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Chick-Fil-A

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

This is a private application requesting to amend the Future Land Use Map category from PR-R (Planned Redevelopment – Residential) to PR-MU (Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use) and rezone from NT-1 (Neighborhood Traditional) to CCS-1 (Commercial Corridor Suburban). The Countywide Plan Map category will also change from RM (Residential Medium) to MMC (Multimodal Corridor). The purpose of this application is to improve Chick-Fil-A’s service at its drive-thru window. It will allow the site to be redeveloped into a modern drive-thru facility with double drive-through points. This will improve traffic circulation and alleviate queuing onto 4th Street North during peak business hours. The application will not increase the depth of physical development, since the area to be rezoned already contains the existing drive-thru lane and equipment.
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APPLICANT INFORMATION:

APPLICANT / PROPERTY OWNER:
Chick-Fil-A
5200 Buffington Road
Atlanta, Georgia 30349

APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE(S):
Gina K. Grimes, Esq.
HILL WARD HENDERSON
3700 Bank of America Plaza
101 East Kennečý Boulevard
Tampa, FL  33602

Eileen Graf
Interplan LLC.
604 Courtland Street
Suite 100
Orlando, FL 32804

SITE DESCRIPTION:

Street Address: 4241 4th Street North
Parcel ID Number: 06-31-17-12937-000-0010
General Description: East of 4th Street North and south of 43rd Avenue
Legal Description: See Attachment No. 2
Acreage: 0.41 acres
Zoning, Existing: NT-1 (Neighborhood Traditional)
Future Land Use: PR-R (Planned Redevelopment Residential)
Countywide Plan Map: RM (Residential Medium)
Existing Use: Parking lot, drive-thru, and dumpster
Surrounding Uses: North: 43rd Ave North; South: single- and multi-family development;
East: 4th Street North; West: single-family development
Neighborhood Assoc.: North East Park Neighborhood Association
ZONING HISTORY:

The present NT-1 zoning designation has been in place since September 2007, following the implementation of the City’s Vision 2020 Plan, the citywide rezoning and update of the land development regulations (LDRs). Prior to 2007 the existing CCS-1 and NT-1 zoning categories were ROR-1 and RS-75, respectively.

SITE HISTORY:

The existing Chick-Fil-A was first approved in 1998 by special exception with one variance to the minimum green yard requirements (SE 98-036). The building is located almost entirely on the CCS-1 portion of the parcel. The existing drive-thru lane and equipment encroaches approximately 110 feet into the designated PR-R and NT-1 portion of the parcel; the remaining balance of the parcel includes a dumpster area and parking lot.

Figure 1: Existing Zoning with proposed site improvements

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The primary issues related to the applicant’s request are the following: 1) consistency of the requested designations with the established land use and zoning patterns; 2) commercial corridor redevelopment opportunities; 3) eliminating existing non-conforming uses; 4) traffic impact; and 5) other level of service considerations.
Figure 2: Proposed Zoning with proposed site improvements

The requested 142 addition feet of PR-MU Plan designation and CCS-1 zoning would create a commercial depth of approximately 270 feet from 4th Street. This demarcation line between the two zoning categories was chosen because it allows for the preservation of a 45 foot buffer zone between the commercially zoned land, and existing residential zoned parcels to the east. Falling on the west edge of the formerly platted lot number 10 of the Laughner sub-division, the buffer area honors the historic development pattern of the neighborhood, while accommodating the requested improvements. The proposed CCS-1 zoning will have the same depth as the commercial uses across 43rd Avenue North, and is consistent with the existing CCS-1 zoning in the area where depths range from 117 to 300 feet. The remaining 45 feet to the east of the rezoning will remain NT-1, and will continue to serve as a buffer between the commercial development and single family housing. It is also dimensionally appropriate to allow for future redevelopment of a single family household. Thus, the request is consistent with Policy LU3.4 of the Comprehensive Plan, which states that "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."

The requested designations are also consistent with Policy LU3.6 which state that "land use planning decisions shall weigh heavily the established character of predominantly developed areas where changes of use or intensity of development are contemplated." The character of this
area of the City is dominated by commercial uses along 4th Street North, a minor arterial roadway.

City staff believes that the applicant’s request is also consistent with Policy LU3.5, which states that “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.”

COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR REDEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

If approved, the applicant’s request will result in new investment and redevelopment within an existing commercial corridor, which is consistent with the following objectives and policies from the Comprehensive Plan: Policy LU3.17, which states that “future expansion of commercial uses is encouraged when infilling into existing commercial areas and activity centers, or where a need can be clearly identified, and where otherwise consistent with the Comprehensive Plan;” Objective LU4(2), which states that “…the City shall provide opportunities for additional commercial development where appropriate;” Policy LU11.2, which states that “the need for redevelopment should be assessed based on non-conforming uses and the potential for private investment;” and Objective LU18, which states that “commercial development along the City’s major corridors shall be limited to infilling and redevelopment of exiting commercially designated frontages.”

ELIMINATING NON-CONFORMING USES

As described in the existing use section of this report, the subject area, although currently residentially designated PR-R and NT-1, does contain the majority of the existing drive thru lane and equipment, as well as a dumpster, and a small section of the main building, all of which are commercial in use. The site plan from 1999 depicts all of these commercial uses in their current layout extending into the residentially zoned property. Following the implementation of the Vision 2020 Special Area Plan in 2007, these uses now exist as legal non-conforming uses that were previously approved.

Given this existing condition, the proposed amendment will not increase the depth of commercial development, since the area to be rezoned is already used for a commercial purpose (drive-thru). The increase in depth of commercial zoning will allow the site to be redeveloped into a modern drive-thru facility that meets all of the LDR standards, including parking and landscaping, and would lie within the range of depths of PR-MU zoned land in the area.

TRAFFIC IMPACT

Roadway level of service (LOS) and traffic impacts are discussed in greater detail in the Impact Section of this report. To summarize, an amendment from Planned Redevelopment Residential to Planned Redevelopment Mixed Use will likely result in a net increase of 13 p.m. peak hour trips; however, such an increase would not have an impact on roadway level of service.
In summary, City staff concludes that the traffic resulting from the proposed amendment will not significantly impact the surrounding roadway network, which is consistent with the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

- Policy LU3.18, which states that 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 LU5.3, which states that the Concurrency Management System shall continue to be implemented to ensure proposed development to be considered for approval shall be in conformance with existing and planned support facilities and that such facilities and services be available, at the adopted level of service standards, concurrent with the impacts of development.

- Policy T1.3, which states that the City shall review the impact of all rezoning proposals and requests to amend the FLUM on the City’s transportation system. FLUM amendment requests that increase traffic generation potential shall demonstrate that transportation capacity is available to accommodate the additional demand.

**LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) IMPACT**

The Level of Service (LOS) impact section of this report concludes that the proposed rezoning will not alter the City’s population or the population density pattern or have a negative effect upon the adopted LOS standards for public services and facilities including potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, traffic, mass transit, recreation, and stormwater management.

**SPECIAL NOTE ON CONCURRENCE:**

Level of Service impacts are addressed further in this report. Approval of this 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 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 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 applicant’s request to amend the Official Zoning Map designation from NT-1 (Neighborhood Traditional) to CCS-1 (Corridor Commercial Suburban), The Future Land Use Map from PR-R (Planned Redevelopment Residential) to PR-MU (Planned Redevelopment Mixed Use), and the Countywide Plan Map from RM (Residential Medium) to MMC (Multimodal Corridor) on the basis that the proposal is consistent with prior development approvals and the goals, objectives and policies of the City’s Comprehensive 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:

LU2.4 The City may permit an increase in land use intensity or density outside of activity center where available infrastructure exists and surrounding uses are compatible.

LU3.1.(F)(2) Planned Redevelopment –Mixed Use (MU) – allowing mixed use retail, office, service and medium density residential uses not to exceed a floor area ration of 1.25 and a net residential density of 24 dwelling units per acre.

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.

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.

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

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.

LU3.17 Future expansion of commercial uses is encouraged when infilling into existing commercial areas and activity centers, or where a need can be clearly identified, and where otherwise consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

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.

LU4(2) Commercial – the City shall provide opportunities for additional commercial development where appropriate.
LU5.3 The Concurrency Management System shall continue to be implemented to ensure proposed development to be considered for approval shall be in conformance with existing and planned support facilities and that such facilities and services be available, at the adopted level of service standards, concurrent with the impacts of development.

LU9: The City shall continue to define and regulate nonconforming and grandfathered uses consistent with the requirements of Chapter 163, F.S. for the purpose of reducing or eliminating land uses that are inconsistent with the character of the community including repetitive loss and other properties that do not comply with minimum FEMA flood elevation standards as targeted in Policies CM11.11 and CM11.12. The regulations may include provisions for eliminating or reducing uses that are inconsistent with interagency hazard mitigation reports.

LU11.2 The need for redevelopment should be assessed based on the following factors; 1) building conditions, 2) socio/economic characteristics, 3) land to improvement value ratios, 4) non-conforming uses and 5) potential for private investment.

LU18: Commercial development along the City's major corridors shall be limited to infilling and redevelopment of existing commercially designated frontages.

T1.3 The City shall review the impact of all rezoning proposals and requests to amend the FLUM on the City's transportation system. FLUM amendment requests that increase traffic generation potential shall demonstrate that transportation capacity is available to accommodate the additional demand.

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 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, traffic, mass transit, recreation, stormwater management.
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, traffic, mass transit, stormwater management and recreation. Should the requested land use change and rezoning for the subject 0.41 acres be approved, the City has sufficient capacity to serve the subject property.

**WATER**

Under the existing inter-local 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 government’s water supply needs. The City’s current potable water demand is 28.8 million gallons per day (mgd).

The City’s adopted LOS standard for potable water is 125 gallons per capita per day, while the actual usage is estimated to be 79 gallons per capita per day. Therefore, there is excess water capacity to serve the amendment area.

**WASTEWATER**

The subject property is served by the Northeast Water Reclamation Facility, which presently has excess average day capacity estimated to be 7.13 million gallons per day (MGD). The estimate is based on a permit capacity of 16 MGD and a calendar year 2016 daily average flow of 8.87 MGD. Therefore, there is excess average daily 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. Thus, there is excess solid waste capacity to serve the amendment area.
TRAFFIC

Summary of traffic impact (p.m. peak hour trips):

Existing Planned Redevelopment Residential Plan Category 4
Requested Planned Redevelopment Mixed-Use Plan Category 17

Existing Conditions

The subject property has access to 4th Street North, which is a six-lane, minor arterial that is maintained by the Florida Department of Transportation. Based on the Forward Pinellas 2016 Level of Service Report, the level of service (LOS) for 4th Street from 62nd Ave N to 38th Ave N is “C”. This level of service is based on the 2015 average annual traffic (AADT) volume of 40,671. The volume-capacity ratio for this six-lane divided facility is 0.723, so there is spare capacity to accommodate new trips.

The statutory provisions for transportation concurrency were rescinded in 2011. In the absence of state imposed transportation concurrency management requirements, the Pinellas County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) authorized a multi-jurisdictional task force to develop a countywide approach to manage the transportation impacts associated with development or redevelopment projects through local site plan review processes. The task force created the Pinellas County Mobility Plan, which was adopted by the MPO in September 2013, and called for the renaming the Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance as the Multimodal Impact Fee Ordinance, which became effective on May 1, 2016. On March 3, 2016 the St. Petersburg City Council approved amendments to the Future Land Use, Transportation, Capital Improvements and Intergovernmental Coordination elements of the Comprehensive Plan in order to ensure consistency with the countywide approach to managing transportation impacts associated with development or redevelopment projects.

Policy T3.1 in the Transportation Element, which previously identified the LOS D standard for major roads in St. Petersburg, was revised to include policies that pertain to the implementation of the Pinellas County Mobility Management System. Transportation management plans, and in some cases traffic studies, are required for large development projects (51 new peak hour trips or more) that impact deficient roads, which are defined countywide as major roads operating at peak hour LOS “E” and “F” and/or volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio 0.9 or greater without a mitigating improvement scheduled for construction within three years. The proposed rezoning is not located on a deficient road, so a transportation management plan or traffic study would not be required.
MASS TRANSIT

The PSTA has one route on 4th Street North. Route 4 provides service from the Gateway Mall in the north, through downtown, to Pinellas Point in the south.

RECREATION

The City's adopted LOS for recreation and open space is 9 acres per 1,000 population, the actual LOS City-wide is estimated to be 21.9 acres per 1,000 population. If approved, there will be no impact on the adopted LOS standard for recreation and open space.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Prior to any re/development within the subject area, site plan approval shall be required. At that time, the stormwater management system for the site will be required to meet all City and SWFWMD stormwater management criteria.

c. **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. As previously stated, the applicant’s desire is to use the subject area with the existing commercially-zoned (CCS-1) abutting to the west in order to construct improve their drive-thru configuration. The additional land will provide adequate area for the new drive-thru.

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 122.348 acres of vacant land within the CCS-1 Zoning category.

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

The proposed rezoning is consistent with the established land use pattern.

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

The proposed boundaries are logically drawn in relation to existing conditions.

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 only results in an additional 0.41 acres of nonresidential land. More non-residential land is not needed in the proposed location.
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"), approximately 900 square feet on the southern end of the property is located within a designated flood zone. The property is not located within the Coastal High Hazard Area ("CHHA").

k. **Other pertinent information.**

None.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION (Area to be Rezoned)

Lots 7, 8, 9, and 10, LAUGHERNS SUBDIVISION, according to the plat thereof on file in the Office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court in and for Pinellas County, Florida recorded in Plat Book 5, page 82, said lands situate and being in Pinellas County, Florida.

AND:

That portion of the alley between lots 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7, LAUGHERNS SUBDIVISION according to the plat thereof recorded in plat book 5, page 82, public records of Pinellas County, Florida; described as follows:

FROM THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 6; RUN THENCE N 89°57’08” E ALONG THE SOUTH RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF 43RD AVENUE, A DISTANCE OF 118.50 FEET FOR A POINT OF BEGINNING; CONTINUE THENCE N 89°57’08” E ALONG SAID SOUTH RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE, A DISTANCE OF 16.00 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 7; THENCE S 00°33’33” E A DISTANCE OF 107.18 FEET TO POINT OF CURVATURE OF A CURVE CONCAVE NORTHEASTERLY HAVING A RADIUS OF 20.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF SAID CURVE (AND SOUTHWESTERLY BOUNDARY OF SAID LOT 7) THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 89°29’19” A DISTANCE OF 31.24 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY ON THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOT 7; THENCE N 89°57’08” E ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE, A DISTANCE OF 0.50 FEET TO A POINT OF CUSP OF A CURVE CONCAVE SOUTHEASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 36.00 FEET; FROM A CHORD BEARING S 44°41’48” W, RUN THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF SAID CURVE, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 90°30’41’ A DISTANCE OF 56.87 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY ON THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 3; THENCE N 00°33’33” W ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOTS 3, 4, 5, AND 6, A DISTANCE OF 163.32 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 18,054 square feet or 0.41 acres, more or less.
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 3rd floor of the Municipal Services Building, One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

APPLICATION

Date of Submittal: March 31, 2017
Street Address: 4241 Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, FL 33703
Parcel ID or Tract Number: 06-31-17-12937-000-000
Zoning Classification: Present: NT-1 Proposed: CCS-1
Future Land Use Category: Present: PR-R Proposed: PR-MU

NAME of APPLICANT (Property Owner): Childs-HA, Inc.
Street Address: 5030 Buford Road
City, State, Zip: Atlanta, GA 30348
Telephone No: (404) 389-6301
Email Address: chadbaker@cldcorp.com

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

NAME of AGENT OR REPRESENTATIVE: Gina Grimes, Hill Ward Henderson / Interplan LLC
Street Address: 151 E. Kennedy Boulevard / 804 Courtland Street, Suite 100
City, State, Zip: Tampa, FL 33602 / Orlando, FL 32804
Telephone No: (813) 227-8421 / (407) 645-5008
Email Address: gina.grimes@hwllaw.com; egreal@interplan.com; srichman@interplan.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 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: _______________________________ Date: 3/30/17

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

| Updated 08-23-2012 |
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FUTURE LAND USE PLAN CHANGE
REZONING

NARRATIVE

PROPERTY INFORMATION:
Street Address: 4241 Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, FL 33703
Parcel ID or Tract Number: 05-31-17-12037-000-0010
Square Feet: 25,251
Acreage: 0.58
Proposed Legal Description:
Please reference attached legal description.

Is there any existing contract for sale on the subject property: No.
If so, list names of all parties to the contract: Not applicable.
Is contract conditional or absolute: Not applicable.

Are there any options to purchase on the subject property: No.
If so, list the names of all parties to option: Not applicable.

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 reference attached Narrative for Request.

UPDATED 08-31-2012
FUTURE LAND USE PLAN CHANGE / REZONING NARRATIVE

Chick-fil-A has owned and operated a fast-food restaurant at the above location for 18 years. When initially constructed, the fast-food restaurant use, including the drive-through, was a permitted use under the applicable zoning category at that time. In 2007, the City implemented the 2020 Comprehensive Plan and at the same time, amended the Zoning Code and Zoning categories. When the City did so, a drive-through was no longer a permitted use under the new zoning category, Neighborhood Traditional-1 (NT-1) which governs the eastern portion of the subject site. As a non-conforming use, Chick-fil-A’s drive-through was permitted to remain, but under the terms of the Zoning Code, the drive-through was limited to alterations or expansions.

Chick-fil-A has implemented company-wide standards to perform maintenance, remodeling, and “Brand Image” updates at certain times during the life-cycle of their restaurants. The subject restaurant is now undergoing a Brand Image update which includes improving the service provided at their drive-through windows by incorporating a double order point at the drive-through [multi-lane order point], as well as other updates and improvements such as adding a walk-in cooler and new service yard/storage area in the rear of the building. Since these proposed improvements will modify and enlarge the drive-through facility and encroach into the NT-1 portion of the site, the use must comply with current NT-1 Zoning Code standards. However, Chick-fil-A’s drive-through is a non-conforming use and not a permitted use under the current NT-1 zoning which governs the eastern portion of the site, therefore, a Rezoning is required. The next Zoning category which allows a drive-through as a permitted use is Corridor Commercial Suburban (CCS-1). However, CCS-1 is not permitted under the current Comprehensive Plan category, Planned Redevelopment Residential (PR-R), which also governs the eastern portion of the site; therefore, in addition to the Rezoning, a Future Land Use Plan Change and Countywide Map Amendment are also necessary to accommodate the modifications to Chick-fil-A’s drive-through facility and service yard/storage area.

Accordingly, Chick-fil-A hereby submits this application for the eastern portion of the existing Chick-fil-A property, per the attached legal description, and requests:

- Future Land Use Map Amendment from Planned Redevelopment Residential (PR-R) to Planned Redevelopment Mixed Use (PR-MU); and
- Countywide Map Amendment from Residential Medium to Multimodal Corridor; and
- Rezoning from Neighborhood Traditional-1 (NT-1) to Corridor Commercial Suburban (CCS-1).

These amendments to the Future Land Use Plan, Countywide Map and Zoning will allow Chick-fil-A to upgrade the site to their internal property maintenance standards as well as industry standards. Given that Chick-fil-A has operated at this location for 18 years, these Amendments are appropriate to accommodate these necessary upgrades and improvements.

Prior to a Pre-Application meeting with the City of St. Petersburg on March 1, 2017, formal notification of the proposed site improvements and upgrades was provided to Mr. Scott Willis, Northeast Park Neighborhood Association, on February 22, 2017. At that time, a request was also made to meet with the Northeast Park Neighborhood Association. However, given the fact that subsequent to the initial notification to the Neighborhood Association, Chick-fil-A was informed the proposed modifications would require a Future Land Use Plan Change and Rezoning, it is now necessary to update the notification to the Northeast Park Neighborhood Association. A formal notification of this application for a Future Land Use Plan Change and Rezoning for Chick-fil-A was provided to Mr. Scott Willis, Northeast Park Neighborhood Association, on March 30, 2017, along with another request to meet with the Neighborhood Association at their next Board meeting to discuss the project.
PUBLIC COMMENTS

City staff has received three phone calls regarding the proposed amendment from residents in the area. They were seeking further clarification of the proposal and were not opposed to the rezoning.
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City File: ZM-7
4142 6th Street South

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

This request is to amend the Official Zoning Map designation from CRT-1 (Corridor Residential Traditional-1) to CCS-1 (Corridor Commercial Suburban-1); there is no Future Land Use Map amendment associated with this request. The applicant’s desire is to develop the site as a retail store.
APPLICANT INFORMATION:

APPLICANT / PROPERTY OWNER:
Jeff Lazenby, P.E.
Palmetto Capital Group, Inc.
1643 Williamsburg Square
Lakeland, FL 33803

APPLICANT’S REPRESENTATIVE(S):
Scott Lincoln, P.E.
LA Civil, Inc.
P.O. Box 7649
Clearwater, FL 33758

SITE DESCRIPTION:

Street Address: 4142 6th Street South
Parcel ID Number: 06-32-17-48080-001-0010; 06-32-17-48078-032-0020; 06-32-17-48078-032-0010
General Description: East of 6th Street South and North of 42nd Avenue South
Legal Description: See Attachment No. 2
Acreage: 1.16 acres
Zoning, Existing: CRT-1 (Corridor Residential Traditional-1)
Future Land Use: PR-MU (Planned Redevelopment-Mixed Use)
Countywide Plan Map: MMC (Multimodal Corridor)
Existing Use: The subject property is a SunTrust Bank with drive-through. The balance of the property is vacant, 0.35 acres.
Surrounding Uses: North: predominantly single family, with one multifamily building and one retail store abutting 6th Street South; South: mixed-use commercial, including: retail, restaurant, drug store or pharmacy and office, veterinary; East: single family dwellings and social services agency; West: school, public, pre-K through 12th.
Neighborhood Assoc.: None

ZONING HISTORY:

The present CRT-1 zoning designation has been in place since September 2007, following the implementation of the City’s Vision 2020 Plan, the citywide rezoning, and update of the land development regulations (LDRs).
SITE HISTORY:

As stated above, the subject property is estimated to be 1.16 acres or 50,530 square feet in size, and is currently being utilized for a bank with drive-through. The applicant has indicated that the subject property will be utilized in the future for a retail store.

Development potential under the present CRT-1 zoning designation is as follows: 28 multifamily units, calculated at a base density of 24 units per acre; 50,530 square feet of non-residential space, based on a floor-area-ratio (FAR) of 1.0; or a mix of these uses.

Development under the requested CCS-1 zoning designation is as follows: 17 multifamily units, calculated at a base density of 15 units per acre; 27,792 square feet of non-residential space, based on a floor-area-ratio (FAR) of 0.55; or a mix of these uses.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The primary issues associated with this private application are consistency and compatibility of the requested designation with the established land use and zoning patterns and level of service considerations.

CONSISTENCY AND COMPATIBILITY

The requested CCS-1 zoning designation is consistent with the existing Planned Redevelopment – Mixed-Use (PR-MU) future land use plan category, therefore the request satisfies Policy LU3.3 of the Comprehensive Plan, which states that “each land use plan category shall have a set of different zoning districts that may be permitted within the land use category, and zoning that is not consistent with the plan category shall not be approved.”

The established character of the immediate area includes a mix of commercial and residential uses to the north and commercial uses to the south, with an elementary school to the west and a social service agency embedded in residential properties to the east. The requested CCS-1 zoning is consistent and a natural continuation of the zoning district designation to the south. Therefore, the requested designation is consistent with Policy LU3.6 which states that “land planning should weigh heavily the established character of predominantly developed areas where changes of use or intensity of development are contemplated.”

