

Gonano, Mark Greene, Bud Holmes, Tom Jefferson, Erik Melville, Stephen Neill, Allen Osteen, Tom Perona, Sara Pride, Natasha Santoro, Holly Theuns, and Jennifer Trefelner. This past November 8th, kindergartners through 5th graders from St. Andrews Episcopal School, Fairlawn Elementary, St. Anastasia Catholic School, and Francis K. Sweet Elementary enthusiastically participated in a Design Day and shared ideas and elements they would like to see in a new dream playground. That afternoon, professional playground designers spent time creating the new playground layout, using ideas from the morning brainstorming sessions with the children. Design Day was a huge success and the evening celebration was enjoyed by the community as the new playground schematic was unveiled. Using today's composite materials along with long-term care and maintenance, the new structure should have a life span of 30 to 50 years. The old playground structure is scheduled to be razed in the Fall of 2013, with the new playground scheduled to be built there shortly after. With the Commission's blessing, they would like to move forward with obtaining approval to post signs on the playground site announcing the new playground will be built in October 2013 and to support this wonderful community effort.

**Mr. Tracey Williams**, 808 Georgia Avenue, said he would like to thank everyone for participating in the parade, it was a great success. One thing he wants to talk about, they have a problem in Fort Pierce - it is violence. They have been talking with the Chief. They would like to get with the Mayor and the Commissioners, and maybe they can come up with a plan or something where they can resolve some of these issues. A lot of the parents and stuff are getting really aggravated. He hears what they are saying because he is there. They want to try to get some of these cases resolved.

-----  
The next item on the Agenda was Public Hearing on Application for Site Plan Review submitted by the Housing Authority of the City of Fort Pierce for construction of Sunrise Heights Senior Housing Center at 707 North 7th Street; said property zoned R-4, Medium Density Residential Zone.

Mr. Ryan Sweeney, Development Review Planner, said they have before them an Application for Site Plan Review in accordance with Sections 22-27 and 22-58 of the City Code. The applicant is requesting review and approval of a Site Plan to construct a 193-unit senior housing center. The site is located at 707 North 7th Street and is approximately 10.38 acres in size. The proposed Site Plan includes two mid-rise apartment style buildings that each house approximately 75 units and also 22 duplexes that house a total of 44 units. The project is proposed to be constructed in two phases. Phase I will include one of the apartment buildings and nine of the duplex buildings, along with all of the required site improvements. Phase II will include the second apartment building and the thirteen remaining duplex buildings, along with the remaining site improvements. All the Code required parking, lighting, landscaping, and stormwater improvements will be provided as demonstrated in the plans. A total of 283 new trees will be planted on site. Per the Engineering Department, the project will be required to dedicate 2.82 feet of right-of-way along North 7th Street, as

well as an additional 5 feet of right-of-way easement along North 7th Street. The project will also be required to dedicate 5-foot right-of-way easements along North 8th Street. All affected departments have reviewed and approved the Site Plan based on it meeting the requirements of the City Code. The proposed structures will share a consistent design scheme that will emulate Mediterranean revival and coastal styles. The apartment buildings will have standing seam metal roofs with various pitches and will include metal canopies, arched windows, and simulated exposed rafter tails. Three variations of the duplex structures provide additional variety in design. All three designs feature a half-hip standing seam metal roof and covered front porches. At their December 11, 2012 meeting, the Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Site Plan with conditions. The Planning Board included a fourth recommended condition of approval in addition to the Staff's recommended conditions, which states that "The proposed Avenue F and Avenue G road extensions not become through streets, but service roads within the Site Plan". The proposed Site Plan meets the requirements of the City Code and is found to be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. Staff recommends approval of the Site Plan with only the following conditions: (1) The applicant shall record and provide a recorded copy of a Unity of Title combining the five parcels into one, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit; (2) The applicant shall provide sketch and legal descriptions and the applicable Owner and Encumbrances title search for each of the requested rights-of-way or right-of-way easement dedications, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit; and (3) The applicant shall record the requested dedications prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Staff did not include the additional recommended condition of approval from the Planning Board and does not support said condition. This is an application for a Site Plan for a permitted use and the recommended condition is not required by the City Code nor is it supported by the City's Comprehensive Plan. There are several Comprehensive Plan policies that do support having Avenue F and Avenue G roads remain as through roads.

