Welcome to the City of St. Petersburg City Council Committee of the Whole. The agenda and supporting documents are available on the City’s website at www.st.pete.org/meetings or by emailing city.clerk@stpete.org.

NOTE: City buildings are closed to the public due to the COVID-19 emergency. Accordingly, the meeting location has been changed from in-person at the Sunshine Center to a “virtual” meeting by means of communications media technology pursuant to Executive Order Number 20-69, issued by the Governor on March 20, 2020, and Executive Order 2020-30 issued by the Mayor on July 8, 2020.

The public can attend the meeting in the following ways:

- Watch live on Channel 15 WOW!/Channel 641 Spectrum/Channel 20 Frontier FiOS
- Watch live online at WWW.stpete.org/TV
- Watch/listen on your computer, mobile phone, or other device by visiting the following link: https://zoom.us/j/94183916547
- Listen by dialing any one of the following phone numbers and entering ID Number: 941 8391 6547#
  
+1 312-626-6799  
+1 646-876-9923  
+1 669-900-6833  
+1 152-215-8782  
+1 301-715-8592  
+1 346-248-7799
City of St. Petersburg
Committee of the Whole Agenda
July 30, 2020 at 2:30 PM

Members: Chair Ed Montanari, Vice-Chair Gina Driscoll, and Councilmembers Brandi Gabbard, Darden Rice, Robert Blackmon, Lisa Wheeler-Bowman, Amy Foster, and Deborah Figgs-Sanders

Support Staff: Kayleigh Sagonowsky, City Council Legislative Aide

A. Call to Order and Roll Call
B. Approval of Agenda
C. Approval of the May 28, 2020 Minutes
D. New Business
   a. Coastal High Hazard Area
      i. Elizabeth Abernethy, Planning and Development Director
   b. FY21 Budget
      i. Elizabeth Makofske, Budget Director
E. Adjourn

Attachments:
● May 28, 2020 COW Minutes
● COW Referral List
● New Business Item Support Material
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Return Date and Time</th>
<th>Referral/ Prior Dates</th>
<th>Referred By</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FY21 Budget</td>
<td>7/30/20 at 2:30 PM</td>
<td>5/5/20 COW</td>
<td>Montanari</td>
<td>Makofske</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coastal High Hazard Area</td>
<td>7/30/20 at 2:30 PM</td>
<td>6/11/20</td>
<td>Abernethy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulled from 6/11/20 agenda and referred to a C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Design change re-evaluation for I-275 from south of 54th Ave. S. to north of 4th St. N.</td>
<td>8/27/20 at 2:30 PM</td>
<td>11/7/19 CC</td>
<td>Montanari</td>
<td>Mory FDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SPHA Annual Reports</td>
<td>8/27/20 at 2:30 PM</td>
<td>1/23/20</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>SPHA</td>
<td>Tentative Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Annual Meeting of Council and SPHA Board</td>
<td>8/27/20 at 2:30 PM</td>
<td>1/31/19</td>
<td>Gerdes</td>
<td>SPHA</td>
<td>Tentative Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>City Initiated Historic Designation</td>
<td>9/24/20 at 2:30 PM</td>
<td>12/5/19</td>
<td>Gerdes</td>
<td>Abernethy Kilborn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Continued Discussion of the Potentially Eligible List</td>
<td>9/24/20 at 2:30 PM</td>
<td>8/8/19 5/16/19</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>Abernethy Kilborn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Residential LDR Updates</td>
<td>10/22/20 at 2:30 PM</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Abernethy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vision 2050</td>
<td>10/22/20 at 2:30 PM</td>
<td>12/17/19</td>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>Abernethy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2021 Calendar Setting</td>
<td>12/10/20 at 1:30</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td>Selection of Chair and Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FY22 Budget Priorities</td>
<td>1/21/21 at 10:00 AM</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Makofske</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated Water Resources Master Plan</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1/23/20</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>Tankersley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Business, Housing, and Grocery Co-Ops</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1/10/19 BFT 1/17/19 CC 8/1/19 CC</td>
<td>Gabbard</td>
<td>Driscoll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At BFT, CM Driscoll referred business co-ops to a COW. During the BFT report, CM Gabbard asked to add housing co-ops. On 8/1/19 Gabbard asked to add grocery co-ops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Commerce Park/Deuces Rising Update</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>Montanari</td>
<td>DeLisle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requested during the 12/12/19 COW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>FY22 Operating Budget</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Makofske</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Present: Chair Ed Montanari, Vice-Chair Gina Driscoll, and Councilmembers Darden Rice, Amy Foster, Deborah Figgs-Sanders, Robert Blackmon, Lisa Wheeler-Bowman, and Brandi Gabbard

Also Present: Deputy Mayor Tomalin, Jackie Kovilaritch, Jeannine Williams, Tom Green, Kevin King, Leah McCrea, Susie Ajoc, Rev. Ken Irby, and Sharon Wright

Absent: None

Support Staff: Kayleigh Sagonowsky, City Council Legislative Aide

New Business:

**Pinellas CARES Update - Daisy Rodriguez, Pinellas County Human Services Director**

Daisy Rodriguez thanked the committee for the opportunity to update them on the Pinellas CARES program that offers one-time assistance for overdue rent, mortgage, and utility payments. She said so far 1,307 people have submitted all of the required documentation and are in the final stages of processing. Collectively, they will receive about $1.5 million. There are another 900 applicants that have partially completed applications that will need to submit additional documentation. Ms. Rodriguez said the Board of County Commissioners voted earlier that day to extend the program deadline to June 30th. Additionally, a committee has been formed to explore a potential second phase of the program.

Councilmember Foster expressed her gratitude for the county’s work and said she knows it's difficult to “build the car as you drive.” However, Foster said she has heard a number of program complaints in the community. For example, many people haven't heard back about their application yet and found it frustrating to gather all necessary documentation and submit it in the correct formats. Ms. Rodriguez encouraged applicants to submit all required documents in one email. But Foster said many people don't have access to a scanner and sometimes the files are too large to send together. Ms. Rodriguez said her staff are looking for ways to reduce these barriers as much as possible.

Councilmember Gabbard emphasized the need of home based businesses and said she’d like to see eligibility criteria expanded to include them. Ms. Rodriguez said this is being discussed as part of the second round.

Chair Montanari asked how much funding the county received from the federal government. Ms. Rodriguez said they were given $170 million to operate both the individual and small business assistance programs. The county commission chose to allocate approximately $35 million of the federal funding for the small business program. She said Mike Meidel, the Director of Pinellas County Economic Development would be able to provide a breakdown of how much the business program has spent.

Ms. Rodriguez said the commission chose not to put a cap on the amount of funding to be used for individual assistance. So far, only $365,000 has been paid out through the individual program, but if all pending applications are approved, another $1.5 million will be distributed. Chair Montanari also asked about the marketing of the program and said he was surprised that more people had not applied. Ms. Rodriguez said the
county has been using a lot of social media campaigns to target applicants and also has workgroups developing more specific outreach strategies.

**COVID-19 Equity Considerations - Sharon Wright, Sustainability Manager**

Sustainability Manager Sharon Wright framed her presentation around questions raised by Councilmembers in the last COVID-19 update. First, she discussed outreach to underrepresented communities and explained what the city is doing to ensure they have access to information and resources like the Fighting Chance Fund. Next, Ms. Wright addressed health education and distribution of face masks. The Urban Affairs department conducted a virtual mask making tutorial and passed out “COVID kits” at food distribution sites. She said the Greenhouse is also working to obtain private donations for masks for small businesses.

Ms. Wright then presented a variety of outreach and communication initiatives taking place. She said the city has an internal CARES workgroup that is compiling a book of resources, in addition to the toolkits already online at restartstpete.org. Communication has been taking place since day one through email blasts, newsletters, social media, print ads, and postcards mailed to homes. Finally, Ms. Wright discussed conducting outreach through churches. Reverend Irby said he has daily dialogue with local faith leaders. They’ve worked together to distribute resources to those in need and have even hosted multiple pop-up testing sites.

Councilmember Driscoll suggested the city utilize advertising opportunities available through PSTA. Councilmember Figgs-Sanders added that councilmembers have also been hard at work communicating with their constituents via Zoom and their district newsletters. Councilmember Foster said the city plays an important role in guiding businesses through reopening and noted businesses she’s spoken with tell her they need masks, not branded coffee sleeves.

Susie Ajoc was asked to explain ongoing outreach to neighborhood associations. She said they have been sending out information to all of their contact lists and have noticed many of them sharing the information further. She also highlighted a few neighborhoods who have conducted virtual meetings and encouraged safe and responsible community gatherings.

Councilmember Foster asked for an update on council’s return to City Hall and asked what social distancing practices would be implemented. Deputy Mayor Tomalin reminded councilmembers of the current plan to resume in person meetings on July 9, 2020. However, as long as Council remains in compliance with Governor DeSantis’ Executive Orders, she said administration does not have a preference on when they return. Like all other departments, City Council is being asked to determine specific guidelines for themselves and the administration will approve of their plans. Deputy Mayor Tomalin said the administration will update council as return to work plans solidify for other departments, however, she doesn’t expect to have anything finalized before June 17, 2020.

Vice Chair Driscoll explained Tampa City Council is resuming their meetings at the Tampa Convention Center in order to accommodate CDC guidelines. Deputy Mayor Tomalin said because of the requirement to live stream meetings, going to another site would be a significant undertaking.

Councilmember Gabbard said she would like to get serious about a mask mandate in City Hall and asked the legal department if it would be feasible. City Attorney Jackie Kovilaritch said her team is currently researching this and similar questions about returning to work and would have more information soon. She reminded councilmembers that specific guidance on virtual meetings will have to come from the governor’s office.

Gabbard asked marketing to develop a publicity campaign to accompany a potential mask mandate and suggested social media profile photos, frames, and hashtags to encourage mask wearing. Councilmember Blackmon asked if the city would be responsible for supplying masks to residents if they were required to enter
City Hall. Ms. Kovilaritch said the legal department is researching this and will be able to advise them over the course of the next few weeks.

Councilmember Rice echoed Gabbard’s concerns and said she supports a mask requirement and a basic screening process before entering the building. She also suggested exploring other preventative measures, such as temperature checks. Councilmember Foster said safe and sustainable practices for childcare and communal meals also need to be established before the city can ask staff, elected officials, and members of the public to return to in person meetings.

Councilmembers discussed the need for another COVID update and other pending topics and agreed to discuss the FY21 budget at the July 30th Committee of the Whole meeting.
Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA)
Frequently Asked Questions

BACKGROUND

To reduce loss of life and property caused by natural disasters, the State of Florida requires local governments to identify a Coastal High Hazard Area (“CHHA”) in which public expenditures and population growth are limited. The CHHA is defined as “the area below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake, and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (SLOSH) computerized storm surge model.” While the CHHA has existed since 1985, the definition and applicable standards have changed several times, starting in 2006, 2010, and most recently 2016. Figure 1 CHHA map shows the 2010 area in yellow and the 2016 area in red. The CHHA land area more than doubled from 7,705 acres in 2010 to 16,328 acres in 2016, an increase of approximately 112-percent now constituting 41-percent of the City’s total land area. Many of our economic centers that initially developed outside of the CHHA, are now included as a result of the 2016 changes, thereby limiting redevelopment opportunities.

Areas included in the CHHA are governed by state law, Pinellas County regulations as well as City of St. Pete policies adopted in our comprehensive plan. The City of St. Petersburg’s Comprehensive Plan (“Plan”) is the regulatory document which outlines the community vision through numerous goals, objectives, and policies. Generally, the Plan establishes the maximum number of residential dwelling units allowed to be built on private property through the assignment of map categories and provides guidelines and procedures for property owners to seek map amendments. The current policy prohibits approval of any map amendment resulting in an increase to the maximum number of residential dwelling units allowed within the CHHA. Pinellas County rules are more flexible and allow map amendment request to be considered using a set of balancing criteria. The proposed text amendments, if approved, will allow City Council to consider map amendment requests, subject to five (5) mandatory review criteria and a balancing of seven (7) additional criteria.

In concert with this proposed comprehensive plan policy change, additional code requirements are recommended for all multi-family and hotel developments within the CHHA regardless of whether a map amendment is included or not. Specifically, proposed amendments to the City’s Land Development Regulations (“LDRs”) and Building Code will require Hurricane Evacuation and Re-entry Plans for all new multi-family and hotel developments. The proposed amendments will require stricter building design and construction standards for multi-family developments. These design standards are intended to result in structures that are more resilient to storm surge, wind and sea level rise, mitigate for service and infrastructure needs throughout a major storm event, and enable safe re-occupation as quickly as possible following an evacuation.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (FAQ)

1. What is the goal of these amendments?
   • Increase safety by establishing stronger building design standards throughout the CHHA, for those areas at highest risk in our City, which will result in buildings that are safer by increasing the height and strength, encouraging replacement of vulnerable structures and by requiring Hurricane Evacuation and Re-entry Plans for all new multi-family and hotel developments
   • Allow targeted increases in development in 30% of the CHHA while continuing to prohibit any changes in the remaining 70%
   • Create a more equitable and sustainable development field, expanding redevelopment opportunities and reducing redevelopment pressure in the remaining 60% of the City
   • Promote sustainability and resiliency goals by mandating use of existing infrastructure and previously developed land, requiring elevated design standards for all new projects and supporting multi-modal transit goals
   • Remove conflicts with other City goals and initiatives such as replacement of obsolescent commercial buildings along our multi-modal corridors
2. **Does the proposed amendment increase density in the CHHA?**
No. The proposed text amendments do not by themselves immediately increase allowable density within the CHHA. Rather, the proposed text amendments would allow the oversight commission and council to consider a future map amendment request within the CHHA that increases the maximum allowable residential density. The map amendment process is a lengthy multi-stage process with multiple public hearings and includes a rigorous analysis by staff, the Community Planning and Preservation Commission, and City Council to determine whether the request is appropriate and in compliance with the proposed review criteria. This would not create an automatic approval of increased or allowable density.

3. **How do these amendments address public safety concerns related to people living in the CHHA?**
All new multi-family and hotel projects in the CHHA will be required to provide a Hurricane Evacuation and Re-entry Plan requiring mandatory evacuation in accordance with Emergency Management directives. All new multi-family projects will be required to follow stricter building design and construction standards in excess of the minimum requirements to reduce risk of flooding and to withstand higher winds. Because the proposed amendments would allow applications for redevelopment that increase the number of allowable residential dwelling units to be rebuilt on a property, the amendments may encourage removal of substandard structures, such as mobile homes. Assisted Living Facilities will now be prohibited in the CHHA.

4. **Do the proposed amendments incentivize development in the CHHA?**
No. Other than allowing property owners to request and be considered for a map amendment within the CHHA, no incentives or rewards are being offered for redevelopment within the CHHA. Moreover, stricter building design and construction standards within the CHHA, regardless of whether a map amendment is requested, will add 7-11% to the cost of construction for all new multi-family projects and will require a Hurricane Evacuation and Recovery plan. Increasing costs and development requirements would not typically be considered as an incentive to development.

5. **Can multi-family projects be built in the CHHA now?**
Yes. Multi-family projects can be developed on parcels at a maximum allowable density designated by the existing Future Land Use Map category. Allowable densities generally range from 7.5 to 15 dwelling units per acre, with certain exceptions when located along Corridors and within existing Activity Centers. Lower densities are making it increasingly difficult to recruit new investment through the private sector or secure federal grants for public transportation improvements within the City’s Corridors and Centers, both of which increasingly look for a minimum allowable density of 30 dwelling units per acre.

6. **Will the new, stricter building design and construction standards apply to all new multi-family projects?**
Yes. As currently proposed, these stricter building design and construction standards will apply to all new residential multi-family development within the CHHA, regardless of whether or not an increase in density was requested through a map amendment. Please note that should an increase in density be requested through a map amendment, stricter building design and construction standards greater than those proposed for development not requesting a map amendment will be required.

7. **Where do we encourage growth in our City?**
The City of St. Petersburg’s Comprehensive Plan establishes a framework of Neighborhoods, Corridors, and Centers. Generally, Corridors (e.g. Central Avenue, 34th Street) and Centers (e.g. Downtown Center, Gateway District, and Skyway Marina District) are identified for the most intensive development due to the location of public transportation, existing utilities, and other supportive infrastructure.

8. **Why is this being considered now and how was stakeholder feedback incorporated?**
Following updates to the CHHA boundary in 2016, consideration of these proposed amendments began immediately afterwards with presentations to City Council in early 2018. Originally proposed to mirror existing language in the Countywide Plan Rules, early feedback from City Council elevated expectations, resulted in nearly two (2) years of stakeholder engagement and feedback, and this final recommendation which includes five (5) mandatory review
The requirements evolved over the multi-year review to reflect feedback provided by City Council, stakeholders as well as the ULI Technical Advisory Committee.

9. What are the review criteria for applications to change density?

The criteria are listed in the table below. Five (5) criteria are mandatory and must be met for any application to change density in the CHHA. The seven other review criteria must be taken into consideration and balanced on a case-by-case basis for each application requesting a change. The proposed text amendments include three (3) additional criteria that are not included in the Countywide Plan Rules, which have been included because of their unique importance to the City of St. Petersburg. The State of Florida has only one statutory requirement that applies to changes in density for all jurisdictions in the State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>City Criteria</th>
<th>Countywide Criteria</th>
<th>Statewide Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Emergency Shelter Space &amp; Evacuation Routes</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of Existing and Planned Infrastructure</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of Existing Disturbed Areas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location within an Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or Multi-modal Corridor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implements the Goals and Policies of the Integrated Sustainability Action Plan (ISAP), Complete Streets and Health in All Policies (HIAP)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Scenic Qualities and Improvement of Public Access to Water</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Dependent Use</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Community Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Reduction of Density or Intensity</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering of Uses</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral Part of Comprehensive Planning Process</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of Storm Vulnerable Structures</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: M = Mandatory Criteria; B = Balancing Criteria (considered and weighted on a case-by-case basis)

10. What are the five mandatory review criteria?

- **Access to Emergency Shelter Space & Evacuation Routes** – This criterion is a requirement of the State of Florida, based on Florida Statutes 163.3178 which requires that appropriate mitigation be provided for shelter space and transportation facilities when maximum hurricane evacuation times and minimum shelter space cannot be provided in a County. Pinellas County does not currently meet the statewide requirements, and any applications for changes in density must demonstrate how mitigation for their impacts will be provided.

- **Utilization of Existing and Planned infrastructure** – This criterion will require utilization of existing infrastructure, as opposed to requiring the expenditure of public funds for the construction of new, unplanned infrastructure with the potential to be damaged by coastal storms.

- **Utilization of Existing Disturbed Areas** – This criterion will require utilization of existing disturbed areas as opposed to natural areas that buffer existing development from coastal storms.

- **Location within an Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or Multi-modal Corridor** – This criterion will require location within an existing or proposed Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or within a Multi-modal Corridor or within one quarter mile of the corridor as designated on the Countywide Plan Map. These areas are targeted for higher density and intensity development based on other goals and policies such as creating employment centers and supporting multi-modal transit.

- **Implements the Goals and Policies of the Integrated Sustainability Action Plan (ISAP), Complete Streets and Health in All Policies (HIAP)** – This criterion requires that design elements and programs which further the sustainability and resiliency goals and policies of the ISAP, Complete Streets and HIAP be included in future development. The proposed companion amendment to the Land Development Regulations adding the CHHA design standards implements this policy, requiring that any project containing dwelling units resulting from a density increase must provide additional items, one for every 50 additional units.
11. **When will a Hurricane Evacuation and Re-entry Plan be required?**
All new multi-family and hotel projects will be required to prepare a Hurricane Evacuation and Re-entry Plan for review and approval by City Emergency Management staff. The plan must require mandatory evacuation in accordance with Emergency Management Directives and include operating procedures for how the project will handle loss of off-site or grid power, transition to a backup source of power (if available), and transition back to normal operation. Requirements must be incorporated into a legally binding document such as lease documents, condominium rules, homeowner rules.

12. **Will all areas of the CHHA qualify?**
No. Requests for map amendments that increase the maximum allowable residential density are to only those locations that are within an Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan, or Multi-Modal Corridor; together, these areas constitute approximately 30-percent of the overall CHHA. Qualified properties are identified on Figure 2 of the attached.

13. **Was Sea Level Rise considered?**
Yes, the 2-foot increase in structure elevation is intended to address NOAA’s mid-range projected sea level rise for 50-years in the future, which projects approximately 2-feet of additional elevation.

14. **How does this relate to the City’s Sustainability and Resiliency goals and policies?**
All new multi-family construction within the CHHA is required to comply with stricter building design and construction standards. The new standards are based on the City of St. Petersburg’s Integrated Sustainability Action Plan (ISAP).

15. **How will this affect single-family properties and neighborhoods?**
The proposed amendments generally do not apply to new single-family houses and do not affect single-family neighborhoods. Most properties inside established neighborhoods will not meet the mandatory locational requirements to qualify for any map amendment that increases the maximum allowable density. Qualified properties are identified on Figure 2 of the attached.

16. **How will this affect redevelopment outside the CHHA?**
StPete2050 projections show a need for the creation over 1,000 new units per year over the next 50 years to accommodate St. Petersburg’s projected growth. If approved, the proposed amendments do not regulate or constrain redevelopment opportunities outside of the CHHA. If denied, redevelopment pressure will be consolidated into the non-CHHA areas of the City. This increased pressure might have inflationary effects on land and construction costs, rent rates, and fee-simple sale prices. Further, there may be negative social impacts including gentrification resulting from redevelopment within established neighborhoods surrounding the downtown center and within close proximity to the pending Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit line.

Alternatively, the requirement for stricter building design and construction standards within the CHHA, regardless of whether a map amendment is requested, will increase construction costs within the CHHA and may influence multi-family developments to locate elsewhere. Since demand will continue to exceed the redevelopment capacity of qualified properties within the CHHA, non-CHHA areas will continue to benefit from new investments.

17. **How does this affect affordability?**
Increasing the areas where housing can be built will increase housing availability, and in turn decrease pressure on inland areas to accommodate the projected growth. The increase in building costs may result in less affordable units in the CHHA, while encouraging redevelopment of more affordable units in areas targeted for growth outside of the CHHA.

18. **Where can I learn more about the research the City has done on the Coastal High Hazard Area?**
Contact: Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division: 727-551-3542; Britton.Wilson@stpete.org
Figure 1. Coastal High Hazard Areas - 2010 and 2016
Figure 2. Qualifying Areas within the Coastal High Hazard Areas
Comprehensive Plan
Text Amendment:
Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA)

CITY COUNCIL
C.O.W.

JULY 30, 2020
Definitions: CHHA, Evac Zone, SFHA

**COASTAL HIGH HAZARD AREA (CHHA) F.S. 163.3178**

Area below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (“SLOSH”) computerized storm surge model. (Required in Comp Plan)

**HURRICANE EVACUATION ZONES**

Hurricane evacuation zones (A to E) reflect storm surge vulnerability and the appropriate evacuation level for Category 1 to 5 storm (hurricane) events.

**SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREAS (SFHA)**

Previously known as the 100-year flood plain. Areas are identified on FEMA’s Flood Insurance Rate Map. Designations include the V-Zone and A- or AE Zone
2010 CHHA Acreage

7,705 Acres
2016 CHHA Acreage

2010: 7,702
2016: 8,623
16,325 Acres
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Requests for residential density increases within the Coastal High Hazard Zone shall not be approved.
1. Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment – 1st & 1st Public Hearing, 2nd PH 08/20
   - Introduce evaluation criteria, consistent with the Countywide Rules, with a few additional criteria specific to the city
2. Land Development Regulations Text Amendment – 1st Reading, PH 08/20
   - Multi-family design standards in the CHHA to address wind, storm surge, sea level rise, while mitigating service and infrastructure needs during and after a storm event, and enable quick and safe re-occupation after evacuation.
   - Two foot increase building elevation (reduce risk for water)
   - Building constructed to a higher wind load (reduce wind risk)
Planning and Zoning Framework

State:
Florida Statutes Ch. 163

County:
Countywide Plan Rules
Countywide Plan Map

City:
Comprehensive Plan
Official Zoning Map & Future Land Use Map

City:
LDRs
A proposed comprehensive plan amendment shall be found in compliance with state coastal high-hazard provisions if:

a. The adopted level of service (16 hours) for out-of-county hurricane evacuation is maintained for a category 5 storm; or

b. A 12-hour evacuation time to shelter is maintained for a category 5 storm event and shelter space is available; or

c. Appropriate mitigation is provided that will satisfy subparagraph 1 or subparagraph 2. **Appropriate mitigation shall include, without limitation, payment of money, contribution of land, and construction of hurricane shelters and transportation facilities.**
Balancing Review Criteria – Countywide Rules

A. Access to Emergency Shelter Space & Evacuation Routes
B. Utilization of Existing and Planned Infrastructure
C. Utilization of Existing Disturbed Area
D. Maintenance of Scenic Qualities / Improve Public Access
E. Water Dependent Uses
F. Part of Community Redevelopment Area
G. Overall Reduction of Density or Intensity
H. Clustering of Uses
I. Integral Part of Comprehensive Planning Process
Balancing Review Criteria - addition

A. Access to Emergency Shelter Space & Evacuation Routes
B. **Utilization of Existing and Planned Infrastructure**
C. **Utilization of Existing Disturbed Area**
D. Maintenance of Scenic Qualities / Improve Public Access
E. Water Dependent Uses
F. Part of Community Redevelopment Area
G. Overall Reduction of Density or Intensity
H. Clustering of Uses
I. Integral Part of Comprehensive Planning Process
J. **Location within an Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or Multi-modal Corridor**
K. **Implement Specific ISAP or Priority Sustainability Actions (to be listed specifically and related to innovation, natural system and realizing resilience)**
L. Reduction of Storm Vulnerable Population / Structures
Balancing Review Criteria – Mandated Minimum Criteria

B. Utilization of Existing and Planned infrastructure – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing infrastructure, as opposed to requiring the expenditure of public funds for the construction of new, unplanned infrastructure with the potential to be damaged by coastal storms.

C. Utilization of Existing Disturbed Areas – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing disturbed areas as opposed to natural areas that buffer existing development for coastal storms.

J. Location within an Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or Multi-modal Corridor – The requested amendment is within an existing or proposed Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or within a Multi-modal Corridor or within one quarter mile of the corridor as designated on the Countywide Plan Map.

K. Implements the Goals and Policies of the Integrated Sustainability Action Plan (ISAP), Complete Streets and Health in All Policies (HIAP) – The requested amendment incorporates design elements and programs which further the sustainability and resiliency goals and policies of the ISAP, Complete Streets and HIAP.
Criteria J. Qualifying Areas
1. Pre-application meeting with the City and Forward Pinellas staff

2. Applicant submits an intent to file with neighborhood and business associations and may hold a stakeholder outreach meeting

3. **Community Planning and Preservation Commission (CPPC) Public Hearing**

4. **City Council Public Hearing**

5. If over 10 acres, proposal is transmitted to the State Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) and other reviewing agencies for comment

6. **City Council Public Hearing 2\(^{nd}\) Public Hearing for consideration of adoption**

7. The Countywide Planning Advisory Committee review and recommendation

8. **Forward Pinellas Public Hearing for review and Recommendation**

9. **Countywide Planning Authority (CPA) Public Hearing for consideration of adoption**
### CHHA Amendment History:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>Innovation District Visioning Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>2016 CHHA Map update issued by FDEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>Innovation District Streetscape &amp; Connectivity Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2017</td>
<td>Comp Plan public hearing: amend CHHA policy deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>Comp Plan public hearing: amend CHHA policy, canceled (Hurricane Irma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>Comp Plan public hearing: amend CHHA policy APPROVED by LPA 4 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2018</td>
<td>Comp Plan public hearing: amend CHHA policy, deferred by Council (Hurricane Michael)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>Council Committee of the Whole to discuss CHHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>ULI Tampa grant process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Innovation District (minus CHHA parcels) approved by Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>Stakeholder Workshop: Main Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>Council Committee of the Whole to discuss CHHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>Stakeholder Workshop: Main Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>Council Committee of the Whole to discuss CHHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>Workshops: CPPC and DRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 10, 2019</td>
<td>Community Planning and Preservation Commission (CPPC) Public Hearing on LGCP-2019-03, Comprehensive Plan amendment, 5 to 2 vote for finding of inconsistency, recommending denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
<td>Development Review Commission (DRC) Public Hearing on LDR-2020-01, unanimous recommendation of approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2018 Hurricane Michael: Mexico Beach
Habitat Strong (FORTIFIED) Homes
“Salt Meadow” Multi-family Complex
Post Super-Storm Sandy in Queens NY
1. Prepare Hurricane Evacuation and Re-entry Plan - LDR
2. Reduce Risk for Water: elevate an additional 2-feet above the required design flood elevation, for a total of 4-feet above Base Flood Elevation (addresses both Sea Level Rise and Storm Surge) – Building Code
3. Reduce Risk for Wind: construct the building to meet design requirements of next higher classification of Risk Category, e.g. increase from 145 to 155 mph, building risk category 2 to 3 – Building Code
4. Enhance Recovery: through selection of a Resiliency option: such as provision of on-site storage of solar generated power, increased efficiency HVAC systems, or providing solar or tank-less water heating systems - LDR
   Projects up to 199 units select one option, projects over 200 units select two.
5. Hurricane Evacuation Shelter: Projects which increase density must mitigate - LDR
Relative Sea Level Change Projections -
Gauge 8726520, St. Petersburg, FL

RSLC in feet (LML)

Year

2000 2010 2020 2030 2040 2050 2060 2070 2080 2090 2100

NOAA Int. Low  NOAA Intermediate  NOAA High

2.0’  4.0’  8.5’
Recommendation

APPROVAL to transmit the Comprehensive Plan text amendment to the State and set the 2\textsuperscript{nd} reading and adoption public hearing for August 20, 2020.
18,490 Pre-FIRM Structures
# Mobile Home Parks in the CHHA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mobile Homes Within Flood Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pinewood Co-Op Inc (Unrec)</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lamplight Village</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Village Green Park Ltd</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hollywood Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mobel Americana</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Venetian Mobile Home PK</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Romany Park</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Treasure Village Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Blackwood’s Sub</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lakeshore Mobile Home</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wilder’s Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Silver Lake Mobile Resort</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,362 2,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Categories Within CHHA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLUM Category</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preservation (P)</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>25.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Urban (RU)</td>
<td>3,213</td>
<td>23.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>10.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Medium (RM)</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>10.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Open Space (R/OS)</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Low (RL)</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Limited (IL)</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Redevelopment-Mixed Use (PR-MU)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Redevelopment-Residential (PR-R)</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional (I)</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Utility (T/U)</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Redevelopment-Commercial (PR-C)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential/Office General (R/OG)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Redevelopment District (CRD)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential High (RH)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Business District (CBD)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial General (CG)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Low Medium (RLM)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13,841</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The land boundary for the CHHA is estimated to be 16,328 acres, including right-of-way.
Multi-modal Corridor
¼ Mile Buffer
Criteria J. Qualifying Areas

1/4 Mile Buffer around Multimodal Corridors, Activity Centers, Target Employment Centers and Special Area Plan Categories within the CHHA

Gulf of Mexico
Boca Ciega Bay
Tampa Bay

Multimodal Corridor (Countywide Plan Map)
1/4 Mile Buffer from Multimodal Corridors
Target Employment Centers
Activity Centers
Special Area Plan Categories
Coastal High Hazard Area
Balancing Review Criteria - Detailed

A. Access to Emergency Shelter Space and Evacuation Routes...
B. Utilization of Existing and Planned infrastructure – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing infrastructure, as opposed to requiring the expenditure of public funds for the construction of new, unplanned infrastructure with the potential to be damaged by coastal storms.
C. Utilization of Existing Disturbed Areas – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing disturbed areas as opposed to natural areas that buffer existing development for coastal storms.
D. Maintenance of Scenic Qualities and Improvement of Public Access to Water – The requested amendment will result in the maintenance of scenic qualities, and the improvement of public access, to the Gulf of Mexico, inland waterways (such as Boca Ciega Bay), and Tampa Bay.
E. Water Dependent Use – The requested amendment is for uses which are water dependent.
F. Part of Community Redevelopment Plan - The requested amendment is included in a Community Redevelopment Plan, as defined by Florida Statutes for a downtown or other designated redevelopment areas.
G. Overall Reduction of Density or Intensity – The requested amendment would result in an increase in density or intensity on a single parcel, in concert with corollary amendments which result in the overall reduction of development density or intensity in the surrounding CHHA.
H. Clustering of Uses – The requested amendment within the CHHA provides for the clustering of uses on a portion of the site outside the CHHA.
I. Integral Part of Comprehensive Planning Process – The requested amendment has been initiated by the local government as an integral part of its comprehensive planning process, consistent with the local government comprehensive plan.
J. Location within an Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or Multi-modal Corridor – The requested amendment is within an existing or proposed Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or within a Multi-modal Corridor or within one quarter mile of the corridor as designated on the Countywide Plan Map.

