

**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  
Douglas Harvey, Alternate  
Joe Rosen, Alternate

Please visit [www.cityofpsl.com/tv](http://www.cityofpsl.com/tv) for new public comment options.

---

**Tuesday, January 20, 2026**

**6:00 PM**

**Council Chambers, City Hall**

---

1. Meeting Called to Order

A Special Meeting of the PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD of the City of Port St. Lucie was called to order by Chair Norton at 6:02 p.m., on January 20, 2026, at Port St. Lucie City Hall, 121 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Council Chambers, Port St. Lucie, Florida.

2. Roll Call

Members Present:

Jim Norton, Chair  
Peter Previte  
Peter Spatara  
Rose Mocerino  
Joe Rosen, Alternate

Members Not Present:

Greg Pettibon, Vice Chair  
Eric Reikenis  
Douglas Harvey, Alternate

3. Determination of a Quorum

4. Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Norton led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance.

5. Approval of Minutes

There was nothing to be heard under this item.

6. Consent Agenda

There was nothing to be heard under this item.

7. Public Hearing - Non Quasi-Judicial

**7.a** P25-157 Sandpiper Bay Resort - Small-Scale Comprehensive  
Plan Amendment to the Future Land Use Map

[2026-016](#)

Location: 3500 SE Morningside Boulevard, generally located north of the North Fork of the St. Lucie River, south of SE Westmoreland Boulevard, between the western terminus of SE Pine Valley Street and the eastern terminus of SE Morningside Boulevard

Legal Description: Portions of Section 23, Township 37 South, Range 40 East (full description attached in Special Warranty Deed)

This is a request to amend the Future Land Use Map to change the designation of approximately 28.6 acres from Commercial Limited (CL), Residential Low (RL), and Open Space Recreational (OSR) to Commercial General / Institutional (CG/I).

(Clerk's Note: Per the Senior Deputy City Attorney, Planning & Zoning Director, and Chair's request, the Deputy City Clerk swore in staff, applicants, and the public for both items at this time.)

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint presentation was shown at this time.) Bethany Grubbs, Planner, presented to the Board and stated that this request was for an amendment to modify the designation of 3 portions of the subject property from Commercial Limited (CL), Residential Low (RL) and Open Space Recreational (OSR) to Commercial General/Institutional (CG/I). She discussed surrounding uses, proposed land use change, application & background, and justification for the amendment. She also discussed the Adequate Public Facilities Analysis and Traffic Analysis.

Per the Board's inquiries, Ms. Grubbs discussed the water usage and further clarified that the current traffic was reported to stay the same. She also clarified that no new residential would be added to this property and confirmed that they would be making the area more cohesive with the Comprehensive Plan.

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint presentation was shown at this time.) Rebecca Miller, MPLD Consulting President, represented the applicant and discussed the Comprehensive Plan, existing parcels and Site Plan Amendments, and proposals for student mixed-use buildings, Student Union Building, tennis court concepts, recreation building, volleyball courts, driving range building, and Morningside entry. She continued with discussion on the traffic impact, PUD amendment, and a PUD Concept

Plan. (Clerk's Note: A video was shown at this time.)

Per the Board's questioning, Ms. Miller discussed that she had 2 public outreach sessions and discussions with HOA members, noting that before the plans were submitted, they had been informed and she took resident feedback into consideration.

Chair Norton opened the Public Hearing.

Resident Tracy Kutzler expressed concerns about the creation of additions and where the water and animals would go.

Student Georgio Centeno spoke in favor of the project and the RPS Academy.

Student Jonathan McFarlane spoke in favor of the project and the RPS Academy.

Student Anthony Seon spoke in favor of the project and the RPS Academy.

Student Suraya Khan spoke in favor of the project and the RPS Academy.

Student Manuela Abuchaibe spoke in favor of the project and the RPS Academy.

Student Greta Baerlund spoke in favor of the project and the RPS Academy.

Student Jose Pablo Coello spoke in favor of the project and the RPS Academy.

Resident Michael Shor inquired if there had been an environmental study, noise study, and traffic study.

Resident Cecile Renna spoke positively of the academy, but expressed concerns about noise levels, effect on property levels, elevation levels/views, traffic & parking, and potential addition of speed bumps.

Student Khrish Tala spoke in favor of the project and the RPS Academy.

Resident David Lipps referred to an older deed to the property and discussed concerns about traffic and the preserve & protected animals.

Gabriel Jaramillo, CEO of RPS Academies, spoke in favor of the project

and the RPS Academy.

Resident Claudia Malina expressed favor for the community and stated that the land should be kept as open recreation.

Resident Chris Chandler expressed concerns about traffic and flooding/drainage.

