VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY
PUBLIC HEARING

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

REPORT TO THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION FROM DEVELOPMENT REVIEW SERVICES DIVISION, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT, for Public Hearing and Executive Action on September 4, 2019 at 2:00 P.M. in the Sunshine Center (Auditorium), located at 330 5th Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

CASE NO.: 19-33000007    PLAT SHEET: G-2
REQUEST: Approval of a vacation of two 16-foot alleys adjacent to lots 59 to 66, Central Land and Title Co Replat, located between Central Avenue and 1st Avenue North, between Seaboard Coast Line Railroad and 15th Street North.

OWNERS: Fergs Sports Bar & Grill, Inc.
7937 9th Avenue South
Saint Petersburg, Florida 33707

Booker Creek Venture, Inc.
3443 1st Avenue North
Saint Petersburg, Florida 33713

Midtown Real Estate 1 FLP
PO Box 429
Saint Petersburg, Florida 33731

AGENT: Lawrence Powers
P.O. Box 48026
Saint Petersburg, Florida 33743

ADDRESSES AND PARCEL ID NOS.: 1450 1st Avenue North; 24/31/16/14544/000/0590
25 15th Street North; 24/31/16/14544/000/0600
1431 Central Avenue; 24/31/16/14544/000/0610
1421 Central Avenue; 24/31/16/14544/000/0630
1415 Central Avenue; 24/31/16/14544/000/0650
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: On File

ZONING: Downtown Center (DC-1)

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION:

Request. The request is to vacate two 16-foot alleys located within the area bounded by 1st Avenue North (north), Central Avenue (south), 15th Street North (west), and the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad (east). The applicants' goal is to vacate these rights-of-way in order to consolidate the property for redevelopment.

The area of the rights-of-way proposed for vacation are depicted on the attached maps (Attachments A and B) and Sketch and Legal Description (Attachment C). A survey of the property is also included for reference (Attachment D).

Analysis. Staff's review of a vacation application is guided by:
A. The City's Land Development Regulations (LDR's);
B. The City's Comprehensive Plan; and
C. Any adopted neighborhood or special area plans.

Applicants bear the burden of demonstrating compliance with the applicable criteria for vacation of public right-of-way. In this case, the material submitted by the applicant (Attachment E) does not provide background or analysis supporting a conclusion that vacating the subject right-of-way would be consistent with the criteria in the City Code, the Comprehensive Plan, or any applicable special area plan.

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

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

The application was routed to City Departments and Private Utility Providers. Duke Energy, Bright House, Frontier Communications, and Wide Open West (WOW!) all have facilities in the alleys requested for vacation. A condition of approval has been added at the end of this report recommending easements be provided over the private facilities.

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

Approval of the vacation will not deny access to any lot of record. However, access to parking located behind the existing structure at 1421 Central Ave could be substantially impaired if the property were to be sold to a separate owner. Currently, both properties on either side of the alley providing access to parking at 1421 Central Ave are owned by the same entity.
3. The vacation shall not adversely impact the existing roadway network, such as to create dead-end rights-of-way, substantially alter utilized travel patterns, or undermine the integrity of historic plats of designated historic landmarks or neighborhoods.

The vacation of the alleys will not create any dead-ends as the proposal is to vacate all alleys within the subject block. Travel patterns will remain unaffected as only the alley that runs directly north/south is accessible by vehicular traffic and that alley effectively terminates into the parking lot for 1421 Central Ave.

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

The City may have a future need for the right-of-way for public pedestrian access as a part of the Booker Creek trail for bicycle and pedestrian use that is included in the St. Petersburg Complete Streets Implementation Plan as identified by the City’s Transportation Department. The City is currently in a dispute to acquire the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad property, owned by CSX Transportation Inc., abutting the subject properties to the east for the planned bicycle and pedestrian trail that follows Booker Creek. Should the dispute for the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad property not be ruled in favor of the City then the last opportunity to implement the planned bicycle and pedestrian trail would be on the public right-of-way that runs parallel to Booker Creek that being requested to be vacated.

The private utility companies that have facilities in the rights-of-way to be vacated will be protected by the recommended conditions of approval at the end of this report requiring the dedication of an easement.

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

The planned Booker Creek trail for bicycle and pedestrian use is a factor for public health as providing recreational facilities can improve community health and increasing multi-modal transportation options reduces greenhouse gases.

B. Comprehensive Plan

Transportation Element Objective T3 states, “The City shall develop and maintain a multi-modal transportation system that increases mobility for bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users as well as motorists and users of aviation and rail facilities, and that promotes development patterns that reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.”

The Transportation Department has identified a proposed trail traversing the area, see attached Transportation Department Memorandum. The proposed trail would connect the South St. Petersburg area to northern parts of the City, as well as central Pinellas County, by utilizing the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad corridor. However, should the City not be successful in obtaining the rights to the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad corridor then an alternative route utilizing areas along Booker Creek and existing roadways could also serve the purpose of linking the southern and northern parts of the City and County with a bicycle and pedestrian trail.
Future Land Use Element Policy LU18.2 states, "The efficiency of the existing one-way system should be preserved. Direct access to First Avenues North and South from abutting lots should be kept to a minimum. Nearby east-west alleys should not be vacated if additional curb cuts into First Avenues North and South might result."

The requested rights-of-way to be vacated provides direct access to First Avenue North. While there are no existing curb cuts on First Avenue North from the existing alley approval of the vacation will prevent future curb cuts from the alley to First Avenue North. Staff has included a condition of approval at the end of this report that future development shall provide access from 15th Street North, which is a local street, rather than 1st Avenue North.

Transportation Element Policy T2.4 states, "The City should preserve the historical grid street pattern, including alleys, and shall not vacate public right-of-way until it is determined that the right-of-way is not required for present or future public use."

As stated above, the City may have a future public use for the rights-of-way requested to be vacated for public pedestrian access as a part of the Booker Creek trail for bicycle and pedestrian use that is included in the St. Petersburg Complete Streets Implementation Plan as identified by the City's Transportation Department.

Coastal Management Element Policy CM7.3 states, "Development of waterfront locations shall give preference to uses which service and provide access to the public."

If approved, the vacation of the public rights-of-way would eliminate the possibility of future public access to the waterfrontage located along Booker Creek. Should a trail for public bicycle and pedestrian use be necessitated at this location then such use would receive preference over a private use.

Coastal Management Element Policy CM7.5 states, "The City shall require the retention of public right-of-way adjacent to waterfront in the platting and replatting of land unless comparable waterfront access is provided."

The requested vacation of public rights-of-way will require replatting of the vacated alleys and abutting properties. Staff would prefer to retain the existing public right-of-way adjacent to Booker Creek. However, staff has included a condition of approval that if the request is supported then a 16-foot public access easement shall be provided along the boundaries of the existing alleyway that runs diagonally along Booker Creek.

C. Adopted Neighborhood or Special Area Plans

The subject rights-of-way are not within the boundaries of any neighborhood associations; however, they are located within the boundaries of a business district, the EDGE District. The EDGE District Master Plan includes a "Water's EDGE Park" along Booker Creek. However, the plan for the park is primarily located on privately owned property. Due to the fact that the plan is located on privately owned land the Development Review Services Staff is not basing a recommendation of approval or denial on this factor.
Comments from Agencies and the Public. Staff did not receive any calls or correspondence from the public regarding the requested vacation of rights-of-way.

The request to vacate the alleys was routed to City Departments and Private Utility Providers for comments. The Engineering Department's Memorandum dated July 22, 2019 (Attachment F) stated that upon replat there shall be dedicated a Public Stormwater Easement or Drainage Right-of-way conforming to the lines of Booker Creek with additional width adequate for the purposes of maintaining the creek, including a minimum width of 15-feet at the top of each bank for maintenance purposes. The Transportation and Parking Management Department recommends preservation of the alley (Attachment G) as they believe that it cannot be stated definitively that there is no future need for the right-of-way for public use. Transportation identifies Booker Creek as a feature in the EDGE District's proposed Water's EDGE Park, which was approved by City Council in 2017, and the Complete Streets Implementation Plan, approved by City Council in 2019, includes a proposed trail through the abutting property to the east owned by CSX Transportation Inc.

Objections were received from Private Utility Providers, as indicated above. The applicant is aware that facilities exist and will be providing a utility easement through the replatting process.

RECOMMENDATION. Staff recommends DENIAL of the proposed vacation of rights-of-way. If the DRC is inclined to support the vacation, Staff recommends the following special conditions of approval:

1. Prior to the recording of the vacation ordinance the vacated rights-of-way, along with the abutting properties, shall be replatted.

2. Prior to recording the vacation ordinance, the applicant(s) shall address the location of public and private utilities and services by providing private or public utility easements as requested, relocating City and private utilities at the applicant's expense or obtain a letter of no objection from the utility provider. In either case a written letter of no objection from the utility providers is required stating that the easement is sufficient for their interest, that the facilities have been relocated, or that there is no conflict.

3. Prior to recording the vacation ordinance, the applicant(s) shall, per City Code Section 16.40.140.4.4, as a part of the replat process provide a dedicated public stormwater easement or drainage right-of-way that shall be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Department.

4. A publicly accessible 16-foot ingress/egress easement shall be provided along the boundaries of the existing alleyway that runs diagonally along Booker Creek should the City's litigation for the property (Parcel I.D. 24-31-16-0000-130-0100) abutting the subject property to the east not be ruled in favor of the City.

