

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE FORT PIERCE CITY PLANNING BOARD HELD ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2005, IN THE CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBERS (due to anticipated seating accommodations for the public), 100 NORTH U.S. 1, FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA.

Due to the fact that there were unknown technical recording problems at the time with the podium microphone and the one used by the secretary, some of the audio from the applicants could not be heard or transcribed. The technical problems have since been addressed. We apologize for any inconvenience.

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

Members absent: Don Bergman (Chairman), and Jeremiah Johnson.

Citizens and Staff present:

José F. Jaramillo
Brian Horowitz
Joe Hooks
Thomas Lang
Al Brodeur
Tom Scammer?
David Bauer
Allen Bottorff
Randall Greer
Mark Smiley
René Tercilla
Gino Reancavilla

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

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. (**Agenda Item #1**).

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

Ms. Rose stated that Mr. Knott and Mr. Bergman had called in but Mr. Johnson had not.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay, Mr. Johnson might come in with who we have here.

Agenda Item #3 – Approval of September 13, 2005 Minutes.

Mrs. Gates stated – I hope everybody has had a chance to review them. Are there any corrections or additions to these minutes?

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 13, 2005. Seconded by Mr. Harris. Unanimously approved by voice vote.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

Site Plan – Peters Commerce Center – Approval for the construction of a mixed-use commercial business building. Generally located on the east side of Peters Road, north of Okeechobee Road. Owner is Red Rock Holdings, LLC, applicant is René Tercilla, and representative is Smiley & Associates, Inc.

Staff Report – Mr. Gibbons stated – The applicant is applying for construction of a site plan for 11,500 sq. ft. commercial retail building. The site is adjacent to the furniture outlet center along I-95 and Peters Road. The applicant has been working with staff and has revised the plan a couple of times to meet our needs. They've also, on their elevations, they have on the rear, which would be facing the I-95 access ramp, they've added (undepungelations?) of molding to replicate the front of the building. And they've also incorporated our recommendation for increased landscaping on the rear of the property to kind of pose as better architecturally and better visualization for the access on I-95. We do have a condition on this property that ...it is a retail business that's going to be in that location, but storage for the property cannot exceed 20 percent of the gross floor area. That way we will prevent retailers such as screen companies, aluminum shutters...those type of things where they're going to have a lot of bulk storage on the property. But staff recommends approval with that condition.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay, thank you. Are there any questions for the staff from the Board on this item?

Mrs. Minton stated – I have one question. The site plan that I have for landscaping, the legend is missing saying what trees are going in. I just wanted to make sure that you were satisfied.

Mr. Trias stated – Yes. I've gone over this project with Paul Williams. They're going to have laurel oaks, live oaks also on top of cabbage palms. And it has met and exceeded all requirements.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay. Are there any further questions for staff? If not, is there anyone here to speak in favor of this request?

Mr. Mark Smiley stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm with Smiley & Associates. We agree...we worked hard with Travis on everything. (Inaudible due to technical difficulties.)

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

Mr. Enns stated – Does the driveway, does it connect to the furniture mart driveway?

Mr. Smiley asked – Is it aligned with it?

Mr. Enns – Yes.

Mr. Smiley continued – It is aligned with opposite sides ...one on the north end...(inaudible).

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

Mr. Enns – Right. Alright.

Mrs. Gates asked – Are there any further questions? No? (Addressing the applicant) Thank you very much. Is there anyone here to speak against this request? I don't think so. What are the wishes of the Board on this item?

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS STATED BY STAFF THAT THE STORAGE FOR THE PROPERTY CANNOT EXCEED 20 PERCENT OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA. Seconded by Ms. Benton. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Mrs. Gates stated to the applicant – You will be receiving a notice of the time when this will go before the City Commission. And we wish you luck on it. Thank you.

Mr. Smiley – Thank you.

Agenda Item #5 – Crossroads Industrial Park – Approval to allow the construction of a commercial warehouse complex. Located in Crossroads Industrial Park. Owner is Pierce Management, LLC, and applicant/representative is Mark Smiley of Smiley & Associates, Inc.

