

**CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 11, 2012**

A Special Meeting of the PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD of the City of Port St. Lucie was called to order by Vice Chair Martin at 7:00 p.m., on April 11, 2012, at Port St. Lucie City Hall, 121 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Port St. Lucie, Florida.

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Ken Martin, Vice Chair
Brian Battle, Alternate
Steven Garrett
Ernie Ojito, Secretary
Susan E. Parks
Ryan Strickland, Alternate

Members Not Present: William Blazak, Chair (Excused)

Others Present: Roger G. Orr, City Attorney
Pam E. Booker, Senior Assistant
City Attorney
Daniel Holbrook, Planning and Zoning
Director
Anne Cox, Assistant Planning
And Zoning Director
Roxanne Chesser, Engineering Department
John Finizio, Planner
Bridget Kean, Senior Planner
Marty Sanders, St. Lucie County
School District
Ryan Strickland, Alternate Member
Margie L. Wilson, Deputy City Clerk

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Parks led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC HEARING

P10-109 CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE - COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Holbrook stated, "Good evening. Thank you for allowing us to have this special meeting, and to everyone who is in attendance. This is a unique and timely application. It is the update to the

City's Comprehensive Plan, based on the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR). We have a team that has been working on this update; it's not one person or entity. I would like to recognize them: the Planning and Zoning Department; our consultant is Lorraine Tappen, the Project Manager, with Calvin, Giordano and Associates; Bridget Kean, Principal Planner with the City; Anne Cox, Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning; Roxanne Chesser, Civil Engineer with the City; Pam Booker, Senior Assistant City Attorney; we've had participation from the City Manager's Office, Parks and Recreation, Utilities, and the Police Department. The public has put in hours to this over the years. I thank them."

Mr. Holbrook continued, "This is a one-topic item Agenda. The format will be my opening comments, followed by our consultant, who will provide a PowerPoint presentation on an overview of the proposed changes. Ms. Kean will give a staff review, analysis, and recommendation. We will open questions and comments from the board, followed by the Public Hearing. We would ask that you allow staff and our consultant to respond to any questions or comments. At the end we will ask the Board to make a recommendation, so that this can go forward to City Council for their consideration to transmit it to the state. This is the first of three Public Hearings that are required by the state. There is more opportunity for folks who may not have been able to participate tonight. As always, people may submit comments by mail and e-mail. What's the big picture? The Comprehensive Plan is a requirement of the State of Florida. We have had an adopted Comprehensive Plan for over three decades. This isn't foreign to the City. It is timely and it is required that we update it. In your materials any proposed text is underlined, and deleted text has a strike through. The remainder of the text is existing language, which is part of the City's Comprehensive Plan."

Lorraine Tappen, Calvin, Giordano & Associates, stated, "It's a pleasure to present to you the EAR-based amendments. You are all familiar with the Comprehensive Plan. The elements of the Plan are as follows: Future Land Use, Transportation, Housing, Infrastructure, Conservation and Coastal Management, Intergovernmental Coordination, Recreation and Open Space, Economic Development, and Capital Improvements. Let's go back through history and how planning has taken place in the City of Port St. Lucie. The City was incorporated in 1961. The General Development Corporation platted and developed a large part of the City, especially on the east side until 1984. In 1971 the City adopted a Zoning Code. In 1980 a Comprehensive Plan was adopted. Soon after that the Conversion Manual was adopted into the Plan to allow some single-family homes along arterials to convert to commercial uses. In 2001 the Community Redevelopment

Area was designated. In 2004 the Urban Land Institute (ULI) Development Strategy was reviewed by the City."

Ms. Tappen said, "This project has a very unsexy name: EAR-Based Comprehensive Plan Amendments. You adopted the Evaluation and Appraisal Report in April 2010. That was approved by the state. The second part of the project is updating the Comprehensive Plan to make changes based upon the recommendations in the EAR. I will review some of the recommendations in the EAR and the proposed changes. The Future Land Use Element designates a future full mix of uses for current and future residents, ensuring that the environment is protected and that facilities are provided concurrent with development. The 2004 ULI Study and the EAR mentioned a need for neighborhood plans, particularly for the eastern neighborhoods. Those are the older neighborhoods. You're getting newer, shinier neighborhoods on the west side. You want to make sure all neighborhoods are maintained in good condition. The EAR and the ULI both suggested neighborhood planning. This would be a multi-department team who would target specific areas. It would include public participation with homeowners' groups and neighborhood associations. There may be façade and landscape programs and capital improvement plans. Another EAR recommendation was to promote mobility, including transit-supported development, upgrading roads to complete streets, and shortcuts between neighborhoods to create interconnectivity. These concepts have been around the City for more than ten years."

