

DRAFT



CITY OF FORT PIERCE PLANNING BOARD

Planning Board Minutes

OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE FORT PIERCE CITY PLANNING BOARD HELD ON MONDAY, **APRIL 13, 2026**, 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: Justine Carter; Nichelle Clemons; Christopher Widing; Alexander Edwards; Clayton Johnson; Anton Kreisl, Chair

Absent: Krista Storey

Staff Present: Sara Hedges, City Attorney
Kev Freeman, Planning Director
Christopher Suneson, Assistant Planning Director
Vennis Gilmore, Historic Preservation/Senior Planner
Kerry Driver, Senior Planner
Alicia Rosenthal, Planning and Development Organizer

4. CONSIDERATION OF ABSENCES

Ms. Storey was excused.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. Minutes from the February 9, 2026, meeting

Motion was made by Nichelle Clemons, and seconded by Christopher Widing to approve the minutes from the February 9, 2026, meeting.

AYE: Christopher Widing, Alexander Edwards, Clayton Johnson, Justine Carter, Nichelle Clemons, Chair Anton Kreisl

Passed

6. NEW BUSINESS

a. PD2025-00002

Final Planned Development
Pulte-Cornerstone
2721 S. Jenkins Road

Mr. Gilmore gave an overview of the application and answered questions from the Board. He said the applicant is requesting approval of a Final Planned Development of the Pulte-Cornerstone Planned Development (PD) Zoning District. Mr. Gilmore said the site area is approximately 49.92 acres with 28% open space, which is over the minimum of 20%. Mr. Gilmore stated the application proposes a 239 fee-simple, single-family residential community with a range of home sizes and designs, and amenities, along with additional buffers from I-95. He noted the linear park amenity leverages a creative use of stormwater facilities by transforming them into bioswales and rain gardens. Mr. Gilmore explained the recent history of the project, noting, the Planning Board unanimously recommended approval of the Master Planned Development with 14 conditions on November 10, 2025, and the City Commission approved the Master Planned Development on February 2, 2026, with the same conditions. He said the Future Land Use is RM, Residential Medium and the Zoning is PD, Planned Development. Mr. Gilmore showed an illustrative site plan with lot types "A" and "B". He reviewed the site data, phasing plan, bus route, and PD benefits. Mr. Gilmore highlighted that the greatest peak hour and peak direction anticipated for the project is the 147 PM entry trips, which is a minimal scale impact project. He showed a typical roadway tract, the section distance rendering for lot type "B", and a landscape plan with tree mitigation. Mr. Gilmore said the exterior color schemes are Florida Mediterranean and Coastal and the architecture of the development reflects current Florida vernacular homes in a wide variety of single-story and two-story options that will create a varied streetscape. He showed the amenity center rendering, the proposed identity feature and the model homes. Mr. Gilmore provided the environmental report findings and storm drainage for the project. Mr. Gilmore noted the seven (7) conditions of approval.

Mr. Freeman added that the Planned Development benefit #2 states, at the southwest corner of the property, and the terminus of the linear park, lies a pocket park where a sculptural art installation is proposed. This art installation will be visible to the traveling public on I-95 and is intended to create a beautiful and unique sense of arrival in the City of Fort Pierce.

Mr. Freeman said, in his opinion, the rendering is not art, it is a project identification monument. He said when this is taken to the City Commission, staff will not be recommending approval of the feature described. Mr. Freeman said it doesn't meet the intent of the public benefits of an identification piece in the sense of art as an identity feature that could be replicated through other projects in gateway situations within the city. Mr. Freeman said he does not think this is what the City Commission was expecting as they wanted to be involved in the design. He asked the Board to take this into account when considering the application.

Chair Kreisl asked if there was any problem with the location and if an additional condition could be added for the artwork. Chair Kreisl agreed with Mr. Freeman that the artwork is not nailing it with what the City Commission had in mind. Mr. Freeman said it is not rendered acceptable and concepts used in other locations from around the country were forwarded to the applicant.

Chair Kreisl asked Mr. Gilmore if all the conditions have been met that could be from the Master

Planned Development. Chair Kreisl asked if planning staff was satisfied with the Technical Review Committee comments regarding sidewalks on both sides of the street. He also asked if planning staff was satisfied with the size of the hurricane-hardened cabana building.

Mr. Freeman noted all the homes would be built to hurricane standards and only if there are extreme storm conditions, the homes and the cabana building would be taken out by a hurricane.

Mr. Widing suggested adding condition eight (8) for the makeup of the sign.

Mr. Freeman said the intent of the artwork was to get a gateway feature that the Planning Board and City Commission would like to see. Mr. Freeman used the example of the tower in Tradition as an identity feature that can be seen from I-95 in Port St. Lucie.