Commissioner Perona said normally when the Planning Board makes these type of decisions, there is usually discussion about the reasons why. He was trying to figure out why the Planning Board got to that point. He knows it has caused kind of an issue between Staff and the Applicant. There was no supporting document that he could find that would lend itself to adding this condition. Does he know why this condition was proposed?

Mr. Sweeney said he doesn't know why the condition was added. He heard that there were safety concerns. The reason the Planning Board Minutes weren't included in their Agenda package is because the meeting literally occurred the night before his Staff report was due. The Planning Board Minutes have not been completed. But there was no discussion of this additional recommended condition held during the hearing.

Commissioner Perona said he is very familiar with the area, it used to be the old Hospital. These roads that were identified basically dead-end on North 7th Street and North 8th Street.

Those really aren't used by traffic that much. If those became part of that east/west corridor and would be contiguous to some main road like 13th Street or U.S. #1, he could understand that issue. But those basically are unused roads in that area. He is just trying to figure out exactly why and he was left hanging there. As for making it a condition, which would cause this applicant a whole lot of grief because it changes a whole lot of the process, he just didn't see any supporting documentation.

Commissioner Sessions said he is looking for the applicant to respond to this, because he was thinking along the same lines, if this poses a hardship to some degree for the applicant and this Site Plan in the construction of this. If the applicant can justify what is requested as opposed to what the Planning Board is suggesting or at least making a recommendation that they deny... He is concerned about that because a road that is useless to some degree up until now that they applicant wants to build this project, and if it will enhance the project, the Comp Plan alone is not justification to deny, unless there is something that he missed in the Minutes here. He is waiting to hear from the applicant as to the hardship itself.

Mr. Sweeney said he wants to be clear. Staff is not recommending denial by any means. Staff is just not carrying forward the additional condition that was recommended by the Planning Board. Staff is recommending approval of the plans as submitted and vetted via the review process. They are by no means recommending denial. They are simply recommending approval.

Mayor Hudson declared a Public Hearing in session and asked if anyone in the audience wished to be heard.

**Mr. Stefan Matthes**, Culpepper & Terpening Inc., said he is representing the applicant, the Fort Pierce Housing Authority, as well as Norstar Development, a partner in this endeavor. Both David Nisivoccia and Richard Cavalieri are here with him.

Commissioner Becht said he thinks there is some confusion up here. The Applicant and City Staff agree that these roads ought to be opened, is that correct?

Mr. Matthes said completely.

Commissioner Becht asked so there is no disagreement between what the Applicant wants and what Staff is recommending?

Mr. Matthes said that is correct.

Commissioner Becht said the disagreement arises with what the Planning Board came up with after public comment was closed, which imposed this additional condition before the Applicant had a chance to respond to that, if he understands correctly.

Mr. Matthes said that is correct.

Commissioner Becht said he has spoken with the applicant. Commissioner Alexander said so has he.

Mayor Hudson said she has too.

Commissioner Perona said so has he.

Mr. Matthes said Staff has done a great job working with them these past four or five months bringing this project forward. Staff represented their desires very well and they concur completely with Staff's recommendation. They were honestly taken quite aback at the Planning Board meeting that an issue came up, an additional condition was put on the Site Plan with them being able to vet it through the process and answer any questions. They can only make suppositions as to what the concerns were and why that additional condition was put on the site. The supposition is that there is a safety concern. He did speak with one of the Planning Board members prior to the Planning Board meeting and he had indicated to him that he did have concerns with the security of the site. His discussion with him at the time was that they were following urban standard practices, the site would be developed in a very safe manner, and that they were more than willing to have those discussions at any Board meeting and answer any questions they may have. Their position is that the site is designed and developed correctly. They have two phases of development, each one is self-standing and can be independently developed. Those both have two points of access, which is standing protocol for emergency access into any kinds of needs that the senior housing development may require, the current urban planning principles. They have rear entry points of access for each one of the individual units as well as the main buildings; but they also have a street network that gives them a front street system where they have eyes on the street - front porches where people will come out and interact with the community. They have the ability to watch their neighbors while they still have a safe access into their dwelling unit from the rear. If indeed the concern was safety of those two streets being opened - as standard planning policy procedures would dictate - he does have four points he would like to make in response to that. The first point is, both Avenues G and F, which are what they call the internal street ways that were requested to be closed, those take the pressure off the existing roadway network in terms of allowing the residents and the people who serve them multiple choices of getting to those developments, rather than just one point in and one point out, putting all the traffic burden on one roadway. The second thing is, the internal streets also provide travel time options for emergency vehicles. The more different options they have to get to an area, the quicker the response time can be; and for an elderly community, that is very important. The third thing is, the overall Site Plan allows the Police to be able to fully monitor the site by vehicle. A patrol car can circulate around and through the block versus trying to monitor a three block area from just one point of access. Essentially this is three blocks long; and if they only had one or two points of access, they would have to do a lot of internal circulation to allow that to occur and it would be difficult to monitor those activities that would occur in the middle of these blocks. The only other option they would have for monitoring is possibly on foot for these mega-block type of