Ms. Tappen said, "The City has grown over 150% over the last ten to twenty years. In the Future Land Use Element are criteria to judge annexations. How should they come in and what development should be expected? Do they provide for mixed uses and complete streets? Are there parks near residential areas? Are there techniques to minimize water use? Are future transit and parking lot facilities provided for? Do they pay their fair share for the needed infrastructure? At the same time, we would like to see more flexibility. We want to give private property owners options for developing their land. We have two new future land use categories. One is a mixed use category that would allow vertical mixed use with residential over commercial. Another new category is Planned Industrial Park. This is for people who want to build and develop to accommodate those industries on the targeted industry list and that have complementary uses. This is to encourage economic activity centers. There are no future land use map changes in this package. This is to introduce new categories for landowners."

Ms. Tappen said, "Another EAR recommendation was to provide criteria for evaluating future land use map amendments. This

will help the Planning and Zoning Board and the City Council review the future amendments considering priorities of the City: satisfying a deficiency of uses, accommodating population growth, and diversifying housing choices. What about the compatibility with nearby developments, preserves or neighborhoods? Can the targeted industry list be accommodated through the future land use map amendment? Commercial development will be supported, particularly in the eastern areas. When GDC developed their focus was residential, not commercial development. Recommend policies include encouraging redevelopment of strict commercial uses to commercial nodes or mixed use. This might occur at major intersections to bring services to the folks who live nearby. Residences on arterial roadways would be evaluated for redevelopment. As the roads get wider you have a residence up against a six-lane road. It's not comfortable. Perhaps those homes could be converted to commercial or office uses. The public has requested allowing greater flexibility in the Zoning Code. Make sure businesses can open in Port St. Lucie."

Ms. Tappen said, "The Transportation Element provides for all modes of transportation: autos, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit. I do want to emphasize that the car is still what we use. Some of the proposed changes suggest looking at other modes of transportation and preparing for the future at the same time as we accommodate how we move today. We need to have our roads working efficiently. Let's talk about level of service (LOS) standards. Levels A/B mean you're moving to your destination quickly and efficiently. Levels C/D give you a few delays. Levels E/F mean that there are significant delays in your travel time. For Port St. Lucie we're maintaining LOS standards of D and E. This is very important, because when development applications come in they do have to accommodate their impacts on the roadways. You want to make sure you have that flexibility, so you don't have major infrastructure costs. At the same time, the City wants the roadways to continue to be efficient. The City is already doing a number of things, and we're proposing policies to be included in the Transportation Element to reflect some of those strategies. One method to increase efficiency is to provide park and ride facilities. There is one near the turnpike. I went by one day at 3 p.m. and it was completely full. A policy is to encourage the addition and development of more park and ride facilities. The City can also improve intersections and signalization and manage access to and from properties. The City is continuing the Crosstown Parkway. We are proposing the concept of complete streets. Those are streets that accommodate all users: motorists, bikers, pedestrians, and transit users. New policies include considering complete streets for new roadways and for existing roadways when

they are reconfigured. Another policy is to consider quality LOS standards for bicycles, pedestrians, and transit. LOS A includes a bike lane and not much traffic to interact with. LOS C means a bike lane with cars on the road. LOS E means you are riding in traffic and it's not comfortable. There is a proposal to encourage the development of bike facilities on collector or arterial roadways and to encourage the development of trails on canal banks, and in parks and utility right-of-ways. The pedestrian LOS could be considered in the future; it is not being instituted in the plan at this time. The City has undertaken an ambitious sidewalk program. More than ten miles of sidewalk have been constructed, especially in the east, to accommodate those neighborhoods that were built without sidewalks. The City has received Safe Routes to School grant funding for a large part of that. We have a proposed policy to prioritize new sidewalks close to schools, parks, and areas where there are existing sidewalk systems, which reflects the City's current practices. For buses there are four transit routes in Port St. Lucie. Proposed policies in the Transportation Element include coordinating with the Regional Transit Development Plan, supporting new bus stops and transit amenities, and encouraging new development to construct these if it is applicable. The City is building a transfer center on Deacon Avenue."

