Staff Report
St. Petersburg Community Planning & Preservation Commission
Prepared by the Planning & Economic Development Department,
Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division

Public Hearing and Executive Action on August 9, 2016
3:00 p.m. - City Council Chambers, City Hall
175 Fifth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

According to Planning and Economic Development Department records, Lisa Wannemacher resides or has a place of business within 2,000 feet of the subject property. All other possible conflicts should be declared upon the announcement of the item.

Extension of Ad Valorem Property Tax Exemption
Application 14-90400004 (Ridgely Residence/Sadler)

BACKGROUND: In 1992, the voters of Florida approved a constitutional amendment allowing ad valorem tax exemptions for up to ten years on improvements to designated
historic properties. The City of St. Petersburg adopted this amendment (Section 16.30.070.4) on July 21, 1994, giving its residents financial incentives to preserve the City’s historical resources. The incentive was strengthened in January 1996, when Pinellas County also adopted the ad valorem tax exemption amendment. This program allows for a ten-year exemption of up to 100 percent of the assessed value of eligible, historically compatible improvements, both interior and exterior, to qualifying historic properties. A “qualifying property” in the City of St. Petersburg is defined as:

- a property designated as a local landmark or part of a thematic grouping;
- a contributing resource to a local historic district;
- a property listed in the National Register of Historic Places as a historic landmark;
- or
- a contributing resource in a historic district listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The property owner’s AVT application (Part 1) was originally approved on January 23, 2014, expiring on January 23, 2016. A six-month extension was granted by Staff until July 23, 2016. Due to circumstances beyond the control of the property owner, a second and final six-month extension to expire January 23, 2017 is requested to allow completion of the rehabilitation. City Code Section 16.30.070.4.F.1(d) requires a second six-month extension to be approved by the CPPC. It is likely that the applicant will complete work prior to this second extension date in order to qualify for the 2017 AVT cycle.

The Ridgely residence was constructed in 1910 for Dr. Roy and Florence Ridgely. The current property owner is making extensive improvements to the interior, restoring and repairing deteriorated exterior elements, and restoring a full array of more accurate divided light windows to the building. When the work is completed, the owner will submit the Part Two – Request for Review of Completed Work form, which includes documentation of the cost of the qualifying improvements, and allow a rehabilitation inspection by Staff. The application will then be placed into the applicable AVT cycle.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends APPROVAL of the second and final six-month extension of AVT 14-90400004 to expire January 23, 2017.
APPENDIX A
Supporting Documentation

Certificate of Appropriateness
City of St. Petersburg
Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

GDA Number: 14-90300017
Application Date: 1/19/2014

Applicant:
First Name: Bruce
Last Name: Sadler

Property Owner:
First Name: Bruce
Last Name: Sadler

Property Address:
600 Beach Drive
Street Type: NE
Designation Number: 03-03

Estimate:
$20,448.00

Build Out and repair. Replace gutters, HVAC. Repair fireplaces. May require alteration of window.

Appraiser:
Staff - XDH

Approved with conditions:
Staff Date: 1/23/2014

Conditions for approval:
Design of replacement window must be approved by staff before installation.

This certificate that the proposed work related to the property listed above has been approved by the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division of the Planning and Economic Development Department. The approval of this Certificate of Appropriateness in no way constitutes approval of an "Application for Permit to Build" by the City of St. Petersburg's Construction Services and Permitting Division or any other required City permit approvals.

Kimberly D. Hudson
Bruce F. Jelen
Certified Appraiser
Certified Appraiser
Instructions: Read the attached instructions carefully before completing this application. Your application cannot be evaluated unless it is complete and all required supporting materials are provided. In the event of any discrepancy between the application for and other supplementary material submitted with it (such as architectural plans, drawings and specifications), the application form shall take precedence. Type or print clearly in black ink. If additional space is needed, attach additional sheets.

A. General Information (to be completed by all applicants)

1. Property Identification and Location

Property Identification Number (from tax records) 12-31-17-04842-007-0170

Address of property: Street 600 Beach Dr NE

City St. Petersburg County Pinellas Zip Code 33701

2. Qualifying Property Information:

The property is:

☐ individually listed on National Register

☐ in a National Register district

☐ a locally designated historic landmark

☐ in a locally designated district

3. Type of request:

☐ Exemption under 196.1997, F.S. (standard exemption)

☐ Exemption under 196.1998, F.S. (Exemption for properties occupied by non-profit organizations or governmental agencies and regularly open to the public.) See section C on page 2.

4. Owner Information:

Name of individual or organization owning the property Bruce & Mary Sadler

Mailing Address 600 Beach Dr NE

City St. Petersburg State FL Zip Code 33701

Daytime Telephone Number 727-417-9914

If the property is in multiple ownership, attach a list of all owners with their mailing addresses.

5. Owner Attestation: I hereby attest that the information I have provided is, to the best of my knowledge correct, and that I own the property described above or that I am the authority in charge of the property. Further, by submission of this application, I agree to allow access to the property by appropriate representatives of the City of St. Petersburg or Pinellas County for the purpose of verifying the information provided in the application. I also understand that, if the requested exemption is granted, I will be required to enter into a covenant with the City of St. Petersburg and Pinellas County in which I must agree to maintain the character of the property and the qualifying improvements for the term of the exemption.

Bruce Sadler

Signature 12/11/13

Date

Complete the following if signing for an organization of multiple owners:

Title

Organization Name
B. **Property Use** (To be completed by all applicants)

1. Use(s) before improvement:
   - Hotel / Apartment Building

2. Proposed use(s):
   - Single Family Residence

C. **Special Exemption** (complete only if applying for exemption under s. 196.1998, F.S., property occupied by non-profit organization or government agency and regularly open to the public)

1. Identify governmental agency or non-profit organization occupying the building or archaeological site.

2. How often does this organization or agency use the building or archaeological site? ____________________________

3. For buildings, indicate the total usable area of the building in square feet. (for archaeological sites, indicate the total area of the upland component in acres) ____________ ☐ square feet ☐ acres

4. How much area does the organization or agency use? ______________ %

5. What percentage of the usable area does the organization or agency use? __________ %

6. Is the property open to the public? ☐ Yes ☐ No. If so, when?

7. Are there regular hours? ☐ Yes ☐ No. If so, what are they?

8. Is the property open by appointment? ☐ Yes ☐ No

9. Is the property open ONLY by appointment? ☐ Yes ☐ No

D. **Description of Improvements** (to be completed by all applicants):
Describe in the blocks below, site work, new construction, alterations, etc. Attach photographs and maps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature 1:</th>
<th>Describe work and impact on existing feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximate date of feature:</td>
<td>For 2nd Floor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description and condition of feature:</td>
<td>New Electrical Wiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Floor completely gutted &amp; re-framed</td>
<td>New Electrical Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Electric</td>
<td>New HVAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HVAC</td>
<td>Complete Plumbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roughed plumbing</td>
<td>Completely finish:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Photo no. | Drawing no. | Sheetrock, Paint, Refinish |
|-----------|-------------| &quot;Heart of Pine&quot; Flooring |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature 2:</th>
<th>Describe work and impact on existing feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximate date of feature:</td>
<td>Tear down several existing walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description and condition of feature:</td>
<td>Re-wire some areas, replace &quot;old windows&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Floor</td>
<td>Expensive New Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Electrical</td>
<td>Re-finish some floors &quot;tile&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Old Windows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature 3:</th>
<th>Describe work and impact on existing feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximate date of feature:</td>
<td>Repair existing fireplaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description and condition of feature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently has 3 non-working fireplaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature 4:</th>
<th>Describe work and impact on existing feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximate date of feature:</td>
<td>Add Solid wood w/raised panels shutters on most windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description and condition of feature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior of Window</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 5:</td>
<td>Feature 6:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate date of feature:</td>
<td>Approximate date of feature:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description and condition of feature:</td>
<td>Description and condition of feature:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently No</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bathrooms Upstairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo no.</td>
<td>Drawing no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature 7:</th>
<th>Describe work and impact on existing feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximate date of feature:</td>
<td>Finish 3 full bathrooms and add marble/granite finish to floors &amp; cabinet tops &amp; showers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description and condition of feature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo no.</td>
<td>Drawing no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preconstruction Application Review
(For Local Historic Preservation Office use only)

Property Identification Number 17/3117/04842/007/0170

Property Address 600 Beach Dr NE

The Local Historic Preservation Office has reviewed Part 1 (Preconstruction Application) of the Historic Preservation Property Tax Exemption Application for the above named property and hereby:

☐ Certifies that the above referenced property qualifies as a historic property consistent with the provisions of s. 196.1997 (11), F.S.

☐ Certifies the above referenced property does not qualify for the special exemption provided under s. 196.1998, (11) F.S.

☐ Certified that the above referenced property qualifies for the special exemption provided under s. 196.1998, F.S., for properties occupied by non-profit organizations or government agencies and regularly open to the public.

☐ Certified that the above referenced property does not qualify for the special exemption provided under s.196.198, F.S.

☐ Determined that improvements to the above referenced property are consistent with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitation

☐ Determines that improvements to the above referenced property are not consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, and the criteria set forth in Chapter 1A-38, F.A.C. All work not consistent with the referenced Standards, Guidelines and criteria is identified in the Review Comments. Recommendations to assist the applicant in bringing the proposed work into compliance with the referenced Standards, Guidelines and criteria are provided in the Review Comments.

Review Comments: See COA 14-90200017 Comments

Additional review comments attached? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Signature Kimberly Hinder

Typed or printed name Kimberly Hinder

Title Historic Preservationist

Date 1/23/14
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Staff Report
St. Petersburg Community Planning & Preservation Commission
Prepared by the Planning & Economic Development Department,
Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Division

For Public Hearing and Executive Action on August 9, 2016
3:00 p.m. - City Council Chambers, City Hall
175 Fifth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

According to Planning and Economic Development Department records, Lisa Wannemacher resides or has a place of business within 2,000 feet of the subject property. All other possible conflicts should be declared upon the announcement of the item.

Extension of Ad Valorem Property Tax Exemption
Application 14-90400005 (Monticello Apartments/Grimes)
BACKGROUND: In 1992, the voters of Florida approved a constitutional amendment allowing ad valorem tax exemptions for up to ten years on improvements to designated historic properties. The City of St. Petersburg adopted this amendment (Section 16.30.070.4) on July 21, 1994, giving its residents financial incentives to preserve the City’s historical resources. The incentive was strengthened in January 1996, when Pinellas County also adopted the ad valorem tax exemption amendment. This program allows for a ten-year exemption of up to 100 percent of the assessed value of eligible, historically compatible improvements, both interior and exterior, to qualifying historic properties. A “qualifying property” in the City of St. Petersburg is defined as:

- a property designated as a local landmark or part of a thematic grouping;
- a contributing resource to a local historic district;
- a property listed in the National Register of Historic Places as a historic landmark; or
- a contributing resource in a historic district listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The property owner’s AVT application (Part 1) was originally approved on September 30, 2013, expiring on September 30, 2015. The Part 1 documentation was forwarded to the Pinellas County Property Appraiser’s office on December 26, 2013. A six-month extension was granted by Staff until March 30, 2016. Due to circumstances beyond the control of the property owner, a second and final six-month extension to expire September 23, 2016 is requested to allow completion of the garage rehabilitation. City Code Section 16.30.070.4.F.1(d) requires that a second six-month extension to be approved by the CPPC. It is likely that the applicant will complete work prior to this second extension date in order to qualify for the 2017 AVT cycle.

