

1 St. Lucie County  
2 Planning and Zoning Commission/Local Planning Agency  
3 Commission Chambers, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Roger Poitras Annex  
4 January 15, 2009 Regular Meeting  
5 6:00 P.M.  
6

7 **A compact disc recording of this meeting, in its entirety, has been placed in the file along with these**  
8 **minutes as part of the record. In the event of a conflict between the written minutes and the compact disc,**  
9 **the compact disc shall control.**

10  
11  
12 **I. CALL TO ORDER**

13 Chairman Caron called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

14  
15 **A. Pledge of Allegiance**

16  
17 **B. Roll Call**

18 Susan Caron .....Chairman  
19 Craig Mundt .....Vice Chairman  
20 Bryan Beaty .....Board Member  
21 (Mr.Beaty arrived at 6:39 p.m.  
22 Brad Culverhouse.....Board Member  
23 (Mr. Culverhouse left at 7:50 p.m.)  
24 Pamela Hammer.....Board Member  
25 Edward Lounds .....Board Member  
26 Stephanie Morgan.....Board Member  
27 Britt Reynolds .....Board Member  
28 Barry Schrader .....Board Member  
29 Kathryn Hensley .....Ex-Officio

30  
31 **Members Absent**

32 None

33  
34 **Others Present**

35 Mark Satterlee .....Director, Growth Management Dept.  
36 Robin Meyer .....Assistant Director, Growth Management Dept.  
37 Heather Young .....Assistant County Attorney  
38 Larry Szykowski .....Senior Planner  
39 Jeffery Johnson.....Senior Planner

40  
41 **C. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

42 None.

43  
44 **D. DISCLOSURES**

45 None.

46  
47 **E. Election of Officials**

1 Mrs. Hammer nominated Mr. Mundt for Chairman of the Planning & Zoning  
2 Commission.

3  
4 Ms. Caron seconded.

5  
6 Ms. Young read the ballots.

7  
8 The motion carried unanimously.

9  
10 Mr. Lounds nominated Mr. Schrader for Vice Chair of the Planning & Zoning  
11 Commission.

12  
13 Mr. Culverhouse seconded.

14  
15 Mr. Mundt nominated Mrs. Hammer

16  
17 Mrs. Hammer respectfully declined.

18  
19 Ms. Young read the ballots.

20  
21 The motion carried unanimously.

22  
23

24  
25

## 25 **II. MINUTES**

26  
27

27 **Review the minutes from the November 20, 2008 regular meeting, for**  
28 **approval.**

29  
30

30 Mr. Lounds motioned approval of the minutes with corrections. (These  
31 corrections have been made).

32  
33

33 Mr. Culverhouse seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

34  
35

## 35 **III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

36  
37

37 **A. St. Lucie County Attorney's Office: Ordinance No. 09-001 (FKA**  
38 **08- 034) - Amending Land Development Code to Regulate**  
39 **Changeable Message Signs.**

40  
41

40 **Petition of St. Lucie County to adopt Ordinance No. 09-001 (FKA 08-**  
41 **034) which, if adopted, would define "changeable message signs" and**  
42 **add changeable message signs to the list of prohibited signs. The**  
43 **Ordinance proposes to prohibit changeable message signs because of**  
44 **the negative effects (distractions) on the driving public.**  
45

1 Ms. Young explained that staff is proposing Ordinance No. 09-001 (FKA 08-034) which  
2 would do two things. The first is to add to the definition section of the LDC a definition  
3 of changeable message signs; second, add changeable message signs to the list of  
4 prohibited signs under the sign chapter, (Chapter nine of the LDC). The Ordinance is  
5 proposed to prohibit such signs because of the distraction they pose for motorists.  
6

7 Ms. Young, Assistant County Attorney presented this item explaining, this item is the  
8 continuation of the public hearing from the November 20, 2008 meeting. Ms. Young  
9 answered several questions the Commission raised at the November 20, 2008 Planning &  
10 Zoning Meeting.  
11

