



CITY OF FORT PIERCE

PLANNING BOARD

Planning Board Minutes

OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE FORT PIERCE CITY PLANNING BOARD HELD ON TUESDAY, AUGUST 11, 2009, IN FORT PIERCE CITY HALL, COMMISSION CHAMBERS, 100 NORTH US HIGHWAY 1, FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA.

Chairman Johnson called the meeting to order.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Upon Roll Call, those present were: Chairman Jeremiah Johnson, Dan Dannahower, Charlie Harris, Charles Hayek, Colin Lloyd, Robert Poitier, Steven Weaver and Camile Yates.

Those absent: Kara Wood.

Staff Present: Robert V. Schwerer, City Attorney; Matthew G. Margotta, Director of Community Development, David Carlin, Assistant Director of Planning; Erica Ehly, Comprehensive Planner; Maritza Suarez, Executive Assistant and Diann Ploetz, Planning Specialist.

The next item considered - **# 3 – Consideration of Absences**

Chairman Johnson said very good. Thank you. Seeing Ms. Wood did call, is there a motion to excuse?

Motion made by Ms. Yates and seconded by Mr. Poitier **to excuse the absence of Ms. Wood.**

Unanimously approved by voice vote.

The next item considered - **#4 – Certification of Alternate Members.**

Chairman Johnson said there are no alternate members so we'll move to item number 5.

The next item considered – **# 5 – Approval of the July 14, 2009 Planning Board Minutes.**

Chairman Johnson said are there any additions or corrections to those minutes?

Motion made by Mr. Poitier and seconded by Ms. Yates **to approve the minutes.**

Unanimously approved by voice vote.

The next item considered: **Item # 6 - Waiver of Distance – J.P. & Sons Enterprises, Inc.:** Request for a Waiver of Distance for a 2APS Alcohol Beverage License for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption. The property is located at 607 Orange Avenue and is zoned C-3, General Commercial. The property owners are Jean P. Baptist and Marie C. Nicolas and the representative is Clem Hill.

Chairman Johnson said could we have staff report please?

Mrs. Ploetz said good evening. The applicant tonight is requesting a 2APS license to serve beer and wine for off-premises consumption at a newly opened grocery store at 607 Orange Avenue. The establishment is located within 500 feet of one church and that's across the street at the First United Methodist Church. The subject property is zoned C-3 with a Future Land Use of Cg, Commercial General. The properties adjacent to the north, south, east and west are also zoned C-3 and Cg. The establishment is approximately 3,900 square feet of gross floor area. The establishment is proposed to be open 24/7. There is only on-street parking for this business. This property is located just 1 block west of the B4 District. Staff recommends that the Planning Board forwards a recommendation to the City Commission for approval of the Waiver of Distance for a 2APS Alcoholic Beverage License for the establishment with the conditions that no sale of alcoholic beverages be permitted between the hours of 2 a.m. and 7 a.m. and that there are no outstanding issues with the Police Department prior to City Commission. Thank you.

Chairman Johnson said thank you. Any questions of staff from the Board?

Mr. Hayek said isn't there a rule that you can't sell alcohol from 2 a.m. – 7:00 a.m. normally?

Mrs. Ploetz said right. We just want to make sure that they know that.

Chairman Johnson said how about on Sundays?

Mrs. Ploetz said it was changed back in September that the only time is 2 a.m. – 7:00 a.m. every day, each day.

Chairman Johnson said any other questions? My question about parking is on-street only so the adjacent parking lot is not?

Mrs. Ploetz said it's not owned by them. It's owned by Eunice Bridal.

Mr. Lloyd said are there any other businesses that sell alcohol within 500 feet of the church there that you are aware of?

Mrs. Ploetz said no. Not that I know.

Chairman Johnson said okay, any other questions of staff? At this time I would like to welcome the applicant. If there is a representative here you can come forward and speak? Seeing none, anyone here from the public that would like to speak for or against this request just come forward at any time.