The Monticello Apartment building (now a single-family residence) was constructed ca. 1909 for William and Cora Powers. The current property owners relocated this building in 2005 to 750 3rd Street North as a means of preserving it, subsequently being awarded a designation as a local landmark. The garage, originally constructed as a “double shotgun” type of dwelling, was formerly located at 328 - 7th Avenue North, and was constructed ca. 1920. Again, as a means of historic building preservation, the current owners used relocation as a means for preserving the building by converting it into a garage apartment under COA#s 13-90200025 and 14-90200010. When the work is completed, the owner will submit the Part Two – Request for Review of Completed Work form, which includes documentation of the cost of the qualifying improvements, and allow a rehabilitation inspection by Staff. The application will then be placed into the applicable AVT cycle.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends APPROVAL of the second and final six-month extension of AVT 14-90400005 to expire September 30, 2016.
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Certificate of Appropriateness
City of St. Petersburg
Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

COA Number 13-90200025  Application Date 8/6/2013
Applicant First Name Ken  Last Name Grimes
Property Owner First Name Ken  Last Name Grimes
Property Address 750 3rd Street N
Resource Name Monticello Apartments
Cost $40,000.00

Proposed Work:
Relocate a double shotgun house from 328 7th Ave N to the south end of the landmark parcel.

Type Review CPC  CPC Date 9/20/2013
Approval Approved with conditions  Active Date 9/30/2013  COA Expiration 3/30/2015

Conditions Of Approval:
1. The relocated building will not be considered a contributing element to the local designation. The relocated building will be subject to limited COA review relevant to the additional conditions of approval for this COA.
2. The owner shall retain the rusticated block exterior.
3. The owner shall retain the diamond shaped roof shingles.
4. The owner shall retain the pattern of fenestration on the building. Changes to the fenestration may be allowed for adaptive reuse.

As per CPC - Approval regarding alterations to the roof and fence shall be decided by staff and does not require further CPC review.

This certifies that the proposed work related to the property listed above has been approved by the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation division of the Planning and Economic Development Department. The approval of this Certificate of Appropriateness in no way constitutes approval of an "Application for Permit to Build" by the City of St. Petersburg's Construction Services and Permitting Division or any other required City permit approvals.

[Signatures]
Applicant Signature

[Handwritten Notes]
Certificate of Appropriateness
City of St. Petersburg
Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

COA Number: 14-90200010
Application Date: 2/18/2014

Applicant:
First Name: Ken
Last Name: Grimes

Property Owner:
First Name: Ken
Last Name: Grimes

Property Address:
Number: 750
Street: 3rd
Street Type: N
Direction: Uni Number:

Resource Name: Monticello Apartments
Designation Number: 03-01

Cost: $180,000.00
Related File:

Proposed Work:
Construct a one story garage under existing relocated double shotgun building.

Type Review:
CPC
CPC Date: 3/11/2014

Approval:
Approved with conditions
Action Date: 3/24/2014
COA Expiration: 6/24/2014

Conditions of Approval:
Garage doors shall be pre-approved by staff prior to purchase and installation.
All windows shall be 4 over 1 or 1 over 4, wood windows to match the original portion of the building.
The design of all doors and door openings shall be approved by staff prior to installation.

This certifies that the proposed work related to the property listed above has been approved by the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation division of the Planning and Economic Development Department. The approval of this Certificate of Appropriateness in no way constitutes approval of an "Application for Permit to Build" by the City of St. Petersburg's Construction Services and Permitting Division or any other required City permit approvals.

Applicant Signature:

[Signature]
City of St. Petersburg
Preconstruction Application

Instructions: Read the attached instructions carefully before completing this application. Your application cannot be evaluated unless it is complete and all required supporting materials are provided. In the event of any discrepancy between the application for and other supplementary material submitted with it (such as architectural plans, drawings and specifications), the application form shall take precedence. Type or print clearly in black ink. If additional space is needed, attach additional sheets.

A. GENERAL INFORMATION  (To be completed by all applicants)

1. Property identification and location:
Property Identification Number (from tax records) 19-31-17-23350-003-0010  (Attach legal description)
Address of property: Street 750 W STREET NORTH
City St. PETERSBURG County PINELLS Zip Code 33701

2. Qualifying Property Information:
The property is
( ) individually listed on National Register
( ) in a National Register district
( ) a locally designated historic landmark
( ) in a locally designated district

3. Type of request:
( ) Exemption under 196.1997, F.S. (Standard exemption)
( ) Exemption under 196.1993, F.S. (Exemption for properties occupied by non-profit organizations or governmental agencies and regularly open to the public.) See section C on page 2.

4. Owner Information:
Name of individual or organization owning the property KENNETH L. GRIMES
Mailing Address ____________________________________________
City ___________________________ State __________ Zip Code __________
Daytime Telephone Number ______________________________________

If the property is in multiple ownership, attach a list of all owners with their mailing addresses.

5. Owner Attestation: I hereby attest that the information I have provided is, to the best of my knowledge correct, and that I own the property described above or that I am the authority in charge of the property. Further, by submission of this application, I agree to allow access to the property by appropriate representatives of the City of St. Petersburg or Pinellas County for the purpose of verifying the information provided in the application. I also understand that, if the requested exemption is granted, I will be required to enter into a covenant with the City of St. Petersburg and Pinellas County in which I must agree to maintain the character of the property and the qualifying improvements for the term of the exemption.

KENNETH L. GRIMES  _________________  10-13-13
Name  Signature  Date

Complete the following if signing for an organization of multiple owners:

Title ________________________________ Organization Name ________________________________
B. **PROPERTY USE** (To be completed by all applicants)

1. Use(s) before improvement: 
   
   [Handwritten: Abandoned]

2. Proposed use(s): 
   
   [Handwritten: Accessory Space]

C. **SPECIAL EXEMPTION** (complete only if applying for exemption under s. 196.1998, F.S., property occupied by non-profit organization or government agency and regularly open to the public)

1. Identify governmental agency or non-profit organization occupying the building or archaeological site.

2. How often does this organization or agency use the building or archaeological site?

3. For buildings, indicate the total usable area of the building in square feet. (For archaeological sites, indicated the total area of the upland component in acres.) __________ square feet (____) acres (____).

4. How much area does the organization or agency use? ________%.

5. What percentage of the usable area does the organization or agency use? ________%.

6. Is the property open to the public? ( ) Yes ( ) No. If so, when?

7. Are there regular hours? ( ) Yes ( ) No. If so, what are they?

8. Is the property open by appointment? ( ) Yes ( ) No

9. Is the property open only by appointment? ( ) Yes ( ) No

D. **DESCRIPTION OF IMPROVEMENTS** (To be completed by all applicants):

Describe in the blocks below site work, new construction, alterations, etc. Attach photographs and Maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature 1: LOCATION/Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximate date of feature: 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description and Condition of Feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imminent Destruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Describe work and impact on existing feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move House Out of Harms Way. Place on New Foundation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Photo no. | Drawing no. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature 2:</th>
<th>Rusticated Block</th>
<th>Describe work and impact on existing feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximate date of feature:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Repair as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description and Condition of Feature</td>
<td>Immense Demise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo no.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Drawing no.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature 3:</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Describe work and impact on existing feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximate date of feature:</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Repair if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description and Condition of Feature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Replace with replica style if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo no.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drawing no.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature 4:</th>
<th>Front Porch</th>
<th>Describe work and impact on existing feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximate date of feature:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description and Condition of Feature</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo no.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Drawing no.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Feature 5:
**Approximate date of feature:**
**Description and Condition of Feature**

**Describe work and impact on existing feature:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo no.</th>
<th>Drawing no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Feature 6:
**Approximate date of feature:**
**Description and Condition of Feature**

**Describe work and impact on existing feature:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo no.</th>
<th>Drawing no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Feature 7:
**Approximate date of feature:**
**Description and Condition of Feature**

**Describe work and impact on existing feature:**

| Photo no. | Drawing no. |
House on front of property

ONE STORY HOUSE TO BE MOVED TO THIS LOCATION

EXISTING THREE STORY HOUSE

3RD STREET NORTH

Property Line 1210'
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Staff Report to the St. Petersburg Community Planning & Preservation Commission
Prepared by the Planning & Economic Development Department,
Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division

For Public Hearing and Executive Action on August 9, 2016
at 3:00 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, City Hall,
175 Fifth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

City File: FLUM-43
Agenda Item # V.C

According to Planning and Economic Development Department records, no commissioners own property located within 2,000 feet of the subject property. All other possible conflicts should be declared upon announcement of the item.

APPLICANT:
Alex Petro, Jr.
13228 Royal George Avenue
Odessa, FL 33556-5724

REPRESENTATIVE:
Nikki Williams
Burr and Forman, LLP
200 South Orange Avenue, Suite 800
Orlando, FL 32801

SUBJECT PROPERTY:
The subject property, located at 2785 Bayside Drive South, is developed with one (1) single-family house. The subject property is legally described as Lot 9, Ling-A-Mor Addition, as recorded in Plat Book 22, Page 90, Public Records of Pinellas County, Florida. The parcel identification numbers ("PIN") is 31-31-17-52074-000-0090.

According to the Pinellas County Property Appraiser’s Office, the subject property is comprised of nearly 7,270 square feet of living area or 8,703 gross square feet when including the garage and open porches.
SURROUNDING USES:

North: Single-family residence
South: Water body (Big Bayou)
East: Public park (South Shore Park)
West: Water body (Big Bayou)
NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:

The subject property is not located within the boundary of an active neighborhood association. The subject property was once part of the Big Bayou Neighborhood Association, but city records indicate that this association is currently inactive.

The closest, active neighborhood association is the Ling-A-Mor Estate Neighborhood Association, generally located northwest of the subject property. The Driftwood Property Owners Association is located to the northeast.

REQUEST:

This request is to amend the Future Land Use Map designation for the single-family residence from Planned Redevelopment Residential to Planned Redevelopment Residential (Resort Facility Overlay or RFO). There is no Official Zoning Map change proposed; the zoning will remain NT-2 (Neighborhood Traditional).

PURPOSE:

Alex Petro, Jr., property owner, operates a short-term vacation rental, technically referred to as a transient accommodation use in Chapter 16 of the City Code ("LDRs"). Such a use at the subject property is not permitted by the City Code. Designating the subject property with an RFO Future Land Use Map designation will allow Mr. Petro to continue operating a short-term vacation rental with rental periods of less than one (1) month, more than three (3) times per calendar year.

BACKGROUND:

The subject property was first acquired by the property owner in February 2002 and homesteaded through 2010. Starting in September 2014, the subject property was advertised on Vacation Rentals Buy Owner ("VRBO") an online vacation rental marketplace, owned by IHomeAway, Inc., a subsidiary of Expedia, Inc. The subject property is currently marketed using several online resources:

- Vacation Rentals By Owner: https://www.vrbo.com/569675#
- Flipkey: https://www.flipkey.com/saint-petersburg-vacation-rentals/p754061/
- Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/Petrowaterfrontmansion

According to the VRBO listing, the subject property has an advertised minimum requirement of seven (7) nights and reservations have been accepted through July 2017.

CODE COMPLIANCE:

Starting on May 3, 2016, the City’s Codes Compliance Assistance Department ("CCAD") first identified a use violation on the subject property. A violation notice (Case No. 16-00007931) was subsequently issued on May 26, 2016, for the operation of a short-term vacation rental in violation of the City’s Land Development Regulations and Comprehensive Plan. The violation notice requested corrective action by June 19, 2016. On June 20, 2016, CCAD staff received a letter of
request for a 30-day extension from the property owner's agent, Nikki Williams, Attorney, Burr & Forman, LLP. The extension request was for the purpose of allowing the applicant the opportunity to consult with the City's Planning and Economic Development Department about future land use and zoning options for the property. On June 23, 2016, CCAD granted a 30-day extension through July 26, 2016. On June 30, 2016, this application was received and processed by the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division. CCAD action is pending the results of this application.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

The subject property is presently designated Planned Redevelopment Residential on the City's Future Land Use Map and NT-2 (Neighborhood Traditional) on the Official Zoning Map. The NT-2 zoning district regulations primarily allow single family residential uses. Transient accommodation uses can be allowed in residential zoning districts, including NT-2, if the RFO is approved for the property. In accordance with the LDRs:

- **Residential uses** include single family homes, garage apartments, duplexes, townhomes and multifamily (apartments or condominiums) units which are available for occupancy on no less than a monthly basis, or for less than a monthly basis three or fewer times in any consecutive 365-day period.