The requested CCS-1 zoning does not create any additional intrusion to the surrounding residential uses and is a natural continuation of the CCS-1 zoning to the South, which contains the large Coquina Key shopping plaza with many similar uses. The existing property use is already commercial in nature. Therefore, the request also satisfies Policy LU3.17, which states “future expansion of commercial uses is encouraged when infilling into existing commercial areas.”
LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) IMPACT

The Level of Service (LOS) impact section of this report concludes that the proposed rezoning will not alter the City’s population or the population density pattern or have a negative effect upon the adopted LOS standards for public services and facilities including potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, traffic, mass transit, recreation, and stormwater management.

SPECIAL NOTE ON CONCURRENCE:

Level of Service impacts are addressed further in this report. Approval of this 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 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 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 applicant’s request to amend the Official Zoning Map designation from CRT-1 (Corridor Residential Traditional-1) to CCS-1 (Corridor Commercial Suburban-1), or other less intensive use, on the basis that the proposal is consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the City’s Comprehensive Plan.

RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS ON AMENDMENTS TO OFFICIAL ZONING MAP:

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:

- **LU3.1.(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.

- **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.

- **LU3.6** Land use planning decisions shall weigh heavily the established character of predominately developed areas where changes of use or intensity of development are contemplated.
Future expansion of commercial uses is encouraged when infilling into existing commercial areas and activity centers, or where a need can be clearly identified, and where otherwise consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

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.

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

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

Commercial development along the City's major corridors shall be limited to infilling and redevelopment of existing commercially designated frontages.

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 population or the population density pattern and thereby impact residential dwelling units and/or public schools. While the zoning will change, both CRT-1 and CCS-1 have a FLUM map category of PR-MU (Planned Redevelopment-Mixed Use) with a total maximum development potential of 24 multifamily units per acre.
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 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, traffic, mass transit, stormwater management and recreation. Should the requested 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 28.8 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 79 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 average day capacity estimated to be 1.29 million gallons per day (MGD). The estimate is based on a permit capacity of 20 MGD and a calendar year 2015 daily average flow of 18.71 MGD. Therefore, there is excess average daily 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

The adopted level of service standard for roadways is “D” in the Comprehensive Plan. 6th Street South is classified as a city collector road and is presently operating at a level of service “C” between 30th Avenue South and 45th Avenue South. Sufficient capacity exists to accommodate the requested change, especially given that the desired and existing uses for the subject property are both commercial.

MASS TRANSIT

The Citywide LOS for mass transit will not be affected. The PSTA has one route that provides local transit service to the subject site: Route 4 has a service frequency of 15 minutes. The LOS standard for mass transit is headways less than one hour.

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 28.1 acres per 1,000 population.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Sufficient capacity exists to accommodate the requested change.

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 122 acres of vacant land in the City designated with CCS-1 zoning.

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

The proposed change will permit mixed-use development, which is consistent with the established land use pattern to the north and south of the subject area.

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

The existing CRT-1 zoning district boundary is not illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions.
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.

Both the current zoning, CRT-1, and the proposed zoning, CCS-1, allow for mixed-use development opportunities (i.e., each allow for some residential, office and commercial uses).

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), a portion of the subject property is located within the 100-year flood plain. A portion of the property is also located within the CHHA (Coastal High Hazard Area). Since the maximum residential development potential decreases in this case from 28 units to 17 units, the rezoning is consistent with development constraints imposed by the CHHA designation.

k. Other pertinent information. None.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION (Area to be Rezoned)

Real property in the City of St. Petersburg, County of Pinellas, State of Florida, described as follows:

Lots 1, 2 and 7 in Block 32, Lake Maggiore Park, revised Subdivision as recorded in Plat Book 7, Page 3 of the Public records of Pinellas County, Florida.

And

Lot 1, Block 1, Lake Maggiore Park Partial Replat of Block 32 as recorded in Plat Book 69, Page 46 of the Public Records of Pinellas County, Florida, fka Lots 3, 4, and 5, Blk 32 of Lake Maggiore Park, revised Subdivision as recorded in Plat Book 7, Page 3 of the Public Records of Pinellas County, Florida.
APPLICATION

FUTURE LAND USE PLAN CHANGE
REZONING

NARRATIVE

PROPERTY INFORMATION:
Street Address: 4142 6th Street South
Parcel ID or Tract Number: 06-32-17-48080-001-0010; 06-32-17-48078-032-0020; 06-32-17-48078-032-0010
Square Feet: 50530
Acreage: 1.16
Proposed Legal Description:
(SEE ATTACHED DEED)

Is there any existing contract for sale on the subject property: Yes
If so, list names of all parties to the contract: Palmetto Capital Group, Inc. and S T FLORIDA PORTFOLIO LLC
Is contract conditional or absolute: Conditional re: Rezoning Success

Are there any options to purchase on the subject property: No
Is so, list the names of all parties to option:

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:
The subject site is occupied by a SunTrust Bank with drive-through and has been in existence for 19 years. The property to the South is zoned CCS-1 and has been developed as a large shopping center since 1957; 60 years. The property to the north is zoned CCS-1. The desired zoning classification for the property is CCS-1 providing continuity along the 6th Street corridor.

The Applicant proposes development of the Site as a Discount Store providing a neighborhood retail use for purchase of general convenience & grocery goods. The use will be a low traffic generator and will provide local employment opportunities.

UPDATED 08-23-2012
PUBLIC COMMENTS

City staff have not received any phone calls, visitors or correspondence related to this item.
STAFF REPORT
COMMUNITY PLANNING & PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST

For Public Hearing and Executive Action on May 9, 2017 beginning at 3:00 P.M., Council Chambers, City Hall, 175 Fifth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.:</th>
<th>17-90200016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>634 Roser Park Drive (Park Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Description:</td>
<td>ROSER PARK PARK AREA, DESC AS BEG SE COR LOT 4 BLK 1 ROSER PARK TH S 60FT(S) TH SE 370FT (S) TH E 110FT(S) TH S 175 FT (S) TH SW 20FT (S) TH N R/W ROSER PARK DR TH NW'LY ALG SD R/W 935FT (S) TO E R/W 8TH ST TH N 28FT TH E ALG S R/W 8TH AVE S 154FT TH S 50FT TH SE 75FT(S) TH SE 53.5FT TH E 59FT TO POB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel ID No.:</td>
<td>30-31-17-76914-001-0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Landmark:</td>
<td>Roser Park Historic District, HPC 87-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner(s):</td>
<td>City of St. Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Historic Roser Park Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request:</td>
<td>Approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a permanent art installation in the north creek bank parkland, between 7th Street S and 6th Street S, consisting generally of five individually placed, sculpted disks at approximately four feet in diameter each.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
History and Significance

The Roser Park Historic District was designated as the City’s first local historic district in 1987, and was included in the National Register of Historic Places in 1998. According to the original local designation report, its historic period of significance ranges from 1910 to 1921. Roser Park, albeit with a slightly different period of significance, was included in the National Register of Historic Places in 1998. The park area is included as a contributing resource under each nomination. The boundary of the historic district consists of no less than nine separately platted subdivisions recorded between 1910 and 1916. Charles M. Roser, a wealthy entrepreneur, began accumulating and subdividing the land adjacent to the Booker Creek banks in 1911, with his first official plat recorded in 1913. However, the first recognition through platting of the parkland that makes up the creek’s rising contours was recorded a few months earlier by Frank Wood who subdivided the extreme northwest section west of 8th Street South, just north of 7th Avenue South. Both designation reports suggest cooperation between Roser and the adjacent developers regarding subdivision design and preservation of the park open space. The bulk of Roser’s platting efforts included the adjoining creek areas mostly recognized today as Roser Park.

While it is not entirely accurate to suggest that the entire historic district represents a technical description or definition of a designed individual cultural landscape per the recognized professional standard, it does represent one that is academically understood. The parkland and its adjacent amenities represents the most precise definition of a designed cultural landscape pursuant to the U.S. National Park Service standard. Therefore, it becomes significant in its own right as a fairly definable area that has remained fairly unaltered from its historic design, while also undergoing cultural weathering over time, as influenced by both natural and cultural agency. That is, it has evolved and changed over time according to the imprints left by those who have used it, managed it, and owned it during consecutive generations.

The diversity of built structural styles within the overall historic district is united in character by this central parkland landscape that is fairly and clearly designed with a purposeful long-standing schedule of preservation, vegetation plantings, and the addition of small and large-scale landscape features. The primary natural feature of the landscape here is Booker Creek that runs through deep, and the hilly contours that at one time was considered too steep, swampy and lushly vegetated for development. It is important to note that early plat maps refer to the creek as "Brooker Creek."

The vision of Roser, having been born in Ohio where innovative land development was already evident in nearby urban areas such as Chicago, Detroit, and Cleveland, allowed him to redesign the uneven and nearly undevelopable lands around the creek with mostly replanted vegetation, hex-block sidewalks and walkways, concrete step systems, bridges, arbors, rusticated creek retaining walls, brick streets, and other detail-oriented and park-like amenities. He thusly created a highly usable outdoor open space that was intrinsically tied to the surrounding neighborhood where some of the most important residents in the City would reside.

Roser Park today remains as a unique landscape in St. Petersburg with its still meandering creek, unusual hilly terrain, and the placement of its lots and houses that together create a distinctive historically significant cultural landscape when compared to others in the City. The parkland has been promoted and jointly maintained by its local residents over multiple decades through various forms of proactive involvement. Historic streetlights were retrofitted into the setting, and an outdoor walking museum with decorative information kiosks was established during the 1990s through the neighborhood association’s completion of the Historic Roser Park Neighborhood Plan (updated 2013). This continual activity represents active involvement in maintaining and
improving the park area, which also calls for changes in programming and future planning for its use that are consistent with its historic past.

A note regarding archaeological significance: The Booker Creek area is known to have been settled as early as the 1850s. In addition, its prehistoric past is also important as a tested archaeological area that may have hosted a native village or other type of gathering place. Designated archaeological sites have been identified within proximity of the Roser Park Historic District. The parklands abutting Booker Creek have been determined to have a Level 2 sensitivity for archaeological resources. Archaeological Site PL01217N: Booker Creek 1 is an identified site located over 150 feet west of the proposed public art installation, and would therefore not be affected. The proposed excavation for the art installation do not require a Certificate to Dig under Level 2 sensitivity parameters. It is known that these parklands are already highly disturbed from prior activity. However, any ground disturbance activity should be monitored by the City Historic Preservation Staff or the parks and Recreation Department (Condition 1).

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Historic Roser Park Neighborhood Association is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the installation on City-owned parkland of an art sculpture consisting of five disks approximately four feet in diameter and eight inches wide each. The approximate location of the disks is proposed to be approximately 200 feet west of 6th Street South, and south of 9th Avenue South. A basic path and spacing of the installation has been provided by the applicant (see below). No trees or significant vegetation are proposed to be removed.

Basic path of five sculptural disks. Graphic by Applicant, 2017.
The disks are to be made of a special glass fiber concrete with foam interiors, making them lighter in weight. This type of concrete results in very resilient surface that will in turn be stained through acid etching that penetrates the surface. A clear, anti-graffiti, anti-scratch coating will provide the outer finish layer, allowing easy maintenance with soap and water. The sculpted disks are designed to be set into individual concrete bases that are approximately 38" x 48" x 6" in dimension, and secured in place using internal stainless steel reinforcement bars. The bases would be inserted into the ground with the flat upper surface exposed to create a 15-inch buffer area to allow for easy lawn mowing by the City’s Parks and Recreation Department.

Each of the disk’s two faces would reveal a relief image and lettering (Appendix B), and each will be of a different color. The appearance of the five disks as a set intends to create the suggestion that they are rolling downward directly on the existing grassed slope. Each represents a particular animal species that frequents the park setting, and includes a quote or other type of positive, inspirational message or popular quote (Appendix B).

The art installation was designed, and will be installed by local artists Jeff Whipple and Kevin Brady. Examples of similar installations by the artists using this material can be observed at the Thrill Hill Bridge, an outdoor bench at the Salvador Dali Museum, and The Ace Fountain at the Bright House Field in Clearwater (shown below, respectively). The proposed art installation project came to fruition through a City of St. Petersburg Community Services Department funding grant that was awarded to the Roser Park Neighborhood Association for updating the Historic Roser Park Neighborhood Plan. As part of the local initiative, Neighborhood Association members have also coordinated closely with the Public Arts Commission, the Parks and Recreation Department, and the Community Services Department who support the proposed project (see support letter at Appendix B). The installation is to be maintained by the Historic Roser Park Neighborhood Association.

Art installations by the artist: L) Thrill Hill Bridge-St. Pete; Mid) Outdoor bench-Salvador Dali Museum; R) Ace Fountain-Clearwater.

It is important to reference the latest neighborhood plan titled *Imagine Roser Park 2013*. A major strategy of the stakeholders is identified in the plan that seeks to "enhance parks and open spaces through appropriate landscaping and multi-use trails, or urban gardening where appropriate." In addition, another related strategy includes "beautification through public art projects..." These strategies appear to support the proposed art installation. The neighborhood plan also supports "public art and inspirational landscape architecture" as a medium for inviting the general public to the park areas and to "foster creativity and imagination." In addition, it strongly supports public art such as park sculpture as a means to "raise community pride and cooperation."

In addition, the Historic Roser Park Neighborhood Association, since 1996, has recognized and implemented a system throughout the historic district described as an Outdoor Museum. This system is comprised mainly of over 20 historical markers that identify important people, buildings,
Native American heritage, and other historical information. The system is complimented with a historical street light array.

The Neighborhood Association has also promoted planning for an annual arts and crafts festival along Booker Creek. This type of festival tends to support the addition of appropriate public art in the parkland area that does not diminish the historic integrity of the district or its historic landscape characteristics. Public art projects can also be used as an aid in promoting historic preservation initiatives for local resources including, but not limited to local and national historic districts. In addition, ongoing and future public works projects for maintenance and repair of the various roadways, bridges, and sidewalks that run through the district and parkland are in-progress, but separate from this COA request.

REVIEW OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

The evaluation of new construction as part of the COA process is important in terms of ensuring compatibility with the historic neighborhood character of Roser Park and its parkland area as it relates to design, scale, size, mass, and orientation, relating in part to its appearance and effect on a historic cultural landscape that is a characteristic element of the overall historic planned subdivision. In approving or denying COA applications for new construction, the CPCC shall consider the Request for New Construction Assessment criteria below as part of their decision-making process. These criteria are based on the St. Petersburg Design Guidelines for Historic Properties and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, as well as, recognized review standards for urban design, cultural landscapes, and historic preservation. Generally, the CPCC should discuss and consider as part of its evaluation:

- the appropriateness of what would be a permanent installation on City-owned parklands;
- the appropriateness of the size and scale of the proposed art installation and its relationship to the historic natural and human-made setting;
- the proposed effect on the historic use of the park as either wholly natural, passive, or recreational, or a combination of each and its effect on existing vegetation;
- the effect of the proposed installation as a permanent construct with regard to historic and existing vistas and viewsheds, and open spaces.

Request for New Construction Assessment

General Criteria for Granting Certificates of Appropriateness
In approving or denying COA applications for new construction, the CPCC shall evaluate the following:

1. The effect of the proposed work on the landmark or the property upon which such work is to be done.

Any new construction is required to be compatible with the contributing resources within the District. In this case, the historic cultural landscape is subject to the potential effects of the proposed art installation due to its designed permanent and physical presence. While the parkland is a contributing site to the historic district, no contributing historic building is proposed to be directly altered or removed. As a public art project, content is not specifically considered for the purposes of this report. Instead, placement, height, scale, and potential ground disturbance are considered.

Regarding placement, there is a concern that the installation would create a feeling of dividing the open space character of the park. Submitted graphics do suggest that the disks
may be separated enough, and placed at varied orientations to prevent any wall effect from a straight-on visual angle; however, from indirect angular views, a wall effect may still be realized. The Applicant should work with Staff to better understand how the vertical and horizontal planes created from the proposed art installation will be viewed from all available angles (Condition 3). This is important for comparing this effect with the discussion contained in the Historic Designation Report from 1987 that identifies as "key characteristics" of the parkland, its creek, unique topography, and vegetation. Any new structure that might otherwise obscure or unnecessarily block these features must be closely considered and evaluated.

Height in this case is approximately four feet overall, which is not that tall for typical public art work projects. This height lessens the possibility of obscuring existing plantings and through vistas. However, a four-foot height of five individual objects may inadvertently create an effect akin to a low- to medium-height wall when viewed from certain angles. This type of permanent effect in what is currently a passive, landscaped open space may be pronounced.

The scale of the installation is rather large in that it extends approximately 80 feet from the top of the creek bank downward to the creek in an angular manner, spaced approximately 20 feet apart. It also suggests movement in that it appears to represent five disks rolling down the hillside. This type of active movement on a permanent basis, may contradict the intent of the passive nature of the park. It is important to note that each disk is approximately 12.56 square feet each, with all five totaling approximately 62.8 square feet. This relates to nearly 63 square feet of solid, opaque concrete mass placed in a purposeful manner within the park.

The measure of ground disturbance is equal to the size of the concrete bases, which is minimal considering the already disturbed site, where utility lines, lawn mowing, and other public works activities have taken place over time. It is recommended that any ground disturbance resulting in defined or undefined cultural artifacts during excavation be reported to the Historic Preservation or City Parks and Recreation staff (Condition 1). The applicant has not proposed to remove any vegetation other than grass (Condition 2). It is important to note that the natural vegetation of the early creek appears to have been cleared resulting in some vegetation that today may have the same age as the platted subdivisions, and therefore, have become historic in its own right.

2. The relationship between such work and other structures on the landmark site or other property in the historic district.

It is important to understand how visible the proposed art installation may be to existing residential owners, of which several have direct views into the park area. Another may be in how the proposed installation overall relates to the designed landscape of the site. Originally, the park was designed to accommodate the benefits of the running stream and to provide a pleasurable walking park through appointed exotic flora that also created park-like views from the various residences and street-level sidewalks. It is acknowledged that Roser also created hardened landscape features that over time, have interacted compatibly with the natural landscape. In addition, there are numerous projections in the park already, consisting of human-made structures such as signage, benches, history markers, and utilities. Art installations, though human-made, are less utilitarian, and are typically found in historic public parks, suggesting a typically compatible and appropriate physical relationship, and are supported by the neighborhood plan.
3. The extent to which the historic, architectural or archaeological significance, architectural style, design, arrangement, texture, materials and color of the landmark or the property will be affected.

While style is not considered, there is a concern that the installation and proposed placement of large, sculpted concrete disks of varying colors could diminish the passive nature and character of the park, and cause an unusual demarcation boundary within, or compartmentalization of the open space.

4. Whether the denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness would deprive the property owner of reasonable beneficial use of his property.

There is no evidence submitted to date indicating that the denial of this COA will deprive the owner (the City) of reasonable beneficial use of the property.

5. Whether the plans may be reasonably carried out by the applicant.

There is no evidence to conclude that the proposed art installation cannot be reasonably carried out by the applicant.

6. Certificates of Appropriateness for non-contributing structures in a historic district shall be reviewed to determine whether the proposed work would negatively impact a contributing structure or the historic integrity of the district. Approval of a COA shall include any conditions necessary to mitigate or eliminate the negative impacts.

Based on the submitted design plans, the proposed art installation appears to be generally compatible within typical park settings. However, close consideration should be given to how the form of the large structure may affect any expected passive character that the park currently provides, as well as, how its appearance from various pedestrian and onlooker angles creates certain new effects (Condition 3).

Additional Guidelines for New Construction

1. The height of the proposed building shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

The four-foot diameter of the proposed disks represent a four-foot height above the ground. This height is nominal for typical art installations, which can be much taller. The overarching concern though, is the effect the solid disks will have collectively when viewed from certain angles and the height appears as a solid wall that may adversely affect the passive character of the park and the expectations of visitors to it.

2. The relationship of the width to height of the frontal elevation shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

As an art installation, there is no frontal elevation, and instead, the effect of its bulk or massing is to be considered here. In this case, there is a concern that the length of the installation may create a wall effect that may diminish the open landscaped character of the park.
3. The relationship of width of the windows to height of windows in a building shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

Not applicable.

4. The relationship of solids and voids (which is the pattern or rhythm created by wall recesses, projections, and openings) in the front façade of a building shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

As an adjunct here, and as previously referenced, the spacing of the disks affords opportunities for openness when viewed from 90-degree angles; however, this openness may exhibit increased closure at more obtuse angular views, which in turn, may create a permanent wall effect in what has typically been a passively open landscape. Additional consideration should be given to this type of effect (Condition 3).

5. The relationship of buildings to open space between it and adjoining buildings shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

See above discussions. Any effect to existing historic buildings is not relevant as part of this report since no building is directly or physically affected, except for impositions to their available views and vistas. The nearest building would be approximately 80 feet south, across the creek (the applicant has not provided information regarding these types of relationships). In this case, the vertical presence would run directly through the parkland in a lengthy manner that may cause visitors to the park to feel as if it has become aesthetically subdivided. In this case, aesthetics is important in that the 1987 historic designation report indicates that “the spatial and aesthetic combination of the features along Booker Creek Drive between Ninth and Sixth Streets South creates one of the most unique areas in St. Petersburg.” The report goes on to read that “the visual focal point is Booker Creek and the surrounding parkland.” There is an impact due to the scale of the proposed art installation in that it runs at near length through the north-south width with an obvious presence that would become a permanent fixture here.

6. The relationship of entrance and porch projections to sidewalks of a building shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

Not applicable.

7. The relationship of the materials, texture, and color of the façade of a building shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials used in contributing resources in the district.

Instead of considering a façade for this criterion, the materials, texture, and color may be considered for the five concrete disks. Concrete, of which the proposed circular disks are to be constructed, is already represented in the park area in the form of sidewalks, step systems, base structures, and revetments. However, the presence of five, four-foot diameter disks in the park setting, each of a different color, appears to be unprecedented based on its particular form in the history of structural additions here. The texture of the concrete is difficult to assess in that real-life reliefs are proposed to be revealed on each face of the disks. The use of smooth, hardened concrete is certainly opposed to the soft elements of the vegetated landscape; however, other hardened features have proven to be compatible and acceptable such as meandering sidewalks, steps that also create divisions, and various forms of landscape walls. Limited information has been provided for
understanding the relationship between the existing state of the landscape, and the effect of the proposed art installation on the site. Now, it can be argued that gigantic structures such as connector bridges have also been added later, which may have created extreme adverse impacts to the overall design, continuity, and passive character of the parkland as a whole and then to what remained.

8. **The roof shape of a building shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.**

Not applicable.

9. **Appurtenances of a building such as walls, wrought iron, fences, evergreen, landscape masses, building facades, shall, if necessary, form cohesive walls of enclosures along a street, to insure visual compatibility of the building with contributing resources in the district.**

Typically, an art installation could be interpreted to be an appurtenance to either a building or an open area. However, in this case, it becomes the primary focal point and object of new construction that may overwhelm. It is known that designed walls that enclose yards and move along planned landscape areas have historic precedent in the park and the district. In these types of instances, cohesiveness is enhanced through the creation of landscaped pods and green open areas as both focal points and cumulative green space. While no significant vegetation is proposed to be removed, the permanent installation of the five, four-foot diameter disks of various colors that would run an irregular length of approximately 80 feet, appears to create an unusual bifurcation of the parkland. It is important to consider that the notion of progress, or downward movement of the installation, as if the disks were rolling toward the creek, may also oppose this passive character, though previous active events have been held in the park, albeit more temporary in duration.

