

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

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

Please visit www.cityofpsl.com/tv for new public comment options as a result of COVID-19.

NOTICE: INDIVIDUALS ARE SUBJECT TO MEDICAL SCREENING PRIOR TO ENTERING ANY CITY BUILDING AND ENTRY MAY BE DENIED IF ANY INDICATOR OF ILLNESS OR PRIOR EXPOSURE IS IDENTIFIED.

Tuesday, January 5, 2021

1:30 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 Beutel at 1:42 p.m., on January 5, 2021 at Port St. Lucie City Hall, 121 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Port St. Lucie, Florida.

2. Roll Call

Members Present:

Deborah Beutel, Chair
Melissa Stephenson, Vice Chair
Dan Kurek, Secretary
Ana Gomez-Mallada
Roberta Briney, Alternate
Alfreda Wooten

3. Determination of a Quorum

Chair Beutel confirmed that there was a quorum.

4. Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Beutel led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance.

5. Approval of Minutes

5.a Approval of Minutes - November 3, 2020 & November 17, 2020

[2021-025](#)

There being no discussion, Vice Chair Stephenson moved to approve the minutes. Ms. Wooten seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote.

6. Consent Agenda

6.a P20-221 Veranda Estates [2020-1003](#)
Preliminary Subdivision Plat with Construction Plans

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Laura Dodd, Planner II, stated that the request was for a Preliminary Plat with Construction Plans for 238 single-family residential lots over two phases on the 209-acre property. She explained that the item was previously proposed and approved under P20-005 but revisions had been made to the right-of-way and an additional four lots were added. She showed the location, an aerial of the property, and explained the land use and the zoning. She stated that the project was consistent for concurrency and advised that the Site Plan Review Committee recommended approval with the condition that the Veranda PUD Conceptual Master Plan indicate a secondary emergency access point connecting to Becker Road prior to final plat approval, which was the same condition as before.

Kinan Husainy, Kimley Horn, stated that he was available for questions. There being no further discussion, Secretary Kurek moved to approve the Consent Agenda, P20-221, Veranda Estates. Vice Chair Stephenson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Approval of the Consent Agenda

This item was Approved.

7. Public Hearings - Non Quasi-Judicial

The Deputy City Attorney read the Quasi-Judicial Rules into the record for Items 8a-8l. The Deputy City Clerk administered the Oath of Testimony to staff, the applicants, and members of the audience.

7.a P20-180 Midway Glades Developers, LLC [2021-007](#)
Location: South of Midway Road and West of Interstate 95
Legal Description: Tract "D" of the Plat of LTC Ranch West
This is a request to change the future land use designation of 58 acres of land designated Residential, Office, Institutional (ROI) to Open Space Recreation/Institutional (OSR/I) and 55 acres of OSR/I to ROI for the relocation of a school site and to realign the road rights-of-way for the proposed arterial roads.

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Anne Cox, Planning & Zoning Assistant Director, explained that the application was for a Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the western portion of the LTC Ranch DRI area which proposed to change 58 acres from Residential Office Institutional to Open Space Recreation

Institutional and also change 55 acres from Open Space Recreation Institutional to Residential Office Institutional; the change would accommodate the relocation of a proposed school dedication site. She added that the item was also proposing to realign the road right-of-way's for Arterial A, E/W #5 and E/W #2. She showed an aerial, showed the existing & future land use map, and the roads that would be aligned. She informed the Board that the applicant had worked closely with School Board staff.

Steve Garrett, Lucido & Associates, informed the Board that adjustments had to be made due to planning and design criteria. Chair Beutel opened the Public Hearing, there being no public to be heard, she closed the Public Hearing. Marty Sanders, St. Lucie County School Board, thanked the applicant for being cooperative and felt that the new school site was centrally located.

There being no further discussion, Vice Chair Stephenson moved to recommend approval of P20-180, Midway Glades Developers, LLC, to the City Council. Ms. Briney seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote.

8. Public Hearing - Quasi-Judicial

8.a P20-109 Gatlin Boulevard Center PUD - PUD Rezoning

[2020-973](#)

Location: The property is located west of the SW Gatlin Boulevard and SW Fondura Road intersection, abutting SW Domina Road.

Legal Description: Parcels 1 and 2, Gatlin Boulevard Center and Lots 26-28, Block 1711, Port St Lucie Section 31.

This is a Request to approve a PUD Conceptual plan document and to rezone property from PUD (Planned Unit Development) and CS (Service Commercial) Zoning designations to a PUD (Planned Unit Development) Zoning designation proposed to allow commercial, accessory and special exception uses listed in the General Commercial (CG) zoning district.

Chair Beutel asked if there were any ex-parte communications, to which the Board responded in the negative.

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Laura Dodd, Planner II, 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 explained that the request was to rezone approximately .62 acres from Commercial Service to Planned Unit Development and amend 2.19 acres of the existing Gatlin Boulevard Center PUD. She showed the location map, an aerial, the

zoning map, and the future land use map. She informed the Board that the applicant was proposing to amend and include the southern properties into the PUD. She stated that there were two related projects, a previously approved variance and P20-190 was a Special Exception Use request to permit a car wash which was to be heard later on the agenda. She informed the Board that the project was consistent with the intention and direction of the Comprehensive Plan and was recommended by the Site Plan Review Committee.