Mr. Robert Hausgrove said my name is Robert Hausgrove and we're in the distance across from the establishment and we're opposed to it. I believe Common Grounds is within that area too, another Church right behind us within that same distance I believe. I believe it's 1200 or 2200 feet or something like that. We had a meeting at the church the other night and we voted. We have seven parcels there we're tax based on and the Admin Council voted against this. I guess representing the church, we're against this.

Chairman Johnson said so you're a representative of the church not a resident within the area, is that correct?

Mr. Hausgrove said nodded.

Chairman Johnson said very good. Thank you.

Chairman Johnson said anyone else here from the public that would like to speak for or against this request? Please come forward, either one of you. Good evening.

Mr. Dale Scott said I'm Dale Scott. I'm a member of the United Methodist Church. My concern is selling the beer and wine across the street from a church which I think causes a hazard because our members park across there right in that little parking lot adjacent to it. You had it on the map there. Being a, I wouldn't say recovering but an ex-beeraholic, it's to me very dangerous for somebody coming in after a Saturday night ordeal looking for more alcohol. We have our members going across the, crossing the street there to go to church and a lot of them are elderly and very slow. We also have the assisted housing project just up the street and surely those people don't need a good close place to be purchasing beer and wine. I'm just concerned about the whole location being across the street from the church. I ask that you turn this application down if you would please.

Chairman Johnson said are there any activities within the church during the week?

Mr. Scott said all during the week, evenings and the church is open all day during the morning where people park across there right next to that building and walk across the street. It's a very busy area to start with. Thank you.

Chairman Johnson said thank you. Anyone else here from the public?

Ms. Gladys King said my name is Gladys King and I've lived in Fort Pierce for 50 odd years. I've been a member of this church from that time forward. I would hate for Fort Pierce to be known as a City that allows a bar and the sale of alcoholic beverages just across the street from a church and that is what this would be and I think that would be a very good bad influence on the people moving into this town. I would very much oppose this and I hope you will consider our opinions. Thank you.

Chairman Johnson said okay, anyone else here? Okay, please come forward.

Ms. Kate Rotindo said my name is Kate Rotindo. I'm a member of the First United Methodist Church. I'm also a member of our community at this end of town. I live on 7th Street. I own a home on 7th Street and the house that my husband and I own is right south of the Marathon Gas station. We see first hand in an alleyway what happens with the alcohol abuse that some of our community members have just with the Kwik Stop on Delaware. That's where most of our neighborhood, right now where they purchase alcohol. My husband and I have owned this house for I think three or four years now and we've had to call the Police every single week. Right now we have Officer James Word who is coming in and patrolling our area. When we met at the Administrative Council meeting to bring this to you all, I mentioned to them how important it is that we stand up against this. My husband and I see first hand the beer cans that are thrown into our yard. We have people sleeping in our alley and I would just hate for that to be and that's, with the Kwik Stop, that's not even open 24 hours. We see first hand what can happen with people who are abusing the purchase of beer and alcohol. With our church, I would just really hate for that to become, that we would allow that to be across the street from the church when we already see the problems in this end of our community with people with problems with alcohol. I would also ask that this be turned down.

Chairman Johnson said thank you. Anyone else from the public that would like to speak?

Kathy Haslegrove said my name is Kathy Haslegrove. I know all of you attend a church of some kind or another. I want you to consider your church directly across the street from an alcohol-selling establishment. Granted they can't drink on premises which means they will walk across the street and drink right in front of our door. I want you to consider how you would feel like that when you walk out of your church door and that's what you're presented with. I'm asking you to deny this petition and be realistic and understand what you're getting ready to present to the City of Fort Pierce in allowing alcohol and beer that close to a church. Thank you.

Chairman Johnson said thank you. Would anyone else like to speak for or against this request? Seeing none, we'll return to the Board and entertain a motion?

Ms. Yates said Mr. Chairman, I have a question of staff. I am wondering what is the closest facility that sells beer and wine to United Methodist Church?