5. Primary vehicular access for any future development shall be provided from 15th Street North, which is a local street, rather than 1st Avenue North and Central Ave, which are major streets. Other than the existing curb cut on Central Ave, there shall be no future curb cuts permitted along either 1st Avenue North or Central Avenue and those existing curb cuts shall be removed upon future development.
6. As required City Code Section 16.70.050.1.1.F, approval of right-of-way vacations requiring replat shall lapse unless a final plat based thereon is recorded in the public records within 24 months from the date of such approval or unless an extension of time is granted by the Development Review Commission or, if appealed, City Council prior to the expiration thereof. Each extension shall be for a period of time not to exceed one (1) year.

REPORT PREPARED BY:

Scot Bolyard, AICP, Deputy Zoning Official
Development Review Services Division
Planning & Development Services Department

REPORT APPROVED BY:

Jennifer Bivla, AICP, Zoning Official (POD)
Development Review Services Division
Planning and Development Services Department

Attachments:
A. Project Location Map
B. Aerial Map
C. Sketch and Legal Description
D. Survey
E. Applicant's Narrative
F. Engineering Department Memorandum dated July 22, 2019
G. Transportation and Parking Management Department Memorandum dated July 23, 2019
Aerial Map
City of St. Petersburg, Florida
Planning and Development Services
Department
Case No.: 19-33000007
Address: 1450 1st Avenue North, 25 15th Street North, 1415, 1421, and 1431 Central Avenue
SKETCH & LEGAL DESCRIPTION

PROPOSED ALLEY VACATION:

A 16 FOOT ALLEY AS PER MAP OR PLAT OF CENTRAL LAND AND TITLE CO. REPLAT AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 4 AT PAGES 15 AND 16 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF PINELLAS COUNTY FLORIDA, BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

AS A POINT OF REFERENCE COMMENCE AT THE SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER OF POLICE COMPLEX REPLAT AS PER MAP OR PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 65 PAGE 40 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF PINELLAS COUNTY FLORIDA; THENCE S89°54'19"W ALONG THE NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF CENTRAL AVENUE A 100 FOOT RIGHT PER MAP OR PLAT OF SAID CENTRAL LAND AND TITLE CO. REPLAT, 126.78 FEET TO A POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE WESTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF SEABOARD COAST RAILROAD, A 100 FOOT RIGHT-OF-WAY AS SHOWN ON SAID MAP OR PLAT OF POLICE COMPLEX REPLAT; THENCE CONTINUE S89°54'19"W ALONG THE NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF SAID CENTRAL AVENUE, 75.96 FEET TO THE SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER OF LOT 65 OF SAID CENTRAL LAND AND TITLE CO. REPLAT AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING OF THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED LANDS: THENCE CONTINUE S89°54'19"W ALONG THE NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF SAID CENTRAL AVENUE, 16.70 FEET TO THE SOUTHEASTERLY CORNER OF LOT 64 OF SAID CENTRAL LAND AND TITLE CO. REPLAT; THENCE N16°47'34"W ALONG THE EASTERN LINE OF SAID LOT 64, 54.51 FEET TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 64; THENCE N47°33'31"W ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 64 AND THE NORTHERLY LINE OF LOT 63 OF SAID CENTRAL LAND AND TITLE CO. REPLAT, 76.60 FEET TO THE NORTH-WESTERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 63; THENCE SO0°09'15"E, ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 63, 104.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 63; THENCE S89°54'19"W ALONG THE NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF SAID CENTRAL AVENUE, 16.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHEASTERLY CORNER OF LOT 62 OF SAID CENTRAL LAND AND TITLE CO. REPLAT; THENCE NO0°09'15"W ALONG THE EASTERN LINE OF SAID LOT 62 AND THE EASTERN LINE OF LOTS 61 AND 60 OF SAID CENTRAL LAND AND TITLE CO. REPLAT, 118.30 FEET TO A POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE SOUTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF SAID 16' ALLEY; THENCE N48°20'12"E ALONG THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 60 AND THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF LOT 59 OF SAID CENTRAL LAND AND TITLE CO. REPLAT, 152.69 FEET TO A POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE SOUTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF 1ST AVENUE NORTH (A 100 FOOT RIGHT-OF-WAY) AS HISTORICALLY MONUMENTED AND OCCUPIED; THENCE N89°56'15"E ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF SAID 1ST AVENUE NORTH, 24.04 FEET; THENCE S48°20'12"E, ALONG THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF LOT 66 OF SAID CENTRAL LAND AND TITLE CO. REPLAT, 156.33 FEET; THENCE CONTINUE ALONG THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 66, S47°33'31"E, 81.11 FEET TO THE SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 66 ALSO KNOWN AS THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 65; THENCE S16°47'34"E ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 65, 63.71 FEET TO THE SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 65 AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING. SAID ALLEY CONTAINS 6,629.82 SQUARE FEET MORE OR LESS.
RE: BOOKER CREEK CENTRAL (Alley Vacation Narrative)

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

June 10, 2019

1. The need for easements for public utilities including stormwater drainage and pedestrian easements to be retained or required to be dedicated as requested by the various departments or utility companies. Reply: We see no need for easements for public utilities since subject alleys currently have no visible utilities within them.
2. Whether the vacation would cause a substantial detrimental effect upon or substantially impair or deny access to any lot of record. Reply: The vacation of the currently platted alleys have no effect on ingress/egress to any lot.
3. Whether the vacation would adversely impact the existing roadway network, such as creating dead-end rights-of-way, substantially alter utilized travel patterns, or undermine the integrity of historic plats of designated historic landmarks or districts. Reply: There would be no impact on any existing roadway network or utilized travel patterns or the integrity of historic plats of designated historic landmarks or districts.
4. Whether the easement is needed for the purpose for which the City has a legal interest and, for rights-of-way, whether there is a present or future need for the right-of-way for public vehicular or pedestrian access, or for public utility corridors. Reply: These alley's have not been used for any purpose by the city or the public in their entire existence over 100 years.
5. The POD, Development Review Commission, and City Council may also consider any other factors affecting the public health, safety, or welfare. Reply: We see no reason that the city would need to retain these alleys.
MEMORANDUM
CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

TO: Iris Winn, Administrative Clerk, Development Services
    Jennifer Bryla, Zoning Official, Development Review Services

FROM: Nancy Davis, Engineering Plan Review Supervisor

DATE: July 22, 2019

SUBJECT: Vacation

FILE: 19-33000007

LOCATION AND PIN: 1421 Central Avenue
                  24/31/16/14544/000/0630

ATLAS: G-2     Zoning: Downtown Center (DC-1)

REQUEST: Approval of the vacation of two 16-foot alleys adjacent to lots 59 to 66, Central Land and Title Co Replat, located between Central Avenue and 1st Avenue North, between Seaboard Coast Line Railroad and 15th Street North.

COMMENTS: The Engineering Department has the following comments regarding this vacation request:

ECID has concern that the existing alleys to be vacated provide the only access to and along the west side of Booker Creek. Since the property will be replatted as a condition of this vacation request, per the requirements for preliminary plat submittal contained in City Code 16.70.050.1.7, the applicant must provide a current survey of the land and all surface features including the creek. On this survey the applicant must show the top of the creek banks and the toe of the creek bank slopes and all other existing structures, surface features, utilities, etc.

Upon replat and per City Land Development Code Section 16.40.140.4.4, when a subdivision is traversed by a drainage way, channel, stream, or other watercourse, there shall be dedicated a Public Stormwater Easement or Drainage Right-of-way conforming substantially to the lines of such watercourses and such additional width as will be adequate for the purpose of maintaining the watercourses and providing the ingress and egress of equipment for this purpose. The width of necessary dedication shall be top of bank to top of bank with a minimum of 15-feet upland of each top of bank for maintenance purposes. The areas dedicated upland of the top of the banks shall be maintained at a level flat slope of not more than 1:12.

Until a survey is provided it will not be possible to determine the impacts of meeting the above criteria.

NED/MJR/

pc: Kelly Donnelly
Correspondence File
CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG
Transportation and Parking Management Department

MEMORANDUM

TO: Scot Bolyard, Deputy Zoning Official, Planning and Development Services Department

FROM: Tom Whalen, Planner III, Transportation and Parking Management Department

DATE: July 23, 2019

SUBJECT: Approval of a vacation of two 16-foot alleys adjacent to lots 59 to 66, Central Land and Title Co Replat, located between Central Avenue and 1st Avenue North, between Seaboard Coast Line Railroad and 15th Street North.

CASE: 19-33000007

The St. Petersburg Transportation and Parking Management Department has reviewed the proposed vacation of two 16-foot alleys located between Central Avenue and 1st Avenue North and between Seaboard Coast Line Railroad and 15th Street North. The Transportation Department does not support the applicant's request, for the reasons given below.