Ms. Carter asked if the only shared space for the residents was a cabana. She said it is a small communal space for the size of the community. She asked for enlargement of the building or a community center for the well-being of the residents. Ms. Carter also pointed out that the Gopher Tortoise Survey shall be submitted 90 days prior to land clearing.

Ms. Clemons said she had concerns about the height of the signage/artwork. She said, with no measurements, there is no way of knowing what would be seen from I-95.

Mr. Freeman said staff had concerns about the visual nature of the sign and that visual nature was being recognized as an entry point into the city. Ms. Carter asked what staff had in mind of what the artwork should be.

Mr Freeman suggested a tower-like installation with the Fort Pierce theme that can be recognized before people get to the property. He noted it can be a challenge to create a gateway feature with such a diverse community and commerce in different areas. The feature should be flexible to be able to deal with different parts of the city.

Ms. Carter asked what native plants on site would be retained and if any of the mitigated plants could be kept.

Mr. Freeman explained that they are finding existing levels of property are below what is required when developments come in to raise to an acceptable level for the flood plain. Unfortunately, a lot of the property levels in the city, and specifically if it has been used for agriculture in the past, require some type of fill to take place. He said there is no option to retain trees, because if fill goes in, the tree will not survive.

Leslie Olson, Applicant Representative, from the District Planning Group, reviewed the high points of the development. She noted the ideal location for the new community, being close to I-95, the turnpike, commercial goods and services and job hubs. She said the project has an approved Future Land Use for Residential Medium and an approved Master Planned Development rezoning. Ms. Olson highlighted the Final Planned Development will have lower density and 88% less traffic than the prior General Commercial Future Land Use designation. Ms. Olson said the Final Planned Development will be walkable, green and connected. She said the design of the buildings was to maximize noise impacts from I-95 by having the least number of windows and doors on the I-95 side. Ms. Olson said they will not be utilizing any storm water dry detention ditches. The dry detention areas will be landscaped and create natural habitat with a natural ecosystem. She talked about the nine (9) Planned Development benefits. Ms. Olson explained that the identity feature was submitted last month, and they received comments back on Friday, April 10, 2026. She said they will work with staff to identify something that the City Commission would be happy with. Ms. Olson said they did show the identity feature to Mayor Hudson, and she liked it. Ms. Olson asked for some guidance on the

identity feature so they do not have to come back to the Planning Board and the City Commission. She said all the development standards have been met or exceeded, including the sidewalk conditions that the City Commission proposed. Ms. Olson said there would be a north main entrance and a south entrance to the property. She noted the easement agreement had been signed by Pulte and the property owner to the north. Ms. Olson noted the jurisdictional boundary determination has been made and there is not a wetland, as it was mentioned that there may be a wetland in the environmental report.

Lee Dobbins, Attorney from Dean Mead Law Firm, reviewed the process and procedures for the Final Planned Development. He said they are following the city's code for the two-step process: the Master Planned Development approval and Final Planned Development approval. Mr. Dobbins said the Master Planned Development was approved by the City Commission, which was primarily conceptual in design. The Final Planned Development includes the fully designed site plan and associated documents. He said the approval of the Master Planned Development authorizes the applicant to submit the associated Final Planned Development in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Master Planned Development. There were two (2) documents approved in the Master Planned Development process, which were the ordinance approving the rezoning and the Planned Development Agreement. Mr. Dobbins stated the Master Site Plan had 14 conditions, which have been slimmed down to seven (7) or eight (8) conditions after today. He said the developers' obligation for Final Planned Development approval is to submit an application that is consistent with the Master Planned Development approval and meets the requirements of the city code for Final Planned Development. The city standard of review is to confirm that the Master Planned Development requirements and Final Planned Development requirements have been met.

Mr. Dobbins answered questions from the Board regarding the lift station and if the art feature is in Phase 1. He said the first amendment to the development agreement in the Final Planned Development was to move the artwork from Phase 2 to Phase 1. Mr. Dobbins said they want to get the artwork nailed down as soon as possible so it does not slow down the other elements of the project. He was asking for as much flexibility as possible in terms of time, and he asked not to come back through the entire process again just for the artwork element. Mr. Dobbins noted the Planned Development agreement states one will be provided. He concluded they will need to work with staff and make sure the City Commission is agreeable to the artwork.

Chair Kreisl said the importance of the feature is something that the public may compel the Board to go through the full process.

The Board members gave final comments.

Ms. Carter said she has concerns about the size of the communal space. She said it is insufficient for the size of the community. Chair Kreisl said he is not happy with the wording of the regulation for the hurricane building. He said there is a lot of gray area. Ms. Carter also had concerns about the trees being removed and replaced with palm trees. She wanted to know if this is the correct habitat for native wildlife. Mr. Johnson said the majority of the trees are native, and they are giving a lot more trees than they are removing.