Ms. Tappen said, "The main purpose of the Housing Element is to ensure that there is adequate housing for existing and future residents, to ensure that housing standards are met and kept up, and to make sure there is sufficient affordable and workforce housing. The City has an Affordable Housing Incentive Plan. We have incorporated that into the Housing Element. Proposed policies include expedited permitting for affordable housing projects, considering changes in setback and parking requirements if that gives the private property owner more leeway to create more units, and making affordable housing convenient to transit. The EAR also recommended supporting Communities of Lifetime Principles. These are principles to make sure there are recreational facilities and services close by for seniors. You do have a significant senior population. Projections are that the proportion will increase over the next twenty years. It is also important to review the existing housing stock. How old are the homes? Do they need new rooftops? Some families don't have the means; do they need assistance? That could be considered in a neighborhood plan. Energy efficiency was recommended. Residents could be educated in simple energy reduction in their home. Affordable housing projects could include renewable energy resources and water re-use could be encouraged."

Ms. Tappen said, "The Infrastructure Element talks about potable water, sanitary sewers, stormwater, and solid waste. They must be made concurrent and available for existing and future development. Potable water and sewer service providers include the Port St. Lucie Utility Service Department, St. Lucie West, and The Reserve. We updated the LOS standard for potable water and sanitary sewer. When a development application comes in the Planning and Zoning Department in conjunction with Utilities calculates the number of gallons expected to be used by that development. They make sure Utilities has the capacity to accommodate that. If there isn't capacity, a conversation can occur and maybe capacity can be made available. Some of you may still be traumatized by the flooding from Tropical Storm Fay, which greatly affected a lot of people, especially on the eastern side of the City. Since that time the City undertook the Eastern Watershed Improvement Program (EWIP). It includes extensive stormwater treatment areas, improved collection and transmission systems, and new pumps. A policy suggested in the Infrastructure Element is to continue that program and to encourage low impact development techniques. That term is extremely unproductive. That means improved stormwater techniques using vegetation and soil, rather than asphalt and other materials. It uses the natural system to drain your property. In the long term it reduces the impact on the existing municipal systems. Building floor elevations for new development should be at or above the 100-year flood elevation. It is encouraged that stormwater management facilities provide joint use of retention areas, and there should be passive recreation opportunities. All solid waste is brought to the St. Lucie County Baling and Recycling Facility. That landfill has sufficient landfill through 2024. New policies recommend continuing to support curbside recycling and hazardous household waste collection."

Ms. Tappen continued, "We'll move on to the Conservation and Coastal Management Element. The EAR recommended that we incorporate more language to support the acquisition, conservation, and preservation of natural habitats. To reflect some of the existing policies and the Natural Resource Code, an Environmental Assessment Report should be submitted for any future land use map amendment for development on properties that are two acres or greater. Native communities and listed species should be protected through the Natural Resource Code. You have had a number of studies in the past: the ULI Study, the Community Redevelopment Plan, and the EAR. The Planning and Zoning Department and other City staff have updated your Code over time. The Comprehensive Plan is now bringing that all together. It is showing the big picture of what the City wants to do in the future, and what it is doing now. The North Fork of

the St. Lucie River is tidally influenced, and that is where you have your coastal high hazard area. The State requires that you designate that area in your Comprehensive Plan. We have it mapped and defined in the proposed policies for the Conservation and Coastal Management Element. That is the area below the storm surge line for a Category 1 hurricane as designated by the SLOSH model. Policies limit and regulate the types of uses in the coastal high hazard area. The good news is that a lot of that area is already a preserve owned by the state, the county and the City. As over time you prepare capital improvements, is there an opportunity for greater flood control or other hazard mitigation measures? Prepare for post disaster redevelopment."

Ms. Tappen said, "The Intergovernmental Coordination Element proposed policies include greater coordination with the county on annexations and continued coordination for the impacts of development on the St. Lucie River, the Indian River Lagoon, and the Savanna State Park."