K. Implements the Goals and Policies of the Integrated Sustainability Action Plan (ISAP), Complete Streets and Health in All Policies (HIAP) – The requested amendment incorporates design elements and programs which further the sustainability and resiliency goals and policies of the ISAP, Complete Streets and HIAP.

L. Reduction of Storm Vulnerable Structures – The requested amendment will result in removal of storm vulnerable structures including but not limited to mobile homes, trailers and residences constructed prior to establishment of FEMA elevation requirements.
ULI Technical Advisory Panel

NICK HERRING
Vice President, Development Framework Group (Tampa Bay)

CHRIS AHERN
Associate Principal Applied Technology (Tampa Bay)

MICHAEL ANTINELLI
Co-Founder, Director of Projects Engineering Brizaga (Fort Lauderdale)

LEIGH FLETCHER
Partner Fletcher & Fischer (Tampa Bay)

BARRY KARPAY
Vice President Lennar Homes (Tampa Bay)

JAMES CLOAR
President Downtown Development Strategies TAP Chair

JEREMY SHARP
Zoning Administrator City of Norfolk

TARYN SABIA
Director, Florida Center for Community Partner Design and Research, USF

MANUELA POWIDAYKO
City of New York Urban Designer

WHIT REMER
Counsel and Director of Public Policy Insurance Institute for Business & Home Safety (Tampa Bay)
ULI Report: Stakeholder Feedback

➢ Opportunities
  o Higher CHHA standards sets example for the rest of the City
  o Opportunity for preparedness education and outreach
  o Risk reduction through replacement of older vulnerable structures with new
  o Existing institutions in CHHA need nearby housing
  o Increases likelihood that residents will have a home to return to post storm
  o Return on investment (ROI) for mitigation is strong

➢ Constraints
  o Draft code is not flexible enough or apply well to large-scale projects
  o Possibility of disinvestment in the CHHA because of increased development cost
  o Less development in the CHHA could slow City’s economic development efforts
  o Increased density will place more people in harms way and burden shelters further
  o Missed opportunity to focus development in less vulnerable areas
  o Utilize coastal land for preservation/mitigation
### Applications for Construction (2008-2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-family Development / Hotel</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tortuga Points Apartments</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elan Gateway Apartments</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Shores Retirement Community</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aura at 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Apartments</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peridot Palms Apartments</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4130 34&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue South*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclave*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Bay Condos*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venetian Apartments &amp; Townhomes*</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess K Hotel*</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra Verde Resort Hotel*</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,443 (218 hotel)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*534 in new CHHA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ULI Report: Sea Level Rise

### Table 1. Sea Level Change Relative to the Year 2000 for St. Petersburg, Florida in Feet above Local Mean Sea Level (LMSL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NOAA Int-Low (feet)</th>
<th>NOAA Intermediate (feet)</th>
<th>NOAA High (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2070</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2080</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2090</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Component 1: Risk Reduction

- Elevate the finished floor with 2 feet of additional freeboard above the required design flood elevation, for a total of 4 feet of freeboard above the BFE (Base Flood Elevation).
- Construct building to meet design requirements of next higher classification of Risk Category, per ASCE 7. (e.g. increase from 145 to 155 mph standard, Category 2 to 3 storm event)

## Component 2: Recovery

- On-site battery storage of solar generated power to keep critical functions working in the event of power failure.
- Install a cool/high-reflectance roof (coating that is white or has special reflective pigments that reflect sunlight) on at least 75% of the total roof area of the development, with a minimum SRI (solar reflectance index value) of 39 and in accordance with the standards set by the HVWZ.
- Install a geothermal energy heating & cooling system that serves as least 75% of the project’s residential units.
- Pre-wire all units to accept power provided by on-site solar panels and/or wind turbines.
- Install a 20+ SEER HVAC system in each dwelling unit.
- Install a 16-19 SEER HVAC system in each dwelling unit.
- Install efficient, zone-controlled heating and cooling systems in each residential unit (mini-splits, or smart thermostats, etc.).
- Install a solar or tank-less water heating system in each residential unit.
- Install no fewer than 2 operable windows on no fewer than two exterior walls in each unit.
- Install a generator for power generation to keep critical functions working in the event of power failure.
- Install highly-reflective blinds/shades, low-E window film/tint, external/structural shade to reduce solar gain.
- Provide for a Resilient Common Area with back-up power source to provide air-conditioning and power, food, water and emergency supplies to support residents after a storm event.
- Provide for a Neighborhood Resilience Hub to provide on-site and neighborhood residents point of distribution of services before and after storm events.
- Contribute to the Emergency Shelter Fund.
- Utilize mold-resistant building materials in all kitchens and baths, such as fiberglass-faced drywall, mold-resistant drywall tape, tile, ceramic, terrazzo, or stained concrete, rated “resistant” or “highly resistant” according to UL 2824 and in compliance with ASTM D 3273 standard.
- Protect coastal property with a living shoreline (LSL) per the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Living Shoreline Permit Standard. (LSLs use natural materials to stabilize the shoreline and maintain valuable fish and wildlife habitat; LSLs utilize a variety of materials such as wetland plants, oyster shell, coir fiber logs, sand, wood, and native rock.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evacuation Level</th>
<th>SRHES OPERATIONAL TARGET @ 20 sq. ft./person</th>
<th>PINELLAS CO. PROJECTED CAPACITY @ 20 sq. ft./person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18,246</td>
<td>22,765 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20,844</td>
<td>22,765 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>28,577</td>
<td>36,221 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35,611</td>
<td>34,954 (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>43,827</td>
<td>23,189 (53%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SRHES: State/Regional Hurricane Evacuation Study (2016)
Policy CM10.1
The City shall designate the Coastal High Hazard Area as the Velocity or “V” zone, as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM).

Policy LU6.5
Requests for residential density increases beyond the planned densities on the FLUP Map in the coastal high hazard zone shall not be approved.
Land Development Regulations and Building Code

1. Prepare Hurricane Evacuation and Re-entry Plan

2. Reduce Risk for Water: elevate an additional 2-feet above the required design flood elevation, for a total of 4-feet above Base Flood Elevation (addresses both Sea Level Rise and Storm Surge) – Building Code Amendment

3. Reduce Risk for Wind: construct the building to meet design requirements of next higher classification of Risk Category, e.g. increase from 145 to 155 mph, building risk category 2 to 3 – Building Code Amendment

4. Enhance Recovery: through selection of a Resiliency option: such as provision of on-site storage of solar generated power, increased efficiency HVAC systems, or providing solar or tank-less water heating systems. Projects up to 199 units select one option, projects over 200 units select two.

5. Hurricane Evacuation Shelter: Projects which increase density must mitigate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHHA Design Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>On-site battery storage of solar generated power to keep critical functions working in the event of power failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Install a cool/high-reflectance roof (coating that is white or has special reflective pigments that reflect sunlight) on at least 75% of the total roof area of the development, with a minimum SRI (solar reflectance index value) of 39 and in accordance with the standards set by the HVWZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Install a geothermal energy heating &amp; cooling system that serves as least 75% of the project’s residential units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Pre-wire all units to accept power provided by on-site solar panels and/or wind turbines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Install a 16-20+ SEER HVAC system in each dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Install efficient, zone-controlled heating and cooling systems in each residential unit (mini-splits, or smart thermostats, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Install a solar or tank-less water heating system in each residential unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Install no fewer than 2 operable windows on no fewer than two exterior walls in each unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Install a generator for power generation to keep critical functions working in the event of power failure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
j. Install highly-reflective blinds/shades, low-E window film/tint, external/structural shade to reduce solar gain

k. Provide for a Resilient Common Area with back-up power source to provide air-conditioning and power, food, water and emergency supplies to support residents after a storm event

l. Provide for a Neighborhood Resilience Hub to provide on-site and neighborhood residents point of distribution of services before and after storm events

m. Utilize mold-resistant building materials in all kitchens and baths, such as fiberglass-faced drywall, mold-resistant drywall tape, tile, ceramic, terrazzo, or stained concrete, rated “resistant” or “highly resistant” according to UL 2824 and in compliance with ASTM D 3273 standard

n. Protect coastal property with a living shoreline (LSL) per the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Living Shoreline Permit Standard. (LSLs use natural materials to stabilize the shoreline and maintain valuable fish and wildlife habitat; LSLs utilize a variety of materials such as wetland plants, oyster shell, coir fiber logs, sand, wood, and native rock.)
### CHHA: Added Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING DESIGN</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Menu Items</td>
<td>0.25 – 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 2-feet Freeboard</td>
<td>1 - 1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Wind Risk Category</td>
<td>6 - 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.25 - 11% increase</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GPI – Greenman-Pederson Inc. Engineering and Planning Consultants
CHHA and SFHA
CHHA and 2 Ft. SLR
285 acres or 7% of Qualifying Area
CHHA and 3 Ft. SLR
529 Acres or 12% of Qualifying Area
CHHA and 4 Ft. SLR
1,188 Acres or 27% of Qualifying Area
Land Development Code & Building Code Amendment: Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA)

CITY COUNCIL C.O.W. JULY 30, 2020

City Files: LDR 20-01 & BCA 20-01

www.stpete.org
Land Development Regulations and Building Code

1. Prepare Hurricane Evacuation and Re-entry Plan

2. Reduce Risk for Water: elevate an additional 2-feet above the required design flood elevation, for a total of 4-feet above Base Flood Elevation (addresses both Sea Level Rise and Storm Surge) – *Building Code Amendment*

3. Reduce Risk for Wind: construct the building to meet design requirements of next higher classification of Risk Category, e.g. increase from 145 to 155 mph, building risk category 2 to 3 – *Building Code Amendment*

4. Enhance Recovery: through selection of a Resiliency option: such as provision of on-site storage of solar generated power, increased efficiency HVAC systems, or providing solar or tank-less water heating systems. Projects up to 199 units select one option, projects over 200 units select two.

5. Hurricane Evacuation Shelter: Projects which increase density must mitigate
## CHHA Design Standards

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>On-site battery storage of solar generated power to keep critical functions working in the event of power failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Install a cool/high-reflectance roof (coating that is white or has special reflective pigments that reflect sunlight) on at least 75% of the total roof area of the development, with a minimum SRI (solar reflectance index value) of 39 and in accordance with the standards set by the HVWZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Install a geothermal energy heating &amp; cooling system that serves as least 75% of the project’s residential units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Pre-wire all units to accept power provided by on-site solar panels and/or wind turbines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Install a 16-20+ SEER HVAC system in each dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Install efficient, zone-controlled heating and cooling systems in each residential unit (mini-splits, or smart thermostats, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Install a solar or tank-less water heating system in each residential unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Install no fewer than 2 operable windows on no fewer than two exterior walls in each unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Install a generator for power generation to keep critical functions working in the event of power failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>j.</strong></td>
<td>Install highly-reflective blinds/shades, low-E window film/tint, external/structural shade to reduce solar gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>k.</strong></td>
<td>Provide for a Resilient Common Area with back-up power source to provide air-conditioning and power, food, water and emergency supplies to support residents after a storm event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>l.</strong></td>
<td>Provide for a Neighborhood Resilience Hub to provide on-site and neighborhood residents point of distribution of services before and after storm events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>m.</strong></td>
<td>Utilize mold-resistant building materials in all kitchens and baths, such as fiberglass-faced drywall, mold-resistant drywall tape, tile, ceramic, terrazzo, or stained concrete, rated “resistant” or “highly resistant” according to UL 2824 and in compliance with ASTM D 3273 standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n.</strong></td>
<td>Protect coastal property with a living shoreline (LSL) per the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Living Shoreline Permit Standard. (LSLs use natural materials to stabilize the shoreline and maintain valuable fish and wildlife habitat; LSLs utilize a variety of materials such as wetland plants, oyster shell, coir fiber logs, sand, wood, and native rock.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16.70.040.1.4. - Site plan review.

A. Applicability. In neighborhood zoning districts, site plan review (SPR) approval by the DRC is required for all projects in excess of 50,000 square feet of gross floor area or 60 dwelling units. In all other districts SPR approval by the DRC is required for all projects in excess of 250,000 square feet of gross floor area except in the EC-2 district or the DC districts. In addition, site plan review (SPR) approval by the DRC is required for all projects located within or partially located within the Coastal High Hazard Area in excess of 60 dwelling units, regardless of the zoning district.
### CHHA: Added Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING DESIGN</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Menu Items</td>
<td>0.25 – 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 2-feet Freeboard</td>
<td>1 - 1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Wind Risk Category</td>
<td>6 - 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.25 - 11% increase</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GPI – Greenman-Pederson Inc. Engineering and Planning Consultants
Recommendation

Staff recommends a finding of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and **APPROVAL** of the proposed text amendments to the Land Development Regulations and the local Building Code because they further the goals of Coastal Management Element by:

- Increasing building design and emergency management standards; and by
- Ensuring safer multi-family development that also addresses resiliency and sustainability.
COASTAL HIGH HAZARD AREA (CHHA)

CITY COUNCIL
C.O.W.
JULY 30, 2020
**ULI Report: Sea Level Rise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NOAA Int-Low (feet)</th>
<th>NOAA Intermediate (feet)</th>
<th>NOAA High (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2070</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2080</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2090</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.** Sea Level Change Relative to the Year 2000 for St. Petersburg, Florida in Feet above Local Mean Sea Level (LMSL)
Relative Sea Level Change Projections -
Gauge 8726520, St. Petersburg, FL

Year

RSCL in feet (LMSL)

2000 2010 2020 2030 2040 2050 2060 2070 2080 2090 2100

NOAA Int. Low
NOAA Intermediate
NOAA High

8.5’
4.0’
2.0’
## Mobile Home Parks in the CHHA

### Number | Name | Type | Mobile Homes within Flood Zones
---|---|---|---
1 | Pinewood Co-op Inc (Unrec) | Owned | 222
2 | Lamplight Village | Rent | 112
3 | Village Green Park Ltd | Rent | 399
4 | Hollywood Mobile Home Park | Rent | 200
5 | Mobel Americana | Owned | 752
6 | Venetian Mobile Home Park | Rent | 159
7 | Romany Park | Rent | 181
8 | Treasure Village Mobile Home Park | Rent | 107
9 | Blackwood’s Sub | Rent | 9
10 | Lakeshore Mobile Home | Owned | 194
11 | Wilder’s Mobile Home Park | Owned | 10
12 | Silver Lake Mobile Resort | Rent | 17

**Total** | 2,362 | 2,074
## Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Categories within CHHA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLUM Category</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preservation (P)</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>25.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Urban (RU)</td>
<td>3,213</td>
<td>23.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>10.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Medium (RM)</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>10.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Open Space (R/OS)</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Low (RL)</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Limited (IL)</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Redevelopment-Mixed Use (PR-MU)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Redevelopment-Residential (PR-R)</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional (I)</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Utility (T/U)</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Redevelopment-Commercial (PR-C)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential/Office General (R/OG)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Redevelopment District (CRD)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential High (RH)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Business District (CBD)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial General (CG)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Low Medium (RLM)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13,841</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The land boundary for the CHHA is estimated to be 16,328 acres, including right-of-way.
B. Utilization of Existing and Planned infrastructure – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing infrastructure, as opposed to requiring the expenditure of public funds for the construction of new, unplanned infrastructure with the potential to be damaged by coastal storms.

C. Utilization of Existing Disturbed Areas – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing disturbed areas as opposed to natural areas that buffer existing development for coastal storms.

J. Location within an Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or Multi-modal Corridor – The requested amendment is within an existing or proposed Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or within a Multi-modal Corridor or within one quarter mile of the corridor as designated on the Countywide Plan Map.

K. Implements the Goals and Policies of the Integrated Sustainability Action Plan (ISAP), Complete Streets and Health in All Policies (HIAP) – The requested amendment incorporates design elements and programs which further the sustainability and resiliency goals and policies of the ISAP, Complete Streets and HIAP.
Multi-modal Corridor
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Balancing Review Criteria - Detailed

A. Access to Emergency Shelter Space and Evacuation Routes...

B. Utilization of Existing and Planned infrastructure – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing infrastructure, as opposed to requiring the expenditure of public funds for the construction of new, unplanned infrastructure with the potential to be damaged by coastal storms.

C. Utilization of Existing Disturbed Areas – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing disturbed areas as opposed to natural areas that buffer existing development for coastal storms.

D. Maintenance of Scenic Qualities and Improvement of Public Access to Water – The requested amendment will result in the maintenance of scenic qualities, and the improvement of public access, to the Gulf of Mexico, inland waterways (such as Boca Ciega Bay), and Tampa Bay.

E. Water Dependent Use – The requested amendment is for uses which are water dependent.

F. Part of Community Redevelopment Plan - The requested amendment is included in a Community Redevelopment Plan, as defined by Florida Statutes for a downtown or other designated redevelopment areas.

G. Overall Reduction of Density or Intensity – The requested amendment would result in an increase in density or intensity on a single parcel, in concert with corollary amendments which result in the overall reduction of development density or intensity in the surrounding CHHA.

H. Clustering of Uses – The requested amendment within the CHHA provides for the clustering of uses on a portion of the site outside the CHHA.

I. Integral Part of Comprehensive Planning Process – The requested amendment has been initiated by the local government as an integral part of its comprehensive planning process, consistent with the local government comprehensive plan.
J. Location within an Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or Multi-modal Corridor – The requested amendment is within an existing or proposed Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or within a Multi-modal Corridor or within one quarter mile of the corridor as designated on the Countywide Plan Map.

K. Implements the Goals and Policies of the Integrated Sustainability Action Plan (ISAP), Complete Streets and Health in All Policies (HIAP) – The requested amendment incorporates design elements and programs which further the sustainability and resiliency goals and policies of the ISAP, Complete Streets and HIAP.

L. Reduction of Storm Vulnerable Structures – The requested amendment will result in removal of storm vulnerable structures including but not limited to mobile homes, trailers and residences constructed prior to establishment of FEMA elevation requirements.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-family Development / Hotel</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tortuga Points Apartments</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elan Gateway Apartments</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Shores Retirement Community</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aura at 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Apartments</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peridot Palms Apartments</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4130 34&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue South*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclave*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Bay Condos*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venetian Apartments &amp; Townhomes*</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess K Hotel*</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra Verde Resort Hotel*</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,443 (218 hotel)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*534 in new CHHA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 1: Risk Reduction

Elevate the finished floor with 2 feet of additional freeboard above the required design flood elevation, for a total of 4 feet of freeboard above the BFE (Base Flood Elevation)

Construct building to meet design requirements of next higher classification of Risk Category, per ASCE 7. (e.g. increase from 145 to 155 mph standard, Category 2 to 3 storm event)

Component 2: Recovery

On-site battery storage of solar generated power to keep critical functions working in the event of power failure

Install a cool/high-reflectance roof (coating that is white or has special reflective pigments that reflect sunlight) on at least 75% of the total roof area of the development, with a minimum SRI (solar reflectance index value) of 39 and in accordance with the standards set by the HVWZ

Install a geothermal energy heating & cooling system that serves as least 75% of the project's residential units

Pre-wire all units to accept power provided by on-site solar panels and/or wind turbines

Install a 20+ SEER HVAC system in each dwelling unit

Install a 16-19 SEER HVAC system in each dwelling unit

Install efficient, zone-controlled heating and cooling systems in each residential unit (mini-splits, or smart thermostats, etc.)

Install a solar or tank-less water heating system in each residential unit

Install no fewer than 2 operable windows on no fewer than two exterior walls in each unit

Install a generator for power generation to keep critical functions working in the event of power failure

Install highly-reflective blinds/shades, low-E window film/tint, external/structural shade to reduce solar gain

Provide for a Resilient Common Area with back-up power source to provide air-conditioning and power, food, water and emergency supplies to support residents after a storm event

Provide for a Neighborhood Resilience Hub to provide on-site and neighborhood residents point of distribution of services before and after storm events

Contribute to the Emergency Shelter Fund

Utilize mold-resistant building materials in all kitchens and baths, such as fiberglass-faced drywall, mold-resistant drywall tape, tile, ceramic, terrazzo, or stained concrete, rated “resistant” or “highly resistant” according to UL 2824 and in compliance with ASTM D 3273 standard

Protect coastal property with a living shoreline (LSL) per the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Living Shoreline Permit Standard. (LSLs use natural materials to stabilize the shoreline and maintain valuable fish and wildlife habitat; LSLs utilize a variety of materials such as wetland plants, oyster shell, coir fiber logs, sand, wood, and native rock.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evacuation Level</th>
<th>SRHES OPERATIONAL TARGET @ 20 sq. ft./person</th>
<th>PINELLAS CO. PROJECTED CAPACITY @ 20 sq. ft./person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18,246</td>
<td>22,765 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20,844</td>
<td>22,765 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>28,577</td>
<td>36,221 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35,611</td>
<td>34,954 (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>43,827</td>
<td>23,189 (53%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SRHES: State/Regional Hurricane Evacuation Study (2016)
ULI Report: Stakeholder Feedback

➢ Opportunities
  o Higher CHHA standards sets example for the rest of the City
  o Opportunity for preparedness education and outreach
  o Risk reduction through replacement of older vulnerable structures with new
  o Existing institutions in CHHA need nearby housing
  o Increases likelihood that residents will have a home to return to post storm
  o Return on investment (ROI) for mitigation is strong

➢ Constraints
  o Draft code is not flexible enough or apply well to large-scale projects
  o Possibility of disinvestment in the CHHA because of increased development cost
  o Less development in the CHHA could slow City’s economic development efforts
  o Increased density will place more people in harms way and burden shelters further
  o Missed opportunity to focus development in less vulnerable areas
  o Utilize coastal land for preservation/mitigation
TO: The Honorable Ed Montanari, Chair, and Members of City Council

SUBJECT: City File: LGCP-2019-03: City-initiated amendments to the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA).

ORDINANCE 429-H, an Ordinance amending the Comprehensive Plan of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida; amending Chapter 1, General Introduction, to amend the definition of Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA); Chapter 3, Future Land Use Element, to amend CHHA policies to allow consideration of increases in density based upon balancing criteria and amending terminology for consistency; amending Chapter 5, Coastal Management Element, to update the CHHA map reference, and objective CM10A to remove the reference to services; and amending Chapter 10, Capital Improvements Element, to update the CHHA map reference; providing for severability; and providing an effective date

RESOLUTION ___ transmitting the proposed amendments for expedited state, regional and county review, in accordance with Chapter 163, Florida Statutes.

BACKGROUND:
A detailed analysis of the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan is provided in the attached CPPC staff report. The text amendments, if approved, do not increase density or intensity in the CHHA. The proposed text amendments only allow for consideration of land use plan amendments, subject to balancing criteria where 4 of the 12 balancing criteria are mandatory. Only amendments to the City’s Future Land Use Map, if approved, will allow for an increase in density or intensity. Requests for such amendments will be subjected to the City’s normal application process, including public notice, CPPC and City Council public hearings, and state, regional and county review. All applications are reviewed and considered on a case-by-case basis.

In support of the Comprehensive Plan text amendments, concurrent text amendments to the Land Development Regulations and Building Code is under consideration to establish elevated building design standards for multi-family development within the CHHA and require Hurricane Evacuation and Reentry Plans for hotel and multi-family projects. These amendments are intended to result in structures which are more resilient to storm surge, sea level rise and wind damage, mitigate for service and infrastructure needs during and immediately following a major storm event, and enable safe re-occupation as quickly as possible following an evacuation.
RECOMMENDATION:

**Administration:** City staff recommends APPROVAL of the CHHA amendments to the Comprehensive Plan along with the related amendments to the Land Development Regulations and local technical amendments to the Building Code (LDR-2020-01 and BCA-2020-01).

**Public Input:** Attached to the CPPC staff report are two comment letters, one from Commissioner Michaels and one from the Sierra Club. In addition, staff met with the Bay Area Apartment Association on February 21st and March 17, 2020.

**Community Planning & Preservation Commission (CPPC):** On December 10, 2019, the CPPC found that the proposed Comprehensive Plan text amendments pertaining to the CHHA were inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan by a vote of 5 to 2 and forwarded the item to City Council without a recommendation of approval. Concerns from the Commissioners included: that the proposal was inconsistent with Policy CM 10B that calls for directing populations away from the CHHA; concerns for public safety; and that the issue requires more community involvement and should be a part of the StPete2050 visioning process.

**Recommended City Council Action:** 1) CONDUCT the first reading and first public hearing of the attached proposed ordinances; 2) APPROVE the attached transmittal resolution; AND 3) SET the second reading and adoption public hearing for August 20, 2020.

**Attachments:** Ordinance, Resolution, CPPC Staff Report and CPPC December 10, 2019 meeting minutes.
ORDINANCE NO. 429-H

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA; AMENDING CHAPTER 1, GENERAL INTRODUCTION, TO AMEND THE DEFINITION OF COASTAL HIGH HAZARD AREA (CHHA); CHAPTER 3, FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT, TO AMEND CHHA POLICIES TO ALLOW CONSIDERATION OF INCREASES IN DENSITY BASED UPON BALANCING CRITERIA AND AMENDING TERMINOLOGY FOR CONSISTENCY; AMENDING CHAPTER 5, COASTAL MANAGEMENT ELEMENT, TO UPDATE THE CHHA MAP REFERENCE, AND OBJECTIVE CM10A TO REMOVE THE REFERENCE TO SERVICES; AND AMENDING CHAPTER 10, CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT, TO UPDATE THE CHHA MAP REFERENCE; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, established the Community Planning Act; and

WHEREAS, consistent with the requirements of the Community Planning Act, the City of St. Petersburg (City) has adopted a Comprehensive Plan to establish goals, objectives and policies to guide the development and redevelopment of the City; and

WHEREAS, the State of Florida requires coastal local governments to identify a Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA), which is defined as the area below the elevation of the category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake, and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (SLOSH) computerized storm surge model; and

WHEREAS, the SLOSH model is updated and rerun from time to time in order to update estimates of the spatial extent of the CHHA for emergency planning purposes; and

WHEREAS, in its most recent update in 2016, the SLOSH model increased the CHHA within St. Petersburg, more than doubling from 7,705 acres (2010 est.) to 16,328 acres; and

WHEREAS, it is currently the City’s policy that properties located within the CHHA are prohibited from Future Land Use map amendments that result in an increase in maximum allowable density; and

WHEREAS, the 2010 CHHA estimate primarily encompassed areas of the City where future requests to increase the maximum allowable density were unlikely, such as single-family residential and preservation areas, the 2016 CHHA estimate now encompasses significant areas of the City where future requests to increase the maximum allowable density are more likely, such as redevelopment of existing mixed-use and commercial areas; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 163.3178(8)(a), Florida Statutes, the City may choose to adopt objectives and policies within its Comprehensive Plan that allow for a property owner within the CHHA to request a Future Land Use map amendment, so long as the adopted level of service
for out-of-county hurricane evacuation is maintained for a category 5 storm event as measured on the Saffir-Simpson scale; or a 12-hour evacuation time to shelter is maintained for a category 5 storm event as measured on the Saffir-Simpson scale and shelter space reasonably expected to accommodate the residents of the development contemplated by a proposed comprehensive plan amendment is available; or appropriate mitigation is provided that will satisfy these requirements; and

WHEREAS, the City Administration has initiated several amendments to the Comprehensive Plan addressing the potential for property owners within the CHHA to request Future Land Use map amendments that increase the maximum allowable density or intensity, including definitions, objectives and policies; and

WHEREAS, appropriate mitigation for impacts is permissible, and such mitigation is contemplated in these amendments to the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, these amendments to the Comprehensive Plan are also based upon and consistent with the Pinellas County Countywide Rules, which requires that a Future Land Use map amendment within the CHHA be based upon nine specific balancing review criteria; and

WHEREAS, in addition to these nine review criteria, the City has included three additional review criteria to further initiatives of the City, including its Integrated Sustainability Action Plan and Health in All Policies, as well as to consider whether redevelopment will result in the reduction of storm vulnerable structures, and whether redevelopment will be located in close proximity to jobs and transit; and

WHEREAS, the City Council may at their discretion elect to prioritize one or more of the twelve specific balancing review criteria included in these amendments, and may also make one or more of these criteria mandatory as a threshold condition to obtaining approval of a Future Land Use map amendment request that increases the maximum allowable density or intensity in the CHHA; and

WHEREAS, this ordinance shall not be deemed to confer any changes in the extant zoning and/or Future Land Use categories for any property in the City, including the CHHA, and that any requests for amendment to the Official Zoning and/or Future Land Use Maps remain subject to all applicable procedural and substantive requirements of state, county, and local law; and

WHEREAS, since 2017, the City has engaged in an extensive community-wide conversation regarding these amendments, including multiple stakeholder workshops and three City Council Committees of the Whole, plus technical assistance from the Urban Land Institute; and

WHEREAS, the Community Planning & Preservation Commission (CPPC) of the City has reviewed the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan at a public hearing on December 12, 2019 and did not recommend approval; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, after taking into consideration the recommendations of the CPPC and the City Administration, and the comments received during the public hearing conducted on this matter, finds that the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan are
appropriate; now, therefore

THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA, DOES ORDAIN:

Section 1. Definitions in Chapter 1, General Introduction, of the St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan is hereby amended as follows:

Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) also referred to as the Coastal High Hazard Zone (CHHZ) – The Area below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (“SLOSH”) computerized storm surge model as approved in July 2016.

Section 2. ISSUE: Coastal Hazard Areas, Section 3.2 in Chapter 3, of the St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan is hereby amended as follows:

ISSUE: Coastal Hazard Areas
Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) also referred to as the Coastal High Hazard Zone (CHHZ) – The Area below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (“SLOSH”) computerized storm surge model as reflected in the most recent Statewide Regional Evacuation Study for the Tampa Bay Region, Storm Tide Atlas Volume 7 prepared by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council and approved in August 2010 July 2016.

Section 3. OBJECTIVE LU7, in Chapter 3, of the St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan is hereby amended as follows:

Development activities of all kinds within the coastal high hazard areas shall be consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the Coastal Management Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Section 4. Policy LU7.1 in Chapter 3, Future Land Use Element, of the St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan is hereby amended to read as follows:

Requests for residential density increases within the Coastal high hazard one shall not be approved.

The City shall consider flood potential, sea level rise and hurricane hazards when processing map amendment requests in the Coastal High Hazard (“CHHA”). The City shall deny any request to amend the Future Land Use Map for property within the CHHA that results in an increase of the maximum allowable density or intensity, except that the City may, at its sole and absolute discretion, consider approving such amendment based upon a balancing of the following criteria, as are determined applicable and significant to the subject amendment with items B, C, J, and K weighted as mandatory minimum criteria.

