

City of Port St. Lucie

Planning and Zoning Board

Meeting Minutes - Draft

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

Melody Creese, At-Large
John "Jack" Doughney, At-Large
James Norton, At-Large
Greg Pettibon, At-Large
Peter Previte, At-Large
Eric Reikenis, At-Large
Peter Louis Spatara, At-Large
Rose Futch, Alternate
Saadat Syed, Alternate

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

Tuesday, November 28, 2023

6:00 PM

Council Chambers, City Hall

Special

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 Deborah Beutel at approximately 6:00 PM, on November 28, 2023 at the Port St. Lucie City Hall, Council Chambers, 121 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Port St. Lucie, Florida.

2. Roll Call

Members Present:

Deborah Beutel, Chair
Carol Taylor-Moore, Secretary
Peter Previte, At-Large
Eric Reikenis, At-Large
Melody Creese, Alternate
Peter L. Spatara, Alternate

Member Not Present:

Alfreda Wooten, Vice Chair
Roberta Briney, At-Large

3. Determination of a Quorum

Chair Beutel determined there was a quorum.

4. Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Beutel led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance.

5. Approval of Minutes

There were no items scheduled for this portion of the agenda.

6. Consent Agenda

There were no items scheduled for this portion of the agenda.

7. Public Hearings - Non Quasi-Judicial

7.a P23-201 Wilson Groves - Comprehensive Plan Text

[2023-1095](#)

Amendment

Location: The property is generally located north of the C-23 Canal, east of Range Line Road, south of the Marshall Parkway right-of-way, and west of the N/B road right-of-way.

Legal Description: The property is legally described as a portion of the Alan Wilson Grove plat and portions of Sections 30 and 31 Township 37 South, Range 39 East.

This is a request for approval of a comprehensive plan text amendment (CPA) to amend Figure 1-6 of the Future Land Use Element.

Planning and Zoning Deputy Director Bridget Keen provided the Board with a PowerPoint Presentation regarding an application for a Large-Scale Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment for Wilson Groves Figure 1-6.

Board Member Spatara asked if they would be approving the 7,000 residences, to which Ms. Keen explained that was an existing development of regional impact (DRI) previously approved in 2006. She added that the development and its entitlements and road improvements date back to 2006. Ms. Keen noted there were previously submitted amendments in 2011 and explained this was just a land use that would demonstrate where the land uses will be. Board Member Spatara asked if this would include additional housing, to which Ms. Keen indicated it was the housing that was previously approved for the DRI.

Board Member Reikenis asked about the memorandum from Diana Spriggs and discussed the concerns mentioned within the memo about the traffic study. He inquired if the concerns were addressed, to which Ms. Keen indicated that those concerns could be addressed as they moved forward with future applications. Ms. Keen added that the item before them only would create the general land-use for the development. She explained the Applicant would have to move forward with rezoning sections of the

MPUD. Board Member Reikenis inquired if this was the appropriate time to address the concerns listed within the memo, to which Diana Spriggs, Public Works Regulatory Division Director, indicated those were items for city awareness to be able to address in the future.

Board Member Creese asked if the changes were only to relocate the land use, to which Ms. Keen responded in the affirmative.

Dan Sorrow, Coteleur & Hearing, addressed the Board and presented a PowerPoint Presentation.

Deputy City Attorney Elizabeth Hertz stated that if Mr. Sorrow intended to incorporate the testimony into the next presentation, she would ask that he and all others be sworn in.

The Deputy City Clerk administered the Oath of Testimony to Mr. Sorrow and all those who would be testifying.

Mr. Sorrow continued his presentation to the Board.

Ms. Keen advised the Board that if they had transportation questions, the third-party consultant was present via Zoom. Chair Beutel inquired who the third-party consultant was, to which Ms. Keen indicated it was Kok Wan Mah, PE, Kittelson and Associates.

Chair Beutel opened Public to be Heard.

Azlina Goldstein, GL Homes, spoke in opposition of Item 7.a.

Chair Beutel closed Public to be Heard.

Board Member Spatara asked Ms. Spriggs if she approved and was in favor of this item, to which she responded in the affirmative and indicated that the staff recommendation was for approval.