Staff Report – Mr. Gibbons stated – This is a request for site plan approval for construction of flex office warehousing. This is within the Crossroads Park. It's a total of 122,880 sq. ft. These type of buildings are going to incorporate your auto body facilities, your marble tile, trucking terminals, things in that nature. There is going to be a mixed-use of office, about 7,600 sq. ft. of office in each building, and 23,000 sq. ft. of warehouse in each building for total of the 122,000 (122,880) sq. ft. They've met and exceeded all requirements when it comes to parking, landscaping. And they've also done a nice entry feature for the property. They've put in brick pavers. And have done sort of a roundabout, just a decorative feature. And staff recommends approval of this site plan.

Mrs. Gates stated – Alright, thank you. Are there questions for staff on this item?

Mrs. Minton asked – May I ask one question? In my notes I don't have elevations. Is it in here and I'm just missing it? I look through it again rapidly if it is.

Mr. Gibbons stated – Yes, it should be. If not, I have them right here as well.

Mrs. Minton – Okay.

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

Mr. Gibbons is showing the elevations to the Board at this time.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

Mr. Gates stated – While we’re looking at the elevations, are there any other questions for staff on this issue?

Mr. Enns stated – Travis, I’m sorry, is the rear backed up to (I-) 95?

Mr. Gibbons stated – No, it’s actually on the west side of the park.

Mr. Enns – Oh, okay.

Mrs. Gates asked – Is everyone satisfied? Okay, is there anyone here to speak in favor of this request?

Mr. Mark Smiley stood once again and introduced himself and stated – (Inaudible....) and we’re here to answer any questions.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay. Are there any questions for the applicant on this issue? None? (Addressing the applicant) Thank you. Is there anyone here to speak against this request? Okay, I’ll entertain a motion from the Board on this item.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MS. BENTON TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN. Seconded by Mr. Enns. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Mrs. Gates stated to the applicant – You will be receiving a notice of this when it goes before the City Commission. It looks like a good project; thank you.

Mr. Smiley – Thank you very much.

Agenda Item #6 – Site Plan with Conditional Use – Dickson Commerce – Approval for the construction of a commercial/warehouse business complex. Located at 3510 S. U.S. 1. Owner/applicant is Dickson Commerce Center LLC, and representative is Glen Hanks Consulting Engineers.

Staff Report – Mr. Gibbons stated – This is a site plan and conditional use for construction of a flex office and warehouse and business complex off of Dickson Drive off of U.S. 1. The project consists of two buildings for a total of 61,000 sq. ft. of space. And once again, this would be for the same type of businesses as marble and tile granite roofing. The design layout of this project will be placed back about 250 ft. off of U.S. 1. They’re going to have an out parcel, in which they have gone through the minor replat application process. That will be designed as a retail commercial...regular retail commercial for restaurants, things in that nature. They’ve done a good job with this project with working with staff and taking our comments, which would be a reduction in the number of buildings. They’ve designed their façade to surround...if you look at the site plan it’s the way it’s angled and the way it’s done, is that the façade will face all right-of-ways and it will face the project behind it as well. All loading will be done in the rear of the project. Also they have a main entry feature off of Dickson Drive. That will be a roundabout

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

that will connect the two projects once they're finished. And also there's one other thing; that would be their landscaping. They've gone ahead and provided good landscaping, they're preserving a lot of the trees within the project, and they've also provided additional landscaping for the out parcel, which they don't even have to do right now, to act as a visual buffer. And staff recommends approval.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay, thank you very much, Travis. Are there any questions for staff on this request?

Mr. Enns asked – Don't we have a couple of other projects that are going to use Dickson as their entrance way for an emergency?

Mr. Gibbons stated – Correct. That would be the Preserve at Gator Trace, which would be using Dickson as a secondary access. Right now that's an unimproved street, so the applicant's going to be providing ...they're going to be improving the street up their entrance, and then the Preserve will take care of the rest. That's my understanding of it.

Mr. Enns stated – So, the Preserve's entrance is further to the east.

Mr. Gibbons stated – Their service entrance will actually be through the Gator Trace Boulevard; that will be their main entrance. But this is their secondary entrance.

Mrs. Gates asked – Okay, any other questions for staff?

Mrs. Minton stated – Somewhere in here it said loop back to Gator Trace. What was that referring to?

Mr. Gibbons stated – I believe that was talking about the water system.

Mrs. Minton – Okay. So, it's going to be connected to Gator Trace's..?

The Applicant stated – We're working with the civil engineer. We're going to tie them together ... (inaudible?).

Mrs. Minton stated – Okay. And Travis, it says with conditional use. What is the conditional use?

Mr. Gibbons stated – The conditional use is actually for the flex warehouse. The warehouse aspect of this project requires the conditional use.

