

**DRAFT**

CITY OF FORT PIERCE  
**PLANNING BOARD**

---

**Planning Board Minutes**

OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE FORT PIERCE CITY PLANNING BOARD HELD ON MONDAY, **NOVEMBER 13, 2023**, IN FORT PIERCE CITY HALL, COMMISSION CHAMBERS, 100 NORTH US HIGHWAY 1, FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA.

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

3. **ROLL CALL**

Present: Anton Kreisl; John Hening; Alexander Edwards; Uline Daniel; Justine Carter; Nichelle Clemons; Frank Creyaufmiller, Chairman

Staff Present: Kev Freeman, Planning Director  
 Alicia Rosenthal, Planning and Development Organizer

4. **CONSIDERATION OF ABSENCES**

All members were in attendance.

5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. Planning Board Minutes from the October 9, 2023, meeting

Motion was made by Nichelle Clemons, and seconded by Anton Kreisl to approve the minutes from the October 9, 2023 meeting.

AYE: Alexander Edwards, Uline Daniel, Justine Carter, Nichelle Clemons, Anton Kreisl, John Hening, Chairman Frank Creyaufmiller

Passed

6. **NEW BUSINESS**

- a. **Zoning Text Amendment - Chapter 125 – Zoning, Article IV – Basic Zoning Districts, Section 125-212. – Planned Development Zone (PD); Deleting Section 125-213. - Planned Unit Redevelopment Zone (PUR)**

Mr. Freeman provided background on the purpose of the proposed amendment. He

explained at a recent City Commission meeting applications were heard for a conceptual Planned Development (PD) and they were very different in what they had submitted. One was brief with very limited detail and conditions were applied to require the applicant to come back to the Planning Board to deliver a final version of the Planned Development. The other application contained a well drawn out conceptual plan. There was a discussion at the City Commission meeting about what comprises a conceptual plan.

Mr. Freeman said in the City Code there are two sections that deal with Planned Development and most applicants, if not all, apply under the Planned Development process, which does not include a conceptual plan. The other part of the code is complex because it allows essentially three types of applications. One being a conceptual plan that would go to the Planning Board only for approval and then go away. The conceptual plan would come back as a preliminary plan which would provide cursory and conceptual engineering details. The code gets confusing and does not point to the documents that are required as part of the application. The last part is the Final Planned Unit Development, which is all the detailed plans, data, diagrams, and landscaping all packaged up.

Mr. Freeman stated there have been Historical Planned Developments and some very large projects dating back to 2010 that have used concept plans as part of their approval. The discussion is about making this better, so applicants know what to do, the City Commission knows what is required, and the Planning Board has a good idea of when they are moving something to the City Commission that is inline with the city code.

The revised code establishes a 'Master Planned Development' (MPD) which will be either a concept plan or bubble plan that sets out the framework for the 'Final Planned Development', (FPD). The revision sets out the minimum required documents for processing an MPD application and an FPD application. The process for submittal and review of an MPD allows certain documents to be in conceptual form which permits property owners/applicants to propose a general plan of development without the necessity of producing a final site plan and calculations to almost construction ready detail. This will allow the property owner or applicant to get some idea of what they are thinking is going to be acceptable. It is more like a directional permission. Upon approval of an MPD, or if the applicant chooses to move directly to an FPD, certain plans and calculations are to be submitted and approved, which encompass the required detail and cost to sufficiently regulate a site plan.

The availability of the Planned Development process is proposed to be restricted to properties greater than five (5) acres unless the subject property is located within the defined Fort Pierce Redevelopment Area (FPRA). The purpose is to simplify the process and give more direction to applicants, Planning Board, staff and City Commission on how this should be wrapped up. Mr. Freeman showed a "Required PD Plans and Documents" chart of what needs to be submitted for both the Master PD and the Final PD.

Mr. Freeman stated the final plat could come in at the same time as the Final Planned Development application. He explained the Master PD is sort of a hybrid way of getting comments to the applicant, and it removes the intense investment in providing all the information. They get the opportunity to get something that directs them to a point of success. Mr. Freeman suggested comments the Planning Board can make at the MPD stage. He said the MPD will have drawings with a set of comments, almost like conditions of approval. He noted that a Planned Development is asking the city to divert from the normal code and the city should get something out of it. He highlighted it is a great opportunity for the Planning Board and staff to put out a vision.