The applicant does not describe the purpose of the proposed vacations in their application. In a letter dated June 10, 2019 from Lawrence Powers to Kathryn Younkin, the alley vacation narrative is provided to address the matters of consideration in Section 16.40.140.2.1.E of the City Code. Paragraph 4 in this Section states "Whether the easement is needed for the purpose for which the City has a legal interest and, for rights-of-way, whether there is a present or future need for the right-of-way for public vehicular or pedestrian access, or for public utility corridors." The applicants' response to this requirement is as follows: "These alley's have not been used for any purpose by the city or the public in their entire existence over 100 years." We believe that it cannot be stated definitively that there is no future need for the right-of-way for public vehicular or pedestrian access. The diagonal alley is located along the western side of Booker Creek. Booker Creek is a feature in several master plans. Booker Creek is located in a proposed Water's EDGE Park in the EDGE District Improvement Plan, which was approved by the St. Petersburg City Council on February 2, 2017. The park is shown to the west of the proposed Booker Creek Trail in the attached illustration. The St. Petersburg Complete Streets Implementation Plan was approved by City Council on May 2, 2019. The Complete Streets Implementation Plan also includes a proposed trail traversing this area (attached). With the uncertainty about the use of the land east of Booker Creek for the proposed trail, we recommend that the City continue to preserve the alley for a potential trail or sidewalk connection from Central Avenue to 1st Avenue North.
Section 16.40.140.4 includes design requirements for improvements associated with platting section. Under paragraph 2, regarding watercourses, it is stated that “Where a subdivision is traversed by a drainage way, channel, stream, or other watercourse, there shall be dedicated a stormwater easement or drainage right-of-way conforming substantially to the lines of such watercourses and such additional width as will be adequate for the purpose of maintaining the watercourses and providing the ingress and egress of equipment for this purpose. Parallel streets or parkways may be required.” Under paragraph 3, it is stated that the “The easement shall either abut or be connected to a public street by a 20-foot wide right-of-way or easement for access. No private facility may be constructed within the easement without a written permit from the City.” The diagonal alley is 16 feet wide, so we question the usefulness of a vacated alley to the applicant. If you have any questions about the Transportation and Parking Management Department’s review of this case, please call me at 893-7883.
STAFF REPORT
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION
REDEVELOPMENT REQUEST
PUBLIC HEARING

For Public Hearing and Executive Action on September 4, 2019 beginning at 2:00 P.M., at The Sunshine Center (Auditorium), located at 330 5th Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

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

CASE NO.: 19-51000003     PLAT SHEET: F-14
REQUEST: Approval of a Redevelopment Plan to allow the construction of two (2) townhouse units (Lot 6).
OWNER: Marni Constructions, Inc.
       17204 Breeders Cup Drive
       Odessa, Florida 33556
AGENT: Igor Savic
       2420 Woodlawn Circle West
       Saint Petersburg, Florida 33704
ADDRESS: 615 and 623 24th Avenue North
PARCEL ID NO.: 07-31-17-1893-003-0070
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 6, Block C, Crescent Park Heights
ZONING: Neighborhood Traditional-2 (NT-2)
SITE AREA TOTAL: 6,350 square feet or 0.146 acres

GROSS FLOOR AREA:

Existing: 3,010 square feet 0.47 F.A.R.
Proposed: 4,120 square feet 0.65 F.A.R. *
Permitted: 4,128 square feet 0.65 F.A.R. **

* Not including the first 300 square feet of garage area or open porches
** The applicant is requesting bonuses to the base floor area ratio standard.

DENSITY:

Existing: 3 dwelling units (43.7 units per acre)
Permitted: 2 dwelling units* (15.0 units per acre)
Proposed: 2 dwelling units** (29.2 units per acre)

* One principal dwelling and one accessory dwelling
** Redevelopment of a portion of the grandfathered density is the subject of this application.

BUILDING COVERAGE:

Existing: 1,452 square feet 23% of Site MOL
Proposed: 2,826 square feet 44% of Site MOL

IMPERVIOUS SURFACE:

Existing: 1,787 square feet 28% of Site MOL
Proposed: 3,326 square feet 51% of Site MOL
Permitted: 4,128 square feet 65% of Site MOL

OPEN GREEN SPACE:

Existing: 3,572 square feet 56% of Site MOL
Proposed: 1,690 square feet 27% of Site MOL

PAVING COVERAGE:

Existing: 335 square feet 5% of Site MOL
Proposed: 500 square feet 7% of Site MOL

PARKING:

Existing: 1 spaces, including 0 handicapped spaces
Proposed: 4 spaces, including 0 handicapped space
Required: 4 spaces, including 0 handicapped space

BUILDING HEIGHT:

Existing: 20-feet
Proposed: 31-feet, 3-inches
Permitted: 36-feet
APPLICATION REVIEW:

I. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS: The applicant has met and complied with the procedural requirements of Section 16.70.040.1.15 of the Municipal Code for site plan review to determine compliance with the criteria for redevelopment.

II. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Background: The subject property is located in the Crescent Heights neighborhood. The lot is approximately 50 feet in width by 127 feet in depth. Property Card records confirm the subject property, Lot 6, was legally developed with two structures, containing a total of three (3) dwelling units. A Business Tax Certificate is active, recognizing the three (3) dwelling units. Continued renewal of the Business Tax Certificate allows for the continued legal existence of the three (3) dwelling units. The current regulations for the NT-2 zoning district allow one (1) principal dwelling unit and one (1) accessory dwelling unit by right. Therefore, the subject property is recognized as having one (1) dwelling unit by right and two (2) grandfathered dwelling units, for a total of three (3) dwelling units. The City Code provides for redevelopment of grandfathered uses, subject to the Commission's approval of a redevelopment plan.

The Request: The applicant seeks approval of a site plan to redevelop the property with a two-unit townhome development utilizing one of the grandfathered dwelling units. The proposed plan requires no variances. A similar two-unit townhome development is proposed on the abutting property to the east concurrent with this application (see DRC Case 19-51000004). The two townhome developments require separate applications as the applicant is seeking F.A.R. bonuses which are only available on a single originally platted lot.

Current Proposal: The proposed plan is for a two-unit townhome development where both units share an open porch located on the front of the building. The building is two stories and has been designed to look as if it is one single-family residence. The detached garage is accessed from the alley in the rear and contains two parking spaces for each unit, one enclosed and one surface, providing a total of four spaces located on-site. Pedestrian access is provided through the front porch accessed from 24th Avenue North.

Redevelopment Criterion: Pursuant to Code Subsection 16.70.040.1.15, an application for redevelopment must be reviewed for compliance with the criterion. An analysis follows, based on the City Code criterion to be considered by the Commission.

1. Building Type. Structures shall be required to match the predominant building type, setbacks and scale in the block face across the street or abutting residential uses.

Structures on the block face include both one-story and two-story single-family residences, and three two-story multi-family townhouses. The proposed two-unit
townhome is designed with one primary entrance oriented towards the front of the property. The second primary entrance is oriented to the interior of the property and is not visible from the public right-of-way giving the structure the appearance of a single-family residence.

2. Building Setbacks. Structures shall be required to match the predominant building type, setbacks and scale in the block face across the street or abutting residential uses.

The proposed building meets the required setbacks for the NT-2 zoning district, which is consistent with the surrounding development pattern.

3. Building Scale. Structures shall be required to match the predominant building type, setbacks and scale in the block face across the street or abutting residential uses.

One- and two-story residential structures are present along the subject block face and within the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed two-story structure meets the height and setback requirements of the district and is consistent with the building type, setbacks and scale of the block face across the street and abutting residential uses.

4. Site Development and Orientation. Structures shall be required to match the predominant development pattern in the block face across the street or abutting residential uses. If alley access exists on the proposed site, garages and parking areas shall be designed for alley use.

The proposed structures will match the orientation of existing structures on the block face that have their front doors facing 24th Avenue North. Alley access exists in the rear and the redevelopment plan includes garages with required parking facing and accessed from the alley.

5. Building Mass. Building mass shall be regulated by building setbacks and floor area ratio (FAR). The maximum FAR shall be the existing FAR of the property prior to redevelopment or 0.50 FAR, whichever is greater or the FAR plus bonuses allowed in the zoning district.

The proposed development has a 0.65 FAR, while the existing structure on the property has 0.29 FAR. The City Code allows options for FAR bonuses that can be utilized for redevelopments. This application meets the criteria that would allow for an additional 0.15 FAR bonus to the maximum 0.50 FAR allowed for redevelopments, resulting in a maximum 0.65 FAR allowed for the entire redevelopment with bonuses. This is discussed in additional detail below in the section regarding FAR bonuses.
6. **Building Height.** Residential structures for a project less than a platted block shall comply with the building height and roof design requirements of the zoning district.

The proposed structure is in compliance with the building height regulations for a single-family structure in the NT-2 zoning district.

7. **Development Across Multiple Lots.** Structures should be separated by zoning district setbacks; however, if the structures are not separated by zoning district setbacks, there shall be a break in the building and roof planes at each original lot line, equal to or greater than the combined side yard setbacks that would be required for each lot.

While this criterion is not applicable, the proposed townhouse development does meet required setbacks for a single-family structure in the NT-2 zoning district.

8. **Single Corner Lots.** Structures on single corner lots shall be oriented so that the front entrance of the structure faces the legal front yard.

This criterion is not applicable as the subject property is an interior lot.

9. **Traditional Grid Roadway Network.** For projects equal to or greater than a platted block, extensions of the traditional grid roadway network which: 1) abut the perimeter of the project area; or 2) would logically be extended through the project are required. Compliance with applicable subdivision and public improvement regulations is required.

This criterion is not applicable.

10. **Non-Traditional Grid Roadway Network.** For projects equal to or greater than a platted block, roadway and pedestrian networks shall meet the following requirements: 1) There shall be at least two points of entry into the project; 2) Sidewalk connections shall be made to surrounding streets; 3) Streets shall be stubbed to property lines to allow for roadway extensions into abutting properties which may be developed or anticipated to be redeveloped in the future.

This criterion is not applicable.

11. **Density and Intensity.** Redevelopment projects shall not exceed the legally grandfathered number of units or intensity of use (e.g., if the use is office it cannot change to a more intensive grandfathered use such as retail). For mobile home park redevelopment, the maximum number of dwelling units shall be equal to the number of legal mobile home unit spaces (lots) within the park prior to redevelopment, or 140 percent of the maximum density of the future land use designation assigned to the property, whichever is less. No variance from this requirement shall be approved.
The subject property contains one (1) dwelling unit by right and two (2) grandfathered dwelling units, for a total of three (3) dwelling units. The applicant is proposing to demolish all three (3) dwelling units and redevelop the property with two (2) dwelling units. No variances to this requirement are requested.

**FAR Bonuses:** The criteria for Floor Area Ratio bonuses are set forth under Subsection 16.70.040.1.15.

FAR bonuses shall only be allowed for originally platted lots which have not been joined together. Structures on joined or combined lots (two or more originally platted lots) shall not be allowed FAR bonus when developed following the development across multiple lots criteria indicated in Section 16.70.040.1.15.