activities and that is one of the reasons why urban principles are allowing more access to those locations. The fourth one is, these internal streets will not create new cut-through traffic. There is very little traffic on the surrounding roadway network. People have very many options to go to and from where they need to go, there is really no need to cut through on these blocks. It provides a service to the community as opposed to a detriment to their security.

**Mr. Bob Burdge**, 1302 Nebraska Avenue, said he was the motion-maker at the Planning Board, so he is here to provide information concerning the reason. The applicant was well aware that this issue was going to be presented at some point. At the Historic Preservation Board meeting in May, he brought this at that particular level when there was a discussion concerning the facade or something being saved as far as the hospital is concerned. At that particular meeting, he spoke and had great concern about those two streets - Avenue F and Avenue G - being through streets. The primary reason is the safety issue of these elderly vulnerable people that are allowed to be able to live there, he is very concerned about that. The aspect of why these streets, first of all these streets are not there right now. This is private property that the applicant is suggesting become streets. As a matter of fact, Avenue G was once a dedicated street, and the City of Fort Pierce vacated that particular right-of-way. So the City of Fort Pierce does not even own any land as far as Avenue G is concerned. The whole premise behind this and the reason why the Planning Board had very little or no discussion... There was discussion. The Chairman asked the Assistant City Attorney, could this recommendation be made? The answer from the Assistant City Attorney was yes, the recommendation can be made. The problem comes down to whether or not the applicant and staff wants this type of recommendation approved by the Commission. Unanimously the Planning Board understood. The reason why they understood was, previous to this particular meeting he had prepared a document that he circulated through the Planning Board as far as an education program is concerned on the Crime Prevention Through Environment Design concept. The concept is still being used today. The Attorney General's office for the State of Florida holds seminars throughout the year in regards to this. There are two police officers in the City of Fort Pierce that are certified CPTED officers. One of them did the review of this particular project that was submitted to the Planning Department today. He does not know if they received a copy of that. While it did approve the project, there were a number of suggested comments. To give them a background, there is currently a six-foot fence around the project. It is chain link. In some instances, there is barbed wire around it. There is currently no access on Avenue G as the through street, no access on the potential Avenue F. There is basically two entry points to the project. If in fact there were the opening of these two additional streets, there would end up being close to five. The numbers 30% or 40% or higher as far as giving the availability of people to be able to come in through there. The motion was simply to not allow these roads to be through roads, not allow these roads to continue from North 7th Street to North 8th Street, but would be called what he considers service roads.

