owner is going to own the on-site collections system that's a different story.

Mr. Trias stated – I think that would be a good suggestion to work out with the UA and see what it is. I don't think it should be a formal condition approval, but it's a good point.

Mr. Johnson – Right, thank you.

Mrs. Gates asked – Are there any other questions for staff?

Mr. Knott asked – Ramon, looking ahead on the agenda for this evening there's a project right across the street from this one that's going to be before us, and they have like 117 or 120 units; and this one is 20 units, and all of a sudden we'll be dumping 140 units onto this street. Has any consideration or thought been given to a traffic impact study singular or collectively for these projects? For what the movement would be out there on that two-lane road?

Mr. Trias stated – We have required a traffic study and it has prepared for this project.

Mr. Knott asked – Oh, it has?

Mr. Trias stated – Yes, it's right here. That's something that we do pretty much in every project now days.

Mr. Knott – Okay.

Mr. Trias continued – And much to my shock and surprise, the conclusions are always so rosy and happy that I'm amazed that we never have any traffic problems.

Mr. Knott asked – The report says that there are no required improvements...?

Mr. Trias stated – You know how those things go and how they're prepared and the methodology that is used. And what happens is that in a nutshell we're implementing the

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

County's Comprehensive Plan in the City. And throughout all this annexation the County's Comprehensive Plan is dense. And at some point we are going to have to deal with these issues for real, and that point is probably coming up in the next two or three years as some of these projects are constructed. At this point, every study seems to say that everything is okay. But you may disagree, that is perfectly valid.

Mr. Knott stated – I'm just a little concerned about if you put these two projects together ...and I don't know how much you can do to Tumblin Kling as far as...I don't believe it has a full 60 ft. right-of-way as a matter of fact. But I was thinking that the intersection at US 1, if you get a half a dozen of people who want to go back to the north, that's a real nightmare there anyway. And you're going to have the cars backed up all the way down Tumblin Kling to Oleander almost. So, I'm just thinking that that adjacent intersection up there should be looked at to see if they should put a dedicated left turn up there at Tumblin Kling and US 1.

Mr. Trias stated – That would be a very valid suggestion. We could review that and see whether that's possible to implement that.

Mr. Knott – Very good. Thank you.

Mrs. Gates stated – That's a good comment.

Attorney Walker stated – Madam Chair, for purposes of the record, the planning rapport here is not seen to set out any conclusion with respect to how this application fits in with the Comprehensive Plan. Might we have a brief statement from staff on the record on whether this does or does not conform with the Comprehensive Plan?

Ms. Clark stated – The proposed use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Attorney Walker – Thank you.

Mr. Trias stated – The comment I was going to make...whether a left turn lane is justified, may not be triggered necessarily by a project of 20 units. So, I wouldn't make that a condition of approval of this project, but I would definitely look into it as a design issue in terms of the design of the road.

Mr. Knott – Thank you.

Mrs. Gates asked – Okay, does that answer you question?

Mr. Knott stated – Yes, until we get to the next project.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay. Any further questions for staff on this?

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Bergman asked – Wendy, to get credit for the extra bonus density unit, is there a minimum that the landscaping should exceed what would normally be required?

Mr. Trias answered – Yes. I'll answer that question if you don't mind. The original application was for two additional units. The compromise was to award one unit, and there was a substantial amount of landscaping in the front that was included that was not in the first design. So, that went through a significant redesign.

Mr. Bergman asked – Well, typically you get half of one for siting, half of one for landscaping, and one for architecture?

Mr. Trias stated – Right. There is a very specific criteria. And architecture was another one of the enhancements that came in...you should have seen the project originally. It was highly enhanced.

Mr. Bergman – Okay.

Mr. Trias added – And these are good things. The applicant did work very hard to make the project better.

Mr. Bergman stated – Wish I could have seen it before.

Mrs. Gates asked – Any further questions for staff?

Mrs. Brenner asked – I'm sure if this question is for staff or for the applicant. These are all rentals...is that correct?

Mr. Trias stated – The applicant can answer that.

Mrs. Brenner – Okay.

Mrs. Gates asked – Okay, anybody else? If not, is there anyone here to speak in favor of this project?

Mr. Roy O. Lim stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm the applicant and the owner. I'm proposing to build 20 units/apartments for rental.

Mrs. Brenner asked – Could you tell me if you have any public monies in it? Are you going for income-controlled population?

Mr. Lim asked – Would you please repeat the question? I don't understand.

Mrs. Brenner asked – Do you have any tax money, any public monies in the project? Are you financing it with any public monies?

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Lim – No.

Mrs. Brenner – Okay, thank you.

Attorney Walker stated – Madam Chair, let me just briefly note for the record that our approval is irrespective of whether the people who live in this project are rich or poor. Our Code does not govern approval on income levels, it does not look at the people who live in the buildings, it is based strictly upon building standards. I would not wish to encourage that sort of question, Madam Chair; lest that it create an appearance that the Board is governing its consideration upon the criteria that are not in the Code itself.

Mrs. Brenner stated – Thank you Mr. Walker. That was not my intention.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay, thank you. Are there any other questions for the applicant?

Mr. Johnson asked – Mr. Lim, has this been reviewed by the Fire District?

Mr. Lim – Yes.

Mr. Johnson stated – It has? They're usually not okay with a 6-inch (d ?) water main coming into the property with a fire hydrant. They usually want an 8-inch water main. But they didn't make any comment like that?