A. Access to Emergency Shelter Space and Evacuation Routes – The uses associated with the requested amendment will have access to adequate emergency shelter space as well as evacuation routes with adequate capacities and evacuation clearance times. Nothing in this policy shall be construed as superseding or otherwise modifying the local plan amendment requirement of Section 163.3178(8), Florida Statutes, as follows:
1. The adopted level of service for out-of-county hurricane evacuation is maintained for a category 5 storm event as measured on the Saffir-Simpson scale; or

2. A 12-hour evacuation time to shelter is maintained for a category 5 storm event as measured on the Saffir-Simpson scale and shelter space reasonably expected to accommodate the residents of the development contemplated by a proposed comprehensive plan amendment is available; or

3. Appropriate mitigation is provided, no later than the time of development approval, that will satisfy subparagraph 1 or subparagraph 2. Appropriate mitigation shall include, without limitation, payment of money, contribution of land, and construction of hurricane shelters and transportation facilities. Required mitigation may not exceed the amount required for a developer to accommodate impacts reasonably attributable to development. The City and a developer shall enter into a binding agreement to memorialize the mitigation plan.

B. Utilization of Existing and Planned infrastructure – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing infrastructure, as opposed to requiring the expenditure of public funds for the construction of new, unplanned infrastructure with the potential to be damaged by coastal storms.

C. Utilization of Existing Disturbed Areas – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing disturbed areas as opposed to natural areas that buffer existing development for coastal storms.

D. Maintenance of Scenic Qualities and Improvement of Public Access to Water – The requested amendment will result in the maintenance of scenic qualities, and the improvement of public access, to the Gulf of Mexico, inland waterways (such as Boca Ciega Bay), and Tampa Bay.

E. Water Dependent Use – The requested amendment is for uses which are water dependent.

F. Part of Community Redevelopment Plan - The requested amendment is included in a Community Redevelopment Plan, as defined by Florida Statutes for a downtown or other designated redevelopment areas.

G. Overall Reduction of Density or Intensity – The requested amendment would result in an increase in density or intensity on a single parcel, in concert with corollary amendments which result in the overall reduction of development density or intensity in the surrounding CHHA.

H. Clustering of Uses – The requested amendment within the CHHA provides for the clustering of uses on a portion of the site outside the CHHA.

I. Integral Part of Comprehensive Planning Process – The requested amendment has been initiated by the local government as an integral part of its comprehensive planning process, consistent with the local government comprehensive plan.
J. Location within an Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or Multi-modal Corridor – The requested amendment is within an existing or proposed Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or within a Multi-modal Corridor or within one quarter mile of the corridor as designated on the Countywide Plan Map.

K. Implements the Goals and Policies of the Integrated Sustainability Action Plan (ISAP), Complete Streets and Health in All Policies (HIAP) – The requested amendment incorporates design elements and programs which further the sustainability and resiliency goals and policies of the ISAP, Complete Streets and HIAP.

L. Reduction of Storm Vulnerable Structures – The requested amendment will result in removal of storm vulnerable structures including but not limited to mobile homes, trailers and residences constructed prior to establishment of FEMA elevation requirements.

Section 5. Policy LU7.3 in Chapter 3, Future Land Use Element, of the St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan is hereby amended to read as follows:

The City will prohibit the new construction of hospitals, nursing homes, and convalescent homes in Evacuation Level A zones, discourage the siting or expansion of these facilities in Evacuation Level B zones the CHHA and limit the expansion of existing sites in these zones to the boundaries of the currently developed lot.

Section 6. Policy LU7.4 in Chapter 3, Future Land Use Element, of the St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan is hereby amended to read as follows:

The City will prohibit the siting of new mobile home parks within the Evacuation Level A zone CHHA and limit the expansion of existing sites in these zones to the boundaries of the currently developed lot.

Section 7. Policy LU7.5 in Chapter 3, Future Land Use Element, of the St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan is hereby amended to read as follows:

When establishing Future Land Use Plan designations through a Comprehensive Plan amendment for annexed properties located within the Coastal High Hazard Area there shall be no net increase in residential density or intensity as compared to the Future Land Use Plan of Pinellas County designation(s) existing at the time of annexation of a property without prior written approval of the state Land planning Agency and Pinellas County unless otherwise compliant with Policy LU7.1.

Section 8. Policy LU7.6 in Chapter 3, Future Land Use Element, of the St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan is hereby amended to read as follows:

Opportunities to decrease residential development potentials on the remaining vacant tracts in the CHHA through plan amendments to less intensive uses, land purchase or transfer of development rights shall be considered.

Section 9. ISSUE: Coastal Hazard Areas, Section 5.2 in Chapter 5, of the St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan is hereby amended to read as follows:
ISSUE: Coastal High Hazard Areas

The coastal high hazard area (“CHHA”) is defined as the area below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (“SLOSH”) computerized storm surge model as reflected in the most recent Statewide Regional Evacuation Study for the Tampa Bay Region, Storm Tide Atlas Volume 7 prepared by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council and approved in August 2010–July 2016 and includes areas that have experienced severe damage or are scientifically predicted to experience damage from storm surge, waves, and erosion. The CHHA is shown on Map 15. In a worst case scenario (i.e., Category 5 storm) most of the City would be vulnerable to storm surge. Areas with historical damages are primarily located within the CHHA, as defined in Section 1.7 of the General Definitions in Chapter 1, General Introduction. Growth in the CHHA puts public expenditures and lives at risk.

Section 10. Objective CM10A in Chapter 5, Coastal Management Element, of the St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan is hereby amended to read as follows:

No public funds shall be used for infrastructure and services which subsidize population concentrations in the coastal high hazard area beyond the planned densities identified on the Future Land Use Map other than the improvements identified in the Capital Improvements Element and that which is necessary to support the limited remaining infill development and for overriding health and safety reasons.

Section 11. ISSUE: Public expenditure in the high hazard zones, Section 10.2 in Chapter 10, Capital Improvements Element, is hereby amended to read as follows:

The coastal high hazard area includes areas that have experienced severe damage or are scientifically predicted to experience damage from storm surge, waves, and erosion. In a worst case scenario (e.g. Category 5 storm) most of the City would be vulnerable to storm surge. Areas with historical damages are primarily located within the confines of the category 1 storm, referred to in the inventory as evacuation level A. Based on the best available information, the coastal high hazard area in St. Petersburg is defined as the area below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (“SLOSH”) computerized storm surge model as reflected in the most recent Statewide Regional Evacuation Study for the Tampa Bay Region, Storm Tide Atlas Volume 7 prepared by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council and approved in August 2010–July 2016. Growth in this area puts public expenditures and lives at risk.

Section 12. Severability. The provisions of this ordinance shall be deemed to be severable. If any provision of this ordinance is deemed unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such determination shall not affect the validity of any other provision of this ordinance.

Section 13. Coding. Words in struck-through type shall be deleted. Underlined words constitute new language that shall be added. Provisions not specifically amended shall continue in full force and effect.
Section 14. Effective date. In the event this ordinance is not vetoed by the Mayor in accordance with the City Charter, it shall become effective 31 days after the state land planning agency notifies the City that the plan amendment package is complete, unless there is a timely administrative challenge in accordance with Section 163.3184(5), F.S., in which case the ordinance shall not become effective unless and until the state land planning agency or the Administration Commission enters a final order determining the adopted amendment(s) to be in compliance. 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 as described above.

REVIEWED AND APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:

/s/Michael J. Dema 5/29/2020
City Attorney (or Designee) Date

/s/Elizabeth Abernethy 5/29/2020
Planning & Development Services Dept. Date
RESOLUTION NO. 2019- ___

A RESOLUTION TRANSMITTING PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT AMENDMENTS FOR STATE, REGIONAL AND COUNTY REVIEW AS REQUIRED BY THE COMMUNITY PLANNING ACT (CHAPTER 163, PART II, FLORIDA STATUTES); AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Community Planning Act requires that all text amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map amendments greater than 10 acres be forwarded for state, regional and county review and comment in compliance with statutory requirements; and

WHEREAS, the St. Petersburg Community Planning & Preservation Commission, acting as the Local Planning Agency, has reviewed and acted on a series of Comprehensive Plan text amendments as required by Section 163.3174, F.S.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida:

That the Comprehensive Plan text amendments acted on by the City of St. Petersburg Community Planning & Preservation Commission on December 10, 2019 attached to this resolution, be transmitted for state, regional and county review pursuant to Section 163.3184(3), Florida Statutes (Expedited State Review Process).

This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT: City File: LGCP-2019-03

/s/Elizabeth Abernethy 5/29/2020
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT DATE

/s/Michael J. Dema 5/29/2020
CITY ATTORNEY (designee) DATE
City File: LGCP 2019-03
Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA)

This is a City-initiated application requesting that the Community Planning and Preservation Commission (“CPPC”), in its capacity as the Local Planning Agency (“LPA”), make a finding of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and recommend to City Council APPROVAL of the following text amendments to the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) provisions.

APPLICANT INFORMATION

APPLICANT: City of St. Petersburg
175 5th Street North
St. Petersburg, Florida 33712

STAFF CONTACT: Britton Wilson, AICP, Planner II
Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division
Planning and Development Services Department
One – 4th Street North
St. Petersburg, Florida 33711
Britton.Wilson@stpete.org
(727) 551-3542

INTRODUCTION

In an effort to reduce loss of life and property caused by natural disasters, the State of Florida requires coastal local governments to identify a Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) in which public expenditures and population growth are limited (section 163.3178, Florida Statutes). The Coastal High Hazard Area is defined as “the area below the elevation of the category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake, and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (SLOSH) computerized storm surge model.” Areas included in the CHHA are governed both by state law and the policies adopted to administer those provisions in the local government comprehensive plans.

While the CHHA was originally adopted into the City’s Comprehensive Plan in 1989, the definition and applicable standards have changed several times starting in 2006, 2010, and 2016. These changes have led to
an expansion of the CHHA causing the city to re-evaluate its adopted policies. The most recent update in 2016 more than doubled the CHHA land area from 7,705 acres to 16,328 acres. Many of the City’s economic centers that were initially developed outside of the CHHA are now located within the CHHA boundary, restricting redevelopment options.

**REQUEST**

The City is requesting a series of Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) related text amendments to the goals, objectives, policies and general introduction statements of the Future Land Use, Coastal Management and Capital Improvements elements. The focus policy amendment is to Land Use Policy 7.1 that currently prohibits requests for residential density increases within the CHHA. Changes to this policy requires amendments to other supporting policies in other elements of the Comprehensive Plan in order to maintain consistency throughout.

The proposed amendments are based upon and consistent with CHHA provisions of the Countywide Rules, which requires that an approval of a land use amendment within the CHHA be based upon nine specific balancing review criteria. This proposal builds upon those nine criteria by including three more criteria that further initiatives of the City. City Council may at their discretion prioritize or weigh the balancing review criteria and/or make one or more criteria mandatory.

In support of the Comprehensive Plan text amendments, a concurrent text amendment to the Land Development Regulations and Building Code is being processed to establish elevated building design standards of multi-family development within the CHHA and require Hurricane Evacuation and Reentry Plans for hotel and multi-family projects. These amendments are intended to result in structures which are more resilient to storm surge, sea level rise and wind damage, mitigate for service and infrastructure needs during and immediately following a major storm event, and enable safe re-occupation as quickly as possible following an evacuation.

**BACKGROUND**

About the same time that the CHHA map was updated 2016, City staff was working on the adoption of a new planning area known as the Innovation District, when it became clear that this policy could limit the planned vision for the district. The CHHA overlapped with a portion of the proposed plan and zoning changes for the district. As part of that effort, staff first proposed the amendment to the policy in August of 2017, and then brought it back again last summer with the Innovation District package. Council requested a workshop to address the CHHA, which was held last January, where the concept of adopting elevated design standards was introduced. Over the course of the last two years since the consideration of the comprehensive plan policy change was initiated, there have been several storm events that led to the consideration of imposing the elevated building and design standards. These standards were initially based on a recent effort by the City of Norfolk Virginia, which established Resilency Quotient requirements for all development within their City, which has similar coastal development issues to St. Petersburg.

After the January 2019 workshop, staff held several meetings with stakeholders and the Urban Land Institute (ULI) provided technical assistance in developing these innovative zoning and development standards. A second workshop was held with City council on July 25th to report the ULI findings, and Council recommended that staff bring back a more refined amendment, based on cost estimates. After a review of the estimates, staff revised the draft LDR amendment, determined that an amendment to the local Building code will also be required and held additional stakeholder meetings before presenting at a final council workshop on October 24th.

The CHHA project timeline is summarized in the below table.
CHHA Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>Innovation District Visioning Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>2016 CHHA Map update issued by FDEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>Innovation District Streetscape &amp; Connectivity Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2017</td>
<td>Comp Plan public hearing: amend CHHA policy deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>Comp Plan public hearing: amend CHHA policy, canceled (Hurricane Irma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>Comp Plan public hearing: amend CHHA policy APPROVED by LPA 4 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2018</td>
<td>Comp Plan public hearing: amend CHHA policy, deferred by Council (Hurricane Michael)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>Council Committee of the Whole to discuss CHHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>ULI Tampa grant process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Innovation District (minus CHHA parcels) approved by Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>Stakeholder Workshop: Main Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>Council Committee of the Whole to discuss CHHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>Stakeholder Workshop: Main Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>Council Committee of the Whole to discuss CHHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>Workshops: CPPC and DRC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LGCP 2019-03: PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT AMENDMENT

The proposed text amendments to the Comprehensive Plan consists of edits to the Definitions section, the Future Land Use Element, the Coastal Management Element and the Capital Improvements Element and are proposed to be amended (in strike through and underline format) as follows:

Definitions in Chapter 1, General Introduction

Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) also referred to as the Coastal High Hazard Zone (CHHZ) – The Area below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (“SLOSH”) computerized storm surge model as approved in July 2016.

Future Land Use Element

General Introduction Section 1.7

ISSUE: Coastal Hazard Areas

Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) also referred to as the Coastal High Hazard Zone (CHHZ) – The Area below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (“SLOSH”) computerized storm surge model as reflected in the most recent Statewide Regional Evacuation Study for the Tampa Bay Region, Storm Tide Atlas Volume 7 prepared by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council and approved in August 2010

OBJECTION LU7:

Development activities of all kinds within the coastal high hazard areas shall be consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the Coastal Management Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Policies:

LU7.1 Requests for residential density increases within the Coastal high hazard one shall not be approved. The City shall consider flood potential, sea level rise and hurricane hazards when processing map amendment requests in the Coastal High Hazard ("CHHA"). The City shall deny any request to amend the Future Land Use Map for property within the CHHA that results in an increase of residential density, except that the City may, at its sole and absolute discretion, consider approving such
amendment based upon a balancing of the following criteria, as are determined applicable and significant to the subject amendment.

A. Access to Emergency Shelter Space and Evacuation Routes – The uses associated with the requested amendment will have access to adequate emergency shelter space as well as evacuation routes with adequate capacities and evacuation clearance times. Nothing in this policy shall be construed as superseding or otherwise modifying the local plan amendment requirement of Section 163.3178(8), Florida Statutes, as follows:

1. The adopted level of service for out-of-county hurricane evacuation is maintained for a category 5 storm event as measured on the Saffir-Simpson scale; or

2. A 12-hour evacuation time to shelter is maintained for a category 5 storm event as measured on the Saffir-Simpson scale and shelter space reasonably expected to accommodate the residents of the development contemplated by a proposed comprehensive plan amendment is available; or

3. Appropriate mitigation is provided, no later than the time of development approval, that will satisfy subparagraph 1 or subparagraph 2. Appropriate mitigation shall include, without limitation, payment of money, contribution of land, and construction of hurricane shelters and transportation facilities. Required mitigation may not exceed the amount required for a developer to accommodate impacts reasonably attributable to development. The City and a developer shall enter into a binding agreement to memorialize the mitigation plan.

B. Utilization of Existing and Planned infrastructure – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing infrastructure, as opposed to requiring the expenditure of public funds for the construction of new, unplanned infrastructure with the potential to be damaged by coastal storms.

C. Utilization of Existing Disturbed Areas – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing disturbed areas as opposed to natural areas that buffer existing development for coastal storms.

D. Maintenance of Scenic Qualities and Improvement of Public Access to Water – The requested amendment will result in the maintenance of scenic qualities, and the improvement of public access, to the Gulf of Mexico, inland waterways (such as Boca Ciega Bay), and Tampa Bay.

E. Water Dependent Use – The requested amendment is for uses which are water dependent.

F. Part of Community Redevelopment Plan - The requested amendment is included in a Community Redevelopment Plan, as defined by Florida Statutes for a downtown or other designated redevelopment areas.

G. Overall Reduction of Density or Intensity – The requested amendment would result in an increase in density or intensity on a single parcel, in concert with corollary amendments which result in the overall reduction of development density or intensity in the surrounding CHHA.

H. Clustering of Uses – The requested amendment within the CHHA provides for the clustering of uses on a portion of the site outside the CHHA.
I. Integral Part of Comprehensive Planning Process – The requested amendment has been initiated by the local government as an integral part of its comprehensive planning process, consistent with the local government comprehensive plan.

J. Location within an Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or Multi-modal Corridor – The requested amendment is within an existing or proposed Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or within a Multi-modal Corridor or within one quarter mile of the corridor as designated on the Countywide Plan Map.

K. Implements the Goals and Policies of the Integrated Sustainability Action Plan (ISAP), Complete Streets and Health in All Policies (HIAP) – The requested amendment incorporates design elements and programs which further the sustainability and resiliency goals and policies of the ISAP, Complete Streets and HIAP.

L. Reduction of Storm Vulnerable Structures – The requested amendment will result in removal of storm vulnerable structures including but not limited to mobile homes, trailers and residences constructed prior to establishment of FEMA elevation requirements.

LU7.2 All approval of new proposed development will consider the hurricane evacuation level/location of the proposed development and provide appropriate mitigation.

LU7.3 The City will prohibit the new construction of hospitals, nursing homes, and convalescent homes in Evacuation Level A zones, discourage the siting or expansion of these facilities in Evacuation Level B zones the CHHA and limit the expansion of existing sites in these zones to the boundaries of the currently developed lot.

LU7.4 The City will prohibit the siting of new mobile home parks within the Evacuation Level A zone CHHA and limit the expansion of existing sites in these zones to the boundaries of the currently developed lot.

LU7.5 When establishing Future Land Use Plan designations through a Comprehensive Plan amendment for annexed properties located within the Coastal High Hazard Area there shall be no net increase in residential density as compared to the Future Land Use Plan of Pinellas County designation(s) existing at the time of annexation of a property without prior written approval of the state Land planning Agency and Pinellas County unless otherwise compliant with Policy LU7.1.

LU7.6 Opportunities to decrease residential development potentials on the remaining vacant tracts in the CHHZ CHHA through plan amendments to less intensive uses, land purchase or transfer of development rights shall be considered.

LU7.7 The City will review the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council’s (TBRPC) Hurricane Evacuation Study for issues that pertain to requests for residential density increases and the general application of residential future land use densities in coastal high hazard areas.
Coastal Management Element

ISSUE: Coastal High Hazard Areas
The coastal high hazard area (“CHHA”) is defined as the area below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (“SLOSH”) computerized storm surge model as reflected in the most recent Statewide Regional Evacuation Study for the Tampa Bay Region, Storm Tide Atlas Volume 7 prepared by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council and approved in August 2010 July 2016 and includes areas that have experienced severe damage or are scientifically predicted to experience damage from storm surge, waves, and erosion. The CHHA is shown on Map 15. In a worst case scenario (i.e., Category 5 storm) most of the City would be vulnerable to storm surge. Areas with historical damages are primarily located within the CHHA, as defined in Section 1.7 of the General Definitions in Chapter 1, General Introduction. Growth in the CHHA puts public expenditures and lives at risk.

OBJECTIVE CM10A:
No public funds shall be used for infrastructure and services which subsidize population concentrations in the coastal high hazard area beyond the planned densities identified on the Future Land Use Map other than the improvements identified in the Capital Improvements Element and that which is necessary to support the limited remaining infill development and for overriding health and safety reasons.

Capital Improvements Element

ISSUE: Public expenditure in high hazard zones
The coastal high hazard area includes areas that have experienced severe damage or are scientifically predicted to experience damage from storm surge, waves, and erosion. In a worst case scenario (e.g. Category 5 storm) most of the City would be vulnerable to storm surge. Areas with historical damages are primarily located within the confines of the category 1 storm, referred to in the inventory as evacuation level A. Based on the best available information, the coastal high hazard area in St. Petersburg is defined as the area below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (“SLOSH”) computerized storm surge model as reflected in the most recent Statewide Regional Evacuation Study for the Tampa Bay Region, Storm Tide Atlas Volume 7 prepared by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council and approved in August 2010 July 2016. Growth in this area puts public expenditures and lives at risk.

CONCURRENT LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS (LDR) AMENDMENT
In conjunction with this proposed Comprehensive Plan text amendment are amendments to the City’s Land Development Regulations and Building Code to establish elevated design standards, intended to result in structures which are more resilient to storm surge and sea level rise, mitigate for service and infrastructure needs during and immediately following a major storm event, and enable safe re-occupation as quickly as possible following an evacuation. As currently proposed, these elevated design standards would apply to all new residential multi-family development with the CHHA, regardless of whether or not an increase in density increase was considered. The elevated land development and building code standards are summarized as follows:

Proposed Changes
1. Prepare Hurricane Evacuation and Re-entry Plan: all multi-family and hotel projects
2. Reduce Risk for Water: elevate an additional 2-feet above the required design flood elevation, for a total of 4-feet above Base Flood Elevation (addresses both Sea Level Rise and Storm Surge)
3. Reduce Risk for Wind: construct the building to meet design requirements of next higher classification of Risk Category, e.g. increase from 145 to 155 mph standard, category 2 to 3 building risk category.
4. Enhance Recovery through selection of a Resiliency option: such as provision of on-site storage of solar generated power, increased efficiency HVAC systems, or providing solar or tank-less water heating systems. Projects up to 199 units select one option, projects over 200 units select two options.
5. Projects which increase density must mitigate for Hurricane Evacuation Shelter space.

**CONSISTENCY with STATE STATUTES**

Florida Statute section 163.3178(8) states that a proposed comprehensive plan amendment shall be found in compliance with state coastal high hazard area provisions if:

1. The adopted level of service for out-of-county hurricane evacuation is maintained for a category 5 storm event as measured on the Saffir-Simpson scale; or
2. A 12-hour evacuation time to shelter is maintained for a category 5 storm event as measured on the Saffir-Simpson scale and shelter space reasonably expected to accommodate the residents of the development contemplated by a proposed comprehensive plan amendment is available; or
3. Appropriate mitigation is provided that will satisfy subparagraph 1 or subparagraph 2. Appropriate mitigation shall include, without limitation, payment of money, contribution of land, and construction of hurricane shelters and transportation facilities. Required mitigation may not exceed the amount required for a developer to accommodate impacts reasonably attributable to development. A local government and a developer shall enter into a binding agreement to memorialize the mitigation plan.

The proposed amendments are consistent with State Statutes as they reflect the evacuation and shelter space requirements while allowing for mitigation for when those requirements cannot be reasonably met.

**CONSISTENCY with the COUNTYWIDE PLAN:**

 Proposed amendments to local future land use plans and land development regulations are required to be consistent with the Countywide Plan Map and the criteria and standards set forth in the Countywide Rules. This proposed set of Comprehensive Plan amendments are based upon, and an expansion of, the Coastal High Hazard provisions within the Countywide Rules and are therefore consistent with the below Countywide Rules.

Staff worked closely with Forward Pinellas, members of the County-wide Planners Advisory Committee (PAC) and County and City Emergency Management staff to draft the proposed amendments.

**SEC. 4.2.7 COASTAL HIGH HAZARD AREAS.**

4.2.7.1 The Pinellas Planning Council and the Countywide Planning Authority shall deny an amendment to the Countywide Plan Map within the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) which results in an increase of density or intensity; except that they may, at their sole and absolute discretion, consider approving such amendment based upon a balancing of the following criteria, as are determined applicable and significant to the subject amendment:

A. Access to Emergency Shelter Space and Evacuation Routes – The uses associated with the requested amendment will have access to adequate emergency shelter space as well as evacuation routes with adequate capacities and evacuation clearance times.

B. Utilization of Existing and Planned Infrastructure – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing infrastructure, as opposed to requiring the expenditure of public funds for the construction of new, unplanned infrastructure with the potential to be damaged by coastal storms.
C. Utilization of Existing Disturbed Areas – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing disturbed areas as opposed to natural areas that buffer existing development from coastal storms.

D. Maintenance of Scenic Qualities and Improvement of Public Access to Water – The requested amendment will result in the maintenance of scenic qualities, and the improvement of public access, to the Gulf of Mexico, inland waterways (such as Boca Ciega Bay), and Tampa Bay.

E. Water Dependent Use – The requested amendment is for uses which are water dependent.

F. Part of Community Redevelopment Plan – The requested amendment is included in a Community Redevelopment Plan, as defined by Florida Statutes for a downtown or other designated redevelopment areas.

G. Overall Reduction of Density or Intensity – The requested amendment would result in an increase in density or intensity on a single parcel, in concert with corollary amendments which result in the overall reduction of development density or intensity in the surrounding CHHA.

H. Clustering of Uses – The requested amendment within the CHHA provides for the clustering of uses on a portion of the site outside the CHHA.

I. Integral Part of Comprehensive Planning Process – The requested amendment has been initiated by the local government as an integral part of its comprehensive planning process, consistent with the local government comprehensive plan.

4.2.7.2 The Pinellas Planning Council and the Countywide Planning Authority shall deny an amendment to the Countywide Plan Map within the CHHA which would permit the siting or expansion of uses that are inconsistent with the CHHA, given their susceptibility to storm damage or special evacuation requirements, including hospitals, nursing homes, convalescent homes, adult living facilities, recreational vehicles, and mobile homes; except that they may, at their sole and absolute discretion, consider approving such amendment based upon a balancing of the criteria in Section 4.2.7.1, A-H, as are determined applicable and significant to the subject amendment.

4.2.7.3 Local government amendments that would result in an increase in density or intensity within the CHHA as discussed in Section 4.2.7.1, or would permit the siting or expansion of uses that are inconsistent with the CHHA as discussed in Section 4.2.7.2 must be reviewed against locally-adopted requirements that are consistent with the balancing criteria found in Section 4.2.7.1 A-H. For Tier II and III amendments, an evaluation of these criteria must be included with a Countywide Plan Map submittal pursuant to Section 6.1.3.2. For Tier I amendments, if a local government has not adopted and utilized the balancing criteria in its review process, any such amendments will be found inconsistent with the Countywide Plan pursuant to the provisions of Article 3.

4.2.7.4 Nothing in these Countywide Rules shall be construed or applied to preclude a local government with jurisdiction from having requirements in the CHHA that are more restrictive than the terms set forth herein.

4.2.7.5 Nothing in these Countywide Rules should be construed as superseding or otherwise modifying the local plan amendment requirements of Section 163.3178(8), Florida Statutes.

City staff finds that the proposed set of CHHA related text amendments is consistent with the Countywide Rules and no further action is anticipated regarding the Countywide Plan.
CONSISTENCY with the COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The amendment is making direct changes to the Coastal High Hazard Area section of both the Land Use Element, the Coastal Management Element and the Capital Improvements Element. However, the proposed Comprehensive Plan text changes presented in this staff report are consistent with the following objectives and policies:

LU 3.5 The tax base will be maintained and improved by encouraging the appropriate use of properties based on their locational characteristics and the goals, objectives and policies within this Comprehensive Plan.

LU 3.6 Land use planning decisions shall weigh heavily the established character of predominately developed areas where changes of use or intensity of development are contemplated.

LU 3.11 More dense residential uses (more than 7.5 units per acre) may be located along (1) passenger rail lines and designated major streets or (2) in close proximity to activity center where compatible.

LU 3.17 Future expansion of commercial uses is encouraged when infilling into existing commercial areas and activity centers, or where a need can be clearly identified, and where otherwise consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

LU 5.3 The Concurrency Management System shall continue to be implemented to ensure proposed development to be considered for approval shall be in conformance with existing and planned support facilities and that such facilities and services be available, at the adopted level of service standards, concurrent with the impacts of development.

T 1.6 The City shall support high-density mixed-use development and redevelopments in and adjacent to Activity Centers, redevelopment areas and locations that are supported by mass transit to reduce the number and length of automobile trips and encourage transit usage, bicycling and walking.

CM 1 The City shall require new development and redevelopment along the coastal shoreline to be located and designed to protect or enhance beach shoreline and native vegetation historically represented in St. Petersburg including, mangroves, salt marsh and seagrasses, so that there are no further losses of coastal wetlands related to development, as documented by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

CM 7 For development and redevelopment on the coastal shoreline, the City will give higher priority to siting water-dependent uses over other uses. The order of priority is listed below.
1. Water-dependent uses;
2. Water-related uses;
3. Water-enhanced uses;

CM 9.1 The approximately 9 linear miles and approximately 1471 acres of publicly accessible waterfront sites, as inventoried in the coastal element, shall be maintained or improved.

CM 13 The City shall cooperate with state, regional and county agencies to maintain or reduce hurricane evacuation times, and actively work with the Red Cross in the identification of emergency shelters to provide space for the population in Evacuation Zone A, B and C.
CM 13.2 The City shall implement the strategies identified in Coastal management Element Subsection 6.6, “Measures to Maintain or Reduce Evacuation Times”

PUBLIC NOTICE

Public hearing notice was published in the Tampa Bay Times on Friday, November 29, 2019 in accordance with Florida Statutes, Section 163.3174(1).

PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS

The proposed ordinance associated with the Comprehensive Plan text amendment requires one (1) public hearing before the Community Planning & Preservation Commission (CPPC) and two (2) City Council public hearings. The amendment will also be transmitted for expedited state, regional and county review. Forward Pinellas (formerly known as Pinellas Planning Council) will review the Comprehensive Plan text amendment for consistency with the Countywide Rules.

SUMMARY

Based upon the analysis contained in this report, City staff finds the proposed text amendments to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. While the City’s original policy in the Comprehensive Plan was a responsible attempt to protect the population from potential storm surge; the impact of the 2016 map update warrants new consideration towards a more flexible policy that considers higher building design and emergency management standards.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Community Planning and Preservation Commission, in its capacity as the Local Planning Agency, make a finding of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and recommend to City Council APPROVAL of the Comprehensive Plan text amendments described herein.

ATTACHMENTS

1. CHHA Map
Coastal High Hazard Area

- Current CHHA (Category 1 Storm Surge)
- Previous CHHA (Category 1 Storm Surge)

City of St. Petersburg
Planning and Economic Development Department
March 2017
This memo supplements the subject staff report by specifically addressing proposed edits to Policy LU7.1 pertaining to balancing review criteria applied to proposed amendments to the Future Land Use Map located within the boundaries of the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA). Staff recommends that of the balancing criteria outlined below, items B, C, J, and K be weighted as mandatory minimum review criteria that must be sufficiently demonstrated by a proposed Future Land Use Map amendment.

LU7.1 Requests for residential density increases within the Coastal high hazard one shall not be approved. The City shall consider flood potential, sea level rise and hurricane hazards when processing map amendment requests in the Coastal High Hazard (“CHHA”). The City shall deny any request to amend the Future Land Use Map for property within the CHHA that results in an increase of residential density, except that the City may, at its sole and absolute discretion, consider approving such amendment based upon a balancing of the following criteria, as are determined applicable and significant to the subject amendment.

A. Access to Emergency Shelter Space and Evacuation Routes – The uses associated with the requested amendment will have access to adequate emergency shelter space as well as evacuation routes with adequate capacities and evacuation clearance times. Nothing in this policy shall be construed as superseding or otherwise modifying the local plan amendment requirement of Section 163.3178(8), Florida Statutes, as follows:

1. The adopted level of service for out-of-county hurricane evacuation is maintained for a category 5 storm event as measured on the Saffir-Simpson scale; or

2. A 12-hour evacuation time to shelter is maintained for a category 5 storm event as measured on the Saffir-Simpson scale and shelter space reasonably expected to accommodate the residents of the development contemplated by a proposed comprehensive plan amendment is available; or

3. Appropriate mitigation is provided, no later than the time of development approval, that will satisfy subparagraph 1 or subparagraph 2. Appropriate mitigation shall include, without limitation, payment of money, contribution of land, and construction of hurricane shelters and transportation facilities. Required mitigation may not exceed the amount required for a developer to accommodate impacts reasonably
attributable to development. The City and a developer shall enter into a binding agreement to memorialize the mitigation plan.

