

City of Port St. Lucie
Planning and Zoning Board
Meeting Minutes

121 SW Port St. Lucie
Blvd.
Port St. Lucie, Florida
34984

Jim Norton, Chair
Greg Pettibon, Vice Chair
Eric Reikenis, Chair Pro-Tem
Peter Previte, At-Large
Peter Louis Spatara, At-Large
Rose Mocerino, At-Large
Joe Rosen, At-Large
Douglas Harvey, Alternate
Peter Webb, Alternate

Please visit www.cityofpsl.com/tv for new public comment options.

Tuesday, May 5, 2026

6:00 PM

Council Chambers, City Hall

1. Meeting Called to Order

A Regular Meeting of the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Port St. Lucie was called to order by Chair Norton at 6:01 PM on May 5, 2026, at Port St. Lucie City Hall, 121 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Florida.

2. Roll Call

Present:

Jim Norton, Chair
Greg Pettibon, Vice Chair
Eric Reikenis, Chair Pro-Tem
Peter Previte
Peter Louis Spatara
Rose Mocerino
Joe Rosen

Others Present:

Mary Savage-Dunham, Director, Planning and Zoning
Anne Cox, Assistant Director, Planning and Zoning
Elizabeth Hertz, Senior Deputy City Attorney
Jasmin De Freese, Deputy City Clerk

3. Determination of a Quorum

Chair Norton determined there was a quorum.

4. Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Norton led the assembly in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

5. Approval of Minutes

5.a Approval of Minutes - April 7, 2026

[2026-412](#)

There being no corrections, Vice Chair Pettibon moved to approve the minutes of the April 7, 2026, Planning and Zoning Board Meeting. Board Member Spatara seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by voice vote.

6. Consent Agenda

There were no Consent Agenda items for the Board to consider.

7. Public Hearings - Non Quasi-Judicial

7.a P26-042 City of Port St. Lucie- Zoning Text

[2026-409](#)

Amendment-Section 158.225 Outdoor Sales and Special Events.

This is a request to amend Section 158.225 to include a different title, provide definitions and remove the application and permitting process details from the section, and allow for those details to be established in a separate policy.

Marissa Da Breo-Latchman, Planning and Zoning, provided a PowerPoint presentation on this City initiated text amendment. She reviewed the request and summarized the proposed changes. Planner Da Breo-Latchman stated the Planning and Zoning Department finds the proposed text amendment to be consistent with the intent and direction of the City's comprehensive plan and recommends approval.

Chair Norton opened the Public Hearing. There being no comments, he closed the Public Hearing.

There being no discussion, Chair Pro-Tem Reikenis moved to approve P26-042, City of Port St. Lucie- Zoning Text Amendment-Section 158.225 Outdoor Sales and Special Events. Vice Chair Pettibon seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by voice vote.

8. Public Hearing - Quasi-Judicial

8.a P24-179 McCarty Road, LLC - Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment

[2026-373](#)

Location: The property is located approximately 1.25 miles south of Midway Road and east of McCarty Road.

Legal Description: The South 1290.46 feet of the Southwest 1/4 lying

South of PONY PINES UNIT 1. Section 9, Township 36 South, Range 39 East LESS the East 46 feet for canal right-of-way and LESS the West 98 feet for road and canal right-of-way, St. Lucie County, Florida.

This is a request for the 1st amendment to the McCarty Road Planned Unit Development (PUD) to amend the PUD document to revise the project name from McCarty Road PUD to the Meadows, revise the permitted uses from townhomes to single-family dwelling units, establish development standards for the dwelling units, revising the concept plan, specifying the required transportation improvements and other miscellaneous changes.

Senior Deputy City Attorney Hertz reviewed the process and procedures for Quasi-Judicial Hearings. The Deputy City Clerk swore in those individuals who intended to provide testimony on Items 8.a through 8.f.

Chair Norton inquired if the Board had any ex-parte communications to disclose, to which each member indicated they had none.

Chair Norton opened the Public Hearing.

Cody Sisk, Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation on this amendment. He stated he was sworn in and the official file was submitted to the City Clerk at least five days prior to today's hearing. Planner Sisk indicated the owner is McCarty Road, LLC, and the applicant is Lucido and Associates. He reviewed the request and project background. He showed the location of the subject property as well as discussed land use consistency and traffic improvements. Planner Sisk stated the Site Plan Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed PUD amendment at their meeting of April 22, 2026. He indicated the Planning and Zoning staff finds the request to be consistent with the direction and intent of the Future Land Use Map and policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan and recommends approval with conditions.