In this case, there were two buildings containing grandfathered density that were previously developed on Lot 6, a single originally platted lot, which is in compliance with the requirements that allow for FAR bonuses to be utilized.

a. An FAR bonus of 0.10 shall be granted when structures are located in a traditional neighborhood context and designed in a traditional building style as defined by the City's neighborhood design review manual or the Land Development Regulations. To qualify for this FAR bonus, the structure shall use the correct proportions, fenestration patterns, details, and materials. Structures that use finishes common to an identified style without proper design, detailing, and fenestration shall not qualify for this FAR bonus.

The proposed townhouse structure is designed in the Mediterranean Revival architectural style as outlined in the St. Petersburg's Design Guidelines for Historic Properties. The proposed structure has a narrow front that utilizes a low-pitched, front-facing gabled roof with a 4:12 roof pitch on a two-story mass with entrance doors under the porch consistent with the Mediterranean Revival architectural style. Consistent fenestration patterns include windows grouped in pairs to create larger openings that are double-hung with a 6 over 6 pattern. Decorative tile vents on the porch and quatrefoil windows are Mediterranean Revival style details that have been provided on the front façade. Barrel tile roof and stucco cladding materials are also consistent with the proposed architectural style.

b. An FAR bonus of 0.05 shall be granted when structures are finished with decorative wall finishes typical of traditional development. This includes clapboard or single products of real wood, "Hardi-Plank" or the equivalent, rough textured or exposed aggregate stucco, tile, brick or stone. Vinyl or aluminum siding and smooth or knock-down stucco shall not qualify for this bonus.
The plans provided show that the townhome will have a stuccoed finish thereby meeting the criteria for the 0.05 FAR bonus for decorative wall finishes that are typical of the Mediterranean Revival architectural style.

Staff reviewed the plans for consistency with the St. Petersburg's Design Guidelines for Historic Properties to ensure that it meets the design requirements for the Mediterranean Revival architectural style and determined that it is in compliance.

Public Comments: The subject property is located within the Crescent Heights Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood association and all property owners within 200 feet of the subject property were notified of the request. Staff did not receive any correspondence from the neighborhood association. Two emails were received from the public in support of the proposed redevelopment, see attached.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Based on a review of the redevelopment application according to the stringent evaluation criteria contained within the City Code, the Development Services Department Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested variance and redevelopment plan.

CONDITIONS OF COMMISSION ACTION: If the application is approved consistent with the site plan submitted with this application, the Planning and Development Services Department Staff recommends that the approval shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. The plans submitted for permitting shall substantially resemble the plans attached to this report. Significant modifications to the plans shall require a new application and public hearing.
2. The site plan submitted for permitting shall depict all proposed ancillary equipment, such as garbage cans, air conditioning and irrigation equipment. These items shall be provided within interior yards and shall be screened with finished walls and perimeter landscaping.
3. The plans submitted for permitting shall depict all necessary information to demonstrate compliance with the tree preservation requirements set forth under Code Subsection 16.40.060.2.1.3.
4. The plans submitted for permitting shall include all necessary information to demonstrate compliance with the landscaping and irrigation requirements set forth under City Code Sections 16.40.060.2.1.3. and 16.40.060.2.1.4., as applicable.
5. This approval shall be valid through September 4, 2022. Substantial construction shall commence prior to this expiration date. The applicant may request up to two two-year extensions from the POD prior to the expiration. Requests for extension must be filed in writing to the POD prior to the expiration date.
Report Prepared By:

Scot Bolyard, AICP
Deputy Zoning Official
Development Review Services Division
Planning and Development Services Department

Date 8.28.19

Report Prepared For:

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

Date 8.23.19

Attachments: Project Location Map; Photographs; Project Narrative; Redevelopment Plan with site plan, floor plans, and elevations; Property Card Records; and, Public Comments
Project Location Map
City of St. Petersburg, Florida
Planning and Development Services
Department
Case No.: 19-51000003
Address: 615 24th Avenue North

(nts)
All applications for redevelopment must provide justification for the requested redevelopment based on the criteria set forth by the City Code. It is recommended that the following responses by typed. Illegible handwritten responses will not be accepted. A separate letter addressing each of the criteria may be provided as a supplement to this form.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET ADDRESS: 615 29TH AVE. N.</th>
<th>CASE NO.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPLICANT NARRATIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detailed Description of Project and Request:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TWO NEW TOWNHOMES WITH ONE CAR GARAGE EACH ATTACHED WITH AN EXCESS.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Building Type.</strong> Describe how the proposed building type (e.g. single-family homes with garage apartments, duplexes, multi-family uses, etc.) will match the predominate building type in the block face across the street, for projects less than a city block. For projects equal to or greater than one city block, describe how the proposed building type for perimeter structures will match the predominate building type in the block face across the street.**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TWO NEW TOWNHOMES WILL FACE SOUTH AS ALL OTHER HOUSES ON THE STREET WITH ACCESS SEAT Armor.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Building Setbacks.</strong> Describe how the proposed building setbacks (including both perimeter and interior setbacks) will match the predominate building setbacks in the block face across the street, for projects less than a city block. For projects equal to or greater than one city block, describe how the proposed building setbacks for perimeter structures will match the predominate building setbacks in the block face across the street.**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOWNHOME WILL HAVE THE SAME SETBACK AS ALL OTHER HOUSES ON THE STREET, 25 FT FROM AND 6 FT FROM THE STREET AND NO STREET.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Building Type.</strong> Describe how the proposed building scale (one-story or two-story principle structures) will match the predominate building scale in the block face across the street, for projects less than a city block. For projects equal to or greater than one city block, describe how the proposed building scale for perimeter structures will match the predominate building scale in the block face across the street.**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TWO- STORY TOWNHOMES WILL BE IN LINE AS ALL OTHER STRUCTURES ON THE STREET, WITH MAX HEIGHT OF 31 FT.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All applications for redevelopment must provide justification for the requested redevelopment based on the criteria set forth by the City Code. It is recommended that the following responses be typed. Illegible handwritten responses will not be accepted.

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

### APPLICANT NARRATIVE

4. **Site Development and Orientation.** Describe how the proposed site development and orientation (e.g. location of buildings, front entries, driveways, parking, and utility functions) will match the predominate development pattern in the block face across the street, for projects less than a city block. For projects equal to or greater than one city block, describe how the proposed development pattern for perimeter structures will match the predominate development pattern in the block face across the street. If alley access exists on the proposed site, garages and parking areas shall be designed for alley use.

5. **Floor area Ratio Bonuses.** FAR bonuses shall only be allowed for originally platted lots which have not been joined together. Structures on joined or combined lots (two or more originally platted lots) shall not be allowed FAR bonuses. If bonuses are required, please complete the following questions:

   - **FAR Bonus of 0.10** – An FAR bonus of 0.10 shall be granted when structures are located in a traditional neighborhood context and designed in a traditional building style as defined by the City’s Neighborhood Design Review Manual or the Land Development Regulations. Describe the principle architectural style of the proposed building and explain how it uses the correct proportions, fenestration patterns, details, and materials of the recognized style.

   - **FAR Bonus of 0.05** – Describe whether the proposed building is finished with decorative wall finishes typical of traditional development. This includes clapboard or single products of real wood “Hardi-Plank” or the equivalent, rough textured or exposed aggregate stucco, tile, brick, or stone. Vinyl or aluminum siding and smooth or knock down stucco shall not qualify for this bonus.
Address Miscellaneous Information Inquiry

Location ID/subdivision: 463803 CRESCENT HEIGHTS NBRHD ASSN
Parcel Identification Nbr: 07/31/17/18936/003/0070/
Old account number:
Location address: 611 24TH AVE N
Primary related party: MORNI CONSTRUCTIONS INC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>App</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESCR</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>7/15/99</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PROPERTY CARD INTER #99-8047 MLG SIX (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCIN</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>5/29/99</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DWELLING UNITS MAY LAWFULLY EXIST ONSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 DAYS FROM MAY 29, 1999 TO APPEAL TO THE BOA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>7/06/99</td>
<td></td>
<td>N District 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBA</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>6/19/99</td>
<td></td>
<td>CREHT CRESCENT HEIGHTS NBRHD ASSN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNP</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>11/01/95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>10/02/95</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>9/16/95</td>
<td>292410 258267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBDIVISION</td>
<td>CRESCE...</td>
<td>HEIGHTS</td>
<td>LOT</td>
<td>6 N2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#CMF Gar Apt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jcars - #3811A-D</td>
<td>1/19/54</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner George Reyes - install three metal flues (Type VI) City Fuel Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#B8540A-R3</td>
<td>3/18/70</td>
<td>$440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Bronnard - reroof w/Class A tear-off, and 4/12 pitch - L.S. Mullen Roofing, Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTALLATION</td>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>SEWER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#G9862A - 1/17/83 - E. Brousard - Ralph W. Hay Plbg - 1-WH (replace) nat'l gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>M. J. Bennett</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Mrs. Margaret Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>L. R. Lorimer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Fixtures</td>
<td>Clo-Lav-Sink-Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>E. L. Carpenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>10-12-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind Bldg.</td>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>271x25'x24'</td>
<td>10-12-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Act.</td>
<td>3 cars</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Rooms</td>
<td>10-12-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>10-12-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu. Ft.</td>
<td>2000.00</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Fixtures</td>
<td>10-12-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>W. B. Carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>L. R. Lorimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partitions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Mrs. Margaret Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Mrs. Margaret Wood</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>O. K. Date</td>
<td>2-15-37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Owner T. B. Carpenter** - Erect chain link fence 3' and 4' high front and rear yard area (Type V & V1)

**H. L. Coleman, Contractor**

**Owner Mrs. Bill Carpenter** - Tear off on main roof and apply a 20 year type built-up roof 90' on parapet wall (Type VI) Hulston Roofing & S/H, Contractor.