In contrast, the installation may encourage increased use of the open areas of the park that occur on fairly steep slopes. However, the steep slopes also seem to discourage the placement of attractions that are not easily accessible to some who would view them in close proximity. A consideration may include the stability of the proposed structures in relation to visitors who would not appear to have smooth surfaces on which to closely observe the installation pieces. Of course, the proposed art installation would not appear to be fully accessible to those with certain disabilities, for example, under the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA—see Condition 4).

10. **The size of a building, the mass of a building in relation to open spaces, the windows, door openings, porches and balconies shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.**

See above discussions regarding effects of size to open space.

11. **A building shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district in its directional character, whether this be vertical character, horizontal character or non-directional character.**

The main consideration here relates to a directional character that would occur as a result of the proposed art installation. The unnatural, angled directional movement of the five colored disks would be an obvious impact to the more passive, open space and natural
character of the park. Typically, passive parks that retain large open areas historically, would appear to change, or be altered, with the addition of a building or structure that could create a boundary that divides or diminishes a prior feeling of passiveness, breadth of openness, or obscuring of a vista or viewshed, etc. Notwithstanding landscape elements such as sidewalks and step systems that were historically designed into the parkland by 1920, new permanent features that are four feet in height, and that could be viewed as a rather lengthy collective installation in what is a passive park, may cause a diminished sense of open space and contribute to confinement. The effect in this case would be from varied perspectives from which the total installation is viewed. Perhaps additional information is necessary to better understand how the physical opaqueness of the proposed disks would appear from these various perspectives (Condition #3).

12. New construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new construction should be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment;

See above discussions regarding size and scale. The proposed art installation of five concrete disks would not destroy historic materials that were identified in the historic designation report, and would be differentiated from the old. The addition of a hardened structure such as the proposed art installation is quite different than adding new plantings. It is obvious that there is no direct precedent in the Roser Park parkland for any art installation with the proposed size and scale. Therefore, there is a concern that its length may diminish the historic, passive and open feeling of the parkland.

13. New construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

It appears that if the proposed art installation is approved, and then removed in the future, that no significant impairment, or adverse effect to the open space character of the park would occur.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

COA 17-90200016: Based on a determination of general consistency with the City of St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan, and Chapter 16, City Code of Ordinances, staff finds that the Certificate of Appropriateress request for the construction and installation at the Roser Park parkland, of a sculptural art installation as evaluated herein, generally meets the criteria for approval under certain conditions.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The applicant, artists, and installers shall acknowledge the potential for archaeological findings, and report any findings that result from excavation to the City Historic Preservation Office or Parks and Recreation Department. In addition, the applicant shall coordinate with City Historic Preservation staff or Parks and Recreation Department staff to be present during any ground disturbance activities.

2. No existing vegetation (other than grass) or landscape features are to be affected or removed.
3. The applicant shall provide additional scaled drawings that indicate the visibility and view perspectives of the proposed art installation, all of which shall be considered by staff, or by the CPPC at a public hearing date to be determined.

4. Any requirement to meet accessibility provisions under the Americans with Disabilities Act, or other accessibility standard, that would add to, alter, or change the submitted art installation proposal as evaluated in this report shall require approval by the CPPC at a public hearing date to be determined.

5. The art installation, as proposed and conditioned herein, is subject to review and approval by all other applicable City departments.

6. Any design changes not included as part of this COA review and approval, shall require the approval of the CPPC, except for minor changes as deemed appropriate by Staff.
APPENDIX B
COA Application, Supporting information

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Application No. 17-90200016 COA

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

NAME of APPLICANT (Property Owner):
City of St. Petersburg

NAME of AGENT or REPRESENTATIVE:
Larry Biddle, Historic Roser Park Neighborhood

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

City staff and the designated Commission will visit the subject property during review of the proposed COA. Any code violations on the property that are noted during the inspections will be referred to the city’s Codes Compliance Assistance Department.

By signing this application, the applicant affirms that all information contained within this application packet has been read and that the information on this application represents an accurate description of the proposed work. The applicant certifies that the project described in this application, as detailed by the plans and specifications enclosed, will be constructed in strict accordance with approved plans and specifications. Further, the applicant agrees to conform to all conditions of approval. It is understood that approval of this application by the Commission in no way constitutes approval of a building permit or other required City permit approvals. Filing an application does not guarantee approval.

NOTES:
1) It is incumbent upon the applicant to submit correct information. Any misleading, deceptive, incomplete or incorrect information may invalidate your approval.
2) To accept an agent's signature, a notarized letter of authorization from the property owner must accompany the application.

Signature of Owner / Agent
Date: 3/23/2017

UPATED 05-15-2017
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

NARRATIVE (PAGE 1 OF 2)

All applications must provide justification for the requested COA based on the criteria set forth in the Historic and Archaeological Preservation Overlay (City Code Section 16.30.070). These criteria are based upon the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (available online at www.nps.gov/history/hps/ptp/standards_guidelines.htm). Please type or print clearly. Ineligible responses will not be accepted. Please use additional sheets of paper if necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Property Address: 634 Rose Park Dr. S

COA Case No: 17-902 000 16

CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG
MAR 23 2017
PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Estimated Cost of Work: $65,000

WRIITEN DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WORK

Explain what changes will be made to the following architectural elements and how the changes will be accomplished. Please provide a detailed brochure or samples of new materials.

1. Structural System

(see attached description by architect)

2. Roof and Roofing System

Page 1 of 2
3. Windows

4. Doors

5. Exterior siding

6. Decorative elements
   (see attachments)

7. Porches, Carriage Porch, Patio, Carport, and Steps

8. Painting and/or Finishes
   (see attached description by artist)

9. Outbuildings

10. Landscaping, Parking, Sidewalk, Garden features

11. Other

   Adding penny for Pinellas Funds and Working
   through all approval community process, they
   members of Pinellas Historic District have
   chosen public art to be installed in the park for public
   use and appreciation. Selected artists are, Florida
   Residents. I attached the photo representations of the
   works of art as designed and proposed by Jeff Whipple
   and Kerry Brady.
Hi Larry,

I think this will cover the info the city requested:

Information on the materials and grout and park maintenance protection for the River Park Sculptural Disk:

The sculptural disks will be cast in glass fiber reinforced concrete (GFRC). GFRC provides a very strong surface and low-maintenance durability. There will be stainless steel reinforcing bars that support the disks and connect them to concrete bases.

The disks will be colored with acid-etched concrete stain, which bonds with the concrete below the surface rather than just sitting on the surface like regular paint. This creates a very resistant surface.

The surface will be sealed with a clear anti-graffiti coating that will allow for cleaning by hand washing with soaped water or acid solutions to remove graffiti. The coating creates a one click surface that resists graffiti spray with paint, spray paint, and permanent markers. With the coating the graffiti can be removed without damaging the color treatment of the sculpture. It also adds a second level of UV light protection.

The disks will be placed on concrete bases that will provide a buffer of 15 inches on all sides of the sculpture. This will allow maintenance workers to use their pressure washers and waterjets around the base without getting near the sculpture.
Disks mounted on concrete slabs with rebar.
Disks mounted on concrete slabs with rebar.
"Half our life is spent trying to find something to do with the time we have rushed through life trying to save." ~ Will Rogers

NEED A BREAK!
"How beautiful it is to do nothing, and then to afterwards understand the value of doing nothing." — Winnie the Pooh

THIS FEELS GOOD!
"Nature provides exceptions to every rule." — Margaret Fuller

"Each of us needs to withdraw from the cases which will not withdraw from us." — Nona Anderson
Hi Larry,

Answers to five of Susan's questions are below. Kevin is traveling right now but said he'd get details on the materials when he goes back to St. Pete if they're needed. That would be brand names and specifications but I don't think they're asking for that much detail.

2) Has artist worked with material before? If so, any issues with vandalism? (how sturdy is material)

Kevin has public art in St. Pete that was made with this material. One project is on a bridge along a sidewalk. It's called "The History of Thrill Hill Bridge" and it is comprised of several cast cement panels that depict historic images of the area. The panels are highly accessible to pedestrian and bicycle traffic. The panels have not suffered any damages. This is the same material, GFRC (glass fiber reinforced cement), we're using on our sculptures but the placement of the sculptures won't have anything like the kind of direct fast-motion pedestrian and bike access as the sidewalk on "Thrill Bridge." Kevin also used the same material for the base of the bench he made for the Salvador Dalí Museum. That bench is outdoors and shows no damage. He used GFRC for the "The Ace Fountain" at Bright House Field in Clearwater. That art fountain features a sculpture of a baseball pitcher on a GFRC column with a circular pool made with cast GFRC wall panels. That is a high-traffic and public interactive artwork with a water feature that is holding up fine.

3) Will graffiti be easy to remove from the surface of the work? Will there be a special coating?

The surface will be sealed with a clear anti-graffiti coating that will allow for cleaning by hand wiping with soap and water or mild solvents to remove graffiti. The coating creates a non-stick surface that repels graffiti made with paint, spray paint, and permanent markers. With this coating the graffiti can be removed without damaging the color treatment (see below) of the sculptures. It also adds another level of UV light protection.

4) Will the color be added to the concrete mix when pieces are created? Or will they be painted?

The sculptures will be colored with acid-etched concrete stain after they are cast and cured. The acid stain bonds with the concrete chemically, below the surface, rather than just sitting on the surface like regular paint.

5) What type and how often will maintenance occur? Question about need to pressure wash if mildews?

With the top coating, mildew is unlikely. It isn't permeable and is a mildew resistant material.
...can accumulate on the sculptures they can be cleaned with soap and water. Pressure washing is possible but they aren't very large and someone can clean all five with a bucket of soapy water and sponges and towels more easily than washing a car.

6) If work is damaged, will neighborhood maintain repair

This is a typical issue in all public art projects and it's always clarified in the contract. If there is significant damage and the artist is still available, they can be contracted to do or oversee the repair. If the artist is not available a local art technician can be hired to repair the artwork. In regards to the sculptures we're creating, any damage that is not catastrophic (i.e. run over by a dump truck), would be relatively easy to patch, recolor and recoat.
ROSER PARK PUBLIC ARTWORK BUDGET ESTIMATE

“Relaxation Rollers for Roser Park”
Five Sculptures by Kevin Brady and Jeff Whipple

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The design of this artwork consists of five separate cast concrete sculptures that are shaped like disks. The disks are four feet in diameter and eight inches thick. They each have sculpted images on both sides along with quotes in curved text. Each disk is mounted on a concrete slab base. The disk installation is in Roser Park with the sculptures placed about twenty feet apart. They are spread down a hill in a manner that suggests that the disks are rolling down the hill to a place near the creek.

PROJECT MATERIALS, DESIGN, ARTWORK, INSTALLATION, AND FEES ESTIMATES

Modeling clay (703.77 lbs. clay per disk x $3.30/lbs. Reusable for each disk):
$2322

Sculpting/carving tools:
$80

Studio equipment (custom made sculpture supports with wheels):
$700

Cement mixer:
$400

Armature supports (structures to reinforce the foam armatures and clay sculptures):
$477

Foam armatures (These are computer cut - CNC - foam structures which will provide the base for the modeling clay in the sculptures. Pedroni Precast, Inc., Jacksonville, Florida):
$2366

Rubber mold material (Smooth-on “Brush-on 40”, 5 gallon unit. $645.71 each incl. tax and shipping. 10 molds with 2 gallons each) 4.4 units:
$2841

Surface treatments (Color concrete acid stain and protective topcoat. 7 gallons of each at $48/gallon):
$280

Studio rental and utilities (6 months):
$8000
Casting sculptures (GFRC casting - reinforced cement and rebar from molds):
$1200 each - $6000 for five
Options 1: This may be done by the artists in a rented studio with assistants.
Options 2: A contractor may be hired to cast the sculptures from the molds. This
price is based on estimate from Podremi Precast, Inc. Jacksonville, Florida.
Note: The final design of the molds will determine the complexity of the casting
process. A contractor may be better equipped to do the casting with size and
weight considerations.

Cast Sculpture Supports (Wood, metal and foam supports for each of the five disks that would
aid in transport and installation):
$2000

Artwork Transportation (truck rentals, lift equipment rentals, shipping materials):
$4600

Artwork bases and installation of the sculptures (This is the framing and concrete application for
the sculptural bases on the site. Includes placing sculptures on the bases and casting the
concrete with reinforcements to the sculptures):
$5500
Note: We received estimates from two contractors in Pinellas County and this is based on
both. The estimates are based on size, weight, complexity, labor, materials and location.
Many of those details are unclear at this time and the estimates cannot be exact.

Artist transportation and housing (Site visits, on-site work and related meetings. Gas and meals):
$2000

Liability insurance:
$2500

Artists fee (Design, Sculpting, Administration, Supervising Contractors, Mold Making):
$25000

TOTAL: $65000

CONTACT:

Jeff Whipple
(813) 223-6190
jwhi@jeffwhipple
APPENDIX C
Photos of Roser Park Parkland


4. Starting point at top of bank for first disk. Also, examples of previously installed projections/objects currently in the parkland. Photo by Staff. 2017
5. Previously installed projections/objects such as this Outdoor Museum marker. Photo by Staff, 2017
APPENDIX D
Public Comment (as of May 2, 2017)

Number of public notice comments: Two non-committal telephone inquiries were handled

Number of comments from other sources: 1 (Community Services Department-see below)

MEMORANDUM
CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG

TO: Derek Kilborn, Urban Design and Historic Preservation Manager
FROM: Susan Ajoc, Community Services Director
DATE: March 27, 2017
RE: Historic Roser Park Public Arts Proposal

The Historic Roser Park Neighborhood updated their neighborhood plan with the assistance of a consultant, the Renaissance Planning Group, with assistance from the Community Services Department in December 2014. Neighborhood Branding and Involvement were major priorities to the community. One of the proposed projects identified was the use of public art as the vehicle to brand their neighborhood. As a result of the neighborhood plan update, Historic Roser Park has $150,000 available for various projects within the community to assist with implementation.

Community Services staff and Historic Roser Park representatives met with the Public Arts Commission to discuss the interest of the neighborhood resident to pursue an art proposal to create a signature piece unique to the community. One of the Public Arts Commission members is also a resident within the Historic Roser Park community agreed to participate to ensure resident input and observe the artist selection process. The neighborhood also contracted with a consultant, who was a former cultural arts manager for the city, to advise and lead the residents through a public arts process.

The Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted is the result of a process in which residents and artists were engaged to identify concepts and potential artwork appropriate for the neighborhood. Community Services staff supports the neighborhood’s efforts to move forward in their process to move toward implementation of their public arts project. Staff have facilitated been discussions with several departments to discuss issues, identify the necessary requirements, and outline remaining processes.

Please contact me if you have any questions or comments.
STAFF REPORT

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND PRESERVATION COMMISSION

REQUEST FOR LISTING IN THE ST. PETERSBURG REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

For public hearing and recommendation to City Council on May 9, 2017 beginning at 3:00 P.M., Council Chambers, City Hall, 175 Fifth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida

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

CASE NUMBER: HPC 17-90300002
STREET ADDRESS: 956 39th Avenue North, St. Petersburg, FL 33703-4520
LANDMARK NAME: Frank Broadfield House
OWNER: Mary Jane McPherson & Michael Ford
APPLICANT: Mary Jane McPherson & Michael Ford
REQUEST: Designation of the Frank Broadfield House as a local historic landmark to be listed in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places
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OVERVIEW
On March 21, 2017, a local historic landmark designation application was submitted for the Frank Broadfield House at 965 39th Avenue North (“the subject property”) by Mary Jane McPherson and Michael Ford, the property’s owners. Following an analysis of the subject property, its contextual history, and extant conditions, staff concurs that the subject property is eligible for inclusion in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places as a local historic landmark.

STAFF FINDINGS
In St. Petersburg, such eligibility is determined based on evaluations of age, context, and integrity under a two-part test as found in Section 16.30.070.2.5(D) of the City Code. Under the first test, historic documentation demonstrates that the Frank Broadfield House was constructed approximately 86 years ago, surpassing the minimum required age of 50. Further, staff finds that the subject property satisfies criteria D, E, and F. Under the second test, staff finds that all of the seven factors of integrity are met.

Historic Significance and Satisfaction of Eligibility Criteria
The first portion of the two-part test to determine eligibility for the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places examines a resource’s historic significance with relation to nine criteria. One or more of these criteria must be met in order for a property to qualify for designation as an individual landmark or district to be placed in the St. Petersburg Register. The nine criteria are based on the National Park Service’s criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, and are designed to assess resources’ importance in a given historic context with objectivity and comprehensiveness. In the case of the Frank Broadfield House, staff has determined that the property satisfies the St. Petersburg Register criteria as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is at least one of the following criteria for eligibility met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D) It is identified as the work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual work has influenced the development of the City, state, or nation;

E) Its value as a building is recognized for the quality of its architecture, and it retains sufficient elements showing its architectural significance; and

F) It has distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials;

The Frank Broadfield House is significant in the area of architecture as an incredibly intact example of the work of Cade Allen, a St. Petersburg builder who aimed to construct “The Highest High-Grade Development in St. Petersburg.” Allen advertised the Broadfield House as a place of enduring beauty:
“Home and Mother – two words that always strike a responsive chord in the hearts of men. This is a place where mother would love to be at home. Bring her to see this beautiful house of enduring stone and see her face brighten as she views the modern conveniences offered in this wonderful home. There is real value in this home and a great deal of satisfaction in its beauty and permanence. In buying a house for a home one should always, in considering the cost take into consideration the upkeep and the resale value over a period of time. You are always welcome in Allendale Terrace and will not be embarrassed in any way.”

The Broadfield House, like its neighbors throughout Allendale, was constructed after the frenzied boom years of the 1920s had subsided. Although it is hardly lacking in grandeur, the Broadfield House’s design is distinct from that of the ornately-detailed Mediterranean Revival homes that are often most closely associated with high-quality architecture in pre-World War II St. Petersburg. Instead of aiming to portray Florida as an escape, a frontier, or an American Riviera, the Broadfield House, and the words that Allen chose to market it, reference both a sense of nostalgia for traditional American values, and an attempt to incorporate new technologies into domestic architecture. The house blends hollow tile construction – very much in vogue during the 1920s and 1930s – with details reminiscent of an English Cottage-style house, such as its truncated gable ends and gently curving, almost whimsical, fascia. Perhaps the most modern aspect of its design, the integral garage, is neatly tucked behind the house, rather than being featured as a prominent element of its design. This combination of new and old, this wholesome approach to modernity, reflects both the optimism of Florida’s land booms and the anxieties brought by the following busts.

It is difficult to classify the Broadfield House with a singular architectural style, as Allen drew from a number of styles, his approach to architectural eclecticism has become iconic to St. Petersburg in its own rite. Homes constructed in his Allendale subdivision were required to have tile or masonry structures and stone or stucco exteriors. His style was practical yet grand, playful yet solid. The Broadfield House speaks to the English Cottage style with details mentioned above, but does not ignore the popularity of Mediterranean Revival details, with its flat-roofed sleeping porch complete with clay tile pipe vents. Though he did not practice within the confines of a defined academic style, Cade Allen’s homes have, indeed, achieved the timelessness that he advertised: it is likely that many residents of St. Petersburg would be able to identify the Broadfield House as an Allen design, even if not by name.

**Historic Integrity**

Under the second part of the two-part assessment of eligibility for designation as a historic landscape, staff finds that the Frank Broadfield House retains integrity in all seven of seven given criteria, surpassing the requirement of one or more.

---

Is at least one of the following factors of integrity met?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Workmanship</th>
<th>Feeling*</th>
<th>Association*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Must be present in addition to at least one other factor.

Location
The Broadfield House has not been moved.

Design
With the exception of several relatively small additions the Broadfield House retains its historic footprint. It further retains the historic fenestration pattern, roofline, and stone exterior surface that so strongly define its unique aesthetic.

Setting
The Broadfield House is located at the core of an incredibly high and intact concentration of homes designed and constructed by Cade Allen as part of the establishment of the Allendale subdivision.

Materials and Workmanship
The Broadfield House’s stone veneer and historic wood windows appear to be in remarkably good condition, due in no small part to the applicants, who purchased the subject property in 2016 and have begun an extensive rehabilitation project.

Feeling and Association
As noted in the discussion of significance above, the Broadfield House has retained its distinct appearance and serves as a reminder of Cade Allen’s unique contribution to St. Petersburg’s architectural heritage.

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

Narrative Description
The subject property is a one and one-half story single-family house with an irregular footprint. Its primary roof structure is gabled, with the two-story portion of the building creating a cross-gabled, T form, off of which several flat-roofed one-story portions branch. The gable ends are slightly truncated and feature boxed cornices with rounded fascia boards and louvered gable vents. Together, these elements of the roof system frame the gable end and add an almost storybook quality to the house. The gabled portions of the roof are clad in composition shingles; the flat portions are surfaced with built-up materials.

The most distinguishable feature of the Broadfield House, like many of Cade Allen’s designs, is the distinct appearance of its exterior treatment. In the subject property’s case, this exterior is clad with a veneer of cut Alabama Sandstone applied in a random ashlar pattern with beaded,
buff-colored mortar. The shade of the sandstone varies from very light shades of off-white, to bright shades of camel, to deep chocolate browns. This exterior surface is a veneer applied over hollow clay tile, a method of construction that is commonly found in Cade Allen’s homes. The stone is continuous and extends smoothly from the ground to the roofline, with regularly-spaced rectangular vent cut outs at the foundation.

The windows are double-hung wood sash, with four- or six-over-one light configurations. Those at the ground level and at the second floor of the gable ends have frames topped with segmental arches; these arches are mirrored in the pattern of the stone above. The windows are placed alone or assembled into paired, tripartite, or ribbon configurations and vary somewhat in size. All feature stone sills.

The front entrance, a single-action wooden door, is approached by a series of four stone steps. A shed roof projection extends from the main body of the house to highlight the entrance; instead of creating a flat edge above the door, it curves upward slightly to create a broad, rounded pediment. This entrance is approached by a hexagonal concrete block walkway extending to 39th Avenue North.

A stone chimney extends from the western gable end. From the west side of the façade (north elevation) extends a small, flat-roofed one-story sunroom with a low parapet. Cylindrical clay-tile pipes are evenly spaced above the windows of this sunroom, serving as drainage for the flat roof. A straight driveway stretches from 39th Avenue North, past this sunroom, and beneath a flat-roofed, stuccoed carport to the garage at the south elevation, which is another one-story flat-roofed projection of the building’s two-story core.

Although interiors are not reviewed as part of local landmark designation, it is worth noting the high degree of integrity that has been maintained at the subject property, including curved interior corners and molding, and original floor finishes.
Historical Context

The following historical context was prepared by staff Historic Preservationist Kimberly Hinder as supporting documentation for the designation of the Cade Allen Residence (HPC Case No. 14-90300001) as a local historic landmark in 2014.

