Welcome to the City of St. Petersburg City Council meeting. To assist the City Council in conducting the City’s business, we ask that you observe the following:

1. If you are speaking under the Public Hearings, Appeals or Open Forum sections of the agenda, please observe the time limits indicated on the agenda.

2. Placards and posters are not permitted in the Chamber. Applause is not permitted except in connection with Awards and Presentations.

3. Please do not address Council from your seat. If asked by Council to speak to an issue, please do so from the podium.

4. Please do not pass notes to Council during the meeting.

5. Please be courteous to other members of the audience by keeping side conversations to a minimum.

6. The Fire Code prohibits anyone from standing in the aisles or in the back of the room.

7. If other seating is Council Meeting, please do not occupy the seats reserved for individuals who are deaf/hard of hearing.

GENERAL AGENDA INFORMATION

For your convenience, a copy of the agenda material is available for your review at the Main Library, 3745 Ninth Avenue North, and at the City Clerk’s Office, 1st Floor, City Hall, 175 Fifth Street North, on the Monday preceding the regularly scheduled Council meeting. The agenda and backup material is also posted on the City’s website at www.stpete.org and generally electronically updated the Friday preceding the meeting and again the day preceding the meeting. The updated agenda and backup material can be viewed at all St. Petersburg libraries. An updated copy is also available on the podium outside Council Chamber at the start of the Council meeting.

If you are deaf/hard of hearing and require the services of an interpreter, please call our TDD number, 892-5259, or the Florida Relay Service at 711 as soon as possible. The City requests at least 72 hours advance notice, prior to the scheduled meeting, and every effort will be made to provide that service for you. If you are a person with a disability who needs an accommodation in order to participate in this/these proceedings or have any questions, please contact the City Clerk’s Office at 893-7448.
A. Meeting Called to Order and Roll Call.

Invocation and Pledge to the Flag of the United States of America.

B. Approval of Agenda with Additions and Deletions.

C. Consent Agenda (see attached)

Open Forum

If you wish to address City Council on subjects other than public hearing or quasi-judicial items listed on this agenda, please sign up with the Clerk prior to the meeting. Only the individual wishing to speak may sign the Open Forum sheet and only City residents, owners of property in the City, owners of businesses in the City or their employees may speak. All issues discussed under Open Forum must be limited to issues related to the City of St. Petersburg government.

Speakers will be called to address Council according to the order in which they sign the Open Forum sheet. In order to provide an opportunity for all citizens to address Council, each individual will be given three (3) minutes. The nature of the speakers’ comments will determine the manner in which the response will be provided. The response will be provided by City staff and may be in the form of a letter or a follow-up phone call depending on the request.

D. New Ordinances - (First Reading of Title and Setting of Public Hearing)

Setting March 14, 2019 as the public hearing date for the following proposed Ordinance(s):

1. Ordinance amending the St. Petersburg City Code to create a new Section 25-228 prohibiting the placement of tables on sidewalks and rights-of-way in designated locations; creating a prohibited zone; providing for enforcement; and providing an effective date.

2. Ordinance approving a vacation of a 10-foot by 105-foot portion of 28th Avenue North, beginning at the Eastern edge of the property and adjacent to the North lot line of the parcel located at 5034 28th Avenue North; setting forth conditions for the vacation to become effective; and providing for an effective date. (City File 18-33000012)

Setting April 4, 2019 as the public hearing date for the following proposed Ordinance(s)

3. Ordinance naming the Sanitation Department administration building after Benjamin F. Shirley Sr.; amending City Code to reflect the naming; and providing an effective date.
E. Reports

1. Approving a term sheet for a mixed-use project with public parking, located on the southeast corner of 1st Avenue North and 5th Street.

2. A Resolution approving the interlocal agreement between the City of St. Petersburg, Florida (“City”), and Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (“PSTA”) for the City to provide funding to PSTA for the design, fabrication and installation of public art as part of the Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project; authorizing the Mayor or his designee to execute the interlocal agreement; and providing an effective date.

3. Sewer Report

(a) Accepting a bid from TLC Diversified, Inc. in the amount of $1,678,985.00 for Lift Station No. 11, Snell Isle Boulevard Rehabilitation Project. (Engineering Project No. 16068-111; Oracle No. 14218); approving a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $954,392 from the unappropriated balance of the Water Resources Capital Projects Fund (4003) to the LST #11 Snell Isle Rehab Project (14218).

(b) Authorizing the Mayor or his designee to execute Task Order No. 16-05-MC/W (Task Order) to the architect/engineering agreement between the City of St. Petersburg, Florida and McKim & Creed, Inc. (A/E) dated December 5, 2016 for A/E to provide funding for project administration, data collection and review, topographical survey, subsurface utility engineering services, geotechnical services, preliminary design services, final design services, permitting, and bidding services related to the Downtown Water Main Replacement Phase III Project in an amount not to exceed $178,207.55 (ECID Project No. 19047-111; Oracle No. 15939).

4. Bayfront Health Update

5. Renewing an annual construction contract with Ajax Paving Industries of Florida, LLC for Citywide Street Milling and Resurfacing for the Engineering and Capital Improvements Dept., in the amount of $4,000,000 for FY2019, for a total contract amount of $7,414,635.50 (ECID Project No. 19003-130; Oracle Project Numbers 16741 and 16730).

6. Proclamation in recognition of The Tampa Bay Lightning Hometown Hero Award presented to Bill Darling.

F. New Business

1. Referring to the Budget, Finance and Taxation Committee (or other relevant committee) a discussion on incentives for more energy efficient HVAC units, such as inclusion in the Rebates for Residential Rehabs Program or waiving permitting fees. (Councilmember Driscoll)

2. Referring to Public Services and Infrastructure Committee to consider amending Chapter 16.40.040, City of St. Petersburg Municipal Code, to allow for fence construction containing corrugated metal panels and establishing standards for such materials. (Chair Gerdes)

3. Respectfully requesting the St. Petersburg City Council refer to the COW of March 28 or the earliest available COW a discussion of providing Weeki Wachee funding for the Maximo Park improvements project. (Councilmember Kornell)
G. Council Committee Reports

1. Co-Sponsored Events Committee (2/21/19)

(a) Approving events for co-sponsorship by the City in name only for FY2019 and FY2020; waiving the non-profit requirements of Resolution No. 2000-562(a)8 for the co-sponsored events to be presented by We Are Concerts LLC, iHeartMedia + Entertainment, Inc., Endorfun Sports, LLC., Yachting Promotions, Inc., Design Ofresco Corp., Floridata Capital Assets Group, Inc., Watercross International, Inc.; authorizing the Mayor or his designee to execute all documents necessary to effectuate this resolution.

(b) Resolution in accordance with City Code Section 21-38(d) exempting Tampa Bay Blues Festival (Vinoy Park) from the beer and wine only restrictions in City Code Section 21-38(d) upon the issuance of a permit for alcoholic beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served, dispensed, possessed, used, and/or consumed at the venue during the event as set forth herein.

(c) Resolution in accordance with City Code Section 21-38(d) exempting 12th Annual St. Petersburg Chillounge Night (North Straub Park) from the beer and wine only restrictions in City Code Section 21-38(d) upon the issuance of a permit for alcoholic beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served, dispensed, possessed, used, and/or consumed at the venue during the event as set forth herein.

(d) Resolution in accordance with City Code Section 21-38(d) exempting Savor St. Pete (North Straub Park) from the beer and wine only restrictions in City Code Section 21-38(d) upon the issuance of a permit for alcoholic beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served, dispensed, possessed, used, and/or consumed at the venue during the event as set forth herein.

(e) Resolution in accordance with City Code Section 21-38(d) exempting Tash Sultana (Vinoy Park) from the beer and wine only restrictions in City Code Section 21-38(d) upon the issuance of a permit for alcoholic beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served, dispensed, possessed, used, and/or consumed at the venue during the event as set forth herein.

(f) Resolution in accordance with City Code Section 21-38(d) exempting 95.7 Beats by the Bay (Vinoy Park) from the beer and wine only restrictions in City Code Section 21-38(d) upon the issuance of a permit for alcoholic beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served, dispensed, possessed, used, and/or consumed at the venue during the event as set forth herein.

2. Budget, Finance & Taxation Committee (2/28/19)

3. Public Services & Infrastructure Committee (2/28/19)

4. Housing, Land Use & Transportation Committee (2/28/19)

5. Committee of the Whole (2/28/19)

(a) Resetting the public hearing for the Storefront Conservation Corridor Overlay from April 18, 2019 to April 4, 2019; and rescheduling the report item for the Storefront Conservation Corridor Grant Program from March 14, 2019 to April 4, 2019.
H. Legal

1. Settlement Michael and Vanessa Albert

I Public Hearings and Quasi-Judicial Proceedings - 5:30 P.M.

Public Hearings

NOTE: The following Public Hearing items have been submitted for consideration by the City Council. If you wish to speak on any of the Public Hearing items, please obtain one of the YELLOW cards from the containers on the wall outside of Council Chamber, fill it out as directed, and present it to the Clerk. You will be given 3 minutes ONLY to state your position on any item but may address more than one item.

1. Ordinance 362-H to revise Chapter 8 of the City Code to remove references to discontinued rental housing inspection programs and clarify procedures related to placarding dangerous buildings.

Quasi-Judicial Proceedings

Swearing in of witnesses. Representatives of City Administration, the applicant/appellant, opponents, and members of the public who wish to speak at the public hearing must declare that he or she will testify truthfully by taking an oath or affirmation in the following form:

"Do you swear or affirm that the evidence you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?"

The oath or affirmation will be administered prior to the presentation of testimony and will be administered in mass to those who wish to speak. Persons who submit cards to speak after the administration of the oath, who have not been previously sworn, will be sworn prior to speaking. For detailed procedures to be followed for Quasi-Judicial Proceedings, please see yellow sheet attached to this agenda.

2. Ordinance 114-HL approving the designation of the Driftwood Local Historic District, generally encompassing the area between 24th Avenue South, Driftwood Road South (that portion formerly known as Ward Avenue South), and Tampa Bay as a Local Historic District and adding the property to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places pursuant to Section 16.30.070, City Code, and providing for an effective date. (City File 17-90300006)

J. Open Forum

K. Adjournment
NOTE: The Consent Agenda contains normal, routine business items that are very likely to be approved by the City Council by a single motion. Council questions on these items were answered prior to the meeting. Each Councilmember may, however, defer any item for added discussion at a later time.

(Procurement)

1. Renewing an annual construction contract with Ajax Paving Industries of Florida, LLC for Citywide Street Milling and Resurfacing for the Engineering and Capital Improvements Dept., in the amount of $4,000,000 for FY2019, for a total contract amount of $7,414,635.50 (ECID Project No. 19003-130; Oracle Project Numbers 16741 and 16730). [MOVED TO REPORTS AS E-5]

(City Development)

(Leisure Services)

(Public Works)

(Appointments)

(Miscellaneous)
NOTE: The Consent Agenda contains normal, routine business items that are very likely to be approved by the City Council by a single motion. Council questions on these items were answered prior to the meeting. Each Councilmember may, however, defer any item for added discussion at a later time.

(Procurement)

1. Accepting a proposal from Perfect Settings, Inc. a sole source provider, to repair and replace water slides at City pools for the Parks & Recreation Department, at a total contract amount of $333,938.81; rescinding unencumbered appropriations in the amount of $200,000 from the Northwest Aquatic Phase II Project (16213) and $65,000 from the FY19 Swimming Pool Improvements Project (16724); approving a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $332,000 from the unappropriated balance of the Recreation and Culture Capital Improvement Fund (3029), partially resulting from the two rescissions, to the City Water Slide Improvements Project (17061); and providing an effective date.

2. Approving the purchase of two transport vans from Alan Jay Ford Lincoln Mercury for the Police Department, at a total cost of $99,933.46.

3. Approving a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $16,964 from the unappropriated balance of the Supply Management Fund to the Procurement & Supply Management Department, for HVAC system replacement at the City’s Consolidated Warehouse, and providing an effective date.

(City Development)

(Leisure Services)

(Public Works)

(Appointments)

(Miscellaneous)
Note: An abbreviated listing of upcoming MEETING AGENDA Council meetings.

Budget, Finance & Taxation Committee  
*Thursday, February 28, 2019, 8:00 a.m., Room 100*

Public Services & Infrastructure Committee  
*Thursday, February 28, 2019, 9:25 a.m., Room 100*

Housing, Land Use & Transportation Committee  
*Thursday, February 28, 2019, 10:50 a.m., Room 100*

CRA/Agenda Review  
*Thursday, February 28, 2019, 1:30 p.m., Room 100*

Committee of the Whole: Storefront Conservation Corridor Plan; 2019 Emergency Medical Services ALS First Responder Growth Management Agreement.  
*Thursday, February 28, 2019, 2:00 p.m., Room 100*

CRA / Agenda Review  
*Monday, March 11, 2019, 9:30 a.m., Room 100*

Budget, Finance & Taxation Committee  
*Thursday, March 14, 2019, 8:00 a.m., Room 100*

Public Services & Infrastructure Committee  
*Thursday, March 14, 2019, 9:25 a.m., Room 100*

Health, Energy, Resiliency & Sustainability Committee  
*Thursday, March 14, 2019, 10:50 a.m., Room 100*

City Council Meeting  
*Thursday, March 14, 2019, 3:00 p.m., Council Chamber*
City Beautiful Commission  
4 Regular Members  
((Term expires 6/30/20))

Civil Service Board  
2 Alternate Members  
((Terms expires 8/31/19 and 11/30/19))

Nuisance Abatement Board  
1 Regular Member  
((Term expires 12/31/19))

Nuisance Abatement Board  
2 Alternate Members  
((Terms expire 8/31/19 and 11/30/19))
PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED FOR QUASI-JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS:

1. Anyone wishing to speak must fill out a yellow card and present the card to the Clerk. All speakers must be sworn prior to presenting testimony. No cards may be submitted after the close of the Public Hearing. Each party and speaker is limited to the time limits set forth herein and may not give their time to another speaker or party.

2. At any time during the proceeding, City Council members may ask questions of any speaker or party. The time consumed by Council questions and answers to such questions shall not count against the time frames allowed herein. **Burden of proof:** in all appeals, the Appellant bears the burden of proof; in rezoning and land use cases, the Property Owner or Applicant bears the burden of proof except in cases initiated by the City, in which event the City Administration bears the burden of proof; for all other applications, the Applicant bears the burden of proof. **Waiver of Objection:** at any time during this proceeding Council Members may leave the Council Chamber for short periods of time. At such times they continue to hear testimony because the audio portion of the hearing is transmitted throughout City Hall by speakers. If any party has an objection to a Council Member leaving the Chamber during the hearing, such objection must be made at the start of the hearing. If an objection is not made as required herein it shall be deemed to have been waived.

3. **Initial Presentation.** Each party shall be allowed ten (10) minutes for their initial presentation.
   a. Presentation by City Administration.
   b. Presentation by Applicant followed by the Appellant, if different. If Appellant and Applicant are different entities then each is allowed the allotted time for each part of these procedures. If the Property Owner is neither the Applicant nor the Appellant (e.g., land use and zoning applications which the City initiates, historic designation applications which a third party initiates, etc.), they shall also be allowed the allotted time for each part of these procedures and shall have the opportunity to speak last.
   c. Presentation by Opponent. If anyone wishes to utilize the initial presentation time provided for an Opponent, said individual shall register with the City Clerk at least one week prior to the scheduled public hearing. If there is an Appellant who is not the Applicant or Property Owner, then no Opponent is allowed.

4. **Public Hearing.** A Public Hearing will be conducted during which anyone may speak for 3 minutes. Speakers should limit their testimony to information relevant to the ordinance or application and criteria for review.

5. **Cross Examination.** Each party shall be allowed five (5) minutes for cross examination. All questions shall be addressed to the Chair and then (at the discretion of the Chair) asked either by the Chair or by the party conducting the cross examination of the appropriate witness. One (1) representative of each party shall conduct the cross examination. If anyone wishes to utilize the time provided for cross examination and rebuttal as an Opponent, and no one has previously registered with the Clerk, said individual shall notify the City Clerk prior to the conclusion of the Public Hearing. If no one gives such notice, there shall be no cross examination or rebuttal by Opponent(s). If more than one person wishes to utilize the time provided for Opponent(s), the City Council shall by motion determine who shall represent Opponent(s).
   a. Cross examination by Opponents.
   b. Cross examination by City Administration.
   c. Cross examination by Appellant followed by Applicant, followed by Property Owner, if different.

6. **Rebuttal/Closing.** Each party shall have five (5) minutes to provide a closing argument or rebuttal.
   a. Rebuttal by Opponents.
   b. Rebuttal by City Administration.
   c. Rebuttal by Appellant followed by the Applicant, followed by Property Owner, if different.
The following page(s) contain the backup material for Agenda Item: Ordinance amending the St. Petersburg City Code to create a new Section 25-228 prohibiting the placement of tables on sidewalks and rights-of-way in designated locations; creating a prohibited zone; providing for enforcement; and providing an effective date.
Please scroll down to view the backup material.
Ordinance No. _______

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ST. PETERSBURG CITY CODE TO CREATE A NEW SECTION 25-228 PROHIBITING THE PLACEMENT OF TABLES ON SIDEWALKS AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY IN DESIGNATED LOCATIONS; CREATING A PROHIBITED ZONE; PROVIDING FOR ENFORCEMENT; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City has a significant government interest in regulating pedestrian traffic along its sidewalks and rights-of-way; and

WHEREAS, the City has a duty to keep its sidewalks and rights-of-way open and available for the movement of persons; and

WHEREAS, the City finds that the preservation of the City's scenic beauty promotes tourism by establishing visual attractiveness for the City and promoting its general economic and cultural development consistent with the City's interest in aesthetics; and

WHEREAS, the City wishes to preserve the aesthetic beauty of the City; and

WHEREAS, the area within the attached diagram is replete with numerous outdoor entertainment and economic activity areas, including sidewalk cafés, restaurants, parks, hotels, retail establishments, and music venues; and

WHEREAS, within this area many people walk from one location to another for dining, shopping and other entertainment; and

WHEREAS, the boundaries within the entire zone shown in the attached diagram are narrowly tailored to only address the commercial areas that have a large volume of pedestrian traffic and are vital to the economic vitality of the City; and

WHEREAS, the unregulated placement of tables on City sidewalks and rights-of-way threatens the safety and convenience of pedestrians, the economic vitality of the City, and the aesthetic beauty of the City.
NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA DOES ORDAIN:

SECTION 1. The City of St. Petersburg City Code is hereby amended by adding a new Section 25-228 to read as follows:

Sec. 25-228. – Placement of tables on City sidewalks and rights-of-way.

(a) Definitions.

Prohibited zone means the area bounded by the following rights-of-way (including sidewalks), which are generally shown on diagram 1 hereunder:

Beginning at the northeasternmost point of the intersection of Fourth Street North and Third Avenue North; then easterly along the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue North to the western right-of-way line of First Street North; then northerly along the western right-of-way line of First Street North to the northern right-of-way line of Fifth Avenue North; then easterly along the northern right-of-way line of Fifth Avenue North to the center line of Beach Drive Northeast; then southerly along the center line of Beach Drive Northeast to the northern right-of-way line of First Avenue South; then easterly along the northern right-of-way line of First Avenue South to the western right-of-way line of Bayshore Drive; then southerly along the western right-of-way line of Bayshore Drive to the southern right-of-way line of First Avenue South; then westerly along the southern right-of-way line of First Avenue South to the eastern right-of-way line of First Street South; then southerly along the eastern right-of-way line of First Street South to the northern right-of-way line of Second Avenue South; then westerly along the southern right-of-way line of Second Avenue South to the eastern right-of-way line of Third Street South; then southerly along the eastern right-of-way line of Third Street South to the southern right-of-way line of Third Avenue South; then westerly along the southern right-of-way line of Third Avenue South to the eastern right-of-way line of Fourth Street South; then northerly along the eastern right-of-way line of Fourth Street South to the point of beginning.

Diagram 1: Prohibited zone
(b) Prohibition. It shall be unlawful for a person to place or utilize a table on any sidewalk or right-of-way in the prohibited zone. The prohibition in this section shall not apply to adjacent property owners placing or utilizing tables pursuant to a valid sidewalk café permit or to anyone placing or utilizing tables pursuant to a street closure permit that has been issued by the City.

(c) Notice. If a person is found to be in violation of this section, a law enforcement officer shall notify the person who placed or is using a table contrary to this section that the person is in violation of this section and shall request the person to remove the offending table. The person shall not be charged with a violation of this section if the person voluntarily removes the table and does not repeat a violation of this section for one year following the law enforcement officer’s notice and request.

(d) Removal of tables by the POD.

(i) If requested by the person in violation of this section, the POD shall remove the table or cause the table to be removed to a secure indoor or outdoor location where the table will be held for a period of 90 days. If the table is not claimed within 90 days by a person supplying sufficient proof of ownership or the person who was utilizing the table at the time of removal, the table shall be deemed abandoned property and be disposed of accordingly.

(ii) If the person who is utilizing the table is cited or arrested for a violation of this section, the table shall be removed or caused to be removed by the POD to a secure indoor or outdoor location where it will be held for a period of 90 days. If the table is not claimed within 90 days by a person supplying sufficient proof of ownership of the table or the person who was utilizing the table at the time of removal, the table shall be deemed abandoned property and be disposed of accordingly.

(iii) If any unpermitted table is found on a City sidewalk or right-of-way by a law enforcement officer and there is no person present who claims ownership of it, the law
enforcement officer shall cause the table to be moved to a secure indoor or outdoor location where the table will be held for a period of 90 days. Upon removal of the table, a notice shall be affixed to the ground in the area where the table was located. The notice shall provide a telephone number and a location where information concerning the retrieval of such table can be obtained. Such notice may be removed after five days. If the table is not claimed by a person supplying sufficient proof of ownership within 90 days after removal, the table shall be deemed abandoned property and may be disposed of accordingly.

SECTION 2. The provisions of this Ordinance shall be deemed severable. The unconstitutionality or invalidity of any word, sentence or portion of this Ordinance shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions.

SECTION 3. In the event that this Ordinance is not vetoed by the Mayor in accordance with the City Charter, it shall become effective after the fifth business day after adoption unless the Mayor notifies the City Council through written notice filed with the City Clerk that the Mayor will not veto the Ordinance, in which case the Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon filing such written notice with the City Clerk. In the event this Ordinance is vetoed by the Mayor in accordance with the City Charter, it shall not become effective unless and until the City Council overrides the veto in accordance with the City Charter, in which case it shall become effective immediately upon a successful vote to override the veto.

Approved as to form and content:

[Signature]

City Attorney (designee)

00431659
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The following page(s) contain the backup material for Agenda Item: Ordinance approving a vacation of a 10-foot by 105-foot portion of 28th Avenue North, beginning at the Eastern edge of the property and adjacent to the North lot line of the parcel located at 5034 28th Avenue North; setting forth conditions for the vacation to become effective; and providing for an effective date. (City File 18-33000012)
Please scroll down to view the backup material.
TO: The Honorable Charles Gerdes, Chair, and Members of City Council

SUBJECT: Ordinance approving a vacation of a 10-foot by 105-foot portion of 28th Avenue North, beginning at the eastern edge of the property and adjacent to the North Lot Line of the parcel located at 5034 28th Avenue North. (City File No.: 18-33000012)

RECOMMENDATION: The Administration and the Development Review Commission recommend APPROVAL.

RECOMMENDED CITY COUNCIL ACTION: 1) Conduct the first reading of the attached proposed ordinance; and 2) Set the second reading and public hearing for March 14, 2019.

The Request: The request recommended by the DRC is to vacate a 10-foot by 105-foot portion of 28th Avenue North, beginning at the eastern edge of the property adjacent to the North Lot Line of the parcel located at 5034 28th Avenue North.

Discussion: As set forth in the attached report provided to the Development Review Commission (DRC), Staff finds that vacating the subject partial right-of-way would be consistent with the criteria in the City Code. There are no policies in the Comprehensive Plan that would affect vacation of right-of-way in this area of the City, and there is no applicable Special Area Plan. The applicant requested vacation of an 11.5-foot by 130-foot portion of 28th Avenue North. Staff had recommended a maximum of 10-feet or right-of-way be vacated, the DRC further recommended that the vacation be limited to 10-feet by 105-feet beginning at the eastern edge of the subject property.

Agency Review: The application was routed to the standard list of City Departments and private utility providers. Frontier Communications and Duke Energy have indicated that they will require an easement for their facilities. Bright House has not yet responded to the City's request for comment. A condition of approval will require the applicant to address these concerns.

Public Comments: The subject property is within the boundaries of the Disston Heights Neighborhood Association. The Neighborhood Association was notified prior to submittal of the
case and the applicant's attended a neighborhood meeting on January 8, 2019. In follow up to that meeting, the Neighborhood Association sent in a signature of support which was handed out to the DRC during the public hearing and is now included in the staff report.

Staff has received numerous phone calls in response to the required public notice. One person indicated that they were not opposed to the vacation but were opposed to the 6-foot fence of this style with no landscaping. The other eight indicated their concerns and objection to the proposed vacation, which included:

- That there is no justification for the vacation;
- That this sets a precedent which would allow others to vacate sections of right-of-way;
- Concern about safety when narrowing the right-of-way;
- That they could maintain the fence location that they have;
- The fence does not protect the public;
- The neighbors are not aware of any safety concerns;
- That the fence is a blight on the neighborhood.

**DRC Action/Public Comments:** On February 6, 2019, the Development Review Commission (DRC) held a public hearing on the subject application. No person spoke in opposition to the request at the hearing. After the public hearing, the DRC voted 7-0 to amend Condition #1 as requested by staff and to amend Condition #4 as shown below and to recommend approval of a 10-foot by 105-foot portion of the requested vacation. In advance of this report, several additional phone calls were received from one neighbor with concerns about the vacation as recommended by the DRC.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration and the DRC recommend APPROVAL of the partial right-of-way vacation of a 10-foot by 105-foot portion of 28th Avenue North, beginning at the eastern edge of the property adjacent to the North Lot Line of the parcel located at 5034 28th Avenue North, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to recording the vacation Ordinance, provide a corrected Description and Sketch to match the City Council approved limits and with the corrections requested by the City Surveyor, this Description and Sketch to be reviewed and approved by the City Surveyor.

2. Prior to recording the vacation Ordinance, either relocate utilities, provide a public utility easement, or provide private easements to Frontier Communications, Duke Energy and Bright House. In any case, a letter of no objection from each affected utility is required.

3. Prior to recording the vacation ordinance, the applicant shall remove the board on board fence located 11.5-feet from their property line.

4. If the applicant wishes to fence within the vacated right-of-way with a 6-foot fence, the applicant shall provide a decorative fence as defined in City Code Section 16.40.040.2 and they shall landscape the area adjacent to the 6-foot fence with a minimum of one shrub for every three linear feet and one under-story tree for every 24 linear feet. Understory trees and shrubs are as defined in Section 16.40.060.2.1.6 attached. The 6-foot fence shall be set back a minimum of 2-feet from the property line in order to
provide the required landscaping. Existing oak trees in the right-of-way located within 8-feet of the face of the fence may be included in the trees required. The fence shall meet the design requirements in City Code Section 16.40.040.3., that fences and walls greater than 100 feet in length shall be articulated by columns or other visual breaks measuring at least two feet in width and spaced no more than 24 feet apart.

5. Any trees listed on the attached list of Prohibited Trees from Section 16.40.060.2.1.6 shall be removed from the area of the right-of-way being vacated.

6. As required by City Code Section 16.70.050.1.1 F, approval of right-of-way vacations shall lapse and become void unless the vacation ordinance is recorded by the City Clerk in the public records within 24 months from the date of such approval or unless an extension of time is granted by the commission designated in the Decisions and Appeals Table or, if appealed, by the City Council prior to the expiration thereof. Each extension shall be for a period of time not to exceed one year. The vacation ordinance shall be recorded after any conditions precedent have been compiled with.

Attachments: Ordinance with Exhibit "A", Attachment A – Parcel Map Attachment B – Aerial Map, DRC Staff Report
Attachment B
City of St. Petersburg, Florida
Planning and Development Services
Department
Case No.: 18-33000012
Address: 5034 28th Avenue North
ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING A VACATION OF A 10-FOOT BY 105-FOOT PORTION OF 28TH AVENUE NORTH, BEGINNING AT THE EASTERN EDGE OF THE PROPERTY AND ADJACENT TO THE NORTH LOT LINE OF THE PARCEL LOCATED AT 5034 28TH AVENUE NORTH; SETTING FORTH CONDITIONS FOR THE VACATION TO BECOME EFFECTIVE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG DOES ORDAIN:

Section 1. The following right-of-way is hereby vacated as recommended by the Administration and the Development Review Commission on February 6, 2019 (City File No. 18-33000012):

Insert Legal Description: See attached “Exhibit “A”

Section 2. The above-mentioned right-of-way is not needed for public use or travel.

Section 3. The vacation is subject to and conditional upon the following:

1. Prior to recording the vacation Ordinance, provide a corrected Description and Sketch to match the City Council approved limits and with the corrections requested by the City Surveyor, this Description and Sketch to be reviewed and approved by the City Surveyor.

2. Prior to recording the vacation Ordinance, either relocate utilities, provide a public utility easement, or provide private easements to Frontier Communications, Duke Energy and Bright House. In any case, a letter of no objection from each affected utility is required.

3. Prior to recording the vacation ordinance, the applicant shall remove the board on board fence located 11.5-feet from their property line.

4. If the applicant wishes to fence within the vacated right-of-way with a 6-foot fence, the applicant shall provide a decorative fence as defined in City Code Section 16.40.040.2. and they shall landscape the area adjacent to the 6-foot fence with a minimum of one shrub for every three linear feet and one understory tree for every 24 linear feet. Understory trees and shrubs are as defined in Section 16.40.060.2.1.6. The 6-foot fence shall be set back a minimum of 2-feet from the property line in order to provide the required landscaping. Existing oak trees in the right-of-way located within 8-feet of the face of the fence may be included in the trees required. The fence shall meet the design requirements in City Code Section 16.40.040.3., that fences and walls greater than 100 feet in length shall be articulated by columns or other visual breaks measuring at least two feet in width and spaced no more than 24 feet apart.
5. Any trees listed on the list of Prohibited Trees from Section 16.40.060.2.1.6 shall be removed from the area of the right-of-way being vacated.

6. As required by City Code Section 16.70.050.1.1 F, approval of right-of-way vacations shall lapse and become void unless the vacation ordinance is recorded by the City Clerk in the public records within 24 months from the date of such approval or unless an extension of time is granted by the commission designated in the Decisions and Appeals Table or, if appealed, by the City Council prior to the expiration thereof. Each extension shall be for a period of time not to exceed one year. The vacation ordinance shall be recorded after any conditions precedent have been compiled with.

Section 4. In the event this ordinance is not vetoed by the Mayor in accordance with the City Charter, it shall become effective upon the expiration of the fifth business day after adoption unless the Mayor notifies the City Council through written notice filed with the City Clerk that the Mayor will not veto the ordinance, in which case the ordinance shall become effective immediately upon filing such written notice with the City Clerk. In the event this ordinance is vetoed by the Mayor in accordance with the City Charter, it shall not become effective unless and until the City Council overrides the veto in accordance with the City Charter, in which case it shall become effective immediately upon a successful vote to override the veto.

LEGAL:

PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT:
EXHIBIT A:

TO BE INSERTED AFTER CITY COUNCIL HEARING
VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY
PUBLIC HEARING

According to Planning & Development Services Department records, no Commission member resides or has a place of business within 2,000 feet of the subject property. All other possible conflicts should be declared upon the announcement of the item.

REPORT TO THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION FROM DEVELOPMENT REVIEW SERVICES DIVISION, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT, for Public Hearing and Executive Action on February 6, 2019 at 2:00 P.M. in Council Chambers, City Hall, 175 Fifth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

CASE NO.: 18-33000012  PLAT SHEET: M-16
REQUEST: Approval of a vacation of an 11.5-foot by 130-foot portion of 28th Avenue North adjacent to the North Lot Line of the parcel located at 5034 28th Avenue North

OWNER: Shayegan 28th Avenue Property Trust
Sharokh and Dawna Shayegan
2299 65th Place North
Saint Petersburg, Florida 33702

ADDRESS: 5034 28th Avenue North

PARCEL ID NO.: 09-31-16-31032-000-0040

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: On File – See Legal Description and Sketch attached (Exhibit "A")

ZONING: Neighborhood Suburban Single-Family (NS-1)

VACATION DISCUSSION:

Request. The request is to vacate a 130-foot by 11.5-foot portion of the street right-of-way of 58th Avenue North, adjacent to the north boundary of Lot 4, located at 5034 28th Avenue North.
The area of the right-of-way proposed for vacation is depicted on the attached maps (Attachments "A" and "B") and Sketch and Legal Description (Exhibit "A"). The boundary survey of the subject property is included as Attachment C. The applicant's goal is to vacate this portion of the right-of-way in order to retain the existing fence and enhance the security of the property.

Please note that this case was originally noticed as a vacation of right-of-way with a variance to the required right-of-way width. It has since been determined that no variance process is applicable.

The subject property consists of one large lot with a large lake on the eastern portion of the subject property. Based on the survey the area proposed for vacation is partially flat (approximately 6.5-feet) and partially sloping down to the lake bed (top of bank is shown at approximately 5-feet into the existing right-of-way).

The applicant desires to vacate this portion of the right-of-way in order to retain an existing fence and continue the fence to the eastern boundary of the subject property. The subject property is a large parcel which contains a lake on more than half of the property. The owner, seeking a vacation, has indicated their concerns with securing the lake bank which now projects into the right-of-way. The subdivision regulations in Section 16.49.140.4.1 Streets, classify this as an Urban Local Street which would require a right-of-way width of 50-feet. In this case the north half of the right-of-way (30-feet) was dedicated in the Summit Grove Subdivision in 1925 (Plat Book 10 Page 66). The subject south half of the right-of-way was dedicated in the Glen Echo Subdivision (Plat Book 15 Page 38), so there is 10-feet of right-of-way beyond what is required.

The applicant is requesting a vacation of 11.5-feet of right-of-way width in order to maintain their existing fence. There is an active Codes Compliance case 18-00010770 for a zoning violation for a 6-foot fence in the right-of-way initiated on May 3, 2018, see Attachment D.

The lake bank appears to have encroached into the right-of-way for some time and the 4-foot chain link fence that was on the property previously and remains on the eastern portion of the frontage requested for vacation, was already in the right-of-way. Per the survey provided by the applicant the chain link fence was located approximately at the top of bank and was encroaching approximately 5-feet into the right-of-way.

The application for the subject property was reviewed by the City's Engineering staff and they had the following findings:

The Engineering Department offers the following technical considerations to assist staff and DRC in determining the level of support for the proposed right of way vacation.

1. The survey indicates that the fence encroaches 11.5' into the 60-foot wide right of way, leaving approximately 9.8-feet of parkway south of the southern curb line of 28th Ave North.

2. The north 30-feet of the right of way of 28th Ave N was dedicated on PB 10, PG 66, Summit Grove Subdivision. The south 30-feet of the right of way of 28th Avenue North was dedicated on PB 15, PG 38, Glen Echo Subdivision. To
maintain the minimum 50-foot wide right of way width required for a local street by current City Land Development Code Section 16.40.140.4.1(E), each of these subdivisions would only be required to dedicate 25-feet of right of way, rather than 30-feet. Vacation of the southern 11.5-feet of the right of way of 28th Avenue North for a distance as necessary to accommodate the fence, will result in an overall right of way width of only 48.5-feet. The right of way boundary will no longer be consistent in the block nor will it be symmetrical (there will be 30-feet of right of way north of the roadway centerline but only 18.5-feet of right of way south of the roadway centerline). If supported by staff, Zoning will need to determine if this vacation would also require a variance to the right of way requirements of the Land Development Code.

3. Per the survey, a fence installed at the top of the existing lake bank would encroach only 5-feet into the southern right of way of 28th Avenue North. Shifting the fence alignment of the entire fence to encroach only 5-feet into the southern right of way of 28th Avenue North would be reasonable since the remaining 25-feet of the right of way would maintain the standard local street right of way width for the southern half of the right of way per the requirements of the City’s Code. If the lake bank is uneven or unstable in this location, it may be necessary for the property owner to construct some type of low retaining wall outside the public right of way adjacent to the lake on which the fence could be mounted.

4. The survey indicates that the top of bank of the privately-owned lake is now encroaching into the public right of way of 28th Avenue North. Based on the survey elevations, the lake bank slope approaches 1:1. The fence may help to secure the area for protection of the public.

5. City Utility maps do not indicate the existence of any City owned public infrastructure in the southern parkway of 28th Avenue North in the area of the proposed vacation.

6. The NS zoning district does not require sidewalk construction on the south side of 28th Avenue North.

In regard to fencing height allowed, City Code Section 16.40.040.3. allows 6-feet for a decorative fence or wall which is landscaped and which is on a property with more than 150 lineal feet of street frontage for residential uses in the front yard. The subject property is 160-feet in length. A decorative fence is defined as a fence that is made of PVC fence material, wrought iron, or aluminum pickets, or is a painted or stained shadow-box or board-on-board type fence. A 4-foot fence or wall of any style and a 5-foot hedge are allowed.

In regard to design, City Code Section 16.40.040.3. requires that fences and walls shall be comprised of no more than three materials for panels, posts, rails, columns, and other elements within all yards of any property. Fences and walls in side, rear, and waterfront yards may be comprised of a different material(s) than that used in the front yard. Fences and walls greater than 100 feet in length shall be articulated by columns or other visual breaks measuring at least two feet in width and spaced no more than 24 feet apart. Landscaping shall be provided in accordance with the landscaping and irrigation section. This design standard shall apply for any portion of a qualifying fence or wall facing a right-of-way.
City Code does not specify the type of landscaping required for a fence of 130-feet on residential property but has a requirement for in Section 16.40.060.2.1.2. for fences over 150-feet that they shall be landscaped with a minimum of one shrub for every three linear feet and one under-story tree for every 25 linear feet.

**Analyses.** Staff's review of a vacation application is guided by:

A. The City's Land Development Regulations (LDR's);
B. The City's Comprehensive Plan; and
C. Any adopted neighborhood or special area plans.

Applicants bear the burden of demonstrating compliance with the applicable criteria for vacation of public right-of-way. In this case, the material submitted by the applicant (Attachment E) does provide background or analysis supporting a conclusion that vacating a portion of the subject right-of-way would be consistent with the criteria in the City Code, the Comprehensive Plan, or any applicable special area plan.

- Staff is recommending a vacation of a maximum of 10-feet of right-of-way which would accomplish several things. The first is to maintain the required right-of-way width. Secondly this could allow the applicant to place a fence at 8-feet (three-feet from top-of-bank to allow maintenance) and provide two feet for the required landscape buffer.

Staff shared this information with the applicant prior to formulating this report. The applicant had previously been noticed that the variance application could not be processed. The applicant elected to proceed with the request with the understanding that Staff would recommend denial of a portion of their request.

**A. Land Development Regulations**

Section 16.40.140.2.1E of the LDR's contains the criteria for reviewing proposed vacations. The criteria are provided below in italics, followed by itemized findings by Staff.

1. *Easements for public utilities including stormwater drainage and pedestrian easements may be retained or required to be dedicated as requested by the various departments or utility companies.*

The application was routed to the standard list of City Departments and private utility providers. Frontier Communications and Duke Energy have indicated that they will require an easement for their facilities. Bright House has not yet responded to the City's request for comment.

This proposed vacation is located on the south side of the right-of-way in the NS-1 zoning district. In the NS-1 zoning district sidewalks are only required on the north and west sides of the street.

2. *The vacation shall not cause a substantial detrimental effect upon or substantially impair or deny access to any lot of record as shown from the testimony and evidence at the public hearing.*
The vacation of this portion of right-of-way will not deny access to any lot of record.

3. The vacation shall not adversely impact the existing roadway network, such as to create dead-end rights-of-way, substantially alter utilized travel patterns, or undermine the integrity of historic plats of designated historic landmarks or neighborhoods.

The vacation of this portion of the street right-of-way will not create a dead-end, or alter current travel patterns. This is not an historically dedicated landmark or neighborhood.

4. The easement is not needed for the purpose for which the City has a legal interest and, for rights-of-way, there is no present or future need for the right-of-way for public vehicular or pedestrian access, or for public utility corridors.

There may be a potential need for future street widening as there is currently a substandard pavement width. It has been noted by one of the neighbors that they have fought City plans to widen the pavement in the past. It has also been noted by one of the neighbors that there is a concern with the width of the roadway as the shoulder is constrained by the curbs in front of the subject address.

Standard pavement width requires 20-feet of paving plus the required curb width of 2-feet on each side if valley curb or 6" on each side if a 6" X 16" standard raised curb. A standard road with valley curb would be 24-feet wide back of curb to back of curb. So this 24-feet of paving could fit within the remaining right-of-way.

Some utility providers run their services to both ends of the subject property but do not cross the area to be vacated, there could be future potential need for connectivity of these services. The remaining approximately 9.8-feet between the back of curb and the proposed vacation could potentially accommodate those electric, gas and cable services. An easement will be required for Frontier Communications, Duke Energy and potentially for Bright House Communications, this is included as a condition of approval at the end of this report.

5. The POD, Development Review Commission, and City Council shall also consider any other factors affecting the public health, safety, or welfare.

It has been the practice of the City’s Engineering Department to not recommend vacate right-of-way when this would result in a “sawtooth” or uneven right-of-way widths. The proposed project would not be consistent with the traditional development along this block face. Adjacent properties have not sought vacation of right-of-way along this corridor and have not requested a variance to right-of-way width. The abutting property at 4950 28th Avenue North shares the same lake and has the same relationship to the right-of-way.

The site contains a portion of a large lake, the top of bank per the survey provided by the applicant, extends into a portion of the right-of-way proposed for vacation, approximately 5-feet. The reduction of right-of-way width below the required 50-feet is not necessary in order to fence and secure the property, which is the applicant’s stated goal. According to the survey provided by the applicant the top of bank extends approximately 5 feet into the right-of-way. The applicant could have placed the fence at 5-feet which is closer to the top
There has been a strong response from the public in response to the mailed notice. One of the common concerns has been the precedent set by the vacating of portions of right-of-way and the question of would this result in others seeking the same thing.

B. Comprehensive Plan

There are policies in the City's Comprehensive Plan which apply to vacation of right-of-way in specific areas of the City, none of these policies apply to this request.

C. Adopted Neighborhood or Special Area Plans

There are no Special Area Plans which affect the subject property. The subject right-of-way is within the boundaries of the Disston Heights Neighborhood Association. The Disston Heights Neighborhood Association does not have a Neighborhood plan.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: The subject property is within the boundaries of the Disston Heights Neighborhood Association. The Neighborhood Association was notified prior to submittal of the case and the applicant's attended a neighborhood meeting on January 8, 2019.

Staff has received numerous phone calls in response to the required public notice. One person indicated that they were not opposed to the vacation but were opposed to the 6-foot fence of this style with no landscaping. The other eight indicated their concerns and objection to the proposed vacation, which included;

- That there is no justification for the vacation;
- That this sets a precedent which would allow others to vacate sections of right-of-way;
- Concern about safety when narrowing the right-of-way;
- That they could maintain the fence location that they have;
- The fence does not protect the public;
- The neighbors are not aware of any safety concerns;
- That the fence is a blight on the neighborhood.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends DENIAL of the proposed 11.5-foot partial street right-of-way vacation and APPROVAL of a maximum of 10-foot right-of-way vacation. If the DRC is inclined to support the vacation, Staff recommends the following amended conditions of approval:

1. Prior to recording the vacation Ordinance, provide a corrected Description and Sketch to match the City Council approved limits and with the corrections requested by the City Surveyor, this Description and Sketch to be reviewed and approved by the City Surveyor.

2. Prior to recording the vacation Ordinance, either relocate utilities, provide a public utility easement, or provide private easements to Frontier Communications, Duke Energy and Bright House. In any case, a letter of no objection from each affected utility is required.
3. Prior to recording the vacation ordinance, the applicant shall remove the board on board fence located 11.5-feet from their property line.

4. If the applicant wishes to fence within the vacated right-of-way with a 6-foot fence, the applicant shall provide a decorative fence as defined in City Code Section 16.40.040.2 and they shall landscape the area adjacent to the 6-foot fence with a minimum of one shrub for every three linear feet and one under-story tree for every 24 linear feet. Understory trees and shrubs are as defined in Section 16.40.060.2.1.6 attached. The 6-foot fence shall be set back a minimum of 2-feet from the property line in order to provide the required landscaping. Existing oak trees in the right-of-way located within 8-feet of the face of the fence may be included in the trees required. This landscaping will be in lieu of decorative columns required under City Code Section 16.40.040.3

5. Any trees listed on the attached list of Prohibited Trees from Section 16.40.060.2.1.6 shall be removed from the area of the right-of-way being vacated.

6. As required by City Code Section 16.70.050.1.1 F, approval of right-of-way vacations shall lapse and become void unless the vacation ordinance is recorded by the City Clerk in the public records within 24 months from the date of such approval or unless an extension of time is granted by the commission designated in the Decisions and Appeals Table or, if appealed, by the City Council prior to the expiration thereof. Each extension shall be for a period of time not to exceed one year. The vacation ordinance shall be recorded after any conditions precedent have been compiled with.

REPORT PREPARED BY:

Kathryn Younkin, AICP, LEED AP BD+C, Subdivision Coordinator
Development Review Services Division
Planning & Development Services Department

REPORT APPROVED BY:

Jennifer C. Bryla, AICP, Zoning Official (POD)
Planning and Development Services Department
Development Review Services Division

A – Parcel Map
B – Aerial Map
C – Boundary Survey
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: (As Furnished)
LOT 4 AND THE WEST 180 FEET OF THE NORTH 470 FEET (B) OF LOT 5, GLEN ECHO EXT, ACCORDING TO THE MAP OR PLAT THEREOF AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 33, PAGE 31, IN THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC RECORDS OF PHILLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA.
28th AVENUE NORTH
60' PLATTED RIGHT-OF-WAY
ASPHALT ROADWAY

RESIDENCE #5034
LAKE
D - Codes Compliance Case 18-00010770
Property Information
Address: 5034 28TH AVE N
      SAINT PETERSBURG, FL 337102744
Location ID: 30155
Parcel Identification Nbr: 09/31/16/31032/000/0040/
Old account number: 59707510
Zoning:
Subdivision: DISSTON HEIGHTS CIVIC ASSN

Case General Information
Case status: AC ACTIVE
Status date: 5/03/2018
Case type: ZONE ZONING VIOLATIONS
Reported date: 5/03/2018
Origination: SC SEE CLICK FIX
Default inspector: MW MONIQUE WADLEY 892-5538
Credit balance: .00
Disposition: Public
Fin number: 834720

Owner Information
Owner name: SHAYEGAN 28TH AVE PROPERTY TRU
Address: 2299 65TH PL N
City: SAINT PETERSBURG, FL 337026361
Phone: 0
Notice: Y
Flip: 

Violations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Date Resolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURE ON RIGHT-OF-WAY</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5/17/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case Data
Description
TYPE USE
FLAT SHEET
OFFICIAL RECORDS BOOK/PA
CEB AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 159
CEB ORDER DAYS 90
CEB ORDER FINE AMOUNT/DA 50.00
CEB ORDER COMPLIANCE DAT 12/25/2018
CEB ORDER MAILED DATE 10/02/2018
SPEC MAGISTRATE SCHED DA 01/23/2019
SPEC MAGISTRATE AGENDA N C88
SPEC MAG LAST CERT Lien
SPEC MAG TOTAL CERT Lien
SPEC MAG ORDER MAILED DA
CEB MEETING DATE 09/26/2018
SPEC MAGISTRATE MEETING 01/23/2019

Active Inspections
No scheduled inspections exist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Case narrative</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scf# 4400298-Front of Yard Home, and Front of Property Along Street within 12' of curb line, are currently being enclosed by 6' Wooden Fence...</td>
<td>5/03/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 3, 2018 8:54:09 AM ksmith.</td>
<td>5/03/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Violation comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>STRUCTURE ON RIGHT-OF-WAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6ft Wood Fence in the front is located on the right of way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspection comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>INITIAL INSPECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>RESULTS STATUS: INSPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>RESULTS STATUS: INSPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 7, 2018 1:57:34 PM MMWADLEY. Measured wood fence from middle of right of way. It appears to be encroaching the front yard by 5 ft. Mr. Shayegan drove up while I was at the property and we discussed fence complaint. Per Supervisor Mike Void, via telephone call, he suggested Mr. Shayegan speak with Engineering re: unique circumstances of his property with lake that they want to fence off. Discussed with him that maybe Engineering will work with them on obtaining a fence variance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>RESULTS STATUS: INSPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 17, 2018 3:52:58 PM mmwadley. Wood Fence remains in the right of way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>RESULTS STATUS: INSPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 18, 2018 2:25:02 PM MMWADLEY. Wood Fence remains on right of way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>RESULTS STATUS: INSPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August 8, 2018 8:23:53 AM mmwadley. Wood Fence remains on right of way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>RESULTS STATUS: INSPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 5, 2018 8:43:56 AM MMWADLEY. Wood Fence remains at 1140a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>RESULTS STATUS: INSPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 12, 2018 3:58:02 PM mmwadley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008 - REINSPECTION</td>
<td>Vn remains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results status INSPECTI</td>
<td>September 25, 2018 2:27:47 PM MMWADLEY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 ft wood fence remains in right of way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009 - REINSPECTION</td>
<td>Results status INSPECTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 27, 2018 9:06:05 AM MMWADLEY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6ft wood fence remains on right of way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board meeting comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001 - MISCELLANEOUS INFORMA</td>
<td>May 17, 2018 3:51:30 PM mwwadley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met with Peter Fritch with Engineering dept. and discussed fence issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002 - TELEPHONE CONVERSATION</td>
<td>May 22, 2018 12:54:12 PM mwwadley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voice mail message received from Mrs. Shayegan requesting to speak with supervisor in regards to the violation notice received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003 - ELECTRONIC MAIL</td>
<td>May 22, 2018 12:55:54 PM mwwadley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Supervisor: Michael Void <a href="mailto:michael.vold@stpete.org">michael.vold@stpete.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at: Tue 5/22/2018 12:53 PM Good Afternoon Mike,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I received a voice mail message from Dawna Shayegan (phone number provided) owner of 5034 28th Ave N Fence Case, requesting to speak with you in regards to violation of fence notice received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004 - TELEPHONE CONVERSATION</td>
<td>May 29, 2018 2:34:05 PM mrvoid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor Void spoke with Ms. Shayegan 727-527-7886, regarding her fence and the property in general. She stated issues with the neighbors and that this house was her mothers and is trying to get it fixed up to sell. Her daughter and boyfriend are staying there. She stated that John Norris with the city put in the storm drains to help with the drainage problem. Set up a time to meet for Friday 6/1/18 at 11 am, to look at the circumstances with the fence location with the lake and right of way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005 - MEETING</td>
<td>June 4, 2018 1:15:20 PM mrvoid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor Void and Investigator Wadley met with owners to discuss the 6 foot wood fence location in the front of the house. After measuring the City right of way and finding that the fence is encroaching into the city right of way, explained to the owners that it is not allowed at this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
location as the Engineering Department states they will not
give a variance or permit for the fence in the right of way.

The owner stated they spoke with Zoning and that Cathryn
stated they could have a six foot fence and I explained that
they could for the length of their lot, but not in the right
of way. She stated that they could not put a fence where
their property lies as the lake/pond bank slopes to much and
too much tree roots.

006 - TAKE PHOTOGR.  
June 4, 2018 3:05:40 PM MMWADLEY.
Photos taken of wood fence.

007 - ELECTRONIC MAIL  
June 14, 2018 9:58:57 AM mrvold.
Supervisor Vold received an email from owner’s a pictures of
their survey. Will attach it to the case.

008 - TELEPHONE CONVERSATIO  
June 14, 2018 10:01:00 AM mrvold.
Supervisor Vold left a message for Peter Fritsch ext. 7397
with Engineering regarding the concern of the city right of
way that is part of this pond/lake at this property and the
steep slope/drop off into the pond/lake as this is why the
owners were wanting to put a fence up in the city right of
way.

009 - ELECTRONIC MAIL  
Hi Dawna,

Thanks, it was a good vacation. Sorry that your fence
situation continues. My suggestion is that you have a
survey done to locate your property line and then install
the new fence on your private property. We can only assume
that the old fence was on private property so to say that
you can put the new fence where the old one was might put it
in the public right-of-way. You really need a survey from a
licensed surveyor to include having the property corner
stakes located or reset. Hope that this email helps at
least a little.

Sincerely,

Peter H. Fritsch
Engineering and Capital Improvements Department
City of St. Petersburg
One Fourth Street North, 7th Floor Engineering Dept.
St. Petersburg, FL 33701-2842
Office Phone: 727-893-7397
Fax: 727-892-5476
Email: Peter.Fritsch@stpete.org

Please note all emails are subject to public records
Dear Mr. Fritsch,

We hope you had a great vacation! We are e-mailing you today because we wanted to get your help regarding our fence once again. We requested that Code Enforcement look at the fence and Mr. Vold and Monique Wadley came out to the property on June 1, 2018, and looked at the fence. Mr. Vold said he would be contacting you and he e-mailed to let us know he would be back in touch with us. Five and a half weeks went by with no response. We then received a notice in the Codes Compliance website stating that a CEB Hearing was being sent, so we called Mr. Vold. He stated that he did not know he was to contact us and there was nothing he could do. We mentioned your voice-mail and our meeting with you stating that we could only put the fence back where the original was, butting up to and going between each tree. He stated if you could put in writing that we can put the new fence back where the old fence was, the CEB Hearing would be cancelled.

Is there any way you could put in writing for Code Compliance that we can put our new fence where the old fence was? This would be exactly where the old fence existed for over fifty years, at the edge of the lake property. We are desperate to complete this project for safety and security.

Your help would be most appreciated again.

Sincerely,

Sharokh and Dawna Shayegan
727-527-7886

P.S. Our hearing is scheduled for August 22, 2018. With a letter it would be cancelled.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST AGENDA ITEM #87</td>
<td>August 9, 2018 10:26:16 AM ltgreene.</td>
<td>8/09/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 - MEETING</td>
<td>August 9, 2018 3:40:57 PM mmwadley. Director James Corbett and Operations Manager, Joe Waugh met with Mr. &amp; Mrs. Shayegan. They are granting them an extension of time and will be removing this case from the August 22, 2018 hearing and has advised them of same. Code Enforcement Board hearing on this case will be scheduled for the September 2018 hearing.</td>
<td>8/09/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013 - CASE REMOVED FROM CEB</td>
<td>August 9, 2018 3:43:58 PM mmwadley. Director James Corbett and Operations Manager, Joe Waugh met with Mr. &amp; Mrs. Shayegan. They are granting them an extension of time and will be removing this case from the August 22, 2018 hearing and has advised them of same. Code Enforcement Board hearing on this case will be scheduled for the September 2018 hearing.</td>
<td>8/09/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014 - OWNER NOTIFIED</td>
<td>August 9, 2018 3:44:20 PM mmwadley. Owners notified case removed from the August 22, 2018 CEB hearing and rescheduled for the Sept 2018 hearing to allow them time to remedy the fence violation.</td>
<td>8/09/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015 - RETURN RECEIPT REC'D</td>
<td>RETURN RECEIPT RECEIVED FOR THE CODE ENFORCEMENT BOARD NOTICE OF HEARING Addressed To: SHAYEGAN 28TH AVE PROPERTY SIGNED BY: NOT LEGIBLE DATED: N/A SEPTEMBER AGENDA ITEM # 159 August 30, 2018 11:04:10 AM ljones.</td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016 - POSTING</td>
<td>September 5, 2018 8:44:28 AM MMWADLEY. Posted 81 for 9/26/18 hearing to the property at 1140A.</td>
<td>9/05/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017 - TAKE PHOTOGRAPHS</td>
<td>September 12, 2018 3:58:32 PM mmwadley. Photos taken for Sept 2018 CEB</td>
<td>9/12/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018 - RECORD CHECK</td>
<td>September 25, 2018 2:28:35 PM MMWADLEY. pa: SHAYEGAN 28TH AVE PROPERTY TRUST SHAYEGAN, SHARONK TRE SHAYEGAN, DAWNA L TRE 2299 65TH PL N ST PETERSBURG Fl 33702-6361</td>
<td>9/25/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019 - ELECTRONIC MAIL</td>
<td>September 25, 2018 2:30:03 PM MMWADLEY. From: Sam Shayegan [<a href="mailto:samfinancial@gmail.com">mailto:samfinancial@gmail.com</a>] Sent: Monday, September 24, 2018 1:54 PM To: Jennifer C. Bryla <a href="mailto:Jennifer.Bryla@stpete.org">Jennifer.Bryla@stpete.org</a>Cc: Michael Vold <a href="mailto:Michael.Vold@stpete.org">Michael.Vold@stpete.org</a>; <a href="mailto:catherine.younkin@stpete.org">catherine.younkin@stpete.org</a>; Scot K. Bolyard <a href="mailto:Scot.Bolyard@stpete.org">Scot.Bolyard@stpete.org</a></td>
<td>9/25/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject: 5034 28th Ave North St. Petersburg 9/25/2018

Dear Jennifer, 9/25/2018

We enjoyed meeting with you today to discuss the process of filing a Partial Vacation of Right-of-Way. Please find attached the Specific Purpose Survey that we discussed. We hope this will provide enough information to go forward with filing the application. 9/25/2018

Please contact us at 727-527-7886 if you have any further questions or information for us. 9/25/2018

Sincerely, 9/25/2018

Sharokh and Dawna Shayegan 9/25/2018

020 - CODES ENFORCEMENT MEE 9/25/2018

COMPLIANCE DATE 12/25/2018. FINE $50.00/DAY. 9/25/2018

***** 9/25/2018

OWNER/REP PRESENT. BOARD GAVE 90 DAYS. 9/25/2018

021 - CODES ENFORCEMENT MEE 9/25/2018

CERTIFIED LIENS TOTAL $0.00. POTENTIAL LIENS NOT CERTIFIED 9/25/2018

$1,450.00 (12/26/2018 01/23/2019). 9/25/2018

022 - CEB ORDER MAILED 9/25/2018

RETURN RECEIPT RECEIVED FOR THE ORDER OF THE BOARD ADDRESSED TO: SHAYEGAN 28TH AVE PROPERTY TRU 9/25/2018

DATED: NOT DATED 9/25/2018

SEPTMBER AGENDA ITEM #159 9/25/2018

October 22, 2018 1:56:55 PM ltgreene. 10/22/2018

024 - RECORD CHECK 10/22/2018

November 27, 2018 9:06:39 AM MMWADLEY. 11/27/2018

No variance info found per rc. 11/27/2018

025 - POSTING 11/27/2018

November 27, 2018 9:07:34 AM MMWADLEY. 11/27/2018

posted m9 notice to the property from item 159 with lien hearing to take place on 1/23/19. 11/27/2018

026 - MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION 11/27/2018

December 20, 2018 2:53:37 PM mmwadley. 12/20/2018

Case to be deferred from hearings until outcome from application owner's submitted to zoning for partial vacation of right of way. 12/20/2018

Land Management information

Legal description

GLEN ECHO EXT

LOT 4 AND W 160FT OF N
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Continued)</td>
<td>470FT (S) OF LOT 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lien information**
F – Applicant's Narrative and Signatures of Support, Neighborhood Participation Report
RECEIVED
DEC 13 2018

SUBDIVISION DECISION
Application
Application No. 18-33000012

All applications are to be filled out completely and correctly. The application shall be submitted to the City of St. Petersburg's Development Review Services Division, located on the 1st floor of the Municipal Services Building, One 4th Street North.

Application Type:
Lot Line Adjustment
Lot Split
Lot Refacing
Street Name Change
Street Closing

Vacating - Street Right-of-Way
Vacating - Alley Right-of-Way
Vacating - Walkway Right-of-Way
Vacating - Easement
Vacating - Air Rights

GENERAL INFORMATION
NAME of APPLICANT (Property Owner):
Street Address: 5034 28th Ave N
City, State, Zip: St. Petersburg, FL 33710
Telephone No: (727) 527-7866 Email Address: Dawna@dawnaavon.com

NAME of AGENT or REPRESENTATIVE:
Street Address: Same As Above
City, State, Zip:
Telephone No: Email Address:

PROPERTY INFORMATION:
Street Address or General Location: 5034 28th Ave N St. Petersburg, FL 33710
Parcel ID(s): 09-31-16-86113-001-0010

DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST: Partial Vacation Right-Of-Way

PRE-APPLICATION DATE: PLANNER:

FEE SCHEDULE
Lot Line & Lot Split Adjustment Administrative Review $200.00
Lot Line & Lot Split Adjustment Commission Review $300.00
Lot Refacing Administrative Review $300.00
Lot Refacing Commission Review $500.00
Variance with any of the above $200.00
Vacating Streets & Alleys $1,000.00
Vacating Walkway $400.00
Vacating Easements $500.00
Vacating Air Rights $1,000.00
Street Name Change $1,000.00
Street Closing $1,000.00

Cash, credit, and checks made payable to the "City of St. Petersburg"

AUTHORIZATION
City Staff and the designated Commission may visit the subject property during review of the requested variance. Any Code violations on the property that are noted during the inspections will be referred to the City's Codes Compliance Assistance Department.

The applicant, by filing this application, agrees he or she will comply with the decision(s) regarding this application and conform to all conditions of approval. The applicant's signature attests that all information contained within this application has been completed, and that the applicant understands that processing this application may involve substantial time and expense. Filing an application does not guarantee approval, and denial or withdrawal of an application does not result in remittance of the application fee.

NOTE: IT IS INCUMBERNT UPON THE APPLICANT TO SUBMIT CORRECT INFORMATION. ANY MISLEADING, DECEPTIVE, INCOMPLETE, OR INCORRECT INFORMATION MAY INVALIDATE YOUR APPLICATION.

Signature of Owner/Agent:
Typed name of Signatory: Sharokh And Dawna Shayegan

Date: 12/23/2016
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All applications for a variance must provide justification for the requested variance(s) based on the criteria set forth by the City Code. It is recommended that the following responses be typed. Illegible handwritten responses will not be accepted. Responses may be provided as a separate letter, addressing each of the six criteria.

ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA MUST BE ANSWERED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT: NARRATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address: 5034 28th Ave No St. Pete, FL 33710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Description of Project and Request:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What is unique about the size, shape, topography, or location of the subject property? How do these unique characteristics justify the requested variance?

Our property line encompasses a steep embankment down into a lake just a few feet from 28th Avenue where pedestrians with children and pets walk daily. This will allow a fence to protect the public.

2. Are there other properties in the immediate neighborhood that have already been developed or utilized in a similar way? If so, please provide addresses and a description of the specific signs or structures being referenced.

Absolutely none.

3. How is the requested variance not the result of actions of the applicant?

No other options are available for a protective fence barrier due to the steep slope into the lake.
All applications for a variance must provide justification for the requested variance(s) based on the criteria set forth by the City Code. It is recommended that the following responses be typed. Illegible handwritten responses will not be accepted. Responses may be provided as a separate letter, addressing each of the six criteria.

**ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA MUST BE ANSWERED.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION NARRATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. How is the requested variance the minimum necessary to make reasonable use of the property? In what ways will granting the requested variance enhance the character of the neighborhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minimum depth of 1.5 feet and a minimum width of 130 feet to secure the lake edge of the property for security.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5. What other alternatives have been considered that do not require a variance? Why are these alternatives unacceptable? |
| There are none available. The natural layout of the land does not permit any other alternatives. |

| 6. In what ways will granting the requested variance enhance the character of the neighborhood? |
| There will be a security fence that is beautiful to look at as well as protect the public and animals from the body of water. |
Kathryn Younkin

From: Kathryn Younkin
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 1:54 PM
To: dawna@dawnaavon.com
Cc: Scot K. Bolyard; Jennifer C. Bryla; Nancy Davis
Subject: FW: Partial Right of Way Vacation to Accommodate Fence 5034 28th Ave No 33710

Mr. and Mrs. Shayegan,

City Engineering has completed their review of the special purpose survey, please see the notes below. So based on the below, city staff could support your request for vacation of a 11.5 foot portion of 28th Avenue North right-of-way (ROW) adjacent to your north property line. Please keep in mind that the ultimate decision is made by the City Council, with a recommendation from the Development Review Commission (DRC). The DRC schedule is attached, and the case would go the City Council typically on the third Thursday of the following month.

This would go through the process of a Vacation of Right-of-Way, please see attached guidelines for more information on the process. I have also attached the application, Subdivision Decision. This application requires a Description and Sketch of the portion of ROW to be vacated, as well as notification of the Neighborhood Association prior to submittal. The fee is $1000. Neighborhood Association contact information:

| Disston Heights | Jennifer Joern | 727-692-4312 | jennifer.joern@yahoo.com; rmcd@.yahoo.com | P.O. Box 41592 | 33732-1592 | 2nd Tue @ 7 p.m. (No July or August Meetings) | St. Petersburg Community Church - 4501 30th Ave N |

We also ask that you reach out to your neighbors for signatures on the Neighborhood Worksheet.

This would also require a variance to our subdivision regulations which would require that 28th Avenue North be maintained as a 50 foot ROW. Please see 16.40.140.4.1. - Streets. At this link: 16.40.140 - SUBDIVISIONS. We would process this variance with your vacation hearing at the DRC hearing. The narrative for this is attached. The fee for the variance portion of your application is $300.

You may have other utility providers such as Duke Energy and multiple cable companies within the ROW you are proposing to vacate. During the vacation process we route your application to them for comment. If they have facilities you will be required to provide an easement to each of the providers or pay for relocation of their facilities. An alternative would be a public utility easement over the entire area to be vacated, there is an $800 city fee to cover the costs for this which would be prepared by the City’s Real Estate Department and recorded at the same time as the vacation.

This email can serve as our required pre-application meeting (please attach a copy of this email with your application). Please also attach a to scale copy of the Special Purpose survey with your application for our records. Please let me know if you have any questions or would prefer to meet in person.

Thank you,

Kathryn Younkin
From: Nancy Davis  
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2018 4:36 PM  
To: Kathryn Younkin <Kathryn.Younkin@stpete.org>  
Cc: Mark Riedmueller <Mark.Riedmueller@stpete.org>; Peter H. Fritsch <Peter.Fritsch@stpete.org>; Jennifer C. Bryla <Jennifer.Bryla@stpete.org>; Mike Ryle <Mike.Ryle@stpete.org>  
Subject: Partial Right of Way Vacation to Accommodate Fence_5034 28th Ave No 33710

Kathryn,

The special purpose survey should be adequate to allow the applicant to accurately define the limits necessary for partial right of way vacation as necessary to accommodate the existing fence. Engineering has reviewed the survey to provide the following technical considerations to assist zoning staff in determining the level of staff support for the proposed right of way vacation:

1. The survey indicates that the fence encroaches 11.5’ into the 60-foot wide right of way, leaving approximately 9.8-feet of parkway south of the southern curb line of 28th Ave North.

2. City Utility maps do not indicate the existence of any City owned public infrastructure in the southern parkway of 28th Avenue North in the area of the proposed vacation.

3. The NS zoning district does not require sidewalk construction on the south side of 28th Avenue North.

4. The north 30-feet of the right of way of 28th Ave N appears to have been dedicated on PB 10, PG 66, Summit Grove Subdivision. The south 30-feet of the right of way of 28th Avenue North appears to have been dedicated on PB 15, PG 38, Glen Echo Subdivision. To maintain the minimum 50-foot wide right of way width required for a local street by current City Land Development Code Section 16.40.140.4.1(E), each of these subdivisions would only be required to dedicate 25-feet of right of way, rather than 30-feet.

Vacation of the southern 11.5-feet of the right of way of 28th Avenue North for a distance as necessary to accommodate the fence, will result in an overall right of way width of only 48.5-feet. The right of way boundary will no longer be consistent in the block nor will it be symmetrical (there will be 30-feet of right of way north of the roadway centerline but only 18.5-feet of right of way south of the roadway centerline). If supported by staff, Zoning will need to determine if this vacation would also require a variance to the right of way requirements of the Land Development Code.

5. The survey indicates that the top of bank of the privately owned lake is now encroaching into the public right of way of 28th Ave N. Based on the survey elevations, the lake bank slope approaches 1:1. The fence may help to secure the area for protection of the public.

Sincerely,
Nancy E. Davis  
Engineering Plan Review Supervisor

Engineering and Capital Improvements Department
LEGAL DESCRIPTION (AS FURNISHED)

LOT 4 AND THE WEST 165 FEET OF THE NORTH 475 FEET (S) OF LOT 1, GLEN ECHO ESTATES, ACCORDING TO THE MAP OR PLAT THEREOF AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 2, PAGE 51 IN THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC RECORDS OF PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA.