**GAS PERMIT NO.** 11-1725 | Date | 9-26-45 | Sewer PER. No. 4018 | Date | 2-6-37 |

**SEPTIC TANK PER. No.** 19020001 | Date | 2-15-37 | Owner | Mrs. Margaret Wood | Date | 2-6-37 |

**SEPTIC TANK PER. No.** 19020001 | Date | 2-15-37 | Owner | Mrs. Margaret Wood | Date | 2-6-37 |
Scot,  

I currently live (622 24th Ave N) directly across the street from the proposed redevelopment. I'm unable to attend the hearing but please use this email as my vote to APPROVE this proposal. I'm 100% in favor of the development and construction of 2 townhouses.  

Thank you,

Jesse Battle  
Executive Director  
North American Trailer Dealers Association  
P: 727-487-3200
Dear Mr. Scot Boylard,

This email is in regards to the request to redevelop the properties located at:

• 615 24th Ave. N. (Lot 6 in the NT-2 zoning district) & • 609 24th Ave. N. (Lot 7 in the NT-2 zoning district

Both of these mentioned properties are pending approval by the Development Review Commission to grant Morni Construction Inc. permits to construct two (2) townhouses in each of these lots.

I'm a property owner within 200 feet of the lots in question. As a matter of fact I live at 616 24th Ave N in a townhouses duplex facing directly across the street from the proposed redevelopment. I'm unable to attend the public hearing but please use this written correspondence as my unanimous vote to APPROVE this plan proposal. I'm 100% in favor of the development and construction of 4 townhouses. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Patricia L. Diaz-Beselin
STAFF REPORT
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION
REDEVELOPMENT REQUEST
PUBLIC HEARING

For Public Hearing and Executive Action on September 4, 2019 beginning at 2:00 P.M., at The Sunshine Center (Auditorium), located at 330 5th Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida

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

CASE NO.: 19-51000004 PLAT SHEET: F-14
REQUEST: Approval of a Redevelopment Plan to allow the construction of two (2) townhouse units (Lot 7).
OWNER: Marni Constructions, Inc.
17204 Breeders Cup Drive
Odessa, Florida 33556-6200
AGENT: Igor Savic
2420 Woodlawn Circle West
Saint Petersburg, Florida 33704
ADDRESS: 609 and 611 24th Avenue North
PARCEL ID NO.: 07-31-17-18936-003-0070
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 7, Block C, Crescent Park Heights
ZONING: Neighborhood Traditional Single-Family (NT-2)
### SITE AREA TOTAL:
6,350 square feet or 0.146 acres

### GROSS FLOOR AREA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing: 1,812 square feet</th>
<th>0.29 F.A.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed:</td>
<td>4,120 square feet</td>
<td>0.65 F.A.R. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted:</td>
<td>4,128 square feet</td>
<td>0.65 F.A.R. **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not including the first 300 square feet of garage area or open porches
** The applicant is requesting bonuses to the base floor area ratio standard.

### DENSITY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing: 3 dwelling units</th>
<th>(43.7 units per acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted:</td>
<td>2 dwelling units*</td>
<td>(15.0 units per acre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed:</td>
<td>2 dwelling units**</td>
<td>(29.2 units per acre)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One principal dwelling and one accessory dwelling
** Redevelopment of a portion of the grandfathered density is the subject of this application.

### BUILDING COVERAGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing: 1,306 square feet</th>
<th>20% of Site MOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed:</td>
<td>2,826 square feet</td>
<td>44% of Site MOL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMPERVIOUS SURFACE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing: 1,563 square feet</th>
<th>24% of Site MOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed:</td>
<td>3,326 square feet</td>
<td>51% of Site MOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted:</td>
<td>4,128 square feet</td>
<td>65% of Site MOL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPEN GREEN SPACE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing: 4,262 square feet</th>
<th>67% of Site MOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed:</td>
<td>1,690 square feet</td>
<td>27% of Site MOL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PAVING COVERAGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing: 257 square feet</th>
<th>4% of Site MOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed:</td>
<td>500 square feet</td>
<td>7% of Site MOL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARKING:

- Existing: 1 spaces, including 0 handicapped spaces
- Proposed: 4 spaces, including 0 handicapped space
- Required: 4 spaces, including 0 handicapped space

### BUILDING HEIGHT:

- Existing: 20-feet
- Proposed: 31-feet, 3-inches
- Permitted: 36-feet
APPLICATION REVIEW:

I. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS: The applicant has met and complied with the procedural requirements of Section 16.70.040.1.15 of the Municipal Code for site plan review to determine compliance with the criteria for redevelopment.

II. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Background: The subject property is located in the Crescent Heights neighborhood. The lot is approximately 50 feet in width by 127 feet in depth. Property Card records confirm the subject property, Lot 6, was legally developed with two structures, containing a total of three (3) dwelling units. A Business Tax Certificate is active, recognizing the three (3) dwelling units. Continued renewal of the Business Tax Certificate allows for the continued legal existence of the three (3) dwelling units. The current regulations for the NT-2 zoning district allow one (1) principal dwelling unit and one (1) accessory dwelling unit by right. Therefore, the subject property is recognized as having one (1) dwelling unit by right and two (2) grandfathered dwelling units, for a total of three (3) dwelling units. The City Code provides for redevelopment of grandfathered uses, subject to the Commission's approval of a redevelopment plan.

The Request: The applicant seeks approval of a site plan to redevelop the property with a two-unit townhome development utilizing one of the grandfathered dwelling units. The proposed plan requires no variances. A similar two-unit townhome development is proposed on the abutting property to the west concurrent with this application (see DRC Case 19-51000003). The two townhome developments require separate applications as the applicant is seeking F.A.R. bonuses which are only available on a single originally platted lot.

Current Proposal: The proposed plan is for a two-unit townhome development where both units share an open porch located on the front of the building. The building is two stories and has been designed to look as if it is one single-family residence. The detached garage is accessed from the alley in the rear and contains two parking spaces for each unit, one enclosed and one surface, providing a total of four spaces located on-site. Pedestrian access is provided through the front porch accessed from 24th Avenue North.

Redevelopment Criterion: Pursuant to Code Subsection 16.70.040.1.15, an application for redevelopment must be reviewed for compliance with the criterion. An analysis follows, based on the City Code criterion to be considered by the Commission.

1. Building Type. Structures shall be required to match the predominant building type, setbacks and scale in the block face across the street or abutting residential uses.

   Structures on the block face include both one-story and two-story single-family residences, and three two-story multi-family townhouses. The proposed two-unit
townhome is designed with one primary entrance oriented towards the front of the property. The second primary entrance is oriented to the interior of the property and is not visible from the public right-of-way giving the structure the appearance of a single-family residence.

2. Building Setbacks. *Structures shall be required to match the predominant building type, setbacks and scale in the block face across the street or abutting residential uses.*

The proposed building meets the required setbacks for the NT-2 zoning district, which is consistent with the surrounding development pattern.

3. Building Scale. *Structures shall be required to match the predominant building type, setbacks and scale in the block face across the street or abutting residential uses.*

One- and two-story residential structures are present along the subject block face and within the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed two-story structure meets the height and setback requirements of the district and is consistent with the building type, setbacks and scale of the block face across the street and abutting residential uses.

4. Site Development and Orientation. *Structures shall be required to match the predominant development pattern in the block face across the street or abutting residential uses. If alley access exists on the proposed site, garages and parking areas shall be designed for alley use.*

The proposed structures will match the orientation of existing structures on the block face that have their front doors facing 24th Avenue North. Alley access exists in the rear and the redevelopment plan includes garages with required parking facing and accessed from the alley.

5. Building Mass. *Building mass shall be regulated by building setbacks and floor area ratio (FAR). The maximum FAR shall be the existing FAR of the property prior to redevelopment or 0.50 FAR, whichever is greater or the FAR plus bonuses allowed in the zoning district.*

The proposed development has a 0.65 FAR, while the existing structure on the property has 0.29 FAR. The City Code allows options for FAR bonuses that can be utilized for redevelopments. This application meets the criteria that would allow for an additional 0.15 FAR bonus to the maximum 0.50 FAR allowed for redevelopments, resulting in a maximum 0.65 FAR allowed for the entire redevelopment with bonuses. This is discussed in additional detail below in the section regarding FAR bonuses.
6. **Building Height.** Residential structures for a project less than a platted block shall comply with the building height and roof design requirements of the zoning district.

The proposed structure is in compliance with the building height regulations for a single-family structure in the NT-2 zoning district.

7. **Development Across Multiple Lots.** Structures should be separated by zoning district setbacks; however, if the structures are not separated by zoning district setbacks, there shall be a break in the building and roof planes at each original lot line, equal to or greater than the combined side yard setbacks that would be required for each lot.

While this criterion is not applicable, the proposed townhouse development does meet required setbacks for a single-family structure in the NT-2 zoning district.

8. **Single Corner Lots.** Structures on single corner lots shall be oriented so that the front entrance of the structure faces the legal front yard.

This criterion is not applicable as the subject property is an interior lot.

9. **Traditional Grid Roadway Network.** For projects equal to or greater than a platted block, extensions of the traditional grid roadway network which: 1) abut the perimeter of the project area; or 2) would logically be extended through the project area are required. Compliance with applicable subdivision and public improvement regulations is required.

This criterion is not applicable.

10. **Non-Traditional Grid Roadway Network.** For projects equal to or greater than a platted block, roadway and pedestrian networks shall meet the following requirements: 1) There shall be at least two points of entry into the project; 2) Sidewalk connections shall be made to surrounding streets; 3) Streets shall be stubbed to property lines to allow for roadway extensions into abutting properties which may be developed or anticipated to be redeveloped in the future.

