



**CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG
COMMUNITY PLANNING & PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING**

**Council Chambers
City Hall**

**December 8, 2015
Tuesday, 3:00 p.m.**

Approved as written 1/12/16

MINUTES

Present: Robert “Bob” Carter, Chair
Jeffery “Jeff” M. Wolf, Vice Chair
Christopher “Chris” A. Burke
Will Michaels
Gwendolyn “Gwen” Reese
Lisa Wannemacher
Jeff Rogo, Alternate
Thomas “Tom” Whiteman, Alternate

Commissioners Absent: Arnett Smith, Jr., Alternate¹ ¹ *excused*

Staff Present: Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Kim Hinder, Historic Preservationist III, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Larry Frey, Historic Preservationist II, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney
Vicky Davidson, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Economic Development

The public hearing was called to order at 3:00 p.m., a quorum was present.

I. OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIR AND SWEARING IN OF WITNESSES

II. ROLL CALL

III. MINUTES

The minutes from the November 10, 2015 meeting were approved as written by a consensus vote.

IV. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARINGS

Note: Commissioner Wannemacher recused herself from the following item due to a conflict.

A. City File COA 15-90200057 **Contact Person: Kim Hinder, 892-5451**

Request: Approval of Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the 1938 and 1967 additions and rehabilitate the 1926 building, known as the Ninth Street Bank and Trust Company (Union Trust Company), located at 801 Central Avenue.

Staff Presentation

Prior to the beginning of the presentation, Commissioner Michaels commented about the letter received from St Petersburg Preservation requesting a deferral of this item due to the late receipt of the Economic Viability Report and then asked Legal about the procedure. Mr. Dema stated that generally we defer on the basis of a request for additional information. He feels that after today's presentations and public hearing, the motion can be heard if this Commission feels additional information is needed; however, the motion can be made at any time.

Commissioner Michaels stated his understanding and will wait until after the presentations and public hearings to make the motion, if he feels additional information is needed.

Kim Hinder gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the staff report.

Applicant Presentation

Don Mastry, representing the owner, Art Village I LLC, and Tim Clemmons, the project's architect, gave a presentation in support of the request.

Registered Opponent Presentation

Emily Elwyn, representing St. Petersburg Preservation, gave a presentation in opposition of the request. She is asking for a denial or a deferral of this request.

Public Hearing

Albert Scafati, 1 Beach Dr SE, spoke in support of the request.

Sharon Winters, 806 – 18th Ave NE, spoke in opposition of the request; need to balance redevelopment with the historic character of the building; offered recommendations relating to design and mitigation if demolition occurs.

Robin Reed, 705 – 16th Ave NE and representing SPPI, spoke in opposition of the request.

Dan Harvey, Jr. – 1425 Central Ave, talked about his concern with the location the clock will be placed (SW corner) which is currently a trolley stop and possibly a significant stop for the BRT in the future.

Thomas J. Nestor, 500 - 45th Ave NE, did not speak but wanted his opposition on record.

Parrice Robinson, 740 – 16th Ave N, spoke in opposition of the request.

Sanford Goldman, architect, 227 Colony Point Rd S, spoke in support of the request.

Cross Examination

By City Administration:
Waived.

By Registered Opponent:
Waived.

By Applicant:

Waived.

Rebuttal

By City Administration:

Mr. Kilborn stated that in hearing today's presentations staff recommends that the Commission seriously consider the information they had heard, evaluate whether or not the applicant has met the code's expectation for approving reasonable use, and to try to work through the deliberation and get to a final vote this afternoon.

By Registered Opponent:

Waived.

By Applicant:

Don Mastry presented reasons why the Commission should approve the request.

Executive Session

Commissioner Michaels asked how limited historic significance is defined referring to the 1938 addition in the staff report. Ms. Hinder stated that there is no real definition of limited historic significance; she was trying to make a point that if the 1938 addition stood by itself, she is unsure it would meet the criteria for designation, its significance is really limited based on the 1926 building design.

Commissioner Michaels asked how the portion of the new building that overhangs the top of the 1926 building meets the criteria of mass, scale and size. Ms. Hinder stated that there are issues of its compatibility and staff is recommending that it possibly lose a floor or two but it does help that it's stepped back from the front inside façade.

Commissioner Michaels asked if there is any other historic landmark in the City that has overhanging new construction. Ms. Hinder replied yes, the Birchwood Hotel/Lantern Lane Apartments.

Commissioner Michaels asked about the square footage of the proposed overhang. Ms. Clemmons stated the floor plate of the 1926 building is 48-feet by 98-feet (approximately 4,700 square feet). The portion over the building represents two studio apartments and is approximately 30-feet (east to west dimension) whereas the original bank building is 48-feet, so it's setback 18-feet off the west façade. The setback from Central Avenue is actually 55-feet as designed, so it's 45-feet by 30-feet (approximately 1,300 square feet representing two studio apartments).

Commissioner Michaels asked for the north side of the building to be addressed. Mr. Clemmons stated that the north side of the building (including all three portions) is basically a blank stucco wall; the first 16-feet heading east from the west corner still has the same granite base, limestone cladding, and double window pattern and parapet. They intentionally setback that wing of the new construction building 16-feet to preserve that portion of the façade.