St. Petersburg originated with the purchase of land by John C. Williams in 1876 and the arrival of the Orange Belt Railroad in 1888. Orange Belt owner, Peter Demens, built the narrow gauge railroad to connect to land situated on the eastern edge of the Pinellas peninsula owned by John C. Williams. The first train arrived in June 1888 to a settlement with little more than a store and a few residences. Demens and Williams collaborated in their plans to build a new community around the terminus of the railroad, complete with a park, depot, and hotel. In exchange for naming the city after Demens’ birthplace, St. Petersburg, Russia, the hotel was named after Williams’ hometown, Detroit, Michigan. Prepared by Engineer A.L. Hunt and Draftsman G.A. Miller in August 1888, the Map of the Town of St. Petersburg was officially filed in April 1889 and revised in October 1889.2

Utilizing Dr. Van Bibber’s endorsement of the Pinellas peninsula as the perfect location for a “Health City” at the 1885 annual convention of the American Medical Association, efforts to promote settlement gained momentum. The Orange Belt Railway offered seaside excursions to St. Petersburg in 1889. These excursions were one of the first concentrated efforts by the community and the development company to attract tourists.3

Residents and developers seized the opportunity for publicity. Frank Davis, a prominent publisher from Philadelphia who arrived in Florida to alleviate his own health problems, utilized Van Bibber’s endorsement to heavily promote the benefits of St. Petersburg. Davis, along with other new residents including St. Petersburg Times editor William Straub and St. Petersburg Evening Independent editor Lew Brown, tirelessly promoted the community during the late 1800s and early 1900s.4 By 1890, the population grew from less than 50 prior to the arrival of the railroad to 273 residents with two hotels, two ice plants, two churches, a school, a pier, and a sawmill to

---


3 Arsenault, Florida Dream, 62; Grismer, The Story of St. Petersburg, 70, 97, 111.

4 Arsenault, Florida Dream, 82-85.
serve the community. Following the incorporation of the city in 1892, utility services, including telephone, electric service, and public water, were introduced in the community. A severe freeze which destroyed the citrus groves throughout north and central Florida during the winter of 1894-95 prompted many farmers to relocate to coastal areas, such as St. Petersburg, which did not experience a freeze as severe. Although the economy remained largely dependent on commercial fishing, tourism from winter visitors quickly grew in importance. During the early 1900s, the creation of St. Petersburg's waterfront park system, the incorporation of a trolley system, and the construction of the Electric Pier drew additional tourists and new residents to the area.5

Largely through the efforts of city boosters to attract businesses and residents, developers such as C. Perry Snell, H. Walter Fuller, Noel Mitchell, Charles Hall, and Charles Roser, triggered the city's first real estate land boom from 1909 to the start of World War I.6 Promotional efforts by the Atlantic Coast Line railroad (created in 1902 from the former Orange Belt Railroad and Henry Plant's South Florida Railroad) brought organized tourist trains from New York in 1909 and from the Midwest in 1913. Many of these tourists continued to winter in the city with some even relocating to St. Petersburg.7

Cade Allen came to St. Petersburg during the city's first boom in 1911, later citing the promotional literature touting Dr. Van Bibber's paper and the health benefits of the Pinellas peninsula as the enticement for relocation. A native of Lownanville, New York, Allen's father passed away just after he completed the eighth grade, prompting him to go to work to help support the family. He became a brick mason, transitioning into building construction, and eventually real estate. He acquired land with high quality clay for brick manufacturing, selling the land to his brother-in-law, who developed the Binghamton Brick Yard in Binghamton, New York. With the proceeds, Allen and his mother, Jennie Vining Allen, came to St. Petersburg in 1911. Allen quickly established a real estate business utilizing penny postcards to advertise the business. Cade Allen, "The Man with the Bargains," opened an office at 510 Central Avenue, where the Plaza Theater would soon be built. He was one of many new agents in the growing city. In 1912, real estate agents met at the Ridgely Real Estate Company office to form the St. Petersburg Board of

5 Arsenault, *Florida Dream*, 52-64, 81-82, 87-89.
7 Arsenault, *Florida Dream*, 37, 144-145.
Realtors. By 1914, approximately 83 real estate companies operated in the city, capitalizing on the doubling of the local population during the winter season. These winter residents even formed tourist societies organized by state or region of origin which acted as booster clubs in their native states.\(^8\)

In 1912, Allen married his longtime Binghamton sweetheart, Eva Bennett, and brought her, along with his sister and brother-in-law, Floyd Riggs, to St. Petersburg. Allen continued his real estate business with his brother-in-law, opening an office at 73 7th Avenue North. In 1913, Allen built his first house in St. Petersburg for his family at present-day 145 7th Avenue Northeast, where he lived until 1916. In that year, he started purchasing land in Snell & Hamlett’s Crescent Lake Subdivision. One of the lots included the house at 1492 4th Street North, which he remodeled and moved into with his family.\(^9\)

The Crescent Lake Subdivision was one of the developments spearheaded by C. Perry Snell. Snell, who had arrived in St. Petersburg in 1904, proceeded to develop St. Petersburg’s earliest subdivisions including Bay Shore, North Shore, Lake Side, and Crescent Lake in conjunction with various partners. J.C. Hamlett, with whom he formed Snell and Hamlett Real Estate Company, purchased Crescent Lake, the land immediately surrounding it, and the area to the east of the lake in 1910. The land was transferred into the holdings of the company and subdivided into the Crescent Lake Addition. The new subdivision, filed in 1911, extended from 12th Avenue to 22nd Avenue North and from 4th Street to 7th Street North and included the area which would become Crescent Lake Park.\(^10\)

In spite of a number of successful projects, the increasingly risky ventures and business interests in other cities led Hamlett to dissolve the partnership in 1916 and transfer his interests to Snell over the following three years. Cade Allen assembled a section of this land roughly located between 13th and 17th Avenues and 4th and 5th Streets North. While still operating his real estate office, the decline in the market due to the onset of World War I led Allen to open a truck farm and dairy on his newly acquired land east of Crescent Lake.\(^11\)

The City’s administration started to formally encourage tourism with promotional campaigns following the election of Al Lang as mayor in 1916. Lang was elected after he arranged to bring the Philadelphia Phillies to the city for spring training. Under his leadership, the City publicly encouraged tourism and made efforts to improve the physical appearance of the city mandating that all of the benches in the city be painted green.\(^12\) Although the land boom collapsed during

---

\(^8\) Allen, *A Life Remembered*, 1-12; “Real Estate Men to Organize,” *St. Petersburg Evening Independent*, June 8, 1912; Arsenault, *Florida Dream*, 143-146.


\(^12\) Arsenault, *Florida Dream*, 143-146.
World War I, the development created a pattern for the future growth of the city. During the 1910s, the city’s population grew from 4,127 in 1910 to 14,237 in 1920.\textsuperscript{13}

Although World War I limited tourism, St. Petersburg quickly rebounded following the war with the winter season of 1918-1919 more profitable than before the war. Thanks in part to the efforts of John Lodwick, publicity agent for the Chamber of Commerce and the City of St. Petersburg, the hotels and boarding houses were filled to capacity during the season.\textsuperscript{14}

The construction of a national, state, and local road system opened St. Petersburg to an increasing number of middle-class vacationers as well as a new type of vacationer known as “tin-can tourists.” This type of vacationer typically came by car and generally favored campgrounds to hotels. The city’s shortage of hotel rooms led to the 1920 creation of Tent City, a municipal campground for the “tin-can tourists.” This new type of tourist threatened the city’s established hotel industry and was not the class of visitor the leaders of the city were interested in attracting.\textsuperscript{15} With only five hotels providing fewer than 500 hotel rooms at the start of the boom, city leaders were encouraged by the construction of mid-sized hotels, such as the Alexander Hotel, the Mari-Jean, and the Hotel Cordova, and several large hotels, including the Princess Martha, Pennsylvania Hotel, and Vinoy Park Hotel, during the boom.\textsuperscript{16}

The lack of hotel space and the booming economy during the late 1910s and early 1920s prompted the conversion of a number of private residences immediately north of downtown into boarding houses, apartment buildings, or small hotels. Many owners in this once residential neighborhood north of downtown recognized the inevitable growth of the central business district and built new houses farther north of downtown in the newly opened residential sections now known as the Old Northeast, Round Lake, Uptown, Euclid/St. Paul, and Crescent Lake neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{17}

In 1919, Snell, who was a strong supporter of a public park system, convinced the City to purchase Crescent Lake and the surrounding 26 acres for a public park. Although the $30,000 would be paid in installments through 1928, the City started improvements to the park immediately including clearing brush around the lake, improving drainage, creating a municipal nursery, and installing a baseball field in 1925. Initially known as the Crescent Lake Baseball Park, the field was renamed the Huggins-Stengel Field and served as the training facility for the New York Yankees from 1925 through 1961. The new homes in the subdivision and park amenities drew residents to the Crescent Lake area during the boom. The opening of the Gandy Bridge to Tampa in 1924

\textsuperscript{13} Arsenault, \textit{Florida Dream}, 124, 190.

\textsuperscript{14} Arsenault, \textit{Florida Dream}, 186-189.

\textsuperscript{15} Arsenault, \textit{Florida Dream}, 186-189.

\textsuperscript{16} Arsenault, \textit{Florida Dream}, 201.

\textsuperscript{17} Sanborn Map Company, Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, 1923; Arsenault, \textit{Florida Dream}, 199-200.
further encouraged widespread development and construction extending north of downtown to the bridge.\textsuperscript{18}

With the creation of Crescent Lake Park and the onset of the Florida Land Boom, Cade Allen decided to sell his cattle and return to the construction and real estate development field. In 1920, Allen opened a real estate office with Harold Smith at 430 Central Avenue. In 1922, the men purchased The Foster Grove, 135 acres formerly owned by William L. and Amanda Foster located along Euclid Boulevard North (renamed 9th Street N. in 1928 and now Dr. M.L. King Jr. Street N). Euclid Boulevard, labeled as such on Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps as early as 1918, was the northern extension of 9th Street situated north of 9th Avenue. The original development of the town had focused on the intersection of Central Avenue and 9th Street, making the street a major north-south corridor when new development spread north of the city in the late 1910s and 1920s. By the early 1920s, the streetcar line extended along 9th Street/Euclid Boulevard North to 34th Avenue, the southernmost boundary of the Allendale development, before turning east toward the North Shore development. Cade Allen moved his family into the former Foster residence just west of Euclid Boulevard and remodeled it (which now has an address of 3650 Foster Hill Drive).\textsuperscript{19}

Allen and Smith retained engineer George F. Young to survey the land and, in 1923, filed the plat for Allendale Terrace. Extending from present-day 34th to 38th Avenues North and 7th Street to

\textsuperscript{18} Wells, \textit{C. Perry Snell}, 40-41, 58-60; Sanborn, 1923; Arsenault, \textit{Florida Dream}, 199-200.

Haines Road, the subdivision incorporated a five-acre public park and soon featured brick streets, granite curbs, and hexagon block sidewalks. Soon after, Allen bought Smith's interest in the subdivision, and moved his real estate office to 3649 Haines Road. In 1924, a new plat, Blocks 7-13 of Allendale Terrace Subdivision, was filed for the area north of the original plat extending from 7th Street to Euclid Blvd. and from 38th to 42nd Avenues North. Two years later, in 1926, the final plat, designated as the Northwest Quarter of Allendale Terrace, was filed covering the area from Euclid Boulevard to Haines Road and from 38th to 42nd Avenues North. Like the first plat, the two later plats were drawn by the office of George F. Young, Civil and Landscape Engineers. Deed restrictions limited development to one residence, to cost no less than $10,000, and be constructed in the “Spanish, Grecian, Moorish, Mission, Italian, Colonial or English types of architecture.” Houses had to be built of masonry with at least one room on the second floor or a high ceiling to give the appearance of a second story. As owner of the subdivision, he made all new construction subject to his review and approval of building plans. Apartment buildings and stores were prohibited.²⁰

The first new home built in the neighborhood was located at 3410 Euclid Boulevard North. Constructed of coquina rock quarried on Florida's east coast, the house was an unusual Mediterranean Revival style built of stone, tile, and stucco, a mixture which would characterize most of Allen's future construction. Across Euclid Boulevard, Allen completed a new house for his family which was located at 3405 Euclid Boulevard North, but the family lived in it for only about a year.²¹

![3600 Euclid Boulevard North (now 3601 Foster Hill Drive North), 1926. Courtesy of Burton Allen.](image)

In 1924, Allen initiated construction on another new house for his family located at 3600 Euclid Boulevard North, which is the subject property (now with the address of 3601 Foster Hill Drive). It was the third of six Allendale homes that the Allen family eventually occupied. When constructed, it had six or seven rooms on the first floor and four bedrooms and three baths on the second floor with an attached garage. Living quarters above the garage housed Mr. and Mrs. Warren Hodges and their son, who worked for the Allens. Warren Hodges wrote his name with

---


the date of February 14, 1925 in the concrete driveway, possibly the date that the house was substantially completed. During this period, Cade and Eva Allen, along with five other residents, met in the Allen home and established the Allendale Methodist Episcopal Church. The eighth, and final, child of Cade and Eva Allen was born in the house in November 1926. According to the Allen family, the projecting granite stones at the corners of the house made for an afternoon of fun “mountain climbing” to the second floor porch and roof. This ever present danger to her children prompted Eva Allen to want to relocate. So Cade Allen built another new house at 944 39th Avenue North for his family in 1928, where they lived until 1947. During the 1920s, Allen had built 22 homes as well as the Allendale Methodist Episcopal Church.\textsuperscript{22}

A relatively healthy tourist trade initially kept the local economy afloat following the downturn of the real estate market in 1926 and the devastating hurricanes which damaged south Florida in 1926 and 1928. However, the crash of the stock market in 1929 kept the traveling public at home during the ensuing national depression. A dismal tourist season during the winter of 1929-1930 led to business failures, mortgage foreclosures, and unemployment in the city. Every bank in the city failed and closed by April 1931.\textsuperscript{23}

\textbf{TOMORROW at 2 P.M.}

The Showplace of St. Petersburg—at Auction
—No. 3600 Euclid Boulevard—Completely Furnished—

The Home

A magnificent architectural masterpiece of concrete and brick, the home is

The Furniture

The Location

The Terms

Your Price Is Ours
Your Big Opportunity

With C. B. GIRL Turner, Co.
147 Central Avenue
Phones—5115-5116

Absolute Sale
By Order of
The Owners


In January 1928, real estate salesmen and auctioneers McLean-Rector & Scott advertised 3600 Euclid Boulevard North as the “Palatial Graystone Mansion” offering the “Ultimate in Residential

\textsuperscript{22} Allen, \textit{A Life Remembered}, 41-46.

\textsuperscript{23} Arsenault, \textit{Florida Dream}, 253-255.
Perfection.”\textsuperscript{24} The agents reported that several thousand visited during a week-long open house in which the home was presented as a “model of modern building construction and furnishing.”\textsuperscript{25} With the decline in the real estate market, the house was still on the market the following year but was briefly occupied by auctioneer Victor McLean of McLean-Rector & Scott. The house finally sold at auction in February 1929. Attorney and future judge Mervin Hilton lived in the home in 1930 and 1931.\textsuperscript{26}

By 1932, William Halls, Jr. and his wife, Hattie, owned the residence. The New York banker had bought a winter residence at 1028 14\textsuperscript{th} Avenue North in 1927. In 1933 and 1934, their local attorney, Walter Wilson, rented 3600 9\textsuperscript{th} Street North. After William Halls died in 1933, it appears that his widow Hattie Halls owned the house and may have periodically lived in the house or rented it to widow Edith Byron from 1937 through 1945. The house was advertised for sale in 1945.\textsuperscript{27}

Federal relief projects helped revive the local economy by the mid-1930s. Local projects included the construction of Bay Pines Veterans’ Hospital, an addition to Albert Whitted Airport, Bartlett Park, an addition to Mound Park City Hospital, a beach water system, a new city hall, the construction of the U.S. Coast Guard Air Station near Bayboro Harbor, the North Shore sewer system, a National Guard armory, and a new campus for the St. Petersburg Junior College. By providing these kinds of projects throughout the nation, the New Deal agencies brought partial economic recovery to residents of St. Petersburg as well as other cities. With an improved financial outlook, tourists returned to St. Petersburg during the late-1930s.\textsuperscript{28}

During the 1930s, Cade Allen continued to live in and develop the Allendale neighborhood. Unlike many developers who went bust in the decline of the real estate market and Great Depression, Cade Allen managed his development well, installing streets and improvements without encumbering the land. As a result, he retained ownership of the parcels, sold a few, and continued to build during the 1930s even though money was tight.\textsuperscript{29} Between 1930 and 1932, Allen completed seven and sold eight homes in Allendale Terrace. At the height of the Depression, however, he only completed and sold two homes from 1932 to 1936. As construction resumed between 1937 and 1940, he built 16 homes.\textsuperscript{30}

Due to a doctrinal disagreement, Allen left Allendale Methodist Episcopal Church and joined Central Presbyterian Church, where he built the new Sunday school class rooms in 1938. As his sons finished school, they also joined the business, and the company became Cade B. Allen &


\textsuperscript{26} “Mervin B. Hilton,” \textit{St. Petersburg Times}, April 3, 1940.

\textsuperscript{27} “Home in City Sold for Cash,” \textit{St. Petersburg Times}, May 15, 1927.

\textsuperscript{28} Arsenault, \textit{Florida Dreams}, 257-260.
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Sons, Designers and Builders. With the onset of World War II, all five of Cade Allen’s sons joined the military. Due to gasoline rationing and limited building materials, little new construction occurred during the war, but Cade Allen managed to keep his real estate office open.\textsuperscript{31}

Although tourism had rebounded to some extent by 1940, the activation of the military, rationing, and travel restrictions of World War II severely curtailed St. Petersburg’s tourism based economy. Most of the city’s hotels and boarding houses remained empty during the winter of 1941-42. Realizing that the empty rooms could be an asset as military housing, city leaders successfully lobbied the War Department for a military base. The opening of a technical services training center for the Army Air Corps brought over ten thousand soldiers to the city during the summer of 1942. The military leased almost every major hotel and many of the smaller hotels in the city. Only the Suwannee Hotel and some of the smaller hotels and boarding houses were open to civilian use. By the time the training center closed in July 1943, over 100,000 soldiers had visited St. Petersburg. Although the training center closed, the United States Maritime Service Bayboro Harbor Base, which trained merchant seamen, continued to grow, and eventually leased four of the downtown hotels abandoned by the Army Air Corps. Other bases and support facilities throughout the area brought thousands of soldiers to central Florida and the St. Petersburg area.\textsuperscript{32}

The city rapidly demilitarized following the war, and many veterans returned to St. Petersburg. Among those returning, the Allen sons rejoined Cade B. Allen & Sons, which now offered “A Complete Home Building Service.”\textsuperscript{33} The Great Depression and governmental restrictions during the war led to a housing shortage following World War II. Many hotels and boarding houses were again filled with tourists and new residents awaiting the construction of new homes. In 1957, Cade Allen retired and passed the family business over to his sons. He died in 1959.

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s in St. Petersburg, new houses filled the subdivisions platted during the 1920s, but left vacant by the real estate decline and the Great Depression. As development spread westward, the introduction of shopping centers, including Central Plaza and Tyrone Gardens Shopping Center, and motels along the west coast drew new residents and tourists away from downtown St. Petersburg.\textsuperscript{34} During the 1960s, downtown and the neighborhoods surrounding the city core entered a period of decline and abandonment. Many of the buildings associated with the early history of the community slowly deteriorated until reinvestment and preservation revived the area during the 1990s.

Subject Property Background
The house at 956 39\textsuperscript{th} Avenue North was constructed by Cade Allen beginning in January of 1931 and purchased by Frank H. Broadfield by mid-1932. Broadfield, born c. 1870, owned and operated

\textsuperscript{31} Allen, A Life Remembered, 48-52.
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\textsuperscript{33} Allen, A Life Remembered, 53.

\textsuperscript{34} Arsenault, Florida Dreams, 307-313.
a farm in Pompey, Onondaga County, New York with his wife Mary and later their adult son Louis, until the 1920s. Although the exact reason and date of Mr. Broadfield’s relocation to St. Petersburg is not presently known, by 1930 he was listed as a widowed resident of 2822 Second Avenue North in St. Petersburg. He was renting the home and lived with Ada C. Pheal, listed as his servant.

When Frank Broadfield became the first permanent resident of the subject property, he was in his early sixties, retired from his New York farming business, and a widower. Although some early residents of the subject property’s vicinity were of retirement age, working professionals and young families also lived in the area. A 1937 report by the Home Owners Loan Corporation lauds Allendale as a successful subdivision that continued to develop during the Depression, due largely to the strict controls placed on development and use by Allen himself. The grandeur of the subject property remains visible to this day, and Broadfield’s retirement years spent there, which lasted into the late 1940s or early 1950s, were undoubtedly coupled with pride of place.

Frank Broadfield appears to have remarried by the early 1950s. According to property records, Mr. and Mrs. Broadfield continued to hire Cade Allen, and later his sons, to update and remodel the subject property into the 1950s. The property was acquired by a new owner between 1952 and 1956, and again in 1966. That year, the new owner, John Bell, expanded the subject property’s footprint with the construction of a flat-roofed, single story, 29 foot by 49 foot addition at the south (rear) elevation. This addition features deeper overhangs at its roofline than other portions of the subject property, and its porch has been enclosed with large, fixed windows. Although the scale and exterior surface treatment of this addition do not replicate the original or historic materials and design of the subject property, the addition’s placement at the rear elevation minimize its impact on the resource’s integrity.

Subsequent owner George Meehan constructed a flat-roofed carport at the west elevation in 1983 and a rear pool and deck in 1987. Like the 1966 addition, these 1980s alterations are non-contributing to the property’s historic significance, but are nonetheless relatively set back from the subject property’s façade, and, therefore do not detract from the historic design.

Primary Character-Defining Features

- Irregular one- and two-story footprint,
- Roof mass of primary cross-gabled two-story core with truncated gable ends and flat-roofed sunroom and garage,
- Boxed cornices with bead board and rounded fascia at gable ends,

---
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• Entryway with stone steps, single-action wood door, curved pediment, and hexagonal concrete block walkway,
• Continuous cut Alabama sandstone veneer exterior with random ashlar pattern, beaded buff-colored mortar, and rectangular foundation vents,
• Louvered gable vents and cylindrical clay tile pipe drains at flat-roofed portions,
• Stone chimney,
• Double-hung wood windows with four- and six-over-one lights,
• Segmental arches above ground-floor and gable-end windows, and
• Stone window sills.

Alterations
The subject property retains remarkable historic integrity, however, all buildings evolve somewhat over time. As mentioned above, the subject property has been expanded through the additions of a flat-roofed addition to the south elevation and a carport to the west. The gabled portions of the roof, originally clad in slate, have been resurfaced with composition shingles. The landscape has also been altered, through the resurfacing of the criveway with contemporary brick pavers and the addition of a pool and deck. The subject property is able to convey its historic significance despite these minor changes.

PROPERTY OWNER CONSENT AND IMPACT OF DESIGNATION
The proposed local landmark designation was submitted and is supported by the subject property’s owners, Mary Jane McPherson and Michael Ford.

The benefits of designation include increased heritage tourism through the maintenance of the historic character and significance of the city, some relief from the requirements of the Florida Building Code and FEMA regulations, and tax incentives, such as the local ad valorem tax exemption and federal tax credit for qualified rehabilitation projects. The owners intend to take advantage of the ad valorem tax exemption for an upcoming rehabilitation project.

CONSISTENCY WITH ST. PETERSBURG’S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, EXISTING LAND USE PLAN, AND FUTURE LAND USE PLAN
The proposed local historic landmark designation is consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan, relating to the protection, use and adaptive reuse of historic buildings. The local landmark designation will not affect the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) or zoning designations, nor will it significantly constrain any existing or future plans for the development of the City. The proposed landmark designation is consistent with the following objectives:

Objective LU10: The historic resources locally designated by the St. Petersburg City Council and Community Planning and Preservation Commission (CPPC) shall be incorporated onto the Land Use Map or map series at the time of original adoption, or through the amendment process, and protected from development and redevelopment activities consistent with the provisions of the Historic Preservation Element and the Historic Preservation Ordinance.
Policy LU10.1: Decisions regarding the designation of historic resources shall be based on the criteria and policies outlined in the Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Historic Preservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy HP2.3: The City shall provide technical assistance to applications for designation of historic structures and districts.