12 Ms. Young addressed what the surrounding counties do regarding changeable message  
13 signs. Changeable message signs are described as signs which change messages more  
14 that once in a twenty four hour period, by electronic, mechanical or other means remotely  
15 or automatically controlled.  
16

17 This ordinance would change the list of prohibited signs by including signs emitting fire  
18 or smoke.  
19

20 Ms. Young did not find that any counties actually addressed this type of sign although a  
21 number of the other counties have the same prohibition that St. Lucie County has on  
22 animated signs.  
23

24 She explained that this draft ordinance is based on one similar to one that was adopted  
25 recently in Leon County.  
26

27 She feels the county would be proactive in addressing this issue now.  
28

29 Chairman Mundt asked the commission if there were any questions for staff.  
30

31 The commission had a lengthy discussion. The questions asked were essentially the same  
32 questions asked at the November 20, 2008 meeting.  
33

34 Ms. Morgan requested a professional sign person be at the next meeting to answer the  
35 commission's questions.  
36  
37

38 **Chairman Mundt opened the public hearing.**  
39

40 No one from the public spoke.  
41

42 **Ms. Morgan motioned to continue the hearing on this item to a date certain March**  
43 **19, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. or as soon thereafter.**  
44

45 **Mr. Schrader seconded.**  
46

1 Roll Call

2 Mr. Beaty – yes  
3 Mr. Reynolds – yes  
4 Mr. Lounds – yes  
5 Ms. Hammer – no  
6 Mr. Culverhouse – yes  
7 Ms. Caron –yes  
8 Vice Chair Schrader – yes  
9 Ms. Morgan – yes  
10 Chairman Mundt – yes

11  
12 **The motion passed 8-1 for the motion with Mrs. Hammer dissenting.**

13  
14 **B. St. Lucie Self Storage, LLC PNRD 06-008**

15 **Petition of St. Lucie Self Storage, LLC for Preliminary and Final**  
16 **PNRD (Planned Non - Residential Development) Site Plan approval**  
17 **for the project to be known as St. Lucie Business Park Storage**  
18 **Planned Unit Development located in Lot #1 St. Lucie Business Park**  
19 **on Business Park Drive, 610 feet West of US -1, and across US-1 from**  
20 **Mediterranean Avenue in a PNRD Zoning District. Draft Resolution**  
21 **No 09-008.**

22  
23 Mr. Szykowski, Senior Planner explained that on December 14, 1988, Resolution  
24 No.88-365 granted the existing St. Lucie Business Park PNRD Zoning District with a  
25 conceptual site plan.

26  
27 On December 14, 1988, Resolution No.88-365 granted the existing St. Lucie Business  
28 Park PNRD Zoning District with a conceptual site plan. On November 17, 1989, a replat  
29 was approved.

30  
31 On November 17, 1989, a replat was approved with 13 lots including Lot #1.

32  
33 On February 6, 1990, Resolution No. 90-27 granted a site plan for Lots #1- #4 and #11-  
34 #13. That 1990 site plan approved four (4) buildings, on seven (7) lots within 8.99 acres,  
35 including one (1) building that crossed over Lot #1 and Lot #2 combined, and is a 26,670  
36 square-foot, one-story building with a shared driveway. Subsequently in 1999, a 10,000  
37 square foot building was built on Lot #2, without reference to the underlying PNRD site  
38 plan approval.