- **Transient accommodation uses** means a building containing one or more transient accommodation units, one or more of which is occupied by one or more persons, or offered or advertised as being available for such occupancy, when the right of occupancy is for a term less than monthly, such right of occupancy being available more than three times in any consecutive 365-day period. The determination that a property is being used as a transient accommodation use is made without regard to the form of ownership of the property or unit, or whether the occupant has a direct or an indirect ownership interest in the property or unit; and without regard to whether the right of occupancy arises from a rental agreement, other agreement, or the payment of consideration. The term "transient accommodation uses" includes but is not limited to hotels, motels, recreational vehicle parks, tourist lodging facilities, resort condominiums, resort dwellings, vacation resorts, and dwelling units occupied or available for occupancy on an interval ownership or "time share" basis, when any of the above are made available for occupancy more than three times in any consecutive 365-day period and the right of occupancy is for a term less than monthly.

In accordance with the City's Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use Element Policy LU3.1(E)(5):

- **Resort Facilities Overlay (RFO)** - Overlaying the future land use designations for areas suitable for the combination of residential and transient accommodation uses. Transient accommodation and residential uses shall be as defined in the Zoning Ordinance. Transient accommodations shall be allowed within areas designated RFO not to exceed the maximum density in the underlying future land use plan category and zoning district. When located within an RFO area, individual transient accommodation units shall comply with the...
definition of dwelling unit as found in the Zoning Ordinance. Uses which are nonconforming or grandfathered uses shall not be eligible for the RFO designation.

Property with an RFO designation may offer less than monthly occupancy without any limitation on the number of times per year it may be offered. All other land development regulations pertaining to residential uses remain in full force and effect.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

As stated above, the applicant presently operates a short-term vacation rental. Such a use at the subject property is not permitted by the City Code. It is the applicant’s desire to designate the subject property with the RFO designation thereby allowing continued operation of short-term vacation rentals for less than one month, more than three times a year.

**Resort Facility Overlay (RFO) Background**

Tourist oriented transient accommodations in residential areas was an issue for the City back in 2001, specifically, timeshare units and the short-term rental of apartment and condominium units. During several Planning Commission and City Council workshops regarding the transient accommodations issue, the RFO designation, which was permitted by the Countywide Plan Rules, was seen as a reasonable way to address the issue. Both Planning Commission and City Council members agreed that while timeshare units and short-term rental units were residential in appearance and character, they have higher turnover and were generally incompatible with the accepted standards for residential areas. However, particularly in locations that have significant tourist and resort destination amenities, there were areas where a mix of transient and residential uses may be appropriate, and the RFO designation provided a mechanism for allowing that mix of transient accommodation and residential uses.

In June 2001, City Council approved Resolution 2001-369 initiating amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and land development regulations to implement the Resort Facilities Overlay (RFO). An amendment to add the RFO designation to the Comprehensive Plan was ultimately adopted in January 2004 (Ordinance 498-G). The reason for the more than two year delay was the fact that the proposed ordinance addressing the RFO designation also addressed providing for two-way traffic on a portion of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street and 8th Street which required more study and analysis.

While the RFO designation has been available for the past 12 years, a private application has never been processed, until now.

**The Sharing Economy**

Largely thanks to an entirely new enterprise model introduced by the millennial generation (age 18 to 34), the term “sharing economy” began to appear in the mid-2000s. The term refers to business models that enable providers and consumers to share resources and services using creative online software and technology platforms. Sharing economy is also commonly referred to as collaborative consumption, the collaborative economy or the peer-to-peer economy. While the
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sharing economy encompasses much more than ride-sharing and home-sharing, these two services are the most mainstream.

➢ Ride-sharing is typically recognized as a one-time transaction where someone who needs a ride is matched with a nearby driver and is shuttled to a destination. Two well-known ride-sharing services are Uber, established in 2009 and Lyft in 2012.

➢ Home-sharing is recognized as an organized agreement between two parties, in which one party rents out all or part of his or her home to another party on a temporary, one-time basis. Popular websites for home-sharing services include VRBO (Vacation Rental By Owner) established in 1995, HomeAway and FlipKey, both established in 2006 and Airbnb, established in 2008.

Applicant’s Request

The property owner filed an application for the RFO designation on Thursday, June 30, 2016. Based upon the narrative attached to the application, the property owner is of the opinion that the request for the RFO designation is appropriate for the described property and conforms to the relevant considerations of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, as follows:

Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan

Comprehensive Plan Policy LU3.1(E)(5) reserves applicability of the RFO for areas where the combination of residential and transient accommodation uses is suitable, meaning that the Community Planning and Preservation Commission (“CPPC”) and City Council must carefully consider the compatibility of transient accommodation uses when proposed within neighborhoods that are predominantly characterized by either single-family residences or clustered multi-family apartments, condominiums, and townhouses. City staff believes the request is not consistent:

➢ Dating back to 2001, the RFO was originally added to the City’s Comprehensive Plan in response to requests for timeshare units and the short-term rental of apartment and condominium units. Consideration of this subject focused almost exclusively on multi-family dwelling units and predated the popular emergence of today’s home-sharing services;

➢ During their deliberations in 2004, both the Planning Commission (now-known as the Community Planning and Preservation Commission) and the City Council agreed that while timeshare units and short-term rental units were residential in appearance and character, they also included higher turnover rates and were generally incompatible with the accepted standards for residential areas;

➢ The Planning Commission and the City Council further acknowledged however, that certain locations may have significant tourist and resort destination amenities, uniquely qualifying them for a mix of transient accommodation and other residential uses. The RFO designation would provide a mechanism for carefully considering the compatibility of each request among the City’s many multi-family dwelling units;
The description for a transient accommodation use embedded within the LDRs makes reference to, “...one or more [transient accommodation units].” Furthermore, the description distinguishes between a “resort condominium” and a “resort dwelling.” While it is likely that these references were attempting to include scenarios where one or more, but not all, multi-family dwelling units within a single building or complex would take advantage of the RFO, consideration of single-family dwelling units could be inferred from the language and therefore, cannot be excluded from consideration;

This important distinction – multi-family residential vs. single-family residential - has been the basis for City Staff’s prior recommendations on the subject. Whereas City Staff has encouraged several multi-family apartments, condominiums, and townhouses to consider utilizing the RFO, it has not supported the use of RFO for single-family dwelling units.

The applicant’s request is not consistent with Comprehensive Plan Policy LU3.6, which states that land use planning decisions shall weigh heavily the established character of predominately developed areas where changes of use or intensity of development are contemplated, and not consistent with Policy LU3.8, which states that “the City shall protect existing and future residential uses from incompatible uses, noise, traffic and other intrusions that detract from the long term desirability of an area...”

Whereas multi-family dwelling units generally benefit from the existence of an on-site operator, or covenants included within the condominium or homeowners association documents, single-family dwelling units do not share the same protections against land use abuses or changes and have little recourse for corrective action. Moreover, property owners in a multi-family development collectively retain final authority to set longer rental terms through their elected Board and bylaws. This governing structure allows the association to moderate the behavior of its owners and tenants while adapting to changing preferences over time.

Multi-family dwelling units are predisposed to support transient accommodation uses because their physical and operational characteristics expect higher volumes of pedestrian and vehicle traffic. Moreover, multi-family dwelling units often include open space and recreational amenities that are properly designed for larger groups of people and located to minimize peripheral impacts upon surrounding properties. This is not true for single-family dwelling units, where transient accommodation uses could disrupt the expectations for a quiet, more peaceful surrounding neighborhood. This should be a primary concern in evaluating the compatibility of a multi-family or single-family dwelling unit for a transient accommodation use. Based on the information and circumstances of this request, it can be said that:

- This single-family dwelling unit is bounded by open water (Big Bayou) on the west and south boundaries and a City public park (South Shore Park) on the east boundary. The applicant has pointed out, and City staff acknowledges, that these surrounding conditions help mitigate peripheral impacts since there is only one single-family residence abutting the subject property, located along the north boundary line;

City File: FLUM-43
Page 7
Parking is a general concern, particularly if special events are being conducted on the subject property. This photograph provided by the property owner appears to show that the subject property can accommodate at least six (6) trucks and sport utility vehicles on-site, not including the enclosed garages. City staff acknowledges that this accommodation is unique among single-family residences but points out the proximity of this vehicle parking to the abutting residence.

More importantly, customer reviews on the VRBO listing and Facebook profile page indicate tenancy by groups ranging from 15 to 25 individuals. While the amount of available parking is higher than a traditional single-family residence, the size of groups that are renting the subject property also suggests that some vehicle parking must require use of the adjoining public rights-of-way.

This problem is exacerbated during special events when catering and service vehicles are on-site and a higher than normal volume of vehicles are attending. One customer review noted a cocktail party with 50 guests and another noted a wedding reception with 45 guests.

Traffic volume in the neighborhood is also periodically impacted. In addition to the larger number of vehicles associated with groups of 15 to 25 individuals and their associated special events, large families and other groups will sometimes require airport, hotel, and transportation shuttles and catering vehicles that are not typical or as frequent within other single family neighborhoods.

Because of the operation of special events at the subject address, it is also important to consider how short-term rentals might be distinguished from bed-and-breakfast facilities, which are a permitted, special exception use within the NT-2 zoning classification. The regulation of bed-and-breakfast facilities within single-family neighborhoods further reinforces the prevailing opinion that short-term rentals were not
contemplated for single-family neighborhoods in the same way they were expected for multi-family dwelling units.

The definition for a bed-and-breakfast is, "A building of a residential character other than a hotel, motel, or other transient accommodation that provides daily overnight accommodation and morning meal services to transients in return for payment." A bed-and-breakfast requires special exception approval and an owner or manager to reside on the premises. There are also regulations on special events including hours, frequency, the number of attendees, noise, parking, and the requirement for submission of a special event parking plan.

Based on the careful consideration of their peripheral impacts and regulation of bed-and-breakfast facilities and their associated special events, it is possible to have a regulated bed-and-breakfast facility immediately next to an unregulated short-term rental using the RFO. City staff believes this would be an unintended (and undesirable) consequence within single-family neighborhoods.

The applicant’s request is not consistent with Comprehensive Plan Policy LU3.7, which states that land use planning decisions shall include a review to determine whether existing Land Use Plan boundaries are logically drawn in relation to existing conditions and expected future conditions.

- Existing land use plan boundaries are logically drawn and designed to protect the single-family character of the Big Bayou neighborhood. For reasons outlined in this report, City staff believes that the application of an RFO to this single-family property will have certain negative consequences on the surrounding single-family neighborhood and set a lasting precedent for the review of all future RFOs within other single family neighborhoods. Adoption of the RFO in this instance is a permanent change to the Future Land Use Map that will extend beyond the current ownership with little recourse for surrounding property owners; this is different than owners of multi-family properties who can effectuate more direct change through their Board and bylaws if certain activities become nuisances.

Qualification of (Abandoned) Grandfathered Units

Pursuant to the City’s Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use Element Policy LU3.1(E)(5), “Uses which are nonconforming or grandfathered uses shall not be eligible for the RFO designation.” In this instance, there is an abandoned grandfathered use that could be mitigated through a conditional approval of the request.