At this time, Vice Chair Pettibon recused himself from this item and stated he would complete the appropriate form.

Chair Norton inquired if the improvements were going to be paid by the Applicant, to which Planner Sisk responded in the affirmative. Planner Kean explained the improvements are included in the Annexation Agreement, which will go before City Council with the first reading of the PUD ordinance. She noted that the ordinance is approved for 530 multi-family units, and the Applicant is proposing 321 single-family residential units, which changes the project and decreases the density.

Steve Garrett, Lucido and Associates, stated he was representing the

Applicant and was sworn in. He provided a PowerPoint presentation, including a brief background of the project. Mr. Garrett noted that concurrent applications have been submitted, but the PUD amendment before the Board this evening is to make the project consistent with single family needs. He showed the location of the PUD as well as the anticipated construction of the surrounding roadways and rights-of-ways. Mr. Garrett noted the Applicant has no issues with accepting the conditions.

There being no further comments, Chair Norton closed the Public Hearing.

There being no further discussion, Board Member Rosen moved to approve P24-179, McCarty Road, LLC - Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment with the two conditions noted. Vice Chair Pettibon seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by voice vote.

8.b P25-178 Wilson Groves Parcel A - Master Planned Unit
Development (MPUD) Amendment No. 2

[2026-370](#)

Location: The property is generally located north of Becker Road, west of future roadway N/S B, east of future roadway N/S A and south of the future extension of SW Hegener Drive.

Legal Description: A Portion of Block 6, Tract 3, Block 3, Block 8 and Block 9 of the Plat of The Alan Wilson Grove, as recorded in Plat Book 12, Pages 50 and 50A, being a portion of those lands as described and recorded in official Record Book 3046, Page 2761, together with all of Wilson Groves Parcel A Plat 1 as recorded in Plat book 126, Page 30, together with all of Wilson Groves Parcel A Plat 2, as recorded in Plat Book 139, Page 14, together with all of Wilson Groves Parcel A Plat 3, as recorded in Plat Book 132, Page 22, of the Public Records of St.

Lucie County, Florida. Lying in Sections 29 and 32, Township 37 South, Range 39 East, City of Port St. Lucie County, Florida.

This is a request for a major amendment to the MPUD zoning regulation book for Wilson Groves Parcel A to reference independent design standards.

Chair Norton inquired if the Board had any ex-parte communications to disclose, to which each member indicated they had none.

Chair Norton opened the Public Hearing.

Daniel Robinson, Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation on this amendment. He stated he was sworn in and the official file was submitted to the City Clerk at least five days prior to today's hearing. He asked the City Clerk to enter the file into the record.

Planner Robinson indicated the agent is Cotleur and Hearing, Inc., and the

applicant is Sundance PSL I, LLC. He reviewed the request and project background, location of the subject property, and proposed project. He indicated the application is to provide independent design standards and guidelines for the MPUD per the exceptions listed in the Citywide design standards. Planner Robinson stated the Site Plan Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed MPUD document and concept plan at their meeting of January 28, 2026. He indicated the Planning and Zoning staff finds the request to be consistent with the direction and intent of the Future Land Use Map and policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan and recommends approval with conditions.

George Missimer, Coteleur and Hearing, stated he was sworn in and provided a brief PowerPoint presentation. He indicated the amendment adopts a design and guideline standards document for the DRI and establishes the Architectural Review Committee within the Parcel A PUD. Mr. Missimer stated the Applicant appreciated Staff's presentation and recommendation for approval.

There being no further comments, Chair Norton closed the Public Hearing.

There being no further discussion, Chair Pro-Tem Reikenis moved to approve P25-178, Wilson Groves Parcel A - Master Planned Unit Development (MPUD) Amendment No. 2. Vice Chair Pettibon seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by voice vote.

8.c P26-036 Haredo Realty Advisors, Inc. and Ghanie, John &
Joan - Variance

[2026-399](#)

Location: The property is generally located on the northwest corner of SW Bougainvillea Avenue and SW Gatlin Boulevard.