B. Utilization of Existing and Planned infrastructure – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing infrastructure, as opposed to requiring the expenditure of public funds for the construction of new, unplanned infrastructure with the potential to be damaged by coastal storms.

C. Utilization of Existing Disturbed Areas – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing disturbed areas as opposed to natural areas that buffer existing development for coastal storms.

D. Maintenance of Scenic Qualities and Improvement of Public Access to Water – The requested amendment will result in the maintenance of scenic qualities, and the improvement of public access, to the Gulf of Mexico, inland waterways (such as Boca Ciega Bay), and Tampa Bay.

E. Water Dependent Use – The requested amendment is for uses which are water dependent.

F. Part of Community Redevelopment Plan - The requested amendment is included in a Community Redevelopment Plan, as defined by Florida Statutes for a downtown or other designated redevelopment areas.

G. Overall Reduction of Density or Intensity – The requested amendment would result in an increase in density or intensity on a single parcel, in concert with corollary amendments which result in the overall reduction of development density or intensity in the surrounding CHHA.

H. Clustering of Uses – The requested amendment within the CHHA provides for the clustering of uses on a portion of the site outside the CHHA.

I. Integral Part of Comprehensive Planning Process – The requested amendment has been initiated by the local government as an integral part of its comprehensive planning process, consistent with the local government comprehensive plan.

J. Location within an Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or Multi-modal Corridor – The requested amendment is within an existing or proposed Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or within a Multi-modal Corridor or within one quarter mile of the corridor as designated on the Countywide Plan Map.

K. Implements the Goals and Policies of the Integrated Sustainability Action Plan (ISAP), Complete Streets and Health in All Policies (HIAP) – The requested amendment incorporates design elements and programs which further the sustainability and resiliency goals and policies of the ISAP, Complete Streets and HIAP.

L. Reduction of Storm Vulnerable Structures – The requested amendment will result in removal of storm vulnerable structures including but not limited to mobile homes, trailers and residences constructed prior to establishment of FEMA elevation requirements.
1/4 Mile Buffer around Multimodal Corridors, Activity Centers, Target Employment Centers and Special Area Plan Categories within the CHHA.
Dear Commissioners of the CPPC,

We write this letter to urge your opposition to the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments pertaining to the Coastal High Hazard Area (LGCP 2019-03). A long history of intensive coastal development has placed significant life, property and public infrastructure in perilous places throughout our community. The applicable science tells us the risk of storms, rising sea levels and flooding are increasing, yet the economic pressures to continue business as usual persist. We must adopt policies that apportion risks and costs more rationally and fairly - in ways that reduce taxpayer liability, promote affordable housing, and align with our broader sustainability and resiliency goals.

The Comprehensive Plan amendments we see today and the LDR Amendments we don’t have have been conflated in the minds of many - something we hope to dispel. Our vision is a City Government that sees issues like energy, land use, transit, housing and disaster preparedness through a unified and forward-looking lens that includes strengthened buildings codes like those proposed for the LDR as part of related CHHA amendments, but without the risks and costs of higher density in the CHHA as proposed in LGCP 19-03. We envision less density in these places because further defying the water that surrounds us is buying borrowed time at taxpayer expense. This is a popular sentiment.

Increasing density in the CHHA has obvious near-term benefits and we respect the perspective of those who support it, yet the increased mid and long-term risks absolutely outweigh them. We should be reducing taxpayers’ liabilities for public infrastructure and services in areas that will be repeatedly inundated in our city’s future, not intensifying them. In contrast to this amendment, the City should have a broad policy of discouraging private sector development in the high hazard area.

Additionally, various case studies demonstrate that coastal flood zones experience a process where flood events clear out older buildings, which are then replaced by more intensive development. These proposed amendments encourage a cycle whereby weather events naturally make way for larger, stronger structures, thereby intensifying expensive public infrastructure commitments over time. The City should aim to reduce long-term infrastructure demands and liabilities for taxpayers in this hazardous flood zone in part by disincentivizing risky private investment.

We support shifting both public and private investment into places that make geographic and strategic sense, such as the South St. Petersburg CRA and the city’s higher elevation areas. The paradigm that increased coastal development is fundamental for growing our city and increasing affordable housing must be rejected. Our city’s future does not lie in the Coastal High Hazard Area. In many instances it will lie in historically depressed areas ripe for investment and growth.

These proposed amendments have had the consequence of inspiring a very spirited but sober discussion about the future of coastal land use in St. Petersburg - just in time for the 2050 conversation. This is a time to be thoughtful and strategic, and to challenge outdated ways of thinking. When Tampa Bay finally finds its way into the CHHA our community will want to know who chose to double down in these hazardous areas. This is one of many difficult decisions that you and all our City’s leaders will need to make in balancing today’s needs with tomorrow’s. We urge you, today’s leaders, to follow the science and resist the pressure to increase density in the CHHA. Again, please vote down LGCP 2019-03.

Respectfully,

James C. Scott
Executive Committee Chair
Memorandum (Rev 1)

TO: Community Planning & Preservation Commission
FROM: Will Michaels, Commission Member
SUBJECT: Pending Coastal High Hazard Area Text Amendments
DATE: December 7, 2019

The pending Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) text amendments are scheduled for consideration by the Commission at the December 10, 2019 meeting. In my judgment this is one of the most important matters to come before the Commission in recent years and I wish to share my research and thoughts about this with the Commission prior to the meeting.

The context of this matter is the 2016 significant increase in the area of the city now covered by the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA). As City staff has noted the area covered has increased from nearly 8,000 acres of city land to somewhat over 16,000 acres. Much of this is residential property but it also includes commercial properties, including parts of Activity Centers and institutional property in the Innovation District (USF and hospitals). The reason for this is new projections by the National Weather Service estimating the area of the city to be flooded from storm surge by a Category 1 Hurricane.

Our state has recently experienced greater intensity of hurricanes, and we are also concerned about sea level rise now projected at between one and two feet by 2040, and reaching approximately four to eight and a half feet by 2100:

- Hurricane Michael (2018)—3rd most intensive Atlantic hurricane. This hurricane developed so fast there was little time for preparation and evacuation. It changed from a tropical storm to a Category 5 hurricane in virtually 2 days, and had a storm surge which reached 13 feet.
- Hurricane Irma (2017)—had the most Accumulated Cyclone Energy (sustained wind velocity) of any Atlantic tropical storm ever. It was a Category 5 hurricane for 3.25 days. Prior to hitting Florida it had sustained winds of 184 mph for some 37 hours straight.
- The last hurricane to directly hit Pinellas County was the 1921 Tarpon Springs Hurricane. This hurricane is estimated by the National Weather Service as a Category 3 which generated a peak surge of 11 feet.
- Tampa Bay Climate Science Advisory Panel in their report, The Cost of Doing Nothing: Economic Impacts of Sea Level Rise in the Tampa Bay Region, projects a sea level rise of nearly 3 feet by 2060 generating a $5 Billion loss, including 28% reduction in value of submerged property, in Pinellas County.
- A 2008 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) examination of 136 port cities worldwide found that Tampa and St. Petersburg together are one of the most vulnerable regions in the world, among the 10 regions with the most property at risk to wind damage and coastal flooding from storm surge.
- Also a 2013 study of World Bank economist Stephane Hallegate concluded that Tampa Bay is one of the ten most threatened regions in the world in terms of cost of overall damage from sea level rise.
- In 2010 the Tampa Bay Planning Council simulated what would happen if a Category 5 hurricane were to directly hit Tampa Bay. They projected nearly a half million homes and businesses would be destroyed; 2 million residents would require medical treatment; and more than 2,000 people would die. Pinellas County would be divided in half by wave water.
• John Bennet, City of Tampa Chief of Staff, concluded after recently visiting the Netherlands, that the major lesson learned was a natural defense system like sand and mangroves and not a hardscape is needed to effectively cope with seal level rise in Tampa Bay (Times, 11/28/19).

City Policy Regarding Increased Density in the Coastal High Hazard Area

Presently Comprehensive Plan City Policy LU 7.1 does not allow any increase in residential density in the Coastal High Hazard Area. This policy is also echoed by policy CM 10B which states “The City shall direct population increases away from known and predicted coastal high hazard areas consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the Future Land Use Element.”

City Administration is proposing to repeal LU 7.1 and now consider development applications which could have the effect of increasing residential density. In considering applications for increased density the Planning Commission and City Council will be asked to “balance” a set of twelve criteria. Administration is also proposing to amend the Land Development Regulations to harden certain construction in the CHHA, most notably by requiring future multi-family housing to build an additional two feet above Base Flood Elevation for a total of four feet and to meet design requirements for a Category 3 hurricane rather than the current Category 2 hurricane. It is noted these requirements are for multi-family projects only and not other types of construction, including commercial. At this time the Commission is being asked only to consider and approve the new balancing criteria for considering development applications increasing density in the CHHA. The proposed LDR changes are to be considered later.

Also proposed is the amendment of policy CM 10A which states “No public funds shall be used for infrastructure and services which subsidize population concentrations in the coastal high hazard area beyond the planned densities identified in the Future Land Use Map...” “Services” is proposed for deletion from this language.

Urban Land Institute (ULI) Study

The City contracted with the Urban Land Institute to undertake a study of opening up the CHHA for increased residential density and requiring higher standards for multi-family housing (ULI Technical Assistance Panel City of St. Petersburg Zoning Standards for Multi-Family Development in the Coastal High Hazard Area). The study identified 16 “Opportunities” or possible Positives and 14 “Constraints” or possible Negatives. Among the Opportunities were:

- Opportunity to increase the likelihood that residents have something to return to in the case of a storm.
- New development in the CHHA can mitigate risk by replacing older, more vulnerable structures with a much more resilient building stock.
- Many of the large institutions in the CHHA, like hospitals, have a strong need for more workforce housing close to their campuses.

Among the “Constraints” were:

- There is the possibility of disinvestment in the CHHA because of an increase of cost of development.
- There seems to be a lack of a detailed understanding of the vulnerable populations within the CHHA, which would help to inform a more holistic strategy for this area.
- Concern that increased density will place more people in harm’s way and that there will be an impact of adding additional density on existing shelter deficits.
- A missed opportunity to instead focus/encourage development in less vulnerable areas and utilize coastal land for preservation/mitigation.
Concern that this elevated standard will exacerbate housing affordability issues.

Many of the ULI recommendations relate to the proposed new CHHA multi-family building standards and point system for the LDRs. There is no evaluation in the report of the above constraints. However, some recommendations include:

- Consider limited future density in areas that may be subject to daily tidal flooding due to sea level rise in the next couple of decades. Comprehensive infrastructure improvements should continue to be targeted in areas to prevent sunny day flooding.
- Target specific areas for buyout, in the event of future disaster within repetitive loss geographies. These areas can serve as coastal defense.
- In other areas that are only subject to coastal flooding by severe but infrequent storms, create a density boost that could assist in getting better resilient building stock and amenities.

Norfolk Model

City Administration makes reference to the Norfolk, Virginia, zoning ordinance and the proposed LDR building standards and related point system (“Resiliency Quotient”). The proposed point system for CHHA multi-family construction is influenced by the Norfolk code. Norfolk is a good model for St. Petersburg as both cities are about the same size and both are surrounded by water. It is noted that Norfolk has not limited itself to development of building standards and incentives for CHHA but has in fact developed a comprehensive plan and future land use plan based on major storm and sea-level rise projections for the entire city (Vision 2100, a comprehensive 2030 plan, and resilience zoning code). Their Vision 2100 includes designation of “adaptation areas” in the city where residents are helped to adapt to rising water and where some new projected submerged land is left as part of the surrounding water body.

Proposed Criteria for St. Petersburg

The proposed 12 criteria range from whether a contemplated development is part of an “overall reduction of development density,” to maintaining “scenic qualities and improvement of public access to water.” There is no criterion which addresses whether the proposed development site is more prone to flooding than other sites within the CHHA.

While the material sent to the Commission for the recent workshop stated “City staff recommends that consideration be given toward making one or more criteria mandatory,” (p. 7) and certain criteria were proposed by some commission members at the workshop for mandating or prioritization, none of the criteria as now presented to the commission for approval are designated mandatory, or prioritized. The implication of this is that commission or council members would have the discretion of basing their decision on a few or even a single criterion.

Assessment

Given the recent significant increase in the city’s coastal high hazard area it is reasonable to consider some limited flexibility in allowing new development in this area. The companion proposal (not now under consideration) to harden new multi-family development against flooding and wind mitigates new development. While a step in the right direction, whether raising the first floor elevation to four feet would prevent interior flooding is still problematic. Even a Category 1 storm may generate surge related flooding in excess of that in certain areas. Also, the Administration is only proposing this for multi-family building. Other types of development including commercial is omitted.

No information has yet been presented to the commission: detailing those areas within the overall coastal high hazard area most vulnerable to flooding, and what the city’s plan is for addressing
this; detailing the likely effect on public resources, whether fixed public facilities such as fire stations and wastewater treatment plants, streets, or emergency services; adequacy of current evacuation shelters; and possible effect of the proposed new policy on the FEMA Community Rating System for St. Petersburg, and the potential for increased government relief for damaged properties post storm.

While the CHHA as a whole is projected to be inundated by the surge of a Category 1 hurricane, flooding due to Tropical and other major storms and sea-level rise will be more nuanced militating against any redevelopment in certain areas. It is agreed the Norfolk Plan is a good model for St. Petersburg. But our understanding is that the provisions of that plan for resilient development in coastal high hazard areas were implemented in the context of a comprehensive and related development plans for the entire city. Also, even within coastal high hazard areas restrictions against increased density were maintained in parts of the area, and in fact steps were proposed for reduced density, or even ceding properties to water. The proposal before the Commission applies to the entire CHHA and is proposed in the absence of a new comprehensive vision and plan for the city as a whole.

What the Administration’s new overall policy regarding increased residential density in the coastal high hazard area is remains unclear. As stated in the ULI report a basic concern identified is that “increased density will place more people in harm’s way.” The current policy (LU7.1) flatly prohibiting increases in residential density is repealed and replaced with the 12 balancing criteria. With the exception of criterion G, where a request would increase density on one parcel in concert with other measures that would reduce overall density, no limit is placed on increased density. Also, criterion G may be outweighed by anyone or more of the remaining 11 criteria. Policy CM 10B is retained which states “The City shall direct population concentrations away from known or predicted coastal hazard areas...” But this policy also retains the language “consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the Future Land Use Element” which circles back to the revised LU7.1 which effectively sets no limits on increases in residential density.

Measures which may be taken to strengthen the pending criteria allowing for some flexibility to development in the coastal high hazard area include:

Designate Criterion “G” as Mandatory. Designating criterion G mandatory would allow for some flexibility but maintain the current policy of no overall increase in residential density. An exception may be made for applications for development where mobile homes and trailers would be replaced (significant storm vulnerable structures). However, this should not be done without fair compensation to owners and assistance in finding alternative affordable housing.

Add a Mandatory Criterion Addressing the Relative Vulnerability to Flooding of the Specific Parcel to Be Developed. All parcels within the CHHA are not equally vulnerable to flooding. Those experiencing or projected for chronic significant flooding and with a history of repetitive flooding are not the best site for redevelopment. As the ULI Study recommended: “Develop a more fine-grain approach to land use in the CHHA....Consider limited future density in areas that may be subject to daily tidal flooding due to sea level rise in the next couple of decades. Comprehensive infrastructure improvements should continue to be targeted in areas to prevent sunny day flooding.....Target specific areas for buyout, in the event of future disaster within repetitive loss geographies. These areas can serve as coastal defense.” Also the City’s recently approved Integrated Sustainability Action Plan (ISAP) recommends, “Rethink FEMA repetitive loss areas. Consider investing funds into community-wide green infrastructure projects that reduce risk and provide benefits for more residents.” Such a criterion might read, “Exceptional Vulnerability to Flood Water—The requested amendment will avoid areas with a history of repetitive flooding or exceptional vulnerability to flooding.”

Consider Placing an Explicit Overall Limit on the Extent to Which Residential Density May be Increased.
**Defer the Proposed Policy Change to the StPete2050 Vision Process.** Deferring the proposed policy change to the current StPete2050 Vision process will allow it to be more carefully considered in tandem with resiliency issues and greater information for both the CHHA and the city as a whole.

I look forward to hearing the views of my colleagues on the Commission.
CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG
COMMUNITY PLANNING & PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING

The Sunshine Center, Auditorium
330 Fifth St. N.
St. Petersburg, FL  33701

DECEMBER 10, 2019
TUESDAY
2:00 PM

MINUTES

Present:   Jeff Rogo, Chair
Christopher “Chris” A. Burke, Vice Chair
Keisha A. Bell
Will Michaels
Gwendolyn “Gwen” Reese
Lisa Wannemacher, Alternate
Sharon Winters, Alternate
Thomas “Tom” Whiteman, Alternate

Commissioners Absent:   Jeffery “Jeff” M. Wolf

Staff Present:   Elizabeth Abernethy, Director Planning & Development Services
Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Britton Wilson, Planner II, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Ann Vickstrom, Planner II, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney
Heather Judd, Assistant City Attorney
Katherine Connell, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Development Services

The public hearing was called to order at 2:00 p.m., a quorum was present.

I. OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIR

II. ROLL CALL

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND SWEARING IN OF WITNESSES

IV. MINUTES

The minutes from the November 12, 2019 meetings were approved by a consensus vote.
V. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

VI. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. City File FLUM-57 Contact Person: Ann Vickstrom, 892-5807

Request: An amendment to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) from Institutional (I) to Planned Redevelopment-Commercial (PR-C) to allow for consistency to the Future Land Use Map, Comprehensive Plan, and Land Development Regulations.

Staff Presentation
Ann Vickstrom gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

Applicant Presentation
Applicant Carlos Yepes, Manager of 2500 34th Street, LLC. was available for questions.

Registered Opponent
None.

Public Hearing
None.

Cross Examination:
City Staff:
Waived.

Applicant:
Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks
City Staff:
Waived.

Applicant/Owner:
Waived.

Executive Session
Commissioner Rogo: Commissioners we are in Executive Session, any questions, comments, by Commissioners or a motion?

Commissioner Burke: Obviously this is a pretty easy one, it makes perfect sense. It is just another example where we say everything meets the infrastructure standards and we just keep kicking down the road the storm sewer and sanitary sewer. We have to stop sometime, right? There is no reason that we would reject this.
Commission Michaels: Yes, I think we have discussed that many times and the City is making good progress there but the level of service standard, in particular, and the ten (10) year flood factor that is used, I think that needs to be reviewed. On the whole I think the Applicant and the Staff have made a good case here for the request in particular they site policy LU3.6 which talks about weighing heavily the established character and this application does that. I move approval.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Second.

Commissioner Rogo: We have a motion and a second, any further comments or questions? Hearing none, clerk.

Commissioner Michaels made a motion finding consistency with the City’s Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulation. Commissioner Wannemacher Seconded

MOTION: Approval of FLUM-57 application

VOTE: YES – 7 – Bell, Burke, Michaels, Reese, Rogo, Whiteman, Winters
NO – 0

B. City File ZM-9 Contact Person: Britton Wilson, 551-3542

Request: An amendment to the official zoning map to change the zoning designation from Neighborhood Mobile Home (NMH) to Neighborhood Suburban Multi-family -1 (NSM-1) located at the site of the Lamplight Village mobile home park located at 8700 4th Street North.

Staff Presentation

Britton Wilson gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

Applicant Presentation

Applicant Carlos Yepes, Manager of BDG Lamplight Village, LLC. was available for questions.

Commissioner Burke: Have you finalized your plans, are there any plans for affordable or workforce housing on this site?

Carlos Yepes: Under the current NSM-1 guidelines you are allowed to increase density and provide some workforce housing. We are looking at all of the options and we also have the new Coastal High Hazard Amendment that is going to pass. We are contemplating with Staff for the last four months. We are happy to see that happen in the City to allow us to build some workforce housing.

Commissioner Burke: Those plans are not finalized?

Carlos Yepes: Correct, no final plans yet, we are looking at the amendment that is going to happen and we expect that amendment to pass and become the new rules by May of this coming year. We are integrating two plans, one with the current zoning that we are proposing and one with the added units.

Commissioner Burke: Thank you.
Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

Mr. Aaron Malice, 603 86th Ave. N., attended to find out how large the project would be and get more information on the matter.

Cross Examination:

City Staff:
Waived.

Applicant:
Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff:
Waived.

Applicant/Owner:
Waived.

Executive Session

Commissioner Rogo: We are in executive session, Commissioners any comments or questions?

Commissioner Winters: At the bottom of page 5 of the Staff Report there is information around one hundred and twelve (112) occupied mobile homes on the subject property and that with the option of workforce housing density bonus there would be one hundred twenty nine (129) units in the new construction. Because this is in a Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) and flood evacuation zone in A, which makes it a really vulnerable property, it was previously mobile homes, but the current Comprehensive Plan language says that there will be no increases in density. This is effectively what’s happening, there will be more people. I understand that there is underlying zoning that allows fifteen (15) units per acre. I assume that the mobile homes are not consuming that much. Technically this is an increase in density in a CHHA and that concerns me, if someone can comment on that.

Britton Wilson: Yes, the strict interpretation of that policy is no new increases in land use density, which this is not proposing any. However, your point to allowing density of workforce housing bonus that was incorporated into City Codes before the contemplation of the overall CHHA issues before us. It has not been excerpted out of that publication.

Commissioner Rogo: I am not sure I understand what you mean. Does that mean they can, if we give approval?

Britton Wilson: It is considered a density bonus, and that the density does not count and that is an incentive to
encourage developers to build workforce housing. That is the way the ordinance has been developed for the past decade.

Derek Kilborn: That is correct, the time that the prohibition would be applied to an application is if there was a map amendment request to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM). In this particular case because there is no change to the FLUM then that particular provision prohibition is not triggered. That is why this particular application is allowed to move forward even though it is in the Coastal High Hazard Area, separate from other applications that might also include a FLUM amendment.

Commissioner Winters: Just so I am clear, you are saying the affordable housing bonus overrides the prohibition on increases in density in Costal High Hazard Areas.

Derek Kilborn: I am saying that the workforce housing bonus is interpreted as part of the zoning category and again the prohibitions only apply when we are looking at an amendment to the Future Land Use Map. One does not apply here, that prohibition is not applied to this particular request.

Commissioner Reese: This is even a little more confusing to me because we are using different labels. Are we using different labels for the same thing? Are we saying, affordable housing, workforce housing what is the difference what is the similarity are they used interchangeably, and it would be less confusing if they were not? Would you clarify that please, which of course is completely different from low income housing, can you please tell me the difference, the similarity and what you are calling affordable and what you are calling workforce.

Derek Kilborn: Yes, I am sorry, workforce housing is the technical term that is used in the City’s Land Development Regulations (LDR) and that is what the original question was speaking to. Is the density bonus for providing workforce housing units, that particular term has a very specific meaning. It is referring to units that are rent or fee-simple price regulated at 80/100% and 120% of area median income. The more generic term, affordable housing, is used very loosely but does not have a technical term in the sense of the code. For us workforce housing is the term that we use when discussing density bonus.

Commissioner Burke: We had a comment from Mr. Malice, of the public. He is a concerned neighbor; can you at least give him some idea of what some of the limitations are in this land use and zoning for height and things like that, at least some general information?

Britton Wilson: Yes, I will meet with the resident after this meeting. I will give him my card and go over the details.

Commissioner Burke: Thank you.

Commissioner Rogo: Commissioners do we have a motion?

Commissioner Burke: I make a motion that we approve based on Staff’s recommendation.

Commissioner Bell: I Second.

*Commissioner Burke made a motion approving the application based on Staff’s recommendation.*

*Commissioner Bell Seconded*
MOTION: Approval of ZM-9 application

VOTE: YES – 6 – Bell, Burke, Michaels, Reese, Rogo, Whiteman
NO – 1 -Winters

VII. PUBLIC HEARING

A. City File SNC-2019-01 Contact People: Ann Vickstrom, 892-5807

Request: Co-name a portion of 37th Street South, from 38th Avenue South to 54th Avenue South, (Skyway Marina Blvd.)

Staff Presentation

Ann Vickstrom gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

Commissioner Michaels: Is it necessary for all of the applicable criteria to be met?

Derek Kilborn: No.

Commissioner Rogo: Any other questions at this time or comments for Staff?

Commissioner Reese: Yes, I have several. As it relates to, you used the word complexity, as it relates to co-naming 34th Street, which is more applicable because that is where all the businesses are, you aid complexity, is it impossible or just complex? More complex to seek that co-naming?

Ann Vickstrom: That is a very good question, it is more complex in that it is a state road and that would have to be done through the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Pinellas County and St. Petersburg. That is what gives it that complexity. Whether it can be done, I would assume so, but I was not involved in those conversations. Jack Dougherty from the Skyway Marina District is here, and he was involved and can answer those questions.

Commissioner Reese: I think you have answered, it is not impossible it is just more complex, it is a little more work. The speed limit on 37th Street is 30 miles per hour, no one adheres to it now. There are all kinds of things there to slow the traffic down, and it is not happening. Even at the roundabout there have been several accidents, so that is a concern for me. On page 2, where it speaks about the outreach to residents and businesses, I am a little concerned because there is an implication that the design of the cards may have skewed the results. There was a place to check support but not a place in opposition which can be confusing for people. Some people did write in the fact that they opposed for what ever reason, do we know why there was not a place to check in opposition as there was to check in support of?

Ann Vickstrom: Those cards were sent out as part of the naming process. Those cards were developed and sent out through the Skyway Marina District, the City was not involved in the design of those cards. Certainly, we would have had a support and an opposition, so that someone could check it either way.

Commissioner Reese: Okay, so can they answer that question for me?
Jack Dougherty: I can answer that question; my name is Jack Dougherty and I was the President of the Skyway Marina District when this was occurring. The cards were originally designed because we were trying to get fifty percent (50%) of the residents along 37th Street, that was the initial design. We could not limit the cards being sent out just to 37th Street residents, we had to send it out to the entire, Maximo and Broadwater and all those. The initial reason was to get fifty one percent (51%) of the residents along 37th Street, by just checking, all we were looking for was fifty one percent (51%) of the residents along 37th Street.

Commissioner Reese: That still does not clarify for me why people were not given the choice of checking opposition or support, either way.

Jack Dougherty: Because, at that point we were thinking that we only needed fifty one percent (51%) support, we were just looking for support for the residents along 37th Street just the support number.

Commissioner Bell: Would it then be correct to, with your rationale, that those who did not respond, did you do some type of math to then take into consideration that those who did not respond may have been against?

Jack Dougherty: We thought that the meetings themselves with people who were in opposition that they would come and express their opposition at the meetings themselves. We were just looking for support for the idea. If there was not support for the idea, if people did not think it was a good idea, we would not have gone forward with it. Just to give you an indication, the way it was originally done, is the board itself, there were nine (9) members of the Skyway Marina District Board, we were throwing out ideas as to how to brand the area better. This was one of the ideas we came up with eight (8) of the nine (9) members voted to go this direction, then we were looking for, the board thinks this is a good idea, do the residents of the neighborhood think this is a good idea also. That is why those cards were sent out, those were originally sent out way back in 2018. We have been working on this for two (2) years now. I can talk about the concerns about the FDOT also if you would like to at this point.

Commissioner Rogo: Sir, I think you have given us a card so maybe in your three (3) minute presentation, if you would address that for us.

**Applicant Presentation:**

None.

**Registered Opponent**

None.

**Public Hearing**

Helen Larson, 4201 37th Street S. spoke in opposition to the application;
Dave Buschman, 429 77th Ave. N. did not speak and did not support or oppose the application;
Jack Dougherty, 4601 34th Street S., spoke in support of the application.

Commissioner Reese: I just wondered, for Staff, I know recently part of Interstate 275, it is either 175 or 375, I never remember which that was renamed/co-named the C. Bette Wimbish Highway. I know it may be difficult, many things are, but I know it is not impossible, I just wanted to get any ideas from Staff. I know it may be difficult, many things are, but I know it is not impossible if they were able to get part of an interstate co-named. Can you give me a little bit more
clarification?

Derek Kilborn: It is 375, the one you are referring to. It is my understanding that those names have been applied through acts of the State Legislature. That is a very unique action at a very high level, and I do not know that a rename or a co-name in this instance would rise to that level of action. We as Staff have deferred to the actions of the Skyway Marina Board and the conversations that they have had with FDOT on this question.

Frank Bozikovich, 4485 37th St. S., spoke in opposition of the request.
Lowell Dexter, 4255 37th Street S., spoke in opposition to the request.

Executive Session

Commissioner Reese: I am not going to vote in favor of this for several reasons. I have been concerned over the increase in requests we have been getting for co-naming and renaming streets throughout the City. I am very familiar with this area and I know that there is only, maybe from 46th Avenue to wherever the Publix shopping center is, that would be commercial in both sides. Maximo Marina on one side and the back of the shopping center, where the UPS Store is on the other side and then around to Publix, one side is the Publix shopping center, but the other side is Maximo Moorings residential. It is more residential than anything, it is a single lane road. There is already traffic problems on it. I am not going to vote in favor of this co-naming. I just wanted to speak clearly to my reasons or my rational, why, thank you.

Commissioner Michaels: Well it is, again one of these for me, a difficult decision. We have a Staff report which is saying that the proposal meets five (5) criteria and is partially meeting one (1) of them, the issue being the duplication of parts of the name. Yet we have the folks who live on the street here, that are very concerned about this long term on their street, opposing it. I guess I am just pointing out that there is a balance here.

Commissioner Winters: I also have a concern about the co-naming/renaming issue and the, I guess as a tax payer I am concerned about the Staff time that goes into these. I really think, it was pointed out in the Staff report there are lots of ways to market an area. I understand the reason behind wanting to do something, but I think you can do a lot with signage and other forms of marketing that will also have impact.

Commissioner Rogo: I too am a nearby neighbor, Isla Del Sol, I travel through the Marina District, Skyway Marina District, at times during my day and I see the two (2) attractive monument signs that are both pretty much on 34th Street and the district is trying to brand itself as a business district a mixed use center and there again I see 34th Street or US 19 as the location, business center or the mixed use center, not 37th and I too am. I wish you could have spent two (2) years on 34th and see where we stand as opposed to having to kind of push the 37th re-naming and now co-naming. Any further comments Commissioners or a motion? Legal if you can maybe help, the Staff recommendation is against, should our motion be positive?

Attorney Dema: It must be, so you have to move approval, and then vote accordingly.

Commissioner Reese: I move approval of the Staff’s recommendation as listed in our report.

Commissioner Rogo: I am not sure…we can’t do that.

Attorney Dema: You must move approval of the application for the co-naming and then vote accordingly.
Commissioner Burke: I will make a motion that we approve the co-naming of the street as presented by the Applicant.

Commissioner Whiteman: So, do we add conditions in the Staff report?

Commissioner Burke: Subject to the final condition of the Staff recommendation.

"Commissioner Burke moved approval of the request subject to Staff recommendations. Commissioner Whiteman seconded."

MOTION: Motion failed.

VOTE: YES – 0
NO – 7 – Bell, Burke, Michaels, Reese, Rogo, Whiteman, Winters

B. City File LGCP-2019-03

Contact Person: Britton Wilson, 551-3542

Request: This is a City-initiated amendment requesting to amend the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to provisions of the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA). The proposed text amendments would allow consideration of land use plan amendments, which increase density subject to balancing criteria.

Staff Presentation

Britton Wilson gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report. Elizabeth Abernethy was available for questions.