This criterion is not applicable.

11. **Density and Intensity.** Redevelopment projects shall not exceed the legally grandfathered number of units or intensity of use (e.g., if the use is office it cannot change to a more intensive grandfathered use such as retail). For mobile home park redevelopment, the maximum number of dwelling units shall be equal to the number of legal mobile home unit spaces (lots) within the park prior to redevelopment, or 140 percent of the maximum density of the future land use designation assigned to the property, whichever is less. No variance from this requirement shall be approved.
The subject property contains one (1) dwelling unit by right and two (2) grandfathered dwelling units, for a total of three (3) dwelling units. The applicant is proposing to demolish all three (3) dwelling units and redevelop the property with two (2) dwelling units. No variances to this requirement are requested.

**FAR Bonuses:** The criteria for Floor Area Ratio bonuses are set forth under Subsection 16.70.040.1.15.

FAR bonuses shall only be allowed for originally platted lots which have not been joined together. Structures on joined or combined lots (two or more originally platted lots) shall not be allowed FAR bonus and shall be developed following the development across multiple lots criteria indicated in Section 16.70.040.1.15.

In this case, there were two buildings containing grandfathered density that were previously developed on Lot 7, a single originally platted lot, which is in compliance with the requirements that allow for FAR bonuses to be utilized.

a. An FAR bonus of 0.10 shall be granted when structures are located in a traditional neighborhood context and designed in a traditional building style as defined by the City's neighborhood design review manual or the Land Development Regulations. To qualify for this FAR bonus, the structure shall use the correct proportions, fenestration patterns, details, and materials. Structures that use finishes common to an identified style without proper design, detailing, and fenestration shall not qualify for this FAR bonus.

The proposed townhouse structure is designed in the Minimal Traditional architectural style as outlined in the St. Petersburg's Design Guidelines for Historic Properties. The proposed structure features correct proportions of the Minimal Traditional architectural style including a gable roof with a 5:12 roof pitch, the ridge line of roof runs perpendicular to the entrance façade, a smaller front-facing gable, windows are symmetrically placed and the entrance door is centered within a front-facing gabled porch. Consistent fenestration patterns include double-hung windows with 6 over 1 muntin pattern, paired window groupings containing two window units, and an entry door with raised panel profiles. The proposed asphalt shingle roof and wood lap siding materials are also consistent with the proposed architectural style.

b. An FAR bonus of 0.05 shall be granted when structures are finished with decorative wall finishes typical of traditional development. This includes clapboard or single products of real wood, "Hardi-Plank" or the equivalent, rough textured or exposed aggregate stucco, tile, brick or stone. Vinyl or aluminum siding and smooth or knock-down stucco shall not qualify for this bonus.

The plans provided show that the townhome will have Hardi-Plank siding thereby meeting the criteria for the 0.05 FAR bonus for decorative wall finishes that are typical of the Minimal Traditional architectural style.
Staff reviewed the plans for consistency with the St. Petersburg's Design Guidelines for Historic Properties to ensure that it meets the design requirements for the Minimal Traditional architectural style and determined that it is in compliance.

**Public Comments:** The subject property is located within the Crescent Heights Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood association and all property owners within 200 feet of the subject property were notified of the request. Staff did not receive any correspondence from the neighborhood association. Two emails were received from the public in support of the proposed redevelopment, see attached.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Based on a review of the redevelopment application according to the stringent evaluation criteria contained within the City Code, the Development Services Department Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the requested variance and redevelopment plan.

**CONDITIONS OF COMMISSION ACTION:** If the application is approved consistent with the site plan submitted with this application, the Planning and Development Services Department Staff recommends that the approval shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. The plans submitted for permitting shall substantially resemble the plans attached to this report. Significant modifications to the plans shall require a new application and public hearing.
2. The site plan submitted for permitting shall depict all proposed ancillary equipment, such as garbage cans, air conditioning and irrigation equipment. These items shall be provided within interior yards and shall be screened with finished walls and perimeter landscaping.
3. The plans submitted for permitting shall depict all necessary information to demonstrate compliance with the tree preservation requirements set forth under Code Subsection 16.40.060.2.1.3.
4. The plans submitted for permitting shall include all necessary information to demonstrate compliance with the landscaping and irrigation requirements set forth under City Code Sections 16.40.060.2.1.3. and 16.40.060.2.1.4., as applicable.
5. This approval shall be valid through September 4, 2022. Substantial construction shall commence prior to this expiration date. The applicant may request up to two two-year extensions from the POD prior to the expiration. Requests for extension must be filed in writing to the POD prior to the expiration date.
Report Prepared By:

Scot Bolyard, AICP
Deputy Zoning Official
Development Review Services Division
Planning and Development Services Department

Report Prepared For:

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

Attachments: Project Location Map; Photographs; Project Narrative; Redevelopment Plan with site plan, floor plans, and elevations; Property Card Records; and, Public Comments
All applications for redevelopment must provide justification for the requested redevelopment based on the criteria set forth by the City Code. It is recommended that the following responses by typed. Illegible handwritten responses will not be accepted. A separate letter addressing each of the criteria may be provided as a supplement to this form.

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

### APPLICANT NARRATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address: 609 24TH AVE N.</th>
<th>Case No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detailed Description of Project and Request:</strong> CONSTRUCTION OF TWO NEW TOWNHOMES 3/2/1 WITH APPX 3000 SF EACH GARAGE WITH ACCESS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Building Type.** Describe how the proposed building type (e.g. single-family homes with garage apartments, duplexes, multi-family uses, etc.) will match the predominate building type in the block face across the street, for projects less than a city block. For projects equal to or greater than one city block, describe how the proposed building type for perimeter structures will match the predominate building type in the block face across the street.

   "Two new townhome designed in mid width traditional style to match the neighborhood. Front door facing south as all other homes on the street."

2. **Building Setbacks.** Describe how the proposed building setbacks (including both perimeter and interior setbacks) will match the predominate building setbacks in the block face across the street, for projects less than a city block. For projects equal to or greater than one city block, describe how the proposed building setbacks for perimeter structures will match the predominate building setbacks in the block face across the street.

   "Building setbacks will be 18' from the rear (alley side), 6' from the sides and 25' from the front to match the homes on the street."

3. **Building Type.** Describe how the proposed building scale (one-story or two-story principle structures) will match the predominate building scale in the block face across the street, for projects less than a city block. For projects equal to or greater than one city block, describe how the proposed building scale for perimeter structures will match the predominate building scale in the block face across the street.

   "Two-story townhomes will match all homes on the street with the same height."

---
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All applications for redevelopment must provide justification for the requested redevelopment based on the criteria set forth by the City Code. It is recommended that the following responses by typed. Illegible handwritten responses will not be accepted.

ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA MUST BE ANSWERED.

4. Site Development and Orientation. Describe how the proposed site development and orientation (e.g. location of buildings, front entries, driveways, parking, and utility functions) will match the predominate development pattern in the block face across the street, for projects less than a city block. For projects equal to or greater than one city block, describe how the proposed development pattern for perimeter structures will match the predominate development pattern in the block face across the street. If alley access exists on the proposed site, garages and parking areas shall be designed for alley use.

5. Floor area Ratio Bonuses. FAR bonuses shall only be allowed for originally platted lots which have not been joined together. Structures on joined or combined lots (two or more originally platted lots) shall not be allowed FAR bonuses. If bonuses are required, please complete the following questions:

a. FAR Bonus of 0.10 – An FAR bonus of 0.10 shall be granted when structures are located in a traditional neighborhood context and designed in a traditional building style as defined by the City’s Neighborhood Design Review Manual or the Land Development Regulations. Describe the principle architectural style of the proposed building and explain how it uses the correct proportions, fenestration patterns, details, and materials of the recognized style.

b. FAR Bonus of 0.05 – Describe whether the proposed building is finished with decorative wall finishes typical of traditional development. This includes clapboard or single products of real wood “Hardie-Plank” or the equivalent, rough textured or exposed aggregate stucco, tile, brick, or stone. Vinyl or aluminum siding and smooth or knock down stucco shall not qualify for this bonus.
Address Miscellaneous Information Inquiry

Location ID/subdivision: 463803 CRESCENT HEIGHTS NBRHD ASSN
Parcel Identification Nbr: 07/31/17/18936/003/0070/
Old account number:
Location address: 611 24TH AVE N
Primary related party: MORNI CONSTRUCTIONS INC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>App</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESCR</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>7/16/99</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PROPERTY CARD INTER #99-8047 MLG SIX (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCIN</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>5/29/99</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DWELLING UNITS MAY LAWFULLY EXIST ONSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 DAYS FROM MAY 29, 1999 TO APPEAL TO THE BOA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>7/06/99</td>
<td></td>
<td>N District 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBA</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>6/19/99</td>
<td></td>
<td>CRHT CRESCENT HEIGHTS NBRHD ASSN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNP</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>11/01/95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>10/02/95</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>9/16/95</td>
<td>292410 258267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12694</td>
<td>10/27/24</td>
<td>609-24 Ave No.</td>
<td>T. B. Jenkins</td>
<td>Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9-56t</td>
<td>1/5/71</td>
<td>627-23 Ave No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CU. FT.</th>
<th>Rate per CU. FT.</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Floors</th>
<th>Partitions</th>
<th>Rooms</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Sign Permit No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#17325</td>
<td>($2500) 10-15-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>W. C. foster</td>
<td>2-st. blk. &amp; fr. Garage</td>
<td>4 - rooms</td>
<td>#12496  ($300) 10/11/44</td>
<td>Add 2-rms. to garage</td>
<td>#56076 9/27/45</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>Mrs. W. M. Dietrich, H. E. Bowles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#1422</td>
<td>6-28-46 Mrs. Barnard</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.D. Cyphers - move meter</td>
<td>(611-24th Avenue North)</td>
<td>#2002 12/15/48</td>
<td>C. Barnard</td>
<td>A.D. Cyphers - 1-w. heater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#1422</td>
<td>6-28-46 Mrs. Barnard</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.D. Cyphers - move meter</td>
<td>(611-24th Avenue North)</td>
<td>#2002 12/15/48</td>
<td>C. Barnard</td>
<td>A.D. Cyphers - 1-w. heater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#3912A-D – 1/19/54 – $100
Owner George Reyes – Install
three metal flues (Type VI)
City Fuel Oil, Contractor.

