

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE FORT PIERCE CITY PLANNING BOARD HELD ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2005, IN THE CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBERS (due to anticipated seating accommodations for the public), 100 NORTH U.S. 1, FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA.

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

Members absent: Charlie Harris

Citizens and Staff present:

Seth Cohen	Fernando Leiva, AICP, Director of Planning
Brad Cohen	Travis Gibbons, Planning Administrator
Kevin Larrimore	James T. Walker, Assistant City Attorney
Gina Nelli	Dianna D. Rose, Administrative Secretary
Joe Friscia	
Mary A. Barrett	
William P. Durkin	
Beverly Butt	
Richard Jones	
Michael Weiner	
Garry L. Moore	
Diana Waite	
Paul Jacquin	
David Loring	
Dawn Gilmore	
Ken Natoli	
Troy Holloway	
Peter May	
Joseph DeFronzo	
Richard Keane	
John Donahue	
Maxine? Bernstein	
Fredric Bernstein	
Todd Felsen	
Tom Anderson	
Bobby Hoyte	
Taft Bradshaw	

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. Harris had called in.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Bergman asked – Alright, I guess we need to entertain a motion for Mr. Harris’ absence.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. JOHNSON TO EXCUSE THE ABSENCE OF MR. HARRIS. Seconded by Mr. Poitier. Unanimously approved by voice vote.

Agenda Item #3 – Approval of Minutes

Mr. Bergman asked – Has everyone had a chance to review the minutes of the November 8, 2005 meeting? Are there any comments or corrections that need to be made?

Mr. Johnson stated – Mr. Chair, one correction. My name is listed in the members present column there; I just wanted to make sure...

Ms. Rose – Sorry about that.

Mrs. Minton added – Mr. Chairman, Mr. Knott’s is listed twice as being present too.

Ms. Rose – Sorry.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any other corrections or comments that need to be made?

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 8, 2005 WITH THE CORRECTIONS. Seconded by Mr. Poitier. Unanimously approved by voice vote.

Agenda Item #4 – Site Plan/Rezoning to PUD – Yale Development – Approval of a Preliminary Planned Development (PUD). Located at the 2800 block of 35th Street. Owners are Roselle Cooney, Fredrick L. Birch, Brad Cohen & Georgia F. Wheeler; and applicant/representative is Steve Ball, of Land Planning Systems, Inc.

Staff Report – Mr. Leiva stated – Good evening, Mr. Chairman, good evening, members of the Board. I just want to say prior to starting the presentation we are featuring a new staff report; and I hope that you’ll understand that we are pretty much a work in progress. We are going to be able to make some adjustments as time goes by. But I just want to mention that the report in front of you is a new one, and hopefully that will soothe your needs as well as the Commission’s needs as well as the staff’s needs. With that, let me go ahead and start with the first item on the agenda. The subject application is regarding a request for a rezone and a preliminary development plan approval for a total of 80 of town home units and 52 single-family homes. The approximate location of it is the 2800 block of S. 35th Street near Kirby Loop Road. The future land use plan map shows RL, which is residential low density, less than 6.5 units to the acre. The zoning is R-1, low density residential. The parcel size is 24.55 acres. The existing use, for the most part of the land is vacant, and we do have a couple of single-family homes on two (2) lots. The proposed use is mixed-use development, again, which is going to be consistent

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

of single-family uses and multi-family town homes. In terms of the specific history on the piece of property...the property was annexed into the City of Fort Pierce back on the 18th of July of this year (2005); and the property is also being platted in St. Lucie County. And that's how it shows on the records at the County. In terms of the applicable codes and ordinances, Section 22-40, which is the Planned Unit Development, applies to this application; and also Section 22-128 of our land development code also applies to this application. Regarding the Comprehensive Plan considerations, the low density residential, as part of our Comprehensive Plan, primarily supports single-family dwelling; however, multi-family development is committed under an astringent development approval regulations. And again, that is subject to the maximum allowable density, which is 6.5 units to the acre. On page 4 of your staff report, basically what we've done is we summarized the comments that we have from the Technical Review Committee...excuse me, that is on page 5, and in terms of the application details, the elevation for the town homes and single-family units have been provided as part of your packet. The access, primarily, is provided by Tri-Ways? and garages for the town home building and for each of the single-family dwelling. In terms of the lighting, it will be provided by the street lights and will comply with provisions of Section 22-58 of our land development code. Drainage plans have been included and conceptually approved. Keep in mind, members of the Board, that the application before you tonight is an application which is going to be meeting a dual purpose; it's an approval for the PUD, which is the preliminary development plan, and it's also a request for approval of a rezone. As such, the drainage plans will come back when the final development plan is submitted for review. In terms of compatibility, the property is a mixed-use development incorporating single-family attached town homes; and again, 52 single-family lots. The properties to the east and north are single-family communities and the south is a proposed mixed-use community, which, I believe, is the next item on the agenda. We'll get a chance to have a discussion about that particular proposal as well. The project proposes to have a net density of 5.3 units to the acre. The surrounding zoning and land uses support 4 to 5 units per acre in the County. On page 5, as I said before, you will have a breakdown of the comments that were made as part of the Technical Review Committee, and really is broken down by disciplines; you have Planning and Zoning, Engineering, Solid Waste, Utilities, and some of the other agencies that have been contacted as part of the development review process. Within the staff analysis the staff finds that this application is in compliance, generally speaking, with our provisions of the land development code, as specifically as it relates to the planning unit development. And it's also in compliance, as it has been mentioned before, with the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Fort Pierce. As far as the staff recommendation, staff recommends approval for the PUD known as Yale Development, conditioned that the turn lanes are provided on the 35th Street entrance, which is the main entrance; and a \$50,000 contribution to the design and implementation to our roundabout at 35th Street and Douglas. I should say that members of the Board that \$50,000 contribution, that has been suggested by staff, basically the way that we arrived at this amount is by looking at the improvements really in a very general way at this point. I would say that in order to get a closer figure or perhaps a more up-to-date figure in the future, what we're going to be doing is we're going to be contacting some potential consultants and we're probably going to be asking them to give us an estimate of the project. And we're going to be developing the scope of services. I'm telling you this because \$50,000 along with the other \$50,000 that has been proposed by the development proposal to the south of

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

this site may not be enough for the construction of this improvement. And I'm talking about the roundabout at 35th and Douglas. So, again, the amount is very approximate. We feel that it may be probably higher than a \$100,000, which is what we are thinking at this point. Again, staff recommends approval of this application and we transmit this now for your review and further consideration. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

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

Mr. Enns asked – If the roundabout runs more than \$100,000, are you going to go back to the developers and try to collect the rest of the money from them?

Mr. Leiva stated – I haven't been privy to the discussions that the applicant may have had regarding the specific dollar amount. The \$50,000 that we are talking about is really a recommendation from my staff, and asking further about the total sum comes from. Again, I just related to you how we arrived at that amount. I would say, at this point, members of the Board, I would ask that you recommend approval on this particular application subject to a more up-to-date figure, which is going to come at a later time.

Mr. Enns stated – I have one more question. The sidewalks...I saw that there's a notation ...under the Planning and Zoning Technical Review...sidewalks are not placed on both sides of the street according to the plans?

Mr. Leiva stated – That is correct. I believe the comments from Planning and Zoning and really every other discipline have been met at this point.

Mr. Enns stated – Okay, so, they have put the sidewalk...?

Mr. Leiva stated – What you see on page 5, if I may, basically, are the comments that have been provided at the time that the application went through the technical review comments. And when you see the recommendation on the last page, basically we are saying, in this particular case, I don't see that we have mentioned that the comments have been addressed in the future, we're going to make a note of it at this point; yes, the comments have been addressed.

Mr. Enns asked – So, everything's been addressed on this?

Mr. Leiva – Yes.

Mrs. Minton stated – Mr. Chairman, so that means that the memorandum that we have dated November 7 (2005) with their responses. You have progressed pass that? For example, there were items in here dealing with everything from education to screening the dumpsters...all of those things you are satisfied with?

Mr. Leiva stated – I believe so. I'm going to refer that to Travis just to confirm to you, members of the Board, that that has been the case. But I believe that has been in place already.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Gibbons added – Yes. All those comments have been addressed. This application has gone through, I believe it was two (2) Technical Review Committee meetings. And those were prior comments that were being addressed as well. So, those were the comments prior to the 15th Technical Review in November.

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman, just a couple of questions for staff on this. Are these...the road that circles through the project...will this be a public road?...a dedicated road?

Mr. Gibbons stated – The actual roadway through the project would be a private maintained by the homeowner's association and the covenants of their PUD. Now, Douglas, on the other hand, the extension, would be a public road and would have to be constructed to County and City standards.

Mr. Knott continued – Okay, but the remainder of it is a private road...is this correct?

Mr. Gibbons – Correct.

Mr. Knott stated – And that being said, do you all have any concern that you have a public road basically...is there a guardhouse that I'm seeing there where Douglas turns and goes to the south? Is there some way for the public to turn around if they come into the project?

Mr. Leiva stated – I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question again, Tom, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Knott stated – I'm concerned that we have Douglas Street, which is public right-of-way, which they're going to approve, I believe, and it appears to stop...it dead ends into a private road system. Is there a turn around there? Is there a guardhouse that's going to be there? How do you stop the public from coming in here and if they do how does the public get turned around to get out of there?

Mr. Leiva asked Mr. Gibbons – Do we have an answer on that?

Applicant stated – I could probably clarify that...

Mr. Knott stated – I tell you what, Steve, I can a couple other questions for staff, then we'll get to that if you don't mind on that. And the other comment I had was the arrangement for the roundabout where they're participating and paying for that. That's good that you modify the agreement to adjust it to a more realistic figure once you get this. Are you still going to split it among the two developers...would that be the intent?

Mr. Gibbons stated – That was the intent from the get go...absolutely.

Mr. Knott stated – And I think the other one is here tonight to join in on this thing. So, we'll be doing it the same time. And one last...just for clarity. In the environment report, on page 7 of 7, under their summary, it says, as you probably know, the development of the property will

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

require permits from the City of Port St. Lucie and South Florida Water Management District. I know that Port St. Lucie likes to get their fingers into things (humorously). Perhaps they could change that to Fort Pierce. Thank you. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions for staff?

Mr. Johnson stated – On 35th Street, is that road a City maintained roadway ...County maintained?

Mr. Leiva stated – It's a County road.

Mr. Johnson stated – Okay. So, their design has included the turn lane, if I'm not mistaken, on the memorandum on the left hand...I guess it would be a southbound turn lane...that's correct?

Mr. Leiva – That is correct.

Mr. Johnson continued – Because it seems, if I remember correctly, there's quite ...aren't there large ditches on each side of 35th Street?

Mr. Knott added – Yeah there are.

Mr. Johnson continued – How's that....?

Mr. Gibbons – No.

Mr. Johnson – Okay.

Mr. Knott added – There are swales along there, I know that. Swale drainage.

Mr. Johnson – Alright.

Mr. Leiva stated – If I may, if I could just add that ...the improvements on 35th actually are going to be subject to County standards. So, whatever those standards are, the applicant, in this case, is going to be able to meet those standards.

Mr. Johnson – Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any other questions for staff? Alright, hearing none, is there anyone here to speak on this project?

Mr. Steve Ball stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm with Land Planning Systems, 201 S.W. P.S.L. Blvd. in Port St. Lucie. And I'm glad to be tonight representing our client, Yale Development, on this PUD project. We've been working on it for quite some time now, and made several revisions based on staff's concerns, and this is a rendering of it here to my left for

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

your review...24.5 acres, as staff said, 132 units, and less than the density that would be permitted by the land use. We have a 40% open space. And I just wanted to point out that the common open space areas include trails around the wetland, there's a residential play area, there's a swimming pool, a clubhouse with parking, a lake with a pavilion on it, and a pedestrian access to that. And we have a bus stop and sidewalks and street lights. So, we try to design the project to accommodate recreation activities for the people that live there. And provide both single family and town-house type of developments. We are also improving the sewer and water service to the area. And, as was mentioned, we're paving this portion of...extension of Douglas to Kirby Loop Road as part of the project. And putting sidewalks and curb and gutters along this as well to the north along 35th Street up to IRCC property on the west side of 35th Street. So, the sidewalks will connect and you can eventually get up to the school there either walking or riding a bicycle. We intend to be a good neighbor and to help provide housing for the City and for the IRCC staff and the students in this vicinity. And we agree with the staff comments and the recommendations in the staff report. And just a note; on the issue of the costs for the roundabout, we would like to contribute to that whatever our proportionate fair share. If there's another project that has greater impacts on that, then hopefully they would pay a greater amount of improvement in relative to the overall impact of that. So, I would ask that the staff keep that in mind when you go through this costing exercise to determine what's appropriate. And one other point, on the buffering on this side of the project, on the east side of the project, there is 15 ft. of improved landscaping and then there's a 25 ft. drainage easement also. And then we have a 15 ft. setback for the homes on the lots, so there would be a minimum of 55 ft. between the homes on this project and the adjacent homes; probably greater than that if they're set back from that easement. I just wanted to point that out because I know that the neighbors are concerned about the buffering; and we would like to make sure that we have a healthy landscape...a mature buffer as well for them. One last point that I think I overlooked was that we have two (2) entrances, so there's good traffic circulation. And the project will not be gated, it will open for the public to come and go as they please through the project; and have the neighbors visit and so forth. And if it's a concern that we have a public street coming into a private street our clients are willing to consider dedicating that street to the City, provided they take over those maintenance responsibilities. So, with that I'll just close and be glad to answer any questions you may have.