According to the property card, the original house was constructed in 1949. A second dwelling unit, described on the property card as a garage apartment, was legally permitted and added to the residence in 1955. The first of several Property Card Interpretations ("PCI") was verbally issued in July 1983, confirming two (2) legal dwelling units. A written PCI (PCI-84-0010) was subsequently issued in January 1984 affirming the earlier determination of two (2) legal dwelling units. In September 1997, a third PCI again confirmed the existence of two (2) legal dwelling units; however, this determination was appealed to the Board of Adjustment ("BOA") for further
consideration (Application No. 97-11-005). In November 1997, the BOA upheld the historic interpretation supporting two (2) dwelling units.

Starting on January 1, 2010, the subject property was no longer homesteaded, meaning that operation of the second dwelling unit required a business license for the rental of property. The two-year grace period for obtaining a business license expired on December 31, 2011, and the second dwelling unit was reclassified from grandfathered to abandoned grandfathered.

If City Council approves the requested map amendment, then a permit will be required through the City’s Construction Services and Permitting Division to permanently eliminate the grandfathered status of the second dwelling unit.

**Level of Service (LOS) Impact**

The Level of Service (LOS) impact section of this report concludes that the proposed Plan change will not affect the adopted LOS standards for public services and facilities including potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, recreation, and stormwater management.

**CONCURRENCY:**
Not applicable.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
Denial.

This is the first application requesting to allow a short-term vacation rental since establishment of the RFO in 2004. Consequently, City staff lacks any precedence for how the Community Planning and Preservation Commission, City Council, or members of the public perceive and prioritize the different variables associated with short-term rentals in general and use of the RFO, specifically.

Based on the original rationale for creating the RFO in 2004, the distinctions between multi-family and single-family properties that are outlined in this report, and the feedback City staff has been providing to owners of multi-family and single-family properties, City staff recommends **DENIAL** of the applicant’s request to amend the Future Land Use Map designation from Planned Redevelopment Residential to Planned Redevelopment Residential (Resort Facility Overlay) on the basis that the request is not consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan.
RESPONSES TO RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS ON AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND USE PLAN:

a. Compliance of probable use with goals, objectives, policies and guidelines of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

The following policies from the Comprehensive Plan are applicable:

Policy LU3.1(E)(5) Resort Facilities Overlay (RFO) - Overlaying the future land use designations for areas suitable for the combination of residential and transient accommodation uses. Transient accommodation and residential uses shall be as defined in the Zoning Ordinance. Transient accommodations shall be allowed within areas designated RFO not to exceed the maximum density in the underlying future land use plan category and zoning district. When located within an RFO area, individual transient accommodation units shall comply with the definition of dwelling unit as found in the Zoning Ordinance. Uses which are nonconforming or grandfathered uses shall not be eligible for the RFO designation.

Policy LU3.6 Land use planning decisions shall weigh heavily the established character of predominately developed areas where changes of use or intensity of development are contemplated.

Policy LU3.7 Land use planning decisions shall include a review to determine whether existing Land Use Plan boundaries are logically drawn in relation to existing conditions and expected future conditions.

Policy LU3.8 The City shall protect existing and future residential uses from incompatible uses, noise, traffic and other intrusions that detract from the long term desirability of an area through appropriate land development regulations.

b. Whether the proposed amendment would impact environmentally sensitive lands or areas which are documented habitat for listed species as defined by the Conservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed amendment will not impact environmentally sensitive lands or areas which are documented habitat for listed species as defined by the Conservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

c. Whether the proposed change would alter population or the population density pattern and thereby impact residential dwelling units and or public schools.

The proposed change will not alter the City’s population or the population density pattern.
d. Impact of the proposed amendment upon the following adopted levels of service (LOS) for public services and facilities including but not limited to: water, sewer, sanitation, traffic, mass transit, recreation, stormwater management.

The proposed change will not affect the City's adopted levels of service standards for potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, stormwater management and recreation.

e. Appropriate and adequate land area sufficient for the use and reasonably anticipated operations and expansion.

There is both appropriate and sufficiently adequate land area for the use and reasonably anticipated transient accommodation activity.

f. The amount and availability of vacant land or land suitable for redevelopment shown for similar uses in the City or in contiguous areas.

Not applicable.

g. Whether the proposed change is consistent with the established land use pattern.

The proposed change to add the Resort Facilities Overlay (RFO) is not inconsistent with the established land use pattern. City staff has concluded that the present Planned Redevelopment Residential boundary is logically drawn and appropriate given the existing multifamily residential uses and the expected (future) use of the property for the same.

h. Whether the existing district boundaries are logically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change.

Not applicable.

i. If the proposed amendment involves a change from a residential to a nonresidential use, whether more nonresidential land is needed in the proposed location to provide services or employment to the residents of the City.

Not applicable.

j. Whether the subject property is located within the 100-year flood plain or Coastal High Hazard Area as identified in the Coastal Management Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

According to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the subject property is located within the 100-year flood plain, specifically Special Flood Hazard Area AE. The property is also located within the CHHA (Coastal High Hazard Area).

k. Other pertinent information. None.
APPENDIX B

APPLICATION
FUTURE LAND USE PLAN CHANGE
REZONING

Application No. (To Be Assigned)

All applications are to be filled out completely and correctly. The application shall be submitted to the City of St. Petersburg's Planning and Economic Development Department, located on the 8th floor of the Municipal Services Building, One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

GENERAL INFORMATION

APPLICATION
Date of Submittal: June 30, 2016
Street Address: 2785 Bayside Drive South
Parcel ID or Tract Number: 31-31-17-52074-000-0090

NAME of APPLICANT (Property Owner): Alex Petro, Jr.
Street Address: 2785 Bayside Drive South
City, State, Zip: St. Petersburg, Florida 33705
Telephone No: 727-458-9925
Email Address: 12alexpetro@gmail.com

NAME of any others PERSONS (Having ownership interest in property):
Specify Interest Held: N/A
Is such Interest Contingent or Absolute: N/A
Street Address: N/A
City, State, Zip: N/A
Telephone No: N/A
Email Address: N/A

NAME of AGENT OR REPRESENTATIVE: Nikki Williams
Street Address: 200 South Orange Avenue, Suite 800
City, State, Zip: Orlando, Florida 32801
Telephone No: 407-540-6681
Email Address: nwilliams@burr.com

AUTHORIZATION

Future Land Use Plan amendment and/or rezoning requiring a change to the Countywide Map $ 2,400.00
Future Land Use Plan amendment and/or rezoning NOT requiring a change to the Countywide Map $ 2,000.00
Rezoning only $ 2,000.00

Cash or credit card or check made payable to the "City of St. Petersburg"

The Undersigned certifies that the ownership of all property within this application has been fully divulged, whether such ownership be contingent or absolute, and that the names of all parties to any contract for sale in existence or any options to purchase are filed with the application. Further, this application must be complete and accurate, before the public hearings can be advertised, with attached justification form completed and filed as part of this application.

Signature: J. Petro
Date: 6.29.16

Must be signed by title holder(s), or by an authorized agent with letter attached.
NARRATIVE

PROPERTY INFORMATION:
Street Address: 2785 Bayside Drive South
Parcel ID or Tract Number: 31-31-17-52074-000-092
Square Feet: 8,703 square feet (gross)
Acreage: approximately .32 acres
Proposed Legal Description:

No change is proposed to the legal description.

Is there any existing contract for sale on the subject property: N/A
If so, list names of all parties to the contract: N/A
Is contract conditional or absolute: N/A

Are there any options to purchase on the subject property: N/A
Is so, list the names of all parties to option: N/A

REQUEST:
The applicant is of the opinion that this request would be an appropriate land use and / or rezoning for the above described property, and conforms with the Relevant Considerations of the Zoning Ordinance for the following reasons:

Please see attached.
Justification Statement
2785 Bayside Drive South

I. Proposed Request
The applicant is requesting an amendment to the future land use map to apply the Resort Facilities Overlay (RFO) designation to the property. The property is located at 2785 Bayside Drive South (the "Subject Property"). The Subject Property is zoned NT-2 and has a future land use designation of Planned Redevelopment-Residential (PR-R). The applicant is requesting the RFO designation to permit the use of the Subject Property as a transient accommodation use, and more specifically to allow for short-term vacation rental use. The RFO will not affect the underlying zoning and future land use which permits single-family residential uses. The Subject Property is bounded to the east and to the south by the Big Bayou. A public park is located immediately to the north, and a residential unit is located adjacent to the west side of the Subject Property.

II. Consistency with Land Use Policy LU3.1 E.5. of the Future Land Use Element
Land Use Policy LU3.1 E.5. of the Future Land Use Element includes the RFO as a special designation. The policy reads as follows:

Resort Facilities Overlay (RFO) - Overlaying the future land use designations for areas suitable for the combination of residential and transient accommodation uses. Transient accommodation and residential uses shall be as defined in the Zoning Ordinance. Transient accommodations shall be allowed within areas designated RFO not to exceed the maximum density in the underlying future land use plan category and zoning district. When located within an RFO area, individual transient accommodation units shall comply with the definition of dwelling unit as found in the Zoning Ordinance. Uses which are nonconforming or grandfathered uses shall not be eligible for the RFO designation.

The following discussion evaluates how the proposed RFO designation for the Subject Property is consistent with the elements of Land Use Policy LU3.1 E.5.

A. Overlaying the future land use designations for areas suitable for the combination of residential and transient accommodation uses:

Consistent with Policy LU3.1.E.5, the Subject Property is located in an area suitable for a combination of residential and transient accommodation uses. The Subject Property contains a residential dwelling unit and the appearance of the property is compatible with the residential units in the neighborhood. The Subject Property is located in an
enclave-like setting as it is bound on two sides by the bay and bound to the north by a park. There is only one single-family residential unit adjacent to the Subject Property. This adjacent single-family residence and the Subject Property are the only residential properties located on and accessible by this segment of Bayside Drive South. The Subject Property is located within an isolated portion of the neighborhood and is situated such that the use can coexist with purely residential uses with little to no impacts.

**B. Transient accommodations shall be allowed within areas designated RFO not to exceed the maximum density in the underlying future land use plan category and zoning district:**

Policy LU3.1.E.5 also provides that transient accommodations shall not exceed the maximum density of the underlying future land use category and zoning district. The PR-R future land use designations allows up to 15 dwelling units per acre. The Subject Property is approximately .32 acres. At this density, without considering any other land development regulations or requirements, the property would be allowed a maximum of approximately four dwelling units. The applicant is not proposing to add any additional units. As such, a transient accommodation use on the Subject Property would not exceed the maximum density permitted under the PR-R future land use designation.

**C. When located within an RFO area, individual transient accommodation units shall comply with the definition of dwelling unit as found in the Zoning Ordinance:**

A dwelling unit is a defined as a single-unit with complement independent living facilities for one or more persons including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation. The Subject Property was constructed as a dwelling unit consistent with this definition. As such, the Subject Property is in compliance and will continue to comply with any requirements necessitated by the policy language of Policy LU3.1.E.5.

**D. Uses which are nonconforming or grandfathered uses shall not be eligible for the RFO designation:**

The Subject Property is a single-family dwelling unit which is permitted in the current NT-2 zoning designation. The Pinellas County Property Appraiser describes the Subject Property as a "Duplex-Triplex-Fourplex". The Subject Property, however is not a duplex which is defined as building occupied exclusively for residential purposes by not more than two families. Neither is the Subject Property a multi-family residence which is intended to provide up to four single-family dwelling units.
III. Consistency with the Standards of Review in Section 16.70.040.1 of the Code of Ordinances

In addition to being consistent with Policy LU3.1.E.5, the request is consistent with the standards of review for planning and zoning decisions as discussed below.