Legal description: Port St. Lucie Section Twenty Three, Block 1616, Lots 6-10 (Plat Book 13, Pages 29, 29A-29D)

A request to grant a variance to the rear building setback requirements and the landscaping requirements for a proposed retail development

Chair Norton inquired if the Board had any ex parte communications to disclose, to which each member indicated they had none.

Sofia Trail, Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation on this variance application. She stated that she was sworn in, and the official packet was submitted to the City Clerk at least five days before today's hearing. She asked the City Clerk to enter the packet into the record.

Planner Trail indicated the applicant and agent is Edward McDonald, Thomas Engineering Group, and the property owners are The John

Mohamed Ghanie and Joan Davis-Ghanie Living Trust (Lot 6) and Haredo Realty Advisors, Inc. (Lots 7-10). She stated the request is to grant a variance for the building rear setback requirements and landscaping requirements for a proposed retail development. Planner Trail discussed the location and surrounding areas of the subject property, variance requests, code requirements, project background, and preliminary conceptual plan.

Chair Norton inquired if Staff was asking for a motion with a condition. Mary Savage-Dunham, Director, Planning and Zoning, explained that Staff was recommending a condition should the Board approve the variance. She noted that a word is missing and the condition should state: The variances will expire one (1) year “from the” approval if 10 feet of the 20-foot drainage easement is not abandoned by the City Council.

Chair Norton asked if this was the only way to construct this project. Planner Trail indicated that the Applicant has a presentation, which includes a proposal for this site.

Chair Norton questioned what it would mean if the variance was not approved. Senior City Attorney Hertz explained the next applications are contingent upon this variance, because of the conceptual plans attached to them. She recommended tabling the applications should the Board not approve this variance, to allow the Applicant time to speak with Staff on how to proceed. Ms. Savage-Dunham added that the site plan would have to be redesigned if the variance is not approved.

Chair Norton stated the Applicant is looking for a variance for relief from the parameters of the City Code. Ms. Savage-Dunham indicated the Applicant is asking for relief and reiterated the Applicant has a presentation.

Edward McDonald, Thomas Engineering Group, stated he was representing the property owners on behalf of the Dollar Tree project. He provided a PowerPoint presentation and further clarified the variance request of 15 feet and to plant trees outside the buffer along the south side of the wall. Mr. McDonald presented aerials of the subject site and discussed rezoning, traffic flow, and unity of control. He showed the Site Plan with the proposed Dollar Tree store as well as spoke to the variance and landscape plan.

Board Member Spatara inquired about the drainage, to which Mr. McDonald explained the existing stormwater discharge pipe that runs to the right of the driveway will be modified and directed to the canal.

Board Member Spatara asked what would happen if the City Council decided to abandon the canal. Ms. Savage-Dunham explained if the project receives approval and moves forward, the City Council would be asked to abandon the drainage easement. She stated this is the reason the condition mandates getting the abandonment within one year, otherwise the variance would be extinguished. Mr. McDonald explained the canal is in its own separate right-of-way and the Applicant is only looking to vacate 10 feet of the 20-foot drainage easement.

Board Member Spatara questioned whether this would cause a stormwater problem, to which Mr. McDonald responded in the negative. He stated this has nothing to do with the flow and capacity of the stormwater system.

Senior City Attorney Hertz explained that if there is a stormwater problem, Public Works will not approve the abandonment to take place.

Diana Spriggs, Public Works, added that Public Works would have less access to the canals, but they can access them in other ways for maintenance purposes.

Ms. Savage-Dunham noted that there are several applications to go through before the abandonment is reviewed and acted on by the City Council. She stated the scope of this Board is to consider granting the relief as requested.

Board Member Previte inquired if Dollar Tree could alter the design of the building to comply with the setback. Mr. McDonald stated that would not work for Dollar Tree and they would walk away from this deal.

Board Member Previte reviewed the Staff Report and confirmed that there were no unique conditions or circumstances present and the variances will confer special privileges denied by other parcels within the LMD zoning district, to which Planner Trail responded in the affirmative.

Board Member Previte questioned the wording of “granting the variances will not be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of this chapter and will not be injurious to the area or detrimental to the public welfare.” Planner Trail explained and clarified the language, as the Applicant is asking for relief from the amount of canopy trees to be planted based on the parking design. She stated it is not in harmony with the intent of the conversion area, and it will not be injurious or detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.