LEGEND

NOTES

FLOOD ZONE INFORMATION

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

SHEET 1 OF 1
AREATOBEVACATED:
THESOUTH11.50FEETOF28ThAVENUENORTHRIGHTOFWAY,LESSTHE
WEST30FEETICONTIGUOUSTOTHEWEST160FEETOFTHENORTH470
FEET(S)OFLOT1,GLENECHOEXT.ACCORDINGTOTHEMAP OR PLAT
THEREOF AS RECORDED IN PLATBOOK35,PAGE31,INTHEOFFICIAL
PUBLICRECORDSOFPINELLASCOUNTY.FLORIDA

FOR ALL INQUIRIES
CONTACT:
Deal Land Surveying, LLC
804 SFrench Avenue
Sanford, FL32771
407-878-3796
info@deallandsurveying.com

NOTASURVEY
DATEEXHIBITED: 12/12/19

DEALLANDSURVEYNG,LLC

PUBLIC RECORDS OF PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA.
THE REPRODUCED IN PLAT BOOK 35, PAGE 31, IN THE OFFICIAL
FEET(S) OF LOT 1, GLENECHO EXT. ACCORDING TO THE MAP OR PLAT
WEST 390 FEET CONTINUOUS TO THE WEST 180 FEET OF THE NORTH 410
THE SOUTH 11.50 FEET OF 28TH AVENUE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY, LESS THE
AREA TO BE VACATED:

LEGAL &
SKETCH

NOT A SURVEY
## VARIANCE

**NEIGHBORHOOD WORKSHEET**

Applicants are strongly encouraged to obtain signatures in support of the proposal(s) from owners of property adjacent to or otherwise affected by a particular request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Description of Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5034-28 Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The undersigned adjacent property owners understand the nature of the applicant's request and do not object (attach additional sheets if necessary):

1. **Affected Property Address:** 5043 S 38th Av N
   - **Owner Name (print):** Michel Jakab
   - **Owner Signature:**

2. **Affected Property Address:** 5021 38th Ave N
   - **Owner Name (print):**
   - **Owner Signature:**

3. **Affected Property Address:** 5033 S 38th Ave N
   - **Owner Name (print):**
   - **Owner Signature:**

4. **Affected Property Address:** 4950 28th Ave N, St Pete FL 33710
   - **Owner Name (print):** Thea Landless
   - **Owner Signature:**

5. **Affected Property Address:** 4930 28th Ave N, St Pete
   - **Owner Name (print):**
   - **Owner Signature:**

6. **Affected Property Address:**
   - **Owner Name (print):**
   - **Owner Signature:**

7. **Affected Property Address:**
   - **Owner Name (print):**
   - **Owner Signature:**

8. **Affected Property Address:**
   - **Owner Name (print):**
   - **Owner Signature:**
Applicants are strongly encouraged to obtain signatures in support of the proposal(s) from owners of property adjacent to or otherwise affected by a particular request.

### NEIGHBORHOOD WORKSHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address: 5034-28 AVENUE N</th>
<th>Case No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Request: VACATION OF PORTION OF RIGHT OF WAY 11.5 FEET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The undersigned adjacent property owners understand the nature of the applicant’s request and do not object (attach additional sheets if necessary):

1. **Affected Property Address:** 5021 28th Ave N  
   **Owner Name (print):** [Signature]  
   **Owner Signature:**

2. **Affected Property Address:** 5035 28th Ave N  
   **Owner Name (print):** [Signature]  
   **Owner Signature:**

3. **Affected Property Address:** 4950 28th Ave N  
   **Owner Name (print):** [Signature]  
   **Owner Signature:**

4. **Affected Property Address:** 5001 28th Ave N  
   **Owner Name (print):** [Signature]  
   **Owner Signature:**

5. **Affected Property Address:** 5015 28th Ave N  
   **Owner Name (print):** [Signature]  
   **Owner Signature:**

6. **Affected Property Address:**  
   **Owner Name (print):**  
   **Owner Signature:**

7. **Affected Property Address:**  
   **Owner Name (print):**  
   **Owner Signature:**

8. **Affected Property Address:**  
   **Owner Name (print):**  
   **Owner Signature:**
Thank you, Dawna, for the update.

I am including DHCA's new President, Pam Huff (effective January 1, 2019), on this note as she will be your point of contact moving forward regarding your notification to DHCA.

Enjoy the holiday season - Jennifer

Jennifer A. Joern
Disston Heights Civic Association, President
c: 727-692-4312
Subject: RE: 5034-28th Avenue North - Re: Partial Vacation Of Right Of Way

From: Kathryn Younkin <Kathryn.Younkin@stpete.org>
Date: 12/4/2018 4:46 PM
To: Jennifer Joern <jennifer.joern@yahoo.com>, "dawna@dawnaavon.com"
CC: Pamela Huff <pehuff@yahoo.com>

I just wanted to clarify that if the application is received by December 10th at 2 pm, then this would be heard at the February 6th DRC or if received between December 10th and January 7th would be heard at the March 6th DRC.

Thank you,

Kathryn A. Younkin, AICP, LEED AP BD+C
Subdivision Coordinator
City of St. Petersburg, Planning and Development Services
1 Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, FL 33701
727-892-5958 / Fax: 727-892-5557
Kathryn.Younkin@stpete.org

Please note all emails are subject to public records law.

From: Jennifer Joern [mailto:jennifer.joern@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2018 11:18 AM
To: dawna@dawnaavon.com
Cc: Kathryn Younkin <Kathryn.Younkin@stpete.org>; Pamela Huff <pehuff@yahoo.com>
Subject: 5034-28th Avenue North - Re: Partial Vacation Of Right Of Way

Thank you for your phone call and follow up e-mail, Mrs. Shayegan.

The following notes summarizes last night's discussion:

1 - You have not presented, nor will you have the opportunity to present, your case to partially vacate the ROW located at 5034 28th Avenue N to the Disston Heights Civic Association (DHCA) due to the date of your hearing with the city (late December).
2 - DHCA does not host an official Membership Meeting in December.
3 - The next scheduled DHCA Membership Meeting is January 8, 2019.
4 - DHCA has no opinion as it pertains to the Public Participation Report required for your Partial Vacation of the ROW application as it was not, nor will do you have plans to, present it to DHCA membership. Kathryn, please take note. Thank you!
5 - DHCA will not sign off of the Public Participation Report required for your Partial Vacation of the ROW application as it was not, nor will do you have plans...
to, present it to DHCA membership. *Kathryn, please take note. Thank you!*  
6 - Effective January 1, 2019, the President of DHCA is Pam Huff (on copy)  

Have a good morning - Jennifer

Jennifer A. Joern  
*Disston Heights Civic Association, President*  
c:  727-692-4312

On Monday, November 19, 2018, 6:37:35 PM EST, dawna@dawnaavon.com <dawna@dawnaavon.com> wrote:

November 18, 2018  
Re: Partial Vacation of Right of Way  
5034-28th Avenue North  

Jennifer Joern,  

We were just informed on November 13, 2018 that we were approved to start the process for the application with the city. Your contact information was given to us at that time. We will be contacting Zoning tomorrow, November 19, 2018 to let them know that we were able to reach you but are unable to meet until after January 2019.  

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.  

Sincerely,  

Mr. & Mrs. Shayegan  
727-527-7888  

*Your Sunshine City*

---  

*Attachments:*
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G – Photographs
H – Engineering Memorandum dated January 24, 2019
TO: Iris Winn, Administrative Clerk, Development Services  
    Jennifer Bryla, Zoning Official, Development Review Services  
    Kathryn Younkin, Development Services  
FROM: Nancy Davis, Engineering Plan Review Supervisor  
DATE: January 24, 2019  
SUBJECT: Vacation with Variance  
FILE: 18-33000012 R1

LOCATION AND PIN: 5034 28th Avenue North; 09/31/16/31032/000/0040  
ATLAS: M-16  
PROJECT: Vacation with Variance  
REQUEST: Approval of a vacation of an 11.5-foot by 130-foot portion of 28th Avenue North adjacent to the North Lot Line of the parcel located at 5034 28th Avenue North, with a variance to the right-of-way, width required from 50.0-feet to 48.5-feet.

COMMENTS: The Engineering Department offers the following technical considerations to assist staff and DRC in determining the level of support for the proposed right of way vacation.

1. The survey indicates that the fence encroaches 11.5' into the 60-foot wide right of way, leaving approximately 9.8-feet of parkway south of the southern curb line of 28th Ave North.

2. The north 30-feet of the right of way of 28th Ave N was dedicated on PB 10, PG 66, Summit Grove Subdivision. The south 30-feet of the right of way of 28th Avenue North was dedicated on PB 15, PG 38, Glen Echo Subdivision. To maintain the minimum 50-foot wide right of way width required for a local street by current City Land Development Code Section 16.40.140.4.1(E), each of these subdivisions would only be required to dedicate 25-feet of right of way, rather than 30-feet. Vacation of the southern 11.5-feet of the right of way of 28th Avenue North for a distance as necessary to accommodate the fence, will result in an overall right of way width of only 48.5-feet. The right of way boundary will no longer be consistent in the block nor will it be symmetrical (there will be 30-feet of right of way north of the roadway centerline but only 18.5-feet of right of way south of the roadway centerline). If supported by staff, Zoning will need to determine if this vacation would also require a variance to the right of way requirements of the Land Development Code.

3. Per the survey, a fence installed at the top of the existing lake bank would encroach only 5-feet into the southern right of way of 28th Avenue North. Shifting the fence alignment of the entire fence to encroach only 5-feet into the southern right of way of 28th Avenue North would be reasonable since the remaining 25-feet of the right of way would maintain the standard local street right of way width for the southern half of the right of way per the requirements of the City's Code. If the lake bank is uneven or unstable in this location, it may be necessary for the property owner to construct some type of low retaining walk outside the public right of way adjacent to the lake on which the fence could be mounted.

4. The survey indicates that the top of bank of the privately owned lake is now encroaching into the public right of way of 28th Ave N. Based on the survey elevations, the lake bank slope approaches 1:1. The fence may help to secure the area for protection of the public.

5. City Utility maps do not indicate the existence of any City owned public infrastructure in the southern parkway of 28th Avenue North in the area of the proposed vacation.

6. The NS zoning district does not require sidewalk construction on the south side of 28th Avenue North.

NED/MJR/meh  
pc: Kelly Donnelly  
Correspondence File
Exhibit “A” – Description and Sketch
I – Emails Received
Hi Kathryn

I noticed that the neighbor has cited this being a safety issue with the lake I just want you to know that I have been here 21 years and there’s never been an issue with the fence and the lake and as far back as 45 years there’s been no reports of any safety issues with the fence just an FYI thank you Mike Mathews

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jan 7, 2019, at 4:24 PM, Mike Mathews <mmathews5100@gmail.com> wrote:
> > Hi Kathryn,
> > My name is Mike Mathews I live at 5100 28 Ave. N. I oppose this variance that my neighbor is requesting, as it does not benefit the neighborhood at all, the road is narrow enough we have no room to get by as it is, I am not opposed for him to put back his 4 foot chain-link fence like it was and stay with in the variance lines like we all have in the neighborhood if he gets this variance than all the other neighbors will what too and what would that look like? Please feel free to reach out to me.
> >
> > Mike Mathews
> > Sent from my iPhone
Good Day Kathryn,

I am Clifford G Hunter III, am the homeowner at 5021 28th Ave N, across the street from 5034 28th Ave N, aka your case # 18-33000012. I have no objection to a variance as it pertains "solely to the location of the fence along the property line". The bank is very steep on the waterfront side lot portion of this property, so it makes sense to allow the homeowner to place a fence, "that meets all city code requirements," on as level a ground as possible.

I do however, and have voiced our opposition to the city, and the homeowner, object to the current placement and use of a 6 foot tall wooden "non-decorative, non-landscaped" stockade fence placed across the front of this residential home and property. Per city fence guidelines 4' tall is the maximum height permitted beyond the sidewalls and across the front of a residential home. A 4' tall chain link was in place across the home, and side lot lake front, for many years, which was removed by the homeowner and replaced by a 6' tall wooden stockade fence, (which, even if allowed, wooden stockade fence is neither "decorative nor landscaped" as would be required by city code).

Per City Residential Requirements: Section 16.40.040.1

Both Descriptions and Diagrams within this code 16.40.040.1 clearly state, and demonstrate, that the use of a fence taller than 4 feet is prohibited across the front this residential property.

I appreciate your time and attention in this matter.

Sincerely,
Clifford G Hunter III
chuntergiii@gmail.com
January 10, 2019

Re: Application #18-33000012

Dear Kathryn,

We went to the DHCA Meeting Tuesday, January 8, 2019. Please find the attachment for the Public Participation Form.

Thank You

Sharokh and Dawna Shayegan
In accordance with LDR Section 16.10.040.1.F.2., it is the policy of the City to encourage applicants to meet with residents of the surrounding neighborhoods prior to filing an application for a permit requiring review and public hearing. The applicant, at his option, may elect to include neighborhood mediation as a preparatory step in the development process. Participation in the public participation process prior to required public hearings will be considered by the decision-making official when considering the need, or request, for a continuance of an application. It is not the intent of this section to require neighborhood meetings, but to encourage meetings prior to the submission of applications for approval and documentation of efforts which have been made to address any potential concerns prior to the formal application process.

**APPLICANT REPORT**

**Street Address:**
1. Details of techniques the applicant used to involve the public
   (a) Dates and locations of all meetings where citizens were invited to discuss the applicant's proposal
      January 8, 2019 we met with the Disston Heights Civic Association and discussed the proposal of a Partial Vacation of Right-of-Way and Variance for a fence located at 5034 28th North. We expressed our concerns about the public, pets and children as the fence is totally accessible to someone walking or falling down the steep embankment just feet away.

   (b) Content, dates mailed, and number of mailings, including letters, meeting notices, newsletters, and other publications
      Saturday, January 5, 2019. Certified letters were mailed to all residents within 200 feet including a map. A Public Hearing sign was posted to the fence for anyone to view.

   (c) Where residents, property owners, and interested parties receiving notices, newsletters, or other written materials are located
      Within 200 feet of our property.

2. Summary of concerns, issues, and problems expressed during the process

   **Public Safety**

3. Signature or affidavit of compliance - President or vice-president of any neighborhood associations
   
   Check one: 
   - Proposal supported
   - Do not support the Proposal
   - Unable to comment on the proposal at this time
   
   **Association Name:** Disston Heights Civic Association
   **President or Vice-President Signature:** [Signature]
   
   If the president or vice-president of the neighborhood association are unavailable or refuse to sign such certification, a statement as to the efforts to contact them and (in the event of unavailability or unwillingness to sign) why they were unable or unwilling to sign the certification.
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J – Section 16.40.060.2.1.6 Landscape Specifications
16.40.060.2.1.6. - Landscape specifications.

A. Unless otherwise specified, all landscape materials shall meet the following specifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Light requirements</th>
<th>Water requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sun    mix  shade</td>
<td>low  med  high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress, Bald</td>
<td><em>Taxodium distichum</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X       X</td>
<td>X     X   X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm, Chinese (Drake)</td>
<td><em>Ulmus parvifolia</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm, florida</td>
<td><em>Ulmus Americana</em>, var. spp. floridana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm, Winged</td>
<td><em>Ulmus Alata</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loblolly Bay</td>
<td><em>Gordonia lasianthus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia, Southern*</td>
<td><em>Magnolia grandiflora</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Type</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia, Sweetbay*</td>
<td><em>Magnolia virginiana</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple, Florida</td>
<td><em>Acer saccharum, &quot;Floridanum&quot;</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple, Red</td>
<td><em>Acer rubrum</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry, Red*</td>
<td><em>Morus rubra</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak, Live</td>
<td><em>Quercus virginiana</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine, Long-Leaf</td>
<td><em>Pinus palustris</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine, Slash</td>
<td><em>Pinus elliottii</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarberry*</td>
<td><em>Celtis laevigata</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetgum*</td>
<td><em>Liquidambar styraciflua</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td><em>Platanus occidentalis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tree produces berries or seed pods, which make it an unsuitable choice for locations near parking or sidewalk spaces.

Other shade trees identified as Florida Friendly by the University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF/IFAS) Extension, Environmental Horticulture Department will be considered (http://fyn.ifas.ufl.edu/pdf/FYN_Plant_Selection_Guide_v090110.pdf).
TREES: UNDERSTORY

All required understory trees shall measure a minimum of eight ft. in height and 1.5 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) at the time of planting. All understory trees shall be rated Florida Grade No. 1 and selected from the following list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Light requirements</th>
<th>Water requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sun</td>
<td>mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay, Red</td>
<td><em>Persea borbonia</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay, Silk</td>
<td><em>Persea humilis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay, Swamp</td>
<td><em>Persea palustris</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttonwood, Green</td>
<td><em>Conocarpus erectus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttonwood, Silver</td>
<td><em>Conocarpus erectus</em>&lt;sup&gt;&quot;sericeus&quot;&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar, Southern Red</td>
<td><em>Juniperus virginiana</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crape Myrtle,</td>
<td><em>Lagerstroemia indica</em> and any disease resistant varieties</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Type</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn, Summer</td>
<td><em>Crataegus flava</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly, American</td>
<td><em>Ilex opaca</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly, Dahoon</td>
<td><em>Ilex cassine</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly, East Palatka</td>
<td><em>Ilex attenuata</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly, Weeping Yaupon</td>
<td><em>Ilex vomitoria</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly, Yaupon</td>
<td><em>Ilex vomitoria</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligustrum</td>
<td><em>Ligustrum japonicum</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia</td>
<td><em>Magnolia grandiflora</em>, and other dwarf varieties that have a maximum height of fifteen feet</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak, Sand Live</td>
<td><em>Quercus virginiana</em> &quot;Geminata&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum, Flatwoods</td>
<td><em>Prunus umbellata</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum, Pigeon</td>
<td><em>Coccoloba diversifolia</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum, Saffron</td>
<td><em>Bumelia celastrina</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podocarpus (tree form)</td>
<td><em>Podocarpus macrophyllus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seagrape (tree form)</td>
<td><em>Coccoloba uvifera</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Acacia</td>
<td><em>Acacia farnesiana</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Olive</td>
<td><em>Cordia boissieri</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other understory trees identified as Florida Friendly by the University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF/IFAS) Extension, Environmental Horticulture Department will be considered.

**TREES: PALMS**
All required palm trees shall measure a minimum height of eight feet of clear trunk. Palm trees identified with an * may be substituted on a one for one basis with shade tree planting requirements. Palm trees identified with a + may be substituted on a three for one basis with shade tree planting requirements. No more than 50% of required shade trees may be substituted for palms in vehicular use areas. All palm trees shall be credited on a one for one basis towards understory tree planting requirements. All palms trees shall be rated Florida Grade No. 1 and selected from the following list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Light requirements</th>
<th>Water requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sun</td>
<td>mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bismarck Palm*</td>
<td><em>Bismarckia nobilis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabbage Palm+</td>
<td><em>Sabal palmetto</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Palm, Medjool*</td>
<td><em>Phoenix dactylifera</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Palm, Pygmy</td>
<td><em>Phoenix roebelenii</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Palm, Silver</td>
<td><em>Phoenix sylvestris</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Palm, Ribbon</td>
<td><em>Livistona decipiens</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Type</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxtail Palm</td>
<td><em>Wodyetia bifurcata</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paurotis Palm</td>
<td><em>Acoelorrhaphe wrightii</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pindo Palm</td>
<td><em>Butia odorata</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Palm, Cuba*</td>
<td><em>Roystonea regia</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Palm, Florida*</td>
<td><em>Roystonea elata</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatch Palm, Florida</td>
<td><em>Thrinax radiata</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle Palm</td>
<td><em>Neodypsis decaryi</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Palm</td>
<td><em>Trachycarpus fortunei</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other palm trees identified as Florida Friendly by the University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF/IFAS) Extension, Environmental Horticulture Department will be considered.*

**SHRUBS**
All required shrubs shall measure a minimum of 24 inches in height at the time of planting. Shrubs required to create a hedge shall be planted not more than 30 inches on center. Shrubs shall be rated Florida Grade No. 1 and selected from the following list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Light requirements</th>
<th>Water requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sun</td>
<td>mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anise, Yellow</td>
<td><em>Illicium parviflorum</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttonwood, Green</td>
<td><em>Conocarpus erectus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttonwood, Silver</td>
<td><em>Conocarpus erectus 'sericeus'</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocoplum, Redtip</td>
<td><em>Chrysobalanus icaco</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firebush</td>
<td><em>Hamelia patens</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallberry</td>
<td><em>Ilex glabra</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus</td>
<td><em>Hibiscus rosa-sinensis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly, Dwarf Yaupon</td>
<td><em>Ilex vomitoria</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Schilling Dwarf&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dwarf cultivars or varieties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ixora</td>
<td><em>Ixora coccinea</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podocarpus</td>
<td><em>Podocarpus macrophyllus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privet, Florida</td>
<td><em>Forestiera segregata</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seagrape</td>
<td><em>Coccoloba uvifera</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson Stopper</td>
<td><em>Myrcianthes fragrans</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viburnum, Awabuki</td>
<td><em>Viburnum odoratissimum</em> &quot;Awabuki&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viburnum, Sandankwa</td>
<td><em>Viburnum suspensum</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viburnum, Sweet</td>
<td><em>Viburnum odoratissimum</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viburnum, Walters</td>
<td><em>Viburnum obovatum</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other shrubs identified as Florida Friendly by the University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF/IFAS) Extension, Environmental Horticulture Department will be considered.

**ACCENT (AND MASSING) PLANTS**
All required foundation plants and accent plants shall be a minimum of one gallon nursery specification at the time of planting. Plants shall be rated Florida Grade No. 1 and selected from the following list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Light requirements</th>
<th>Water requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sun</td>
<td>mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allamanda</td>
<td>Allamanda cathartica</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allamanda</td>
<td>Allamanda neriifolia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Beautyberry</td>
<td>Callicarpa americana spp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azalea, Florida Flame</td>
<td>Rhododendron austrinum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azalea, Pinxter or Piedmont</td>
<td>Rhododendron canescens</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Bamboo, clumping varieties only</td>
<td>Bambusa spp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azalea</td>
<td>Rhododendron spp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird of Paradise</td>
<td>Strelitzia reginae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bougainvillea</td>
<td>Bougainvillea glabra</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Weed</td>
<td>Asclepias tuberosa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardboard Plant</td>
<td>Zamia furfuracea</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast-Iron Plant</td>
<td>Aspidistra elatior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmasberry</td>
<td>Lycium carolinianum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coontie</td>
<td>Zamia floridana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copperleaf</td>
<td>Acalypha wilkesiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crinum Lily</td>
<td>Crinum spp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croton</td>
<td>Codiaeum variegatum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firespike</td>
<td>Odontonema cuspidata</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger, Shell</td>
<td>Alpinia zerumbet</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Dewdrop</td>
<td>Duranta erecta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn, Indian, disease resistant cvs.</td>
<td>Raphiolepsis spp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus, Red</td>
<td>Hhibiscus coccineus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris, African</td>
<td>Dietes spp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Palm</td>
<td>Rhapis excelsa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimosa, Sunshine</td>
<td>Mimosa strigillosa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milkweed, Scarlet</td>
<td>Asclepias curassavica</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needle Palm</td>
<td>Rhapidophyllum hystrix</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philodendron</td>
<td>Philodendron spp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbago</td>
<td>Plumbago auriculata</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto, Saw</td>
<td>Serenoa repens</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimp Plant</td>
<td>Justicia brandegeana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowberry</td>
<td>Chiococca alba</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Bush</td>
<td>Breynia disticha</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Light Requirements</td>
<td>Water Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thryallis</td>
<td><em>Galphimia gracilis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks-Cap</td>
<td><em>Malaviscus arboreus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varrish Leaf</td>
<td><em>Dodonaea viscosa</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Indigoberry</td>
<td><em>Randia aculeata</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Coffee</td>
<td><em>Psychotria nervosa</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Necklace Pod</td>
<td><em>Sophora tomentosa</em> &quot;Truncata&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other accent plants identified as Florida Friendly by the University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF/IFAS) Extension, Environmental Horticulture Department will be considered.

**ORNAMENTAL GRASSES**

All required foundation plants and ornamental grasses shall be a minimum of one gallon nursery specification at the time of planting. Plants shall be rated Florida Grade No. 1 and selected from the following list.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ground Cover</th>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mix</th>
<th>Shade</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Muhly Grass</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Cordgrass</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Marsh Cordgrass</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other ornamental grasses identified as "Florida Friendly" by the University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF/IFAS) Extension, Environmental Horticulture Department will be considered.

**GROUND COVER**

All required foundation plants and ornamental grasses shall be a minimum of one gallon nursery specification at the time of planting. Plants shall be rated Florida Grade No. 1 and selected from the following list.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mix</th>
<th>Shade</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aztec Grass</td>
<td><em>Ophiopogon spp.</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Sunflower</td>
<td><em>Helianthus debilis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Morning Glory</td>
<td><em>Ipomoea imperati</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Daze</td>
<td><em>Evolvulus glomerata</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Honeysuckle</td>
<td><em>Lonicera sempervirens</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine, Asiatic (Minima) and other low growing varieties</td>
<td><em>Trachelospernum asiaticum</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine, Downy</td>
<td><em>Jasminum multiflorum</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniper, Parson</td>
<td><em>Juniperus davurica</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniper, Shore</td>
<td><em>Juniperus conferta</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantana, Trailing</td>
<td><em>Lantana montevidensis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liriope, Evergreen Giant</td>
<td><em>Liriope &quot;Evergreen Giant&quot;</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimosa, Sunshine</td>
<td><em>Mimosa strigillosa</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterweed</td>
<td><em>Strachytarpheta jamaicensis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Vine</td>
<td><em>Ipomoea pescaprae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage, Tropical</td>
<td><em>Salvia coccinea</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Oxeye Daisy</td>
<td><em>Borrchia frutescens</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Purslane</td>
<td><em>Sesuvium portulacastrum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twinflower</td>
<td><em>Dyschoriste oblongifolia</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other foundation plants identified as Florida Friendly by the University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF/IFAS) Extension, Environmental Horticulture Department will be considered.
B. Plant selection criteria. The species of required landscape materials shall be site appropriate and shall be selected based on the existing and neighboring vegetative communities, sun exposure, soil types, proposed function of the materials, cold tolerance, water use, fertilizer needs, existence of utilities or overhead power lines, and aesthetics.

C. Unprotected trees. Due to their status as non-native species or invasive species, any unprotected or prohibited trees may be removed from private property and the abutting right-of-way without a permit unless they are part of an approved landscape plan, or otherwise required by this section, and shall not be used to meet the vegetation required by this section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNPROTECTED TREES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avocado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry laurel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ficus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacaranda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem thorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapok ¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loquat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkey puzzle tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Island pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchid Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Poinciana ¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman's tongue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Note: Jacaranda and Royal Poinciana Trees over eight inches DBH and Banyan and Kapok over 30 inches DBH are signature trees and therefore may be required to obtain a permit before removing.

D. **Prohibited trees.** It is unlawful to plant or cause to be planted, or to sell or offer for sale, within the City limits the following exotic and nuisance plant species. Any development or redevelopment which is required to obtain a landscaping permit or file a landscape plan shall remove all prohibited trees on the property and
abutting right-of-way and shall include a plan to prevent re-growth prior to approval of a certificate of occupancy.

### PROHIBITED TREES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acacia, earleaf</td>
<td>Acada auriculiformis</td>
<td>Australia, New Guinea, Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian pines, all</td>
<td>Casuarina spp.</td>
<td>South Pacific, SE Asia (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian pepper</td>
<td>Schnius terebinthifolius</td>
<td>Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrotwood</td>
<td>Cupaniopsis anacardioides</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinaberry</td>
<td>Melia azederach</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese tallow</td>
<td>Triadica sebifera</td>
<td>China, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead tree</td>
<td>Leucaena leucocephala</td>
<td>Central America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punk</td>
<td>Melaleuca quinquernervia</td>
<td>Australia, New Guinea, Solomon Isle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangler fig</td>
<td>Ficus aurea</td>
<td>North America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ST. PETERSBURG CITY COUNCIL
March 7th, 2019

TO: The Honorable Charlie Gerdes, Chair, and Members of City Council

FROM: Willie Joseph, Sanitation Director

DATE: March 7th, 2019

SUBJECT: Naming the Sanitation Administrative Building after Benjamin F. Shirley Sr.

Background:
In recognition of the many contributions that Joseph E. Savage and Benjamin F. Shirley Sr. made to the City of St. Petersburg, the Administration requests that the City continue to honor Mr. Savage as the namesake of the sanitation complex on 28th Street North while honoring Mr. Shirley by naming the Sanitation Department administration building at the complex in Mr. Shirley’s honor.

In 2006, the Mayor and City Council named the Sanitation Complex located at 2001 28th Street North, the Joseph E. Savage Sanitation Complex. Mr. Savage served as a Sanitation employee for the City of St. Petersburg for 37 years. In 1968, he helped organize meetings with management concerning better working conditions and wages for the department’s predominately black workers. Mr. Savage eventually led more than 300 Sanitation employees in more than 40 marches on City Hall during a four-month walkout which brought national attention to St. Petersburg during the same time Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was leading the Civil Rights march in Memphis. A. D. King, who is the brother of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., also joined marchers in St. Petersburg.

Not only did Mr. Savage’s contributions to the civil rights movement focus on improving conditions for the Sanitation employees, it also enhanced the collaboration of black and white leaders that formed a community alliance. The City Administration assigned an employee to the minority neighborhoods to provide education on the services made available to the citizens. Housing improvement programs were initiated and the first black City Council member was elected in 1969.

In 1970, Benjamin F. Shirley Sr. started his career as a Sanitation Serviceman assisting drivers in the automated collection and disposal of solid waste for the City of St.
Petersburg. His employment began just after the strike and for 20 years Mr. Shirley worked alongside Mr. Savage. During those years, Mr. Shirley improved upon his skills by attending classes and learning new skills which helped him steadily rise through the ranks. Mr. Shirley held the positions of Sanitation Specialist, Commercial Supervisor, Chief of Commercial Collections, Sanitation Manager, Assistant Director and in 2006 he became the first black Director for the City of St. Petersburg’s Sanitation Department. Mr. Shirley’s efforts and strong leadership helped make the City of St. Petersburg’s Sanitation Department one of the most modern, innovative, efficient and well-respected solid waste management operations in the country.

Mr. Shirley had accountability for approximately 200 employees who collect and dispose of more than 250,000 tons of solid waste each year. His innovative leadership resulted in considerable savings for the City of St. Petersburg as well as excellent customer service. He transitioned the Sanitation fleet from diesel fuel to CNG natural gas and constructed a CNG natural gas station at the Joseph E. Savage complex. Mr. Shirley also organized and led a team to implement the St. Petersburg recycling program in 2015.

During his tenure with the City of St. Petersburg, Mr. Shirley was awarded several accolades, including: the “Hats Off” award for his service within the neighborhoods, first City employee to receive a Key to the City for his outstanding service during hurricane Hugo, honors from Florida Power (Duke Energy) and PARC for his continuous service within the community. Mr. Shirley was heavily involved with the community. He was a member of the following organizations: Community Awareness and Response Team, American Public Works Association, Solid Waste Association of North America, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Parade Committee, Neighborhood-Team, Spirit of the Wine Maker and the National Forum for Black Public Administrators.

Mr. Shirley supported his staff and created a family atmosphere in the department. This quote from Mr. Shirley expresses his philosophy: "It is not what I do myself, it is the people that surround me that make the whole engine run."

The City Administration requests that City Council approve an Ordinance to create the Benjamin F. Shirley Sr. Administrative Building at the Joseph E. Savage Sanitation Complex.

On February 28th, 2019, the Public Services and Infrastructure Committee voted unanimously to approve the attached ordinance.

CC: Mayor Kriseman
    Deputy Mayor Tomalin
    Tom Greene, Assistant City Administrator
    Jackie Kovlaritch, City Attorney
    Robert Gerdes, Neighborhood Affairs Administrator
    Brett Pettigrew, Assistant City Attorney

Attachment: Ordinance
ORDINANCE NO. ______

AN ORDINANCE NAMING THE SANITATION DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION BUILDING AFTER BENJAMIN F. SHIRLEY SR.; AMENDING CITY CODE TO REFLECT THAT NAMING; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, Benjamin F. Shirley Sr., who was affectionately known to family and friends as “Uncle Ben,” was the youngest of ten siblings and learned at an early age the value of respecting elders and gathering profound knowledge through the wisdom of others; and

WHEREAS, his ambitious personality, trustworthiness, respect, sense of responsibility, fairness, and caring personality led him to rise in the ranks of the City of St. Petersburg to become the first African-American Sanitation Director and achieve 48 years of dedicated service; and

WHEREAS, Benjamin F. Shirley Sr. was a philanthropic person and inspired everyone he met (especially his children and grandchildren) to give back to the community; and

WHEREAS, the love, infectious personality, and commitment to service and excellence demonstrated by Benjamin F. Shirley Sr. left an indelible mark on the hearts and lives of all who knew him; and

WHEREAS, on December 13, 2018, the Mayor and the City Council adopted resolution 2018-642 acknowledging the debt of gratitude owed to Benjamin F. Shirley Sr. for his untiring and steadfast devotion to making St. Petersburg a better place to live, work, and play; and

WHEREAS, City Council now desires to further acknowledge Mr. Shirley’s devotion to the City by renaming the Sanitation Department’s administration building in his honor; and

WHEREAS, City Code section 2-512 provides that the name of any City-owned facility may be changed only by ordinance; and

WHEREAS, City Council desires to adopt such an ordinance for the purpose of naming the Sanitation Department administration building in honor of Benjamin F. Shirley Sr., while continuing to honor Joseph E. Savage as the namesake of the sanitation complex at which that administration building is located.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG ORDAINS:
SECTION 1—ESTABLISHMENT OF NAME: The Sanitation Department administration building located at the Joseph E. Savage Sanitation Complex is hereby named the “Benjamin F. Shirley Sr. Administration Building.”

SECTION 2—AMENDMENT OF CITY CODE: St. Petersburg City Code subsection 2-512(d) is hereby amended as set forth below, with additions indicated by underlining, deletions indicated by strikethrough, and unchanged paragraphs omitted for brevity indicated by three widely spaced ellipsis dots:

(d) Since September 7, 2000, the names of the following City-owned real property, buildings, facilities, or portions thereof have been established, changed, or removed and are not otherwise reflected in City Code:

(4) The sanitation complex located at 2001 28th Street North is named the “Joseph E. Savage Sanitation Complex.”

(5) The administration building located at the Joseph E. Savage Sanitation Complex is named the “Benjamin F. Shirley Sr. Administration Building.”

(56) The terminal building located at the Albert Whitted Airport, 540 1st Street Southeast, is named the “John and Rosemary Galbraith Terminal.”

(67) The parking garage located at 117 2nd Street North is named the “Sundial Parking Garage.”

SECTION 3—EFFECTIVE DATE: In the event this ordinance is not vetoed by the Mayor in accordance with the City Charter, it will become effective upon the expiration of the fifth business day after adoption unless the Mayor notifies the City Council through written notice filed with the City Clerk that the Mayor will not veto this ordinance, in which case this ordinance will become effective immediately upon filing such written notice with the City Clerk. In the event this ordinance is vetoed by the Mayor in accordance with the City Charter, it will not become effective unless the City Council overrides the veto in accordance with the City Charter, in which case it will become effective immediately upon a successful vote to override the veto.

Approved as to form and content:

City Attorney (Designee) Administration
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Memorandum
City of St. Petersburg City Council
Meeting of March 7, 2019
REPORTS

TO: The Honorable Charlie Gerdes, Chair and Members of City Council

REQUEST: Approving the Attached Term Sheet for a Mixed Use Project, Located on the Southeast Corner of 1st Avenue North and 5th Street.

DATE: Meeting of March 7, 2019

BACKGROUND: In May, 2016 the City completed a comprehensive downtown parking study. Included in the study’s recommendations was the need to increase parking supply in the downtown area with an emphasis on doing so strategically through public-private partnerships. By approaching the addition of public parking in the downtown area through public-private partnerships the City can realize additional public parking on land not owned by the City and incentivize private development projects that include development categories which the City wishes to encourage that may not occur without the parking partnership offered by the City. The location of this potential project is within one of the three areas identified in the Parking Study as an area where additional public parking should be built. The spacing of this project from other major City garages is advantageous and aligns with actual parking demand. The fact that the proposed project is approximately one block away from a former public parking lot and garage that was fully occupied and no longer exists also demonstrates demand for public parking in this area.

Besides the fact that the location is advantageous for the addition of public parking, the adding of new office space is a priority of the City during a time when residential clearly dominates the downtown construction market. Due to the current economics of new construction costs versus the existing market rates that can be charged to office tenants, new office is much less attractive to developers than residential. In the last twenty-plus years the downtown has generally only seen new office construction demand for single-tenant corporate offices such as Duke Energy and UPC. Office vacancy rates are now low and it is important to our local economy to be able to accept new office tenants who want to locate downtown now and going into the future.

The attached Term Sheet between the City and DeNunzio is the next step in moving forward to realize the timely construction of new public parking spaces. The Term Sheet is the basis for the development of a final agreement that will be negotiated over the next few months. City Council approval of the Key Business Points has been requested by DeNunzio to affirm the City’s interest in moving forward with the next level of negotiations. The funding sources for the parking structure (should a Development Agreement be executed) is intended to be Intown Tax Increment Revenue and Parking Revenue. Currently the City has appropriated $5 million anticipating the need to begin budgeting for such a project and additional funding will be available to complete the project through the appropriation process. When the Administration brings forward the anticipated Development Agreement, more specifics about the number of spaces and final City funding requirements and sources will be identified. It is anticipated that additional Intown Tax Increment
(recently approved extension with the County) and Parking Revenue would both be options for additional funding. The final agreement will require CRA and City Council approval.

**DESCRIPTION:** DeNunzio proposes developing a mixed-use project with a parking garage on property currently under their control on the South East corner of 1st Avenue North and 5th Street. The preliminary plan is for a mixed-use development that includes: (1) ground floor retail, (2) approximately 40,000 square feet of office space, (3) two to three levels of hotel, and (4) multiple levels of residential, and/or multi-family. The anticipated height of the project is approximately 25 stories. Key Business Points of the Term Sheet include:

- City would fund between four levels of public parking estimated to contain 75 parking spaces per level (depending on the final parking space layout) at a price of up to $28,700 per space (approximately $8,610,000 for 300 spaces). The City would also have the right to construct a fifth level of parking at the City's sole discretion.
- City funding would be paid out in increments during the project as follows (provided that a guarantee of the City's investment may be required depending upon the legal structure of ownership):
  - 5% at City Council approval of the Development Agreement
  - 5% upon submission of complete building permit applications
  - 30% upon commencement of foundation pours
  - 50% upon notice that the parking garage phase construction has reached 50% completion
  - 10% upon issuance of a certificate of occupancy
- The City would own the City-funded parking spaces under a condominium form of ownership once construction is complete.
- DeNunzio would be responsible for all maintenance and repair of the entire facility, including the City parking floors.
- The City would be paid 15% of the annual net profits generated from the City funded spaces.
- DeNunzio will be required to build additional floors of on-site parking to meet the zoning requirements for the retail, hotel, and residential components while the office users will be allowed to utilize the public parking within the garage, just like the general public and such spaces would be counted towards the office parking requirement.
- A project timeline will be determined in the Development Agreement.
- If the City funds or builds a new parking garage or lot in the “exclusion area” (defined as ¼ mile) within 3 years of DeNunzio's completion of the parking garage described herein, DeNunzio may purchase the City's interest in the parking garage described herein, as their exclusive remedy at the higher of the City's investment or replacement value.
- The term sheet is non-binding and provides a framework for developing a final legally binding agreement. Either party may terminate negotiations without cause without any financial or legal responsibility.

City staff has performed a 50 year discounted cash flow analysis of the DeNunzio proposal, comparing it to City land acquisition and construction of the parking assets on the subject site. This analysis shows that the DeNunzio proposal is financially advantageous to the City.
RECOMMENDATION: Administration recommends APPROVAL of the attached Resolution that approves the Term Sheet for a Mixed-Use Project in the Downtown Core and supporting Administration’s negotiation of a Development Agreement.

ATTACHMENTS: Term Sheet
          Resolution
          Site Map

APPROVAL:

Administration
TERM SHEET

This Term Sheet outlines the key business terms upon which The DeNunzio Group, LLC, or an affiliated entity which is controlled, or wholly owned, by The DeNunzio Group, LLC, ("DeNunzio") and the City of St. Petersburg ("City") will proceed in good faith with the negotiation of a definitive development agreement with respect to DeNunzio’s development of the mixed-use project described below. Any proposed change in control of the DeNunzio development outlined in this Term Sheet would require approval by the City. City Council approval of this Term Sheet has been requested by DeNunzio to affirm the City’s interest in moving forward on the foregoing basis and the City is amenable to entering into this Term Sheet for that purpose. Accordingly, the City Administration will ask the City Council to approve the key business terms set forth in this Term Sheet. Thereafter, the City and DeNunzio will negotiate in good faith to finalize a definitive development agreement that is consistent with the key business terms set forth in this Term Sheet (the “Development Agreement”), which agreement is subject to City Council approval.

Notwithstanding as much, both parties agree this Term Sheet is non-binding and creates no legally-enforceable covenants whatsoever. Either party may terminate negotiations, at any time, at will, and without cause or financial or legal responsibility.

Based on the foregoing, DeNunzio and the City agree to the following key business terms as the underlying basis for the project described below:

Land/Project: DeNunzio is presently under contract to purchase the existing parking lot and vacant lot located at the southeast corner of 1st Avenue N. and 5th Street N., St. Petersburg, Florida comprising approximately .65 acres, which property is more particularly depicted on the map attached hereto as Exhibit “A” (the “Property”). The Property is located in the City’s Downtown Center-Core (DC-C) Zoning District, the most intensive zoning district in the City’s schedule of regulations, the purpose of which “is to create a diverse and vibrant downtown which serves as a center for employment, entertainment and retail activity.” (Section 16.20.120.3.1, St. Petersburg Code of Ordinances). The Property is currently owned by Christ United Methodist Church, Inc. (“CUMC”) and is presently used solely for parking. Subject to additional due diligence, a successful closing and the City’s approval of the Development Agreement, DeNunzio proposes to develop a newly constructed mixed-use building on the Property consistent with the DC-C’s FAR of 8.0 (utilizing the bonus provisions of the DC-C District) and having the following uses (A) ground floor level retail, (B) at least seven levels of parking immediately above the retail space (the “Parking Facility”), (C) at least two levels of office space immediately above the Parking Facility which shall be approximately 40,000 square feet, (D) two to three levels of hotel immediately above the office space, and (E) multiple levels of residential, and/or multi-family space immediately above the hotel space ((A) through (E) collectively, the “Building”). It is proposed that the Parking Facility and other portions of the Building will be submitted to the condominium form of ownership with identified portions of the Building owned in fee simple. DeNunzio will file and record a Declaration of Condominium (the “Declaration”) to accomplish such formation prior to any conveyances of the applicable portions of the Buildings. The Building will initially be owned and later managed by or through a special purpose entity owned or
controlled by DeNunzio. The Parking Facility would include at least four levels (approximately 60 to 75 parking spaces per level) allocated to public parking. The final number of parking spaces per level will be determined by the approved building plan. DeNunzio will seek a vacation of air rights over a portion of the public right of way for the Parking Facility levels in order to optimize the number of spaces per level. DeNunzio reserves the right to make changes to the site plan for the Building that are consistent with the mixed-use intent; a fully defined scope of the project will be included in the Development Agreement.

**City Funding:** The City agrees to fund a not-to-exceed amount of $28,700 per parking space to develop at least 4 levels of the Parking Facility devoted to public parking and, if mutually agreed upon by DeNunzio and the City in the Development Agreement, the City may have the option to fund a 5th parking level at the Parking Facility (collectively, the “City Funded Parking Spaces”). In exchange for such funding, the City Funded Parking Spaces will be conveyed to the City by fee simple deed upon the City’s issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy/Completion for the Building. Subject to the terms of this Term Sheet and the Development Agreement, the Public Parking Facility will be used for public parking, which may include parking for businesses (and their invitees/guests) within the Building and in other nearby buildings. All City Funded Parking Spaces will be leased at market rates. The spaces shall serve the public on the basis of a mix of monthly, daily and event parking. Monthly parking shall be on a month-to-month basis. Six months before the opening of the garage the Developer shall deliver to the City for the City’s review and approval, a security and operations plan for the garage. City-funded spaces may not be used to meet the minimum parking required by applicable zoning requirements except that of the office space. The City has indicated that sufficient funding is available to fulfill the funding of the City Funded Parking Spaces. Depending upon the legal structure of the City’s ownership (which will be addressed the Development Agreement), a guarantee of the City’s investment may be required (e.g. Performance Bond or similar). The City will pay the amounts listed below within 30 days of the corresponding milestone date:

- 5% of funding after City Council approval of a Development Agreement;
- 5% of the funding will be paid upon submittal for Building Permit;
- 30% of the funding will be paid upon commencement of foundation pours;
- 50% of the funding will be paid upon notice that the parking garage phase construction has reached 50% construction completion; and
- 10% of funding will be paid by the City upon issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

**Ownership of Parking Facility:** Portions of the Building, including the Parking Facility, will be submitted to the condominium form of ownership. DeNunzio will file and record a Declaration of Condominium for the Building to accomplish such formation prior to any conveyances of those portions of the Buildings. The City Funded Parking Spaces will be transferred to the City by fee simple deed simultaneously with the City’s issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the Building. As fee simple owner of the City Funded Parking Spaces, the City will be a member of the condominium association established under the Declaration, and the City Funded Parking Spaces will be subject to the terms and conditions of the Declaration such as easement rights, restrictions and rights of first refusal. With the City Funded Parking Spaces being
owned by the City, it is the parties’ intent that the City Funded Parking Spaces will not be subject to real estate taxes or assessments, and the parties will cooperate with another to attempt to accomplish such status. City makes no guarantees related to taxability.

Ownership and Management of Building: Initially, the Building will be owned by a special purpose entity owned or controlled by DeNunzio. The SPE will be responsible for managing and operating the Building, including the Parking Facility, or will retain a management company to do the same. Parking rates to be charged and the term of use will be determined at the discretion of the SPE. After conveyance of the City Funded Parking Spaces to the City, (1) the SPE will be paid an asset management and maintenance fee equal to 85% of the annual net profits generated from the City Funded Parking Spaces, and (2) the City will be paid 15% of the annual net profits generated from the City Funded Parking Spaces, all of which will be specified in the Development Agreement. All expenses related to the Parking Facility will be paid from the revenues received from the Parking Facility operation. The split of annual net profits will occur after all operating expenses have been paid. If the Parking Facility expenses exceed the total revenue, the SPE (owner or manager) will be responsible for payment of the shortfall. The intent is that the City will share in the split of the profits but not be responsible for any of the ongoing expenses, including any taxes. A Management Agreement will be executed between the City and the SPE identifying that the SPE or DeNunzio will maintain responsibility for any and all costs associated with repairing, maintaining and operating the Parking. The key terms and timing for entering into such agreement will be specified in the Development Agreement.

Use of Parking Facility by CUMC: CUMC would be entitled to use up to 120 parking spaces within the Parking Facility on Sunday’s and during additional days specified in the Development Agreement, all free of charge. CUMC’s right to use the Parking Facility will be established pursuant to an easement recorded against the Parking Facility or other written instrument.

Use of Parking Facility by City: If the Parking Facility is not at an operationally full capacity, as determined by the SPE, the City will have the right to use up to 20 parking spaces, free of charge, for City employees or other City-related business during normal business hours. If the Parking Facility is at operational capacity, the City may still lease any number of desired parking spaces at the lowest monthly rate offered by the SPE. A system for managing this process will be included in the Development Agreement.

Timeline: A proposed schedule identifying appropriate milestones will be defined in the Development Agreement, including any easily ascertainable definition of construction commencement.

Competition Exclusion: This paragraph applies to an exclusion zone that is defined as a ¼-mile radius from the center of the Property (the “Exclusion Area”). The City, so long as the Parking Facility is in operation, agrees that it does not intend to fund or develop any new off street parking (i.e. lot or deck) within the Exclusion Area for a period of 3 years from the date DeNunzio receives a final Certificate of Occupancy for the Building; however, should the City fund or build new off street parking, DeNunzio has the right to provide notice to purchase the City's interest in the
Parking Facility at Replacement Value, or the value of the City’s investment, whichever is greater. DeNunzio's right to purchase is their exclusive remedy related to competition. Details of this paragraph will be further defined as part of the Development Agreement. This provision shall not apply to land currently owned by the City.

**Non-Binding:** City and DeNunzio recognize that this Term Sheet is non-binding upon the parties but wish to use this document to establish the business terms and conditions of a final, legally binding Development Agreement. Either party may terminate negotiations at will, and without cause without any financial or legal responsibility.

Agreed and accepted this _______ day of February, 2019.

The DeNunzio Group, LLC

By: ____________________________
Name: Dustin J. DeNunzio
Title: Manager

Mayor Rick Kriseman,
City of St. Petersburg

Alan Delisle
City of St. Petersburg, City
City Development Administrator
Resolution No. 2019 -

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE ATTACHED TERM SHEET FOR A MIXED-USE PROJECT WITH PUBLIC PARKING, LOCATED ON THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF 1st AVENUE NORTH and 5th STREET, ST. PETERSBURG, AND LOCATED WITHIN A COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AREA; AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR, OR HIS DESIGNEE, TO NEGOTIATE A PURCHASE AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH THE DENUZIO GROUP, LLC, WHICH AGREEMENT WILL INCLUDE TERMS AND CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THE TERM SHEET AND BE SUBJECT TO CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHILFREAS, The DeNuzio Group, LLC ("DeNuzio") has proposed developing a approximately 25-story, mixed-use project with a parking garage on property currently under their control on the South East corner of 1st Avenue North and 5th Street, which is located within a Community Redevelopment Area ("CRA"); and

WHEREAS, as there is an ongoing need for public parking downtown, the City has proposed funding at least four levels of public parking, estimated to contain 75 parking spaces per level, at a price not-to-exceed $28,700 per space (approximately $8,610,000 for 300 spaces), at the proposed development; and

WHEREAS, City Administration has developed a term sheet ('Term Sheet') outlining the key business points in anticipation of presenting same to City Council for approval; and

WHEREAS, the Term Sheet is non-binding and states that either party may terminate negotiations at any time without financial or legal responsibility, but the City and DeNuzio wish to frame out the business terms and broad conditions of a final, binding agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Term Sheet has been reviewed and agreed to by DeNuzio, subject to City Council approval; and

WHEREAS, the transaction described in this report is consistent with the IRP objectives as it will enable the construction of a publicly-available structured parking facility west
of 3rd Street, where there is a lack of such facilities on a site specifically identified for them on Map 7 of the Intown Redevelopment Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE BF II RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida, that the Term Sheet for a mixed-use project with public parking located on the South East corner of 1st Avenue North and 5th Street, St. Petersburg, and located within a Community Redevelopment Area is hereby approved; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that City Council authorizes the Mayor, or his designee, to negotiate a Lease and Development Agreement ("Agreement") with The DeNuzio Group LLC, which Agreement will include terms and conditions consistent with the Term Sheet and be subject to City Council approval.

This Resolution becomes effective immediately upon its adoption.

LEGAL:

City Attorney (Designee)

APPROVED BY:

Evan Mory, Director
Transportation & Parking Management
The following page(s) contain the backup material for Agenda Item: A Resolution approving the interlocal agreement between the City of St. Petersburg, Florida (“City”), and Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (“PSTA”) for the City to provide funding to PSTA for the design, fabrication and installation of public art as part of the Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project; authorizing the Mayor or his designee to execute the interlocal agreement; and providing an effective date. Please scroll down to view the backup material.
ST. PETERSBURG CITY COUNCIL
REPORTS

Meeting of March 7, 2019

TO:    The Honorable Charlie Gerdes, Chair, and Members of City Council

SUBJECT: A Resolution approving the interlocal agreement between the City of St. Petersburg, Florida (“City”), and Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (“PSTA”) for the City to provide funding to PSTA for the design, fabrication and installation of public art as part of the Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project; authorizing the Mayor or his designee to execute the interlocal agreement; rescinding unencumbered appropriations in the Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement Fund (3027) in the amount of $167,971.36 from the Comprehensive Streetscape and Greenscape 13 Project (13762), $249,694.05 from the Comprehensive Streetscape and Greenscape 16 Project (15079), and $249,937.86 from the Comprehensive Streetscape and Greenscape 17 Project (15633); approving a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $667,603.27 from the unappropriated balance of the Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement Fund (3027), resulting from the rescissions, to the Art in Transit – Central Avenue Corridor BRT Project (TBD); rescinding an unencumbered appropriation in the Multimodal Impact Fees Capital Improvement Fund (3071) in the amount of $82,396.73 from the BRT Downtown Project (12588); approving a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $82,396.73 from the unappropriated balance of the Multimodal Impact Fees Capital Improvement Fund (3071), resulting from the rescission, to the Art in Transit – Central Avenue Corridor BRT Project (TBD); and providing an effective date.

EXPLANATION: City staff recommends that local funding in the Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement Fund (3027) and Multimodal Impact Fees Capital Improvement Fund (3071) reserved for the City’s Art in Transit Project ("AiT Project") be transferred to the PSTA so that PSTA can incorporate public art at future transit stations along the proposed Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project ("BRT Project") route. The BRT Project will provide a premium transit service that will operate primarily along 1st Avenues North and South with proposed service frequencies of 15 minutes from 6 a.m. to 8 p.m. and 30 minutes after 8 p.m. The BRT service will connect downtown St. Petersburg to St. Pete Beach and complement PSTA’s popular Central Avenue Trolley ("CAT") service. PSTA recently completed 30% design plans for the BRT service and anticipates completing final design plans and receiving funding from the Federal Transit Administration ("FTA") to begin constructing the BRT Project in late 2019. The BRT service will be a rapid service because it will have a limited number of stations, which will be located near the major north-south streets along the 1st Avenues. The BRT stations will have more amenities than a typical bus stop and will provide a comfortable and pleasant environment for transit riders that would be enhanced by public art.

The City and PSTA began studying the feasibility of a BRT service along the Central Avenue corridor in the early to mid-2000s. PSTA completed its first study in 2007, but the recession occurred and PSTA did not have enough revenue to implement a new service. In preparation for the BRT service that would hopefully occur when the economy improved, the City applied for
federal grants to implement the Central Avenue BRT Corridor Enhancement Project ("Corridor Enhancement Project"). The purpose of the Corridor Enhancement Project is to enhance the Central Avenue corridor from downtown to 66th Street through a series of pedestrian improvements, such as new ADA accessible curb ramps and sidewalks, primarily along the major north-south streets between the BRT stations on the 1st Avenues and Central Avenue. The City received a 2009 Congressional Earmark in the amount of $475,000 and a 2010 Congressional Earmark in the amount of $500,000 for FTA Section 5309 grant funds to implement the Corridor Enhancement Project.

The City planned to spend up to $500,000 in Penny funds and $500,000 in Transportation Impact Fee funds (now called Multimodal Impact Fee funds) to augment the federal funds that were received. A local match, however, was not required for the City to receive the federal funds. The FTA Section 5309 Program required a 20% local match, which the State of Florida agreed to provide through its toll credit program. This credit could be used instead of local funds to free up local funds that otherwise would have been used to match federal aid for other uses.

The City completed the Central Avenue Revitalization Plan ("CARP") in 2012. Since the BRT Project was not progressing as anticipated and the CAT had become a very popular service between downtown St. Petersburg and St. Pete Beach, the City considered shifting the local Penny and Impact Fee funds towards the CAT by improving the transit shelters and other features on Central Avenue instead of focusing primarily on the BRT route. The City is still required to spend the federal funds on pedestrian connections between the 1st Avenues and Central Avenue. This would also still serve the riders on the CAT and popular routes on the 1st Avenues and other pedestrians by providing safer pedestrian facilities, particularly those with mobility challenges, through new and repaired sidewalks as well as up to date ADA ramps. In coordination with the implementation of the Corridor Enhancement Project improvements that would be designed and built with federal funds, the City initiated the AiT Project to develop an overarching artistic concept for the entire length of Central Avenue and a series of artistic transit stops on Central Avenue between 4th and 28th Streets.

To implement the AiT Project, the City’s Office of Cultural Affairs issued a Request for Qualifications in May of 2013 and received proposals from 11 artists/artist teams. The AiT Project Committee selected Mickett Stackhouse Studio, LLC ("Artist"). The City and Artist entered into an agreement on January 21, 2014 to develop and create the artist master concept for the Central Avenue Corridor. The Artist prepared an artist master concept and received support from the AiT Project Committee, Arts Advisory Committee, Public Arts Commission and Central Avenue Council. The St. Petersburg City Council acknowledged such concept on July 24, 2014 and Administration commenced contract negotiations with the Artist for the design, fabrication and installation of artist transit stops. Due to several contractual requirements, the parties were unable to move forward with an agreement.

In 2015, PSTA received funding from the FDOT to begin a new project development study for the BRT service. PSTA completed the study in September 2017 and submitted a Small Starts application to the FTA, which has received a very favorable evaluation. Since the BRT Project has been progressing steadily, it is appropriate to focus the investment of the City’s local funds again on the BRT service. City staff worked with the Artist and PSTA staff to develop an
alternative approach for incorporating public art along the Central Avenue corridor. PSTA was receptive to hiring the Artist to work on a public art component for the BRT stations. In the past, up to 2% of FTA funds could be used on public art, but FTA funds now cannot be spent on public art. The local funds provide a unique opportunity to incorporate artistic elements at the BRT stations that would not be possible otherwise.

If City Council approves the interlocal agreement with PSTA, the Artist would work for PSTA as a subconsultant under the direction of PSTA’s design consultant, H.W. Lochner, Inc. City staff recommends that City Council approve the interlocal agreement so that the $750,000 that was designated for the AiT Project be provided to PSTA for the design, fabrication and installation of public art as part of the BRT Project.

Incorporating public art into the BRT Project is anticipated to bring major benefits to the Central Avenue corridor, including to Central Avenue via the benefits of premium transit and art. Additionally, City and PSTA staff will work with the Central Avenue Council and other entities to upgrade the existing transit stops with PSTA’s modern and attractive shelters to improve the aesthetic of Central Avenue and further improve the Central Avenue Trolley rider experience. Additionally, ridership will be studied to determine if additional existing stops without shelters should have new shelters added. City funds exist to implement these improvements in the Comprehensive Streetscape and Greenscape program in the Penny Fund, as well as the new CIP project specifically created to participate in PSTA’s shelter match program.

COST/FUNDING/ASSESSMENT INFORMATION: Funding would be available to provide $750,000 to PSTA for the public art component of the Central Avenue BRT Project, after the approval of the rescission of unencumbered appropriations in the Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement Fund (3027) in the amount of $167,971.36 from the Comprehensive Streetscape and Greenscape 13 Project (13762), $249,694.05 from the Comprehensive Streetscape and Greenscape 16 Project (15079), and $249,937.86 from the Comprehensive Streetscape and Greenscape 17 Project (15633); a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $667,603.27 from the unappropriated balance of the Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement Fund (3027), resulting from the rescissions, to the Art in Transit – Central Avenue Corridor BRT Project (TBD); the rescission of an unencumbered appropriation in the Multimodal Impact Fees Capital Improvement Fund (3071) in the amount of $82,396.73 from the BRT Downtown Project (12588); and a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $82,396.73 from the unappropriated balance of the Multimodal Impact Fees Capital Improvement Fund (3071), resulting from the rescission, to the Art in Transit – Central Avenue Corridor BRT Project (TBD).

RECOMMENDATION: Administration recommends that City Council adopt the attached resolution approving the interlocal agreement between the City of St. Petersburg, Florida ("City"), and Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority ("PSTA") for the City to provide funding to PSTA for the design, fabrication and installation of public art as part of the Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project; authorizing the Mayor or his designee to execute the interlocal agreement; and providing an effective date.

ATTACHMENTS: Resolution Interlocal Agreement
APPROVALS:
Administration:
Budget:
A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA ("CITY"), AND PINELLAS SUNCOAST TRANSIT AUTHORITY ("PSTA") FOR THE CITY TO PROVIDE FUNDING TO PSTA FOR THE DESIGN, FABRICATION AND INSTALLATION OF PUBLIC ART AS PART OF THE CENTRAL AVENUE BUS RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT; AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR HIS DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT; RESCINDING UNENCUMBERED APPROPRIATIONS IN THE CITYWIDE INFRASTRUCTURE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND (3027) IN THE AMOUNT OF $167,971.36 FROM THE COMPREHENSIVE STREETSCAPE AND GREENSCAPE 13 PROJECT (13762), $249,694.05 FROM THE COMPREHENSIVE STREETSCAPE AND GREENSCAPE 16 PROJECT (15079), AND $249,937.86 FROM THE COMPREHENSIVE STREETSCAPE AND GREENSCAPE 17 PROJECT (15633); APPROVING A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION IN THE AMOUNT OF $667,603.27 FROM THE UNAPPROPRIATED BALANCE OF THE CITYWIDE INFRASTRUCTURE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND (3027), RESULTING FROM THE RESCISSIONS, TO THE ART IN TRANSIT – CENTRAL AVENUE CORRIDOR BRT PROJECT (TBD); RESCINDING AN UNENCUMBERED APPROPRIATION IN THE MULTIMODAL IMPACT FEES CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND (3071) IN THE AMOUNT OF $82,396.73 FROM THE BRT DOWNTOWN PROJECT (12588); APPROVING A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION IN THE AMOUNT OF $82,396.73 FROM THE UNAPPROPRIATED BALANCE OF THE MULTIMODAL IMPACT FEES CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND (3071), RESULTING FROM THE RESCISSION, TO THE ART IN TRANSIT – CENTRAL AVENUE CORRIDOR BRT PROJECT (TBD); AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Central Avenue corridor has the highest transit ridership of any travel market in the region and is a key focus area for redevelopment in St. Petersburg and Pinellas County; and

WHEREAS, Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority ("PSTA") and the Florida Department of Transportation funded the project development phase of the Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project under the guidance of the Federal Transit Administration’s Small Starts process; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Transit Administration ("FTA") has provided a favorable rating for the project, which allows the project to advance in the FTA process; and

WHEREAS, PSTA and the City of St. Petersburg, Florida ("City") have worked in partnership to develop and analyze alternative routes to connect the regionally significant activity center of downtown St. Petersburg with Pinellas County’s tourist-driven economic base along the Gulf Coast beaches; and
WHEREAS, the City and PSTA have developed capital elements to be included in the project, including but not limited to a semi-dedicated bus lane, construction of new station/stops designed for a limited stop service, reconstruction of the 1st Avenue North and 1st Avenue South corridors as needed, and improved traffic signal technology; and

WHEREAS, in September 2017, PSTA submitted the project to the FTA Capital Investment Grant Small Starts rating process; and

WHEREAS, in 2018, PSTA entered into an agreement with H.W. Lochner, Inc. to design the project; and

WHEREAS, the City has a robust and vibrant public art experience and exposure to culture through various art forms; and

WHEREAS, the City and PSTA recognize that the aesthetic diversity provided by art throughout a community is vital to the quality of life, health, and general welfare of citizens, visitors, and patrons; and

WHEREAS, the City and PSTA desire to incorporate art into the project and enter into an Interlocal Agreement for the City to provide funding to PSTA for the design, fabrication and installation of public art as part of the project; and

WHEREAS, funds needed for this agreement will be available after (i) a rescission in the amount of $167,971.36 from the Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement Fund (3027), Comprehensive Streetscape and Greenscape 13 Project (13762); (ii) a rescission in the amount of $249,649.05 from the Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement Fund (3027), Comprehensive Streetscape and Greenscape 16 Project (15079); (iii) a rescission in the amount of $249,937.86 from the Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement Fund (3027), Comprehensive Streetscape and Greenscape 17 Project (15633); (iv) a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $667,603.27 from the unappropriated balance of the Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement Fund (3027) to the Art in Transit – Central Avenue Corridor BRT Project (TBD); (v) a rescission in the amount of $82,396.73 from the Multimodal Impact Fees Capital Improvement Fund (3071), BRT Downtown Project (12588); and (vi) a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $82,396.73 from the unappropriated balance of the Multimodal Impact Fees Capital Improvement Fund (3071) to the Art in Transit – Central Avenue Corridor BRT Project (TBD).

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida, that the Interlocal Agreement between the City of St. Petersburg, Florida ("City"), and Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority ("PSTA") for the City to provide funding to PSTA for the design, fabrication and installation of public art as part of the Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project is hereby approved.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor or his designee is authorized to execute the Interlocal Agreement.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the appropriation in the amount of $167,971.36 from the Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement Fund (3027), Comprehensive Streetscape and Greenscape 13 Project (13762) is hereby rescinded.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the appropriation in the amount of $249,694.05 from the Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement Fund (3027), Comprehensive Streetscape and Greenscape 16 Project (15079) is hereby rescinded.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the appropriation in the amount of $249,937.86 from the Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement Fund (3027), Comprehensive Streetscape and Greenscape 17 Project (15633) is hereby rescinded.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that there is hereby approved from the unappropriated balance of the Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement Fund (3027) the following supplemental appropriation for FY19:

Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement Fund (3027)
Art in Transit – Central Avenue Corridor BRT Project (TBD) $667,603.27

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the appropriation in the amount of $82,396.73 from the Multimodal Impact Fees Capital Improvement Fund (3071), BRT Downtown Project (12588) is hereby rescinded.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that there is hereby approved from the unappropriated balance of the Multimodal Impact Fees Capital Improvement Fund (3071) the following supplemental appropriation for FY19:

Multimodal Impact Fees Capital Improvement Fund (3071)
Art in Transit – Central Avenue Corridor BRT Project (TBD) $82,396.73

This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

Approvals:

City Attorney (Designee)

Budget

Administration

00431620
INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT

THIS INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT ("Agreement") is made and entered into as of this day of __________, 2019 by and between the City of St. Petersburg, Florida ("City") and Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority ("PSTA").

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the Central Avenue corridor has the highest transit ridership of any travel market in the region and is a key focus area for redevelopment in St. Petersburg and Pinellas County; and

WHEREAS, PSTA has proposed a regionally significant major capital transit investment project that could be the first premium transit project in the Tampa Bay region to receive funding from the Federal Transit Administration Capital Investment Grant Program for passenger rail and premium bus projects; and

WHEREAS, PSTA and the Florida Department of Transportation funded the project development phase of the Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project ("BRT Project") under the guidance of the Federal Transit Administration’s Small Starts process; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Transit Administration ("FTA") has provided a favorable rating for the BRT Project, which allows the BRT Project to advance in the FTA process; and

WHEREAS, PSTA and the City have worked in partnership to develop and analyze alternative routes to connect the regionally significant activity center of downtown St. Petersburg with the County’s tourist-driven economic base along the Gulf Coast beaches; and

WHEREAS, the City has worked cooperatively with PSTA in the development of the capital elements to be included in the BRT Project, including but not limited to a semi-dedicated bus lane, construction of new station/stops designed for a limited stop service, reconstruction of the 1st Avenue North and 1st Avenue South corridors as needed, and improved traffic signal technology; and

WHEREAS, in September 2017, PSTA submitted the BRT Project to the FTA Capital Investment Grant Small Starts rating process; and

WHEREAS, in 2018, PSTA entered into an agreement with H.W. Lochner, Inc. to design the BRT Project; and

WHEREAS, the City has a robust and vibrant public art experience and exposure to culture through various art forms; and

WHEREAS, the City and PSTA recognize that the aesthetic diversity provided by art throughout a community is vital to the quality of life, health, and general welfare of citizens, visitors, and patrons; and
WHEREAS, the City and PSTA desire to incorporate art into the BRT Project; and

WHEREAS, the City desires to provide funding to PSTA for the design, fabrication and installation of public art as part of the BRT Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the foregoing recitals (all of which are hereby adopted as an integral part of this Agreement), the mutual promises, covenants, and conditions herein contained and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and adequacy of which are hereby acknowledged, the City and PSTA hereby agree as follows:

1. PURPOSE

The City and PSTA desire to enter into this Agreement for the City to provide funding for the design, fabrication and installation of public art as part of the BRT Project.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE BRT PROJECT

The BRT Project is a premium transit route that will connect the Innovation District, in downtown St. Petersburg to St. Pete Beach (11 miles one way), along 3rd and 4th Streets, 1st Avenues North and South, Pasadena Avenue, Corey Causeway and Gulf Boulevard. The BRT Project consists of 17 stations, a service frequency of 15 minutes during daytime hours, and a proposed service span from 6 a.m. to midnight, seven days per week. Stations will be built to serve as the stops and offer level boarding as well as off-bus fare payment opportunities to increase efficiency of operations. The stations will include shelters and/or other amenities which will provide an opportunity for the inclusion of public art as part of the station design in St. Petersburg.