Ms. Tappen said, "The Recreation and Open Space Element is very important for a high quality of life for everybody who lives here and for attracting new businesses. Proposed policies include coordinating the City's trail system with the county's greenway and trail program; using the Conservation Trust Fund for purchasing additional upland preserves; and encourage parks to be built within at least a three-mile radius of residences. The Economic Development Element is next. The City has been very active in economic development and had recruited a number of high profile businesses to the area. This is a very important element of the Comprehensive Plan. Most places do not have an Economic Development Element. Because it is a high profile subject and very important to the City, it has been included in the Comprehensive Plan. We have a few recommended proposed changes, including incorporating the targeted industry list, encouraging the development of industries within that list with the hope that they pay higher than average wage levels, bring new skills and capital, and diversify the economic base. We also want to make sure we have enough industrial and commercial land for new companies. The future land use map must allocate sufficient land for commercial and industrial development, and it must ensure that there is adequate infrastructure for the business climate. We propose continued coordination with the Economic Development Council of St. Lucie County and the Florida Research Coast. There should also be coordination with the colleges and schools to make sure they have the programs you need to accommodate these new businesses. It is important that you have great facilities to attract people to the area, not only for businesses but also for tourism. Recommended policies include promoting tourism and recreation based upon your natural

resources. There should be coordination with the St. Lucie County Tourism Office, support of arts and culture, and continuation of the public art program. Make sure you support your local businesses, as well. Support the preference system for local businesses in the City's bid system and new business training. The Building Department and Planning and Zoning Department meet with new businesses to let them know how to get the permits they need. See if there is flexibility in the Zoning Code to help people get up and running faster."

Ms. Tappen said, "The Capital Improvements Element ensures that you have the infrastructure planned and improved for your existing and future development, and that you have the money for it. It is already required that you assess a fair share from anyone developing their property for any improvements that might need to be made to accommodate that development. A proposed policy is to require a fiscal impact analysis for any future annexation. If someone wants to be annexed into the City and they have a development proposal, let them bring forward an analysis to make sure there isn't a negative impact on the City's finances. Scheduled capital improvements are included in this element. These include planned projects, such as widening Port St. Lucie Boulevard, the Crosstown Parkway, stormwater, canal excavation, and the EWIP, and a new boat launch."

Ms. Tappen said, "I would like to go over the schedule involved in the EAR-based amendments. We had two community planning workshops last fall in November and December with a similar presentation. We met in small groups to get comments, which we will go over. You have the opportunity to recommend to the City Council that they transmit the amendments to the state planning agency, which is now called the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO). In a couple of weeks we will do this presentation for the City Council. If they choose to transmit it, the amendments will be evaluated by DEO. They will send back a report called the Objections, Recommendations, and Comments Report (ORC). We will make adjustments based on their recommendations and bring it back for final adoption by October 30, 2012."

Ms. Kean stated, "I want to point out that Ms. Tappen has also prepared a memo which outlines the proposed additions and changes to the Comprehensive Plan that were based on the EAR recommendations and the public workshops. I would like to go over the ordinance and point out that the City is adopting only the new and revised goals, objectives, and policies for the future land use: transportation, housing, infrastructure, conservation, intergovernmental coordination, parks, economic development, and capital improvements elements. Staff is not

proposing any changes to the Public School Facilities Element, so that will stay as is. Each of the elements in the document includes supporting documentation, data and analysis to clarify and elaborate on the rationale for adopting the goals, objectives and policies. The City will not be adopting the data and analysis section. That is so that the City can make changes in the future as things change. We can make changes to that information without going through the Comprehensive Plan amendment process. That was recommended by the state's land planning agency. The submittal packet includes a write-up of the comments from the public workshops as well as the written comments we received. All of these comments were reviewed and considered by staff and our consultant. The amendments were revised where appropriate to reflect the input from the meetings. There is a second memo based on the feedback from the public workshops. This contains various recommendations that could be made to the document if the board chooses. They are not now included in the document. In addition to the public workshops on November 2 and December 7, we ran an online survey for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit use in June 2011. There were over 800 responses. It was part of our reference material; it is in your packet. The ordinance also amends the recommendations of the City's Affordable Housing Advisory Committee, which adopted a specific list of recommendations to be included in the Comprehensive Plan update. They are listed as Objective 3.1.10 and subsequent Policies 3.1.10.1 to 3.1.10.7 of the Housing Element. The Affordable Housing Committee was reconvened in 2012, and they revised some of their recommendations. They are attached to the ordinance as Exhibit B. The Planning and Zoning Department is recommending that they be adopted. If the Board and City Council adopt them, they will be added to the document when it goes to the DEO. Updated roadway LOS is included, based on 2011 traffic counts. There are update population projections from the Shimberg Center at the University of Florida. The Planning and Zoning Department finds the petition to be consistent with the recommendations contained in the adopted EAR and recommends that the ordinance be approved for transmittal of the amendments to the Department of Economic Opportunity for review and issuance of the ORC Report."