39  
40 The project is proposing a new Preliminary/Final Site Plan approval for a PNRD  
41 (Planned Non- Residential Development) Site Plan for the project to be known as St.  
42 Lucie Business Park Storage Planned Unit Development for a six-story, 104,369 square-  
43 foot, self-storage building. This would be built on lot one of St. Lucie Business Park on  
44 1.42 acres, located 600 feet west of US 1 and across from Mediterranean Ave. on the east  
45 side of US 1 and 19,206 square feet of pavement. The construction would consist of the  
46 following:

1 The 1<sup>st</sup> floor would be 16,864 square feet self-storage, plus 932 square feet of office  
2 space; Floors 2 thru 5 would be 17,796 square feet of self- storage; the 6<sup>th</sup> floor would be  
3 15,389 square feet of self-storage; and a paved area would have 27 parking spaces and a  
4 36-foot by 55-foot loading area for large vans.

5  
6 Mr.Szynkowski informed the commission that there seems to be an inconsistency (which  
7 staff cannot account for) in the 1989 replat and the site plan that was created in 1990. He  
8 feels the reason for this is that there were two different Planning Agencies that were  
9 private in nature that developed each of these projects.

10  
11 On October 23, 2008, the agent for the applicant held a Neighborhood Meeting with the  
12 residents of Spanish Lakes Riverfront Leasehold Estates PUD. Approximately 80  
13 residents attended in addition to the underlying property owner. The applicant has tried  
14 to work together with the neighbors to provide an acceptable landscape buffer,  
15 lighting restrictions and hours of operation that are not objectionable. The agreed upon  
16 hours of operation are 6 am to 10 pm. The landscape buffer was agreed to be a chain-link  
17 fence with slats, and opaque landscape material planted on both sides of the fence. Staff  
18 recommends an 8-foot high masonry wall or fence with a hedge on both sides and 60% of  
19 the required landscape materials planted on the exterior of the wall, facing the residential  
20 area.

21 It was also agreed that no outdoor storage of boats or RV vehicles would be allowed on  
22 the west side of the building. The residents were in agreement that this use is low  
23 intensity commercial without any windows or exterior lighting. Together with the  
24 recommended accommodations, there were no further objections from the neighbors.

25  
26 Mr. Szynkowski went on to explain the code calls for substantial conformity (which  
27 there was none). This is the reason the applicant and agent elected to come back with a  
28 new Preliminary and Final PNRD.

29  
30 Staff is concerned about the height and floor area (bulk of the building) even with the  
31 increased landscaping. The proposed increase in landscaping does meet and exceeds  
32 code in the LDC landscaping per Section 7.09.04.

33  
34 Chairman Mundt asked the commission if there were any questions for staff.

35  
36 The commission was concerned with light pollution, noise and that the fence should be  
37 an eight foot masonry wall.

38  
39 Mr. Szynkowski incorporated a Power Point Presentation in his address to the Planning  
40 & Zoning Commission.

41  
42 **Chairman Mundt opened the public hearing.**

43  
44 Noreen Dryer, with the Law firm of Ruden McClosky representing the applicant feels  
45 this is a much better plan than originally approved. The use being proposed is of very low  
46 impact and meets and exceeds all requirements of the county. She stated that there has

1 been much discussion with the owners, Property Owners Association and with neighbors  
2 surrounding this proposed project. The concerns addressed were; outside storage of boats  
3 and trailers in the back parking area, lighting, drainage and fencing.

4  
5 All issues that were of concern have been met including the masonry wall that will be  
6 built in lieu of a chained link or wood fence.

7 Norman Schulman, applicant, addressed the commission stating that parking would only  
8 be in the designated parking area.

9  
10 Freight elevators will be used in case any emergency does arise.

11  
12 The sixth floor is smaller than the other floors due to the way the code is written and to  
13 make a nice pitched roof on the building.

14  
15 Randy Rodgers, with Frisicia Engineering addressed the commission in regards to how  
16 the tractor trailers would pull into the building.

17  
18 Mr. Rodgers explained the ninety degree angle is the easiest way for the tractor trailers to  
19 enter the proposed project.

20  
21 Mrs. Hammer suggested the applicant or agent look into the possibility of a new system  
22 for irrigation. This system measures the moisture of the ground. The system detects if the  
23 ground is wet enough then the sprinklers would not come on.