Chair Kreisl asked each Board member if they were comfortable with not having the sign art come back to the Planning Board. Ms. Clemons said the public should have an opportunity to see the art, not a sign. Mr. Widing said they should get some public input, especially with all the changes in the past 6–9 months. He noted the identity feature is a time element and can't be kicked down the road. Chair Kreisl said he is leaning toward the applicant coming back to the Planning Board to allow the public to say whether they like or dislike the artwork. Mr. Edwards said coming back to the Planning Board will allow public input and give the Planning Board another chance to look at the artwork. Mr. Johnson said he doesn't mind public input, but he does not want to hold up Planned Development. He is okay with leaving the decision to the

Planning staff to get the process going. Ms. Carter wants the artwork to come back to the Planning Board since this is branding for the city. She said she wants visibility of the artwork and she would like public feedback. Ms. Carter said she was looking for a pretty large monument versus a small sign.

Based on the Board member's input, the Chair said the artwork would need to be brought back to the Planning Board and the City Commission. He said condition # 8 would read that the applicant shall receive final monument design approval from the Planning Board and the City Commission prior to the final certificate of occupancy of Phase 1.

Motion was made by Nichelle Clemons, and seconded by Alexander Edwards to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Commission with the following seven (7) conditions:

1. The Final PD plan shall conform to the requirements of the City Code of Ordinances unless alternate standards are approved through the Planned Development Agreement.
2. A Gopher Tortoise Survey shall be submitted 90 days prior to land clearing.
3. After approval of the Final PD Site Plan, a detailed stormwater and drainage plan and statement shall be submitted at the time of Building Permit.
4. The Final PD site plan shall be in unified control and property ownership. All land intended to be included in the planned development shall be under the legal control of the applicant.
5. The property may not be subdivided into single-family lots unless the applicant obtains a subdivision plat approval in accordance with all applicable City Code requirements.
6. Prior to plat approval, developer shall obtain a sound study to determine if the noise within the property from the I-95 off-ramp exceeds FDOT Noise Abatement Criteria for residential properties (which is 66 db(A), as set forth in Figure 18-1 of Part 2, Chapter 18, Highway Traffic Noise, from the FDOT PD&E Manual) and shall deliver a copy of the study to the City. If the foregoing FDOT Noise Abatement Criteria is exceeded at the location of any proposed homes within the development, then the developer shall commit to implement noise reduction measures for such homes calculated to meet the HUD interior noise goal set forth in 24 CFR Subpart B, 51.101(a)(9) (i.e. not to exceed a day-night average sound level of 45 db(A)). Such noise reduction measures may include the measures set forth in the FDOT PD&E Manual, Part 2, Chapter 18, Figure 18-3 Building Noise Reduction Factors, and the City will accept FDOT's calculations of noise reduction as set forth in Figure 18-3. Prior to plat approval, the City shall review the sound study and developer's proposed noise reduction measures (if such measures are required), to confirm this condition has been satisfied.
7. The project site is party to an access easement (recorded at ORB 3093, PG 2587) in favor of the owner of the 1.51-acre parcel located at 2627 S. Jenkins Road (Parcel ID 2324-800-0001-000-4), immediately adjacent to the north. At the time of Final Plat application submittal for any phase contemplated under the Final Development Plan, the applicant will provide staff with a copy of a recorded easement negotiated between the applicant and the adjacent property owner for their mutual benefit, preserving the adjacent owner's right of access through the project site.
8. Applicant shall receive final monument design approval from the Planning Board and the City Commission prior to the final certificate of occupancy for Phase 1.

AYE: Alexander Edwards, Clayton Johnson, Justine Carter, Nichelle Clemons, Christopher Widing, Chair Anton Kreisl

Passed

- b. **PZCON2025-00010**
Conditional Use
Legacy Future Scholars Academy
510 Orange Avenue

Mr. Gilmore gave an overview of the application and answered questions from the Board. He said the conditional use is to allow for the operation of a private school serving Pre-Kindergarten through 8th Grade, with a capacity for up to 200 students in 18,428 square feet of the existing 20,195 square foot commercial building. The property is zone C-3, General Commercial Zone with a future land use of GC, General Commercial. The subject property has a total of approximately 0.53 acres. Mr. Gilmore said the school has secured strategic community partnerships to ensure safe and effective operations through a shared playground and shared parking. He stated the First United Methodist Church has agreed to allow shared use of its playground for the students and the United Methodist Church has also agreed to a shared parking agreement, where the school can use their parking lot for both arrival and dismissal, ensuring smooth traffic flow and safe pedestrian pathways during arrival and dismissal. Mr. Gilmore reviewed the arrival and dismissal plan. He said the staggered schedule ensures smooth traffic management, limits overlap between groups and reduces the impact on local roads during peak hours. Mr. Gilmore said the operation of the proposed facility will be from 8:00 am to 3:30 pm, Monday through Friday and there will be a total of 26 staff members. He showed the site plan, proposed design elevations and landscape plan. Mr. Gilmore reviewed the student arrival and dismissal safety plan and traffic analysis. He concluded that staff recommends approval with six (6) conditions of approval.