Chair Beutel inquired if the DRI amendment occurred last in 2011, to which Ms. Keen indicated the item before the Board was the Comprehensive Plan. Chair Beutel advised she was trying to make a point that a lot of change in the City had occurred since then. She indicated that it would be important to have a commitment that the two-lane network gets developed at the correct time.

Ms. Keen explained that the developers have requirements within their DRI development conditions that trigger construction of roadways. She reported that staff would be reviewing those conditions as the future

applications for the MPUD rezoning and overall picture of their DRI concept plan. Ms. Keen indicated that the current application asked if the City could make the change without created failures within the existing conditions of the DRI Development Order. She explained that their review demonstrated that it can be accommodated with this change because the DRI already anticipated the development. Ms. Keen stated that the Applicant was moving some of the mixed use to the north that will require future roadways when that area gets developed as well as other roads in addition to Becker Road as they move forward to the MPUD stage.

Planning and Zoning Director Mary Savage-Dunham asked Mr. Mah to provide his thoughts about the review of the project and his recommendations. Mr. Mah provided his explanation to the Board regarding the Traffic Study.

Ms. Keen stated that with each future DRI Amendment and MPUD application there would be another traffic study required. She explained that they do request new traffic studies with each application.

Deputy City Attorney Hertz advised Chair Beutel to allow the Applicant to speak prior to engaging in the Board deliberation.

Board Member Creese confirmed that this application was for the revision of Figure 1-6 to reallocate to cover Parcel F and E in addition to Parcel C and D to take out some of the weight off Becker Road, to which Ms. Keen responded in the affirmative. Ms. Keen indicated there would be more development that would require the construction of Marshall Parkway, North South A and Hegener Drive.

Board Member Creese inquired if there had been an analysis to find out if the reallocation would produce more traffic onto Paar Drive, Ms. Keen stated she believed it would place traffic on all required roadways. Mr. Mah explained there was an approved traffic study that was completed and reported there would not be an assumption of additional impacts due to the number of trips not increasing beyond the external boundary of the project. He indicated they only reviewed the internal roads and therefore assumed everything outside still fits within the project entitlement.

Board Member Creese asked if triggers would occur as to when roads must be completed by, to which Ms. Keen responded in the affirmative and stated it would be included with the DRI Development Order. Board Member Creese inquired if the triggers were not a concern at the previous hearing, to which Ms. Keen explained that previously the concern was that traffic would be concentrated onto Becker Road, which would cause it to

fail.

Tara Duhy, Lewis, Longman & Walker, Attorney for the Applicant, addressed the statement regarding the lack of commitment to build the internal roadway network. She explained that was within their development order with triggers for each road and to date they had built more lane miles than most of the development projects. Attorney Duhy stated they have a vested right to construct the density and intensity that was previously approved in the development order. She advised that they did not agree to the changes in the initial map H resulted in any changes because there was no net changes to density and intensity; however, to work with them they brought the application forward to address those concerns. Attorney Duhy stated that GL Homes had not committed to building the entirety of their two-lane road system. She explained that they were building lane miles without having a single unit built. Attorney Duhy reported they were not doing anything different than other developments in the area. She recommended that the Board move forward with a recommendation of approval.

Board Member Reikenis indicated his concern was if traffic was mitigated prior to the increase. Board Member Reikenis moved to recommend approval P23-201 Wilson Groves - Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment. Secretary Taylor-Moore seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote.

8. Public Hearing - Quasi-Judicial

8.a P21-127 Wilson Groves - DRI Map H Amendment

[2023-1096](#)

Location: The property is generally located north of the C-23 Canal, east of Range Line Road, south of the Marshall Parkway right-of-way, and west of the N/B road right-of-way.

Legal Description: The property is legally described as a portion of the Alan Wilson Grove plat and portions of Sections 30 and 31 Township 37 South, Range 39 East. A full legal description is available in the Planning and Zoning Department.

This is an application to amend the Wilson Groves DRI development order by amending Map H, the DRI master development plan.

Chair Beutel inquired if the Board had any ex-parte communications. Chair Beutel indicated that she spoke to Azlina Goldstein.

Ms. Keen asked that Mr. Mah be sworn in as he was present via zoom and not previously sworn in.

The Deputy City Clerk administered the Oath of Testimony to Mr. Mah.