3. AGREEMENTS FOR THE BRT PROJECT

PSTA shall be responsible for contracting with the necessary persons or entities to accomplish the (i) design and construction of the BRT Project and (ii) design, fabrication and installation of public art as part of the BRT Project. PSTA shall be solely responsible for and in control of the design and construction of the BRT Project and the design, fabrication, and installation of public art as part of the BRT Project, including but not limited to procurement and selection of a general contractor and engineer, preparation of the specifications and final site plans for the BRT Project, and ensuring that all necessary licenses and permits are obtained for the completion of the BRT Project. Any contractor and/or engineer retained to work on the BRT Project will be selected by PSTA pursuant to PSTA purchasing and procurement procedures. Nothing herein shall be construed as a restriction on PSTA’s ability to select such contractor or the engineer, to reject any and all bids, or take any other action during the procurement or construction process. PSTA shall own all improvements made as part of the BRT Project and shall be solely responsible for maintaining, operating, and repairing the BRT Project, as needed and in PSTA’s sole discretion.
Notwithstanding the foregoing, the City will provide input and recommendations on the design and selection of public art to be incorporated into the BRT Project and both parties shall approve the public art selected to be incorporated into the BRT Project.

PSTA shall not be liable to the City for any delays in completing the BRT Project, including but not limited to any delays in connection with PSTA’s contractor(s), manufacturer(s), supplier(s) or agents thereof, or the selection and approval of the public art to be incorporated into the BRT Project.

4. FUNDING AND REIMBURSEMENT

A. The City shall pay PSTA seven hundred fifty thousand dollars ($750,000) towards the design, fabrication and installation of public art as part of the BRT Project within sixty (60) days after the effective date of this Agreement.

B. In the event that PSTA does not obtain the necessary funding to construct the BRT Project within five (5) years after the effective date of this Agreement, any of the funds paid to PSTA for the design, fabrication and installation of public art as part of the BRT Project that are not expended or are contractually committed and not retained by PSTA or paid/re-paid to PSTA shall be reimbursed to the City.

C. In the event this Agreement is terminated pursuant to paragraph 6 or paragraph 15, any of the funds paid to PSTA for the design, fabrication and installation of public art as part of the BRT Project that are not expended or are contractually committed and not retained by PSTA or paid/re-paid to PSTA shall be reimbursed to the City.

5. NO LIABILITY

The City shall not be responsible for or incur any liability for any claims or demands arising out of or in connection with (i) the design and construction of the BRT Project or (ii) the design, fabrication and installation of public art as part of the BRT Project.

The City and PSTA shall be responsible for their respective employees’ acts of negligence when such employees are acting within the scope of their employment, and shall only be liable for any damages resulting from said negligence to the extent permitted by Section 768.28, Florida Statues. Nothing herein is intended to serve as a waiver of sovereign immunity by either the City or PSTA. Nothing herein shall be construed as consent by the City or PSTA to be sued by third parties in any matter arising out of this Agreement.

6. TERMINATION

Either party may terminate this Agreement for any reason upon sixty (60) days prior written notice to the other party.
7. EFFECTIVE DATE AND TERM OF AGREEMENT

PSTA shall be responsible for filing this Agreement with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Pinellas County and this Agreement shall be effective on the date of such filing.

The term of this Agreement shall commence on the effective date of this Agreement and shall terminate upon completion of the construction of the BRT Project, unless earlier terminated as provided for herein.

8. AMENDMENTS

This Agreement may be modified or amended only by a document in writing executed by the City and PSTA with the same formality of this Agreement.

9. GOVERNING LAW

The laws of the State of Florida shall govern this Agreement.

10. RELATIONSHIP OF PARTIES

Nothing contained herein shall be deemed or construed by the parties, nor by any third party, as creating the relationship of principal and agent or landlord and tenant or of partnership or of joint venture between the City and PSTA.

11. SEVERABILITY

Should any paragraph or portion of any paragraph of this Agreement be rendered void, invalid or unenforceable by any court of law for any reason, such determination shall not render void, invalid or unenforceable any other section or any part of any other section of this Agreement.

12. NOTICES

Unless and to the extent otherwise provided in this Agreement, all notices, demands, requests for approvals and other communications which are required to be given by one party to another shall be in writing and shall be deemed given and delivered on the date delivered in person, upon the expiration of five (5) days following the date mailed by registered or certified mail, postage prepaid, return receipt requested to the address provided below, or upon the date delivered by overnight courier (signature required) to the address provided below.

If to PSTA:
Chief Executive Officer
Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority
3201 Scherer Drive
St. Petersburg, Florida 33716
Fax No. 727-540-1913

If to the City:
Director, Transportation & Parking Mgt.
City of St. Petersburg
One 4th Street N.
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
Fax No. 727-551-3326
With required copy to:
Alan S. Zimmet, General Counsel
Bryant Miller Olive, P.A.
One Tampa City Center, Suite 2700
Tampa, FL 33602
Fax: (813) 223-2705

13. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

This Agreement reflects the full and complete agreement between the City and PSTA regarding the subject matter contained herein and supersedes all prior or contemporaneous agreements (whether oral or written) between them regarding the subject matter contained herein.

14. SURVIVAL

All obligations and rights of any party arising during or attributable to the period prior to expiration or earlier termination of this Agreement shall survive such expiration or earlier termination.

15. NON-APPROPRIATION

The obligations of the City as to any funding required pursuant to this Agreement shall be limited to an obligation in any given year to budget, appropriate and pay from legally available funds, after monies for essential City services have been budgeted and appropriated, sufficient monies for the funding that is required during that year. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the City shall not be prohibited from pledging any legally available non-ad valorem revenues for any obligations heretofore or hereafter incurred, which pledge shall be prior and superior to any obligations of the City pursuant to this Agreement. In the event PSTA, in its sole discretion, determines that sufficient budgeted funds are not available to appropriate for its respective costs of the BRT Project, PSTA shall notify the City of such occurrence, return any unexpended funds to the City pursuant to paragraph 4.C., and this Agreement shall automatically terminate and be of no further force or effect.

16. FORCE MAJEURE

Neither party shall be liable for its non-performance or delayed performance under this Agreement if caused by Force Majeure. Force Majeure shall be defined as a fire, flood, act of God, war, terrorism, riot, national emergency, sabotage, civil disturbance, strike, labor dispute, governmental act, law, ordinance, rule or regulation, or events which are not the fault or are beyond the control of the party.

REMAINING PORTION INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement as of the
day and year first written above.

CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA

By: ____________________________
    Rick Kriseman, as its Mayor

Approved as to Form and Content

City Attorney (Designee)
00429352 2-11-19 version

City Clerk
(SEAL)

PINELLAS SUNCOAST TRANSIT AUTHORITY

By: ____________________________
    Chief Executive Officer

Approved as to form:

for
Alan S. Zimmer, General Counsel

ATTEST

By: ____________________________
    Rachael Cappella,
    Executive Assistant
The following page(s) contain the backup material for Agenda Item: Sewer Report
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To: The Honorable Charlie Gerdes, Chair, and Members of City Council

Subject: Accepting a bid from TLC Diversified, Inc. in the amount of $1,678,985.00 for Lift Station No. 11, Snell Isle Boulevard Rehabilitation Project. (Engineering Project No. 16068-111; Oracle No. 14218); approving a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $954,392 from the unappropriated balance of the Water Resources Capital Projects Fund (4003) to the LST #11 Snell Isle Rehab Project (14218).

Explanation: The Procurement and Supply Management Department received two (2) bids for rehabilitation of Lift Station No. 11. The bids were opened on January 10, 2019, and tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidder</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.V. Diversified, LLC (West Palm Beach, FL)</td>
<td>$1,240,989.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC Diversified, Inc. (Palmetto, FL)</td>
<td>$1,678,985.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contractor will provide all labor, material, and equipment necessary for demolition of the existing lift station, construction of a 12" PVC gravity sanitary sewer, construction of a 12' diameter fiberglass reinforced pipe wet well, construction of a ductile iron force main, construction of a new pumping system, and associated electrical construction of a concrete wall and all related restoration.

The Procurement and Supply Management Department, in cooperation with the Engineering and Capital Improvements Department, recommends an award to:

TLC Diversified, Inc. (Palmetto, FL)................................. $1,678,985.00

The contractor pre-qualifications required bidders to have successfully completed a minimum of three (3) projects of a similar type as the project being bid during the past five (5) years and for the project superintendent to have successfully completed a minimum of three (3) similar projects during the past five (5) years; also each project should have had a minimum value of $750,000 in construction costs and with the minimum of a 30 horsepower pump in a duplex configuration.

The apparent low bidder, T.V. Diversified, LLC, did not submit any individual projects which met the minimum construction costs or the horsepower pump and configuration requirements. For the above reasons, and in accordance with the bid documents, the proposal submitted by T.V. Diversified, LLC is deemed non-responsive.

TLC Diversified, Inc. the lowest responsible and responsive bidder, has met the specifications, terms and conditions of Bid No. 7148 dated December 5, 2019. They have performed similar work for the cities of Bradenton, St. Pete Beach, and Orange and Hillsborough Counties and have performed satisfactorily. They are currently under contract with the City for the NEWRF and NWWRF Sludge Transfer Force Mains, Pump Stations, and Odor Control project in the amount of $5,722,777. References have been checked and are acceptable. The principals of the firm are Thurston Lamberson, president and Joanne R. Lamberson, vice president.
The contractor is compliant with City Code 2-296 through 2-297 Major Construction Projects Requirements for Employing Apprentices.

The contractor will begin work approximately ten calendar days from written notice to proceed. Work Completion is scheduled within two hundred and forty (240) consecutive calendar days thereafter.

**Cost/Funding/Assessment Information:** A portion of the funding has been previously appropriated in the Water Resources Capital Projects Fund (4003), in the amount of $724,593 in the LST #11 Snell Isle Rehab Project (14218). Additional funding will be available following a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $954,392 from the unappropriated balance of the Water Resources Capital Projects Fund (4003), to the LST #11 Snell Isle Rehab Project (14218).

**Attachments:** Resolution

**Approvals:**

[Administrative signature]

[Budget signature]
RESOLUTION 2019-__

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE BID AND APPROVING THE AWARD OF AN AGREEMENT TO TLC DIVERSIFIED, INC. FOR THE LIFT STATION NO. 11, SNELL ISLE BOULEVARD REHABILITATION PROJECT FOR A TOTAL CONTRACT AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $1,678,985; AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR HIS DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE ALL DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THIS TRANSACTION; APPROVING A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION IN THE AMOUNT OF $954,392 FROM THE UNAPPROPRIATED BALANCE OF THE WATER RESOURCES CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND (4003) TO THE LST #11 SNELL ISLE REHAB PROJECT (14218); AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Procurement & Supply Management Department received two (2) bids for the Lift Station No. 11, Snell Isle Boulevard Rehabilitation Project pursuant to Bid No. 7148, dated December 5, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the apparent low bidder, T.V. Diversified, LLC, was non-responsive; and

WHEREAS, TLC Diversified, Inc. the lowest responsible and responsive bidder, has met the specifications, terms and conditions of Bid No. 7148; and

WHEREAS, a portion of the funding has been previously appropriated in the Water Resources Capital Projects Fund (4003) and additional funding for this project will be available after a supplemental appropriation from the unappropriated balance of the Water Resources Capital Projects Fund (4003) to the LST #11 Snell Isle Rehab Project (14218); and

WHEREAS, the Procurement & Supply Management Department, in cooperation with the Water Resources Department, recommends approval of this resolution.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida that the bid is hereby accepted and the award of an agreement to TLC Diversified, Inc. for the Lift Station No. 11, Snell Isle Boulevard Rehabilitation Project for a total contract amount not to exceed $1,678,985 is hereby approved.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor or his designee is hereby authorized to execute all documents necessary to effectuate this transaction.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that there is hereby approved from the unappropriated balance of the Water Resources Capital Projects Fund (4003) the following supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 2019:

Water Resources Capital Projects Fund (4003)
LST #11 Snell Isle Rehab Project (14218) $954,392

This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

APPROVALS:

City Attorney (designee)

Budget
ST. PETERSBURG CITY COUNCIL

Sewer Report

Meeting of March 7, 2019

TO: The Honorable Charles Gerdes, Chair and Members of City Council

SUBJECT: A Resolution authorizing the Mayor or his designee to execute Task Order No. 16-05-MC/W ("Task Order") to the architect/engineering agreement between the City of St. Petersburg, Florida and McKim & Creed, Inc. ("A/E") dated December 5, 2016 for A/E to provide funding for project administration, data collection and review, topographical survey, subsurface utility engineering services, geotechnical services, preliminary design services, final design services, permitting, and bidding services related to the Downtown Water Main Replacement Phase III Project in an amount not to exceed $178,207.55 (ECID Project No. 19047-111; Oracle No. 15939); and providing an effective date.

EXPLANATION: The City intends to replace cast iron pipelines installed in the 1940s, and has identified aging water main infrastructure in the downtown area in need of replacement. Due to the aging infrastructure, the City will be replacing approximately 3500 linear feet of 12-inch diameter water mains on 7th Street South between Central Avenue and 2nd Avenue South and, 2nd Avenue South between 7th Street South and 1st Street Southeast.

On December 5, 2016, City Council approved an A/E Agreement between the City of St. Petersburg and McKim & Creed, Inc. ("A/E") for potable water, wastewater, and reclaimed water projects.

Task Order No. 16-05-MC/W in the amount of $178,207.55 will provide funding for project administration, data collection and review, topographical survey, subsurface utility engineering services, geotechnical services, preliminary design services, final design services, permitting, and bidding services. The work will be within the existing public rights-of-way. Existing pipes will be removed or decommissioned in place, and new 12-inch pipes will be constructed to replace the existing pipes. Fire hydrants and existing meters will be connected to the new pipe. Construction methods may include open cut, horizontal directional drilling and pipe bursting, to minimize the potential for traffic disruptions and unnecessary inconveniences during the construction. The work will also include restoration of roadways and disturbed areas.

Task Order No. 16-05-MC/W includes the following phases and associated not to exceed costs respectively:

- Project Administration $ 8,818.78 (New)
- Topographical Survey $ 4,263.76 (New)
- Data Collection and Review $ 45,321.96 (New)
- Subsurface Utility Engineering Services $ 26,655.14 (New)
- Geotechnical Services $ 8,029.53 (New)
- Preliminary Design Services $ 11,690.42 (New)
- Final Design Services $ 48,147.84 (New)
- Permitting Services $ 8,771.96 (New)
- Bidding Services $ 6,508.16 (New)
- Allowance $ 10,000.00 (New)

Total $ 178,207.55

A/E services during the construction phase will be provided to Council for approval as an Amendment to this Task Order.
Contractor costs for the improvements will be provided to Council for approval as a separate agreement.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Administration recommends approving a Resolution authorizing the Mayor or his designee to execute Task Order No. 16-05-MC/W ("Task Order") to the architect/engineering agreement between the City of St. Petersburg, Florida ("City") and McKim & Creed, Inc. ("A/E") dated December 5, 2016 for A/E to provide funding for project administration, data collection and review, topographical survey, subsurface utility engineering services, geotechnical services, preliminary design services, final design services, permitting, and bidding services related to the Downtown Water Main Replacement Phase III Project in an amount not to exceed $178,207.55 (ECID Project No. 19047-111; Oracle No. 15939); and providing an effective date.

**COST/FUNDING/ASSESSMENT INFORMATION:** Funds have been previously appropriated in the Water Resources Capital Projects Fund (4003) DIS Downtown Main Repl FY17/18 Project (15939).

**ATTACHMENTS:**
- Resolution
- Task Order No. 16-05-MC/W
- Map

**APPROVALS:**

[Signature]
Administrative

[Signature]
Budget
RESOLUTION 2019-____

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR HIS DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE TASK ORDER NO. 16-05-MC/W ("TASK ORDER") TO THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEERING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA AND MCKIM & CREED, INC. ("A/E") DATED DECEMBER 5, 2016 FOR A/E TO PROVIDE PROJECT ADMINISTRATION, DATA COLLECTION AND REVIEW, TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY, SUBSURFACE UTILITY ENGINEERING SERVICES, GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES, PRELIMINARY DESIGN SERVICES, FINAL DESIGN SERVICES, PERMITTING, AND BIDDING SERVICES RELATED TO THE DOWNTOWN WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT PHASE III PROJECT IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $178,207.55 (ECID PROJECT NO. 19047-111; ORACLE NO. 15939); AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City of St. Petersburg, Florida and McKim & Creed, Inc. ("A/E") entered into an architect/engineering agreement on December 5, 2016 for A/E to provide miscellaneous professional services for Potable Water, Wastewater, and Reclaimed Water Projects; and

WHEREAS, Administration desires to issue Task Order No. 16-05-MC/W in an amount not to exceed $178,207.55 for A/E to provide project administration, data collection and review, topographical survey, subsurface utility engineering services, geotechnical services, preliminary design services, final design services, permitting, and bidding services related to the Downtown Water Main Replacement Phase III Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida, that the Mayor or his designee is hereby authorized to execute Task Order No. 16-05-MC/W to the architect/engineering agreement between the City of St. Petersburg, Florida and McKim & Creed, Inc. ("A/E") dated December 5, 2016 for A/E to provide project administration, data collection and review, topographical survey, subsurface utility engineering services, geotechnical services, preliminary design services, final design services, permitting, and bidding services related to the Downtown Water Main Replacement Phase III Project in an amount not to exceed $178,207.55.

This resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

Approved by:

Legal Department
By: (City Attorney or Designee)
00430749

Approved by:

Brijesh Prayman, P.E., SP, ENV
Engineering & Capital Improvements Director
MEMORANDUM
CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG
Engineering and Capital Improvements Department

TO: The Honorable Charles Gerdes, Chair, and City Councilmembers

FROM: Brejesh Prayman, P.E., ENV SP, Director
       Engineering & Capital Improvements Department

RE: Consultant Selection Information
    Firm: McKim & Creed, Inc.
    Task Order No. 16-05-MC/W in the amount of $178,207.55

This memorandum is to provide information pursuant to City Council Policy and Procedures Manual, Chapter 3, Section I(F.) for agenda package information.

1. Summary of Reasons for Selection

   The project involves design, permitting and bidding for replacement of an existing 12-inch diameter water mains on 7th Street South between Central Avenue and 2nd Avenue South and, 2nd Avenue South between 7th Street South and 1st Street Southeast.

   McKim & Creed, Inc. has satisfactorily completed similar work under pervious A/E Annual Master Agreements in 2012, and is familiar with the City Standards.

   McKim & Creed, Inc. has significant experience in the design, permitting and construction phase activities in pipeline design.

   This is the fifth Task Order issued under the 2016 Master Agreement.

2. Transaction Report listing current work – See Attachment A
### ATTACHMENT A

Transaction Report
for
McKim & Creed, Inc.

Miscellaneous Professional Services for Potable Water, Wastewater and Reclaimed Water Projects
A/E Agreement Effective - December 5, 2016
A/E Agreement Expiration - November 2, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Order No.</th>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>NTP Issued</th>
<th>Authorized Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>WRD</td>
<td>FY18 Water Resources Utility Rate Study</td>
<td>03/03/17</td>
<td>89,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>SPTO</td>
<td>FY18 Stormwater Utility Rate Study</td>
<td>03/03/17</td>
<td>99,870.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>18091-111</td>
<td>31st Street South 12-Inch Water Main Improvements</td>
<td>05/10/18</td>
<td>144,930.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>WRD</td>
<td>FY19 Water Resources Utility Rate Study</td>
<td>03/27/18</td>
<td>102,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>19047-111</td>
<td>Downtown Water Main Replacement Phase III</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>436,120.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TASK ORDER NO. 16-05-MCW
DOWNTOWN WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT - PHASE III
MISCELLANEOUS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR POTABLE WATER,
WASTEWATER AND RECLAIMED WATER PROJECTS
CITY PROJECT NO. 19047-111

This Task Order No. 16-05-MCW is made and entered into this ____ day of
__________________, 201__, pursuant to the ARCHITECT/ENGINEERING AGREEMENT FOR
MISCELLANEOUS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR POTABLE WATER, WASTEWATER AND
RECLAIMED WATER PROJECTS dated December 5, 2016 ("Agreement") between McKim &
Creed, Inc. ("A/E"), and the City of St. Petersburg, Florida ("City"), and upon execution shall
become a part of the Agreement.

I. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The City continues to be proactive in its effort to replace aging infrastructure within the
downtown are to avoid emergency repairs, thus minimizing service impacts to the local
businesses.

The A/E will design replacement of approximately 3,500 linear feet of 12-inch water main
with a new 12-inch water main at the following locations:

- 7th Street South between Central Avenue and 2nd Avenue South
- 2nd Avenue South between 7th Street South and 1st Street Southeast

Figure 1: Project Limits
II. **SCOPE OF SERVICES**

**TASK 1 – PROJECT ADMINISTRATION**

Develop project documents and filing systems for the project that will include project set-up, Project Management Plan, Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Plan, hard and electronic filing systems, sub-consultant agreements and monthly invoices as necessary for these services. The A/E will also hold an internal kick-off meeting with the design team to discuss the project scope, the project schedule, safety procedures, and to establish responsibilities.

Attend a Kick-Off Meeting with the City to review project goals, scope of work, project schedule and administrative issues. A/E will prepare meeting minutes and distribute via email to the attendees.

Prepare and electronically submit Monthly Project Status Reports to the City on the progress of this scope of work for each month during the design phase services.

**TASK 2 – DATA COLLECTION AND REVIEW**

Review information made available that pertains to the project area including City atlas maps, record drawings and intersection maps. The A/E will perform a site visit of the area to become familiar with unique features and challenges of the project.

**TASK 3 – TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY**

A/E will perform a full Rights-of-Way topographical survey within the project limits shown in Figure 1 including:

- Drainage system inlets; junction boxes; and where accessible, pipe inverts, size, type and direction; end structures; canals; ditches and swales.
- Visible above ground water equipment, including valves, hydrants, and meters.
- Sanitary sewer manholes, invert, size, type and direction.
- Other visible above ground utilities including; gas, electrical power distribution and transmission, telephone equipment, cable TV equipment, utility and traffic poles and any other above ground utilities not mentioned above.
- Trees 4" or greater DBH, size and type; shrubs and landscaping within the project limits.
- Improvements belonging to private owners located within or along the Rights-of-Way, i.e., fences, planters, mailboxes.
- Driveways and sidewalks including the surface type.
- Site elevations on a maximum 50 foot grid, at grade breaks, at changes in direction on curbing/paving.
• All elevations will be referenced to the NAVD 88 vertical datum and the City of St. Petersburg vertical datum. No less that six project benchmarks will be established on site at 500-ft intervals. All horizontal data will be referenced to Florida State Plane Coordinates - NAD 83/22 datum - Florida West Zone.

• Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) will be provided in accordance with FDOT requirements to execute the work.

TASK 4 – SUBSURFACE UTILITY ENGINEERING SERVICES (SUE)

A/E will conduct SUE services after the horizontal alignment has been accepted by the City. The SUE will consisting of utility designation using standard electromagnetic locating techniques and ground penetrating radar to investigate the location of the existing City owned utilities through the project area. The A/E will conduct subsurface locates of potential crossings and conflicts of City owned utilities using vacuum excavation. A total of up to 20-test hole locates have been budgeted for this task. MOT will be provided in accordance with FDOT requirements to execute the work. Per the City’s Ordinance, private utilities owners will be required to provide the horizontal and vertical location of their utilities that are in conflict with the design. As such, SUE services to locate private utilities are not included. Location of the test holes will be shown on the construction plans with a corresponding table showing the results of the test holes including test hole number, utility type, depth to top of pipe, pipe diameter and pipe material.

TASK 5 – GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES

A/E will coordinate geotechnical services to perform a geotechnical investigation of the conditions along the route of the proposed water main to assist with the design and construction of the water main. The investigation will include 7 Standard Penetration Tests (SPT) borings to a depth of 15-ft below grade spaced approximately 550-600 ft apart along the water main alignment. Due to the location of the project, it is anticipated that work will require pre-renting parking stalls and other MOT procedures in accordance with applicable FDOT Standards. The report will include discussion on existing pavement sections. Two copies of a final geotechnical report will be provided to the City. The report will also be referenced in the Contract Documents.

TASK 6 – PRELIMINARY DESIGN SERVICES

Prepare and submit 30% Design Documents which will include cover and key sheet, general notes and abbreviations, proposed horizontal alignment, and standard piping details. The topographic survey is anticipated to be competed after the 30% Design Document submittal, so the 30% Design Documents will be based on the City’s atlas maps. A/E will also prepare a preliminary Engineer’s opinion of probable construction cost for the project. Following the submittal, the A/E will meet with the City to discuss its comments. A/E will prepare and distribute meeting minutes and incorporate the City’s comments into the subsequent submittal. The 30% Design Documents will be sent to the private utility owners requesting them to mark-up the drawings to properly show their utilities.
TASK 7 – FINAL DESIGN SERVICES

Prepare and submit 60% and 90% Design Documents which will advance the 30% Design Documents approved by the City by including the topographical survey and SUE information, the proposed plan and profile, special piping details and maintenance of traffic drawings. A/E will also prepare and submit technical specifications and an updated Engineer’s opinion of probable construction cost at each design milestone. Following each submittal, the A/E will meet with the City to discuss its comments. A/E will prepare and distribute meeting minutes and incorporate the City’s comments into the subsequent submittal.

TASK 8 – PERMITTING SERVICES

A/E will prepare and submit permit applications and supporting documents to the following jurisdictional agencies:

- FDEP – Environmental Resource Permit (Notice General)
- FDEP – Notice of Intent to Use the General Permit for Construction of Water Main Extensions for PWs
- FDOT – Rights-of-Way Utilization Permit - 3rd and 4th Streets South (SR 687)

A/E will respond to the Departments’ Request for Additional Information (RAI). Permit fees are to be paid by the City and are not included as a reimbursable cost in the A/E’s compensation.

TASK 9 – BIDDING SERVICES

Incorporate the permits and comments received from the permitting agencies and the City’s 90% review comments and provide the City with an Issued for Bid set of Contract Documents for its use to solicit bids. The submittal will include the final opinion of probable construction cost, technical specifications, SBE and Bid Form. The City will insert the City’s standard front-end documents.

Attend the Pre-Bid Conference conducted by City to review the project’s requirements with prospective bidders. Meeting minutes will be taken and distributed by the City.

Issue clarifications through written response and/or revising technical specifications and drawings to respond to bidders’ request for clarifications. The City will be responsible for distributing the addenda to the prospective bidders.

Review the bid tabulation provided by the City and check the references of the apparent three lowest bidders to discuss assess qualifications and past performance.

Provide a letter of recommendation to the City for award of the contract.

Conformed Documents: After the bidding and award process, the City will assemble the final Conformed Documents and provide two (2) sets to the A/E for review. Once the
documents have been found to be in order, the A/E will sign and seal one set of the Conformed Documents and return to the City for their records and use in construction of the project.

III. **SCHEDULE**

Work under this Task Order shall begin no later than 10 days from Notice to Proceed (NTP). The Design Milestones will be performed as outlined in the schedule below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weeks from NTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Data Collection and Review</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>Topographical Survey</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>SUE Services</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>Geotechnical Services</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>Preliminary Design Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% Design Submittal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% Design Review Meeting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60% Design Submittal</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60% Design Submittal Review Meeting</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90% Design Submittal/Permit Submittal</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90% Design Submittal Review Meeting</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7</td>
<td>Final Design Services</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8</td>
<td>Permitting Services</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 9</td>
<td>Bidding Services</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design Milestone Schedule is based on a two-week review period for each submittal.

IV. **A/E'S RESPONSIBILITIES**

The A/E will assign a Project Manager, along with other personnel as necessary, to assure faithful execution and timely delivery of services pursuant to the requirements of Section II. Scope of Services outlined herein.

V. **CITY'S RESPONSIBILITIES**

- The City will provide the A/E copies of the available record drawings, utility atlas maps, utility GIS data, standard construction details and standard technical specifications for its use in preparing the Contract Documents.

- The City will assemble the final construction document package to include the City's front-end contract documents and advertise the project.
• The City will advertise the project, conduct a pre-bid meeting, respond to comments and prepare and distribute the bid addenda.

• When the project is awarded, the City will assemble conformed documents and forward two copies to the A/E for review and to be signed and sealed.

VI. **DELIBERABLES**

• **TASK 1 Project Administration**  Meeting minutes for the Kick-Off and 30%, 60% and 90% Design Review Meetings (PDF, electronically)

• **TASK 2 Data Collection and Review**  Not Applicable

• **TASK 3 Topographical Survey**  One (1) CD ROM of the topographical survey signed and sealed (PDF, electronically).

• **TASK 4 SUE Services**  Not Applicable

• **TASK 5 Geotechnical Services**  One (1) CD ROM of the geotechnical report signed and sealed (PDF, electronically).

• **TASK 6 Preliminary Design Services**  One (1) CD ROM of the 30%, 60% and 90% Design Submittals: The A/E will submit the documents to the City in electronic format consisting of a single PDF of the drawings in numerical order, and a PDF file of the Engineer’s preliminary opinion of probable construction cost.

• **TASK 7 Final Design Services**  One (1) CD ROM of the Issue for Bid Submittal. The A/E will submit the documents to the City in electronic format consisting of the 2018 CADD files, a single PDF of the drawings in numerical order, a PDF file of the technical specifications, Engineer’s opinion of probable construction cost, SBE and Bid Form.

• **TASK 8 Permitting Services**  FDEP General Permit for Construction of Water Main Extensions for PWs (PDF, electronically).

FDEP Notice General Environmental Resource Permit (PDF, electronically).

FDOT Right-of-Way Utilization Permit (PDF, electronically).

• **TASK 9 Bidding Services**  Responses to the bidders’ questions received during the bidding phase (e-mail).
Letter of Recommendation for Bid Award (email).

One (1) signed and sealed set of the Conformed Documents (paper copy).

VII. **A/E'S COMPENSATION**

For Tasks 1 through 9, the City shall compensate the A/E the lump sum amount of $168,207.55.

This Task Order establishes an allowance in the amount of $10,000.00 for additional services not identified in the Scope of Services. Additional services may be performed only upon receipt of prior written authorization from the City and such authorization shall set forth the additional services to be provided by the A/E. The cost for any additional services shall not exceed the amount of the allowance set forth in this Task Order.

The total Task Order amount is $178,207.55 per Appendix A.

VIII. **PROJECT TEAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitchel Chiavaroli, PE</th>
<th>QA/QC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Wehner, PE</td>
<td>Sr. Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriell Shrikissoon, PE</td>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Hong, EI</td>
<td>Engineering Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Vieth</td>
<td>Designer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyatt Survey Services, Inc.</th>
<th>Survey Subconsultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driggers Engineering Services, Inc.</td>
<td>Geotechnical Subconsultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX. **MISCELLANEOUS**

In the event of a conflict between this Task Order and the Agreement, the Agreement shall prevail.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF the Parties have caused this Task Order to be executed by their duly authorized representatives on the day and date first above written.

ATTEST

By: Chandrahasa Srinivasa
   City Clerk

(SEAL)

CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA

By: Brejesh Prayman, P.E., ENV SP, Director Engineering & Capital Improvements

DATE: ________________

APPROVED AS TO FORM FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE STANDARD TASK ORDER.
NO OPINION OR APPROVAL OF THE SCOPE OF SERVICES IS BEING RENDERED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

By: City Attorney (Designee)

McKim & Creed, Inc. (Company Name)

By: (Signature)
   David C. Wehner SP. AM
   (Printed Name and Title)

Date: 1/16/19

WITNESSES:

By: (Signature)
   Adriell Shrikiss
   (Printed Name)

By: (Signature)
   Johnny Relend
   (Printed Name)
### I. Manpower Estimate: All Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Labor Rates Classifications</th>
<th>Division Director/GE</th>
<th>Senior Project Manager</th>
<th>Project Engineer</th>
<th>Engineering Intern</th>
<th>Designer</th>
<th>Administrative Assistance</th>
<th>Survey Manager</th>
<th>Project Surveyor</th>
<th>Field Survey Party of 2</th>
<th>Survey CAD Tech</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Labor Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Salary</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$72.50</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>$48.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$58.00</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$8,718.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier/Overhead 152.00%</td>
<td>$348.00</td>
<td>$1,153.83</td>
<td>$81.75</td>
<td>$64.75</td>
<td>$63.00</td>
<td>$48.15</td>
<td>$88.60</td>
<td>$85.35</td>
<td>$107.30</td>
<td>$92.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$4,263.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit 10%</td>
<td>$57.80</td>
<td>$17.82</td>
<td>$12.83</td>
<td>$9.98</td>
<td>$9.99</td>
<td>$7.41</td>
<td>$13.68</td>
<td>$12.83</td>
<td>$16.53</td>
<td>$9.12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,018.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing Rates</td>
<td>$250.80</td>
<td>$195.95</td>
<td>$141.08</td>
<td>$109.73</td>
<td>$106.09</td>
<td>$81.51</td>
<td>$150.48</td>
<td>$141.08</td>
<td>$181.89</td>
<td>$100.27</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>$20,655.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TASK**

| 1 Project Administration          | 2 22 10 4 4 20                      | 62          | $8,718.78  |
| 2 Data Collection and Review       | 4 10 12 4 4 4                        | 34          | $4,263.76  |
| 3 Topographical Survey             | 4 10 12 4 4                          | 10          | $1,018.30  |
| 4 Subsurface Utility Engineering Services | 1 2 4 4 4 4                   | 61          | $11,510.40 |
| 5 Geotechnical Services            | 4 10 16 24 32 4                     | 5           | $514.15    |
| 6 Preliminary Design Services      | 10 36 60 80 180 24                 | 92          | $47,947.84 |
| 7 Final Design Services            | 10 36 60 80 180 24                 | 180         | $8,771.96  |
| 8 Permitting Services              | 4 12 24 16 24                      | 390         | $4,608.16  |
| 9 Bidding Services                 | 8 12 12 8 12                       | 52          | $6,898.53  |
| **Totals**                         | 16 85 122 166 154 92 2 30 72 16 855| 132         | $20,655.14 |

### II. Fee Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Labor Cost</th>
<th>Expenses $</th>
<th>Subconsultant Services</th>
<th>Mark-up on Subconsultant Services +</th>
<th>Total Cost Without Allowance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,718.78</td>
<td>$106.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$8,824.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$4,263.76</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$4,263.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$42,184.44</td>
<td>$2,269.22</td>
<td>$124,554.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$26,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$514.15</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$7,187.50</td>
<td>$357.88</td>
<td>$8,039.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$11,510.40</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$11,610.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$47,947.84</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$48,047.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$8,771.96</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$8,771.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$6,608.16</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$6,708.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$109,888.51</td>
<td>$6,500.00</td>
<td>$49,241.84</td>
<td>$2,467.10</td>
<td>$168,207.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. Fee Limit

Lump Sum Cost: $168,207.55
Allowance: $50,000.00
Total: $218,207.55

### IV. Notes:

1. Rate 3.5% overhead = 10% profit (per contract).
2. Includes expenses for: Task 1, 7 & 9 printing and mileage, Task 4: MOT Svcs
3. Includes 5 percent markup of SUBCONSULTANT (per contract).
4. Allowance to be used only upon City’s written authorization.
The following page(s) contain the backup material for Agenda Item: Renewing an annual construction contract with Ajax Paving Industries of Florida, LLC for Citywide Street Milling and Resurfacing for the Engineering and Capital Improvements Dept., in the amount of $4,000,000 for FY2019, for a total contract amount of $7,414,635.50 (ECID Project No. 19003-130; Oracle Project Numbers 16741 and 16730). Please scroll down to view the backup material.
To: The Honorable Charlie Gerdes, Chair, and Members of City Council

Subject: Renewing an annual construction contract with Ajax Paving Industries of Florida, LLC for Citywide Street Milling and Resurfacing for the Engineering and Capital Improvements Dept., in the amount of $4,000,000 for FY2019, for a total contract amount of $7,414,635.50 (ECID Project No. 19003-130; Oracle Project Numbers 16741 and 16730).

Explanation: On February 1, 2018, City Council approved a one-year agreement with Ajax Paving Industries of Florida, LLC in the amount of $3,389,768.40 for Citywide Street Milling and Resurfacing FY18, effective through February 7, 2019. This is the single one-year renewal option for the agreement.

The contractor provides all labor, materials, and equipment necessary to perform street milling, street resurfacing, alley and parking lot resurfacing, and all related operations at various locations within the City. The work includes approximately 32,000 tons of asphalt and 400,000 SY of milling. Surface adjustment of manhole rings and restoration of traffic signal controller loops will also be required.

The Procurement and Supply Management Department, in cooperation with the Engineering and Capital Improvements Department, recommends for renewal:

Ajax Paving Industries of Florida, LLC (North Venice, FL) $4,000,000

| Original contract amount | $3,389,768.40 |
| Amendment No. 1          | 24,866.90    |
| Renewal                 | 4,000,000.00 |
| Total agreement amount  | $7,414,635.30|

Amendment No. 1 was for additional work requested by the St. Petersburg Fire and Rescue Department for resurfacing the parking lot at Fire Headquarters.

Unit prices for asphalt for FY19 have increased and are adjusted based on the Florida Department of Transportation Fuel and Bituminous Average Price Index. The price changes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FDOT Type SP-12.5 roadway</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.35</td>
<td>100.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT Type SP-9.5 roadway</td>
<td>98.75</td>
<td>106.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT Type SP-9.5 alley &amp; parking lot</td>
<td>91.41</td>
<td>99.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All other unit prices in the FY18 contract are unchanged for FY19.

The contractor is in compliance with the City Code Sec 2-298.5 Major Construction Project Requirements for employing disadvantaged workers.

However, the City is waiving the Major Construction Project Requirements for City Code 2-296; for employing apprentices; as no program is listed for apprentices under the State of Florida Department of Education or the United States Department of Labor for that particular trade.

The contractor will begin work approximately ten (10) days from notice to proceed and is scheduled to complete the work within one hundred eighty (180) consecutive calendar days thereafter.

Administration recommends renewal of the agreement based on the vendor's past satisfactory performance and compliance with the terms and conditions of the agreement. The renewal will be effective through February 7, 2020.

Continued on Page 2
Cost/Funding/Assessment Information: Funds have been previously appropriated in the Citywide Infrastructure CIP Fund (3027), Street & Road Imps FY19 Project (16741) and the Recreation and Culture Improvement Fund (3029), Parking Lot Improvements FY19 Project (16730).

Attachments: Map
Resolution

Approvals:

[Signatures]

Administrative

Budget
A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT WITH AJAX PAVING INDUSTRIES OF FLORIDA, LLC FOR CITYWIDE STREET MILLING AND RESURFACING TO EXTEND THE TERM AND INCREASE THE CONTRACT PRICE FOR THIS RENEWAL TERM IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $4,000,000; PROVIDING THAT THE TOTAL CONTRACT AMOUNT SHALL NOT EXCEED $7,414,635.50; AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR HIS DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE ALL DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THIS TRANSACTION; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, on February 1, 2018, City Council awarded a one-year agreement ("Agreement") with a one-year renewal option to Ajax Paving Industries of Florida, LLC ("Ajax") for Citywide Street Milling and Resurfacing pursuant to IFB 6741, dated November 16, 2017; and

WHEREAS, on December 10, 2018, Administration issued a change order to increase the contract price in the amount of $24,866.90 for milling and resurfacing of the parking lot at Fire Headquarters; and

WHEREAS, Administration desires to amend the Agreement to extend the term and increase the contract price amount by $4,000,000 for the renewal term (for a total contract price not to exceed $7,414,635.50); and

WHEREAS, the Procurement & Supply Management Department in cooperation with the Engineering & Capital Improvements Department recommends approval of this resolution.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida, that an amendment to the agreement with Ajax Paving Industries of Florida, LLC for Citywide Street Milling and Resurfacing to extend the term and increase the contract price for this renewal term in an amount not to exceed $4,000,000 is hereby approved.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the total contract amount shall not exceed $7,414,635.50.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor or his designee is authorized to execute all documents necessary to effectuate this transaction.

This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

Approved as to Form and Substance:

City Attorney (Designee)
00430826
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March 1, 2019

TO: The Honorable Members of City Council

SUBJECT: Proclamation in recognition of The Tampa Bay Lightning Hometown Hero Award presented to Bill Darling

PRESENTER: Mayor’s Office

SCHEDULE FOR COUNCIL ON:

Agenda of March 7, 2019

Rick Kriseman
Mayor
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ACTION DESIRED:

Respectfully requesting a referral to the Budget, Finance and Taxation Committee (or other relevant committee) a discussion on incentives for more energy efficient HVAC units, such as inclusion in the Rebates for Residential Rehabs Program or waiving permitting fees.

RATIONALE:

While the City’s minimum requirements for HVAC are the maximum allowed by the state - 14 SEER (Seasonal Energy Efficiency Ration) - there are more energy efficient systems available that reduce the level of harmful greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) released into the environment and provide long-term monetary savings for the homeowner. A rebate or other incentive will motivate more St. Petersburg homeowners to choose the better system.

Gina Driscoll
Council Member, District 6
Referring to Public Services and Infrastructure Committee to consider amending Chapter 16.40.040, City of St. Petersburg Municipal Code, to allow for fence construction containing corrugated metal panels and establishing standards for such materials. (Chair Gerdes)

Please scroll down to view the backup material.
TO: Members of City Council

DATE: February 22, 2019

COUNCIL DATE: March 7, 2019

RE: Referral to Public Services and Infrastructure Committee to Discuss Amending Chapter 16.40.040 of the City Code to Allow For Fence Construction Containing Metal Panels and Establishing Standards For Such Material

ACTION DESIRED:

Respectfully request a referral to Public Services and Infrastructure Committee to consider amending Chapter 16.40.040, City of St. Petersburg Municipal Code, to allow for fence construction containing corrugated metal panels and establishing standards for such materials.

Charlie Gerdes, Council Chair
District 1
Respectfully requesting the St. Petersburg City Council refer to the COW of March 28 or the earliest available COW a discussion of providing Weeki Wachee funding for the Maximo Park improvements project. (Councilmember Kornell)

Please scroll down to view the backup material.
TO: Members of City Council

DATE: February 28, 2019

COUNCIL DATE: March 7, 2019

RE: Respectfully requesting the St. Petersburg City Council refer to the COW of March 28 or the earliest available COW a discussion of providing Weeki Wachee funding for the Maximo Park improvements project.

ACTION DESIRED:

Respectfully requesting the St. Petersburg City Council refer to the COW of March 28 or the earliest available COW a discussion of providing Weeki Wachee funding for the Maximo Park improvements project.

The cost estimate for the project is $650,000 and the Parks and Recreation Department has prepared a full presentation regarding the project.

Steve Kornell, City Council
District 5
TIMELINE:

January 28, 2011  Council member Kornell meets with the FDOT secretary for the region and opens the discussion regarding the city obtaining a long term lease for the property.

March, 2011  Parking and transportation staff continues the discussions regarding the city obtaining some level of control of the property.

July 22, 2014  City Real Estate Department agrees with FDOT and executes a 25 year lease for the water front half of the property.

June, 2015  Parks and Recreation staff solicit quotes for removing the materials from the park, but they are over $600,000 to remove a pile of debris. Due to the high costs the project does not move forward at this time.

February, 2016  Parks and Recreation staff negotiate with FDOT and contractors to reduce the price of moving the construction materials from over $600,000 to $150,000.

August 4, 2016  City Council allocates $150,000 in Weeki Wachee funds to be used for the removal of the street milling and other construction materials stored on the waterfront half of the parcel.

September, 2017  The project is delayed for several months due to debris from Hurricane Irma.

June, 2018  Council Member Kornell, along with Parks and Recreation staff have a final meeting with FDOT to evaluate the possibility of the city obtaining a long term lease for the entire parcel. FDOT is not able to accommodate the request.

September, 2018  Parks and Recreation staff begin developing a draft proposal for what they would like to do with the 4.5 waterfront acres for which we have a long term lease.

January 8, 2019  Parks and Recreation staff present the proposed uses for the new waterfront park land to the board of the Greater Pinellas Point Civic Association.

January 22, 2019  Parks and Recreation staff present the proposal at the general membership meeting of the Greater Pinellas Point Civic Association.
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City of St. Petersburg
City Council
Co-Sponsored Events Committee
Thursday, February 21, 2019, 1:30PM
City Hall Room 100
Committee Members
Lisa Wheeler-Bowman
Charlie Gerdes
Darden Rice
Ed Montanari
Steve Kornell (Alternate)

Meeting Report

The meeting was called to order by Committee Chair Council Member Charlie Gerdes at 2:35pm. Present at the meeting was Council Member Gerdes, Council Member Ed Montanari, Council Member Rice, Parks & Recreation Manager Lynn Gordon, Supervisor II Denis Burns, City Development Administration Manager Tony Leno, Deputy City Clerk Cathy Davis, and Assistant City Attorney Sharon Michnowicz.

Council Member Gerdes was elected chair of the committee and Council Member Montanari was elected vice-chair.

The committee considered four events for approval for FY2019, a non-profit waiver for one event, and a liquor request for one event. After a few questions about the events, a motion to approve all events and the waiver was made by Council Member Montanari; the motion was unanimously approved by the committee. A motion to approve the liquor request was made Council Member Rice and that motion was unanimously approved by the committee.

The committee next considered twenty-three event for FY 2020, a non-profit waiver for six events, and liquor requests by six events. After a few questions about the events, a motion to approve all events and the waivers was made by Council Member Montanari; the motion was unanimously approved by the committee. A motion to approve the liquor requests was made by Council Member Rice and that motion was unanimously approved by the committee.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05pm

Lynn Gordon
Parks & Recreation Manager
Co-Sponsored Events Committee Liaison
Resolution No. 2019-______

A RESOLUTION APPROVING EVENTS FOR CO-SPONSORSHIP BY THE CITY IN NAME ONLY FOR FY2019 AND FY2020; WAIVING THE NON-PROFIT REQUIREMENTS OF RESOLUTION NO. 2000-562(a)8 FOR THE CO-SPONSORED EVENTS TO BE PRESENTED BY WE ARE CONCERTS LLC, IHEARTMEDIA + ENTERTAINMENT, INC., ENDORFUN SPORTS, LLC., YACHTING PROMOTIONS, INC., DESIGN OFRESCO CORP., FLORIDATA CAPITAL ASSETS GROUP, INC., WATERCROSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.; AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR HIS DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE ALL DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THIS RESOLUTION; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, various entities have requested that the City co-sponsor their public events in name only for FY2019 and FY2020; and

WHEREAS, the City Council Co-Sponsored Events Committee has reviewed these requests in accordance with City Council Resolution No. 2000-562, as amended, and has made recommendations to City Council as to which requests to approve in name only; and

WHEREAS, City Council has reviewed the recommendations and has determined which of these requests to approve in name only; and

WHEREAS, City Council Resolution No. 2000-562(a)8 requires in part that all applicant agencies requesting co-sponsorship must have been a non-profit or not-for-profit corporation, exempt from federal income tax for a period of 1 year prior to the date of application; and

WHEREAS, WE ARE CONCERTS LLC, IHEARTMEDIA + ENTERTAINMENT, INC., ENDORFUN SPORTS, LLC., YACHTING PROMOTIONS, INC., DESIGN OFRESCO CORP., FLORIDATA CAPITAL ASSETS GROUP, INC., WATERCROSS INTERNATIONAL, INC., ("For-Profit Entities"), do not meet the non-profit requirements of Resolution No. 2000-562(a)8; and

WHEREAS, in order for the City to enter into co-sponsorship agreements with these For-Profit Entities, the non-profit requirements of Resolution No. 2000-562(a)8 must be waived by City Council; and

WHEREAS, Administration and the City Council Co-sponsored Events Committee, having reviewed the events set forth below that have been proposed by the various entities, recognize them as events that will benefit the community and recommend approval of the events for co-sponsorship and a grant of waivers to the For-Profit Entities.
NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida, that the following events for co-sponsorship by the City in name only are approved for FY2019 and FY2020:

**FY2019 Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2019 Event Name</th>
<th>Non Profit Organization</th>
<th>For-Profit Entity</th>
<th>Event Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swim Across America Tampa Bay</td>
<td>SWIM ACROSS AMERICA, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/11/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Step Closer 5K</td>
<td>CELMA MASTRY OVARIAN CANCER FOUNDATION, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>09/21/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tash Suitana</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>WE ARE CONCERTS LLC</td>
<td>05/08/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay CureSearch Walk</td>
<td>CURESEARCH FOR CHILDREN'S CANCER CORPORATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>09/28/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY2020 Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2020 Event Name</th>
<th>Non Profit Organization</th>
<th>For-Profit Entity</th>
<th>Event Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocephalus Association Walk</td>
<td>HYDROCEPHALUS ASSOCIATION INCORPORATED</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/09/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Strides Against Breast Cancer</td>
<td>AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Walk Like MADD Pinellas</td>
<td>MOTHERS AGAINST DRUNK DRIVING, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/12/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIFFS 45th Annual International Folk Fair</td>
<td>ST. PETERSBURG INTERNATIONAL FOLK FAIR SOCIETY, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/24/19 - 10/27/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.7 Beats by the Bay</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>IHEARTMEDIA + ENTERTAINMENT, INC.</td>
<td>11/02/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies in the Park (Oct.)</td>
<td>SAINT PETERSBURG PRESERVATION, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thursdays in October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CraftArt Festival 2019</td>
<td>FLORIDA CRAFTSMEN, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/23/19 &amp; 11/24/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls on the Run 5k – 2019 Fall</td>
<td>GIRLS ON THE RUN GREATER TAMPA BAY, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/14/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls on the Run - 2020 Spring</td>
<td>GIRLS ON THE RUN GREATER TAMPA BAY, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/02/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Pete Run Fest</td>
<td>JUMP FOR KIDS, INC</td>
<td>ENDORFUN SPORTS, LLC</td>
<td>11/15/19, 11/16/19, 11/17/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCA Tampa Bay Pet Walk</td>
<td>SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS, TAMPA BAY, FLORIDA, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/01/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Pot Turkey Trot</td>
<td>FRIENDS OF NORTH SHORE ELEMENTARY INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/28/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Night St. Pete 2020</td>
<td>FIRST NIGHT ST. PETERSBURG, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/31/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2020 Event Name</td>
<td>Non Profit Organization</td>
<td>For-Profit Entity</td>
<td>Event Date(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Pete Science Festival / Marineques</td>
<td>PIER AQUARIUM, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/19, 10/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon’s Walk for ACC Cure</td>
<td>ACC C.U.R.E. A N J NONPROFIT CORPORATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Pete Empower + Yoga</td>
<td>HEELS TO HEAL, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/06/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungalow Fest</td>
<td>HISTORIC KENWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/02/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Pete Power &amp; Sailboat Show</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>YACHTING PROMOTIONS, INC.</td>
<td>12/05/19, 12/06/19, 12/07/19, 12/08/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Annual St. Petersburg Chillounge Night</td>
<td>CREATIVE CLAY INC.</td>
<td>DESIGN OFRESCO CORP.</td>
<td>11/16/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savor St. Pete</td>
<td>ST. PETERSBURG COLLEGE FOUNDATION, INC.</td>
<td>FLORIDATA CAPITAL ASSETS GROUP, INC.</td>
<td>11/02/19, 11/03/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay Blues Festival</td>
<td>TAMPA BAY BLUES FOUNDATION, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/03/20, 04/04/20, 04/05/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Annual St. Petersburg Distance Classic</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>WATERCROSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.</td>
<td>02/09/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIPM Biathle/Triathle World Championship</td>
<td>USA PENTATHLON, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/24/19, 10/25/19, 10/26/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the non-profit requirements of Resolution No. 2000-562(a)8 are waived for the co-sponsored events to be presented in FY2019 and FY2020 by WE ARE CONCERTS LLC., IHEARTMEDIA + ENTERTAINMENT, INC., ENDORFUN SPORTS, LLC, YACHTING PROMOTIONS, INC., DESIGN OFRESCO CORP., FLORIDATA CAPITAL ASSETS GROUP, INC., and WATERCROSS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (“For-Profit Entities”), provided that the For-Profit Entities provide the City with evidence of partnership with a non-profit organization no later than 45 days prior to the first day of each For-Profit Entity’s co-sponsored event.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor or his designee is authorized to execute all documents necessary to effectuate this resolution.

This resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

Approvals:

Legal:

Administration:
Resolution No. 2019-_____  

A RESOLUTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY CODE SECTION 21-38(D) EXEMPTING TAMPA BAY BLUES FESTIVAL (VINOY PARK) FROM THE BEER AND WINE ONLY RESTRICTIONS IN CITY CODE SECTION 21-38(D) UPON THE ISSUANCE OF A PERMIT FOR ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES (FOR ON PREMISES CONSUMPTION ONLY) TO BE SOLD, SERVED, DISPENSED, POSSESSED, USED, AND/OR CONSUMED AT THE VENUE DURING THE EVENT AS SET FORTH HEREIN; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.  

WHEREAS, Tampa Bay Blues Festival has been approved as a co-sponsored event; and  

WHEREAS, the promoter of this event has requested, in accordance with Section 21-38(d) of the City Code, that it be exempt from the beer and wine only restrictions of the serving of alcoholic beverages set forth in City Code Section 21-38(d) on the issuance of a permit for alcoholic beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served, dispensed, possessed, used, and/or consumed at the venue during the event; and  

WHEREAS, Tampa Bay Blues Festival will take place on April 3-5, 2020 between the hours of 11:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. in Vinoy Park.  

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida that Tampa Bay Blues Festival (Vino Park) is exempt from the beer and wine only restrictions on the serving of alcoholic beverages in City Code Section 21-38(d) upon the issuance of a permit for alcoholic beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served, dispensed, possessed, used and/or consumed at the venue during the time and date of the event as set forth herein.  

This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.  

Approvals:  

Legal: 

Administration:  
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Resolution No. 2019-_____

A RESOLUTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY CODE SECTION 21-38(D) EXEMPTING 12TH ANNUAL ST. PETERSBURG CHILLOUNGE NIGHT (NORTH STRAUB PARK) FROM THE BEER AND WINE ONLY RESTRICTIONS IN CITY CODE SECTION 21-38(D) UPON THE ISSUANCE OF A PERMIT FOR ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES (FOR ON PREMISES CONSUMPTION ONLY) TO BE SOLD, SERVED, DISPENSED, POSSESSED, USED, AND/OR CONSUMED AT THE VENUE DURING THE EVENT AS SET FORTH HEREIN; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, 12th Annual St. Petersburg Chillounge Night has been approved as a co-sponsored event; and

WHEREAS, the promoter of this event has requested, in accordance with Section 21-38(d) of the City Code, that it be exempt from the beer and wine only restrictions of the serving of alcoholic beverages set forth in City Code Section 21-38(d) on the issuance of a permit for alcoholic beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served, dispensed, possessed, used, and/or consumed at the venue during the event; and

WHEREAS, 12th Annual St. Petersburg Chillounge Night will take place on November 16, 2019 between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 11:00 p.m. in North Straub Park.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida that 12th Annual St. Petersburg Chillounge Night (North Straub Park) is exempt from the beer and wine only restrictions on the serving of alcoholic beverages in City Code Section 21-38(d) upon the issuance of a permit for alcoholic beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served, dispensed, possessed, used and/or consumed at the venue during the time and date of the event as set forth herein.

This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

Approvals:

Legal: [Signature] Administration: ____________________________
Resolution No. 2019- ______

A RESOLUTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY CODE SECTION 21-38(D) EXEMPTING SAVOR ST. PETE (NORTH STRAUB PARK) FROM THE BEER AND WINE ONLY RESTRICTIONS IN CITY CODE SECTION 21-38(D) UPON THE ISSUANCE OF A PERMIT FOR ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES (FOR ON PREMISES CONSUMPTION ONLY) TO BE SOLD, SERVED, DISPENSED, POSSESSED, USED, AND/OR CONSUMED AT THE VENUE DURING THE EVENT AS SET FORTH HEREIN; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, Savor St. Pete has been approved as a co-sponsored event; and

WHEREAS, the promoter of this event has requested, in accordance with Section 21-38(d) of the City Code, that it be exempt from the beer and wine only restrictions of the serving of alcoholic beverages set forth in City Code Section 21-38(d) on the issuance of a permit for alcoholic beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served, dispensed, possessed, used, and/or consumed at the venue during the event; and

WHEREAS, Savor St. Pete will take place on November 2 & 3, 2019 between the hours of 12:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. in North Straub Park.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida that Savor St. Pete (North Straub Park) is exempt from the beer and wine only restrictions on the serving of alcoholic beverages in City Code Section 21-38(d) upon the issuance of a permit for alcoholic beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served, dispensed, possessed, used and/or consumed at the venue during the time and date of the event as set forth herein.

This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

Approvals:

Legal: [Signature] Administration: ____________________________
Resolution No. 2019-______

A RESOLUTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY CODE
SECTION 21-38(D) EXEMPTING TASH SULTANA (VINOY
PARK) FROM THE BEER AND WINE ONLY RESTRICTIONS IN
CITY CODE SECTION 21-38(D) UPON THE ISSUANCE OF A
PERMIT FOR ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES (FOR ON PREMISES
CONSUMPTION ONLY) TO BE SOLD, SERVED, DISPENSED,
POSSESSED, USED, AND/OR CONSUMED AT THE VENUE
DURING THE EVENT AS SET FORTH HEREIN; AND
PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, Tash Sultana has been approved as a co-sponsored event; and

WHEREAS, the promoter of this event has requested, in accordance with Section 21-
38(d) of the City Code, that it be exempt from the beer and wine only restrictions of the serving of
alcoholic beverages set forth in City Code Section 21-38(d) on the issuance of a permit for alcoholic
beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served, dispensed, possessed, used, and/or
consumed at the venue during the event; and

WHEREAS, Tash Sultana will take place on May 8, 2019 between the hours of 3:00
p.m. and 10:00 p.m. in Vinoy Park.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St.
Petersburg, Florida that Tash Sultana (Vinoy Park) is exempt from the beer and wine only
restrictions on the serving of alcoholic beverages in City Code Section 21-38(d) upon the issuance
of a permit for alcoholic beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served,
dispensed, possessed, used and/or consumed at the venue during the time and date of the event as set
forth herein.

This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

Approvals:

Legal: ___________________________ Administration: ___________________________
Resolution No. 2019-______

A RESOLUTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY CODE SECTION 21-38(D) EXEMPTING 95.7 BEATS BY THE BAY (VINOY PARK) FROM THE BEER AND WINE ONLY RESTRICTIONS IN CITY CODE SECTION 21-38(D) UPON THE ISSUANCE OF A PERMIT FOR ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES (FOR ON PREMISES CONSUMPTION ONLY) TO BE SOLD, SERVED, DISPENSED, POSSESSED, USED, AND/OR CONSUMED AT THE VENUE DURING THE EVENT AS SET FORTH HEREIN; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, 95.7 Beats by the Bay has been approved as a co-sponsored event; and

WHEREAS, the promoter of this event has requested, in accordance with Section 21-38(d) of the City Code, that it be exempt from the beer and wine only restrictions of the serving of alcoholic beverages set forth in City Code Section 21-38(d) on the issuance of a permit for alcoholic beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served, dispensed, possessed, used, and/or consumed at the venue during the event; and

WHEREAS, 95.7 Beats by the Bay will take place on November 2, 2019 between the hours of 2:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. in Vinoy Park.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida that 95.7 Beats by the Bay (Vino Park) is exempt from the beer and wine only restrictions on the serving of alcoholic beverages in City Code Section 21-38(d) upon the issuance of a permit for alcoholic beverages (for on premises consumption only) to be sold, served, dispensed, possessed, used and/or consumed at the venue during the time and date of the event as set forth herein.

This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

Approvals:

Legal:  ___________________________ Administration: ___________________________
The following page(s) contain the backup material for Agenda Item: *Ordinance 362-H to revise Chapter 8 of the City Code to remove references to discontinued rental housing inspection programs and clarify procedures related to placarding dangerous buildings.*

Please scroll down to view the backup material.
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG AMENDING THE CITY CODE TO REMOVE CHAPTER 8, ARTICLE III, DIVISION 2, SUBDIVISION II - RENTAL HOUSING INSPECTION PROGRAMS; ADDING DEFINITIONS FOR "CHANGE IN OCCUPANCY" AND "RECURRENT OR REPEAT VIOLATION" TO SECTION 8-63; AMENDING SECTION 8-98(a) RELATED TO PLACARDING BUILDINGS FOR UNFIT UNSAFE CONDITIONS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA DOES ORDAIN:

Section 1. Chapter 8, Article III, Division 2, Subdivision II - Rental Housing Inspection Programs is hereby deleted in its entirety.

Section 2. Section 8-63 of the St. Petersburg City Code is hereby amended to add the following definitions to be placed in the correct alphabetical order.

*Change in occupancy* means a change in all of the occupants of a rental unit.

*Recurrent or repeat violation* means any violation of the Code, which occurs within 12 months after the same violation has been found on the same property or any violation which remains uncorrected for 30 days after a violation has been found. A violation shall be found by either:

1. The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the Code Enforcement Board; or
2. A conviction, plea of no contest or a plea of guilty has been entered, in the county court for such violations.

Section 3. Section 8-98(a) of the St. Petersburg City Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

A. The POD shall cause to be posted a notice stating: "This Building Unfit For Human Habitation" at the entrance to a building or structure that is found to be unsafe or unfit. The placard shall remain posted until the required repairs and rehabilitation are made, the electric, water, or sanitary sewer service is reactivated, or until the building or structure is demolished. It shall be unlawful for any person to enter such a building or structure except for the purpose of making required repairs or demolishing it. No person shall occupy or let to another for occupancy such a placarded building or structure except as provided for in this section.

Section 4. As used in this ordinance, language appearing in struck-through type is language to be deleted from the City Code, and underlined language is language to be added to the City Code, in the section, subsection, or other location where indicated. Language in the
City Code not appearing in this ordinance continues in full force and effect unless the context clearly indicates otherwise. Sections of this ordinance that amend the City Code to add new sections or subsections are generally not underlined.

Section 5. The provisions of this ordinance shall be deemed to be severable. If any provision of this ordinance is determined unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such determination shall not affect the validity of any other provisions of this ordinance.

Section 6. In the event this Ordinance is not vetoed by the Mayor in accordance with the City Charter, it shall become effective upon the expiration of the fifth business day after adoption unless the Mayor notifies the City Council through written notice filed with the City Clerk that the Mayor will not veto this Ordinance, in which case this Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon filing such written notice with the City Clerk. In the event this Ordinance is vetoed by the Mayor in accordance with the City Charter, it shall not become effective unless and until the City Council overrides the veto in accordance with the City Charter, in which case it shall become effective immediately upon a successful vote to override the veto.

Approved as to form and content:

[Signature]

City Attorney or Designee
The following page(s) contain the backup material for Agenda Item: Ordinance 114-HL approving the designation of the Driftwood Local Historic District, generally encompassing the area between 24th Avenue South, Driftwood Road South (that portion formerly known as Ward Avenue South), and Tampa Bay as a Local Historic District and adding the property to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places pursuant to Section 16.30.070, City Code, and providing for an effective date. (City File 17-90300006)
Please scroll down to view the backup material.
Summary of Public Comments Received
The attached application has generated a large amount of public input, necessitating this summary page.

- Through the website of local historic preservation nonprofit Preserve the ‘Burg, 31 form letters have been received from 28 individuals. A sample is included in this appendix to avoid redundancy. Those which included additional comments from the sender are included in full.
- A number of comments have also been received from property owners within the proposed district offering suggestions for boundary revisions or raising issue with the City's district designation process. Some have warranted formal responses from City staff. These comments, and responses where applicable, are included in full.
- In total, comments of support have been received by staff from 31 individuals; comments of opposition have been received from ten (10) individuals as of the October 1, 2018 compilation of this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sender</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/21/2018</td>
<td>Lisa Lennox</td>
<td>742 62\textsuperscript{nd} Ave. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/21/2018</td>
<td>Rabikanta Thokchom</td>
<td>742 62\textsuperscript{nd} Ave. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/25/2018</td>
<td>Katherine Gibson</td>
<td>158 11\textsuperscript{th} Ave. N.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/2018</td>
<td>Ron Clark</td>
<td>199 Dali Blvd, Unit 804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01/2018</td>
<td>John Bell</td>
<td>130 4\textsuperscript{th} Ave N., Apt 204/206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01/2018</td>
<td>Catherine Gomez</td>
<td>2108 N. Ola Ave., #308, Tampa, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01/2018</td>
<td>Brenda Pluguez</td>
<td>2108 N. Ola Ave., #308, Tampa, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01/2018</td>
<td>Neftali Pluguez</td>
<td>2108 N. Ola Ave., #308, Tampa, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/02/2018</td>
<td>Lois Consenzo</td>
<td>130 4\textsuperscript{th} Ave. N., #611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/04/2018</td>
<td>Naomi Rutenberg</td>
<td>155 18\textsuperscript{th} Ave. S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/05/2018</td>
<td>Megan Jones</td>
<td>1035 16\textsuperscript{th} Ave. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/06/2018</td>
<td>Tim O’Neill</td>
<td>3964 39\textsuperscript{th} Cir. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/15/2018</td>
<td>Cindy Stiles</td>
<td>13225 101\textsuperscript{st} St. S.E., Lo: 484, Largo, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/2018</td>
<td>Duncan Stuart</td>
<td>7950 Blind Pass Rd., Apt 2, St. Pete Beach, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/25/2018</td>
<td>Cindy Stiles</td>
<td>13225 101\textsuperscript{st} St. S.E., Lo: 484, Largo, FL (repeat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/2018</td>
<td>Annamarie Reed</td>
<td>4617 71\textsuperscript{st} St. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/2018</td>
<td>Natalie DeVicente</td>
<td>1500 4\textsuperscript{th} St. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/22/2018</td>
<td>Roxanne Neilson</td>
<td>1100 32\textsuperscript{nd} Ave. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/23/2018</td>
<td>Fran Mikuta</td>
<td>1101 16\textsuperscript{th} Ave. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/28/2018</td>
<td>Melissa Newman</td>
<td>5425 2\textsuperscript{nd} Ave. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/2018</td>
<td>Elizabeth Grebenschikoff</td>
<td>130 4\textsuperscript{th} Ave. N. #506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/2018</td>
<td>Duncan Stuart</td>
<td>7950 Blind Pass Rd., Apt 2, St. Pete Beach, FL (repeat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/2018</td>
<td>Patricia Wood</td>
<td>762 26\textsuperscript{th} Ave. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/2018</td>
<td>Jack Bell</td>
<td>130 4\textsuperscript{th} Ave. N., Apt 204/206 (repeat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/2018</td>
<td>Elizabeth Bell</td>
<td>130 4\textsuperscript{th} Ave. N., Apt 204/206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/2018</td>
<td>Frank Bird</td>
<td>2317 Tropical Shores, S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/2018</td>
<td>Melissa Buhler</td>
<td>125 56\textsuperscript{th} Ave. S., #508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/2018</td>
<td>Rebecca Falkenberry</td>
<td>301 2\textsuperscript{nd} St. N., Unit 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/2018</td>
<td>Holly Hail</td>
<td>955 51\textsuperscript{st} St. N., Unit 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/2018</td>
<td>Linda Snyder</td>
<td>145 2\textsuperscript{nd} Ave. S., Unit 514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/19/2018</td>
<td>June Bedford</td>
<td>1 Beach Dr. S.E., Unit 2610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mayor and Council Members: There is no doubt Driftwood is a special neighborhood and one meeting the criteria for historic district designation. It is important both to the neighborhood and to the city as a whole to help ensure that its special character is not lost. That's why it is important to designate Driftwood as a local historic district and why I urge you to vote yes on the historic district application. Keeping St. Petersburg special is key to our city's ongoing economic success and keeping the city attractive to residents and visitors.
Mayor and Council Members: There is no doubt Driftwood is a special neighborhood and one meeting the criteria for historic district designation. It is important both to the neighborhood and to the city as a whole to help ensure that its special character is not lost. That’s why it is important to designate Driftwood as a local historic district and why I urge you to vote yes on the historic district application. Keeping St. Petersburg special is key to our city’s ongoing economic success and keeping the city attractive to residents and visitors.

Tearing down single-family homes and building multi-family high rises are putting too many people on this little tiny peninsular. We are completely surrounded by salt water. We already OVER populated and already FULLY developed. Instead of tearing down single-family homes and building multi-family high rises to make us even more OVER populated, we should build single-family homes in place of single-family homes, multi-family homes with a height restriction in place of multi-family homes and businesses with a height restriction in place of businesses. This way we have sustainable grown for an OVER populated area instead OVER populating what is already OVER populated. Tearing down single-family homes and businesses and building multi-family high rises is the most idiotic thing to do on this little tiny peninsular. We don’t have the land or the water for all of these people. Our quality of life as already been jeopardized. You took the beaches from us, now you want to take the rest of Pinellas County away from us.

This fight is not over for me. I am a Pinellas County native who is sick to my stomach at the destruction that has been caused by greedy developers. I will continue to fight until our politicians and legislatures wake up and finally realize that we don’t have the land or the water for this kind of development.

Referer URL: http://www.emailmeform.com/builder/form/W0Z0m72fTQ20zoiBU0evbc
Mayor and Council Members:

I am a local real estate agent and 3rd generation native of St. Petersburg. I grew up around Little and Big Bayous, and Driftwood has always been one of the most magical neighborhoods to me.

Fast forward many years, and I was lucky enough to be the listing agent for the "Mullet Farm" property owned previously by the Gandy family. The property being over 1 1/3 acres was a rarity in itself, with trees and vegetation that had been there since before Barney Williams built the home in 1910. The value we came to was mostly for the land, as it was a large piece that could not be found anywhere on the waterfront in St. Petersburg.