The Board inquired if the canopy trees will be installed elsewhere on the parcel. Planner Trail stated she understood that the trees would not be placed elsewhere. Mr. McDonald indicated he was not certain, but if the Applicant could add the two trees elsewhere on the site. Planner Trail stated she would have to look at the landscape plan but indicated the Applicant would be deficient by two trees and 154 shrubs at the rear of the property boundary. She indicated that Mr. McDonald stated they are meeting the requirement and clarified the City Code. Planner Trail confirmed that the residents would be looking at a wall without hedges and trees.

Senior City Attorney Hertz reminded the Board to look at the facts of the application before them and not the other properties. Planner Trail noted that all lots within conversion area 2 are required to follow the Code regulations.

Mr. McDonald showed the other properties that do not have a lot of landscaping material. He stated for the Applicant to develop at this site; the first step is the approval of the variance for the setback and landscape variance.

Ms. Savage-Dunham suggested the Board focus on the application and request before them, as they do not know the circumstances of the other parcels.

Vice Chair Pettibon asked for the distance across the canal to the adjacent homes. Mr. McDonald estimated that it could be over 100 feet.

Chair Norton inquired if the Applicant was unwilling to modify the Site Plan. Mr. McDonald stated the Applicant has modified the Site Plan multiple times to try to make it work. He explained that Dollar Tree has standards on how their stores operate, so they cannot make modifications.

Chair Norton opened the Public Hearing.

1. Dwayne Richard Bushey, Developer for the project, stated he was sworn in. He commented on the building size and shape, noting that cutting off part of the building to fit compliance could compromise the structure.
2. Hal Dodt, Haredo Realty Advisors, stated he was sworn in. He spoke on behalf of the project and indicated they held a neighborhood meeting, but no residents attended and there has been no opposition to the project.

Ms. Savage-Dunham stated the City noticed those within 750 feet of the project and noted there was additional public comment in the Board’s backup documentation.

There being no further comments, Chair Norton closed the Public Hearing.

At this time, Board Member Previte indicated he was not in favor of variances, so he will probably vote no.

There being no further discussion, Chair Pro-Tem Reikenis moved to approve P26-036 Haredo Realty Advisors, Inc. and Ghanie, John & Joan – Variance, with the condition stating that the variances will expire one year from approval if 10 feet of the 20-foot drainage easement is not abandoned by the City Council. Vice Chair Pettibon seconded the motion, which failed by roll call vote with Board Member Mocerino, Chair Pro-Tem Reikenis, and Vice Chair Pettibon in favor, and Board Member Rosen, Chair Norton, Board Member Previte, and Board Member Spatara opposed.

Chair Norten announced that the motion failed and inquired about the process for the next two items. Senior City Attorney Hertz recommended that the Board table the items to a date certain, unless the Applicant wants it tabled to a date uncertain to give them time to discuss next steps. Ms. Savage-Dunham indicated that Staff recommends tabling to a date certain of June 2, 2026, unless the Applicant has a preference. Mr. McDonald stated the Applicant preferred a date uncertain.

8.d P25-217 Dollar Tree - Gatlin and Bougainvillea - Limited [2026-402](#)

Mixed Density (LMD) Rezoning

Location: The project is generally located on the northwest corner of SW Bougainvillea Avenue and SW Gatlin Boulevard.

Legal Description: Port St. Lucie Section Twenty Three, Block 1616, Lots 5-10 (Plat Book 13, Pages 29, 29A-29D)

This is a request to rezone lots 5 through 10 to the Limited Mixed Density (LMD) Zoning District.

Vice Chair Pettibon moved to table P25-217 Dollar Tree - Gatlin and Bougainvillea - Limited Mixed Density (LMD) Rezoning Location to a date uncertain. Board Member Previte seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by voice vote.

8.e P25-219 Dollar Tree - Gatlin and Bougainvillea - Special [2026-407](#)

Exception Use

The property is generally located on the northwest corner of SW Gatlin Boulevard and SW Bougainvillea Avenue.

Legal Description: Lots 5-10, Block 1616, Port St. Lucie Section Twenty Three, according to the plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 13, Pages

29, 29A through 29D, of the public records of St. Lucie County, Florida
This is a special exception use application for a retail use that exceeds
50 percent of the building's gross floor area and exceeds 5,000 square
feet.