Ms. Keen provided the Board with a PowerPoint Presentation regarding an application for a map amendment to the existing master development plan for Wilson Groves. She indicated that there were no changes proposed to the DRI development order. Ms. Keen stated the application before the Board was for the approval of the map knowing that the remaining conditions of the DRI remains in full force in effect. She explained this was a revised submission based on the resubmission of the developer's revised Comprehensive Plan application.

Board Member Previte asked if the original plan was approved by staff back in June 2023, to which Ms. Keen advised it was recommended with comments. She indicated there was additional information that resulted in staff changing their recommendation based on the concern that the plan would overload Becker Road. Board Member Previte, Ms. Keen, and Ms. Savage-Dunham discussed the previously submitted application by the Applicant and what occurred.

Secretary Taylor-Moore inquired if it was customary to receive additional information after the Planning and Zoning Board recommends approval or denial and asked what the process was, to which Ms. Savage-Dunham indicated it was not customary; however, staff must react to information as it comes in. She explained it was the only time that it had happened during her tenure with the City. Secretary Taylor-Moore asked if it would have been more judicious to bring it back before the Planning and Zoning Board rather than taking the additional information to the City Council. She expressed concern over the way the matter was handled.

Chair Beutel inquired if the matter should have come back to the Planning and Zoning Board, to which Ms. Keen stated she believed it would have to be an individual decision as it comes up. Ms. Savage-Dunham explained that they can review the Board procedures and discuss how to handle this situation in the future. Chair Beutel asked if they could discuss this matter under New Business to make sure that the procedures are followed.

Board Member Creese explained that she did not understand how the school and fire house were moved south of Becker Road, and traffic would not be heavily impacted by 2 schools in the same area during the time of entrance or dismissal. She inquired how traffic would be impacted by that or what is the expectation that it would be, to which Ms. Keen advised that the applicant indicated they were only place holders until they worked with the school district to establish the exact location. Ms. Keen explained that the applicant had to show it as it is a requirement by their DRI and they decided to locate them south of Becker Road. She reported that the applicant will need to submit a future amendment to look at where the

school sites will be located. Board Member Creese asked why the Board was being asked to approve the map if there was the possibility that the School Board may not agree with the location, to which Ms. Keen indicated she would defer to the applicant.

Attorney Duhy explained that the application before the Board was a conceptual high level Map H and confirmed that it was not a site plan. She stated that they cannot locate the schools without the concurrence of the school district. Board Member Creese inquired why the applicant would come before or shift them without the agreement from the school district to which Attorney Duhy stated they were placed based on the best understanding of where they were going to go. Board Member Creese asked if a traffic analysis was completed with the expectation that the schools could remain on Becker Road, to which Ms. Duhy indicated that was in their original study.

Susan O'Rourke, O'Rourke Engineering, explained that the traffic study was completed with the proposed sites as shown on the map. She reported that the traffic study shows that based on the locations of the schools everything will work. Ms. O'Rourke stated that additional details such as drop-off and pick-up and the operation plan would be handled during the Site Plan level once the applicant knows the school's time of operation and the type of school it will be. Board Member Creese asked if there was a higher trip evaluation based on the two schools being moved, to which Ms. O'Rourke stated they recognized there's a shift of traffic for the school on Becker Road and it was reflected in traffic analysis.

Nicole Fogarty, St. Lucie School District, welcomed the applicant to collaborate with the School District to discuss the final location of the schools. She indicated that they prefer them to not be on major fairways and would prefer an off-road.

Attorney Duhy asked that the previous testimony and PowerPoint presentation discussed during Item 7.a be made part of the record for this item.

Ms. Keen explained that the DRI did require an agreement with the school district. She stated if the change of location was significant it would come back before the Board.

Chair Beutel opened Public to be Heard.

Azlina Goldstein, GL Homes, spoke in opposition of Item 7.b.

Chair Beutel closed Public to be Heard.

Chair Beutel asked if the triggers to build the roads were in writing, to which Ms. Keen responded in the affirmative.

Board Member Reikenis inquired if the concerns vocalized by the public were addressed in the plans, to which Ms. Keen indicated that during each application process the staff reviews the requirements within the DRI and discuss how the property would be accessed. Ms. Spriggs explained that there were no changes proposed to the original DRI and traffic study previously approved that would affect the roadway as it was originally approved. She indicated that there was not enough change proposed that affects the original plans of the DRI for roadway commitments.