Mrs. Minton – Okay.

Mrs. Gates asked – Are there any other questions?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

Mr. Enns stated – Just to get it straight in my mind though. The front 250 ft., though, is going to be future commercial use?

Mr. Gibbons stated – That’s correct. They’ve already applied for the actual minor replat; and that will be a 1.46-acre out parcel.

Mr. Enns – Okay.

Mr. Gibbons continued – So, that building’s future design will actually mask from U.S. 1 this project.

Mr. Enns asked – So, eventually you will not be able to see....

Mr. Gibbons added – You will never know it’s there.

Mr. Enns – Okay.

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

Mr. José Jaramillo stood and introduced himself and stated – ...We’ve been working with Travis on the project, and we took care of a lot of the considerations that the City had. And we think it’s turned out to be much better project. We’ve addressed....(inaudible)....and some of the landscape requirements...also, we took advantage of the(inaudible?).

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

Mrs. Minton asked – Are we having any turning lanes put in? Is there a turning lane? If we have big trucks going in there, are they going to...?

The applicant stated – We’re right now in the process of turning lanes from U.S. 1...There would be a one-way entrance into the project...(inaudible?).

Mrs. Gates asked – Any other questions? (Addressing the applicant) Thank you very much.

The applicant – Thank you.

Mrs. Gates asked – Is there anyone here to speak against this request? I don’t think so. Okay. What are the Board’s wishes on this issue?

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. POITIER TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN WITH CONDITIONAL USE. Seconded by Mr. Enns. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

Mrs. Gates stated to the applicants – Okay, your request has been approved and you’ll receive a notice when the item goes before the City Commission. It looks like a good project. I like the color in it. So, good luck.

The applicants – Thank you.

Agenda Item #7 – Site Plan with Conditional Use – Prestige Concrete Block Plant – Approval for the construction of a concrete block plant and storage facility. Generally located on the corner of Prosperity Lane & Selvitz Road. Owner/applicant is K & M Properties, LLC, and representative is Richard Ladyko, of Culpepper & Turpening.

Staff Report – Mr. Gibbons stated – This is a site plan with conditional use for a concrete block plant within the Fort Pierce Business Park Phase II. This is property that has been recently annexed in the past six (6) months. This is for a 28,875 sq. ft. building, which will be used for the block manufacturing. The main concern that staff has is the open storage of the blocks. Now, they won’t be on the property for long...that’s for sure, but there will be open storage of the blocks. We’ve requested that they provide a berm on the property to raise the landscape buffer and then on top of it we are requiring mature trees to be placed on the Selvitz right-of-way just on that right-of-way. And those trees would be in the four (4) inch caliper, 16 foot tall range. And those would be double checked at permitting time as well. But this is a necessary evil, so to speak, we do need these type of facilities, and we have recently annexed this property. It did have a heavy industrial use within the County; but within the City of Fort Pierce it has the I-1, Light Industrial, thus the conditional use. I think it’s a good opportunity just for it to set an example on how to have these type of facilities, but yet make them visually attractive within the community. And we recommend approval based on the four (4) inch caliper, 16 foot trees on Selvitz Road and sidewalks placed on the right-of-ways.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay, thank you. Are there any questions for staff on this item?

Mr. Enns stated – The project is on Selvitz Road....but is there sidewalks on Selvitz now?

Mr. Gibbons stated – No there is not. And within Prosperity Park there is also no sidewalks.

Mr. Enns asked – Then, why are we requiring them to put in sidewalks?

Mr. Gibbons stated – Actually all projects within the City of Fort Pierce are required to have sidewalks on the right-of-ways for any construction over \$10,000.

Mr. Enns continued – So, anybody who wants to walk by the block plant they can....

Mr. Gibbons stated – Well, in addition, you have to think this is for the future...you will have future growth; you will have future expansion; and it will tie into future projects.

Mr. Enns – I understand.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

Ms. Benton stated – Travis, is there any residential out in that area right now?

Mr. Gibbons stated – No, that is completely industrial. There is Fort Pierce Business Park Phase II to the north, and then Cargill and those other facilities to the east.

Ms. Benton stated – And not that I'm opposing it, I like it, but why was there was there so emphasis on the buffering?

Mr. Gibbons stated – Because there is going to be future residential to the south and that will be a connector, Selvitz Road to Edwards Road. And it's a way to have a visualization to kind of buffer that property.