Chair Kreisl asked if the school would require school zones on Orange Avenue and Avenue A and additional signage on both sides of the building. He also asked if the shared parking agreement indicates a time period.

Ms. Clemons verified the hours of operation from 8 am to 3:30 pm.

Ms. Carter asked if students would be bussed or dropped off.

Mike Menard, applicant representative from Architectonic, explained that the Public Works department gave three (3) locations for the dumpster, and they have picked the location that is shown on the site plan.

Chair Kreisl said he has concerns with the location, being that the school does not have control over the queuing of property because the partnership with the church could be terminated at any time. He asked what the plan would be if the shared agreement dissolves. He asked how the school was going to accommodate pick-up and drop off if the agreement was no longer in place.

Mr. Menard said the property on 500 Orange Avenue has a loop drive but the Planning and Engineering department was not happy with that option, so they went with the United Methodist Church on Avenue A to come up with the current plan.

Chair Kreisl agreed the church is a better plan, but he said the concerns are still there with the parking lease agreement. If the agreement is dissolved, the Conditional Use is no longer valid and becomes an enforcement issue. He said he is hesitant to recommend approval unless a back-up plan is in place to keep operating. He said another concern is parents parking on the street for drop off and pickup. Chair Kreisl said it needs to be very clearly understood by parents to know the traffic regulations and to not violate them. He said he needed to see an alternate plan in place for pickup and drop off.

Mr. Menard said students would be biking, walking or driven to school.

Mr. Widing said the intent is to have 100% of the students picked up and dropped off on Avenue A and not Orange Avenue. The biggest concern is safety.

Mr. Menard said the parking lot on the property is for staff and Avenue A is for pickup and drop off.

Chair Kreisl said without the parking agreement the Conditional Use would not be possible. Since the applicant doesn't own the parking lot, it puts the city in a tough spot. Option "B" is needed.

City Attorney, Sara Hedges, clarified if the shared parking agreement was with the First Methodist Church or 500 Event Center. Ms Hedges said the parking agreement with First Methodist Church will auto-renew on a 5-year term.

Mr. Menard explained the 500 Orange Avenue Event Center was the original shared parking agreement. The parking agreement is with the First Methodist Church.

Steve Tarr, building owner, said the parking issue was resolved with the Planning Department and in the unlikely event the lease was terminated, the school will provide personal transportation by using buses and vans to pick up the students and 500 Orange Avenue is also another back-up plan.

Chair Kreisl said the applicant needs to have a plan in place, and it needs to be added to the application. It needs to show that traffic will not be bogged down on Avenue A and Orange Avenue.

Ms. Clemons was concerned about the constant traffic and stacking of cars compacted for one or two hours in the morning and afternoon. She noted that without an alternative plan, the school could be closed. Parents waiting on the street because of inclement weather could create an issue.

Mr. Tarr said there are a lot more uses that could have significantly more trips than a school. The school will basically have trips to it an hour in the morning and an hour in the afternoon. It is a low intensive use traffic wise, versus a business that could have traffic all day long as well as in the evening and not even deal with Avenue A at all. The drop-off issue has been the same over the past year. He said the operator of the school is investing one million dollars into the building, and they will deal with the issues.

Ms. Hedges asked the Board to take a five-minute recess to discuss a possible conflict of interest with Board member Widing. After the recess, Mr. Widing recused himself from the item.

Chair Kreisl asked Ms. Hedges if she sees what she needs to see in the lease agreement to understand whether this is applying to all the property that is being discussed.

Ms. Hedges said she was confused about the two posted agreements, and she wants to make sure everyone is looking at the First United Methodist church agreement. She said she would have loved for the lease to be written a little bit better. It doesn't explain exactly where the parking lot is located or include a picture of the property and what they are doing. It is mainly talking about the recitals and playground area. Ms. Hedges said in the agreement portion there is kind of a throwaway about the student arrival, drop off and pickup, but it does not have much detail. She said there is not a lot of control in the agreement, because it does not outline much in the way of parking. It is very heavy on the playground but light in the parking lot. There is not a lot in the lease agreement that controls how the parking and drop off is going to happen. She said, if the Board is uncomfortable, they could create conditions if the agreement goes away.