Policy HP2.6: Decisions regarding the designation of historic resources shall be based on National Register eligibility criteria and policies outlined in the Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan. The City will use the following selection criteria [for city initiated landmark designations] as a guideline for staff recommendations to the CPC and City Council:

- National Register or DOE status
- Prominence/importance related to the City
- Prominence/importance related to the neighborhood
- Degree of threat to the landmark
- Condition of the landmark
- Degree of owner support

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the request to designate the Frank Broadfield House, located at 956 39th Avenue North, as a local historic landmark, thereby referring the application to City Council for first and second reading and public hearing.
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Application
Local Landmark Designation Application

1. NAME AND LOCATION OF PROPERTY

  historic name
   ALLENDALE TERRACE

2. PROPERTY OWNER(S) NAME AND ADDRESS

   name
   MICHAEL FORD AND MARY S. MCPherson

   street and number
   950 39TH AVENUE NORTH

   city or town
   SAINT PETERSBURG

   state
   FLORIDA

   zip code
   33703

   phone number (h)
   727-510-3140, 727-713-7749 (w)

   e-mail
   mcphersonamj@msn.com

3. NOMINATION PREPARED BY

   name/title

   organization

   street and number
   950 39TH AVENUE NORTH

   city or town
   SAINT PETERSBURG

   state
   FLORIDA

   zip code
   33703

   phone number (h)
   727-773-7749

   date prepared
   06-07-2017

   signature

4. BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION

   Describe boundary line encompassing all man-made and natural resources to be included in designation (general legal description or survey). Attach map delimiting proposed boundary. (Use continuation sheet if necessary)

   See attached Survey

5. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

   acreage of property
   .58 acre.

   property identification number

   Allendale Terrace
   950 39TH AVENUE NORTH
   1077 LESS W 15',
   ALL OF 1078
   IN A LOT IN THEREOF BLOCK 1
Name of Property

9. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:

Criteria for Significance
(mark one or more boxes for the appropriate criteria)

☐ Its value is a significant reminder of the cultural or archaeological heritage of the City, state, or nation.

☐ Its location is the site of a significant local, state, or national event.

☐ It is identified with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the City, state, or nation.

☐ It is identified as the work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose work has influenced the development of the City, state, or nation.

☐ Its value as a building is recognized for the quality of its architecture, and it retains sufficient elements showing its architectural significance.

☐ It has distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials.

☐ Its character is a geographically definable area possessing a significant concentration, or continuity of sites, buildings, objects or structures united in past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development.

☐ Its character is an established and geographically definable neighborhood, united in culture, architectural style or physical plan and development.

☐ It has contributed, or is likely to contribute, information important to the prehistory or history of the City, state, or nation.

Areas of Significance
(see Attachment B for detailed list of categories)

Addenda Terrace

Period of Significance

1929 - 1930

Significant Dates (date constructed & altered)

Significant Person(s)

Cade B. Allen

Cultural Affiliation/Historic Period

Builder

Cade B. Allen

Architect

Narrative Statement of Significance

(Explain the significance of the property as it relates to the above criteria and information on one or more continuation sheets. Include biographical data on significant person(s), builder and architect, if known. Please use parenthetical notations, footnotes or endnotes for citations of work used.)

10. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Please list bibliographical references
Allendale Terrace 950 39th Avenue N.
Saint Petersburg FL 33701

6. FUNCTION OR USE

Historic Functions

Single Family

Current Functions

Single Family

7. DESCRIPTION

Architectural Classification
(See Appendix A for list)

Materials

Alabama buff sandstone

Narrative Description

On one or more continuation sheets describe the historic and existing condition of the property use conveying the following information: original location and setting; natural features; pre-historic man-made features; subdivision design; description of surrounding buildings, major alterations and present appearance; interior appearance;

8. NUMBER OF RESOURCES WITHIN PROPERTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Contributing resources previously listed on the National Register or Local Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of multiple property listings
St. Petersburg Local Landmark Designation Application

Name of property **Broad Field House**

Continuation Section
A BOUNDARY SURVEY OF: Lot 7, less the West 15.00 feet thereof, all of Lot 8, and Lot 9 less the East 1/2 thereof, Block C, NORTHWEST QUARTER-ALLENDALE TERRACE, as recorded in Plat Book 18, Pages 1-2 of the Public Records of Pinellas County, Florida.
THREE PERIODS OF CONSTRUCTION AT ALLENDALE

With work already well advanced on two new subdivisions, one on the north side of the trail and the other on the south side, the development of Allendale is rapidly progressing.

**First Period:**
- Construction began in the late 1920s.
- Main focus was on building basic infrastructure.
- Initial homes were modest in design.

**Second Period:**
- Mid-1930s to early 1940s.
- Increased emphasis on landscaping and more durable materials.
- Homes began to incorporate contemporary architectural features.

**Third Period:**
- Late 1940s to 1950s.
- Major development with modern homes and extensive amenities.
- Expansion into new neighborhoods.

The above collage of news articles was found among the many items of memorabilia left by Cade B. Allen.
Miss Ruby Swords and J. F. Tidwell Are Married

The marriage of Miss Ruby Swords and John Tidwell was celebrated Saturday afternoon at 3 o'clock in the First Baptist Church by the Rev. David H. McDonald. The church was beautifully decorated with flowers and the ceremony was performed by the Rev. David H. McDonald.

The bride and groom were married in the presence of many friends and relatives.

University Women Hear Miss Kim At Luncheon

University Women's Club held a luncheon in honor of Miss Kim at the University Club. The luncheon was attended by many members of the club and guests.

Society Calendar

- **Mondays:**
  - **Luncheon, 1 p.m.** at the Presbyterian Church
  - **Dinner, 7 p.m.** at the Country Club
- **Tuesdays:**
  - **Dinner, 7 p.m.** at the Country Club
- **Wednesdays:**
  - **Luncheon, 1 p.m.** at the Country Club
  - **Dinner, 7 p.m.** at the Country Club
- **Thursdays:**
  - **Luncheon, 1 p.m.** at the Presbyterian Church
  - **Dinner, 7 p.m.** at the Country Club
- **Fridays:**
  - **Luncheon, 1 p.m.** at the Presbyterian Church
  - **Dinner, 7 p.m.** at the Country Club
- **Saturdays:**
  - **Luncheon, 1 p.m.** at the Presbyterian Church
  - **Dinner, 7 p.m.** at the Country Club
- **Sundays:**
  - **Luncheon, 1 p.m.** at the Presbyterian Church
  - **Dinner, 7 p.m.** at the Country Club

Miss Mary Marries Mr. With Cerem

Miss Frances Re Veds Mr. Trusl
OPPORTUNITIES, COLL DECLARES

Industry Board Secretary Sees Bright Future for Florida Real Estate

Discussing the relation of the industry board to the St. Petersburg County Board, a member of the board, recently spoke to the members of the board. He said that the board is important because it provides a voice for the industry to the county officials. He also mentioned that the board is working to improve the development of the county by providing input on land use and development plans. The board is composed of representatives from various industries and organizations, including real estate developers, homeowners associations, and local businesses. The goal of the board is to ensure that development in the county is sustainable and meets the needs of the community. The member of the board emphasized the importance of collaboration between the board and county officials to achieve these goals.
FOREIGN MISSIONS

On many occasions missionaries from foreign lands would visit our church and speak to the congregation about their work and mission. Over the years while we eight kids were growing up Mother and Dad would occasionally say something about giving to the missionaries that had spoken. We knew that they had supported missions in Africa, China, Borneo and others around the world. There was no physical evidence of their giving except for some Chinese coins that had been given to them. That is, until granddaughter June McClendon DeHart found, among her mother Rena’s belongings, two receipts dated May 15, 1925 from North China Mission of the Methodist Episcopal Church. There was likely other receipts from this mission as well as others but the two receipts is all we have.

Finding the two receipts set us on a quest to learn more about the North China Mission if we could. The search to obtain datum about the mission started with an appointment with Rev. Lisa Degrenia, Senior Pastor, Allendale United Methodist Church. She provided two leads namely Rev. M. McCoy Gibbs at the Methodist Archives and History in Leesburg, Florida and Mr. Elliott Wright on the Board of Global Ministries in New York City.

I wrote to Rev. Gibbs explaining the reason for my inquiry. I included pictures of the receipts and coins. Mr. Gibbs forwarded all the information to Mr. Dale Patterson who is higher up the archives chain.

On January 7, 2008 an e-mail was sent to Mr. Patterson stating that it would be helpful and greatly appreciated if he could decipher the recipients handwriting giving the names of the geographic area or community in which the church buildings were to be built. On January 15 a phone call was made to Mr. Patterson explaining more fully our reasons for wanting information on the North China Mission. He graciously responded with the e-mail and map of China on pages 9 and 10.
NORTH CHINA MISSION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

Formal Acknowledgment of Special Gift

No. 1

My dear Mr. Allen:

This is to acknowledge the receipt of your gift of $100.00 for the support of the Church at Tientsin City, which urgently needs a new building to replace an older one.

Very sincerely yours,

F. M. Lyde

NORTH CHINA MISSION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

Formal Acknowledgment of Special Gift

No. 250

My dear Mr. Allen:

This is to acknowledge the receipt of your gift of $100.00 for the support of a new Church at Tientsin City. The new church is to replace an old one in need of repair.

Very sincerely yours,

F. M. Lyde
Mr. Allen -
It was a pleasure to speak with you. Here is what I have been able to learn.

Your father’s gift went to the Yenchow City church in the North China Mission Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Like an annual conference in the U.S. mission conferences overseas were composed of ministers and also included the missionaries. The conference was considered a mission conference because it was not yet large enough to generate enough funds to support its pastors directly. At that time there were also a few mission conferences within the U.S. as well. The North China Mission started in 1869. I am attaching a map of China showing the boundaries of the various conferences around the 1920s. Yenchow is not on the map, but it appears to have been close to Taian, which is on the map. I am not sure of the modern spelling, but I believe it is Yenzhou. In looking at several resources I have not been able to confirm its exact location; there are several cities and towns with almost the exact same spelling.

Methodist work actually started in southern China, Foochow conference, in the mid 19th century and then moved north. By the 1920s there appears to be about 50 or so pastors in the conference - all Chinese, and about 6 missionaries who serve mostly as teachers, evangelists or medical missionaries. Yenchow was a large enough town to have the entire district named for it. The North China mission covered two significant provinces, Hopeh and Shantung. Shantung became the scene of heavy fighting between the nationalist and communist Chinese forces and later with the Japanese. In the late 1930s the missionaries evacuated from the area and went to Nanking. Those that stayed behind where interned as were many at Nanking when it fell. During the 1920s there are reports of church growth and a real interest on the part of the people for the church. Many churches, medical missions and even Peking University were started by the members of the North China mission. All of the mission work was closed down by the Japanese and then by the Communists. Peking University still exists but has lost any awareness of its past connection with the church. I am not aware that any other church or institution has continued to today.

I hope this helps a little. Your Dad’s gift came at an important time. If you have any further questions please feel free to contact me.
EXPANDING MISSIONS—CHINA
HIS LIFE LIVES ON...

This past January, we were notified of the death of Harold Allen who donated the very first car to Missionary Ministries. At that time, his family told us that they were requesting any monetary donations to be given to us in Harold's memory. Following are some excerpts from the 'Harold Allen Memorial' written by his daughter, Stephanie Bower, and read at the memorial service held here in St. Petersburg, January 24th, 2007! These words are a very short summary of Harold's life.

"Dad was born in St. Petersburg, FL on July 20, 1915" ... "Dad grew up in St. Petersburg. He didn't graduate from high school because he had a learning disability and struggled with reading. He dropped out of school by the 9th grade. He went to work with Grandpa Allen who owned a construction business" ... "When Dad built something, he always built it to last ... Everything he did, he did with the best of his ability" ... "Dad was truly a servant of the Lord. He was a member of First Baptist Church, St. Petersburg, FL for more than 55 years ... If anyone ever needed anything built or repaired at church, they would always go to Dad. I know that he took each job as a privilege to serve his church and God" ... "One of the highlights of Dad's later life was his time spent at D&D Missionary Homes in St. Petersburg ... Dad loved working on these homes. While working at D&D, and just before moving to Birmingham, Dad donated his car to Missionary Ministries. In fact, his car was the first car donated to them. The cars are used to assist the same missionaries with transportation needs" ... "Tom and Lois name all their vehicles and they named Dad's donated car 'Stone' because Stone, one of Dad's great-grandchildren, was the reason we moved to Birmingham. This program has grown and blessed many people along the way. I know that Dad was proud to be a part of this blessing to many missionaries."

Tom adds the following: "Harold lived out the scripture from Galatians 6:10 which is also one of the founding scriptures of Missionary Ministries. 'As we have opportunity, let us do good to all people, especially to those who belong to the family of believers'. Harold Allen truly showed his faith by his deeds. He was a great mentor to me personally and a special gift from God to strengthen and encourage me. He will always have a very special place in my life."

Although Harold has passed on to be with his Lord, his memory will continue to live on. We have been honored to establish the "Harold Allen Memorial Fund", and we praise God that He has already blessed us with $6000.00 for this purpose. Once this fund reaches the $10,000.00 needed, we will then purchase, in memory of Harold, a vehicle similar to the one pictured here. We are grateful to you, Harold's family, for your love and kindness and making this possible for our ministry.
FIRST SUPPORTING CHURCH...

Victory Church of the Nazarene held a mission month this October featuring Missionary Ministries. We were able to present the ministry for 10 minutes in both morning services each week as well as take the entire service on 2 of the Sunday evenings. It was a real success and a real challenge to us. The pastor had requested ministry brochures be inserted into all bulletins, so the completion of this brochure was another first for us. From this church, we have received prayer support, vehicle donations, technical, moral and financial support. In this picture, Tom is presenting a ‘Certificate of Appreciation’ to Pastor Rocky Hambrick.

THANK ‘YOU’ FOR AFFECTING THE WORLD

“We really appreciate your hearts and vision to provide this service. There are others who do something similar, but only for missionaries from their own denomination. We are very grateful!” ... Germany

“I just wanted to say how much we have appreciated ... your personal ministry of wheels for missionaries. Again, your ministry & friendship is much appreciated. The Lord bless.” ... Papua New Guinea

“Having Tom pick me up and drop me off at the airport is a HUGE BLESSING every time he has done so. Your ministry is incredible. Thanks so very much.” ... Chile

MISSIONARY MINISTRIES’ MEDIA DEBUT...

During the months of May and June, Tom was privileged to appear on a local television program, ‘Life As a Christian’. Tom was given opportunity to speak for almost the entire half hour each time, and then each program aired 3 days a week on two cable networks for the entire month. Tom was able to present the ministry as well as encourage those watching with God’s winning combination for their lives. DVDs and videos of this program were made and are now in other countries! Isn’t God amazing???

EMAIL PRAYER MINISTRY

Missionary Ministries has over 60 people praying daily for the needs of this ministry. Emails are sent out regularly to all who wish to support the ministry in prayer and, we know without a doubt, that this is the backbone of this ministry. It is prayer that moves the hand of God and we rely heavily on our prayer partners and are grateful for each one of them! A special thank you to all who have partnered with us in this way. Without you, we could not do it!!

SHARING OUR MINISTRY NEEDS:

- New prayer partners to join our prayer ministry
- Technical help for the web site and office work
- An individual to help with day to day preparation and maintenance of vehicles
- Replacement and repairs of various vehicles
- Donations of newer cars/vans or finances to purchase the same
- Individuals and churches who will provide monthly financial support

CONTACT INFO: Missionary Ministries, 4020 58th Ave. N., St. Petersburg, FL 33714 missionaryministries@juno.com

OFFICE WORK

Although her computer skills are being stretched and she is still very much in the process of learning, Lois enjoys tackling the varied aspects of this end of the ministry. Some of these include responding to the numerous requests for vehicles, writing newsletters and creating documents. Her favorite part is our email prayer ministry! Lois is pictured here doing the print job on our very first brochure!

MERRY CHRISTMAS TO YOU!

Again, we have reached the time of year when we celebrate the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ. Due to the many happenings of this year, Tom and I will be unable to send out personal Christmas greetings and wishes. As a result, we want to take this opportunity to do two things. Firstly, we wish each and every one of you God’s richest blessings now and throughout the coming year. May you truly have a blessed Christmas season! And also, because He is the Reason for this season, we say ‘Happy Birthday Jesus’.

www.missionaryministries.org
Grandpa Allen’s Desire to the 3rd and 4th Generation
My Call and Ministry
Raymond C. Allen

When my parents, Harold and Marjorie Allen, dedicated themselves to bring me up in a Christian home they also dedicated me to the ministry – they never told me that they had done this – there was never any pressure about Christian Ministry.

One Christmas, when Carolyn, Michelle, Stephen and I were visiting in Florida we sat in on a Bible Study my parents hosted – in the after study conversation I overheard my father say that he and mom had dedicated me to the ministry. I asked him why they had not told me. His reply, "We dedicated you to the Lord and the ministry, it was up to Him to call you."

God did call me. One day when our church youth group was at Passagrille beach I went up to the car to get something and God spoke to my heart and said, "Will you serve Me?" I thought if you were going to serve God you had only five options - 1. Be a pastor; 2. Be a missionary; 3. Be a full-time youth minister; 4. Be a music minister; 5. Be an educational director – I did not want to do any of those things; I wanted to be a lawyer. I ran from God's call for seven years until I got myself expelled from Bob Jones University. At that time I repented of my rebellion and many sins and God forgave me. He reissued His original call and I submitted my life to whatever He wanted me to do.

Each summer our family spent a week at Mountain Home, NC visiting with Grandma and Grandpa Allen and then attending Music Week at Ridgecrest, NC. One day I did something that displeased Grandpa Allen and he said to me, "Raymond, you're the Black Sheep of this family." I know now that he was trying to challenge me to prove him wrong but as I was running from God I lived up to that label for a long time. It is a sorrow to me that I did not learn from my Grandfather.

I have often told the congregations I ministered to that we all need to be careful what we say to our children, grandchildren, and anyone else we have influence over. We can push them in the wrong direction. It was a good lesson for me to learn.

After leaving Bob Jones and working for the St. Pete Times for a year I was accepted at Toccoa Falls College in Toccoa, GA. It was there that I met (in 1967) and married Carolyn Shifflett, January 20, 1968. Carolyn graduated from Toccoa Falls and Georgia Baptist Nursing School in Atlanta. Michelle was born in Atlanta (November 18, 1968) before I graduated from Toccoa Falls with a degree in Bible and Theology. It was then that First Baptist Church of St. Petersburg, FL ordained me to the Gospel Ministry.

The Lord closed the door to Southwestern Seminary in Ft. Worth, TX where I wanted to go and sent us to Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in So. Hamilton, MA. It was while Carolyn and I served as Youth Directors with the Salvation Army that we met Ms. Edith Lawrence, the Church Extension Director for the Baptist General Association of New England, SBC. She asked us if we would like to try and start a mission church in the Lawrence, MA area. We said yes!

Edith also told us about New Colony Baptist Church in Billerica, MA, about 15 miles from our home, where we began to attend on Sunday nights. I was serving at the Post Chapel at Fort Devens Army Base, Ayer, MA, as the Educational Director on Sunday mornings. Shortly after my contract ended at Fort Devens the pastor of New Colony resigned. The Deacons asked Carolyn and I if we would serve the Church as
their Interim Pastor. We pastored for eighteen months. The church grew and we broke ground, built, and dedicated their first Church building.

Just before I graduated from Gordon-Conwell in 1972 with a Masters degree in Religious Education, Carolyn and I began a mission church in No. Andover, MA – Judson Memorial Baptist Church. We did not have anyone to lead music so I played the piano for the hymns, the offertory and the invitation hymn (Music Director) as well as preached the sermons. The church constituted and called me as Pastor in 1975 and we began looking for a place to buy or build a new building. Stephen was born in Lawrence, MA, June 27, 1973.

In early 1977, we were still looking for a building. In our separate devotional times, God indicated to Carolyn and me that our ministry was to build congregations, not buildings. We resigned the church and in June 1977 we moved to Carver, MA to begin serving as Church Planting Missionaries for the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. God allowed us to serve Him on the South Shore and Cape Cod area of Massachusetts for almost seven years. We helped start 6 mission congregations.


Since I “retired” I have had the privilege of serving as the Interim Executive Director for the Greater Boston Baptist Association for 21 months. I am now in my 4th year serving the Massachusetts Baptist Association as their Interim Associational Missionary. In August 2007 I began serving the Baptist Convention of New England as an employed missionary promoting the Cooperative Program, the Mission giving plan that supports over 5000 missionaries here in America and around the world. I will also help churches with stewardship emphasis’, work with the New England Baptist Foundation and supervise the Convention’s physical property.

As you can see with my bold and underlined words that I have done all five things that I did not want to do when God first called me to serve Him – but it has been, and continues to be, a joy to be part of our God’s plan to reach New England for Christ.

Michelle and her husband, Michael Dean, serve the Greater Boston Baptist Association as the International Coordinators – they minister to under graduates, graduate students, post-docs, 41 foreign consulates and 200 foreign owned businesses in Boston. Granddaughter Lauren (1997) and Grandson Nathaniel (2000) are our joy.

And just to show you that God has a sense of humor – our son, Stephen, is a Christian lawyer – and that is not an oxymoron. He is a Deacon in his church and plays his guitar with the church’s worship team in Broken Arrow, OK. Stephen and his wife, Rachel had our new grandson, Caden Brent Allen, on September 26, 2007.

“For we ourselves were also once foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving various lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another. But when the kindness and the love of God our Savior toward men appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, whom He poured out on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior, that having been justified by His grace we should become heirs according to the hope of the eternal life.” Titus 3:3-7 NKJV
Pamela Chandler Evans and Mark W. Evans – Greenville, S.C.

Continuing Christian Witness In Descendants of Cade and Eva Allen

Pamela C. Evans

It is my privilege to be the oldest daughter, born to Paul and Esther Chandler. Esther Chandler was the seventh child born to Cade and Eva Allen. Mother and Daddy diligently trained us up in the way we should go, as instructed by God’s Word. We were faithfully in church every time the doors opened. Mama led me to the Lord at the age of five. I trusted Him as my Savior then, and now, nearly 65 years later, I still trust Him today. The Lord was good to allow my sisters and me to be raised in a home with very strict training and rules. We were taught to honor God’s Word and to be obedient. We had much love and laughter in our home, and every day our lives revolved around things of the Lord and how we could serve and honor Him. Being a PK (“Preacher’s Kid”) was a wonderful experience and good training for my future as a pastor’s wife.

We had the joy of visiting with Meme and Papa Allen, both at Mountain Home, NC, and in St. Pete. I still remember how much they loved the Lord, and I was very much aware of their wonderful Christian testimonies. I was a pre-teen when Papa Allen passed away, but memories of his godly influence and his desire to have a good testimony before the Lord greatly impacted my life. I remember his giving his testimony in church one night, recalling how he was convicted about being part of a square dance. He had tears and deep conviction about not living for the Lord, as he should have at that time. I believe that even though his participation in square dancing was before he was saved, he was still ashamed that he had taken part in worldly activities. I remember Meme reading her Bible and praying and talking often of things of the Lord. One time she was visiting us in Memphis, TN, and she found $50 on the ground outside a store. She went back into the store and told the clerk that she had found some money and left a number where she could be reached if someone inquired about it, who could accurately say how much they had lost. No one ever claimed the money. She asked me what I would do with the money if I had found it. I told her I didn’t know. She then said she thought she would give it to missions. Meme was a kind and gracious lady, who never talked about others nor spoke unkindly. She was hard working and diligent, a good and faithful servant of the Lord. She went home to be with the Lord the year that our first daughter was born. We still miss Meme and Papa very much.