24  
25 Mr. Lounds stated this system is called a tensiometer, which are available at irrigation  
26 supply stores. Tensiometers can be set to trigger the irrigation system when the soil  
27 moisture gets below a certain level to activate the system. It is the better way to control  
28 irrigation watering because it is based on the true soil moisture and not the moisture in  
29 the air as most of the old controllers do.

30  
31 The applicant agreed to look into this state of the art process as a possible option.

32  
33 Mrs. Hammer thanked staff for the great work in the preparation of the resolution (page  
34 2, line 12, A), stating the information in this paragraph is the best addition she has seen in  
35 all her years on the board.

36  
37 She also thanked Frisicia Engineers stating, “this was one of the most complete and  
38 correct plans that she has ever seen”.

39  
40 Mr. Lounds, for the record, cautioned the applicant and agent about the five or six pine  
41 trees that are staying on the property and being protected by barriers. He was concerned  
42 about the sensitivity involved in manipulating around the pine trees.

43  
44 Mr. Schulman stated he was very aware of this issue and all precautions will be taken.

45  
46 Ms. Caron requested that Ms. Dryer submit to staff the information (conditions) she  
47 compiled from the meetings with the Wynn Corporation and the owners, residents, and

1 neighbors in order for staff to get this information to the Board of County  
2 Commissioners.

3  
4 Mr. Beaty wanted to make sure the owners, residents and neighbors understood (and are  
5 very clear) that a six story building is taller than the Lawnwood Regional Medical Center.

6  
7 Ms. Dryer stated they do know that it is a six story building; she did not mention it would  
8 be taller than the Lawnwood Regional Medical Center.

9  
10 The building will have sprinklers and comply with the Fire Department and Sheriffs  
11 Office concerns of Radio Amplifications (emergency responders being able to use their  
12 communication radios inside the building).

13  
14 The commission requested dumpster pick up during the day.

15  
16 Mr. Schulman agreed.

17  
18 Mr. Reynolds brought to the attention of staff that this project is located within Fire  
19 Station #12 not Station #1.

20  
21  
22 **Mr. Schrader motioned after considering the testimony presented during the**  
23 **public hearing, including staff comments, and the standards of review as set forth**  
24 **in Section 11.02.05, St. Lucie County Land Development Code, I hereby move**  
25 **that the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend that the St. Lucie County**  
26 **Board of County Commissioners adopt a resolution granting approval of the**  
27 **Preliminary/Final PNRD (Planned Non - Residential Development) site plan for**  
28 **the project known as St. Lucie Business Park Storage PNRD located in lot #1 of the**  
29 **PNRD (Planned Non - Residential Development) Zoning District, with the**  
30 **mentioned conditions as agreed upon; a masonry eight foot fence along the western**  
31 **side of the property, no outside storage, the additional landscaping as recommended**  
32 **by staff, and hours of operation between 6 a.m. and 10 p.m.. Because it is a low**  
33 **impact development it does meet the need of the surrounding area and most**  
34 **importantly it meets the concerns of the neighbors.**

35  
36 **Mr. Reynolds seconded.**

37  
38 Roll Call

39 Ms. Caron – yes

40 Mr. Culverhouse – yes

41 Ms. Hammer – yes

42 Mr. Lounds – yes

43 Ms. Morgan - yes

44 Mr. Beaty – yes

45 Mr. Reynolds – yes

46 Vice Chair Schrader - yes

1 Chairman Mundt - yes

2  
3 **The motion carried unanimously**

4 Mr. Culverhouse addressed Chairman Mundt stating; regrets and apologized that he had  
5 to leave.

6  
7  
8 **C. St Lucie County PNRD 1020081529**

9  
10 **Petition of St. Lucie County to grant an amendment to change the**  
11 **zoning from AR – 1 (Agricultural, Residential – 1 du/acre) to the**  
12 **PNRD (Planned Non – Residential Development) Zoning District and**  
13 **Preliminary and Final PNRD Site Plan Approval for the project to be**  
14 **known as Treasure Coast Research and Education Park Core**  
15 **Research Campus – Phase I. Draft Resolution No. 09-002**  
16

17 Mr. Satterlee, Director of Growth Management informed the Commission that this  
18 petition is a preliminary step to help expedite the development of the plan when it begins.