Ms. Hedges said if the Board is not happy with what exists currently, they can also table the application and ask the applicant to bring back better plans showing how to handle backed-up parking and if the parking lease agreement goes away, what are the secondary plans.

Ms. Hedges advised the Board on what they should be looking for from the applicant as far as the lease agreement. She said it should be related to the actual areas covered by the lease agreement. She suggested providing an image. Ms. Hedges said the agreement does not discuss flow and where the cars are going to flow. She said specifics are needed of what they are authorized to do. She also suggested terms and conditions for pick-up and drop-off, including timeframes, days of week, and what time drop off begins and ends. Ms. Hedges informed the Board that they can also fashion conditions of approval and if the lease agreement does not allow them to do the conditions, then they can't operate, but if it is hammered out in the agreement, then there is no question.

Chair Kreisl explained to the applicant that the lease agreement should clearly define the boundaries of the parking lot itself, and the location with an image or site plan. He said it needs to include specific language about how the shared parking is going to be used and what times it is going to be used. Chair Kreisl said the applicant needs to effectively own the entirety of the parking lot intended to be used during the specific times. He also said a structured option B plan of how the school will operate if the lease agreement ever goes away is also needed.

Mr. Menard said the building is in the Peacock Art District, and it is 20,000 square feet and has been vacant for over 25 years. It has 18 parking spaces. He asked the Board to name one business that could go into the building and meet the city's requirements. Mr. Menard said the parking requirement for office or retail use is 67 to 100 spaces. He asked what we can do to revitalize this building. Mr. Menard said the City Commission has already reduced the parking by 50%, trying to get redevelopment, and nothing is being redeveloped. He said we finally got staff on board, we have a safety plan and a back-up plan by the school. Mr. Menard concluded that there is going to be a problem with parking no matter what goes into the building.

Chair Kreisl said the Conditional Use needs to be approved with specific conditions.

Ms. Hedges said if the applicant does not want to come back to the Board and wants a vote today, it would be appropriate to make a motion to approve or recommend denial of the Conditional Use application. Ms Hedges said we would need the applicant's input on whether he wants to move forward with a vote today.

Mr. Menard wanted to know if the application could be approved with conditions.

Leslie Olson, resident, said she has some degree of Historic Preservation, and she cares deeply about the neighborhood, downtown, revitalization and redevelopment. She said what makes our downtown parking special is there is not enough parking. She said if there was enough parking it wouldn't be special because it would be all parking. If we want to revitalize and redevelop and have old buildings purchased, we have to be flexible and look at other options. Ms. Olson said there is on-street parking on Avenue A and Orange Avenue. The streets were designed to be pedestrian oriented. If there is an acceptable lease agreement reached, this is a great opportunity for that building. She said none of the old buildings are going to meet the code. She suggested finding the best way to work around it and encouraging redevelopment of the special places.

Ms. Carter asked if there was a time constraint for the school to be in place for the upcoming school year.

Board discussion ensued on how to move forward.

Mr. Freeman said the recommendation would be hinged on the outstanding pieces of information being included in the application when it is presented to the City Commission.

Chair Kreisl summarized the conditions for the Board. #1 - Prior to the presentation of this application to the City Commission, the lease agreement will be revised to clearly define the location boundaries of the parking lot use, and time of operation and signed by both parties. #2 - Prior to the presentation of this application to the City Commission, this application will include a back-up plan B for drop off and pick up should the lease agreement be dissolved.

Motion was made by Nichelle Clemons, and seconded by Alexander Edwards to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Commission with the following six (6) conditions:

1. A Landscape Maintenance Agreement will be required and approved by the Planning Department prior to Final Certificate of Occupancy.
2. A Landscape Inspection will be required and approved by the Planning Department prior to Final Certificate of Occupancy.
3. Coordinate with the City of Fort Pierce Public Works – Solid Waste Division to ensure that your proposed dumpster enclosure meets the City Standards and is accessible for City Garbage Trucks.
4. Should vehicle staging encroach into Avenue A right-of-way, the operator of the school shall provide an alternative transportation solution to alleviate any roadway impacts.
5. Any impacts to Avenue A, such as signage, crosswalks, temporary lane closures, etc., require a City of Fort Pierce Right-of-Way Permit approved by the City Engineer.
6. This Conditional Use Approval is based on the maximum capacity of 200 students.
7. Prior to the presentation of this application to the City Commission, the lease agreement will be revised to clearly define the location, boundaries of the parking lot use, and time of operation and signed by both parties.
8. Prior to the presentation of this application to the City Commission, this application will include a back-up plan B for drop off and pick up should the lease agreement be dissolved.