It would still give the applicant the availability of the parking that he is needing in order to have the project move through the planning state and get approval from the Commission. The bottom line is the safety of limited access to this particular property. It was suggested in the aspect that the Planning Board may not be able to make these comments or additional conditions; whereas under Section 22-58 of the Code where it talks about Site Plan approval, it says the City Planning Board shall review the proposed Site Plan and make recommendations to the City Commission. This is a recommendation, just as the City Staff has made three recommendations. This is an additional recommendation that the Commission can either accept or reject as they choose. But it is an important one because it is a safety issue of these elderly people who are going to be living there. The other thing is, while Staff this evening suggested numerous parts of the Comp Plan, in the information presented to the Commission they only cited one area, which was Policy 2.6.2. So where these other ones came from, he didn't have the availability to look at them. But throughout all of this, they had discussion as far as the Chairman having discussion with the Assistant City Attorney that yes, they could do this, it is a recommendation. As far as the Site Plan approval, they do have the aspect as a Planning Board to make recommendations that the legal concern exploring further that the application could be not something that they could do. But is it something that they can do. Finally, as far as the Police report that was presented today, it was delayed. Even at the Planning Board, they did not have the availability through the Technical Review Committee in order to be able to understand what the Police Department's feelings was about this particular project. He wants to read something that came from Officer Cozine, which is the CPTED officer. It says: "Due to the high crime area and the buildings, he would recommend the 6-foot fence around the entire property. When erecting the fence, the Fort Pierce Police Department recommends using the crime-prevention friendly fence. Fencing should be opaque and difficult to climb." It also goes on to say: "I am worried about extending Avenue G through the middle of the property. The building will house the elderly and handicapped." He indicates that they are prime victims of crime. "The road gives criminals access to the residents." That is the premise that he also believes, that those roads as thoroughfares give access to the project. Limited access is not something that is unknown to all of them. He knows of High Point, a plus-55 residential community here, where they have limited access, a guarded gate. Ocean Village, another situation of limited access where people living on South Beach at that particular project. He is sure some of them here this evening live in projects or homeowner associations that have limited access. Limited access is not a bad thing. Commissioner Perona had some questions on why this came about? It came about primarily because of this packet that he put together dealing with the CPTED concept. When he sat on the City Commission back in the 1980's and early 1990's, he attended two classes put on by the Attorney General's office that were week long. He did one in 1988 in Jacksonville and he learned about the concept of environmentally designing something so they don't have the problem later, so they don't have the safety issues. That is

the reason why. He asks the Commission that they basically approve this particular plan and he urges them to approve the Site Plan with all four of the conditions that were unanimously recommended by the Planning Board. CPTED is something that he would hope they might become familiar with. It is not a dead issue. It is something that if they design buildings and projects, he believes they would probably have a safer community. They might ask the Police Chief in regards to this, since this report came so late. He had discussions with him in regards to CPTED and he is a supporter of the concept.

Commissioner Perona said he does appreciate his efforts, he reads his comments in Planning Board meeting Minutes quite often. He talked about the CPTED study. Is the rest of the Planning Board up to date on all of the issues he has in that red book?

Mr. Burdge said they were given the booklet in September. Some of them might have read it and some of them might not have read it. But when the motion was made and seconded, not one member spoke against the concept of closing these streets, not one member questioned his desire and his understanding of the safety issue. They understand in his heart is the safety of this particular project. If this project had these streets closed, he would be in support of it. But the Applicant and in some ways Planning Staff are sort of pushing that these streets be opened. Someone brought up a good point - those will only go from 7th Street to 8th Street. What is the big necessity of having these opened when currently they are not opened now? There is no necessity for that. He speaks in the aspect of making it a cul-de-sac along the North 8th Street area; and then they will have a service road to service the houses, they will have the parking availability that they need in order to do the Site Plan, and they have everything they need, but they don't have the thoroughfare. Also, even though it wasn't in the motion, this aspect of some sort of fencing around the property. He would not want to come back to this Commission and say they should have done it when they had the opportunity to do it. They have the opportunity to potentially prevent some of these things by the design aspect of it. He would not want to see something happen to those vulnerable elderly people. It is just that that he is the most concerned about. When he sat on the Commission, the Commission closed a number of streets in the City of Fort Pierce because they saw those were not only not needed, but they offered that straight line to be able to get away or to something. One he will discuss is South 17th Street at Kentucky Avenue. It used to go into North Lawnwood Circle. After coming back from these meetings, he recognized that it was opening up access to the Villages of Longwood and to The Pines. For what reason? So someone could scoot up North 17th Street, use 13th Street, use 23rd Street, use 25th Street. Limiting the access for people so that they have the safety issue, especially with these older folks.

Commissioner Perona said he commends his passion. But he has to understand from his standpoint, he is used to reading the deliberation of an idea from the Planning Board getting to that resolution. He expects to see some discussion, especially after

reading through what he had, this was a left turn out of nowhere. He is trying to grasp that and decide what happened, how did this come about, what was Staff's position in this? They rely on Staff also for a lot of the support and making sure that they are following the appropriate rules and regulations and moving in a way that can enhance the possibility of this \$30-plus million dollar project and a definite benefit to their community. He has to understand his standpoint, it left him high and dry.

Mr. Burdge said he completely understand that from the aspect of every Commissioner here. But the situation is, it is the aspect of they are not doing anything that is already not there. There is no street there now. There is no Avenue G. Avenue G does not exist. The City gave they right-of-way back. Avenue F, he is not sure that it is a plotted street either. Even within the Site Plan it says that these streets will be private streets, that they will be maintained by the Housing Authority. Those are not even going to be City streets. The only thing that is going to be a City street is the opening to 7th Street and to 8th Street.