A. Compliance of the proposed use with the goals, objectives, policies and guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan:

The proposed request is consistent with the Resort Facilities Overlay designation as previously discussed.

B. Whether the proposed amendment would adversely affect environmentally sensitive lands or properties which are documented as habitat for the listed species as defined by the conservation element of the Comprehensive Plan:

The Subject Property is already developed and this request does not include a request for additional development. The RFO would allow for short-term vacation rentals on the Subject Property. The RFO use, however, is similar to the residential use for which the property is permitted.

C. Whether the proposed changes would alter the population density pattern and thereby adversely affect residential dwelling units or public schools:

The proposed use would not alter the population in a manner that would adversely affect residential units or public schools. In fact, although minimal, the proposed use has the effect of decreasing the projected student population from this school attendance zone, which positively contributes to available school capacity.

D. Impact of the proposed amendment upon the adopted level of service (LOS) for public services and facilities including, but not limited to: water, sewer, sanitation, recreation and stormwater management and impact on LOS standards for traffic and mass transit. The POD may require the applicant to prepare and present with the application whatever studies are necessary to determine what effects the amendment will have on the LOS

The infrastructure and public services have accommodated the existing residential use. The impact of the proposed use is not anticipated to be greater than that of the existing residential use. If requested, the applicant will provide any necessary
E. Appropriate and adequate land area sufficient for the use and reasonably anticipated operations and expansions:

The land area is sufficient for the proposed use. No expansions are planned.

F. The amount and availability of vacant land or land suitable for redevelopment for similar uses in the City or on contiguous properties:

The proposed use will occur on and within the already developed Subject Property. The proposed use is not occurring on a greenfield or in a situation that would contribute to urban sprawl or the inefficient use of land, infrastructure, or public services.

G. Whether the proposed change is consistent with the established land use pattern of the areas in reasonable proximity:

The proposal does not involve a change to the established land use pattern as the request is not to change the future land use amendment designation or zoning classification from a residential to a non-residential use. Rather, the request will maintain the underlying uses and the RFO will allow for the use of the property as a short-term vacation rental which is in character with a residential use and a residential-like use such as a bed and breakfast.

H. Whether the exiting district boundaries are logically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change:

The proposal does not involve a request to change the existing zoning district or the existing future land use designation boundaries.

I. If the proposed amendment involves a change from residential to a nonresidential use or a mixed use, whether more nonresidential land is needed in the proposed location to provide services or employment to residents of the City:

The request will maintain the underlying uses and the RFO will allow for the use of the property as a short-term vacation rental similar to the permitted residential use or a residential-like use such as a bed and breakfast.

J. Whether the subject property is within the 100-year floodplain, hurricane evacuation level zone A or coastal high hazard areas as identified in the coastal management element of the Comprehensive Plan:
The use is proposed on an already developed property. As such, development of the Subject Property has addressed any applicable issues.
APPENDIX C

ORIGINAL PROPERTY CARD
Location: 2785 Bayside Drive $7.517B - 2/2/50 - C. Brestle
Mitchell - 20c 33sw 27p 4b 3ws 100amp 2-meters 1-range
and bath residence with 2-w heaters - Attic Fan
Dishwasher - 2-15KW Heaters
2-2KW
#2239F - 8-19-55 - Brestle
Allcorn Elec. - 13 plugs
#E1647G - 4/11/78 - Jerry Fowler
Angel Haya - swimming pool
#E7802G - 7/20/79 - Jerry Fowler
Owner - 5-cen 10-rec 5-swp
#E8163G - 8/27/79 - Jerry Fowler-Owner
- 1-WH (add to #E7802G)
INSTALLATION
#1731 - 9/9/55 - C. Brestle
Krauss Inc. - 97,500 BTU
Bryant oil heater

#10295 - 1/10/50 - C. Brestle
W. Forsyth - 2-closets 1-air
1-lavatory 1-bath 1-shower 2-ewh 1-dishwasher 1-tray
#11049 - 3/2/50 - Brestle
Forsyth - lavatory - bendi,
#6834C - 8-2-55 - C. Brestle
Golden Plbg. - 2-closets 1-bath
3-lavatories 1-shower 1-sink
31-01-17 E-15

GAS

SEWER

SEPTIC TANK

plastering (Type V) By owner
#731- 8/2 - 7/277 - 76
#718
Owner Jerry Fowler - 40' x 20' swimming pool (Type V) Tropicana Pool Inc, Contractor

OVER OVER

30-day letter /1/63 Proj. 10
C. W. Brestle, 27 Hayride Dr. So.
#8566L - 10/14/63 - C. Brestle
Hickson Plbg. - 1-tap

#4931 - 2/7/50 - Brestle
J.H. Morris - 3 tanks
#5811F - 1-23-58 - The B restless Co.  
Allcorn Elec. - 33c 17sw 15p 4-air cond. circuits added to Permit #2239-F  
#E5848G 1/29/79 Jerry Fowler  
By Owner 2-swh 10-recp  
#E8199G - 8/30/79 - Jerry Fowler  
(By Owner) add 60amp sub-panel (Add to Permit #E7802G)  
#P9496C 1/29/79 Jerry Fowler  
By Owner 1-tub 1-lav 1-W/C  
#P1024D - 7/20/79 - Jerry Fowler  
owner - tub - lav - bar - sink - closet  
#P1279D - 8/27/79 - Jerry Fowler-Owner - 1-ewh (add to #P1024D)  

BUILDING  
%60017-RS75 - 12/8/78 - $5,000  
Owner Jerry Fowler - Add two story addition with 2 room 1 bath 1 sun desk on rear of residence (929 sq ft principal floor area; 513 sq ft accessory area) (Type V) By owner  
#E5464-RS-75-7/20/79- $13,324  
Owner Jerry Fowler - Add 24'x36'0" two room family room with full bath on rear of residence. (This will not be a rental apt.) By owner  
  
To FLA.POWER #2/3/80-80017 & 65464  
Property Card Interpretation 7-1-83  
(2) Dwelling Units - (Verbal)  
Property Card Interpretation dated 7-84 (PCIC-84-0010) Letter to  
Stifel - 2 (2) dwelling units this site. (JWK/bad)
APPENDIX D

PUBLIC COMMENTS

[Pending]
Staff Report to the St. Petersburg Community Planning & Preservation Commission
Prepared by the Planning & Economic Development Department,
Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division

For Public Hearing and Executive Action on August 9, 2016
at 3:00 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, City Hall,
175 Fifth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

City File: FLUM-40
Agenda Item #V.A.

According to Planning and Economic Development Department records, no Community Planning & Preservation Commission member owns property located within 2,000 feet of the subject property. All other possible conflicts should be declared upon announcement of the item.

PROPERTY OWNER: City of St. Petersburg
Attention: Real Estate & Property Management
P.O. Box 2842
St. Petersburg, FL 33731

APPLICANTS: St. Petersburg Commerce Park, LLC
1330 2nd Street South
St. Petersburg, FL 33701

MCSP Holdings, LLC
d/b/a Euro Cycles of Tampa Bay
8509 Gunn Highway
Odessa, FL 33556

AUTHORIZED AGENT: Stephen C. Chumbris, Attorney
Fisher & Sauls
100 Second Avenue South
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
SUBJECT PROPERTY:

The subject property, estimated to be 3.69 acres in size, is generally located south of 6th Avenue South and north of 8th Avenue South and I-275, between 22nd Street South and 23rd Street South. (See attached map series.)

PIN/LEGAL:

The subject property is comprised of 25 parcels. The parcel identification numbers and legal descriptions are attached.

REQUEST:

The request is to amend the Future Land Use Map designation from Industrial General/Target Employment Center Overlay to Planned Redevelopment-Mixed Use/Target Employment Center Overlay and the Official Zoning Map designation from IT (Industrial Traditional) to CCT-1 (Corridor Commercial Traditional), or other less intensive use.

PURPOSE:

The applicants have each entered into separate land leases and development agreements with the City, agreeing to undertake significant redevelopment on the subject property. The proposed PR-MU and CCT-1 designations will accommodate the anticipated job-generating redevelopment activity. (Additional background information is provided in the Staff Analysis section of this report.)

EXISTING USES:

All of the subject property is vacant.

SURROUNDING USES:

- North: Warehouse operations, outdoor storage businesses and strip commercial uses
- South: I-275
- East: Pinellas County Job Corps Center, Manhattan Casino, I-275
- West: Outdoor storage businesses, industrial operations, vacant land

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION(S):

The subject property is located within the boundaries of the Palmetto Park Neighborhood Association, the Deuces Live Main Street and the Warehouse Arts District, and located north of the Wildwood Heights Neighborhood Association and west of the Melrose Mercy Neighborhood Association.
ZONING HISTORY:

The present IT (Industrial Traditional) zoning has been in place since September 2007, following implementation of the City’s Vision 2020 Plan, the City-wide rezoning and update of the City Code, Chapter 16, Land Development Regulations.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

As previously stated, the subject property is estimated to be 3.69 acres, or 160,000 sq. ft., in size. While the subject property is presently separated by streets and alleys, for analysis purposes the entire 3.69 acres will be considered.

- Development potential under the present IT zoning designation is 120,000 sq. ft. of light industrial, manufacturing, laboratory, research & development or warehouse space, calculated at a base floor-area-ratio (FAR) of 0.75. Other permitted uses include micro-breweries, motor vehicle service & repair, outdoor and indoor (mini-warehouse) storage, and fleet-based services. The Target Employment Center (TEC) Overlay will allow up to a 100 percent intensity (FAR) bonus for light industrial, manufacturing, laboratory and research & development uses, or up to 240,000 sq. ft. of space for these specific uses.

- Development potential under the proposed CCT-1 zoning designation is 160,000 sq. ft. of office and retail uses calculated at a base FAR of 1.0, or 89 multifamily units calculated at a base density of 24 units/acre, or a mix of these uses. It should be noted that other permitted uses include laboratory and research & development uses. The TEC Overlay will allow up to a 100 percent intensity (FAR) bonus for office, laboratory and research & development uses, or up to 320,000 sq. ft. of space for these specific uses.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Background

On May 19, 2016 the City Council approved two separate land lease and development agreements ("Agreements") for approximately 14.1 acres (including right-of-way) of vacant City-owned land, generally located west of 22nd Street South to 26th Street South and from approximately 6th Avenue South to the boundary of Interstate 275 ("Land"). The Land was formerly a part of the Dome Industrial Park Community Redevelopment Area and is now part of the South St. Petersburg Community Redevelopment Area. Objectives of both CRA plans include directing the City to pursue land assembly opportunities in order to facilitate business retention, expansion and relocation efforts, and generate new jobs. The City created the South St. Petersburg CRA (adopted in May 2015) in part to establish a special financing program known as "tax increment financing" ("TIF") that will be eligible to fund many community and economic development activities, including public improvements, such as land acquisition and infrastructure, to support future economic development projects.

While formerly known as the Dome Industrial Park, the Land, and other surrounding City acquisitions, have been re-branded as the St. Petersburg Commerce Park. The Land was the subject of a Request for Proposal ("RFP") issued by the City on May 10, 2015, seeking a
developer buyer/tenant for all or part of the acreage. The RFP resulted in four proposals being received and culminated with the Agreements.

**Present Situation**

St. Petersburg Commerce Park, LLC, was one of the two selected proposers, agreeing to redevelop the City-owned land as follows:

✓ Approximately 7.69 acres will have building/improvements of not less than 60,000 square feet suitable for office/warehouse/manufacturing. These improvements will be made available to and reasonably divided among the following three companies, and any other companies deemed suitable by the tenant.

  o EMP Industries Inc., a Florida corporation and the developer's company, a St. Petersburg marine manufacturing company.
  o Attaj Energy, a Spanish LED and solar energy innovator.
  o Accmar Equipment Company, a Florida corporation and marine manufacturing company currently headquartered in Miami.