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Lee Dobbins, Dean Mead Law Firm, thanked staff for their presentation and explained the areas of the previously approved variance, the PUD, and the Special Exception Use. He informed the Board that Auto Zone was in favor of the change since it would be complementary to their store. He stated that the use was compatible with both existing and permitted uses in the surrounding area. He informed the Board that the location had to be aesthetically pleasing since it was located on Gatlin Boulevard. He added that the location met or exceeded the architectural, landscaping and buffering requirements which he pointed out by showing different viewpoints of the building.

Hunter Chambliss, Chambliss Group, stated that he was excited to be part of the City and stated that he was available for questions.

Chair Beutel opened the Public Hearing there being no public to be heard, she closed the Public Hearing. Ms. Briney moved to recommend approval of P20-109, Gatlin Boulevard Center PUD - PUD Rezoning, to the City Council. Ms. Wooten seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote.

(Clerk's Note: This item was added at the request of Chair Beutel.)

Adventure Park Phase 1A

Kelly Boatwright, Project Manager Parks and Recreation, informed the Board that the City was proposing to create an Adventure Park at Crosstown Parkway and Cameo Boulevard which would be spread out over 38 acres and would consist of a BMX competition track, Pump tracks, BMX trail, skate park, artificial wave and rope courses. She stated that the budget this year was \$1.78 million to begin the final development & construction and the proposed application for a grant would be \$1 million; \$2 million was proposed for next year. She stated that staff was applying for a Land & Water Conservation grant and if received they would have close to \$3 million for Phase 1A of the park. She requested the Board's support in moving forward with the grant application. Chair Beutel inquired if a pool would be one of

the amenities, to which Ms. Boatwright responded in the negative and added that the artificial wave was not a pool, it was a wave rider. Vice Chair Stephenson inquired if the park was part of the Port District, to which Ms. Boatwright responded in the negative.

There being no further discussion, Vice Chair Stephenson moved to approve the Adventure Park Phase 1A plans. Ms. Gomez- Mallada seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote.

8.b P20-162 Riverland/Kennedy Development of Regional Impact
(DRI) - DRI Amendment

[2020-971](#)

Location: The property is located South of Discovery Way, West of Community Boulevard and east of Range Line Road.

Legal Description: A parcel of land lying in Sections 15-22, 27, 28, 33, 34, Township 37 South, Range 39 East, City of Port St. Lucie, Florida.

This a request to amend Map H, the Master Development Plan, and the conditions of approval of the DRI.

Chair Beutel asked if there were any ex-parte communications, to which the Board responded in the negative with the exception of Secretary Kurek who replied that he had communication with a representative of the Wilson Property.

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Daniel Robinson, Planner I, stated that he had been sworn in and stated that the file had been submitted to the City Clerk's Office 5 days prior to the meeting and requested that it be entered into the record. He explained that the item was the 4th amendment to the Riverland/Kennedy DRI development order, which was located south of Discovery Way, west of Community Boulevard, and east of Rangeline Road and consisted of 3,845 acres. He stated that the Future Land Use was New Community Development and that the Development plan divided the project into major districts consistent with the New Community Development Future Land Use classification and policies. He stated that the purpose of the amendment was to amend Exhibit "B", general conditions of approval and Exhibit "D", Master Development Plan (Map H) of the DRI; Exhibit "D" proposed amendment to the Master Development Plan (Map H) adjusts the locations for the Residential, Mixed Use, Neighborhood/Village Commercial and Regional Business Center categories to accommodate new development proposals. He informed the Board that the proposed changes would not change the net acreage of any land use designation, as it was just a proposed change in location. He showed the existing map and the proposed map and added that staff finds the petition to be consistent with the intent and

direction of the City's Comprehensive Plan and recommended approval.

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Ken Tuma, Managing Principal of Urban Design Studio, stated that the subject area was located in the southwest annexation area of the Riverland/Kennedy DRI. He explained that the DRI was approved in 2006 and there had been three amendments since the approval. He stated that the item was proposing to modify Exhibit D, Map H to update the Conceptual Site Plan, and expressed that there was no net change; no change in residential density, no change in commercial intensity, no additional land area, as they were reallocating subdistricts around the project. He said that they would be updating the phasing, the build-out, and the permit dates to reflect tolling; proposing to add a minimum number of age restricted dwelling units and establish guidelines for the creation of age restricted communities; proposing to amend certain language of the conditions to reflect changes in relation to state statutes and were amending Condition 48 to correct a Scrivener's Error and reflect an approved fee change and lastly they were proposing to add language where appropriate to confirm satisfaction of certain conditions. He showed the existing Map H and the proposed Map H and explained all the relocations of the subdistricts. He informed the Board that two Governors had issued several Emergency Orders which allowed for an extension of time to the Development Order; he showed each of the orders and how the extensions affected phasing. He informed the Board that they were proposing to amend the conditions to specify that a minimum of 3,275 age-restricted dwelling units are proposed out of the total 8,424 single-family units approved, they worked with staff and community development to define what an age-restricted community or community consisting of age restricted units means and they were also proposing to add language to establish a requirement to record restrictive covenants for an age-restricted community in the event that an age-restricted community fails to meet the criteria. Lastly, he explained that there were miscellaneous amendments to the Development Order Conditions to reflect current law; correcting a Scrivener's Error that occurred in Condition 48, and they were proposing to add language, where appropriate, to confirm the satisfaction of and compliance with certain conditions, specifically those relating to the dedications of rights-of-way, the construction of roadway improvements, and the preparation of a plan to be approved by the City regarding the conveyance of land for future parks and recreational facility sites.