I know that my grandparents had the desire for their children and grandchildren to serve the Lord. It is wonderful to see the covenant promises of the Lord evident from generation to generation. The Lord has blessed me with a wonderful Christian husband, Mark Evans, whom I met while we were both students at Bob Jones University. We were married the summer after we graduated; then Mark continued in graduate school, where he received his Master of Divinity degree in 1979. That year he received his degree, was ordained as a minister in the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Synod, and became installed as pastor of Augusta Street Presbyterian Church in Greenville, SC. He served as pastor there until 1977. In 1979, he entered the Bible Presbyterian Synod, and became pastor of the Bible Presbyterian Church in Greenville. In 1983, he, three elders, and some other Christian people started the Hope Presbyterian Church, where he continues as pastor. We should be celebrating our 25th year at this church in August 2008. The Lord has blessed us with three wonderful children who have married Christian spouses. They have established Christian homes and are all blessed with precious children, whom they are trying to raise for the Lord. Our family believes that man’s chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever, as we have been taught in the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Confession of Faith. I have had great joy in being a pastor’s wife and having the privilege of serving my Savior in our little church here. The Lord has blessed me with opportunities to teach my own children and grandchildren and many other children throughout the years in Sunday School and Vacation Bible School.

Psalm 103:17 & 18 is a special blessing to our family:

"But the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear Him, and His righteousness unto children’s children; to such as keep His covenant, and to those that remember His commandments to do them."

I am thankful to see the Lord’s faithfulness from generation to generation in the Allen family. May His name be praised and may He receive all the glory.

Pamela Chandler Evans
November 24, 2007
Stephen and Janice Worth – Scotland and England

Because of God’s mercies and the blessing of both growing up in Christian homes, Steve and Janice (Chandler) Worth were given tender hearts for missionary work in their youth. They met each other while at Bob Jones University in a child evangelism class. In the summer of 1969, Steve went to Scotland on a summer mission team where the Lord first stirred his heart toward the spiritual needs of that country. Married in 1970, Steve and Janice sailed for Scotland in the fall of 1971 and lived for a short time in Edinburgh. Then the Lord provided an opportunity for them to settle in Penicuik, a community of 12,000, (now approx. 24,000) southwest of Edinburgh with little evangelical witness. Starting with children’s Bible classes and home Bible studies, by God’s grace they were enabled to see the Free Baptist Church of Penicuik established (now called Penicuik Baptist Church). Meanwhile, the Lord was pleased to enlarge their family with Stephen in 1973, Paul in 1976, and Sarah in 1979. Paul married Hannah Cooke in 2002, and they are expecting a baby in early March 2008.

The congregation consists of all ages, with a number of unconverted attending. Members range in age from teens to the late 70’s, including some men and women whose husbands and wives are unconverted. The Worth’s work with children and young people through various clubs in the church, and endeavor to reach them and their families with the Gospel. They enjoy visiting and ministering in the community and leading Bible studies and Christianity Explored groups, which are evangelistic studies for the non-Christian. An additional outreach of the church is a bookshop that is well stocked with Bibles, Christian literature, greetings cards and gifts and is used by the church and local community.

Great Britain is a country where religious apathy and indifference are pervasive. Church attendance averages no more than 10%, lower in Scotland, which is a stark contrast to nearly every area of the USA. Pray for God’s strengthening of Steve and Janice as they continue in evangelism and move to a new ministry— that of assisting and encouraging new works of Gospel outreach.

After 35 years ministering the gospel in Penicuik, Scotland, Steve and Janice have felt the call to a new chapter of gospel service – in Blackpool, England (population of 155,000)! They will be joining the leadership team at Rehoboth Christian Centre (www.rcchblackpool.com), a young 4 year old church plant with the FIEC (Fellowship of Independent Evangelical Churches) (www.fiec.org.uk).

If you broke the church open like a stick of Blackpool rock these are the values you would find running through the centre:

G – God centred life
L – Learning to grow to be like Christ
O – Open arms reaching out to the world
R – Real relationships
Y – Yes to service

For the remaining years the Lord gives them, they would like to work as part of a team, holding up their arms and being of help wherever they can, seeking to encourage believers and to reach the unconverted.

Please pray for them in this new sphere of ministry.

Contact: Rehoboth Christian Centre, Collingwood Avenue, Blackpool, FY3 8RJ.
T: 01253 304210.
E: info@rcchblackpool.com

Steve and Janice eph11723@aol.com or mcoworthuk@aol.com
FIRST SUPPORTING CHURCH...

Victory Church of the Nazarenes held a mission month this October featuring Missionary Ministries. We were able to present the ministry for 10 minutes in both morning services each week as well as take the entire service on 2 of the Sunday evenings. It was a real success and real challenge to us. The pastor had requested ministry brochures be inserted into all bulletins, so the completion of this brochure was another first for us. From this church, we have received prayer support, vehicle donations, technical, moral and financial support. In this picture, Tom is presenting a ‘Certificate of Appreciation’ to Pastor Rocky Hambrick.

THANK ‘YOU’ FOR AFFECTING THE WORLD

“We really appreciate your hearts and vision to provide this service. There are others who do something similar, but only for missionaries from their own denomination. We are very grateful!” … Germany

“I just wanted to say how much we have appreciated … your personal ministry of wheels for missionaries. Again, your ministry & friendship is much appreciated. The Lord bless.” … Papua New Guinea

“Having Tom pick me up and drop me off at the airport is a HUGE BLESSING every time he has done so. Your ministry is incredible. Thanks so very much.” … Chile

MISSIONARY MINISTRIES’ MEDIA DEBUT...

During the months of May and June, Tom was privileged to appear on a local television program, ‘Life As a Christian’. Tom was given opportunity to speak for almost the entire half hour each time, and then each program aired 3 days a week on two cable networks for the entire month. Tom was able to present the ministry as well as encourage those watching with God’s winning combination for their lives. DVDs and videos of this program were made and are now in other countries! Isn’t God amazing???

EMAIL PRAYER MINISTRY

Missionary Ministries has over 60 people praying daily for the needs of this ministry. Emails are sent out regularly to all who wish to support the ministry in prayer and, we knew without a doubt, that this is the backbone of this ministry. It is prayer that moves the hand of God and we rely heavily on our prayer partners and are grateful for each one of them! A special thank you to all who have partnered with us in this way. Without you, we could not do it!!

SHARING OUR MINISTRY NEEDS:

- New prayer partners to join our prayer ministry
- Technical help for the website and office work
- An individual to help with day to day preparation and maintenance of vehicles
- Replacement and repairs of various vehicles
- Donations of newer cars/vans or finances to purchase the same
- Individuals and churches who will provide monthly financial support

CONTACT INFO: Missionary Ministries, 4020 58th Ave. N., St. Petersburg, FL 33714 missionarymphilministries@juno.com

OFFICE WORK

Although her computer skills are being stretched and she is still very much in the process of learning, Lois enjoys tackling the varied aspects of this end of the ministry. Some of these include responding to the numerous requests for vehicles, writing newsletters and creating documents. Her favorite part is our email prayer ministry! Lois is pictured here doing the print job on our very first brochure.

MERRY CHRISTMAS TO YOU!

Again, we have reached the time of year when we celebrate the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ. Due to the many happenings of this year, Tom and I will be unable to send out personal Christmas greetings and wishes. As a result, we want to take this opportunity to do two things. Firstly, we wish each and every one of you God’s richest blessings now and throughout the coming year. May you truly have a blessed Christmas season! And also, because He is the Reason for this season, we say ‘Happy Birthday Jesus!’.
Appendix C

Public Comment
No public comment has been received as of May 1, 2017.
Appendix D
Additional Photographs of Subject Property
Figure 1: The Frank Broadfield House, facing southeast

Figure 2: East elevation showing relationship between original house and 1966 addition
Figure 3: Western side of north-facing façade, showing flat-roofed sunroom, stone chimney, and cylindrical clay tile pipe vents.

Figure 4: Detail of boxed cornice, south elevation.
Figure 5: Interior gate at top of stairs

Figure 6: Detail of rounded interior walls
COMMUNITY PLANNING and PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Prepared by the Planning & Economic Development Department,
Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division

For Public Hearing on Tuesday, May 9, 2017
at 3:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, City Hall,
175 Fifth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

Application: CITY FILE LDR 2017-05: Amendment Section 16.30.070, Land Development Regulations ("LDRs"), Chapter 16, City Code of Ordinances, making minor clarifications to the City's Historic and Archaeological Preservation Overlay. The purpose of this application is to implement minor text amendments that will help clarify the regulations and remove ambiguity that has been identified since implementation of the 2015 update.

Subject: HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION ORDINANCE

Applicant: City of St. Petersburg
275 5th Street North
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701

Request: Staff recommends that the Community Planning and Preservation Commission ("CPPC"), in its capacity as the Land Development Regulation Commission ("LDRC"), make a finding of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and recommend to City Council APPROVAL of the City Code, Chapter 16, text amendments described in this report.

Authority: Pursuant to Section 16.80.030.1 of the City Code of Ordinances, the CPPC, acting as the LDRC for the purposes of and as required by the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act to review and evaluate proposed modifications to the LDRs related to historic and archaeological preservation, to review and evaluate proposed historic designations, certificates of appropriateness and any other action to be performed pursuant to the Historic and Archaeological Preservation Overlay Section (currently Sec. 16.30.070)

Background: On August 20, 2015, the City Council adopted Ordinance 157-H amending Section 12-6(8), Section 16.30.070, and Section 16.70 of the City Code. The adoption was a culmination of several years of partnership between City staff and residents to update the Historic and Archaeological Preservation Overlay section of the city code.
The City of St. Petersburg is a Certified Local Government ("CLG"). The CLG program links three (3) levels of government (federal, state and local) into a preservation partnership for the identification, evaluation and protection of historic properties. The program was first enacted on the federal level as part of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980. On the state and local level, Florida’s CLG program and the City of St. Petersburg’s CLG designation were both established in 1986. Since that time, the CLG program has assisted in the survey, designation and preservation of historic and cultural resources citywide and helped to increase the public awareness of historic preservation.

In accordance with the conditions of its CLG designation, St. Petersburg makes historic preservation a public policy through maintenance of a historic and archaeological preservation ordinance. The purpose of this application is to implement minor text amendments that will help clarify the regulations and remove ambiguity that has been identified since implementation of the 2015 update.

Text amendments are identified in a strikethrough-underline format on the attached. Text amendments generally relate to the following key subjects:

1. **Application Requirements, Who is Authorized to Submit.** Clarify who is authorized to submit an application for designation of an individual, local landmark where property owners are co-located within a multi-family development, for e.g. condominium complex. The purpose of this clarification is to state that a homeowners’ association has the authority to submit an application for individual, local landmark designation. (Section 16.30.070.2.5.B, Page 7)

2. **Application Fee Waiver.** Clarify when an application fee for local landmark designation may be waived. The current language is ambiguous and has been interpreted by some to mean that any contributing resource to a National Register district shall not be charged a fee when applying for an individual, local landmark designation. Since the detailed property research required for an individual listing on the National Register is more substantial than the basic research required for determining a contributing resource to a National Register district, the application fee waiver should only apply when the property is individually listed on the National Register. The detailed property research required for an individual, local landmark designation was presumably completed at the time of individual listing on the National Register; therefore, staff time is significantly reduced. A contributing resource to a National Register district, without individual listing, will not qualify for the waiver. (Section 16.30.070.2.5.B, Page 7)

3. **City-Issued Ballots and Postage, Who Pays?** The code does not assign responsibility for paying the postage when mailing City-issued ballots. Ballots are distributed for the purpose of determining whether a proposal to establish a local historic district meets the minimum threshold of public support required for initiating an application. This amendment will clarify that postage shall be paid by the applicant. (Section 16.30.070.2.5.B, Page 8)

4. **Minimum District Size.** The code does not require a minimum district size for the purpose of considering an application for designation of a local historic district. This amendment will establish that a local historic district shall be no smaller than one roadway segment containing two opposing block faces; or where one roadway segment is a major street as identified on the Future Major Streets Map in the Comprehensive Plan, only one block face is required. (Section 16.30.070.2.5.B, Page 8)
5. **Individual vs. District Designation, Five-Year Prohibition Reapplication.** When applying the five-year prohibition for reapplication, the code does not distinguish between applications for an individual, local landmark and a local historic district. This amendment will clarify that a new application for designation of an individual, local landmark may be initiated by a non-owner or the City Council at any time, even though the property is located within the boundary of a failed local historic district application and inside the five-year prohibition period. (Section 16.30.070.2.5.C, Page 9)

6. **Supermajority vs. Simple Majority Vote.** Clarify when a simple majority and supermajority vote is required. The proposed amendments do not change the current regulations rather they simply restate the standard in a more clear and precise way. (Section 16.30.070.2.5.I, Page 13)

Compliance with Comprehensive Plan:
The following objectives and policies from the City's Comprehensive Plan are applicable to the attached proposed amendments:

**Objective HP1:** To continue to promote the preservation of resources through the commitment to conduct historic and archaeological resource surveys and the continued development of ordinances, guidelines and databases.

**Objective HP2:** To continue to develop programs and policies to protect and preserve the City's historic resources.

**Objective HP3:** To support the programs and incentives provided by local, state and national preservation organizations.

*Policy HP3.5:* The City will continue to review its land use and Land Development Regulations and consider initiating amendments to such regulations to remove unnecessary disincentives to the reuse and redevelopment of historic landmarks. The City will solicit input from appropriate local and state organizations and interest groups.

**Objective LU7:** The City will continue to revise and amend the land development regulations, as necessary, to ensure compliance with the requirements of Chapter 163.3202, Florida Statutes [and Chapter 9J-24 F.A.C.]. The City will amend its land development regulations consistent with the requirements of Chapter 163.3202, Florida Statutes [and Chapter 9J-24 F.A.C.] so that future growth and development will continue to be managed through the preparation, adoption, implementation and enforcement of land development regulations that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

*Policy LU7.1:* Pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 163.3202 F.S. and Chapter 9J-24 F.A.C. the land development regulations will be amended, as necessary, to ensure consistency with the goals, objectives and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

**Objective LU20:** The City shall, on an ongoing basis, review and consider for adoption, amendments to existing and/or new innovative land development regulations that can provide additional incentives for the achievement of Comprehensive Plan Objectives.

*Policy LU20.1:* The City shall continue to utilize its innovative development regulations and staff shall continue to examine new innovative techniques by working with the private sector, neighborhood groups, special interest groups and by monitoring regulatory innovations to identify potential solutions to development issues that provide incentives for the achievement of the goals, objectives and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

---

1 Chapter 9J-24 F.A.C. is no longer a valid reference in State statute. As of this writing, the city's Comprehensive Plan has not been updated to reflect this legislative change.
**Housing Statement:**
The proposed amendments will have a minimal impact on housing affordability, availability or accessibility. A Housing Affordability Impact Statement is attached.

**Attachments:**
1. Proposed text amendments, strikethrough and underline
2. Housing Affordability Statement
SECTION 16.30.070. - HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION OVERLAY

Sections:

Footnotes:

--- (10) ---

State Law reference— Historical resources, F.S. ch. 267.

16.30.070.1. - Generally.

16.30.070.2. - Preservation of historic properties.

16.30.070.2.1. Purpose and declaration of public policy.

A. The City Council declares as a matter of public policy that the preservation, protection, perpetuation and use of local landmarks is a public necessity because they have a special historic, architectural, archaeological, aesthetic or cultural interest and value and thus serve as visible and tangible reminders of the history and heritage of this City, the state and nation. The Council finds that this section benefits the City's residents and property owners and declares as a matter of public policy that this section is required in the interest of the health, prosperity, safety, welfare and economic well-being of the people.

B. The purpose of this section is to:

1. Effect and accomplish the preservation, protection, perpetuation and use of local landmarks having a special historic, architectural, archaeological, aesthetic or cultural interest and value to this City, the state and nation;

2. Promote the educational, cultural, economic and general welfare of the people and to safeguard the City's history and heritage as embodied and reflected in such local landmarks;

3. Stabilize and improve property values in historic districts and in the City as a whole;

4. Foster civic pride in the value of notable accomplishments of the past;

5. Strengthen the economy of the City;

6. Protect and enhance the City's attractions to residents, tourists and visitors and serve as a support and stimulus to business and industry;

7. Enhance the visual and aesthetic character, diversity and interest of the City;

8. Provide for incentives to renovate or rehabilitate historic structures by implementing State law (currently F.S. §§ 196.1997 and 196.1998) relating to exemption of certain ad valorem taxes for historic properties.
16.30.070.2.2. Definitions.

Definitions shall be as provided in the rules of interpretation and definitions section and Chapter 1.

16.30.070.2.3. Designation of Community Planning and Preservation Commission.

It is hereby established that the Community Planning and Preservation Commission shall serve as the Commission responsible for matters pertaining to historic and archaeological preservation as provided in this overlay section. It is the City Council's intent that this Commission shall meet the requirements of the state and federal Certified Local Government program. When a new member is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by City Council, the professional education and qualifications of the new member should be considered to ensure that the requirements of the Certified Local Government program are met. When necessary, persons serving on the Commission shall attend educational meetings to develop a special interest, experience or knowledge in history, architecture, or related disciplines.

16.30.070.2.4. Powers and duties of the Commission.

A. In addition to the powers and duties stated elsewhere, the Commission shall take action necessary and appropriate to accomplish the purposes of this section. These actions may include, but are not limited to:

1. Continuing the survey and inventory of historic buildings and areas and archaeological sites and the plan for their preservation;

2. Recommending the designation of local landmarks;

3. Regulating alterations, demolitions, relocations, and new construction to local landmarks;

4. Recommending specific design review criteria for local landmarks;

5. Working with and advising the federal, state and county governments and other departments or commissions of the City;

6. Advising and assisting property owners and other persons and groups including neighborhood organizations who are interested in historic preservation;

7. Initiating plans for the preservation and rehabilitation of individual historic buildings; and

8. Undertaking educational programs including the preparation of publications and placing of historic markers.

B. The Commission shall review all nominations of a local property to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) following the regulations of the Florida Division of Historical Resources. The Commission shall also ask the Mayor and the chairman of the Board of County Commissioners for their written opinion as to whether or not each property should be nominated to the NRHP. The Commission shall conduct a public hearing to consider the nomination and publish and mail notice as provided in the supplemental notice section of the application and procedures section. When necessary, the Commission shall seek expert advice before evaluating the nomination. The Commission shall forward to the state historic preservation officer its action on the nomination and the recommendations of the local officials.

When a property owner objects to having their property nominated to the National Register, a notarized written statement from the property owner must be requested by the POO before the nomination is
considered. The Commission may then continue its review, forwarding its recommendation to the state historic preservation officer noting the property owner's objection or it may cease any further review process and notify the state historic preservation officer of the property owner's objection to the proposed listing.

C. In the development of the certified local government program, the City Council may ask the Commission to perform other responsibilities that may be delegated to the City under the National Historic Preservation Act.

D. The Commission shall conduct at least four public hearings a year to consider historic preservation issues. The Commission shall prepare and keep on file available for public inspection a written annual report of its historic preservation activities, cases, decisions, qualifications of members and other historic preservation work.

E. The Commission shall receive assistance in the performance of its historic preservation responsibilities from the POD who shall provide expertise in historic preservation or a closely related field. Other City staff members may be asked to assist the Commission by providing technical advice or helping in the administration of this section.

16.30.070.2.5. Designation of local landmarks.

A. *Generally.* Upon recommendation of the Commission, the City Council shall consider local landmark designation by ordinance of individual buildings, structures, objects, archaeological sites, local historic districts and multiple property landmarks. An application for the creation of TDR, H credits and/or for a historic ad valorem tax exemption may be processed simultaneously with an application for designation.

B. *Application requirements.* Consideration of the designation of a local landmark shall be initiated by the filing of an application for designation by the property owner, any resident of the City, or any organization in the City, including the City. Where multiple property owners are co-located within a multi-family development or building (e.g., condominiums, townhouses, etc.), the owners' representative association (e.g., a condominium or homeowners association) may submit an application for individual designation of the multi-family development or building. The City shall charge a fee for each application. Such fee shall be waived for City-initiated applications and/or where properties are individually listed in the NRHP or are the subject of an active application for individual listing in the NRHP. This fee exemption does not include contributing resources to a district listing in the NRHP. Or, upon demonstration of a pending application, proposed to be listed in the NRHP. The POD shall determine when an application is complete and may request additional information when such application is determined to be incomplete.

1. Generally. The applicant shall complete an application form provided by the POD which shall include:
   a. A written description of the architectural, historical, or archaeological significance of the proposed local landmark specifically addressing and documenting those related points contained in the criteria of this section;
   b. The date of construction of each of the structures on the property;
   c. Photographs of the property; and
   d. The legal description and a map of the property to be designated as a local landmark or upon which the local landmark is located.
2. Additional requirements for historic districts. On applications for the designation of historic districts, the applicant shall also submit:

a. Evidence of the support of the historic district from the owners of 50 percent plus one tax parcel (50% + 1) (e.g. if there are 201 tax parcels, 50% = 100 ½ tax parcels, plus one would equal 101 ½ which would mean 102 tax parcels must vote in favor), of the tax parcels within the proposed district except for City initiated applications. Such evidence shall be obtained in the following manner:

1) the City shall mail to all property owners of each tax parcel within the proposed historic district, as listed in the Public Records of Pinellas County, and at the applicant’s sole expense, a City issued ballot requesting the owner to return by mail a signed ballot showing support or opposition/nonsupport for the application;

2) the POD shall obtain a certificate of mailing on the date of the mailing, and only City issued ballots that have a postmark within 60 days of the date of mailing, or have been physically received by the POD within 60 days the date of mailing and have been date stamped by the City, shall be counted;

3) the response for each tax parcel shall be counted as one vote, if more than one owner of a tax parcel responds and one or more owners show opposition/nonsupport then the property shall not be found to support the application; each tax parcel (which may be more than one lot) shall be a “property”;

4) City owned tax parcels shall not have a vote and shall not be counted toward the total number of tax parcels;

5) the POD shall not accept an application which does not meet this requirement. Once a signed ballot is received by the City, the signer’s position may not be changed for the purposes of meeting the requirements of the application minimum (such persons may express any change of opinion or vote in any other legal manner);

6) applications must be filed within six months of a determination by the City that the requirements of this subparagraph have been complied with in their entirety;

7) the POD shall not accept an application which does not meet this requirement;

b. Justification for the formation of the historic district based on the criteria for designation;

c. A written description of the boundaries of the district which shall include a map. The proposed district boundary shall include a minimum of one roadway segment containing two opposing block faces; or, where the roadway segment is a major street as identified on the Future Major Streets Map (currently Map 29) of the Comprehensive Plan, only one block face is required. The proposed district boundary will be evaluated using the criteria for designation and the preference for a geographically definable area or neighborhood; and

d. A list of contributing and noncontributing resources.