Ms. Benton stated – Okay, thank you.

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

Mr. Richard Ladyko stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm with Culpepper & Turpening. Here with me is Thomas Lang, who is with Prestige ...block plant. We're here to answer any questions you might have. A couple of things I'd like to point out that Travis didn't mention; ...on top of the landscape there's a continuous hedge between the trees ...(inaudible?)...Also I'd like to mention, ...(inaudible?)...that it's not necessarily residential area but continued industrial area...Midway industrial...Phase III north will have an entrance on Selvitz Road a little bit further to the south. This particular project is on the west corner of Prosperity...(inaudible?)...Prestige also has a concrete manufacturing plant located immediately adjacent to this project on the east side of Selvitz Road. We confer with staff's recommendation, and look forward to seeking approval.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay. Are there any questions for the applicants?

Ms. Benton stated – Just a simple question. How much noise, if any, is there associated with this business?

Mr. Thomas Lang stated – Certainly no less than the activities that are going on around the site. There's a concrete plant across the street, and two block plants going in behind our project right now. (Inaudible?)...We will be meeting all sound requirements....(inaudible?).

Ms. Benton – Okay.

Mrs. Gates asked – Any further questions? (Addressing the applicants) Thank you very much.

The applicants – Thank you.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

Mrs. Gates asked – Is there anyone here to speak against this request? If not, I'll entertain a motion from the Board.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN WITH CONDITIONAL USE WITH THE CONDITIONS STATED BY STAFF OF THE FOUR (4)-INCH CALIPER, 16-FOOT TREES ON SELVITZ ROAD AND SIDEWALKS PLACED ON THE RIGHT-OF-WAYS. Seconded by Mr. Harris. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Mrs. Gates stated to the applicants – Okay, you will be receiving a notice of when you'll go before the City Commission on this. And I wish you the best of luck. Thank you.

The applicants – Thank you very much.

Agenda Item #8 – Site Plan/Rezone to PUD – Magnolia Park – Approval of a Preliminary Planned Unit Redevelopment (PUD). Located at 3602, 3610, and 3612 S. U.S. 1. Owner is Van Dyke, LLC, and applicant/representative is Thomas Lucido & Associates.

Staff Report – Mr. Gibbons stated – This is a mixed-use development on U.S. 1. It's for 32 multi-family units and 22 single-family plotted lots within a 5.5-acre development. There is a total of 54 units, a density of 9.8 units per acre. If you know the location, it's within an area where there is a mobile home park to the north and a storage building to the south. It's undeveloped and I believed it's undeveloped forever. This is a low-intensity multi-family type development. It's set back in the Key West Style. It's supposed to model the type of the Key West architecture and the type of single-family development is placed on the streets connected to sidewalks...the zero-lot-line-type homes. And also the multi family is the Key West Style architecture as well. There are four (4) buildings and those are going to be placed closer to U.S. 1. And also the single-family (homes) extend back from U.S. 1 all the way to the rear of the property. They've met and exceeded all requirements of the PUD application process, 40 percent open space requirements, and they've also taken in staff's recommendation to increase buffering to the mobile home park to the north and to the south. And staff recommends approval of the site plan and rezoning.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay, thank you, Travis. Are there any questions for our staff?

Mrs. Minton asked – Madam Chairman. Travis, why are we considering changing General Commercial to high density on property that abuts U.S. 1? Can you explain that to me?

Mr. Gibbons stated – Well, it's not high density. High density would be anything over 15 units per acre; this is more in line with...The future land use of the property is General Commercial and it supports up to 15-18 units per acre; this is at roughly 9.9 units per acre. This is an area that has been undeveloped for many years. And it's also been blighted as well. This is an opportunity to have some new development. The impacts on this project and on the roadway system are minimal at best with 54 units; especially single family as half the project. This is

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

mainly a way to have a quality development that's going to be affordable because the applicant has worked with the City before and has provided affordable housing. It's not affordable housing in the sense of government subsidized or anything in that nature. But it would be for young families and things in that nature...And who can actually afford something now? You're probably talking in the upper 100's for a home...something in that nature. It's a chance for revitalization in that area.

Mrs. Minton stated – So, as I understand it, your reasoning for taking potential commercial property and turn it into residential, is only because nothing else has been put on there.

Mr. Gibbons stated – Well, that would be one instance, but like I said, in the future, it would be an extension of strip. You would have an extension of more commercial in this region, which does not support commercial right now.