Commissioner Rogo: Commissioners, questions for Staff?

Commissioner Winters: On Criteria J:

Location within an Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or Multimodal Corridor – the requested amendment is within and existing or proposed Activity Center.

Proposed, are there areas that are proposed that you do not really know about? That seems…

Britton Wilson: An application can be made in the future for expanding or creating a new Activity Center, it would follow the land use map amendment process.

Elizabeth Abernethy: Elizabeth Abernethy, Director of Planning and Development, to just further what Britton was saying, it is conceivable that when we are done with our 2050, we are going to be looking at our Activity Centers and Employment Centers and we could be expanding those depending on what we hear from the community through the 2050 process. There is nothing currently on the table to change anything but that could be a result of our 2050.

Commissioner Winters: How long have these been in place? I am new to the state I do not have the history.
Have we been doing this for a long time, creating these Activity Centers?

Elizabeth Abernethy: I will defer to, I know the answer is yes, but I know that…

Derek Kilborn: I am not sure the exact time, at least two (2) decades. It definitely goes back beyond two (2) decades but my experience with the City has been nineteen (19) years. It definitely existed pre nineteen (19) years.

Attorney Dema: Special area plans were like the DRIs (Development of Regional Impact), in the Gateway area and Intown and those go back to the early 80s.

Commissioner Winters: So, you can say there has been a lot, a good bit of investment in these areas.

Derek Kilborn: That is correct, what is probably more familiar to this Commission in terms of Activity Centers, Special Area Plans would be the Innovation District. The district was just recently classified Activity Center as well as Central Avenue. You will recall there was a Central Avenue Revitalization Plan in 2012. Following that, the Central Avenue spine was made an Activity Center to reflect the initiatives in that plan. That reflects, I think, why these particular references are in here as it requires more front-end planning work in order to be established as an Activity Center. When you look at Central Avenue and the Skyway Marina District, when you look at the Innovation District, there was a very extensive planning process over several years that led up to, first the plan and then the Activity Center designation that followed. Because of the planning work that goes into those particular initiatives, those are seen as a little different than the generic application that might just come in over the counter to rezone from Neighborhood Suburban (NS) to some other higher threshold.

Commissioner Winters: Thank you, I guess my concern is the word proposed in there, because essentially it opens us up to just creating new Activity Centers to fit within the proposal.

Derek Kilborn: The word proposed is designed to allow for some of that flexibility that was basis for this conversation in the first place. Acknowledging that in order to become one of those categories listed, they are going to have to go through a more detailed planning process upfront. Any conditions that might be unique or specific to a particular location and concerns especially with coastal resiliency, could be worked in on the frontend to that planning document and the overall masterplan, for that area.

Commissioner Winters: Thank you, I appreciate that information very much.

Commissioner Michaels: I have a few questions, if my questions go too long, if somebody has a question I can stop and then comeback. I have spent a lot of looking at this, to me this is the most important issue to have been brought before the Planning Commission in six (6) years or so. I think this needs to be looked at very carefully. We did get, today, we got the additional proposal or recommendation that makes four (4) of the criteria weighted as “mandatory minimum” review criteria, etcetera. I just want to clarify that, are we saying that an application that came before the Commission would have to meet all four (4) of those criteria?

Britton Wilson: Yes, sir that is correct.

Commissioner Michaels: Thank you, I had some questions about the policies, and one is the policy that relates to not increasing infrastructure or services, CM 10A. My question there is, why are services being deleted?
Britton Wilson: It was Staff’s concern that that was restricting the ability for police and fire to offer services to this area and that was not what was intended.

Commissioner Michaels: Okay, it would seem to me that the reason for that policy would be the concern about increasing density in the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) putting an additional burden on the City services. I am just speculating here, that may be the reason why that was adopted. I noticed where the policies that are being consistent with this proposed change, CM 10B what is omitted is

“City shall direct population concentrations away from known or predicted Coastal High Hazard Areas consistent with the goals etcetera.”

What was the reason for omitting that?

Elizabeth Abernethy: I will jump in, it is not the intention of the City to start directing populations to the CHHA. We did not see a need to change that, that is still the policy. Now a change that allows incremental or de minimus additional population, additional people, we do not see as directing population to the Coastal High Hazard Area. We would not see an inherent conflict in an application coming forward say on a mobile home site that changed the density from fifteen (15) to twenty four (24) units per acre as directing population to the Coastal High Hazard Area. Did that answer your question?

Commissioner Michaels: I think so.

Elizabeth Abernethy: We want to keep that policy about, where we are directing our population as is.

Commissioner Michaels: But it is not listed as a policy that proposed changes are in keeping with, is not one of your polices identified as consistent with the proposed changes.

Elizabeth Abernethy: We are not asking for any changes to that policy.

Commissioner Michaels: You are not asking for any changes to a dozen policies that you are citing as being consistent with this proposed change.

Elizabeth Abernethy: Okay I understand what you are saying, I thought you were asking why we weren’t proposing to change it, I misunderstood.

Commissioner Michaels: So, is that just an oversight, an error?

Britton Wilson: Oversight.

Commissioner Michaels: Oversight, okay. Then I guess a question for legal, would be how do we make a finding of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan when we are proposing to change an important part of that plan?

Attorney Dema: That is an amendment has to be consistent with the overall plan, because you are changing it, does not mean you cannot make the finding of consistency. You are looking at the entirety of a three hundred (300) page plan and some limited, some amendments to that and how do they fit in with the overall tenor of the Comprehensive Plan and Staff has set forth those dozen or so policies that they think establishes the grounds for finding that consistency and will likely add another one based on your suggestion Commissioner Michaels.
Generally speaking, the consistency finding for amendments is done based on the balance of what is left in the plan and you see how that fits in with it going forward.

Commissioner Michaels: Even though we are changing an important part of the Comprehensive Plan the proposed changes on balance, doing the balancing, would be that there are other policies that the proposed changes are in harmony with. We can then make a finding of consistency, that helps. I did prepare a memorandum for the Commissioners. I understand that it has been distributed. I have some proposals for strengthening the proposed criteria. I guess one of my concerns with what has been presented to us, and I might say I do think that providing some flexibility is appropriate here, is that too much flexibility may lead to very significant changes in the density of our residential population in the Coastal High Hazard Areas. That would be unacceptable. I am trying to find ways to limit if you will the density that might otherwise occur. One proposal was to designate criteria “G” also as a minimum mandatory criterion. Perhaps making exceptions for mobile homes and trailer parks which are obviously very vulnerable, and it would be desirable to replace them. What does the Staff think about that, designating criterion “G” as mandatory?

Elizabeth Abernethy: Well. I can see that, there could be situations where that might be too limiting. What comes to my mind is, say a redevelopment of a shopping center on MLK or 16th, that currently might have fifteen (15) dwelling units per acre, we want to increase that to be more consistent with our multi-modal corridor strategies and policies by allowing redevelopment with mixed use and I can see where we might support increase say from fifteen (15) to twenty (20) dwelling units per acre. Instead of townhouses we can have a multi-family project in concert with a mixed-use commercial project. Those are kind of circumstances where I would think that the policies about supporting multi-modal transit and land use types that help to drive transit might be weighed against the concern of an additional thirty (30) or forty (40) units being placed in a Coastal High Hazard Area. That was our concern that it might be too limiting to some of the other policies that might.

Commissioner Michaels: What if instead, in the words of the Staff memos, there were two (2) weightings, one was “mandatory” and the other was “prioritized” or “priority”. What about instead of using mandatory we can use the word priority there? In other words if we got an application which says yes we are going to replace this mobile home park but it is going to increase the density on that particular site to some extent, not an unreasonable extent, and at the same time we were undertaking some action that would reduce density on another site. That would seem to me be an obvious thing for the Commission to approve and then we would make that a priority.

Elizabeth Abernethy: So, I am almost hearing, make three (3) tiers, a mandatory then a higher priority and then a lower priority?

Commissioner Michaels: That would be true, you would have the four (4) mandatory criteria and then after the four (4) mandatory criteria, the remaining criteria that particular one would be prioritized, in other words, if you had an application that proposed to increase density on one site but reduce it on another site so that there was no net increase in density then that would be considered, what is the language we have been using, “great weight” would be given to that application.

Elizabeth Abernethy: I hear what you are saying. I have to think about how we would word something like that. I do understand what you are trying to do, is trying to set three (3) different tiers of priority for the criteria.

Commissioner Michaels: That would be the case…
Attorney Dema: I just want to flush that out make sure I understand what you are saying Commissioner Michaels, and I apologize for interjecting. I think the situation is a little, it would present itself in fewer circumstances than you would think. I think an applicant would have to have control of enough property within the CHHA where they were seeking the density increase, they could also go to another piece of property they owned and downzone their property essentially. In a case where an applicant is seeking simply an increase in density or intensity, I do not think the City could unilaterally come in and try to downzone something else unless they had control of, unless we had control of the property. I think the situation would present itself maybe not that often unless they were larger parcels or multiple parcels and under the ownership of a particular applicant. To make it mandatory would be…

Commissioner Michaels: I understand it would not be frequent, but it would likely happen. Apparently, it would happen enough so that you have included as a criterion in the proposed...

Attorney Dema: Right, I guess that would be my argument against it being mandatory.

Commissioner Michaels: Pushing aside “mandatory” it would be designated as a “priority”. Again, Staff are using the word “priority” maybe we need to define what you mean.

Elizabeth Abernethy: That is one of the criteria that came through the County, that was in the Countywide Rules not one that we drafted internally. That is something again that we are, unlike the County or the Special Planned Area, to begin with to be able to, where somebody could control multiple parcels. Your language about reducing the mobile homes and trailers, it is really captured in our L, which is reduction of storm vulnerable structures. That is the new criteria that we were proposing that we would want to do a balancing criterion as well.

Commissioner Rogo: May I ask, maybe for additional clarification on that. I think I know the answer but let’s try it out anyway. Are we talking about a single owner or take a case like and Activity Center, lets say Carillon, someone who is with in the CHHA has come to us and asked for an increase in density on one parcel within Carillon. Can they propose or could the City impose a reduction in density in another part of Carillon or another part of the Activity Center? Does it need one owner?

Elizabeth Abernethy: Or an owner’s consent. We would want the consent of owners.

Commissioner Rogo: That is what I thought the answer was but thought I would broach that to see if that flew at all to what you are striving to accomplish. (To Commissioner Michaels) I am going to take you up on your offer and ask a couple of questions, maybe some other Commissioners have some as well. We are pleased to come back to you because you have put a lot of time and thought into this issue. Ms. Wilson, did you say that forty-one percent (41%) of the City’s area is now included in the CHHA, four (4) one (1) forty one percent?

Britton Wilson: That is correct and looking for the land use map showing percentage of which land use category is actually in the Coastal High Hazard Area. We have twenty five percent (25%) area is preservation twenty three percent (23%) is low density residential, water is another ten percent (10%).

Commissioner Rogo: It just appears to be something less than forty one percent (41%) so that is why I ask.

Commissioner Michaels: I think it is more like eighteen percent (18%), the whole City is about one hundred and seventy five square miles (175 sq. miles).
Britton Wilson: These numbers also exclude right of way, so if you add right of way to it.

Commissioner Michaels: To me, I would go back and double check the forty one percent (41%).
Britton Wilson: Okay.

Commissioner Rogo: Just a lot of white as opposed to red and yellow that.

Commissioner Burke: These numbers do not corollate to that. These numbers are the percentage of this type of use that are in the Coastal High Hazard Area. She is not saying that forty one percent (41%) of the City’s land is included in the Coastal High Hazard Area, correct? You did not mean to imply that?

Britton Wilson: It is my understanding that forty one percent (41%) of the City’s land mass is within the Coastal High Hazard Area.

Commissioner Bell: Wow.

Attorney Judd: Not including the right of ways, so the right of way is the streets the sidewalks, everything the City owns was taken out of that calculation. You take that calculation it is forty one percent (41%) of the right of way available to build on land.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Right of way is a large area, a very large area.

Attorney Dema: The City is about sixty two square miles (62 sq. miles). That is sixteen thousand three hundred and twenty eight acres (16,328) is twenty five point five square miles (25.5 sq. miles) divided by sixty two (62) just using a rough estimate is forty one point one percent (41.1%) of the City so.

Commissioner Rogo: Thank you.

Elizabeth Abernethy: Thank you Michael.

Commissioner Rogo: Ms. Wilson before you go away from the podium, could you define for us disturbed area? Is that an area that has some existing development as opposed to an area that does not have any kind of development?

Elizabeth Abernethy: I will go ahead and answer for Britton, it is not defined in our code but that would be my understanding, something that had development on it, a parking lot, a building, a developed site.

Commissioner Rogo: Thank you.

Commissioner Burke: Obviously a lot of work has gone into this, what are the top three (3) benefits that the City will receive as a result of this change should it pass?

Elizabeth Abernethy: I will have our team help us out here, I did not think about the top three (3). One would be provide some additional flexibility with re-development and balance on other priorities such as promoting multi-modal development and re-development in our City. Reducing storm vulnerable structures, taking, I think we have a map of the number of structures that were built prior to the regulations. We have over eighteen thousand (18,000) structures in the Coastal High Hazard Area now that do not meet our current minimum standards. Again, incentivizing re-development that results in structures that meet today’s standards we see that
as an asset for the City. That is two (2), what was the third one.

Commissioner Burke: I do not want to put you on the spot, I guess I was really looking at, I think a huge benefit of this is going to be replacing some of these storm vulnerable structures with these fortified structures. In my mind having one hundred (100) people on a plot of land in vulnerable structures or one hundred and twenty five (125) in that same plot of land in fortified structures is a huge benefit to us. Do you anticipate that should this pass, that we will see an increase in replacement of those vulnerable structures?

Elizabeth Abernethy: That would be our intent.

Commissioner Burke: I see that as the main benefit.

Elizabeth Abernethy: The companion amendments that are now, have been moving forward as a result of our thinking on this issue, to increase our building code with the additional two feet (2 ft.) of freeboard and the additional wind load as well as the land development code changes to mandate providing hurricane evacuation of re-entry plans and to address some of our sustainability goals and policies. As a package of amendments, we really see this as helping our City move forward and addressing both sea level rise and vulnerability and flood hazards.

Commissioner Burke: Certainly, the reduction in density is not aligned with a lot of the things that the City is seeking to do. They are talking about bringing in new industry and bringing in home offices and things like that, well we have to increase density to fill those jobs. We have an employment rate below four percent (4%) so I think that this would be a great benefit to the City.

Commissioner Whiteman: Just a couple of clarifications, if Jabil wanted to build out there where they are now, that is in the Coastal High Hazard Area, right? So if Jabil wanted to build a new manufacturing building where there international headquarters are, they build it, what do they have to do? That is a high density.

Elizabeth Abernethy: Correct and I think currently they are in an Activity Center and Employment Center. As long as they did not want to add housing on their site for their work force than they probably would not have any issue. If they wanted to do mixed use and bring in some type of residential component, that would be could be an issue.

Commissioner Whiteman: Let me give you an example, Bayfront Medical Center, is it in Coastal High Hazard Area or not?

Elizabeth Abernethy: The majority of the north portion of the Innovation District is not, I do not believe any of the land that is owned by Bayfront is in the Coastal High Hazard.

Commissioner Whiteman: Okay, if someone wanted to build a skilled nursing facility there, can they build it?

Elizabeth Abernethy: As long as it is not in a Coastal High Hazard Area.

Commissioner Whiteman: So on Beach Drive, someone could not build one now?

Elizabeth Abernethy: Not in those portions that are within the Coastal High Hazard Area.

Commissioner Whiteman: We have all those ones on Beach Drive, the skilled nursing facilities or the ALF or whatever they could not build new ones?
Elizabeth Abernethy: They are not allowed to expand if they are in the Coastal High Hazard Area, correct. Not all of them are, I mean I know you can zoom into that area.

Commissioner Whiteman: Even on that map I could not figure out what was covered for sure. The streets, you can’t read.

Elizabeth Abernethy: We definitely do have nursing homes and ALFs in our City that are in the Coastal High Hazard Area. There is Shore Acres, Bon Secours up on 4th Street.

Commissioner Whiteman: But you are going to prohibit them from expanding?

Elizabeth Abernethy: Yes, we currently do, we do not allow.

Commissioner Burke: Can you just clarify, we currently prohibit them from expanding and what you are proposing here will not in anyway change that current prohibition.

Elizabeth Abernethy: That is correct.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Just a quick comment, does Duke Energy have some kind of overlay for burying their powerlines or transformers in the Coastal High Hazard Area that corresponds with what we are doing in the City.

Elizabeth Abernethy: Not that I am familiar with.

Commissioner Wannemacher: I was just curious if they had a plan that they were taking all of this into consideration as well because that is a big component.

Elizabeth Abernethy: That is a good point, we will reach out to them, but I do not have any knowledge that they have a plan. I know that there some areas in the City that have been lobbying for that. It is a huge cost and how that is handled is usually what is at issue.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Speaking of cost, I mean, for instance going from requiring buildings to withstand one hundred and forty five (145) miles per hour versus one hundred and fifty five (155) miles per hour, that will result alone in expediential increase in construction cost. It is not just a 1 for 1 increase when you make the code stronger in such a fashion. It will mean really expediential increases in cost for even public, municipal construction and workforce housing construction which will be more difficult to achieve. The extra two (2) feet of freeboard, that is a big, it is going to be a big increase in construction costs.

Elizabeth Abernethy: We have done some preliminary costs estimates with a consultant who was going to be providing us with another final report that will accompany those changes. That has been taken into consideration and we will have some feedback from a consultant on the additional cost on those items as well.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Great, thank you.

Commissioner Reese: As it relates to L., reduction of storm vulnerable structures not limited to mobile homes, trailers and residences. I am concerned about the residences, when would the requirement to meet the FEMA elevation requirements be, when would that pertain to residences? Would it be upon sale of a current residence
and someone else is buying it? Would it be if and when it is damaged or destroyed by a storm or would it just be levied upon the owner of the property that they must now bring their property up to the standards?

Elizabeth Abernethy: The current proposal for the land development and the Building Code changes would apply to anything more than a two (2) unit project, multi-family and it is new construction. Current requirements for single family and if your expanding your single family is part of our FEMA flood requirements, two (2) additional feet of freeboard for new construction and substantial improvements.

Commissioner Rogo: Any additional questions of Staff? We will have an opportunity to ask them questions when we go into executive session. I do have some cards.

**Applicant Presentation**

None.

**Public Hearing**

Peter Belmont, 102 Fareham Place North, spoke in opposition to the application;
Maureen Sheedy, 2515 Oakdale Street South, spoke in opposition to the application;
William (Bill) Dahl, 105 23rd Ave SE, spoke in opposition to the application;
Robert Burn, 155 18th Avenue SE., spoke in opposition to the application;
Cathy Harrelson, 257 32nd Avenue North, spoke in opposition to the application;
Joshua Rumschlag, 234 21st Avenue South, spoke in opposition to the application;
Merribeth Farnham, 156 21st Avenue South, spoke in opposition to the application;
Karl Nurse, 176 21st Avenue SE., spoke in opposition to the application;
Carlos Yepes, 300 Beach Drive NE # 3001, spoke in support of the application.

**Executive Session**

Commissioner Rogo: Thank you, I have no other cards, looking around the audience it looks as if everyone has spoken. Commissioners any additional questions or..

Commissioner Whiteman: May I ask Karl Nurse a question?

Commissioner Rogo: Sure.

Commissioner Whiteman: Karl when you said, put it to bed, what did you mean, how would you change this?

Karl Nurse: I would eliminate the ability to increase density in the high hazard area. Leave that as it is, if you want to do some things to have additional requirements to lower risk of flood, that is fine. In fact, I was the City Council member that pushed for the two feet (2 ft.) above freeboard for residential. It took me two steps to get there but yeah, I just would not change the zoning, I apologize, the land development regulations.

Commissioner Michaels: I have been trying to find a way to tailor this so that it would make sense to support it, but I do not think I have been very successful. I read the Urban Land Institute Report that was given to the City Council about a month or so ago. I do not think that was distributed to the Commission here. They recommended in that plan, I will just read this:

Urban Land Institute Technical Assistance Panel
City of St. Petersburg
Zoning Standards for Multi-Family Development in the Coastal High Hazard Area
June 18 and June 19, 2019

- Develop a more-fine grain approach to land use in the CHHA by:
  
  o Consider limited future density in areas that may be subject to daily tidal flooding due to sea level rise in the next couple of decades. Comprehensive infrastructure improvements should continue to be targeted in areas to prevent sunny day flooding.
  
  o Target specific areas for buyout, in the event of future disaster within respective loss geographies. These areas can serve as coastal defense.

I also read the Sustainability Plan which emphasizes the earmarking of green spaces around the edge of the City in the Coastal High Hazard Areas as a way to effectively mitigate to some extent potential future flooding. I also read the Norfolk Plan which Staff made reference to. If you read that Norfolk Plan through, and I do agree that it is a good model for St. Petersburg, they have not carved out a set of criteria that relates only to the Coastal High Hazard Area. They have in fact completely redone their comprehensive plan and their other vision documents. Those documents do designate areas within the Coastal High Hazard Area that are going to be left vacant, they are going to join adjacent water bodies. In other words, they are not going to build on those areas. I guess where I am at right now, I would like to see the mobile homes that are high hazard structures in the Coastal High Hazard Areas replaced with better housing, but I think what we are lacking is that total integrated perspective. We are taking a piece of this and we are not looking at how this interrelates, like raising streets for example. We have had no discussion whether or not in ten (10) or fifteen (15) years we are going to have to raise streets within certain areas of the Coastal High Hazard Area. I think those are things we need to get on the table before we make a decision like this. I think where I am at right now is, if we refer it to the 2050 visioning process. Let’s look at it comprehensively, let’s build more of a consensus, let’s understand what is going on, get more facts and do this a better way than I think we can do it today.

Commissioner Winters: I have a question for Mr. Kilborn before I comment on the bottom of page 26 in the minutes from last month’s meeting, you commented about, you called it zombie development, properties that are essentially distressed that sit in Coastal High Hazard Areas and developers are not willing to invest because they cannot increase density. This is probably my sole concern around this, because I can’t really support this change, but I am concerned about this particular issue of having distressed properties sitting there in Coastal High Hazard Areas. Is there another way that this particular issue could be addressed other than making a code change or comp plan change?

Derek Kilborn: Sure, it could potential, I guess to kind of frame out your comment a little bit more for maybe people who are watching and were not part of that conversation. I think at that time we were representing that there are distressed commercial properties in the City along some of our corridors that would be great candidates for redevelopment and new investment and that some of that activity is paralyzed at the moment because in order to do that they require a property or two to the rear that is currently zoned single family perhaps but is in the Coastal High Hazard Area. They attempt to consolidate property that makes the redevelopment work number, but the numbers do not add up. We continue to have the distressed property there rather than have a new building that perhaps meets the current flood and storm requirements in the Florida Building Code. That is a concern of ours, in order to perhaps incorporate that back lot or side lot they would require a Future Land Use Map amendment which they could not get approved for because the Comprehensive Plan says we are not authorized to review those. That has been a driving factor for us to bring up this conversation. One way to approach it as an alternative would be to more narrowly focus on just commercial development or commercial redevelopment. I think that might get into constraining some other efforts that
have already been previewed in some of our special area master plans that have been adopted. I had some notes here to run down as a summary statement for some of the public comments that we have heard. I think at the moment right now there is a way to perhaps look at that where you are just focused on commercial, to answer your question.

Commissioner Winters: Okay thank you and we had an example earlier in the meeting where a mobile home park in a Coastal High Hazard Area, a developer was willing to get rid of the mobile home park to build multi-family and it would probably be more expensive project if the land development regs are changed requiring more resiliency in the construction, it would increase the cost as Commissioner Wannemacher pointed out. There are still ways to address this issue because of the underlying zoning. Thank you for your comment. I just want to comment, on where I am with this, I found the public testimony powerful and I appreciate everybody showing up today. I also found the Sierra Club’s letter quite compelling and they made a number of points that were reiterated today. I go back to my gut reaction to this proposal a year and a half ago, sitting at home reading it, I just thought to myself, this just sounds like an incredibly bad idea. The more I studied it and the more hearings I went to and the more conversations I observed, I have to say I have been very impressed with the energy that City Staff and Council have put into this, they have been very, very thoughtful about it. I still come back to my gut. I just think this is a really bad idea, it is a very pragmatic approach and I think what we are looking at here is, we have economic development is an issue because when you look at the Staff Report, one of the opening sentences states:

About same time the CHHA map was updated in 2016, City Staff was working on the adoption of a new planning area known as the Innovation District, when it became clear that this policy could limit the planned vision for the district.

So this started as a conversation around economic development. I think some of us believe that there is a big issue around public safety here and there the environmental reality that we are all aware of. To me, public safety issues and the environmental reality win the day. I just think that we have to be very attentive to that as members of this Commission and other elected and appointed officials and I feel that burden quite powerfully right now.

Commissioner Reese: Thank you, I would like to share my thoughts about it too. I am not able to support the amendment, to support this at this time. I really, I thank Commissioner Michaels for all of the work that he did, I read it in detail, and I agree that we are in the middle of this incredible 2050 Visioning process and this does not, to me, need to be taken in to consideration separately from that process. I think this is something that should be part of the 2050 Vision, I am also impressed with the letter from the Sierra Club, one of the things that I would like to say that concerns me, and I have heard it today. The fifth paragraph of the Sierra Club’s letter, where it talks about geographic and strategic sense to shift to South St Pete CRA and the City’s higher elevation areas. Which is primarily part of the City that is inhabited most by the African American population is greatly concentrated there. We have always had concerns and Karl Nurse has disagreed with us at times on the use of the word gentrification, but that is a concern in our community. When I saw that, that is one of the first things, and I have heard some of the people in the audience refer to that particular part of our community. We are seeing gentrification and we are seeing someone else mentioned that in Old Southeast that things come in and price the residents out of the communities they have lived in forever. We are seeing that in the CRA district and South St Pete, so I heard you and I am aware of that. I just wanted to point that out, that is not why I cannot approve this today. I just believe that it requires more thought more involvement more community engagement and that because we are int the midst of the 2050 Vision Project that is where it belongs.

Commissioner Burke: I think the proposal has a lot of merit. Taken as a whole if we are able to replace some substandard housing stock with fortified housing stock at the same time ensure that we have proper sheltering
and proper evacuation, I think that ultimately has a lot of merit and will do us a lot of good. We are going to need to increase density in the City of St. Petersburg if we want to meet the other objectives which is primarily bring better jobs bring in corporate headquarters and things like that into the City. Two good points were made, if forty one percent (41%) of the City is in this area, fifty nine percent (59%) is not, so we have some area there to increase density. Currently just by natural economics we will be replacing a lot of our housing stock. One of our people spoke about homes being torn down and mc-mansions being built next door. Maybe you do not want a mc-mansion next door but that is an increase in our housing stock. I think that this has merit, but I think maybe we are premature, I think that this really, we are putting the cart before the horse. We really need to look at the bigger picture like Commissioner Reese said. This probably needs to be part of a bigger plan for the City moving forward. It is too early for me to vote for it.

Commissioner Rogo: I have to harken back to one of the first questions you asked Commissioner Michaels and that is can we find an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to be consistent. The Comprehensive Plan takes up a little more meaning now for me then when it did when you asked the question earlier, it takes on more meaning than it did when you asked the question earlier. We are addressing a very significant provision in our Comprehensive Plan and considering making a very substantial change to it. Whether or not we are consistent or for or against, I am not quite sure. I suspect that we are here to make just that decision, is this consistent and all of our conversation and discussion will be forward to City Council along with that recommendation or lack of recommendation. Do we have a motion for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan? Please Derek, I know you wanted to make some comments and several people have said what an important conversation this is so let’s take the time we need to take, thank you.

Derek Kilborn: I do appreciate that I did not want to get off topic. I think it relates and what I wanted to do was just go back and address some of the comments you heard in the public comment portion if you do not mind. First there was a reference to the ULI Report. I do want to remind the Commissioners that in January there was a Committee of the Whole (COW) and the ULI Report was included in the package that you had from that meeting. That material was provided at that time. There was a comment about money and greed being a driving influence in this particular conversation, I think it was mentioned by another individual who said if that was the case, and I am paraphrasing, Staff would not be recommending any balancing criteria, we would just recommend removing the prohibition and that is not the case. What Staff is bringing to you as a recommendation is a total of twelve (12) evaluation criteria four (4) of which would be mandatory in order to move forward. I know former City Council member Karl Nurse, we work a lot on projects together and I am sure it was not intended the way it was received but we are professional Planners. We are held to a particular ethical standard and we approach every application, every subject or initiative with a Planners prospective and we try provide our professional input on those cases. We do not take direction from top down in violation of any ethical standards that we commit ourselves to. In this particular case for over a period of two years we think that the question merits a serious conversation. We’ve tried to construct for the City a deliberative process that involves not only this Commission but also the City Council and professionals in other areas who can bring their technical expertise to the table. As part of that we brought the Urban Land Institute into the discussion, we have had a number of meetings with Forward Pinellas and Emergency Service personnel throughout the County. We have spoken to our own City departments and agencies, Public Works and Engineering on this issue, all of those materials and feedback have been collected and provided at every stage of the process. As planners we are trying to give you an opportunity to have this serious discussion in a deliberative way, we think we have done that, and we do not think as Planners that we have compromised or surrendered our own integrity in doing that. In this particular case, Staff agrees with the points that have been made. On general planning principal it is a good thing to try and move populations out of harms way and because of that the City has worked aggressively in the last few years on planning initiatives that are not in the Coastal High Hazard Area. I mentioned earlier in 2012 we adopted the Central Avenue Revitalization Plan in
the Central Avenue Activity Center, that increased density is along the Central Avenue spine to sixty (60) units per acre; that is a substantial density increase and that is entirely outside the Coastal High Hazard Area. That density number mirrors in some ways what we are seeing being developed downtown right now. That was an initiative to move population away from the coastline. The Union Central Master Plan was mentioned, that is going through the adoption process. Again, that will result in potentially substantial density increases and allowances in our intent to move people to a more central location in the City. We, this year, adopted changes to allow an expansion of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) that adds nine thousand six hundred parcels (9,600) to the list of qualified properties that can now build ADUs, looking at that map most of those are locations are outside the Coastal High Hazard Area. We are having a discussion now about Neighborhood Traditional Mixed Residential (NTM) again, that is allowing for “Missing Middle” housing opportunities, increased densities, two (2) to four (4) units per parcel. Most of those locations are outside the Coastal High Hazard Area. We are doing a lot of different things to help incentivize increasing density, increasing new construction and development outside the Coastal High Hazard Area. That being said, we also have some significant Activity Centers and some substantial planning initiatives that are already in place and we cannot turn our back on those either. How do we continue to reinvest in those areas in ways that further enhance the work that has already gone in, while at the same time, we are pursuing these other initiatives to move people towards the center. Carillon Town Center is a major location for our economic and workforce development initiatives. Skyway Marina District, we are seeing a lot of new development down there and again, with Ceridian Tower down there, they are a driving tool for our workforce and economic recruitment. Those things are important to us, there has been a lot of planning work there, those areas already exist and that is why that limitation is in one of the criteria. How do we focus on those existing Activity Centers target Employment Centers, Multimodal Corridors and finally is that reference to Multi Modal Corridors, and you can see in the map here, where that Multimodal Corridor is primarily along 4th Street corridor north of 54th Ave. We have some obsolete commercial properties up there that are definitely due for redevelopment and improvement and if it means capturing some of those parcels at the back to consolidate lots and redevelop them, is something that is important to us, particularly as we also try to synchronize our transportation and land use policies, using corridors that already exist. For us that has been our approach to this, we think that we have constructed a fair and deliberative process for not only this Commission but everybody who has been involved and we hear your comments about St. Pete 2050 and that has been discussed as well and if that is where the Commissioner goes today with their recommendation, we will honor that. I just wanted to make sure you understood our perspective and how we have approached some of these things. Finally, I noticed the one comment that I missed was related to eminent domain, the City does not have an active eminent domain policy, we have no intentions of using eminent domain in situations as was described. Thank you for the time to respond to those comments.