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

Mr. Enns stated – Mr. Chairman, a project this size, I assume there's probably going to be quite a few families in this ...do you see them using the wetland as a play area? I mean, is there like a ...?

Mr. Ball stated – No, I don't think so. This is the wetland in the light green here (referring to renderings); and there's a trail that goes around the outside of the wetland area. And then we also have this recreation field here and quite a big area next to it...it's just an open play area that we set aside, both to meet our open space requirements and for the purpose of having that unimproved open space for the community as well.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Enns asked – So, that’s between the basketball court and building H there?

Mr. Ball – Yes, sir.

Ms. Benton asked – Where is the Brazilian peppers disturbed land in reference to the buildings there? And how would that impact and what, if anything, are you all going to do about it?

Mr. Ball stated – I don’t know exactly. I’d have to go back and look through the environmental report in detail, but I know that there are some on there. There is probably a map in there in the report for your review. It will taken out, it will be removed...the Brazilian peppers.

Mr. Bergman asked Mr. Leiva – Do you have a question?

Mr. Leiva stated – I do have one question, Mr. Chairman, and I do have a statement that I’d like to make relative to the comment from the applicant. Just do the quick math and this particular development is proposing 132 units all together, if I’m not mistaken. Then the next proposal that you’re going to see it does proposed quite a few more units. So, I think the statement of coming out with a proportionate share on this application and on the next one, and any other that may be in the pipeline. As I understand, we don’t have any other ones at this point. But if there is any in the future, I think this statement is very well taken in terms that we can go ahead and figure it out what is the specific portion or share as far as this application. And then the question that I do have is ...you know, I haven’t looked in my staff report, I haven’t been able to find the specifics on the open space...and the question is ...we’re going to be doing the calculations in the future as far as 75% of the open space that has been proposed, should be used for common space as opposed to used by individual property owners. I guess the question is, have you made the calculations? And can you speak on that?

Mr. Ball stated – Well, 40%, which is what’s required by the code, is common usable open space.

Mr. Leiva – That’s right.

Mr. Ball continued – The remaining of the open space would be within the project but not necessarily accessible for the general public use; and I believe that complies with the code.

Mr. Leiva stated – Again, my question is within that 40% of open space that has been set aside as part of this side plan application, the question is my code says that at least 75% of the required open space area must be common open space.

Mr. Ball stated – I’m sorry, I misunderstood.

Mr. Leiva continued – That is the question.

Mr. Ball stated – Oh yes. It’s all...the 40% is all available for public use.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Leiva stated – That’s all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bergman – Thank you. Any other questions?

Mr. Knott stated – Yes. Mr. Chairman, I’m trying to find the survey that goes with this; I’m sure it’s in here somewhere but I can’t locate it. But my question is Douglas, as it comes in, you all are going to pave that up to the City’s standards?

Mr. Ball – Yes. Which is this entrance road here.

Mr. Knott asked – You have like a 24 ft. road with 2 ft. of curb and gutter on each side?

Mr. Ball stated – Right. And inside walks as well.

Mr. Knott continued – My question is, where it turns and goes to the south, and that’s when I just happen to notice it...it appears to have a full right-of-way...

Mr. Ball – Yes.

Mr. Knott continued - ...But you’re only paving 12 ft. of it.

Mr. Ball stated – Actually we’re not paving any of that right-of-way. And the reason for that, is because that right-of-way is a County right-of-way, and it’s use for drainage purposes of that area.

Mr. Knott asked – Oh, is there a ditch in there?

Mr. Ball stated – Yes, there is a ditch.

Mr. Knott stated – Okay. So, that’s off the other half of the right-of-way that you got your 12 ft. pavement?

Mr. Ball stated – No, sir. We moved it out of that area.

Mr. Knott stated – So, the intent of that is that you’re just providing an exit rather than putting a cul-de-sac down?

Mr. Ball stated – Yes. For traffic circulation, for these people that come down here, they can continue on and circulate back to the exit.

Mr. Knott stated – Okay. I guess what I’m getting at is normally when you have a right-of-way like that, it’s been recorded evidently, that’s why I was looking for the survey to see it was part of a plat. You either try to fill it out because it looks like it goes somewhere; I don’t if it ties into the project to the south or if it’s something that needs...?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Ball stated – No. There's a canal that runs on the south part of the boundary here, and so it doesn't actually go anywhere. It stops at the canal, and I think the next project on your agenda is the one that's on the other side of that canal.

Mr. Knott stated – I think that they just back up to, I don't think that they have a point of a ...

Mr. Ball stated – So, it could probably be vacated through the County, and if you want to pursue that. But since it's used for drainage in the area we wanted to maintain the historical drainage flows and not get into all of that.

Mr. Knott stated – As long as you all aren't just taking half of it...

Mr. Ball stated – No we're not. We're outside of the right-of-way.

Mr. Knott stated – One question of staff. Staff, is that interlocal agreement here with the County, is that something that they...that's their right-of-way...is there any need for you to ask them if they have any plans to extend that ...or is it too late to ask that or....?

Mr. Ball stated – As part of this application...you probably have a letter in your file. I sent a copy of the plans to the County and just asked them to review it. I haven't heard back from them.

Mr. Knott asked – So, we're covered on that then?

Mr. Ball – Yes.

Mr. Knott continued – Because a lot of times they'll get ...

Mr. Ball stated – Right. We wanted to know if they had concerns.

Mr. Knott stated – That's very good, thank you. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ball – Yes.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions of staff? Travis, I have one for you. What's the density allowed in R-1?

Mr. Gibbons stated – The density in R-1 is four (4) units per acre.

Mr. Bergman stated – So, this was zoned RS4 in the County, which is four (4) units per acre.

Mr. Gibbons – Correct.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Bergman continued - ...Which matches R-1 for City; and it has a residential low density, but we're going to allow a density of 5.5 units per acre?

Mr. Gibbons stated – In essence, that would be the approval. Also, on top of it, you could think of it as a bonus density for the mixed-use development.

Mr. Bergman – Okay.

Mr. Leiva added – I think the question is R-1, again, is a low density residential and currently our zoning allows up to six (6) units to the acre (this will be corrected later on by Mr. Leiva). So, in essence, the proposal is coming a little bit under the maximum that is allowed for this zoning district.

Mr. Ball stated – Also the future land use map of both the County and the City allow the density that we're proposing. So, even though it had different zoning categories, when it was annexed in the City, it's now my understanding that it's the City's policy to apply the lowest density that's available when a residential property comes in. But under the County land use map, as well as the City's land use map, the density is allowed.

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, the only reason I'm bringing this up is apparently there was some question at the Technical Review Meeting that there was some issues with compatibility with surrounding land use. And the other question that I had...has your site plan addressed the school bus stop issue that was brought up?

Mr. Ball stated – Yes, we have a turnaround area here, but also, initially that was brought up because we were considering having it gated. And because it's not gate a bus would be able to come through either from the north or from the middle and circulate through the project. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bergman asked – Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on this project?

Mr. Gary Moore stood and introduced himself and stated – I live at 2801 Grove Drive. We're directly east of the ...right here (referring to the renderings). The project is very nice. We're very happy with it, we just have one problem with it...the buffer. I work for Culpepper & Turpening, and I've been doing plats for 10 years; I've never dealt with a 15 ft. buffer. We do have a 25 ft. buffer on our property and drainage easement; that's a private drainage easement. So, they have a 15 ft. We would like it somewhat compatible...minimum of 25 ft. on their part. Our offsets for our houses are larger. They have a lot more houses, we only have one (1)-acre lots there. So, 15 ft. is not very much. It's very small as a matter of fact. I have a lot of trees that I've planted and taken care of it behind, so we do have somewhat of a buffer. But that is a 25 ft. buffer on our property, and theirs is just 15 ft.

Mr. Bergman asked – Has that been brought up to the applicant prior to this?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Moore stated – We've talked to them a little bit about it, yes. So, that's mainly what we have to say about that. But, like I said, it's 10 years and I've done most of the plats in St. Lucie County and we've never seen a 15 ft. buffer. So, we would like you to think about that. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bergman stated – Alright, thank you. Were there any questions?

Mr. Leiva stated – Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a correction for the record. I did just say to you a few minutes ago that the R-1 district allows up to six (6) units per acre and I do want to make a correction. I apologize for that. I was thinking of the land use. The R-1, the existing zoning on the property, actually does allow an average net density of less than four (4) units per acre. I just wanted to make that correct. I apologize.

Mr. Bergman stated – Alright, thank you. Is there anyone here to speak on this project?

Mr. Paul Jacquin stood and introduced himself and stated – I reside at 2707 Grove Drive, which is just east of this project on their north boundary. I also would like to say that the 15 ft. buffer is just not acceptable...it's just not enough. The 25 ft. that they're talking about, I pay taxes on. And also I would like to see an earth berm on it. And I also have a couple of other items, one, is there is congestion at Cortez and 25th Street. There is a project going into the County for approval that is just south of Cortez, which is going to add to the traffic coming out on Cortez, which is already very heavy. A lot of accidents have happened there. I'd like to see a traffic light at this intersection of Cortez and 25th Street. Drainage...he talked about historical drainage, which are drainage is for us, not for them. And just a quick question; is it rental units, lease units, or is it owner purchased units, just curious.

Mr. Ball stated – For sale...purchased.

Mr. Jacquin – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman stated – Thank you, Paul. Were there any questions for Mr. Jacquin?

Mr. Enns asked – Paul, if they did put an earth berm across the east side there, would that satisfy you?

Mr. Jacquin stated – Yes, it would. But when they do the berm, there's a slope on that berm and I'm afraid that 15 ft. just isn't going to get it; they're going to have to have more area. And with the vegetation it would either have to be very heavy or fenced.

Mr. Enns continued – If they did do an earth berm what would you feel comfortable with as far as the height?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Jacquin stated – It should be at least four (4) ft.; a lot of them are six (6) ft. And then they're fenced...four (4) ft. is fenced. Get the height up so we have our privacy that we have.

Mr. Enns asked - ...And then screen it with landscaping?

Mr. Jacquin – Right.

Mr. Johnson stated – Mr. Chair, Mr. Jacquin, could you describe the characteristics of the drainage easement that's right there?

Mr. Jacquin stated – Well, I have not been privy to this. And our properties don't show on here. But I'm assuming that the 25 ft. they're talking about is to the east...our property line going east. Is that correct?

Mr. Ball asked – What was your question?

Mr. Jacquin stated – The drainage easement you speak of is from their eastern property line going east; is that correct?

Mr. Ball stated – It's along this dashed line here (referring to renderings)...

Mr. Jacquin added - ...Which is actually along somebody else's property.

Mr. Ball – That's right.

Mr. Jacquin – Okay.

Mr. Johnson continued – So, what are the physical characteristics that you see ...?

Mr. Jacquin asked – With that drainage ditch?

Mr. Johnson – Yes.

Mr. Jacquin stated – That's what drains us back to the south.

Mr. Johnson – Okay.

Mr. Jacquin continued – And it is historical, but we own it.

Mr. Johnson – Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman, if I could ask. Paul, what ...in addition to that 25 ft. or whatever it is ...the platted drainage easement...there's another 25 ft. off of your property that's....?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Jacquin stated – No. Have you got...?

Mr. Knott stated – Yes. It shows here a 25 ft. drainage easement; then they have their 15 ft.

Mr. Jacquin stated – Yeah, but this 25 ft. is actually on our property. This is our property line here (referring to rendering).

Mr. Knott asked – Is there a ditch in there?

Mr. Jacquin stated – Oh yeah.

Mr. Knott continued – So, that 25 ft...so that's as a buffer for your property over here then?

Mr. Jacquin stated – No, no...no. That's not to be included in their buffer.

Mr. Knott stated – No, I'm saying that for your property you're saying...

Mr. Jacquin stated – It's my property, right. They have an easement to travel that. We own it, we pay taxes on it.

Mr. Knott asked – So, you're thinking that they ought to go ahead and have a 25 ft. to match that 25 ft.

Mr. Jacquin – Yes, sir.

Mr. Knott – Thank you.

Mr. Jacquin – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Were there any other questions for Mr. Jacquin? Thank you, Paul.

Mr. Jacquin – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

Ms. Diana Waite stood and introduced herself and stated – I live at 2801 Grove Drive. It's the one (1)-acre lot subdivision that's just to the east of this. Within the subdivision there are drainage easements throughout the subdivision to serve those lots within the Grove Drive subdivisions. And there's just a small swale. Those are privately owned property. The buffer between our property lines and this for this project is only 15 ft. And as the others, I don't that is sufficient for ...it doesn't fit into the character of that area. It needs to be a little bit wider. It needs to be heavily vegetated and the only other concern I have, other than the buffer being increased, is traffic. It was nice to hear about the roundabouts. It sounds like a good idea. There is quite a bit of traffic on 25th Street into the Indian River Community River College is Cortez

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Blvd. And I don't know if this project will warrant it...would a right-hand turn lane onto Cortez Blvd. be warranted by this, if that's something you can look at? And also, from Cortez Blvd. heading west, would a left-hand turn lane onto 25th also be warranted? Right now Cortez Blvd. is only a two-lane roadway. So, if we start getting some large subdivision, a large number of residents in that area there's going to be quite a back log to take a left-hand turn as well as thru traffic and right-hand turns. So, if you can look at that intersection to see if there might be some turn lanes added. The other concern, which involves this project probably as well as several others that are now coming into the area, is Cortez Blvd. Cortez Blvd. is historically, before I moved there, there was a lot of accidents at that intersection. Cortez Blvd. and 25th ...Cortez Blvd. extends to the east...there are people trying to cut across 25th Street, trying to make left-hand turns, and there is often accidents. But if traffic warrants that it can be done on that intersection, and I don't know if it should be part of this project or others, but if you can work with other projects coming in the area, and maybe even the County, that traffic light needs to be looked at. Also, at 25th and Cortez Blvd. there is not a right-hand turn lane. And if we start ...you have two lanes, so if somebody was going straight or trying to make a left-hand turn, traffic backs up there periodically. Thank you.