Mr. Ojito asked for a brief summary as to how the public input was incorporated. Ms. Kean explained, "Some items were taken out that people at the public workshops felt may not be something government is telling people to do. We took out references in some areas to green building." Mr. Holbrook added, "As a part of the EAR process major issues were identified during a public workshop. Those were a part of the foundation for the update. There were several public involvements, as well as the survey. Staff and our consultant have tried to accommodate those

requests. Some of the comments you have and some of the policies concerning annexations and future Comprehensive Plan amendments come directly from public comments. They said they wanted to ensure that if there is an impact to the City outside of what the state requires they would like to see what that is. Those are reflected in some of the proposed policies."

Vice Chair Martin opened the Public Hearing and advised, "Anyone wishing to speak on any item may approach the podium after the issue has been opened for the public to comment. Each person wishing to speak may do so for not more than three minutes. Your comments and concerns are very welcome. However, we must maintain order and provide time for everyone."

JOHN MULLER said, "I live in Port St. Lucie in the Torino area. Do we need a \$351,000 dog park? I don't own a dog and I don't know that many people in my neighborhood who do. Is there any way to combine bike paths and sidewalks? If buses run at a profit, I can understand doing it and expanding. Every time I see a bus, I usually see only one or two people in it. I'm sure it's running at a deficit. Where are we getting the money? I was confused about what you said about two acres. Do you have to have an environmental study if you have more than two acres that you want to do something with? I can understand 50 acres, but two acres is rather small. Those are my issues."

GARRICK BUSSEL said, "I live in the Southbend area. Can the public get a copy of the packet?" Mr. Holbrook answered, "Yes. All of this is public document. We can provide a hard copy. We also have all documents on the City's web site. Everything will be posted. Most of it has been posted as of tonight." Mr. Bussel asked why the City would build bike paths on collectors and arterials.

ROBERT BARRY MUCKLOW said, "I have handouts but I don't have enough. I apologize. I live on Aires Lane. Some of what I will say will seem far out to you. One of the first things Lorraine Tappen said was to protect the environment. I submit that that is a false premise. This meeting is one of a series that is nothing more than a façade to hide a pre-planned outcome. If the public was aware of the contents and final outcome of this plan, there would be gridlock surrounding this building. Instead there are a few here to stand against a metastasizing cancer that has invaded our area. It has been attacking private property rights that make this country the freest and most prosperous nation on earth. The name of this cancer is sustainability. I know to some of you that word has a nice ring. I submit that it is totally deceptive. A little bit of sugar helps the poison go down. We are being told to change our lives and our economy because our

environment is at risk. You are being coerced into misusing your authority by groups that are using fraudulent scientific data to give them credibility, and scientists who have confessed to bias and corruption. This entire Comprehensive Plan lacks a constitutional basis of any kind. It did not originate in this country, nor does it have any authority from any duly elected representative legislature at any level. This was instituted by executive authority. Its premises are false, the science is a fraud and the authority is nonexistent. I'm sure some of you have never heard what I'm telling you tonight. I am sure of what I'm telling you. This document is a Trojan horse. While claiming to provide solutions for problems that do not exist, it negates solutions that do exist. Our economy depends on land, not resource restrictions. Our economy depends on efficient transportation, not a bicycle and pedestrian system. We have a six-lane thoroughfare from I-95 to nowhere. Why are we even thinking about complete streets, sidewalks, and bicycle greenways? We don't have the money for them. We're looking at layers of bureaucracy, money whose sources are yet to be found, private property rights and a free economy subservient to a hazy ephemeral goal, such as fairness, social equity, and sustainable. None of these are defined, nor is it indicated how these goals benefit mankind. The truth is, they do not. Every detail of life is being planned for the government's benefit."