Commissioner Rogo: We appreciate it, thank you very much.

Attorney Dema: We are barred from using eminent domain for economic development purposes under State law in response to the Kelo v. New London case, Kelo v. City of New London, 545 U.S. 469 (2005). The Supreme Court said that was okay and then, I think, thirty nine (39) states immediately came out and said no, not okay. It is strictly limited to transportation type, right of way.

Commissioner Rogo: Commissioners one thing that has come to my mind, is we are not a true democracy. Can we turn an important issue like this into a discussion of public process such as the Vision2050, I do not know? I have some trouble envisioning that happening. Do we have a motion finding consistency with the Comprehensive Plan?
Commissioner Whiteman: Can I ask a question first? If we make this motion as in the Staff Report and it gets turned down or approved, whichever way it goes, if it is turned down do, we have the ability to then make another motion to punt it to the 2050 or are we dead?

Attorney Dema: You can make a recommendation via motion. If you recommend denial, this is going to Council one way or the other, it will just travel with that recommendation. If you wanted to make and additional motion should you say it fails to be approved and you make an additional motion, then we would transmit said motion results to Council as well.

Commissioner Michaels: Well, to get it off the table I will move approval of the Staff recommendation regarding the proposal before us.

Commissioner Whiteman: Second.

VOTE:  
YES – 2 – Rogo, Whiteman
NO – 5 - Bell, Burke, Michaels, Reese, Winters

Motion failed

Commissioner Burke: Is this on City Council’s Agenda this week?

Attorney Dema: No not yet.

Commissioner Michaels moved the Commission recommend to the City Council that the proposal being considered here today for the Coastal High Hazard Area be referred to the Vision 2050 process.

Commissioner Winters Seconded.

VOTE:  
YES – 3 – Bell, Michaels, Reese,
NO – 4 - Burke, Rogo, Whiteman, Winters

Motion failed

VII. CPPC MEMBER/STAFF COMMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Rogo: Do we have any Staff announcements or Commissioners any announcements before we adjourn?

Derek Kilborn: I am sorry what was your question?

Commissioner Rogo: Do you have anything you wish to present to us at the conclusion of our meeting, any updates or news to share?
Derek Kilborn: This time you came to me and I don’t have anything, so I will take this opportunity to remind everybody St.Pete2050 is now an active process and we encourage anybody who has not already done so to go to the City’s website, StPete2050.com. We have an open online survey right now. We have been getting a lot of great feedback through that survey so far and it is really important for people to be engaged. That survey is a great opportunity for individuals to express their opinions outside the normal traditional methods, which is coming to a scheduled City meeting or rec. center, you can engage that survey 24/7. At minimum please do that and invite your friends and family to do it. We will be announcing, shortly, the community, there is a second round of community workshops that will be coming up the last week in January the first week in February, we will be posting those over the next week.

Commissioner Rogo: Thank you, I believe it was Commissioner Whiteman who had the suggestion that someone who might be interested in serving on our Commission we continue to seek out someone to join us, at least someone to join us because we still have the vacancy. I think you have been suggested to present the name to Derek or to City Council members to bring it on to the Mayor.

Commissioner Winters: I have a question for Ms. Abernethy, that came up at the last meeting. You had mentioned there was proposed legislation regarding regulations and zoning on single family neighborhoods. Where is that at, that troubles me.

Elizabeth Abernethy: I noticed in recent update there is a companion Senate Bill, it is moving forward. We will be monitoring it and I guess we can follow up with an email so that you can contact your legislators to let them know you are concerned about those limitations. It would significantly undermine the design regulations we have in our conditional district. We are, as Staff, very concerned about that proposed legislation.

Commissioner Rogo: This is one of those years where the Legislature meets in January.

Attorney Judd: That is correct.

VIII. ADJOURN

With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 5:10 P.M.
TO: The Honorable Ed Montanari, Chair, and Members of City Council

SUBJECT: City File: LDR-2020-01: City-initiated amendments to the Land Development Regulations pertaining to development within the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA).

ORDINANCE 428-H amending Chapter 16 of the St. Petersburg City Code relating to development within the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA); amending the CHHA development regulations; creating CHHA design standards; amending Sections 16.30.040 and 16.30.040.1; amending Sections 16.40.050.12.1, 16.40.050.12.1.1 and 16.40.050.12.1.2 for consistency of CHHA terminology; adding a new Section 16.30.040.2; deleting the definition of CHHA from Section 16.40.050.9.4; providing for severability; and providing an effective date.

INTRODUCTION:
This is the companion amendment to LGCP-2019-03 and BCA-2020-01, proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and local Building Code related to the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA). The proposed comprehensive plan text amendments allow for consideration of land use plan amendments, subject to balancing criteria.

BACKGROUND:
A detailed analysis of the proposed amendments to the Land Development Regulations is provided in the attached DRC staff report. The proposed LDR text amendments along with the proposed local Building Code technical amendment will establish elevated building design standards for multi-family development within the CHHA and require Hurricane Evacuation and Reentry Plans for hotel and multi-family projects. These amendments are intended to result in structures which are more resilient to storm surge, sea level rise and wind damage, mitigate for service and infrastructure needs during and immediately following a major storm event, and enable safe re-occupation as quickly as possible following an evacuation. These elevated design standards would apply to all new residential multi-family development with the CHHA, regardless of whether or not an increase in density increase was considered as part of a comprehensive plan map amendment.

RECOMMENDATION:
Administration: City staff recommends APPROVAL of the CHHA amendments to the Land Development Regulations along with the related amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and local technical amendments to the Building Code (LGCP-2019-03 and BCA-2020-01).
Public Input: Members of the public spoke in favor and in opposition to the proposed amendments at the DRC public hearing, see attached DRC Action Agenda. In addition, staff met with the Bay Area Apartment Association on February 21st and March 17, 2020.

Development Review Commission (DRC): On January 7, 2020, The DRC held a public hearing regarding the text amendment to the Land Development Regulations and voted unanimously to recommend APPROVAL.

Recommended City Council Action: 1) CONDUCT the first reading of the attached proposed ordinances; AND 2) SET the second reading and public hearing for August 20, 2020.

Attachments: Ordinance, DRC Staff Report and DRC Action Agenda January 7, 2020, Correspondence from Bay Area Apartment Association May 27, 2020
ORDINANCE NO. 428-H

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 16 OF THE ST. PETERSBURG CITY CODE RELATING TO LAND DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE COASTAL HIGH HAZARD AREA (CHHA); AMENDING THE CHHA DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS; CREATING CHHA DESIGN STANDARDS; AMENDING SECTIONS 16.30.040 AND 16.30.040.1; AMENDING SECTIONS 16.40.050.12.1, 16.40.050.12.1.1 AND 16.40.050.12.1.2 FOR CONSISTENCY OF CHHA TERMINOLOGY; ADDING A NEW SECTION 16.30.040.2; DELETING THE DEFINITION OF CHHA FROM SECTION 16.40.050.9.4; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, established the Community Planning Act; and

WHEREAS, consistent with the requirements of the Community Planning Act, the City of St. Petersburg (City) has adopted Land Development Regulations (LDRs) to implement its Comprehensive Plan, and more particularly, regulate land use in areas subject to seasonal and periodic flooding; and

WHEREAS, the State of Florida requires coastal local governments to identify a Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA), which is defined as the area below the elevation of the category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake, and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (SLOSH) computerized storm surge model; and

WHEREAS, the SLOSH model is updated and rerun from time to time in order to update estimates of the spatial extent of the CHHA for emergency planning purposes; and

WHEREAS, in its most recent update in 2016, the SLOSH model increased the CHHA within St. Petersburg, more than doubling from 7,705 acres (2010 est.) to 16,328 acres; and

WHEREAS, the 2010 CHHA estimate primarily encompassed areas of the City where redevelopment of land to multi-family residential uses was unlikely, such as single-family residential and preservation areas, the 2016 CHHA estimate now encompasses significant areas of the City where future requests to redevelop land into multi-family residential uses are more likely, such as existing mixed-use and commercial areas; and

WHEREAS, the City, in recognition of the ongoing and growing threats posed by sea level rise, storm surge, and high wind events, desires to add resiliency to its building stock; and

WHEREAS, the City further recognizes that adoption of these amendments to the LDRs, which add elevated design standards applicable to new multi-family residential development in the CHHA (regardless of whether the new development is associated with an increase in density), is in the interest of protecting the health, safety, and welfare of its citizens and can aid the City’s progress towards achieving its resiliency goals; and
WHEREAS, the Development Review Commission (DRC) of the City has reviewed the proposed amendments to the LDRs at a public hearing on January 7, 2020 and unanimously recommends approval, finding the amendments to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, after taking into consideration the recommendations of the DRC and the City Administration, and the comments received during the public hearing conducted on this matter, finds that the proposed amendments to the LDRs are appropriate; now, therefore

THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA DOES ORDAIN:

SECTION 1. Section 16.30.040. of the St. Petersburg Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

SECTION 16.30.040. - DEVELOPMENT IN THE COASTAL HIGH HAZARD AREA (CHHA) AND THE HURRICANE VULNERABILITY ZONE OVERLAY

16.30.040.1. - Development regulations.

A. The Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) is the area at or below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge line as established by the sea, lake and overland surges from hurricanes (SLOSH) computerized storm surge model. The CHHA and the hurricane vulnerability zone are generally shown on the map in the coastal management element of the Comprehensive Plan. Development within these areas shall be consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

B. New construction of hospitals, nursing homes and assisted living facilities is prohibited in Hurricane Evacuation Level A Zones the CHHA. The construction or expansion of these uses in Hurricane Evacuation Level B Zones is discouraged.

C. New mobile home parks are prohibited in Evacuation Level A Zone the CHHA.

D. Solid waste and commercial hazardous waste management facilities including regional storage, treatment or transfer sites are prohibited in the hurricane vulnerability zone CHHA.

E. New construction of residential multifamily dwelling units resulting from a density/intensity increase from a plan amendment after *adoption date* shall provide for hurricane shelter mitigation. Such mitigation for the impacts attributable to the development shall include one or a combination of the following: payment of a hurricane mitigation shelter fee, contribution of land, or construction of hurricane shelters. If the property owner elects to contribute land or construct hurricane shelter space, a binding agreement, approved by the City Attorney’s Office, shall be executed regarding such mitigation prior to issuance of a building permit for construction of the residential units.

F. Construction, expansion or substantial renovations of hotel uses shall provide a Hurricane Evacuation and Closure Plan that complies with all Pinellas County and City of St. Petersburg hurricane evacuation plans and procedures to ensure orderly evacuation of guests and visitors pursuant to the Pinellas County Code, Chapter 34, Article III.
G. New construction of multi-family residential dwelling units shall provide a Hurricane Evacuation and Re-entry Plan requiring mandatory evacuation in accordance with Emergency Management Directives. The plan shall include operating procedures for how the project will handle loss of off-site or grid power, transition to a backup source of power (if available), and transition back to normal operation. Such requirements shall be incorporated into a legally binding document such as lease documents, condominium rules, homeowner rules, or other such method approved by the POD.

SECTION 2. The St. Petersburg City Code is hereby amended by adding a new Section 16.30.040.2., to read as follows:

16.30.040.2. – CHHA Design Standards.

A. Purpose: The City of St. Petersburg is committed to improving the capacity to endure and quickly recover from coastal hazards. This section in concert with Building Code Section 8.36(c)(1) is intended to ensure that developments are more resilient to storm surge and sea level rise, mitigate for service and infrastructure needs during and immediately following major storm events, and enable safe re-occupation following an evacuation or weather event.

B. New construction of multi-family residential dwelling units in the CHHA shall comply with Building Code Section 8.36(c)(1) requiring 2 feet of additional freeboard (for a total of 4 feet above the minimum FEMA design elevation) and building design of the next higher Risk Category classification, in addition to the following CHHA Design Standards. Projects containing up to 199 units shall provide one item. Projects containing 200 units or greater shall provide two items. Projects containing dwelling units resulting from a density increase from a plan amendment after *adoption date* shall provide one additional item for every 50 additional units.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>On-site battery storage of solar generated power to keep critical functions working in the event of power failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Install a cool/high-reflectance roof (coating that is white or has special reflective pigments that reflect sunlight) on at least 75% of the total roof area of the development, with a minimum SRI (solar reflectance index value) of 39 and in accordance with the standards set by the HVWZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Install a geothermal energy heating &amp; cooling system that serves as least 75% of the project’s residential units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Pre-wire all units to accept power provided by on-site solar panels and/or wind turbines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Install a 16-20+ SEER HVAC system in each dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Install efficient, zone-controlled heating and cooling systems in each residential unit (mini-splits, or smart thermostats, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Install a solar or tank-less water heating system in each residential unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Install no fewer than 2 operable windows on no fewer than two exterior walls in each unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Install a generator for power generation to keep critical functions working in the event of power failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Install highly-reflective blinds/shades, low-E window film/tint, external/structural shade to reduce solar gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Provide for a Resilient Common Area with back-up power source to provide air-conditioning and power, food, water and emergency supplies to support residents after a storm event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Provide for a Neighborhood Resilience Hub to provide on-site and neighborhood residents point of distribution of services before and after storm events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Utilize mold-resistant building materials in all kitchens and baths, such as fiberglass-faced drywall, mold-resistant drywall tape, tile, ceramic, terrazzo, or stained concrete, rated “resistant” or “highly resistant” according to UL 2824 and in compliance with ASTM D 3273 standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>Protect coastal property with a living shoreline (LSL) per the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Living Shoreline Permit Standard. <em>(LSLs use natural materials to stabilize the shoreline and maintain valuable fish and wildlife habitat; LSLs utilize a variety of materials such as wetland plants, oyster shell, coir fiber logs, sand, wood, and native rock.)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Alternative Methods of Compliance: In lieu of compliance with subsection B above, for Large Tract Planned Development projects and projects which are subject to Site Plan Review, an applicant may propose an alternative method of compliance for review and approval by the DRC. The applicant will need to demonstrate that the site-specific analysis and wholistic resilient design methods meet or exceed the requirements of the CHHA Design Standards through such methods as follows:

- Provision of a site-specific risk assessment analysis;
- Addressing infrastructure improvements such as-wet/dry proofing, raising streets and flood gates;
- Provision of park/green space which allows for standoff buffer during flood events and can be designed in tiers to provide flood capacity; and
- Inclusion of an Operations/Maintenance Component where the development/users actively prepare for an event (e.g., down draining ponds/basins, closing flood gates, etc).

**SECTION 3.** Section 16.40.050.12.1. of the St. Petersburg City Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

16.40.050.12.1. - Minimum requirements. All proposed new development shall be reviewed to determine that:

1. Such proposals are consistent with the need to minimize flood damage and will be reasonably safe from flooding;
2. In coastal high hazard areas (Zone V) Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) Zone V, buildings and structures are located a minimum of ten feet landward of the reach of mean high tide;
3. All public utilities and facilities such as sewer, gas, electric, communications, and water systems are located and constructed to minimize or eliminate flood damage; and
4. Adequate drainage is provided to reduce exposure to flood hazards; in Zones AH and AO, adequate drainage paths shall be provided to guide floodwaters around and away from proposed structures.

**SECTION 4.** Section 16.40.050.12.1.1. of the St. Petersburg City Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

16.40.050.12.1.1. Use of nonstructural fill in flood hazard areas (Zone A) Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) Zone A. In flood hazard areas other than coastal high hazard areas (Zone A) SFHA Zone A, fill on the outside of the footprint of the foundation of single-family through quadruplex residential structures on lots which are not part of a development with a master grading plan approved by the POD is prohibited, except for fill in the front yard which is necessary in the construction of a driveway to a garage and the front entrance for access to the structure. If a site plan with lot elevations and proposed fill is submitted for plan review prior to issuance of a permit and approved in advance by the Building Official, and if the use of fill does not create any additional stormwater runoff onto abutting properties, minor amounts of fill shall be allowed to:

1. Provide adequate lot grading for drainage;
2. Raise a side yard up to the elevation of an abutting property; and
3. The use of fill shall not create any additional stormwater runoff onto abutting property.

**SECTION 5.** Section 16.40.050.12.1.2. of the St. Petersburg City Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

16.40.050.12.1.2. Use of nonstructural fill in coastal high hazard areas (Zone V) Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) Zone V. In coastal high hazard areas (Zone V) SFHA Zone V, limited noncompacted fill (not exceeding six inches in depth) may be used around the perimeter of a building for landscaping/aesthetic purposes provided the fill will wash out from storm surge (thereby rendering the building free of obstructions) prior to generating excessive loading forces, ramping effects or wave deflection.

The Building Official shall approve design plans for landscaping/aesthetic fill only after the applicant has provided an analysis by an engineer, architect and/or soil scientist, along with the any supporting data required by the Building Official, which demonstrates that the following factors have been fully considered:

1. Particle composition of fill material does not have a tendency for excessive material compaction;
2. Volume and distribution of fill will not cause wave deflection to adjacent properties;
3. Slope of fill will not cause wave run up or ramping; and
4. The use of fill shall not create any additional stormwater runoff onto abutting property.

**SECTION 6.** Section 16.40.050.9.4. of the St. Petersburg City Code is hereby amended by deleting the definition of “Coastal high hazard area”: 

5
Coastal high hazard area means a special flood hazard area extending from offshore to the inland limit of a primary frontal dune along an open coast and any other area subject to high velocity wave action from storms or seismic sources. Coastal high hazard areas are also referred to as “high hazard areas subject to high velocity wave action” or “V Zones” and are designated on Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) as Zone V1-V30, VE, or V.

SECTION 7. Coding: 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 8. 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 9. In the event this Ordinance is not vetoed by the Mayor in accordance with the City Charter, it shall become effective after 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:

/s/Michael J. Dema
City Attorney (designee)
00511748.docx
City File: LDR 2020-01
Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA)

This is a City-initiated application requesting that the Development Review Commission (“DRC”), in its capacity as the Land Development Regulations Commission (LDRC), make a finding of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and recommend to City Council APPROVAL of the following text amendments to the City Code, Chapter 16, Land Development Regulations (LDRs) pertaining to the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA).

APPLICANT INFORMATION

APPLICANT: City of St. Petersburg
175 5th Street North
St. Petersburg, Florida 33712

STAFF CONTACT: Britton Wilson, AICP, Planner II
Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division
Planning and Development Services Department
One – 4th Street North
St. Petersburg, Florida 33711
Britton.Wilson@stpete.org
(727) 551-3542

INTRODUCTION

In an effort to reduce loss of life and property caused by natural disasters, the State of Florida requires coastal jurisdictions to identify a Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) in their Comprehensive Plan in which public expenditures and population growth are limited (section 163.3178, Florida Statutes). The Coastal High Hazard Area is defined as “the area below the elevation of the category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake, and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (SLOSH) computerized storm surge model.” Areas included in the CHHA are governed both by state law and the policies adopted to administer those provisions in local government comprehensive plans with further development controls within land development regulations.

While the CHHA was originally adopted into the City’s Comprehensive Plan in 1989, the definition and applicable standards have changed several times starting in 2006, 2010, and 2016. These changes have led to an expansion of the CHHA causing the city to re-evaluate its adopted policies. The most recent update in 2016...
more than doubled the CHHA land area from 7,705 acres to 16,328 acres. Many of the City’s economic centers that were initially developed outside of the CHHA are now located within the CHHA boundary, restricting redevelopment options.

Continuing to prohibit any changes in density within the CHHA may conflict with other policy goals and initiatives such as redevelopment of obsolete commercial sites along our multi-modal corridors with mixed-use higher density and intensity projects which support transit and removal of substandard buildings and housing, including mobile home parks where currently over 2,000 mobile home units currently reside. These goals need to be balanced with the concern of allowing more people to live in vulnerable areas by increasing the building and design standards to make that development safer and address resiliency and sustainability.

REQUEST

The City is requesting a series of Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) related text amendments to the goals, objectives, policies of the Comprehensive Plan to be reviewed by the Community Planning and Preservation Commission (CPPC). The focus policy amendment is to Land Use Policy 7.1 that currently prohibits requests for residential density increases within the CHHA. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments are based upon and consistent with CHHA provisions of the Countywide Rules, which requires that an approval of a land use amendment within the CHHA be based upon nine specific balancing review criteria. This proposal builds upon those nine criteria by including three more criteria that further initiatives of the City (see Comprehensive Plan section below), while requiring four of the criteria to be mandatory resulting in locational restrictions shown on the attached map.

In support of the Comprehensive Plan text amendments, concurrent text amendments to the Land Development Regulations and Building Code are proposed to establish elevated building design standards for multi-family developments within the CHHA and require Hurricane Evacuation and Reentry Plans for hotel and multi-family projects. These amendments are intended to result in structures which are more resilient to storm surge, sea level rise and wind damage, mitigate for service and infrastructure needs during and immediately following a major storm event, and enable safe re-occupation as quickly as possible following an evacuation. The amendments are also intended to address sustainability and resiliency goals as outlined in the Integrated Sustainability Action Plan (ISAP) by requiring the selection of one or two CHHA Design Standards from a menu of fourteen (14) sustainability and resiliency design options.

BACKGROUND

About the same time that the CHHA map was updated 2016, City staff was working on the adoption of a new planning area known as the Innovation District, when it became clear that this policy could limit the planned vision for the district. The CHHA overlapped with a portion of the proposed plan and zoning changes for the district. As part of that effort, staff first proposed the amendment to the policy in August of 2017, and then brought it back again last summer with the Innovation District package. Council requested a workshop to address the CHHA, which was held last January, where the concept of adopting elevated design standards was introduced. Over the course of the last two years since the consideration of the comprehensive plan policy change was initiated, there have been several storm events that led to the consideration of imposing the elevated building and design standards. These standards were initially based on a recent effort by the City of Norfolk Virginia, which established Resilency Quotient requirements for all development within their City, which has similar coastal development issues to St. Petersburg.

After the January 2019 workshop, staff held several meetings with stakeholders and the Urban Land Institute (ULI) provided technical assistance in developing these innovative zoning and development standards. A second workshop was held with City council on July 25th to report the ULI findings, and Council recommended that staff bring back a more refined amendment, based on cost estimates. After a review of the estimates, staff revised the draft LDR amendment, determined that an amendment to the local Building code
will also be required and held additional stakeholder meetings before presenting at a final council workshop on October 24th.

The CHHA project timeline is summarized in the below table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHHA Project Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Planning and Preservation Commission (CPPC) Action
On December 10, 2019, the CPPC found that the proposed Comprehensive Plan text amendments pertaining to the CHHA were inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan by a vote of 5 to 2 and forwarded the item to City Council without a recommendation of approval. Concerns from the Commissioners included: that the proposal was inconsistent with Policy CM 10B that calls for directing populations away from the CHHA; concerns for public safety; and that the issue requires more community involvement and should be a part of the StPete2050 visioning process.

PROPOSED LDR TEXT AMENDMENT
The following summary of the proposed amendments to the City’s Land Development Regulations and Building Code set forth elevated design standards intended to result in structures which are more resilient to storm surge and sea level rise, mitigate for service and infrastructure needs during and immediately following a major storm event, and enable safe re-occupation as quickly as possible following an evacuation. As currently proposed, these elevated design standards would apply to all new residential multi-family development with the CHHA, regardless of whether or not an increase in land use density was considered. All multi-family developments are to meet the following five (5) CHHA standards:

1. Prepare Hurricane Evacuation and Re-entry Plan: all multi-family and hotel projects – LDR Amendment
2. Reduce Risk for Water: elevate an additional 2-feet above the required design flood elevation, for a total of 4-feet above Base Flood Elevation (addresses both Sea Level Rise and Storm Surge) - Building Code Amendment
3. Reduce Risk for Wind: construct the building to meet design requirements of next higher classification of risk category, e.g. increase from 145 to 155 mph standard, category 2 to 3 building risk category. – Building Code Amendment
4. **Enhance Recovery through selection of a Resiliency option:** such as provision of on-site storage of solar generated power, increased efficiency HVAC systems, or providing solar or tank-less water heating systems. Projects up to 199 units select one option, projects over 200 units select two options. For projects benefiting from an approval of a comprehensive plan amendment to increase density, select one additional item for every 50 units. – LDR Amendment

5. **Projects which increase density must mitigate for Hurricane Evacuation Shelter space.** – LDR Amendment

Proposed LDR Changes Detailed (in strikethrough and underline format):

**SECTION 16.30.040. - DEVELOPMENT IN THE COASTAL HIGH HAZARD AREA (CHHA) AND THE HURRICANE VULNERABILITY ZONE OVERLAY**

16.30.040.1. - Development regulations.

A. **The Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) is the area at or below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge line as established by the sea, lake and overland surges from hurricanes (SLOSH) computerized storm surge model. The CHHA and the hurricane vulnerability zone are generally shown on the map in the coastal management element of the Comprehensive Plan. Development within these areas shall be consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.**

B. **New construction of hospitals, nursing homes and assisted living facilities is prohibited in Hurricane Evacuation Level A Zones the CHHA. The construction or expansion of these uses in Hurricane Evacuation Level B Zones is discouraged.**

C. **New mobile home parks are prohibited in Evacuation Level A Zone the CHHA.**

D. **Solid waste and commercial hazardous waste management facilities including regional storage, treatment or transfer sites are prohibited in the hurricane vulnerability zone CHHA.**

E. **New construction of residential multifamily dwelling units resulting from a density/intensity increase from a plan amendment after *adoption date* shall provide for hurricane shelter mitigation. Such mitigation for the impacts attributable to the development shall include one or a combination of the following: payment of a hurricane mitigation shelter fee, contribution of land, or construction of hurricane shelters. If the property owner elects to contribute land or construct hurricane shelter space, a binding agreement shall be executed regarding such mitigation prior to issuance of a building permit for construction of the residential units.**

F. **Construction, expansion or substantial renovations of hotel uses shall provide a Hurricane Evacuation and Closure Plan that complies with all Pinellas County and City of St. Petersburg hurricane evacuation plans and procedures to ensure orderly evacuation of guests and visitors pursuant to the Pinellas County Code, Chapter 34, Article III.**

G. **New construction of multi-family residential dwelling units shall provide a Hurricane Evacuation and Re-entry Plan requiring mandatory evacuation in accordance with emergency management directives. The plan shall include operating procedures for how the project will handle loss of off-site or grid power, transition to a backup source of power (if available), and transition back to normal operation. Such requirements shall be incorporated into a legally binding document such as lease documents, condominium rules, homeowner rules, or other such method approved by the POD.**
A. **Purpose:** The City of St. Petersburg is committed to improving the capacity to endure and quickly recover from coastal hazards. This section in concert with Building Code Section 8.36.c.1. is intended to ensure that developments are more resilient to storm surge and sea level rise, mitigate for service and infrastructure needs during and immediately following major storm events, and enable safe re-occupation following an evacuation or weather event.

B. **New construction of multi-family residential dwelling units in the CHHA shall comply with Building Code Section 8.36.c.1. requiring 2 feet of additional freeboard (for a total of 4 feet above the minimum FEMA design elevation) and building design of the next higher Risk Category classification, in addition to the following CHHA Design Standards. Projects containing up to 199 units shall provide one item. Projects containing 200 units or greater shall provide two items. Projects containing dwelling units resulting from a density increase from a plan amendment after “adoption date” shall provide one additional item for every 50 additional units.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>On-site battery storage of solar generated power to keep critical functions working in the event of power failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Install a cool/high-reflectance roof (coating that is white or has special reflective pigments that reflect sunlight) on at least 75% of the total roof area of the development, with a minimum SRI (solar reflectance index value) of 39 and in accordance with the standards set by the HVWZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Install a geothermal energy heating &amp; cooling system that serves as least 75% of the project’s residential units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Pre-wire all units to accept power provided by on-site solar panels and/or wind turbines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Install a 16-20+ SEER HVAC system in each dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Install efficient, zone-controlled heating and cooling systems in each residential unit (mini-splits, or smart thermostats, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Install a solar or tank-less water heating system in each residential unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Install no fewer than 2 operable windows on no fewer than two exterior walls in each unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Install a generator for power generation to keep critical functions working in the event of power failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Install highly-reflective blinds/shades, low-E window film/tint, external/structural shade to reduce solar gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Provide for a Resilient Common Area with back-up power source to provide air-conditioning and power, food, water and emergency supplies to support residents after a storm event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Provide for a Neighborhood Resilience Hub to provide on-site and neighborhood residents point of distribution of services before and after storm events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Utilize mold-resistant building materials in all kitchens and baths, such as fiberglass-faced drywall, mold-resistant drywall tape, tile, ceramic, terrazzo, or stained concrete, rated “resistant” or “highly resistant” according to UL 2824 and in compliance with ASTM D 3273 standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>Protect coastal property with a living shoreline (LSL) per the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Living Shoreline Permit Standard. <em>(LSLs use natural materials to stabilize the shoreline and maintain valuable fish and wildlife habitat; LSLs utilize a variety of materials such as wetland plants, oyster shell, coir fiber logs, sand, wood, and native rock.)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Alternative Methods of Compliance: In lieu of compliance with subsection B above, for Large Tract Planned Development projects and projects which are subject to Site Plan Review, an applicant may propose an alternative method of compliance for review and approval by the DRC. The applicant will need to demonstrate that the site-specific analysis and wholistic resilient design methods meet or exceed the requirements of the CHHA Design Standards through such methods as follows:

- Provision of a site-specific risk assessment analysis;
- Addressing infrastructure improvements such as wet/dry proofing, raising streets and flood gates;
- Provision of park/green space which allows for standoff buffer during flood events and can be designed in tiers to provide flood capacity; and
- Inclusion of an Operations/Maintenance Component where the development/users actively prepare for an event (e.g., down draining ponds/basins, closing flood gates, etc).

16.40.050.12.1. - Minimum requirements. All proposed new development shall be reviewed to determine that:

1. Such proposals are consistent with the need to minimize flood damage and will be reasonably safe from flooding;
2. In coastal high hazard areas (Zone V) Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) Zone V, buildings and structures are located a minimum of ten feet landward of the reach of mean high tide;
3. All public utilities and facilities such as sewer, gas, electric, communications, and water systems are located and constructed to minimize or eliminate flood damage; and
4. Adequate drainage is provided to reduce exposure to flood hazards; in Zones AH and AO, adequate drainage paths shall be provided to guide floodwaters around and away from proposed structures.

16.40.050.12.1.1. Use of nonstructural fill in flood hazard areas (Zone A) Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) Zone A. In flood hazard areas other than coastal high hazard areas (Zone A) SFHA Zone A, fill on the outside of the footprint of the foundation of single-family through quadruplex residential structures on lots which are not part of a development with a master grading plan approved by the POD is prohibited, except for fill in the front yard which is necessary in the construction of a driveway to a garage and the front entrance for access to the structure. If a site plan with lot elevations and proposed fill is submitted for plan review prior to issuance of a permit and approved in advance by the Building Official, and if the use of fill does not create any additional stormwater runoff onto abutting properties, minor amounts of fill shall be allowed to:

1. Provide adequate lot grading for drainage;
2. Raise a side yard up to the elevation of an abutting property; and
3. The use of fill shall not create any additional stormwater runoff onto abutting property.

16.40.050.12.1.2. Use of nonstructural fill in coastal high hazard areas (Zone V) in Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) Zone V. In coastal high hazard areas (Zone V) SFHA Zone V, limited noncompacted fill (not exceeding six inches in depth) may be used around the perimeter of a building for landscaping/aesthetic purposes provided the fill will wash out from storm surge (thereby rendering the building free of obstructions) prior to generating excessive loading forces, ramping effects or wave deflection.