Mr. Bergman stated – Thank you. Were there any questions? Is there anyone else who would like to speak?

Mr. Steve Ball stood once again and stated – If I could, I would just like a chance to comment on some of those issues.

Mr. Bergman – Certainly.

Mr. Ball continued – Maybe add a little bit ofFirst of all, I just wanted to note that we are complying with all the land development regulations. So, I think we need to just keep that in mind as we review the project, that we are consistent and we have a positive recommendation from staff in that regard. However, and I just reviewed this with my client, they're willing to put an additional five (5) ft. of landscaping in the buffer area to bring it up to 20 ft. And that would give you essentially 60 ft. of separation between any buildings between the two home sites that would back up to each other. So, they're willing to do that as an effort to be a good neighbor, which exceeds the requirements of the code. And we would like to ask your consideration on that. As far as the traffic issues go, we did a traffic analysis and there is no additional impacts on the levels of service in the road network in this area. So, we're willing to do the improvements that we had discussed with staff, but nothing else as far as additional turn lanes or lights for other roads in the vicinity. And we're not going to impact the drainage easement; I don't know if that was clear or not. Our drainage is flowing in the opposite direction into the lake area for retention. So, just with that, I just wanted to clarify those issues. Thank you.

Mr. Enns asked – Would your client be willing to put a dirt berm across the east side of the property?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Ball stated – I think they would...would you like to do that? (addressing his client). But we just wanted to make sure that the drainage works properly. And we haven't finished all of the drainage plans. We'll come back with the final drainage ...we have conceptual ones at this time. So, if the drainage works, I think we would be willing to do that.

Mr. Enns asked – If we made it a condition?

Mr. Ball stated – Yes, I think so. They're (the clients) saying that it's acceptable. Just one other point on the buffering and the open space. This city has very, in my opinion, the open space requirements for PUD is very strict, it's 40%... for common open space. So, when you have that requirement, and that's fine, and that's a policy decision, but it certainly compresses your development. So, that means that we have to ...to make it work financially we have to have more intense development because there's more open space. So, I think you should just keep that in mind when we're talking about increasing the buffering as well.

Mrs. Gates stated – My question was answered because I was going to question you on the berm. So, Mr. Enns took care of that. Thank you.

Mr. Johnson asked – What's going to happen to your lots numbers 9 – 22 by increasing that buffer? Are those going to be...?

Mr. Ball stated – Yes, they'll have to be shortened by five (5) ft.

Mr. Johnson stated – Well, I understand that, but are they going to meet code as far as their dimension?

Mr. Ball stated – Yeah, because we can write our dimensions as a PUD; we'll adjust those.

Mr. Johnson – Okay.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions? Alright thank you. Alright, this time we'll close the public hearing. What's the pleasure of the Board?

Mr. Knott asked – Mr. Chairman, in addition to the staff's recommendations, were we going to put a condition on here that they will increase the buffer on the east side from 15 ft. 20 ft., is this correct? Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, I think that is what they suggested. We have people that live in the Grove subdivision suggest 25 ft.

Mr. Knott stated – Yeah, and I agree that it would be nice, but at some point you...because they have...that gives them within five (5) ft. of what they have off of their side basically. The 25 ft. they have on their side, they have another 20 ft. plus they have a 10 ft. setback before they can put any structure at all, according to this. They can't put a patio or pool or anything like that

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

another 10 ft. from that, and then it's another five (5) ft. to the house. So, what I'm saying, is do we need to put a stipulation? Is the Board comfortable with that five (5) or do you want to go for more?

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, Mr. Leiva, as far as I understand, they're bringing this back again...this is a Preliminary PUD?

Mr. Leiva stated – That is correct, Mr. Chairman, this is Preliminary Development Plan, and they're going to have to come back for the final development plan. (This does not come back before the Planning Board, it only forwards onto the City Commission). This is just one phase of two phases on a Planned Unit Development.

Ms. Benton stated – Yeah, I would like to see this go preliminarily with the 20 ft. buffer. Let's see how it works. I would recommend the 20 ft.

Mrs. Gates asked – With a 4 ft. berm? I mean, I don't know what size berm to say, but berm buffer? Is that feasible?

Mr. Knott added – To maintain it you need like a 2-1, 3-1 slope to get it back...? South Florida is going to require them to probably have a berm back there anyway to keep their drainage on their property...so, more than likely they'll have a foot back there anyway, because I didn't look at the topo (topographic) but just from seeing how much they have to do here ...so they're probably going to have a one (1) ft. berm back there somewhere anyway, or maybe two (2), who knows; it depends on how low the property is back there. So, it's up to you all, you cansince it's a preliminary you can put the four (4) ft. high berm in a 20 ft. buffer. Just keep in mind, though, when you do that, if there's any natural vegetation in there you're going to take it out when you do that too. So, they would start putting dirt in there. So, these are just things...the reality of dealing with some of these conditions. Was that the only issue, Mr. Chairman, that we needed...?

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, I think there's a couple. I mean, they've addressed the school bus stop. I was just going through the new form report that the staff had provided. And it's pretty good because they bring up a lot of issues that we don't often get to hear, unless you're at the Technical Review Meeting. The school bus stop, they seem to have already addressed. The density still seems to be an issue in my mind because R-1 allows up to four (4) units an acre and they're basically almost on an R-3 or R-4 level in terms of the density they have. The buffer from the property owners...they'd like to see 25 ft., obviously we have some leeway in what we can require as a condition. Earth berm was the other issue, and then I think the Cortez and 25th Street traffic signalization may or may not be an issue. We may not have any say over it, but it may be something that we could certainly require some research on.

Mr. Knott stated – Well, I was looking in the traffic report they did an intersection analysis of Virginia and 35th but they were speaking about 35th and Cortez, which is ...if you look at their traffic...they have 85% of their traffic of their 1,100 trips going that direction. And 50% of it is

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

going on up to Virginia and other 35 is going down to Cortez. So, if you put that together with the upcoming project to the south here, which is going to be coming that way, it's going to be a shortcut from Edward's now up through here. So, you're going to have a lot more traffic coming up to the college and to other activities up there. So, I don't know if, and I don't know how staff ...you know we've had this issue before with traffic reports. I rant and rave and staff says it's okay...So, they got a traffic report. Now if we want to stipulate an intersection analysis based on this other project coming in and dumping their traffic on it too, I don't know. I just don't know how comfortable staff would be with us making recommendations like that.

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, I don't think it's a bad idea. We know that there's another development going in. We know what the traffic situation is at Cortez and 25th Street now. If you drive up that street during the day there's obviously people going to work, people going to school, people live in that area. I mean it's something that I don't think we can kind of stick our head in the sand and say we'll just wait until something bad happens or wait until State decides to put something there. I don't know if we can....

Mr. Knott stated – Yeah, I agree with you, Don, there's a lot of traffic with the other project that's going to be coming up 35th. That Cortez is going to be kind of busy.

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, like Mrs. Gates was saying, I think it's something that we can request, because we do have time before they do come back for their final PUD (they don't come back to the Planning Board).

Mrs. Gates added – Intersection analysis...

Mr. Knott stated – Yeah right. And again, our codes...I'm not if our codes can ...how much tooth they got in them...maybe staff can help me on this. Can we stipulate deep down analysis of another intersection...but we want you do this one, but we want you to throw in this make believe project that's going to become right at the same time as yours. I don't know, can we do that? Or maybe Mr. Walker needs to tell us...I'm not sure.

Mr. Leiva added – I was just going to tell you from a standpoint of planning from staff would say that you either deny the application, approve it, or approve it with conditions. This may be one of the conditions that is going to be attached to your recommendation. Keep in mind, though, that the applicant has stated that they had submitted a traffic analysis and the document hasn't really shown any specifics on 35th and Cortez. What you can do is probably have the applicant add additional information addressing that concern. And that would be an option. The other option would be that you can have the applicant on this application and the applicant on the applicant to the south of this side do a combined traffic analysis. But again, those are some of the conditions that you may be able to come up with.

Mr. Knott stated – That would make sense. I would be comfortable ...

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Ball stated – I think we could look at our project's impact on that intersection if you want us to. But combining other projects...I think that's a slippery slope there; you never know...they might not ever build it.

Mr. Knott agreed – Exactly.

Mr. Ball continued – And then we're stuck with improvements that are, you know, imaginary or ghosts. So, we would be glad to look at our project's impacts on that intersection and see if we have any impact on that, if you have doubts about our traffic study. But we did have a professional traffic engineer submit it.

Mr. Knott stated – I see that Kimbley Horn do it...and that's fantastic...there's not much better than that for traffic, but they did not do the intersection that we're asking for, they did 35th and Virginia, but they did not do Cortez. That's what I'm saying, that's one we've have people who live out there who have experienced difficulties. And so, I think I would be comfortable asking them...at this point I'd say ...I'm still not clear if we can make them include a proposed project that's going to be impacting the roadways, if it's developed. I don't know if we can do that.

Mr. Bergman stated – I don't see why not because if the project's not developed now by this developer it might be developed by another one. I think you have to take that into consideration, that the property is going to be developed at some point. Because a lot of these developers now are getting site plan approval and they're flipping the property. You have to think about the reality of something being developed adjacent to this property.

Mr. Knott – Okay.

Mr. Bergman asked – So, what's the pleasure? I know you guys are all...

Mr. Knott continued – Yeah, that's what I'm trying to find out, we have the five (5) ft. additional buffer...it says right here their recommendation...staff's, and now ...

Mr. Bergman stated – I think Mrs. Gates is going to spare you.

Mr. Knott stated – Oh, she? Very good, thank you.

Mr. Bergman stated – I think she's ready to make a motion.

Mr. Knott – Very good.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MRS. GATES TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN/REZONING TO PUD WITH THE CONDITIONS THAT THEY ADD FIVE (5) ADDITIONAL FEET TO THE LANDSCAPE BUFFER, THAT THE EARTH BERM BE WORKED OUT BETWEEN STAFF AND THE DEVELOPER, AND A POSSIBLE THE

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

IMPACT OF THE INTERSECTIONS DISCUSSED, AND THE CONDITIONS OF STAFF FOR THE CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS THE ROUNDABOUT.

Ms. Benton asked – A ‘possible’ look at the impact on the intersection...?

Mrs. Gates stated – Excuse me, let me take the word out ‘possible’. I want them to look at it and see what comes up.

Mr. Ball asked – And just for clarification, this would be before the final development plans come back?

Mrs. Gates – Yes.

Mr. Ball – Okay.

Mrs. Gates continued – So we can see them when they come back through as a site plan. (These will not be coming back to the Planning Board. Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked Mrs. Gates – Do you want to be more specific with the intersection?

Mr. Knott added – Well, that’s what I was going to ask. Sunny, did you want to include what we discussed for them when they look at that intersection to include the proposed development...I think it’s called the Reserve (actually Edwards Preserve), I believe, which is on our agenda tonight?

Mrs. Gates – Okay.

Mr. Knott continued – Using their traffic numbers also?

Mrs. Gates – Yes.

Mr. Knott – Okay.

Mr. Enns added – And you want that intersection analysis.

Mrs. Gates stated – I was going to make a motion but there are six other people that are doing it.

Mr. Ball asked – What if we don’t trigger any improvements but they do in our analysis? You see, this is the problem when we’re looking at other people’s projects.

Mr. Knott stated – I think what it is that’s just like with the roundabout. That’s what I was getting at. If combined, you all do trigger an intersection improvement, then I think you both have to bite the bullet and share it. That’s my thinking...just like you’re going to do with the

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

roundabout. But collectively if you don't impact it, if your numbers come back and say hey, it's still level C or something like that then we're fine.

Mr. Ball stated – Well, we'd be glad to talk to them about the impacts.

Mr. Knott – Thank you.

Mrs. Gates – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Is there any other discussion?

Mrs. Minton stated – Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. I have a problem with this in that we're taking something that's zoned four (4) units per acre with bad traffic around it, or at least I'm hearing concern about traffic, and it could go up to 6.5 with a PUD, as I read it. So, the purpose of this project before us, the PUD, is to increase the density. And whether or not I like the design or whatever, it's not what I think should occur. So, that's my opinion.

Mr. Ball added – Just a point of clarification, if I may. The land use map, the future land use map sets the density. That's the vision that the City puts forward for what they want as far as density goes on this property. And the land use allows up to, I believe, it's six (6) in the City isn't it? So, I think we're consistent with ...

Mrs. Minton added – It's currently zoned R-1...

Mr. Ball stated – It's zoned R-1 because when we annexed, the City gave it the lowest density possible...

Mrs. Minton added – Which is a good thing.

Mr. Ball continued – Yes, but your land use is your policy, what you want for density for your City. That's the guiding factor here. So, we're within our legal rights to ask for this as long as we meet our code requirements.