Mr. Lim stated – Not on that respect. They reviewed it several times.

Mr. Johnson stated – Okay, I think it's satisfactory. I just know that they sometimes request an 8-inch water main.

Mr. Trias added – The process, in case you may not remember, includes the Technical Review meeting, which has a person from the Fire District usually Captain Emerson. He reviews all of this, and this went before that Board a couple of times.

Mr. Johnson – Okay, thank you. Any other questions for the applicant? Thank you very much. Is there anyone here to speak against this request? If not, I entertain a motion from the Board on this issue.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN WITH CONDITIONAL USE. Seconded by Mrs. Brenner. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Mrs. Gates stated to the applicant – Okay, you have been approved, and you will receive a notice of the City Commission meeting when this issue will come before the City Commission. Good luck to you.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Lim – Thank you.

Agenda Item #6 – Site Plan w/Conditional Use – Tumblin Oaks – For the approval to allow the construction of a multi-family development with a bonus density award. Generally located on the west side of South US 1 on Tumblin Kling Road. Owner is John Grenier of Tumblin Oaks Condominium LLC, and applicants/representatives are Al Brodeur of Thomas Lucido and Associates and Don Bergman of Peacock & Lewis Architects.

Mr. Bergman stated – If I may interrupt. Mr. Walker, I have an obvious conflict of this project. I'll ask to excuse myself. I have the forms here with me.

Attorney Walker – Yes sir.

Mr. Bergman is passing out elevations of his project to the Board members.

Staff Report – Ms. Clark stated – The project consists of 117 units. The applicant has justified the bonus density awards through increased landscaping and creative design. And staff is recommending approval.

Mrs. Gates asked – Okay, are there questions on this site plan from the Board of staff?

Attorney Walker stated – Madam Chair, as before, for purposes of the minutes. Might we get a brief statement from staff on the conformity of this application with the Comprehensive Plan?

Ms. Clark stated – The purposed project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Attorney Walker – Thank you.

Mrs. Gates asked – Any questions for staff from the Board?

Mr. Knott asked – Wendy, perhaps you can help me with this one. The driveway on this project appears to be almost across from the one from the previous project. Have you compared this at all?

Ms. Clark asked – I'm sorry. What was the question?

Mr. Knott stated – Well, if you look at the last project, which is on the south side...I'm trying to find out if these driveways line up with each other. Because you're going to have 20 units dumping onto a two-lane road on the south side and you're going to have 117, I believe, on this one. And I was just wondering if their driveways lined up, which always makes it nicer; or if there's a possibility that they could line up.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Trias stated – I think that needs to be reviewed with the City Engineer and make sure that we are following the Code in terms of the distances between driveways, etc. I really can't answer that question tonight, but it's a valid concern. It's an issue of design so it can be adjusted as the projects are constructed.

Mr. Knott asked – And also, what did this traffic report indicate?

Ms. Clark stated – It indicated that the roads would operate at an acceptable level of service.

Mr. Knott stated – Very good. One final question...I know in dealing with the Engineering Department in the past, when they had right-of-way acquisition; if they had a substandard right-of-way within the City of Fort Pierce or projects that were associated with the City limits, they would require the applicant to dedicate the additional right-of-way needed off the project to fill out that right-of-way. And even though they couldn't get those parcels on either side of them, they could condemn at least that land...you see what I'm saying. It appears that there's only 50 ft. of right-of-way here and that doesn't meet City standards I believe. I think City standard is 60 ft.

Mr. Trias stated – As I commented before, in the Technical Review Committee, as you well know, the City Engineer sits there and that's an opportunity for them to comment on these issues. And we did not get that comment. However, this is as good chance as any to express your concern and we'll definitely forward that as part of the record.

Mr. Knott added – It appears that they could, and we'll ask the applicant when they get up here, give some right-of-way...another 5 or 10 ft. off of theirs. I don't think it would...

Mr. Trias stated – That appears to be a very reasonable request.

Mr. Knott stated – I'm still concerned about what's going to happen to that little two-lane road down there.

Mr. Trias stated – Well, I think what's going to happen with these two-lane roads is that they're going to have a lot of traffic. And traffic is going to be quite unpleasant. That is the future. And that is a result of the existing Comprehensive Plans mostly of the County, in terms of the those parcels that we're annexing, and the densities that are in those plans. And just to answer Mr. Walker's question in just a universal way, every time we annex something, we do it in a way that's consistent with the existing Comprehensive Plan of the County, because that's what the state law says. So, that's how we end up with this type of zoning. However, there's really no other thinking that goes on in terms of traffic or how to deal with the future demands of the network or anything like that. That's not going on. That's going on except for maybe US 1 or some of the major corridors as you well know. At some point we will have to deal with those

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

issues and at some point we will address them. But that has not happened yet. But I can assure you that we will have to.

Mr. Knott stated – Yes. You will have people knocking on the door. Thank you.

Mrs. Gates asked – Are there any other questions for the staff?

Mrs. Brenner asked – How many actual living units are there in this? It's seven three-story with 18 per unit...is that correct?

Ms. Clark stated – Yes. A total of the 117.

Mrs. Brenner asked – Or is it 126?

Mr. Trias added – There's one larger building in this one. By the way, this is important that we make this clear on the record, because we had an applicant that showed up at the City Commission with additional units that would have been requested in front of the Planning Board. So, I think if you ever have any question about that, please clarify that on the record.