Chair Beutel opened the Public Hearing. Doug Smith, Attorney from Hoppings, Greens and Sams for Riverland, stated that an issue arose during the holiday week in which a letter from Akel Homes, Wilson Groves Development, was received. The letter raised objections to traffic issues, but Attorney Smith stated that he addressed those issues in a response letter. He stated that the letter mentioned that the annexation agreement which was entered into in the Western annexation area may affect the Board's decision which he felt, legally, did not apply. He informed the Board that a Circuit Court was reviewing and interpreting the meaning of the annexation agreement. He said that the primary objection that was raised was that the item would affect the Wilson Groves access to its property but that "the development condition that they are complaining about was actually imposed in NOPC #3 which was approved about two years ago and it is legal unassailable now." He assured that Board that they were not proposing to change the Development Conditions as they related to Becker Road and did not pertain to the item presented to the Board. He stated that the annexation agreement made clear that the City's approval process was not impacted by the annexation agreement. He requested that the Board vote on the evidence that was submitted and requested that his response letter be entered into the record.

Alfred Malefatto, Lewis, Longman, Walker, Attorney for Akel Homes, requested that Mr. Akel's letter opposing the item be entered into the record. He informed the Board that he felt that the annexation agreement was relevant to the application before the Board. He noted that the annexation agreement, dating back to 2004, involved three developers (Riverland/Kennedy, Wilson Groves, and Southern Groves) in the southwest annexation area. He felt that the item should be denied or tabled until the issues were resolved, and he felt that the application "improperly seeks approval of more units than it currently permits under Phase I of the DRI without the required road construction." He felt that "an approval would allow Riverland to avoid meeting its obligation under the DRI even with the NOPC's and the changes and the annexation agreement to construct roads necessary for both Riverland and the surrounding developments, notably road segments that were originally intended to be Riverland Phase I roads including segments of East/West 3, Community Boulevard, and Becker Road." He felt that since they were not proposed for construction it could have an adverse effect on Wilson Grove and its future development. He showed slides that explained: the road networks

listed under the annexation agreement and the DRI approvals, roads built by Riverland/Kennedy which he stated only provided access to Riverland properties, and roads he proposed should be built by Riverland. He felt that Riverland/Kennedy was intentionally landlocking Wilson Groves by eliminating roads which would provide access to Wilson Groves. He informed the Board that the annexation agreement was in litigation and felt that the obligations still existed. He added that development had to be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and the annexation agreement. He found it troubling that staff did not know the requirements of the annexation agreement and the fact that Riverland eliminated road segments which were required to be built. He stated that if there was a breach, no future development "should go forward" per the annexation agreement. He requested that staff provide a detailed summary of all the approvals allowed to Riverland/Kennedy through the project history and the roads that have been eliminated.

Susan O'Rourke, Traffic Engineer for Wilson Groves, informed the Board that the revisions and impacts to Map H were unknown as they did not have a traffic study or an analysis that evaluated the change in the location of the land use. She felt that the change in location of the land use could change the internal capture and would impact specific segments of the roadway. She said that the Western Annexation Traffic Study (WATS), the governing traffic study for all the DRI's, did not include the land uses in the same locations or the same densities that were being proposed. She advised that if changes were being made to the phasing and infrastructure an analysis was needed to demonstrate that there were no impacts.

Daniel Sorrow, Coteleur-Hearing, stated that Wilson Groves was unable to construct homes, parks, or roads because they were landlocked by Riverland/Kennedy. He explained that the issues could be discussed under the DRI Amendment. He felt that Riverland/Kennedy had taken advantage of current infrastructure and were not extending roads to Wilson Groves because of the competition. He explained that in the past staff used agencies to provide another layer of review for road analysis, but due to the passing of the House Bill it was up to the City to provide an analysis. He reiterated that the City was conducting a further analysis and did not feel that the application correctly represented what was being proposed regionally with the different DRI's in the area. He requested the item be tabled to allow staff and the developer more time to establish a road network. He thanked the Board for their

consideration. Chair Beutel inquired as to how much time was needed for the annexation agreement, to which Mr. Sorrow replied that the DRI amendment had to extend any road to Wilson Groves, they asked that Riverland/Kennedy figure it out.

Horacio Moncada, Akel Homes, stated that he had been sworn in and stated that Akel Homes had paid \$20 million over the years to the City in good faith to ensure that Akel Homes rights and interests were protected. He felt that staff's willingness to work with the neighboring development jeopardized the vision of a better city. He informed the Board that if roads were not created Wilson Groves would be left as an "unreachable island that benefits no one and leaves the City underprepared to service the new side of the City." He stated that Akel Homes would be willing to negotiate ending the relationship with the City, in exchange for adequate restitutions.