Mrs. Minton asked – Well, you're putting something just at 3510 I believe?

Mr. Gibbons – Yes.

Mrs. Minton stated – And this is 36...

Mr. Gibbons stated – 36.. is farther south, and then farther south of this you have the ...on the corner of Midway and U.S. 1 you have the shopping center, and you have a shopping center to the east side as well. Extensions of commercial ...and the future...from what we've seen is that it's going to be more flex warehousing; it will more office warehousing. It's not a prime location for retail. For a pure retail development I'm curious, as the project before, about what type of activity they're going to get there. But it's a buffer. It's a good mixture to break up the commercial...the monogamy of the U.S. 1 retail corridor, with a small development in between it.

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

Mr. Enns stated – Just one comment. I think...I read somewhere...this is an odd-shaped lot also, I think, that's the reason why it would be difficult to put a commercial...

Mr. Gibbons stated – Yes. That was also within my report. Because of the shape of the property, it has a long extension in the rear of the property that's very narrow. It's pretty much unusable in a commercial aspect as well except for retention. And at that point, if it was developed in a commercial sense you'd have massing right on U.S. 1.; you'd have high intensity right on U.S. 1 and then pure retention in the rear. So, this kind of balances out the property as well.

Ms. Benton asked – Also, Travis, this is a proposed PUD, so does this preclude the use of it for commercial or does that mean this includes a possibility of some commercial...does it not?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

Mr. Gibbons stated – It does. That is, if the applicant ever wanted to go that route. But it's not a requirement.

Ms. Benton stated – I understand. Is there anything that's left here for that possibility after this development?

Mr. Gibbons stated – No. Just the size of the project and the size of the property; the property is only 5.5 acres, but the way they have it designed I don't see commercial as being a future use on the property...the way they have it designed now.

Ms. Benton continued – I guess my next question is, is it consistent with being a PUD?

Mr. Gibbons stated – It does meet all the requirements of a PUD for the PUD requirements that we have.

Mrs. Gates asked Ms. Benton – Does that answer your question?

Ms. Benton stated – Yes it does. I still wonder...I guess I'm wondering why a PUD when there's really never going to be, from what it appears, any usage of all aspect of what a PUD allows.

Mr. Gibbons stated – Well, there is a multi-family type of clause within General Commercial, as that's the zoning on it now. If the applicant wanted to they can come and propose sheer multi family. With the PUD it's allowing them to do a mixed-use project, which will actually put single family in this project as well instead of just purely multi family. So, it gives a better blend to the project than just straight multi family. That's the request for the PUD.

Ms. Benton – Okay, thank you.

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

Mr. Al Brodeur stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm with Thomas Lucido & Associates. With me tonight is David Bower ...What we're proposing tonight is a PUD...a parcel on U.S. 1. (Inaudible?) ...This will be geared towards first-time home buyers. And we'll provide an opportunity for them to live a nice community...(inaudible?)...We've paid a lot of attention to the architectural designs ...(inaudible?)...Now, I do understand some of the concerns about the commercial...(inaudible?)...in the past it was common practice to zone every main road and zone everything on both sides of the road (collectively?) ...(inaudible?)...This is an opportunity to provide additional uses...(inaudible?)...They're definitely affordable...(inaudible?)...He's also the developer of the new Magnolia Square on Sunrise...it's also an example of the quality of this project.

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

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

Mr. Enns asked – Al, the pictures that you handed us, is this actually a project that your client has done in Key West?

Mr. David Bower stated – I actually have pictures of Magnolia Square...

Mrs. Gates stated – These are great. Al, the pictures that we're seeing of Magnolia Square, is this kind of reminiscent of what ...?