Mr. Freeman answered questions from the Board.

Motion was made by Nichelle Clemons, and seconded by John Hearing to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Commission.

AYE: Uline Daniel, Justine Carter, Nichelle Clemons, Anton Kreisler, John Hearing, Alexander Edwards, Chairman Frank Creyaufmiller

Passed

- b. **Zoning Text Amendment - Chapter 125 – Zoning, Article I – General, Section 125–3 – Definitions Generally to add and Clarify Definitions; to Include a Definition of Agricultural, Amending Chapter 125 – Zoning, Article IV– Basic Zoning Districts, Section 125–187, Subsection (g) – Allowed Uses to Amend the Use Table; to Include Agricultural Use and Railroad Passenger Station Use by Right in Certain Zoning Districts; Amending Chapter 125 – Zoning, Article VII – Supplementary Regulations, Division 1 – Generally, Section 125-318 – Home Occupations to include Reference to State Statute Establishing Section 125–328 – Boardinghouses and Roominghouses to Regulate the Locations and Standards of Operation of Boardinghouses and Roominghouses**

Mr. Freeman explained the amendment is basically for housekeeping and since the amendment was approved by the Planning Board on September 11, 2023, additional amendments have been proposed in respect of the List of Definitions and Permitted Use Table. He said several amendments to the City's Code of Ordinances are required to address the above code amendments and to remove conflicts within the Code and to reflect recent amendments to Florida State Statutes. The proposed amendments are the establishment of standards for Boardinghouses and Roominghouses in the city in a manner which protects and preserves the health, safety, appearance, and general welfare of the citizens of the city; revisions and additions to the permitted Use Table in respect of Agricultural and Railroad Passenger Stations in certain zoning districts and amendments to the list of definitions.

Mr. Freeman said the addition of agricultural use is to be permitted by right in the E-1, E-2, E-3, C-2, C-3 and C-5 zoning districts (similar development rights as Stables or Equestrian facilities). This will allow the designation of city zoning districts in respect of property which has an agricultural use (county zoning) and is annexing into the city but wishes to retain that use. The definition of agriculture has also been added. Agricultural; use which involves one or more of the following - livestock and poultry farming, crop production, plant nurseries, greenhouses, forestry, or associated farm facilities.

Mr. Freeman stated an additional amendment to the table of permitted uses relates to the Railroad Passenger Station, which is important in respect of the potential future siting of such within the city. The use table is amended to allow the use of a railroad passenger station in the commercial and industrial zoning districts and to remove the conditional use to permitted use. Mr. Freeman noted the city is putting in a proposal for the Brighline station, and it will put the city in a better place as the development will be allowed by right. He explained the railroad passenger station will still need site plan review and comply with the code. The definition has also been added. Railroad passenger station; means a facility, either light or heavy rail, for the boarding of passengers and related ticketing sales and offices. Railroad passenger station and associated facilities shall not be subject to yard setback or landscaping buffer requirements.

Mr. Freeman briefly reviewed the changes to the Boardinghouse and Roominghouse changes that the Planning Board had already reviewed and approved.

Mr. Freeman noted the definitions that changed. 1. Mobile, Manufactured and Modular homes are treated the same way as single family homes as far as setbacks and zoning requirements. He noted that staff is looking at design standards in the Fort Pierce Redevelopment area to help maintain quality. 2. Home occupations are allowed

where single family use is allowed. He said the number of employees and visitors is limited, and they must comply with the city code. 3. The density definition will match both the comprehensive plan and zoning. 4. A fence is no longer considered an accessory structure. It was causing conflict with placement on the lot lines. 5. The Modular, Manufactured and Mobile Home Planning definitions match the Florida building code. 6. Removal of the word "mean" after the definitions. 7. Added railroad passenger station can be adjacent to a railroad, so there will be no landscaping buffer requirements.

Mr. Freeman answered questions from the Board regarding conditions on bus terminals, definitions aligning with St. Lucie County, setbacks for railroad stations abutting residential homes, extension of an overlay into the Central Business District, adding a definition for accessory dwelling units.

Motion was made by Nichelle Clemons, and seconded by Anton Kreisl to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Commission.