#392A-D – 7/17/56 – $500
Owner Marie R. Tassiter – Replace
wood stairs with steel stairs
(Types V & VI)
(609-615 – 24th Ave. No.)

#3859A-43 – 3/18/70 – $450
Owner Brunard – Reroof with Class
A, tear-off, and 4/12” pitch –
L. S. Mullen Roofing, Contractor
Scot,  

I currently live (622 24th Ave N) directly across the street from the proposed redevelopment. I'm unable to attend the hearing but please use this email as my vote to APPROVE this proposal. I'm 100% in favor of the development and construction of 2 townhouses.

Thank you,

Jesse Battle  
*Executive Director*  
North American Trailer Dealers Association  
P: 727-487-3200
Dear Mr. Scot Bolyard,

This email is in regards to the request to redevelop the properties located at:

- 615 24th Ave. N. (Lot 6 in the NT-2 zoning district)
- 609 24th Ave. N. (Lot 7 in the NT-2 zoning district)

Both aforementioned properties are pending approval by the Development Review Commission to grant Marni Construction Inc. permits to construct two (2) townhouses in each of these lots.

I'm a property owner within 200 feet of the lots in question. As a matter of fact, I live at 616 24th Ave N in a townhouses duplex facing directly across the street from the proposed redevelopment. I'm unable to attend the public hearing but please use this written correspondence as my unanimous vote to APPROVE this plan proposal. I'm 100% in favor of the development and construction of 4 townhouses. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Patricia L. Diaz-Beselin
For **Public Hearing** and **Executive Action** on **September 4, 2019** beginning at 2:00 P.M., at The Sunshine Center (Auditorium), located at 330 5th Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

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

**CASE NO.:** 19-51000005  
**PLAT SHEET:** F-6  
**REQUEST:** Approval of a redevelopment plan to allow for the construction of a 20-unit multi-family development to replace an existing 22-units in the CRT-1 zoning district.

**OWNER:** Pinellas Affordable Living Inc  
445 31st Street North  
Saint Petersburg, Florida 33713

**AGENT:** Mark W. Stephenson  
146 2nd Street North  
Saint Petersburg, Florida 33701

**ADDRESSES:** 715 5th Avenue North and 506 Grove Street North

**PARCEL ID NO.:** 18-31-17-72288-000-0190

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** On File

**ZONING:** Corridor Residential Traditional (CRT-1)
**SITE AREA TOTAL:** 18,083 square feet or .42 acres

**GROSS FLOOR AREA:**
- **Existing:** 9,106 square feet, .51 F.A.R.
- **Proposed:** 11,754 square feet, .65 F.A.R.
- **Permitted:** 11,754 square feet, .65 F.A.R. *
* The applicant is requesting bonuses to the base floor area ratio standard.

**DENSITY:**
- **Existing:** 22 (53 units per acre)
- **Permitted:** 10 (24 units per acre)
- **Proposed:** 20 (48 units per acre) *
* Redevelopment of a portion of the grandfathered density is the subject of this application.

**BUILDING COVERAGE:**
- **Existing:** 5,528 square feet, 31% of Site MOL
- **Proposed:** 1,486 square feet, 8% of Site MOL

**IMPERVIOUS SURFACE:**
- **Existing:** 10,468 square feet, 58% of Site MOL
- **Proposed:** 9,586 square feet, 53% of Site MOL
- **Permitted:** 13,575 square feet, 75% of Site MOL

**OPEN GREEN SPACE:**
- **Existing:** 7,615 square feet, 42% of Site MOL
- **Proposed:** 8,525 square feet, 47% of Site MOL

**PAVING COVERAGE:**
- **Existing:** 4,940 square feet, 27% of Site MOL
- **Proposed:** 8,082 square feet, 45% of Site MOL

**PARKING:**
- **Existing:** 4 spaces, including 0 handicapped spaces
- **Proposed:** 20 spaces, including 1 handicapped space
- **Required:** 20 spaces, including 1 handicapped space

**BUILDING HEIGHT:**
- **Existing:** 35 feet
- **Proposed:** 34 feet
- **Permitted:** 36 feet
APPLICATION REVIEW:

I. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS: The applicant has met and complied with the procedural requirements of Section 16.70.040.1.15 of the Municipal Code for site plan review to determine compliance with the criteria for redevelopment.

II. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Background: The subject property is located in the Historic Uptown neighborhood. The lot is approximately 112-feet wide, 162-feet deep, and 18,083 square feet (.42 acres). The parcel is made up of two platted lots (Lots 19 and 20, Elijah B of the Plunkets subdivision) that front to Grove Street North. Two multi-family structures currently exist on site with a total of 22 total dwelling units. Ten units are allowed by right on this property. Thus, 12 units are grandfathered. The building identified as 506 Grove Street N currently contains 10 legal dwelling units. The building identified as 715 5th Ave North currently contains 12 legal dwelling units. The current regulations for the CRT-1 zoning district allow for up to 24 units per acre. The existing property contains 22 units on .42 acres for a grandfathered density of 53 units per acre. The attached Zoning Letter (19-42000014) and Property Card can be referenced for more information. The Code provides for redevelopment of grandfathered uses, subject to the Commission’s approval of a redevelopment plan.

The Request: The applicant seeks approval of a site plan to redevelop the property with two 10-unit multi-family structures for a total of 20 units. The proposed plan does not require approval of variances, but does require FAR bonuses.

Current Proposal: The proposed plan is for two multi-family structures with two primary pedestrian entrances from Grove Street North and another from 5th Avenue North. Each structure will be three stories. The second and third stories will contain one-bedroom apartments. The first floor will contain parking, a laundry room, meeting room, and utility rooms. Vehicles will access the property from the alley along the West side of the property.

Redevelopment Criterion: Pursuant to Code Subsection 29-113(8)(f), an application for redevelopment must be reviewed for compliance with the criterion. An analysis follows, based on the City Code criterion to be considered by the Commission.

1. Building Type. Structures shall be required to match the predominate building type in the block face across the street.

The subject property faces the onramp to I-375 across 5th Avenue North to the South. Directly across Grove Street North to the East is Alpha House of Pinellas County, a social service agency that uses this property to house women who happen to be homeless, especially those who are pregnant. The remaining properties on the subject blockface are a mix of one and two-story single-family detached and townhome residences.

2. Building Setbacks. Structures shall be required to match the predominate building setbacks in the block face across the street.

The proposed building meets the required setbacks for the CRT-1 zoning district, which is consistent with the surrounding development pattern.
3. **Building Scale.** *Structures shall be required to match the predominate building type, setbacks and scale in the block face across the street.*

The site currently contains one three-story building and one single-story building. The two proposed structures will both be three stories and will be the tallest structures on the blockface. Staff believes that the height of the proposed three-story structures is mitigated by the property being on the corner of the block, on a major street (5th Avenue North), and directly across from the I-375 onramp to the South and another social service use to the East.

4. **Site Development.** *Structures shall be required to match the predominate development pattern in the block face across the street. If alley access exists on the proposed site, garages and parking areas shall be designed for alley use.*

The proposed structures will match the orientation of existing structures on the block face that have their front doors facing Grove Street North. Alley access exists in the rear and the redevelopment plan includes parking underneath the building.

5. **Building Mass.** *Building Mass shall be regulated by building setbacks and floor area ratio (FAR). The maximum FAR shall be existing FAR of the property prior to redevelopment or 0.50 FAR, whichever is greater.*

The proposed development has a 0.65 FAR, while the existing structure on the property has 0.51 FAR. The City Code allows options for FAR bonuses that can be utilized for redevelopments. This application meets the criteria that would allow for an additional 0.15 FAR bonus to the maximum 0.50 FAR allowed for redevelopments, resulting in a maximum 0.65 FAR allowed for the entire redevelopment with bonuses. This is discussed in additional detail below in the section regarding FAR bonuses.

6. **Building Height.** *Residential structures for a project less than a city block shall comply with the following building height and roof design requirements: i. The maximum height shall not exceed 24 feet to the eave line and 36 feet to the peak of the roof for primary structures, ii. The maximum height shall not exceed 20 feet to the eave line and 32 feet to the peak of the roof for secondary or accessory structures, iii. The maximum slope of any roof angle shall not exceed 12/12. iv. Dormers shall not exceed 50-percent of any roof surface.*

The proposed structures are in compliance with the applicable building height regulations for structures in the CRT-1 zoning district and for redevelopment projects as noted above. The proposed buildings have flat roofs with parapet walls. The height to the top of the parapet wall is 34-feet tall, where 36-feet is the maximum height allowed.

7. **Development Across Multiple Lots.** *Structures shall be separated by zoning district setbacks, however, if not separated by zoning district setbacks, there shall be a break in the building and roof planes at each original lot line which shall be equal to or greater than the combined side yard setbacks that would be required for each lot.*

This criterion is met for the proposed redevelopment. The required setback from an interior side lot line is 5-feet, therefore at least 10-feet is required between buildings. The two proposed buildings will be constructed to position one building per platted lot. The buildings will be on either side of the platted lot line between Lot 19 and 20 with 24-feet between buildings. The buildings will be conjoined by an elevated walkway.
8. **Single Corner Lots.** Structures on single corner lots shall be oriented so that the front entrance of the structure faces the legal front yard.