✓ Approximately 2.94 acres will have building/improvements with not less than twenty thousand (20,000) square feet of retail on the first floor and not less than forty thousand (40,000) square feet of workforce housing on the second floor.

✓ A total of 50 full-time jobs are to be created not later than the end of the second year of the lease, including not less than 26 jobs employing individuals from households in the low to moderate income range, and not less than 13 jobs employing individuals from the South St. Petersburg CRA. The balance of the jobs may be from other areas of the city/county and other households.

MCSP Holdings, LLC, dba Euro Cycles of St. Petersburg, was the second of the two selected proposers, agreeing to redevelop the City-owned land as follows:

✓ Approximately 3.23 acres will have building/improvements of not less than 20,000 square feet suitable for office/warehouse/manufacturing. The tenant is to use the premises for the following:

  o A motorcycle dealership.
  o A motorcycle service department.
  o Any additional use permitted under the zoning classification.

✓ A total of 15 full-time jobs are to be created not later than the end of the second year of the lease, including not less than eight (8) jobs employing individuals from households in the low to moderate income range, and not less than four (4) jobs employing individuals from the South St. Petersburg CRA. The balance of the jobs may be from other areas of the city/county and other households.
Deuces Live Connection and the Depth of Existing PR-MU Land Use and CCT-1 Zoning

Abutting the subject parcel to the east is a narrow strip (approximately 133') of CCT-1 zoned land that was intended to allow commercial develop adjacent to and in support of the historic Manhattan Casino located on the east side of 22nd Street. The existing narrow strip of CCT-1 severely limits the opportunity to create that node of commercial activity within the Deuces Live Main Street area. Further, the I-275 underpass, which has been a barrier to the historic connection between the Manhattan Casino site and the Deuces Live Main Street District, is scheduled for improved landscaping, lighting, including artistic lighting of the overpass bridge, and pedestrian improvements, that will serve to reconnect the two areas. The prosed amendment will assist in creating an opportunity for the previously envisioned supporting commercial development and is essential to implement the approved Land Lease and Development Agreement with St. Petersburg Commerce Park, LLC.

Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan

✓ The requested Planned Redevelopment-Mixed Use (PR-MU) and CCT-1 designations for the subject 3.69 acres are needed to accommodate the proposed redevelopment sought by the City for the St. Petersburg Commerce Park area. Consistent with Policy LU3.4, these requested designations are identical to the designations of a contiguous (approximately one acre) area located along the west side of 22nd Street South. The proposed redevelopment is intended to generate economic and community growth in the area. The two identified tenants will bring commercial and industrial uses to an area in need of job stimulation. Consistent with Objective LU11, Policy LU3.7 and Policy LU13.1, this redevelopment will achieve many of the purposes and objectives set forth in the South St. Petersburg CRA, including attracting new capital investment, adding diversity to the existing businesses in the area, along with expansion of employment opportunities.

The redevelopment program for the South St. Petersburg Community Redevelopment Plan centers, in part, on the following:

- revitalizing corridors to grow existing businesses and attract new ones, and, on a case-by-case basis, allowing for an increased depth of commercial zoning;

- creating new jobs for CRA residents;

- providing affordable multifamily housing and introduce multifamily housing and mixed uses at strategic locations; and

- targeting the rezoning of land to increase densities and promote greater affordability and improved transit access for CRA residents. (With regard to the latter, PSTA’s Route 7 provides local transit service on 22nd St. South, south of 9th Ave. South, with a peak hour service frequency of 60 minutes. Also, PSTA’s Route 79 serves 5th Ave. South and has a peak hour service frequency of 30 minutes.)
Loss of Industrial Land

The City has a limited amount of industrial land. Retaining industrially-zoned land aids in keeping the local economy diversified, improves the tax base, and presents opportunities for high skill/higher paying employment opportunities. However, as previously noted, the requested CCT-I zoning permits office, laboratory and research & development uses, which are employment generating uses. Perhaps more important, while the present Industrial General and IT designations permit some of the anticipated uses it does not permit the mix of uses spelled out in the land lease and development agreements, specifically a mix of office, warehouse, manufacturing and retail space, in addition to workforce housing.

While policies set forth in the Comprehensive Plan support industrially-zoned land (LU3.21, LU3.22 and LU3.24), in 2004 the City Council adopted Policy LU3.26 which is intended to allow greater flexibility in evaluating future land use plan amendments involving industrial land uses, and provide clarity and guidance about when it is appropriate to designate property as industrial and when it is appropriate to remove an industrial land use designation. Policy LU3.26.a states that “Plan amendment applications that propose changing underperforming industrially designated areas (Industrial General or Industrial Limited) to a non-industrial designation may be favorably considered if one or more of the following characteristics exist over an extended period of time: 1) vacant or underutilized land; 2) vacant or underutilized buildings; 3) poor quality job creation in terms of pay, employee density and spin-off or multiplier effects; and 4) chronic competitive disadvantages in terms of location, transportation infrastructure/accessibility and other market considerations. The request to rezone the subject property is consistent with the first criterion (vacant land), and is arguably consistent with the fourth criterion because, due in part to market considerations or overall location, the land has not attracted any industrial users.

St. Petersburg Vision 2020 Plan

The St. Petersburg Vision 2020 Plan, adopted by the City Council in October 2002, includes 15 citizen-based themes with mission statements voted on by the participants. The approved Economic Development Mission Statement is as follows:

St. Petersburg shall be a community of economic diversity, strength and self-sufficiency, resulting in a growth economy. Mixed use centers shall be vital with service, professional and technology businesses that provide economic stability. All areas of the city make meaningful and stable economic contributions as well as manifesting a beautiful built environment. Economic initiatives shall be prioritized and executed based on creating partnerships and social equity. Results of a successful 2020 Vision Include:

- Long range comprehensive redevelopment strategy that identifies the economic landscape, future opportunities, and marketing approaches.
- Successful Southside reinvestment.
Thus, the requested amendments are consistent with Objective LU1 of the Comprehensive Plan which states that the City shall take into account the citizen based themes noted in the Vision Element when considering development decisions.

**Countywide Plan Rules**

The subject property is designated Industrial/Target Employment Center on the Countywide Plan Map, adopted in August 2015 by the Pinellas Board of County Commissioners, acting in their capacity as the Countywide Planning Authority. Due to the importance of reserving industrial land in Pinellas County, Section 6.5.4.5 of the Countywide Plan Rules identifies five criteria that are to be considered and balanced when converting from Industrial to another Countywide Plan category. In summary, the criteria include target employment opportunities within the proposed category, amendment site and area characteristics, supporting transportation and infrastructure characteristics, and supporting redevelopment plans.

City staff firmly believes that the proposed amendment from Industrial General/Target Employment Center (TEC) Overlay to Planned Redevelopment Mixed Use/TEC Overlay on the (City’s) Future Land Use Map can be found consistent with the Countywide Plan Rules and supported with an associated amendment from Industrial/TEC Overlay to MMC/TEC Overlay on the Countywide Plan Map for the following reasons:

- The City’s proposed PR-MU/TEC designation, along with the land lease and development agreements, will continue to provide target employment opportunities. Specifically, the City’s designation will allow office, laboratory and research & development uses, which are all target employment uses. Moreover, the mix of uses spelled out in the land lease and development agreements includes office, warehouse and manufacturing space.

- As outlined above, the amendment is supported by the South St. Petersburg Community Redevelopment Plan.

**Public Facility Level of Service (LOS) Considerations**

The Level of Service (LOS) impact section of this report concludes that the proposed Plan change and rezoning will not impact the City’s adopted LOS standards for public services and facilities including potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, recreation and stormwater management. The City has more than sufficient capacity to serve the amendment area.

**SPECIAL NOTE ON CONCURRENCY:**

Levels of Service impacts are addressed further in this report. Approval of this land use change and rezoning request does not guarantee that the subject property will meet the requirements of concurrency at the time development permits are requested. **Completion of this land use plan change and rezoning does not guarantee the right to develop on the subject property.** Upon application for site plan review, or development permits, a full concurrency review will be completed to determine whether or not the proposed development may proceed. The property
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owner will have to comply with all laws and ordinances in effect at the time development permits are requested.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

City staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the request to amend the Future Land Use Map designation from Industrial General/Target Employment Center Overlay to Planned Redevelopment-Mixed Use/Target Employment Center Overlay and the Official Zoning Map designation from IT (Industrial Traditional) to CCT-1 (Corridor Commercial Traditional) on the basis that the request is consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan.
RESPONSES TO RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS ON AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND USE PLAN:

a. Compliance of probable use with goals, objectives, policies and guidelines of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

The following objectives and policies from the Comprehensive Plan are applicable:

Objective LU1: The City shall take into account the citizen based themes noted in the Vision Element when considering development decisions.

Policy LU1.1 When considering the probable use of land in a development application, the principles and recommendations noted in the Vision Element should be considered where applicable.

Policy LU1.2 The City will continue to recognize the City Administration’s policy responses, incorporated into the St. Pete Vision 2020 Plan as The General Policy Implementations but not made a part of the Vision Element to the Comprehensive Plan, with the objective of supporting and improving the neighborhoods, community appearance, the environment, education, economic development, parks and recreation, transportation, personal security, and public safety, to the extent that the resources of the City will allow.

Policy LU3.1.C.2. Industrial General (IG) - Allowing a mixture of light or heavy industrial and industrial park uses with a floor area ratio up to 0.75.

E.8. Target Employment Center (TEC) Overlay - Overlaying the future land use designations of those areas, not less than 100 acres in size, that are now developed or appropriate to be developed in a concentrated and cohesive pattern to facilitate employment uses of countywide significance. Permitted uses and density/intensity standards shall be as per the underlying future land use categories, with a 100 percent intensity bonus for manufacturing, office and research/development uses.

F.2. Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use (MU) - allowing mixed use retail, office, service and medium density residential uses not to exceed a floor area ratio of 1.25 and a net residential density of 24 dwelling units per acre.

Policy LU3.4 The Land Use Plan shall provide for compatible land use transition through an orderly land use arrangement, proper buffering, and the use of physical and natural separators.
Policy LU3.7  Land use planning decisions shall include a review to determine whether existing Land Use Plan boundaries are logically drawn in relation to existing conditions and expected future conditions.

Policy LU3.18  All retail and office activities shall be located, designed and regulated so as to benefit from the access afforded by major streets without impairing the efficiency of operation of these streets or lowering the LOS below adopted standards, and with proper facilities for pedestrian convenience and safety.

Policy LU3.21  The City shall continue to expand the acreage available for industrial development in appropriate locations provided such expansion is supported by current and likely long-term market conditions.

Policy LU3.22  Industrial uses shall be concentrated in suitable locations taking advantage of existing infrastructure and natural site characteristics.

Policy LU3.24  The City shall encourage non-polluting industrial and research facility uses, through the use of incentives that may include land assembly assistance, areawide DRI approval and provision of infrastructure and amenities.

Policy LU3.26.a  Plan amendment applications that propose changing underperforming industrially designated areas (Industrial General or Industrial Limited) to a non-industrial designation may be favorably considered if one or more of the following characteristics exist over an extended period of time: 1) vacant or underutilized land; 2) vacant or underutilized buildings; 3) poor quality job creation in terms of pay, employee density and spin-off or multiplier effects; and 4) chronic competitive disadvantages in terms of location, transportation infrastructure/accessibility and other market considerations.