Board Member Reikenis asked if the concerns raised by Ms. Goldstein confirm that the developers will be developing the roads as they are required to do so and that they were in writing, to which Ms. Spriggs responded in the affirmative. She explained that as the development meets the triggers, the roads will be required to be constructed.

Board Member Creese inquired if Becker Road would be built prior to the issuance of a building permit, to which Ms. Spriggs stated that the road is currently under construction from Village to Range Line Road. She explained there were separate agreements with all 3 developers that include time commitments.

Ms. Fogarty asked if Becker Road would be two-lanes or four-lanes, to which Ms. Spriggs confirmed it would be two-lanes. She inquired if the proposal would be to add two schools on Becker Road and if there was any future plan for it becoming four-lanes. Ms. Spriggs reported that the DRI states when it would be required to turn Becker Road into four-lanes based on trip triggers. Ms. Fogarty reiterated she had concerns about placing two K-8 Schools on a two-lane road, Becker Road, and it being a major fairway. She indicated that two schools would cause a burden.

Ms. Fogarty stated that her comments were not meant for the Board to halt the request but rather to work with the Applicant to add solidarity to the school sites. Board Member Creese inquired if this would lock in the site location for the schools. Board Member Previte indicated he did not believe it would not be locking in the school site locations. Ms. Keen indicated that one of the school sites had been previously approved to be located south of Becker Road, while the other school has yet to be approved. Director Savage-Dunham explained there was an interlocal agreement with St. Lucie County and confirmed that any school site had to be reviewed by the

Planning and Zoning Department for Site Plan Review. She noted that their department had to review the traffic, access, queuing and stacking. Director Savage-Dunham indicated that if during the review process it was concluded that it would not work, they would have the capability to reject the plan. She added that there would be multiple ways to discuss the school and stated this was a high-level conceptual plan.

Attorney Duhy clarified that their testimony was truthful based on the comments made during Public Comment. She explained to the Board that the item was a simple Map H amendment. Attorney Duhy stated they are going through the same process that all other developers go through with similar amendments and using identical traffic methodology. She confirmed that the triggers were in writing as previously stated by staff. Attorney Duhy clarified that this was not a comprehensive plan but rather an application for a Map H amendment.

Board Member Reikenis moved to recommend approval of P21-127 Wilson Groves - DRI Map H Amendment. Secretary Taylor-Moore seconded the motion. The motion passed by roll call vote to recommend approval of P21-127 Wilson Groves - DRI Map H Amendment, to the City Council with Chair Beutel, Secretary Taylor-Moore, Mr. Previte, Mr. Reikenis, and Mr. Spataro voting in favor and Ms. Creese dissenting.

9. New Business

Secretary Taylor-Moore questioned what the process was after the Board approved an item and additional information is received prior to getting to the City Council. She questioned if the additional information should come back to the Board for them to review. Director Savage-Dunham stated they were currently gathering information for Board training in January to incorporate the process.

Chair Beutel asked if there could be written procedures as to what would occur in the event there is additional information received in the future. Director Savage-Dunham indicated that they would review the ordinances governing the Board and the rules of procedures.

Secretary Taylor-Moore requested to discuss the process when an item comes before the Planning and Zoning Board and they make a recommendation and new information comes forward once it goes to the City Council for their review. She inquired if the item should come back to the Planning and Zoning Board once new information is received. Secretary Taylor-Moore asked that there be a process on how to handle this type of situation in the future.

Board Member Previte inquired what the policy would be to contact the Planning and Zoning staff, to which Director Savage-Dunham stated that Board Members

could contact the Planner of the Day or schedule a meeting with the staff members.

Board Member Reikenis thanked the Planning and Zoning staff.

Secretary Taylor-Moore thanked the Planning and Zoning staff and announced her resignation to the Board.

Chair Beutel thanked the Planning and Zoning staff.

Director Savage-Dunham reminded the Board there would be a meeting next Tuesday, December 5th. She thanked Secretary Taylor-Moore and other members of the Board who had previously resigned.

10. Old Business

There was nothing scheduled under this portion of the agenda.

11. Public to be Heard

Councilman Anthony Bonna thanked the Board Members for their time and dedication to the City.

12. Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:40 PM.

Secretary

Daisy Ruiz, Deputy City Clerk