Board Member Previte moved to table P25-219 Dollar Tree - Gatlin and
Bougainvillea - Special Exception Use to a date uncertain. Chair Pro-Tem
Reikenis seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by voice vote.

8.f P26-026 Tradition Master Planned Unit Development
(MPUD) - Amendment No. 16

[2026-324](#)

Location: The subject property is generally located at the southwest
corner of Crosstown Parkway and SW Fairgreen Drive.

Legal Description: As set forth in the attached Warranty Deed

The request is to amend the Tradition MPUD and concept plan for two
parcels from Residential use to Retail/Office use.

Chair Norton noted that the ultimate decision on this item would be made
by the City Council, to which Senior City Attorney Hertz responded in the
affirmative.

Chair Norton inquired if there was any ex-parte communications, to which
Board Member Previte disclosed he had a conversation with Brad last
month regarding Brazilian pepper trees and Chair Pro-Tem Reikenis
disclosed he had a phone conversation with the commercial real estate
broker who was in attendance at the last meeting. The remaining Board
members indicated they had none.

Chair Norton opened the Public Hearing.

Bridget Kean, Planner, stated she was sworn in and that the file was
submitted to the Clerk's Office. She indicated this item was tabled
previously and that she could provide a brief presentation. At the pleasure
of the Board, Chair Norton requested that the Staff presentation from the
last meeting be entered into the public record.

At the request of the Board, Planner Kean explained and clarified the
conversion matrix for the DRI.

Board Member Previte inquired about the breakdown of the target ratio for
the Comprehensive Plan for residential to commercial. Planner Kean and
Ms. Savage-Dunham explained the City has significantly more residential
than commercial and indicated a recent study showed it is best for a city to
have 80% residential to 20% commercial to be revenue/fiscally neutral.
Ms. Savage-Dunham noted that the Planning and Infrastructure study is
not currently in the Comprehensive Plan. Board Member Previte

emphasized that if the Board decides to move forward with more commercial, it is in line with the study if the City falls below the recommended ratio of 80/20.

The Deputy City Clerk swore in David Baggett of Haley Ward, at this time. Mr. Baggett introduced himself and provided a PowerPoint presentation on this amendment request. He stated his team was receptive to and supportive of everything discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Baggett indicated he did not have a proposed Site Plan, construction plans, or specific development plan for the Board this evening, as these documents have not been submitted to the City for approval. He stated what has been submitted is a request for MPUD Amendment No. 16, which would amend the Tradition MPUD and concept plan for two parcels from Residential to Commercial. Mr. Baggett showed the location of the subject property and MPUD amendment map. He discussed the history of the site, environmental assessment, and shielded lighting of site. Mr. Baggett also reviewed the Tradition DRI traffic impact, proposed intersection improvements; traffic impact – level of service, level of significance; and traffic impact – SW Fairgreen Road. He showed the landscape buffer exhibit, proposed landscape berm and wall typical section. Mr. Baggett concluded his presentation by providing a summary of the request and reviewing the conditions.

Chair Norton inquired if the conditions were included in the Staff's recommendations. Ms. Savage-Dunham indicated that Staff proposed conditions that future development of the property shall include the installation of an architectural wall and enhanced landscaping along the eastern and southern boundaries of the property, extinguish commercial access to Heritage Oaks, and request submittal of a photometric plan with the Site Plan, showing any proposed lighting is shielded and/or oriented to prevent light spillover off the parcel.

Senior City Attorney Hertz asked Staff to clarify the conditions word for word, so there are no overlapping conditions. Ms. Savage-Dunham indicated Staff was satisfied with the wording of their conditions, as they just want a photometric plan submitted at the time of the Site Plan to show the lighting of the site.

Board Member Rosen inquired about the condition regarding Glenbrook and how it relates to the HOA, the turn lane, and the traffic analysis/impact. Mr. Baggett responded to his questions. Dianna Spriggs, Public Works, further explained and clarified the traffic impact data for the level of significance for 106 multi-family residential units.

Lee Dobbins, Dean Mead Law Firm, stated there has been some discussion in the public comment about preserving green space. He indicated that this has been an entitled property for 106 multi-family units and part of the mixed-use section of the DRI for decades. Mr. Dobbins also explained the buy-right process and discussed the change in use from residential to commercial.