Attorney Smith responded by saying that the Land Development Code and the Comprehensive Plan did not state that a development order had to be consistent with the annexation agreement. He replied to the comment about Wilson Groves being land locked as not true and added that it was being brought before the Circuit Court. He stated that the annexation agreement afforded Wilson Groves the right to build two lanes across Riverland to gain access to their property and charge the cost plus 18% to the developer. He advised the Board that their decision on the item was not impacted by annexation agreement and he referenced the provision. He stated that the application was submitted in August of 2020 and should not be delayed.

Mr. Moncada reiterated that \$20 million was given to the City and Wilson Groves paid over \$300,000 annually since the annexation agreement and "had nothing to show for it".

There being no more public to be heard, Chair Beutel closed the Public Hearing. Secretary Kurek stated that he understands the importance of growth in the City and the County. He inquired if the Board had to approve the age-restricted community, to which Attorney Smith replied that legally they Board could not deny the project due to the age-restriction, but he was unsure if there was a Code provision that allowed for discretion for age-restricted communities when it complies with all components. Secretary Kurek replied that the City needed to stop being a retired community to keep the taxes at a low level. He stated that whether the Board approved or denied this item, it had to be brought before the City Council for a final decision and he voiced his concern over the fact that the two developers could not work together

to come to a resolution. He voiced that the Board did not have the ability to assume what the Circuit Court would decide, to which Chair Beutel, Vice Chair Stephenson and Ms. Briney agreed. Chair Beutel stated that the Board should research and have more time to come to an answer. She agreed with Secretary Kurek's comment regarding age-restricted housing and had concerns over the other remaining homes being allowed to switch to age-restricted. Marty Sanders replied that age-restricted housing was a benefit to the school district because it prevented providing capital facilities to expand schools to meet the growth and increased the tax base to offset the remaining school costs. He informed the Board that there was nothing specific in the Zoning Code that required age-restricted communities to do anything differently. Secretary Kurek inquired if age-restriction was set for a certain amount of time, or if they could remove that restriction at any point, to which Mr. Sanders replied that Riverland had specific documents that specified that Riverland needed School Board consent to eliminate the age-restriction and would have to pay the impact fees to the School Board due at the time. Secretary Kurek voiced that the issues were outside the Board's authority and felt that the Board would put themselves in jeopardy if they denied the project. Chair Beutel voiced that if they tabled the item the Board would have more time to make an educated decision. Vice Chair Stephenson inquired if the issue arose from Becker Road not expanding into their property and inquired if there were more connectors from Village Parkway, to which Mr. Robinson replied that he could only speak on the applicant's proposed roadways which were East/West 3, Paar Road, N/S A, Riverland Boulevard and Becker Road. Vice Chair Stephenson replied that her biggest issue was that Wilson Groves could not access the property from Becker Road. Mr. Robinson responded by saying that the legal question was who was responsible for the expanding of Becker Road.

Attorney Smith replied that the roadway network was dedicated a long time ago and the City had the right to build roads, but the annexation agreement explained that the parties were responsible for building certain roads, and if the other party built the road the cost and interest would be charged. He said the question was who was going to build the right-of-way. Vice Chair Stephenson stated that there should have been documents which explained how Becker Road would continue to the property. Attorney Malefatto replied that Wilson Road can construct Becker Road at their cost but had already spent \$20 million and felt that it was fair that Riverland Boulevard build Becker Road. Mr. Moncada

replied that there was an annexation agreement which indicated what part of Becker Road the developers were liable to build. He stated that the City owned the rights-of-way and had the obligation to force the developers to build their corresponding roads and if not, the City could withhold permitting privileges. He added that Paar Road was no longer a viable option since it would be an internal road for Southern Grove, therefore the only options were Becker Road and the roads to the north that should be provided.

Ms. Gomez-Mallada requested a copy of the annexation agreement and moved to table the item to the February 2, 2021 Planning & Zoning Board meeting to allow the Board time to review the document; the motion died for a lack of a second. Ms. Wooten moved to deny P20-162, Riverland/Kennedy Development of Regional Impact. Ms. Gomez-Mallada seconded the motion, which passed by roll call vote with Ms. Briney, Vice Chair Stephenson, Ms. Gomez- Mallada and Ms. Wooten voting in favor and Chair Beutel, and Secretary Kurek voting against.

- 8.c** P20-175 Riverland/Kennedy DRI Parcel B - MPUD Rezoning
Location: Located south of the Discovery Way (E/W 1) right-of-way and west of the Community Boulevard.
Legal Description: The property is legally described as portions of Sections 21 and 22, Township 37 South, Range 39 East, St. Lucie County, Florida.
This is a request to rezone 341 acres from the St. Lucie County AG-5 zoning designation to a Master Planned Unit Development (MPUD).

[2021-005](#)

Chair Beutel asked if there were any ex-parte communications, to which the Board responded in the negative.

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Mr. Robinson stated that he had been sworn in and stated that the file had been submitted to the City Clerk's Office 5 days prior to the meeting and requested that it be entered into the record. He explained that the property consisted of 341 acres and the proposed MPUD would allow for 938 age-restricted residential dwelling units. He added that it was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, specified that Port St. Lucie Utilities Systems will provide water and sewer service, and informed the Board that the Site Plan Review Committee had recommend approval.