Mr. Leiva added – Mr. Chairman, if I may, I think relative to the point that's just been made by the applicant, ideally when you have your set of regulations and directives from the Comprehensive Plan you have your land use policies. And you have in specific cities at which specific land uses should be developed at... ideally your zoning tools, you implementation tools and our land development code is one of those implementation tools. Ideally those tools should be consistent with the comprehensive plan. In this particular case, the existing land use and the existing zoning, if you will, are not really compatible. You're talking about up to 6.5 units to the acre in terms of the land use. And then in terms of the current zoning, you're looking up to 4 units per acre. But I have to give you a caveat on the existing zoning; that applies to conventional development. Now, this proposal is really, as I said before, has a dual purpose.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

They are asking for approval on a rezone as well as a development plan, preliminary development plan or PUD. So, the recent request really would be from R-1 to a PUD. The reason that they're asking for additional density, is because it is within the pervue? of the Planned Unit Development. But you're right. Going back to the existing, the land use and the zoning are now jiving at this point. That is something that the County and the City have been dealing with from quite some time. Hopefully this time around that we are updating our Comprehensive Plan, we are going to have to discern much better in terms of the compatibility of our development code versus the Comprehensive Plan. I just wanted to say that for the record.

Mrs. Minton – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other discussion?

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman, if I'm hearing the Director right on this, the existing...the underlying land use will support 6.5 units an acre...is that correct?

Mr. Leiva stated – That is correct.

Mr. Knott asked – So, there's no going to DCA or anything like this to...not a land use modification. It's already established, yes. The density, according the land use, is already established at 6.5 units to the acre. And again, we're talking about the maximum allowable...you know it could come under. And then the zoning is up to 4 units to the acre for conventional development. And obviously a PUD district it's intended to provide for flexibility when it comes to creative designs that would include open space, and would include some features in terms of the architectural style. And that's what the applicant is going for. Our land development code allows for that.

Mr. Knott – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other discussion?

MOTION WAS MADE BY MRS. GATES TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN/REZONING TO PUD WITH THE CONDITIONS THAT THEY ADD FIVE (5) ADDITIONAL FEET TO THE LANDSCAPE BUFFER, THAT THE EARTH BERM BE WORKED OUT BETWEEN STAFF AND THE DEVELOPER, AND A POSSIBLE THE IMPACT OF THE INTERSECTIONS DISCUSSED, AND THE CONDITIONS OF STAFF FOR THE CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS THE ROUNDABOUT. Seconded by Mr. Knott. Approved by roll call vote of 8 – 1.

Mr. Ball – Thank you.

Agenda Item #5 – Site Plan/Rezoning to PUD – Edwards Preserve – Approval of a Preliminary Planned Development (PUD). Located at 3100 Old Edwards Road. Owners are

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Charles & Valerie Crooks, applicant is Southstar Land, and representative is Ken Natoli, of Houston Cuzzo Group, Inc.

Staff Report – Mr. Leiva stated – Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This application is very similar to the one that you just had an opportunity to hear about. And it's very similar in that the applicant is requesting both, a rezoning to a PUD as well as a preliminary site plan on the project. The total number of units on this application is 233 and it's broken down by a 192 town home units, 41 single-family lots. The general location on this site is 3100 Old Edwards Road, and the future land use map is RL, which again, is the residential low density, which allows a maximum density of 6.5 units to the acre. The zoning is R-1, low density residential. The parcel size is 42.24 acres and the existing use is vacant. The proposed, is what I told you, 233 units at a density of about 5.5 units to the acre. The surrounding uses and land use to the north you have the mixed-use, that has just been presented to you. To the south we have County land and for the most part it's single family. And to the east it's single family as well within the County. And to the west is single family agriculture within the County. On the zoning history the property was annexed into the City of Fort Pierce from St. Lucie County earlier this year; specifically it was August 15, 2005. The property had an AR-1, agricultural residential zoning in St. Lucie County, and a future land use of RU, which is residential urban. At the time that the property was annexed into the City, it was assigned a zoning of R-1, low density single-family residential and a future land use of RL, which is residential low density. The property has been platted in St. Lucie County and has been recorded as such. In terms of the traffic concurrency agreements, the traffic impact has been reviewed and will not change the level of service for the roadways in the surrounding region. The site plan was submitted while the annexation was in progress, and has been modified many times to reflect comments from all different governmental agencies. My notes show that this particular application has gone through some iterations before the staff and the technical review committee. And the staff report, at this point, shows that the applicant has been able to address those comments from the technical review committee, and the agencies that are providing comments as part of this review. And at this point it meets the conditions and the provisions of the PUD, as well as the rezoning that is part of this application. As far as the recommendation on this particular application, staff recommends approval subject to the conditions that have been stated in the staff report. And at this point we're transmitting this application for your further review and consideration.

Mr. Bergman stated – Alright, thank you. Are there any questions for staff from the Board? Well, if you have any questions, we can get back to staff.

Mr. Leiva added – I just wanted to add, Mr. Chairman, a couple of things. One of them is I'd like to bring to your attention to a letter that was written by our brand new urban designer that we have within the Department of Planning. And the letter, if you go through, it does make several points from a urban designing standpoint. I remember reviewing this application for compatibility, not only in terms of the surrounding uses and zoning, but also in terms of the circulation pattern within the development. And the applicant has been able to make some improvements that I think do improve the overall circulation of this site, and also in terms of the

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

surrounding street network. In addition, the applicant has been able to make a lot of progress in terms of the architectural features, which are going to be part of the final phase on this application. The lake has been looked at in terms of being one of the main amenities as part of this development. And the applicant has been able to provide those lengths to the use of open space by the citizens and the residents of this community. I just wanted to make sure that I do provide that comment to you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Did we get a copy of that letter in our packet?

Mr. Leiva stated – I'm looking at myDianna, did you get a copy of that letter?

Ms. Rose stated – No, sir, I didn't include that in their packets, I didn't know that was needed. (Ms. Rose confers with Mr. Gibbons before anything goes out in the packets. This item was not mentioned to be included.)

Mr. Leiva stated – I'll be happy to provide a copy of that letter to you, Mr. Chairman, I apologize. In fact, I've been looking at that letter at the technical review committee...it was provided by Kara Wood.

Mr. Bergman stated – Yes. I would like to see what her comments were.

Mr. Leiva stated – Sure. Let me see one more time, Mr. Chairman, if I do find a copy of the letter in my packet. I'll ask Travis to print a copy of the letter very quickly. And we'll bring it down in a few minutes.

Mr. Bergman – Okay, great.

Mr. Leiva – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Alright, were there any questions for staff?

Mrs. Gates stated – I'm going to ask a question. So, we'll just get this out of the way. I'm trying to find where the...I guess it's in my landscape detail, but the buffers for the property here. I was looking to see how wide they were. And I was ...I guess they're down here and I missed it.

Mr. Leiva stated – Let me take a look at the landscaping. No, I don't see that is being called out from my comments in landscaping. Mrs. Gates, give me just a couple of minutes here. Alternatively I think I'm going to defer that to the applicant when the turn comes please if you can provide us with that information.

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, if we didn't have any comments, I was going to go ahead and let the applicant go ahead and present what they had to present.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mrs. Gates stated – Yeah, I think I see it. Maybe the applicant can answer my question. I found it now...I'm seeing it. Is it 10 ft.?

Mr. Ken Natoli stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm with Houston Cuozzo Group. The planner and landscape architect representing Tri-Star Development on this. And if you look on the landscape plan, the numbers that are called out, 10 ft. wide, those are the requirements. And I think if you notice in your staff report that the landscape plan exceeded the requirements. And for instance, we have 10 ft. along Old Edwards Road...we provide 25 ft. Nowhere do we provide the minimum. Where we don't even have a landscape buffer requirement, we're providing landscape buffers all along this. So, none of the minimums that are stated on the plan, we actually exceed them all along our properties. And so, I think that's significant. And they're different ...they're 25 ft. here...I think 35...

Mrs. Gates – Thank you.

Mr. Ken Natoli continued – I just wanted to briefly add a few things. We certainly concur with staff. I think it's not a coincidence that staff is recommending approval, because I think we worked diligently with them...both regimes. We started with the other regime and we worked through and I think we've developed a plan that I think is a good site plan. I think it tends to raise the bar of the development here in the area in Fort Pierce. And also I think what's really important is between the site plan I think you have the PUD agreement and the architectural design guidelines. I think you also have some insurances that this plan will be implemented according to the site plan. I think if you look at the rendering we have provided a network of open space along the Five Mile Creek and a pedestrian path all along that area. In addition to sidewalks on both sides of the streets, and sidewalk and road activity. And I think what it's alluding to was...one of the things I think is also important is the client decide that he would take a little chance...we're going to go with rear loaded garages. Most of the units are rear loaded garages with front porches. And I think that the whole community is going to be a front porch new urban community. And it's got that feel. And I think that does take a little ...it's different from what you're looking at, but I think it's really going to make a difference in the community. We got some preliminary conceptual architectural elevations that I think you were provided with your packet. And we've also, for request, provided some of the other amenities as you look at the site plan. As you come in it will be seating, a picnic area right along the lake. And this area (referring to renderings) will be a single-family network. As you come in the entrance, which is right next to a roundabout fountain feature, when you come down at the end of the street we provided a rec area...another little play area. I think all through the site plan we provided accesses to the water, to the open space. Lots of little features that are really going to make this project stand out. And as far as the density, just to clarify also, just a couple of things on this one, we're a little bit different. We are adjacent to Edwards Road, which will providing additional right-of-way for it also. This property right here is actually in the County but is actually zoned commercial neighborhood. This property is in the County as a future land use of commercial, although technically right now there is a proposal in the County for 9 units per acre. So, our land uses and surroundings are a little bit different. Again, the future land use that was designated as 6.5 units per acre, we are at 5.5 units per acre. We also transitioned a single family

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

as we moved to the west to the site. Again, working with staff on a lot of comments. Again, we've addressed all the comments. There are none outstanding. And we think that the project has a lot of merit. A little density is below the land use. Again, R-1, I think is the standard zoning that you're going to get when you annexed with that future land use is probably a reasonable thing for the staff to do, because they get it they don't know what's going to happen with the site plan. So, they pick a R-1 zoning. But the future land use, remember, is 6.5 dwelling units per acre; we are 5.5. So, we come in below that. And again, a transition from town homes to single family. And with that I think I'll open it to questions that you all may have.

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

Mr. Enns stated – Mr. Chairman. The two areas that you have indicated in blue there in the multi family, what are those?

Mr. Natoli stated – That's a lake.

Mr. Enns stated – Okay. And the other one is a lake too?

Mr. Natoli stated – Yes. These are lakes.

Mr. Enns stated – Okay. Where's the recreation for the kids and stuff to play?

Mr. Natoli stated – Okay, we have a recreation area here, of course we have a pool, and a little clubhouse that goes along with it, we have a recreation in the top lot right here. And then we have little smaller recreation areas and play areas in different locations on the site along the perimeter ...Those are all rec areas that we're providing.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions?

Mr. Knott stated – Ken, you heard what the project previous, the Yale. Does your client also agree that the \$50,000 number is just a starting point for the roundabout? That the final number will be based on an actual construction estimate and you all would be willing to pay your fair share?

Mr. Natoli stated – Yeah, I think that we actually came up with that as opposed to the City. We understand there's going to have to be some further looking at that and certainly we're on board with that.

Mr. Knott stated – Okay. And the other thing this issue about the intersection analysis of 35th and Cortez that you all get your two traffic engineers together and let them combine your trips and see if that impacts that if there is any impact on that intersection. Do you have any problem with that?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Natoli stated – I don't think we would have any problem. We'll have the traffic engineer...again, they do things just to be aware that they use background traffic. Instead of when you don't have specific traffic, there's background traffic that's built into the professional traffic engineer's report. It doesn't specifically pick one project or another, but it picks a 2% overall...usually I think it's 2%. But if our traffic engineer needs to look at it...Cortez is the intersection you're looking at...can certainly again, it really matters when it's 2% or whatever of your traffic impacts that intersection, then you have to study it further. So, we'll certainly have our traffic engineer take a look at that intersection and see if that...it probably didn't come up the first time. The engineers can take a look at it based on if he needs to look and see if their project...

Mr. Knott stated – Yeah, I don't have a copy of your traffic studies. I can see that they did an intersection analysis for Virginia but not for Cortez. And that's what we're trying to find out if the combined trips is going to justify intersection improvements of turning lanes.

Mr. Natoli stated – Right. And again, the combined trips would be the difference between what our development or what their development would be over the 2% background traffic. But that intersection is probably a little further away, and most of our traffic might be heading Edwards because most of our units are down there. But we'd certainly take a look at that intersection.

Mr. Knott stated – I would just guess that most of yours is going to go out on Edwards because that's almost the back door there for you. Single family up there may use it but this multifamily is probably going to use Edwards.

Mrs. Gates stated – Travis, I have a question. Did the developer receive a copy of Mrs. Wood's ...so he has seen what the urban designer has recommended?

Mr. Gibbons stated – Yes. She was actually in on the meeting.

Mr. Natoli stated – Yes. We since have met with her and I think everybody was pretty comfortable with the kind of things...

Mrs. Gates – Thank you.

Mr. Natoli – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Benton stated – I'm assuming that your open space includes all the lakes?