Mr. Bower stated – Let me explain some of that. Basically what I've done ...Magnolia Square is approximately (inaudible?). I've spent countless hours designing Magnolia Square. I've spent a lot of time ...in Georgia...in Key West. And I merged basically Savannah, Georgia and Key West. I took the architecture of the Key West style and merged it with the landscaping of Savannah, Georgia; where there are one-way streets around parks, and oak trees. I mean Magnolia Square has five (5) main parks and three (3) or four (4) small parks. But basically, as I was building Magnolia Square, I was seeing a lot of people that couldn't quite get in, I know it was affordable in nature, they couldn't quite get in school teachers...we've sold to three or four school teachers in Magnolia Square. But are probably seven or eight who couldn't quite afford it. So what I did was scale it down just a slight, not effecting architecture in any way, shape or form. But the elevations are basically the same. But I said, what is the minimum needs for a new family to get in? And I came up with the design that you see there; which starts out as 1,000 sq. ft. We'll try to bring that in about \$160,000 per unit, which people can afford at this moment. Magnolia Square, right now, is selling at \$205,000 a unit. So, it brings in a lot of people. We've also come in with a design that's a 1 1/2 story. So, what that means is two things; one, a family would buy the actual unit, we finish the downstairs 100 percent, which we turn it into like a 2/2, or a 3/2 downstairs. Then the upstairs we leave that unfinished but all stubbed out and ready for something...The plumbing would all be ready. The electricity would all be up there, capped off. And ready for a future build. So, if newlyweds have a baby, a family to add to the situation, they can maybe remortgage their house as it appreciates and refinish the upstairs and add another 400 or 500 sq. ft. It's all under the roof. It will have windows and everything ready. Or they can actually go in contract with us in the very beginning to build it up to 1300...1500 sq. ft. finished unit. So, it brings more affordability ...(inaudible?). This is something nobody is doing. Everybody is laying out the maximum dollar and wanting to make the most amount of money from the highest priced units. So, very few people are actually doing this; so there is actually a hole in the nature that we have here where nobody's paying attention to it. I worked with staff and pretty much everyone in the City knows me, knows my product, knows that I build with quality. We don't fail inspections, we don't cut corners. You can see by the elevations that we're building now—I don't know how many have actually gone out to see our product. We built the parks first, then we started the construction of homes. So, that's something else that we developed. The land that we have here, we came to ...(inaudible?) It was already pre-approved for trailers, because this was part of the trailer park next to it. And this is a better design than what was already pre-approved. As far as the commercial, the problem with adding commercial to the land, the parking requirements would eat up the land instantly. And you end up with really nothing but a small little three (3)-unit strip center that might be an ice cream shop or something that's not going to really make any money and then it's going to be blighted in four (4) to five (5)

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

years. So reality is we're actually taking this unit and facing U.S. 1 with this. And then you've got a little bus stop—it's very hard to see in this—but I think you have a hand-out. There's a little unit in here that's actually for the children as a bus stop; which worked out well in Magnolia Square. Magnolia Square, we have a big gazebo that the children can come in and then the roundabouts around the bus stop. Also in here we took a picture...this park here...actually the part that you may have on the hand-out, and I took the exact park that I built in Magnolia Square, which I don't know...do you guys have a picture of the park?

Mrs. Gates stated – We don't have a picture but we have the ...

Mrs. Minton asked the applicant – Is this what you were referring to?

Mr. Bower continued – That's one of the parks. This is the picture of the (toddlers'?) park. I don't know if you guys can see it. But this is a playhouse. And then you can see the jungle set here. On this you can't quite see here...this is a little pirate ship with a sand box. And then on the other side of here is the picnic center. Here, you can see the pirate ship in this one. This is a tether ball and sand box...it's a bunch of events. We're taking this exact same park with the exact same equipment, and we're putting it in this property. And that would be built right off the bat ...(inaudible?) And then next to that is a park that is more geared for the adults with a gazebo and where the adults can picnic. So, you know, taking the park concept, which was so successful in Magnolia, and putting it into this next plan. The idea is to continue to try to build these kind of developments in Fort Pierce and set a precedence. I worked with staff and listening on the concepts and ...(inaudible?) The buildings are top of the line for what's happening right now.

Mrs. Gates stated – I have a question. I don't know for who. Travis, do you –I don't think I've had anything that has come before us yet where it was not quite finished as far as what he was talking about...the concept to make it affordable—it this something that is being done around the state?

Mr. Gibbons stated – It's probably fairly a new concept. You've seen where some developments have left 10 percent as like affordable without the upgraded kitchens and the upgrades baths. This would be the same concept but yet an unfinished extra room; where, in essence, it makes it more affordable. It's finished. It's plumbed...

Mr. Bower added – It's one big open space.

Mr. Gibbons and Mrs. Gates stated – Right.

Mr. Bower continued – Okay, it's basically 1 ½ story. You could almost say it's the attic. It's framed in such a way...you see a half of a story where you walk up to a house and you see the dormers sticking out from the roof...that's a half of a story.