Commissioner Perona said the biggest issue he has is, he knows the Director of the Housing Authority's number one objective is to offer not only a very decent place for people to live, but he is sure safety is the first thing being done. In fact, his conversations with Mr. Nisivoccia was exactly that. For them and their team of planners and engineers and builders and contractors to sit there and just recklessly put these streets in there, it is just inconsistent with everything he had learned up to this point.

Mr. Burdge said he understands. If he can read from the Minutes of the Historic Preservation Board, because he did speak on this issue. It says, "CPTED is an issue that we are not discussing." He is speaking about the Director of the Housing Authority. "We are familiar with the process and the concept." He goes on to say, "I think that it is something that we can discuss. But it would be our position that the main structure would come down, as well as we would open up Avenue G." He basically on May 29th this year said it is not something they are discussing. It is something that he discussed at this meeting, so the Director is well aware of it, as the engineer from Culpepper, they had conversation. He had conversation with the Police Chief, he had conversation with Jim Cozine, the CPTED officer who reviewed this particular project. It is something that is passionate in his mind, the safety issues of Fort Pierce. He does not want them to say to someone in the future, if only. He would rather have it stopped and settled at this area, just follow the four conditions that the Planning Board recommended, that is all he is asking.

Commissioner Alexander said at the 12 o'clock hour now they are discussing the change of the plats of this project. Would that cause a delay?

Mr. Sweeney said most certainly it would. It is his understanding that per the federal funding cycle, these plans

have to receive local approval by the end of this calendar year.

Commissioner Alexander said with these being private roads, they can name them Perona Drive or Alexander Drive, because there is no Avenue G or Avenue F on the west side of North 8th Street. So if they just change the name from Avenue G to Perona Drive, he will go for that.

Mr. Sweeney said there was an Avenue G right-of-way that was abandoned during the construction of the administration building annex to the Fort Pierce Hospital years ago.

Commissioner Alexander said at the 12 o'clock hour, he wouldn't dare want to stop this project from going forward. He does have the safety in mind of everyone. Looking at the Site Plan, there are properties on the south end. Someone should be able to go from North 8th Street instead of going all the way around to North 7th Street, even if they are walking or riding in their little wheelchairs. They have got to have some access. If this had been addressed earlier, maybe he would have considered it.

**Mr. David Nisivoccia**, Executive Director of the Housing Authority, said he wants to address a couple of concerns that were raised by Mr. Burdge. Number one, CPTED is a well thought out theory regarding safety through environmental design, and it is something the Housing Authority does consider. But he would argue the details of it with Mr. Burdge. Through all planning purposes and CPTED design, typically the more activity you have on the street, the safer it is. Second, these are private streets, not public streets; so they are not asking the City to take on any financial burden in regards to the development. Third, these streets do create a quality of life issue. They are extremely careful to consider how their clients are going to live on this site. The larger buildings will have security mechanisms within. The smaller duplexes are a little more challenging. But they are lucky they have a current partnership with the Fort Pierce Police Department. Chief Baldwin provides them crime reports on all their developments on a monthly basis. Looking at those crime reports, they will see that crime currently on those sites is lesser of a percentage of the major crime categories than almost anywhere else in the City. Last, the fence issue would be something they would object to, because they inherited that fence, he is not a fan of that fence. The fence that is actually standing there now would not stop any crime because people have access into the site on the two existing entranceways, one on the north and one on the south. So they look forward to the Commission approving Staff's recommendation and they agree with the three stipulations.

Commissioner Alexander said he heard someone speak of barbed wire. That has to come down.

Mr. Nisivoccia said he is in favor of that.

Chief Baldwin said he believes the Building Codes prohibit the use of barbed wire in most cases.

Mr. Nisivoccia said it is an oversight on his part and something

he probably should have taken down years ago. The last thing he wants to touch on, they were trying to apply for Florida Housing Tax Finance credits on this application. If this has to go through the process again, they would lose the opportunity of applying for those most likely this year, and there would be a full delay on the project of one year.

Commissioner Perona asked what is the price tag on this total development?

Mr. Nisivoccia said approximately \$30 million to \$35 million. It will probably create somewhere between 200 to 400 jobs over the lifetime of the project. They have a commitment to utilize MBWE on this project and create local jobs for local people as well.