Mrs. Brenner asked – So, this one is 117 or 120?...I'm not sure.

Mr. Trias – It's 117.

Mrs. Brenner – Thank you.

Mrs. Gates asked – Any further questions for staff? If not, is there anyone here to speak in favor of this request?

Al Brodeur stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm with Thomas Lucido & Associates. Let me start out by giving this (traffic study) to Tom (Knott).

Mr. Knott – Thank you.

Mr. Brodeur stated – Just for clarification, we are requesting 117 units. There is one building that is 9 units, that's why the numbers don't seem to work out quite right. We're requesting an innovative design density bonus. The R-4 district allows for 10 units per acre, possibly 12 with the innovative design. We've accomplished in three different ways, as required by Code, landscaping, siting, and architecture. I'll let the architect describe the architectural bonus. But I'd like to give you a brief explanation of what we've done on this site plan. As you can see, the northern section of the property above Platts Creek we're leaving alone. That's almost 5 acres. It's in Oak Hammock. So, basically we've set aside the buildings at least 100 ft. from the creek, and any kind of exotic underbrush that's in that area would be cleared with the rest of the native vegetation. And the large oaks and pines would be left alone. The conservation

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

easement in that area would be a picnic area/park/jogging, if you may, for the future residents. We've also situated the buildings a little bit further from Tumblin Kling for two different reasons. One, is that there are quite a few large trees in that area...we wanted to preserve those trees. Two, this will provide the City for opportunity for additional right-of-way in the easement in the future. So, the nearest building to Tumblin Kling will be 65 ft. setback. And landscaping, according to Code, we're required to have at least 10 % additional landscaped area or green area. We've actually exceeded that by quite a bit. The required landscaped area or wooded area would be 11,385 sq. ft., and we're providing 281,000 sq. ft. obviously including the Preserve area. And I'd be happy to answer any of your questions.

Mrs. Gates asked – Are there any questions for Mr. Brodeur?

Mr. Johnson stated – The site plan looks good. Just one question on the utilities as far as the electric. Do you know if the owner has requested from the UA for underground or overhead?

Mr. Brodeur stated – That is a question that I unfortunately do not know.

Mr. Trias added – If I could make a suggestion. As a matter of policy we are requesting underground utilities. And I think that should be part of the record and should be a requirement of approval.

Mr. Johnson – Alright, thank you.

Mrs. Gates asked – Any other questions for Mr. Brodeur? Thank you very much. Mr. Bergman, do you want to comment?

Mr. Don Bergman (Peacock & Lewis Architects) stated – The architectural density credit we're applying for ...originally this project was conceived as 10 buildings at 12 units each. And what happened, I think as part of the work between the owner and Lucido's office and ourselves was that we were able to convince the owner to go to a taller building. To go to a three-story building which requires fire sprinklers instead of trying to destroy the site with additional building coverage. So, part of siting and part of the landscape credit that we were able to get would be because we've reduced the square footage of building on the site. I think at one point they were talking about putting buildings across Platts Creek, which would have really impacted the whole site. So, what we were able to do was to reduce the number of actual buildings and go a little taller. The elevations that you have are fairly representative of what we're trying to do. It's basically the old Florida look...balconies front and back, cupolas. I can't remember if there are any dormers on there or not. And he was happy with that. I think a three story fits in that environment with the trees that they've got there. We had really tried to site the buildings in and among the trees without really taking too many out. And I think we were able to accomplish that even with the civil engineer complaining all the way that we didn't have enough room for drainage. So, we tried to save as many of the oak trees,

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

anyway, and we probably lost some of the pines. But it's a nice compact little project. I think we tried to save as much of the green space for the users of the project and keep everything towards the front. Al (Brodeur) mentioned the 65 ft. right-of-way or the 65 ft. setback for the future right-of-way enlargement if needed. There was one consideration with our civil engineer. We talked about actually putting a turning lane in there and if it was going to be needed, which is why we have that additional space. Mrs. Brenner, the one question you had. I think there's 8 or 9 of the 18-unit buildings and then there's one 9-unit building. The owner really screamed. He wanted to try to get 120 units even though we're really only allowed, I think, 118. And he really wanted that last unit, but you can't really get it when you're stacked in a three-story building. You can't get a 10-unit building to work very well. So, we had to lose a unit. I think it's going to be a nice little project. There should be enough massing with the clubhouses and the variety of different sizes of units and the way that they're sited on there, that it will more than just a plain apartment complex.

Mrs. Brenner asked – Are these condominiums?

Mr. Bergman stated – I believe so. I believe that's what their intent is. These are all three bedroom two bath, balconies front and back, fully sprinklered. We were able to convince the owner to go vertically with another floor instead of spreading additional buildings out. It's going to cost him a little more for his fire sprinklers. But in the long run since he's going vertically he'll probably save some money versus building new buildings. He just wanted to get the units on there and have a nice project.

Mrs. Gates asked – Don, are there elevators in here at all?

Mr. Bergman stated – Yes ma'am, they're right in the center of the building. There are two stair towers, one on each end, and there's an elevator in the middle.

Mrs. Gates stated – Right, okay, thank you. Any further questions for Mr. Bergman?

Mr. Enns asked – Don, are they all 3/2 in all of the buildings?

Mr. Bergman stated – Right now they're all set up as a 3/2. He may change and depending on how the sales go. We may give him an option to do like a two master setup where you have a 2/2...two large master bedrooms, one front and one back. But right now it's set up as 3/2...I'm sorry it's probably a 2/2.