Chair Norton inquired if any road improvements were included in the currently approved entitlement, to which Mr. Dobbins responded in the negative and stated the original proposed Site Plan was never approved.

Board Member Previte stated he thought Mattamy was already committed to making some improvements to the intersection. Mr. Baggett indicated the intersection improvements were approved with the DRI.

Board Member Previte questioned the timing of the improvements as they would have to be started by mid-year 2027 to accelerate the December 2027 date. Ms. Savage-Dunham stated this condition is in the DRI, but if a Site Plan comes forward, a traffic analysis will be completed. If it is determined that more improvements beyond what is already conditioned are required, then Staff would have a discussion with the Applicant at the time of Site Plan.

Chair Norton called on those who wish to speak:

1. Joseph Mucciolo, 10540 SW Southgate Court, expressed concern over the growth and traffic data presented, and how Fairgreen and Heritage Oaks would be affected. He spoke against developing the 9.48 acres into commercial property.
2. Margaret Mucciolo, 10540 SW Southgate Court, stated she opposed amendment MPUD regulation book and concept plan P26-026, Tradition MPUD - Amendment No. 16. She indicated she lives within the 750 feet and discussed her concerns.
3. Ms. Mcginnis, 9522 SW Flowermound Circle, reviewed her concerns for the plants, stormwater drainage, flooding, and loss of green space and asked what the plan is to mitigate these issues. She confirmed with the Board that they received the photos she sent to the City.
4. Ray Mcginnis, 9522 SW Flowermound Circle, requested that the Board disapprove the residential change request under consideration and commented on the potential impacts to Heritage Oaks.

5. Janet Edwards, 9528 SW Flowermound Circle, stated she considered moving and hoped some mitigation would occur with the new plans. She discussed security, streetlighting, the lake, flooding, etc., and encouraged the Board to strongly consider the pros and cons.

6. Robert Gattison, 10700 SW Southgate Court, discussed the importance of security, wildlife, and property maintenance.

At this time, the Deputy City Clerk administered the Oath of Testimony to Dana Davidson.

7. Dana Davidson, 9552 SW Flowermound Circle, expressed concern for how this development will proceed and that the adjacent residents are not subject to avoidable impacts. She discussed traffic noise and requested a formal traffic noise study. She also discussed a neighborhood petition that includes 256 signatures; reflects concerns regarding wildlife, safety, noise, sleep disturbance, loss of use, and air quality; and requests mitigation of these issues.

8. Sara Pinto, 10520 SW Southgate Court, stated she did not understand the numbers presented regarding traffic and expressed her concerns for the stormwater, lighting, and wildlife.

9. Linda Buckholtz, 10003 Glenbrook Drive, expressed her concern for increased traffic. She stated the City needed to address safety as well as the impacts to the economy, community, Tradition, and Heritage Oaks.

There being no further comments, Chair Norton closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Norton reviewed with the Staff the process and procedures going forward regarding development of the site, such as the traffic study, Site Plan approval, additional studies, maintenance of property, road improvements. Regarding controlled growth, Chair Norton noted that there are entitlements for thousands of properties, which the City cannot restrict or has limited options. He stated one of the City's goals is for more green space, but this property is not an option. He indicated that rainwater drainage and flooding issues will be addressed at Site Plan. Chair Norton reiterated the final decision on this project rests with the City Council. Chair Norton indicated the Applicant has stated and testified they will go over and above to what has been conditioned already and provide a buffer wall, buffer landscaping, lighting mitigation, etc. Ms. Savage-Dunham stated the Applicant is amenable to a condition requiring them to extinguish any access into Heritage Oaks, a condition requiring a landscape wall and berm be installed as part of any development along the

south and east side of the parcel, and a condition relative to shielding and/or orientation of lights to prevent spillover off the parcel. She noted that Staff would supplement the latter condition with a requirement for a photometric plan at the time of Site Plan approval.

Chair Norton inquired about the blinking red light issue. Ms. Savage-Dunham explained the issue was outside the scope of this application and could be discussed offline.

Vice Chair Pettibon discussed the buffering requirements for commercial versus residential. He proposed that the Applicant elevate the 6-foot wall to an 8-foot wall and significantly increase the buffer by perhaps 25% to 50% in material on the Heritage Oaks side of the community.