Commissioner Becht asked is there any question in his mind that this project, as he has paid his professionals to design it, will be safe for the residents?

Mr. Nisivoccia said no, he knows it will be safe for the residents.

Commissioner Sessions said Mr. Nisivoccia said if they postpone it, it will set them back substantially financially in terms of funding. But by the same token, Mr. Burdge brought up some major concerns and it appeared he had done his homework in terms of working with the Police Department and in terms of the format or plat itself and how it is designed. Bottom line is, the protection of the citizens, making sure they can keep these elderly people safe and sound. However, the last thing in the world he wants to see is a Taj Mahal with a wall built around it excluding the outside area and not including the outside area, which is what he believes these thoroughways will do in terms of improving the social aspect of the whole entire area. But Mr. Burdge did bring up some major concerns that seemed to have some validity. He just wants to hear his response to that.

Mr. Nisivoccia said safety and security is foremost on their minds, that is why they entered into a contract with the Police Department where they employ two full-time Police Officers for all their properties. That shows the commitment he and his Board have regarding their constituency. And specifically the two subgroups of that constituency, the elderly and the children, that is where they invest the majority of the time with the Police Officers who serve. They would not be requesting this Site Plan and building this project if they didn't have the safety and security for their clients in mind. The team they did employ, Norstar Development has done over 10 of these in the relative recent past. And Torti Gallas & Partners Inc., the architectural firm they utilized, is one of the leading experts in the country in regards to site and safety design for site planning of elderly facilities. So they feel they have addressed the issues. He appreciates Mr. Burdge's questions and concerns, they are not running away from them and they embrace them; but they believe they will be a safe site.

**Mr. Frederick Jackson**, 617 Ixoria Avenue, asked this is the

current place where the Housing Authority is located, the old hospital?

Mayor Hudson said yes.

Mr. Jackson said currently In the Image of Christ, which is a foundation that has been very much helpful for the entire City, helping with food, clothing, HIV testing, as well as counseling and things of that nature, and they even offered help to those that were homeless during the very cold days. If approval is made to move forward with this development for the seniors, he would just ask that the City of Fort Pierce will definitely give consideration for a transition. It may be something that Miss Hazel has already in her plans to move somewhere else or do something different, he has no idea right now. This is new to him as he sits here in this meeting tonight. The reason why he says that is, he thought about a few months ago when they were concerned about the homeless in their area, it would be a good idea that they could move forward with some things that would be helpful for transitional housing. There is a lot of mental people that are in current facilities, group homes and things of that nature. If they have a place that can assist with the homeless, a place that can assist with transitional housing for the mentally ill and the seniors, that might be something to think about. If Miss Hazel does decide to transition somewhere else or whatever, he does not know whether she has any say-so in the matter. But if that is so, would the City of Fort Pierce sit down with her and ask her what does she suggest?

Mr. Nisivoccia said Hazel does wonderful work, that is why the Housing Authority basically offered her approximately 18,000 square feet after they moved their offices to 511 Orange Avenue, because she was having a difficult time in a 2,000 square foot office she had on Orange Avenue. They provided that space gratis to her for \$1 a month, plus anything over a certain utility amount they cover. Remember, it is going to take a year for construction, they are not knocking down the old Buell Brown site until the second year of the project. They are also building the Williams Community Center out at Garden Terrace. They have the Boys & Girls Club existing in a facility of about 6,000 square feet, which was the original maintenance facility for the Housing Authority. They are going to transition the Boys & Girls Club into the Williams Community Center, thus creating a 6,000 square foot space available for Hazel. That was their preliminary discussion. He thinks after her getting used to 18,000 square feet, it might be a little shock, but 6,000 square feet is still three times larger than what she had previously. So there will be time for a transition and they are happy to provide her a space at that location.

Seeing no one further and hearing no one wishing to be heard, Mayor Hudson declared the Public Hearing closed.