Mr. Enns stated – As it's set up now it's a 2/2.

Mr. Bergman stated – Okay, it was a 3/2 at one point, and I think that the rooms were too small.

Mr. Enns stated – But we don't have a floor plan, that's why I was just asking.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Bergman stated – I can't remember. I think it was a 2/2 when we got it in there...you're right.

Mr. Enns asked – Do you remember off hand about how big the square footage is per unit?

Mr. Bergman stated – I think they are 28 ft. wide units center to center. And they are ...I can't remember if they're 40 or 50 ft. deep. You're probably right around 1800 sq. ft. per unit. They're not overly large, but they're still two bedrooms, two baths, dining(room), living(room), kitchen.

Mrs. Gates asked – Any other questions for Mr. Bergman? Thank you.

Mr. Bergman – Thanks.

Mr. Brodeur stated – Just for clarification, unfortunately the engineer couldn't make it tonight, but it does appear that the electrical lines and the interior of the property will be underground. Just for clarification, Ramon, that condition upon the electrical lines being underground, you mean in the interior of the property?

Mr. Trias answered – Or any new lines that need to be built as original to the project.

Mr. Brodeur – Okay, thank you.

Mrs. Gates stated – Thank you. Is there anyone here to speak against this request? If not, what are the wishes of the Board on this item?

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. JOHNSON TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN WITH CONDITIONAL USE WITH THE CONDITION THAT ALL TRADITIONAL OVERHEAD UTILITIES BE INSTALLED UNDERGROUND TO EACH BUILDING AND THAT THEY FOLLOW THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN AS REPRESENTED TONIGHT. Seconded by Mr. Harris. Unanimously approved by roll call vote with Don Bergman abstaining from voting due to conflict of interest.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay, your item will go to the City Commission and you will receive a notice about it. Thank you. Good project, Don (Bergman). I'm going to turn the meeting back over to our Chairman. I think he's finished with his projects.

Mr. Bergman stated – Thank you, Mrs. Gates. Ramon, I think your comment towards the end of that last project presentation is something that we really ought to start sticking to. The part about the architecture being followed on all these projects. Because I know we're in the middle of a project now where we did go for an IRD (Innovative Residential Development) that the owner is trying to cut corners, and I keep throwing it back at him that if he starts cutting the corners and changing the character of the project then he's

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

going to lose his bonus density. So, that's a great strong-arm tool. It works great when he's got these developers trying to cut corners. I think it's a good point to stick to.

Mr. Trias stated – Yes, but the main concern also is that when an applicant gets a building permit, the building permit needs to match what was approved by the Planning Board. And sometimes that gets lost in the process, and I want to make sure that we have it on the record.

Mr. Bergman stated – That's a good point to bring up.

Agenda Item #7 – Site Plan – Harbour Isle – An approval of an amended preliminary development plan for a PUD. Located at 801 Seaway Drive. Owner is Causeway Island Trust (Jack B. Owen, Trustee), applicant is Harbour Isle Development, and representative is Al Brodeur of Thomas Lucido & Associates.

Staff Report – Ms. Clark stated – Four changes included in the amendment. The first being the elimination of retail space of 9,900 sq. ft. The second, the addition of two condominium buildings. The third change would be tract M being dedicated to St. Lucie County Fire District as a future site. And the last change being adding project signage in tract L. And staff is recommending approval conditioned upon the lengthy conditions that are included underneath the recommendation.

Mr. Bergman stated – Alright, thank you. Ramon, were these the recommendations under item 2? Were those finally resolved between City staff and Harbour Isle? I know they were still up in the air at the TRC meeting.

Mr. Ramon stated – Yes, the short answer is yes. And what you have before you is a result of an extensive process of discussion with applicant and also with the Fire District and with a variety of other people. So, I think we have a very good and effective design at this point and it accomplishes the goals of the different parties involved.

Mr. Bergman stated – Okay, thank you. Are there any other questions for staff from the Board? Hearing none, is there anyone here to speak on behalf of the site plan application?

Mr. Philippe Jeck stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm the attorney representing the applicant here today. I just to want to say briefly one thing about the two conditions of approval that are on the project. The one condition that we have worked out with the help of staff and the Fire District relates to the contribution of tract M, which is the parcel that I'm pointing to on this exhibit site plan, to the Fire District in exchange for a relief from the impact fees from the Fire District. That's, even with the impact fees, credit. There is still a contribution of an additional \$330,000 of value of this property. In other words it's worth \$330,000 more than the impact fees that we're being credited. So, there's a gift, in essence, to the Fire District by that much amount. And it's been agreed to by the developer as well as the Fire District, so we're pleased with that condition. The

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

other condition of approval deals with a contribution of cost for putting the electrical lines along Seaway Drive underground, which is a condition that was not negotiated but we were informed of in the course of the staff report. And our assumption is just like the Fire District that that cost would be a contribution ...would receive a credit against the impact fees that are related to the Utility Authority, and with that understanding we would accept that condition as well.

Mr. Trias stated – If I could add. I think the details of that condition need to be worked out and I think that the attorney is correct. There probably is a reasonable solution to this.

Mr. Bergman – Alright.

Mr. Jeck – Thank you.

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

Mr. Johnson stated – I think this is for the applicant. It talks about tract M in regards to the South Florida Water Management District and trying to get that tract removed from the conditions of your site plan. Currently that is one of the conditions stated...is that correct?