Mrs. Gates – Okay.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

Mr. Bower continued – That would be left unfinished... There would not be a working bathroom up there. The big ticket items would be off the list. And you know, again, they can add it at any time...(inaudible?) You know, a person can get into the unit, spend \$160,000 and then two (2) years from now remortgage the house ...and pull out \$20,000 or \$30,000 and hire a contractor and just go in with the renovation. This way, as the family grows, it depends on what ...maybe it's going to be two (2) bedrooms for the toddlers, maybe it's going to be a big master bedroom and the kids are going to be downstairs. It gives a versatile, you know, feel.

Mrs. Gates – Right.

Mr. Bower continued – We also have two or three other models that we plan on putting there...(inaudible?) We've been very successful in Magnolia Square with our Springfield models...1,265 sq. ft. ...The second I opened one up it sold instantly. And I've been restricting it because you don't want 40 Springfields down the street. So, it's really neat; it has a three (3) bedroom, two (2) bath. The master bedroom has two (2) small closets, it has a double vanity. It's the perfect family house in that price range. So, that model is (obsolete?) now; it's \$205,000, because of the various reasons of gates and all of the texture things ...(inaudible?) to kind of get into affordability.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay, thank you. Are there any other questions for the applicant? Good design. (Addressing the applicant) Thank you very much.

Mrs. Benton stated – I have a question. I just have the question of the type of construction material that is the project is being built out of...the houses and the multi-family units. By that I mean, what are we talking about here in terms of construction materials...wood, block,...?

Mr. Bower stated – My houses are modular...they go on CBS foundations...and we bring them...we build them in Georgia, and assemble them and build porches and fine tune everything...(inaudible?). You definitely owe it to yourself to tour Magnolia Square. All of our stuff has been through both hurricanes (of 2004) with no damage.

Mrs. Gates asked – Any further questions for the applicant? (Addressing the applicant) Thank you very much. Is there anyone here to speak against this request? Hearing none, what are the wishes of the Board on this item?

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN/PUD. Seconded by Mr. Poitier. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Mrs. Gates stated to the applicants – Okay, your request has been approved and you'll receive notice when it goes before the City Commission. Good project. Good luck.

The applicants – Thank you.

Agenda Item # 9 – Rezone & Future Land Use Amendment – Lenders Plus, Inc. – Approval to rezone the subject property from R-4, Medium Density Residential, to R-5, High

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

Density Residential. The Future Land Use of the subject property from RM, Medium Density Residential, to RH, Residential High Density. Located at 2901 Avenue D. Owner/applicant is Lenders Plus, Inc., and Brahm & Moore, Attorney at Law.

Staff Report – Mr. Gibbons stated – The applicant is proposing a zoning and land use change to high density residential. There is an existing 20-unit apartment complex on the property. The property is 1.34 acres in size. And zoning currently permits 10 units per acre, thus it creates a non-conforming use. The applicant is requesting to do a condominium conversion to this property; and in order to do that applicable zoning and densities must conform to each zoning. However, this is within an area of medium density and also single family to the south. And a request to rezone to RH for a land use in R-5, high density would be spot zoning it; and staff does not support spot zoning to that nature. In addition, it's not a good planning practice to rezone property just to make it conform to the code. In order for them to conform with the code with density, that's why they've requested the actual rezoning. And staff recommends denial.

Mrs. Gates stated – Thank you. Are there any questions for staff on this item?

Mr. Enns asked – Mrs. Chair, is the City going to be doing a project right across the street from this also?

Mr. Gibbons stated – Yes. That would be the Human Development Resource Center, right, Hector?

Mr. Arias – Yes.

Mr. Gibbons added – And that's commercial land as of right now.

Mrs. Gates asked – Okay, are there any further questions for staff?

Ms. Benton stated – Maybe I'm missing something....But are they proposing to add units?

Mr. Gibbons – No, ma'am.

Ms. Benton continued – Just to convert?

Mr. Gibbons stated – They want to do a condominium conversion for ownership. It's an apartment complex right now.

Mr. Enns asked – And they want to make it a fee simple...?

Mr. Gibbons – Correct.

Ms. Benton asked – And that accounts for greater density for what we have there already?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

Mr. Gibbons stated – Correct. Right now it allows 10 units per acre. They’re requesting to go to R-5, which allows 15 units per acre and thus that would make their property in compliance. But within the area you have R-4 zoning surrounding the property....commercial to the north, and then residential single family to the south. And this is a spot zoning issue and staff doesn’t support that.

Ms. Benton stated – I guess that’s why I asked the question whether they were going to ...did they have room or were they planning to add any units?