AYE: Justine Carter, Nichelle Clemons, Anton Kreisl, John Heaning, Alexander Edwards, Uline Daniel, Chairman Frank Creyaufmiller

Passed

## 7. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no comments from the public.

## 8. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Freeman continued the discussion with the Board on accessory dwelling units. He explained the city needs to find out how to accommodate accessory structures in areas where they are needed and on small lots. There are issues with density due to the lot size, setbacks, lighting and floor space. Mr. Freeman said the density calculation could be changed to bedrooms per acre, which allows more flexibility. He stressed the city needs to focus on the intended consequences, and they can be addressed if the city does not like what they see. Mr. Freeman stated the city needs to look at where the market is going, what the demands are, and which route will keep the building cost down. This will provide more options for the community to benefit from.

Mr. Freeman answered the question regarding the vision for Fort Pierce. He explained it is multidimensional. The vision comes from staff, Board members, and community ideas. Mr. Freeman said currently, the zoning code is setting the vision. He said the ultimate vision is in the master and community plans. He noted the city is missing a distinct vision. Mr. Freeman stressed it is part of the Planning Boards role to provide input and recommend changes to the code.

Mr. Freeman noted affordable housing is not Section 8 housing. He said there needs to be a full range of accommodations made available for anyone to live or work in the city. Mr Freeman stated there needs to be jobs located close to transportation and housing, better architecture, standards for landscaping, better street design, a link between east and west off of US Highway 1, maintaining current communities and deciding whether to develop CRA or expand the city.

Lastly, Mr. Freeman stated that staff expects direction, redirection and confirmation from the Board that the city is going in the right direction. The staff needs to understand what people are looking for and what struggles they face. He invited Board members to talk with staff and give further details.

Mr. Freeman stated in reaction to the City Commission the Planning staff is moving

forward with revising the Planned Development zoning code.

Mr. Freeman stated a large part of his time has been spent on weighing in on the Brightline rail station response to the request for proposal. He said the city has a consultant to help out, and hopefully he will be reporting in January 2024. Mr. Freeman said one of the visions he had when he came to Fort Pierce was to get a Brightline Station. From that, the city would see a whole different thought process for Fort Pierce with the amount of investment that is likely to come in. In the past year, the Planning department has been setting up a framework as a better way to handle investments.

Mr. Freeman stressed the city needs to fix the housing elements, accessory dwellings and density quickly before there is a wrath of investments coming in and damaging the community.

Mr. Freeman said the Kings Landing permits are in place, and he recently had a meeting with the owner and the building department.

Mr. Freeman updated the Board on the city port. He stated there will be a meeting with the property owners at the end of November 2023 to discuss the overlay district.

Mr. Freeman stated the city owned property by the boat ramp is under legal review. It is earmarked for boat storage and restaurants. He said the overlay district or districts will come back to the Planning Board for review.

Mr. Freeman concluded by stating he had a discussion with the director of the local FDOT district about what the state and county will be looking at in terms of traffic statements. He said the state would like amendments to how applicants predict traffic movements. Applicants will need to talk to the county and state to get approval of their traffic analysis. If roadway improvements are needed, the state and county will advise the city of that, and the solution to the roadway improvements will be attached to any site plan approval coming forward.

## 9. BOARD COMMENTS

Chairman Creyaufmiller noted that all streets in the city are not owned by the city and that is a hurdle the city faces.

Chairman Creyaufmiller asked the Board to never hold back on a question or thought. He highlighted the Board needs to be careful to only make statements that have the same standard as testimony, which is required for a Quasi-Judicial hearing.

Chairman Creyaufmiller complimented Mr. Freeman on moving the Planning department in the right direction and noted Mr. Freeman has been the driving force behind fixing the Planning Code of Ordinances.

Mr. Kreisl said he is concerned about a variety of domain and infrastructure in the city. He said the Board has been approving a lot of development and annexations on properties of the roads in and out and infrastructure the city has no control over. He noted St. Lucie County has a broader scope of priorities than just the city. Where the city has the opportunity to gain some control of the domain, Mr. Kreisl recommended the city go after it as aggressively as possible. He said not having the opportunity to react to development changes and traffic pattern changes, the city is going to create problems by trying to do things well by encouraging development and growth.

Chairman Creyaufmiller said he spoke to Jack Andrews, City Engineer, about coming to talk to the Planning Board about how the Engineering department interfaces with the

county and state roadways and is involved with the widening of Jenkins Road and connecting Jenkins Road to Midway.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**