C. Additional requirements.

1. When an owner objects to an application involving designation of their property, other than when in a local historic district, approval by the Commission and City Council shall require a super
majority vote. An application for individual designation shall require a simple majority vote of the Commission and City Council. When a property owner is opposed to the individual designation, a supermajority vote of the Commission and City Council when the property owner is opposed to the individual designation is required. An application for district designation shall require a simple majority vote of the Commission and City Council, regardless of whether there is opposition from one or more property owners located within the proposed district boundary.

2. A designation application made by a *non-owner* shall not be made or accepted for a property with an unexpired site plan approval.

3. If a designation application for an individual property has been made by a *non-owner* and has been denied by the City Council, no new application to designate the same property (unless it is part of a local historic district designation application) shall be accepted by the POD initiated for five years from the date of the *failed* public hearing unless initiated by the property owner. The property owner may initiate an application for individual designation at any time, regardless of previous denials.

4. If an application for district designation is denied by City Council, a new application to designate the same or substantially similar district shall not be initiated for five years from the date of the mailing of ballots for the previously failed effort.

5. If an application for district designation is denied by the City Council, a new application for individual designation of buildings located within the boundary of the failed district may be initiated by a *non-owner* or the City Council at any time, unless otherwise prohibited by this subsection.

6. One complete copy of a *non-owner* initiated designation application for an individual property shall be provided to the applicant to each property owner (and may be made to any legal person of interest) as shown in the Public Records of Pinellas County, by certified mail. The application shall not be complete until proof of mailing has been provided to the POD and the POD shall not process the application until complete. The applicant of a *non-owner* initiated designation application for an individual property shall mail notice of each public hearing at least 30 days prior to each public hearing, to each property owner as shown in the Public Records of Pinellas County by regular mail. The applicant shall provide proof of mailing to the POD at least 14 days prior to the public hearing.

5. If a ballot process to initiate a designation application for a historic district has failed, no ballot process to designate the same or a substantially similar district may be undertaken by the City for five years from the date of the initiation of the prior failed ballot.

D. **Criteria for designation of property.** The City of St. Petersburg uses locally adopted minimum criteria modeled after recognized national historic standards for determining the significance of historic properties. At least one or more criteria each, under a two-part test for designation as a local landmark must be met, as evaluated herein. As part of the first test for local landmark designation, a property proposed for designation must meet the general 50-year age requirement. Also under the first test, at least one or more of nine criteria must be met. The second test involves the property’s integrity, of which at least one or more of seven factors of integrity (i.e., location, design, setting, materials, craftsmanship, feeling, and association) must be met; however, feeling and association, without meeting at least one other factor, are insufficient to support designation.
1. The Commission shall recommend the designation of property as a local landmark after the public hearing if the principal structure is at least 50 years old and if meets one or more of the following criteria:
   a. Its value is a significant reminder of the cultural or archaeological heritage of the City, state or nation;
   b. Its location is a site of a significant local, state, or national event;
   c. It is identified with a person who significantly contributed to the development of the City, state, or nation;
   d. It is identified as the work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual work has influenced the development of the City, state, or nation;
   e. Its value as a building is recognized for the quality of its architecture, and it retains sufficient elements showing its architectural significance;
   f. It has distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials;
   g. Its character is a geographically definable area possessing a significant concentration, or continuity of sites, buildings, objects or structures united in past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development;
   h. Its character is an established and geographically definable neighborhood, united in culture, architectural style or physical plan and development; or
   i. It has contributed, or is likely to contribute, information important to the prehistory or history of the City, state, or nation.

2. If a property meets the criteria for designation set forth in paragraph 1. above, then the Commission shall also consider the following seven factors of integrity as they apply to the property. The property shall meet at least one of the following factors of integrity; however, feeling and association, without meeting at least one other factor, are insufficient to support designation:
   a. Location. The place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
   b. Design. The combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
   c. Setting. The physical environment of a historic property.
   d. Materials. The physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
   e. Workmanship. The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
   f. Feeling. The property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
   g. Association. The direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.
In order to be designated as a local landmark, a property shall meet at least one of the following factors of integrity; however, foiling and association, without meeting at least one other factor, are insufficient to support designation.

3. Special properties. Cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historical figures, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructions of historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years shall not be considered eligible for designation unless it is an integral part of a historic district that meets the criteria above or if it falls within the following categories:

a. A cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of significance either from its age, from its distinctive design features, or from its association with historic events;

b. A birthplace or grave of a historical figure of significance if there is not an appropriate building or site directly associated with the historical figure's life;

c. A building or structure removed from its original location but which is significant primarily for its architectural value or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event;

d. An accurate reconstruction of an historic building or structure which was destroyed by catastrophic causes, located in an environment which is compatible with its historic location, presented in an academic manner, and no other building or structure with the same historic significance has survived;

e. A property primarily commemorative in intent if its design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has created its own exceptional significance; or

f. A property achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance and meets one or more of the general criteria.

4. Additional criteria for designation of hexagon block sidewalk preservation areas.

a. Evidence of approval of the property owners of greater than 50 percent of the linear front footage of property abutting the sidewalks (right-of-way) within the area designated in the application at the time the application is submitted to the POD. For the purposes of this subsection and unless otherwise directed by City Council, the City shall be presumed to approve of the application for designation of hexagon block sidewalk preservation areas for all City owned property, excluding rights-of-way, within an area designated in the application. This presumption shall not affect the power of City Council to deny an application. City Council may initiate the designation of a hexagon block sidewalk preservation area without the approval of any owners.

b. The hexagon block sidewalk preservation area contributes an aesthetic or cultural interest and value which enhances the character of the City.

c. A proposed hexagon block sidewalk preservation area shall contain a minimum of four abutting city blocks or a minimum of 1,500 linear feet of sidewalk. Preservation areas should contain at least 66 percent of the total linear feet in hexagon block sidewalks after measuring all sidewalks along the streets within the proposed district.

E. Updating and modifying historic districts.
1. The status of properties as either contributing or non-contributing resources within a historic district may be changed by following the same process as required for the initial designation.

2. The boundaries of a historic district may be expanded to include (an) adjoining property(ies) at the request of the property owner if the property(ies) meet(s) the designation criteria.

3. The boundaries of a historic district may be contracted to exclude (a) property(ies) if the property(ies) no longer meet(s) the criteria for designation and if the contraction does not create an 'enclave' within the historic district or make any portion of the historic district noncontiguous with the remainder of the historic district.

4. Approval of the expanded or contracted boundaries shall follow the same process as required for the initial designation, as described in this section. The Commission and City Council shall only consider the properties to be added or removed and shall not re-evaluate the designation of the entire historic district or other properties which are not included in the request.

F. Public hearings for designations. The Commission shall schedule a public hearing on the proposed designation within 60 days of the submission of a completed application. Notice of the public hearing and notice to the owner(s) shall clearly state the boundaries for the proposed local landmark and notice shall include mailed notice to the owner, and written and posted notice as provided in the applications and procedures section except that no posted notice for an application for a historic district shall be required.

G. Commission recommendation. After evaluating the testimony, evidence, and other material presented to the Commission, the Commission shall:

1. Recommend approval, denial or approval with modifications of the application within 60 days.

2. Within this 60-day period, the Commission may vote to defer its recommendation if adequate information is not available to make a recommendation but shall reconsider the application at the earliest opportunity after adequate information is made available.

3. A written report to the City Council on the Commission's recommendation shall be sent for Council's review and action. If the Commission recommends a designation, it shall explain how the proposed local landmark qualifies for designation under the criteria contained in this section. This evaluation may include references to other buildings and areas in the City and shall identify the significant features of the proposed local landmark. The report shall include a discussion of the relationship between the proposed designation and existing and future plans for the development of the City. The POD shall promptly notify the applicant and the property owner of the Commission recommendation.

H. Permit issuance. When a complete (as determined by the POD) application for designation of a local landmark has been submitted, no permits shall be issued for any exterior alteration, new construction, demolition, or relocation on the property which is the subject of the recommendation until one of the following has occurred:

1. City Council designates the property and a certificate of appropriateness is issued;

2. The application is withdrawn; or

3. The designation is denied by City Council.
4. This prohibition shall not apply to a noncontributing resource within the boundaries of an application for local landmark designation for a local historic district nor shall it apply to permits for ordinary repair and maintenance of contributing resources, as determined by the POD.

I. City Council review and designation. The City Council shall schedule a public hearing on the proposed designation within 60 days of the Commission recommendation. Notice of the public hearing and notice to the owner(s) shall clearly state the boundaries for the proposed local landmark and notice shall include mailed notice to the owner, and written and posted notice as provided in the applications and procedures section except that no posted notice for an application for a historic district shall be required. After evaluating the testimony, evidence, and other material presented to the Council, and considering the criteria for designation, the Council shall:

1. Approve, deny or approve with modifications of the Commission recommendation.

2. Within this 60-day period, the Council may vote to defer its decision if adequate information is not available to make a decision, but shall reconsider the application at the earliest opportunity after adequate information is made available.

3. In addition to the criteria for designation, Council may also consider the relationship of the proposed designation to the existing and future plans for the development of the City.

4. If the Commission recommends individual designation, and the City Council supports the application, then a simple majority vote of the City Council is required to approve the application. When the property owner is opposed to the individual designation, a supermajority vote of both the Commission and City Council is required.

5. If the Commission recommends against individual designation, and the City Council reverses the Commission recommendation, then a supermajority vote of the City Council is required to reverse the Commission recommendation and approve the application.

6. If the Commission recommends district designation, and the City Council supports the application, then a simple majority vote of the City Council is required to approve the application, regardless of whether a property owner located within the district boundary is opposed to the district designation.

7. If the Commission recommends against district designation, and the City Council reverses the Commission recommendation, then a supermajority vote of the City Council is required to reverse the Commission recommendation and approve the application.

A decision to reverse a Commission recommendation, or to approve the designation over an owner objection shall be by a supermajority vote.

Modification of the boundaries of a proposed local landmark is not a reversal of a Commission recommendation so long as a substantial portion of the recommended area is approved.

If a designation is made, the Comprehensive Plan including the land use map shall automatically be amended to show the designation with no further action by City Council necessary.

The POD shall notify the applicant and property owner of the decision relating to the property and shall arrange that notice of the designation of a property as a local landmark or as a part of a historic district is provided to the property appraiser and tax collector so that they may include this information in their public records and with the City Clerk.
J. Amendments and rescissions. The designation of any local landmark may be amended or rescinded through the same procedure utilized for the original designation. Where a physical portion of a local landmark remains, the Commission may consider whether the local landmark has lost its significance as a result of the approval of a COA which required the retention of a portion of the original local landmark.

16.30.070.2.6. Approval of changes to local landmarks.

A. Certificate of appropriateness (COA). No person may undertake any of the following actions affecting a local landmark or property within a local landmark district without first obtaining a COA:

1. Alteration of a designated archaeological site;
2. Alteration to the exterior part of a building, structure or object within the designated boundary of a local landmark;
3. New construction;
4. Demolition; or
5. Relocation, including the relocation of a building into a historic district.

Review of new construction and alterations to designated buildings and structures shall be limited to exterior changes, except when part of an application for an Ad Valorem Tax Exemption. Whenever any alteration, new construction, demolition, or relocation is undertaken on a local landmark or within a local landmark district without a COA, the Building Official is authorized to issue a stop work order.

A COA shall be in addition to any other building permits required by law. The issuance of a COA shall not relieve the property owner of the duty to comply with other federal, state and local laws and regulations.

Certain ordinary repair and maintenance activities, that is are otherwise permitted by law may be undertaken without a COA. The final determination of what work is considered ordinary repair and maintenance shall be made by the POD. Property owners may request the POD to review any scope of work to determine if a COA is required at no charge.

Owners of properties which are subject to a COA review shall make all artifacts from archaeological sites available to the investigating archaeologists for purposes of analysis and for the reasonable period of time needed for the analysis.

No COA approved by the Commission shall be effective for a period of ten days from the date of approval. If during that ten-day period an appeal is made, the decision shall automatically be stayed during the appeal.

B. Application procedures for a COA. Each application for a COA shall be accompanied by the required fee. No permits shall be issued for an alteration, new construction, demolition or relocation affecting a local landmark without first directing the applicant to the POD to determine if a COA is required. The applicant shall complete an application form provided by the POD which shall include the following information:

1. Drawings, sketches, and plans of the proposed work;
2. Photographs of the existing building or structure and adjacent properties
3. A complete written description of the proposed work which clearly describes the building materials to be used;
4. In the case of archaeological sites, a site plan that illustrates the archaeological site boundary and clearly describes any potential impacts or disturbances to the site.

5. The POD shall determine when an application is complete and may request additional information when such application is determined to be incomplete.

6. For relocations, a written statement from the applicant shall be included in the application addressing:
   a. How the proposed relocation of the local landmark will impact the NRHP seven factors of integrity which contribute to its; and
   b. Why the relocation is necessary.

7. Each application for a COA shall be accompanied by the required fees.

C. Review of a COA.

1. The Commission shall hold a public hearing and approve, by resolution, a COA approval matrix for local landmarks and archaeological sites. The matrix shall identify which approvals shall be made by the POD and which shall be made by the Commission. Changes to the matrix shall be made in the same manner. Approval of any action which is not specifically identified on the matrix shall be made by the Commission.

2. The decision to approve, approve with conditions, or deny any application, shall be based on the criteria contained in this section.

3. The Commission shall hold a public hearing after providing mailed and posted notice as required in the application and procedures section for each COA request requiring Commission approval. The Commission may vote to defer its decision if adequate information is not available to make a decision but shall reconsider the application at the earliest opportunity after adequate information is made available. The Commission shall act within 60 days after the close of the public hearing unless an extension is agreed to by the property owner.

4. The decision by the POD to approve, approve with conditions, or deny any application shall be provided to the owner, and the applicant, if different than the owner. The POD’s decision shall be in writing and shall state the reasons for such approval. The POD’s decision may be appealed to the Commission by following the procedures for appeals in the applications and procedures section, however, only the owner may appeal the POD’s decision under this paragraph. The POD shall provide mailed notice to the owner as required in the application and procedures section for each COA request requiring POD approval at least ten days before making a decision unless this time frame is waived by the owner.

D. Modifications to a COA. Modifications to a COA shall be made only by the Commission or POD, based on the approval matrix, after receipt of a completed application by following the procedures for approval of a COA. The POD shall determine when an action affects a local landmark or property within a local landmark district. Modification to any work or materials approved by the COA or any condition of the COA is prohibited without receipt of an approval as set forth herein. Fees for review of a COA shall be established by the City Council.

E. General criteria for granting a COA. In approving or denying applications for a COA for alterations, new construction, demolition, or relocation, the Commission and the POD shall evaluate the following:

1. The effect(s) of the proposed work activity on the local landmark;
2. The relationship between such work activity and other structures on the property or, if within a historic district, other property in the historic district;

3. The extent to which the historic, architectural, or archaeological significance, architectural style, design, arrangement, texture and materials of the local landmark or the property will be affected;

4. Whether the denial of a COA would deprive the property owner of reasonable beneficial use of the property;

5. Whether the plans may be reasonably carried out by the applicant;

6. A COA for a noncontributing structure in a historic district shall be reviewed to determine whether the proposed work would negatively impact a contributing structure or the historic integrity of the district. Approval of a COA shall include any conditions necessary to mitigate or eliminate the negative impacts.

F. Additional guidelines for alterations. In approving or denying applications for a COA for alterations, the Commission and the POD shall also use the following additional guidelines which are based on the United States Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties:

1. A local landmark should be used for its historic purpose or be adaptively fit into placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

2. The distinguishing historic qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall be preserved. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features shall be avoided when reasonable.

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings without sufficient documentary evidence, shall not be undertaken.

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved, as appropriate.

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, texture, and other visual qualities and, where reasonable, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentles: means possible.

8. Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved if designated pursuant to this section. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
G. Additional guidelines for new construction. In approving or denying applications for a COA for new construction (which includes additions to an existing structure), the Commission and the POD shall also use the following additional guidelines:

1. The height and scale of the proposed new construction shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

2. The relationship of the width of the new construction to the height of the front elevation shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

3. The relationship of the width of the windows to the height of the windows in the new construction shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

4. The relationship of solids and voids (which is the pattern or rhythm created by wall recesses, projections, and openings) in the front facade of a building shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

5. The relationship of the new construction to open space between it and adjoining buildings shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

6. The relationship of the entrance and porch projections, and balconies, to sidewalks of the new construction shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

7. The relationship of the materials and texture of the facade of the new construction shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials used in contributing resources in the district.

8. The roof shape of the new construction shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

9. Appurtenances of the new construction such as walls, wrought iron, gates and fences, evergreen, vegetation and landscape masses/features, building facades, shall, if necessary, form cohesive walls of enclosures along a street, to ensure visual compatibility of the new construction with contributing resources in the district.

10. The size of the new construction, the mass of the new construction in relation to open spaces, the windows, door openings, porches and balconies shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

11. The new construction shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district in its orientation, flow, and directional character, whether this is the vertical character, horizontal, character or nondirectional static character.

12. New construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the local landmark or contributing property to a local landmark district. The new construction shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the local landmark and its environment, or the local landmark district.

13. New construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the local landmark and its environment would be unimpaired.

H. Additional requirements and guidelines for demolition. In approving or denying applications for a COA for demolition, the Commission and the POD shall also use the following additional guidelines:
1. The purpose and intent of these additional requirements is to determine that no other feasible alternative to demolition of the local landmark or contributing property can be found.

2. No COA for demolition shall be issued by the Commission until the applicant has demonstrated that there is no reasonable beneficial use of the property or the applicant cannot receive a reasonable return on a commercial or income-producing property.

The Commission may solicit expert testimony and should request that the applicant furnish such additional information believed to be necessary and relevant in the determination of whether there is a reasonable beneficial use or a reasonable return. The information to be submitted by a property owner should include, but not be limited to, the following information:

a. A report from a licensed architect or engineer who shall have demonstrated experience in structural rehabilitation concerning the structural soundness of the building and its suitability for rehabilitation including an estimated cost to rehabilitate the property.

b. A report from a qualified architect, real estate professional, or developer, with demonstrated experience in rehabilitation, or the owner as to the economic feasibility of rehabilitation or reuse of the property. The report should explore various alternative uses for the property and include, but not be limited to, the following information:

i. The amount paid for the property, date of purchase, remaining mortgage amount (including other existing liens) and the party from whom purchased, including a description of the relationship, if any, between the owner of record or applicant and the person from whom the property was purchased, and any terms of financing between the seller and buyer.

ii. The most recent assessed value of the property.

iii. Photographs of the property and description of its condition.

iv. Annual debt service or mortgage payment.

v. Real estate property taxes for the current year and the previous two years.

vi. An appraisal of the property conducted within the last two years. The City may hire an appraiser to evaluate any appraisals. All appraisals shall include the professional credentials of the appraiser.

vii. Estimated market value of the property in its current condition; estimated market value after completion of the proposed demolition; and estimated market value after rehabilitation of the existing local landmark for continued use.

viii. Evidence of attempts to sell or rent the property, including the price asked within the last two years and any offers received.

ix. Cost of rehabilitation for various use alternatives. Provide specific examples of the infeasibility of rehabilitation or alternative uses which could earn a reasonable return for the property.

x. If the property is income-producing, submit the annual gross income from the property for the previous two years as well as annual cash flow before and after debt service and expenses, itemized operating and maintenance expenses for the previous two years, and depreciation deduction and projected five-year cash flow after rehabilitation.
xi. If the property is not income-producing, projections of the annual gross income which could be obtained from the property in its current condition.

xii. Evidence that the building can or cannot be relocated.

c. The Commission may request that the applicant provide additional information to be used in making the determinations of reasonable beneficial use and reasonable return.

d. If the applicant does not provide the requested information, the applicant shall submit a statement to the Commission detailing the reasons why the requested information was not provided.

3. The Commission may ask interested individuals and organizations for assistance in seeking an alternative to demolition.

4. The Commission shall review the evidence provided and shall determine whether the property can be put to a reasonable beneficial use or the applicant can receive a reasonable return without the approval of the demolition application. The applicant has the burden of proving that there is no reasonable beneficial use of the property or that the owner cannot receive a reasonable return. If the applicant fails to establish the lack of a reasonable beneficial use or the lack of a reasonable return, the Commission shall deny the demolition application except as provided below.

5. The Commission may condition any demolition approval upon the receipt of plans and building permits for any new structure and submission of evidence of financing in order to ensure that the site does not remain vacant after demolition.

6. The Commission may grant a COA for demolition even though the local landmark, or property within a local historic district has reasonable beneficial use or receives a reasonable return if:

a. The Commission determines that the property no longer contributes to a local historic district or no longer has significance as a historic, architectural or archaeological local landmark; or

b. The Commission determines that the demolition of the designated property is necessary to achieve the purposes of a community redevelopment plan or the Comprehensive Plan.

7. The Commission may, at the owner’s expense, require the recording of the property for archival purposes prior to demolition. The recording may include, but shall not be limited to, video recording, photographic documentation with negatives and measured architectural drawings.

I. Additional guidelines for relocation. In approving or denying applications for a COA for the relocation of a local landmark or to relocate a building or structure to a property in historic district, the Commission and the POD shall also use the following additional guidelines:

1. The contribution the local landmark makes to its present setting;

2. Whether there are definite plans for the property the local landmark is being moved from;

3. Whether the local landmark can be moved without significant damage to its physical integrity; and

4. The compatibility of the local landmark to its proposed site and adjacent properties.

5. If the structure is a noncontributing resource, the compatibility and impact of the noncontributing resource on abutting contributing resources and the historic district.

6. The property owner may be required to obtain an approved site plan before permits may be issued to relocate a local landmark.
J. Additional guidelines for window replacement. The City's historic preservation office, State of Florida Division of Historic Resources, and U.S. Department of Interior Technical Preservation Services can provide additional information relating to window repair and replacement for individual landmark buildings and properties within local historic districts. While preservation and repair of historic windows is often preferable, property owners may replace windows provided that each replacement window meets the following criteria:

1. Impact resistance. The replacement window and glass shall be impact resistant;
2. Energy performance. The replacement window shall be Energy Star qualified for Southern climate zones;
3. Depth in wall. The replacement window shall be setback into the wall the same distance as the historic window;
4. Frame size, shape and exterior trim. The replacement window shall be the same size and shape as the historic window and opening. Historic openings shall not be altered in size. Existing exterior trim shall be retained, where practicable;
5. Configuration. The replacement window shall have the same light configuration as the historic window. If the historic window configuration cannot be determined, the replacement window configuration shall be appropriate to the architectural style of the subject building;
6. Proportions. The replacement window shall have the same visual qualities of the historic window, where commercially reasonable:
   a. Muntins and Mullions. Where provided, muntins and mullions shall have the same dimensions and profile of the historic muntins and mullions.
   b. Muntins. Reproduced as simulated divided lights and affixed tight to the glass, muntins shall have the same dimensions (width and depth) and profile of the historic muntins.
   c. Stiles. For hung windows, stiles shall align vertically and be the same width at the upper and lower sashes.
   d. Top, meeting and bottom rails, and blind stop. The top, meeting and bottom rails of a hung window, including the corresponding blind stop, shall have the same dimensions and profile of the historic window.
7. Finish. The finished surface and appearance shall match the historic window, where commercially reasonable.

K. Additional guidelines for construction in hexagon block sidewalk preservation areas. In approving or denying applications for a COA for construction in hexagon block sidewalk preservation areas, the Commission and the POD shall also use the following additional guidelines:

1. The responsibility for proper repair of hexagon block sidewalks within a preservation area shall be governed by City policies and ordinances.
2. All construction shall be done in accordance with City sidewalk specifications and shall be inspected by the POD.
3. All construction must obtain all required permits.
4. The replacement and/or repair of existing hexagon block sidewalks shall be made with hexagon block.