When we took the home to market, the family told me that they would be looking for a buyer who could appreciate the grounds AND the home itself. Granted, the home had been neglected for many years, and badly needed attention for termite and structural damage. However, it contained a handpainted ceiling by Gidge Gandy of a compass rose, and a handrail up the stairwell that used to be the mast of an old sailing ship. There were many elements of the home that were historic, even if its shell was not in good shape. It certainly could have been restored, or even moved. And lucky for us, we had two potential buyers for the home, both of which said they would restore the home and enjoy the land, not dividing up what could have been 4 parcels.

Unfortunately after the sale, the buyers we thought would care for the property the most ended up tearing down the home and clearing the beautiful landscape, with the intention of building something very anti-Driftwood in its place. While property owners have rights to do as they please, this one was misleading and the owners would have gone with the other party for less money who had the intention of keeping the home. The new owners will ultimately change the feel of Driftwood forever. That was never our intention, and it sickens me that we did not have any regulations to fall back on, even with the purest intentions to retain the magical feel of Mullet Farm and Driftwood as a whole.

I don't necessarily believe that all homes in Driftwood should be saved - some are not historically contributing and some falling apart that cannot be saved. However, there should be some regulation as to how the tree canopies and vegetation are preserved, and the style of homes that need to be built should an original be torn down. Driftwood will have a very different
appearance if no regulations or designation is taken. These neighbors have strived to keep it a wonderful neighborhood, with some homes being passed down through generations to keep their integrity. PTB and The City need to designate it, just as they have for Roser Park, as a place that Keeps St. Pete Special.

Please consider designations for Driftwood as a historic district to help preserve this gem!

Kindest regards,
Natalie DeVicente
Southern Roots Realty

Referer URL: http://www.emailmeform.com/builder/form/W0Z0n72fTQ20zoibU0evbc
City of St. Petersburg,

I have just communicated to Peter Pav that I changed my position on the Historical designation and now support of it. However, I feel very strongly that the Pav’s home be excluded as it is a non-contributing building from an architectural and construction standpoint. I hope you take this request to heart when making your decisions.

If you wish to discuss, please call me at 727.641.5161.

Best,

Eric Higgs

On Mar 7, 2018, at 11:40 AM, Peter Pav <ppav@ mindspring.com> wrote:

<OPT-OUT 2ND REQUEST FOR 5 REMAINING PARCELS.doc>
To: Derek Kilborn  
Manager, Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division  
City of St. Petersburg  
Municipal Services Center  
One 4th Street North, 8th Floor  
St. Petersburg, FL 33701  
derek.kilborn@stpete.org

From: Chris Keller  
2680 Driftwood Rd S  
St Petersburg, FL, 33705

Date: March 21, 2018

Subject: Proposed Driftwood Local Historic District

Mr. Kilborn,

I am the homeowner at the address listed above and I am writing to you in regard to the proposed designation of Local Historic District (LHD) for the Driftwood area. My home is within the proposed boundary, and I am respectfully requesting that the subject of the LHD for Driftwood at the April 10 hearing with the CPPC be postponed. My substantiation for requesting the delay is as follows:

1. I did not receive sufficient notification that I would be included in the LHD. I was invited to an informational session held in May 2017. From that point forward, there were a few updates regarding findings about the potential of a LHD at our homeowners’ association meetings, but not until the first of this year did the team indicate that they had prepared an application and intended to submit it. I now have minimal time to absorb the current and future impact on my property and the surrounding properties. Also, I have very limited time to understand and provide input on proposed design guidelines. I am requesting additional time to understand and contribute to guidelines that could forever bind my property. (see attached email regarding lack of communication within the neighborhood).

2. It appears that the ballot process has been compromised. Firstly, the boundary to be included in the LHD was redrawn AFTER the ballots and accompanying information was distributed. I know that some of the residents believed that this designation was one way of keeping the Mullet Farm from demolition. Further, it is unclear to me whether appropriate controls are put on the ballots since they arrive with no name or property address on them. I am asking for more time to determine if these compromises have had an impact on voting thus far.

3. I have heard there has been much misinformation spread about the control an LHD would have on development. As late as March 18, I participated in a meeting where the team and others were inquiring about design guidelines that would supersede the existing zoning restrictions, including setbacks, building mass, and tree and landscape requirements. An expert, hired to participate in the meeting informed them that they would have little chance of getting such zoning changes processed. I think this misinformation is widespread and could have potentially skewed voting. (note that I am not suggesting impropriety here; simply the spread of proposed controls that the LHD cannot impose). I am asking for more time to fully understand what the LHD can and cannot afford the residents that live within the LHD, so we are all more informed and involved.
4. I believe that the combination of zones NS-2 and NT-2 within the proposed LHD is unprecedented in the city, and warrants further study as to impacts on ability to define and govern as a singular LHD. I understand from a brief meeting with zoning, that no other waterfront in St Petersburg has been included in an LHD. Further, in a poll, I understand that the majority of those in the NS-2 zone are opposed to the LHD, and are being overruled by a majority number of properties in the NT-2 zone. I am asking for more time to understand if the LHD boundary can effectively cross-over two zones, and if it is fair and equitable that a majority surrounding the NS-2 zone can impose the LHD upon the residents within NS-2.

5. It seems that the re-drawing of the proposed boundary of the LHD AFTER the ballots were sent out is, at the least, suspicious. As you are aware, the omitted properties asked to be excluded, and as such were known opponents to the application. I understand that one of the reasons provided was that they were not in the historic area of Driftwood. If this is the logic used, why not also exclude what the locals refer to as New Driftwood, the east-end of the neighborhood that has little of the character in homes and landscape of the remainder of Driftwood. From a distance I could infer they remained in the boundary as known supporters of the LHD. I seek additional time to fully understand the proposed boundaries from this standpoint.

I ask that you regard this request as an opportunity for me and others to further understand the process, and the implications of implementing a Local Historic District in Driftwood. I don’t know what is acceptable or customary for the duration of a postponement, but I would think 30 days would be sufficient. I would be glad to further discuss at your convenience.

Regards,

Chris Keller
727-488-4446

CC: Gina Driscoll,
City Council District 5
Gina.Driscoll@stpete.org

Jacqueline Kovilarich
City Attorney
Jacqueline.kovilarich@stpete.org
Dear Mr. Kilborn,

I hereby request termination of the captioned application, which is scheduled for 10 April CPPC hearing. The process has serious procedural flaws. The Official Ballot solicited votes on a district including the four West End parcels which I believe have now been deleted. At least one Support voter stated that had she known of this deletion, she would have been opposed. What she voted on was not what was officially presented to her. This goes for all voters, whether or not they were aware of the deletion – what they actually voted on was not what their Ballot stated they were voting on. Incredibly ironic is eliminating of Mullet Farm, Driftwood’s hallmark historical/architectural property, while not acceding to my request to opt out my nearby 2660 home which lacks such features. This situation strikes me as thinly-veiled, capricious special interest maneuvering.

The list of applicants shows names of some persons who are not voting property owners, some who had little or nothing to do with preparing the application, and at least one opponent whose name was hijacked without his knowledge and/or against his will. Some were told “go ahead and sign — it’s only a draft application,” “this applies only to trees,” or “controls won’t start for ten years.” The uncontrolled balloting procedure is open to fraud or misuse — a very scary prospect for a designation which could take away some of my property rights, and lose me hundreds of thousands of dollars upon sale of my home.

Historical designation is clearly appropriate for those Dodd homes which share a distinctive historical architecture, but not so for the many other homes which lack architectural or historic commonality. A chief characteristic of the non-Dodd homes is their variegation and individuality — something for which historical preservation is unsuited. Another key feature of Driftwood is its excellent, large waterfront lots. These parcels are the key to Driftwood’s future. Their highest and best usage would be compromised by the lock-in of historic designation applied to non-historical structures lacking distinctive architectural merit.
Historic Designation is an inappropriate way to maintain Driftwood's quality, because its enforcement centers primarily on architecture rather than social fabric, and uses the COA process reactively to prevent the wrong thing from being done. More appropriate would be Covenants and Restrictions of a Homeowners' Association which proactively guide homeowners to do the right thing. The misnamed Driftwood Property Owners' Association is just an unincorporated civic association rather than a POA/HOA per Florida Statutes, but it was the natural forum for fair and open exploration of how to maintain Driftwood's special nature. Designation proponents did not use this forum, nor did they explore the logical alternative of creating a real HOA – both approaches being more appropriate than Historic Designation. Instead they chose to commit tyranny of the majority enabled by the 50% + 1 standard applied with a dose of misinformation in the absence of substantive community discussion of control and equitability.

Historic Designation is the wrong way to preserve the whimsical, live and let live, individualistic social atmosphere of Driftwood. It would be appropriate if some Dodd home owners historically designate their homes. But please do not mis-apply historic designation to parcels like mine. Please terminate the process.

Sincerely,

Peter A. Pav
Friends and neighbors,

As the Historic Designation discussion has taken an unwelcome tone, I feel I may have inadvertently fueled mistrust, and for that I sincerely apologize. Historic districts in St. Pete have been resident initiatives, rather than Association initiatives, and in my efforts to keep the homeowners' association out of the historic debate, it was not on the January meeting agenda. My intent was to avoid any impression that the DPOA was taking a position. In hindsight, I should have asked for an update on the application process, with questions and concerns addressed after. I'm very sorry if my miscue contributed to unwarranted suspicions.

In my 15 years in Driftwood, historic designation has been brought up many times, but never fully pursued. Inevitably, it came up again, and the first exploration meeting in this round of historic designation discussions was held May 2017 with Laura Duvekot from the city. Everyone on the updated Driftwood mailing list was invited. (Unfortunately, we'd never had contact information from the Perezs.) Informal polling subsequently conducted, both in person and by phone, indicated a great deal of support throughout the neighborhood. Notices were also sent out about the following 2 meetings. In my opinion, the process has been transparent, and I'm sorry that some of you seem to feel blindsided or targeted. That was never anyone's intention.

I'm always proud to say that I'm from Driftwood, because we're known for our unique mix of personalities and collegiality. I hope we can all work to keep it that way.

Thank you so much.

Bonnie Agan
DPOA President
Laura Duvekot

From: Derek Kilborn
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 6:09 PM
To: Shepherd Grimes
Cc: Laura Duvekot
Subject: RE: Driftwood Historic Designation Application

Shepherd Grimes:

You do not need to resubmit your earlier comments. Only the vote is reset. I am copying Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist, who is processing the application.

Respectfully,
Derek S. Kilborn, Manager
Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division
Planning and Development Services Department
City of St. Petersburg, Florida
(+1) 727.893.7872

From: Shepherd Grimes [mailto:shepherd.grimes@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 4:39 PM
To: Council <Council@stpete.org>; Derek Kilborn <Derek.Kilborn@stpete.org>
Subject: Re: Driftwood Historic Designation Application

Dear City Officials,

Since the City has required a new referendum to support the revised application for historic designation in Driftwood, I am uncertain as to the official status of my prior comment letter (in the email chain below). Will it automatically be included as part of the record for the ongoing historic designation process, or has the process started anew, thereby requiring me to resubmit comments on the "new" application? I’m happy to act either way, as my views are unchanged and it is merely a matter of hitting send, but I’d like to know the answer so I can appropriately advise others in my neighborhood.

Thank you,
Shepherd R Grimes

On Fri, May 4, 2018 at 2:47 PM, Council <Council@stpete.org> wrote:

Thank you for contacting the Office of City Council. Your email will be shared with all members of Council.

Cindy Sheppard
Dear City Officials,

I am writing to express my wholehearted support for the proposed historic designation in Driftwood. As a directly affected homeowner, I ask that you take the time to read and fully consider my input. I own the property at 2500 Florida Ave S, where I have resided since November 2007. I am the sole owner of record for the property, but I now reside there with my wife, Jennifer Lee (copied on this email), and our 5 year old son, Bryan Grimes, both of whom also ardently support the designation.

One of the main factors that led me to purchase the property in 2007, and pay more than I believed good judgment supported, was the heavily wooded and historic nature of the surrounding community. Despite its close proximity to downtown, the area has retained a more rural and traditional Florida feel, and these are factors upon which I place great economic and social value. My entire family cherishes the existing character, and we hope to continue to do so for many years to come. Driftwood is a unique neighborhood within Saint Petersburg, from being off the rigid street grid imposed throughout Pinellas County to the tree in the middle of the road, it is truly distinctive, and my family will do what we can to maintain its current character. I believe a supermajority of the current property owners share my sentiments, as reflected by their votes in support for the application for historic designation.
I first moved to Saint Petersburg in 2001. Since that time, the area has changed dramatically, and generally, I'd say it has been for the better. The change has resulted in considerable redevelopment, most often in areas I considered in need of redevelopment. I would agree that there are remaining areas, particularly in southern and central Saint Petersburg, that would benefit considerably from neighborhood redevelopment, and I would fully support such efforts. However, Driftwood is definitely not one of those areas.

Looking at the City's neighborhoods, particularly in the waterfront neighborhoods, it is easy to see the result of the economic forces driving neighborhood redevelopment. Bigger, newer, and more costly structures can improve the financial status of the owners looking to cash out and can increase the ad valorem tax revenues generated from the higher valued properties, but this is not always in the best interests of the residents, the neighborhoods, or the City as a whole. As City officials should be well aware, there are non economic, often intangible, factors, which contribute greatly to the desirability of any given location. The Driftwood application for historic designation is merely seeking to protect some of those factors in a very small portion of south Saint Petersburg. Not every neighborhood needs or wants to become like Snell Isle or the Old Northeast, and the only effective way to restrain the economic forces that drive such redevelopment is through local government regulation of development.

I expect that such historic designations are always rather controversial. Despite the designation having been discussed openly in Driftwood for a number of years, the application stirred considerable dissent from a very vocal minority. The decision to preserve the historic nature of any community necessarily divides those who are primarily concerned with preserving the area in which they live from those who are primarily concerned with economic considerations (maximizing property value by avoiding additional restrictions on future redevelopment and reducing future maintenance costs) and perceive historic designation as a threat to their economic interests. I have attended a few meetings where the issues have been discussed by residents of Driftwood, as well as hired consults and interested parties, and I have closely read lengthy email exchanges among Driftwood residents. Through that experience, this is the exact same divide that I have observed in Driftwood.

As a named applicant in the historic designation process, I am concerned primarily with preserving the character of the neighborhood. The concrete, wood, metal, and plastic contained in the structures located at my address do not comprise my 401K. Likewise, the materials do not represent my long term care plan or my bequest to my descendants. Although I have made a financial investment in them, those materials combine to form my home, which is something I value in more than monetary terms. The same is true for the land underlying the structures at my address, which combine with surrounding land and structures to form my neighborhood. No matter their economic value, these are places where my children are nurtured, where a lifetime of memories are formed, and where my family continues to develop into part of the future of the community and the City of Saint Petersburg.

Through the aforementioned neighborhood discussions, I have confirmed that most Driftwood residents share a similar sentimentality about the neighborhood, although some clearly do not. It would be extremely naive to expect otherwise, because our city has considerable diversity, which it needs to truly prosper. I gladly accept such diversity of opinion, so long as it is informed opinion. In an effort to understand the views that are so different than my own, I’ve listened intently to concerns of the opponents to the application for historic designation. The underlying themes with every point raised in opposition to the designation have been defending individual property rights based on philosophical principles and maximizing economic return associated with ownership of property. I believe the former theme is actually rooted in the latter, but if it isn’t, there is nothing that can be done to address the concern via the ongoing historic designation process. Some simply feel that they should have absolute dominion over all that they own, but fortunately, such a notion is not supported in American jurisprudence. As to the economic self interest theme, I believe it is based largely on a fundamental misconception that historic designation necessarily leads to reduced property value. I believe something can be done to better inform, if not correct this misconception, and I believe the process for historic designation can play a main role in doing so. I ask for your assistance in this regard.

The City of Saint Petersburg has vastly more experience with historical designation than any individual party involved in
the Driftwood designation, including the advocates and consultants employed thus far in the process. What has this experience taught the City about the designation’s affect on property values? Has the City made any attempt to examine the effect of historic designation on the property values in existing historic neighborhoods? I could certainly be wrong, but I doubt there is a detectable negative effect at all. It seems just as likely that there would be a positive effect. As noted above, the historic character of my neighborhood increased the amount I was willing to pay, and I’m confident I’m not unique in that regard. Given how much modern society invests in real estate and the apparent obsession over its economic value, some reasonable metric of the economic impact of designation, or a reasonable proxy thereof, must be available. These are some of the facts that should be addressed via the designation process in an attempt to inform Driftwood Residents and City of Saint Petersburg decision makers, and assuage what I believe to be ill informed fears of financial loss associated with the designation. To date, I’ve seen a fair amount of what I consider fear mongering related to the potential designation, but I’m optimistic that actual facts can be used to assuage any unwarranted fears.

Despite my strong support for the designation, I am not unconcerned with its potential effect, including its economic effect. While I fully support preserving the character of Driftwood, I don’t want to see unnecessarily burdensome restrictions placed on property owners, so that the increased cost of maintenance, or making reasonable upgrades, prevents those activities from occurring. I don’t believe that such an increase in cost is a necessary outcome of the designation, and I anticipate that these concerns will be adequately addressed through the development of guidelines for the potential new historic district. I have no meaningful background in, or knowledge of, architectural styles, but even the untrained eye can observe that Driftwood contains a variety of styles and characteristics. My expectation is that this eclectic nature will present some challenges for developing guidelines for Driftwood, and that such guidelines will necessarily require considerable diversity and flexibility to accommodate preserving the existing character. In turn, this flexibility should serve to establish reasonable limits on any additional burdens placed on existing properties by the designation, including any increased costs associated with maintaining or redeveloping consistent with those guidelines.

I ask that you keep the above in mind as we all work to continue the historic designation process for Driftwood. I thank you for taking the time to read and contemplate my concerns.

Sincerely,

Shepherd R Grimes

Your Sunshine City
Richard and Bonnie Agan  
251 Driftwood Rd SE  
St. Petersburg, FL  33705

Sept. 15, 2018

Distinguished members of the St. Petersburg Community Planning and Preservation Commission,

As residents of Driftwood for 16 years, we feel incredibly privileged to live in this special place, along with a responsibility to preserve it. Although we do not live in one of the original Dodd houses, our street was developed after WWII with loving regard to Driftwood’s majestic old oaks, long leaf pines, and tropical shrubs.

It’s no coincidence that, when the city undertook a project featuring neighborhood videos for its website, Driftwood was the very first one chosen. It is obviously regarded as a city treasure.

A history of Driftwood was written in 1999 by Randell Dixon Dodd, son of artist and designer Mark Dixon Dodd, who laid out the winding roads and deep lots between 1936 and 1941, and created the 19 charming and unique homes still called “Dodd houses”. He wrote: “In 1981 the Planning Division of St. Petersburg’s Community Development Department conducted an extensive site survey of our city’s architectural and historic resources. Their comprehensive published report identified two neighborhoods, Driftwood and Roser Park, as primary areas with ‘strong site characteristics along with significant historic association and architectural uniqueness in that in each area one man envisioned and developed it so that the buildings were enhanced by their setting, and not vice versa.’ Their final recommendation was that ‘the architectural and natural site character and integrity of Driftwood should be preserved and maintained.’”

Today, 37 years later, we are asking the Community and Planning and Preservation Commission to fulfill the above recommendation by officially designating Driftwood for Historic Preservation.

With much appreciation,

Richard and Bonnie Agan

Cc: Derek Kilborn  
Laura Duvekot
February 2, 2018

VIA EMAIL: derek.kilborn@stpete.org
Derek Kilborn
Manager, Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division
City of St. Petersburg
P.O. Box 2842
St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842

Re: Proposed Driftwood Local Historic District

Dear Mr. Kilborn,

This firm represents Timothy and Janna Ranney, the owners of 2700 Driftwood Road South. As you are aware, their property is currently within the area proposed by several nearby homeowners for approval of a Local Historic District. The Ranneys, and several their contiguous neighbors, do not wish to be included in the proposed historic district or in an application to create a historic district, and hereby request their properties be removed from the proposed boundary as soon as possible.

Mr. Ranney spoke at the neighborhood meeting on January 17, 2018 and expressed his opposition. At that time, the individuals coordinating the application agreed to exclude the Ranneys. However, those individuals have since unilaterally rescinded their agreement, and have indicated they are now unwilling to exclude the Ranneys' property from the proposed district boundary. The Ranneys want the ability to build an appropriate home for the area without the unnecessary costs, extended timeframes and governmental oversight created by being in a historic district. They have therefore asked us to prepare this letter formally advising the City and the neighbors of their request to be removed.

In addition to the Ranneys, the contiguous neighbors listed below do not want to be within the boundaries of the proposed historic district. The following neighbors have signed statements (attached hereto) indicating their request to be excluded from the proposed boundary and any application to create a Local Historic District in the Driftwood area:

Ralph and Candace O'Brien, 2720 Driftwood Rd S
Julia McDowell, 2736 Driftwood Rd S
Eduardo Zavala, 2620 Driftwood Rd S
Christopher Keller, 2680 Driftwood Rd S
Peter and Yvonne Pav, 2660 Driftwood Rd S
The Ranneys bought their property because they love the location, and they plan to build a home on their property that is consistent with the neighborhood and landscaped in harmony with the surrounding area. But they and their neighbors do not wish to be in the proposed historic district, and respectfully request that they be excluded before a vote is sent out to the neighborhood or an application filed with the City.

Sincerely yours,

Anne Q. Pollack

cc: Laurie MacDonald
I am the owner of the Property located at 2620 Driftwood Rd S, Saint Petersburg, Florida. I am aware of the current plan to file an application to designate the Driftwood Neighborhood as an historic district, and I have been made aware that my property is within the boundary of the proposed district. While I have no objection to the creation of this historic district, I do not want my property to be included as part of the proposed district.

By my signature below, I am requesting that my property be removed from the boundary of the proposed Driftwood Historic District.

Eduardo Zavala
We are the owners of 2620 Driftwood Road South, St. Petersburg, Fl, which we recently purchased. Only after purchasing our property did we learn of the plan to apply for historic district designation for the Driftwood neighborhood. We also learned that our new property is within the boundaries of the proposed historic district.

We both appreciate and are greatly interested in history, and have no objection to a historic district. We do not, however, want our property to be included in the proposed historic district. We purchased it for a family home, with the intent of updating it for our needs while respecting the look and “feel” of the neighborhood. It is uncomfortable to think that this movement for an historic district, of which we were unaware, could infringe on our plans.

We therefore request that our property not be included within the boundaries of an historic district.

Respectfully,

Eduardo Zavala and Michelle Harris
I am the owner of the Property located at 2720 Driftwood Rd S, Saint Petersburg, Florida. I am aware of the current plan to file an application to designate the Driftwood Neighborhood as an historic district, and I have been made aware that my property is within the boundary of the proposed district. While I have no objection to the creation of this historic district, I do not want my property to be included as part of the proposed district.

By my signature below, I am requesting that my property be removed from the boundary of the proposed Driftwood Historic District.

Ralph O'Brien

Candace D. Berner
I am the owner of the Property located at 2660 Driftwood Rd S, Saint Petersburg, Florida. I am aware of the current plan to file an application to designate the Driftwood Neighborhood as an historic district, and I have been made aware that my property is within the boundary of the proposed district. While I have no objection to the creation of this historic district, I do not want my property to be included as part of the proposed district.

By my signature below, I am requesting that my property be removed from the boundary of the proposed Driftwood Historic District.

Peter Pav

Yvonne M. Pav
I am the owner of the Property located at 2736 Driftwood Rd S, Saint Petersburg, Florida. I am aware of the current plan to file an application to designate the Driftwood Neighborhood as an historic district, and I have been made aware that my property is within the boundary of the proposed district. While I have no objection to the creation of this historic district, I do not want my property to be included as part of the proposed district.

By my signature below, I am requesting that my property be removed from the boundary of the proposed Driftwood Historic District.

[Signature]
Julia McDowell
I am the owner of the Property located at 2680 Driftwood Rd S, Saint Petersburg, Florida. I am aware of the current plan to file an application to designate the Driftwood Neighborhood as an historic district, and I have been made aware that my property is within the boundary of the proposed district. While I have no objection to the creation of this historic district, I do not want my property to be included as part of the proposed district.

By my signature below, I am requesting that my property be removed from the boundary of the proposed Driftwood Historic District.

[Signature]

Christopher Keller
To: Derek Kilborn  
Manager, Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division  
City of St. Petersburg  
P.O. Box 2842  
St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842  
derek.kilborn@stpete.org

From: Chris Keller  
2680 Driftwood Rd S  
St. Petersburg, FL, 33705

Date: February 2, 2018

Subject: Proposed Driftwood Local Historic District

Mr. Kilborn,

I am the homeowner at the address listed above and I am writing to you in regard to the proposed designation of Local Historic District for the Driftwood area. My home is within the proposed boundary, but I respectfully request that you exclude my home and property from this designation. There is nothing historic nor even noteworthy about my home or property. Further, I have intentions of improving the property from its humble beginnings and do not want to incur the additional time, cost and scrutiny that accompanies historic designation.

Please note that I have also signed an affidavit joining a group of adjacent neighbors requesting exclusion from the Driftwood Local Historic District. I also support those in the area who have homes and properties that have historic interest, but I was compelled to personally convey my request under separate cover to reinforce my standing.

You may contact me at any time if you have any questions about my request to be excluded from this historic designation.

Regards,

Chris Keller  
727-488-4446
We are the owners of 2620 Driftwood Road South, St. Petersburg, Fl, which we recently purchased. Only after purchasing our property did we learn of the plan to apply for historic district designation for the Driftwood neighborhood. We also learned that our new property is within the boundaries of the proposed historic district.

We both appreciate and are greatly interested in history, and have no objection to a historic district. We do not, however, want our property to be included in the proposed historic district. We purchased it for a family home, with the intent of updating it for our needs while respecting the look and “feel” of the neighborhood. It is uncomfortable to think that this movement for an historic district, of which we were unaware, could infringe on our plans.

We therefore request that our property not be included within the boundaries of an historic district.

Respectfully,

Eduardo Zavala and Michelle Harris
To: Derek Kilborn  
Manager, Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division  
City of St. Petersburg  
P.O. Box 2842  
St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842  
derek.kilborn@stpete.org

From: Chris Keller  
2680 Driftwood Rd S  
St. Petersburg, FL, 33705

Date: February 2, 2018

Subject: Proposed Driftwood Local Historic District

Mr. Kilborn,

I am the homeowner at the address listed above and I am writing to you in regard to the proposed designation of Local Historic District for the Driftwood area. My home is within the proposed boundary, but I respectfully request that you exclude my home and property from this designation. There is nothing historic nor even noteworthy about my home or property. Further, I have intentions of improving the property from its humble beginnings and do not want to incur the additional time, cost and scrutiny that accompanies historic designation.

Please note that I have also signed an affidavit joining a group of adjacent neighbors requesting exclusion from the Driftwood Local Historic District. I also support those in the area who have homes and properties that have historic interest, but I was compelled to personally convey my request under separate cover to reinforce my standing.

You may contact me at any time if you have any questions about my request to be excluded from this historic designation.

Regards,

Chris Keller  
727-488-4446
I am the owner of the Property located at 2608 Driftwood Rd S, St. Petersburg, FL. I am aware of the current plan to file an application to designate the Driftwood Neighborhood as an historic district, and I have been made aware that my property is within the boundary of the proposed district. While I have no objection to the creation of this historic district, I do not want my property to be included as part of the proposed district.

By my signature below, I am requesting that my property be removed from the boundary of the proposed Driftwood Historic District.

[Signature]

Eric Higgs
Dear Mr. Kilborn,

Yesterday, via the included email, we sent you an historic district exclusion request from an additional contiguous neighbor, the Rixons. Today, please find an additional signed exclusion request from an additional contiguous property neighbor, the Higgs family at 2608 Driftwood.

This represents a total of eight contiguous property owners on the southwest end of the area commonly referred to as the "Driftwood Neighborhood" who are formally requesting to be excluded from any attempt to create an historic district that includes our properties.

As before, if you need any clarification pertaining to this request or additional information, please feel free to contact Tina Fischer at your convenience. Thank you in advance for your attention in this matter.

Regards,

Janna Ranney

> On Feb 3, 2018, at 2:04 PM, Janna Ranney <jannrann@gmail.com> wrote:
> Dear Mr. Kilborn,
> Yesterday via email, our attorney, Tina Fischer, sent you a letter with attachments from six contiguous property owners in the Driftwood area requesting exclusion from the proposed historic designation initiative. The Email was also sent to Laurie McDonald as one of the organizers of the initiative. Yesterday's email letter is being followed by a hardcopy letter that you and Ms. McDonald should receive Monday.
Since yesterday, and addition additional contiguous property owner has joined our request. Attached, please find a signed request from the Rixon family at 2675 formally requesting that their property be excluded from the boundary area for the proposed historic district. This represents a total of seven contiguous properties formally requesting to be opted out of any submission that the group promoting historic designation may attempt to submit to your office.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter. If any additional information is required pertaining to this request of the attached form, please feel free to contact Tina Fischer. I am sure you have her number.

Regards,

Janna Raaney

<scan.pdf>
I am the owner of the Property located at 2675 Driftwood Rd S, St. Petersburg, FL. I am aware of the current plan to file an application to designate the Driftwood Neighborhood as an historic district, and I have been made aware that my property is within the boundary of the proposed district. While I have no objection to the creation of this historic district, I do not want my property to be included as part of the proposed district.

By my signature below, I am requesting that my property be removed from the boundary of the proposed Driftwood Historic District.

Michael Rixon

Lucy Rixon
Thank you Michael. Laura, please note for the file. Thanks.

All,

Please see below email exchange between CM Rice and a citizen in the Driftwood neighborhood. Make sure that this makes it into the record for the case going forward.

Thanks,
Michael

Good morning,

Please see message below. It appears that Janna Ranney sent the same message to each CM individually.

Judy Tenison
Administrative Aide
Office of City Council
P.O. Box 2824
St. Petersburg, FL 33731
(727) 551-3305 / Fax: (727) 892-5360
Judy.Tenison@stpete.org

Please note all emails are subject to public records law.

From: Darden Rice
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 9:59 AM
To: Janna Ranney
Cc: Shaun Amarnani, Trenam Law; Justin L. Dees, Trenam Law; Judy A. Tenison
Subject: Re: Sea Level Rise / Flood Safety vs. Historic Designation for the Driftwood Neighborhood
Hi, Janna.

I appreciate your thoughtful and informed note.

Please understand that the likelihood of this coming before Council as a quasi-judicial matter prevents me from a back-and-forth dialogue. Shaun can explain how the quasi-judicial process works. Normally, I would not reply at all, but I can tell you put some thought into your letter and addressed it directly to me personally, and I did not want 'radio silence' to be the response as if you are being ignored or dismissed. There’s just a different process we have to follow here and I have to give the same little speech to everyone. So bear with me on that.

I am copying Judy Tenison to send this email to our land development city attorney Mike Dema to make sure this is part of the public record and to file accordingly if it becomes quasi-judicial.

You can reach out to staff for more information, such as Derek Kilborn, who leads our historic preservation and planning department. (Just not council members who serve as ‘judges’ in a quasi-judicial matter.)

Thank you for your understanding.

CM Darden Rice

Sent from my iPad

On Feb 14, 2018, at 6:03 PM, Janna Ranney <jannrann@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Honorable Councilwoman Darden Rice,

I am writing to you as a concerned citizen and property owner who believes historic preservation is both appropriate and necessary under circumstances where it is accomplished in accordance with St Petersburg's progressive stance on preparing for climate change. I hope you agree, potential loss of life, safety, and property damage from climate change takes precedence over historic designation.

Last year, I purchased a non-historically designated property in an A-rated flood zone located at 2700 Driftwood Road S., in the Driftwood neighborhood. Its exact location is indicated on attached flood zone map. I made plans to demolish the existing house as the house sits in an A-rated flood zone, the water level in Tampa Bay is rising, and the existing house currently represents a significant safety risk of flooding during hurricanes and other flood events. In response to my filing for a demolition permit, Preserve the Burg and certain neighbors decided to submit an application to designate the entire Driftwood neighborhood as historic, to stop the demolition.

I moved to St. Petersburg because it is a progressive city which at the same time respects and honors its history. For a city on the water, climate change poses many significant challenges for both our citizens and City leaders. Certainly one of these challenges is maintaining our City's character while keeping our residents safe. I hope our City officials will recognize the prudence of applying proactive measures and encourage homeowners in A-rated flood zones to rebuild their properties to comply with current FEMA regulations. While it might seem as though everything is fine right now with the existing homes in Driftwood, please consider the long term impacts of climate change in the years to come. There will be a point where a majority of the existing flood zone houses in Driftwood will no longer be safe without being rebuilt.

Driftwood neighbors leading the charge for a neighborhood historic district told me they would exclude my property from their application. They also agreed to exclude several other properties, all
contiguous to mine, and also located in the A-rated flood zone. I found out later, these same neighbors worked behind closed doors with Preserve the Burg to keep our properties within the proposed border for their historic district application, thus shutting my neighbors and me completely out of the process. This historic district designation will impact A-zone properties in a tremendously different manner than in other St. Petersburg historic neighborhoods. Had I been involved, I would have presented my concerns to my neighbors regarding climate change and flooding issues, as I have shared with you.

Addressing climate change is a tough process that will require strong leadership in the future. Dealing with the issue will get even tougher if we decide to inconsistently address the problem. At this point, I strongly urge you to not entertain this first-of-its-kind historic district proposal over a neighborhood that is primarily in an A-rated flood zone. At a minimum, please use your broad authority to allow those property owners in A-rated flood zones to opt out of a neighborhood historic district for Driftwood. The potential for loss of life, injury, and damage to property is too great and it outweighs any potential benefits of historic preservation.

Thank you for your time.

Best regards,

Janna Ranney

<2700 Driftwood Rd.png>
Good Afternoon - In the attached document are some serious thoughts for you to consider before placing your vote for the potential Driftwood historic designation.

Thank you for your time regarding this very important matter.

Best regards, Janna Ranney
February 15, 2018

Re: Sea Level Rise / Flood Safety vs. Historic Designation for the Driftwood Neighborhood

Dear Driftwood Neighbor:

I write to you as a deeply concerned neighbor regrading the potential historic designation of our beautiful Driftwood neighborhood. My husband and I bought in Driftwood because we love the Old Florida feel of the area and were told it was a friendly neighborhood with a "live and let live" philosophy; a philosophy that harks back to times past. I believe the historic designation movement for Driftwood goes against this philosophy.

We were not actively involved in, nor aware of the proposed plan for a historic designation in Driftwood until late in the game. Had we been given the opportunity to participate, we would have encouraged the neighborhood to reflect on some of the major consequences of historically designating Driftwood and how this decision could adversely affect our neighbors and our neighborhood.

We do not know if it was a strategy of divide and conquer by Preserve the Burg and others, but we were initially told by the proponents of the designation that our property and subsequently eight of our contiguous neighbors on the west side, would be excluded in the application to historically designate Driftwood. Recently we were told these promises are not going to be kept.

Based on this experience, we have serious reservations and doubts with trusting whether Preserve the Burg and other historic designation proponents are looking out for our best interests. We were not invited to numerous neighborhood meetings that discussed the historic designation and thus, we did not have the opportunity to participate in the process.

Had we been included in the process, we would voiced major concerns for the potential historic designation of the Driftwood neighborhood that include:

1. Our neighborhood is mostly in an A-rated flood zone as indicated on attached map. The Historic Code has no process to accommodate properties in flood zones. Only a few of the houses in Driftwood are built to withstand flooding from a hurricane or the rise of Tampa Bay due to climate change.
Insurance rates skyrocketed a few years ago when the national flood insurance program was cancelled. Homes not built to FEMA requirements pay a substantial premium. It is not unreasonable to foresee flood insurance rates for our non-compliant homes rising to $20k+ per year at some point. Homes that are not maintained to minimum standards are likely to not be eligible for insurance. This may cause many homes in Driftwood to become derelict or unsaleable, not only due to natural occurring disasters, but owners may not improve their properties if they are uninsurable.

There are too many unknowns about this issue that give us pause. To our knowledge, the City has never designated an A-rated flood zone neighborhood in the past. We feel strongly that property owners in A-rated flood zones should have the option to opt out of any potential historic district.

2. Last year, we all had the helpless feeling that Hurricane Irma was going to directly hit St. Petersburg. Under the Historic Code, we may not be able protect our homes until our current homes are destroyed by such a natural disaster. In order to demolish a building under the Historic Code, one must “demonstrate there is no reasonable beneficial use of the property.”

This is a life and safety issue. We all care more about our own and our neighbors’ safety during a hurricane than any potential benefit of a historically designated property.

3. The historic design standards were created for neighborhoods built in the 1920s and 1930s. As far as we know, all homes and neighborhoods granted a historic designation were built and established decades before Driftwood. Overlaying these design standards on a non-historic neighborhood like Driftwood will create a high level of unpredictability and confusion, likely causing a significant delay in approval as well unnecessary time, money, and stress just to perform routine exterior maintenance. The City of St. Petersburg Historic Code requires city approval for doors, roofs, windows, hurricane shutters, and other architectural features and that these features be styled closely as is original to the home. This may facilitate custom fabrication.

We would like to reiterate that we are not against the concept of historic preservation and designation for certain neighborhoods. However, given the uncertainties mentioned above, we are fully against the historic designation for Driftwood.

If any of the issues appeal to you as a valid concern, we strongly recommend you vote "No" when you receive the ballot to designate the neighborhood. If you are on the fence or even have a hint of doubt, please reach out before you vote.
If you are interested in learning more about the real consequences of historic designation, we will volunteer to have Shaun Amarnani of Trenam Law, one of our real estate and land use attorneys, give a presentation on the complicated and real issues with historic designation and how Driftwood could be impacted. Shaun formerly worked as a manager for the City of St. Petersburg City Development Administration and he is very familiar with the City’s Historic Code. Prior to that, he also sat as the attorney for two Tampa historic review boards, the Architectural Review Commission and Barrio Latino Commission, when he was an attorney for the City of Tampa.

For more information or if you would like to join us in our mission stop the Driftwood historic designation process, please email me at jannranng@gmail.com or call at (727) 599-3200.

Best regards,

Janna Ranney
I am the owner of the Property located at 2600 Driftwood Rd SE, St. Petersburg, FL. I am aware of the current plan to file an application to designate the Driftwood Neighborhood as an historic district, and I have been made aware that my property is within the boundary of the proposed district. While I have no objection to the creation of this historic district, I do not want my property to be included as part of the proposed district.

By my signature below, I am requesting that my property be removed from the boundary of the proposed Driftwood Historic District.

[Signature]

REVANE RICHMAN
I, Mark Brumby, am the owner of the Property located at 2510 Driftwood Rd SE, St. Petersburg, FL. I am aware of the current application to designate the Driftwood Neighborhood as an historic district, and I have been made aware that my property is within the boundary of the proposed district. Just as the boundaries were re-drawn to exclude properties at the west end of the neighborhood, I request that my property also be excluded as part of the proposed district.

By my signature below, I am requesting that my property be removed from the boundary of the proposed Driftwood Historic District.

Mark Brumby

PHONE: (727) 458-7948

EMAIL: markb@rezmagic.com
Good Afternoon Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am a 23 year resident of the Driftwood neighborhood. Attached please find my request for opt out status of the Historic designation for the neighborhood. I believe that inclusion of waterfront properties will place undue hardship on myself and other properties on the waterfront due to our vulnerability from potential storm surge and sea level rise, increased costs of maintenance and additional factors.

I am also attaching an Opt out request from my next door neighbor, Ruvane Richman, owner of 2600 Driftwood Rd SE. He is in the process of relocating from Seattle to St. Petersburg.

There are currently nine waterfront properties opposed to the designation.

I have two questions that I would appreciate answers to in regard to the upcoming hearing:

1. What is the date and time of CPPC quasi-judicial hearing?

2. Are we allowed to use Power Point and/or other media tools in our remarks at the hearing and is there a specific time limit that we are allowed to make our case.

Thank you in advance for your consideration and I look forward to your responses.

Regard,

Mark Brumby
I am the owner of the Property located at 2600 Driftwood Rd SE, St. Petersburg, FL. I am aware of the current plan to file an application to designate the Driftwood Neighborhood as an historic district, and I have been made aware that my property is within the boundary of the proposed district. While I have no objection to the creation of this historic district, I do not want my property to be included as part of the proposed district.

By my signature below, I am requesting that my property be removed from the boundary of the proposed Driftwood Historic District.

[Signature]

RUVANE RICHMAN
March 14, 2018

Elizabeth Schuh
160 International Parkway, Suite 180
Lake Mary, Florida 32746

RE: Your email and letter dated March 11, 2018, relating to 2420 Driftwood Road SE

Dear Ms. Elizabeth Schuh:

This is a letter of response to your email dated March 11, 2018, and relates to property located at 2420 Driftwood Road SE. My name is Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division (“UPHP”). The UPHP is responsible for administering the City of St. Petersburg’s Historic Preservation and Archaeological Overlay and related programs. The following information is organized to specifically address each of your concerns and provide additional direction, where appropriate.

According to the Pinellas County Property Appraiser’s Office (“PCPAO”), Daniel B. Schuh, is the registered owner of two (2) tax parcels (31-31-17-22590-000-0010 and 31-31-17-22554-000-0021) located at 2420 Driftwood Rd. SE. The mailing address for the registered owner is the same as the subject property. This mailing address was used for all official correspondence from our division.

Non/Support by Daniel B. Schuh

On February 8, 2017, Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist, received an email sent by Laurie MacDonald with copy to BJ Sheffield, Trish Moore, and Peter Meinke, indicating that a draft application was in process. Duvekot responded to this email asking for a list of parties to be named as applicants on the ballot distribution. Sheffield replied with a list of 25 individual names. Since several of the names appeared to be nicknames, Duvekot cross-referenced the PCPAO records for accuracy and the names were updated accordingly. Sheffield was then asked to confirm the updated list, which she did by email response. As you correctly noted, the list includes names of individuals who are not property owners; these names were included on the [ballot] cover letter in order to identify every individual who was presented as part of the organization effort.

On February 16, 2018, ballots were distributed to all registered property owners of tax parcels within the proposed boundary. A copy of the cover letter and ballot is attached. On February 26, 2018, Sheffield emailed Duvekot to inform her that Daniel B. Schuh never agreed to inclusion on this list of names and should be removed from the application. The email was copied to Laurie MacDonald, Trish Moore, Peter Meinke, Daniel Schuh, and callmepace@gmail.com. Duvekot replied that the application had not been formally submitted and that Schuh’s name could be removed by the applicants before filing the application.
In addition to the opportunity for comment at the two (2) public hearings, you may also submit a letter of opinion to be included in the staff report. If submitted at least seven (7) days prior to the Community Planning and Preservation Commission public hearing, your letter of opinion will be included with the initial staff report and other attachments.

**Ballot Process**

The ballot process was established in 2015 as a mechanism for improving upon an earlier petition process that included a number of deficiencies. The ballot process is designed to ascertain support for initiating a local historic district designation application. The outcome of the ballot process is not a legal designation, which can only be granted by ordinance through the City Council.

The ballot process begins with direct mail notice to all registered property owners within the proposed district boundary. This information is collated by the City's Computer Systems Coordinator using official records from the PCPAO. In the case of trusts, the PCPAO usually lists a primary contact for the trust separate from the treasurer; a letter and ballot are sent to both. Ballots are sent by City Staff using a Certificate of Mailing through the United States Postal Service (“USPS”). Remitted ballots are returned to our office, where they are date stamped by the Administrative Assistant, recorded in a tracking log, and then filed through Duvekot in the application folder. This process of distribution and collection is controlled by City Staff in order to mitigate any accusations of exclusion or omission.

The objective of the ballot process is to obtain a signed authorization from the owners of record indicating their support for, or opposition to, initiating a local historic district designation application. During development of the ballot process with City Council and the City Attorney’s office, it was determined that a unique tracking number would not be required for each individual ballot. Furthermore, it was determined that the original ballot was not required and that signed authorization may be remitted on a photocopy; however, the remitted ballot must include the printed name, street address, signature of the registered property owner, and date. Regarding possible forgeries, the official ballot states, “A forged signature is an illegal signature that may be prosecuted accordingly; the City of St. Petersburg reserves the right to verify signature authenticity with the ballot recipient.” The City has not received a ballot for the subject property at 2420 Driftwood Rd. SE.

**Coastal Resiliency and Sea Level Rise**

The subject property is located in Flood Zone AE with a base flood elevation line of 8.00 feet. Your letter notes, and City Staff acknowledges, the competing goals of historic preservation with coastal resiliency. While certain exemptions from federal flood regulations exist for designated properties and building modifications are possible, concerns about personal safety, homeowner’s insurance, and property damage remain. City staff is currently researching the impact of local historic district designation on efforts to improve coastal resiliency and will address this concern in the final report and presentation.

**History of Driftwood Neighborhood**

The application narrative submitted with the designation application includes extensive details about the history of the Driftwood neighborhood. Your letter states that the application includes, “…false information about Driftwood’s history…” These descriptions are important not only for processing the application, but also for maintaining an accurate historic record of the neighborhood. Our historic preservation staff welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these specific statements regarding historic accuracy.
Conclusion

The UPHP is most interested in administering a fair process that respects input from all interested parties. I hope the information provided here demonstrates a sincere effort and helps to explain the areas of concern outlined in your letter. If you have any questions, comments, or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully,

[Derek S. Kilborn]
Manager
Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division
Planning and Economic Development Department
City of St. Petersburg, Florida
(+1) 727.893.7872 Ms. Elizabeth S

Attachments:

- Original letter by Elizabeth Schuh dated March 11, 2018
- Email exchange regarding status of Daniel B. Schuh
- Official cover letter and ballot
- Ballot distribution list
Dear City Council,

My name is Elizabeth Schuh. I am writing to you as the representative and power of attorney for my 80 year old father, Daniel Schuh, who is the property owner of a home at 2420 Driftwood Rd SE and the longest living resident in Driftwood.

I am highly concerned about the tactics used my father’s neighbor, Laurie Macdonald, along with her partner, Peter Belmont from Preserve the Burg, to get Driftwood designated as a local historic district. These individuals placed my father, an elderly man with major health issues including cognitive problems, on a Driftwood historic designation application without his knowledge and then circulated it to the City of St. Petersburg staff and my father’s neighbors. Laurie Macdonald did not contact me, otherwise I would have communicated his wishes against the historic designation. His support on this issue in particular could negatively impact him financially and jeopardize his ability to continue living in the neighborhood he loves so much. I cannot believe these proponents of historic designation would stoop to this level and take advantage of our elderly.

Besides the lies regarding my father’s support, the fact that my father’s house sits in a flood zone, and that there are a lot of other inherent problems with the costs associated with maintaining a historic house, my father and I think this process is tremendously unfair for the following reasons:

1. I read the historic district application provided by the proponents of designation. The following 7 people are not property owners who are eligible to vote for a Driftwood historic designation but they misleadingly showed up on the application in support of a Driftwood District:
   1. Rebekah Pulley
   2. Pamela McMullen
   3. Carolyn Bradfield
   4. Jennifer Hardin
   5. Gail Halsey Collins
   6. Kathryn Krystan
   7. Jennifer Lee Grimes

2. Even worst, the City Staff sent out the historic district ballots with all of these falsified names, including my father, and they were placed on the ballot as “applicants” for the district (see attached). I don’t know why the ballots were written like this. One can only assume that it appears that names were placed on the ballot in order to show favoritism for support of the District. This would be comparable to a ballot for your city council elections that contained all of the endorsements of your opponents (along with some fake endorsements). This fearmongering tactic also influences any future district vote because now neighbors think my dad is a historic district supporter, which he is rot, and he cannot walk the neighborhood to tell all of his neighbors that he is completely against a Driftwood designation.

3. The ballots also appear to be easily subject to tampering. There are no tracking numbers on the ballots to confirm that the ballots are unique. There are also no City return envelopes. What’s to say that one of the proponents of preservation couldn’t just copy the form, adjust the name, and turn in a forged ballot for a neighbor who they know is out-of-town? This may seem far-fetched, but given that my father was taken advantage of, I would approach everything involved in this process with a high level of skepticism.
4. The application also has other false information about Driftwood's history that, again, compounds my concern about the legitimacy of this process.

Do not let these proponents of designation get away with what they are doing. There comes a time when common decency should prevail over those who clearly abuse the process for personal desires and gain. We are counting on you to make this right and rework this process in a way that is honest and legitimate.

Due to the mistrust I've gained of forces driving historic redistricting and the significant infringements a small majority can force on unwilling and/or uninformed property owners, I request disclosure on how the City validates;

- All legal property owners including identifying the legal agents associated with corporations, trusts and estates;
- The receipt of official notifications to all affected and legal property owners; and
- Each returned ballot is original and signed by a valid owner or owner's agent.

In addition to these more general and standard concerns for all of St. Petersburg residents, I would like to know what steps the city takes to protect elderly residents from unknowingly being subject to fraud during the historical designation process, and if there are any penalties for those who knowingly falsify applications for local historic districts?

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Schuh
Laura Duvekot

From: Laura Duvekot  
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2018 9:02 AM  
To: 'Bi-Empyrean'; Derek Kilborn  
Cc: 'Laurie Macdonald'; Trish Moore; '*Peter Meinke'; '*Daniel Schuh'; callmepaco@gmail.com  
Subject: RE: Request to remove a name from Driftwood Historic application

Good morning—

The draft version of the application that was submitted on 2/12 lists Mr. Schuh among the applicants; you/the applicants can modify that document before final submission to reflect a change in this list of applicants. I will be sure to confirm that the list of applicants is accurate and have noted the request for this change. Thank you for the update.

Regards,
Laura Duvekot
Historic Preservationist II
Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
City of St. Petersburg, Florida

727.892.5451
laura.duvekot@stpete.org

From: BJ - Empyrean [mailto:bj@empyrean.net]  
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2018 11:25 AM  
To: Laura Duvekot <Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org>; Derek Kilborn <Derek.Kilborn@stpete.org>  
Cc: 'Laurie Macdonald' <lauriewildwood@gmail.com>; Trish Moore <trishloweymoore@gmail.com>; '*Peter Meinke' <meinkep@eckerd.edu>; '*Daniel Schuh' <danschuh@earthlink.net>; callmepaco@gmail.com  
Subject: Request to remove a name from Driftwood Historic application

Dear Laura,

It has been brought to our attention in a very public fashion that one of the names on our application never agreed to that inclusion. I have made an apology for the misunderstanding and hope that since we are still in DRAFT mode we can remove that person’s name from the Driftwood Historic District application. Please let me know if you need this request for removal in writing with their signature or if I can simply request that you remove Daniel B Schuh’s name from the application?

I request this removal be done prior to submission of the real application. I have copied all parties in this email.

Sincerely,

BJ Sheffield
727-460-8141c
Driftwood Historic District Initiative
Instructions for Ballot to Determine Support/Opposition of an Application for the Designation of the Proposed Driftwood Local Historic District

File Number: HPC 17-90300006

Boundaries of Affected Area: Roughly, 24th Avenue Southeast, the rear parcel lines of properties located on the 2700 block of Driftwood Road South, Beach Drive Southeast, and Tampa Bay, as shown below.

Legal Description: Pearson Subdivision, Lots 1 and 2; Driftwood, Lots 1 through 22; Driftwood First Addition, Lots A and 1 through 17; and Driftwood Second Addition, Lots 1 through 14

Applicants: Laurie Macdonald Mary P. Moore Terence Moore
Belinda Sheffield Peter Meinke Jeanne Meinke
Ann Sackett Pamela McMullen David McMuller
Martha Sammy Arthur Skinner Katrina Van Tassel-Skinner
Bruce Ahern Carolyn Bradfield Donald C. Myers
Tira Myers James Studdiford Jeff Thompson
Bonita Agan Richard Agan Marilyn Shay
F. Thomas Shay Gail Halsey Collins Lynne McDonald
Winton Morrison Siddie Morrison Robert Pastore
Rebekah Pulley Shepherd Grimes Jennifer Lee Grimes
Mordecai Walker Emmanuel Roux Jennifer Hardin
Daniel Schuh Kathryn Krystan Robert Krystan
Orion Ayer Miriam Gregg Ronald Gregg

Request: Listing of the Driftwood Local Historic District in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places

Dear Property Owner,

Per the St. Petersburg City Code, Historic and Archaeological Preservation Overlay, Section 16.30.070.2.5.2.a, you are receiving this notification and attached ballot because you are the owner of property that is located within a proposed local historic district. A public information session regarding this application, of which your household was directly noticed, was held on January 17, 2018 at the Friends’ Meeting House. If you were unable to attend the meeting or have additional questions about the impacts of this proposal, please contact City staff using the information listed below.

The support of property owners representing more than 50% of the subject tax parcels is required for the application process to proceed. This vote will not finalize the designation of the above-referenced local historic district, rather it is required in order for the application to be considered by the Community Planning and Preservation Commission (CPPC) and the City Council.

Process for Tallying Votes

Each tax parcel is counted as one vote, regardless of the number of owners registered to that property. However, in the case of properties with multiple owners, each registered owner will receive a ballot and have the opportunity to vote. If ballots representing conflicting votes among multiple owners of a single tax parcel are received, the vote for that parcel will be counted as a vote of non-support. If there are multiple owners of a property and only one ballot has been received by Monday, April 16, 2018, then the vote indicated on the returned ballot will be counted for the entire parcel. Properties from which no ballot has been returned by Monday, April 16, 2018 will be considered to express nonsupport/opposition.
There are fifty-one (51) parcels within the proposed district. If support from the owners of twenty-seven (27) properties and all other materials required for the submission of a designation application, including an application fee, have been provided to the City, then the district application will be certified complete and proceed to quasi-judicial hearing and review by the CPPC. Once a district application has been certified complete, no permits shall be issued for any exterior alterations, demolitions, or new construction, except in cases of ordinary repair and maintenance, until the City Council has rendered a final decision on the designation request.

**Next Steps in the Designation Process**

Both you, as a property owner, and the owners of properties within 200 feet of the proposed boundary, will be notified a minimum of ten days prior to the CPPC quasi-judicial hearing. This hearing will include a presentation by City staff of an analysis of the potential district’s historic significance and integrity. This will be followed by a presentation from the applicant and an opportunity for public input. After hearing from staff, the applicant, and any interested parties, the CPPC will vote for or against recommendation of designation of the proposed district.

Within 60 days following the CPPC meeting, the City Council will evaluate the proposed district designation at a quasi-judicial hearing. Property owners and owners of properties within 200 feet of the proposed boundary will again be notified a minimum of ten days prior to the quasi-judicial hearing of its time and location. The hearing will be conducted in the same manner as the CPPC hearing and followed by a discussion and final decision of the City Council.

**Effects Should the Proposed District Application Be Approved**

If the application is approved by the City Council, your property will be recorded as either a contributing or non-contributing property within the local district. As such, a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) will be required for future exterior alteration, new construction, demolition, or relocation. The COA process is essentially a design review that is generally conducted concurrently with the issuance of other necessary building or demolition permits. The process, which has recently been streamlined, is not designed to hinder owners’ ability to update and maintain their properties, but aims to ensure the sensitivity of exterior alterations and additions to the historic nature of a designated district or individual local landmark.

**Ballot Remittance and Status Updates**

Contact Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist, at 727.892.5451/laura.duvekot@stpete.org or visit www.stpete.org/history for further information on the City’s historic preservation program and this application.

Please consider your choice of support or opposition/nonsupport and return the attached ballot to:

- Official Ballot, Driftwood LHD
- c/o Laura Duvekot
- Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division
- PO Box 2842
- St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842

Signed ballots must be postmarked on or before Monday, April 16, 2018 or delivered in person by 4pm on that date to the Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division, 8th Floor, Municipal Services Center, One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg. Please note that the results of this vote are not exempt from relevant public records laws.

Respectfully,

Derek Kilborn, Manager
Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division
Planning and Economic Development Department

/cc: Dave Goodwin, Director, Planning & Economic Development Department
Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney, City Attorney’s Office
I, __________________________________________, owner of the property located at
(Insert Street Address) __________________________________________, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705,

☐ SUPPORT

☐ DO NOT SUPPORT

the initiation of an application for designation of the Driftwood Local Historic District in the St. Petersburg Register
of Historic Places. The proposed district boundary includes the fifty-two (52) properties roughly bounded by 24th
Avenue Southeast, Tampa Bay, the rear parcel line of properties along the 2700 block of Driftwood Road South,
and Beach Drive Southeast.

A forged signature is an illegal signature that may be prosecuted accordingly; the City of St. Petersburg reserves
the right to verify signature authenticity with the ballot recipient.

(Signature) ___________________________ (Date) ___________________________

Ballot Instructions:

Please sign and return this ballot on or before Monday, April 16, 2018. The ballot may be:

- Delivered in person to the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division, 8th Floor of the Municipal Services Center,
  One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, FL 33701;
- Mailed to Official Ballot, Driftwood LHD c/o Laura Duvekot, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division, PO Box
  2842, St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842.

A demonstration of support from 50% + one (1) of the tax parcels located within the proposed boundary is required for this
application to proceed to the Community Planning & Preservation Commission (CPPC) and City Council. The final decision
regarding this application will be determined by City Council action, not by the outcome of this vote. The application will be deemed
complete immediately upon receipt of: "support" votes representing at least twenty-seven (27) of the fifty-one (51) tax parcels
within the proposed district a complete application for the designation of the proposed area as a local historic district, and a
processing fee from the applicant.

The response for each tax parcel will be counted as one (1) vote; in the case of conflicting votes among multiple owners of a single
tax parcel, the vote will be counted as nonsupport. If there are multiple owners of a property and only one ballot has been received
by April 16, 2018, then the vote indicated on the returned ballot will be counted for the entire parcel. Following return of the ballot,
your position may not be changed.

Ballots not received or postmarked on or before April 16, 2018 will be recorded as a nonresponse and counted as a “do not
support” vote, except among multiple owners of a single tax parcel where one or more ballots have been remitted. These will be
recorded as described above.

This vote is to initiate the application process only; it does not finalize the decision of whether a historic district will be officially
created. If sufficient support is demonstrated and the application forwarded to the CPPC and City Council, you will be given a
minimum of 10 days' notice of the public hearings at which you may provide input regarding the potential district designation,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIPCODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FREEMAN, JAMES R</td>
<td>127 WILDWOOD LN SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST PETERSBURG, CITY OF</td>
<td>PO BOX 2842</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33731-2842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWART, REID E</td>
<td>227 DRIFTWOOD RD SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-2845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC DONALD, LYNN E</td>
<td>W875 SHERWOOD RD</td>
<td>PITTSVILLE</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>54466-9647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYER, ORION T JR</td>
<td>200 DRIFTWOOD RD SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-2846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAVALA, EDUARDO ALBERTO</td>
<td>2620 DRIFTWOOD RD S</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart, REID</td>
<td>262 DRIFTWOOD RD SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-2845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDONALD, LYNN E</td>
<td>234 DRIFTWOOD RD SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-2846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUX, EMMANUEL J</td>
<td>2519 DRIFTWOOD RD SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER, MORDECAI</td>
<td>231 DRIFTWOOD RD SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-2845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIXON, MICHAEL</td>
<td>287 DRIFTWOOD RD S</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINEBERGER, IAN M</td>
<td>2505 DRIFTWOOD RD SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANNEY, TIMOTHY R</td>
<td>4600 WATERFORD CT NE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COWEN, JAMES S</td>
<td>135 WILDWOOD LN SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600 DRIFTWOOD ROAD LLC</td>
<td>PO BOX 23114</td>
<td>SEATTLE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>98102-0414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC DONALD, LAURIE A</td>
<td>103 WILDWOOD LN SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANCUSI, DENNIS</td>
<td>111 WILDWOOD LN SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARNETT, J PAXTON</td>
<td>136 25TH AVE S</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'BRIEN, RALPH B JR</td>
<td>2720 DRIFTWOOD RD S</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHUH, DANIEL B</td>
<td>2420 DRIFTWOOD RD SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRITNER, MICHAEL</td>
<td>345 71ST ST S</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33707-1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPYTEK, NATALIA</td>
<td>207 DRIFTWOOD RD SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-2845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLER, CHRISTOPHER</td>
<td>2680 DRIFTWOOD RD S</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEREZ, BRUCE A</td>
<td>515 GEORGETOWN PL</td>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>34695-4434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEINKE, J PETER</td>
<td>147 WILDWOOD LN SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASTORE, ROBERT J</td>
<td>2605 DRIFTWOOD RD S</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEMAN, JAMES R</td>
<td>127 WILDWOOD LN SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINEBERGER, IAN M</td>
<td>2505 DRIFTWOOD RD SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAV, PETER A TRE</td>
<td>2660 DRIFTWOOD RD S</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE, TERENCE S</td>
<td>240 DRIFTWOOD RD SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-2846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORRISON, SIDDIE J</td>
<td>277 DRIFTWOOD RD SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-2845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGGS, ERIC J</td>
<td>2608 DRIFTWOOD RD S</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'BRIEN, KIM M</td>
<td>2635 FLORIDA AVE S</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTTER-PEREZ, PENNI S</td>
<td>515 GEORGETOWN PL</td>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>34695-4434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANNEY, JANNA P</td>
<td>4600 WATERFORD CT NE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIXON, LUCILLE</td>
<td>2675 DRIFTWOOD RD S</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAY, MARILYN J</td>
<td>241 DRIFTWOOD RD SE</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-2845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANTASSEL-SKINNER, KATRINA</td>
<td>2617 DRIFTWOOD RD S</td>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33705-3247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: The Honorable Lisa Wheeler-Bowman, Chair, and Members of City Council

SUBJECT: [Quasi-Judicial Item] Privately initiated and ballot-approved Local Landmark Designation of the Driftwood Local Historic District, which shall generally include the area between 24th Avenue South, Driftwood Road South (that portion formerly known as Ward Avenue South), and Tampa Bay, as shown on the attached map. (City File HPC 17-90300006).

An analysis of the request is provided in the attached Staff Report.

REQUEST: The request is to designate the Driftwood Local Historic District as a local historic district to be included in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places.

RECOMMENDATION:

Administration: Administration recommends APPROVAL.

Community Planning and Preservation Commission: On October 9, 2018, the Community Planning and Preservation Commission held a public hearing on this matter and voted unanimously 7-to-0 to recommend approval of the landmark designation, including the recommendations of contributing and noncontributing resources and of significant character-defining features suggested by the attached Staff Report, to City Council.

Special Notes:

1. This item was originally scheduled for consideration by City Council on November 15, 2018. Due to legal complaint filed by the opponents, and upon recommendation from the City Attorney’s Office, the City Council voted to defer the item prior to opening the public hearing.

2. The Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division subsequently prepared a response to certain allegations in the complaint, see attached.

Recommended City Council Action: 1) CONDUCT the second reading and quasi-judicial public hearing, and 2) APPROVE the proposed ordinance.

Attachments: Memorandum Responding to Complaint, Ordinance (including map), CPPC Draft Minutes, Staff Report to the CPPC, Designation Application
To: Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney

From: Derek Kilborn, Manager, and Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist II
Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division
Planning and Development Services Department.

Date: December 17, 2018

Re: Driftwood: Response to Complaint

Daniel Schuh, Peter Pav, Yvonne Pav, Michelle Harris, Eduardo Zavala, 2600 Driftwood road, LLC, Christopher Keller, Dennis Mancusi, and Mark Brusby

v.

The City of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg Preservation, Inc. d/b/a Preserve the Burg, Peter Belmont, Emily Elwyn, Howard Hansen, and Laurie MacDonald.

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide specific responses to the “General Allegations” outlined in Circuit Court of the Sixth Judicial Circuit, Filing No. 80781536, 11/14/2018, 01:03:40 P.M. Since the numbered items are a combination of general statements of fact and opinion and allegations, the following responses have been abbreviated to address only those allegations that are applicable to our Division.

10. Driftwood is an officially recognized neighborhood and with defined boundaries. According to the City of St. Petersburg’s Community Services Department, the neighborhood is represented by the Driftwood Property Owners Association, http://driftwoodpoa.com. The registered contact is Bonnie Agan, (727) 896-2426, bonnie@bonnieagan.com, 251 Driftwood Rd. SE, 33705. Further, the City of St. Petersburg’s Marketing Department produced a video featuring the Driftwood neighborhood: https://youtu.be/r1-s7ZJuqA.

The registered boundary of the neighborhood association matches the proposed boundary of the landmark application.

Attachment No. 1: Neighborhood Association Map

The registered boundary of the neighborhood association and the subject boundary of the submitted application are further supported by the recorded subdivision plats:

Attachment No. 2: 1937 Driftwood Book 20, Page 75
Attachment No. 3: 1937 Driftwood Book 20, Page 76
Attachment No. 4: 1940 Driftwood 1st Addition Book 21, Page 50
Attachment No. 5: 1940 Driftwood 2nd Addition Book 22, Page 29
13. When combined with line item 14, the characterization suggests a narrow effort by three (3) individuals – Ms. Laurie Macdonald, Mr. Peter Belmont, and Mr. Howard Hansen. This characterization excludes any reference to a much broader public discussion that took place prior to preparation and distribution of ballots:

02.02.2017: Meeting with Laurie Macdonald;

05.30.2017: First meeting with multiple property owners at home of Carla Jimenez. City staff was invited to answer neighborhood questions about a potential designation of the Driftwood neighborhood as a local landmark district;

11.13.2017: Second meeting with multiple property owners at home of Carla Jimenez. City staff was invited to answer neighborhood questions about a potential designation of the Driftwood neighborhood as a local landmark district;

12.12.2017: Neighborhood canvassing effort reported by supporters of the application. City staff met on-site with Laurie Macdonald, Kim O’Brien, Belinda Sheffield, and Howard Hansen to further discuss the requirements for applying and possible boundary considerations;

01-17-2018: Public information meeting hosted by City staff at the Quaker Religious Society’s Friends Meeting House, 130 19th Avenue SE, St. Petersburg, 33705. Invitations to this meeting were sent by USPS to all owners of property as registered with the Pinellas County Property Appraiser’s Office;

02-18-2018: Original ballots distributed.

Attachment No. 6: Sign-In Sheet, May 30, 2017
Attachment No. 7: Sign-In Sheet, November 13, 2017
Attachment No. 8: Sign-in Sheet, January 17, 2018

17. This line item introduces several separate considerations:

First, that ballots could not be changed after submission:

   a. It is not clear whether this allegation is addressing the first round of ballots exclusively, or is it conflating the first round of ballots with the second round of ballots. Since it appears under a section heading for the first round of ballots, it is assumed that this allegation is exclusive to the first round of ballots.

   b. The first round included three (3) ballots that were remitted to the City, which were signed by the property owner but not checked to indicate whether the property owner was voting “support” or “do not support.” These ballots included:

      1) Ronald Gregg, 2400 1st Street SE;
      2) Terence Moore, 240 Driftwood Rd. SE; and
      3) Mordecai Walker, 231 Driftwood Rd. SE.
Upon receipt of these unchecked ballots, each owner was contacted directly by City staff or where direct contact information was not on file, through the application liaison. Since an unchecked box does not constitute a vote, each owner was given an opportunity to correct the record by submitting a new ballot or visiting the office to place a checkmark on the original submission indicating their vote.

c. No property owner was permitted to change their vote within the first round of ballots.

Second, that photocopies (of ballots) were submitted via email. While it is factual to say that at least one (1) ballot was transmitted by email, ballots were not officially counted until a physical copy was received by City staff as prescribed by City Code. Specifically, Lisa and Ruvane Richman, 2600 Driftwood Road, initially attempted to remit their ballot by email attachment. City staff could not accept this form of submission, so they remitted their ballot by FedEx Priority Overnight Mail to guarantee that it would be included in the final tally. [Please note, this correspondence occurred as part of the second round of balloting and not the first.]

Third, that handwriting inconsistencies exist on the ballot. This is an allegation of fraudulent signature that cannot be answered by City staff.

Finally, if this allegation was intended to include changed votes from the first round of balloting to the second round of balloting, the following is also included for your information. For reasons outlined in the cover letter accompanying the second round of ballots, the first round of balloting was nullified, and an entirely new round of balloting was conducted. During the second round of balloting, the following distinctions were identified, all of which favor the “Plaintiffs” [italics] and other opponents:

- Dennis Mancusi, from no response first round to “does not support” second round
- Paxton Barnett, from no response first round to “does not support” second round
- Bruce Ahern, from “support” first round to “does not support” second round
- Michelle Harris, from no response first round to “does not support” second round
- Eduardo Zavala, from no response first round to “does not support” second round
- Peter Pav, from no response first round to “does not support” second round
- Lucille Rixon, from no response first round to “does not support” second round
- Michael Rixon, from no response first round to “does not support” second round

Attachment No. 9: Unchecked Ballots
Attachment No. 10: Correspondence and Priority Overnight Mail receipt

18. This allegation includes two (2) parts:

First, that Timothy and Janna Ranney were engaged in a “legal battle” with the City of St. Petersburg. This characterization is misleading. City Code Section 16.30.070.2.11 prescribes a 30-day stay of demolition for all addresses included on the list of potentially eligible properties for local landmark designation. The house at 2700 Driftwood Road South was included on the list. In accordance with City Code, a letter of notification was sent on February 21, 2018, with a response.
deadline of March 26, 2018. The City executed its requirement per the City Code; the City Council did not initiate an emergency action nor did the City Council initiate a designation application over the owners' objection.