Brad Currie, Haley Ward, stated he was sworn in. He explained they do not like to construct 8-foot walls because of the structure, wind load, and increased expense. Board Member Pettibon inquired if the berm could be elevated by two feet. Mr. Currie indicated that would be difficult with a 10-foot buffer, but they will comply and work with the will of the Board.

Chair Pro-Tem Reikenis noted that most concerns were regarding nature and believe a 6-foot wall with an enhanced natural buffer would mitigate the issue. Mr. McDonald reviewed the slides of the landscape berm and wall with the Board.

Vice Chair Pettibon stated he would be able to support this with the condition of a 6-foot wall and 30-foot spacing on trees, as the residents are very concerned with the impacts of noise, light, and sound.

Senior Deputy City Attorney Hertz requested that the motion include the alteration by Ms. Savage-Dunham regarding the photometric study at Site Plan. Vice Chair Pettibon stated his motion would include all Staff required conditions, all conditions the Applicant has agreed to, and the significantly increased spacing of trees and buffering material.

Ms. Savage-Dunham clarified that the slide shows a one-foot berm with a six-foot wall. She asked if the Board was accepting the proposed landscape screen that shows the trees 30-feet on center, with a tree every 15 feet. Vice Chair Pettibon suggested spacing of 20 feet instead of 30 feet, which would give them a third more trees. He stated it could be determined by Staff and the landscape architecture firms.

Ms. Savage-Dunham indicated she understood the deciduous trees shall be spaced 20 feet on center on the Heritage Oaks side of the wall. She

stated that Staff needed to understand the Board's spacing requirements, as the buffer and species/roots of the trees will have to be reviewed by a landscape architect.

Board Member Pettibon stated his intent is to get as much tree canopy as possible, as tall as possible, and maybe the landscape architect could recommend other trees.

Mr. Dobbins stated his client was agreeable to the 20-foot spacing of the trees on the outside of the wall.

Chair Pro-Tem Reikenis inquired if there was any benefit to increasing the depth of the buffer on the Heritage Oaks side of the wall. Mr. Dobbins explained they would not want to do that as it would impact the site design.

Board Member Rosen asked to clarify the intent of the trees, as the request was for both sides of the fence and the Applicant stated they were agreeable to the request for the outside of the fence.

Board Member Spatara inquired if they could contain the hours of operation. Ms. Savage-Dunham explained there was no proposed development there yet, as this was a request to change the use.

Vice Chair Pettibon moved to approve, with Staff conditions, Applicant agreed concessions for a one-third increase in buffering trees to be worked out on the 20-foot basis of spacing.

Ms. Savage-Dunham reiterated the proposed conditions requiring that any lighting on the site be shielded and/or oriented to prevent light spillover off the parcel and the Applicant shall submit a photometric plan with the Site Plan for review; the Applicant shall extinguish or eliminate any access from that parcel into the Heritage Oaks right-of-way; and the Applicant shall provide not less than a 10-foot landscape buffer with a 6-foot wall, one-foot berm with shrubs and deciduous trees on both sides. She indicated the supplement was that the trees would be placed 20 feet on center on both sides of the wall.

There being no further discussion, Vice Chair Pettibon moved to approve P26-026, Tradition Master Planned Unit Development (MPUD) - Amendment No. 16 to the City Council with the conditions as stated by Staff. Chair Pro-Tem Reikenis seconded the motion which passed unanimously by voice vote.

9. New Business

- 9.a** Selection of a Planning and Zoning Board Representative for the Site Plan Review Committee

[2026-388](#)

There being no discussion, Chair Pro-Tem Reikenis moved to approve Peter Spatara as the Planning & Zoning Board representative for the Site Plan Review Committee. Board Member Mocerino seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by voice vote.

At this time, Ms. Savage-Dunham noted that the City Manager's Office coordinated a volunteer appreciation breakfast and for those who were unable to attend, a bag was left for them on the dais. She thanked the Board members for their service.

Ms. Savage-Dunham stated the November 2026 Planning and Zoning Board Meeting is scheduled for Election Day. She asked if the Board would entertain moving it to the Monday before Election Day and stated she would put this on the Agenda for consideration at their next meeting.

10. Old Business

There were no Old Business items to be heard.

11. Public to be Heard

There were no comments from the public.

12. Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:52 PM.

James Norton, Chair

Jasmin De Freese, Deputy City Clerk

Typed by: Traci Mehl, Deputy City Clerk