Mr. Gibbons – No.

Ms. Benton continued – So, from a practical point of view, nothing is changing...?

Mr. Gibbons stated – Nothing is changing on the property. What this does ...you have your zoning that’s in place...it is non-conforming in essence; but yet, future development, whether this was torn down ...if it’s destroyed we have codes and issues in place to deal with these issues. And thus the project that would come if it was destroyed would be a project that’s suited to the neighborhood, which would be a medium density at 10 units to the acre.

Mrs. Gates asked Ms. Benton – Does that answer your question?

Ms. Benton – Yes, it does.

Mrs. Gates asked – Any further questions? If not, is there anyone here to speak in favor of this request? I don’t think so. Is there anyone here to speak against this request? I don’t think we have any representatives here on this issue. Okay, what are the wishes of the Board on this?

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO RECOMMEND DENIAL OF THE REZONE & FUTURE LAND USE AMENDMENT BASED ON STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL OF “SPOT ZONING.” Seconded by Mr. Poitier. Unanimously denied by roll call vote.

Mrs. Gates stated – The next items are three (3) annexations. Mr. Walker, may we take these collectively.

Attorney Walker stated – That is a matter of discretion for the Chair and the Board at this level.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay. If it’s okay with the Board I’m going to ask that items #10, #11, & #12 be presented together by staff. And if it’s okay we will go ahead and vote on them as a collective issue. But I would like to have them presented separately.

Agenda Item #10 – Annexation – Craig/Cook – Approval of an annexation of property identified as having contiguous municipal boundaries of Fort Pierce. Generally located at Kings Hwy. & White Road. Owners/applicants are Steven Craig & Christopher Cook.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

Staff Report – Mr. Gibbons stated – This is a 40-acre piece that’s contiguous on White Road and its proposed land use is C-3. Future Land Use is CG, General Commercial. And staff recommends approval.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay, item #11

Agenda Item #11 – Annexation – Eduardo Leal – Approval of an annexation of property identified as having contiguous municipal boundaries of Fort Pierce. Located at 4202 P;eamder Avenue. Owner/applicant is Eduardo A. Leal, and representative is Jacquin & Sons.

Staff Report – Mr. Gibbons stated – This is a property on 4202 Oleander. It’s 9.32 acres. The proposed zoning is R-4, and Future Land Use is RM. And staff recommends approval.

Agenda Item #12 – Annexation – Dickson – Pierce Properties, LLC. – Approval of an annexation of property identified as having contiguous municipal boundaries of Fort Pierce. Located at 570 West Weatherbee Road. Owner/applicant is Dickson-Pierce Properties, LLC.

Staff Report – Mr. Gibbons stated – This would be an 18-acre piece off of Weatherbee Road. It’s a compromise of about 10 parcels. And staff recommends approval.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay. Are there any questions for the staff on any of these three (3) items for annexation? No? Okay. Is there anyone here to speak in favor of any of the annexations?

Mr. Eugene (.....villa?...inaudible?) stood and introduced himself and stated – I’m here on behalf of Craig/Cook property to be annexed...(inaudible?) This property is adjacent to the City. Thank you.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay, thank you. Are there any questions for the applicant? Thank you very much. Okay, I don’t think there is anyone here to speak against this request; I don’t see anyone else in the room. So, having said that, what are the wishes of the Board of these three (3) issues?

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE THREE ANNEXATIONS: CRAIG/COOK PROPERTY, EDUARDO LEAL PROPERTY, & DICKSON-PIERCE PROPERTY. Seconded by Mr. Poitier. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Mrs. Gates stated to the applicant of one of the annexations – Okay, your request has been approved. You should be receiving a notice on that. Thank you very much.

Reverting back to Agenda Item #2 – Consideration of Absences.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay. I have we have to excuse or not excuse the two (2) that called in: Don Bergman and Tom Knott.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 11, 2005.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MS. BENTON TO APPROVE THE ABSENCES OF DON BERGMAN AND TOM KNOTT. Seconded by Mr. Poitier. Unanimously approved by voice vote.

Mrs. Gates continued – And I don't know if you all want to wait and see what Mr. Jeremiah Johnson has to say when he comes next time, but that would be fine with me.

Agenda Item #13 – Discussions

Mrs. Gates asked – Are there any further discussions for the Board this evening? There were none.

Adjournment of meeting at 8:30 p.m.