Finally, that the building owned by Timothy and Janna Ranney, 2700 Driftwood Road SE "could not be restored." While not relevant to the case under consideration, it should be noted for the record that City staff was not presented with a forensic study of the building or a report from a licensed architect or engineer concerning the structural soundness of the building and its suitability for rehabilitation, including an estimated cost to rehabilitate the property. Lacking this evidence, a statement regarding restoration is speculative and not substantiated by any evidence.

20. This allegation states "Rather than address the concerns raised by the Ranneys and other like-minded tax parcel owners in Driftwood, as further outlined below, the Defendants simply cut out the Ranneys from the historical designation process, thereby silencing their biggest critics." On February 22, 2018 and March 1, 2018, Tim and Janna Ranney hosted an event at the St. Petersburg Yacht Club with presentations by their legal counsel, at that time – Shaun Amarnani and Justin Dees, Trenam Law. These meetings were memorialized in a news article published in the Tampa Bay Times on March 1, 2018 titled “Neighbors unhappy about planned demolition of Gandy House.” The Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division was not invited to either event, as an observer or participant.

While the Ranneys are under no obligation to invite City staff, this exclusion discredits any accusation that City staff “simply cut-out” or attempted to silence their biggest critics. Since our office administers the historic preservation program in St. Petersburg, City staff could have provided important and specific information about a variety of questions including new concerns raised regarding storm surge and coastal resiliency. City staff also could have coordinated to include the Certified Floodplain Manager and related staff from the City’s Construction Services and Permitting Division to answer questions about FEMA and the Florida Building Code. An offer was extended by City staff to their legal counsel to participate in any future meetings.

Attachment 11: Invitation to Meeting


23. This allegation asserts that “Terrance Moore, Ronald and Miriam Gregg, and Mordecai Walker” originally “opposed historic designation, and thus were opposed to the Application.” Based on the official record, this is incorrect and not supported by the physical evidence:

- An unchecked box does not constitute a vote, which is described more completely in the City staff response to line item 17 above.
- Miriam Gregg is included in this list of names by the Plaintiffs, but Miriam Gregg’s first round ballot was submitted with the box checked indicating her "support" for the application to proceed.
• All individuals listed here were included on the submitted application, and none have protested or communicated their opposition otherwise.

24. The completion of a local landmark designation application for a local historic district requires assistance from many individuals. Efforts include, but are not limited to, initial research, neighborhood canvassing, written descriptions, and coordination with City staff. In some cases, the application narrative is prepared before the ballot round, as it is intended to inform the neighborhood discussion and consideration about whether to proceed toward a designation application. The listing of all names associated with preparation of an application is considered important for an open and transparent process, regardless of property ownership.

Only registered owners of property may vote through the ballot process to initiate a designation application; it is correct to say that individuals not registered as property owners through the Pinellas County Property Appraiser’s Office are not eligible to vote.

27. This allegation includes two (2) parts related to mapping and the boundary narrative.

First, the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division provides courtesy assistance to the community on questions relating to historic preservation, including mapping. When an applicant is preparing a local landmark designation application, historic preservation staff will routinely coordinate with Michael Hernandez, City of St. Petersburg’s Computer Systems Coordinator, to prepare a map(s) that is consistent with the City’s geographic information system. In this instance, maps were prepared by the Coordinator in response to evolving discussions about the final boundary. These maps are the most accurate and preferred for official use.

A map was included in the original ballot distribution. An updated map was included in the second ballot distribution, including a copy of the original map and description of the updated boundary change.

Second, the allegation asserts that the narrative should have been updated to reflect the new boundary. The Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division disagrees. The original narrative not only encompasses the original ballot boundary but also the history of the Driftwood neighborhood in the context of the broader area. Regardless of an exact boundary, this information is still relevant to determining at least one (1) factor of integrity – setting.

28. This allegation states that Daniel Schuh was erroneously included on the cover letter enclosed with the first ballot round. This statement is correct and based on information provided to City staff by designation proponents.

On February 8, 2018, an email from Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist, Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division to BJ Sheffield attempted to confirm the list of names for inclusion on the original ballot cover letter. Daniel Schuh was listed in the embedded table. A final confirmation from Sheffield was received on the same date at 4:26 p.m.

Attachment 12: Email thread with BJ Sheffield, February 8, 2018
On March 11, 2018, Elizabeth Schuh sent a letter of correspondence to the City Council with copy to Mayor Rick Kriseman, Jacqueline Kovilaritch, City Attorney, and Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division. The letter asserts that Ms. Schuh is the representative and power of attorney for Daniel Schuh. Based on this testimony from Ms. Schuh, and a separate concern related to the amended district boundary, the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division requested a new ballot process and voided the results of the first ballot round. This decision was made over the objection of the proponents and intended to guarantee a fair and transparent process for all property owners within the proposed district.

While the characterization of Daniel Schuh as one of the application’s “strongest opponents” may be true, that has not been the experience of City staff. Schuh participated in a neighborhood information meeting on Monday, November 13, 2017 at 135 Wildwood Lane SE. Although his questions and comments indicated that he had reservations about district designation, City staff would not characterize his participation in the meeting as strongly opposed nor has he explicitly stated such an opinion directly to City staff at any point in this process. Schuh did not attend the public information meeting hosted by City staff at the Quaker Religious Society’s Friends Meeting House. Schuh did not remit his ballot during the first or second round of voting.

Section 16.30.070.2.5.B.2.a(2) states, “The POD shall obtain a certificate of mailing on the date of the mailing, and only City issued ballots that have a postmark within 60 days of the date of mailing, or have been physically received by the POD within 60 days the date of mailing and have been date stamped by the City, shall be counted.” This section clearly delineates two options of receipt:

1) City issued ballots that have a postmark within 60 days of the date of mailing; OR
2) [City issued ballots that have been] physically received by the POD within 60 days the date of mailing and have been date stamped by the City.

The Plaintiffs and corresponding citations of code omit reference to the word “or” which is critical in answering this question. Separate allegations regarding electronic submission(s) are refuted elsewhere in this response.

This allegation references use of a “falsified Application.” It is not clear from this statement whether the Plaintiffs are alleging false information was included in the ballot cover letter for the second ballot round or in the application narrative. The Plaintiffs have provided no evidence to either identify or refute the historic narrative of the proposed local historic district. A letter from Elizabeth Schuh dated March 11, 2018, made similar accusations of inaccuracy, “The application also has other false information about Driftwood’s history that, again, compounds my concern about the legitimacy of this process.” A subsequent letter sent by Derek Kilborn in response to
Schuh's letter invited submissions of any information that would help correct the application narrative. As of this writing, no additional information has been received:

"The application narrative submitted with the designation application includes extensive details about the history of the Driftwood neighborhood. Your letter states that the application includes, "...false information about Driftwood's history..." These descriptions are important not only for processing the application, but also for maintaining an accurate historic record of the neighborhood. Our historic preservation staff welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these specific statements regarding historic accuracy."

Attachment No. 14: Letter from Elizabeth Schuh, March 11, 2018
Attachment No. 15: Letter of response from Derek Kilborn to Elizabeth Schuh, March 14, 2018

35. City staff did not accept or tally ballots that were transmitted by email. Details are outlined in line item 17 above, paragraph two.

36. City staff rejects the assertion that City staff "chose to ignore violations of the City ordinances, and instead doubled-down, insisting that any opponents taking issue with the voting improprieties voice their concerns to City Council." Following the first ballot round, City staff carefully listened to the opponents concerns and nullified the results based on that information. This is the antithesis of doubling-down and demonstrates that City staff took those concerns seriously. City staff does not acknowledge any alleged violations of the City Code relating to the second ballot round. Moreover, the reference to City Council was an invitation for future discussion regarding historic process in general and not a dismissal as inferred by the Plaintiffs:

“To the extent that you are concerned with the process generally, our Community Planning and Preservation Commission and City Council are more appropriate forums to voice such concerns. Historic preservation staff has indicated that they are open to suggestions, and we share your desire to making the process better where appropriate.”

The reference was included in an email sent from Michael Dema, Esq., Assistant City Attorney, Cit of St. Petersburg, to Justin Dees, Esq., Trenam Law, dated August 1, 2018. Trenam Law is no longer representing their client on this matter.

Attachment No. 16: Letter of response from Michael Dema. Esq. to Justin Dees, Esq., August 1, 2018

37. The Summary of “Round Two” Ballot Returns, included as “Appendix B: Sample of Ballot Distributed June 27, 2018" in the City staff report, is accurate. There were nine (9) ballots remitted representing eight (8) parcels; each ballot voted “do not support” by checking the required box. City staff cannot discern the intentions of non-responses, and to present the information as suggested by the Plaintiffs would be based on presumption and more importantly, dishonest.
Attachment No. 17: Summary of “Round Two” Ballot Returns

38. City staff rejects these allegations as “blunders”. In this instance, both the process and responses included herein demonstrate a transparent and honest attempt to address all competing opinions on this matter.

Attachments
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA
CIVIL DIVISION

DANIEL SCHUH, PETER PAV, YVONNE
PAV, MICHELLE HARRIS, EDUARDO
ZAVALA, 2600 DRIFTWOOD ROAD, LLC,
CHRISTOPHER KELLER, DENNIS
MANCUSI, and MARK BRUMBY,

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, a
municipality, ST. PETERSBURG
PRESERVATION, INC. d/b/a PRESERVE
THE ‘BURG, PETER BELMONT, EMILY
ELWYN, HOWARD FEREBEE HANSEN,
and LAURIE MACDONALD,

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs, DANIEL SCHUH, PETER PAV, YVONNE PAV, MICHELLE HARRIS,
EDUARDO ZAVALA, 2600 DRIFTWOOD ROAD, LLC, CHRISTOPHER KELLER, DENNIS
MANCUSI and MARK BRUMBY (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), hereby sue Defendants, THE
CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG (the “City”), ST. PETERSBURG PRESERVATION, INC. d/b/a
PRESERVE THE ‘BURG (“Preserve the ‘Burg”), PETER BELMONT (“Mr. Belmont”),
EMILY ELWYN (“Ms. Elwyn”), HOWARD FEREBEE HANSEN (“Mr. Hansen”), AND
LAURIE MACDONALD (“Ms. Macdonald”), and allege:

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

1. The Plaintiffs own real property in St. Petersburg, Florida.
2. The City is a municipality organized and existing under the laws of the State of Florida and located in Pinellas County, Florida.

3. Preserve the ‘Burg is a not-for-profit corporation, organized and existing under the laws of the State of Florida and doing business in Pinellas County, Florida. Mr. Belmont is also the Vice President of Preserve the ‘Burg.

4. Mr. Belmont is an individual who, upon information and belief, resides in Pinellas County, Florida.

5. Ms. Elwyn is an individual who, upon information and belief, resides in Pinellas County, Florida.

6. Mr. Hansen is an individual who, upon information and belief, resides in Pinellas County, Florida.

7. Ms. Macdonald is an individual who, upon information and belief, resides in Pinellas County, Florida.

8. Venue is proper in this county pursuant to Section 47.011, Florida Statutes, because: (1) one or more of the Defendants resides in Pinellas County, Florida; and (2) the causes of action asserted herein accrued in Pinellas County, Florida.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

9. The “Driftwood” neighborhood is generally located in the southeastern section of St. Petersburg, just south of the downtown urban core (“Driftwood”).

10. Driftwood is not, however, an officially defined or recognized neighborhood, nor is it otherwise definable by clear and definite geographical boundaries or roadways.

11. Further, Driftwood is not recognizable by any certain cohesive structural, architectural or building style; rather, Driftwood is an eclectic hodgepodge of various buildings, structures and homes built over a nearly 77-year timespan, in greatly differing architectural styles,
and of vastly dissimilar sizes, setbacks and altered characteristics from their original construction dates.

12. The Plaintiffs own tax parcels within a geographical area that the Defendants have deemed to be Driftwood.

*The City's First Round of Balloting Impropriety and Ordinance Violations*

13. During the summer and fall of 2017, Ms. Macdonald, a resident of Driftwood and advocate for Preserve the 'Burg (and longtime partner of its Vice President, Mr. Belmont) met with City officials to initiate the balloting process required to submit an application for historical designation of Driftwood.

14. Thereafter, in or around December of 2017, with input from Ms. Macdonald, Mr. Hansen and Mr. Belmont, the City began drafting official voting ballots to be mailed to the owners of each of 51 tax parcels contained within what Defendants arbitrarily deemed to be Driftwood (the "Original Proposed Boundaries") such that a subsequent application could be submitted to designate Driftwood as a historical district.

15. On February 18, 2018, the City mailed the official ballots to each of the 51 tax parcels contained within the Original Proposed Boundaries to determine if there was sufficient neighborhood support for the Application (collectively, the "Original Ballots"). A true and correct copy of one of the Original Ballots is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

---

1 The Original Proposed Boundaries were described as: "[T]he shoreline of Big Bayou to its south and this riparian "bulkhead line" runs east along the shore to the western r.o.w. line of Beach Drive SE, thence north along the west line of said drive to the southern line of the vacated parcel of 24th Avenue SE continuing westerly along this line to the southern r.o.w. line of 24th Avenue SE thence west to the eastern r.o.w. line of 1st Street SE, thence south along this line to the southern r.o.w. line of 25th Avenue S, thence west to the southeastern r.o.w. line of Florida Avenue S, thence southeast to the southeastern r.o.w. line of Bethel Avenue S, thence southwest to the SE r.o.w. of Ward Avenue (Driftwood Road S), thence southeast along said line continuing along to the shore of Big Bayou, the point of beginning [sic]." (See Ex. A).
16. As indicated on the Original Ballots:

A demonstration of support from 50% + one (1) of the tax parcels located within the proposed boundary is required for this application to proceed to the Community Planning & Preservation Commission (CPPC) and City Council . . . The response for each tax parcel will be counted as one (1) vote; in the case of conflicting votes among multiple owners of a single tax parcel, the vote will be counted as nonsupport . . . Following return of the ballot your position may not be changed. Ballots not received or postmarked on or before April 16, 2018 will be recorded as a nonresponse and counted as a “do not support” vote . . . .

(emphasis added).

17. Notwithstanding the fact that ballots could not be changed after submission, the City disregarded its own ordinances2 and accepted not only Original Ballots that were changed from their initial positions, but also photocopies submitted via email (and thus NOT original or received “physically”), some of which contained handwriting inconsistencies evidencing that certain tax parcel owners who previously voted in opposition were not the same individuals that ultimately submitted the changed ballot (the “Altered Ballots”). True and correct copies of Altered Ballots are attached here as Composite Exhibit B.

18. Around the same time as the issuance of the Original Ballots, Timothy and Janna Ranney, the new owners of the Gandy House—a notable landmark which just so happened to be one of the 51 tax parcels in the Original Proposed Boundaries—were engaged in a related and widely publicized legal battle with the City over the demolition of the Gandy House, which had fallen into disrepair and could not be restored.

19. Mr. and Mrs. Ranney, much to the chagrin of Ms. Macdonald, Mr. Belmont and Preserve the ‘Burg, were also prominently opposed to the historical designation of Driftwood, and

---

2 See City Code Section 16.30.070.2.5(B)(2)(a).
were active in a grassroots campaign to inform neighbors of the potential pitfalls of historical designation.

20. Rather than address the concerns raised by the Ranneys and other like-minded tax parcel owners in Driftwood, as further outlined below, the Defendants simply cut out the Ranneys from the historical designation process, thereby silencing their biggest critics.

Defendants' False Application for Historic Designation

21. On March 5, 2018, and based entirely on the City's improper tallying of Altered Ballots, the Defendants, Ms. Elwyn, Mr. Hansen and Ms. Macdonald, with the assistance of the Defendants' attorney, Peter Belmont and other representatives from Preserve the 'Burg, submitted an application to the City for local landmark designation seeking to designate the Driftwood neighborhood as a historic district (the "Application"), which the City subsequently accepted. A true and correct copy of the Application is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

22. The City violated its own ordinances in accepting the Application because it was based entirely on the City's improper tallying of the Original Ballots and the Altered Ballots.

23. Moreover, the Application falsely identifies Terrance Moore, Ronald and Miriam Gregg and Mordecai Walker as favorable "applicants" to the historical designation. In reality, at the time the Application was submitted, Terrance Moore, Ronald and Miriam Gregg and Mordecai Walker's Original Ballots submitted to the City opposed historical designation, and thus they were opposed to the Application.

24. The Application also misleadingly includes at least 7 other individuals as supposed "applicants" that do not even own tax parcels in the proposed Driftwood neighborhood and, therefore, are not even eligible to vote in support of historic designation.3

3 These individuals include: Rebekah Pulley; Pamela McMullen, Carolyn Bradfield, Jennifer Hardin, Gail Hasley Collins, Kathryn Kryzst, and Jennifer Lee Grimes.
25. The Application itself also reveals that Driftwood is far from a cohesive and historically preserved neighborhood, but rather, that the Defendants had stretched the City’s definitions in order to make a square peg fit in a round hole.

26. Indeed, the Application speciously lumps all the Driftwood properties together as “historic” under the guise that certain events, including a Civil War skirmish and the location of the Abel Miranda’s former home, somehow drape the entire Driftwood area with the auspices of legitimate historic designation, when in reality, the Driftwood area is simply a quaint series of narrow tree lined streets which are already protected by various arborist ordinances.

27. Although the Application fails to include a map of the proposed property to be designated as a historic district—something else required by City Code Section 16.30.070.2.5(B)(1)(d), which should have summarily resulted in its rejection—it generally describes the proposed historic district’s boundaries as the Original Proposed Boundaries (which again, were entirely of the Defendants’ making).

28. In addition to the wrongfully included names of applicant supporters, the instructions for the Original Ballots dishonestly listed Daniel Schuh—another of the proposed historic district’s strongest opponents—as a supposed applicant for the historic designation.4

29. This not only was false since Mr. Schuh vehemently opposes historic designation, but also because the Application itself did not identify him as an applicant.

30. Based on questions raised regarding the legality of the Original Ballots, pressure from the Ranneys, and mounting concerns over their grassroots movement to put an end to the

---

4 Other supposed applicants on the Original Ballots, ostensibly included to drum up support and inflate its backing, include those listed in Footnote 2, supra, which again are not even owners of tax parcels in Driftwood, and therefore cannot vote for the historical designation.
improper historical designation, the Defendants scrapped the Original Ballots and attempted to start anew.

The City’s Second Round of Balloting Impropriety and Ordinance Violations

31. On June 27, 2018, the City mailed a second round of official ballots to 47 tax parcels, which excised the Ranneys and three other tax parcel owners (the “Revised Ballots”). A true and correct copy of the Revised Ballots is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

32. The Revised Ballots were required to adhere to the same ordinances as the Original Ballots including, but not limited to, the requirement that the tax parcel owners must “return by mail a signed ballot” and that only Revised Ballots that “have been being physically received... shall be counted.” (emphasis supplied).

33. Furthermore, the Revised Ballots confirmed that the City cannot accept an application which does not meet the requirements of a valid balloting and voting procedure.5

34. Unfortunately, however, the City failed to require that a new, amended and truthful application be filed and instead allowed the second round of Revised Ballots be mailed to support the same falsified Application as before.

35. Just like it ignored ordinance violations within the Original Ballots, the City again ignored ordinance violations within the Revised Ballots by accepting and tallying the Revised Ballots that it did not “physically” receive, but rather received electronically and through photocopies. (Exhibit E).

36. When confronted directly with this fact, the City still chose to ignore violations of the City’s ordinances, and instead doubled-down, insisting that any opponents taking issue with the voting improprieties voice their concerns to City Council. Correspondences between the City

---

5 See City Code Section 16.30.070.2.5(B)(2)(a)(7).
and Mr. Schuh's attorneys memorializing this exchange are attached hereto as Composite Exhibit F.

37. Moreover, in tallying the Revised Ballots, and authoring its Staff Report to City Council recommending the historical designation of Driftwood, the City's staff members incorrectly reported to City Council that there were only 9 Revised Ballots of "non-support" to the Driftwood historical designation, when in fact there were 19 Revised Ballots that should have been reported as "opposed" pursuant to the City's ordinances. A true and correct copy of the City Staff Report is attached hereto as Exhibit G, and the City's Tally Sheet for the Revised Ballots is attached hereto as Exhibit H.

38. The Staff Report, like the City's prior blunders with the Original Ballots and Revised Ballots, as well as the Defendants' falsified Application, further evidences the mishandling, misinformation and deceit that the Driftwood historical designation process is now synonymous with.

39. What's more, the Defendants' egregious conduct outlined above is not innocuous as it negatively and directly impacts the Plaintiffs' respective property rights, which are now in jeopardy.

40. Plaintiffs have retained the law firm of Smolker, Bartlett, Loeb, Hinds & Thompson, P.A. to represent them in this matter, and are further obligated to pay their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

41. All conditions precedent to bringing this action have been met or have been waived.

**COUNT I**
**Declaratory Judgment**

42. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate paragraphs 1–41 above as if fully set forth herein.

43. This is an action for declaratory relief.
44. The parties are in dispute regarding the validity and legality of the procedure employed in attempting to designate the Driftwood neighborhood a historic district in light of the falsified Application, Original Ballots, Altered Ballots, Revised Ballots and the City's tallying of votes.

45. There is a bona fide, actual, present practical need for a declaration regarding the validity and legality of the procedure employed in attempting to designate the Driftwood neighborhood a historic district.

46. Such a declaration deals with a present, ascertainable state of facts and/or a present controversy as to those facts.

47. An immunity, power, privileged or right of the Plaintiffs is dependent upon these facts and/or the law applicable to these facts including, but not limited to, the Plaintiffs' property rights.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court enter a judgment:

(a) Declaring that the City's actions with respect to the Original Ballots and Altered Ballots violated City ordinances;

(b) Declaring that the City’s actions with respect to the Revised Ballots violated City ordinances;

(c) Declaring that the Application, which is based on the improper Original Ballots, Altered Ballots and Revised Ballots fails to meet the requirements of an application for historical designation and is false, null and void;

(d) Declaring that the City Staff Report authored by the City's Community Planning and Preservation Commission underreported votes of "non-support" by ignoring unreturned
ballots that must be counted in opposition, thereby reporting false and misleading information to City Council;

(e) Declaring that the Defendants violated the City’s ordinances in their attempts at designating the Plaintiffs’ properties as historic;

(f) Awarding the Plaintiffs their reasonable and equitable costs incurred in bringing this action pursuant to Section 86.081, Florida Statutes; and,

(g) Granting any other and further relief as this Court deems just and appropriate, with respect to the Revised Ballots violated its own ordinances;

Dated this 14th day of November, 2018.

/s/ Tyler A. Hayden
ETHAN J. LOEB
Florida Bar Number 0668338
ethaal@smolkerbartlett.com
susanm@smolkerbartlett.com
TYLER A. HAYDEN
Florida Bar Number 095205
tylerh@smolkerbartlett.com
alyssac@smolkerbartlett.com
MICHAEL J. LABBEE
Florida Bar Number 106058
michael@smolkerbartlett.com
rochelle@smolkerbartlett.com
SMOLKER, BARTLETT, LOEB, HINDS & THOMPSON, P.A.
100 North Tampa Street, Suite 2050
Tampa, Florida 33602
(813) 223-3888; Fax: (813) 228-6422
Attorneys for Plaintiffs
FIRST ADDITION TO DRIFTWOOD SUBDIVISION

BEING A REPLAT OF BLOCK A & LOT 1 OF DRIFTWOOD SUBDIVISION AS RECORDED IN Plat Book 6 Page PANAGIL PINELLAS COUNTY, PINELLAS CO. FLOMIA.

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF PINELLAS

BEING A PART OF THE NE1/4 OF SECTION 31, TWP. 31 S, RNG. 17 E, ST PETERSBURG, PINELLAS CO., FLOMIA.

DESCRIPT:

Date: 5/26/1954
Owner: Harry F. Blood

APPROVED:

Harry F. Blood
Owner

Prepared by the

St. Petersburg

State Engineer

Prepared by

B. E. Johnson

ST. PETERSBURG

State Engineer

Prepared by

B. E. Johnson

PRELIMINARY PLAT

First Addition to Driftwood

First Add. to Driftwood

12-12-54

M. J. Jones

City Manager

Appended to the Planning Board of St. Petersburg, 8th Day of April, A.D. 1954.

The property described has been surveyed and depicted on the plat herein and that the Plat is correct and the survey is true and correct.

Prepared by

B. E. Johnson

Prepared by

B. E. Johnson
Laura

This is a reminder that the Driftwood meeting is this evening, Tuesday, May 30th at 7pm at 127 Wildwood Lane SE (Jimenez/Freeman home). I will be on work travel most of the day but you can reach me at 727-580-9585 if you have any questions in preparation for the meeting. I will bring a screen and a back up projector. I may try to set up a speaker phone for the owners (family) of the Archie Parrish home as they are not in the state at this time yet are very interested in taking part.

Please send me a brief bio for your introduction, as well as for any other staff that may be accompanying you.

I called all neighbors around Wildwood Park, from Bay Street to First Street on Driftwood and Wildwood, to check that this would be a good date with the exception of Perez as I do not have contact information for them. All whom I reached said that they would plan to come. I talked with our Driftwood secretary a couple days ago and she said at that time about 16 people had RSVP'd. Here is the notice that went out to the whole neighborhood; it is only slightly different from the draft I submitted, for instance I included a phrase that no boundary has been chosen yet:

Please join neighbors on Tuesday May 30th, 7 p.m., at 127 Wildwood Lane, the Jimenez/Freeman home, to hear a presentation and take part in a question/answer dialogue with Laura Doveket of the City of St Pete's Historic Preservation Dept. We will be exploring the possibility of historic neighborhood landmarking for a portion of Driftwood in order to preserve the unique character of the area. Laura will let us know what historic neighborhood designation means for homeowners, the benefits and the required conditions. Ask questions and become fully informed. The primary area of interest is the circle Park. All Driftwood neighbors are welcome and encouraged to attend.
We hope to have a good turnout next week to learn about the program. Please RSVP by reply to this email so we'll have enough chairs set out.

We look forward to your presentation,
Laurie

Laurie Macdonald
727.580.9585
lauriewildwood@gmail.com
St. Petersburg FL / Hood River OR
POSSIBLE DRIFTWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
INITIAL MEETING WITH NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
MAY 30, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura Duvekot</td>
<td>City of St. Petersburg</td>
<td>727.892.5451</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Laura.duvekot@stpete.org">Laura.duvekot@stpete.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Sackett</td>
<td>2500 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>727 896 5426</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wsackett@tampabay.rr.com">wsackett@tampabay.rr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Agan</td>
<td>251 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>727 896 5426</td>
<td>bonnie@bonnieagar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. W. Scott</td>
<td>277 Driftwood Ln SE</td>
<td>727 599 5472</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wscott@swfls.com">wscott@swfls.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Marcusi</td>
<td>111 Wildwood Lane SE</td>
<td>727 599 5472</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmsdn34@gmail.com">jmsdn34@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Bob Rizpston</td>
<td>3 Whittier Ct, Jesseville Rd</td>
<td>410 991 1112</td>
<td><a href="mailto:krizpston@earthlink.net">krizpston@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne &amp; Peter Meulicke</td>
<td>147 Wildwood Ln SE</td>
<td>727 896 1862</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmeuleke@prodigy.net">jmeuleke@prodigy.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Studdiford</td>
<td>3575 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>727-823-0718</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jess@yotmail.com">jess@yotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Macdonald</td>
<td>103 Wildwood Lane SE</td>
<td>727-580-9585</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lmacdonald@earthlink.net">lmacdonald@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Jimenez</td>
<td>127 Wildwood Lane SE</td>
<td>727-823-1508</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carla53@gmail.com">carla53@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of St. Petersburg – Division of Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Neighborhood Meeting Presentation & Workshop
Potential Historic District – Driftwood Neighborhood
Meeting beginning 7:00 pm on Monday, November 13, 2017 at 135 Wildwood Lane SE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura Duvekot</td>
<td>City of St. Petersburg</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org">Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Kilborn</td>
<td>City of St. Petersburg</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Derek.Kilborn@stpete.org">Derek.Kilborn@stpete.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selma Sheffield</td>
<td>2417 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bj@empyrean.net">bj@empyrean.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish Moore</td>
<td>240 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:trishslowemoore@gmail.com">trishslowemoore@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim E. Bauan</td>
<td>2635 Florida Ave S.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:muppyhuo@fro1.com">muppyhuo@fro1.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Schulz</td>
<td>2420 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jin Sackett</td>
<td>2500 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jinsackett@tampabayrr.com">jinsackett@tampabayrr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Skinner</td>
<td>2617 Driftwood Pk.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kts@tampabayrr.com">kts@tampabayrr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M. Schuh</td>
<td>2425 Oakdale St South 33706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Roque</td>
<td>2519 Driftwood Rd 33705</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emroux16@gmail.com">emroux16@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Jimenez</td>
<td>127 Wildwood Lane SE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carlaj3e@gmail.com">carlaj3e@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Studdiford</td>
<td>2515 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald</td>
<td>103 Wildwood Lane</td>
<td><a href="mailto:davinwildwords@gmail.com">davinwildwords@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Hansen</td>
<td>3810 20th N.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:floetjard10@gmail.com">floetjard10@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Not in Driftwood

---

Meeting at 7:00 pm on Monday, November 13, 2017 at 135 Wildwood Lane SE.

Attendees:
- Brian
- Jim
- Trish

Note to Laurie: Email 50-60 attendees.
Mtg Jan 17 @ Friends Mtg Home.

Please Sign Up!

Name		Addie		Email
Laura Duckett	city of St Pete	lauandulent@hotmail.com
Pax @Janice Barnett 136-25th Ave S. Driftwood	jbarnett43@Eaospa.com
Marilyn Shay 241 Driftwood Rd SE marilyn@petfittplus.com
Erica Lacker 2272 Driftwood Rd SE erin.lack@gmail.com
Laurie McDonald 103 Wildwood Lane SE lauriewildwood@gmail.com
TRISH MOORE 240 Driftwood Rd SE trishloweymore@gmail.com

Pamela & David McFadden 2521 Driftwood Rd SE
Tim Barry
Lisa Fischer 433 Central Ave threeprofessional@fletcherbischec.com
Kathy Kropfman 123 Wildwood Ln SE kropfman@verizon.net
Jim Studdiford 2515 Driftwood Rd SE
Bonnie Agem 251 Driftwood Rd SE bonnie@bonnieagem.com
BJ Sheffield 237 Driftwood Rd SE bj@emptyhead.net

13. Properties
I, Ronald Gregg, owner of the property located at 2400 - 1st Street SE, do not support the initiation of an application for designation of the Driftwood Local Historic District in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places. The proposed district boundary includes the fifty-two (52) properties roughly bounded by 24th Avenue Southeast, Tampa Bay, the rear parcel line of properties along the 2700 block of Driftwood Road South, and Beach Drive Southeast.

A forged signature is an illegal signature that may be prosecuted accordingly; the City of St. Petersburg reserves the right to verify signature authenticity with the ballot recipient.

Ronald Gregg 02-22-2018
(Signature) (Date)
I, ___________________________________________, owner of the property located at

2400-1ST S.E.__________________________________________ St. Petersburg, Florida 33705,

SUPPORT

DO NOT SUPPORT

the initiation of an application for designation of the Driftwood Local Historic District in the St. Petersburg Register
of Historic Places. The proposed district boundary includes the fifty-two (52) properties roughly bounded by 24th
Avenue Southeast, Tampa Bay, the rear parcel line of properties along the 2700 block of Driftwood Road South,
and Beach Drive Southeast.

A forged signature is an illegal signature that may be prosecuted accordingly; the City of St. Petersburg reserves
the right to verify signature authenticity with the ballot recipient.

Ronald Gregg 02-26-18

(Signature) (Date)

Ballot Instructions:

Please sign and return this ballot on or before Monday, April 16, 2018. The ballot may be:

- Delivered in person to the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division. 8th Floor of the Municipal Services Center.
One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, FL 33701;

- Mailed to Official Ballot, Driftwood LHD c/o Laura Duvekot, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division, PO Box
2842, St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842.

A demonstration of support from 50% + one (1) of the tax parcels located within the proposed boundary is required for this
application to proceed to the Community Planning & Preservation Commission (CPPC) and City Council. The final decision
regarding this application will be determined by City Council action, not by the outcome of this vote. The application will be deemed
complete immediately upon receipt of: "support" votes representing at least twenty-seven (27) of the fifty-one (51) tax parcels
within the proposed district a complete application for the designation of the proposed area as a local historic district, and a
processing fee from the applicant.

The response for each tax parcel will be counted as one (1) vote; in the case of conflicting votes among multiple owners of a single
tax parcel, the vote will be counted as nonsupport. If there are multiple owners of a property and only one ballot has been received
by April 16, 2018, then the vote indicated on the returned ballot will be counted for the entire parcel. Following return of the ballot,
your position may not be changed.

Ballots not received or postmarked on or before April 16, 2018 will be recorded as a nonresponse and counted as a "do not
support" vote, except among multiple owners of a single tax parcel where one or more ballots have been remitted. These will be
recorded as described above.

This vote is to initiate the application process only; it does not finalize the decision of whether a historic district will be officially
created. If sufficient support is demonstrated and the application forwarded to the CPPC and City Council, you will be given a
minimum of 10 days’ notice of the public hearings at which you may provide input regarding the potential district designation.
I, Eugene S. Moore, owner of the property located at
240 Driftwood Rd SE, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705,

☐ SUPPORT
☐ DO NOT SUPPORT

the initiation of an application for designation of the Driftwood Local Historic District in the St. Petersburg Register
of Historic Places. The proposed district boundary includes the fifty-two (52) properties roughly bounded by 24th
Avenue Southeast, Tampa Bay, the rear parcel line of properties along the 2700 block of Driftwood Road South,
and Beach Drive Southeast.

A forged signature is an illegal signature that may be prosecuted accordingly; the City of St. Petersburg reserves
the right to verify signature authenticity with the ballot recipient.

(Signature)  (Date)
OFFICIAL BALLOT

Must be returned or postmarked on or before April 16, 2018.

I, Terence S. Moore, owner of the property located at
240 Driftwood RD SE, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705,

X SUPPORT
□ DO NOT SUPPORT

the initiation of an application for designation of the Driftwood Local Historic District in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places. The proposed district boundary includes the fifty-two (52) properties roughly bounded by 24th Avenue Southeast, Tampa Bay, the rear parcel line of properties along the 2700 block of Driftwood Road South, and Beach Drive Southeast.

A forged signature is an illegal signature that may be prosecuted accordingly; the City of St. Petersburg reserves the right to verify signature authenticity with the ballot recipient.

Terence S. Moore 2-24-18
(Signature) (Date)

Ballot Instructions:

Please sign and return this ballot on or before Monday, April 16, 2018. The ballot may be:

- Delivered in person to the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division, 8th Floor of the Municipal Services Center, One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, FL 33701;
- Mailed to Official Ballot, Driftwood LHD c/o Laura Duvekot, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division, PO Box 2842, St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842.

A demonstration of support from 50% + one (1) of the tax parcels located within the proposed boundary is required for this application to proceed to the Community Planning & Preservation Commission (CPPC) and City Council. The final decision regarding this application will be determined by City Council action, not by the outcome of this vote. The application will be deemed complete immediately upon receipt of: “support” votes representing at least twenty-seven (27) of the fifty-one (51) tax parcels within the proposed district a complete application for the designation of the proposed area as a local historic district, and a processing fee from the applicant.

The response for each tax parcel will be counted as one (1) vote; in the case of conflicting votes among multiple owners of a single tax parcel, the vote will be counted as nonsupport. If there are multiple owners of a property and only one ballot has been received by April 16, 2018, then the vote indicated on the returned ballot will be counted for the entire parcel. Following return of the ballot, your position may not be changed.

Ballots not received or postmarked on or before April 16, 2018 will be recorded as a nonresponse and counted as a “do not support” vote, except among multiple owners of a single tax parcel where one or more ballots have been remitted. These will be recorded as described above.

This vote is to initiate the application process only; it does not finalize the decision of whether a historic district will be officially created. If sufficient support is demonstrated and the application forwarded to the CPPC and City Council, you will be given a minimum of 10 days’ notice of the public hearings at which you may provide input regarding the potential district designation.
OFFICIAL BALLOT

Must be returned or postmarked on or before April 16, 2018.

I,  MORDECAI WALKER, owner of the property located at 231 DRIFTWOOD RD SE, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705,

☐ SUPPORT
☐ DO NOT SUPPORT.

the initiation of an application for designation of the Driftwood Local Historic District in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places. The proposed district boundary includes the fifty-two (52) properties roughly bounded by 24th Avenue Southeast, Tampa Bay, the rear parcel line of properties along the 2700 block of Driftwood Road South, and Beach Drive Southeast.

A forged signature is an illegal signature that may be prosecuted accordingly; the City of St. Petersburg reserves the right to verify signature authenticity with the ballot recipient.

(Signature)  

(Date)

Ballot Instructions:

Please sign and return this ballot on or before Monday, April 16, 2018. The ballot may be:

- Delivered in person to the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division, 8th Floor of the Municipal Services Center, One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, FL 33701;
- Mailed to Official Ballot, Driftwood LHD c/o Laura Duvekot, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division, PO Box 2842, St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842.

A demonstration of support from 50% + one (1) of the tax parcels located within the proposed boundary is required for this application to proceed to the Community Planning & Preservation Commission (CPPC) and City Council. The final decision regarding this application will be determined by City Council action, not by the outcome of this vote. The application will be deemed complete immediately upon receipt of: “support” votes representing at least twenty-seven (27) of the fifty-one (51) tax parcels within the proposed district a complete application for the designation of the proposed area as a local historic district, and a processing fee from the applicant.

The response for each tax parcel will be counted as one (1) vote; in the case of conflicting votes among multiple owners of a single tax parcel, the vote will be counted as nonsupport. If there are multiple owners of a property and only one ballot has been received by April 16, 2018, then the vote indicated on the returned ballot will be counted for the entire parcel. Following return of the ballot, your position may not be changed.

Ballots not received or postmarked on or before April 16, 2018 will be recorded as nonresponse and counted as a “do not support” vote, except among multiple owners of a single tax parcel where one or more ballots have been remitted. These will be recorded as described above.

This vote is to initiate the application process only; it does not finalize the decision of whether a historic district will be officially created. If sufficient support is demonstrated and the application forwarded to the CPPC and City Council, you will be given a minimum of 10 days’ notice of the public hearings at which you may provide input regarding the potential district designation.
OFFICIAL BALLOT

Must be returned or postmarked on or before April 16, 2018.

1. Mordecai Walker, owner of the property located at 231 Driftwood Rd SE, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705,

   X SUPPORT
   — DO NOT SUPPORT

the initiation of an application for designation of the Driftwood Local Historic District in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places. The proposed district boundary includes the fifty-two (52) properties roughly bounded by 24th Avenue Southeast, Tampa Bay, the rear parcel line of properties along the 2700 block of Driftwood Road South, and Beach Drive Southeast.

A forged signature is an illegal signature that may be prosecuted accordingly; the City of St. Petersburg reserves the right to verify signature authenticity with the ballot recipient.

   Signature

   2-25-18

Ballot Instructions:

Please sign and return this ballot on or before Monday, April 16, 2018. The ballot may be:

- Delivered in person to the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division, 6th Floor of the Municipal Services Center, One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, FL 33701;
- Mailed to Official Ballot, Driftwood LHD c/o Laura Duvekot, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division, PO Box 2842, St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842.

A demonstration of support from 50% + one (1) of the tax parcels located within the proposed boundary is required for this application to proceed to the Community Planning & Preservation Commission (CPPC) and City Council. The final decision regarding this application will be determined by City Council action, not by the outcome of this vote. The application will be deemed complete immediately upon receipt of: "support" votes representing at least twenty-seven (27) of the fifty-one (51) tax parcels within the proposed district complete application for the designation of the proposed area as a local historic district, and a processing fee from the applicant.

The response for each tax parcel will be counted as one (1) vote; in the case of conflicting votes among multiple owners of a single tax parcel, the vote will be counted as nonsupport. If there are multiple owners of a property and only one ballot has been received by April 16, 2018, then the vote indicated on the returned ballot will be counted for the entire parcel. Following return of the ballot, your position may not be changed.

Ballots not received or postmarked on or before April 16, 2018 will be recorded as a nonresponse and counted as a "do not support" vote, except among multiple owners of a single tax parcel where one or more ballots have been remitted. These will be recorded as described above.

This vote is to initiate the application process only; it does not finalize the decision of whether a historic district will be officially created. If sufficient support is demonstrated and the application forwarded to the CPPC and City Council, you will be given a minimum of 10 days' notice of the public hearings at which you may provide input regarding the potential district designation.
RE: Making sure our Driftwood ballot counts DUE AUG 27

Laura Duvekot
Tue 8/28/2018 1:04 PM
Sent Items
To Derek Kilborn <derek.kilborn@stpete.org>; 1 attachments (18 KB)

Driftwood Round 2 Ballot Results.doc;
Find attached a summary and timeline of ballot returns per Vicky's log. To my knowledge, the only ballots that have been returned as undeliverable to our office were revealed to reflect outdated ownership info upon further research and new ballots were issued in the case of each of those 4 parcels. Ballots for 3 of those 4 were ultimately remitted by the new owners before the August 27th deadline.

Best regards,

Laura Duvekot
Historic Preservationist II
Planning and Development Services
City of St. Petersburg, Florida
laura.duvekot@stpete.org
727.892.5451

From: Derek Kilborn
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2018 11:55 AM
To: Laura Duvekot <Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org>
Subject: FW: Making sure our Driftwood ballot counts DUE AUG 27

FYI: I telephoned this property owner to discuss further and left a message. You do not need to do anything more.

From: Lisa Thornhill Richman <outreachmarkoptical.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2018 11:44 AM
To: Ruvane Richman <ruvane.richman@marketoptical.com>; Laura Duvekot <Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org>; Mark Brumby <markb@rezmagic.com>; Derek Kilborn <derek.kilborn@stpete.org>; callipaco@gmail.com; cskeller1@yahoo.com; southden@msn.com; skipperayer@gmail.com; gpav@mindspring.com; kimramcnelly@gmail.com; harris9496@aol.com; ezavala@zegroup.com; cowen.stan1@gmail.com; argylemg@aol.com
Subject: Making sure our Driftwood ballot counts DUE AUG 27

Laura and Derek at the historic planning division and fellow Driftwood residents:

I am copying other residents of Driftwood to this email to ensure that your office confirmed that your office received their ballot in time by your deadline because if we had not confirmed, we would not know that our ballots had not yet counting.
If you are copied to this email, pls reach out to other like-minded neighbors to ensure our vote counted by the Aug 27th deadline. Laura Duvekot’s contact: 727-892-5451, laura.duvekot@stpete.org or by physically going to her office today at the physical address where we re-sent the ballot at Municipal Services Center, ATTN Laura Duvekot (urban Planning Historic Preservation Division), ONE 4th Street North, 8th Floor, St. Petersburg, FL 33701

Laura: Yesterday, August 27 ON THE DAY THE BALLOT WAS DUE, you informed us that you were not sure if the scanned copy of our ballot would count. Your response came my email from Thursday Aug 23rd which stated that our mailed ballot to you was mailed back to as as undeliverable to your PO box that we sent in early August.

We have now expressed mailed you the ballot (costing $45) to arrive to you today 8/28 by 1030 am so that our ballot will have the postmark of Aug 27th and may count.

This whole initial process to begin the second round of votes for an initiative that targets our neighborhood that we purchased a home in with NO knowledge of any discussions about historicization feels again frustrating and uncommunicative. I only wonder how many other initial ballots have not been counted or received because they were marked undeliverable and sent back. The fact you tell us this on the due date seems to only compound the feeling that we are beginning this next round of decision making on the wrong foot with information that should be readily accessible and confirmed.

Please confirm when you (Laura) receive that ballot today Tuesday 8/28 with our postmark by your deadline of Aug 27th.

The fact that we need to double confirm that our ballot counts in this next process is frustrating and upsetting as we enter into the next phase of exhausting dialogues between those neighborhood homeowners and city officials that will only increase tension again with ballot measures cloaked to do other business and misguided attempts to reform a neighborhood that is doing well enough let alone.

Lisa and Ruvane Richman
Owners: 2600 Driftwood Road
St Peters burg, Fl
2062509460
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Laura Duvekot <Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org>
Date: August 27, 2018 at 10:41:49 AM PDT
To: Lisa Thornhill Richman <outreach@marketoptical.com>, Ruvane Richman <ruvichman@marketoptical.com>
Cc: Derek Kilborn <Derek.Kilborn@stpete.org>
Subject: RE: [FWD: Driftwood ballot - Aug 23, 2018]

Hi Lisa –
Apologies for the delayed response; I did receive your scanned ballot. We are confirming with legal as to whether or not we can count a scanned and emailed ballot toward the formal tally. Supportive ballots from over 50% + 1 parcels, the minimum number required to proceed with the application, was received on August 13, and the application is currently active and scheduled for hearing before the Community Planning and Preservation Commission (CPPC) on October 9 at 2pm. You will be noticed of this hearing as the date approaches. If your ballot is not formally counted in the tally I will include your note of non-support as part of the public input included in the staff report provided to CPPC members.

Best regards,

Laura Duvekot
Historic Preservationist II
Planning and Development Services
City of St. Petersburg, Florida

laura.duvekot@stpete.org
727.892.5451

From: Lisa Thornhill Richman [mailto:outreach@marketoptical.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 25, 2018 12:09 PM
To: Laura Duvekot <Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org>; Ruvane Richman <ruvichman@marketoptical.com>; outreach@marketoptical.com
Subject: [FWD: Driftwood ballot - Aug 23, 2018]
HI, Laura

Just checking in to make sure you got my email from Thursday Aug 23rd and to confirm that this firm of delivery via email of our ballot counts as our vote that we do NOT support the initiation of an application for designation of the Driftwood Local Historic District in St Pete of Historic Places.

Pls let me know as soon as possible as our last attempt to mail it was returned to us as undeliverable and your deadline is coming up. Thx, Lisa

2062509460

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: Driftwood ballot - Aug 23, 2018
From: Lisa Thönhilli Richman <outreach@marketoptical.com>
Date: Thu, August 23, 2018 11:21 am
To: Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org, Ruvane Richman <urichman@marketoptical.com>, "lissahillman@yahoo.com"

Dear Laura

We send this ballot off but it was returned to us. I’ve scanned it here so that you/your office receives it by deadline. Please confirm that this firm of delivery counts as our ballot. Thank you!
Lisa and Ruvane

Scanned with TurboScan.

Sent from my iPhone

Your Sunshine City
Sent from my iPhone
Dear Janna and neighbors,

The historic district meetings we have held over the years for the Driftwood neighbors have all included City staff who administer the historic resources program.

We suggest that you also include the City staff as resources for this invitational meeting.
Thank you,
Driftwood Historic District Initiative

Good Morning -

As the emails fly, the biggest issue that comes to the forefront is how the potential historic designation is dividing the neighborhood, creating conflict between neighbors.

The spirit of Driftwood, which has survived for nearly 80 years, is being rapidly lost in just a few short months. Peter Pav's solution is a prudent one. Hopefully, the proponents of the designation will agree, restoring peace to Driftwood is vital, and put the district designation to rest.

However, as there has been so vivid a response to my original letter, titled Sea Lev Historic Designation for the Driftwood Neighborhood...
for an

Informational, Discussion and Question & Answer Event

Living Under the Historic Preservation Designation

exclusively for ballot recipients of the Driftwood neighborhood

Thursday February 22, 2018

and/or

Thursday March 1, 2018

7:00 p.m

St Pete Yacht Club, Downtown St Pete

open bar and hors d'oeuvres

* Presenters:

Shaun Amaranani, Senior Counsel, Trenam Law
https://www.trenam.com/people-list/shaun-amaranani/

Justin Dees, Counsel and Shareholder, Trenam Law
https://www.trenam.com/people-list/justin-l-dees/

* Ballots are due back to the City in 60 days.

This event is not designed to sway you for or against. It is strictly to present factual information and facilitate an open discussion between neighbors.

We will be at the door to meet and greet you, but will not attend the event.
RE: descriptions - edited yet again!

BJ - Empyrean <bj@empyrean.net>

Thu 2/8/2018 4:26 PM

To Laura Duvekot <Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org>; 'Laurie MacDonald' <lauriewildwood@gmail.com>; 'Trish Moore' <trishsloweymoore@gmail.com>

Laura,
The applicant names look good for legal names. We will send out our email tomorrow. Many thanks for all your effort. We’re getting close and yet a long way to go.
BJ Sheffield
727-460-8141

From: Laura Duvekot [mailto:Laura.Duvekot@istpete.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 3:46 PM
To: BJ - Empyrean <bj@empyrean.net>; Laurie MacDonald (lauriewildwood@gmail.com) <lauriewildwood@gmail.com>; Trish Moore <trishsloweymoore@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: descriptions - edited yet again!

Our admin, who will be sending them, is out today; I am working to get the labels and ballots on her desk before I leave today so she can start putting them together tomorrow morning and hopefully get them in the mail. Because of the volume (both of ballots and things going on around here generally), it might be Monday, but we’ll surely try.

I’d like to use legal names for everyone. I cross-checked the applicants with the ballot list and came up with the following (changes highlighted). Please tell me if I’ve made any errors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laurie MacDonald</th>
<th>Mary P. Moore</th>
<th>Terence Moore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Sheffield</td>
<td>Peter Meinke</td>
<td>Jeanne Meinke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Sackett</td>
<td>Pamela McMullen</td>
<td>David McMullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Sammy</td>
<td>Arthur Skinner</td>
<td>Karina Van Tassel-Skinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Ahern</td>
<td>Carolyn Bradfield</td>
<td>Donald C. Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tira Myers</td>
<td>James Studdiford</td>
<td>Jeff Thomson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita Agan</td>
<td>Richard Agan</td>
<td>Marilyn Shay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Thomas Shay</td>
<td>Gail Halsey Collins</td>
<td>Lynne McDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winton Morrison</td>
<td>Siddie Morrison</td>
<td>Robert Pastore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebekah Pulley</td>
<td>Shepherd Grimes</td>
<td>Jennifer Lee Grimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordecai Walker</td>
<td>Emmanuel Roux</td>
<td>Jennifer Hardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Schuh</td>
<td>Kathryn Krystan</td>
<td>Robert Krystan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion Ayer</td>
<td>Miriam Gregg</td>
<td>Ronald Gregg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regards,
Laura Duvekot
From: BJ - Empyrean [mailto:bj@empyrean.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 3:26 PM
To: Laura Duvekot <Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org>
Subject: RE: descriptions edited yet again!

Laura,
Great. We'll follow up. Do you still think the ballots will go out tomorrow, Friday, Feb 9?
Thanks,
BJ
727-460-8141c

From: Laura Duvekot [mailto:Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 3:17 PM
To: BJ - Empyrean <bj@empyrean.net>
Cc: 'Laurie Macdonald' <lauriewildwood@gmail.com>; Trish Moore <trishsloweymoore@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: descriptions - edited yet again!

Received; thank you.

FYI, I just got the mailing list and there are 52 parcels because both the Schuh property that you mentioned and that of Carla Jimenez appear as two. We will therefore need 27 supportive votes to proceed.

Since we send a ballot to each owner separately, 73 ballots will be distributed.

Regards,
Laura Duvekot
Historic Preservationist II
Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
City of St. Petersburg, Florida

727.892.5451
laura.duvekot@stpete.org

From: BJ - Empyrean [mailto:bj@empyrean.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 3:02 PM
To: Laura Duvekot <Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org>
Cc: 'Laurie Macdonald' <lauriewildwood@gmail.com>; Trish Moore <trishsloweymoore@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: descriptions - edited yet again!

Laura,
Here is the list of names for the application. I looked at the boundary map and it encompasses the correct application area. I'm sure Laurie will weigh in as soon as possible.

Application names for Driftwood Historic District designation application:

Laurie Macdonald, Trish Moore & Terence Moore, B.J. Sheffield
Peter and Jeanne Meinke, Ann Sackett, Pamela and David McMullen, Martha Sammy
Arthur Skinner and Katrina Van Tassel-Skinner, Bruce Ahern & Carolyn Bradfield
Chris and Tira Myers, James Studdiford, Jeff Thompson, Bonnie and Richard Agan
Marilyn and Tom Shay, Gail Halsey Collins, Lynne McDonald, Winton & Siddie Morrison
Rob Pastore and Rebekah Pulley, Shepherd & Jennifer Lee Grimes, Mordecai Walker
Emmanuel Roux & Jennifer Hardin, Daniel Schuh, Kathryn and Bob Krystan
Skip Ayer, Miriam and Ronald Gregg,

From: Laura Duvekot [mailto:Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 1:08 PM
To: Laurie Macdonald <lauriewildwood@gmail.com>
Cc: Sheffield, B.J. <bj@empyrean.net>; Trish Moore <trishloweymoore@gmail.com>; 0 Peter Meinke <meinke@eckerd.edu>
Subject: RE: descriptions - edited yet again!

And can you please confirm the parties who would like to be named as applicants on the ballots? Thanks.

Regards,
Laura Duvekot
Historic Preservationist II
Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
City of St. Petersburg, Florida

727.892.5451
laura.duvekot@stpete.org

From: Laurie Macdonald [mailto:lauriewildwood@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 11:48 AM
To: Laura Duvekot <Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org>
Cc: Sheffield, B.J. <bj@empyrean.net>; Trish Moore <trishloweymoore@gmail.com>; 0 Peter Meinke <meinke@eckerd.edu>
Subject: Fwd: descriptions - edited yet again!

Laura

Please add the attached document describing the exteriors of the Driftwood
homes to the Driftwood Application file. Photos taken by Emily Elwyn to accompany the document attached here should already be in the file.

Also in that file should be the set of labeled photos of the homes and significant elements of Driftwood. That set of approximately 114 images is missing one property, 2400 Florida Ave S.

The application on Google Docs is a DRAFT and has not been officially submitted yet.

Thank you,
Laurie

Laurie Macdonald
727.580.9585
lauriewildwood@gmail.com
St Petersburg FL / Hood River OR

--------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Emily Elwyn <eelwyn@mac.com>
Date: 2018-02-07 18:04 GMT-05:00
Subject: descriptions - edited yet again!
To: Laurie Macdonald <lauriewildwood@gmail.com>

This is the fixed one!! Delete last email!

Your Sunshine City
**Laura Duvekot**

From: Laura Duvekot  
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2018 9:02 AM  
To: 'BJ - Empyrean'; Derek Kilborn  
Cc: 'Laurie Macdonald'; Trish Moore; '*Peter Meinke'; '*Daniel Schuh'; callmepaco@gmail.com  
Subject: RE: Request to remove a name from Driftwood Historic application

Good morning –

The draft version of the application that was submitted on 2/12 lists Mr. Schuh among the applicants; you/the applicants can modify that document before final submission to reflect a change in this list of applicants. I will be sure to confirm that the list of applicants is accurate and have noted the request for this change. Thank you for the update.

Regards,  
Laura Duvekot  
Historic Preservationist II  
Urban Planning & Historic Preservation  
City of St. Petersburg, Florida

727.892.5451  
laura.duvekot@stpete.org

---

From: BJ - Empyrean [mailto:bj@empyrean.net]  
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2018 11:25 AM  
To: Laura Duvekot <Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org>; Derek Kilborn <Derek.Kilborn@stpete.org>  
Cc: 'Laurie Macdonald' <lauriewildwood@gmail.com>; Trish Moore <trishloweymoore@gmail.com>; '*Peter Meinke' <meinkep@eckerd.edu>; '*Daniel Schuh' <danschuh@earthlink.net>; callmepaco@gmail.com  
Subject: Request to remove a name from Driftwood Historic application

Dear Laura,

It has been brought to our attention in a very public fashion that one of the names on our application never agreed to that inclusion. I have made an apology for the misunderstanding and hope that since we are still in DRAFT mode we can remove that person’s name from the Driftwood Historic District application. Please let me know if you need this request for removal in writing with their signature or if I can simply request that you remove Daniel B Schuh’s name from the application?

I request this removal be done prior to submission of the real application. I have copied all parties in this email.

Sincerely,  
BJ Sheffield  
727-460-8141c  
Driftwood Historic District Initiative
Dear City Council,

My name is Elizabeth Schuh. I am writing to you as the representative and power of attorney for my 80 year old father, Daniel Schuh, who is the property owner of a home at 2420 Driftwood Rd SE and the longest living resident in Driftwood.

I am highly concerned about the tactics used my father’s neighbor, Laurie Macdonald, along with her partner, Peter Belmont from Preserve the Burg, to get Driftwood designated as a local historic district. These individuals placed my father, an elderly man with major health issues including cognitive problems, on a Driftwood historic designation application without his knowledge and then circulated it to the City of St. Petersburg staff and my father’s neighbors. Laurie Macdonald did not contact me, otherwise I would have communicated his wishes against the historic designation. His support on this issue in particular could negatively impact him financially and jeopardize his ability to continue living in the neighborhood he loves so much. I cannot believe these proponents of historic designation would stoop to this level and take advantage of our elderly.

Besides the lies regarding my father’s support, the fact that my father’s house sits in a flood zone, and that there are a lot of other inherent problems with the costs associated with maintaining a historic house, my father and I think this process is tremendously unfair for the following reasons:

1. I read the historic district application provided by the proponents of designation. The following 7 people are not property owners who are eligible to vote for a Driftwood historic designation but they misleadingly showed up on the application in support of a Driftwood District:
   1. Rebekah Pulley
   2. Pamela McMullen
   3. Carolyn Bradfield
   4. Jennifer Hardin
   5. Gail Halsey Collins
   6. Kathryn Krzystan
   7. Jennifer Lee Grimes

2. Even worst, the City Staff sent out the historic district ballots with all of these falsified names, including my father, and they were placed on the ballot as “applicants” for the district (see attached). I don’t know why the ballots were written like this. One can only assume that it appears that names were placed on the ballot in order to show favoritism for support of the District. This would be comparable to a ballot for your city council elections that contained all of the endorsements of your opponents (along with some fake endorsements). This fearmongering tactic also influences any future district vote because now neighbors think my dad is a historic district supporter, which he is not, and he cannot walk the neighborhood to tell all of his neighbors that he is completely against a Driftwood designation.

3. The ballots also appear to be easily subject to tampering. There are no tracking numbers on the ballots to confirm that the ballots are unique. There are also no City return envelopes. What’s to say that one of the proponents of preservation couldn’t just copy the form, adjust the name, and turn in a forged ballot for a neighbor who they know is out-of-town? This may seem far-fetched, but given that my father was taken advantage of, I would approach everything involved in this process with a high level of sk
4. The application also has other false information about Driftwood's history that, again, compounds my concern about the legitimacy of this process.

Do not let these proponents of designation get away with what they are doing. There comes a time when common decency should prevail over those who clearly abuse the process for personal desires and gain. We are counting on you to make this right and rework this process in a way that is honest and legitimate.

Due to the mistrust I've gained of forces driving historic redistricting and the significant infringements a small majority can force on unwilling and/or uninformed property owners, I request disclosure on how the City validates;

- All legal property owners including identifying the legal agents associated with corporations, trusts and estates;
- The receipt of official notifications to all affected and legal property owners; and
- Each returned ballot is original and signed by a valid owner or owner's agent.

In addition to these more general and standard concerns for all of St. Petersburg residents, I would like to know what steps the city takes to protect elderly residents from unknowingly being subject to fraud during the historical designation process, and if there are any penalties for those who knowingly falsify applications for local historic districts?

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Schuh
March 14, 2018

Elizabeth Schuh
160 International Parkway, Suite 180
Lake Mary, Florida 32746

RE: Your email and letter dated March 11, 2018, relating to 2420 Driftwood Road SE

Dear Ms. Elizabeth Schuh:

This is a letter of response to your email dated March 11, 2018, and relates to property located at 2420 Driftwood Road SE. My name is Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division ("UPHP"). The UPHP is responsible for administering the City of St. Petersburg’s Historic Preservation and Archaeological Overlay and related programs. The following information is organized to specifically address each of your concerns and provide additional direction, where appropriate.

According to the Pinellas County Property Appraiser’s Office ("PCPAO"), Daniel B. Schuh, is the registered owner of two (2) tax parcels (31-31-17-22590-000-0010 and 31-31-17-22554-000-0021) located at 2420 Driftwood Rd. SE. The mailing address for the registered owner is the same as the subject property. This mailing address was used for all official correspondence from our division.

Non/Support by Daniel B. Schuh

On February 8, 2017, Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist, received an email sent by Laurie MacDonald with copy to BJ Sheffield, Trish Moore, and Peter Meinke, indicating that a draft application was in process. Duvekot responded to this email asking for a list of parties to be named as applicants on the ballot distribution. Sheffield replied with a list of 25 individual names. Since several of the names appeared to be nicknames, Duvekot cross-referenced the PCPAO records for accuracy and the names were updated accordingly. Sheffield was then asked to confirm the updated list, which she did by email response. As you correctly noted, the list includes names of individuals who are not property owners; these names were included on the [ballot] cover letter in order to identify every individual who was presented as part of the organization effort.

On February 16, 2018, ballots were distributed to all registered property owners of tax parcels within the proposed boundary. A copy of the cover letter and ballot is attached. On February 26, 2018, Sheffield emailed Duvekot to inform her that Daniel B. Schuh never agreed to inclusion on this list of names and should be removed from the application. The email was copied to Laurie MacDonald, Trish Moore, Peter Meinke, Daniel Schuh, and callmepaco@gmail.com. Duvekot replied that the application had not been formally submitted and that Schuh’s name could be removed by the applicant application.
In addition to the opportunity for comment at the two (2) public hearings, you may also submit a letter of opinion to be included in the staff report. If submitted at least seven (7) days prior to the Community Planning and Preservation Commission public hearing, your letter of opinion will be included with the initial staff report and other attachments.

**Ballot Process**

The ballot process was established in 2015 as a mechanism for improving upon an earlier petition process that included a number of deficiencies. The ballot process is designed to ascertain support for initiating a local historic district designation application. The outcome of the ballot process is not a legal designation, which can only be granted by ordinance through the City Council.

The ballot process begins with direct mail notice to all registered property owners within the proposed district boundary. This information is collated by the City’s Computer Systems Coordinator using official records from the PCPAO. In the case of trusts, the PCPAO usually lists a primary contact for the trust separate from the treasurer; a letter and ballot are sent to both. Ballots are sent by City Staff using a Certificate of Mailing through the United States Postal Service (“USPS”). Remitted ballots are returned to our office, where they are date stamped by the Administrative Assistant, recorded in a tracking log, and then filed through Duvekot in the application folder. This process of distribution and collection is controlled by City Staff in order to mitigate any accusations of exclusion or omission.

The objective of the ballot process is to obtain a signed authorization from the owners of record indicating their support for, or opposition to, initiating a local historic district designation application. During development of the ballot process with City Council and the City Attorney’s office, it was determined that a unique tracking number would not be required for each individual ballot. Furthermore, it was determined that the original ballot was not required and that signed authorization may be remitted on a photocopy; however, the remitted ballot must include the printed name, street address, signature of the registered property owner, and date. Regarding possible forgeries, the official ballot states, “A forged signature is an illegal signature that may be prosecuted accordingly; the City of St. Petersburg reserves the right to verify signature authenticity with the ballot recipient.” The City has not received a ballot for the subject property at 2420 Driftwood Rd. SE.

**Coastal Resiliency and Sea Level Rise**

The subject property is located in Flood Zone AE with a base flood elevation line of 8.00 feet. Your letter notes, and City Staff acknowledges, the competing goals of historic preservation with coastal resiliency. While certain exemptions from federal flood regulations exist for designated properties and building modifications are possible, concerns about personal safety, homeowner’s insurance, and property damage remain. City staff is currently researching the impact of local historic district designation on efforts to improve coastal resiliency and will address this concern in the final report and presentation.

**History of Driftwood Neighborhood**

The application narrative submitted with the designation application includes extensive details about the history of the Driftwood neighborhood. Your letter states that the application includes, “...false information about Driftwood’s history...” These descriptions are important not only for processing the application, but also for maintaining an accurate historic record of the neighborhood. Our historic preservation staff welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these specific statements regarding historic accuracy.
Conclusion

The UPHP is most interested in administering a fair process that respects input from all interested parties. I hope the information provided here demonstrates a sincere effort and helps to explain the areas of concern outlined in your letter. If you have any questions, comments, or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully,

Derek S. Kilborn, Manager
Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division
Planning and Economic Development Department
City of St. Petersburg, Florida
(+1) 727.893.7872 Ms. Elizabeth S

Attachments:

- Original letter by Elizabeth Schuh dated March 11, 2018
- Email exchange regarding status of Daniel B. Schuh
- Official cover letter and ballot
- Ballot distribution list
Thank you for reaching out to the City Attorney’s Office. I have been asked by the City Attorney to respond to your letter dated July 20, 2018 regarding the ongoing historic designation process for the Driftwood neighborhood.

- We appreciate your efforts to ensure that the ballot process is fair. In your letter, you raise concerns that previous ballots may have been fraudulently completed. Please help us understand that better by showing us which ballots and which residents you believe have been subjected to this potentially fraudulent behavior, who may be filling out ballots on an owner’s behalf without their consent, and if you believe this behavior to be occurring with the current ballot. Otherwise, we do not see an inherently problematic issue with photocopied ballots, so long as we only receive one ballot per property owner. Please note that the provision you cited at City Code Sec. 16.30.070.2.5.B.2.a. was chosen after a very long public process that had the participation of nearly every major stakeholder in historic preservation in the City. We see no reason to subvert the community’s decision with respect to this process, and we further believe that it is a significant administrative overreach to give this a ballot process like that of a referendum or an elected office. To the extent that you are concerned with the process generally, our Community Planning and Preservation Commission and City Council are more appropriate forums to voice such concerns. Historic preservation staff has indicated that they are open to suggestions, and we share your desire to making the process better where appropriate.

- We have heard the concerns voiced from some residents within the Driftwood neighborhood regarding the impacts of a possible historical designation with respect to the AE flood zones in which they reside. To that end, the City has not made any final conclusions at this point as to its recommendations for the boundaries of the district, as well as to the designations therein of properties as contributing and non-contributing. The applicant is merely in the balloting stage currently (a stage which they largely control), attempting to meet the Code’s support threshold to even apply in the first place. This is a first step in submitting an application, with more opportunities going forward to exchange ideas as to what works best for the neighborhood. Indeed, the removal of the Gandy House from the application after the last round of balloting demonstrates that there are meaningful opportunities to affect the application throughout the process. Ultimately, there will be two public hearings on the application as well, where the Commission and the Council each have the power to respond to residents’ concerns over the district’s boundaries and its contributing/non-contributing resources.

- Finally, it has come to my attention that your client, Mr. Schuh, has a couple of ongoing issues with our Codes Compliance Department, including outstanding code liens and open code violations. Please reach out to Codes Compliance so that we can help your client develop a strategy to tackle this problem.
I hope this helps answer some of your questions and we look forward to working with you and the entirety of the Driftwood neighborhood in solving these important issues.

Sincerely,
Michael J. Dema, Esq.
Managing Assistant City Attorney – Land Use & Environmental Matters
City of St. Petersburg
P.O. Box 2842
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
727.893.7401

Notice: The information contained in this email and any accompanying attachment(s) is intended only for the addressee(s) listed above. If you are not the intended recipient of this information, any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by return email or by calling 727.893.7401. In addition, please note that, pursuant to Florida Statutes Chapter 119, this or any other written or electronic communication with this office, including email addresses, may be subject to public disclosure unless expressly made exempt by that Florida Statutes.

Your Sunshine City
Summary of “Round Two” Ballot Returns
City File 17-90300006/Driftwood Local Historic District

June 27, 2018 70 ballots mailed by city staff to owners of 47 parcels w/in subject district
August 13, 2018 Ballot indicating support from 26th parcel logged and application marked as “Active.”
August 27, 2018 Deadline for ballots to be returned or postmarked.

As of 11:30am, August 28, 2018:
• 42 ballots of support have been received representing 29 parcels;
• 9 ballots of non-support have been received representing 8 parcels.
• 7 ballots representing 4 parcels have been noted as having been sent to individuals that no longer own the parcels in question;
• 5 ballots have been issued to the new owners of those 4 parcels, per updated PCPAO information;
• 3 ballots representing 3 of those parcels [all indicating support] have been received by city staff.
ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA, DESIGNATING THE DRIFTWOOD LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT, GENERALLY ENCOMPASSING THE AREA BETWEEN 24TH AVENUE SOUTH, DRIFTWOOD ROAD SOUTH (THAT PORTION FORMERLY KNOWN AS WARD AVENUE SOUTH), AND TAMPA BAY, AS SHOWN BELOW, AS A LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT AND ADDING THE PROPERTY TO THE ST. PETERSBURG REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES PURSUANT TO SECTION 16.30.070, CITY CODE; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG DOES ORDAIN:

SECTION 1. The City Council finds that the Driftwood Local Historic District, which is recognized for its significance as a highly intact collection of single-family residences, ancillary buildings, landscapes, and streetscapes dating to a period of significance including the period of Pre-Anglo European Settlement, 1857-1906, and 1935-1967, meets at least one of the nine criteria listed in Section 16.30.070.2.5.D, City Code, for designating historic properties. More specifically, the Driftwood Local Historic District meets the following criteria:

(a) Its value is a significant reminder of the cultural or archaeological heritage of the City, state or nation;
(b) Its location is the site of a significant local, state, or national event;
(c) It is identified with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the city, state, or nation,
(d) It is identified as the work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose work has influenced the development of the city, state, or nation;
(f) It has distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials;
(g) Its character is a geographically definable area possessing a significant concentration, or continuity of sites, buildings, objects or structures united in past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development; and
(h) Its character is an established and geographically definable neighborhood, united in culture, architectural style or physical plan and development.