Mr. Jeck stated – Yes, that was a request from the Fire District. And we were perfectly comfortable, and I think the City was as well, leaving that within the development restrictions, but the Fire District asked that we remove that so they have freedom of use of the property. And we consented to that request from them.

Mr. Johnson asked – Okay, so they'll be in correspondence with South Florida saying that you're removing that portion from the project?

Mr. Jeck stated – Yes, that's already underway.

Mr. Johnson – Okay, thank you.

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

Mr. Jeck – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Is there anyone else here to speak on behalf of the site plan application? Is there anyone here to oppose the application? I'll entertain a motion from the Board.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. POITIER TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN.

Mr. Knott asked – Do we need to clarify that one condition by staff?

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Bergman asked – On what? The electrical?

Mr. Knott stated – It's my understanding that everyone agreed that their expense for putting the utilities underground would be considered as portion of their impact fees. Is this right?

Mr. Bergman stated – I think maybe the way to handle that would be to just go with staff's conditions and then let them work it out.

Mr. Knott stated – Alright, that's fine with me. I was just thinking of the developer, but that's fine.

Mr. Bergman stated – Because I'm sure staff and the owner are probably going to have to come to some kind of terms on that.

Mr. Trias stated – We cannot negotiate on behalf of the UA and I think that discussion needs to take place. At this point, the information I have is that the UA estimates the cost to be about \$300,000. The cost that will be reimbursable to them, because the work has already been completed based on what they tell me.

Attorney Walker stated – Mr. Chair, although this was probably implied in the motion. The motion simply recommended approval and did not explicitly incorporate the conditions by staff.

Mr. Bergman stated – That's correct. I was going to get Mr. Poitier to reinstate his motion if we could.

Attorney Walker – Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Poitier asked – Aren't the conditions already dealing with the Fire Department?

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, typically when we make a motion for any project, if there are staff recommendations or conditions, the motion should include staff conditions.

MOTION REVISED

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. POITIER TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN WITH STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION OF CONDITIONS. Seconded by Mr. Knott. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Mr. Bergman stated – You'll be notified when this goes to the City Commission. Thank you very much.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Agenda Item #8 – Site Plan w/Conditional Use – Dock – For approval to allow the construction of four mooring piling for a boat dock. Located at the Port of Fort Pierce. The owner is Lloyd Bell, and the applicant/representative is Herman Summerlin Sr.

Staff Report – Ms. Clark stated – Based on the lack of information provided by the applicant, staff is recommending denial.

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

Mr. Enns asked – Wendy, did you just need to have the location of the pilings? Is that why you're requesting denial?

Ms. Clark stated – Well, as you tell in the site sketch that was provided, it was simply handwritten off of a property appraiser's map, and staff did not feel that provided the amount of detail that was necessary to make a recommendation.

Mr. Trias added – Also, based on the fact that this is the Port we do need to have more information about the activity and the way that it is going to impact on the uplands. And clearly we don't know what this is all about at this point. And unless the applicant is here to explain it, we don't have enough information to recommend approval.

Mr. Enns asked – So, generally on something like this then you would require a more detailed site plan, number one. And number two, you're looking for what other information?

Mr. Trias stated – A site plan is required as part of the process, and a site plan includes the location of the actual project, but also whether or not there's going to be, say, parking next to it, or what's going to happen to landscape etc. This is a site that is not developed at this point in any way that would meet the Code. So we need to understand it clearly.

Mr. Bergman asked – Ramon, it looks like this is taking place where they're doing all that offloading for that material storage on the corner. Is that what this is still about you think?

Mr. Trias stated – We don't know, and that's what staff is telling you. We just don't know enough.

Mr. Bergman – Okay.

Mr. Knott asked – Mr. Chairman, if I could ask Ramon also. It says it's for temporary storage in this location. Have they given you any indication of the terms of the temporary?

Mr. Trias – No.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Knott continued – So, we don't know if it's one year or one week or ...

Mr. Trias added – Or infinity.

Mr. Knott – Okay.

Mr. Trias continued – It's not very clear, and that's one of the ongoing issues with this parcel. The lack of a clear future and a clear direction.

Mr. Knott asked – So, it appears that they need to come back to you with more information before you can make the best of it?

Mr. Trias stated – That is my recommendation to the Board, yes.

Mr. Knott – Very good, thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any other questions for staff from the Board? Is there anyone here to speak on behalf of the site plan with conditional use? Guess not. Okay, is there anyone here to oppose the site plan with conditional use application? Hearing none, I'll entertain a motion from the Board.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MRS. BRENNER TO DENY SITE PLAN WITH CONDITIONAL USE. Seconded by Mr. Poitier.

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

Ms. Benton asked – Yes, I would just like to ask staff. Was there any communication at all between the applicant and staff? Seeing that nobody's here and staff doesn't approve the submitted information.

Ms. Clark stated – I had talked with the applicant prior to him submitting the site plan with conditional use.

Mr. Knott asked – Mr. Chairman, if I might ask Mr. Walker a question. Mr. Walker, would it be prudent to include a reason for the recommended denial, such as a lack of information, or the applicant would need to provide staff with required information?

Attorney Walker stated – Mr. Chair, I'm embarrassed that it was necessary to ask that question...I should have said something. Mr. Chair, whenever there is a site plan that comes up for review and if the Board recommends disapproval of the site plan, it is necessary that the motion contain some indication of the basis for that. So, respectfully there's a point of order as to any such motion that recommends denial should incorporate within that a reason for that denial. And I do appreciate the question.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Bergman stated – Thank you. Well, I’m glad that Mr. Knott caught that because I forgot all about it.