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Azlina Goldstein Siegel, Riverland/Kennedy, stated that the property was located west of Community Boulevard, east of Riverland Boulevard, and south of

Discovery Way. She stated that the primary access for Parcel B would be along Community Boulevard with secondary access along Marshall Parkway. She informed the Board that they would be offering single-family homes, villas, and townhomes. She stated that she was available for questions. Vice Chair Stephenson inquired if this parcel was age-restricted, to which Ms. Goldstein-Siegel responded in the affirmative.

Chair Beutel opened the Public Hearing. Mr. Moncada stated that roadways were being developed along the eastern side and the secondary access was not reachable at this time and may not be built for five years. He stated that there was no access to Wilson Grove and requested that his previous testimony be entered into the record for this item. Attorney Malefatto, requested that his previous testimony be entered into the record for this item and requested that the item be tabled. Attorney Smith requested that his previous testimony and letter be entered into the record for this item.

There being no further public to be heard, Chair Beutel closed the Public Hearing. Secretary Kurek moved to approve P20-175, Riverland/Kennedy DRI Parcel B – MPUD. Ms. Lamar-Sarno interjected that the rezoning would be consistent with Map H, therefore Secretary Kurek withdrew his motion. Vice Chair Stephenson moved to deny P20-175, Riverland/Kennedy DRI Parcel B - MPUD. Ms. Briney seconded the motion, which passed by roll call vote with Ms. Briney, Vice Chair Stephenson, Ms. Gomez- Mallada, Ms. Wooten and Chair Beutel voting in favor, and Secretary Kurek voting against.

Vice Chair Stephenson inquired if items 8b & 8c would go before the City Council, to which Ms. Lamar-Sarno responded in the affirmative.

8.d P20-187 Western Grove - DRI Amendment

[2021-013](#)

Location: The property is generally located west of Interstate 95, directly east of Range Line Road, south of the proposed extension of Crosstown Parkway and north of the Discovery Way right-of-way.

Legal Description: A parcel of land lying in Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 17 and 18, Township 37 South, Range 39 East.

This is a request to amend the development order for the Western Grove Development of Regional Impact (DRI), which includes a revised Map H, the master development plan, amendments to certain conditions and revisions to the buildout and termination dates.

Chair Beutel asked if there were any ex-parte communications, to which the Board responded in the negative.

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Bridget Kean, Senior Planner, stated that she had been sworn in and added that the file had been submitted to the City Clerk's Office 5 days prior to the meeting and requested that it be entered into the record. She informed the Board that the amendment was previously approved in 2007, the 1st amendment was approved in April 2016 and the 2nd Amendment was approved in November 2018. She explained that the 3rd Amendment to the Western Grove DRI was to amend the Master Development Plan, Map H, to revise the buildout and expiration dates per the State granted extensions and included miscellaneous changes to some of the Development Order conditions of approval. She stated that the property was located east of Rangeline Road, south of the proposed extension of Crosstown Parkway, and north of the Discovery Road right-of-way and was approximately 1,941 acres. She informed the Board that the current Development Plan allowed for retail space, residential dwelling units, and office space. She reminded the Board that on the December 1, 2020 Planning & Zoning Board meeting a Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Western Grove which amended the Land Use Subdistrict for 8.12 acres to Residential, realigned a portion of the N/S A road right-of-way located north of Westcliffe Lane & south of future Crosstown Parkway to accommodate a proposed utility site and updated the conceptual lake system to be consistent with developer's current subdivision plans that had been recommended for approval. She informed the Board that the purpose of this item was to mirror those previous changes. The other changes were to allow for the flexibility in intersection design, support mass transit, to reference conditions that were satisfied, remove outdated state mandated regulations, and to extent the buildout & expiration dates pursuant to the Hurricane Emergency Declaration issued by the Governor. She showed an existing map and a map with the proposed changes. She stated that staff recommended approval. She said that a letter was received from Rainbow Groves who were not opposed to the application, but they requested adequate buffering and added that there was a buffer along Rangeline Road.

Mr. Garrett stated that he had been sworn in and had responded to the Rainbow Groves email; he requested that it be entered into the record. He stated that the current buffering provided a 100-110-foot width open space/buffer along the western & northern boundaries.

Chair Beutel opened the Public Hearing there being no public to be

heard, she closed the Public Hearing. Ms. Wooten moved to recommend approval of P20-187, Western Grove - DRI Amendment, to the City Council. Secretary Kurek seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote.

8.e P20-193 Western Grove MPUD Amendment No. 1

[2021-018](#)

Location: The property is located directly east of Range Line Road, south of the proposed extension of Crosstown Parkway and north of the Discovery Way right-of-way.

Legal Description: A parcel of land lying in Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 17 and 18, Township 37 South, Range 39 East.

Request: The proposed amendment revises the property ownership information, adjusts the development program and land use areas, adjusts the development intensity for residential and non-residential uses, and includes a minor adjustment to residential setbacks.

Chair Beutel asked if there were any ex-parte communications, to which the Board responded in the negative.