19  
20 Mr. Johnson, Senior Planner noted a couple of corrections in the item itself that will be  
21 made before the item goes before the County Commission. On Page nine of the staff  
22 report under number three there is an error that will be cleaned up. The site plan does not  
23 incorporate the two existing institutional facilities and second, referring to the resolution  
24 Condition of Approval # four that references a master association and restrictive  
25 covenants will be removed. He stated that after discussions with our County Attorney's  
26 Office it was recommended that this condition was not needed.

27  
28 Growth Management staff has been working very closely with the Treasure Coast  
29 Education Research and Development Authority on this proposal. Early this week staff  
30 made a presentation and the Authority supported the proposal with no requested changes.

31  
32 The purpose of this land development petition by St. Lucie County accomplishes 2 main  
33 objectives in order to aid the future development of the Research Park.

- 34  
35 1. Establishes underlying regulations for the Park  
36 2. Facilitates planned, orderly development along with an expedited review process

37  
38 First, it changes the underlying zoning from AR-1, Agricultural Residential to PNRD,  
39 Planned Non Residential in order to be consistent with the Research and Education Park  
40 Overlay zoning requirements in our Land Development Code. The zoning overlay  
41 requirements in our code have performance standards or regulations, and specify the  
42 types of permitted uses that will assure superior and quality development of the Research  
43 Park.

44  
45 Second, the newly designated underlying PNRD zoning district will facilitate planned,  
46 orderly development of the Park that is consistent with the framework and design



1 elements in the Treasure Coast Research Park Conceptual Master Plan, which will in turn  
2 expedite the site plan review and approval process. Furthermore, the PNRD designation  
3 allows for flexible and creative design approaches to development that are not normally  
4 found under a straight zoning designation, which will encourage an environment of stable  
5 character that is compatible with the surrounding land uses.

6  
7 As you may be aware, back on August 12<sup>th</sup> of last year, the Board of County  
8 Commissioners approved the Treasure Coast Research Park Conceptual Master Plan that  
9 establishes the development framework for this park. This plan divided the 1, 650 acre  
10 park into four (4) phases.

11  
12 The zoning change and site plan represents the 1<sup>st</sup> phase consisting of approximately 162  
13 acres (highlighted in dark green) called the Core Research Campus, located at the SW  
14 intersection of Picos Road and Kings Highway.

15  
16 As mentioned, the property is currently zoned AR-1, Agricultural Residential, with a  
17 future land use designation of SD or Special District. The current zoning and land use are  
18 incompatible. The only underlying zoning district option available to implement the  
19 Special District land use designation as per our overlay zoning district requirements in  
20 the land development code is the proposed PNRD zoning district.

21  
22 The proposed site plan before you this evening implements the overlay zone and PNRD  
23 requirements in our code and is consistent with the Research Park Master Plan. The plan  
24 creates a single lot for future development that is approximately 31 acres in size located  
25 in the southeast corner of the campus that can accommodate up to 339,000 square feet of  
26 uses.

27  
28 Access to this lot will be provided by a new, four (4) lane divided main entry road from  
29 Graham Road @Kings Highway and full utilities. Tract A, (approximately three [3] acres  
30 in size) is located to the south of the main entrance and will provide for common storm  
31 water retention, landscaping and signage for the park. The remaining +/-127 acres is  
32 identified as “future development” that will transform and grow with the development of  
33 the Park and will support approximately 1.8 million square feet of use.