SECTION 2. The City Council finds that the Driftwood Local Historic District meets at least one of the seven factors of integrity listed in Section 16.30.070.2.5.D, City Code, for designating historic properties. More specifically, the property meets the following factors of integrity:

(a) Location. The place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred;
(b) Design. The combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property;
(c) Setting. The physical environment of a historic property;
(d) Materials. The physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property;
(e) Workmanship. The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory; and
(f) Feeling. The property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.

SECTION 3. The Driftwood Local Historic District, located within the following described boundaries, is hereby designated as a local historic district, and shall be added to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places, the list of designated landmarks, landmark sites, and historic and thematic districts which is maintained in the office of the City Clerk:

**Designation Boundary**

The official boundary of the local landmark designation shall encompass the entire parcels, generally described as Driftwood Subdivision, Block B, Lots 2-4, 6, 7, and 10-22; Driftwood First Addition, Lots 1A and 8-16; Driftwood Second Addition, Lots 1-13; Driftwood Replat, Lots 1-7, and Powers Bayview Estates, Lot 1, as depicted on Exhibit “A.”

SECTION 4: The Driftwood Local Historic District, noted for its significance in the areas listed above, serves as a physical representation of St. Petersburg’s tangible history. The City Council finds that contributing resources draw significance in the areas of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, and therefore specifically includes within this designation certain character-defining features, which include architectural styles, community design features, and landscape elements, and which are incorporated hereto by reference to City Case File No. HPC 17-90300006. Future alterations to the District and these character-defining features shall, therefore, be reviewed under the procedures established by Section 16.30.070.2.6-- Approval of changes to local landmarks, and shall be consistent with the recommendations set forth in the Staff Report for City Case File No. HPC 17-90300006, which is available for public view with the City’s Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division.

SECTION 5. In the event this ordinance is not vetoed by the Mayor in accordance with the City Charter, it shall become effective after the fifth business day after adoption unless the Mayor notifies the City Council through written notice filed with the City Clerk that the Mayor will not veto the ordinance, in which case the ordinance shall take effective immediately upon filing such written notice with the City Clerk. In the event this ordinance is vetoed by the Mayor in accordance with the City Charter, it shall not become effective unless and until the City Council overrides the veto in accordance with the City Charter, in which case it shall become effective immediately upon a successful vote to override the veto.

Approved as to Form and Substance:

![Signature]

City Attorney (or Designee)  
Date

![Signature]

Planning and Development Services Department  
Date
CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG
COMMUNITY PLANNING & PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING

Council Chambers
City Hall

October 9, 2018
Tuesday, 2:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Present:
Robert "Bob" Carter, Chair
Jeff Rogo, Vice Chair
Keisha A. Bell
Christopher "Chris" A. Burke
Will Michaels
Lisa Wannemacher, Alternate
Thomas "Tom" Whiteman, Alternate
Sharon Winters, Alternate

Commissioners Absent:
Gwendolyn "Gwen" Reese
Jeffery "Jeff" M. Wolf

Staff Present:
Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist II, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Michael Dena, Assistant City Attorney
Heather Judd, Assistant City Attorney
Vicky Davidson, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Development Services

The public hearing was called to order at 2:03 p.m., a quorum was present.

I. OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIR AND SWEARING IN OF WITNESSES

II. ROLL CALL

III. MINUTES

The minutes from the September 11, 2018 meeting were approved as written by a consensus vote.

IV. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARING

A. City File HPC 17-90300006

Request: Owner-initiated application for the designation of a local historic district to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places.

Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451
Location: The proposed district generally includes the area between 24th Avenue South, Driftwood Road South (that portion formerly known as Ward Avenue South), and Tampa Bay.

Staff Presentation
Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the staff report.

Applicant Presentation
Eric Higgs, 2608 Driftwood Rd S and representing multiple owners within the Driftwood Neighborhood, gave a presentation in support of the request.

Public Hearing
The following people spoke in support of the application:
Ray Arsenault, 767 36th Ave N and representing USFSP
Shepherd Grimes, 2500 Florida Ave S
Kim O’Brien, 2635 Florida Ave S; asking equal weight to be given to the landscape and submitted letters in support
Beth Connor, 636 64th Ave S
Natalie DeVicente, 229 18th Ave NE
Trish Moore, 240 Driftwood Rd SE; submitted booklets depicting the contrast between Driftwood vs. the developed properties in nearby Old Southeast neighborhood
Bonnie Agan, 251 Driftwood Rd SE; submitted photos of events in Driftwood
BJ Sheffield, 287 Driftwood Rd
Robert Pastore, 2605 Driftwood Rd S; submitted material regarding the correlation between historic designation and the cost of flood insurance
Emmanuel Raul, 2519 Driftwood Rd
Ann Sackett, 2500 Driftwood Rd SE
Donna Mills, 4779 Palerma Ct NE; did not wish to speak
Peter Belmont, 102 Fareham Pl N
Emily Elwyn, 336 16th Ave NE and representing Preserve the Burg
Jean Charles, 172 Coquina Bay Dr SE and representing Driftwood resident, Gail Halsey Collins
Howard Hansen, 3810 20th Ave N
Robin Reed, 705 16th Ave NE
Monica Kile, 365 17th Ave NE
Jennifer Hardin, 2519 Driftwood Rd
Peter Meinke, 147 Wildwood Ln SE

The following people requested their property be excluded from the application because they feel their property is non-contributing:
Peter Pav, 2660 Driftwood Rd S
Chris Keller, 2680 Driftwood Rd S
Lauren Rubenstein, 2700 1st Ave N and representing Driftwood residents Michelle Harris and Eduardo Zavala, 2620 Driftwood Rd S
The following people spoke in opposition:
Mark Brumby, 2510 Driftwood Rd – no guarantee for tree/landscape protection to maintain character of neighborhood
Elizabeth Schuh, 450 Roser Park Dr S

Cross Examination
By Administration:
Waived

By Applicant:
Laurie MacDonald asked for confirmation that eight of the nine criteria for significance were met, not seven out of the eight as stated in the staff report. Ms. Duvekot stated that was correct.

Ms. MacDonald asked if the City will continue to work with them on finding ways to increase the protection of the trees and landscaping. Ms. Duvekot stated that the staff’s recommendation is to include the landscaping which is something that does not exist in many of the other districts; she recommends that it really be a part of the designation.

Mr. Kilborn further explained that including a reference to landscaping as a character-defining element is unique. Mr. Kilborn first noted that the existing landscape ordinance already includes a tree protection section for “specimen trees” and “grand trees.” This will continue to be enforced. In addition, staff has added character defining references to some of the landscaping patterns in the neighborhood. When there is a request for building demolition or new construction where a site plan is required, a landscape plan must be submitted as part of the COA application. The landscape plan will be reviewed for compliance with the character-defining elements itemized by City staff in the report, or as amended by City Council upon final adoption.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks
By Administration:
In response to an earlier comment, Mr. Kilborn stated that in 2016, 91% of all the COAs reviewed were handled at the staff level not requiring a public hearing and 99% of the COAs were approved. Starting in 2017, City staff began interpreting more permit requests as “ordinary maintenance and repair” resulting in the following shift: 70% of all COAs were reviewed at the staff level, 13% were reviewed through public hearing, and the remaining 17% were determined to be ordinary maintenance and repair. Mr. Kilborn then addressed an earlier comment about docks, referring to a table on page 9 of the staff report. The table identifies the community beach access, path & dock. No other docks are included as character-defining elements. Any request for a dock modification or installation will be processed using the normal standards for dock construction. Designation is not a prohibition, and new docks may be considered within the subject boundary.

By Applicant:
Waived

Executive Session
Commissioner Whiteman asked staff to clarify the COA process for a teardown of non-contributing property. Ms. Duvekot explained that a COA would be required looking at the effects of the loss to the district as a whole.
as well as looking at the new proposed construction with major consideration given. A non-contributing property will not be required to change anything to fit in.

Commissioner Michaels stated that it was a good presentation by staff with the application meeting all of the criteria; he will support the application.

Commissioner Burke stated that this a cohesive configuration of homes; a very unique district.

Commissioner Rogo stated that the criteria have been met and complimented the neighborhood on their convincing presentation; very pleased that staff supports the preservation of the canopy and character of the neighborhood which are linked.

Commissioner Bell stated that she was impressed with the presentations, both for and against.

Commissioner Winters stated that she wholeheartedly supports the application; very touched by the testimonies made. She is very concerned about the integrity of the landscape and feels it is a character-defining element and then asked if there would be any restrictions on fencing. Ms. Duvekot stated that front yard fencing is not very present in the district and really should be avoided where possible, and side and rear fencing should be screened as much as possible by landscaping and vegetation.

Commissioner Winters stated that the setbacks are incredible and are a character-defining element of the neighborhood and then asked about the setbacks for new construction. Ms. Duvekot stated that the setbacks of new construction need to conform with the neighborhood probably using the block face versus zoning to keep that consistent line parallel with the street with the surrounding properties since there is often a difference between one side of the street and the other.

Commissioner Winters asked about the appropriate architectural styles for new construction in Driftwood since it consists of eclectic styles of homes which is part of the charm; what kind of criteria will be used for new construction assessing what architectural style will fit. Ms. Duvekot stated that creating something new and eclectic in Driftwood is still possible taking cues from what is currently there. The criteria used for new construction give them guidance on the elements of style or the underlying style used for the ultimate designation; there is a lot of similarity with the overall shapes and massing that are prevalent in the district even though there were two distinct periods of construction.

Commissioner Wannemacher stated her agreement with the prior comments of the Commissioners. The architecture is very eclectic but really pulls the neighborhood together is the beautiful tree canopy and landscaping and is very pleased that this will be included in the designation. She supports the designation.

Commission Chair Carter stated his agreement with the Commissioners' prior comments and appreciates the comments from everyone.

MOTION: Commissioner Michaels moved and Commissioner Winters seconded a motion to approve the designation of a Local Historic District to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places, including the character-defining features identified in the staff report, the general area within the Driftwood Neighborhood between 24th Avenue South, Driftwood Road South and Tampa Bay, in accordance with the staff report.
VOTE:  
YES – Bell, Burke, Michaels, Rogo, Wannemacher, Winters, Carter  
NO – None

Motion passed by a vote of 7 to 0.

V. CPPC MEMBER/STAFF COMMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS

A suggestion from Commissioner Winters for next May 2019 (National Preservation Month) to present a summary to City Council celebrating register listings, ads valorem and the money saved, and key preservation initiatives; a great opportunity to increase awareness. Mr. Kilborn stated that the City has completely revamped the Marketing Dept. who communicates with the community and staff provides on an on-going basis information and timelines of certain City events related to historic preservation. Presentations have been given to City Council in the past following the submission of the required annual report to the State Historic Preservation Office that runs through September 30th.

VII. ADJOURN

With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

For additional information, please telephone 893-7871 or visit the St. Petersburg Planning & Development Services Department on the 8th floor of the Municipal Services Building at One Fourth Street North.
STAFF REPORT

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REQUEST FOR LISTING IN THE ST. PETERSBURG REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

For public hearing and recommendation to City Council on October 9, 2018
beginning at 2:00 PM, Council Chambers, City Hall, 175 Fifth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

According to Planning and Development Services Department records, no member of the Community
Planning and Preservation Commission resides or has a place of business within 2,000 feet of the proposed
district. All possible conflicts should be declared upon the announcement of the item.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE NUMBER:</th>
<th>HPC 17-90300006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTIES, SITES, AND OBJECTS INCLUDED IN PROPOSED DISTRICT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objects &amp; Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parcel Identification Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Driftwood&quot; Archway</td>
<td>313117727200100162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Home Marker</td>
<td>313117727200100010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st St. S. / 1st St. S.E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1st St. S.</td>
<td>313117225540000060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400 1st St. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th Ave. S.</td>
<td>313117225540000030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 25th Ave. S.</td>
<td>313117225540000020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driftwood Rd. S. / Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>313117225540000040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2601 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>313117225540000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2602 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>313117225540000070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2615 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>313117225540000120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2617 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>313117225540000100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2620 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>313117225540000140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2660 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>313117225540000010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2675 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>313117225540000040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2680 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>313117225540000030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2420 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>31311722554000021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2510 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2515 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2519 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540020030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2521 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>3131172255400110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Ave. S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 Florida Ave. S.</td>
<td>313117225540020010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600 Florida Ave. S.</td>
<td>31311722608000130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2621 Florida Ave. S.</td>
<td>31311722608000090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635 Florida Ave. S.</td>
<td>31311722608000070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Phone Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.5 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>313117225540000160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>3131172255400000170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>3131172255400000180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>3131172255400000190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>3131172255400000200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:**
- Driftwood Subdivision Block B; Lots 2-4, 6, 7, and 10-22;  
- Driftwood 1st Addition Lots 1A and 8-16;  
- Driftwood 2nd Addition Lots 1-13;  
- Driftwood Replat Lots 1-7; and  
- Powers Bayview Estates Lot 1

**LANDMARK NAME:**
- Driftwood Local Historic District

**NOMINATION PREPARED BY:**
- Howard Ferebee Hansen  
- Laurie Macdonald  
- Emily Elwyn

**APPLICANT LIST:**
- Laurie Macdonald  
- Peter and Jeanne Meinke  
- Belinda Sheffield  
- Mary P. and Terence Moore  
- Lynne [Parish] McDonald  
- Bonita and Richard Agan  
- Bruce E. Ahern and Carolyn Bradfield  
- Orion T. Ayer
- Gail Halsey Collins  
- Miriam and Ronald Gregg  
- Shepherd R. and Jennifer Lee Grimes  
- Robert E. and Kathryn Krystan  
- Pamela and David McMullen  
- Siddle and Winton Morrison  
- Tira and Donald C. Myers  
- Robert J. Pastore and Rebekeh Pulley
- Emmanuel Roux and Jennifer Hardin  
- Ann Sackett  
- Martha Sammy  
- Marilyn and F. Thomas Shay  
- Aurthur Skinner and Katrina Van Tassel-Skinner  
- Natalia Spytek
- James Studdiford  
- Jeffrey Thompson  
- Mordecai Walker

**REQUEST:**
- Designation of the properties noted above as a local historic district to be added to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places
APPLICATION BACKGROUND

The Driftwood neighborhood, located in the southeastern section of St. Petersburg, has long been considered unique and important within the city for its distinctive architecture and landscape. Conversations surrounding the potential designation being considered herein began in February of 2017, when Laurie Macdonald, an owner of the individually-designated Dodd House (HPC 07-01), a property within the proposed district, met with staff to discuss the neighborhood’s eligibility and district designation process.

City staff attended meetings organized by Ms. Macdonald and other applicants noted above on May 30, 2017 and November 13, 2017 to provide further information on the process and implications of designation to potentially-affected property owners.

A “Public Information Session,” arranged by City staff and directly noticed by mail to the owners of all property within the proposed district, was held at Friends Meeting House on January 17, 2018. In attendance were the owner or owners of 13 properties within the proposed district’s boundaries.

In addition to meetings with staff, the applicants conducted an organized and thorough effort to educate property owners within the proposed district on the process and effects of seeking local district designation. Staff remained available to individually answer any specific questions that owners had about designation, process, the resulting Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) requirements, and other implications of historic district creation.

As prescribed by St. Petersburg’s Historic and Archaeological Preservation Overlay (City Code Section 16.30.070.2), an application for local historic district designation must include the support of the owners of 50 percent plus one (1) parcels within the proposed boundaries, as demonstrated by the remittance of ballots issued by, and returned to, the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division. Individual ballots were mailed by City staff on February 18, 2018 to each owner of parcels within the boundary proposed at that time, as shown on the sample ballot included in Appendix A. Although a successful degree of support was shown by the ballots returned, an application narrative subsequently submitted to City staff on March 5, 2018 suggested a boundary with dissimilarities from that described in the initial ballot. For that reason, it was determined by City staff that a second balloting process must be carried out in order to determine support for a district with the proposed boundary which would be reviewed during the course of public hearings to follow. Ballots depicting the appropriate boundaries (Appendix B) were mailed to each owner of property therein by City staff on June 27, 2018. The necessary threshold of supportive ballots was passed on August 12, 2018. Having already received all requisite application narratives and fees, staff marked the application complete and began the process of reviewing the application and scheduling public hearings on that date.

The Local Historic Landmark Designation Application narratives and photographic documentation provide a thorough evaluation of the properties within the proposed district and justification for their listing in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Preservation (Appendix C). Staff analysis of the application’s merit follows.
STAFF FINDINGS

Summary

Staff recommends approval of the listing of the Driftwood Local Historic District in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places. This finding has been reached following a review of the application attached in Appendix C, through the lens of an evaluation of age, historic significance, and integrity as defined by St. Petersburg's Historic and Archaeological Preservation Overlay (Section 16.30.070.2.5). The district was found to satisfy seven (7) of the eight (8) criteria for significance defined by City Code, and to have acquired said significance more than the minimum 50 years prior to the application for designation. Only one criterion must be met in order for a property to be designated as a local landmark. A historic resource must additionally retain at least one (1) of seven (7) factors of integrity to be considered landmark designation. The proposed Driftwood Local Historic District has been found to retain six (6) of these seven (7).

Narrative Description and Historic Context

Historic Context

As established by the attached application, the sparse population that dotted the Pinellas Peninsula prior to the Civil War included a farm and grove established by Abel Miranda within the area now known as Driftwood. The short-lived Miranda homestead was established in 1857 but destroyed in 1862 in present-day Pinellas County’s only known armed conflict of the Civil War (Figure 1). John A. Bethell and family also settled in the vicinity in the late 1850s. Both families fled the area following the 1862 raid, as did most of the peninsula’s small population during the Civil War. Following the War, Abel Miranda, John Bethell, and their families returned to the shore of Big Bayou in the vicinity of what now is Driftwood, establishing a hamlet, complete with post office, called Pinellas Village. Though it was later assimilated into St. Petersburg, the establishment of Pinellas Village in 1876 predated the incorporation of the modern city by over a decade.

Figure 1: Marker commemorating site of Miranda Home, near southwestern boundary of present-day 2680 Driftwood Rd. S. Photograph provided by applicant.
The Orange Belt Railroad provided a convenient connection between St. Petersburg and the larger world beginning in 1888, spurring development surrounding the rail terminus in modern-day downtown, several miles north of the proposed district. The Pinellas Village post office was closed in 1906, but development continued to expand outward from downtown St. Petersburg throughout the early 20th century, notably as the local real estate market experienced a major boom between 1919 and 1926. As captured by a 1926 aerial photograph of the vicinity (Figure 2), the area surrounding the proposed district was partially developed by the end of these growth years, primarily with relatively small, single-family houses constructed on narrow and deep lots and lined up along straight roads with rear alley access. This development pattern was predominant throughout the city's neighborhoods established during the period. The proposed district, however, was almost entirely undeveloped; the majority of the land appears to have remained under ownership by the Bethell family.

Figure 2: 1926 Aerial Photograph of St. Petersburg, Sheet No. 328, showing proposed district and vicinity. Cropped and corrected for legibility by staff.

As discussed in the attached application, residential construction slowly began again in the mid-1930s following its near-halt during the early years of the Great Depression. Because the speculative sale of vacant, platted lots had reached such a frenzied pace and then dropped off during the boom/bust cycle of the previous decade, there was an ample supply of residential
parcels awaiting development within established neighborhoods throughout the city. The Driftwood Subdivision, therefore, is unique in St. Petersburg for its creation during the 1930s.

American engagement in World War II necessitated a prohibition of private construction between 1941 and 1945. Following the war, however, St. Petersburg’s population once again boomed, creating a surge of housing infill and newly-platted neighborhoods. A number of new homes, many of them custom-built, were constructed in the proposed district between the late 1940s and mid-1960s. Although they tend to demonstrate a modern architectural palette, the precedent set by the Bayview Construction Company’s Minimal Traditional aesthetic was carried into the post-War homes in many ways, most notably in their scale, deep setbacks on their parcels, and low-pitched roofs.

**Existing Conditions**

Detailed architectural descriptions of each of the 43 primary residential buildings within the proposed district, as well as contributing objects, sites, and landscape features, are included in the Local Landmark Designation Application (Appendix C). In addition to single family residences, the proposed district features a number of detached garages or accessory buildings. Constructing garages as separate buildings was most common in pre-War residences, whereas houses built in the late-1940s and thereafter tend to feature attached garages which are more visible from the public street; this pattern is visible in the proposed district.

The homes within the proposed district feature a unique blend of architectural styles, with the majority of the contributing properties (and many noncontributing houses built in recent years) appearing to interact closely with the community's street system, which features narrow, often meandering roads. A dense, mature canopy of trees and lack of sidewalks creates a further sense of deviation from the streetscape more typical to St. Petersburg’s early suburbs: a tidy grid of square blocks, broad streets, and sidewalks running parallel. Instead, Driftwood’s enveloping landscape creates an area through which vehicular traffic is naturally calmed and pedestrians feel comfortable walking along the shaded streets. One oak tree even pierces Driftwood Road South itself (Figure 3), allowing traffic to crawl past while reminding drivers that the landscape came first, followed by the roads. The force of early-twentieth century development rigidly shaped most of the urban landscape in southern Pinellas County; the landscape itself, however, shaped the development of Driftwood.
The intended appreciation of natural scenery which influenced Driftwood’s 1930s development has been intentionally and carefully restored and maintained by generations of residents, and heightened by their continuing use of native species as understory plantings and groundcover, with the turf grass that dominates surrounding neighborhoods being used only sparsely in the proposed district. The density and variety of vegetation throughout the proposed district blurs the lines between properties, almost making the built resources appear more as a cohesive series of homes set within a singular landscape than a set of individual properties. Front yard fences and site walls are rare, and tend to serve as trellises for vines where they are found. Rear fences tend to be so screened from view by vegetation as to disappear into the background.

Several sites and objects should be noted as significant to the proposed district. The marker indicating the former location of the Miranda House (Figure 1) dates to circa 1950, and not only provides a continued reminder of the events that once transpired in present-day Driftwood, but underscores the fact that the area has been considered significant for its historic association with St. Petersburg’s foundational years for many decades. Additionally, the circa 1938 “Driftwood” arch (Figure 4), which was constructed as part of Bayview development, serves as an entrance to the community and has become an icon of the differentiation of feeling and atmosphere which exist between the proposed district and the surrounding suburban residential developments.

Figure 3: An oak tree grows at the center of narrow Driftwood Road South, naturally creating a traffic calming effect and reinforcing a feeling of safety for pedestrians using the street in lieu of sidewalks. Staff photograph.
Architecture and landscape have been deeply entwined in the proposed district since Driftwood’s conception in the mid-1930s. The architectural styles found within the proposed district tend to be eclectic and informal, a fact which should not be mistaken for a lack of significance by any means. The opposite is true – the relative stylistic simplicity of many of the homes within Driftwood is the result of a very mindful effort to encourage the built community and the existing coastal hammock to coexist. The naming and categorizing of architectural movements tends to be retroactive, especially in the modern era, and the use of terms such as “Minimal Traditional” and “Masonry Vernacular” sometimes differ from the language used in evaluations of similar designs done in the past (and may well differ from terminology used at later dates). Nonetheless, the contributing properties within the proposed district are significant for their relationship to two closely related stages of the neighborhood’s development: the period of collaboration of Mark Dixon Dodd, Archie Parish, Arthur Modine and Francis Marion Boone between 1937 and 1940, and the period of 1948 through 1967, during which time a small handful of builders and architects brought a more modern interpretation of homebuilding to the neighborhood. As shown in Figure 5, the number of properties that are now being proposed for listing as contributing grew steeply during the late 1930s, followed by a halt in construction during World
War II. The post-War infill, which represented the work of a number of builders and architects, was more steady throughout over the next two decades.

The predominant architectural style during the Bayview period of construction can be classified as Minimal Traditional, often with influences including Mediterranean Revival, Colonial, and, perhaps most notably, Storybook. Minimal Traditional designs were largely fueled by a need to construct relatively low-cost homes during the Great Depression. Typically one-story cottages, though sometimes featuring a half-story above, the style of these homes was dictated by restrained references to traditional styles. Dodd incorporated a number of eclectic references, most commonly the Storybook or English Cottage Vernacular style. Incorporating whimsical "Storybook" elements into residential architecture experienced some degree of popularity during the eclectic period of the 1920s. The style’s use in homes set amidst dense and mature vegetation enhances a sense of enchantment.

Many of the homes constructed following the end of World War II were custom-built, and, therefore, uniquely represent the changing lifestyles and technology of the era. Although stylistically they aim to focus on the clean horizontality that dominated that period’s architecture, their overall scale is consistent with earlier contributing houses in Driftwood.

Of the 32 contributing primary residences within the proposed district, 11 are one (1) story and 21 have a partial or full second story. Although the sizes of both homes and parcels vary, setbacks are fairly consistent throughout the proposed district. Front setbacks are at least 30 feet but average over 55 feet, and side setbacks average approximately 20 feet per side, according to the applicant’s calculations. Information submitted with the application features setback measurements; Appendix D features additional information on the existing conditions of the proposed district. Appendix E contains additional photographs taken by staff.
Boundary Justification

Initial Boundaries
The boundaries described in the application submitted on March 6, 2018, following the initial balloting process, included the area platted by the Bayview Construction Company in 1937 as the original Driftwood Subdivision, the First and Second Additions to Driftwood Subdivision (both platted in 1940) and the four (4) parcels at the western edge of the subdivision along Driftwood Road South which faced the Second Addition. These four parcels contain three (3) homes constructed in the early post-War years, as well as a home dating to circa 1910. The 1910 “Mullet Farm” or “Gandy House” (2700 Driftwood Road South/FMSF 8PI00824) had been listed for over a decade on the City’s list of “Potentially Eligible” properties and was the only remaining building relating to the area’s “pre-boom” development as a relatively distinct village rather than the suburban neighborhood of St. Petersburg, which Driftwood would be shaped into by the Bayview Construction Company. The inclusion of these parcels was justified due to their orientation toward other contributing resources in the district, as well as the very high degree of historic significance exhibited by the house at 2700 Driftwood Road South. This boundary is shown on the sample ballot enclosed as Appendix A.

Amended Boundaries
During the early stages of this application, and prior to its designation as officially “active,” the house at 2700 Driftwood Road South was demolished and a decision was made by the applicants to redraw the boundary line to follow the platted boundaries of the Driftwood Subdivision and its two (2) additions. Although including properties along both sides of minor or residential streets within historic districts is generally encouraged by staff in order to create an immersive district and ensure that properties facing one another evolve under the guidance of the same policies, following historic plat lines is another recommended approach to the delineation of historic district edges. For this reason, staff supported the request to amend the proposed boundaries but reissued ballots to all property owners within the new boundaries to ensure a complete understanding of the effect of this proposed designation. Appendix E contains maps of the proposed district’s boundaries as considered herein; Appendix F contains maps of the proposed district’s boundaries as considered herein; Appendix F contains historic plats.

Contributing and Noncontributing Properties
In historic preservation parlance, the terms “contributing” and “noncontributing” are used to discuss the relationship that an individual building, object, site, or structure exhibits with relationship to the historic significance of its encompassing district or resource as a whole. The National Park Service defines these terms within the National Historic Landmark program as follows:

Contributing resources are the buildings, objects, sites, and structures that played a role or, more simply, existed at the time the event(s) associated with the proposed National Historic Landmark occurred...Noncontributing resources are the buildings, objects, sites, and structures that did not exist at the time the
event(s) associated with the proposed National Historic Landmark occurred or have lost integrity from that period.¹

Within the proposed district, therefore, resources constructed after 1967 or those which have been altered to such a degree that overall integrity has been lost, are recommended for listing as noncontributing, whereas those constructed within the period of significance and demonstrating retained integrity are recommended to be listed as contributing resources within the Driftwood Local Historic District. Detailed architectural descriptions have been provided as part of the application; staff’s recommendations for contributing and non-contributing resources within the proposed district follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect / Builder</th>
<th>Dominant Architectural Style(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st St. S.E.</td>
<td>Landscape Feature (Built)</td>
<td>c. 1938</td>
<td>15’ &quot;Driftwood&quot; archway</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st St. at 25th Ave. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Weikel, W.W.</td>
<td>Vernacular/Mid-Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400 1st S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Harvard/Beard</td>
<td>Minimal Colonial/ Monterey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th Ave. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 25th Ave. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Mediterranean Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2605 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2615 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2617 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2620 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Pfau, A.L. for H. Dreyer</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Community Beach Access</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Path &amp; Dock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Rose, O.W.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional/ Tropical Modern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Contributing Primary Residences and Noteworthy Sites and Objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect / Builder</th>
<th>Dominant Architectural Style(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>234 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Parish, Archie for owner William Moore</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional/ Minimal Colonial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Rose, O.W.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional/ Tropical Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Vandervort, Claude for owner M.W. McDonald</td>
<td>Mid-Century/ Ranch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Rose, O.W.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional/ Tropical Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Wallace, W.T. for Norman C. Halsey</td>
<td>Mid-Century/ Masonry Vernacular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Sennholtz, K.P. for owner Eva Carr</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2420 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Monterey/ Mediterranean Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Gorman &amp; Bonesy for owner John Rowell</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2505 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional/ Storybook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2510 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional/ Mediterranean Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2515 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2519 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional/ Storybook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2521 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional/ Storybook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>c. 1950</td>
<td>Miranda Home marker</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Florida Ave. S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect / Builder</th>
<th>Dominant Architectural Style(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2500 Florida Ave. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Hendry Bldg Co. for owner Dr. Franklin Plumley</td>
<td>Mid-Century/ Masonry Vernacular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600 Florida Ave. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Rose, O.W.</td>
<td>Mid-Century/ Masonry Vernacular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2621 Florida Ave. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Contributing Primary Residences and Noteworthy Sites and Objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect / Builder</th>
<th>Dominant Architectural Style(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103 Wildwood Ln. S.E. (Local Historic Landmark HPC 07-01)</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional/Storybook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional/Storybook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional/Storybook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional/Storybook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional/Storybook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional/Storybook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood Park</td>
<td>Park (historically site of Sales Office)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Bayview Construction Co.</td>
<td>Demolished – now community greenspace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Contributing Accessory Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2605 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>Detached Garage</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Detached Garage</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>Detached Garage</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.5 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Unit</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>Detached Garage</td>
<td>c. 1937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Noncontributing Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Reason for Noncontributing Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1st St. S.</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2660 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Diminished Integrity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Noncontributing Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Reason for Noncontributing Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2675 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence and Detached Garage</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Construction Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2680 Driftwood Rd. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Construction Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Demolition of Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence and Ancillary Buildings</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Diminished Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence and Detached Garage</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Construction Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Construction Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Construction Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Diminished Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Diminished Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287 Driftwood Rd. S.E.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Construction Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 Florida Ave. S.</td>
<td>Detached Garage</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Construction Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635 Florida Ave. S.</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Diminished Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Wildwood Ln. S.E.</td>
<td>Detached Garage</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Construction Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Historic Significance and Satisfaction of Eligibility Criteria

### Period of Significance

The designation application (Appendix C) proposes a Period of Significance which includes Pre-Anglo-European settlement and the years spanning 1857 to 1967, with noted significant dates of 1857, 1862, 1937, and 1940.

Although archaeological explorations conducted in the 1970s (Florida Master Site File No. 8PI00022) did not reveal artifacts, historical accounts of middens at the site are numerous, and the possibility of the site yielding future information should not be discounted. This possibility necessitates the inclusion of the pre-Columbian era in the period of significance.

The latter span of years, 1857 to 1967, includes the period during which the proposed district reached historic significance under the criteria discussed below. 1857 is the year of Abel Miranda's settlement of the area; land in the proposed district was under ownership of the family of fellow early settler until 1940, by which point Modine and Dodd had begun developing the land as the Driftwood community. Although construction lagged somewhat during World War II, post-War infill began shortly thereafter, with homes tending to be custom-built and responsive to their sites and the overall character of the area.
Because of the lack of "land boom" development that occurred during the early 20th century, as other residential suburbs in St. Petersburg were being platted and built up rapidly, staff recommends that the period of significance be modified to exclude the time between the closure of the Pinellas Village post office (1906) and the beginning of the Bayshore Investment Company's developmental activity (1935). A period of significance typically may extend no less than 50 years prior to designation. Because the conversations surrounding this application, and outreach to property owners, began in 2017, the year 1967 is recommended as an end-date for the historic period.

The recommended period of significance for the Driftwood Local Historic District, therefore, is Pre-Anglo-European Settlement; 1857-1906; 1935-1967. These years include the periods during which the land within the proposed district was being actively settled or developed, resulting in the establishment of historic significance with relation to the area's historical context.

Criteria for Significance

Evaluation of potential local historic landmarks considers a resource’s historic significance with relation to nine criteria. One or more of these criteria must be met in order for a property to qualify for designation as an individual landmark or district to be placed in the St. Petersburg Register. The nine criteria are based on the National Park Service's criteria for placement in the National Register of Historic Places, and are designed to assess resources' importance in a given historic context with objectivity and comprehensiveness. In the case of the proposed Driftwood Local Historic District, the application proposes that the resource satisfies the St. Petersburg Register criteria as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is at least one of the following criteria for eligibility met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A thorough discussion of the proposed district’s satisfaction of these criteria is provided in the application. Following an evaluation of the proposed district’s existing conditions and history within its historic context, staff concurs with the applicant’s assertion that the resource is eligible for listing in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places under Criteria A, B, C, D, F, G, H, and I.

**Historic Integrity**

In addition to assessing historic significance, the evaluation for eligibility for listing in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places questions whether at least one (1) of seven (7) factors of historic integrity have been met. In the case of the proposed Driftwood Local Historic District, staff finds six (6) factors to remain intact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is at least one of the following factors of integrity met?</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Workmanship</th>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Must be present in addition to at least one other factor.

**Location**

All properties within the proposed district remain in their original locations.

**Design**

The intended designs of both the district overall and its individual properties have been well-preserved. The individual buildings, sites, and structures within the district have maintained their historic designs to a large degree, with 32 of the proposed district’s 43 primary residences remaining contributing.

**Setting**

The proposed district is surrounded by single-family residential development, primarily platted and at least partially developed during the 1920s. In addition, and perhaps more importantly, the setting of the proposed district itself retains an impressive degree of integrity, with the mature vegetation that inspired Dodd’s vision for Driftwood remaining intact and creating a true sense of immersion within the proposed district. The proposed boundaries capture this vision to the greatest extent possible.

**Materials**

Some individual contributing properties have seen alterations such as the construction of side and rear additions and the replacement of windows, and certain aspects of the landscape have
been necessarily modernized, perhaps diminishing the intention of a natural setting slightly. The district as a whole, however, maintains sufficient historic materials to allow the viewer to read the district in its entirety as being composed of historic materials.

Workmanship

Workmanship is defined by the National Park Services as “the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period of history.” The proposed Driftwood Local Historic District serves as physical documentation of the historic construction techniques that were prevalent during its period of significance. The aesthetic principals that guided the area’s development remain visible in the way that the landscapes and individual resources were constructed, from Driftwood Road’s meandering path parallel to the Big Bayou shoreline to Dodd’s whimsical inclusion of birdhouses at some of his buildings’ facades.

Feeling

Feeling, a resource’s aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time, permeates the proposed district through its unique community design, which was, even when established in the 1930s, a reference to an earlier era in many ways.

Character-Defining Features

Shortly before retiring from the role of President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 2010, Richard Moe remarked that “there may have been a time when preservation was about saving an old building here and there, but those days are gone. Preservation is in the business of saving communities and the values they embody.” Nearly a decade later, these words ring true when evaluating the aspects of the proposed Driftwood Local Historic District that relate to its historic significance. The proposed district is undeniably among the most unique neighborhoods within contemporary St. Petersburg, due to a rich and distinct architectural palette, a small network of narrow streets which “break the grid” to follow the natural shoreline and topographical features, and dense, perhaps even seemingly untamed, vegetation. Alterations to properties within local historic districts are reviewed for their impacts on the resource as a whole with a priority of preserving and rehabilitating of character-defining features, which relate to the district’s historic significance. Although the appropriateness of future alterations is reviewed on a case-by-case basis with relation to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, staff recommends the following elements of the district be noted as character-defining elements of the proposed district, and, therefore, particularly worthy of preservation.

Architecture: Homes Constructed by the Bayview Construction Company and Mark Dixon Dodd

- Most typically Minimal Traditional in style, often with eclectic and whimsical references including that from the Mediterranean Revival, Colonial, and Storybook styles.

---

2 United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Register Bulletin 15 — How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.
• Low-pitched, gabled roof, generally featuring at least one cross gable. The predominant form is most commonly the front gable, typically with a vent or other decoration at the gable end.
• Minimal roof overhangs.
• Metal casement windows arranged in pairs or tripartite units, often with shutters.
• Stucco exterior treatment, sometimes incorporating decorative siding or half-timbering at gable ends as a focal point.
• Sheltered stoops rather than full front porches.

*Architecture: Mid-Century Infill*
• Mid-century or Masonry Vernacular in style, featuring an overall emphasis of horizontality.
• One story or split level.
• Attached garages.
• Metal windows, casement or awning, often arranged in ribbon configurations.
• Stucco exterior.
• Low-pitched hipped or flat roof.

*Community Design*
• Narrow, meandering roads with low curbs and lacking sidewalks.
• Generous front yard setbacks.

*Landscape*
The landscape elements that have traditionally been protected by local historic designation within the city have primarily been within public right of way. However, given the particularly distinctive and unique atmosphere created by Driftwood's heavily-vegetated landscape, the application being discussed herein suggests a degree of protection be extended to the vegetated areas of private properties, most notably to the deep front setbacks which contribute so significantly to the proposed district. Staff suggests that a landscape plan be required as part of the COA process for new construction and alterations or additions significant enough to require a site plan as part of Building and Zoning review, with a focus on the following:
• Mature tree canopy, including, but not limited to, trees in Right of Way.
• Dense native vegetation extending to street edge.
• Limited use of turf grass as ground cover.
• Lack of fences in front yards.
• Side and rear fences set back from façade and well-screened with vegetation.

*RESULTS OF DESIGNATION*
The creation and preservation of historic districts enhances the city's historic character, fulfills the City's goals as a Certified Local Government in Historic Preservation, reinforces a strong sense of place, and plays a role in the local economy. A 2010 study of the *Economic Impacts of Historic Preservation in Florida* concluded that preservation-related activities including historic rehabilitation projects, heritage tourism, Main Street Programs, and history museums created over 110 thousand jobs in Florida and another 20 thousand in other parts of the country during
the period of 2007-2008. During that same time frame, preservation activities added $3.77 billion to in-state wealth.³

As a local historic district, certain financial benefits such as the Ad Valorem Tax Exemption for Rehabilitation and relief from some requirements of the Florida Building Code will additionally become available to property owners.

The local historic district listing being sought by this nomination will provide the proposed district and its property owners with a heightened degree of protection through design reviews to be conducted by staff of the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division under the guidance of the Community Planning and Preservation Commission. This process, which results in the issuance of Certificates of Appropriateness (COAs), is required in addition to any other building permits required by law. Only exterior modifications are reviewed through the COA process.

These determinations of appropriateness are guided by City Code Section 16.30.070.2.6, Approval of Changes to Local Landmarks, and by St. Petersburg’s Design Guidelines for Historic Properties, both of which are based on principals set forth by the National Park Service through the Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation. The documentation of properties’ history and extant conditions within the proposed district amassed within this nomination, and especially the Character-Defining Features identified above, will further serve as guides for future decisions, as they act to highlight the characteristics of the proposed district that relate directly to its architectural and historic significance.

CONSISTENCY WITH ST. PETERSBURG’S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, EXISTING LAND USE PLAN, AND FUTURE LAND USE PLAN

The proposed local historic landmark district designation is consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan, relating to the protection, use and adaptive reuse of historic buildings. The local landmark designation will not affect the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) or zoning designations, nor will it significantly constrain any existing or future plans for the development of the City. The proposed landmark designation is consistent with the following objectives:

Objective LU10: The historic resources locally designated by the St. Petersburg City Council and Community Planning and Preservation Commission (CPPC) shall be incorporated onto the Land Use Map or map series at the time of original adoption, or through the amendment process, and protected from development and redevelopment activities consistent with the provisions of the Historic Preservation Element and the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Policy LU10.1: Decisions regarding the designation of historic resources shall be based on the criteria and policies outlined in the Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Historic Preservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy HP2.3: The City shall provide technical assistance to applications for designation of historic structures and districts.

Policy HP2.6: Decisions regarding the designation of historic resources shall be based on National Register eligibility criteria and policies outlined in the Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan. The City will use the following selection criteria [for city initiated landmark designations] as a guideline for staff recommendations to the CPPC and City Council:

- National Register or DOE status
- Prominence/importance related to the City
- Prominence/importance related to the neighborhood
- Degree of threat to the landmark
- Condition of the landmark
- Degree of owner support

Policy CM11.14: In order to reduce risk resulting from or associated with high-tide events, storm surge, flash floods, stormwater runoff and impacts related to sea-level rise, THE City shall continue to promote the use of the development and redevelopment principles, strategies, and engineering solutions contained in the Florida Building Code and Land Development Regulations.

Policy CM15.1: The City will continue to promote the preservation of resources by conducting historic resource surveys and developing ordinances, guidelines, and databases.

FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT

The local historic district, as proposed, is located partially within a designated flood zone. Of the 43 primary residences within the proposed boundaries:

- 16 proposed contributing and 9 proposed non-contributing are within or partially within an AE Zone (buildable area), and
- 16 proposed contributing and 2 proposed non-contributing are within X or X-shaded (buildable area).

Historic structures that are repeatedly flooded will eventually deteriorate and require demolition, a negative outcome in direct contrast with the goals, objectives, and policies of the City’s historic preservation program. For this reason, improvements that maintain the integrity of the local historic district while incorporating flood mitigation measures is encouraged and further supported by the National Flood Insurance Program (“NFIP”).

The NFIP gives special consideration to the unique value of historic buildings, landmarks, and sites, in two ways. First, the NFIP floodplain management regulations provide relief to historic structures, as defined by CFR 44 Part 59, which includes historic districts. Historic structures do not have to meet the floodplain management requirements of the program if they maintain their historic structure designation meaning they do not have to meet the new construction,
substantial improvement, or substantial damage requirements applied to non-historic structures. This exclusion serves as an incentive for property owners to maintain the historic character of the designated structures and district.

Second, a designated structure can obtain the benefit of subsidized flood insurance through NFIP even if it has been substantially improved or substantially damaged so long as the structure maintains its historic designation. Allowing historic structures to continue to be insured at subsidized rates, even when they are substantially improved or substantially damaged, can represent a significant financial benefit to these building owners.

To qualify for this relief, local municipalities must adopt an ordinance that requires variances for improvements or repairs to historic structures. Pursuant to Ordinance 98-H, adopted on December 5, 2013, the City of St. Petersburg is a qualified municipality. City Code Chapter 16, Section 16.40.050.7.5, states:

"Historic Buildings. A variance is authorized to be issued for the repair, improvement, reconstruction, restoration or rehabilitation of a historic building that is determined eligible for the exception to the flood resistant construction requirements of the Florida Building Code, Existing Buildings, upon a determination that the proposed repair, improvement, reconstruction, restoration or rehabilitation will not preclude the building's continued designation as a historic building and the variance is the minimum necessary to preserve the historic character and design of the building. If the proposed work precludes the building's continued designation as a historic building, a variance shall not be granted and the building and any repair, improvement, reconstruction, restoration and rehabilitation shall be subject to the requirements of the Florida Building Code. Historic properties may be required to obtain a certificate of appropriateness pursuant to the City Code. No fee shall be required for the variance application and, if the historic structure has a current certificate of appropriateness, no notice of the variance shall be required."

Non-contributing resources and vacant lots in historic districts remain subject to all the floodplain management requirements that apply for new construction and substantial improvements. Any non-contributing resource may be voluntarily improved so that it can become a contributing resource to the historic district; this type of improvement might involve removal of modern additions and other actions to restore the historic nature of the resource. Contributing resources will qualify for relief provided they maintain their historic designation. Both will be reviewed through the Certificate of Appropriateness ("COAs") process and include variances, where required in accordance with the NFIP.

For more information, please read the Floodplain Management Bulletin: Historic Structures (FEMA P-467-2, May 2008) published through the National Flood Insurance Program ("NFIP"). In addition to describing how the NFIP treats historic structures, this bulletin also includes mitigation measures that can be sensitively implemented to protect historic structures from floods. Flood mitigation measures range from simple, low-cost improvements (such as elevating utilities and mechanical equipment) to structural modifications (such as building elevation and dry-floodproofing).
RECOMMENDATION

Given the proposed Driftwood Local Historic District's satisfaction of the criteria for designation as a local historic district to be added to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places, staff recommends approval of Case No. HPC 17-90300006, thus referring the issue to City Council for public hearing and a final determination.
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APPENDIX A: SAMPLE OF BALLOT DISTRIBUTED FEBRUARY 16, 2018
Instructions for Ballot to Determine Support/Opposition of an Application for the Designation of the Proposed Driftwood Local Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Number:</th>
<th>HPC 17-90300006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries of Affected Area:</td>
<td>Roughly, 24th Avenue Southeast, the rear parcel lines of properties located on the 2700 block of Driftwood Road South, Beach Drive Southeast, and Tampa Bay, as shown below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Description:</td>
<td>Pearson Subdivision, Lots 1 and 2; Driftwood, Lots 1 through 22; Driftwood First Addition, Lots A and 1 through 17; and Driftwood Second Addition, Lots 1 through 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request:</td>
<td>Listing of the Driftwood Local Historic District in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Property Owner,

Per the St. Petersburg City Code, Historic and Archaeological Preservation Overlay, Section 16.30.070.2.5.2.a, you are receiving this notification and attached ballot because you are the owner of property that is located within a proposed local historic district. A public information session regarding this application, of which your household was directly noticed, was held on January 17, 2018 at the Friends’ Meeting House. If you were unable to attend the meeting or have additional questions about the impacts of this proposal, please contact City staff using the information listed below.

The support of property owners representing more than 50% of the subject tax parcels is required for the application process to proceed. This vote will not finalize the designation of the above-referenced local historic district, rather it is required in order for the application to be considered by the Community Planning and Preservation Commission (CPPC) and the City Council.

**Process for Tallying Votes**

Each tax parcel is counted as one vote, regardless of the number of owners registered to that property. However, in the case of properties with multiple owners, each registered owner will receive a ballot and have the opportunity to vote. If ballots representing conflicting votes among multiple owners of a single tax parcel are received, the vote for that parcel will be counted as a vote of non-support. If there are multiple owners of a property and only one ballot has been received by Monday, April 16, 2018, then the vote indicated on the returned ballot will be counted for the entire parcel. Properties from which no ballot has been returned by Monday, April 16, 2018 will be considered to express nonsupport/opposition.
There are fifty-one (51) parcels within the proposed district. If support from the owners of twenty-seven (27) properties and all other materials required for the submission of a designation application, including an application fee, have been provided to the City, then the district application will be certified complete and proceed to quasi-judicial hearing and review by the CPPC. Once a district application has been certified complete, no permits shall be issued for any exterior alterations, demolitions, or new construction, except in cases of ordinary repair and maintenance, until the City Council has rendered a final decision on the designation request.

Next Steps in the Designation Process
Both you, as a property owner, and the owners of properties within 200 feet of the proposed boundary, will be notified a minimum of ten days prior to the CPPC quasi-judicial hearing. This hearing will include a presentation by City staff of an analysis of the potential district’s historic significance and integrity. This will be followed by a presentation from the applicant and an opportunity for public input. After hearing from staff, the applicant, and any interested parties, the CPPC will vote for or against recommendation of designation of the proposed district. Within 60 days following the CPPC meeting, the City Council will evaluate the proposed district designation at a quasi-judicial hearing. Property owners and owners of properties within 200 feet of the proposed boundary will again be notified a minimum of ten days prior to the quasi-judicial hearing of its time and location. The hearing will be conducted in the same manner as the CPPC hearing and followed by a discussion and final decision of the City Council.

Effects Should the Proposed District Application Be Approved
If the application is approved by the City Council, your property will be recorded as either a contributing or non-contributing property within the local district. As such, a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) will be required for future exterior alteration, new construction, demolition, or relocation. The COA process is essentially a design review that is generally conducted concurrently with the issuance of other necessary building or demolition permits. The process, which has recently been streamlined, is not designed to hinder owners’ ability to update and maintain their properties, but aims to ensure the sensitivity of exterior alterations and additions to the historic nature of a designated district or individual local landmark.

Ballot Remittance and Status Updates
Contact Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist, at 727.892.5451/laura.duvekot@stpete.org or visit www.stpete.org/history for further information on the City’s historic preservation program and this application.

Please consider your choice of support or opposition/nonsupport and return the attached ballot to:
Official Ballot, Driftwood LHD
c/o Laura Duvekot
Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division
PO Box 2842
St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842

Signed ballots must be postmarked on or before Monday, April 16, 2018 or delivered in person by 4pm on that date to the Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division, 8th Floor, Municipal Services Center, One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg. Please note that the results of this vote are not exempt from relevant public records laws.

Respectfully,

Derek Kilborn, Manager
Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division
Planning and Economic Development Department

cc: Dave Goodwin, Director, Planning & Economic Development Department
    Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney, City Attorney’s Office
I, ___________________________________________, owner of the property located at
_____________________________________________, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705,

☐ SUPPORT
☐ DO NOT SUPPORT

the initiation of an application for designation of the Driftwood Local Historic District in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places. The proposed district boundary includes the fifty-two (52) properties roughly bounded by 24th Avenue Southeast, Tampa Bay, the rear parcel line of properties along the 2700 block of Driftwood Road South, and Beach Drive Southeast.

A forged signature is an illegal signature that may be prosecuted accordingly; the City of St. Petersburg reserves the right to verify signature authenticity with the ballot recipient.

__________________________________________
(Signature)

__________________________________________
(Date)

Ballot Instructions:

Please sign and return this ballot on or before Monday, April 16, 2018. The ballot may be:

- Delivered in person to the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division, 6th Floor of the Municipal Services Center, One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, FL 33701;
- Mailed to Official Ballot, Driftwood LHD c/o Laura Duvekot, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division, PO Box 2842, St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842.

A demonstration of support from 50% + one (1) of the tax parcels located within the proposed boundary is required for this application to proceed to the Community Planning & Preservation Commission (CPPC) and City Council. The final decision regarding this application will be determined by City Council action, not by the outcome of this vote. The application will be deemed complete immediately upon receipt of: “support” votes representing at least twenty-seven (27) of the fifty-one (51) tax parcels within the proposed district a complete application for the designation of the proposed area as a local historic district, and a processing fee from the applicant.

The response for each tax parcel will be counted as one (1) vote; in the case of conflicting votes among multiple owners of a single tax parcel, the vote will be counted as nonsupport. If there are multiple owners of a property and only one ballot has been received by April 16, 2018, then the vote indicated on the returned ballot will be counted for the entire parcel. Following return of the ballot, your position may not be changed.

Ballots not received or postmarked on or before April 16, 2018 will be recorded as a nonresponse and counted as a “do not support” vote, except among multiple owners of a single tax parcel where one or more ballots have been remitted. These will be recorded as described above.

This vote is to initiate the application process only; it does not finalize the decision of whether a historic district will be officially created. If sufficient support is demonstrated and the application forwarded to the CPPC and City Council, you will be given a minimum of 10 days’ notice of the public hearings at which you may provide input regarding the potential district designation.
APPENDIX B: SAMPLE OF BALLOT DISTRIBUTED JUNE 27, 2018
BACKGROUND/NEW BALLOT EXPLANATION

On February 16, 2018, the City mailed ballots to fifty-one (51) tax parcels in accord with City ordinance to determine if there is sufficient neighborhood support for submission of an application to designate the Driftwood neighborhood a local historic district. The number of ballots of support returned exceeded the minimum requirement, and an application was subsequently filed on March 5, 2018. The district boundary depicted in the submitted application did not include four parcels (2700, 2720, 2736 and 2772 Driftwood Road South) that had been shown on the proposed district map sent out with the ballots.

The City’s Historic and Archaeological Preservation Overlay Ordinance does not specify whether the area sought for designation within the application and the area receiving ballots be the same. Accordingly, the City advised the applicants that it would be permissible to submit an application without including the four Driftwood Road (Ward Avenue South) properties. After making this determination, staff received an inquiry questioning the legality of the ballot process. In an effort to resolve this procedural question and guarantee a fair and transparent process for all property owners within the proposed district, the City’s Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division (“Division”) has requested a new ballot process.

Enclosed with this letter is a new ballot and map. Your previous vote from the original ballot process is void. The Division appreciates your understanding and invites you to remit your ballots accordingly. Additional instructions are included in the following section. The new ballot map does not include 2700, 2720, 2736 & 2772 Driftwood Road (Ward Avenue South). To assist with your understanding of the above, please find below three maps showing the portion of the neighborhood along Driftwood Road South (Ward Avenue South) directly affected. The first map is a section of the original ballot map; the second of the application map and the third of the 1940 Driftwood subdivision map.
BALLOT INSTRUCTIONS

Per the St. Petersburg City Code, Historic and Archaeological Preservation Overlay, Section 16.30.070.2.5.2.a, you are receiving this notification and attached ballot because you are the owner of property that is located within a proposed local historic district. A public information session regarding this application, of which your household was directly noticed, was held on January 17, 2018 at the Friends’ Meeting House. If you were unable to attend the meeting or have additional questions about the impacts of this proposal, please contact City staff using the information listed below.

The support of property owners representing more than 50% of the subject tax parcels is required for the application process to proceed. City owned property, such as the Driftwood/Wildwood park, is not included in the ballot process. This vote will not finalize the designation of the above-referenced local historic district, rather it is required in order for the application to be considered by the Community Planning and Preservation Commission ("CPPC") and the City Council.

Process for Tallying Votes

Each tax parcel, exclusive of City owned parcels, is counted as one vote, regardless of the number of owners registered to that parcel. However, in the case of parcels with multiple owners, each registered owner will receive a ballot and have the opportunity to vote. If one of the multiple owners returns a ballot of non-support then the vote for that parcel will be counted as a vote of non-support. If there are multiple owners of a parcel and only one ballot has been received by Monday, August 27, 2018, then the vote indicated on the returned ballot will be counted for the entire parcel. Parcels from which no ballot has been returned by Monday, August 27, 2018, regardless of the number of owners, will be counted as a vote of non-support/opposition.

Once a ballot has been submitted, the choice of support or non-support/opposition reflected on the ballot may not be changed. An owner may voice support or opposition/non-support at any public hearing regardless of the position reflected on a ballot. There are forty-seven (47) parcels within the proposed district. If support from the owners of twenty-five (25) properties and all other materials required for the submission of a designation application, including an application fee, have been provided to the City, then the district application will be certified complete and proceed to quasi-judicial hearing and review by the CPPC. Once a district application has
been certified complete, a permit may only be issued for exterior alterations, demolitions, or new construction if processed in accord with the Certificate of Appropriateness process (further explained below), except in cases of ordinary repair and maintenance, until the City Council has rendered a final decision on the designation request.

**Next Steps in the Designation Process**

Both you, as a property owner, and the owners of properties within 200 feet of the proposed boundary, will be notified a minimum of ten days prior to the CPPC quasi-judicial hearing. This hearing will include a presentation by City staff of an analysis of the potential district’s historic significance and integrity, a presentation from the applicant and an opportunity for public input. After hearing from staff, the applicant, and any interested parties, the CPPC will vote to recommend approve, approve with modifications, or to deny designation of the proposed district.

Within 60 days following the CPPC meeting, the City Council will evaluate the proposed district designation at a quasi-judicial hearing. Property owners and owners of properties within 200 feet of the proposed boundary will again be notified a minimum of ten days prior to the quasi-judicial hearing of its time and location. The hearing will be conducted in the same manner as the CPPC hearing and followed by a discussion and final decision of the City Council to approve, approve with modifications, or to deny the application.

**Effects Should the Proposed District Application Be Approved**

If the application is approved by the City Council, your property will be recorded as either a contributing or non-contributing property within the local district. As such, a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) will be required for future exterior alteration, new construction, demolition, or relocation, except for ordinary repairs or maintenance. The COA process is essentially a design review that is generally conducted concurrently with the issuance of other necessary building or demolition permits. The process, which has recently been streamlined, is not designed to hinder owners’ ability to update and maintain their properties, but aims to ensure the sensitivity of exterior alterations and additions to the historic nature of a designated district or individual local landmark.

**Ballot Remittance and Status Updates**

Contact Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist, at 727.892.5451, Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org or visit www.stpete.org/history for further information on the City’s historic preservation program and this application.

*Please consider your choice of support or opposition/non-support and return the attached ballot to:*

Official Ballot, Driftwood LHD  
c/o Laura Duvekot  
Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division  
PO Box 2842  
St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842

Signed ballots must be postmarked on or before Monday, August 27, 2018 or delivered in person by 4:00 p.m. on that date to the Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division, 8th Floor, Municipal Services Center, One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg. Please note that the results of this vote are not exempt from relevant public records laws.
Respectfully,

Derek Kilborn, Manager
Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division
Planning and Economic Development Department
Derek.Kilborn@stpete.org
(727) 893-7872

cc: Elizabeth Abernethy, Director, Planning & Development Department
Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist, Planning & Development Department
Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney, City Attorney’s Office

Proposed District Boundary:

Driftwood Local Historic District
Local Historic District Proposed Boundaries
File: HPC-17-90300006.
OFFICIAL BALLOT

Must be returned or postmarked on or before August 27, 2018.

I, ________________________________, owner of the property located at

__________________________________________, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705,

☐ SUPPORT

☐ DO NOT SUPPORT

the initiation of an application for designation of the Driftwood Local Historic District in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places. The proposed district boundary includes the forty-seven (47) parcels roughly bounded by 24th Avenue Southeast, Tampa Bay, the rear parcel line of properties along the 2700 block of Driftwood Road South (Ward Avenue South), and Beach Drive Southeast.

A forged signature is an illegal signature that may be prosecuted accordingly; the City of St. Petersburg reserves the right to verify signature authenticity with the ballot recipient.

__________________________________________

(Signature)  (Date)

Ballot Instructions:

Please sign and return this ballot on or before Monday, August 27, 2018. The ballot may be:

- Delivered in person to the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division, 8th Floor of the Municipal Services Center, One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, FL 33701;
- Mailed to Official Ballot, Driftwood LHD c/o Laura Duvekot, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division, PO Box 2842, St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842.

A demonstration of support from 50% + one (1) of the tax parcels located within the proposed boundary is required for this application to proceed to the Community Planning & Preservation Commission (CPPC) and City Council. The final decision regarding this application will be determined by City Council action, not by the outcome of this vote. The application will be deemed complete immediately upon receipt of: “support” votes representing at least twenty-five (25) of the forty-seven (47) tax parcels within the proposed district, a complete application for the designation of the proposed area as a local historic district, and a processing fee from the applicant.

The response for each tax parcel will be counted as one (1) vote; in the case of conflicting votes among multiple owners of a single tax parcel, the vote will be counted as nonsupport. If there are multiple owners of a tax parcel and only one ballot has been received by August 27, 2018, then the vote indicated on the returned ballot will be counted for the entire parcel. Following return of the ballot, your position may not be changed.

Ballots not received or postmarked on or before August 27, 2018 will be recorded as a nonresponse and counted as a “do not support” vote, except among multiple owners of a single tax parcel where one or more ballots have been remitted. These will be recorded as described above.

This vote is to initiate the application process only; it does not finalize the decision of whether a historic district will be officially created. If sufficient support is demonstrated and the application forwarded to the CPPC and City Council, you will be given a minimum of 10 days’ notice of the public hearings at which you may provide input regarding the potential district designation.
Summary of “Round Two” Ballot Returns
City File 17-90300006/Driftwood Local Historic District

June 27, 2018  70 ballots mailed by city staff to owners of 47 parcels w/in subject district
August 13, 2018  Ballot indicating support from 26th parcel logged and application marked as "Active."
August 27, 2018  Deadline for ballots to be returned or postmarked.

As of 11:30am, August 28, 2018:

- 42 ballots of support have been received representing 29 parcels;
- 9 ballots of non-support have been received representing 8 parcels.

- 7 ballots representing 4 parcels have been noted as having been sent to individuals that no longer own the parcels in question;
- 5 ballots have been issued to the new owners of those 4 parcels, per updated PCPAO information;
- 3 ballots representing 3 of those parcels [all indicating support] have been received by city staff.
APPENDIX C: LOCAL LANDMARK DESIGNATION APPLICATION SUBMITTED MARCH 6, 2018 AND ADDITIONAL BACKUP MATERIAL FROM APPLICANTS
Local Landmark
Designation Application

1. NAME AND LOCATION OF PROPERTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>historic name</td>
<td>Driftwood Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other names/site number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historic address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. PROPERTY OWNER(S) NAME AND ADDRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>street and number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city or town</td>
<td>St Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phone number (h)</td>
<td>727-580-9585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street and number</td>
<td>Howard Ferebee Hansen - 3810 20th Ave. N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city or town</td>
<td>St Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phone number (h)</td>
<td>727-323-1351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date prepared</td>
<td>March 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. NOMINATION PREPARED BY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>name/title</td>
<td>Howard Ferebee Hansen, Laurie Macdonald, Emily Elwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street and number</td>
<td>Howard Ferebee Hansen - 3810 20th Ave. N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city or town</td>
<td>St Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phone number (h)</td>
<td>727-323-1351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date prepared</td>
<td>March 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION

Describe boundary line encompassing all man-made and natural resources to be included in designation (general legal description or survey). Attach map delimiting proposed boundary. (Use continuation sheet if necessary)
Bounds of the district - The Driftwood Historic District is bounded by the shoreline of Big Bayou to its south and this riparian "bulkhead line" runs east along the shore to the western r.o.w. line of Beach Drive SE, thence north along the west line of said drive to the southern line of the vacated parcel of 24th Avenue SE continuing westerly along this line to the southern r.o.w. line of 24th Avenue SE thence west to the eastern r.o.w. line of 1st Street SE, thence south along this line to the southern r.o.w. line of 25th Avenue S, thence west to the southeastern r.o.w. line of Florida Avenue S, thence southeast to the southeastern r.o.w. line of Bethel Avenue S, thence southwest to the SE r.o.w. of Ward Avenue (Driftwood Road S), thence southeast along said line continuing along to the shore of Big Bayou, the point of beginning.

Boundary Justification - This boundary encompasses all of the lots and blocks of the Driftwood Subdivision, Driftwood Subdivision First Addition, and the Driftwood Subdivision Second Addition which are the historic boundaries of this subdivision.

5. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

acreage of property
more than 1 acre

property identification number

7. DESCRIPTION

Architectural Classification
(See Appendix A for list)
Minimal Traditional, Mid-Century Ranch,
Eclectic Historicism, Mediterranean
Revival, English Vernacular
Revival

Influences of Storybook, Tudor,
Monterey, Tropical Modern, Colonial
Revival

Materials
concrete block, stucco, wood,

Narrative Description

On one or more continuation sheets describe the historic and existing condition of the property use conveying the following information: original location and setting; natural features; pre-historic man-made features; subdivision design; description of surrounding buildings; major alterations and present appearance; interior appearance;

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT
The Driftwood Historic District is situated on the north shore of Big Bayou an arm of Tampa Bay. The shoreline is still a natural sandy beach with swaths of mangrove. The soil is sand or sandy loam with an elevation of 2' to 5' that rises gently from the shore. The interior of the district reaches an elevation of 15'-16' at its highest point. The district is located within a semi-tropical coastal hammock comprised of mature native oak species, red cedars, pines, and sabal palms that form a nearly continuous tree canopy throughout the district. Exotic semi-tropical and tropical-temperate tree and plant species have been introduced by homeowners since the 1930s.

The subdivision's streets are narrow and the principal street, Driftwood Road, winds following the shoreline and was unpaved until 1970, but now has asphalt pavement and roll gutter concrete curbs. One section of the road is bisected by an oak tree which was left undisturbed during development. The south side of Big Bayou was drastically altered during the 1920s dredge and fill of the Lewis Island (Coquina Key) subdivision. The land adjacent to the east of the district (east of Beach Drive SE) was dredged and filled in the early 1950s to create the Tropical Shores subdivision. The orientation of the streets and lot shapes and sizes are varied and irregular, do not conform with the earlier surrounding subdivision plats nor St Petersburg's typical grid pattern. The one street that aligns with the subdivision to the west is the 2700 block of Ward Ave ( currently called Driftwood Road So. ) This street was the first one built at the district in the 1870s connecting a wooden pier at its foot to connecting inland roads.

A metal 1950s era Florida state historical marker is located on the east side of this street near the bayou approximately on the site of the 1875 post office building and is listed as a contributing object to the district.

The focal point of the district is an irregular oblong park approximately 265' in length X 80' which has a dense planting of oaks and an understory of ornamental tropical native and non-native plants and low groundcover. The park includes a small circular pond with a statue of a child and a sitting bench. In recent years neighbors have placed bricks bearing past and current residents' names around the north edge of the pond. The eastern end of Driftwood also has a median park enhancing the foliage filled character of the district.

Another important defining feature of the district is the large 15' high metal archway of forged soft steel inscribed with "DRIFTWOOD" which spans First Street So at 25th Ave So. The archway is topped by a weathervane with bird in flight, fish in talons. The weathervane has been changed over the years as repairs were called for. This was the original gateway to the subdivision, erected in circa 1938 and is listed as a contributing object to the district.

There is a private easement for neighborhood access to Big Bayou about 288' long X 6' wide that is owned by Driftwood Addition Lot 2 and Lot 3. Solely Driftwood Subdivision homeowner deeds include use of this easement.

Lots vary in size within the district from small ones inland that are 50' to 70' wide and 125' to 180' in depth. Waterfront lots are larger in size ranging from 85' to 90'+ wide and 175' to 200'+. House setbacks on lots are a minimum of 30' and greater on water lots, there are minimal approximately 10' side setbacks, and both inland lots and water lots generally have large rear yards. House square footage varies widely from the small inland cottages designed by Dodd in the 1930s to the grander waterfront houses. Fencing of any type was not used in the pre WWII period and was still uncommon to pre -1968 homes because hedges and dense floral screens were considered more appropriate to the picturesque landscape aesthetic of the subdivision's original design. However, modern fences have begun to mar the streetscapes, although fences and gates are generally of an open design that afford connectivity and flow of plantings and view.
The vast majority of the houses are of masonry construction, concrete block with concrete stucco veneer, on running wall raised foundations supported by concrete spread footings, or the newer houses with concrete slab slightly above grade foundations. The majority of the historic houses’ roof type is wood truss gable, cross gable, or gable on hip. The majority of the district’s houses have fireplaces that often serve as an important design feature. The 1930s to early 1950s houses generally have steel casement or wood sash windows, houses from the mid 1950s to 1968 normally have aluminum awning windows. The majority of the outbuildings in the district are detached garages although post-WWII houses have attached garages.

Post 1968 alterations within the district are minimal and have not adversely impacted the historic appearance of the landscape nor its houses. The most common alterations found on the houses are roof and window replacements with materials differing from the original fabric. Some of the houses have been enlarged with newer additions generally to the rear of the buildings.

8. NUMBER OF RESOURCES WITHIN PROPERTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Contributing resources previously listed on the National Register or Local Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>1 (103 Wildwood Lane SE, Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(43 houses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sites 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objects 2</td>
<td>Number of multiple property listings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Driftwood Historic District
Name of Property

9. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Criteria for Significance
(mark one or more boxes for the appropriate criteria)

X☐ Its value is a significant reminder of the cultural or archaeological heritage of the City, state, or nation.
X☐ Its location is the site of a significant local, state, or national event.

X☐ It is identified with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the City, state, or nation.

X☐ It is identified as the work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose work has influenced the development of the City, state, or nation.

☐ Its value as a building is recognized for the quality of its architecture, and it retains sufficient elements showing its architectural significance.

X☐ It has distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials.

X☐ Its character is a geographically definable area possessing a significant concentration, or continuity or sites, buildings, objects or structures united in past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development.

X☐ Its character is an established and geographically definable neighborhood, united in culture, architectural style or physical plan and development.

X☐ It has contributed, or is likely to contribute, information important to the prehistory or history of the City, state, or nation.