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Ms. Kean stated that she had been sworn in and added that the file had been submitted to the City Clerk's Office 5 days prior to the meeting and requested that it be entered into the record. She explained that the item was a proposed amendment to the MPUD Rezoning Regulation Book and Concept Plan for the Western Grove DRI and was associated with the previous item; it applied to 1,339.94 acres. The property was located east of Rangeline Road, south of the Crosstown Parkway extension, and north of Discovery Way. She informed the Board that the MPUD was currently approved for 2,900 residential dwelling units, 200,000 square feet of retail use, and 50,000 square feet of office use; it contained sites for a school, a park, and a fire station. She stated that the residential units may be a combination of detached single-family, attached villas, townhomes, or multi-family units. She informed the Board that Mattamy Palm Beach LLC was applying to amend the MPUD to increase the residential entitlements by an additional 500 units, totaling 3,400 and a decrease in the retail entitlements by 30,000 square feet, totaling 170,000 square feet of retail space; the change was still within the approved 4,000 dwelling units and 200,000 square feet of retail space. She stated that Vitalia residents had concerns over the change but were ensured that the change was not increasing the entitlements in the DRI. She stated that the changes mirror the changes that would be made to the DRI maps and Conceptual Plan. She explained that when Tradition Parkway extending to Rangeline Road had been removed and then added back into the DRI, but the

maps were not revised, therefore the MPUD Concept Plan will show the connection. She said that the amendment would also include minor adjustments to side setbacks (6-foot to 5-foot), and the inclusion of certain requirements requested by staff. She stated that the Site Plan Review Committee and staff recommended approval.

Mr. Garrett gave a brief history of the property and added that it has turned into a more family orientated development, therefore 8 acres of commercial had to be removed, they enlarged the utility site, and the adjustments mentioned by Ms. Kean. He stated that the number of dwelling units was within the threshold that was entitled for the Western Grove DRI. He explained to the Board that the remaining 600 units would be located north of Westcliff, and east of N/S A and part of the Taylor Morrison Community.

Chair Beutel opened the Public Hearing. The Deputy City Clerk administered the Oath of Testimony to James Morris who inquired if the buffering would decrease and requested more information on the proposal. Chair Beutel requested that Planning & Zoning staff contact Mr. Morris to address his concerns.

The Deputy City Clerk administered the Oath of Testimony to Louis Tuzzolino who voiced his concerns over how this item would affect him and his neighbors personally. Chair Beutel requested that Planning & Zoning staff contact Mr. Tuzzolino.

Chair Beutel closed the Public Hearing and, Ms. Wooten moved to recommend approval of P20-193, Western Grove MPUD Amendment No. 1, to the City Council. Ms. Briney seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote.

8.f P20-198 Gatlin Boulevard Center PUD Parcel 1 - Special Exception Use

[2020-975](#)

Location: The property is located west of the SW Gatlin Boulevard and SW Fondura Road intersection, abutting SW Domina Road.

Legal Description: Parcels 1 and 2, Gatlin Boulevard Center and Lots 26-28, Block 1711, Port St. Lucie Section 31

This is a request for approval of a carwash within the Gatlin Boulevard Center PUD.

Chair Beutel asked if there were any ex-parte communications, to which the Board responded in the negative.

(Clerk’s Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Ms. Dodd stated

that she had been sworn in and added that the file had been submitted to the City Clerk’s Office 5 days prior to the meeting and requested that it be entered into the record. She stated that this item was related to Item 8a and a Variance request. She explained that the purpose of the request was to provide for a car wash Special Exception Use within the Gatlin Boulevard PUD which was acceptable in the new PUD and consistent with the code requirements within the General Commercial District. She showed an aerial, the zoning map, the Future Land Use, the Conceptual Plan, and Conceptual Landscaping and Elevations. She informed the Board that the code required a sound/acoustic study and a stacking analysis which was supplied, reviewed, and accepted by the Site Plan Review Committee. She added that the Site Plan Review Committee and staff recommended approval.

Attorney Dobbins requested that his previous testimony be added into the record for this item and stated that he was available for questions.

Chair Beutel opened the Public Hearing there being no public to be heard, she closed the Public Hearing. Ms. Briney moved to recommend approval of P20-198, Gatlin Boulevard Center PUD Parcel 1 - Special Exception Use, to the City Council. Vice Chair Stephenson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote.

8.g P20-212 Verano PUD 1 Amendment No. 10 - PUD
Amendment

2021-011

Location: The property is located north of the C-24 Canal, east of Range Line Road, west of I-95 and north of the Crosstown Parkway.

Legal Description: A parcel of land lying in Sections 31 and 32, Township 36 South, Range 39 East, and Sections 5 and 6, Township 37 South, Range 39 East, St. Lucie County, Florida and being a portion of Sections 28, 29, 32, Township 36 South, Range 39 East, St. Lucie County, Florida.

This is a request to amend the Planned Unit Development (PUD) to change the parking requirements for all single-family development to have at least two (2) parking spaces and change the requirements for all duplexes with single-car garages to have at least one (1) parking space in the garage and one tandem exterior parking space in the driveway per unit.

Chair Beutel asked if there were any ex-parte communications, to which the Board responded in the negative.

Vice Chair Stephenson moved to table P20-212, Verano PUD 1 Amendment No. 10 - PUD Amendment. Ms. Briney seconded the

motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote. (Clerk's Note: Ms. Gomez-Mallada was not present for the vote.)