Mrs. Brenner stated – Thank you, I knew it was going to come because the three us started talking at one time.

Mr. Poitier – You’re right.

MOTION REVISED

MOTION WAS MADE BY MRS. BRENNER TO DENY THE SITE PLAN WITH CONDITIONAL USE REQUEST BASED ON THE FACT OF NOT RECEIVING ENOUGH INFORMATION, WHICH IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION, AND ALSO NO ONE PRESENT TO SPEAK ON BEHALF OF THIS PROJECT TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS. Seconded by Mr. Poitier. Unanimously denied by roll call vote.

Agenda Item #9 – Waiver of Distance – Pizzoodle’s – To waive the distance requirement between places of business in order to obtain a (4-COP) license for operating an establishment for the consumption and selling of beer, wine, (and liquor). Located at 222 Orange Avenue. Owner is Kraas & Kraas Finance Inc., and the applicant/representative is Dennis M. Franklin of Pizzoodle’s Inc.

Staff Report – Ms. Clark stated – In fact, to make a correction, the application is for a 2-COP license, which is for beer and wine. The application is downtown and it does comply with the requirements for granting a distance waiver. And staff is recommending approval.

Mr. Bergman asked – Did they represent at any time that it was going to be a 4-COP?

Ms. Clark stated – No, it was beer and wine.

Mr. Bergman stated – Okay, are there any other questions for staff from the Board?

Mrs. Brenner asked – Wendy, is this where the Jiffy used to be? Is it in that particular bank of storefront? It appears to be there but I didn’t know they had gone out of business, but then I didn’t ask them.

Mr. Enns added – No, that’s the wrong...

Mr. Trias stated – That’s the restaurant that was there recently (Nessa’s?)

Mr. Bergman asked – Wasn’t this the old Pig & Whistle?

Mr. Trias stated – No, it was (Nessa’s?) I believe.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Bergman – Oh okay. That’s right.

Mrs. Brenner asked – So, it’s not the one that is red (on the map)? It got crossed up in our papers...it says that it’s the corner of Depot and Orange Avenue.

Mr. Enns added – No, that’s wrong.

Mrs. Brenner continued – That what it says...that is Jiffy.

Mr. Trias stated – Yes, it’s not as big as the rectangle shows but it’s there.

Mrs. Brenner – Okay, thank you very much.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any other questions for staff from the Board? Is there anyone here to speak on behalf of the application for waiver of distance? Is there anyone here to oppose the waiver application? What’s the pleasure of the Board?

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

Agenda Item #10 – Abandonment – St. Lucie Outboard Marine – To abandon a portion of City of right-of-way.

Staff Report – Ms. Clark stated – The request is relative to a previous site plan that was seen before the Planning Board for St. Lucie Outboard Marine. The Avenue G right-of-way dissects property owned by the applicant both the north and south. The application itself had forwarded through all City departments with no objections, and staff is recommending approval based upon the fact that the property owner should draft a utility easement for approval from the FPUA.

Mr. Bergman asked – Wendy, don’t we typically not abandon...this is a City right-of-way, don’t we typically offer these up for sale to the owners?

Ms. Clark stated – At the Commission level, it’s generally been their policy to offer it up for sale.

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, I thought we always got into that as well...

Mr. Trias added – You’re welcome to do that if you want to.

Mr. Bergman stated – I just know in the past that it’s always been staff’s position or at least the attorney’s position that we never abandoned property, that we would always offer it up at fair market value once the appraisal was done.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Trias stated – Yeah, I think we should just define in the Code that when we say abandonment, we are going to offer it to the public at a fair market price.

Attorney Walker stated – Mr. Chair, may I briefly elaborate on that?

Mr. Bergman – Certainly.

Attorney Walker stated – The purpose of a Planning Board involvement is to determine whether retention of the property serves a public purpose. That really is the issue here. The City has in the past conducted an over all planning study of the alleyways of the City for the purpose of guiding this decision process. Although the memorandum supplied to the Board doesn't address the study, I assume the Planning Board did in fact review that to determine for itself, but there was no planning purpose to be served by retaining it. Whether the property is to be abandoned or sold off to the public is ultimately a financial decision to be made by the City Commission and the question in the first instance whether or not the property serves a public purpose and should be retained or not. And that really is the issue to be addressed by the Planning Board as opposed to whether it should be sold or given away.

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

Mr. Knott asked – Just for clarity, Wendy, does the property on the both sides...north and south of this abandonment is the applicant, is that correct?

Ms. Clark – That's correct.

Mr. Knott asked – So, there are no other ownerships involved? Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions for staff? Is there anyone here to speak on behalf of the abandonment?

Mr. Stef Matthes introduced himself and stated – I'm with the firm Culpepper & Turpening, I'm here representing the abandon request, and I'm just here to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any questions of the applicant? Guess not. Thank you. Is there anyone else to speak on behalf of the abandonment application? Is there anyone here to oppose the abandonment?

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO APPROVE THE ABANDONMENT WITH THE CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF. Seconded by Mr. Johnson. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Mr. Bergman stated – You'll be notified when this goes to the City Commission.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mr. Mathes – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman stated – If there's no objection from staff or Mr. Walker, I'd like to take all three of these as a single item if we can. Unless there are any questions from the Board members that we need to pull one item for one reason or another.