Mrs. Ploetz said I'm not exactly sure. There is the Septentrion Market. I'm not exactly sure if they sell alcoholic beverages or not but there is nothing besides that within the 500 feet so it might be the Kwik Stop that's on Delaware.

Unknown speaker said there's Mervis.

Mrs. Ploetz said they're outside of the 500 feet.

Mr. Weaver said Mr. Chair? I was just trying to confirm what the parking requirements are for the C-3 zoning district. I was wondering if perhaps this property was in compliance with the parking requirements?

Mr. Carlin said well Mr. Chair, Mr. Weaver. If I can take a stab at that. This is an existing retail establishment that's been there. The building has been there. There is no parking. It was contemplated back in the day where on-street parking now our B-4 Business District as you know doesn't encompass most of these establishments and buildings that don't have parking lots. There is kind of an issue that we have to work through as part of our rewrite process to cover these types of transactions but this is basically a building that was already in existence and they just modified the interior and it is what it is.

Mr. Weaver said and there is no requirement for a Certificate of Zoning compliance in order for this to go for this Waiver of Distance?

Mr. Carlin said Mr. Chair, Mr. Weaver. A Certificate of Zoning Compliance is associated with review for applications but keep in mind when there is no landscaping requirements because there is no landscape strips and there is no parking because the building is there and there is no lot so there are no other issues associated with this particular request but you do bring up a good point and we will have to address how to take into account and review these types of establishments and these types of buildings within the confines of parking and landscaping in our rewrite.

Mr. Weaver said thank you.

Chairman Johnson said any other questions from the Board before we entertain a motion or are we ready? Okay, ready for a motion.

Board Attorney Schwerer said Mr. Chairman. I'd hate to interrupt the Board but in keeping within the past practice of Mr. Walker who usually handles this Board, and this may be for the public's consideration as well, the general objections to the sale of off-premises alcohol are generally reserved for the policy-making decision of the City Commission. I think under the Code, the Planning Board's, dictates that there are six factors to consider under 3-7 of the City Code and they are all laid out in the Staff's report. Not that the public's objections aren't important but they are not for this Board to really consider in weighing in your decision-

making tonight. Those are certainly issues that can be raised later on at the Commission level for the policy makers. I think it's important to consider any comments from the public that go directly to and weigh on those six factors that are specified in Section 3-7. I just wanted to make it clear. I know Mr. Walker regularly instructs the Board on the dictates of the Code and what the Planning Board's function is. Again, the public may not understand that but they will certainly have the opportunity to express those considerations at the City Commission level and the City Commission will be considering those as part of the factors. The City Commission is not bound by the same criteria as this Board.

Chairman Johnson said I have a question to you. As we instruct the Board then considering like question A or question number 1 in proximity to churches and schools, they can weigh into that factor to some degree. Is that correct?

Mr. Schwerer said yes you can. In other words, what type of, again, not just generally the sale of alcohol and what affect that is going to have but also potential congestion that is already existing in the area, any traffic issues, parking issues, those sorts of things and disruption of services. In other words, you have a church utilizing the property versus a grocery store or I'm not sure if it's a grocery store I can't make that determination for the record it looks like more of a convenience store that's located in a downtown neighborhood. Those are certainly issues for consideration.

Chairman Johnson said correct. I just want to make sure the Board members understood that as part of the aspect. Okay, still waiting for a motion from the Board.

Mr. Hayek said in light of the fact that the applicant was not present to present his side of it and tell us what his store is going to be made of I'd like to make a motion due to the lack of parking, the proximity to the church that we deny the applicant.

Motion made by Mr. Hayek and seconded by Mr. Poitier to forward a recommendation to the City Commission **denial of a Waiver of Distance for a 2APS Alcohol Beverage License for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption for the property located at 607 Orange Avenue.**

Chairman Johnson said okay, we have a motion to deny the application before us or the Waiver of Distance based on the reasons stated and a second. Is there any discussion on that motion? Seeing none, we'll have roll call please?