Commissioner Rogo stated that the proposed drawings are preliminary and asked if there was still a possibility to incorporate today's suggestions from the people who have spoken. Mr. Clemmons stated his appreciation of

receiving more concrete ideas in terms of what City staff is looking at and today's hearing and what was received today is very helpful and will revisit a portion of the building to align window patterns, size, etc.

Commissioner Rogo stated his concern about the amount of conditions they choose to put upon the design at this point and how appropriate they may be. He believes that the biggest decision of the Commission is the historical significance of the 1938 structure of the COA.

Commissioner Reese commented about the staff report and letters received from SPP stating that the applicant has not submitted any written demonstration regarding the reasonable beneficial use of the property and then asked staff if they still felt the same way. Mr. Kilborn stated that when the staff report was prepared for distribution, they did not have the feasibility analysis, which everyone received on Monday. In the staff report's analysis, absent the feasibility analysis, staff looked at the historic integrity of the 1938 and 1967 additions, and leaned on that in making the final recommendation that on balance, the application met the general goals and objectives of historic preservation and redevelopment within the Downtown Center. The staff report would not have been phrased the same way if the feasibility analysis was received earlier. Mr. Kilborn went on to say that in the ordinance, itself, when evaluating this it identifies testimony being presented which would come at times during the public hearing, itself; thus a deferment to another hearing for the possibility of expert testimony does not mean by itself adequate time was not provided.

Commissioner Michaels again voiced his concern about the basic fairness of receiving information at a point in time where it is difficult to vet and then asked Ms. Elwyn if she still believes that this case should be deferred for reasons of the report received on Monday. Ms. Elwyn replied, yes and that the COA process was not followed.

Commissioner Wolf asked if the 1926 building was the only portion historically designated. Ms. Hinder replied, no, the entire building is designated. The entire parcel consists of the entire block but only the building is designated.

Commission Chair Carter stated that he appreciates the development of this block but feels it is real competitive advantage for a city to have older buildings that can be developed. He does not think that architecturally the proposed project blends at all; however, he does see a need for development on that block. As for the 1938 and 1967 additions, he agrees with Mr. Mastry; the 1967 portion has no bearing for this Commission and the 1938 portion is very different and does not match up with the 1926 building. He sees both sides of the argument.

Commissioner Wolf stated that because it has sit for so long, he was kind of glad that someone wants to develop this parcel and willing to preserve what he feels is the most significant portion of the building. He feels that the building may benefit more from having some activity done rather than having that block sit for an indefinite period.

Commissioner Rogo made the following comments: Staff's judgement of the historic integrity (or lack thereof) of the 1938 addition outweighs the Commission's need for more detail in the economic feasibility analysis. He also agrees that the City has a jewel in the 1926 building and hopes that the developers will keep that in mind; polish that jewel and make sure it stands out in whatever new development should occur on this block.

Commissioner Burke stated that he is going to vote in favor of the request. He feels that by the time this had come to them, compromises have been done by the developers; contributing significantly toward the historic preservation of the block with a significant cost to save that 1926 building.

Commissioner Michaels moved to defer this item until the next meeting to give St. Petersburg Preservation an opportunity to bring back additional information regarding the viability of the 1938 portion. The motion failed for lack of a second.

MOTION: *Commissioner Michaels moved and Commissioner Reese seconded a motion approving the request with the special conditions of approval in accordance with the staff report as well as the amended conditions stated in the staff's memorandum dated December 8, 2015.*

VOTE: *YES – Burke, Michaels, Reese, Wolf, Carter, Rogo, Whiteman
NO – None*

Motion passed by a vote of 7 to 0.

Note: Commission Chair Carter recused himself from the following item due to a conflict.

B. City File COA 15-90200053

Contact Person: Larry Frey, 892-5470

Request: Approval of Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a single family residence located at 2247 Brevard Road Northeast.

Staff Presentation

Larry Frey gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the staff report.

Applicant Presentation

Dan Dawson, representing the owners Peter and Christina Apostolou, gave a presentation in support of the request.

Public Hearing

Emily Elwyn, representing St. Petersburg Preservation, spoke in support of the request.

Linda Dobbs, 2296 Coffee Pot Blvd., spoke in support of the request.

Executive Session

Commissioner Wannemacher stated that she thinks the home is beautifully designed and commends the applicant for seeking out a very well respected architect (Mr. Dawson) to help design the home.

Commissioner Michaels stated that it is nice to see this contribution to our tradition of Mediterranean Revival architecture in the city; that is certainly the signature architecture of our community that we are particularly noted for.

Commissioner Rogo asked if the issuing of a building permit is dependent upon meeting the conditions. Mr. Kilborn replied, absolutely, and then explained the process.

MOTION: *Commissioner Michaels moved and Commissioner Rogo seconded a motion approving the COA request subject to the required and recommended conditions of approval in accordance with the staff report.*

VOTE: *YES – Burke, Michaels, Reese, Wannemacher, Wolf, Rogo, Whiteman
NO – None*

Motion passed by a vote of 7 to 0.

V. CPPC MEMBER COMMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS

Derek Kilborn announced the resignation of Kim Hinder; she is leaving at the end of this month. He publically thanked her for her years of service and contribution to our staff and to the residents of our community. Everyone, including the City's Historic Preservation program has benefitted greatly from her service to us. We wish her the best in her new endeavor.

IX. ADJOURN

With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.