Under Criteria 1 - "Its value is a significant reminder of the cultural or archaeological heritage of the City, state, or nation." The Driftwood Historic District is locally significant for its potential to contain archaeological features related to the 1800s pioneer homesteads of Miranda and Bethell, the 1862 Civil War military engagement at this site, and the remnants of the late 1800s village of Pinellas.

Under Criteria 2 - "Its location is the site of a significant local, state, or national event." The Driftwood Historic District is the site of the February 1862 Civil War engagement between the U.S. Navy and the settlement of alleged blockade-runners. This was the only military action during this war which occurred in Pinellas County.

Under Criteria 3 - "It is identified with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the City, state, or nation." The Driftwood Historic District is locally significant as the site of the homesteads of the first permanent European settlers in lower Pinellas County, Abel Miranda and John Bethell.

Under Criteria 4 - "It is identified as the work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose work has influenced the development of the City, state, or nation." The Driftwood Historic District is locally significant because it is associated with Mark Dixon Dodd, a nationally known artist who was the designer of the 1930s to 1940s subdivision and 19 of the houses within the district and with Archie Parish an important local architect who partnered with Dodd.

Under Criteria 6 - "It has distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials." The Driftwood Historic District is locally significant because it contains a collection of single family residences that represent the local taste in suburban housing of the period from 1937 to 1967.

[Under Criteria 5 - N/A Applies to individual structure applications]
Under Criteria 7 - "Its character is a geographically definable area possessing a significant concentration, or continuity or sites, buildings, objects or structures united in past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development." The Driftwood Historic District is locally significant because it was a planned subdivision within a coastal sub-tropical hammock which was preserved by its designer, this original concept visually unites all of its houses which date to a thirty year period and are all of relatively similar materials.

Under Criteria 8 - "Its character is an established and geographically definable neighborhood, united in culture, architectural style or physical plan and development." The Driftwood Historic District is locally significant as a small neighborhood that has cohesive and instantly recognizable character thanks to its plan and dense tree canopy with an understory of lush jungle-like garden landscape.

Under Criteria 9 - "It has contributed, or is likely to contribute, information important to the prehistory or history of the City, state, or nation." The Driftwood Historic District is locally significant for its potential to contain archaeological features related to the 1800s pioneer homesteads of Miranda and Bethell, the 1862 Civil War military engagement at this site, and the remnants of the late 1800s village of Pinellas. It also has the potential to contain prehistoric features and artifacts from the native settlement nearby whose large shell mounds (located approximately 500' to the west) were destroyed in the early 20th century. The district also lies within the level 1 high probability zone as demarcated by the predictive models used in the 1987 Archaeological Survey of St Petersburg.
Areas of Significance
(see Attachment B for detailed list of categories)

Period of Significance

Pre Anglo-European settlement, 1857 to 1967

Significant Dates (date constructed & altered)

1857, 1862, 1937, 1940,

Significant Person(s)

John A. Bethel - see narrative
Abel Miranda - see narrative
Mark Dixon Dodd - see narrative
Archie Parish AIA - see narrative
Arthur Modine - see narrative
Francis Marion Boone - see narrative

George Shepard "Gidge" Gandy (October 20, 1851 – November 25, 1946) was an American business executive and developer, best known for constructing the original Gandy Bridge, the first bridge to span the Tampa Bay and connecting St Petersburg and Tampa. He is also known for developing numerous buildings and transportation lines in St Petersburg and Philidelphia. Opened on November 20, 1924 it was at one time the longest auto toll bridge in the world. He married Henry Disston's daughter, Mary, who died at the age of 26. “The Mullet Farm” at 2700 Driftwood Rd S where the Gandy’s lived was built in 1910 by shipbuilder Barney Williams, son of John Constantine Williams, co-founder of St. Petersburg.
George S. Gandy, Jr. Gandy St.'s legacy was continued by his son, George S. Gandy, Jr., who founded the famous St. Petersburg-Habana Sailboat Race,\(^{[13]}\) which was discontinued in 1959 upon the rise of Cuban dictator Fidel Castro. The race was revived in 2017.

Charles J Schuh, Jr. (d. 1950) Florida State Representative Rep. Charles J. Schuh Jr., was an esteemed lawyer, legislator, family man and war hero.  
http://www.sptimes.com/News/112900/SouthPinellas/Gunman_ended_young_la.shtml

Charles Edward Schuh (d.2009), Mayor of St Petersburg 1975-1977. Lived at 230 Driftwood Rd SE.

Peter Meinke, Florida Poet Laureate, St Petersburg Poet Laureate: Named Florida's Poet Laureate by Governor Rick Scott in June 2015, Peter Meinke's work has appeared in the Atlantic, The New Yorker, The Nation and dozens of other journals. He has received many major awards, including a Fulbright, two NEA Fellowships, and three prizes from the Poetry Society of America. Peter and his wife, artist Jeanne Meinke, collaborate on the bi-weekly column “The Poet’s Notebook” for the newspaper Creative Loafing. Peter and Jeanne live at 147 Wildwood Lane SE.

Jeanne Meinke, whose artwork depicting scenes and homes in Driftwood is included as a part of this application, has had her pen and ink drawings included in The New Yorker (over a hundred times), Gourmet, Bon Appetit, Yankee, Early American Life and other magazines. Jeanne and her husband
Peter Meinke have collaborated on many projects including children's books, poetry chapbooks, and the prize-winning *CAMPOCORTO*. A collection of her drawings *Lines from Wildwood Lane* (Driftwood) was published by the University of Tampa Press (2010.)

**Charles Morgan**, Yacht Designer. Used some of Dodd's interior designs as inspiration in his work. Lived at 103 Wildwood Lane SE. Currently resides in St Petersburg.

**Robert James**, builder-contractor. In the 1970s he renovated property at 2440 Driftwood Rd SE, the childhood home of his son Tom James who went on to build the publicly traded company known as Raymond James Financial. Unoccupied home demolished c. 2003.

---

**Cultural Affiliation/Historic Period**

**Builder**

- Modine and Boone

**Designer**

- Mark Dixon Dodd (19 houses) and others

**Architect**

- Archie Parish (19 houses) and others

**NARRATIVE STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE**

(Explain the significance of the property as it relates to the above criteria and information on one or more continuation sheets. Include biographical data on significant person(s), builder and architect, if known. Please use parenthetical notations, footnotes or endnotes for citations of work.
SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

See Attachment A, “DRIFTWOOD,” by Randell Dixon Dodd, Son of The Driftwood Designer, Revised March 1999. The Driftwood Historic District on Big Bayou is significant to St. Petersburg’s history as one of the earliest areas to be settled and the site of a military engagement during the Civil War - the only such event related to the war that occurred in Pinellas County. A pioneer 1857 homestead on adjacent Ward Avenue (currently called Driftwood Road S) was destroyed in that event and rebuilt after 1867 by John Bethell is a significant historic archaeological site.

There is the potential of prehistoric archaeological features within the district. The remains of fortification, along with arrowheads and other artifacts, were discovered by pioneer settlers and by the builders of the current community.

The district is also significant for the architecture and urban planning of the 1937 Driftwood Subdivision as a picturesque romantic style suburban neighborhood of single family homes set in a lush semi-tropical coastal hammock. Custom built homes representative of popular local styles continued to be built in this subdivision after WWII through the 1960s creating an ensemble of high quality 20th century suburban residential architecture.

The landscape setting of Driftwood is the most character defining element of the district and the one that is most striking to a first time visitor. “Driftwood was carved out of the woods on the north shore of Big Bayou and became one of the most charming residential areas of St. Petersburg.” (Dodd Residence Designation Report, 2008)

HISTORIC CONTEXT

The Pinellas peninsula was uninhabited after the 1704 to 1706 military raids of Governor James Moore (d. 1706) of South Carolina who slew or captured the sparse native population he called “Spanish Indians” and sold them into slavery. In 1824 the U.S. Army established Fort Brooke as a military base to monitor the Seminole population who were encroaching from northern Florida and it served as the “seat of war” during the Second Seminole War of 1835-1842 which was the largest campaign by the federal government against a native population during the 19th century. The fort also served as the base of operations for the Third Seminole War of 1855-8. For this reason Seminoles did not occupy Hillsborough County and its Pinellas peninsula.

A civilian population grew up around the fort which became the village of Tampa. The Pinellas peninsula was initially surveyed in 1845 and 1848, the first tracts of land in present-day St. Petersburg were purchased from the State of Florida in 1860 (State of Florida, Plat Map 1845, 1848 and Tract Book Entries 59, 60). The Pinellas peninsula had a handful of permanent settlers by the mid 1840s these pioneers, Maximo Hernandez, John Leveque, Joe Silva, and William Bunce were fisherman who sold smoke dried mullet to markets in Cuba. The mega hurricane of 1848 destroyed their “fish ranchos” and most left the area.

During the 1850s two very different groups of pioneers came to the peninsula, Anglo-American farmers and cattlemen from the South known as Crackers and the Conchs who were Bahamian or...
Cuban immigrants from Key West. Few of these people purchased their homestead lands from the state and were squatters, however the 1860 U.S. Census for the 1st Precinct of Hillsborough County (all of present-day Pinellas County) lists 54 households with five of them living in today’s St. Petersburg city limits; inland were the Hay family of farmers from Georgia (near Gulfport), the Griner family of farmers from Georgia, the Girards (inland), the Miranda and Bethell families of Conchs were clustered along Big Bayou and Little Bayou. (1860 Federal Census, Hillsborough Co. FL. pp. 694-5).

In 1856 stockmen from Tampa who were grazing herds of free range cattle in lower Pinellas cleared a “cart road” that ran from Taylor’s homestead near Largo south along the Disston ridge (49th St.) to the Hays farm, he being the stockmen’s overseer. The northern end of this road connected with the Old Tampa Road which runs from Clearwater via Bayview and Oldsmar to Tampa. Hay and Miranda in 1857 extended this road east along today’s 22nd Ave. S. to Big Bayou (Bethell (1912/1962:88).

Abel Miranda established a farm and grove on the site of the Driftwood Subdivision in 1857, but it was destroyed by the U.S. Navy in 1862. The Conchs and Cracker pioneers were pro-Confederate so at the outbreak of war Miranda and Mulrenan organized local militias for coastal defense in early 1861 which had a camp on Maximo Point to guard the mouth of the bay, but in by early 1862 most of their soldiers joined state regiments. The U.S. Navy held control of Key West and Fort Brooke during the war and it was focused on maintaining a naval blockade of the Gulf coast. In July 1861 the navy stationed seamen on Egmont Key an ancillary part of Fort Brooke and used it as a base for reconnaissance of the Central Florida coast. During the war Egmont’s population was about 200 people comprised of seamen, refugee pro-Union homesteaders (Griner, Hay, Girard, etc.), and runaway slaves. After the raid on Miranda’s farm in 1862 all settlers in lower Pinellas fled to Tampa for the duration of the war except for William Coons who bought the Hay farm in 1860 (Thompson, Don & Carol, _Egmont Key, A History (2013) passim).

The Abel Miranda and John Bethell families returned to Pinellas after the war along with new homesteaders and they established a small community named Pinellas Village, or Bethell’s Landing. The first post office on the lower Pinellas peninsula was established here adjacent to the north of present-day Driftwood in 1876 and remained in operation for thirty years till 1906. The earliest plat including the Driftwood area was Sterling’s Addition to Pinellas, filed in 1885, and amended in 1886 (Dodd 1999; Hillsborough County Plat Book, pp. 2-3). However, this small settlement was later consumed by the growing community of St. Petersburg by 1900. This town’s development began with the arrival of Detroit native John C. Williams in 1875 who purchased a large tract of land located in present-day downtown St. Petersburg and persuaded the Orange Belt Railroad to locate its terminus there in 1888. These two events were the major impetus for the formation and rapid growth of St. Petersburg.

The Driftwood Subdivision project which began in 1937 on Bethell’s old homestead is an example of the renewal of residential construction in St. Petersburg as a result of the improving national economy eight years after the start of the Great Depression. This recovery was slow and modest, but the continuing popularity of the city as a tourist destination did create a market for winter residences and retirement homes. The majority of the houses built during the era from 1935 to 1941 were within existing subdivisions located in proximity to downtown, the large inventory of vacant lots in these neighborhoods were ample to satisfy new housing demand. For
this reason Driftwood is a very unusual example of the creation of a new subdivision in the city during the 1930s.

**NARRATIVE STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The waterfront site chosen by Abel Miranda and his family for settlement in 1857 contains vestiges of earlier human occupation. John Bethell describes "three large shell mounds several hundred yards west" of Miranda’s home and that one was tall enough to serve as a lookout post during the Civil War (Bethell 1912/1962: 16). Bethell also describes "an old fortification made entirely of oyster and conch shells, evidently built by the discoverers of Tampa Bay" (likely in vicinity of the south side of the east end of Driftwood Road). It was located at the mouth of Big Bayou onto Tampa Bay, square in plan covering about an acre of ground, and consisted of moundec shell "walls" three feet high on three sides except for the side adjacent the shoreline. When Bethell first saw it in 1859 the site was covered with mature pines, sabal palms, and massive oaks (Bethell 1912/1962: 61). A 1916 archaeological report states that the mound located on Bay Side Blvd (6th St. S.) at Big Bayou was originally about 30’ high, 105’ in length, and 80’ wide; all has now been carried away except for a 20’ section at SW corner, here was found two skeletons with shell, bone, and pottery grave goods (Wainwright, Cap’t. R. D. “Two Month’s Research in the Sand and Shell Mounds of Florida” “The Archaeological Journal” vol. 7 #6 (Nov. 1916) pp. 141-4).

The father of the clan who moved to Big Bayou was William C. Bethell born ca. 1803 at Nassau, Bahamas and died at St. Petersburg in 1893. He married about 1830 to Mary Ann Mott who was born July 1808 at Nassau and died 1881 at Pinellas (burial site of William & Mary unknown, either Big Bayou or St. Bartholomew Cemetery [est. 1887]). They immigrated to Key West between 1832 when their daughter Eliza Ann was born in the Bahamas and son John was born at Key West in 1834 (1860, 1870, 1880 U.S. Census). William came to Key West with his brother Joseph Bethell (1810 -1859) who married on 31 Dec. 1831 to Nickola Juan Fecunda. The elder Joseph died at sea in June 1839 when the ship he was piloting capsized off the coast of Louisiana. Joseph and William were descendants of John Bethell one of the English Puritan colonists who settled at Eleuthera in 1648, a century later a branch of this family moved to Nassau on New Providence Island (Bethell, Talbot, _The Early Settlers of the Bahamas… (1930) p. 88). On 25 May 1839 Congressman Mr. Wise of Florida presented a petition of William C. Bethell of Key Vacas in Florida; praying permission to form a settlement on the Florida Reef at Indian Key ( _U.S. Congressional Serial Set, issue 362 (1839) p. 1004). On 28 April 1840 Mr. Tappan presented the memorial of William C. Bethell to be allowed to establish a permanent settlement of the island of Mattacumba in the Territory of Florida; which was presented to the Committee on Public Lands (_Journal of the Senate of the U.S.A… 1840 (1841) p. 345). The 1840 U.S. Census for Dade Co. Fl. (p. 173) conducted in July lists the homestead of William C. Bethell on Indian Key with 1 male <5, 1 male <10, 1 male 30-40, 1 female <5, and 1 female 20-30. In the early morning of 7 August 1840 a large party of Seminoles sneaked onto the key and attacked the settlers and set their houses on fire. Most of the 70 some residents escaped, but 13 were killed. On 31 Dec. 1840 “Mr. Downing presented a paper relating to the claim of William C. Bethell for renumeration for the loss of a schooner by deprivations of the Indians”, also the claim of G. L. Mott for property taken by the Indians, Mott was a close kinsman of Mrs. Bethell (_Journal of the House of Representatives of the U. S. vol. 26, issue 2 (1841) p. 124). The island was abandoned but the U.S. Navy base at nearby Table Key occupied it till 1842. In 1842 the county seat for Dade County was moved from Indian Key to the Miami River settlement. However two families
returned to the key and several U.S. Army soldiers were stationed there to protect them in 1856 during the Third Seminole War. One of these inhabitants was William Bethel, a wrecker, who continued to live on the island until the 1880 census (Buker, George, _Swamp Sailors: Riverine Warfare in the Everglades 1835 -1842 (1975) pp. 106-7). This William Bethell of Indian Key was a close kinsman of William C. Bethell. In 1847 “Eliza Ann Bethell, spinster, father William C. Bethell, married 14 July 1847 to Joseph Pappy. A second marriage license issued to Joseph Pappy at Key West in 1850 indicates that Eliza Ann and Joseph divorced before this date (Monroe Co. FL. Marriage Licenses). Jose Francisco Papi y Peso de Burgos was born at St. Augustine March 1823, moved to Key West in the 1840s, and died there 11 Mar. 1905.

John Bethell served from 1856 to 1857 as a mate on the small U.S. Navy steamer ‘Texas Ranger’ which ran between Ft. Brooke in Tampa and Ft. Myers transporting troops and supplies during the Third Seminole War. The steamer also transported the captured Seminoles to Egmont Key where they were imprisoned until deportation to Oklahoma. Abel Miranda was an army ranger who captured Seminoles in the Everglades during the war. Bethell and Miranda met and became friends at Ft. Myers and after the war Miranda visited Bethell at Key West and fell in love with his sister, Eliza (Grismer, Karl, _The Story of St. Petersburg,. (1948) p. 24). The proceeding tale was told to Grismer by two of Bethell’s daughters in the 1930s, however Bethell devotes three pages of his book to his experience on the ‘Texas Ranger’ and never mentions Miranda. The marriage license for Abel Merander (sic) and Eliza Bethell is dated 5 June 1849 at Tampa (Hillsborough Co. FL, Marriage Licenses Book 1). So, how and where Miranda really came to know Eliza and the Bethell family is unknown. William C Bethell does not appear in the 1850 federal census. He last appears in the 1880 census as; William C. Bethell aged 74 and his wife Mary Ann aged 64 (sic) were living in the household of Abel Miranda in Pinellas.


In February 1862 the Union Navy attacked the Miranda homestead. The commandant of the blockading fleet at Egmont Key manned a captured Key West fishing smack with men from the fleet and the smack’s crew and went to Big Bayou to capture Abel Miranda and destroy his home. The smack was furnished with a cannon and plenty of ammunition including shot and shell. They anchored off the bayou before sunrise and about 7 a.m. opened fire, but they were shooting too high so they quit till about 8 a.m. when they opened fire with shells. When the shelling began Miranda, Bethell, their families, and hired help all fled. John Bethell and Abel Miranda climbed one of the high Indian mounds west of the homestead and observed the action for several hours. The Union force looted the home, captured all of the livestock and chickens they could and shot at the ones that tried to escape. The homesteaders’ boats were stolen or wrecked and the home
and outbuildings burned. That night the Bethell family fled to Tampa where they remained for the duration of the war. Mrs. Miranda and her children took refuge with the Coons family, and Abel Miranda vanished (Bethell 1912/1962: pp. 15-21).

John Bethell returned to Tampa after his service as a Confederate soldier in 1865. In 1866 he married Sarah Clifton Hager (b. 16 May 1847 Tampa), daughter of Charles Hager born in Germany and his wife Florence Leonardi born in St. Augustine. Sarah died 15 Nov. 1921 and is buried at Greenwood Cemetery (FL Death Certificate). The newlyweds returned to Big Bayou in 1867 and settled on the site of Abel Miranda’s burned homestead. He acquired a homestead patent for 44 acres of this land and bought 68a. adjacent on the bayou from William Wall of Tampa, he also bought the Coons property which he sold to Charley Reed. Alex Leonardy lived with John Bethell until 1868 when his father, Vincent bought land on Lakeview Avenue and developed it into fruit groves, farm fields, and cattle pastures (Bethell 1912/1962: 23-5). Vicente Andres Leonardy (b. 21 Jan. 1823) was the son of Bartolome Leonardy (1782 -1844) of St. Augustine and the brother of Florencia Josefa Leonardy (1820 -1911 Tampa) the mother of Mrs. Bethell. A list dated 23 Mar. 1865 of blockade runners, in prison at Ft. Warren, turned over for exchange, names Vincent Leonardy captured by the U.S. Navy on 17 Oct. 1863 with C. J. Mobley crew members of the steamer “Scottish Chief” owned by James McKay of Tampa after a “vessel affair with the “U.S.S. Adele” off Tampa Bay which killed two navy seamen and wounded four (_War of the Rebellion... (vol. 47 (1903) p. 577). The 1870 federal census shows two households living at Big Bayou: #550- William C. Bethell/ aged 66/ sailor/ and wife Mary A./ aged 60/ keeping house, William Roberts/ aged 13/ sailor/ born FL/, Walter Roberts/ aged 9/ sailor/ born FL/. On 1 Apr. 1857 Caroline Bethell daughter of William C. Bethell married William B. Roberts (23 Apr. 1833 -27 Jun. 1901 Key West) at Key West (Monroe Co. FL, Marriage License Book). #551 John A. Bethell/ aged 36/ sailor/ born FL/ value real estate $0/ personal worth $200/, wife Sarah C. Bethell/ aged 23/ keeping house/ born FL/, son Charles Bethell/ aged 1/ at home/ born FL/, Ella Sheffield/ aged 16/ no occupation/ born FL.

During the late 1860s and early 1870s the lower part of the Pinellas peninsula saw an influx of new settlers including John Bethell’s younger brother, Joseph Bethell in 1870. He was a sailor and Confederate veteran who never married; he built a cottage adjacent to John (Bethell 1912/1962 : 25-32, 1870 Census, Hills. Co. Pct.1). At this time the Bethells began a ship building business at Big Bayou, the first sailing craft built on the West Coast after the war was a sloop of 9 tons built for a lumber company to haul cedar logs from Cedar Key to their pencil factory. They also built a 5 ton sloop for freight that carried the mail from Cedar Key to Tampa in the mid 1870s. The first steamboat built on the West Coast of Florida, the “lola” 59’ long, 13’ beam was built for Thomas Sterling and Charles Rouff and launched at Big Bayou in 1885. It was built for trade between Big Bayou and Tampa (Bethell 1912/1962: 58-9).

The settlers became numerous enough to obtain a U. S. Post Office on 8 June 1876 and it was named Pinellas. The first postmaster was William Benton who resigned 6 months later in favor of John Bethell. Members of the Bethell family were postmasters till its closing on 29 Sep. 1906 (Bethell 1912/1962: 89). At the same time as the settlement was growing the Bethell family did too. The 1880 federal census lists: John A. Bethell/ aged 46/ ship carpenter/, wife Sarah Bethell/ aged 33/ keeping house/, son Charles M. Bethell/ aged 11/, daughter Cora G. Bethell/ aged 9/, daughter Mary E. Bethell/ aged 7/, son Clifford O. Bethell/ aged 4/, and daughter Cleopatra F. (Florence) Bethell/ aged 1. Other children soon followed; Alma in 1881 (died young), John A. Bethell Jr. and William C. Bethell. This growing village provided a consumer market and
William Neeld opened a grocery in the late 1870s; Vincent Leonard, E. R. Ward, and E. P. Grubb opened stores by the mid 1880s (Bethell 1912/1962: 89). The settlers got their first church when St. Batholomew's Episcopal was built on Lakeview Ave. and 18th St. S. in 1887.

In 1883 Thomas Sterling from Connecticut arrived at Pinellas village and purchased for $1000 a tract of 60 acres from Bethell lying around his 112a. homestead from Oakdale St. S. to 22nd Ave.S and to Beach Drive SE, this was filed as “Sterling’s Addition to Pinellas” sub, this sub was replatted in 1926 by its owner the Central National Bank and Trust Co. as “Power’s Bayview Estates” sub (Pinellas Co. Plat Book 18, p.5). On this tract Sterling built his own home, six more houses, and the Hotel San Jose a small hotel with 12 rooms on the bayfront. The hotel served mainly for Sunday excursions of Tampa residents. However, he became ill and sold his property for $10,000 in 1891 to an order of Jesuits headquartered at Tampa but originally from Spain who planned to establish a school and seminary (Bethell 1912/1962: 44-6, 86). On September 11, 1892, also the feast of the Most Holy Name of the Virgin Mary, the first known and recorded Mass on the lower Pinellas peninsula was celebrated at the Hotel San Jose in the area of Saint Petersburg now known as Driftwood. The area was served by the Jesuits of Sacred Heart, Tampa, 1892-1920 (St. Mary Our Lady of Grace R.C.C. St. Petersburg, website, retrieved Dec. 2017).

An 1885 gazetteer states; “Pinellas is located on the “Great Bayou” 22 miles from Tampa which is reached by steam or sailing vessel in from 2 to 8 hours. It was settled about the year 1860 by Messrs. Miranda, Coons, Hayes, Bethell, etc. At the present writing it has a population of about 325. Principal occupations are gardening and fruit culture.” (Webb, Wanton, _Webb’s Historical, Industrial, and Biographical Florida, vol. 1 (N.Y. 1885) p.58). The completion of the Orange Belt Railroad in 1888 with its terminus at First Ave. S. on the waterfront in downtown St. Petersburg was the beginning of the end for Pinellas village. Within a decade the town of St. Petersburg became the commercial and population center for the lower Pinellas peninsula.

The village had residents near the shore of Big Bayou, but the majority were scattered on farmsteads stretching along Lakeview and Tangerine Avenues to its west. In 1910 Bethell sold a parcel of waterfront land adjacent to the west of his homestead to Barney C. Williams (1864-1930), son of John C. Williams (1817-1892) co-founder of St. Petersburg. Barney came to Pinellas with his father in 1875 and married here in 1886. He was a boat builder and mechanic. In 1907 he divorced his wife and married Elizabeth Finnegan. In 1910 he built a large two story frame house fronting on Big Bayou which he sold in 1921 to George Gandy.

John Bethell died at the age of 80 on 12 Apr. 1915. In the 1916 city directory his widow Sarah is listed with a home “near Oakdale” with children; Charles, Clifford, Cora, John A., and William C. living with her. Sarah died in 1921 and was buried beside her husband in Greenwood Cemetery. In the 1922 city directory Cora Bethell is living “on S. side of Bethel Ave. 2 houses E. of Oakdale” (the site of the old Bethell homestead house demolished ca. 1937.) Boarding with her are her brothers Clifford, John, and William C. Bethell. In 1927 Cora was living at 2104 Bethell Ave. with her sister Florence and her husband, Herbert A. Loader (Polk, R. L. _St. Petersburg City Directory (1916, 1927).

During the Prohibition era (1920 - 1933) Big Bayou and Driftwood were used by bootleggers to smuggle alcohol into the city and a speakeasy was located on the Bethell property at approximately the site of the present-day house at 2675 Driftwood Road. Kim Marie [Gandy] O'Brien whose grandfather and mother lived nearby at their residence “the Mullet Farm” relates
"... the speakeasy - I was told it was run by the Bethel daughters and was named the Hawaiian Village or Hawaiian Gardens, in reality nothing more than a series of chickoo huts. Bootleggers provided the bounty from the end of what was then Ward Ave. The Gandy home was the closest house to the landing site and my grandfather did not object to them using nearby access until one night which my mother clearly remembered. The family heard agonized screams coming from the landing site. Gidge (Mr. Gandy) called the police who came down Ward from 4th Street with their sirens blaring. That alerted the men who took their victim across to Lewis Island (Coquina Key) where on the next day the police found a man who had been bullied whipped to death and dumped in the oyster beds.” O’Brien also relates that many of the Bethell sons were mentally challenged and never married, they were cared for by their sisters. This fact helps to explain why the Bethell family sold their homestead. (personal communication: Kim O’Brien to Howard Hansen, Jan. 2018).

THE DRIFTWOOD SUBDIVISION

In 1936 Arthur Modine purchased the Bethell homestead land and formed a real estate development corporation to turn the property into a single family residential neighborhood. Based on the success of several houses that a local artist, Mark Dixon Dodd, designed in St. Petersburg during the 1930s, the Bayview Construction Company commissioned him to design their new residential subdivision named Driftwood. The company’s owner Arthur B. Modine (1885 - 1981) was a wealthy inventor and mechanical engineer from Wisconsin who supplied the capital and Francis Marion Boone, was a retired haberdasher from Kentucky who apparently served as the local project manager since Modine was a winter resident (Hinder 2008). Little can be found about Boone. He first appears in the 1936 city directory with wife Martha; he is listed as a farmer, and was renting an apartment at 725 9th Ave. NE (Polk, St. Petersburg City Directory 1935-6). The 1940 federal census lists Francis M. Boone, aged 59 (b. ca. 1881) born in Mississippi as was his wife Martha. Modine invented the water-cooled fin radiator for gas powered engines. He partnered with Henry Ford from 1925 through the 1940s and supplied all the radiators for the Model T. His Modine Manufacturing Co. founded in 1917 is located at Racine, Wisconsin; it grew into a large international firm still in existence (Modine Manufacturing Co. website, “history section” retrieved Dec. 2017).

Dodd’s first task was to design an attractive neighborhood that would retain and capitalize on its natural features. Between 1936 and 1941, Dodd laid out a plan of winding roads and deep lots that followed the contour of the shoreline, cleared out a minimum of the entangling underbrush and designed and supervised the construction of 19 charming and unique homes. The Driftwood Subdivision plat was filed in May 1937, a First Addition to Driftwood (east of Bay St. SE.) was filed in 1938, and a Second Addition to Driftwood Subdivision was filed in September 1940 (west of 1st St. S.).

Dodd had no architectural degree or license so he turned to local architect, Archie Gale Parish for plan approval. The supervision and construction of homes in Driftwood were a collaborative effort between Dodd and Parish (Hinder 2008.) Parish was born in Minneapolis, Minnesota on January 5, 1898. He had been working with engineering firms in Minneapolis before moving to St. Petersburg in 1924. Because St. Petersburg was in the midst of a building boom, Parish found a demand for architects. Parish designed and supervised construction of many private, commercial, and public buildings on the West Coast of Florida, from Ft. Myers to Homosassa. In St. Petersburg, Parish designed the St. Petersburg YMCA, Christ United Methodist Church, First
Presbyterian Church, the 1940s era additions to the St. Petersburg Shuffleboard Club, and the 1950s additions to Stetson Law School, among others. Recognition of his architectural ability resulted in his being chosen president of the Florida Central Chapter, American Institute of Architects, and president of the Florida State Board of Architecture. Parish served on the “Materials Board” and on the “New Building Code Committee” in St. Petersburg in 1947. He also aided the World War II effort by his assistance in planning and supervising army camps and field installations around the state. In 1940 Parish designed a residence for himself in Driftwood at 145 Wildwood Lane Southeast (Dodd 1999:3), where his son, Richard, continued to live until recent years. The home remains with the family today.

Dodd and his wife Vivien Moran, grandniece of artists Thomas and Edward Moran, initially lived at 103 Wildwood Lane SE (formerly 101 Wildwood Lane which itself was formerly called Cardinal Lane.), one of the first residences to be completed. A permit was obtained from the City on 9 March 1938 for a one story residence and one car garage to be constructed at a projected cost of $4,000 (City of St. Petersburg, property card.) It was situated across the street from the Field Office, construction and sales office for the development located at the west end of the park. The Field Office was a small one story Tudor Revival style cottage adorned with paintings of scenes of the neighborhood and its history. The paintings were donated to the city history museum when the Field Office was demolished during the 1950s.

The home at 103 Wildwood Lane, the “Mark Dixon Dodd Home,” was designated a City landmark in 2008 and an extensive description of the exterior and interior of the house is included in the Dodd Residence Designation Report February 7, 2008. The Dodds also lived at the home next door at 2505 Driftwood Road SE once completed. The Dodd family remained in the 2505 Driftwood house until 1941 (Dodd, Randell, “Driftwood” (1999) p. 3). This two story building is a combination of stucco and frame and features magnolia flooring and walls and ceiling beams made of knotty pine (Hinder, Kim, "The Mark Dixon Dodd Residence" local historic landmark application, City of St. Petersburg (2008)).

The City directory shows that in 1939 there were nine houses in Driftwood; Modine-2420, vacant- 2499, Dodd- 2505, Boone- 2515. vacant- 2519, Jesse Hubbard- 2521, Robt. W. Lyons-2600, Harry Hutchinson- 2605, and Susan B. Mills- 2608 Driftwood Road (1940 R. L. Polk. _City Directory St. Petersburg FL, passim).

The developers of the subdivision, Boone and Modine, also commissioned homes for themselves in Driftwood. The Modine residence completed in 1939 was the first waterfront house in the subdivision. It is a two story masonry house of about 4,400 sq. ft. designed in a simplified Mediterranean Revival style that is more typical of the aesthetic of Parish than that of Dodd. Modine had an 87’ yacht so he had a channel dredged in the bayou to his home; however, it was not deep enough to accommodate the “Paladin” so it was moored at the City marina.

The bombing of Pearl Harbor by the Japanese on 7 Dec. 1941 brought building activity in the country to an abrupt halt, federal war restrictions prevented any private construction till 1945. After the war builders faced another crisis building materials were in short supply, of poor quality, and expensive these issues hampered the construction industry till 1947-8.

NARRATIVE STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE, ARCHITECTURE AND LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
SIGNIFICANCE, ARCHITECTURE

The Driftwood Subdivision is a rare case where its designers had the opportunity to create all aspects of the neighborhood, the street layout, the houses, and the landscape. This resulted in a unified vision that gives the district its unique character. Although its houses were built over a thirty year period and the subdivision is now over eighty years old, the original design concepts were maintained through the years. This idea of detached single family houses set in a wooded idyllic setting of winding lanes has its origin in 1800s Britain as a Romantic era reaction to the squalor of the harsh urban environment caused by the industrial revolution. Ironically the most important examples of these first “model villages” or “garden towns” were built by wealthy industrialists adjacent to their factories to supply housing for employees. In West Yorkshire textile magnates Titus Salt built Saltaire in 1851, Edward Akroyd built Akroydon in 1859 a Gothic Revival style model housing scheme designed by noted architect Sir Gilbert Scott. This new type of community planning spread to the U.S. both as industrial workers’s villages or “mill towns”, e.g. Pullman built by George Pullman from 1880 onwards, or as luxury suburban enclaves on the edge of a metropolis. The exclusive gated subdivision of Tuxedo Park just north of New York City founded in 1885 by Pierre Lorillard IV with its winding streets and picturesque Shingle style cottages was the most influential of these early subdivisions. Architects influenced by the City Beautiful movement adopted these models during the 1890s at a time when the discipline of landscape architecture was emerging in the U.K. and the U.S. The streetcar made suburbs accessible to the urban core and many streetcar companies by 1900 became real estate developers constructing new subdivisions for the affluent class near the end of their lines.

St. Petersburg saw several upscale suburban subdivisions built in this style. The first being the Jungle in 1913 centered around a large golf course and country club; during the 1920s land boom similar golf course subdivisions Snell Isle and Pasadena were built. However these developments were based on a speculative land sales scheme whose economic model was to entice winter tourists to purchase vacant lots on margin and trade them as they increased in value, it was the equivalent of stock market futures trading. This resulted in the construction of few houses and the retail investors soon abandoning their highly leveraged lots to local tax foreclosure.

The hard lessons taught by the 1926 collapse of the Florida land boom certainly influenced the mind-set and actions of both the developers and the buyers of Driftwood. By 1935 a fragile recovery of the national economy began, but even the wealthy were by now cautious spenders. The developers, Modine and Boone embarked on a modest scale project and it was evidently self-financed as were the home purchases because the few surviving banks were allergic to real estate loans. In Driftwood lots were sold only to buyers who contracted to build a home on it and the size and style of these residences reflected the austerity of the era. While new construction costs, labor and materials, were at a record low during the 1930s, few people had survived with much cash to spend on a new custom-built vacation home in Florida. These economic realities are apparent in Driftwood’s architecture with the result of homes of a modest scale that exhibit labor intensive contruction methods and details; it was a matter of quality versus quantity.

In 1940, Dodd wrote that “It costs no more to build an attractive home than an ugly one... Often a little gem of a place can be a masterpiece.” He also stated, “What a garden spot our city would be with close cooperation among architects, designers, builders and landscape men”.


The 19 homes designed by Dodd vary greatly in size, style, and in the selection of assorted natural materials used. Quality craftsmanship was used to build each individual home with great care given to detail. According to Dodd’s son, Randall Dixon Dodd some of the more visible details of the house include; patios and courtyards, archways, balconies of various styles and sizes, and small pools and fountains. Interiors feature both pitched and flat ceilings with exposed natural wood beams. Two of the houses have sleeping lofts overlooking the living room. Fireplaces were a must in the Dodd homes, as much for visual effect as to dispel the chill of a cool winter’s eve, and Dodd often painted an appropriate mural above the mantel. Several homes have mini-balconies in the wall plane above the fireplace, affording a peek into the living room from the stairwell or a bedroom. Floors are often fabricated of unusual materials, such as pegged random-width oak planks, magnolia planking with its highly contrasting grain coloring, and even a flowing form glazed cement tile designed by Dodd. Although each residence shared similar features predominantly reflecting the Minimal Traditional and Mediterranean Revival styles, each one was unique. The buildings featured different construction materials and floor plans to reflect the lot size, existing vegetation, and orientation. Dodd designed each feature of the residence. When he could not find tiles made of colored cement, he invented a cement and sand tile process to produce the tiles he wanted for the Driftwood homes. Manufactured by Old Tavern Tile, Dodd used the tile on at least one floor of every house with his only complaint that he wished he had used it more.

In 1940, Mark Dixon Dodd wrote that “A beautifully designed home contains all the elements of a fine painting composition, balance, color and individuality” (Hinder 2008).

The largest of the Dodd houses as originally built is at 2420 Driftwood Road, it was designed by Dodd and Parish for Modine, the permit was issued 24 Mar. 1939 and completed by November. The card says; 2 story, 6 room, C.B., cost $10,000, contractor- owner, Dodd. Modine lived in the house through 1943, in 1944 it was owned by Robert C. Huffman, who sold it to Col. Frederick W. Fenn in 1948. He made a 15’ x 13.5’ two story addition to the house in 1952 costing $4500. (Polk 1939-49, city property card 2420 Driftwood Rd SE).

The post World War II houses built in Driftwood are all masonry (concrete block with stucco finish) custom-built homes that reflect the taste and popular building materials of the decade in which they were constructed. They form a chronological catalogue of the evolution of the typical suburban Florida single family home from 1945 till 1968. These newer houses are of the same basic massing and materials as the pre-war Dodd era homes and do not alter the original design scheme of the subdivision. The architectural significance of these houses may not be readily apparent or appreciated to many people born during the decades when they were built; they will become historic artifacts to younger generations. The continual good maintenance and relative absence of alterations of these houses give them a high level of historic integrity which serves as a valuable resource for the study of architecture and building construction of their era.

The oldest house in the Driftwood Subdivision is at 136 25th Avenue South. Built in 1935 by Carlton Beard, builder of the Don CeSar Hotel, it is a two story, wood framed home (wood appearance aluminum siding) whose balcony with ornamental ironwork is supported by wood beams. The home served as the parsonage for the First United Methodist Church located at 212 3rd Street No. in downtown St Petersburg.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
No examination of the character of Driftwood would be complete without addressing its flora and fauna. It is the natural splendor and nestled setting of the homes that sets Driftwood uniquely apart from other neighborhoods. The preservation of the semi-tropical coastal hammock, sheltering tree canopy, multitude of shrub and bushes and groundcovers from azaleas to ferns to wild ginger, with the foliage intertwining from yard to yard, is not found elsewhere in St. Petersburg. The only comparable landscapes survive in less extensive sections of the Jungle neighborhood along the shore of Boca Ciega Bay. Whereas in other subdivisions this type of preservation was a matter of luck, here it was an intentional component of the original design. This high level of sensitive management (and non-management) of an ecosystem over time is a rare and significant example of successful urban planning that should be protected for the good health it bestows on residents and for current and future study.

The enveloping nature of the wooded historical landscape has been revitalized by former and current residents after much of the area was cleared by the early settlers. Huge old oaks, pines and cabbage palms still contribute to an upper canopy which provides a marked drop in temperatures in summer and provides food and nesting, resting and roosting sites for diverse bird species, such as, pileated woodpeckers, osprey, Coopers hawks, great horned owls, yellow crowned night herons, and other impressive species, as well as the more diminutive yet beautiful songbirds. Secondary cover as wildlife habitat is provided by shrubs and bushes, both indigenous and decorative. A preponderance of groundcovers, as opposed to cultivated grass, provides an understory that requires less water, maintenance and fewer polluting fertilizers which reduces chemical runoff from yards to the natural shoreline and into Big Bayou which is frequented by dolphins, rays, manatees and other sea life. This oasis is home to many screech owls that nest in the faded palm fronds that still cling to the trees. Shore birds, wading birds, song birds and migrating species are attracted to the shoreline and the upland landscape. Traveling through the garden is the occasional box turtle or black racer. Raccoons, opossums, squirrels, armadillos and visiting coyotes find habitat in Driftwood. The Driftwood neighborhood demonstrates that even in a city a community of contiguous properties whose owners have chosen to contribute to rather than detract from a natural landscape can create a magical place that provides homes for both people and wildlife.

Driftwood has opened it's gardens, generally as philanthropic fundraising events, to the Museum of Fine Arts on several occasions and the St Petersburg Museum of History. Individual gardens have hosted many garden clubs and groups from throughout Pinellas County, as well as, The Florida Society of Landscape Architects, and the national Horticultural Society headquartered in Richmond Virginia. St Petersburg Preservation and other local groups have held several tours and events in Driftwood.

BIOGRAPHIES OF SIGNIFICANT PEOPLE ASSOCIATED WITH THE HISTORIC DISTRICT

ABEL MIRANDA (1825 -1900)
Abel was born at St. Augustine, Florida in March 1822 (1850 icensus, 1825 in 1860 census, 1823 in 1880 census). The later 1860, 1880 census data say that his father was born in Spain and his mother in England. There is one household named Miranda in the 1840 census for St. Johns County; George Maranda in St. Augustine has a male son aged 10-15. Abel Miranda appears in the 1850 census for Hillsborough County FL in the town of Tampa living in the household of M.
L. Shannonhouse aged 37 a grocer with a wife and 5 small children: Abel Miranda / male/ aged 28/ carpenter/ born Florida, and Eliza Miranda/ aged 18/ no occupation/ born Florida. A widow’s pension application filed 25 Sep. 1902 by Eliza Miranda says; service- A. D. Johnston’s Company Mounted Volunteers, Ft. Brooke, Florida 1856-7 (U.S. Indian Wars, Pension Files, NARA). A newspaper article says, “At the courthouse in Tampa on July 24, 1856 the “Know Nothings” of Tampa, John Darling presiding held a meeting to appoint delegates to county and district conventions. County delegates; M. L. Shannonhouse.... district delegates; A. Miranda.... (et al.) (“Sunland Tribune” no. 19 (Nov. 1993) pp. 1-8). The Know Nothings or American Party was a short lived American nativist political party that was anti-Catholic and opposed immigration. It supported Millard Fillmore in the 1856 national election. Bethell states in his history that Miranda moved to Big Bayou in 1857 and began improving his homestead buying the structures from William Paul’s failed homestead, however the outbreak of the Civil War interrupted his plans.

Miranda was appointed a Second Lieutenant by the local militia to head a coastal patrol company stationed on the Pinellas peninsula called, “Able Merander’s Coast Guard Detachment”, it was formed by July 14, 1861, and lasted till 5 September 1861 when it merged with Henry Mulrenan’s Volunteer Coast Guards. In Miranda’s patrol were seven seamen including John Bethell and Anderson Woods (Fuller 1972: 66). Miranda did not join the Confederate military as did his brother-in-law Bethell and the majority of his coast guards. Meanwhile, on Egmont Key the lighthouse destroyed by the hurricane of 1848 was rebuilt between 1857 and 1859 and a keeper took up residence on the recently deserted military base. In July 1861 30 to 40 U. S. Navy seamen arrived and fortified the island with a gun battery, but left for patrol a month later. The lighthouse keeper was a Confederate sympathizer and he and a volunteer group removed the fresnel lens and lamp and took it to Tampa where it remained hidden till after the war. The federal Navy returned to Egmont and began patrols for blockade runners. On 31 Oct. 1862 they captured Cap’t. James McKay of Tampa’s ship the ‘Salvor.’ He would loose two more to the feds during the war (Fuller 1972: 63). The Navy’s February 1862 attack on Miranda’s home and attempt to arrest him was certainly provoked by evidence of his complicity in running the naval blockade. Fuller, a Tampa Bay native who knew many pioneer settlers claims this and suggests that he worked for McKay (Fuller 1972: 64). After the Navy raid Miranda disappeared from the public until 1866. An entry in the Robert Watson Diary kept by a Confederate soldier in Mulrenan’s coast guards dated 10 April 1862 mentions that Mrs. Miranda and her son Charles were living with the Coons family at Clam Bayou and Watson accompanied them on a trip to Tampa on that date (Fuller 1972: 61).

Miranda in local lore is linked to the murders of Scott and John Whitehurst in August 1862. Daniel Scott Whitehurst was born 1829 at Jasper, Hamilton Co. FL. He and his large extended family immigrated from coastal North Carolina via Georgia, North Florida, to Benton (now Hernando) County FL by 1850. The Darby massacre in May 1856 inspired many nearby settlers to flee to the safety of the Pinellas peninsula. In this group were the McMullen, Taylor, Sutton, Brownlow, Campbell, and Whitehurst families who settled inland around Largo to Clearwater, and Curlew. These Anglo-American dirt farmers and cattlemen were all from the South, some owned slaves, and many later became Confederate soldiers. Scott Whitehurst was a Private in Co. D of the 7th FL Regiment the “Alachua Rebels” however he deserted and returned to his homestead located on the site of Bay Pines V.A. Hospital to care for his wife and 7 small children. Scott’s first cousin John Alexander Whitehurst (b. 12 Jan 1816 in GA) lived at Curlew with his wife and 6 children, he refused to go to war. On 26 August 1862 Scott and John were
transporting a skiff full of food to Egmont to sell to the Union soldiers, they had briefly beached their boat “at the inlet of Tampa Bay to Boca Ciega Bay” (likely Maximo Park area?) as related in the military report, when they were ambushed by men in the woods who shot both of them. Scott died on the beach, but John wounded managed to get to Egmont on his boat and died there of his wounds on 2 Sep. 1862. The two Whitehurst widows spent the remainder of the war on Egmont with their children who were told that Miranda and his gang of blockade runners were the culprits. The fact that Coons living on Boca Ciega Bay with Miranda’s family were the only settlers living on the mainland at this time lends credence to the rumor.

In 1866 Miranada filed a petition with the Hillsborough County court to regain guardianship of his son Charles F. Miranda (Hillsborough County FL Old Guardianship Record Book 1848>). Abel Miranda does not appear in the 1870 federal census; however, Bethell states that he returned to Pinellas and settled near Lakeview Avenue South. He is listed in the 1880 census in Pinellas County. Abel Miranda died in 1900, his wife, Eliza died 1907. Both are buried in St. Batholomew’s Episcopal Church Cemetery on Lakeview (22nd) Ave. S.

JOHN ALEXANDER BETHELL (1834 - 1915)
2nd Lieutenant John A. Bethell was born on July 21, 1834, in Key West, Florida. His family were some of the early settlers of Pinellas Point (St. Petersburg), Florida. He was teaching school at the outbreak of the war. He entered state service as a member of Able Merander's Coast Guard Detachment, between July 14, 1861, and September 5, 1861. He continued state service by enlisting in Captain Henry Mulrennan's Florida Volunteers Coast Guards on November 27, 1861; he was promoted to coxswain on February 1, 1862. He served with this organization until April 25, 1862. He was enlisted as a 2nd corporal on April 25, 1862, in Captain Smith's Company (Key West Avengers), 7th Regiment Florida Infantry by Major R. B. Thomas at Tampa, Florida, for a period of 3 years or the war. An undated company muster roll for April 30 to November 14, 1862, documents that he was brevetted to 2nd lieutenant from 2nd corporal on April 25, 1862; an undated company muster roll for February 7-28, 1863, documents his promotion to 2nd lieutenant January 1, 1863. He is present on all company muster rolls until an undated company muster roll for January and February 1864 stating that he was absent on 25-day furlough starting February 14, 1864. He tendered his resignation on February 27, 1864. In a letter dated April 5, 1864, by Lt. Col Tilghman Ingram to Colonel Kinloch Falconer AAG, he recommended that Lieut. Bethell "be discharged from the service for the following reasons – 1st That Lt. Bethell on the 4th day of February 1864 was furloughed for Twenty five (25) days and has not since reported [to] this command. 2nd That by letter to his Captain [Robert Blair Smith] he states that he has resigned on Surgeon's Certificate of disability with the intention of doing the Navy." His name last appears on a Register containing Rosters of Commissioned Officers, Provisional Army Confederate States as being "Dropped" May 16, 1864. After the war he ran a small store and made a living as a fisherman at Point Pinellas. He drew a Confederate Pension. One year prior to his death on April 12, 1915, he published a history of Point Pinellas Florida. It was said at the time of his death that throughout his life he never complained of illness, and when he died he suffered from no recognizable disease. The doctor in attendance declared, "He just passed away, like a piece of machinery, worn out."

MARK DIXON DODD (1888 - 1952)
In 1925, seeking a warmer climate for his daughter’s health, Mark Dixon Dodd moved from New York City to St. Petersburg, Florida. He soon became a prominent member of the city’s art community. Dodd opened the Mark Dixon Dodd School of Art in 1930 at 232 Beach Drive, later
moving to 5345 Fourth Street South. In 1933 he finished his mural Seminole War, commissioned by the state of Florida as one of the series of six historical subjects to adorn the Florida building of A Century of Progress International Exposition, in Chicago, which opened in June 1933. In 1936, as his reputation as an artist and teacher grew, he was hired by real estate investors, Arthur Modine and Francis Marion Boone, to design a real estate subdivision -Driftwood- in the St.Petersburg area know as the Big Bayou. Starting in 1937, Dodd designed and built nineteen homes in Driftwood. In each he placed at least one of his paintings, usually anchored to the wall above the fireplace. Many of the paintings are still there today. Dodd later became head of the art department at St. Petersburg Junior College. In the summer months, Dodd taught art at a camp in Tuxedo, North Carolina, near Asheville.

A review in the St. Petersburg Times, April 13, 1930, by Eve Alsman Fuller notes, “Mark Dixon Dodd may be truly called a St. Petersburg artist since for the last few years he has had his house and studio in the city, except for those painting pilgrimages which he has taken from time to time to the west and to the Carolina Mountains. He has a delightful studio and school of art in the picturesque Bayboro section, and is also head of the fine arts department of the St. Petersburg Junior College. Mr. Dodd is showing in the member’s group six oil paintings and nine watercolors, none of which have ever been hung in the gallery, and has the distinction of having the largest representation in the exhibition. Among the oils, two pictures in the opinion of this reviewer stand out as the best painting this versatile artists has ever done. One is “Self Portrait”, simple, direct, hurriedly done. One of the hardest subjects an artist undertakes. In it Mark has caught something of himself that we all know, but we don’t believe he knows. It’s a little spark of contrariness tempered by a smile.... Watercolors by Mr. Dodd are mostly scenes caught in every day studio life about the Bayboro waterfront. They are vivid and free and active.
Born: January 28, 1888, St. Louis, Missouri.
Died: 1952, St. Petersburg.
Education: St. Louis School of Fine Art; Art Students League, NYC; with Kenneth Hayes Miller, Johansen, Romanovsky; Provincetown, Cape Cod School of Art with Charles Hawthorne; St. Louis School of Fine Art.
Membership: Florida Federation of Art, Chairman, Arts Committee; Art Club St. Petersburg, director; American Federation of Arts; Florida Artist Group. (Frankel, Alfred, “Artists of Old Florida” website (dated 2015), retrieved 21 Dec. 2017).
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THIS IS THE STORY OF DRIFTWOOD, A BEAUTIFUL, SECLUDED AND QUAIN'T RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION LOCATED IN SOUTHEAST ST. PETERSBURG; A UNIQUE AND DISTINCTIVE ECOLOGICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL GEM NESTLED AMONG MORE TRADITIONAL NEIGHBORHOODS ON THE PEACEFUL SHORELINE OF HISTORIC BIG BAYOU.

PINELLAS HISTORY RECORDS THAT ON THIS SITE EARLY INDIAN INHABITANTS, OR PERHAPS SPANISH EXPLORERS, BUILT A SHELL BREASTWORKS TO DEFEND THE BAYOU ENTRANCE AGAINST THEIR ENEMIES. THE REMAINS OF THIS FORTIFICATION, ALONG WITH ARROWHEADS AND OTHER ARTIFACTS, WERE DISCOVERED BY PIONEER SETTLERS AND BY THE BUILDERS OF MODERN DRIFTWOOD.

IN 1857 ABEL MIRANDA, ONE OF THE EARLIEST PIONEERS TO SETTLE ON PINELLAS SHORES, ESTABLISHED A "FISH RANCH" AND CITRUS GROVE HERE PRIOR TO THE WAR BETWEEN THE STATES, BUT HAD TO FLEE WITH HIS FAMILY WHEN THEIR HOME WAS SHELLED BY A UNION GUNBOAT AND BURNED BY ITS TROOPS IN FEBRUARY, 1862. AFTER THE WAR, IN 1868, THE MIRANDA PROPERTY WAS BOUGHT AND RE-ESTABLISHED BY HIS FRIEND AND BROTHER-IN-LAW, JOHN BETHELL, WHO HAD ORIGINALLY SETTLED NEARER PINELLAS POINT, AND WHO HAD FLED THE SCENE WITH MIRANDA DURING THE FEDERALIST ATTACK. BETHELL RECORDS IN HIS HISTORY OF PINELLAS PENINSULA THAT THE AREA ABOUNDED WITH PLentiful GAME: BEAR, DEER, PANTHER, WILDCATS, FOXES, TURKEY, ALLIGATOS, RACCOONS, OPOSUMS, AND SQUIRREL.

THE SETTLERS ORIGINALLY ENGAGED IN THE FISHING INDUSTRY, PROVIDING SALTED MULLET FOR CUBAN MARKETS, BUT LATER INCLUDED FARMING, BOAT BUILDING, SHIPPING AND OTHER COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISES. AS THE POPULATION GREW, PINELLAS VILLAGE, OR BETHEL LANDING, AS IT WAS OFTEN CALLED, PROVED TO BE A NATURAL SETTING FOR SUCH DIVERSIFIED INTERESTS. THE FIRST POST OFFICE ON LOWER PINELLAS PENINSULA STOOD AT THE WESTERN END OF MODERN DRIFTWOOD. IT WAS ESTABLISHED IN 1876 AND MR. BETHELL SERVED AS ITS POSTMASTER FOR FOURTEEN OF HIS THIRTY YEARS IN EXISTENCE.


THE DODD HOUSES WERE PLANNED TO TAKE FULL ADVANTAGE OF THE IRREGULAR LOT SHAPES AND EXISTING TREES. INTERIOR DESIGNS EMPHASIZE CROSS VENTILATION THROUGH THE GENEROUS USE OF CASEMENT WINDOWS AND FRENCH DOORS. CATHEDRAL CEILINGS MINIMIZED THE HEAT OF PRE-AIR CONDITIONED FLORIDA SUMMERS.


SINCE DODD WAS NOT AN ARCHITECT, HE HAD TO SEEK PLAN APPROVAL FROM A LICENSED MEMBER OF THE PROFESSION. A LONGTIME FRIEND AND RESPECTED ST. PETERSBURG ARCHITECT, ARCHIE PARISH, PROVIDED THIS SERVICE, AND WAS SO ENCHANTED BY THE DRIFTWOOD CONCEPT THAT HE DESIGNED HIS OWN HOME IN DRIFTWOOD IN A SIMILAR STYLE AND LIVED THERE UNTIL HIS DEATH IN 1986.

THE FIRST HOUSE TO BE SOLD WAS OCCUPIED IN 1938 BY GRETCHEN ELLIOTT, A WIDOW FROM NEW ENGLAND. THE ADDRESS WAS ORIGINALLY 174 CARDINAL ROAD, BUT WAS SOON CHANGED TO WILDWOOD LANE TO AVOID CONFLICT WITH ANOTHER STREET WITH THE CARDINAL NAME. THAT SAME YEAR THE DODD FAMILY BUILT THEIR HOME AT 2505 DRIFTWOOD ROAD. IN 1939 THE MODINE FAMILY OCCUPIED THE FIRST WATERFRONT HOME, AT 135 WILDWOOD LANE.

ART MODINE OWNED AN 87-FOOT YACHT WHICH HE DECIDED TO ANCHOR IN THE BAYOU BEHIND HIS HOUSE. HE OBTAINED A LICENSE AND SECURED A DREDGE TO FORM A DEEP HARBOR AND, AT THE SAME TIME, CREATE A SANDY BEACH WHERE MANGROVES AND OYSTERS HAD LONG EXISTED. WHEN THE PROJECT WAS COMPLETED, HE FOUND THAT THE BAYOU CHANNEL WAS NOT SUFFICIENTLY STRAIGHT AND DEEP TO ACCOMMODATE HIS "PALADIN," WHICH WAS MOORED THEREAFTER AT THE CITY MARINA. UNWITTINGLY, HE HAD CREATED A GREAT HOLE FOR COLD WEATHER TROUT FISHING.
IN 1940 THE PROPERTY'S OTHER PARTNER, MARION BOONE, BOUGHT AND OCCUPIED THE SMALL HOUSE AT 2515 DRIFTWOOD ROAD. IN 1941 THE BOONES PURCHASED AND FOR SEVERAL YEARS OCCUPIED THE WATERFRONT HOME AT 2510 DRIFTWOOD ROAD. ALSO IN 1940, ARCHIE PARISH AND HIS FAMILY HAD THEIR OWN HOME BUILT AT 145 WILLOW WOOD LANE. IT HAS BEEN OWNED AND OCCUPIED BY MEMBERS OF THE PARISH FAMILY UP TO THE TIME OF THIS WRITING, SETTING A RECORD FOR ONE-FAMILY OWNERSHIP.

THE ORIGINAL DEVELOPMENT WAS CONFINED TO AN AREA SOUTH OF 24TH AVENUE SOUTH TO THE BAYOU, AND BETWEEN BAY STREET AND FLORIDA AVENUE. ITS NINETEEN HOMES ESTABLISHED THE FLAVOR OF DRIFTWOOD, AND HAVE BEEN THE SUBJECT OF NUMEROUS NEWSPAPER ARTICLES THROUGH THE YEARS. THE AREA HAS OTHER INTERESTING HOUSES INCLUDED IN ITS TOTAL OF FORTY RESIDENCES. THE OLDEST, ON A SITE ADJOINING DRIFTWOOD SUBDIVISION, WAS BUILT BY BARNEY WILLIAMS, A SON OF A CO-FOUNDER OF THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, AND WAS LATER OWNED BY GEORGE S. GANDY JR., SON OF THE GANDY BRIDGE BUILDER. THREE GENERATIONS OF THE GANDY FAMILY HAVE CONTINUED TO MAKE THEIR HOMES IN DRIFTWOOD.

VARIOUS OTHER HOUSES, BUILT IN THE SUBDIVISION DURING POST WW II YEARS, ARE BOTH INDIVIDUALLY ATTRACTIVE AND CONSTITUTE A POSITIVE IMAGE FOR THE OVERALL DESIRABILITY OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD. ONE OF THEM, AT 2500 DRIFTWOOD ROAD, WAS DESIGNED BY JOHN BRUCE DODD, A RESPECTED ST. PETERSBURG ARCHITECT AND OLDER SON OF MARK DODD.

A GATED PATH ON DRIFTWOOD ROAD AFFORDS RESIDENTS ACCESS TO A BEACH EASEMENT FOR FISHING, SWIMMING OR SUNBATHING. FOR MANY YEARS IT BOASTED A DOCK WHERE THEY MIGHT MOOR THEIR SMALL BOATS.
ECOLOGICALLY, DRIFTWOOD IS AN ANCIENT HAMMOCK LAND OF MAJESTIC OLD OAKS, CABBAGE PALMS, A LARGE STAND OF LONG LEAF PINES, GIGANTIC BAMBOO, AND MANY OTHER TROPICAL AND SUB-TROPICAL TREES AND SHRUBS, BORDERED BY A SANDY SHORELINE WITH ITS MANGROVES AND OYSTER BEDS. THIS MARITIME ENVIRONMENT ATTRACTION HERONS, EGRETS, PELICANS, TERNs, AND AN OCCASIONAL EAGLE OR OSPREY. ONCE IN A WHILE A FORAGING MANATEE MAY BE SEEN. ITS YEAR-ROUND WOODLAND INHABITANTS INCLUDE THE NUMEROUS CARDINALS, RED-BELLIED WOODPECKERS AND FLICKERS, BLUE JAYS, MOCKINGBIRDS, SCREECH OWLS, TUFTED TITMICE, AND MOST OTHER LOCAL SPECIES. FURRY DENIZENS THAT ARE OFTEN SEEN ARE THE PLAYFUL GRAY SQUIRRELS, THE CUNNING RACCOONS, AND AN OCCASIONAL OPOSSUM.

The Driftwood entrance about 1939. My dog "Noddy", in the foreground, was killed by a large rattler in an area that had not yet been cleared

IN 1981 THE PLANNING DIVISION OF ST. PETERSBURG'S COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT CONDUCTED AN EXTENSIVE SITE SURVEY OF OUR CITY'S ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES. THEIR COMPREHENSIVE PUBLISHED REPORT IDENTIFIED TWO NEIGHBORHOODS, DRIFTWOOD AND ROSE PARK, AS PRIMARY AREAS WITH "STRONG SITE CHARACTERISTICS ALONG WITH SIGNIFICANT HISTORIC ASSOCIATION AND ARCHITECTURAL UNIQUENESS - UNIQUENESS IN THAT IN EACH AREA ONE MAN ENVISIONED AND DEVELOPED IT SO THAT THE BUILDINGS WERE ENHANCED BY THEIR SETTING, AND NOT VICE VERSA." THEIR FINAL RECOMMENDATION WAS THAT "THE ARCHITECTURAL AND NATURAL SITE CHARACTER AND INTEGRITY OF DRIFTWOOD SHOULD BE PRESERVED AND MAINTAINED."

DRIFTWOOD'S HUMAN INHABITANTS HAVE AN ACTIVE PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION WHOSE MEMBERS ENJOY AND MAINTAIN THEIR INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE PROPERTIES WITH A GREAT SENSE OF HERITAGE AND PRIDE. ALL WHO LIVE THERE APPRECIATE DRIFTWOOD'S PEACEFULNESS AND SHARE A CONTINUING OBJECTIVE TO PROTECT AND PRESERVE ITS NATURAL BEAUTY AND ESTHETIC UNIQUENESS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS.
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Driftwood Resident
To File Suit

JOHN LANÉFORD
Independent Reporter

The city's planned — and approved — program to improve the Driftwood area of southeastern St. Petersburg will be challenged in court.

A complaint will be filed Monday at 9 a.m. by attorneys representing Dr. James Mason, who has spearheaded the Driftwood residents' battle against the city.

The complaint names the City of St. Petersburg and seeks a legal remedy for what the residents of Driftwood say are unjust actions.

The actions center around the city's plans to implement the Area Improvement Program in areas of Driftwood.

The improvements, as outlined by the city's engineering department, include paving of some streets, the addition of curbing to others and storm sewers throughout the area.

The areas along Driftwood Road SE do not have storm sewers now and residents there say there is no need for the sewers.

"There is no drainage problem in our area," said Dr. Mason. "The water from heavy rain drains onto the yards and helps keep the area green."

That the Driftwood area is one of the city's most plush as far as greenery is concerned is not questioned, according to city officials.

"It's just that the city has adopted an improvement program and allowing residents of certain areas to establish their own programs is just not consistent with good government," Interim City Manager Herbert Holt said at a December City Council meeting at which the program was approved.

As detailed by the city, the improvement of Driftwood will cost more than $120,000 which the residents say is an unnecessary expense since feelings against the improvement are running high.

"Improving Driftwood would be like trying to improve the Sistine Chapel," Dr. Mason told the council in December.

The suit to be filed Monday is being handled through the law firm of Roney & Ulmer by Charles Carrere.

Dr. Mason has been considering filing the suit for the past few weeks. His final decision was based on the fact he feels the improvements are "wrong in principle" blaming the city's actions on an "engineering mentality."

Dr. Mason said the situation was now mostly a question of ethics.

"We're going mostly on public opinion which, I believe, is in our favor," the doctor said yesterday.

Driftwood Residents File Suit To Stop Improvements

A suit seeking a permanent injunction, barring the city of St. Petersburg from implementing its area improvement program in the Driftwood section has been filed in Circuit Court in Clearwater.

The suit was filed today by residents of the Driftwood area who are objecting to the city's planned work.

The work involves paving and the installation of storm sewers in Driftwood, which has often been referred to as one of St. Petersburg's most beautiful sections.

The objecting residents say the improvements planned by the city would spoil the beauty of the locale.

The suit asks the court to prohibit the work from taking place. A hearing is to be set sometime next week.

The suit is signed by Dr. James Mason, Dr. James K. McCorkel, Dr. Paul Thompson, Otis Beard, Calvin Jones, Charles Harwood and D. A. Selig, all residents of the area involved.

The city work plans call for about $120,000 in paving, curbs and sewers to be installed this year. Bids are being taken on the project at this time.

The injunction request lists that portion of Driftwood Road SE from the entrance of Driftwood at 25th Avenue S for about two city blocks.

Dr. Mason said today the chances of legal success remain about 50 per cent and said the group was counting on "plenty of public support."

Dr. Mason has been one of the chief opponents of the improvement plans saying at one point at a City Council meeting that "improving Driftwood would be like trying to improve the Sistine Chapel."

Others in the Driftwood area have been arguing against the sewers saying to drain off the natural rain water would spoil the greenery of the area.

Dr. Mason said he expects the group's day in court will be just that because the reasons for the temporary injunction are the same as the reasons for the permanent injunction and that the first hearing next week should be sufficient to issue or deny the permanent injunction.
Driftwood Residents Sue City

CLEARWATER — Eight residents of the woodsy and affluent Driftwood section in southeast St. Petersburg brought suit yesterday to prevent the city from starting a paving and drainage project in the area.

James L. Mason, James K. McCorkle, Paul Thompson, Charles Harwood, William Selig, J. O. Beard, Calvin H. Jones and R. Carleton Fontaine claim in the suit the project threatens the rustic character of the area and would seriously harm its esthetic quality.

The St. Petersburg City Council overrode the objections of a number of Driftwood property owners last November, and then capped the action Dec. 9 with a 4-3 vote to go ahead with the improvements.

Nestled on the shores of Tampa Bay, the section lies between 16th and 20th Avenues S.

Assigned in Circuit Judge C. Richard Leavengood, the suit says a substantial number of trees and related vegetation will be destroyed along with the ecology of the area.

St. Petersburg Times, Wednesday, April 15, 1970

Driftwood’s Quiet Beauty Retained In Spite Of . . .

The road graders have been at work in the Driftwood area of St. Petersburg for about a month as evidenced by this scene at Bay Street SE and Wildwood Lane. The city’s public works department reports work included installation of storm sewers and curbs and paving of streets. Driftwood residents fought unsuccessfully against the improvements contending that they would impair the rustic character of the neighborhood, disrupt the ecology and be a general detriment. A $12,000 cost has been estimated for the improvement project.
Philosophy Of The 30's Pays Off

By CHARLES BENDOW
Times Art Writer

"It costs no more to build an attractive home than an ugly one," wrote the late Mark Dixon Dodd in 1960. "Often a little gem of a place can be a masterpiece."

The little gems Dodd built in the 1930's in St. Petersburg for as little as $4,000 (eight room house in the 100 block of 27th Avenue North) are still attracting buyers with their charm and appeal unmatched by the usual routine architectural remnants of that period.

At first glance, they may give only an impression of all their 30 years, but then their distinctiveness comes through — ideas and reminders for designing houses in which it is a pleasure to live.

The secret of the house's time-defying appeal lies in Dodd's concepts of design. Dodd earned a moderate income and some local public acclaim for his painting — portraits and murals (for example, those in the Huntington Hotel dining room) in the popular style of the time. "A beautifully designed home contains all the elements of a fine painting," he wrote, "composition, balance, color and individuality."

Thus his houses are far from the simple shoe-box shapes of most inexpensive homes. His exteriors are many faceted, interlocking masses with balconies, decks and jogs of small wall planes and roof areas, giving a deceiving impression of a small-sized house.

He Built his own home, and about 15 others, in the Driftwood section on Big Bayou in southeast St. Petersburg. Beautifully maintained by its present owners, it contains two bedrooms, living room, dining room, kitchen with breakfast area, bath, sunroom and a four-room apartment on the ground floor with a bath and two-room sleeping suite and sundeck on the upper level.

The low-walled patio shared by both living and dining room is balanced by a beamed arbor outdoor sitting area off the living room and sunroom. A year ago, its market price was quoted at $15,000.

Moving into and through the house, one is delighted by the fact that the rooms are wider or longer than expected because they aren't fitted into a predetermined overall rectangular plan.

None gives the effect of being simply an area subdivided by partitions from a larger volume. Rather each has its own individuality based on its functional requirements of size and location.

The upper suite has two floor levels. The stairway is located behind and "over" the used-brick fireplace.