Those in favor: Mr. Dannahower, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hayek, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Poitier, Mr. Weaver, Ms. Yates and Chairman Johnson.

Those opposed: none.

Chairman Johnson said so Mr. Schwerer, correct me if I'm wrong. It will be passed with a recommendation of denial to the City Commission.

Mr. Schwerer said that is correct.

Chairman Johnson said very good. Thank you.

Mr. Schwerer said let me correct the record. I'm sorry. I know I said Section 3-7 of the Code, it's 3-9 so let the record reflect that it is 3-9 that have the six criteria and I apologize for that.

Chairman Johnson said very good. No problem. Thank you. Okay

The next item considered: **Item # 7a- Discussions: Evaluation and Appraisal Report ("EAR")**

Chairman Johnson said Ms. Ehly?

Ms. Ehly said good evening Mr. Chair, Planning Board members. As you may recall from the last couple of meetings, the Evaluation and Appraisal Report of the Comprehensive Plan is actually a two-part process. The first part is the actual report and the second part is the amendments that are based upon the recommendations that are going to come from the report. Where we are now is the first step of the process: identifying the major issues that affect the ability of the City to achieve the community vision. Through a series of scoping exercises with internal meetings with Planning staff and discussions before the Planning Board and also with the City Commission, these are the four issues that have been identified. Also, with these four issues they are the overview and then underneath these issues are sub-issues and specific areas that will be analyzed in the report. Those are in the handout that you received before the meeting which I gave you so we can speed through it. We can go through those if you'd like but those are in underneath each major issue. Now, for each of these major issues that have been identified, the following slide shows what the report will do with regard to each of those issues: identifying the social environmental and economic impacts of those four issues and the sub elements; assess whether the plan objectives within each element as they relate to the major issues have been achieved; identify any changes or circumstances that were not anticipated and the results if any; and identify the amendments required to address those issues. That's what's going to be taking place in the report. With regard to the issues, the next step will be finalizing the list. This is not a final list. This is still a draft list. Then we'll submit to DCA the list with a request for a Letter of Understanding from them. Additionally before the list is finalized, the list will be sent out to reviewing agencies including DEP and South Florida Water Management District, the County, the whole list of reviewing agencies for their feedback. They'll be invited to come to the next Planning Board meeting on September 8th which is when I anticipate the Planning Board to finalize the list. We'll have public input and also if any of the agencies want to show up with their comments but I'm expecting their comments in writing and then we present it at that time. After that, we'll plan and schedule the actual tasks of evaluating and appraising the Comp Plan and we'll also be incorporating the fifteen issues. There are additional issues besides the major issues that are identified by the City which are those four and then those sub issues. There are also 15 issues that have to be evaluated per Florida Statute. In addition to those and as the evaluation begins, we'll also be incorporating the evaluation of these issues: changes to population; the location of vacant and buildable land in the City; the

success in providing needed infrastructure to meet the demands of the growth; the location of existing growth compared to where it was anticipated by the Plan; the identification of major issues for the jurisdiction that folds into the requirements of the Florida Statutes; changes in State and Regional policy that includes the State Comprehensive Plan, the Regional Strategic Plan and also changes in the Florida Statutes and the Florida Administrative Code. There's a lot going on there this year. Also an assessment of whether the objectives of the Plan have been achieved, just the general objectives throughout the Plan; an assessment of successes and shortcomings of each element of the Plan in general and not specifically related to the major issues that the City has identified; recommendations for actions and corrective measures to revise the Plan; and a summary of public participation activities undertaken by the local government in preparing the report so that would be the public hearings before the Planning Board and City Commission and if there were any workshops to be requested or needed that would be included but they are not required; the coordination of school planning with land use planning; the coordination of water supply planning with land use planning; strategies for addressing residential nonconforming land uses in the coastal high hazard area; the extent to which concurrency exception areas are designated; and the establishment of a common methodology for measuring impacts on roads which traverse multiple jurisdictions. So that's where we are at right now with the EAR. If you have any comments or you have any questions or if you want to discuss any part of that, I'm available.