Mr. Natoli – Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Benton continued – And I was wondering what percentage of your open space consist of lakes number one, and number two, a question was asked about where the children are going to play, where is the open space for the people...? What went into your decision to make whatever percentage that is of open space lakes?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Natoli stated – Well, part of the lake and the (inaudible?) decision was that we are along the creek and we felt like this was a project where you have a feature like a creek; we would like to enhance that feature. And that was kind of our special feature. And we provided smaller recreation and tot lot areas around areas to supplement that. But I think that was the features that we looked at. We saw the Five Mile Creek as a really nice sort of an environmental amenity. And that's kind of where we were coming about with the lakes that run along this ...some of our other space we are preserving...some existing trees. But our smaller areas around where the children would play. But I think in this case and this project because we had that environmental feature, that's kind of where we were leaning towards...providing that environmental feature along the water. And I don't know what percentage of our project is lakes, I'm not sure what that is. There is 6.5 acres of lakes out of about total about 18.7 plus or minus acres of just open space.

Ms. Benton – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman stated – You know that's a good point, Margaret. You're going to have a number of single family lots and the town houses in there you basically have no place for these kids to play. The 40 X 120 lots certainly don't leave you much room for a yard. And I really appreciate the new urban layout for town houses. I think that works pretty well but I think I'd see more green space maybe traded out for some of the water features that you have, to either create a plaza or a park or a field area for maybe some place for these kids. You know there are going to be kids going in there, it's not going to be a retirement village; I'm sure that's not what you had in mind. But I would think that you would want to try to give these kids some places to go, otherwise they're going to be in the water. And I don't know if you necessarily want that. But maybe something to consider, because you're trying to meet your open space requirement, but I think that maybe trying to provide a green space would be an alternative to the water features.

Mr. Natoli stated – I think we can work with our engineers to look at a portion of that, even if it's, you know, some dry...some of the white turns to dry...it's grass most of the time. And it could be double duty or whatever if we could reduce some of those lakes in a couple of areas just to provide a little more green. We do have some ...we do have some around the rec area where we'll have a tot lot and a playground and little areas but we don't have any really big ones. But we might be able to turn some of that to green.

Mr. Bergman stated – Some place where the kids can go out there and just run around and play football...Well, I live on a golf course and my kids and my neighbors go out there and tear the golf course up when there's no one on the course. They just need a place to go out and run around and burn up some energy. Any other comments?

Mr. Enns stated – My only comment, Mr. Chairman, would be if I see one problem with this layout is that there's not an area for the bigger kids. I'm sure the tot lots are plenty big enough for them but to have something where they could play a game of football or something like that would be awful nice.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Johnson stated – Mr. Chair. A couple of things. The first question, I guess, would be in regard to Mrs. Wood, what kind of features were you going to change on the Edwards Road...the multi-family units that were adjacent to Edwards Road there? I think she talked about the varying architecture of the town houses...especially along the entrance areas and along Edwards Road. What was the discussion? Or was there any thought to change those at this point?

Mr. Natoli stated – I don't remember all the specifics about what she asked for, I just know that we did meet with her and we went through some of the items. Varying the architecture of the town homes and I think we've done that. And I maybe slightly granted a taller (inaudible?) on the porch for entrances. But we made all those changes. The varying units, the frame, the entrance road, the clubhouse and the lake. These are conceptual, but I certainly don't have any problems, especially at the entrance nor to do something...maybe keep looking for a little bit or architectural feature at these entrances and again, we're conceptual at this point in time, but I don't have any problems because that's part of our entry and I think that's something...we could use some features along this area right here. We've made the other changes to the rest of the building and we've varied the architecture. But that's certainly something we could put into ...

Mr. Johnson stated – As you approach from the east traveling westbound on Edwards Road, you're going to get a very blunt view of every building that faces east. Because you're veering to the southwest as you make the first curve from the east...

Mr. Natoli – Heading west.

Mr. Johnson – Heading west on Edwards Road, that's correct.

Mr. Natoli continued – Until there's actually....there's a lot of trees there and you really don't get that view when this gets developed. You may get a little more view of it right now.

Mr. Johnson stated – Okay. The other question would be in regards to the single-family lots. I just question the 40 ft. lot widths. It's a very tight squeeze, you're talking about minimum or zero lot line type of construction I would assume, unless you have some plan in mind that I'm not seeing maybe on the single-family areas.

Mr. Natoli stated – No, all we've developed at this point in time is an elevation single-family house and I think it's, you know...you've got a 40 ft. lot now but you can still do a nice looking attractive house on a narrow lot. I don't think it prohibits that. We're trying also to be consistent, and again, based on the urban design comments to be consistent with the town homes. And I think also you'll see the architectural guidelines that have been put into this will also reflect that. So, again, it's not a wide lot but I don't think it prohibits a decent house.

Mr. Johnson stated – Right. And that lot width also just leads me to the other comments that were made about green areas and space for the kids or whatnot. If there was a 55 ft. lot or something of that nature, you might have some more area to work with there, you know, as far as the single-family homes. So, just something to keep in mind.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other comments? Alright, thank you, Ken. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on this project? If not, we will close the public hearing and entertain a motion from the Board.

Mr. Knott asked – That letter that was given to us? Do we have to concern ourselves with this or is staff taking care of this?

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, I think that’s what Mr. Johnson addressed some of the comments on there. Apparently they’ve dealt with some of them but maybe not the units at the main entry off of Old Edwards.

Mr. Knott continued – I mean, do you need to include these in our conditions or ...?

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, you’re certainly entitled to.

Mr. Knott stated – I’m ready to make a motion, but I only have a couple that we talked about on the previous unless the members of the Board have some others. That’s why I was asking if there was anyone that had any concern with it that they wanted to include in a motion.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. KNOTT TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN/REZONING TO PUD WITH THE CONDITIONS OUTLINED BY STAFF WITH THE REVISION OF STAFF’S COMMENT THAT THE SHARED COSTS OF THE ROUNDABOUT WITH YALE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT BE ADJUSTED BASED ON FINAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS, AND THAT THE APPLICANT’S TRAFFIC ENGINEERS WORK WITH THE TRAFFIC ENGINEERS FROM THE YALE PROJECT TO PROVIDE INTERSECTION ANALYSIS OF SOUTH 35TH AND CORTEZ TO SEE IF THERE IS ANY IMPACT ON THAT INTERSECTION OR ANY IMPROVEMENTS ARE NEEDED. Seconded by Ms. Benton.

Mr. Bergman asked – Is there any discussion?

Mrs. Gates asked – Am I understanding that you are including our concern for more green space in your conditions?

Mr. Knott stated – Yes, if you want to I can.

Mr. Bergman and Mrs. Gates stated – Well, you didn’t address it specifically.

Mr. Knott asked – What kind of wording?

Mrs. Gates stated – Well, I think Mr. Enns is concerned making some of the water space into more green space for recreation area for families.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Motion Revised

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. KNOTT TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN/REZONING TO PUD WITH THE CONDITIONS OUTLINED BY STAFF WITH THE REVISION OF STAFF'S COMMENT THAT THE SHARED COSTS OF THE ROUNDABOUT WITH YALE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT BE ADJUSTED BASED ON FINAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS, AND THAT THE APPLICANT'S TRAFFIC ENGINEERS WORK WITH THE TRAFFIC ENGINEERS FROM THE YALE PROJECT TO PROVIDE INTERSECTION ANALYSIS OF SOUTH 35TH AND CORTEZ TO SEE IF THERE IS ANY IMPACT ON THAT INTERSECTION OR ANY IMPROVEMENTS ARE NEEDED, AND THAT THEY REVISIT THE USES FOR WET RETENTION PONDS AND TO TRY TO INCORPORATE MORE OF A PLAYGROUND FOR FAMILY USE. Seconded by Ms. Benton.

Mr. Bergman asked – Is there any other discussion?

Mrs. Minton asked – Mr. Chairman, are you all comfortable with the buffer...I believe he said there was like a 10 ft.?

Mrs. Gates added – I'm concerned about that.

Mr. Bergman stated – They vary looking at their drawing of the buffers from what I saw. The plan varies as you go around the property, depending on what side their on. But now would be the time to bring that up to the planners if there's an area of concern specifically...

Mrs. Gates stated – If we're going to hold one developer to wider buffers for future development concerns, why should we not be concerned with another area in the same situation?

Ms. Benton added – I'm not sure for future development it would be...

Mrs. Gates stated – I'm talking surrounding development of this ...

Ms. Benton asked – Is there another surrounding development?

Mr. Bergman – Not yet. There's probably going to be one to the east of Edwards but that's probably in the County though.

Mr. Natoli stated – All our buffer exceed the minimum, I just wanted to clarify. 10 ft. is just the number. This is 35 ft. I believe, this is 25 ft. over here, this is probably at least 25 ft. or more on this side. So, we didn't have any buffer requirements over here by the canal yet we still provided a landscape buffer on that one. That's just a clarification.

Ms. Benton asked – Excuse me, where was the reference to 10 ft.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Natoli stated – The reference is on the landscape plan that calls out what the required buffer is of 10 ft. But we never use 10 ft., we have always exceeded 10 ft. on all our buffers. And I think that’s the difference between this one and the other one; we exceed all the buffers, we never use 10 ft.

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, I think on the landscape plan is probably misleading or confusing.

Mrs. Gates agreed – It is.

Mr. Natoli stated – We should probably put what the proposed is and we could make that revision to the landscape plan.

Mr. Bergman asked – Alright, is there any other discussion? If there’s nothing else, could we have roll call please?

Approved by roll call by 8 – 1 vote.

Mr. Bergman stated to the applicant – You’ll be notified by the City Clerk when this is going to the Commission.

Mr. Natoli – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman stated – Mr. Walker, this next item is a conflict for me. And I’m going to pass the gavel to Mrs. Gates to hear this item.

Attorney Walker stated – Yes, sir. Do you want to briefly announce the nature of the conflict and, of course, you’re reminded about the necessity for filing a form, 8B, I think.

Mr. Bergman stated – The form has already been filed.

Attorney Walker – Thank you, sir.

Mr. Bergman stated – I’ll go ahead and go through the introduction project.

Agenda Item #6 – Three Ocean Estates – Approval to allow the construction of a site plan with conditional use of a three (3) single-family residences eastward (seaward) of the Coastal Construction Control Line. Generally located at the corner of Avalon Avenue & South Ocean Drive. Owner is Nathan Ohren, and applicant/representative is Donald Bergman, of Peacock & Lewis Architects.

Mr. Bergman stated – And on that note, I ask to be excused as I have a direct conflict as we represent the owner on this project.

Mrs. Gates stated – Thank you, Mr. Bergman.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Staff Report – Mr. Gibbons stated – This is for three (3) single-family homes on three (3) pre-platted lots within the City of Fort Pierce. It's generally located on Ocean Drive, on the corner of Avalon and Ocean Drive. Surrounding land uses to the north is the beach access, south of there are duplexes, east is the ocean, but the west is duplexes as well. The applicant is working with pre-platted lots that are designed for...the zoning is R-4A, Medium Density Residential for Hutchinson Island. They're actually going with single family, which is good. I think that's supportive on all issues for anything eastward of the Coastal Control Line is for a single-family home. What we're looking at...this is something for Mr. Walker, I'm not sure, but because there are three (3) individual lots and there are three (3) platted individual lots, we combined these as one project. And that's something I would like to clarify for Mr. Walker. We vote on these separately or we can vote on them together. The project has been reviewed by all agencies. And it's for single family. It meets all lot coverage requirements. It's actually at 36%, which 40% is the maximum. The height from grade to the average roof height is 45 ft. All setbacks for single family development, which is 25 ft. in the front, 6 ft. on the sides, and 15 ft. in the rear have been met as well. And staff recommends approval.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay, thank you. Are there any questions for staff on this issue? No questions? Don, you're getting off easy so far. Is there anyone here to speak in favor of this request?

Mr. Don Bergman stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm with Peacock & Lewis Architects. I'll be here to answer any questions you have on the project.

Mrs. Gates stated – Okay. Any questions for the applicant?

Attorney Walker stated – Madam Chair, note this model presentation. Hopefully it will be adopted as a precedent by future applicants.

Laughter from the Board members.

Mr. Knott asked – Mr. Bergman, are these rentals or are these ...?

Mr. Bergman stated – No, these are to be owned...individually ownership.

Mr. Knott asked – Are they all the same owner? Or are they three (3) different owners?

Mr. Bergman stated – Right now their all under the same ownership, but I know the intent is to sell them off as single family.

Mr. Knott stated – So, these would just be a single-family dwelling.

Mr. Bergman – Correct.

Mr. Knott – Thank you.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mrs. Gates asked – Any further questions for the applicant? No questions?

Mr. Bergman – Thank you.

Mrs. Gates – Thank you, Don. Is there anyone here to speak against this request? I don't think so. What are is the Board's wish on these three (3) parcels please?

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN WITH CONDITIONAL USE. Seconded by Ms. Benton. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Mrs. Gates stated to the applicant – Okay, your request has been approved, and you'll receive a notice of the next City Commission meeting. And I will now turn the gavel back over to Mr. Bergman.

Mr. Bergman – Thank you, Sunny.

A five (5) minute break was taken at this point.

Agenda Item #7 – Site Plan – Harbor Federal Bank – Approval for the construction of a Harbor Federal Bank teller building (Phase I). Located at 5000 Okeechobee Road on the west side of McNeil Road. Owner is Harbor Federal, and applicant/representative is Lochrane Engineering, Inc.