The Building Official shall approve design plans for landscaping/aesthetic fill only after the applicant has provided an analysis by an engineer, architect and/or soil scientist, along with the any supporting data required by the Building Official, which demonstrates that the following factors have been fully considered:
1. Particle composition of fill material does not have a tendency for excessive material compaction;
2. Volume and distribution of fill will not cause wave deflection to adjacent properties;
3. Slope of fill will not cause wave run up or ramping; and
4. The use of fill shall not create any additional stormwater runoff onto abutting property.

Definition Section:

**Coastal high hazard area** means a special flood hazard area extending from offshore to the inland limit of a primary frontal dune along an open coast and any other area subject to high velocity wave action from storms or seismic sources. Coastal high hazard areas are also referred to as “high hazard areas subject to high velocity wave action” or “V Zones” and are designated on Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) as Zone V1-V30, VE, or V.

**CONCURRENT PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT AMENDMENT**

Concurrent with this proposed text amendment to the Land Development Regulations are amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, which are under the recommendation authority of the Community Planning and Preservation Commission. The focus of the amendments is Land Use Policy 7.1, which currently prohibits requests for residential density increases with the CHHA. A proposed text amendment would allow consideration of land use plan amendments, subject to review criteria. Four mandatory criteria would include: Utilization of Existing and Planned Infrastructure; Utilization of Existing Disturbed Areas; Location within an Activity Center, Target Employment Center, Special Area Plan or Multi-modal Corridor; and Implements the Goals and Policies of the Integrated Sustainability Action Plan (ISAP), Complete Streets and Health in All Policies (HIAP) plans. Additional review criteria include: Access to Emergency Shelter Space & Evacuation Routes, Maintenance of Scenic Qualities & Improvement Public Access to the Water, Water Dependent Uses, Part of Community Redevelopment Area, Overall Reduction of Density or Intensity, Clustering of Uses, Integral Part of Comprehensive Planning Process, and Reduction of Storm Vulnerable Structures.

**CONSISTENCY with the COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

The following objectives and policies from the City’s Comprehensive Plan are applicable to the proposed amendments the Land Development Regulations:

**LU 3.5** The tax base will be maintained and improved by encouraging the appropriate use of properties based on their locational characteristics and the goals, objectives and policies within this Comprehensive Plan.

**LU 3.6** Land use planning decisions shall weigh heavily the established character of predominately developed areas where changes of use or intensity of development are contemplated.

**LU 3.11** More dense residential uses (more than 7.5 units per acre) may be located along (1) passenger rail lines and designated major streets or (2) in close proximity to activity center where compatible.

**LU 3.17** Future expansion of commercial uses is encouraged when infilling into existing commercial areas and activity centers, or where a need can be clearly identified, and where otherwise consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
LU 5.3 The Concurrency Management System shall continue to be implemented to ensure proposed development to be considered for approval shall be in conformance with existing and planned support facilities and that such facilities and services be available, at the adopted level of service standards, concurrent with the impacts of development.

T 1.6 The City shall support high-density mixed-use development and redevelopments in and adjacent to Activity Centers, redevelopment areas and locations that are supported by mass transit to reduce the number and length of automobile trips and encourage transit usage, bicycling and walking.

CM 1 The City shall require new development and redevelopment along the coastal shoreline to be located and designed to protect or enhance beach shoreline and native vegetation historically represented in St. Petersburg including, mangroves, salt marsh and seagrasses, so that there are no further losses of coastal wetlands related to development, as documented by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

CM 7 For development and redevelopment on the coastal shoreline, the City will give higher priority to siting water-dependent uses over other uses. The order of priority is listed below.

1. Water-dependent uses;
2. Water-related uses;
3. Water-enhanced uses;

CM 9.1 The approximately 9 linear miles and approximately 1471 acres of publicly accessible waterfront sites, as inventoried in the coastal element, shall be maintained or improved.

CM 10B The City shall direct population concentrations away from known or predicted coastal high hazard areas consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the Future Land Use Element.

CM 13 The City shall cooperate with state, regional and county agencies to maintain or reduce hurricane evacuation times, and actively work with the Red Cross in the identification of emergency shelters to provide space for the population in Evacuation Zone A, B and C.

CM 13.2 The City shall implement the strategies identified in Coastal management Element Subsection 6.6, “Measures to Maintain or Reduce Evacuation Times”

PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS

The proposed ordinance associated with the Land Development Regulations text amendment requires one (1) public hearing before the Development Review Commission (DRC) and one (1) City Council public hearing.

SUMMARY

Based upon the analysis contained in this report, City staff finds the proposed LDR text amendments to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The 2016 CHHA boundary expansion warrants higher building design and emergency management standards that ensure safer multi-family development that also addresses resiliency and sustainability.
RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Development Review Commission, in its capacity as the Land Development Regulation Commission, make a finding of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and recommend to City Council APPROVAL of the City Code, Chapter 16 LDR text amendments described herein.
Each year, the City of St. Petersburg receives approximately $2 million in State Housing Initiative Partnership (SHIP) funds for its affordable housing programs. To receive these funds, the City is required to maintain an ongoing process for review of local policies, ordinances, resolutions, and plan provisions that increase the cost of housing construction, or of housing redevelopment, and to establish a tracking system to estimate the cumulative cost per housing unit from these actions for the period July 1–June 30 annually. This form should be attached to all policies, ordinances, resolutions, and plan provisions which increase housing costs, and a copy of the completed form should be provided to the City’s Housing and Community Development Department.

I. **Initiating Department:** Planning & Development Services Development

II. **Policy, Procedure, Regulation, or Comprehensive Plan Amendment Under Consideration for adoption by Ordinance or Resolution:**

See attached proposed amendments to Chapter 16, City Code of Ordinances (City File LDR 2020-01).

III. **Impact Analysis:**

A. Will the proposed policy, procedure, regulation, or plan amendment, (being adopted by ordinance or resolution) increase the cost of housing development? (i.e. more landscaping, larger lot sizes, increase fees, require more infrastructure costs up front, etc.)

   No  ____  (No further explanation required.)
   Yes  ____X____ Explanation: Higher building and design standards are proposed for multi-family housing within the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA).

   If Yes, the **per unit cost increase** associated with this proposed policy change is estimated to be: .25 to .5%.

B. Will the proposed policy, procedure, regulation, plan amendment, etc. increase the time needed for housing development approvals?

   No  ____X____ (No further explanation required)
   Yes  ____  Explanation:

IV: **Certification**

It is important that new local laws which could counteract or negate local, state and federal reforms and incentives created for the housing construction industry receive due consideration. If the adoption of the proposed regulation is imperative to protect the public health, safety and welfare, and therefore its public purpose outweighs the need to continue the community’s ability to provide affordable housing, please explain below:

CHECK ONE:

☐ The proposed regulation, policy, procedure, or comprehensive plan amendment will not result in an increase to the cost of housing development or redevelopment in the City of St. Petersburg and no further
action is required. (Please attach this Impact Statement to City Council Material, and provide a copy to Housing and Community Development department.)

OR

X The proposed regulation, policy, procedure, or comprehensive plan amendment being proposed by resolution or ordinance will increase housing costs in the City of St. Petersburg. (Please attach this Impact Statement to City Council Material and provide a copy to Housing and Community Development department.)

Copies to: City Clerk
Joshua A. Johnson, Director, Housing and Community Development

ATTACHMENTS

1. CHHA Map
2. CHHA Map: Criteria J. Qualifying Areas
3. CPPC Staff Report
1/4 Mile Buffer around Multimodal Corridors, Activity Centers, Target Employment Centers and Special Area Plan Categories within the CHHA
A. OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIR
B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
C. SWEARING IN OF WITNESSES
D. ROLL CALL
E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF December 4, 2019, as presented.
   Minutes approved as presented by a unanimous vote of the Commission.
F. PUBLIC COMMENTS
   Charlotte Smith spoke regarding environmental issues, to include climate change and solar panel initiatives.
G. WITHDRAWAL
   1. Case No. 19-33000018 – 263 13th Avenue South
H. EXTENSION REQUEST
   1. Case No. 14-33000012 – 1101 4th Street South and 416 11th Avenue South
I. PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA
   LEGISLATIVE
   1. LDR-2020-01 Coastal High Hazard Area LDR Amendment
   2. Case No. 19-33000020 – 4912 4th Street North, 435, and 445 49th Avenue North
   QUASI-JUDICIAL
   3. Case No. 19-32000020 – 4912 4th Street North, 435 and 445 49th Avenue North
   4. Case No. 19-54000072 – 323 Mount Richmond Avenue Northeast – Appeal
   5. Case No. 19-51000002 – 710 35th Avenue South
   6. Case No. 19-54000080 – 1855 32nd Street North
J. COMPLETE STREETS PRESENTATION
K. ADJOURNMENT at 6:25 p.m.
L. LDR WORKSHOP – Proposed LDR Amendment: Redevelopment Notice
AGENDA ITEM #G-1  CASE NO. 19-33000018  E-7  
CASE WITHDRAWN

AGENDA ITEM #H-1  EXTENSION REQUEST  F-7

DRC Case No. 14-33000012 – 1101 4th Street South and 416 11th Avenue South

REQUEST:  
Approval of an extension from January 22, 2019 to January 22, 2021 of a vacation of a 10-foot north south alley lying southwest of the intersection of 4th Street South and 11th Avenue South.

MOTION:  
Approval of an extension from January 22, 2019 to January 22, 2021 of a vacation of a 10-foot north south alley lying southwest of the intersection of 4th Street South and 11th Avenue South.

VOTE:  
Yes – Flynt, Griner, Samuel, Walker, Ehrlich, Cuevas, Rutland.
No – None.

ACTION TAKEN ON 14-33000012:  
Approval of an extension from January 22, 2019 to January 22, 2021 of a vacation of a 10-foot north south alley lying southwest of the intersection of 4th Street South and 11th Avenue South, APPROVED 7-0.

AGENDA ITEM #I-1  LDR AMENDMENTS

LDR-2020-01:  
Coastal High Hazard Area LDR Amendment

PRESENTATIONS:  
Britton Wilson made a presentation to the Commission.
Elizabeth Abernethy spoke regarding the proposal.

PUBLIC HEARING:  
Michael Lazzara spoke in favor of the proposal.
Alison Barlow spoke in favor of the proposal.
Mario Farias spoke in favor of the proposal.
Johannes “Jopie” Helsen spoke in favor of the proposal.
Amy Parsons spoke regarding the proposal.
Joshua D. Rumschlag spoke against the proposal.
Don Mastry spoke in favor of the proposal.
Jason Mathis spoke in favor of the proposal.
Bill Dahl spoke against the proposal.
Tom Chapman spoke in favor of the proposal.
Ken Herctick spoke in favor of the proposal.

MOTION:  
Approval of consistency with the proposed text amendments to the City Code Chapter 16, Land Development Regulations (LDRs), confirming consistency with the City of St. Petersburg’s Comprehensive Plan and recommendation to City Council for approval.

VOTE:  
Yes – Flynt, Griner, Samuel, Walker, Ehrlich, Cuevas, Rutland.
No – None.

ACTION TAKEN ON LDR-2020-01:  
Approval of consistency with the proposed text amendments to the City Code Chapter 16, Land Development Regulations (LDRs), confirming consistency with the City of St. Petersburg’s Comprehensive Plan and recommendation to City Council for approval, APPROVED 7-0.
AGENDA ITEM #I-6  CASE NO. 19-54000080  J-12

REQUEST: Approval of a sign variance to allow the addition of a 69.23 square-foot wall sign to bring total signage to 218.40 square-feet where 150 square-feet is the maximum in the CCS-1 zoning district.

OWNER: 22nd Avenue Venture, LLC
3708 West Swann Avenue, Suite 200
Tampa, Florida 33609

AGENT: Crystal Miller
Global Sign and Awning
1182 Kapp Drive
Clearwater, Florida 33765

ADDRESS: 1855 32nd Street North

PARCEL ID NO.: 14-31-16-71460-000-0100

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: On File

ZONING: Corridor Commercial Suburban (CCS-1)

PRESENTATIONS: Jaime Jones made a presentation based on the Staff Report.

PUBLIC HEARING: No speakers were present.

MOTION: Approval of a sign variance to allow the addition of a 69.23 square-foot wall sign to bring total signage to 218.40 square-feet where 150 square-feet is the maximum in the CCS-1 zoning district, subject to the special conditions in the Staff Report.

VOTE: Yes – None.
No – Flynt, Griner, Samuel, Walker, Ehrlich, Rutland, Stowe.

ACTION TAKEN ON 19-54000080: Motion to approve FAILED by a vote of 0-7, thereby DENYING the request.

AGENDA ITEM J  COMPLETE STREETS PRESENTATION

DRC WORKSHOP: Complete Streets Implementation Plan

PRESENTATIONS: Lucas Cruse made a presentation to the Commission. Elizabeth Abernethy spoke regarding the proposal.

AGENDA ITEM K  ADJOURNMENT

AGENDA ITEM L  LDR WORKSHOP - Proposed LDR Amendment: Redevelopment Notice
Hi Liz,

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide input on elements of the CHHA. We have had some internal conversations and have come up with suggestions that mainly focus on the CHHA Design Standards that provide additional options that developers would be allowed to choose from. Our suggested options advance energy efficiency, storm durability, and/or post-storm recovery, and we think developers could find ways to make them cost-efficient. This is a key concern since as you know the other requirements already add significantly to building costs. Our ideas are:

- Install an Energy Star-rated ceiling fan in each dwelling unit’s main living area and in each bedroom.
- Ensure that at least 95% of each dwelling unit’s hard-wired lighting fixtures are Energy Star-rated.
- Install Energy Star-rated kitchen appliances.
- Install low-flow fixtures like dual flush toilets, water closets, faucets, and showerheads.
- Install hard flooring only (easier clean-up, drying if flooring does get wet).
- Ensure the finished grade on all sides of the building is sloped away from the edge of the building at a minimum slope of 5% (Florida building code requires the finished grade be at a minimum slope of 2%).
- Use pervious hardscape in place of impervious hardscape.
- Use Florida Friendly drought tolerant vegetation as provided via the Florida Friendly Landscape Certification or WaterStar Certification.
- Place mechanical systems on the roof.
- Install a cool/reflective roof.
- Install roofing product with a rating that exceeds current wind zone (as adjusted by other LDR changes) by 20 mph.
- Install a secondary water protection on roof (i.e., minimum hot mop or peel and stick under finished roof).
- Install highly reflective blinds/shades.
- Install windows with impact glazing.
- Build 2 feet of additional freeboard (beyond total 4 feet required by other LDR changes).
- Provide under building parking (so all occupied areas, except lobby, are elevated above parking).
- Provide electric vehicle charging for 1.5% of parking capacity.

In addition to these design standard suggestions, one item that we would appreciate additional clarity in the LDR changes is a definition of “critical functions.” I know we discussed this on our last call, and I believe we talked about this referring to elevators and emergency lighting, which makes sense to us. We would like to pin this down though, so it doesn’t expand and become a catch-all for functions that go well beyond things that can reasonably be considered critical.

Again, we appreciate this chance to provide input hope that these ideas can be incorporated into the package you send to City Council. Please let me know if you have questions regarding any of these ideas, and I would be happy to elaborate via email or we can jump on a call.

Kind regards,

Eric
On Fri, May 22, 2020 at 12:07 PM Eric Garduno <gad@baaahq.org> wrote:

Thank you!

I hope you have a great weekend!

On Fri, May 22, 2020 at 11:54 AM Elizabeth Abernethy <Elizabeth.Abernethy@stpete.org> wrote:

Email me

If I get it before next Wednesday CLOB, I can include in my package to city council

Thanks!
--Liz

Please note all emails are subject to public records law.

From: Eric Garduno <gad@baaahq.org>
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2020 11:52 AM
To: Elizabeth Abernethy <Elizabeth.Abernethy@stpete.org>
Subject: Re: Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) update

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Thanks for this Elizabeth!

At this point, if we have additional ideas on some of these pieces what would be the best way of having them considered?

Kind regards,

Eric Garduño

Government Affairs Director

Bay Area Apartment Association

813-882-0222

GAD@baaahq.org
City of Saint Petersburg
CITY COUNCIL
Meeting of June 11, 2020

Submitting Department: Planning & Development Services Dept.

Department Contact and Phone Number: Britton Wilson, (727) 551-3542

Agenda Category: New Ordinance/First Reading

Agenda Subject Matter:

City initiated amendments adopting local technical amendments related to design standards for multi-family buildings in the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) (City File: BCA-2020-01)

Reviewed and Approved by (signature and date):

Administration: /s/Elizabeth Abernethy for Alan DeLisle /s/ERA

Budget: N/A

Legal: [Signature]

Is attached backup material complete? YES
TO: The Honorable Ed Montanari, Chair, and Members of City Council

SUBJECT: City File: City-initiated local technical amendments to the Building Code pertaining to the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA).

ORDINANCE XXX-H BCA 20-01 amending Chapter 8, City Code of Ordinances (Building Code), adopting local technical amendments related to design standards for multi-family buildings in the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA). An Ordinance of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida amending the City Code to adopt criteria for R2 occupancy multi-family residential construction in certain flood hazard areas, increasing height requirement above the FEMA flood elevation requirements, classifying all R2 occupancy multi-family residential buildings as Risk Category III for wind design loads; and providing an effective date

INTRODUCTION:
This is the companion amendment to LGCP-2019-03 and LDR-2020-01, proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations related to Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA). The proposed comprehensive plan text amendments allow for consideration of land use plan amendments, subject to balancing criteria. The proposed amendments to the City’s Land Development Regulations and Building Code will establish elevated building design standards for multi-family development within the CHHA and require Hurricane Evacuation and Reentry Plans for hotel and multi-family projects. These amendments are intended to result in structures which are more resilient to storm surge, sea level rise and wind damage, mitigate for service and infrastructure needs during and immediately following a major storm event, and enable safe re-occupation as quickly as possible following an evacuation. These elevated design standards would apply to all new residential multi-family development with the CHHA, regardless of whether or not an increase in density increase was considered as part of a comprehensive plan map amendment.

BACKGROUND:
About the same time that the CHHA map was updated 2016, City staff was working on the adoption of a new planning area known as the Innovation District, when it became clear that this policy could limit the planned vision for the district. The CHHA overlapped with a portion of the proposed plan and zoning changes for the district. As part of that effort, staff first proposed the amendment to the policy in August of 2017, and then brought it back again last summer with the Innovation District package. Council requested a workshop to address the CHHA, which was held last January, where the concept of adopting elevated design standards was introduced. Over the course of the last two years since the consideration of the comprehensive plan policy change was initiated, there have been several storm events that led to the consideration of imposing the elevated building and design standards. These standards were initially based on a recent effort by the City of Norfolk Virginia, which established Resilency Quotient requirements for all development within their City, which has similar coastal development issues to St. Petersburg.
After the January 2019 workshop, staff held several meetings with stakeholders and the Urban Land Institute (ULI) provided technical assistance in developing these innovative zoning and development standards. A second workshop was held with City council on July 25th to report the ULI findings, and Council recommended that staff bring back a more refined amendment, based on cost estimates. After a review of the estimates, staff revised the draft LDR amendment, determined that an amendment to the local Building code will also be required and held additional stakeholder meetings before presenting at a final council workshop on October 24th.

The CHHA project timeline is summarized in the below table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHHA Project Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 10, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed local technical amendments to the Building Code are intended to reduce risk for water and wind as follows:

- **Reduce Risk for Water:** elevate an additional 2-feet above the required design flood elevation, for a total of 4-feet above Base Flood Elevation (addresses both Sea Level Rise and Storm Surge)

- **Reduce Risk for Wind:** construct the building to meet design requirements of next higher classification of risk category, e.g. increase from 145 to 155 mph standard, category 2 to 3 building risk category.

In accordance with F.S. 553.73.4.b.1, the expansion of the CHHA by the state based on the update to the SLOSH model has demonstrated that there are greater risks to people living in these areas and therefore there is a need to reduce risk from water and wind through this local technical amendment. By focusing the design changes on higher density multi-family buildings with high occupant loads, the proposed regulations will have the greatest direct impact on the safety of the greatest number of residents living in the CHHA. These regulations will result in a more sustainable design that will reduce
the risk of substantial damage during a flood or high wind storm event for a future housing located in the CHHA within the City.

More specifically, the proposed ordinance change will affect all properties in the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA). The SFHA are areas identified on FEMA’s Flood Insurance Rate Map. The SFHA is the area where the National Flood Insurance Program's (NFIP's) floodplain management regulations must be enforced and the area where the purchase of flood insurance applies. The SFHA includes Zones A, AO, AH, A1-30, AE, A99, AR, AR/A1-30, AR/AE, AR/AO, AR/AH, AR/A, VO, V1-30, VE, and V. All properties which are located in the CHHA (area below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge line) are also located within the SFHA.

In accordance with F.S.553.73.4.b.9., a Fiscal Impact Analysis has been prepared and is attached. The analysis estimates that the cost of constructing to the next higher wind category to be approximately 8% for high-rise and 5% for low rise structures (three stories or less). The analysis also notes that “the cost of Risk Category increase to the developer and contractor in both materials and potential labor, may be recoverable when consideration of potential insurance ratings and savings might be realized based on the building’s increased structural integrity. While this is a transitional cost benefit item from the developer\contractor to the building owner, it is a cost benefit that should be pursued. The National Institute of Building Sciences Natural Hazard Mitigation Saves: 2018 Interim Report, shows a nationwide benefit of approximately $11 saved for every $1 invested in mitigation and the increase of Risk Category requirements can be recognized as one such effort.” A Freeboard Increase memo was also prepared, indicating that cost for elevating the structures the additional 2-feet of elevation above the current code would be minimal, see attached. Further, in exchange for the additional cost, the overall risk of flooding for the building will be reduced by the added margin of safety and result in potential lower flood insurance rates.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Administration:** City staff recommends APPROVAL of the local technical amendment to the Building Code as with the related amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations (LGCP-2019-03 and LDR-2020-01).

**Public Input:** See City Council Memo and Reports for companion LGCP-2019-03 and LDR-2020-01 amendments for public input information. In addition, staff met with the Bay Area Apartment Association on February 21st and March 17, 2020.

**Recommended City Council Action:** 1) CONDUCT the first reading SET the second reading and public hearing for August 20, 2020.

**Attachments:** Ordinance, Fiscal Impact Statement, Freeboard Increase Memo.
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA AMENDING THE CITY CODE TO ADOPT CRITERIA FOR R2 OCCUPANCY MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION IN CERTAIN FLOOD HAZARD AREAS; INCREASING THE HEIGHT REQUIREMENT ABOVE THE FEMA FLOOD ELEVATION REQUIREMENTS; CLASSIFYING ALL R2 OCCUPANCY MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS AS RISK CATEGORY III FOR WIND DESIGN LOADS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the State of Florida requires coastal local governments to identify a Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA), which is defined as the area below the elevation of the category 1 storm surge line as established by a Sea, Lake, and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (SLOSH) computerized storm surge model; and

WHEREAS, the SLOSH model is updated and rerun from time to time in order to update estimates of the spatial extent of the CHHA for emergency planning purposes; and

WHEREAS, in its most recent update in 2016, the SLOSH model increased the CHHA within St. Petersburg, more than doubling from 7,705 acres (2010 est.) to 16,328 acres; and

WHEREAS, the City of St. Petersburg (City) intends on protecting the health, safety, and welfare of its citizens through the adoption of administrative and technical amendments to the Florida Building Code (FBC) that will apply to all new multi-family development within the CHHA, regardless of whether a Future Land Use Map amendment to increase density has been requested for a subject property; and

WHEREAS, one purpose of the amendments to the FBC is to reduce risk for water threats to property and life by requiring new multi-family development in the CHHA to elevate an additional 2-feet above the required design flood elevation, for a total of 4-feet above Base Flood Elevation, which addresses both sea level rise and storm surge; and

WHEREAS, another purpose of the amendments to the FBC is to reduce risk for wind threats to property and life by requiring new multi-family development in the CHHA to construct the building to meet design requirements of the next higher classification of risk category, i.e. increase from 145 to 155 mph standard, category 2 to 3 building risk category; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the requirements of Section 553.73(4)(b)9., Florida Statutes, a Fiscal Impact Analysis was performed; and
WHEREAS, in light of the expansion of the CHHA and the ongoing and mounting threat of sea level rise, storm surge, and wind events, City Administration recommends approval of this ordinance; now, therefore

THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA, DOES ORDAIN:

SECTION 1. The Florida Building Code (FBC) which has previously been adopted by the City in Chapter Eight of the City Code, is hereby amended by making the following amendment to FBC Section 107.3.5 in Sec. 8-36(c)(1) to read as follows:

1. Administrative amendments to the Florida Building Code, Building.

Modify the following subsections of Sec. 107.3.5 as follows:

107.3.5 Minimum plan review criteria for buildings.

Commercial Buildings: Building

8. Structural requirements shall include:

Flood requirements in accordance with Section 1612, including lowest floor elevations, enclosures, declaration of land restriction (nonconversion agreement), flood damage-resistant materials, 2 feet of freeboard (or 4 feet of freeboard for buildings with an R2 occupancy, multi-family dwellings with three or more residential units) or floodproofing. When an existing building or structure permitted under this section complies with the FIRM at the time of issuance of a permit for new construction/addition, neither the existing building nor the new construction/addition, is required to comply with the additional building height footage required to be added to the base flood elevation by this section.

SECTION 2. The Florida Building Code (FBC) which has previously been adopted by the City in Chapter Eight of the City Code, is hereby amended by making the following amendments to FBC Sections 1604.5, 1609.1.1, and 1612.4 in Sec. 8-36(c)(3) to read as follows:

1. Technical amendments to the Florida Building Code, Building.

Modify Sec. 1612.4 as follows:

1612.4 Design and construction.
The design and construction of buildings and structures located in flood hazard areas, including coastal high hazard areas and Coastal A Zones, shall be in accordance with Chapter 5 of ASCE 7 and with ASCE 24. The Design flood elevation per FBC section 1612 and ASCE 24 shall include 2 feet of freeboard above the (BFE) base flood elevation for all flood hazard areas. All group R2 occupancy multi family dwelling buildings with three or more dwelling units attached located in a flood hazard area shall include 4 feet of freeboard above the (BFE) to establish the (DFE).

Modify Sec. 1609.1.1 as follows:
1609.1.1 Determination of wind loads.
Wind loads on every building or structure shall be determined in accordance with Chapters 26 to 30 of ASCE 7 or provisions of the alternate all-heights method in Section 1609.6. Wind shall be assumed to come from any horizontal direction and wind pressures shall be assumed to act normal to the surface considered. All group R2 occupancy multi family dwelling buildings with three or more dwelling units attached located within in a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) shall be classified as a risk category III structure in accordance with table 1604.5 in the determination of wind design loads per section 1609 and ASCE 7.

Exceptions:
1. Subject to the limitations of Section 1609.1.1.1, the provisions of ICC 600 shall be permitted for applicable Group R-2 and R-3 buildings.
2. Subject to the limitations of Section 1609.1.1.1, residential structures using the provisions of AWC WFCM.
3. Subject to the limitations of Section 1609.1.1.1, residential structures using the provisions of AISI S230.
5. Designs using TIA-222 for antenna-supporting structures and antennas, provided the horizontal extent of Topographic Category 2 escarpments in Section 2.6.6.2 of TIA-222 shall be 16 times the height of the escarpment. Design using this standard shall be permitted for communication tower and steel antenna support structures.
6. Wind tunnel tests in accordance with ASCE 49 and Sections 31.4 and 31.5 of ASCE 7.
7. Wind loads for screen enclosures shall be determined in accordance with Section 2002.4.
8. Exposed mechanical equipment or appliances fastened to a roof or installed on the ground in compliance with the code using rated stands, platforms, curbs, slabs, walls, or other means are deemed to comply with the wind resistance requirements of the 2007 Florida Building Code, as amended. Further support or enclosure of such mechanical equipment or appliances is not required by a state or local official having authority to enforce the Florida Building Code.
9. Group R3 occupancy Single Family, detached duplex two family dwelling units, and Townhouse buildings not more than three stories above grade plane are permitted to be designed under the wind loads established per the scope section R101.2 of the Florida Building Code, Residential and ASCE 7.

Modify Sec. 1604.5 and table 1604.5:

1604.5 Risk category.
Each building and structure shall be assigned a risk category in accordance with Table 1604.5. Where a referenced standard specifies an occupancy category, the risk category shall not be taken as lower than the occupancy category specified therein. Where a referenced standard specifies that the assignment of a risk category be in accordance with ASCE 7, Table 1.5-1, Table 1604.5 shall be used in lieu of ASCE 7, Table 1.5-1.

TABLE 1604.5
RISK CATEGORY OF BUILDINGS AND OTHER STRUCTURES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RISK CATEGORY</strong></th>
<th><strong>NATURE OF OCCUPANCY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **I**             | Buildings and other structures that represent a low hazard to human life in the event of failure, including but not limited to:  
|                   | • Agricultural facilities.  
|                   | • Certain temporary facilities.  
|                   | • Minor storage facilities.  
|                   | • Screen enclosures. |
| **II**            | Buildings and other structures except those listed in Risk Categories I, III and IV. |
| **III**           | Buildings and other structures that represent a substantial hazard to human life in the event of failure, including but not limited to:  
|                   | • Group R2 occupancy multi-family buildings with three or more attached dwelling units located within a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA).  
|                   | • Buildings and other structures whose primary occupancy is public assembly with an occupant load greater than 300.  
|                   | • Buildings and other structures containing Group E occupancies with an occupant load greater than 250.  
|                   | • Buildings and other structures containing educational occupancies for students above the 12th grade with an occupant load greater than 500.  
|                   | • Group I-2 occupancies with an occupant load of 50 or more resident care recipients but not having surgery or emergency treatment facilities.  
|                   | • Group I-3 occupancies.  
|                   | • Any other occupancy with an occupant load greater than 5,000.  
|                   | • Power-generating stations, water treatment facilities for potable water, wastewater treatment facilities and other public utility facilities not included in Risk Category IV.  
|                   | • Buildings and other structures not included in Risk Category IV containing quantities of toxic or explosive materials that:  
|                   | o Exceed maximum allowable quantities per control area as given in Table 307.1(1) or 307.1(2) or per outdoor control area in accordance with the Florida Fire Prevention Code; and  
|                   | o Are sufficient to pose a threat to the public if released.  
| **IV**            | Buildings and other structures designated as essential facilities, including but not limited to:  
|                   | • Group I-2 occupancies having surgery or emergency treatment facilities.  
|                   | • Fire, rescue, ambulance and police stations and emergency vehicle garages.  
|                   | • Designated earthquake, hurricane or other emergency shelters.  
|                   | • Designated emergency preparedness, communications and operations centers and other facilities required for emergency response.  
|                   | • Power-generating stations and other public utility facilities required as emergency backup facilities for Risk Category IV structures.  
|                   | • Buildings and other structures containing quantities of highly toxic materials that: |
Exceed maximum allowable quantities per control area as given in Table 307.1(2) or per outdoor control area in accordance with the Florida Fire Prevention Code; and

- Are sufficient to pose a threat to the public if released.

- Aviation control towers, air traffic control centers and emergency aircraft hangars.
- Buildings and other structures having critical national defense functions.
- Water storage facilities and pump structures required to maintain water pressure for fire suppression.

a. For purposes of occupant load calculation, occupancies required by Table 1004.1.2 to use gross floor area calculations shall be permitted to use net floor areas to determine the total occupant load.

b. Where approved by the building official, the classification of buildings and other structures as Risk Category III or IV based on their quantities of toxic, highly toxic or explosive materials is permitted to be reduced to Risk Category II, provided it can be demonstrated by a hazard assessment in accordance with Section 1.5.3 of ASCE 7 that a release of the toxic, highly toxic or explosive materials is not sufficient to pose a threat to the public.