Chairman Johnson said okay Board members. Any questions on what we have?

Ms. Ehly said did you guys have a chance to look over those handouts?

Chairman Johnson said yes, very good. The first one I had was just talking about affordable housing in downtown area. I remember at one time the Comp Plan talked about a limited number of affordable housing units within the City of Fort Pierce and we're trying to encourage affordable housing. How are we going to correlate such a task? What does the Comp Plan now dictate?

Ms. Ehly said through the EAR we're hoping to specify the definition of affordable in Fort Pierce, means affordable to the residents of the City of Fort Pierce; not affordable in terms of what Tallahassee defines as affordable or what HUD or those affordable housing plans. They define a higher threshold for affordability based on the median income of the metropolitan area including Martin County, Stuart, Port St. Lucie and St. Lucie County. Those areas are almost twice as high with regard to median income than Fort Pierce is. A lot of times there's affordable housing developers that would come and say it's affordable housing. It is for the region but not for the citizens of Fort Pierce. In actuality, our affordable housing inventory, when we're looking at planning and approving additional development, it looks like we have more affordable housing than we actually do because of that definition which is skewing them.

Chairman Johnson said so the numbers will be, the Comp Plan still dictates a number that we should not exceed, is that correct?

Ms. Ehly said well the inventory will be amended. Those residential units that we have that right now, we could define as affordable even though we all know is not affordable with

regard to the median income in Fort Pierce is \$29,600 a year. A lot of those residential units that we've approved as affordable housing aren't affordable.

Mr. Lloyd said in Florida it's like \$41,000, \$42,000.

Ms. Ehly said yes.

Mr. Poitier said I got a question. Don't we have a shortage in Fort Pierce?

Ms. Ehly said we do actually have a shortage of actual affordable housing if we use the median income of the City and that's a major issue. That will be addressed in the Comp Plan through policies and objectives during the amendment process to include that in the Comp Plan. That will direct the LDRs and the development review process to use the right numbers that are appropriate to meet the needs of the citizens of Fort Pierce rather than just meeting the definition for a program.

Mr. Weaver said I really like the collection of issues that you have identified here. I wonder if the EAR process requires to put any timelines in implementing whatever strategies we do put in place?

Ms. Ehly said the legal status of the Comprehensive Plan is as soon as these amendments are adopted, after they've gone to DCA for review and we do the second adoption hearing they are in effect even if our Land Development Regulations are not consistent, then it would be the Comp Plan that we would be following until they are consistent but definitely DCA gives you a year to get your LDRs updated to your Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Weaver said I guess for an example, you mentioned perhaps establishing a Transfer Development's Right Program. I myself would not limit that to the outskirts of the City but if the EAR reflects it, that's an objective or one of the elements of your EAR. Is there any burden on you or the City to actually to put this into effect anytime in the foreseeable future?

Ms. Ehly said in the report. The report is just a report. Once the report is adopted, there is no legal status of the report. It's after the amendments go through that gives the standing to implement those policies and goals and objectives. I'm anticipating the report to be adopted in February by the deadline so then you have 18 months after that adoption date to implement what the report recommends through the amendment process. It would be about 18 months later that those recommendations would be implemented.

Mr. Margotta said Mr. Chairman, if I could interject and kind of cap on top of what Ms. Ehly was talking about. These are basically issues and things that staff is considering with input from a lot of sources just right now. We haven't even gone through the appraisal process yet. This has not gone through a recommendation from this Board, even to the City Commission for adoption. For all we know, the City Commission could add to or take away whatever with this entire list so these are just, consider them ideas right now and things that are swaying around. If you have some particular direction that this Board has to take or to put a little more data behind some of these ideas, that's what we're supposed to do. So don't

think any of these right here as an absolute that's what the City of Fort Pierce is going to do. We haven't started the report yet.