Objective LU4:  The following future land use needs are identified by this Future Land Use Element:

2. Commercial – the City shall provide opportunities for additional commercial development where appropriate.

4. Mixed-use - developments are encouraged in appropriate locations to foster a land use pattern that results in fewer and shorter automobile trips and vibrant walkable communities.
Objective LU11: The City of St. Petersburg shall identify and address the needs of specific areas of the City that are deteriorated, blighted, underutilized, threatened or generally inconsistent with the community's character including but not limited to:

2. Redevelopment Areas

Objective LU13: All development proposals in community redevelopment areas shall be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's adopted goals, objectives, and policies and the goals, objectives and policies of the adopted redevelopment plan.

Policy LU13.1 Development proposals in community redevelopment areas shall be reviewed for compliance with the goals, objectives and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and the goals, objectives and policies of the applicable adopted redevelopment plan including:

4. South St. Petersburg Redevelopment Plan

b. Whether the proposed amendment would impact environmentally sensitive lands or areas which are documented habitat for listed species as defined by the Conservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed amendment will not impact environmentally sensitive lands or areas which are documented habitat for listed species as defined by the Conservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

c. Whether the proposed change would alter population or the population density pattern and thereby impact residential dwelling units and or public schools.

The proposed change will not significantly alter population or the population density pattern. The proposed workforce housing will generate some additional students for the public schools.

d. Impact of the proposed amendment upon the following adopted levels of service (LOS) for public services and facilities including but not limited to: water, sewer, sanitation, traffic, mass transit, recreation, stormwater management.

The proposed change will not have an impact on the City's adopted levels of service for potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, traffic, mass transit, stormwater management and recreation. The City has sufficient capacity to serve the subject area should the proposed land use change and rezoning be approved.
WATER

Under the existing interlocal agreement with Tampa Bay Water (TBW), the region’s local governments are required to project and submit, on or before February 1 of each year, the anticipated water demand for the following water year (October 1 through September 30). TBW is contractually obligated to meet the City’s and other member governments’ water supply needs. The City’s current potable water demand is 27.7 million gallons per day.

The City’s adopted level of service (LOS) standard for potable water is 125 gallons per capita per day, while the actual usage is estimated to be 78 gallons per capita per day. Therefore, there is excess water capacity to serve the amendment area.

WASTEWATER

The subject property is served by the Southwest Water Reclamation Facility, which presently has excess capacity estimated to be 3.7 million gallons per day. Therefore, there is excess sanitary sewer capacity to serve the amendment area.

SOLID WASTE

All solid waste disposal is the responsibility of Pinellas County. The County currently receives and disposes of municipal solid waste, and construction and demolition debris, generated throughout Pinellas County. The Pinellas County Waste-to-Energy Plant and the Bridgeway Acres Sanitary Landfill are the responsibility of Pinellas County Utilities, Department of Solid Waste Operations; however, they are operated and maintained under contract by two private companies. The Waste-to-Energy Plant continues to operate below its design capacity of incinerating 985,500 tons of solid waste per year. The continuation of successful recycling efforts and the efficient operation of the Waste-to-Energy Plant have helped to extend the life span of Bridgeway Acres. The landfill has approximately 30 years remaining, based on current grading and disposal plans.

There is excess solid waste capacity to serve the amendment area.

TRAFFIC

Existing Conditions

The subject property has primary access to 22nd Street South, which is a two-lane undivided roadway that is classified as a collector and maintained by the City. Sixth, 7th, 8th and Fairfield Avenues South are local roads.

The roadway level of service (LOS) for 22nd Street South in the vicinity of the subject property is “C.” This LOS determination is based on a traffic count conducted by the City. The average daily traffic volume is 3,015 and the volume-to-capacity ratio is 0.26.
On May 1, 2016 the Pinellas County Multimodal Impact Fee (MIF) Ordinance became effective, replacing the previous Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) Ordinance. The new MIF Ordinance principally resulted from the implementation of the Pinellas County Mobility Plan and elimination of transportation concurrency requirements, countywide. Transportation management plans, and in some cases traffic studies, will be required for large development projects (those creating 51 new peak hour trips or more) that impact a deficient roadway (LOS E or F, and/or a volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.90 or higher with no mitigating improvements scheduled within three years). The City’s only deficient roadways are 1) 22nd Avenue North from 34th Street to 22nd Street, 2) 38th Avenue North from 49th Street to 34th Street, 3) Gandy Boulevard from US 19 to I-275, 4) Gandy Boulevard from 4th Street to Brighton Bay Boulevard NE, and 5) I-275 from Gandy Boulevard to I-175.

The proposed amendment does not affect any of the City’s deficient roadways. There is adequate roadway capacity to accommodate any new daily or p.m. peak hour trips resulting from the amendment.

Source: Transportation and Parking Management Department.

MASS TRANSIT

The PSTA has a route that provides local transit service on 22nd St. South, south of 9th Ave. South. Route 7 has a peak hour service frequency of 60 minutes. Route 79 serves 5th Ave. South and has a peak hour service frequency of 30 minutes.

RECREATION

The City’s adopted LOS standard for recreation and open space (R/OS) is nine (9) acres per 1,000 population. However, for many years the City has enjoyed an actual R/OS level of service that is estimated to be 21.9 acres per 1,000 population. The proposed amendment will not affect the City’s adopted LOS standard for recreation and open space.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Prior to development of the subject property, site plan approval will be required. At that time, the stormwater management system for the site will be required to meet all city and SWFWMD stormwater management criteria.

e. Appropriate and adequate land area sufficient for the use and reasonably anticipated operations and expansion.

The land area is both appropriate and adequate for the anticipated use of the subject property.
f. The amount and availability of vacant land or land suitable for redevelopment shown for similar uses in the City or in contiguous areas.

There are approximately 36 acres of vacant land in the City designated with CCT-1 zoning.

g. Whether the proposed change is consistent with the established land use pattern.

The proposed Planned Redevelopment Mixed-Use land use designation is consistent with the established land use pattern to the south and east.

h. Whether the existing district boundaries are logically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change.

Arguably, the existing IT zoning district boundaries are not logically drawn in relation to existing conditions. The property has been vacant for a number of years. Due in part to market considerations or overall location, the land has not attracted any industrial users.

i. If the proposed amendment involves a change from a residential to a nonresidential use, whether more nonresidential land is needed in the proposed location to provide services or employment to the residents of the City.

The proposed amendment does not involve a change from a residential to a nonresidential use. The proposed redevelopment is intended to generate economic and community growth in the area. The two identified tenants will bring commercial manufacturing to an area in need of job stimulation.

j. Whether the subject property is located within the 100-year flood plain or Coastal High Hazard Area as identified in the Coastal Management Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

According to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the subject property is located in X-Zone (Non-flood Area). The property is not located within the CHHA (Coastal High Hazard Area).

k. Other pertinent information. None.
Parcel Identification Numbers and Legal Description

The subject property, comprised of 25 parcels and estimated to be 3.69 acres in size, is generally located south of 6th Avenue South and north of 8th Avenue South, between 22nd Street South and 23rd Street South.

233116386280040141  263116728820000220  233116386280030120
263116728820000210  233116386280040100  233116386280040130
233116386280030010  263116728820000190  233116386280030140
233116386280030090  263116728820000060  233116386280030130
263116728820000250  233116386280030100  233116386280030150
233116386280040090  263116728820000040  233116386280030151
233116386280030110  263116728820000240  233116386280040030
233116386280040110  263116728820000050
263116728820000080  263116728820000070

The subject property is legally described as:

Highland Crest, Block 3, Lots 1, 2 and 9 through 16; Block 4, Lot 3 less E 25 ft., Lots 4 through 13, and W 15 ft. of Lot 14; and Prather’s Second Royal Replat, Lots 4 through 8, E 10 ft. of Lot 18, Lots 19 through 21, Lots 22 through 24 less rd, and Lot 25 less pt for I-275.
**FUTURE LAND USE PLAN DESIGNATION**

**CITY FILE**

**FLUM-40**

**SCALE:** 1" = 120'

**From:** Industrial General (IG)  
**To:** Planned Redevelopment - Mixed Use (PR-MU)

**SUBJECT AREA**
STAFF REPORT
COMMUNITY PLANNING AND PRESERVATION COMMISSION
FUTURE LAND USE MAP AND ZONING MAP AMENDMENT

For Public Hearing and Executive Action on August 9, 2016 beginning at 3:00 p.m.,
Council Chambers, City Hall, 175 Fifth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

According to Planning & Economic Development Department records, no Commission members
reside or have a place of business located within 2,000 feet of the subject property. All other
possible conflicts should be declared upon announcement of the item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY FILE NO.:</th>
<th>FLUM-42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| OWNERS:       | Desai Real Estate Investments, LLC
               | 9404 Pebble Beach Court W.
               | Seminole, FL 33777
               | Operation Hope of Pinellas, Inc.
               | 463 30th Street North
               | St. Petersburg, FL 33713 |
| APPLICANT/    | Carlos A. Yepes |
| AUTHORIZED AGENT: | Belleair Development Group |
|               | 6644 78th Avenue North |
|               | Pinellas Park, FL 33781 |
| SUBJECT PROPERTY: | The estimated 0.91 acre subject property is generally located on
|                  | the northeast corner of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street South
|                  | and 6th Avenue South. The property is comprised of four parcels,
|                  | legally described as Revised Map of St. Petersburg, Block 84,
|                  | Lots 11 through 14. The parcel numbers are 19-31-17-74466-084-0130,
|                  | -0110, -0111 and -0112. |
| REQUEST:       | The request is to amend the Future Land Use Map designation
|                | from Institutional/Activity Center to Planned Redevelopment
|                | Mixed-Use/Activity Center and the Official Zoning Map
designation from IC/I (Institutional Center/Institutional) to CRT-1
|                | (Corridor Residential Traditional-1). |
| PURPOSE:       | It is the applicant’s desire to construct multifamily residential units
|                | on site (likely apartments). If the applicant’s request is approved,
|                | approximately 55 apartments could be constructed. |
EXISTING USES

A vacant, one-story office building, owned by Desai Real Estate Investments, LLC, is located on the northeast corner of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street South and 6th Avenue South (Lots 11 and 12). Operation Hope of Pinellas, Inc. owns the adjacent property abutting to the east, comprised of two vacant, one-story office buildings (Lots 13 and 14).

SURROUNDING USES

North: Across 5th Terrace South, multifamily apartments, a single-family home, vacant land, Interstate-175
South: Across 6th Avenue South, surface parking lots, Bayfront Medical Campus, single-family homes in the Historic Roser Park neighborhood, Booker Creek
East: Vacant land, medical office, Bayfront Medical Campus
West: Across Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street South, vacant land, medical office, Staybridge Suites Hotel, Campbell Park Elementary School

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

The subject property is not located within the boundaries of a formal neighborhood association, however, the Campbell Park Neighborhood Association is located to the west and Historic Roser Park Neighborhood Association to the south. The property is located within the boundaries of the Downtown Residents Civic Association.

ST. PETERSBURG INNOVATION DISTRICT

The subject property is located within the St. Petersburg Innovation District.

ZONING HISTORY

The subject property was designated with IC/I (Institutional Center/Institutional) zoning in September 2007, following implementation of the City's Vision 2020 Plan, the City-wide rezoning and update of the City Code, Chapter 16, Land Development Regulations (LDRs).

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

The subject property is estimated to be 0.91 acres (or 39,640 sq. ft.) in size, and as noted, the property is located within the Intown Activity Center.