AYE: Clayton Johnson, Justine Carter, Nichelle Clemons, Christopher Widing, Alexander Edwards, Chair Anton Kreisl

Passed

- c. **PZSITE2025-00043**
Major Site Plan Amendment
John Carroll High School
407 S. 33rd Street

Ms. Driver gave an overview of the application. She said John Carroll High School is seeking approval to add a 45,159 square foot building for academic and administrative use. Ms. Driver said the site area is approximately 17.49 acres with a Future Land Use of RM - Residential Medium and a Zoning of R-4, Medium Density Residential. She said the building is 3 stories, with 251 parking spaces. She showed the building design, and the landscape plan.

Mike McCarty, Applicant, from McCarty & Associates Land Planning, introduced the team working on the project. He said the project proposes a new three-story, 45,159 gross square footage academic and administrative building, replacing outdated classrooms and portables. Mr. McCarty said the redevelopment modernizes facilities, enhances safety, and improves campus functionality. He stated approximately 12,000 square feet total of building will be demolished to accommodate the new building and the removal of the portable classrooms once construction is complete. Mr. McCarty said the site's improvements include: a stormwater treatment system, paved parking and improved circulation, new landscaping, sidewalks with pedestrian crossings

and improved ADA accessibility.

Rick Gonzalez, president of REG Architects, stated he does a lot of historical preservation. He said five (5) design principles were incorporated at the site. Mr. Gonzalez said the site has some weathered mid-century modern buildings that they are hoping to use as an inspiration for the project and the rhythm of the building was incorporated into the new design structure. He said there is a strong base with brickwork and soft sand colors to match the building on the other side and a strong roofline which will create shade on the building. Mr. Gonzalez noted the social and learning areas are transparent with glass to differentiate them from the classroom. He said the chapel is like an anchor going into the sky to allow for a high ceiling inside the chapel and the chapel lines up above the new primary entry. Mr. Gonzalez said the existing courtyard is incorporated into the glass common areas and there is a notch between the new and historic building.

Corey Heroux, President of John Carroll High School, said the school is celebrating its 60th anniversary in Fort Pierce. She said there are many 3rd generation students and the redevelopment will secure the foundation for generations to come.

Chair Kreisl asked Ms. Driver if there were any Technical Review Committee comments and if anything was unresolved.

Motion was made by Justine Carter, and seconded by Clayton Johnson to forward a recommendation of approval to the CityCommission with the following six (6) conditions:

1. A Site Development Permit is required with St. Lucie County Public Works Department.
2. A land clearing permit must be approved prior to the submission of the development permit with COFP.
3. Tree removal permit with mitigation is required prior to development permit.
4. All sign permits shall be filed separately of development permit.
5. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the city approved Landscape Maintenance Agreement must be notarized and submitted.
6. Demolition permits are required prior to submission of site development permits.

AYE: Justine Carter, Nichelle Clemons, Christopher Widing, Alexander Edwards, Clayton Johnson, Chair Anton Kreisl

Passed

- d. **PZSITE2026-00001**
Major Site Plan Amendment
Amazon Distribution Center
2300 S. Kings Highway

Mr. Suneson gave an overview of the application to construct 1.1 million square feet of refrigerated warehouse and office building with associated site improvements on 69.19 acres. He said the land was recently subdivided into three (3) parcels through administrative approval. Mr. Suneson said 740 new permanent jobs are proposed with this use. He said the subject parcel is currently vacant and has a Future Land Use of GC, General Commercial and a Zoning of CP-1, Commercial Parkway Zone. Mr. Suneson provided some history on the project. He said the property was previously rezoned in August 2021 to its current CP-1 designation and in September 2021, a major site plan was approved to construct two buildings totaling 485,000 square feet of office and warehouse distribution space. Mr. Suneson noted the proposed building to land area of 0.36 is way less than the 1.0 floor-to-area ratio. He explained that warehouses and freight are allowed by right in the zoning district and the office is an accessory to the main use. Ms. Suneson showed the site plan, landscape plan and the modern masonry

building elevations. He said there is a lot of landscaping around the three lakes and a landscaping screening buffer around the perimeter. Mr. Suneson said there would be two main types of traffic for the semi-trucks and for the employees. Mr. Suneson said the semi-trucks would enter from the south and circulate counterclockwise and exit on White Road. He highlighted that signalization is under review for White Road and Kings Highway. Mr. Suneson said the employees would enter into the internal parking lot between Lake 1 and Lake 2 as shown on the site plan. He concluded that staff recommended approval with five conditions.