34  
35 A concurrency deferral affidavit for this site plan is requested .This will defer the  
36 certificates of public facilities reservation until future site plans (with proposed uses and  
37 buildings) are submitted to the County for site plan review and approval. At that time  
38 these projects will be required to reserve capacity via concurrency evaluation pursuant to  
39 our code requirements.

40  
41 The review of site plans will be expedited through the County’s site plan review process  
42 within ten (10) business days. It should be noted that these individual site plans will be  
43 required to be consistent with the Treasure Coast Research Park Conceptual Master Plan  
44 elements and concepts with a focus on building design, green building standards,  
45 sustainability, storm water management and traffic and pedestrian circulation elements,  
46 just to name a few.

1 When the individual site plans are submitted to the County, it is anticipated that staff  
2 along with the applicant will be making a presentation before Treasure Coast Education  
3 Research Development Authority for their blessing prior to Development Review  
4 Committee certification and County Commission approval (this includes all plan  
5 documents – the site plan, landscape plans, storm water retention plans, architectural  
6 building design and signage review just to name a few).

7  
8 Mr. Mundt asked the commission if there were any questions for staff.

9  
10 Mrs. Hammer asked if this means it would never come to the Planning & Zoning Board.

11  
12 Mr. Johnson stated that Mrs. Hammer was correct.

13  
14 Ms. Caron questioned the annexation between the county and the city (Ft. Pierce) in  
15 regards to this project.

16  
17 Mr. Satterlee stated that the county and the city are in negotiations regarding annexations.

18  
19 He also stated; that half this project is within the cities envisioned annexation territory.

20  
21 Mr. Satterlee and Dan McIntyre, County Attorney will be attending the City of Ft. Pierce  
22 Council Meeting on January 20, 2009, encouraging them to defer annexation of  
23 properties until a broader agreement can be worked out.

24  
25 Ms. Hensley stated that this site is all government owned property.

26  
27 **Chairman Mundt opened the public hearing.**

28  
29 No one spoke.

30  
31 **Mr. Beaty motioned after considering the testimony presented during the public**  
32 **hearing, including staff comments, and the standards of review as set forth in Sections**  
33 **11.02.07 and 11.06.03, St. Lucie County land Development Code, I hereby move that**  
34 **the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend that the St. Lucie County Board of**  
35 **County Commissioners grant approval to the application of St. Lucie County, for an**  
36 **amendment to the official zoning atlas to change the zoning from the AR-1,**  
37 **Agricultural Residential (1 du/acre) Zoning District to the PNRD, Planned - Non**  
38 **Residential Development Zoning District and Preliminary/Final PNRD site plan**  
39 **approval for a project known as Treasure Coast Research & Education Park Core**  
40 **Campus – Phase 1.**

41  
42 **Mr. Lounds seconded.**

43  
44 Roll Call

45  
46 Vice Chair Schrader - yes

47 Mr. Reynolds – yes

- 1 Ms. Morgan – yes
- 2 Ms. Hammer – yes
- 3 Ms. Caron – yes
- 4 Mr. Lounds – yes
- 5 Mr. Beaty – yes
- 6 Chairman Mundt - yes

7  
8  
9 **D. Growth Management Department, Chapters 10, 11 & 12 of the St.**  
10 **Lucie County Land Development Code.**

11  
12 Mr. Meyers and the Commission discussed how to achieve a final draft version of the  
13 chapters for public distribution.

14  
15 It was determined that Chapter 10 would be discussed first, Chapter 12 second and  
16 Chapter 11 last.

17  
18 The Planning & Zoning Workshop for Chapter 10 was tentatively scheduled for Monday,  
19 February 2, 2009. Staff will e-mail the Planning & Zoning Commissioners a definite date.

20  
21 **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

22 Mr. Myers, as promised updated the commission on the status of the Mellon Patch  
23 Inn.

24  
25 **V. ADJOURN**

26 There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.