Staff Report – Mr. Gibbons stated – The site is generally located on the south side of Okeechobee Road, west of McNeil Road. The future land use is CG, zoning is C-3, General Commercial. The parcel size is 4.25 acres. This is Phase I of II; this is for the drive-thru teller building on the southern side of the property. This property was actually annexed in the early 1990's, and it's next to the carwash and next to Golden Corral for your reference. What Harbor Federal is proposing to do is have a multi-purpose property office building and also the drive-thru teller. They came through with Phase I first to get the drive-thru teller building approved, the infrastructure in place for the project; and they'll be following this application up in the next month probably with Phase II for the office building. They've actually done a good job in the design. They've met all requirements of the code, all issues regarding traffic, parking, lighting, landscaping, and drainage have been taken care of. And staff recommends approval for Phase I.

Mr. Bergman stated – Alright, thank you. Are there any questions of staff from the Board? Alright, we'll give you a chance to come up with some if you haven't done it yet. In the meantime, is there anyone here to speak on this project?

Mr. Kevin Larrimore stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm with Lochrane Engineering. We agree with staff, and are here to answer any questions.

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

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Ms. Benton stated – Yes. This is not so much about the plan itself, but you already have a facility in what was the old mall right off of Okeechobee...not that far away.

Mr. Larrimore stated – That would be the Orange Blossom Mall.

Ms. Benton asked – Is this an addition to or...?

Mr. Larrimore stated – We will be closing that one once the Phase II opens.

Ms. Benton – Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions? Alright, thank you (addressing the applicant). Is there anyone else who would like to speak on this project? Alright, what's the pleasure of the Board?

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

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

The applicants – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman – Thank you.

Agenda Item #8 – Site Plan – Island Village Hotel – Approval for the construction of a resort hotel on Hutchinson Island. Generally located on the north side of Seaway Drive, west of Ocean Drive. Owner/applicant is Fred Bernstein, Island Village Developers, LLC, and representatives are Quincy R. Johnson, Jones, Myott, Williams & Jones.

Staff Report – Mr. Gibbons stated – Mr. Chairman, the background information. This is located on the north side of Seaway Drive west of Ocean, which is just west of the Days Inn property. It's a combination of five (5) lots totaling for 5.08 acres. The future land use has it as CG, General Commercial; and the zoning is C-5, Tourist Commercial. Right now the existing use is vacant with some abandoned buildings as well on the property. And the proposed use is for a condominium/hotel/resort. Some surrounding land uses would be ...to the south there is residential, single family, duplexes, and also some office space. To the east is the Days Inn Hotel, and to the west are condominiums. Like I said, the property is a combination of the five (5) lots. The property has been platted in the 1920's in the City of Fort Pierce. There has been a traffic report issued by the applicant and indicated that it's not going to change the level of service on Seaway Drive for the proposed use. The applicant has actually worked with the City on this and has been through the process on this application. The original proposed design included four (4) stories over parking and 252 units of actual hotel space. The made a revision after meeting with staff and actually meeting with commissioners to reduce it to three (3) stories over parking for a total of four (4) stories and 45 feet. And because of the change in the height,

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

it actually reduced the count to 243 units, I would like to make that correction, it was an error that was placed on the applicant, and this was sent out after we noticed the error. So, it is for 243 units. The units do meet the guidelines for hotel, which means that 25% of the units can have kitchen facilities and then the 75% cannot have kitchen facilities, they would have to have a wet bar or something in that nature; they do meet that requirement. They meet the requirements for landscaping, they exceed the landscaping requirements. They meet the access and parking requirements. Drainage...and they meet all codes with the Fire Department as well. We've also been in contact with the owner of the property and the applicant for a contribution; we have not come up with an exact figure, we would like to see a submittal from the applicant for Jetty Park improvements, whether that be infrastructure, new paving, restroom facilities, pavilion areas, that type of thing. We're looking for a submittal, and we would like that to be a condition of approval, and staff recommends approval.

Mr. Bergman stated – Alright, thank you. Are there any questions of staff from the Board? Is there anyone here to speak on behalf of this project?

Mr. Michael Weiner stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm here on behalf of the project. We also have Richard Jones and Taft Bradshaw and Todd Felsen who will speak to you a little bit more on the project. I don't know if I have quite enough to go around but for your deliberations you can share these little brochures. The wonderful Chris Knight of Fort Pierce....and thank you for the attention that you're giving the matters tonight. This particular project that Fred has brought forward is an upscale five (5) star hotel on the waterfront in Fort Pierce. You'll see, and Richard will talk about it, it's won architectural awards. It has a Caribbean theme to it, and it's going to have an island lifestyle. And I think to promote tourism in a new way in Fort Pierce. I think in a very exciting way for Fort Pierce. Construction costs are estimated to be about a hundred million dollars, and with the respect of the condition of approval on Jetty Park, we're happy to design and install certain landscaping, which is in their plans, and of course, in addition to that, we have to do the design (inaudible?) installation; and that's a condition of approval which we accept. There are local people who are excited about this project. We've gotten letters of support from Hoyt Murphy, Atlantic Corner Food Store, ABC Realty, Ocean Reef, Surfside Center, the Hurricane Grill, and Marker Ten Restaurant. You'll hear from Taft from Bradshaw and Associates, he's our landscape architect and land planner; and from Richard Jones, he's our architect for the building itself, and Todd Felsen, he's from Monarch Hotel Management, he'll talk a little bit about how this hotel is going to operate. You know you've been through some things tonight...we are here for site plan only. As your staff has mentioned to you, we have a CG land use, we have a CG zoning; these are questions and issues that were solved a long time ago with respect to your Comprehensive Plan. In fact if you take a look at the little handout that I sent to you, there are some quotations on the last page from your Comprehensive Plan, and they talk about the need for tourism, and they especially talk about a need for establishing tourism in Fort Pierce in the future, and certainly with an upscale hotel of this type of nature. That's precisely what you're doing, you're carrying our your future land use map. You'll also see some pictures of the existing conditions as the hotel sits now, and obviously the site itself (there's a picture of it) of how it addresses the water. As you know, the

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

restaurant is an existing use and is being incorporated in this particular hotel. So, let me bring forward Taft Bradshaw, who will get you into the plan itself, and Taft, come on forward.

Mr. Taft Bradshaw stood and introduced himself and stated – I’m the landscape architect and planner located in Largo By the Sea, Florida. Ladies and gentlemen of the Board, and as Thomas Jefferson would have said, “My fellow citizens”, I would like to present to you this evening the concept that we have and the site plan for this unique resort. I’ve had the opportunity and have had an enormous amount of experience, and you can tell from my gray hair, over the many years of designing resorts. Some of the resorts that I have been responsible for, and have worked continuously for the last 25 years at Fisher Island, Ocean Reef, Williams Island, The Turn Berry? Resorts, the new resorts in this area on the south end of Hutchinson Island. And I’ve have an enormous experience in designing resorts...tropical resorts; I specialize in ...my firm has always specialized in tropical resorts. This property has an unique opportunity from a point of view, not only of its location in the City and the location into its adjoining neighbors, but also the primary views to the water, the sunrise, the sunset, and creating an ambiance in which a five (5) star hotel can be placed. Most important thing in designing resort properties is to create a resort atmosphere. And the resort atmosphere, in this particular piece of property, and the relationship of linking it to the existing restaurant offers unique opportunities. I would like to kind of take you through the site plan, through the concept of the site plan and the integration with the architect, in which we worked very closely. And I’d like to introduce Bobby Holt, an associate from my office, he’s worked very closely and a lot of work on the project with us. And this is kind of a handout and if you just kind of stay with and I can walk you through it, it may be helpful for you in understanding the project in more detail. So, I’d like to begin with the implication of the existing restaurant...is existing here (referring to renderings)...big old ficas trees in here and at present time you have two (2) entrances in and out to the restaurant. The old concept was to unify the site in one continuous piece of design. We chose to make primary entrance, which is the entrance and we have the three? exits, so that all the entrances coming into the property would experience the new proposed architecture of the lobby and the relationship and the linkage with the existing restaurant. Viewing that, we’ve created a large resort-type pool, this is in which we come in ...the north is obviously the bulkhead line here where there is this rip-rap. So, as you come in we wanted to be able to view the property, come into porte cochere go into a lobby which leads directly out into this resort pool. The resort pool is the heart of this section here (referring to renderings) in which it would be with the waterscapes and the waterfalls as well as the cabanas on the local level, the spas, the waterslides for the children, observation and linkage in outside decks to the existing things. So, this is becoming very active resort space. The leaning character of the site then, and with the setback requirements, utilizing, hopefully, the existing facilities that sit out over the water here, that we would like, in the future, to turn those into viewing site, because they’re presently existing; so, we’re not asking...that would be a separate application for refurbishing the existing facilities there. The project is four stories in maximum height. The ground floor or the lower level is all parking. It’s a 25-ft. setback from the front...from the sidewalk. That 25 ft. will be landscaping if you see any in your sections there you see how we are berming that up to create a pedestrian scale. The sidewalk is in this area here. We thought that an establishment of pedestrian scale, with the four (4)-story height and establishing the height of the vegetation, which is reflected in the elevation, to the height, creates this green landscape buffer or landscape edge to the

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

property...a soft edge as opposed to a hard architectural edge. The architect will explain ...he brought the face of the parking as an architecture, so you're not looking at the legs running underneath the building so it has a façade or veneer to the parking. The interior of the units would be ...half of the units are related to the inlet the other half is related landside. And on the first level of the units, we created this tropical atrium all through the property, which is penetrated at several points by the elevators and service cores? and the breaks in the buildings. This tropical atrium would then be viewed by the access ways looking down into it; we think that's ...by keeping it open to the sky as opposed to closing it, I think it's inviting and actually be very tropical in nature as far as the plant material. On the water side, as you exit or leave the main pool area, you're then greeted by the area that is designated on the ground level as the spa. The spa would have its own separate area, this is a path linking all the different recreational activities that's related to this side of the project. The spa area, which consists of a resistance pool ...one of these swim against the water...one of these pressure things...spas here of a canvass nature as well as a spa here, those would be those cabana tents, excuse me, that's the spa here. This is a children's area, which would have it's children's play area on the inside...a playroom on the inside as well as an external play confined...very safe oriented, playground for the children, very highly visible. And then we go to the most eastern portion of the property it becomes a more quiet, a more sedate type of atmosphere inside ...and the other swimming pool on the eastern end, which would be surrounded by these canvas cabanas or day cabanas around the swimming pool here. All the pavement on the external areas through here would be a series of integrated colors of pavers as well as the contouring around ...you notice in your book we mounted these areas to separate the different uses on the inside. The orientation of this area, the tan areas here or the balconies of the units that would be oriented out internal circulation. All the circulation is on the lower level of the service (inaudible?). The service area is where they can pick up the refuge and the utilities located in these areas here...very well screened...necessary buffers at each end. And the primary entrance at point of approach. The development of this property in relationship with the architect, was a challenge in that we wanted to combine, and this is an architectural elevation of the property; this is where you enter. And as you noticed in your booklet there, this would actually be the scale in which you're viewing, so, the necessary breaks occur at these points here to allow cart? of use as opposed to a continuous mass of the architecture. It would be very heavily landscaped. The colors would be very soft tropical colors in architecture. The vernacular or the vocabulary that we want to establish is extremely very tropical, a kind of the "The Old Florida Look", which I think is very compatible with the look of the old portion of Fort Pierce that I really loved on the street. And we think that this approach, this attitude, the commitment from the client, working closely with the architect, and the staff, would be a major contribution to the City and to the area. It also establishes a wonderful opportunity for good neighbor policy presently on the street. And the north side of the street has some wonderful architecture as it goes there now. We think that this style of architecture is very compatible. The landscaping would be super lush. We've expanded an exceeded as in the report, the landscape requirements. I'm really committed to a good design. My firm is always done that for quite a few years. And this would just be an extension of our reputation. It would also be an opportunity to make a significant impact to the City. And I was looking at the kind of goals and objectives that you've established for some of your planning directions and the architectural character that has been set forth. And I think this really enhances that. And it

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

brings it all together in a very significant location in an area that is semi-blighted now from the potential use of the property. And it could have a significant influence on surrounding property. And our commitment to the Jetty Park as Michael had mentioned; we would certainly live up to that. And we would work very closely with your staff and community awareness groups and probably get involved with the whole group so that it's just not a separate design but it would be something that the community and the neighborhood feels important, and we would work very closely with that. So, if I had more time, I'd written a shorter letter. So, this is ...I'm going to turn it over to the architect. And he can explain to you the architecture unless you have direct questions at this time or if you want to, I could come back and answer questions or you can send me on my way. But I would certainly appreciate the opportunity of you all passing this and approving this because this is a significant site plan. And that's what we're asking for. And it's a nice opportunity to be back in Fort Pierce. Thank you very much. Richard, you want to step up to the microphone and tell them a little bit about your architecture?