Ms. Yates said Mr. Chairman, I have a comment for Ms. Ehly. I, on the intergovernmental coordination, I really like the emphasis on the environmental aspect of our area and getting greenways and trails connected throughout the area, placing an importance on Heathcote Botanical Park which is going to become a regional park in the area. I grew up in a huge city in Dallas and I know how important it is to have greenspace in the area so I really commend you for adding these environmentally-sensitive issues into a recommendation.

Ms. Ehly said those were actually submitted primarily by the Urban Forester.

Ms. Yates said thank you Paul.

Ms. Ehly said but yes. That's definitely an area that needs to be strengthened I think.

Ms. Yates said well in my mind what attracts me to this area and I think I can speak for a lot of people who come to Fort Pierce it's the water. It's the beauty of the land that we have preserved in the area, on the mosquito controlled impalements, if we didn't have those on the Barrier Island, we'd probably have condos. I just think that's one thing that's really for this City.

Mr. Poitier said Chair? Does this cover the whole County or just the City the report you're making? Does it cover St. Lucie County as a whole or just the City?

Ms. Ehly said just the City of Fort Pierce.

Mr. Poitier said I figured because we had one five or six years ago. Have you ever looked at that one?

Ms. Ehly said yes.

Mr. Poitier said are you adding something to it or taking something from?

Ms. Ehly said well, we had the rewrite that was adopted in 2007 and so every seven years we're supposed to do the evaluation so we're doing it sooner because that 2007 one was out of the cycle.

Mr. Poitier said we touched on the housing then too. That was our big problem. We were short on housing.

Ms. Ehly said yes and so now you bring up a good point because we did look at it and now we are going to be looking at that again. We're going to be probably saying "well what we had didn't necessarily work out so well". That's one of the things that we do with the evaluation and appraisal is that you can look at what you have and you can see what's working and what's not working.

Mr. Poitier said yeah because we had some housing but that wasn't up to date, you know, there were some raggedy houses that were included in the program and that's the reason too but I hope you make a good report on the housing. That would be a good point.

Ms. Ehly said there have been quite a few comments on the affordable housing policies of the City in response.

Mr. Poitier said okay, thank you.

Mr. Hayek said I just have one comment. We should go a little bit faster on identifying an area to relocate historic structures because if we wait too long the Governor's House is not going to last. They need to move it and do something with it.

Ms. Ehly said there were a lot of comments about the Historic Preservation Program in general as to whether it's a positive or a negative for development in the City. Generally, the way it's being looked at right now, it's causing more problems for developers and we don't have a lot of solutions in that area. That's one solution and certainly it's not the only solution that will come out of the EAR process.

Mr. Hayek said thank you.

Mr. Weaver said I just wanted to suggest that maybe the development review process that perhaps you consider putting some sort of timeline or timely response or some sort of thought process in this thing having not a two-year life cycle which is one of the biggest detriments to development in this area that I'm aware of is that sometimes the process just takes too long. That's just an idea. It's a worthy goal.

Ms. Ehly said I'm not sure if that would be in the Comprehensive Plan though. I'm not sure if we could address it there but certainly that was one of the areas that everybody said that needs to be dealt with is the development review process. Not necessarily within the Planning Department but the development review process with regard to permitting agencies, regulatory agencies and also the different departments within City Hall and just coordinating with South Florida Water Management permitting and things like that. That all should be taking place for the developer at the beginning. They should know what they are looking at. We can put that in the intergovernmental coordination part of the Comprehensive Plan things like that and then that will trickle down to the LDRs and in the end we'll probably make it a more efficient and streamlined process. A lot of the issues with development review are outside the Planning Department and that's why you can see it in the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Johnson said that was my last comment too is concerning the intergovernmental because we listed the Fort Pierce Utilities, St. Lucie County, Florida East Coast Railroad, there's got to be others in there.

Ms. Ehly said sure.

Chairman Johnson said Florida DOT, DEP-Department of Environmental Protection, there's got to be a bullet list I would imagine for each one of those, right?

Ms. Ehly said we do have in the intergovernmental coordination element right now. We have the matrix of the different agencies and how we coordinate with them. Intergovernmental coordination is the major overall issue. Those sub-elements are just general for now but certainly the whole is going to be looked at as to how we coordinate with all of them, the County and every agency.