There is a sense of dropped ceilings in some rooms while the beamed cathedral ceiling of the living room rises high enough to permit little cabinet doors opening into the upper rooms for fireplace heat circulation or for children to peek at the decorating of the Christmas tree.

These little doors and the stylistic detailing in other parts of the house borrow something of the charm of a child's doll house without the saccharine sentimentality.

Eye color, Dodd made extensive use of highly polished natural woods for interior or finishing — vertical pine planking walls, magnolia wood flooring (which he left uncovered but for small "area" rugs again popular in today's decor).

Because he loved wood, Dodd left every tree standing when possible as he built. The Driftwood Area is still heavily forested, affording restful views into greenery from its upper level windows over the variety of roof planes.
The simple sign arching over the entrance road reads DRIFTWOOD. Beyond, a narrow road meanders through a tunnel of live oaks, past almost-bidder houses.

This lane is traveled only by residents or their visitors or those who are lost. For Driftwood, in southeast St. Petersburg, is not on the way to anywhere. The residents love that.

"I didn't know this was here," recalls newcomer Jay Knaust about his first trip down Wildwood Lane.

"What is this place?" a curious tourist once stopped to ask Randall Dodd, working on some branches in his wooded front yard.

Dodd put down his saw to oblige his questioner — most Driftwood residents enjoy talking about their quaint, secluded neighborhood. As son of the designer, Dodd has prepared a glossy brochure with slides for the city of St. Petersburg's survey of historical resources.

Not that Driftwood's history is so long. In 1935, this was a wilderness of cabbage palms, oaks and wild undergrowth on the mangrove shores of Big Bayou. Long-leaf pine and bamboo bordered a marsh-and-mangrove waterfront. Across the bay was Lewin Island, home to a few fishermen's shacks. (Now, the hundreds of apartments and homes on that site are the neighborhood of Coquina Key.)

In 1939, Mark Dixon Dodd had laid out a plan with a winding road and deep lots, clearing out a maximum of foliage. Dodd was an artist rather than an architect. He once wrote that a "beautifully designed home contained all the elements of a fine painting." Those elements — composition, balance, color, individuality — had to be functional to the design.

Nineteen homes were built among the trees. A narrow shingle drive — Driftwood Road forks into Wildwood Lane — steered away from trees.

These first houses ranged from cottage to two-story, usually part-frame, part-stucco, all with many-windowed exteriors. They also featured shadowed roofs and little balconies — which earned them the nickname "Dodd's storybook houses.

The 20 or so additional homes, built in the 1950s, matched that mood.

And Driftwood today?

The tiny neighborhood is still there, still different. If many of St. Petersburg's residential streets are as predictable as vanilla ice cream in a plastic dish, Driftwood is Grandma's spice cake served from an old sideboard.

Some neighborhoods near Driftwood have succumbed to the prevailing "changing" and "declining." And the Knausts did their best to preserve the character of the house.
Driftwood

from 1-H

the crime rate for the area north and west of Driftwood is relatively high, according to Bill Doniel, St. Petersburg Police spokesman. But he says that no serious incidence of crime has been reported in Driftwood, whose residents participate in one of 112 Neighborhood Crime Watch areas in the city. (As a crime deterrent, residents in these areas report to a block coordinator any suspicious person or activity.)

This vest-pocket neighborhood offers clues to the question: What keeps an older area charming rather than seedy?

Not every neighborhood has a history and an "ecological integrity" to preserve. Driftwood has managed to look after both, even when it meant marching down to City Hall to protest the paving of streets.

(After the fact, residents admit they are glad they lost that battle.)

In his back yard, looking out on Big Bayou and Coquina Key, Dan Schuh relates the area's early history, rife with tales of Indian wars and Union gunboats and pioneer settlers 100 years ago.

"At one time... an Indian fort was on this spot where you're standing. Everybody who lives here has a story about how they got here and why they're here."

Driftwood has what older neighborhoods often don't keep: extended families, the second generation.

Schuh, like some other householders, spent his youth swimming and fishing on this waterfront. His mother Katherine lives in the family home, built in the 1940s.

Helen O'Brien grew up here in a two-story Victorian house built by her father, the late George S. Gandy Jr. (It was Gandy Sr. for whom the first bridge connecting Hillsborough and Pinellas was named.)

Today Helen and Ralph O'Brien are renovating the Gandy home. With white walls and gray shutters, the house has an imposing dignity. When the couple moves in, son Ralph Jr. will buy his parents' present home, a ranch-style next door.

Driftwood has what older neighborhoods often don't keep: extended families, the second generation.

Schuh, like some other householders, spent his youth swimming and fishing on this waterfront. His mother Katherine lives in the family home, built in the 1940s.

Helen O'Brien grew up here in a two-story Victorian house built by her father, the late George S. Gandy Jr. (It was Gandy Sr. for whom the first bridge connecting Hillsborough and Pinellas was named.)

Today Helen and Ralph O'Brien are renovating the Gandy home. With white walls and gray shutters, the house has an imposing dignity. When the couple moves in, son Ralph Jr. will buy his parents' present home, a ranch-style next door.

He's not complaining. Schuh is one of the "Driftwood natives" who loves the natural waterfront.

Here, wild parrots squawk in the trees shared by hawks and owls, raccoons and possums. A manatee has been spotted recently in the bayou.

Schuh, an attorney, and wife Barbara, a realtor, and their three children moved here in 1973, into a two-story white home. Pale blue, wrought-iron railing highlights a second-floor balcony; an arched porch offers a graceful entrance.

Inside, structural repairs necessitated covering original details and removing antique beams. But Mrs. Schuh notes, "The outside is gorgeous." This is the part of the home they are interested in preserving.
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Not long ago, there was concern in Driftwood of declining property values. Recognizing the firestorm that can erupt when neighbors frighten and follow each other by posting for-sale signs, this neighborhood faced a crisis in upkeep and pride.

"In the 1960s, some people thought of selling out. Property values were down," one resident recalls. 

Another says: "There was a period when some were hesitant to put lots of money into homes here ..."

Even one of the little community's symbols, the wooded park in the heart of the neighborhood, was growing wild: "No one wanted to clear it," recalls one resident. The huge live oak in the center was in need of a tree surgeon.

Then the residents revived their neighborhood association. Most of the residents decided to stay and to pitch in. Now, twice a year, everyone works to prune and clean the landmark oak is doing well.

(Maintenance in this lush area involves a lot of labor outdoors. "Don't come here unless you expect to work," advises a typical resident. "To maintain your property calls for hacking away at it like a jungle. You keep loading up trash for the dump.")

One resident captures the rejuvenated spirit of community: "The neighborhood is friendly, social; but lord help you if you intrude."

While charm is fine, old houses call for repair. And not every family can expect or want the grown children to move in with or replace the parents in the family home. Fresh investment and newcomers are needed.

A single house was built in Driftwood last year. It is a large home of natural logs and wood siding. The owner and Driftwood newcomer is Jo Hudgens, who searched for "just the right place" to use the logs.

Older homes that have not been kept up can present a monumental challenge to redecorate, Valerie and Jay Knaust learned. But they aren't daunted.

"Welcome to Amityville," she exclaims, joking about the possessed home featured in novel and film. This couple lived on St. Petersburg Beach when they found Driftwood "by accident. We got lost on this one little street and wound up here, captivated," says Knaust, an attorney.

The smallish, frame home was losing its battle with rampant foliage when the Knausts saw the place.

"It was green with mildew. Ivy was growing in the dining room. A 20-year-old bougainvillea was beautiful but had grown up completely over the oak tree by the house. The tree was dying. Not a drop of sunshine was getting in the house.

"We had to chop down 17 trees."

Cleaning out the yard uncovered "all sorts of little brick paths and patios."

His wife recalls, with high spirits, "That was a fun day!" when they discovered hundreds of bees living in an outside wall.

Renting nearby at first, they started the work in December. "I worked 12-hour days with seven contractors. Everything had to be done," she relates.

There was no way to polish down to the original wood ceiling and make it match as they'd hoped. "We found mahogany, yellow pine and poplar (in the ceiling panels). . . (But) We gave up rough planing to find raw wood. We ended up with plaster with the beams showing."

The upstairs wooden floor had to be rebuilt — the floor was so weak a contractor working up there was afraid he would fall through.

"We knew we were buying some troubles. We didn't know how much work it was going to be," relates Knaust.

The couple didn't want to "wreck the character of the house," says Mrs. Knaust, including the detail work that is part of the charm. "Look at these nice doodaddy details," she says, pointing out the design of leaping deer cut into the white mantel place.

In new white paint and red shutters, the house has emerged "Cape Codish" outside and Florida Spanish inside, with arches and white plaster walls. The Knausts have no regrets about the amount of work or the $4,000 over budget — to date — for the repairs.

The neighborhood made it worthwhile, they say.

"Neighbors stop by to check on our progress. We give them a paint brush . . . it's that kind of a place."

THE END
ART HISTORY OF PINELLAS

Early city artist
is recalled in show
of his paintings

BY MARY ANN MARGER
Times Staff Writer

With the Mark Dixon Dodd show, the Arts Center reinintroducts a prominent St. Petersburg artist through his works borrowed from collections.

Those without deep roots in St. Petersburg may not recognize his name. But those who remember will recall that Dodd, who came to the city with his family in 1924, was more than an artist who recorded portraits of residents and scenes of historical significance. He was also a volunteer at the Art Club (later to merge with the Arts Center), an art teacher and a proponent of establishing St. Petersburg as an art colony.

By avocation, he was an architect. He designed 19 storybook homes in St. Petersburg's Driftwood area, noted also for its winding, shady roads.

But it is for his paintings that he is best known. His subjects included many portraits as well as landscapes, some painted on location, others from imagination.

Working in a traditional style, he depicted Pinellas Village, a settlement in what is now the Driftwood area, established shortly after the Civil War by John Bethel. As the area grew, it needed a post office, built in 1876. Bethel served as postmaster for 14 of its 30 years of existence. In 1910 Bethel wrote a book, A History of Pinellas Village. Dodd, reading the book, decided to paint a series of small murals from scenes described, among them the post office, long gone before Dodd ever arrived. The painting now belongs to the St. Petersburg Historical Society Museum, which lent it to the Arts Center for the show.

Another work in the show is a heroic composition, Osceola's Knife Treaty, a preliminary oil painting for a 10-foot-square mural commissioned by the State of Florida through WPA funds and exhibited at the World's Fair in Chicago in 1933. In the work Osceola, a Seminole subchief, shows his anger at the treaty requiring his tribe to leave Florida by plunging his knife into the document.

The mural no longer exists. Dodd's son, St. Petersburg resident Randell Dixon Dodd, who did much of the search and research for the show, traced the preliminary work from the artist's physician, who received it in exchange for services, to Fort Cooper-State Park's ranger facilities.

Dodd shows his sense of humor in the witty map of St. Petersburg, signed "Mark Dixon Dodd, cartographer in his spare time."

Dodd was born the year that St. Petersburg was founded, 1888, which makes the show especially appropriate for the city's Centennial year.

Mark Dixon Dodd shows the area's first post office in Pinellas Village.
Mark Dixon Dodd was born in St. Louis, Missouri, January 28, 1888, the next to youngest in a family of eight children. When his father died in 1895, the widow and children were taken into the home of a bachelor uncle, Samuel Morris Dodd, a well-known St. Louis businessman who was also prominent in community affairs. Mark attended schools in St. Louis and a private school in Clinton, New York, and for one year was a student at Washington University in St. Louis.

Having shown a consuming passion for drawing, Dodd determined to pursue a career in art. He attended the St. Louis School of Fine Arts, probably at night courses, while working at the Wagner Electric Company which was owned by his Uncle Sam. His mother passed away in 1903, and Uncle Sam in 1913, leaving the children an inheritance which enabled Dodd to move to New York City to further his art education. He enrolled in the Art Students' League where he studied with Johansen, Dumond, Romanovsky and Kenneth Hayes Miller, and in Provincetown under Charles W. Hawthorne.

At the Art Students' League Dodd met and, in 1917, married Vivien Moran, a grand-niece of the artists Thomas and Edward Moran, granddaughter of Philadelphia photographer John Moran, and daughter of New York interior decorator Horace Moran. The Dodds lived in Bloomfield, N.J., New York City, and in Mt. Vernon and Bronxville, NY while Dodd painted and exhibited his works and for a time, worked as a commercial artist for several New York advertising agencies. This line of work, which he really did not enjoy, was necessitated by the birth of a son, John Bruce, in 1918, and a daughter, Sydney, in 1921.

In the fall of 1924, the Dodds travelled to St. Petersburg on the advice of the family physician, to benefit the health of one of their children. They returned to Bronxville in the spring to sell their house, and moved permanently to St. Petersburg in 1925. Dodd soon established an art school where he taught classes in drawing and painting, and also designed and built the first of many homes he was to design in St. Petersburg. This house, located on 10th Avenue North near 45th Street, was also the first home of the Dodd’s third child, Randell Dixon, born in 1928.
Dodd's art classes, portrait commissions and other artistic endeavors grew during this period of fast population and economic expansion, and he and Vivien became thoroughly involved in the emerging cultural life of Florida Boom times. They even branched out into the restaurant business for several years, renovating an old picturesque frame building in what was then known as the "Goose Pond" area (now known as Central Plaza) into the Goose Pond Tavern, a colorful English inn setting with a jolly chef and waitresses in milkmaid costumes.

His contributions to education in the arts included serving as the St. Petersburg Junior College faculty art teacher during the second year of its existence, 1928, until 1930. His portraits of SPJC founder and president, George M. Lynch, and longtime Dean, Robert B. Reed, are exhibited in the entrance hall of the St. Petersburg campus Administration Building.

The Florida real estate market collapse of the late 20s and Great Depression during the early 30s saw the Dodds losing stocks they had held in St. Louis family businesses, and their local assets, including the two houses they had owned on 10th Avenue North. They moved into rental housing while Dodd continued to provide a living by teaching in his art school and fulfilling portrait commissions for local residents and winter visitors. During these difficult times he was often obliged to pay the family bills by presenting a doctor or dentist with one of his oils or watercolors. Many of these "payments in kind" still grace the walls of local families' homes.

In 1933 he was commissioned by the State of Florida to paint a mural for the Florida exhibit at the World's Fair in Chicago. In 1936 he completed a mural of Mediterranean scenes which encompass the rather large wall areas of the dining room at the Huntington Hotel in St. Petersburg.

From 1937 to 1941, Dodd was engaged to design houses for a new subdivision carved out of the woods on the north shore of Big Bayou. "Driftwood" became one of the most charming residential areas of St. Petersburg with its narrow lanes winding through moss-draped oaks, and the nineteen story book style houses that Dodd created there invididually placed and styled amid their lush tropical settings.

CONTINUED NEXT PAGE
The U.S. entry into World War II forced a halt to home building, and Dodd was obliged to look for other means of support. He designed and built the Turnstile Motel on 4th Street and 20th Avenue South, and the family lived there and operated the motel until 1948. A large room served as an art studio where he could continue to teach his classes and paint individually. During the war years he also set up a small shop in downtown St. Petersburg where he sketched and painted portraits for the many service men who were billeted and training in the area.

In 1948 the Dodds sold the Turnstile, and built and moved into a house at 4th Street and 54th Avenue South. This house, also, was designed to include a large studio room for the Mark Dixon Dodd School of Art. Dodd designed and built three more homes on adjoining property, and he and Vivien continued to live there while he plied his painting trade until his death November 4, 1952.

Newspaper articles from the late 1920s describe Mark Dixon Dodd as the first artist of national prominence to make his home in St. Petersburg. His legacy to the city, in addition to the Driftwood subdivision, includes several other homes in various parts of the city, and murals, portraits and watercolors that are owned by many of his contemporaries or their heirs.

Randell Dixon Dodd, son of Mark Dixon Dodd  
April, 1987
Driftwood is a residential subdivision on the shore of Big Bayou in St. Petersburg. In the second half of the nineteenth century, it was the site of one of the first pioneer settlements, where first Abel Miranda, then his brother-in-law John Bethell owned and operated a fishing industry. The first post office in lower Pinellas county was established here.

In 1937, when the present subdivision was begun, the land had reverted to a wild state with dense foliage and plentiful wildlife: opossums, squirrels, rabbits, gopher tortoises, foxes, diamond-back rattlers, and the omnipresent families of raccoons. The vestigial evidence of earlier human inhabitants remained in the form of shell mounds, the outline of a shell fortification, and an occasional find of an Indian arrowhead.

The developers exercised an exceptional degree of foresight and sensitivity in retaining most of the natural resources. Residents who lived and grew up in this environment were often skeptical spectators to the "dredge and fill" and "raze and pave" methods of development taking place around them, and ultimately covering virtually all of the St. Petersburg peninsula.

Amidst all of this "progress", humans and raccoons have accommodated their lifestyles to the urban scene. But those who remember a simpler life closer to God's creation (as does the composer of this song), still cast a wistful look toward the Big Bayou shore — and "DRIFTWOOD".

Randell Dixon Dodd - January, 1988
"DRIFTWOOD"
A Perspective on the Centennial of St. Petersburg, Florida

I
It was early morning and the shifting sands began to shimmer in the dawn of time;
The myriad oysters flicked their tongues toward the plankton sifting through the bayou slime;
Then Timucuan braves and the Spaniard came, and the oysters' home became forts and mounds,
And the young raccoon turned his quizzical face in patient wonder toward the sights and sounds
Of these strange intrusions in this sacred place - of Driftwood.

II
It was brilliant midday and a cool Gulf breeze brought welcome respite from their hot travail,
Where Pinellas settlers hewed the oak and pine, forging homes and farmland from the forest trail.
Soon their growing numbers spread the word afar of a land of beauty and of promise rare,
And the raccoon stared with his family at the streets and buildings that were spreading there,
From the meager shelter of an old oak tree - in Driftwood.

III
It is late winter evening and the city rests from the hustle and bustle of the urban strain;
From the crunch of traffic in the spending place; from the malls and the banks, and pursuits so vain;
From the Grand Prix screeching and the Stadium roar. As the tee-vees flicker in each high-rise home,
The old raccoon shifts his knowing gaze from this place in the sewer by the Suncoast Dome
Toward the scene of his youth and those bygone days - in Driftwood.

Randell Dixon Jodd - 1987
DRIFTWOOD
"A PERSPECTIVE ON THE CENTENNIAL OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA"
Words and music by RANDELL DIXON DODD
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pat-i-ent won-der
toward the
streets and build-ings that were
sights and sounds of these
place in the sew-er
Spread-ing there, from the
sun-coast Dome
toward the
strange in-tru-sions in this
mea-ger shel-ter of an
sac-red place of
scene of his youth
and those
old oak tree
by-gone day:
in
Drift-wood
1. It was
2. It is
3. Drift-wood
Drift-wood
Drift-wood
Drift-wood.
Attachment B

Driftwood House Descriptions

Descriptions expected to be verified and completed upon City review. Built date and current (as of today vs. when originally built) total square footage (tsqft) taken from the Pinellas County Property Appraiser's website.

2675 Driftwood Road S – Build date 2012 – 2210 total square feet (tsqft) - New construction – 1-2 story concrete block with multi-pitched roof.

2635 Florida Avenue S – 1952 – 3666 tsqft - Minimal Traditional concrete block ranch type house with smooth stucco exterior and attached carport.

2621 Florida Ave S – 1937 – 2384 tsqft – Dodd Home - Minimal Traditional, 1-2 story, concrete block construction, cross gable roof, dominant projecting front gable with differentiated pediment and scalloped trim cornice, ornamental front gable over front door with ornamental fluted concrete resembling Greek pilasters flanking front door, integrated ornamental concrete planter flanking front door, replacement windows.

2600 Florida Ave S - 1951 - 1608 tsqft - Minimal Traditional, concrete block, single-story, horizontally oriented, hipped roof with asphalt shingles, boxed cornice, front porch recessed under continuous front roof eve, integrated garage.

2500 Florida Avenue – 1952 – 2288 tsqft - Minimal Traditional, concrete block construction with stucco exterior, single-story, horizontally oriented roof with asphalt shingles, boxed cornice, front porch recessed under continuous front roof eve, detached single garage.

136 25th Avenue S – 1935 – 3958 tsqft - Two-story, wood framed with aluminum siding, hipped roof with asphalt shingles, single fireplace, highly symmetrical front façade, recessed front porch and second story balcony. Balcony is supported by wood beams and has ornamental ironwork, single front door with elliptical fan light above flanked by side lights. 41 windows and 1 patio glass door replaced in 2004 with double pane energy efficient V-grooved glass. This is the oldest house in Driftwood subdivision, built by Carlton Beard in 1935 (builder of The Don CeSar Hotel).

2519 Driftwood Road SE – 1939 – 2115 tsqft - Dodd Home - Minimal Traditional, whimsical Storybook influences trending towards Mediterranean Revival, concrete block construction, 1 – 2 story, multi pitched hip and gable roof with asphalt shingles, recessed porch under side gabled eve with turned concrete porch supports, oriel bay window, mixture of aluminum casement windows and replacement vinyl windows, second story overhang with ornamental supporting beams, second story attached balcony with ornamental supports.

2521 Driftwood Road SE – 1938 – 2032 tsqft - Dodd Home - Minimal Traditional with English Vernacular Revival influences, single story, concrete block construction, steeply pitched side gabled roof with projecting front cross gable with board and batten style vertical clapboard and scalloped trim, visible rafter tails, exterior brick chimney, projecting gable over front porch with brackets. Enclosed attached sunroom, carport and additional one story appendage with multiple rooflines, replacement windows.
2605 Driftwood Road SE – 1939 – 4818 tsqft - Dodd Home - Two-story Minimal Traditional with side gabled roof, symmetrical 3 bay front façade, smooth stucco exterior, central front entrance with standing seam metal oriel-type awning roof with scalloped details, replacement windows. Detached garage.

2615 Driftwood Road S – 1937 – 2247 tsqft - Dodd Home - Irregular shaped, single-story Minimal Traditional with hipped roof with cross front gable with vertical patterned board siding with scalloped detail, stucco exterior with exposed block resembling brick, some original windows with deep sills, off-set front entrance in the projecting front gable.

2617 Driftwood Road S – 1937- 2344 tsqft - Dodd Home - Minimal Traditional with Mediterranean Revival elements, 1-2 story, irregular plan, block construction with smooth stucco finish, multiple roof orientations with red barrel tile, sculpted lintel over front door, projecting hipped room single-story porch with wood supports.

2515 Driftwood Road S – 1937 – 1727 tsqft - Dodd Home - Minimal Traditional single-story with side-gabled shingle roof with visible rafter tails with scalloped ends, projecting front cross-gable, attached shed roof porch, both smooth stucco and horizontal wood siding.

2505 Driftwood Road SE – 1937- 3082 tsqft - Dodd Home - Minimal Traditional with English Vernacular Revival elements, 1-2 story, irregular-plan, multiple roof pitches predominated by front gables, vertical board and batten with a slight diagonal orientation and scalloped trim under one-story front gable, rough stucco exterior on first floor and horizontal wood siding on second story, exterior brick fireplace set on gable, original windows, shed roof awning over entrance.


111 Wildwood Lane SE – 1936 – 1600 tsqft - Dodd Home - English Vernacular Revival, irregular plan, with multiple roof planes and multiple gables, new standing seam metal roof, prominent front gabled single story projection with Tudor influences board and batten under gable, visible rafter tails under cornices, prominent gable end brick chimney, offset front entrance with shed roof porch, multiple siding materials including horizontal wood siding, smooth stucco and brick.

123 Wildwood Lane SE – 1938 – 1209 tsqft - Dodd Home - Minimal Traditional, cross gabled shingle roof with prominent front gable with vertical scalloped board and batten, stucco exterior covering block to resemble brick, offset front entrance with shed roof, oriel bay window, original wood shutters with diamond-shaped cutouts, interior brick chimney.

127 Wildwood Lane SE - 1938 – 3738 tsqft - Dodd Home - Minimal Traditional with strong English Vernacular Revival influence, 1-2 story, block construction, stucco exterior finish, horizontal second story siding, vertical scalloped trim under second story front gable., recessed second story porch with small projecting front gable, offset front door with attached projecting front gable porch, original wood shutters with clover cutouts, geometric ironwork, single story side gable with deep eve sheltering screened porch.
135 Wildwood Lane SE – 1937 – 2192 tsqft - **Dodd Home** - Minimal Traditional with Monterey Revival elements, 1-2 story, multiple roof planes and gables, stucco and wood siding exterior, projecting single story front gable with virtual board and batten in decorative design with scalloped finish, second story integrated porch under low pitched side gable roof with scalloped cornice and wood porch supports, first story front entrance off-set from center with sculpted concrete surround, attached single story enclosed porch.

145 Wildwood Lane SE – 1938 – 1716 tsqft - **Dodd Home** - Minimal Traditional with English Vernacular Revival elements, cross-gable with strong projecting front gable with wavy horizontal siding, large picture window with horizontal divided sidelights concrete lintels and sills, enclosed porch under low-pitched gable extension, stucco and block exterior.

147 Wildwood Lane SE - 1938 - 1694 tsqft - **Dodd Home** - Minimal Traditional with English Vernacular Revival and whimsical Storybook elements, primarily 2 story structure with single story attachments, front gable roof with multiple additional plains, recessed and attached second story porch and balconies, off-set front entrance with elaborate fluted standing seam metal awning with scalloped trim and iron scroll posts, some original paired casement windows, attached enclosed first story porch with side gabled roof with scalloped vertical board and batten clapboard trim, exterior stucco clad chimney.


227 Driftwood Road SE – 1973 – 3423 tsqft - Minimal Traditional single story with second story pop up, first story has smooth stucco exterior with sculpted concrete details around front entrance, second story clad in vertical board and batten, hipped roof with asphalt shingles.

231 Driftwood Road SE – 1952 – 3938 tsqft - Minimal Traditional with Tropical Modern influences, 1-2 story, hipped roof with deep eves, first story 2 bay integrated garage with second story over, two bay windows mirroring garage pattern, elongated horizontal rough brick detail, applied stone, attached single story with deep integrated porch.


251 Driftwood Road SE – 1950 – 2156 tsqft - Single-story, Minimal Traditional with Tropical Modern element, hipped shingle roof with deep overhanging eves, projecting front garage with original door, offset front entrance under deep roof overhang and stacked stone posts, large 6 bay front facing window alternating jalousie and plate glass.


287 Driftwood Road SE – 1997 – 3105 tsqft - Concrete block new construction

262 Driftwood Road SE – 1950 – 3301 tsqft - Contemporary style, low-pitched hipped roof with deep eves, projecting 2-story hipped-roof garage.
250 Driftwood Road SE - 1964 – 3576 tsqft - Midcentury Ranch, multiple low-pitched front facing gables with deep overhanging eves, projecting front garage, horizontal ribbon windows, half-story brick clad exterior with upper half of exterior clad in smooth stucco, recessed front entrance.

240 Driftwood Road SE – 1940 – 5065 tsqft - Modern construction. Two story.

234 Driftwood Road SE – 1950 – 5706 tsqft - Minimal Traditional with Colonial Revival elements, 2-story with hipped shingle roof, attached single story symmetrical 2 bay garage, paired exterior chimneys.


200 Driftwood Road SE – 1949 – 7141 tsqft - Two-story irregular plan, multiple modern additions, concrete block and wood frame with applied stucco. Connecting two original Driftwood lots into one address with multiple structures on both lots.


2440 Driftwood Road SE – Vacant Lot


2510 Driftwood Road SE – 1938 – 2562 tsqft - Dodd Home - Minimal Traditional with Mediterranean Revival elements, modern additions, multiple roof planes with predominant front gables, red tile roof, smooth stucco exterior with sculpted concrete details.

2600 Driftwood Road S – 1940 – 5346 tsqft - Dodd Home - Mediterranean Revival, multi-story, multiple modern additions, multi-plane roof with red barrel tile, highly irregular plan, smooth stucco exterior with sculpted concrete ornamentation, modern 2-story height portico entrance.

2608 Driftwood Road S – 1938 – 2942 tsqft - Dodd Home - Minimal Traditional with Mediterranean Revival elements, 1-2 story, side gabled and hipped roof, projecting front entrance with sculpted concrete detail, some elevations exhibit smooth stucco finish while others retain original exposed block resembling brick, deep concrete sills and sculpted concrete lintels.

2620 Driftwood Road S – 1948 – 4381 tsqft - Minimal Traditional, Mediterranean Revival influences, 1 – 2 story, concrete block construction, with continuous concrete foundation, red barrel tile roof with boxed cornice front facing garage, horizontal concrete banding, deep-set aluminum casement windows with concrete sills, recessed
front porch with predominant bay window flanked by casement windows, original screen door, geometric ironwork.

**2660 Driftwood Road S** – 1954 – 3909 tsqft - 1-2 story Minimal Traditional with modern-style elements, multiple modern additions, concrete screen block, replacement windows, multiple roof types, stucco and vertical clapboard siding.

Driftwood & Wildwood Lane

Driftwood SE Park

Driftwood Archway

Driftwood west entrance at Bethel Ave
Easement (shoreline at 2500 Driftwood Rd)

Easement (Shoreline of Big Bayou)

Easement entrance

Historic Marker - Miranda Home (1)
Historic Marker - Miranda Home

Tree preserved in Driftwood Rd

Wildwood Lane at Bay St

Wildwood Lane
City of St. Petersburg, Florida

PROJECT NUMBER: 17-90300006  DRIFTWOOD LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HISTORIC DIST DESIGNATION</td>
<td>670.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DUE</td>
<td>670.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please present this invoice to the cashier with full payment.
Laurie Macdonald has shared a link to the following document:

Driftwood House Descriptions - V-3 dates - sqft - 2-27-2018 -.docx

This is the link to the updated version of the "Driftwood House Descriptions" which is Attachment B to the Driftwood Historic District Application.

Attachment A to the application is the document titled "DRIFTWOOD" by Randell Dixon Dodd, which will be delivered to you today.

Attachment C to the application are the photographs currently in the Dropbox.

Attachment D to the application are the prints by Jeanne Meinke currently in the Dropbox.

Laurie Macdonald
Open in Docs
Laura Duvekot

From: Laurie Macdonald (via Google Docs) <lauriewildwood@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2018 12:08 PM
To: Laura Duvekot
Cc: bj@empyrean.net; trishsloweymoore@gmail.com; meinkep@eckerd.edu; jeannemeinke@gmail.com; lauriewildwood@gmail.com
Subject: Driftwood Historic District

Laurie Macdonald has shared a link to the following document:

Driftwood Historic District

Laura Duvekot,

This link is to the Driftwood Historic District application and constitutes submittal for consideration by the City of St. Petersburg with expectations of being heard at the April meeting of the CPPC. It is our understanding that sufficient ballots have been received to move forward with the application process. A check will be delivered to the City today to cover the application fee.

Laurie Macdonald on behalf of Applicants

Google Docs: Create and edit documents online.
Google LLC. 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, CA 94043, USA
You have received this email because someone shared a document with you from Google Docs.
Hi Laura,

Please note that today, 26 March I made a modification of the boundary description language which clarifies that the western boundary of the proposed district includes the street right of way of Ward Avenue (Driftwood Ave. S.). With all the additions and changes being made to this document, I want to be certain that you are aware of this so you can get the staff report map drawn correctly. Good luck with this project,

Cheers, Howard F. Hansen
Community Characteristics: District Features

HEIGHT
Building height of Driftwood homes varies from one to two stories, with one and one half stories being the most common.

MASSING & SCALE
There is a great deal of variation in the scale of the houses, ranging from modest cottages and ranch homes to larger single and two story homes. This variation in scale dates back to the original 19 homes designed by Mark Dixon Dodd and Archie Parish in the mid-1930s where emphasis was on a naturalistic neighborhood design and homes blended with nature in the lush garden-park like setting. The modern mid-century homes and other architectural styles exhibit similar mass and scale to their lot size.

BUILDING DESIGN
The neighborhood has an eclectic mix of houses with no predominant design style, yet a recognizable look to the 19 Dodd homes. The original Dodd homes integrate a variety of styles including English Vernacular, Cottage, Mediterranean-revival and Storybock, and Tudor-revival plus others less easily classified. Common features among the Dodd homes are gabled, multiplane roofs, porches, screened rooms, low walled patios and balconies: distinctive front door entrances; fireplaces; stucco mixed with clapboard and ornamental wood trim details; attached garages; planters, ponds or water fountains; and bird houses located beneath the roof line peak.

RELATIONSHIP
Lot sizes are irregular and generally deep, with houses set well back from the road and oriented toward the winding roads utilizing the privacy of front foliage green space. Waterfront lots range from 100 to nearly 200 ft. wide and over 100 ft. deep. Frontage setbacks on most lots average more than 50 ft. from the road and 20 ft. on the sides. Garages are either attached, built-in or detached.

RHYTHM & EXPERIENCE
The original subdivision plat followed the contour of Big Bayou's shoreline with lots formed to allow live oaks and other vegetation to thrive undisturbed. Newer editions to the subdivision have largely continued the tradition where homes blend with nature. The narrow winding roads shaded by the mature canopy and two interior island park spaces add to the relaxed meandering garden feel. The diversity of architectural design keeps Driftwood feeling current while being cloaked by its historic oak canopy. The layout of the homes, roads, tree canopy and greenery make Driftwood as exceptionally walkable neighborhood. Pedestrians enjoy this quiet natural district in contrast to the nearby urban environment.

MATERIALS & DETAILS
Many houses are masonry first floors with masonry or wood frame second floors. Several Dodd homes were constructed with materials available during the 1930's and include yellow heart pine beams, magnolia flooring, "Cuban tile", milk stain. Roofs are often steeply pitched and gabled with extended eaves. The mid-century homes have more contemporary flat rooflines. Newer
homes add to an eclectic mix that includes a few of modern and/or mountain design. Roofing materials include composition shingles, terra cotta tile, bitumen and metal.

EXTERIOR SPACES
Mature lush landscaping under a large canopy has been a hallmark of the Driftwood Historic District. Solid fencing or privacy walls are limited. Many properties opt for green fences or open air fencing thereby enhancing natural air flow, visual continuity within the “garden neighborhood” and improved water and energy conservation. Low walled patios, porches both open and screened and curving walkways and driveways feature in many of the home sites. A private neighborhood maintained easement connecting to a small private beach on Big Bayou gives all the residents access to enjoy the waterfront and its wildlife. The Big Park and Little Park situated amidst winding roads allow for community gathering space. The DRIFTWOOD arch across First St. S. at 25th Avenue S. is considered a signature landmark and its presence dates back to the 1930’s.

STREETSCEAPE
Originally narrow one lane dirt roads, Driftwood Road, Wildwood Lane SE and Florida Avenue SE were paved in 1970 along with the addition of storm drains. Through neighborhood efforts the scale, direction, width and rustic character of the streets was protected along with trees and vegetation. This includes the signature live oak tree in the middle of Driftwood Road and the memory pond in the Big Park. The ambient temperature is cooler due to the preservation and conservation of signature and grand trees within the magnificent tree canopy. Traversing through Driftwood whether on foot, bike or car feels like entering a magic garden where the houses are hidden treasures dwarfed and embraced by the trees and vegetation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>STYLE(S)</th>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
<td>English Vernacular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
<td>English Vernacular</td>
<td>Mediterranean Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Block</td>
<td>Stucco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2420 Driftwood Road S</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2559 Driftwood Road SE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2521 Driftwood Road SE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600 Driftwood Road S</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2608 Driftwood Road SE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2615 Driftwood Road S</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2617 Driftwood Road S</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2621 Florida Avenue S</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balcony</td>
<td>Roof Style</td>
<td>Roof Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balcony</td>
<td>Hip</td>
<td>Gabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironwork</td>
<td>Columns</td>
<td>Recessed entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other decorative features: e.g. Bird house, medallion</th>
<th>Garden low wall extends from house</th>
<th>Pond, Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x x x</td>
<td>Built-in planters located at bay window and front entrance and patio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x x x</td>
<td>Originally there was a &quot;large tiled walled zino stony&quot; deck over the original garage which was accessed by stairs leading up from the front patio. At some point the deck and stairs were removed and the garage was converted into a bedroom. An attached carport was added and later an attached studio apartment, both with flat roofs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Driftwood Neighborhood Property Setbacks

## Inland Properties

All measurements approximate. Front setbacks measured from front of closest structure to edge of street.

Side setbacks measured from building to property line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Front Setback</th>
<th>Side Setback 1</th>
<th>Side Setback 2</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>251 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Agan</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>West 6.3'</td>
<td>East 15.4'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Shay</td>
<td>76'</td>
<td>West 12.5'</td>
<td>East 10.5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>101.5'</td>
<td>West 3.5'</td>
<td>East 20'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>75'</td>
<td>West 30.5'</td>
<td>East 40'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Spytek</td>
<td>42.3'</td>
<td>West 60'</td>
<td>East 23'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 Wildwood Ln SE</td>
<td>Meinke</td>
<td>33'</td>
<td>West 3.5'</td>
<td>East 53.5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 Wildwood Ln SE</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>34'</td>
<td>West 7.4'</td>
<td>East 16'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Wildwood Ln SE</td>
<td>Cowen</td>
<td>46'</td>
<td>West 10.5'</td>
<td>East 15'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 Wildwood Ln SE</td>
<td>Krystan</td>
<td>18.5'</td>
<td>West 13'</td>
<td>East 2'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 Wildwood Ln SE</td>
<td>Jiminez/Freeman</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>West 14.7'</td>
<td>East 27'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Wildwood Ln SE</td>
<td>Mancusi</td>
<td>34'</td>
<td>West 2'</td>
<td>East 2.5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Wildwood Ln SE</td>
<td>Macdonald</td>
<td>46'</td>
<td>West 4.5'</td>
<td>East 17'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2505 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Lineberger</td>
<td>28'</td>
<td>West 5.2'</td>
<td>East 9'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2515 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Studdiford</td>
<td>23'</td>
<td>West 38'</td>
<td>East 12'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400 1st St SE</td>
<td>Gregg</td>
<td>52.4'</td>
<td>North 5'</td>
<td>South 44'</td>
<td>Rear property boundary is on lot line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2519 Driftwood Rd S</td>
<td>Roux</td>
<td>65.4'</td>
<td>North 61'</td>
<td>South 89'</td>
<td>Front setback measured to edge of 1st St SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2521 Driftwood Rd S</td>
<td>McMullen</td>
<td>68'</td>
<td>West 2'</td>
<td>East 20'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2605 Driftwood Rd S</td>
<td>Pastore</td>
<td>61.5'</td>
<td>West 2'</td>
<td>East 22'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2615 Driftwood Rd S</td>
<td>Lloyd</td>
<td>121'</td>
<td>West 28.8'</td>
<td>East 15'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2617 Driftwood Rd S</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>61.5'</td>
<td>West 15.5'</td>
<td>East 24'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2675 Driftwood Rd S</td>
<td>Rixon</td>
<td>35.8'</td>
<td>West 23.5'</td>
<td>East 57'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635 Florida Ave S</td>
<td>Moneym/O'Brien</td>
<td>99'</td>
<td>North 37.2'</td>
<td>South 116'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2621 Florida Ave S</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>North 5'</td>
<td>South 2.5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600 Florida Ave S</td>
<td>Grittner</td>
<td>45.2'</td>
<td>North 10'</td>
<td>South 19.5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 Florida Ave S</td>
<td>Grimes</td>
<td>57.5'</td>
<td>North 35'</td>
<td>South 23.6'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 25th Ave S</td>
<td>Barnett</td>
<td>64'</td>
<td>West 25.5'</td>
<td>East 22'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 53.6' 19.5' 26.2'
Driftwood Neighborhood Property Setbacks

**Waterfront Properties**

All measurements approximate. Front setbacks measured from front of closest structure to edge of street. Side setbacks measured from building to property line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Front Setback</th>
<th>Side Setback 1</th>
<th>Side Setback 2</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>262 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Halsey</td>
<td>25.5'</td>
<td>West 8.5'</td>
<td>East 6'</td>
<td>At end of cul-de-sac, next door to City water plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>74'</td>
<td>West 10.5'</td>
<td>East 14'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>86'</td>
<td>West 11.4'</td>
<td>East 15.5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>39.5'</td>
<td>West 27.2'</td>
<td>East 11.7'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Ahern</td>
<td>98'</td>
<td>West 26'</td>
<td>East 19.4'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Wolverton</td>
<td>48.5'</td>
<td>West 23'</td>
<td>East 2.5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Ayer</td>
<td>43'</td>
<td>West 7.6'</td>
<td>East 26'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2420 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Schuh</td>
<td>67.9'</td>
<td>West 45'</td>
<td>East 33.4'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2440 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Perez</td>
<td>82'</td>
<td>West 15'</td>
<td>East 19'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Sackett</td>
<td>90'</td>
<td>West 25'</td>
<td>East 15'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2510 Driftwood Rd SE</td>
<td>Brumby</td>
<td>80.5'</td>
<td>West 15'</td>
<td>East 40.4'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2608 Driftwood Rd S</td>
<td>Higgs</td>
<td>56'</td>
<td>West 10.5'</td>
<td>East 24.5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2620 Driftwood Rd S</td>
<td>Zavales</td>
<td>48'</td>
<td>West 28.7'</td>
<td>East 23'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2660 Driftwood Rd S</td>
<td>Pav</td>
<td>61.4'</td>
<td>West 24'</td>
<td>East 44.5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2680 Driftwood Rd S</td>
<td>Keller</td>
<td>52.7'</td>
<td>West 12'</td>
<td>East 28'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>63.5'</td>
<td>19.3'</td>
<td>21.5'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DRIFTWOOD DESIGN REVIEW PROPOSALS
PETER PAV

PROPOSAL 1: PROSPECTIVE BUYERS CAN GET PROVISIONAL DEMOLITION APPROVAL IN ADVANCE OF CLOSING, CONTINGENT UPON TIMELY AND PROPER APPLICATION THEREFOR, ACCEPTABILITY OF PROPOSED REPLACEMENT STRUCTURE, AND PROOF OF FINANCING.

JUSTIFICATION: THIS IS TO ENABLE A SALE TO BUYER WHO WISHES TO BUY A PROPERTY PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF THE LOT’S HIGH QUALITY, REGARDING THE EXISTING STRUCTURE AS A THROWAWAY IN ORDER TO REPLACE IT WITH A STRUCTURE HAVING A MORE APPROPRIATE FAÇADE AND/OR A MORE FUNCTIONAL INTERIOR. THIS WOULD BE A WIN-WIN FOR BUYER, SELLER, AND THE PRESERVATION OF DRIFTWOOD’S CHARACTER.

PROPOSAL 2: A COA CAN BE BASED NOT ONLY UPON ITS HISTORICITY, CONSISTENCY OR COMPLEMENTARITY WITH EXISTING NEIGHBORING STRUCTURES, BUT ALSO ON THE PROPOSAL’S OWN MERITS TO MAINTAIN DRIFTWOOD’S VARIETY OF UNIQUE, ATTRACTIVE, AND INTERESTING PROPERTIES HOMES.

JUSTIFICATION: ONE OF DRIFTWOOD’S PRIMARY MERITS IS THE, VARIATION, INDIVIDUALITY, NON-LOCKSTEP STYLE AND INTERESTING NATURE OF ITS RESIDENCES.

PROPOSAL 3: SUBDIVIDE DRIFTWOOD INTO THREE SEPARATE ZONES EACH WITH ITS OWN COA GUIDELINES.—ZONE A DODD HOMES, ZONE B NON-DODD NON-WATERFRONT HOMES, ZONE C WATERFRONT HOMES.

JUSTIFICATION: DODD HOMES ALONE HAVE A SHARED ARCHITECTURAL HISTORICITY AS THE PROMINENT FACTOR TO PRESERVE, AND THEY ARE VERY SIMILAR. NON-DODD HOMES LACK HISTORIC COMMONALITY. THE MAIN FEATURE OF WATERFRONT HOMES IS THE LOT ITSELF. DODD HOMES COULD BE REPLICAED, BUT NATURAL WATERFRONT LOTS CANNOT – THEY ARE A VALUED RESOURCE IN LIMITED SUPPLY, AND SHOULD BE CHERISHED AND USED CAREFULLY. (ST PETERSBURG CITY ZONING TREATS WATERFRONT (SUBURBAN) AND NON-WATERFRONT (TRADITIONAL) DIFFERENTLY.)
Notes for Laura Duvekor from Driftwood Historic District Initiative

In the Landscape guidelines section we would like to add this recommendation:

The neighborhood tree assessment should include and plan that new saplings be planted prior to the removal or death of an older tree so the new growth will develop with respective character of its surroundings not necessarily straight up.

We’re also aware that circumstances at any planting site may have restrictions for replacement whether it is ground conditions or location conditions. Most important is replacement of the trees in an effort most advantageous for the growth and health of the tree in its environment.

EmR 3/26/18
Suggested Guidelines for Landscape
In Driftwood Neighborhood

Each headline or category will be accompanied by a photo illustrating that particular section.

PURPOSE: Two contrasting photos with captions; one of a new build with landscape pursuant to city code and one of opposing photo of lushly landscaped and canopied Driftwood property. [See Figure 1 and Figure 2.]

- Purpose is to customize city code which is inadequate by Driftwood standards to preserve and allow for continued appreciation of the unique characteristics of Driftwood tree canopy and landscape. Characterized by 3 distinct layers of life: 1) protective hardwood tree canopy 2) secondary understory trees and shrubs 3) ground covers and grasses. [See Figure 3.]

- Landscape and tree canopy is the single most identifiable and unifying element of Driftwood. Driftwood is a sanctuary for old growth trees and a rarely preserved example of a coastal hammock in the county. [See Figure 4.]

TREES: [See Figure 5.]

- Largely an issue of protecting what we have and providing for their replacement due to aging out and land redevelopment. Remind people that you can always replace a structure but cannot replace an old growth tree.

- A tree survey conducted by the city arborist concluded that this neighborhood has a high concentration of 19 Grand Trees in public right of ways and the parks. A Grand Tree must have a circumference exceeding 30 inches or more and must not be a prohibited species. There are an addition 6 trees which barely fell below these criteria. This does not count Grand Trees on private property. Special protection should be granted for all Grand Trees whether they are on private or public property in this neighborhood district as they embody the essence of a rare coastal hammock and are irreplaceable. Any issue involving a Grand Tree requires additional review by the CPPC.

- A minimum of 4 shade trees per 50 ft. lot; 7 shade trees per 100 ft. lot with new builds.

- Call for more stringent consultations of primary canopy prior to removal or trimming of limbs, especially as it involves city or power provider’s cutting crews. Request that young, pliant trees be trimmed to a height of 14 ft. to avoid unnecessary conflict with the city. Allow conservative removal of dead limbs by adjacent neighbors.
• Establish tree in the middle of the road as an "Iconic Driftwood Tree" and call for its protection as a "Vertical Speed Bump" which reduces speeding down our narrow, serpentine roads. [See Figure 6.]

• **Provide list of shade trees in this section.** Recommend planting long lived indigenous trees such as live oaks and long leaf pines.

• Require multiple (2) arborists to review a tree prior to removal for health and other issues an individual homeowner may put forward. **Provide protected tree list here and draw distinction between Grand Trees and others. Provide prohibited tree list here.**

• Require trees be replanted after renovation and new construction at a number which adequately replaces the trees removed by a mathematical formula: for example, if you remove a live oak 30" in diameter (which we don't want to allow!), then you must replace it with three 10" diameter live oak trees.

• Encourage people to refrain from removing unthreatening dead trunks of pines, palms and oaks to provide habitat for woodpeckers, osprey and other birds.

• Large trees add an immediate sense of maturity to your garden. They not only visually anchor a landscape design, but they literally anchor other trees by root systems which help keep them from falling over due to high winds. Consider planting tree groupings.

• In nature, trees act as a host for other plants such as resurrection fern and wildlife. Although some vines may be detrimental, tree do not have to be bare to be healthy. [See Figure 7.]

• There are a number of unusual trees in the neighborhood including a Grand Podocarpus, a Grand Banyan and a probable Indian Marker Tree.

SHRUBS AND UNDERSTORY TREES: [See Figure 8.]

• Minimum of 30 shrubs, accent plants or understory trees per 50 ft. lot, and a minimum of 75 for lots 100 ft. or more with new construction, including palms. **No substituting palms for shade trees.**

• **Put tree understory list here and shrub list etc. here as well as palm list.**

• All new plantings must be at least 20 inches high for accent plants, 28 inches high for shrubs, and 7' high above the root ball for trees.

• Encourage habitat producing plants to feed and provide nesting places for birds, butterflies and other wildlife. Refrain from using chemicals which create imbalance in the yard and wipe out the natural predators of bug pests such as frogs and lizards. You will have far fewer bugs in your
home if you let them do the work for you. We are vulnerable to run off fertilizers and pesticides which adversely affect Big Bayou and other estuaries.

- Let oaks visually anchor the landscape design. We encourage planting wind breaks to protect homes and trees. Tree groupings help to anchor other trees from coming down due to high winds. [See Figure 9.]

- The more variety in plant species, the better it is for the environment and protects you against a single disease or pest from wiping out your landscape investment. [See Figure 10.]

- Consider hardy blooming perennials for consistent blooming and accent with annuals. [See Figure 11.]

- Insert mangrove preservation rules here.

GROUND COVER AND SOD: [See Figure 12.]

- Accent and Massing plant and ornamental grasses; insert ground cover lists here.

- Percentage of St. Augustine and other sod should not exceed 35% of permeable landscape on the street side.

SPECIAL FEATURES:

- Ponds were common with the original Dodd/Parish homes though many have been filled in. Ponds are encouraged because they are in keeping with the original design of the neighborhood and also because they provide valuable resources for wildlife. Mosquito abatement is easy with natural tablets which are readily available. [See Figure 13.]

- Brick and other patios and driveways should be set in sand as opposed to mortar to allow drainage. [See Figure 14.]

- Pergolas of various configurations were also found in original Driftwood homes.

- Both parks should be kept in a style comparable to the signature landscaping of the neighborhood: natural and unmanicured. [See Figure 15.]

More Reasons for These Recommendations:

- There is unity among the neighbors that the landscape of Driftwood is our greatest asset which adds to the exceptional quality of life that we all enjoy. Preserving this precious natural asset helps with countless urban issues facing such a densely populated county. Trees provide noise abatement as well as lessening our summer temperatures.

- Whether it is at the top or at the end of the list of reasons why trees are so important, it is confirmed that mature trees add value to property.
- Addressing water usage, erosion and runoff issues, slowing water evaporation from lawns, cleaning the atmosphere, and promoting emotional wellbeing are all benefits of our well-treed neighborhood.

- There were many other features and regulations of value in the city code that have not been addressed in my suggestions. I changed some of the requirements to better reflect our neighborhood ethos in terms of its readily identifiable landscape and unique character.

Thanks, and hopefully some of this will help.

Kim O'Brien  
c. 727-631-6842  
h. 727-894-5611
FIGURE 1. New build at 26th Ave S with landscape pursuant to City code.
FIGURE 2. Lushly landscaped and canopied Driftwood home representative of neighborhood. Illustrates the need to customize City code to preserve unique landscape of Driftwood.
FIGURE 3. Our coastal hammock is distinguished by three layers of landscape: 1. protective hardwood tree canopy; 2. secondary understory trees and shrubs; 3. groundcovers and grasses.
FIGURE 4. Landscape and tree canopy is the single most identifiable and unifying element of Driftwood.
FIGURE 5. Mature Driftwood shade trees provide protection for both homes and neighborhood streets, keeping temperatures cooler, reducing soil erosion, and saving water.
FIGURE 6. The iconic tree in the middle of the road in Driftwood. The guidelines call for its protection as a “Vertical Speed Bump” which reduces speeding down our narrow, serpentine roads.
FIGURE 7. In nature, trees act as a host for other plants such as resurrection fern and wildlife. Although some vines may be detrimental, tree do not have to be bare to be healthy.
FIGURE 8. Shrubs and understory trees add to the distinctive landscape of Driftwood.
FIGURE 9. Let oaks visually anchor the landscape design. We encourage planting wind breaks to protect homes and trees. Tree groupings help to anchor other trees from coming down due to high winds.
FIGURE 10. The more variety in plant species, the better it is for the environment. It also protects you against a single pest or disease that could wipe out your landscape investment.
FIGURE 11. Consider hardy, colorful perennials for consistent blooming, and accent with annuals.
FIGURE 12. Percentage of St. Augustine and other sod should not exceed 35% of permeable landscape on the street side.
FIGURE 13. Ponds were common with the original Dodd/Parish homes, though many have been filled in. Ponds are encouraged because they are in keeping with the original design of the neighborhood but also because they provide valuable resources for wildlife.
FIGURE 14. Brick and other patios and driveways should be set in sand as opposed to mortar to allow drainage.
FIGURE 15. Both parks should be kept in a style comparable to the signature landscaping of the neighborhood: natural and unmanicured.
APPENDIX D: PROPERTY INFORMATION

CPPC Case No.: HPC 17-90300006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street No.</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Historic Use</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Architect / Builder</th>
<th>Dominant Architectural Style</th>
<th>PHN</th>
<th>Resource Classification</th>
<th>Flood Zone [Structure]</th>
<th>C/N C</th>
<th>Property Total Gross SF</th>
<th>Lot Area</th>
<th>Height [Stories]</th>
<th>Noteworthy Alterations</th>
<th>Owner 1</th>
<th>Owner 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-110</td>
<td>Main St</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>E. S. Thomas</td>
<td>Classical Revival</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E: ADDITIONAL STAFF PHOTOGRAPHS OF PROPOSED DISTRICT
APPENDIX F: MAP OF PROPOSED DISTRICT
The following page(s) contain the backup material for Agenda Item: Accepting a proposal from Perfect Settings, Inc. a sole source provider, to repair and replace water slides at City pools for the Parks & Recreation Department, at a total contract amount of $333,938.81; rescinding unencumbered appropriations in the amount of $200,000 from the Northwest Aquatic Phase II Project (16213) and $65,000 from the FY19 Swimming Pool Improvements Project (16724); approving a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $332,000 from the unappropriated balance of the Recreation and Culture Capital Improvement Fund (3029), partially resulting from the two rescissions, to the City Water Slide Improvements Project (17061); and providing an effective date. Please scroll down to view the backup material.
To: The Honorable Charlie Gerdes, Chair, and Members of City Council

Subject: Accepting a proposal from Perfect Settings, Inc. as a sole source provider, to repair and replace water slides at City pools for the Parks & Recreation Department, at a total contract amount of $333,938.81; rescinding unencumbered appropriations in the amount of $200,000 from the Northwest Aquatic Phase II Project (16213) and $65,000 from the FY19 Swimming Pool Improvements Project (16724); approving a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $332,000 from the unappropriated balance of the Recreation and Culture Capital Improvement Fund (3029), partially resulting from the two rescissions, to the City Water Slide Improvements Project (17061); and providing an effective date.

Explanation: The contractor will furnish and install four new slides at Childs Park Pool, Lake Vista Pool, Jennie Hall Pool, and North Shore Aquatic Complex. Preventative maintenance and inspections have routinely been carried out on these assets since their installation, but they have reached the end of their useful lives and need to be replaced. The contractor will also perform various maintenance and repairs for the remaining City slides to help ensure safe use and durability. These repairs include new slide flumes at Northwest Pool, a new support structure for Fossil Park Pool, fitting repairs at Walter Fuller Pool, and annual maintenance at Shore Acres and E.H. McLin Pools.

Mason Slide Corporation was the selected manufacturer of all water slides installed at City pools in 2003. Perfect Settings is the manufacturer-approved maintenance contractor and distributor for Mason Slide Cooperation, therefore a sole source procurement is recommended.

The Procurement & Supply Management Department, in cooperation with the Parks and Recreation Department, recommends:

Perfect Settings, Inc. (Columbia, TN) $333,938.81

Perfect Settings, Inc. is headquartered in Columbia, TN., employs eight people, and has been in business since 2006. They have satisfactorily provided these services to the City in the past.

This purchase is made in accordance with Section 2-249, sole source procurement of the procurement code, which authorizes City Council to approve the purchase of a supply or service of over $100,000 without competitive bidding, if it has been determined that the supply or service is available from only one source.

Cost/Funding/Assessment Information: Funding in the amount of $2,720 for the repairs and annual maintenance portion of the contract are available in the General Fund (0001), Parks and Recreation Department (190). The remaining funding will be available after the rescission of unencumbered appropriations in the amount of $200,000 from the Northwest Aquatic Phase II Project (16213) and $65,000 from the FY19 Swimming Pool Improvements Project (16724) and a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $332,000 from the unappropriated balance of the Recreation and Culture Capital Improvement Fund (3029), partially resulting from the two rescissions, to the City Water Slide Improvements Project (17061).

Attachments: Price Proposal (2 pages) Sole Source Resolution

Approvals:

[Signatures]
QUOTE

ADDRESS
Bryan M. Eichler
Anita Westmoreland
City of St Petersburg
St.Petersburg, FL 33713 USA

PROJECT
Water Slide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>902-SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61,470.00</td>
<td>61,470.00T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childs Park - Tear down and Replace the existing slide with a 902-SP. Shipping and Installation Included. Includes a 5 year Warranty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902-SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61,470.00</td>
<td>61,470.00T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Vista - Tear down and Replace the existing slide with a 902-SP. Shipping and Installation Included. Includes a 5 year Warranty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902-SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61,470.00</td>
<td>61,470.00T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennie Hall - Tear down and Replace the existing slide with a 902-SP. Shipping and Installation Included. Includes a 5 year Warranty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902-SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61,470.00</td>
<td>61,470.00T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore - Tear down and Replace the existing slide with a 902-SP. Shipping and Installation Included. Includes a 5 year Warranty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Slide:Water Slide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42,558.62</td>
<td>42,558.62T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest - Plastic Flumes are failing but Aluminum Pipe and Fittings as a whole are fine - Disassemble the Model 308 and reuse the Good Pipe and Fittings to create a 902-SP. Includes a 5 year Warranty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Slide:Water Slide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42,780.19</td>
<td>42,780.19T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossil Park - Supports are Failing but Plastic Flumes are fine - Disassemble the Model 303 and reuse the new plastic to create a 902-SP. Includes a 5 year Warranty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Slide:Repair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,480.00</td>
<td>1,480.00T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Fueller - Water slide Repair - Replace cracked Fittings, Missing Post-Padding, missing Zip-ties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Slide:Repair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>620.00</td>
<td>620.00T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore Acres - Water slide Repair - Drill holes in the center of the decks to allow water to drain. Pressure wash and inspection before opening. Includes a 5 year Warranty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Slide:Repair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>620.00</td>
<td>620.00T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.H. McLin - Water slide Repair - Drill holes in the center of the decks to allow water to drain. Pressure wash and inspection before opening. Includes a 5 year Warranty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All estimates are valid for 30 days unless otherwise specified.

*50% Deposit and Purchase Order due with signed quote.

Thank you for your consideration.

SUBTOTAL 333,938.81
TAX (0%) 0.00
TOTAL $333,938.81

Accepted By

Accepted Date
CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG
REQUEST FOR SOLE SOURCE

Department: Parks and Recreation  Requisition No. ______________

Check One  X Sole Source  ___ Proprietary Specifications

 Proposed Vendor: Perfect Settings

Estimated Total Cost: $333,938.81

Description of Items (or Services) to be purchased: Water slide replacement of 4 units that are at the end of their useful lives. Slide repair/maintenance on 5 units that includes various maintenance repairs such as fittings, padding replacement, and slide repair.

Purpose of Function of items: Replacement/Repairs/Maintenance that ensures the safety of the City's water slides located at our various aquatic locations.

Justification for Sole Source of Proprietary specification: The slides at all the City aquatic locations require very specific parts based on manufacture safety recommendations. This Contractor is the only vendor approved by the manufacturer of these slides to perform this work. Due to the specialization of this equipment and the need for this system to work in conjunction with specific existing equipment, is the purpose for this sole source request.

I hereby certify that in accordance with Section 2-232(d) of the City of St. Petersburg Purchasing Code, I have conducted a good faith review of available sources and have determined that there is only one potential source for the required items per the above justification.

Department Director

Administrator/Chief

Louis Moore, Director
Purchasing and Materials Management

Date  1-28-19

Date  1-30-19
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-

A RESOLUTION DECLARING PERFECT SETTINGS, INC. TO BE A SOLE SOURCE PROVIDER TO REPAIR AND REPLACE WATER SLIDES AT CITY POOLS; ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL AND APPROVING THE PURCHASE TO REPAIR AND REPLACE WATER SLIDES FROM PERFECT SETTING, INC. AT CITY POOLS FOR A TOTAL COST NOT TO EXCEED $333,938.81; AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR HIS DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE ALL DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THIS TRANSACTION; RESCINDING UNENCUMBERED APPROPRIATIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF $200,000 FROM THE RECREATION AND CULTURE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND (3029), NORTHWEST AQUATIC PHASE II PROJECT (16213) AND IN THE AMOUNT OF $65,000 FROM THE RECREATION AND CULTURE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND (3029), FY19 SWIMMING POOL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT (16724); APPROVING A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION IN THE AMOUNT OF $332,000 FROM THE UNAPPROPRIATED BALANCE OF THE RECREATION AND CULTURE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND (3029) TO THE CITY WATER SLIDE IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT (17061); AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City desires to repair and replace water slides at City pools; and

WHEREAS, a sole source is recommended because Perfect Settings, Inc. is the manufacturer-approved maintenance contractor and distributor for Mason Slide Corporation, who is the manufacturer of water slides installed at City pools; and

WHEREAS, Section 2-249 of the City Code provides for sole source procurement when a supply or service is available from only one source; and

WHEREAS, the Procurement & Supply Management Department in cooperation with the Parks and Recreation Department recommends approval of the award to Perfect Settings, Inc. as a sole source provider; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor or his designee has prepared a written statement to the City Council certifying the condition and circumstances for the sole source purchase.

WHEREAS, funds needed for this purchase will be available after (i) a rescission in the amount of $200,000 from the Recreation and Culture Capital Improvement Fund (3029), Northwest Aquatic Phase II Project (16213); (ii) a rescission in the amount of $65,000 from the Recreation and Culture Capital Improvement Fund (3029), FY19 swimming Pool Improvements Project (16724); and (iii) a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $332,000 from the
unappropriated balance of the Recreation and Culture Capital Improvement Fund (3029) to the
City Water Slide Improvements Project (17061).

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St.
Petersburg, Florida, that Perfect Settings, Inc. is declared a sole source supplier to repair and
replace water slides at City pools.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the proposal is accepted and the purchase to
repair and replace water slides Perfect Settings, Inc. at City pools for a total cost not to exceed
$333,938.81 is hereby approved.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor or his designee is hereby
authorized to execute all documents necessary to effectuate this transaction.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the appropriation in the amount of $200,000
in the Recreation and Culture Capital Fund (3029), Northwest Aquatic Phase II Project (16213)
is hereby rescinded.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the appropriation in the amount of $65,000 in
the Recreation and Culture Capital Fund (3029), Swimming Pool Improvements Project (16724)
is hereby rescinded.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that there is hereby approved from the
unappropriated balance of the Recreation and Culture Capital Improvement Fund (3029) the
following supplemental appropriation for FY 19:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation and Culture Capital Improvement Fund (3029)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Water Slide Improvements Project (17061)</td>
<td>$332,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

Legal:

City Attorney (Designee)  
00430855

[Signature]

Budget
The following page(s) contain the backup material for Agenda Item: Approving the purchase of two transport vans from Alan Jay Ford Lincoln Mercury for the Police Department, at a total cost of $99,933.46.
Please scroll down to view the backup material.
To: The Honorable Charlie Gerdes, Chair, and Members of City Council

Subject: Approving the purchase of two transport vans from Alan Jay Ford Lincoln Mercury for the Police Department, at a total cost of $99,933.46.

Explanation: This purchase is being made from the National Joint Powers Alliance Contract No. 120716-NAF.

The vendor will furnish and deliver two (2) 2019 Ford Transit Cargo T-350 low roof vans equipped with side and rear swing-out doors.

The two vans are the preferred alternative chosen from the Chevrolet Express 3500 vans that had a 6.6 liter V8 diesel engine. The new vans will have a 3.7 liter V6 gas engine, which is the smallest most fuel efficient engine available in this series van.

The new vehicles are replacing units that are nine years old and have reached the end of their economic, useful life. The new vans with a life expectancy of seven years will be used to transport prisoners. The old vehicles will be sold at public auction.

The Procurement and Supply Management Department, in cooperation with the Fleet Management Department, recommends an award utilizing the National Joint Powers Alliance Contract No. 120716-NAF.

Alan Jay Ford Lincoln Mercury (Sebring FL) ................................................................. $99,933.45

2019 Ford Transit Cargo T-350 Van 2 EA @ $49,966.73 $99,933.45

The vendor has met the specifications, terms and conditions of the National Joint Powers Alliance Contract No. 120716-NAF, effective through January 17, 2021. This purchase is made in accordance with Section 2-256 (2) of the Procurement Code, which authorizes the Mayor, or his designee, to piggyback off contracts competitively bid by other governmental entities or a consortium.

Cost/Funding/Assessment Information: Funds have been previously appropriated in the Equipment Replacement Fund (5002), Fleet Management Department, Fleet Mechanical Costs Division (800-2527).

Attachments: Resolution

Approvals:

[Signature]   Administrative

[Signature]   Budget
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-____

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE PURCHASE OF (2) TWO TRANSPORT VANS FROM ALAN JAY FORD LINCOLN MERCURY, INC. FOR THE POLICE DEPARTMENT AT A TOTAL COST NOT TO EXCEED $99,933.46 UTILIZING THE NATIONAL JOINT POWERS ALLIANCE CONTRACT NO. 120716-NAF; AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR HIS DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE ALL DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THIS TRANSACTION; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City desires to purchase 2 transport vans to replace vehicles that have reached the end of their economic useful life for the Police Department; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 2-256(2) of the Procurement Code, the City is permitted to utilize competitively bid contracts of other governmental agencies; and

WHEREAS, Alan Jay Ford Lincoln Mercury, Inc. has met the specifications, terms and conditions of the National Joint Powers Alliance Contract No. 120716-NAF; and

WHEREAS, the Procurement & Supply Management Department, in cooperation with the Fleet Management Department, recommends approval of this resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida that the purchase of (2) two transport vans from Alan Jay Ford Lincoln Mercury, Inc. for the Police Department at a total cost not to exceed $99,933.46 utilizing the National Joint Powers Alliance Contract No. 120716-NAF is hereby approved.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor or his designee is authorized to execute all documents necessary to effectuate this transaction.

This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

Approved as to Form and Substance:

[Signature]

City Attorney (Designee)

00391047
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To: Honorable Charlie Gerdes, Chair, and Members of City Council

Subject: Approving a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $16,964 from the unappropriated balance of the Supply Management Fund to the Procurement & Supply Management Department, for HVAC system replacement at the City's Consolidated Warehouse, and providing an effective date.

Explanation: On June 15, 2017, City Council approved a blanket purchase agreement with Air Mechanical and Services Corp. to provide HVAC maintenance, repairs, and services for the Parks and Recreation Department, Police Department, the Libraries, Leisure Services Administration, various Water Resources Department locations, and other City departments as needed. The agreement is effective through 2023, and is limited to purchases made within the budgeted amount for these products and services for the fiscal year.

These funds will provide for installation of a complete HVAC system to include a 7.5 ton Trane split-system, thermostat, and all associated ductwork and wiring in the Consolidated Warehouse's main building office space. The original system is 13 years old and has exceeded its useful service life.

The Procurement and Supply Management Department, recommends for approval:

Air Mechanical & Service Corp.............$16,964

Cost/Funding/Assessment Information: Funds will be available after approval of a supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $16,964, from the unappropriated balance of the Supply Management Fund (5031) to the Procurement and Supply Management Department, Supply Management Division (0601053).

Attachments: Resolution

Approvals:

[Signatures]  [Signatures]  [Signatures]

Administrative  Budget
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-

A RESOLUTION APPROVING A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION IN THE AMOUNT OF $16,964 FROM THE UNAPPROPRIATED BALANCE OF THE SUPPLY MANAGEMENT FUND (5031) TO THE SUPPLY MANAGEMENT DIVISION (060-1053), TO PROVIDE FUNDING FOR THE HVAC SYSTEM REPLACEMENT AT THE CONSOLIDATED WAREHOUSE; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City of St. Petersburg, Florida ("City") and Air Mechanical and Services Corp. ("Air Mechanical") entered into a three-year agreement ("Agreement") on June 1, 2017 for Air Mechanical to provide as needed HVAC maintenance, repairs and services for various City Departments; and

WHEREAS, the City desires to replace the HVAC system at the Consolidated Warehouse ("Project") which has exceeded its useful service life; and

WHEREAS, since the Project was not budgeted for FY19, funding will require a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $16,964 from the unappropriated balance of the Supply Management Fund (5031) to the Supply Management Division (060-1053); and

WHEREAS, Administration recommends approval of this resolution.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida, that there is hereby approved the following supplemental appropriation from the unappropriated balance of the Supply Management Fund (5031) to the Supply Management Division (060-1053) to provide funding for the HVAC system replacement at the Consolidated Warehouse:

Supply Management Fund (5031)
Supply Management Division (060-1053) $16,964

This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

Legal:

City Attorney (designee)

Budget Director