8.h P20-213 Verano South Pod A PUD 1 Amendment No. 2 - PUD
Amendment

[2021-012](#)

Location: The property is located south of the C-24 Canal, east of Range Line Road, west of I-95 and north of the Crosstown Parkway.

Legal Description: A parcel of land lying in Sections 31 and 32, Township 36 South, Range 39 East, and Sections 5 and 6, Township 37 South, Range 39 East, St. Lucie County, Florida and being a portion of Sections 28, 29, 32, Township 36 South, Range 39 East, St. Lucie County, Florida.

This is a request to amend the Planned Unit Development (PUD) to change the parking requirements for single-family and duplex villa units.

Chair Beutel asked if there were any ex-parte communications, to which the Board responded in the negative.

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Holly Price, Planner III, stated that she had been sworn in and added that the file had been submitted to the City Clerk's Office 5 days prior to the meeting and requested that it be entered into the record. She explained that the original Verano South Pod D PUD was approved as a low density single-family residential development with recreation areas, open space, lakes, and roads to access these uses; the proposed PUD application proposed a maximum of 350 units on 147.414 acres, or 2.4 dwelling units per acre. She stated that the major changes to the amendment were to change the parking requirements for all single-family developments to have at least two (2) parking spaces, and to change the requirements for all duplexes with single-car garages to have at least one parking space in the garage and one tandem exterior parking space in the driveway per unit, thereby reducing the number of parking spaces. She showed an aerial, a location map, and added that the Site Plan Review Committee recommended approval.

Mr. Sorrow stated that he was available for questions and requested approval.

Chair Beutel opened the Public Hearing there being no public to be heard, she closed the Public Hearing. Secretary Kurek moved to recommend approval of P20-213, Verano South Pod A PUD 1 Amendment No. 2 - PUD Amendment, to the City Council. Vice Chair Stephenson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll

call vote. (Clerk's Note: Ms. Gomez-Mallada was not present for the vote.)

8.i P20-214 Verano South Pod 'D' Amendment No. 3 - PUD
Amendment

[2021-009](#)

Location: The property is located south of the C-24 Canal, east of Range Line Road, west of I-95 and north of the Crosstown Parkway.

Legal Description: Sections 28, 29, 32 and 33, Township 36 South, Range 39 East.

This is a request to amend the Planned Unit Development (PUD) document and concept plan to change the layout of the Pod D Conceptual Master Plan and add language to the PUD document regarding the applicability of the Citywide Design Standards.

Chair Beutel asked if there were any ex-parte communications, to which the Board responded in the negative.

(Clerk's Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) She explained that the development was the same development as the previous item and had a projected density of 2.35 dwelling units per acre which allowed a maximum of 702 units on 298.73 acres. She stated that the major changes included with this amendment were to revise the layout of the Pod D Master Concept Plan and to add language to the PUD regarding the applicability of the Citywide Design Standards. She showed an aerial, a location map, and added that the Site Plan Review Committee had recommended approval.

Mr. Sorrow stated that he was available for questions and requested approval.

Chair Beutel opened the Public Hearing, there being no public to be heard, she closed the Public Hearing. Ms. Briney moved to recommend approval of P20-214, Verano South Pod 'D' Amendment No. 3 - PUD Amendment, to the City Council. Secretary Kurek seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote. (Clerk's Note: Ms. Gomez-Mallada was not present for the vote.)

8.j P20-219 Verano South Pod 'E' Amendment No. 3 - PUD
Amendment

[2021-010](#)

Location: The property is located south of the C-24 Canal, east of Range Line Road, west of I-95 and north of the Crosstown Parkway.

Legal Description: Sections 28, 29, 32 and 33, Township 36 South, Range 39 East.

This is a request to amend the Planned Unit Development (PUD) document and concept plan to change the layout of the Pod D

Conceptual Master Plan and add language to the PUD document regarding the applicability of the Citywide Design Standards.

Chair Beutel asked if there were any ex-parte communications, to which the Board responded in the negative.

(Clerk’s Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Ms. Price stated that the item was almost identical to the previous item and allowed for a maximum of 307 units. She explained that the major changes included with this amendment were to revise the layout of the Pod D Master Concept Plan and to add language to the PUD regarding the applicability of the Citywide Design Standards. She showed an aerial and a location and added that the Site Plan Review Committee had recommended approval.

Mr. Sorrow stated that he was available for questions and requested approval.

Chair Beutel opened the Public Hearing there being no public to be heard, she closed the Public Hearing. Vice Chair Stephenson moved to recommend approval of P20-219, Verano South Pod ‘E’ Amendment No. 3 - PUD Amendment, to the City Council. Ms. Wooten seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote. (Clerk’s Note: Ms. Gomez-Mallada was not present for the vote.)

8.k P20-225 University Boulevard Business Center at St. Lucie West - Variance

[2021-015](#)

Location: The property is generally located at the SW corner of NW University Boulevard and NW California Boulevard.