Chairman Johnson said any other comments or questions?

Mr. Hayek said because our agenda is so light tonight, is there anything in the pipeline in the future?

Mr. Carlin said Mr. Chair, Mr. Hayek, if I understand your question correctly you are talking about development review, any site plans and things like that? The answer to your question is we have a very limited number of applications that are pending right now. We will have one larger type residential development that will be coming before you. We don't anticipate it becoming probably till September at the earliest. We have a few smaller type things, you know cell phone antenna tower requests but there really aren't, some rezones, but as far as major development is concerned we have seen a slow down in that process. As you probably see from your agendas the past two meetings it's been on the light side.

Mr. Hayek said thank you.

Mr. Poitier said my question is the County working with you pretty good on this? In the past we could get no help with the County, St. Lucie County.

Ms. Ehly said they will participate as a commenting and reviewing agency but certainly we coordinate with them. The County does their EAR first and then the municipalities do it about 12 months later. They've just completed theirs. They're starting their amendment cycle now. As the Comprehensive Planner, that's one thing that I look at is the County's Comprehensive Plan and their amendments and so it is being coordinated with if not out right that we're getting.

Mr. Poitier said I hope so because we didn't have that kind of help in the past. You're doing better now?

Ms. Ehly said yes. We coordinate pretty well with the County these days.

Mr. Poitier said okay.

Mr. Carlin said Mr. Chair, Mr. Poitier, we've really, and I think this kind of goes to with what Mr. Weaver was talking about with development review and coordination, I mean we really have changed the way our plans are reviewed. We have the County that attends our TRC meetings when we review a lot of development applications, rezones so we do have a much better review with the County. We're able to get feedback. The feedback is provided to applicants. We're able to talk about issues between City and County so it has been a

process that has improved substantially compared to where it was a few years ago. Certainly we can go further but it's been a great experience thus far.

Mr. Poitier said thank you.

Chairman Johnson said anything else to discuss from the Board? Staff?

Mr. Dannahower said a point of information. I understand the September meeting is going to be Wednesday the 9th due to the Labor Day Holiday just so that everybody is on the same page.

Mr. Schwerer said Mr. Chairman, I don't know if it's appropriate at this point in time but I would like to inform this Board. I know all of you are very active in the development process and have a great interest in the development of Fort Pierce; otherwise, you wouldn't be sitting here supporting the City in serving on this Board. This morning, some of you may know that the Governor and Cabinet did approve our lease and project for the total reconstruction of the Fort Pierce City Marina. That is going to be a multi-million dollar reconstruction project. There are wave attenuation island is going to be created. It's going to be a fantastic project. It's going to be an economic stimulus to the downtown. We're going to get a lot of our dock space back. That was a joint project really with the State of Florida, DEP and the Governor and the Cabinet supported it 100%. Our Mayor is in Tallahassee coming back and I'm sure he'll have something to say for the press. I encourage you to take a look at the plans if you haven't already seen them as to what's going to be happening down there. It's a fantastic project. I'd just thought I'd let you know that.

Ms. Yates said Mr. Schwerer, where are the plans located?

Mr. Schwerer said they are, I believe being, we have a consultant that is working very closely with staff. I know Ed Seissinger in Engineering has full set of the plans and specifications. When I say plans, this the conceptual plan, the layout of the islands and how they are going to go and for the permit requirements so they're fairly detailed at this point in time. Ed Seissinger in Engineering has them as well as Christa Razem who is our Grant Writer and of course I'm sure the City Manager's Office has multiple copies but Engineering is probably the place you can get them the quickest.

Chairman Johnson said thank you.

Mr. Weaver said I would hope Procurement has them too.

Mr. Schwerer said as soon as we start getting into the active construction plans we'll all certainly have that.

Chairman Johnson said sure. Thank you for being here, Mr. Schwerer. I appreciate it. Any other comments?

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.