Mr. Poitier and Mr. Harris in unison – Group them all together.

Agenda Items #11, 12, & 13 – Annexations – Aslan Inc. (lot #11), Bayshore Limited, and Broom (lot #12) – Identified as having either a Fort Pierce Utilities annexation agreement and/or being contiguous with the municipal boundaries of Fort Pierce. The first parcel is located on South A1A, lot #11. Owner/applicant is Aslan Inc. The second parcel is located at Barrel and Oleander Avenue. Owner/applicant is Bayshore Limited Inc. And the third parcel is located on South A1A, lot #12. Owner/applicant is Marion Paul Broome.

Staff Report – Ms. Clark stated – Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any questions for staff? Is there anyone here to speak on any of these annexation requests?

Mr. Marion Paul Broome stood and introduced himself and stated – And I'm here to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Bergman asked – So, you're representing Aslan Inc.?

Mr. Broome – Yes.

Mr. Bergman asked the applicant – So, you have no objection?

Mr. Broome – No.

Mr. Bergman asked – Is there anyone here to speak on behalf of against the annexations?

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. JOHNSON TO APPROVE THE THREE ANNEXATION REQUESTS. Seconded by Mr. Poitier. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Agenda Item #14 - Discussions

Mr. Bergman stated – Mr. Walker, Ramon, Wendy, any discussions, any items we need to know about?

Attorney Walker and the staff stated – No.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

Mrs. Brenner stated – I have one question. I want to go back where we did your project on side of the street, and the other project, Mr. Kim’s project (should be Lim). There was no mention of the underground power lines in that project. Was that an assumed thing?

Mr. Trias stated – Yes, as a matter of policy that’s what we do, but we should make it clearer. I think it’s a mistake to assume things. What happened with Harbour Isle is that the Utilities Authority went ahead and did the work and the assumed thing was that developer was going to pay for it, but apparently that’s not what he assumed later on.

Mrs. Brenner stated – Okay, but Mr. Kim’s (should be Lim) project across from Mr. Bergman’s project will also have the same requirements for underground wiring?

Mr. Trias stated – That’s what everybody has regarded, yes.

Mrs. Brenner stated – So, we’ll have it clear that next time it comes up it will be part of the package?

Mr. Trias – Yes.

Mrs. Brenner – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, it’s a good point that you brought that up, because I think in the last two weeks I’ve had an opportunity to meet with a lot of Commissioners and they, believe it or not, read our minutes very thoroughly from what they tell me. Because of what’s going on in Fort Pierce with the length of the agendas that they have and the packets they get, they don’t always get to spend a lot of time reviewing our minutes. So, the more questions we could ask, the more detail we can do, they all appreciate that very much. So, I think that kind of comment at the end is still most appropriate. Any time we have a site plan come up and if there are any questions or comments that you have ...it may not make much sense to us but the City Commission may raise some questions about it. It’s always a good point to bring up. I know when Eddy was on the Board, he’s the one of the ones who mentioned it to me. You know how he was when he was on the Board, asking a million questions. Well, he still asks them, I guess, of the City Commission, and he wants us to continue to ask the questions.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any other questions or discussions?

Mr. Knott stated – I do. One thing about this traffic issue. And I don’t want to beat this ‘dead horse’, and I know it’s out of your hands because it goes back to engineering—a lot of it does, or to certain standards—but for example, this project here. I looked at their traffic report and that one of Don’s (Bergman) project is generating 734 trips a day. And you think that it’s going to take care of itself, and it will in the future because it’s going to be something that the taxpayers will have to do. I just wish there was some way we could...because we keep having more and more projects and all of you are doing the right thing by asking for traffic reports. But the traffic reports are coming in saying that

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

nothing's required, well I don't buy that. Somebody's going to have to face up to this, and most other communities on the cutting edge of these developments will say, look Mr. Developer, you're going to have to kick in some money here, whether you do it by escrow or something to help offset some of the future costs that are going to be incurred when these 700 trips a day hit that intersection right there. And it's going to be a problem. And I don't know how to address it other than just bring it up...and there's nothing we can do about it. We just have to deal with it in the future when it happens. Ramon, is there anyway we could somehow put some 'teeth' into our traffic issues?

Mr. Trias stated – The problem is that the projects that we deal with are relatively small. And in themselves usually do not trigger any major improvements and so on. And obviously we were doing that development regional impact...the DRI process, which would be, let's say, 1,000 acres, part of the process is to deal with the improvements miles away. It doesn't have to be on-site. But for these little projects ...what's going on is that we're implementing the County Comprehensive Plan, and it's not any good. And it's not anymore complicated than that. I probably know about this issue than most and I have no idea on how to fix it.

Mr. Knott stated – Well, you're right...it has to occur before you can fix it.

Mr. Trias stated – It's quite a serious conceptual crisis here, in the sense that we're building is not any good and we don't have any way to do something different. And we're going to have a crisis and we're going to have some kind of collapse at some point.

Mr. Knott stated – My thought was on something like this where you can see it on paper. It even says there's going to be between those two project sites there's going to be probably a 1,000 more trips right at that intersection. And where it is right now, if you look at what did on their traffic count, there's only fifty going on at that intersection...or 150. So, this is really going to be staggering.