Resident James Len spoke on the history of the area, signs, homeownership, and property values.

Resident Marika Sexton expressed support for the project.

Resident Tom Renna spoke on traffic, the cutting down of the mangroves, noise levels, and concerns for the future.

There being no further public to be heard, Chair Norton closed the Public Hearing.

Ms. Miller clarified that they were not part of the group that cut down the mangroves, and she stated that they were working on the drainage requirements. Ms. Grubbs confirmed that an environmental assessment had been completed, and no gopher tortoises or listed plant species had been observed, but there were osprey nests. Planning & Zoning Director Mary Savage-Dunham clarified that a Site Plan would come forward at the second reading during the City Council meeting.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Spatara moved to recommend approval of P25-157 Sandpiper Bay Resort – Small-Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment to the Future Land Use Map to the City Council. Mr. Previte seconded the motion which passed unanimously by voice vote.

8. Public Hearing - Quasi-Judicial

**8.a** P25-158 Sandpiper Bay Resort PUD Amendment No. 2

[2026-025](#)

Location: 3500 SE Morningside Boulevard, generally located north of the North Fork of the St. Lucie River, south of SE Westmoreland Boulevard, between the western terminus of SE Pine Valley Street and the eastern terminus of SE Morningside Boulevard

Legal Description: Portions of Section 23, Township 37 South, Range 40 East (full legal description attached in the PUD regulation book)

This is a request for the 2nd Amendment to the Sandpiper Bay Resort Planned Unit Development (PUD) to amend the PUD concept plan, update to the permitted uses, update property ownership, and other miscellaneous changes.

Chair Norton inquired if there was any ex-parte communication, to which the Board responded in the affirmative.

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint presentation was shown at this time.) Bethany Grubs, Planner, stated that she was sworn in and that the file was submitted to the City Clerk's Office 5 days prior to the meeting and requested that it be entered into the record. She presented to the Board and stated that the request was to amend the PUD Concept Plan, update permitted uses, update property ownership, and other miscellaneous changes. She discussed the proposed PUD Concept Plan, proposal summary, findings, and traffic review.

She noted that with the agreement, they were requiring a photometric plan at the time of field construction, dark sky lighting, and the lighting must be turned off 1 hour after the game matches/practice training. She also stated that they wanted to protect the residents, so they created an extensive parking condition for overflow parking, with a 12-month window for review and construction. Clyde Cuffy, Public Works, further discussed the traffic study, noting that there was no change in traffic, so a new study was not required.

Ms. Grubbs also clarified that a new building was not being built, it was being replaced, and she and Ms. Savage-Dunham stated that if an event was to be held at the school, the school needed to revise the traffic plan to mitigate issues. Attorney Hertz also clarified the Revocable Encroachment Agreement, which was a condition in the agreement.

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint presentation was shown during item 7.a.) Ms. Miller clarified the distances between the residents and the project site and stated that a buffer would be included. She also discussed the lighting within the area.

Chair Norton opened the Public Hearing.

Resident Jim Len stated that the flow of water was wrong, and he questioned the height of the hotel.

Ms. Grubbs clarified that they were not building another 335 units, it was already existing and under renovation during phase 1, and that there was a requirement that stated that they must submit renderings and elevations if they were planning to build more than 35 ft. in height.

Resident Richard Cameron stated that they were not against economic development, but it needed accountability, and he expressed concerns

about the construction issues and washing debris and chemicals into the canal.

Resident David Lipps requested not to put areca palms into the berms and that they should be 6ft., not 5ft.. He inquired if they could find out what the changes would be in the future regarding traffic. He also inquired if there had been a school pickup/drop-off established and an evacuation plan.

Resident Cecile Renna stated that the traffic study would be a different scenario and they needed to take it into consideration, and that the parking needed to be more environmentally done.

There being no further public to be heard, Chair Norton closed the Public Hearing.

Per the Board’s questioning, Ms. Miller clarified the mangrove incident and noted that the group responsible for the incident had since been bought out. She also clarified that there was no intent to takeover portions of the preserve for parking. Ms. Miller then discussed being under mandates and permits regarding cleaning and trash in the area.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Spatara moved to recommend approval of P25-158 Sandpiper Bay Resort PUD Amendment No. 2, to the City Council with the condition that the applicant will enter into a Revocable Encroachment Agreement prior to Site Plan approval. Mr. Previte seconded the motion which passed unanimously by voice vote.

9. New Business

There was nothing to be heard under this item.

10. Old Business

There was nothing to be heard under this item.

11. Public to be Heard

There was nothing heard under this item.

12. Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Jim Norton, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Jasmin De Freese, Deputy City Clerk