



Indian River County, Florida

Indian River County
Administration Complex
1801 27th Street
Vero Beach, Florida 32960
indianriver.gov

Draft Meeting Minutes

Board of County Commissioners

Susan Adams, District 1, Chairman
Joseph Flescher, District 2, Vice Chairman
Joseph H. Earman, District 3
Deryl Loar, District 4
Laura Moss, District 5

John A. Titkanich, Jr., County Administrator
Jennifer W. Shuler, County Attorney
Ryan L. Butler, Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller

Tuesday, November 12, 2024

12:00 PM

Commission Chambers

Special Call Meeting / Evaluation Appraisal Report (EAR) Workshop

1. CALL TO ORDER

2.A. A MOMENT OF SILENT REFLECTION FOR FIRST RESPONDERS AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

2.B. INVOCATION

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

4. STAFF / CONSULTANT PRESENTATION

4.A.

Presentation of the Indian River County 2024 Comprehensive Plan Evaluation & Appraisal Report (EAR)

Chris Balter, Chief of Long Range Planning, provided an overview of the Comprehensive Plan Evaluation and Appraisal Review Report (EAR). He pointed out the County's Comprehensive Plan provided a framework for the community's future, and the State required an independent evaluation of it every seven years. Mr Balter then introduced Kelley Klepper from consulting firm Kimley-Horn who provided the results of the evaluation.

Mr. Klepper compared the EAR to a doctor's checkup with the goal of ensuring the Comprehensive Plan (CP) adhered to updated statutes, eliminated redundancies, removed Land Development references, incorporated Interlocal Agreements, and adhered to best planning practices. He detailed the efforts to collect community feedback via workshops and surveys which would ensure the CP met the community's needs and concerns. He noted the EAR's recommendations would address terminology, statutory changes, redundancies, and provide status updates on proposed programs.

Mr. Klepper's presentation referred to the extensive report produced as he provided summaries of the recommendations for each of the 12 specific elements of the Comprehensive Plan according to the EAR's goals. The categories were: Future Land Use, Public Infrastructure, Transportation, Economic Development, Capital Improvements, Housing, Conservation, Coastal Management, Recreation and Open Space, Intergovernmental Coordination, Public School Facilities, and Property Rights. He informed the overarching concerns when evaluating the CP were to ensure it reflected what the County wanted to be, which direction it wanted to grow, which goals were fiscally realistic, what type of economic development was appropriate, and how to best maintain the quality of life residents enjoyed.

5. BOARD COMMENTS / QUESTIONS

Following the EAR report presentation, discussion ensued among the Board, Mr. Balter, and Mr. Klepper who provided clarification and priorities in the Comprehensive Plan (CP) for staff to consider in the coming year. It was noted that the community's top three concerns were infrastructure, the impact of growth on the environment, and transportation/traffic.

Transportation and traffic management were among residents' top concerns, and discussion began with aligning the Urban Service Boundary (USB) with the Comprehensive Plan's growth strategies. Commissioner Moss received information regarding how traffic impacts from new subdivisions were communicated to the public, and if a cumulative impact could be provided.

Urban planning discussions focused on the balance between urban sprawl and infill development. Commissioner Loar addressed concerns about development, and implications for traffic management, and long-range transportation plans. Staff responded with information on the need for intergovernmental coordination, and identifying timely updates to Interlocal Agreements, some of which are over 20 years old. County Administrator John Titkanich agreed effective communication between municipalities and the County was important for comprehensive planning efforts.

Vice Chairman Flescher received information on how to evaluate sprawl and its impact on the Board's policy decisions regarding growth. Additional discussion was had among the Commissioners regarding how the different reports layer to work together, discussion of County road standards, and the importance of effectively communicating traffic definitions to avoid public misunderstandings.

The conversation acknowledged that while the comprehensive plan provided guidance, macro decisions would be tackled at a lower level and address issues such as traffic congestion and the shape of housing developments. County Administrator Titkanich responded to the Board's question about the approval procedure by providing insight into the State's process of evaluating Comprehensive Plans, with noted deference to the County's decisions regarding priorities.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Tom Sullivan discussed the congestion caused by new developments which have only one main exit, and are located along a main thoroughfare. He was concerned with the backup created when many residents exited at the same time along a road such as US Highway 1. He requested the Board consider diversifying the design of these subdivisions to ease congestion.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 12:59 p.m.