Legal Description: Lots 10 and 11 of St. Lucie West Plat No. 143, Second Replat in Parcel 21D

This is a request to grant a variance to Section 158.222(B)(4) of the City’s Code of Ordinance that states that driveways located on arterial roads within commercial districts shall have a spacing of 250 feet from intersections. The application is for a variance of 20 feet to allow a spacing of 230 feet from the driveway to the NW University Boulevard & NW California Boulevard roundabout intersection.

Chair Beutel asked if there were any ex-parte communications, to which the Board responded in the negative.

(Clerk’s Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Bolivar Gomez, Planner II, stated that he had been sworn in and added that the file had been submitted to the City Clerk’s Office 5 days prior to the meeting and requested that it be entered into the record. He explained that the

applicant was seeking a variance of 20 feet to allow a spacing of 230 feet from the driveway for a project known as University Boulevard Business Center to the northwest University Boulevard & northwest California Boulevard roundabout intersection. He stated that Section 158.222(B)(4) required commercial driveways located on arterial roads, to be 250 feet from intersections. He informed the Board that this request was related to P20-159 – St. Lucie West – University Boulevard Business Center – Small-Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment and P20-160 – St. Lucie West – University Boulevard Business Center PUD Rezoning. He noted that a memorandum of no objection for the requested variance had been provided by the City’s Public Works Department. (Clerk’s Note: Secretary Kurek requested that Mr. Gomez indicate where the driveway was on the Conceptual Plan.)

Brad Currie, Engineering Design and Construction, informed the Board that depth caused the variance and requested access to both University Boulevard and California Boulevard to provide for circulation on the site. He stated that the Planning & Zoning Department and the Public Works Department supported the project and added that he was available for questions.

Chair Beutel opened the Public Hearing there being no public to be heard, she closed the Public Hearing. Ms. Briney moved to approve P20-225, University Boulevard Business Center at St. Lucie West – Variance. Ms. Wooten seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote. (Clerk’s Note: Ms. Gomez-Mallada was not present for the vote.)

8.1 P20-246 City of Port St. Lucie - City Center Master Sign Program Amendment No.2

[2020-999](#)

Location: Southeast corner of US Highway #1 and Walton Road.

Legal Description: City Center Plat

This is a request to amend to the City Center Master Sign Program to allow an additional sign on US Highway #1.

Chair Beutel asked if there were any ex-parte communications, to which the Board responded in the negative.

(Clerk’s Note: A PowerPoint was shown at this time.) Patti Tobin, Long Range Planning Administrator, stated that she had been sworn in and added that the file had been submitted to the City Clerk’s Office 5 days prior to the meeting and requested that it be entered into the record. She explained that the request was proposing to modify the existing

City Center Master Sign Program to allow for an additional sign on US Highway 1 in the vicinity of southeast Village Square Drive's intersection with US Highway 1. She showed an aerial/ location map, a picture of the current signs, a figure of the proposed sign and read the proposed language that was to be added. She added that staff recommend approval.

Linda McCarthy, MidFlorida Event Center Director, stated that she available for questions.

Chair Beutel opened the Public Hearing there being no public to be heard, she closed the Public Hearing. Ms. Wooten moved to recommend approval of P20-246, City of Port St. Lucie - City Center Master Sign Program Amendment No.2, to the City Council. Secretary Kurek seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote. (Clerk's Note: Ms. Gomez-Mallada was not present for the vote.)

9. New Business

Vice Chair Stephenson moved to approve agenda item [FILE_NR]. Board Member Wooten seconded the motion. The City Clerk restated the motion as follows: to approve [FILE_NR]. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

9.a Planning and Zoning Board Alternate Member Interviews

[2021-028](#)

It was the consensus of the Board to table the Planning & Zoning interviews to the February 2, 2021 Planning & Zoning meeting. Chair Beutel inquired if the Board could move the At-Large members to open District positions, to which Attorney Hertz responded in the negative. She stated that the Board could make a request to the City Council to modify the Code of Ordinances which would allow the At-Large members to move into open District positions. Vice Chair Stephenson explained that it was easier to fill At-Large positions than District positions. Attorney Hertz responded by saying that a previous discussion had brought up the issue of removing the District positions, which could be requested to the City Council and the other issue was to "move" members around which the Legal Department deemed inappropriate.

There being no further discussion, Vice Chair Stephenson moved to request that At-Large Planning & Zoning Board members be moved into open District positions, to the City Council. Ms. Wooten seconded the motion which passed unanimously by roll call vote. (Clerk's Note: Ms. Gomez-Mallada was not present for the vote.)

Chair Beutel thanked Ms. Briney for attending the meetings, even though she was an alternate. She inquired if Ms. Briney would consider being a permanent Board member and stated that she could become a permanent member by having a vote of the Board. Attorney Hertz replied that it was not appropriate since there was an application process and an interview process. Ms. Lamar-Sarno stated that years ago a process was setup and the By-Laws were changed to reflect that everyone be interviewed for open positions. She stated that the only open positions were for District 1 and District 2 and Ms. Briney could apply for either of those positions if she lived in either district.

Chair Beutel inquired if the Board wanted to set a limit on the amount of times an applicant could apply for an open position, to which there was no response. Attorney Hertz & Ms. Lamar-Sarno thanked the Board for their hard work.

10. Old Business

There was nothing 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 4:56 p.m.

Daniel Kurek, Secretary

Shanna Donleavy, Deputy City Clerk