Mr. Johnson asked about potentially having over 200 U-turns for employees coming from the north, because the median break is south of the area.

Chair Kreisl asked if there is a continuous sidewalk proposed for the entire frontage of the property and if there is any information on the county's roadway improvement project at White Road.

Jeff Iravani, Applicant Representative from JHI Consultants, explained that the sidewalk comes in from Kings Highway for the employees. There are no sidewalks by the truck portion of the site. He said in Phase 1 there will be 700 plus employees and access for the associates will be a right turn in and out. He said there is a left-hand turn lane at White Road and Kings Highway, so they can make a U-turn. All entries will have a right turn lane. Mr. Iravani said the applicant has already contributed \$400,000 to the Peters Road construction. He said White Road is being constructed into a 2-lane road with a sidewalk and the entry at the intersection of Kings Highway is being improved with a left and right turn lane and signalization. Mr Iravani said that Amazon is taking the 69 acres in Phase 1 and there is a possibility for Amzon taking Phase 2 for an additional 69 acres with an additional 500 employees.

Chair Kreisl asked if the employees would have to drive all the way down to Okeechobee Road to make a U-turn. Mr. Iravani said a U-turn could be made at Crossroads.

Mr. Johnson asked if the employee parking lot was gated. Mr. Iravani said the employee parking lot will not be gated at this time. He said the traffic report was submitted and approved by DOT.

Ms. Carter asked if there were any options to improve Peters Road for employees coming into the back entrance.

Mr. Iravani said that the area is designed for truck traffic. Mr. Iravani answered questions from the Board on employees having to make a U-turn coming and going to work. Mr. Iravani explained that the employees come in shifts and, since this is not a fulfillment center, there will be no small vans, only refrigerated trucks, which will make for less traffic.

Chair Kreisl said geographically, this part of Fort Pierce is custom-built for this type of facility with access to I-95 and the turnpike and where it is located from the rest of the city.

Ms. Carter asked if there was a chance for a second employee entry/exit besides having to make U-turns. Chair Kreisl said they are bound to DOT crossings and the next crossroad is Crossroads.

Luke Lambert, Traffic Engineer with Traffic Mobility Consultants, explained how the traffic report works. He said with regard to the U-turn movement for northbound employees exiting, there are figures in the report that make that movement. Then a detailed analysis is done, and it shows how many people can make the U-turn. The report is under review by FDOT and St. Lucie County and everything looks good. Mr. Lambert said there is also an option to make a right turn on White Road to get to Peters to go southbound to Crossroads or Okeechobee. He said no matter where employees come from, they have many options, and they are projecting 50 U-turn

movements for passenger vehicles.

Mr. Johnson asked with the signalization at White Road, if there was any capacity for the parking lot to have admittance from the north to White Road for inflow of traffic.

Mr. Iravani stated that Amazon wants single access for employees, and they do not want the employees going along White Road because it will conflict with the truck traffic. He said Amazon may put a gate on the employee parking lot in the future. Mr. Iravani said he can't get a left turn out of DOT because of the classification and restrictions on median openings.

Mr. Widing wanted to know if 50 is a lot of U-turns or not. Mr. Lambert said the traffic report occurs in the worst case scenario. He noted Amazon breaks up their shifts, and they are not during peak hours of traffic. Mr. Iravani said FDOT agreed with the left-turn and right-turn storage lanes and, based on what is on the road right now for the left-turn storage lane or U-turns, the links are sufficient for the traffic from Amazon and other trips in the area to make a left-hand turn or U-turn.

Motion was made by Justine Carter, and seconded by Nichelle Clemons to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Commission with the following five (5) conditions:

1. A review of the tree survey and tree mitigation calculations will be performed at the time of Development Permit Compliance Review.
2. Per the submitted environmental report, evidence of consultation with US Fish and Wildlife will be required during Development Permit Compliance Review.
3. All signage will be permitted separately through building permits.
4. All required State and Federal agency permits will be required at time of Development Permit Compliance Review.
5. A Saint Lucie County right-of-way permit will be required prior to Development Permit Compliance Review.

AYE: Nichelle Clemons, Christopher Widing, Alexander Edwards, Clayton Johnson, Justine Carter, Chair Anton Kreisl

Passed

7. **ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR**

Motion was made by Christopher Widing, and seconded by Alexander Edwards to re-elect Ms. Clemons as Vice-Chair.

AYE: Christopher Widing, Alexander Edwards, Clayton Johnson, Justine Carter, Nichelle Clemons, Chair Anton Kreisl

Passed

Motion was made by Clayton Johnson, and seconded by Nichelle Clemons to re-elect Mr. Kreisl as Chair.

