

From: [Felix Osorio](#)
To: [Kevin Freeman](#); [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Project Neptune Rezoning Objection
Date: Thursday, September 17, 2026 9:11:11 AM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful [REDACTED] in the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

[REDACTED] d this message don't often get email from
[REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at
[REDACTED]tSenderIdentification]

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear Members of the Planning and Zoning Board and City Planning & Zoning Staff:

My name is Felix Osorio Martínez, and I am a homeowner and resident of Brystol North at Wylde in Port St. Lucie, Florida. I am writing to formally and strongly oppose the proposed data center being considered in the area between Fort Pierce and Port St. Lucie. I am not opposed to responsible economic development, technology, or job creation. My objection is to placing a large, continuously operating, industrial-type data center in an area that is surrounded by and continuing to develop as a residential community. The City's own documents identify significant potential impacts involving noise, water, electrical infrastructure, generators, fuel storage, cooling systems, and other industrial infrastructure. Those impacts deserve careful scrutiny before this project is approved.

The City's Data Center Zoning Category Analysis states that the current zoning regulations do not expressly identify "data center" as a separate use category and that its classification must therefore be based on the use most similar in its actual operational characteristics. The City concludes that a data center is most appropriately treated as comparable to an I-1 Light Industrial use. The same analysis describes I-1 as a district intended for industrial and related uses with limited objectionable external effects. That distinction is important. The question should not simply be whether a data center can be compared to light industrial use. The question should be whether this particular data center, at this particular location, will actually have limited objectionable external effects and remain compatible with the nearby residential communities.

The City's own analysis describes a conventional data center as a large warehouse-like building containing computer servers and data-processing equipment, with limited public access but continuous HVAC and cooling operations, significant electrical and telecommunications infrastructure, emergency generators, fuel storage, transformers and switchgear, loading and maintenance activity, and potential noise from chillers and mechanical equipment. In other words, the facility may have few employees, but its physical and infrastructure impacts can be substantial.

Noise is one of my greatest concerns. The City's separate data-center materials specifically call for a professional acoustical analysis before site-plan approval and identify the need for property-line and receptor-based limits, including limits at the nearest residential or other sensitive receptors. The document also recognizes low-frequency and tonal noise and recommends restrictions on routine generator testing. If these protections are important enough to be identified by the City's own materials, they should be fully addressed before approval—not after residents are exposed to the impacts.

Water consumption is another major concern. The City's materials identify water supply, reclaimed-water availability, cooling technology, consumptive-

use permitting, and comprehensive-plan consistency as important Conditional Use review issues. They also call for water-demand calculations, cooling-system descriptions, reclaimed-water feasibility analysis, and SFWMD/DEP permit information. I believe residents have a right to know exactly how much water this facility will require and what effect that demand could have on local resources.

Electrical demand also deserves full disclosure. The City's materials recognize that data centers can require significant electrical service, transformers, switchgear, and related infrastructure. Florida law, as summarized in the City's materials, defines a "large-scale data center" as a single-location data center with an anticipated monthly peak load of 50 megawatts or more. The City should therefore disclose the anticipated electrical demand of this project and explain what utility infrastructure will be required to serve it.

The location matters. This project is being considered in the developing area between Fort Pierce and Port St. Lucie, where homeowners are purchasing property and establishing neighborhoods. A decision to place a 24-hour industrial-type facility in this corridor should consider not only the individual parcel but also the long-term character, livability, infrastructure capacity, and cumulative impacts on surrounding residential communities.

Other communities provide a warning that these concerns are not hypothetical. In Northern Virginia, residents living near data centers have reported persistent mechanical noise. Virginia's Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission reported that residents in the Great Oak neighborhood complained about noise from a nearby data center and that the issue remained unresolved to residents' satisfaction for an extended period. Residents in Brook Haven also raised noise concerns, with mitigation taking time and repeated communications before reductions were observed.

In Chesapeake, Virginia, residents living near proposed data-center development have expressed concerns about continuous cooling-system noise, water consumption, pollution, and backup diesel generators. Georgia Public Broadcasting reported that one resident living only a few hundred feet from a proposed site specifically questioned how she could relax with cooling equipment potentially producing a continuous 24-hour hum.