Mr. Richard Jones stood and introduced himself and stated – Good evening, I'm with Quincy Johnson, Jones Myott, Williams Architects out of Boca Raton. And we had a lot of fun with this project. It was fun working with Taft. It's been fun working with Michael; and also fun working with our client, Fred Bernstein. And about a year ago Fred came to us and said he wanted to build a hotel on Hutchinson Island. And I told him that we were the perfect architects for the job...very familiar with Hutchinson Island. My parents have had a place on South Hutchinson Island for many years. And spent a lot of time and a lot of summers up here. And the program was to create a five (5)-star hotel with an access of 240 units on five (5) acres of waterfront property. And in addition to that, we had to preserve an existing landmark restaurant, Mangrove Matties, which I've spent a lot of time in as well. The solution was to first come up with a theme for the project. What did we want to create in order to capture the spirit of Fort Pierce and island living? And I told Fred that he was going to have to sponsor some travel for us so we can create this nice story board here...to kind of come up with an architectural theme. So, what we did was we did some travel, we visited some sites and created a story board and decided to create a Caribbean-inspired village of diversity rather than repetition...in a cookie-cutter nature. What we wanted was a streetscape...a building that basically had two (2) elevations...it had two (2) fronts. It had a front on Seaway Drive, it also had a front on the water...the inlet, which is the gateway to Fort Pierce, via the City. So, what we did was through design create an elevation to appear to be several large-scale homes or town homes if you will. Creating diversity through colors, materials, massing, and variation down to details on railings, and details on brackets. And you can see some of the details that we've captured in our story board here. And to really create a unique destination a building that Fort Pierce can be proud of. And a building that when you're traveling up and down Seaway Drive can be viewed any number of angles. And around each turn is a different perspective, if you will, of the building. In order to break down the mass of the building, we essentially come into three (3) separate buildings unified underneath with the parking level and to preserve some of the vistas on Seaway Drive. The parking level we've disguised with garage doors, shutters, some window openings, items that are more in a human scale, something that you would encounter in a town home or in a single-family home rather than just having columns every 20 ft. for structure and seeing all the cars underneath. Varied roof heights, introduction of dormers, introduction of towers. And basically individuality with

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

underlining consistency to create a real world class destination. We're very proud of it. We've already won a Gold Prism Award with the project and we haven't even stuck a shovel in the ground yet. So, we're proudly displaying that on the cover page. And we'd like to see the project completed and built. And I told Fred from day one it would have my personal attention with my connection to the City, and I still come up here quite frequently from down in Boca Raton. So, I look forward to working in the City. And Michael.....

Mr. Michael Weiner stood and stated – Todd, you want to come on up and talk a little bit about the hotel operations, because I think that's something new that we're bringing to Fort Pierce.

Mr. Todd Felsen stood and stated – I'm the president, chief executive officer of Monarch Hotels based out of Fort Lauderdale, Florida. And I have to tell you, I don't have gray hair like Taft, but I've been in this business long enough where I learned how to diet a little bit. So, these very talented gentlemen really created a beautiful thing on paper. And what we do now is we basically service the dream and we take care of the guests that come visit Fort Pierce and Hutchinson Island. We've really touched on the beautification of the property and the layout, and I wanted to just tell you what the hotel has as far as guest amenities. We'll have three (3) swimming pools, one (1) 5,000 sq. ft. pool, which is a free form pool overlooking the water, waterslides, zero entry for the little children so they can come and sit in the pool with their parents. The waterfalls will be cascading all around the pool, we'll have three (3) bars. The existing restaurant of Mangrove Matties, which we really like the name and we decided to keep since it's been here for such a long period of time; and would actually like to reconcept that into a Caribbean-style restaurant as we keep with the Caribbean and Key West theme throughout the property. We'll have a gourmet shop, a sundry shop where you can buy coffee, muffins, and nice things to bring back to your room. We'll have meeting space so we can bring small executive-type meetings to the property. Our market demographics will be basically from the northeast because the northeasterners, which consist of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, the Boston/Washington D.C. area as well as Chicago, love the warm weather in South Florida. We're also looking to attract our local drive market, which we consider here in Florida as the Miami/Ft. Lauderdale area, Tampa, Jacksonville, Palm Beach County, etc.; even west coast...Naples. We want people to come to this side of the state to see this beautiful property. My background...I was with Ritz Carlton for many, many years out in California and Hawaii. We started our management company four years ago and we're very proud to be associated with a project like this because it's so upscale. And it's going to be beautiful. Outdoor function space...we have a lot of areas that, if I can bring this (referring to renderings) up. These areas right here are Bermuda lawns, those areas are outdoor function space. We have over at least 5,000 sq. ft. of space there where we can have weddings, barmitzvas, parties, all outdoor activities for your children that are here. Moving over here they touched on the kid's club, we like to call it the Island Kids where we teach the children about the Caribbean and educate them about what the kids do on the islands, what kinds of games they have down in the islands, because it's much different living down in the Caribbean as I did for five years. The kid's club, like I said, will educate the children. But besides educating them they'll have a lot here at the hotel. They'll be swimming, they'll have movies at night, we'll have big movie screen set up for the children at night so they can float in their floaties in the swimming pools. We'll do sunset

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

cruises, we'll get involved with charter companies down here in the local market and have sunset cruises for the businesses and groups that come into town as well as families. We'll do fishing tours with the local fishermen here, and fishing charters for our guests. We'll do sandcastle building at Jetty Park on the beach and create a great atmosphere of family and fun. We'll have 24-hour room service where our guests can dine in their guest rooms. We offer twice daily housekeeping service. We want to really have, the guests that come here as well, visit the City...the local destination. Go out and have dinner. They can't eat dinner in the hotel every single night, they have to visit the area restaurants, they need to go shopping, we want to do shopping excursions both here in Fort Pierce and St. Lucie County. We'll have a business center for guests that want to check their e-mails or visit the Internet and do some work in there. We'll have secretarial services for the business clientele. We'll have high-speed Internet access from every room as well as in-room entertainment, movies, video games, for the children. And an executive board room for small meetings up to 16 people. Our meeting space, which is located over here (referring to renderings) will have approximately 8,000 sq. ft. so we can do parties, weddings, dinners, meetings, conferences, teleconferences. And then, of course, for the ladies, the spa. We'll have a 5,000 sq. ft. spa with a fitness center of about 800 sq. ft. The spa will consist of treatment rooms, different types of treatments, massages, nail...pedicure...for those of you that like hot rocks, etc; we'll offer that as well. So, there is many different types of amenities that go into the property. And what these gentlemen have done is just create a phenomenal piece of artwork and we're very excited for it to come out of the ground and bring more guests to this destination and really create a destination for tourism. I want to thank you, ladies and gentlemen for having us and look forward to having a beautiful hotel here where we can all visit. Thank you.

Mr. Michael Weiner stood and stated – Thanks Todd. We're very proud of our positive staff report. This application...Fred, about 10 months now? We've worked through quite a few situations with the staff in order to make sure that we could come with a positive staff report. You have a very well written code. There's almost nine (9) different standards that you have to meet in connection with site plans. And your staff reviews it for those nine (9) different standards, some of them are specific some of them are more general. Some of them have to do with engineering, some of them just have to do with health and safety. And we meet all of those nine (9) and we've gotten to this point where we can say successfully...notice we haven't used the words variance and things of that sort. We came in under your code and we've been working to meet all of the standards that are there. Some of them are like generalize, like general welfare and safety. And if you take a look at some of the pictures that I've given you, you can see the present conditions. There are numerous ingresses and egresses there obviously designed in the 50's and 60's...don't meet any standards now. You've heard from Taft. This project will actually be safer than the present situations that you have there. You've also seen in the staff report with respect to the traffic report. There's no change in the level of service, even after upgrading and doing what we're going to be doing. The other thing is I think, and we pointed out in the Comprehensive Plan a couple of things that have to do with how important tourism is to the general area. And to this point tourism has really been under utilized in your City; it's the smallest portion of your commercial land is devoted to that. This will actually increase it double the size of things that you're devoting to hotel tourism. And that's the direction that you want to

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

go. And in doing so, obviously you're going to have an operating hotel. The operating hotel will have a great amount of gross receipts estimates in excess of 18 million dollars with respect to the restaurant with respect to the hotel itself, with respect to the spa facilities. We're talking about 40 employees...in three shifts of 40 employees. And that doesn't count the spin-off that we give in terms of jobs that we'll be creating for the services that we need...the laundry services that we won't be doing on-site, the landscaping services that we'll be employing, the food, wine, and beverage distribution. So, there's really a ripple effect here. We feel strongly about this because what Fred did was he took a look at your Comprehensive Plan map and your zoning map and if it was on the wall you could see there's this red area and it says this is where we want our hotels, this is what we want to do. This is in your Comprehensive Plan ... it says this is where we should plan it. And then, to Fred's credit, he said I'm not going to put there a Days Inn. I'm not going to put there something that quite honestly wouldn't fit this beautiful vista and area that you have in which you could be so proud, I'm going to give you top notch. And in doing so I think you're going to see that of course you'll have that effect...that economic effect for the town, as well as being something that all of you locally or whether you come from far away can be proud of in Fort Pierce. We're here to answer any questions. I think you get the flavor of it. I know it's getting late so I'm not going to go on further. Any questions that you have we have our team here. And we hope you find that this is something you can approve. Thank you.

Mr. Bergman stated – Thank you. Were there any questions of the applicant from the Board?

Mr. Johnson stated – A couple of different items actually. In regards to the parking that's available, I'm not sure who wants to answer it, at Mangrove Matties, how many parking spaces will be available to the public. And is it outside of the western most parking lot that will be available to the public there? I know the parking meets code but as far as the western parking lot there, is that for public access ...?

Applicant stated – I believe Mangrove Matties is going to become a private restaurant...correct?

Another applicant stated – Mangrove Matties will be a private restaurant for use by the hotel and so all the parking will be incorporated in with the hotel parking.

Mr. Johnson stated – Okay. That's what I figured...but thank you. And also, the number of units...can you confirm the number of total units?

Applicant – It's 243.

Mr. Johnson continued – Okay. And how many of those would have the kitchen or kitchenette?

Applicant stated – 25% ...I believe 61.

Mr. Johnson stated – Okay. Because it was originally stated, I guess as 63. I just wanted to clarify that.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Applicant stated – Yeah. There was an error in the unit calculation; we had it at 252, which would accounted for 63, but in recalculating to the 243 it's now 61.

Mr. Johnson – Okay. The last question I have is just for the ...the detail in the landscape plan that talks about a planter wall section. And then I saw the new detail...the color details that you submitted to us this evening. That's not going to be on the Seaway Drive side, is that correct? That's just along the north side of the property along the waterway?

Applicant stated – No. It's all along ...

Mr. Johnson continued – Around the front also?

Applicant – Yes.

Mr. Johnson – Okay.

Applicant continued – And then outside of that is the sidewalk.

Mr. Johnson stated – Right. You've got the sidewalk, you've got the berm, and ...

Applicant added – In that 25 ft. you'll have the berm then the section then the landscaping...The berm will probably be ... You were talking about berm, I felt like I got a course in bermology as you said earlier in the evening. But the berm would probably be 3 ½ to 4 ft. high with a level on the top to be easier to maintain.

Mr. Johnson continued – And is there a wall behind that?

Applicant continued – Behind that is the wall of the parking, and it swales back down to ...the veneer of the parking would be behind that.

Mr. Johnson asked – Is it a stucco wall or is it actually a (planter-type?) wall?

Applicant stated – It's actually a combination. And I think that the architect can go into more detail on that. But as he mentioned, it's not continuous character all the way down. They wanted to be able to break it up, make it more of an interesting façade. The fenestrations on it would be very compatible with vertical fenestrations.

Mr. Johnson – Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Poitier stated – I have a question. How big is the conference room?

Applicant stated – The conference is approximately 8,000 sq. ft. which is over here (referring to renderings). And it's divisible into four (4) separate sections.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Poitier asked – One or two? How many do you have?

Applicant stated – Well, depending on how you look at, you can either have one (1) or four (4) at any given time.

Mr. Poitier continued – Well the reason I was asking was that I'm a member of a club, I might want to bring a conference there.

Applicant stated humorously – Well, you can come next week if you like.

Light laughter.

Applicant continued – But yeah, there are four (4) separate rooms. You'll have a pre-function area here in the front. And then there will sliding doors in each section of the ball room that open up to a covered patio area for outdoor functions.

Mr. Poitier stated – We need something like that. It looks pretty good.

Mr. Enns added – We need a lot of things like that.

Mrs. Gates stated – I don't know who needs to address this, but on the landscape plan here I see the scale with your landscaping. And I would like to make sure that when you are putting the landscaping in that this is the landscaping to scale that will put in, not to grow to this scale. Am I making sense?

Mr. Taft Bradshaw stated – Yes, you're making a great deal of sense. I can assure you that they would be that size at installation.

Mrs. Gates – Thank you.

Mr. Taft continued – As one of our trademarks of our firm is that we overplant and start with mature materials. Thank you.

Mrs. Gates – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked Mrs. Gates – Do you have another question?

Mrs. Gates stated – Well, I don't have another question but I do have a comment for the gentleman that was talking to us from the hotel. On your children's program, I hope that you will incorporate not only the Caribbean lifestyle and flavor for the children in their learning, I hope that you will also think about what we have in this area that is tropical to this community such as the Manatee Center, which I'm a member of the Board in which I'm very proud of. But things like that...they can also interact with things that are in our community. We have some things that are very useful to children here.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Applicant stated – Absolutely. And like I said, we want to be able to get involved with the community. I personally am not familiar with Fort Pierce that much, to be honest with you. But I am learning every single day.

Mrs. Gates added – We'll help you.

Applicant added – And I saw you had a dolphin encounter here around in St. Lucie County. And the more we learn...absolutely, yes we want to educate the children here.

Mrs. Gates continued – I just wanted to make sure you all are going to incorporate our good features in Fort Pierce with these children and adults. Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Tom, did you have a question?

Mr. Knott stated – Yes. A couple ...yeah, but I'm not sure who to direct it to. First of all, I've lived in Fort Pierce for over 40 years. I knew that someday that we would get a five (5)-star hotel, but are you sure you guys got off the right exit out here? (humorously)

Laughter.