MATTHEW RENSON, Port St. Lucie, said, "I have three questions. This plan will be submitted to the state. Are you required to change this?" Vice Chair Martin said that it must be revised on a regular basis. Mr. Renson asked, "If you returned it with nothing, would that be acceptable?" Vice Chair Martin answered, "What's in place needs to stay in place, and we have the opportunity to amend it." Mr. Renson asked, "Once it's submitted, can it be changed after that?" Mr. Holbrook replied, "Yes, the City can amend the Comprehensive Plan. The City is required by state law to review its Comprehensive Plan every seven years and to make recommendations to change it. Those recommendations are based off either changes in state law or changes in policy direction from the City. What we have tonight is both. The City has changed dramatically since the last time this was adopted in 1998. The City has grown in area and population. Diversity and infrastructure has increased citywide. This plan is working to address current needs and to plan for the future. The history of the City is that the population is continuing to grow. This plan is to accommodate that." Mr. Renson asked if when people decide they don't like it, it can be amended and changed. Mr. Holbrook responded, "The state does allow for the City to submit amendments and changes for review."

There being no further comments, Vice Chair Martin closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Holbrook said, "A series of questions have been raised. We can address the questions to provide answers or comments. The question was raised as to whether we need a dog park. This is part of the Capital Improvement Plan, which has been adopted by the City Council already. There has been a demand from the public for that type of facility. If funds are available it is proposed to be constructed. Everyone doesn't use all the facilities in parks and recreation. There is passive and active recreation, and sometimes people do both, or they don't use any of them. As far as combining sidewalks and bike paths, that is an option. This Comprehensive Plan doesn't dictate how that design is going to be accommodated in future road projects. It really is road specific. There are many right of ways in the City that are constrained; that would limit the design. Becker Road is a good example of where there was a policy decision to accommodate those facilities in the sidewalk, so you have a multi-purpose path. It's a wider sidewalk for walkers and cyclists to use the same facility. The design is dictated by how the roads are and what the proposed demand is. It is not specific to the Comprehensive Plan as far as design. It is asking that it be considered in the design. Concerning the bus system, that is not operated by the City. Part of the interlocal discussion is to have the dialog. They changed services last year to better accommodate citizens. We will make note concerning the environmental study and acreage size. The report will be available on line. The entire Comprehensive Plan draft is available. PowerPoints will be on the City's web site. If you don't see something, call us. Concerning the constitutional basis for the Comprehensive Plan, I will ask Ms. Booker to respond."

Ms. Booker advised, "The constitutionality of Comprehensive Plan amendments has been challenged more than once in court. It is a requirement of the state that has been upheld. Other property rights issues have been litigated in the state and on the federal level. The Comprehensive Plan is a requirement of the state. We are following requirements as set forth in the Florida statutes. What we are doing is legal and proper. What we are doing is required. Even last year with some of the amendments to Chapter 163 there have been numerous lawsuits; some of those are still proceeding through the court process. At this point what we are doing is legal and valid. Even though people have challenged the state's right to proceed as they are proceeding and there are several property owners like the gentleman who spoke who believe in property owners' rights superseding what the government chooses to do on limiting those property rights,

the courts have upheld the state's ability to restrict property right use. What we're doing is valid and complies with that. On the dog park issue and funding, the Parks and Recreation Department is working on that. A tower company is looking to install a tower on one of the park properties, as they have done in several other City-owned facilities. The revenue generated from that tower could fund it, so it would not be tax-payer revenue. If that works out it would fund the construction of the dog park at that location. The City is aware that some residents don't use these facilities, but there are several residents who have requested the facility for quite some time."

Mr. Holbrook said, "I would remind the Board that the Goals, Objectives, and Policies are what is proposed to be adopted. If there are specific comments about any policy, this would be the appropriate time. This plan is for the City. When we say the City, it is for residents, property owners, business owners, and people who are coming here. If you have a specific concern about a specific policy, share that with us so we can give you the information."