5. The replacement and/or repair of existing concrete sidewalks shall be made with hexagon block.

6. All new sidewalk construction shall be made with hexagon block.

7. The abutting property owner shall be responsible for the expenses associated with the construction and repair of hexagon block sidewalks as set forth in city policies concerning sidewalk assessments.

L. Additional guidelines for archaeological sites. In approving or denying applications for a COA for activity on archaeological sites, the Commission and the POD shall also use the following additional guidelines which are based on the United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties:

1. Any ground disturbing activity requires approval of a COA. Archaeological resources should be left undisturbed. The existing form, integrity, and materials of the archaeological site should be retained. Ground disturbing activity should be located to avoid known archaeological sites. Where avoidance of ground disturbing activity on or near the archaeological site is not possible, projects shall be designed to avoid or minimize ground disturbance.

2. Stabilization of an archaeological site to arrest and inhibit deterioration is recommended and should be done in such a way as to detract as little as possible from its appearance and significance and not adversely affect its research potential unless adequate data recovery has occurred. Stabilization by vegetation, installation of rip rap or landscape netting, burial, or other alteration will be undertaken only after sufficient research or experimentation to determine the probable effectiveness of the action and only after existing conditions are fully documented. A complete record of stabilization work shall be provided to the City.

3. Ground disturbing activities should be employed only when necessary to provide sufficient information for research, interpretation, and management needs. Excavated areas should be backfilled or otherwise stabilized.

4. The use of heavy machinery or equipment is discouraged and such equipment shall be used in a manner to reduce the impact to known archaeological resources on an archaeological site. The applicant shall provide justification for their use when necessary and their use will be subject to conditions of approval to minimize the impact on known archaeological resources on an archaeological site.

5. For a major disturbance which occurs when preservation of significant archaeological resources in place is not reasonable, a professional archaeologist shall be used to survey the site to determine the potential impact and exact location of significant archaeological resources prior to any ground disturbing activities. If avoidance of an impact is not possible, a professional archaeologist shall document the site, shall monitor construction activities, and shall be given an opportunity to excavate and preserve any archaeological resources. Such work shall be performed by a professional archaeologist who meets the professional qualification standards set forth in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (36 CFR pt. 61).

6. For a minor disturbance which occurs when preservation of significant archaeological resources in place is reasonable but ground disturbing activities will occur on the site, a professional
archaeologist or individuals certified by the Florida Department of State, Bureau of Archaeological Research, Archaeological Resource Management Training shall monitor construction activities.

7. Recovered archaeological resources shall be recorded, cataloged, and curated or reinterred on site when possible. A complete record as to their original location, location to be stored or reinterred, and the stabilization of the site shall be provided to the City.

8. Significant archaeological resources affected by ground disturbing activity shall be protected and preserved.

M. Emergency conditions; designated properties. In any case where the Building Official determines that there are emergency conditions dangerous to life, health or property affecting a local landmark or a property in a historic district, the Building Official may order the remediing of these conditions (including demolition) without the approval of the Commission or issuance of a required COA. The POD shall promptly notify the Commission of the action being taken.

16.30.070.2.7. Appeals.

Decisions of the POD may be appealed to the Commission. Decisions of the Commission may be appealed to City Council.

16.30.070.2.8. Conformity with the COA.

All work performed pursuant to a COA shall conform to all provisions of such COA. The POD may inspect any work being performed to ensure such compliance. In the event work is not in compliance with such COA the Building Official may issue a stop work order. No additional work shall be undertaken as long as such stop work order is in effect.

16.30.070.2.9. Maintenance and repair of local landmarks and property in historic districts.

A. Every owner of a local landmark shall protect the local landmark against any fault, defect, or condition of the local landmark which renders it structurally unsafe or not watertight and shall keep it in good repair including:

1. All of the exterior portions of such buildings or structures including but not limited to all roofing materials and roof components, window glass, window frames and sashes, exterior doors and door frames;

2. All interior portions thereof which, if not so maintained, may cause such buildings or structures to deteriorate or to become damaged or otherwise to fall into a state of disrepair; and

3. In addition, where the landmark is a designated archaeological site, the owner shall maintain the property in such a manner so as not to adversely affect the archaeological integrity of the site.

B. Compliance. The property owner and any other person having possession or control of a local landmark shall comply with the City's minimum building standards and repair the local landmark if it is found to have any of the defects listed above. In addition, the property owner and any other person having possession or control of the local landmark shall keep all property, including vacant property, clear of all fallen trees or limbs, debris, abandoned vehicles, and all other refuse as specified under the City's minimum building codes and ordinances. The provisions of this section shall be supplemental to any other laws requiring buildings and structures to be kept in good repair.

C. Enforcement.
1. The POD and the Commission may work with the property owner to encourage maintenance and stabilization of the structure and identify resources available before taking enforcement action under this section.

2. The POD or the Commission may file a complaint with the POD performing code enforcement requesting that the POD issue a citation to require repairs to any local landmark so that the local landmark shall be preserved and protected in accordance with this section.

16.30.070.2.10. Expedited actions; stop work order; nondesignated properties.

A. The City Council may call a special meeting to review a threat to property that has not yet been designated by the City.

B. The POD may issue a temporary stop work order for a maximum of 15 days or until City Council conducts the special meeting or discusses the property at a regular City Council session within that period. The City Council may request that a stop work order be issued for up to 120 days to provide time to negotiate with the property owner to remove the threat to the property.

C. During the stop work order period the City Council may initiate steps to designate the property. Within the stop work order period the Commission shall meet and seek alternatives that may remove the threat to the property, determine if the property should be designated and make a recommendation to City Council.

D. If a stop work order is requested by an individual or group and the City Council issues a stop work order, the requesting individual or group shall submit a completed designation application form and fee within 30 days from the date the City Council stop work order is issued. If the City Council or Commission does not receive adequate information and documentation concerning the property or if a completed application and fees are not filed within this period, the City Council may lift the stop work order or allow it to expire without taking further action.

16.30.070.2.11. Identification of potentially eligible landmarks which are not locally designated.

In order to protect and preserve the City's historic resources, the City shall discourage the demolition of historic resources which are listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP or the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places.

1. The property records and planning and permitting database should identify all properties listed individually or as a contributing resource on the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places or the NRHP. The property records and planning and permitting database should also identify all properties which are potentially eligible for designation as a local landmark, as approved by the Commission. Eligible landmarks that have been approved by the Commission will have first been determined by the POD to be potentially eligible for local landmark designation. Potentially eligible landmarks are for inventory and assessment purposes only, and have no restrictions or limitations under this section.

2. Upon receipt of a complete application (or substantially complete as determined by the POD) for a site plan that includes demolition, the POD shall delay the processing of the site plan and the issuance of a permit for the demolition of a property which is potentially-eligible for designation as an individual local landmark and which is identified as such in the property records and planning and permitting database, for 30 days.
3. The City will notify by e-mail or letter mailed first class mail to the members of the Commission and any resident or community group who annually files their name with the POD requesting notice of any applications for a site plan that includes demolition for a property which is potentially eligible for designation as an individual local landmark and which is identified as such in the property records and planning and permitting database.

4. The requirement for delay and notice set forth in subsections 1. through 3. of this section shall not apply when:
   a. The Building Official or Fire Chief determines that it is necessary to demolish all or part of a building to protect the safety of the public;
   b. The Building Official determines that the building is structurally unsafe;
   c. The property has been the subject of an application for historic designation which has been denied and which is not on appeal; and
   d. The property has been the subject of an application for a site plan which has been approved and which is not on appeal, and the site plan approval has not expired or been withdrawn.


16.30.070.3. - Archaeological protection and preservation.

   In order to protect and preserve the City's historical resources, the City discourages the destruction of any archaeological resources. The POD may authorize archaeological investigations including, but not limited to, survey of archaeological site boundaries, survey of specified properties in order to locate any previously unrecorded sites, site assessment in order to determine landmark status, and mitigation of archaeological resources in cases where preservation of a resource is determined by the Commission to be infeasible. These investigations may be in conjunction with existing or proposed designations or COA applications. Public records requests made of the City regarding the location of archaeological sites may be subject to F.S. § 267.135, as it may be amended from time to time.


16.30.070.3.1. - Certificate to Dig on property which has not been designated.

   The purpose for requiring a Certificate to Dig on property which has not been designated as an archaeological site is to assist in identifying archaeological resources before they are disturbed, and if necessary, to allow sufficient time to conduct any investigations to determine the location, to evaluate the significance of, and to protect significant archaeological sites and resources in areas identified as potentially having such sites.

   1. Any project that obtains a site plan or building permit which will include ground disturbing activity in a sensitivity “Sensitivity Level 1” zone is required to obtain a Certificate to Dig if it is on property which has not been designated or is not required to obtain a COA.
2. An application for a Certificate to Dig shall be on the form required by the POD which shall include an aerial, a site plan, a description and the location on the site of all proposed ground disturbing activity, and the fee established by City Council. An application for a commercial property or a three or more unit residential property shall not be considered complete unless it includes a report from a professional archaeologist identifying the boundaries of the site, the significance of the site, an analysis of the impact of the proposed activity on the archaeological resources on the site (if any), and recommendations concerning avoidance of adverse impacts or mitigation. Such work shall be performed by a professional archaeologist who meets the professional qualification standards set forth in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (36 CFR pt. 61). Upon receipt of a complete application (or substantially complete as determined by the POD), the POD may delay issuance of the certificate for up to 30 days to allow a local landmark designation application to be filed.

3. If a local landmark designation application has not been filed within 30 days, or has been filed and denied, the Certificate to Dig shall be issued which may contain conditions providing for the curation of any recovered artifacts and, where the archaeological site, or any portion thereof, is not being developed, the avoidance or reduction of ground disturbing activities. The curation of any recovered artifacts should be performed by a professional archaeologist who meets the professional qualification standards set forth in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (36 CFR pt. 61).

4. Decisions to deny, approve, or approve with conditions Certificate to Dig shall be made by the POD. Decisions of the POD require at least ten days public notice to the applicant prior to the decision but shall not require notice to any other person. Appeals of POD decisions shall be made to the Commission, may be made only by the applicant, and shall follow the procedures for appeals set forth in the application and procedures section.

5. The POD shall inspect any work being performed to ensure compliance with the Certificate to Dig. In the event work is not in compliance with such certificate, the Building Official may issue a stop work order. No additional work shall be undertaken as long as such stop work order is in effect. The POD may refer violations of this section to the POD for code enforcement for citation.


16.30.070.3.2. - Human remains.

If human skeletal remains are found, the property owner, person in possession, or applicant for any permit or certificate shall notify the POD and comply with all relevant state laws (currently see F.S. § 872.05).

(Ord. No. 157-H, § 1, 9-17-2015)

16.30.070.3.3. - Prohibited practices and penalties.

Any person who conducts removes or attempts to remove, or defaces, destroys, or otherwise alters any archaeological site or archaeological resource located upon, any land owned or controlled by the City or within the boundaries of a local landmark or sensitivity zone, except in the course of activities allowed
under an approved COA or an approved Certificate to Dig is subject to a $500.00 per day fine for each violation and, in addition, shall forfeit to the City all archaeological resources collected, together with all photographs and records relating to such material. No individual shall be allowed to use a probe, metal detector, or any other device to search or excavate for archaeological resources on public property without the written permission of the City.

(Ord. No. 157-H, § 1, 9-17-2015)

16.30.070.4. - Procedure for ad valorem tax exemption for historic properties.

A. Generally. State statutes (currently F.S. §§ 196.1997 and 196.1998) authorize the City to adopt an ordinance allowing certain ad valorem tax exemptions under the state Constitution for historic properties which meet certain requirements.

B. Definitions. For the purposes of this section, the following words shall have the following meanings:

Assessed value means the total value of a tax parcel (including the structures, land and any other rights appurtenant thereto) as determined by the county property appraiser and shown on the property tax bill sent to the owner of record by the county.

Covenant means the Historic Preservation Property Tax Exemption Covenant required to be recorded to obtain an exemption pursuant to this chapter.

Exemption means the ad valorem tax exemption for historic properties authorized pursuant to this chapter.

Qualifying improvement means:

1. Any change in the condition of a qualifying property which is sympathetic to the architectural and/or historical integrity of the structure as determined by a review for a COA which may include additions and accessory structures (e.g., a garage, cabana, guest cottage, storage/utility structure) so long as the new construction is compatible with the historic character of the building and site in terms of size, scale, massing, design, and materials and preserves the historic relationship between a building or buildings, landscape features and open spaces; and

2. Which occurs as a result of the expenditure of money on labor or materials for the restoration, renovation or rehabilitation of such property; and

3. Which expenditures the property owner can document to the satisfaction of the City; and

4. Which improvements were made on or after the original adoption of this section, July 21, 1994; and

5. That the total expenditure on the qualifying improvement was paid within the two years prior to the date of submission of the request for review of completed work; and

6. That the total expenditure equals or exceeds ten percent of the assessed value of the property in the year in which the qualifying improvement was initiated (expenditures for interior and exterior work, including construction of additions but excluding all recreational facilities, shall be included in the meaning of improvement for purposes of this section); and
7. That the qualifying improvement complies with the COA criteria and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Revised 1990) U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service and F.A.C. ch. 1A-38.

Qualifying property means real property which is:
1. Property designated as a local landmark or part of a multiple property landmark;
2. A contributing resource to a local historic district;
3. A property listed in the NRHP;
4. A contributing resource in a historic district listed in the NRHP; or
5. A property proposed for listing as an individual or contributing resource on either historic register. "Proposed" in this instance means that a local landmark application or NRHP nomination report has been submitted to the City for review or an agreement has been signed by the City or other parties to prepare the local landmark application or NRHP nomination. A property must be officially designated as a local landmark or contributing resource by the City or by the federal government's keeper of the NRHP before the City Council will approve the ad valorem tax exemption request.

C. Ad valorem tax exemption for historic properties. A qualifying property that has completed a qualifying improvement may be granted an exemption from that portion of the ad valorem taxation levied by the City on 100 percent of the assessed value of the qualifying improvement.

This exemption shall not apply to taxes levied for the payment of bonds or to taxes authorized by a vote of electors pursuant to section 9(b) or section 12, article VII of the state Constitution.

D. Ad valorem tax exemption period. Any exemption granted shall remain in effect for up to ten years, with the effective date being January 1 of the year following substantial completion of the qualifying improvement. The exemption shall continue in force if the authority of the City to grant exemptions changes (unless the City is preempted by state law) or if ownership of the property changes (including any change from a tax exempt entity to a tax paying entity except as set forth in the following subsection).

E. Ad valorem tax exemptions for historic properties open to the public. If a qualifying improvement is for a qualifying property that is used for non-profit or governmental purposes and is regularly and frequently open for the public’s visitation, use and benefit, the City may exempt 100 percent of the assessed value of the property as improved from ad valorem taxes levied by the City provided that the assessed value of the qualifying improvement must be equal to at least 50 percent of the total assessed value of the property as improved. This subsection applies only if the qualifying improvements are made by or for the use of the existing property owner. A qualifying property is considered used for non-profit or governmental purposes if the occupant or user of at least 65 percent of the useable space of the building is an agency of the federal, state or local government or a non-profit corporation whose articles of incorporation have been filed by the Department of State in accordance with F.S. § 617.0125. Useable space means that portion of the space within a building which is available for assignment or rental to an occupant. A property is considered regularly and frequently opened to the public if public access to the property is provided not less than 52 days a year on an equitably spaced basis, and at other times by appointment. This exemption does not prohibit the owner from charging a reasonable nondiscriminatory admission fee. If a property that qualifies for
this exemption is no longer used for non-profit or governmental purposes or is no longer regularly and frequently open to the public or if ownership is transferred then this exemption shall be revoked.

F. Application process.

1. Preconstruction application. Consideration of the exemption shall be initiated by the filing of a preconstruction application by the property owner on the form provided by the City prior to the initiation of any work on a qualifying improvement. Qualifying improvements or any portion thereof initiated prior to approval of the preconstruction application shall not be eligible for the exemption.

   a. The property owner shall also provide all information required for a COA review, the proposed cost of the qualifying improvement based on a licensed contractor’s price estimates or other city approved cost estimate method, and a copy of the most recent tax assessment and bill for the property.

   b. The POD shall review and approve or deny the preconstruction application and shall follow the review and appeal procedures for a COA. After such review, the POD shall notify the property owner in writing of the following:

      (1) Whether the proposed work is a qualifying improvement;

      (2) Whether the work, as proposed, is consistent with the criteria for the certificate of appropriateness and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Revised 1990) U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service and F.A.C. ch. 1A-38; and

      (3) Making recommendations for correction of work which is not consistent with the foregoing.

   c. Any changes made to the qualifying improvement after approval of the preconstruction application must receive prior approval by the POD or the Commission to ensure compliance with the criteria set forth herein. Failure to obtain prior approval may result in denial of the exemption.

   d. The property owner must complete the qualifying improvement within two years following the date of approval of a preconstruction application. A preconstruction application approval shall automatically be revoked if the property owner has not submitted a request for review of completed work within two years following the date of approval of a preconstruction application. The POD may grant an extension to this provision for up to six months if such request is made in writing prior to the expiration of the initial period. Any other extensions must be approved by the Commission and shall require a public hearing and notification as set forth for appeal of a COA decision.

2. Request for review of completed work. A request for review of completed work (post construction application) shall be submitted to the POD by January 15 for work completed by December 31 of the prior year. The request for review of the completed work shall include documentation acceptable to the City showing the total cost of, and an itemized list of expenses for, the qualifying improvement. Appropriate documentation may include paid contractor’s bills, canceled checks, an approved building permit application listing cost of work to be performed and any other information required by the POD. The POD may inspect the qualifying improvement to determine compliance with this section. Following the Property Appraiser’s established time frames, the POD shall recommend that City Council grant or deny the exemption and shall notify the property
owner in writing of the recommendation and the date which the City Council shall consider the exemption.

a. If the completed qualifying improvement complies with the requirements set forth in the preconstruction application approval, as amended, this section, the COA, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings and any additional conditions required by the City, then the POD shall recommend that City Council grant the exemption.

b. If the completed qualifying improvement does not comply with the requirements of this section, then the POD shall provide a written summary of the reasons for that determination, including recommendations to the property owner concerning changes to the proposed work necessary to comply and shall recommend that City Council deny the exemption.

c. If the property owner is notified that the improvement does not comply with the requirements of this section, the property owner shall have 15 days from the date of the POD’s notification to respond in writing describing the specific actions to be taken by the property owner to comply. If the POD receives a written response within 15 days, the property owner shall have 30 days from receipt of the written response to comply with the requirements of this section. The POD may grant an extension to this provision for up to an additional (60 days if such request is made prior to the expiration of the initial period. At the end of this period the POD shall review the qualifying improvement and make a recommendation to City Council to grant or deny the exemption based on the requirements of this section.

3. Historic preservation property tax exemption covenant. A covenant in the form approved by the City Attorney must be executed by the property owner for the term of the exemption before an exemption is approved by the City Council. The covenant shall provide that the property owner shall maintain and repair the property so as to preserve and maintain the historic architectural qualities or historical or archaeological integrity of the qualifying property for which an exemption was granted. If the exemption is granted, the property owner shall have the covenant recorded with the deed for the property in the official records of the county prior to the effective date of the exemption which shall be binding on the property owner, transferees, and their heirs, successors or assigns.

The applicant shall provide a certified copy of the recorded covenant to the POD by June 15 or said approval by the City Council shall be void.

If the property changes ownership during the exemption period, the requirements of the covenant must be transferred to the new owner. The property owner may sign a waiver which discontinues the exemption on the property. The exemption will be discontinued beginning with the tax year in which the waiver was received with no penalty to the property owner. The exemption may not be reinstated after the waiver has been delivered to the POD.

4. City Council review and approval of the request for review for completion of work. The City Council shall approve, modify, defer or deny the exemption by resolution within 60 days of the POD’s recommendation. If approved the resolution shall include but not be limited to the following: the period of time the exemption shall be in effect and the expiration date of that period, approval of the covenant, any conditions of approval, the name of the owner and address of the property for which the exemption is granted and a finding that the property meets the requirements of F.S.
§ 196.1997. Said approval shall be conditioned upon receipt by the POD of a certified copy of the recorded covenant.

5. *Reapplication*. A property owner previously granted an exemption may undertake additional qualifying improvements during this period or apply for additional exemptions for qualifying improvements following its expiration. A property owner may not reapply for an exemption for a qualifying improvement which has been denied by City Council.

6. *Notice to property appraiser*. Within 15 days following receipt of a certified copy of the recorded covenant, the POD shall transmit a copy of the approved request for review of completed work to the county property appraiser. The property appraiser shall implement the exemption as provided by State law.

7. *Revocation proceedings*. The City Council may revoke an exemption at any time in the event that the property owner, or any subsequent owner or successor in interest to the property, violates the covenant, fails to maintain the qualifying property according to the terms, conditions and standards of the covenant, the historic character of the property and improvements which qualified the property for the exemption are not maintained or if the qualifying property has been damaged by accidental or natural causes to the extent that the historic integrity of the features, materials, appearances, workmanship and environment, or archeological integrity which made it eligible for listing or designation have been lost or damaged so that restoration is not possible. The POD shall provide written notice of such proceedings to the owner of record of the qualifying property at least ten days before the public hearing. The City Council shall hold a public hearing and determine whether or not the exemption shall be revoked. The POD shall provide written notice of the decision to the owner of record and the county property appraiser.

8. *Civil penalties*. If an exemption is revoked for violation of the covenant required hereby, the property owner shall pay an amount equal to the total amount of taxes that would have been due in March in each of the previous years in which the covenant was in effect had the property not received the exemption, less the total amount of taxes actually paid in those years, plus interest on the difference calculated as provided in F.S. §212.12(3). This payment shall be made to the City within 30 days of the effective date of the revocation. If the City initiates an action in any court to enforce this provision, the property owner shall be liable for all administrative expenses, attorneys' fees and all other costs associated with such action.


16.30.070.5. - Civil penalties.

In addition to any other penalties, any person who violates any provision of this section shall forfeit and pay to the City civil penalties equal to the fair market value of any property demolished or destroyed in violation of this section or the cost to repair or rehabilitate any property that is altered in violation of this section. In lieu of a monetary penalty, any person altering property in violation of the provisions of this section may be required to repair or restore any such property.

City of St. Petersburg
Housing Affordability Impact Statement

Each year, the City of St. Petersburg receives approximately $2 million in State Housing Initiative Partnership (SHIP) funds for its affordable housing programs. To receive these funds, the City is required to maintain an ongoing process for review of local policies, ordinances, resolutions, and plan provisions that increase the cost of housing construction, or of housing redevelopment, and to establish a tracking system to estimate the cumulative cost per housing unit from these actions for the period July 1–June 30 annually. This form should be attached to all policies, ordinances, resolutions, and plan provisions which increase housing costs, and a copy of the completed form should be provided to the City's Housing and Community Development Department.

I. Initiating Department: Planning & Economic Development

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

See attached proposed amendments to Chapter 16, City Code of Ordinances (City File LDR 2017-05).

III. Impact Analysis:

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

No  X  (No further explanation required.)
Yes  ____  Explanation:

if Yes, the per unit cost increase associated with this proposed policy change is estimated to be: $_____________________.

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

No  X  (No further explanation required)
Yes  ____  Explanation:
IV: Certification

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

CHECK ONE:

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

[Signature]
For D.G. May 2, 2017

Department Director (signature) Date

OR

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

Department Director (signature) Date

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