In Goochland County, Virginia, residents confronting a proposed large data-center campus raised concerns about noise pollution, diesel generators near homes, transmission lines, and water use. The developer discussed air cooling as a way to reduce water consumption, but acknowledged that air cooling would require substantially more electricity. That example demonstrates an important point: solving one data-center impact can shift the burden to another resource. The City should therefore evaluate the entire infrastructure picture rather than considering water, power, noise, or generators in isolation.

Data-center growth has also produced broader community and infrastructure concerns in other states. Texas is currently increasing oversight of data-center water use, with state officials requiring greater reporting and enforcement because of concerns about the industry's rapidly increasing water and power demands. These developments reinforce why water-use projections and utility capacity should be addressed before—not after—major facilities are approved.

The issue is also not limited to one state. Communities across the country are increasingly questioning whether the economic benefits of data centers justify the local impacts associated with power demand, water use, noise, land use, and infrastructure. That national experience should encourage Port St. Lucie to proceed carefully rather than assume that the impacts will be insignificant simply because the facility has relatively few permanent employees.

I am also concerned about the City's use of the "similar use" provision. Section 125-6 contains limitations concerning the placement of a use into a zone where it is not listed and the relationship between a proposed similar use and uses specifically listed in another zoning district. I respectfully request that the City clearly explain the legal and factual basis for determining that this particular data center qualifies under Section 125-6 and why I-1 is the appropriate classification.

Finally, the City's state-law materials identify an additional legal issue involving SB 484 and SB 180 and state that a City Attorney/legal opinion is required regarding the City's authority to impose certain additional requirements. I respectfully request that any such legal determination be made clear to the public before the project is approved, particularly concerning noise studies, generator testing, water-use documentation, utility-capacity studies, setbacks, buffers, and architectural screening.

MY REQUEST TO THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD

- Do not approve the proposed data center at this location unless the City can establish that the use is legally authorized, properly classified, and compatible with surrounding residential development.
- Require a professional acoustical study that evaluates continuous cooling noise, low-frequency and tonal noise, nighttime conditions, and noise at the nearest residential receptors.
- Require complete information regarding the number, size, location, fuel type, fuel-storage capacity, emissions, and testing schedule of emergency generators.
- Require detailed water-demand calculations, cooling-system information, reclaimed-water analysis, and confirmation of all required SFWMD/DEP permits.
- Require disclosure of anticipated electrical demand and all major utility infrastructure needed to serve the facility.
- Require a comprehensive evaluation of traffic, construction impacts, lighting, visual impacts, setbacks, buffering, stormwater, and emergency response.
- Require enforceable operating conditions that protect nearby residents after the facility becomes operational, rather than relying solely on voluntary promises.
- Ensure that all applicable legal and zoning questions are resolved and made part of the public record before any final approval.

I strongly oppose this proposed data center because the potential impacts are too significant to be treated as an ordinary light-industrial use without a rigorous, site-specific review. The City's own documents identify the very issues that concern residents: continuous cooling, noise, generators, fuel storage, electrical infrastructure, water demand, and compatibility with nearby sensitive receptors. Homeowners should not be required to live next to a facility first and then attempt to correct problems after construction. The appropriate time to protect our community is before approval and before construction.

I respectfully request that this letter be included in the official record and provided to the Planning and Zoning Board for consideration.

Respectfully,

Felix Osorio Martínez
Homeowner/Resident
Bristol North at Wylder [REDACTED]

Sources reviewed

City of Port St. Lucie - Data Center Zoning Category Analysis (uploaded document).
City of Port St. Lucie - Data Centers - State (uploaded document).
Virginia Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission, Chapter 6: Local Residential Impacts.
Georgia Public Broadcasting, "Why more residents are saying 'No' to AI data centers in their backyard" (July 18, 2025).
Virginia Mercury, "Goochland residents rebuff data center developer Tract ahead of permit application" (July 27, 2026).
Reuters, "Texas moves to penalize data centers for water violations" (September 14, 2026).