Mr. Garrett said, "On Page 1-10 on future land use, it mentions Class C and D debris in regard to the landfill. What is that? On Page 1-10 it states that we have capacity for that until 2024, versus 2035. It also says that we have both short and long term needs met. On Page 4-5 that is clarified a little more. Maybe we need clarity. I don't know if 2024 meets the long term objective. Secondly, on Page 1-48 Southern Grove, Kennedy/Riverland and Western Grove are mentioned. Has that been updated with the most recent increases in square footage and capacity? Do the maps need to be adjusted? I have a question on level of service evaluation. We state the current LOS and then it is further evaluated in the future. Was the extension of the Crosstown Parkway to US 1 considered in the future projections? I have some general comments. Is it possible to double-side this huge document to conserve resources? Secondly, under home ownership there is an interesting fact that the public should be aware of. I was rather proud to read on Page 3-4 that the 2010 Census Report says that 78.1% of households in Port St. Lucie are owner occupied. That is well above the state average of 67.4%. We should be proud of that statistic. Lastly, on Page 8-10, Goal 8-2 is being added. I think it's great. You are adding to support the retention and growth of the industrial sector, retain existing businesses and small firms, and industrial businesses. You have stricken that the City will promote the development of infrastructure needed to support future businesses and light industrial expansion. That's a key point. It goes to the fact that we're using dollars that are in the ground today that the City has invested to pay dividends to the

residents in the form of new jobs. It's a great element in the Plan."

Mr. Sanders stated, "On behalf of the School Board I want to thank you for the continued cooperation from the City. We have worked over the last decade on sidewalks, land use, and public school facilities elements. Everything in here continues that collaboration. We are in agreement that we do not need to amend the schools element. We thank you. If you think about the changes to public policy today versus 1961 when GDC came in, the environment has changed and the needs for students to have sidewalks is so much more important today. That sums up why we have to do Comprehensive Plan changes to adjust to the citizens' needs."

Vice Chair Martin said, "I have a couple of comments in response to the people who showed up tonight. I agree with freedom and liberty. But we live in a City of 165,000 people. The capacity for the City is 500,000. I don't necessarily like what my neighbors do a lot of the time, so I'm glad there are some limitations and restrictions to what people can do with their own property. We do live in a civilized society. I believe that the regulations are just a necessary evil. Your concerns about the green environment are more political. I don't believe any of us are scientists. I've lived here almost 13 years. It's a great City. I encourage people to come here. Part of the multi-modal transportation is a reflection of that. The demographics are changing on a daily basis. Every year Port St. Lucie grows with different types of people. Twenty years from now they may be riding bicycles everywhere. None of us knows what is going to happen. But the experts, which I believe the staff is, are trying to help the citizens mold this City into something that will be acceptable decades from now for everybody. I hope I live long enough to see 500,000 neighbors in Port St. Lucie. There are some changes I don't necessarily agree with. I think we should focus more on economic development. I'm glad to see that was added. There's an open door policy here. You can speak to these people if you have concerns. Attend meetings. Make recommendations."

Mr. Holbrook said, "Concerning the double sided paper, that's an easy one. We appreciate you reading through and finding the facts. We are a predominantly owner-occupied City. We are a suburban City. That's the trend. The City will become denser as time goes by. GDC platted single family lots and there wasn't a build out. Sometimes with the build out there would be one house on a block or a street. There weren't the same issues. Now there is a neighbor-to-neighbor issue. Mr. Garrett, we will verify

that the densities and intensities are increased. That change just occurred; this document will be updated.”

Ms. Tappen explained, “Mr. Garrett pointed out the C and D debris. That is construction and demolition. That is kept separate from household waste because the household waste leeches and is a little more toxic. You pointed out that in the future land use we said there is sufficient capacity for the long range planning time frame. But in the Infrastructure Element we say it is only through 2024 and the county needs to come up with a plan. I agree that we should refine that statement. In the LOS table in the Transportation Element regarding the 2035 figures, those are from the 2035 long range transportation plan put out by the St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization. It does take the Crosstown Parkway into account. The housing tenure is impressive. This is a very stable community. The City should take pride in that. And it is very important that industrial businesses are supported and that infrastructure is available.”

Vice Chair Martin stated, “We have three options. We can recommend approval, or approval with conditions, or we can deny moving this forward.” Mr. Strickland **moved** to adopt the proposed EAR-based amendments to the City of Port St. Lucie Comprehensive Plan based on the changes that were discussed today are amended before going to City Council. Mr. Ojito **seconded** the motion, which **passed unanimously** by roll call vote.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Ernie Ojito, Secretary

Margie L. Wilson, Deputy City Clerk