Mr. Knott continued – This is really spectacular. I was sitting here looking at this, and you guys got rooms bigger than my house. You have 2,800 sq. ft. in some of these rooms. What sort of price range are you looking for renting these things? These aren't going to be for our local fishing tournaments is it?

Applicant stated – Preliminary. Since number one we're going to be new to the market, and we want to be able to get business here to the Fort Pierce area. It's very important that we're competitive with some of your surrounding properties. Even though there's not a lot of properties here, I'll give you an example, I did some demographic studies and found out that some of the smaller motels or inns, if you will, are charging \$179 a night.

Mr. Knott added – Holiday Express.

Applicant stated – That's right. And for a property like that in an area like this is a lot of money. And we will be significantly higher than that, but we want to make an introduction in the market. When you're a new hotel, we don't want to upset anybody or anybody here locally because not only are we counting on the business from the northeast and the rest of the country, but we want individuals like you and your families to come to the hotel and recommend your friends and families that live out of town to come visit us. So, we'll have introductory rates for the individuals that live here locally in St. Lucie County. And then be very competitive with everyone else.

Mr. Knott continued – You said your market is like the northeast lot. How will these folks get here? Will they have to go to Palm Beach, fly into Palm Beach ...?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Applicant stated – Well, there are many ways of getting here. Number one, is boat, you know staying at the local marinas where you'll get your Miami/Fort Lauderdale, your Broward crowd, and also the airports. And yes, the airports are...you know, either one of them is 30 miles away. So, we're going to offer transportation to and from both major airports so we can get people here. And then obviously the rental car certainly goes a long ways as well.

Mr. Knott stated – Right. Have you all established a construction schedule ...after you get your permits...what is that...all one phase...or ?

Applicant stated – Everything will done in one phase and we would certainly like to get this project off the ground as quickly as possible. We want to be open by early to mid 2007.

Mr. Knott – Really?

Applicant – Yes. That's very aggressive, but again, to make an impact here locally, it's very important that we start off on the right foot and we get things done quickly so we can get the doors open.

Mr. Knott asked – Will these all be rentals or leases or something like that...or will anybody actually own any of these larger units?

Applicant stated – We're operating a resort/hotel.

Mr. Knott asked – So, it will be all rental then?

Applicant – Exactly.

Mr. Knott stated – This is the right tone for our beach. This is fantastic. From what I'm seeing here I like it.

Mrs. Gates added – I agree with you. I hope you have good summer rates.

Light laughter.

Applicant stated – Well you all will be invited to the grand opening party unless Mr. Bernstein says other. But I'm sure he'll invite everybody here. So, it will be a great time.

Mr. Knott – Thank you very much.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions?

Ms. Benton stated – To the gentleman representing the hotels. I have a question about the hand-out that we got from staff which references Host Mart? Hospitality Group. And I was wondering the relationship between your Monarch Hotels and that...?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Applicant stated – We are the management? company, Monarch.

Ms. Benton asked – For the Host Mart? Hospitality?

Applicant stated – No, there is no Host Mart. That must be a typo.

Ms. Benton stated – That was included in staff’s site plan report. And I was just wondering whether there was a relationship.

Mr. Leiva stated – We’re going to be making the corrections as necessary. Thank you for bringing that up.

Ms. Benton – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions? Alright, thank you (to the applicant).

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman, on there it says hotel and condominium. Where does the condominium come in?

Applicant stated – We are a resort.

Mr. Knott stated – I thought that implied several ownerships with the property owners’ association, but the condominium is just used as a term.

Applicant – Correct.

Mr. Knott – Okay, thank you.

Applicant – Sure.

Mr. Bergman asked – Alright, is there anyone else that would like to speak on this project? Alright, if there’s no one else, we will close the public hearing. What’s the pleasure of the Board?

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN.

Mr. Knott asked – Didn’t staff have a condition in here? I thought they had about the Jetty Park.

Motion Restated

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN WITH THE STAFF CONDITIONS REGARDING THE JETTY PARK REVISION.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Bergman asked – Now that that has come up, how is that going to work? How are they going to be able to improve a piece of property that is not under their control?

Mr. Gibbons stated – It will be a joint collaboration between St. Lucie County and the City of Fort Pierce. We've had preliminary discussions with St. Lucie County; they'd love to see that park improved as well. If it's not at their expense and it's not at the City's expense, they're for it.

Mr. Bergman stated – Because I know a lot of the waterfront is not owned by the County, it's under the ownership of the person that owns the Jetty.

Mr. Gibbons stated – Well, there's one portion of the Jetty that's the land area, but the actual pavilions and the actual boardwalk and the parking area, that's actually St. Lucie County.

Mr. Bergman stated – Okay. I was just curious how that was going to work, because I know when we were doing that project at the Jetty...

Mr. Gibbons asked – That conceptual plan?

Mr. Bergman stated – Yes. That got into the ownership that there's a road that goes through the property that ...really there's an easement for it...there was just a whole bunch of complications to it. So, I was just kind of curious how that was going to come about.

Mr. Leiva stated – Mr. Chairman, if I may offer a suggestion. Normally what you would do in this case is you would have the applicant make the contribution and make sure that that gets done prior to CO. And that way it gives us time to coordinate with the County and any other agency that may be effected as far as the type of improvements that we're going to have to get realized from this site. If it's early to Mid 2007, I think it would give us plenty of time...I just made a note to myself that we are going to be initiating contact with St. Lucie County very early on in January. In fact, I do have a meeting that is scheduled for the 10th of January. And these are the type of issues that we're going to bring up with the County as well as with some of the other agencies. I'll make sure that I bring this up. And eventually I'll be happy to give you some feedback as to how those conversations go.

Mr. Bergman stated – Okay. I'm sure it's something that can they...the complications with the Jetty are probably minor. They were able to get the airports moved 30 miles closer. I'm sorry to pick on you (addressing applicant). I think Palm Beach is 60 miles and Melbourne is 45, but it was close. Alright, is there any other discussion?

Mrs. Gates stated – Yes. I would like to add in the conditions my little request about the mature landscaping that is on the landscape plan, that it's indeed to scale when it's planted.

Motion Restated Third Time

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN WITH THE CONDITIONS MADE BY STAFF REFERRING TO THE JETTY PARK REVISIONS AND ALSO THAT THERE BE MATURE PLANTINGS FOR THE LANDSCAPING. Seconded by Mr. Poitier. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Mr. Bergman stated to the applicants – You have a good project. Good luck with it. You'll be notified by the City Clerk's Office when this is going to go to the City Commission.

Applicants – Thank you.

Agenda Item #9 – Site Plan – Brone Crossroads Park of Commerce – Approval for the construction of a flex/office warehouse. Generally located at Crossroads Parkway. Owner is Brone Crossroads of Commerce, and applicant/representative is Joseph T. Friscia, P.E.

Staff Report – Mr. Gibbons stated – This is a site plan approval for a flex/office warehouse space in the Crossroads Park Industrial Commerce Center; lot 22. It's 2.870 acres. The actual construction would entail 42,198 sq. ft. of office warehouse space. Proposed is a split into 14 different partitions, which would house various types of activities, such as window repairs, screen companies, irrigation, cabinet builders, etc. It's been through the Technical Review process. It now meets codes in all aspects. And staff recommends approval.

Mr. Bergman stated – Alright, thank you. Are there any questions of staff from the Board? Travis, have they modified their plan to reflect the Technical Review comments?

Mr. Gibbons – Yes.

Mr. Bergman stated – Okay. Alright, no questions? Is there anyone here who would like to speak on this project?

Mr. Joseph Friscia stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm here as agent for the applicant. I'm sorry I don't have a presentation like those before me; but I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Light laughter from the Board.

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

Mr. Enns added – It looks good to me, Joe.

Mr. Knott added – It looks fine to me.

Mr. Bergman stated – Thank you (to the applicant).

Mr. Friscia – Thank you.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Bergman asked – Is there anyone else here who would like to speak on this project? Alright, hearing none, what's the pleasure of the Board?

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

Mr. Bergman stated to the applicant – Thank you, Joe.

Agenda Item #10 – Subdivision – Kings Landing Subdivision – Approval to subdivide a parcel of land into fifteen (15) separate lots for a commercial subdivision. Located at 2496 S. Kings Hwy. Owner is Six Kings, LLC, and applicant/representative is Troy Holloway, of Gentile Holloway, O'Mahoney & Associates, Inc.

Staff Report – Mr. Gibbons stated – The property is located at 2496 Kings Hwy. It's 24 acres plus or minus. It's for a proposed subdivision of fifteen (15) separate lots. The property was annexed July 5 of this year (2005); and it was zoned with a C-3, General Commercial, and a CG, future land use. This is for a preliminary plat subdivision of the land. And, of course, all lots meet the codes for C-3...each one is over one (1) acre. They're over 10,000 sq. ft. An adequate right-of-way has been placed through the property. Landscaping, engineering have all approved the actual subdivision, and so has the Fire Department and utilities. And staff recommends approval to the preliminary plat.

Mr. Bergman stated – Travis, I thought the City was trying to discourage retention ponds by the entrance to these types of projects.

Mr. Gibbons stated – That would be dry retention, because they turn into mud pits. This is a proposed lake. And it's going to be used as an entry feature with fountains.

Mr. Bergman – Okay.

Mr. Gibbons added – In addition, one other note. It's not technically in the front yard.

Mr. Poitier asked – It's in the back?

Mr. Gibbons stated – Well, it's still 40 ft. off the road, but it's a good feature ...they're going to expand Kings Hwy...the County is. In addition to that, it's going to keep future commercial buildings off of Kings Hwy., it's going to be a nice feature.

Mr. Bergman added – It's going to give them some setback off the road, which I think is good.

Mr. Gibbons stated – It's mainly dry retention that we try to avoid.

Mr. Bergman asked – Was the comment about the additional right-of-way for Kings Hwy. addressed?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Gibbons stated – Yes. It was actually in that section...there's adequate right-of-way as it is, isn't there?

Mr. Troy Holloway stood and introduced himself and stated – Yes. I can answer that for the record. I'm with Gentile, Holloway & O'Mahoney. Actually Kings Hwy...the expansion will go to the west. It begins one property south of this one, it jogs to the west, and then as it gets one property north it jogs back to the west. The right-of-way moves in and out. And in this particular parcel it totally misses it.

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

Mr. Knott stated – Just out of curiosity, those parcels that are...this thing is t-boned there...is it just a matter of ownership there...the applicant didn't own those parcels that you all are paving the road for somebody else down through there?

Mr. Holloway asked – The center road?

Mr. Knott continued – Well, you're paving the road, it appears that way, all the way from...

Mr. Holloway added - ...from Kings and Peters...

Mr. Knott continued – Yeah, and but not under application...it's pretty good size pieces of land there...in front with your road...do you all own that too or does the ...?

Mr. Holloway stated – No, that was all sold off prior to this piece being sold.

Mr. Knott asked – So you all are going to pave the road for those people then, huh?

Mr. Holloway stated – That's potentially what will happen...but the best part about it is for southbound traffic on Kings Hwy., because at this point everybody will go to Peters and it's a huge asset.

Mr. Knott stated – Yeah, it's great. I was just curious as to why they weren't part of the plat. Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions of staff? Alright, hearing none, is there anyone here to speak on behalf of this project?

Mr. Holloway spoke once again – In light of the hour, I won't do any presentation. If you have any questions I'll be happy to answer them.

Mr. Bergman asked – Alright, are there any other questions for the applicant? Will this come back to us as final plat or no?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Gibbons stated – No, it won't. But it will require two (2) hearings at the City Commission though.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. POITIER TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SUBDIVISION/PRELIMINARY PLAT. Seconded by Mr. Johnson. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Mr. Bergman stated to the applicant – You'll be notified by the City Clerk when this will be heard by the City Commission.

Mr. Holloway – Thank you very much.

Mr. Bergman – Good luck.

Agenda Item #11 – Discussions

Mr. Bergman asked – Margaret, weren't you absent last meeting?

Ms. Benton – Yes. I apologize.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO EXCUSE MS. BENTON'S ABSENCE OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD NOVEMBER 8, 2005. Seconded by Mr. Knott. Unanimously approved by voice vote.

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Dianna for those great cookies. She always has nice things for us. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Gates added – She's getting us spoiled.

Ms. Rose – You're welcome.

Mr. Bergman asked – Does staff have any comments...remarks?

Mr. Leiva stated – Mr. Chairman, very quickly. We want to wish a Merry Christmas I guess that's all. I just wanted to tell you a heads up. At the next meeting in January we would like to bring up the subject of the Architectural Design Guidelines for discussion. So, you'll have a paper from us with some options that we would probably like to discuss and talk about. And hopefully you'll get your feedback and go to the City Commission.

Mr. Bergman stated – All it does for missing your first inaugural meeting. I like what you've done with the staff report.

Mr. Leiva stated – Thank you very much, I appreciate that.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 13, 2005.

Mr. Bergman continued – I think it brings up a lot of questions that I think normally I think would be overlooked, especially with TRC. Because TRC...the departments are generally pretty picky and thorough about viewing their projects. And that's a lot of stuff, I think, that we don't always get to see the information on them. I think the direction you're heading with the staff report is really good.

Mr. Leiva stated – We appreciate that. Thank you. On behalf of my staff, thank you very much.

Mr. Bergman asked – Mr. Walker, do you have any comments?

Attorney Walker stated – No, Mr. Chair. Thank you for asking.

Adjournment approximately 10:15 p.m.