Mr. Trias stated – Well the question is who pays for public projects? The public at large or the people who are moving in? That really a policy decision, it could go either way. I guess what I'm saying is for the last 20 years or so, there has been a real belief that though impact fees, and the people who are moving into the towns should pay for all of these improvements. And that's really a philosophical discussion more than a practical discussion to some extent, in a sense, that ultimately the public is the one that's doing all of this, and whether it's you, me or them is really a choice that we're making. Frankly I think that the only practical solution is that we build roads as a public project as time goes by and as we need them.

Mr. Knott stated – Well, that's the way it usually works, as most of us know...

Mr. Trias added – There's really no other practical way to do it ...we can deal with one intersection or driveways like that. The fundamental issues are that we're not building a

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

grid. We're building all this 20 and 40 acres of cul-de-sacs. After that, there's very little to talk about.

Mr. Knott – Okay, thank you.

Mrs. Brenner asked – May I ask who owns that road? Even though it's in the City does that still belong to the County? Is that a County road?

Mr. Trias stated – I'm pretty sure it's a County road.

Mrs. Brenner asked – So, the County Commissioners would have to be the ones who would have to be approached to get them to do something about it?

Mr. Trias stated – Maybe, maybe not, the City does a lot of lot of work on County roads and on State roads also. So, it could go either way.

Mrs. Brenner asked – And what's your feeling about increasing the impact fees? I've heard many people talking about the fact that we have such low impact fees in St. Lucie County generally speaking.

Mr. Trias stated – That's probably a good idea. That's such a small problem in comparison to the real problem which is that we're building really bad urban form with no connectivity at all. Having done that is going to last a long, long time. When downtown was laid out in 1888 with the grid that we have now, it hasn't changed. So basically, this pattern of development that we're doing...40, 60, 100 acres at a time with no connectivity is going to set the tone for a long, long time...easily 30, 40, 50, 100 years. And since it doesn't follow any of the most basic design concepts that have been followed for thousands of years in city design, like for example, having blocks and having streets that connect and things like that, the consequences are going to be severe and very, very negative. And all you have to do is to visit some counties south of us to see what the future is. That's what is going to happen and I don't know how to fix...I really don't know.

Mrs. Brenner asked – Is there any possibility of a long-range planning committee being formed with the two cities and the county to do something like that so they would sit down and look at the long way out?

Mr. Trias stated – The only way that this is going to change is through the private sector doing different development. That's what was done in the twenties. There was no zoning back in the twenties. And yet they did a pretty good job in terms of developing cities with blocks and so on. Now, zoning was invented at that time. Zoning was invented, I think, in the teens or so in New York and then it began to be implemented through the years later on. And as that progressed, all of a sudden we had more regulation and less quality development from a design point of view and from the point of view quality of life. Clearly America is driven by the private sector and the answer is

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

in the private sector. And I think that's what needs to happen, and it probably will as the customers begin to demand better quality. Efforts by the private sector are very weak. People have done this before in Palm Beach County, that have a county-wide planning council whatever...I haven't seen any real progress.

Mr. Poitier asked – I have a question for you Ramon. If you're saying that we need to plan long range like they do in the south, we have to do something or we'll be choked to death.

Mr. Trias stated –The best thing we can do is to talk about it and begin the process. But like I said, unless the private sector is interested—because it makes sense from the point of view of the market—unless people demand a better quality, it's going to take a long time. Development is better today than it was 20 years ago. I mean certainly it's better and I think it's going to be much better 10 years from now that it is today.

Mr. Poitier – Okay.

Mr. Bergman asked – Ramon, have you seen the City Engineers' Traffic Study that you would like to implement? Have you reviewed that at all?

Mr. Trias asked – Which traffic study?

Mr. Bergman stated – The overall traffic study...it's not a traffic study, I guess he wants to implement the requirements for traffic studies of various projects?

Mr. Trias stated – Okay, I'll have to talk to him.

Mr. Bergman stated – He's been after me now for about two meetings now to bring this to the Planning Board as an item. Could you look at that and bring it to us when you get a chance? Because I've read through it, it's pretty lengthy, it's great sleeping material.

Mr. Trias stated – Keep in mind about traffic okay. What have we done in Fort Pierce about traffic? We have actually narrowed the streets. We have not made them any bigger. And the reason traffic flows better is because we have completed the grid. All the one-way streets that were mistakenly implemented some years ago, we changed that and so on. So, the solution to this is not the traffic solution that would be recommended at a typical traffic study, which is let's add some lanes, let's change the intersection. The solution is really about having a grid that has connectivity and therefore able to distribute traffic. You can have the same amount of traffic with the same amount of lanes and have a very different traffic condition if you only have one big road, or let's say five little roads. Even though you add up the number of lanes, you have exactly the same lanes. What happens when you have one big road is that everybody's going through the same place at the same time; therefore you have a traffic jam, regardless of how big that road is. This has been known for a long, long, time. And yet, if we do a traffic study that's what the traffic study recommendation would be...make the road bigger. Well, the

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 10, 2004.

recommendation is how are we able to connect things better? How are we able to have more of a highly connected grid? And that's impossible in today's world because of the way that we're doing very small projects, I mean relatively small...one at a time. And the private sector is completely uninterested in connecting with other projects, because the problem is not bad yet. Now, when it's worse, then you will see how people will begin to say, oh, maybe we should connect to our neighbors. But it's not there yet. We'll keep seeing some of this for a while.

Mr. Bergman stated – I think if you get a chance to look at it, I think it was to establish a baseline of when traffic studies would be required. Anything else from anyone else?

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.