SECTION 3. Coding: For Section 1 of this Ordinance, which makes an administrative amendment to a previously amended section of the Florida Building Code (FBC) in Chapter 8 of the City Code, the following interpretive rules shall apply: Language that is single underlined represents previous City amendments to the FBC language. Language that is double underlined shall be added to the existing FBC and City Code. For Section 2 of this Ordinance, which makes technical amendments to sections of the FBC that have not been previously amended in Chapter 8 of the City Code, the following interpretive rules shall apply: Language that is single underlined is unamended FBC language that shall be added to the City Code. Language that is double underlined represents City amendments to the existing FBC that shall be added to the City Code.

SECTION 4. The provisions of this ordinance shall be deemed to be severable. If any portion of this ordinance is deemed unconstitutional it shall not affect the constitutionality of any other portion of this ordinance.

SECTION 5. 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.

Approved as to form and content:

_/s/Michael J. Dema_
City Attorney (designee)
00511700.docx
Fiscal Impact Statement

The City of St. Petersburg is looking to adopt a new standard into their local building code for new multi-family developments in the Coastal High Hazard Area: Construct building to meet design requirements of next higher classification of Risk Category, per ASCE 7 (e.g. increase from 145 to 155 mph standard, Category 2 to 3 storm event).

Per State of Florida statute 553.73, a fiscal impact statement is required. The statement will document “the costs and benefits of the proposed amendment. Criteria for the fiscal impact statement shall include the impact to local government relative to enforcement, the impact to property and building owners, as well as to industry, relative to the cost of compliance.”

The fiscal impact of increasing new multi-family construction in the City of St. Petersburg to meet wind speed increases from Risk Category 2 to Risk Category 3 is shown in the accompanying table (Table 1). Original cost values were based on previously provided costs for real multi-family developments in the City.

Cost estimates were made on the primary components that would require engineered enhancements to accommodate the higher wind loads and category increase. Note the items identified in the table account for the cost of wind measures and not the aspects that may be required based on the occupancy type classification that could trigger the increase in Risk Category. These would be exclusive of any intentional wind provision increases. Examples might include increased sprinkler systems to meet hazardous material requirements or items such as larger exit access necessary due to increased occupant load that are exclusive of structural wind design yet could also trigger the change from Risk category 2 to Risk Category 3. (See ASCE 7 Table 1.5-1 for additional information).

As identified in Table 1, these costs have been calculated to be approximately 8% (range from 6-9%) increase from the existing building cost. The 8% cost increase is based on the aspect of a structure being consistent with other high-rise, multi-family buildings that have recently been constructed that exceed a 60’ high threshold. Low rise structures (those being only a few stories in height) would typically see a cost increase of around 5%. This range is based on calculating differing types of construction methods typically found in multi-family coastal structures and the respective elements necessary to meet the higher category requirements.

The City already lies within the delineated ASCE 7, Windborne Debris Region (area where windspeed is 130mph or greater), so the requirement to utilize impact glazing or an approved shutter system is already in effect. While there would be some additional cost for the building envelope components (windows and doors) due to higher pressure and wind speed requirements having to be met, the typically largest cost of the glazing being impact rated is already being enforced.

Fiscal Impact to the City

The fiscal impact to the City to increase risk category requirements observed within the building department would be minimal. The review of construction plans and subsequent field inspections based on the changes would be nominal as once staff was trained up to the new standards, enforcement would be straightforward. This would be comparable to when a new code edition is adopted and subsequently enforced. There would also be some nominal cost in the notification of contractors, developers and the general public of the construction requirement changes.

Fiscal Impact to developers and contractors

The cost of Risk Category increase to the developer and contractor in both materials and potential labor, may be recoverable when consideration of potential insurance ratings and savings might be realized based on the building’s increased structural integrity. While this is a transitional cost benefit item from the developer/contractor to the building owner, it is a cost benefit that should be pursued. The National Institute of Building Sciences Natural Hazard Mitigation Saves: 2018 Interim Report, shows a nationwide benefit of approximately $11 saved for every $1 invested in mitigation and the increase of Risk Category requirements can be recognized as one such effort.
### Table 1

**Increased Cost for Multi-family Structure to Increase from Risk Category 2 to Risk Category 3 Wind Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-family Property Example (XXX Central Avenue)</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Building Total Area (BSF)</th>
<th>Unit Area (USF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Cost Values (Risk Category 2)</td>
<td>$38,000,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Cost per Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Cost per Unit Sq Ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$117.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increase from Risk Category 2 to Risk Category 3**

- **Roofing material enhancements**
  - $786,000
  - $2.43
  - $2,620.00

- **Wind speed/pressure rating requirements for glazing**
  - $296,025
  - $0.91
  - $296,025

- **Wind speed/pressure rating requirements for doors/sliding glass doors**
  - $280,050
  - $0.86
  - $336,500

- **Components & Cladding**
  - $310,975
  - $0.96
  - $313,978

- **Structural components and connections**
  - $260,100
  - $0.83
  - $260,100

- **Foundation enhancements**
  - $237,200
  - $0.73
  - $237,200

- **Mechanical or other rooftop mounted equipment**
  - $167,525
  - $0.52
  - $558,425

| Subtotal Direct Cost Increases | $2,346,875 | $7.24 | $7,822.92 |
| Subtotal Indirect Cost Increases | $721,000 | $2.23 | $2,403.33 |
| **Total Cost Increase** | $3,067,875 | $9.47 | $10,226.25 |

**Updated Project Cost Values (Risk Category 3)**

- $41,067,875

| Updated Cost per Unit | $136,892.92 | $126.75 |
| Updated Cost per Unit Sq Ft | approximate 8% | approximate 8% |

**Notes**

- Costs identified are only for wind provisions. Other requirements based on Risk Category level increase such as fire code-related life safety measures are not included.

- As the City of St. Petersburg is already within the Windborne Debris region with impact glazing requirements enforced, the cost of such is not included as part of this cost increase.

- Stronger provisions are required in ASCE 7-16 than 7-10

- ASCE 7-16 also addresses roof top solar panel attachment requirements but these were not considered in this fiscal analysis as they are optional to a structure.
Freeboard Increase Memo

The City of St. Petersburg is looking to adopt a new standard into their local building code for new multi-family developments in the Coastal High Hazard Area: *Elevate the finished floor with 2 feet of additional freeboard above the required design flood elevation, for a total of 4 feet of freeboard above the BFE (Base Flood Elevation).*

The costs associated with the additional height in elevation will be based on the type of foundation/floor construction being used and in what FEMA National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) flood zone the structure is being built. Foundations will typically include slab on grade and stem wall foundations found in the NFIP A Zone and elevated structures such as pile or pier foundations which are normally required in the V Zone often located on the coast.

In slab on grade, additional costs will be recognized in the fill used for grading and additional concrete if the foundation portion of the slab is increased to meet the additional height.

If a stem wall style foundation is being used, typically three (3) additional courses of a standard Concrete Masonry Unit (CMU) or concrete block would be required. Each block is 8 inches high, so three vertical courses would achieve the 2-foot requirement (8” x 3 courses = 2 feet). Additional fill would be required in the interior footprint of the foundation if fill is being used in the project. Projects that are utilizing an open crawl space below the structure would not incur any additional cost for fill as that area would be intended to remain open regardless of the additional elevation in floor height.

If a structure will be elevated using piles or piers, the requirements would be achieved by driving pilings or pouring piers with an additional 2 foot in length to meet the new freeboard requirement.

All the methods of construction would be impacted by the need for additional access elevation by an increase of the 2 feet in height to any stairs or staircase being used to access the building. The typical code-compliant stair riser has a maximum height of 7 inches so four additional stairs would be needed to meet the additional 2-foot freeboard height.

Consideration for any exterior or enclosure walls (based on the type of construction) would be needed, but as with the stem wall foundation, these exterior walls would only require three additional courses of concrete block to achieve the additional height. Poured concrete walls would recognize the additional height in the need for slightly taller formwork and the additional concrete needed. In a simplified calculation, one yard of concrete would be needed for each 20-foot-long wall segment for a wall 8 inches thick to meet the additional 2 foot in height elevation.

Finishes used on these exterior walls would be necessary for any such addition in height which would include additional stucco, siding or other finish such as paint being used.

Consideration for any service items used in the structure will be necessary. The largest impact in this area would be the elevation of any MEP or HVAC equipment to meet the additional freeboard height. A requirement of the NFIP is that any service equipment in the structure be elevated above the Design Flood Elevation which includes all 4 feet of the new freeboard requirement. This would include both interior and externally located equipment.

Summary

While there are recognized costs in new construction with the increase to 4 feet of freeboard, the overall costs as they relate to the entire structure are likely to be minimal. In exchange for the additional cost, the overall risk of flooding for the building will be reduced by the added margin of safety and potential lower flood insurance rates.
Committee of the Whole
Fiscal Year 2021
Recommended Budget
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Revenue Changes
General Fund
## General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Workshop Budget</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$143,433,371</td>
<td>$4,818,153</td>
<td>$148,251,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from School Crossing Guard Fund</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>($100,000)</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation - Charges for Services</td>
<td>$8,282,751</td>
<td>($1,242,828)</td>
<td>$7,039,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries - Charges for Services/Fines &amp; Forfeitures</td>
<td>$1,071,500</td>
<td>($41,721)</td>
<td>$1,029,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes – Fines &amp; Forfeitures</td>
<td>$1,570,000</td>
<td>($221,000)</td>
<td>$1,349,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance – State Shared Revenue/Business Tax</td>
<td>$29,890,084</td>
<td>($4,480,040)</td>
<td>$25,410,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue Change</strong></td>
<td><strong>$294,092,437</strong></td>
<td><strong>($1,267,436)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$292,825,001</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Requirement Changes
General Fund
## Requirement Changes – General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Preliminary Budget</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Contingency</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>($4,685,036)</td>
<td>$1,314,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>$194,940,299</td>
<td>($1,992,564)</td>
<td>$192,947,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>$28,046,801</td>
<td>($891,576)</td>
<td>$27,155,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$3,773,844</td>
<td>($724,000)</td>
<td>$3,049,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>$5,281,440</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$5,331,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Development Administration (CDA)</td>
<td>$1,264,422</td>
<td>$50,782</td>
<td>$1,315,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Facilities Department</td>
<td>$664,778</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,264,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Workforce Development</td>
<td>$3,458,185</td>
<td>$9,704</td>
<td>$3,467,889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Requirement Changes – General Fund Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Preliminary Budget</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>$3,453,473</td>
<td>($38,343)</td>
<td>$3,415,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$42,861,114</td>
<td>($65,000)</td>
<td>$42,796,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Clerk</td>
<td>$1,876,934</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$1,904,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier Subsidy</td>
<td>$1,909,600</td>
<td>$87,400</td>
<td>$1,997,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coliseum Subsidy</td>
<td>$177,000</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$195,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>$116,367,838</td>
<td>$845,408</td>
<td>$117,213,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater, Pavement, and Traffic Operations</td>
<td>$7,193,617</td>
<td>$21,876</td>
<td>$7,215,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Requirement Change</strong></td>
<td><strong>$299,509,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>($6,684,849)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$292,825,001</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revenue Changes
Other Funds
### Revenue Changes – Other Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Workshop Budget</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHIP (Local Housing Assistance)</td>
<td>$978,209</td>
<td>($378,209)</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Crossing Guard</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>($100,000)</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South St. Petersburg Redevelopment District</td>
<td>$5,468,281</td>
<td>$578,523</td>
<td>$6,046,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Redevelopment District</td>
<td>$19,217,621</td>
<td>$1,475,966</td>
<td>$20,693,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intown West Redevelopment District</td>
<td>$905,768</td>
<td>($580,967)</td>
<td>$324,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intown West- City Portion</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$672,246</td>
<td>$672,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier Operating Fund</td>
<td>$3,911,514</td>
<td>($9,187)</td>
<td>$3,902,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coliseum Operating Fund</td>
<td>$933,000</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$951,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Requirement Changes
Other Funds
# Requirement Changes – Other Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Workshop Budget</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits (All Other Funds with FTEs)</td>
<td>$119,406,094</td>
<td>($1,738,138)</td>
<td>$117,667,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIP (Local Housing Assistance)</td>
<td>$978,209</td>
<td>($378,209)</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Crossing Guard</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>($100,000)</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Revenue Fund</td>
<td>$8,243,792</td>
<td>($275,000)</td>
<td>$7,968,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Revenue Fund</td>
<td>$26,100</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$226,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier Operating Fund</td>
<td>$3,911,514</td>
<td>($10,000)</td>
<td>$3,901,514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Requirement Changes – Other Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Workshop Budget</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources Operating Fund</td>
<td>$170,463,741</td>
<td>($5,916,323)</td>
<td>$164,547,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Utility Operating Fund</td>
<td>$22,746,766</td>
<td>($34,132)</td>
<td>$22,712,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Operating Fund</td>
<td>$1,276,815</td>
<td>($7,016)</td>
<td>$1,269,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$10,097,100</td>
<td>$10,036</td>
<td>$10,107,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Management Fund</td>
<td>$577,380</td>
<td>$2,433</td>
<td>$579,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Insurance Fund</td>
<td>$5,335,525</td>
<td>$373,365</td>
<td>$5,708,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital Improvement Program
Revenue Changes
Rebecca Changes - CIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP Funds</th>
<th>Workshop Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Capital Improvement</td>
<td>$3,851,000</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>$4,531,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources Capital Projects</td>
<td>$62,583,000</td>
<td>($14,750,000)</td>
<td>$47,833,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Drainage Capital Projects</td>
<td>$6,792,000</td>
<td>($2,116,000)</td>
<td>$4,676,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement</td>
<td>$23,822,588</td>
<td>($39,072)</td>
<td>$23,783,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture Capital Improvement</td>
<td>$3,696,250</td>
<td>$39,072</td>
<td>$3,735,322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital Improvement Program Requirement Changes
# Requirement Changes - CIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP Funds</th>
<th>Workshop Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Capital Improvement</td>
<td>$3,913,231</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>$4,593,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources Capital Projects</td>
<td>$67,310,000</td>
<td>($14,750,000)</td>
<td>$52,560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Drainage Capital Projects</td>
<td>$6,790,000</td>
<td>($1,880,000)</td>
<td>$4,910,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement</td>
<td>$24,644,266</td>
<td>($29,322)</td>
<td>$24,614,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture Capital Improvement</td>
<td>$3,601,002</td>
<td>$29,322</td>
<td>$3,630,324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY21 Recommended Budget in Brief
FY21 Recommended Budget
Operating Revenues

$702.929 Million

- **Charges for Services**: $296,188,249
- **Taxes**: $211,314,632
- **Transfers**: $95,036,322
- **Debt Proceeds**: $1,224,877
- **PILOT/G&A**: $29,547,517
- **Miscellaneous Revenue**: $11,335,695
- **Fines**: $4,652,129
- **Licenses and Permits**: $6,298,025
- **Intergovernmental Revenue**: $47,331,671

st.petersburg
www.stpete.org
FY21 Recommended Operating Budget

$672.269 Million

- Public Works $202,782,457
- Public Safety $171,877,898
- General Government $130,219,515
- Neighborhood Affairs $66,199,496
- Leisure Services $54,979,913
- City Development $46,210,143
FY21 Recommended Budget

General Fund Revenue

- Taxes $211,314,632
- PILOT/G&A $29,547,517
- Transfers $1,992,159
- Intergovernmental Revenue $30,510,462
- Licenses and Permits $212,936
- Charges for Services $14,519,320
- Miscellaneous Revenue $2,541,637
- Fines $2,186,338

Total Revenue $292.825 Million
FY21 Recommended General Fund Expenditure by Administration

$292.825 Million

- Public Safety: $153,903,406
- Leisure Services: $50,854,751
- General Government: $55,785,027
- Public Works: $13,097,276
- City Development: $11,522,077
- Neighborhood Affairs: $7,662,464
FY21 Recommended General Fund Expenditure by Type

$292.825 Million

- Salaries & Wages: $140,951,249
- Benefits: $52,031,927
- Contract Services: $25,284,901
- Commodities: $5,113,399
- Internal Service Charges: $33,436,680
- Capital: $972,092
- Debt: $5,086,385
- Grants & Aid: $5,792,433
- Transfers: $22,840,971
- Contingency: $1,314,964
FY21 Capital Improvement Program

$104.104 Million

Water Resources, Penny, and Other CIP Funds
- Water Resources: 50.5%
- Penny Funds: 35.0%
- Other: 14.5%

Break Down of Other CIP Funds
- Airport, Marina, & Downtown Parking: 3.5%
- Stormwater: 4.7%
- Bicylce Safety & Multimodal Impact Fees: 1.3%
- Housing & General CIP: 5.0%
- Other: 14.5%
Five-Year CIP (FY21-25)

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FIVE-YEAR PLAN - $684.703 MILLION (000s omitted)

- Penny Funds
- Water Resources
- Other Funds

FY21: $15,139
FY22: $52,560
FY23: $63,063
FY24: $85,659
FY25: $87,153
Looking Forward – Utility Revenue Changes for Public Hearing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>Public Hearing Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources</td>
<td>$170,036,313</td>
<td>($2,084,516)</td>
<td>$167,951,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Utility Operating</td>
<td>$24,067,421</td>
<td>($1,017,891)</td>
<td>$23,049,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>$51,580,324</td>
<td>($1,101,914)</td>
<td>$50,478,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking Forward – Penny Project Changes for Public Hearing

• Current Penny Revenue Estimates (may change by Public Hearing due to new data)
  - FY20 Revenues down approximately $2M
  - FY21 Revenues estimate down 15% ($4.511M)

• Resolution passed by City Council on 7/9/20 to fund land acquisition and design of Fire Station 2 ($1.750M)

• Will need to reduce approximately $2M in existing penny projects to cover current year revenue loss.

• Will need to reduce projects in the FY21 Recommended CIP Plan by $6.261M to cover penny revenue loss and funding of Fire Station 2.
Looking Forward – Penny Project Changes for Public Hearing Cont.

- $36.405M FY21 Recommended Penny Plan Budget
- $8.236M (Required Debt Service Repayments)
- $28.169M
- $9.000M (WR Underground Infrastructure I&I)
- $19.169M
- $4.511M (Estimated Revenue Reductions at PH due to COVID-19)
- $14.658M
- $1.250M (Further Reduction of Existing Projects for FS2 Land)
- $0.500M (Further Reductions of Existing Projects for FS2 Design)
- $12.908M Penny Funding Left for ALL other Penny Projects
## Looking Forward – Penny Project

### Changes for Public Hearing Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Amount of Reduction</th>
<th>Balance for Project in FY21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3025</td>
<td>Take Home Vehicles</td>
<td>504,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3025</td>
<td>Public Safety Facilities Assignment</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3025</td>
<td>Replacement of Engine 13</td>
<td>323,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3025</td>
<td>Replacement of Engine 8</td>
<td>317,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal 3025</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,844,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Bridge Life Extension (Reduce by $300K to $450K)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Delay a bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Dredging Arterial Channels</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Emergency Dredging Small Boat Channels</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Minor Storm Drainage</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Alleys Reduce (2 Projects from $500K to $250K)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Traffic Signal BRT ($400K moved to FY22)</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Neighborhood Transportation Mgmt</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Wayfaring Signage- Sign Replacement</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Street and Roads (Reduce to $4.5M by $1M)</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Neighborhood Partnership Grants</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Bike Share</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Sidewalk Expansion</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Seawall</td>
<td>382,000</td>
<td>418,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal 3027</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,957,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Looking Forward – Penny Project Changes for Public Hearing Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Amount of Reduction</th>
<th>Balance for Project in FY21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3029</td>
<td>Play Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029</td>
<td>Park Facilities Improvement</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029</td>
<td>Athletic Facilities Improvements</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029</td>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029</td>
<td>Recreation Center Improvements</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029</td>
<td>General Library Improvements</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal 3029</strong></td>
<td><strong>350,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031</td>
<td>General Fire Station Improvements</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031</td>
<td>City Facility HVAC Replacement/Upgrade</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031</td>
<td>City Facility Roof/Waterproofing</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal 3031</strong></td>
<td><strong>110,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL ESTIMATED REDUCTIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,261,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL ESTIMATED NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Revenue Reduction (15%)</td>
<td>4,511,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated need for Fire Station #2</td>
<td>1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6,261,141</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY21 Budget Hearing Information

First Public Hearing
September 3, 2020

Second Public Hearing
September 17, 2020

6:00 PM
City Hall

Information is available on the city website at:

http://www.stpete.org/budget/
Committee of the Whole
Fiscal Year 2021
Recommended Budget
July 30, 2020

Revenue Changes
General Fund
## Revenue Changes – General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Workshop Budget</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$143,433,371</td>
<td>$4,818,153</td>
<td>$148,251,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from School Crossing Guard Fund</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>($100,000)</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation - Charges for Services</td>
<td>$8,282,751</td>
<td>($1,242,828)</td>
<td>$7,039,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries - Charges for Services/Fines &amp; Forfeitures</td>
<td>$1,071,500</td>
<td>($41,721)</td>
<td>$1,029,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes – Fines &amp; Forfeitures</td>
<td>$1,570,000</td>
<td>($221,000)</td>
<td>$1,349,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance – State Shared Revenue/Business Tax</td>
<td>$29,890,084</td>
<td>($4,480,040)</td>
<td>$25,410,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue Change</strong></td>
<td>$294,092,437</td>
<td>($1,267,436)</td>
<td>$292,825,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Requirement Changes

### General Fund
## Requirement Changes – General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Preliminary Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Contingency</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>($4,685,036)</td>
<td>$1,314,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>$194,940,299</td>
<td>($1,992,564)</td>
<td>$192,947,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>$28,046,801</td>
<td>($891,576)</td>
<td>$27,155,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$3,773,844</td>
<td>($724,000)</td>
<td>$3,049,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor's Office</td>
<td>$5,281,440</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$5,331,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Development Administration (CDA)</td>
<td>$1,264,422</td>
<td>$50,782</td>
<td>$1,315,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Facilities Department</td>
<td>$664,778</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,264,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Workforce Development</td>
<td>$3,458,185</td>
<td>$9,704</td>
<td>$3,467,889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Requirement Changes – General Fund Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Preliminary Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>$3,453,473</td>
<td>($38,343)</td>
<td>$3,415,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$42,861,114</td>
<td>($65,000)</td>
<td>$42,796,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Clerk</td>
<td>$1,876,934</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$1,904,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier Subsidy</td>
<td>$1,909,600</td>
<td>$87,400</td>
<td>$1,997,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coliseum Subsidy</td>
<td>$177,000</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$195,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>$116,367,838</td>
<td>$845,408</td>
<td>$117,213,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater, Pavement, and Traffic Operations</td>
<td>$7,193,617</td>
<td>$21,876</td>
<td>$7,215,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Requirement Change** | $299,509,850 | ($6,684,849) | $292,825,001
### Revenue Changes – Other Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Workshop Budget</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHIP (Local Housing Assistance)</td>
<td>$978,209</td>
<td>($378,209)</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Crossing Guard</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>($100,000)</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South St. Petersburg Redevelopment District</td>
<td>$5,468,281</td>
<td>$578,523</td>
<td>$6,046,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Redevelopment District</td>
<td>$19,217,621</td>
<td>$1,475,966</td>
<td>$20,693,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intown West Redevelopment District</td>
<td>$905,768</td>
<td>($580,967)</td>
<td>$324,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intown West- City Portion</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$672,246</td>
<td>$672,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier Operating Fund</td>
<td>$3,911,514</td>
<td>($9,187)</td>
<td>$3,902,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coliseum Operating Fund</td>
<td>$933,000</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$951,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Requirement Changes – Other Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Workshop Budget</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits (All Other Funds with FTEs)</td>
<td>$119,406,094</td>
<td>($1,738,138)</td>
<td>$117,667,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIP (Local Housing Assistance)</td>
<td>$978,209</td>
<td>($378,209)</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Crossing Guard</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>($100,000)</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Revenue Fund</td>
<td>$8,243,792</td>
<td>($275,000)</td>
<td>$7,968,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Revenue Fund</td>
<td>$26,100</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$226,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier Operating Fund</td>
<td>$3,911,514</td>
<td>($10,000)</td>
<td>$3,901,514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Requirement Changes – Other Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Workshop Budget</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources Operating Fund</td>
<td>$170,463,741</td>
<td>($5,916,323)</td>
<td>$164,547,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Utility Operating Fund</td>
<td>$22,746,766</td>
<td>($34,132)</td>
<td>$22,712,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Operating Fund</td>
<td>$1,276,815</td>
<td>($7,016)</td>
<td>$1,269,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$10,097,100</td>
<td>$10,036</td>
<td>$10,107,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Management Fund</td>
<td>$577,380</td>
<td>$2,433</td>
<td>$579,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Insurance Fund</td>
<td>$5,335,525</td>
<td>$373,365</td>
<td>$5,708,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital Improvement Program
Revenue Changes
Revenue Changes - CIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP Funds</th>
<th>Workshop Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Capital Improvement</td>
<td>$3,851,000</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>$4,531,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources Capital Projects</td>
<td>$62,583,000</td>
<td>$(14,750,000)</td>
<td>$47,833,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Drainage Capital Projects</td>
<td>$6,792,000</td>
<td>$(2,116,000)</td>
<td>$4,676,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement</td>
<td>$23,822,588</td>
<td>$(39,072)</td>
<td>$23,783,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture Capital Improvement</td>
<td>$3,696,250</td>
<td>$39,072</td>
<td>$3,735,322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital Improvement Program Requirement Changes
Requirement Changes - CIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP Funds</th>
<th>Workshop Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Capital Improvement</td>
<td>$3,913,231</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>$4,593,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources Capital Projects</td>
<td>$67,310,000</td>
<td>($14,750,000)</td>
<td>$52,560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Drainage Capital Projects</td>
<td>$6,790,000</td>
<td>($1,880,000)</td>
<td>$4,910,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Infrastructure Capital Improvement</td>
<td>$24,644,266</td>
<td>($29,322)</td>
<td>$24,614,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture Capital Improvement</td>
<td>$3,601,002</td>
<td>$29,322</td>
<td>$3,630,324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY21 Recommended Budget in Brief
FY21 Recommended Budget
Operating Revenues

$702.929 Million

- Charges for Services: $296,188,249
- Taxes: $211,314,632
- Licenses and Permits: $6,298,025
- Intergovernmental Revenue: $47,331,671
- PILOT/G&A: $29,547,517
- Transfers: $95,036,322
- Miscellaneous Revenue: $11,335,695
- Debt Proceeds: $1,224,877
- Fines: $4,652,129

FY21 Recommended Operating Budget

$672.269 Million

- Public Works: $202,782,457
- General Government: $130,219,515
- Public Safety: $171,877,898
- Leisure Services: $54,979,913
- City Development: $46,210,143
- Neighborhood Affairs: $66,199,496
FY21 Recommended Budget
General Fund Revenue

$292.825 Million

- Taxes $211,314,632
- PILOT/G&A $29,547,517
- Transfers $1,992,159
- Intergovernmental Revenue $30,510,462
- Licenses and Permits $212,936
- Charges for Services $14,519,320
- Fines $2,186,338
- Miscellaneous Revenue $2,541,637

FY21 Recommended General Fund Expenditure by Administration

$292.825 Million

- Public Safety $153,903,406
- Leisure Services $50,854,751
- General Government $55,785,027
- Public Works $13,097,276
- City Development $11,522,077
- Neighborhood Affairs $7,662,464
FY21 Recommended General Fund Expenditure by Type

$292.825 Million

Salaries & Wages $146,953,249
Benefits $53,031,927
Contract Services $25,284,901
Commodities $5,113,399
Internal Service Charges $33,436,680
Capital $972,092
Debt $5,086,385
Grants & Aid $5,792,433
Transfers $22,840,971
Contingency $1,314,964

FY21 Capital Improvement Program

$104.104 Million

Water Resources, Penny, and Other CIP Funds

- Water Resources 50.5%
- Penny Funds 35.0%
- Other 14.5%

Break Down of Other CIP Funds

- Airport, Marina, & Downtown Parking 3.5%
- Stormwater 4.7%
- Bicycle Safety & Multimodal Impact Fees 1.3%
- Housing & General CIP 5.0%

---

s1.petersburg
www.slpala.org
Five-Year CIP (FY21-25)

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FIVE-YEAR PLAN - $684.703 MILLION (000s omitted)

FY21 FY22 FY23 FY24 FY25
Penny Funds Water Resources Other Funds
$3,640 $29,275 $30,164 $30,765 $30,869
$52,560 $63,063 $85,659 $89,177 $87,153
$15,139 $43,111 $31,048 $30,851 $29,464

Looking Forward – Utility Revenue Changes for Public Hearing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>Public Hearing Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources</td>
<td>$170,036,313</td>
<td>($2,084,516)</td>
<td>$167,951,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Utility Operating</td>
<td>$24,067,421</td>
<td>($1,017,891)</td>
<td>$23,049,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>$51,580,324</td>
<td>($1,101,914)</td>
<td>$50,478,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

www.slpala.org
## Looking Forward – Penny Project Changes for Public Hearing

- Current Penny Revenue Estimates (may change by Public Hearing due to new data)
  - FY20 Revenues down approximately $2M
  - FY21 Revenues estimate down 15% ($4.511M)
- Resolution passed by City Council on 7/9/20 to fund land acquisition and design of Fire Station 2 ($1.750M)
- Will need to reduce approximately $2M in existing penny projects to cover current year revenue loss.
- Will need to reduce projects in the FY21 Recommended CIP Plan by $6.261M to cover penny revenue loss and funding of Fire Station 2.

## Looking Forward – Penny Project Changes for Public Hearing Cont.

- $36.405M FY21 Recommended Penny Plan Budget
- $ 8.236M (Required Debt Service Repayments)
- $28.169M
- $ 9.000M (WR Underground Infrastructure I&I)
- $19.169M
- $ 4.511M (Estimated Revenue Reductions at PH due to COVID-19)
- $14.658M
- $ 1.250M (Further Reduction of Existing Projects for FS2 Land)
- $ .500M (Further Reductions of Existing Projects for FS2 Design)
- $12.908M Penny Funding Left for ALL other Penny Projects
## Looking Forward – Penny Project Changes for Public Hearing Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Amount of Reduction</th>
<th>Balance for Project in FY21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3025</td>
<td>Take Home Vehicles</td>
<td>504,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3025</td>
<td>Public Safety Facilities Assignment</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3025</td>
<td>Replacement of Engine 13</td>
<td>323,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3025</td>
<td>Replacement of Engine 8</td>
<td>317,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal 3025</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,844,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Bridge Life Extension (Reduce by $300K to $450K)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Delay a bridge</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Dredging Arterial Channels</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Emergency Dredging Small Boat Channels</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Alleys Reduce (2 Projects from $500K to $250K)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Traffic Signal BRT ($400K moved to FY22)</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Neighborhood Transportation Mgmt</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Wayfaring Signage- Sign Replacement</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Street and Roads (Reduce to $4.5M by $1M)</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Neighborhood Partnership Grants</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Bike Share</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Sidewalk Expansion</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Seawall</td>
<td>382,000</td>
<td>418,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal 3027</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,957,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029</td>
<td>Play Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029</td>
<td>Park Facilities Improvement</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029</td>
<td>Athletic Facilities Improvements</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029</td>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029</td>
<td>Recreation Center Improvements</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029</td>
<td>General Library Improvements</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal 3029</strong></td>
<td><strong>350,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031</td>
<td>General Fire Station Improvements</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031</td>
<td>City Facility HVAC Replacement/Upgrade</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031</td>
<td>City Facility Roof/Waterproofing</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal 3031</strong></td>
<td><strong>110,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total Estimated Reductions**: 6,261,000

**Total Estimated Needs**

- Estimated Revenue Reduction (15%): 4,511,141
- Estimated need for Fire Station #2: 1,750,000

**Total**: 6,261,141
FY21 Budget Hearing Information

First Public Hearing
September 3, 2020

Second Public Hearing
September 17, 2020

6:00 PM
City Hall

Information is available on the city website at:

http://www.stpete.org/budget/