Motion was made by Commissioner Sessions, seconded by Commissioner Becht, to approve the Site Plan submitted by the Housing Authority of the City of Fort Pierce for construction of Sunrise Heights Senior Housing Center at 707 North 7th Street, with Staff's recommendations: (1) The applicant shall record

and provide a recorded copy of a Unity of Title combining the five parcels into one, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit; (2) The applicant shall provide sketch and legal descriptions and the applicable Owner and Encumbrances title search for each of the requested rights-of-way or right-of-way easement dedications, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit; and (3) The applicant shall record the requested dedications prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Commissioner Becht said while he appreciates some of the comments by Mr. Burdge, he has his concerns about the proactive stance that a seated member of their Planning Board took with passion on a project of this magnitude. He serves as a City Commission, but he used to serve on the Housing Authority and he served as a Planning Board member. He always felt it best that if he had a vote as a Planning Board member, it was inappropriate as he viewed it to go out and speak at multiple hearings on projects on which he had a chance to vote. It is 2012, almost 2013; and the reactions to crime that were done in the 1980's and 1990's, some were successful but not all of them were. Closing off streets and creating enclaves didn't work, don't work, and in his opinion, are absolutely contrary to the urban ideas that have built Fort Pierce and will continue to build Fort Pierce. These experts that are in the field of building facilities for the elderly have told him without a doubt that this is a safe plan. So it is not a question of it being a safe plan, he has been told by experts that it is a safe plan. So the balance here is, he is not going to be a rubber stamp for the Planning Board and he is going to exercise his own intelligent vote tonight in support of what is a good plan according to Staff and according to the Applicant.

Commissioner Perona said he appreciates what is being done by their Boards and Committees, but the Commissioners are not always going to agree. In looking at the plans, if this ever becomes a major issue, if this is something that just absolutely does not work, they are talking about a roadway and they can make changes to that roadway in the future if they absolutely had to. It is not like putting a building in the middle of a street, it is basically the use of a street and how it is going to relate to the project. The other thing is, he would be interested to learn a little bit more about this CPTED aspect of building and perhaps maybe this Commission can get a little bit more indoctrination so they don't have to sit here and try to learn about it as they are considering an application. His signal to Staff is, that is something he would like to learn more about. If his fellow Commissioners and Mayor would like to do so also, it might be something they can do in the future.

Commissioner Sessions said first of all, he wants to thank the Planning Board and Mr. Burdge for his work in doing his homework in terms of going out and analyzing this situation. These are the types of discussions he can appreciate in terms of making decisions that are in the best interests of the citizens. While it doesn't take an individual with a Bachelor's in Criminal Justice to know that a criminal doesn't find a safe haven in an area that is surrounded by a gate, but would certainly rather have an area that he has access to get in and out. So he can

appreciate that and can relate to that because he sees that. But by the same token, from his perspective this puts a high expectation on Mr. Nisivoccia in terms of what he just stood before this Commission to say that they are going to have a safe place for these citizens. He has great expectations of the Housing Authority in protecting those elderly people that have to rely upon them to make sure that they are safe. He thanks Mr. Burdge; but in light of what he is hearing from the Housing Authority and the fact that the funding may be lost or set back substantially, he is going to support the motion he made.

Mayor Hudson said she did watch the Planning Board meeting all the way through. There was a little bit of discussion at the end of the meeting, because there seemed to be some concern and curiosity from some of the Planning Board members about that condition. She has had several conversations, she is very concerned about the vulnerability of the elderly. However, she believes also that the Housing Authority has been taking a proactive stand and has been taking care of these elderly. They are now going to be moving from the Avenue B site to this new site and she thinks they are very conscious of the need to protect the people that are in their care. She is going to support the recommending of Planning Staff.

Those voting in favor of the motion were: Commissioners Alexander, Becht, Perona, Sessions, and Hudson. Those opposed: None.

-----  
City Clerk Steele introduced the following Resolution by title only:

RESOLUTION NO. 12-57

"A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA, APPOINTING **BRIAN PAUL** AS AN ALTERNATE MEMBER ON THE **CITY PLANNING BOARD**; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE."

Motion was made by Commissioner Alexander, seconded by Commissioner Sessions, that Resolution No. 12-57 be adopted.

Commissioner Alexander asked in February they are having some more of these individuals coming off of that Board?

City Clerk Steele said generally in February a lot of the Boards have expirations on the 28th and the Planning Board is one of them.

Commissioner Alexander said they had quite a few people that were interested in the Planning Board. Can they consider these applications?

City Clerk Steele said those applications will be included in the package. She keeps them for a year.

Commissioner Becht said he would echo Commissioner Alexander's statement. They had an applicant for the Planning Board who is a Civil Engineer and an applicant who has experience working in Planning Departments for cities and counties and for FEMA. They