AYE: Alexander Edwards, Clayton Johnson, Justine Carter, Nichelle Clemons, Christopher Widing, Chair Anton Kreisl

Passed

8. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no comments from the public.

9. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Freeman said his update revolves around state legislation. He said there have been a number of bills coming through that go into effect next January. The bills relate to fees, processing times, and alternative ways of doing Pre-Application meetings with external agencies. He said the city attorney will need to review ordinances that will be dealing with state issues.

Mr. Freeman said a response was received from the Department of Commerce regarding the EAR Comprehensive Plan. He said it was sent back because they found three (3) issues relating primarily to State Bill 180, because the Comprehensive Plan has become more restrictive with the amendments made to it. Mr. Freeman said they are very minor comments, and he will provide an update once they meet with the state.

Mr. Freeman said he is moving forward with looking at an ordinance on how the city reuses existing property, particularly in the CRA. There have been a lot of issues of applicants not being able to get approval because of the city code relating to what is required to set up a new business in an existing building. The underlying issue is the city code does not allow it. Mr. Freeman said what staff finds more than likely is that they have signed a lease to go into an existing property that may have already been used for the similar use they intend to do. They now have to make substantial improvements and bring everything up to the city code, which is not the same as it was 10–20 years ago. He said we have vacant and underutilized buildings, especially on Orange Avenue and segments of US Highway 1. Most of the entryways into the city are affected by trying to get people to reuse existing property. Mr. Freeman said staff is going to slim down some of the code issues that are obstructing this. He said he would want feedback from the Planning Board. Mr. Freeman said he is also talking with developers and agents to get their input on what they find difficult in getting a simple reuse of a building and especially if most of the work is internal to the building. He said the city wants to see improvements but not at the expense of maintaining the building's vacancy for another 10 years. Mr. Freeman concluded that this will also help create a different image of the city, in terms of use and being active, and also create more jobs.

Chair Kreisal said this is a challenging issue to deal with. Vacant buildings paint a picture of degradation, lack of interest, crime and a declining community when, in a lot of cases, it is just inaccessibility and people want to develop, but they can't because there are hurdles. The city does not do a good enough job of creating those incentives to streamline that process for potential applicants.

10. BOARD COMMENTS

Ms. Carter suggested adding additional communal space requirements for the size of the community and the community hardened building.

Mr. Freeman said this comes from the policy in the Comprehensive Plan, and we cannot amend the policy unless we remove it in its entirety. He suggested the enabling regulations should be incorporated into the Code of Ordinances. Mr. Freeman said once we have got the Comprehensive Plan from the state, then staff can come back with amendments. Staff has to make sure they are not making things more restrictive. He said the legislation is in place until October 2027 unless we are subjected to a hurricane or state of emergency issued by the governor. If this is the case, the legislation deadline will be extended.

11. ADJOURNMENT

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING:

- You must disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You must complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who must incorporate the form in the minutes. A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency, and the form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, CHRISTOPHER G. WIDING, hereby disclose that on APRIL 13, 20 26 :

(a) A measure came or will come before my agency which (check one or more)

- inured to my special private gain or loss;
- inured to the special gain or loss of my business associate, _____ ;
- inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____ ;
- inured to the special gain or loss of _____, by whom I am retained; or
- inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

PZCON 2025-00010
CONDITIONAL USE
LEGACY FUTURE SCHOLARS ACADEMY (L.F.S.A.)

I AM A NON-COMPENSATED MEMBER OF FIRST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH WHICH AGREED TO A USAGE AGREEMENT WITH LEGACY FUTURE SCHOLARS ACADEMY TO USE THE CHURCH'S PAVED AND ADD PARKING LOT.

I STATED THESE FACTS, EXCUSED MYSELF FROM THE BOARD AND DISCLOSURE OF SPECIFIC INFORMATION WOULD VIOLATE CONFIDENTIALITY OR PRIVILEGE PURSUANT TO LAW OR RULES GOVERNING ATTORNEYS, A PUBLIC OFFICER, WHO IS ALSO AN ATTORNEY, MAY COMPLY WITH THE DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS SECTION BY DISCLOSING THE NATURE OF THE INTEREST IN SUCH A WAY AS TO PROVIDE THE PUBLIC WITH NOTICE OF THE CONFLICT.

DID NOT VOTE ON ANY PLANNING BOARD DECISION.

4/13/2025
 Date Filed

Christopher G. Widing
 Signature

NOTICE: UNDER PROVISIONS OF FLORIDA STATUTES §112.317, A FAILURE TO MAKE ANY REQUIRED DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR AND MAY BE PUNISHED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION FROM OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT, DEMOTION, REDUCTION IN SALARY, REPRIMAND, OR A CIVIL PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000.

N/A ON ALL