Assuming all zoning district regulations are met, under the existing IC/I (Institutional Center/Institutional) zoning the following could be developed:

- 54,300 sq. ft. of marine-related, post-secondary school, accessory medical office or research & development uses developed at a 1.37 FAR, which reflects the property's location within an activity center; or
- 21,800 sq. ft. restaurant and bar, reflecting a non-residential FAR of 0.55; or
- 11 multifamily residential units could be constructed as an accessory use, reflecting a density of 12.5 units per acre; or
- 33 bed nursing home or assisted living facility, reflecting a residential equivalent use of three (3) beds per residential unit.
Assuming all zoning district regulations are met, under the requested CRT-1 zoning the following could be developed:

- 99,000 sq. ft. of general or medical office space, personal/office service space, or research and development space, all developed at a 2.5 FAR, which reflects the property's location within an activity center; or
- 55 multifamily residential units at a density of 60 units per acre, again, reflecting the property's location within an activity center; or
- 165 bed nursing home or assisted living facility, reflecting a residential equivalent use of three (3) beds per residential unit.

**ANALYSIS**

**Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan**

The proposed amendments are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan:

- The proposed amendments will accommodate higher density development consistent with Objective LU2, which supports a compact urban development pattern that provides opportunities to more efficiently use and develop infrastructure, land and other resources and services by concentrating more intensive growth in activity centers and other appropriate areas.

- The proposed amendments are consistent with Policy LU2.3 which encourages concentrating growth and attracting large-scale, quality development within the City's activity centers.

- The proposed amendments are consistent with Policy LU3.11 which encourages more dense residential uses to be located along designated major streets and in close proximity to activity centers. The subject property is located along a major street (Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street South) and is within an activity center (Intown).  

**St. Petersburg Innovation District**

The subject property is located within the boundaries of the St. Petersburg Innovation District, a triangular-shaped geographic area that abuts the downtown's southern boundary. The St. Pete Innovation District is a collaboration between twelve different organizations representing higher education, marine & life sciences, healthcare, business incubation, and media communication. The District lies immediately south of downtown and incorporates the Medical District, USFSP, and Bayboro Harbor. A Visioning Summary Report for the district was completed in September 2015. Currently, a Streetscape & Connectivity Plan and Branding Strategy are underway for the Innovation District. Key aspects of the Plan will include recommendations for improving the District's brand positioning, gateway signage, landscaping, crosswalks, sidewalks, bicycle lanes, bus stops and shelters, landscaped medians, and potential for public art. By the end of 2016 it is anticipated that an Action Plan (consisting of the Visioning Summary, Streetscape Plan, and Branding Strategy) will be adopted for the District.
It should be noted that, in conjunction with and parallel to the streetscape and connectivity planning project, City staff is presently analyzing the IC/I (Institutional Center/Institutional) and IC/CRD (Institutional Center/Community Redevelopment District) zoning district regulations, which comprise the majority of the Innovation District. Both the City and the Innovation District Board recognize that the present zoning regulations are too restrictive in terms of the mix of uses and maximum FAR that is desired and needed to make the District successful. For example, allowing hotels within the District would complement the anticipated job generating redevelopment in this area of the City. To achieve the desired mix of uses and FAR, staff anticipates proposing land use changes, whether that is in the form of additional future land use map and zoning map amendments and/or changes to the LDRs.

Concerns about losing critical land available for employment generating uses are mitigated by two factors. First, the land within the Innovation District is largely owned and controlled by the companies and institutions that are driving job growth in the District. Second, allowing additional mixed uses is critical to making the District more vibrant and attractive to the technology, and marine and life sciences companies and talent that will drive future growth in the District.

The anticipated multifamily residential (apartment) development will increase the supply of multifamily residential units for the employers and employees within the Innovation District, consistent with Objective LU4, which states that the City shall provide opportunities for additional residential development where appropriate.

Public Services and Facilities

The proposed amendments will not have a negative effect upon the City's public services and facilities. There is more than adequate capacity to serve the subject property, including potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, recreation, and stormwater management.

SPECIAL NOTE ON CONCURRENCY

Public facility impacts are generally addressed further in this report. Approval of this request does not guarantee that the subject property will meet the requirements of concurrency at the time development permits are requested. Completion of this Future Land Use Map amendment and rezoning does not guarantee the right to develop on any of the subject property. Upon application for site plan review, or development permits, a full concurrency review will be completed to determine whether or not the proposed development may proceed. The property owner will have to comply with all laws and ordinances in effect at the time development permits are requested.

RECOMMENDATION

City staff recommends APPROVAL of the request to amend the Future Land Use Map designation from Institutional/Activity Center to Planned Redevelopment Mixed-Use/Activity Center and to amend the Official Zoning Map designation from IC/I (Institutional Center/Institutional) to CRT-1 (Corridor Residential Traditional-1), based on consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.
RESPONSES TO RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS ON AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND USE PLAN:

a. Compliance of probable use with goals, objectives, policies and guidelines of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

The following policies and objectives from the Comprehensive Plan are applicable:

LU2: The Future Land Use Plan shall facilitate a compact urban development pattern that provides opportunities to more efficiently use and develop infrastructure, land and other resources and services by concentrating more intensive growth in activity centers and other appropriate areas.

LU2.1 To facilitate compact urban development the City shall adopt the following activity centers as part of this Land Use Plan:

2. Intown

LU2.2 The City shall concentrate growth in the designated Activity Centers and prioritize infrastructure improvements to service demand in those areas.

LU2.3 To attract large scale quality development and assure the proper coordination, programming and timing of City services in the activity centers the City shall do the following:

2. Continue to develop, evaluate and implement appropriate activity center development incentives.

LU3.5 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.

LU3.11 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 centers where compatible.

LU3.15 The Land Use Plan shall provide housing opportunity for a variety of households of various age, sex, race and income by providing a diversity of zoning categories with a range of densities and lot requirements.

LU4 The following future land use needs are identified by this Future Land Use Element:

(1) Residential – the City shall provide opportunities for additional residential development where appropriate.
b. Whether the proposed amendment would impact environmentally sensitive lands or areas which are documented habitat for listed species as defined by the Conservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed amendment will not impact environmentally sensitive lands or areas which are documented habitat for listed species as defined by the Conservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

c. Whether the proposed change would alter population or the population density pattern and thereby impact residential dwelling units and or public schools.

The requested CRT-1 zoning provides a greater residential density for multifamily residential development than the present IC/I zoning regulations (60 units/acre vs. 12.5 units/acre, respectively). The 60 units/acre density reflects the property's location within an activity center. This proposed change will not significantly alter population or the population density pattern and thereby impact residential dwelling units and or public schools.

d. Impact of the proposed amendment upon the following adopted levels of service (LOS) for public services and facilities including but not limited to: water, sewer, sanitation, recreation, and stormwater management and impact on LOS standards for traffic and mass transit.

The following analysis indicates that the proposed change will not have a significant impact on the City's adopted levels of service for potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, recreation, and stormwater management and standards for traffic and mass transit. Should the requested land use change and rezoning for the subject property be approved the City has sufficient capacity to meet all demands.

WATER

Under the existing interlocal agreement with Tampa Bay Water (TBW), the region's local governments are required to project and submit, on or before February 1 of each year, the anticipated water demand for the following water year (October 1 through September 30). TBW is contractually obligated to meet the City's and other member governments' water supply needs. The City's current potable water demand is 27.7 million gallons per day.

The City's adopted level of service (LOS) standard for potable water is 125 gallons per capita per day, while the actual usage is estimated to be 78 gallons per capita per day. Therefore, there is excess water capacity to serve the amendment area.

WASTEWATER

The subject property is served by the Southwest Water Reclamation Facility, which presently has excess capacity estimated to be 3.7 million gallons per day. Therefore, there is excess sanitary sewer capacity to serve the amendment area.
SOLID WASTE

All solid waste disposal is the responsibility of Pinellas County. The County currently receives and disposes of municipal solid waste, and construction and demolition debris, generated throughout Pinellas County. The Pinellas County Waste-to-Energy Plant and the Bridgeway Acres Sanitary Landfill are the responsibility of Pinellas County Utilities, Department of Solid Waste Operations; however, they are operated and maintained under contract by two private companies. The Waste-to-Energy Plant continues to operate below its design capacity of incinerating 985,500 tons of solid waste per year. The continuation of successful recycling efforts and the efficient operation of the Waste-to-Energy Plant have helped to extend the life span of Bridgeway Acres. The landfill has approximately 30 years remaining, based on current grading and disposal plans.

There is excess solid waste capacity to serve the amendment area.

RECREATION

The City's adopted LOS for recreational acreage, which is 9 acres per 1,000 population, will not be impacted by this proposed rezoning. Under both the existing and proposed zoning, the LOS citywide will remain at 21.9 acres per 1,000 population.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Should the subject property be redeveloped site plan approval will be required. At that time, the stormwater management system for the site will be required to meet all City and SWFWMD stormwater management criteria.

TRAFFIC

Existing Conditions

The estimated 0.91 acre subject property is generally located on the northeast corner of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street South and 6th Avenue South. The subject property has access to Dr. ML King Jr. Street South, 6th Avenue South and 5th Terrace South. Dr. ML King Jr. Street South is a four-lane, one-way facility that is classified as a minor arterial and maintained by the City. Sixth Avenue South and 5th Terrace South are local roads.

Based on the Pinellas County Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO's) 2015 Level of Service Report, the level of service (LOS) for Dr. ML King Jr. Street South within the vicinity of the subject property is "C." This LOS determination is based on the 2014 average annual daily traffic (AADT) volume of 12,370. The volume-to-capacity ratio for this facility is 0.315.

On May 1, 2016 the Pinellas County Multimodal Impact Fee (MIF) Ordinance became effective, replacing the previous Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) Ordinance. The new MIF Ordinance principally resulted from the implementation of the Pinellas County Mobility Plan and elimination of transportation concurrency requirements, countywide. Transportation management plans, and in some cases traffic studies, will be required for large development projects (51 new peak hour trips or more) that impact a deficient roadway (LOS E or F, and/or a volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.9 or higher with no
mitigating improvements scheduled within three years). The City's only deficient roadways are 1) 22nd Avenue North from 34th Street to 22nd Street, 2) 38th Avenue North from 49th Street to 34th Street, 3) Gandy Boulevard from US 19 to I-275, 4) Gandy Boulevard from 4th Street to Brighton Bay Boulevard NE, and 5) I-275 from Gandy Boulevard to I-175.

The proposed amendment does not affect any of the City's deficient roadways. There is adequate roadway capacity to accommodate any new daily or p.m. peak hour trips resulting from the amendment.

*Source: City of St. Petersburg, Transportation and Parking Management Department.*

**MASS TRANSIT**

The PSTA has five routes that provide local transit service along Dr. MLK Jr. St. South. Route 7 and 20 have a peak hour service frequency of 60 minutes. Route 14, 23, and 79 have a peak hour service frequency of 30 minutes.

e. Appropriate and adequate land area sufficient for the use and reasonably anticipated operations and expansion.

The land area is both appropriate and sufficient for the anticipated multifamily residential development.

f. The amount and availability of vacant land or land suitable for redevelopment shown for similar uses in the City or in contiguous areas.

There are approximately 28 acres of vacant CRT-1 zoned land in the City.

g. Whether the proposed change is consistent with the established land use pattern.

The proposed change is consistent with the established land use pattern to the west.

h. Whether the existing district boundaries are logically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change.

The existing zoning district boundaries are not illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change.

i. If the proposed amendment involves a change from a residential to a nonresidential use, whether more nonresidential land is needed in the proposed location to provide services or employment to the residents of the City.

Not applicable.
j. **Whether the subject property is located within the 100-year flood plain or Coastal High Hazard Area as identified in the Coastal Management Element of the Comprehensive Plan.**

According to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the subject property is not located within the 100-year flood plain. The property is not located within the CHHA (Coastal High Hazard Area).

k. **Other pertinent information.** None.