This redevelopment project is situated on the corner of Grove Street North and 5th Avenue North with the legal front yard located along Grove Street North. The proposed primary entrances will be oriented towards Grove Street North.

9. **Traditional Grid Roadway Network.** For projects equal to or greater than a city block, extensions of the traditional grid roadway network which 1) abut the perimeter of the project area and 2) would be logically extended through the project area shall be required. Compliance with applicable subdivision and public improvement regulations shall be required.

This criterion is not applicable to this case.

10. **Non-Traditional Grid Roadway Network.** For projects equal to or greater than a city block, roadway and pedestrian networks shall meet the following requirements: i. There should be at least two (2) points of entry into the project, ii. Sidewalk connections shall be made to surrounding streets, homes and businesses, iii. Streets shall be stubbed to property lines to allow for roadway extensions into abutting properties which may be developed or are anticipated to be redeveloped in the future.

This criterion is not applicable to this case.

11. **Density and Intensity.** For mobile home park redevelopment, the maximum number of dwelling units shall be equal to the number of legal mobile home spaces(lots) within the park prior to redevelopment, or 140-percent of the maximum density of the future land use designation assigned to the property, whichever is less.

This criterion is not applicable to this case.

**FAR Bonuses:** The criteria for Floor Area Ratio bonuses are set forth under Subsection 16.70.040.1.15.

FAR bonuses shall only be allowed for originally platted lots which have not been joined together. Structures on joined or combined lots (two or more originally platted lots) shall not be allowed FAR bonus and shall be developed following the development across multiple lots criteria indicated in section 16.70.040.1.15.

In this case, the originally platted lots have been aggregated. This redevelopment plan follows the criteria for development across multiple lots in section 16.70.040.1.15 by exceeding the required setbacks from the interior side lot line for each building. Each building is being developed on a single platted lot such that it could stand alone if the parcel were separated, thereby allowing for FAR bonuses to be utilized.

   a. An FAR bonus of 0.10 shall be granted when structures are located in a traditional neighborhood context and designed in a traditional building style as defined by the City’s neighborhood design review manual or the Land Development Regulations. To qualify for this FAR bonus, the structure shall use the correct proportions, fenestration patterns, details, and materials. Structures that use finishes common to an identified style without proper design, detailing, and fenestration shall not qualify for this FAR bonus.
The proposed multi-family structures are consistent with both the Mission Revival and Commercial storefront styles as outlined in St Petersburg's Design Guidelines for Historic Properties. Consistent with the Mission Revival style the structures provide decorative curved parapet walls extending up from the roof. The walls are primarily stucco with decorative elements that are typical of a Spanish style building. The placement of windows and doors is symmetrical. The front porches are centered on each building and project toward the primary street. The applicant has also proposed decorative brick finishes that are supported by local residents and would be consistent with the Commercial Storefront style of the Design Guidelines. The final design will be approved by Planning and Development Review Services Staff prior to permitting.

b. An FAR bonus of 0.05 shall be granted when structures are finished with decorative wall finishes typical of traditional development. This includes clapboard or single products of real wood, "Hardi-Plank" or the equivalent, rough textured or exposed aggregate stucco, tile, brick or stone. Vinyl or aluminum siding and smooth or knock-down stucco shall not qualify for this bonus.

Decorative stucco and brick finishes have been proposed on the new buildings. The final design will be approved by Planning and Development Review Services Staff prior to permitting.

Public Comments: The subject property is located within the Historic Uptown Neighborhood Association. The Neighborhood Association and all property owners within 200 feet of the subject property were notified of the request. Staff has not received any correspondence in favor, or opposed, to the request.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Based on a review of the redevelopment application according to the stringent evaluation criteria contained within the City Code, the Development Services Department Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested variance and redevelopment plan.

CONDITIONS OF COMMISSION ACTION: If the application is approved consistent with the site plan submitted with this application, the Planning and Development Services Department Staff recommends that the approval shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. The plans submitted for permitting shall substantially resemble the plans attached to this report. Significant modifications to the plans shall require a new application and public hearing.

2. The site plan submitted for permitting shall depict all proposed ancillary equipment, such as garbage cans, air conditioning and irrigation equipment. These items shall be provided within interior yards and shall be screened with finished walls and perimeter landscaping.

3. The plans submitted for permitting shall depict all necessary information to demonstrate compliance with the tree preservation requirements set forth under Code Subsection 16.40.060.2.1.3.
4. The plans submitted for permitting shall include all necessary information to demonstrate compliance with the landscaping and irrigation requirements set forth under City Code Sections 16.40.060.2.1.3. and 16.40.060.2.1.4., as applicable.

5. This approval shall be valid through September 4, 2022. Substantial construction shall commence prior to this expiration date. The applicant may request up to two two-year extensions from the POD prior to the expiration. Requests for extension must be filed in writing to the POD prior to the expiration date.

Report Prepared By:       Report Prepared For:

Jaime Jones, Planner I  Jennifer Brina, AICP, Zoning Official
Development Review Services Division  Development Review Services Division
Planning & Development Services Dept.  Planning & Development Services Dept.

Attachments: Project Location Map, Photographs, Project Narrative, Redevelopment Plan with site plan, elevation plans, floor plans, Zoning Letter, Property Card
Project Location Map
City of St. Petersburg, Florida
Planning and Development Services
Department
Case No.: 19-51000005
Address: 715 5th Avenue North and 506 Grove Street North
All applications are to be filled out completely and correctly. The application shall be submitted to the City of St. Petersburg's Development Review Services Division, located on the 1st floor of the Municipal Services Building, One 4th Street North.

### GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME of PROPERTY OWNER:</th>
<th>PINELAS AFFORDABLE LIVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address:</td>
<td>445 - 31ST STREET N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State, Zip:</td>
<td>ST. PETERSBURG, FL 33713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone No:</td>
<td>727-821-4619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jack.humphrey@baylorhealth.org">jack.humphrey@baylorhealth.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME of AGENT or REPRESENTATIVE:</th>
<th>MARK W. STEPHENSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address:</td>
<td>460-2ND STREET N. #30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State, Zip:</td>
<td>ST. PETERSBURG, FL. 33701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone No:</td>
<td>727-821-6410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark@weddingsarchitects.com">mark@weddingsarchitects.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPERTY INFORMATION:
- Street Address or General Location: 5010 GROVE STREET + 715-5TH AVE, N.
- Parcel ID#(s): 18-31-17-7288-000-0190

### DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST:
- REDEVELOPMENT OF EXISTING 22 UNITS AND BONUS FAR. 75

### PRE-APPLICATION DATE:
- 5-30-19

### FEE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Plan Review</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance - First Variance</td>
<td>$300.00; Each additional Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, credit, and checks made payable to the &quot;City of St. Petersburg&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AUTHORIZATION

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

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

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

**Signature of Owner / Agent**: 

**Printed Name**: MARK W. STEPHENSON

*Affidavit to Authorize Agent required, if signed by Agent.

City of St. Petersburg – One 4th Street North – PO Box 2842 – St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842 – (727) 893-7471
REDEVELOPMENT

AFFIDAVIT TO AUTHORIZE AGENT

I am (we are) the owner(s) and record title holder(s) of the property noted herein

Property Owner's Name: Pinellas Affordable Living, Inc.

This property constitutes the property for which the following request is made

Property Address: 715 5th Ave North and 506 Grove Street North

Property ID No.: 18-31-17-72288-000-0190

Request: Submission of any and all documents necessary for the redevelopment of this site.

The undersigned has (have) appointed and does (do) appoint the following agent(s) to execute any application(s) or other documentation necessary to effectuate such application(s)

Agent's Name(s): MARK W. STEPHENSON

This affidavit has been executed to induce the City of St. Petersburg, Florida, to consider and act on the above described property.

I (we), the undersigned authority, hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature (owner): [Signature]

Sworn to and subscribed on this date

Identification or personally known:

Notary Signature: [Signature]
Commission Expiration (Stamp or date):

Date: 6/6/2019

Jenine Thomley
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF FLORIDA
Comm# GG184394
Expires 6/4/2022

City of St. Petersburg – One 4th Street North – PO Box 2842 – St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842 – (727) 893-7471
www.stpete.org/ldr
## DATA TABLE

1. **Zoning Classification:** CRT-1 CORRIDOR RESIDENTIAL TRADITIONAL

2. **Existing Land Use Type(s):** MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

3. **Proposed Land Use Type(s):** MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

4. **Area of Subject Property:** 13,083 SQ. FT. — 0.42 AC.

5. **Variance(s) Requested:** NO VARIANCE. ASKING FOR PERMITTED FAR BONUS OF 0.15 FOR TOTAL REDEVELOPMENT FAS OF 0.405 OR 11,754 S.F.

6. **Gross Floor Area** (total square feet of building(s))
   - Existing: 9,100 Sq. ft.
   - Proposed: 11,754 Sq. ft.
   - Permitted: 11,754 Sq. ft.

7. **Floor Area Ratio** (total square feet of building(s) divided by the total square feet of entire site)
   - Existing: 0.51 Sq. ft. 9,100
   - Proposed: 0.405 Sq. ft. 11,754
   - Permitted: 0.405 Sq. ft. 11,754

8. **Building Coverage** (first floor square footage of building(s))
   - Existing: 5522 Sq. ft. 31.0 % of site
   - Proposed: 1480 Sq. ft. 8.0 % of site
   - Permitted: Sq. ft. % of site

9. **Open Green Space** (include all green space on site; do not include any paved areas)
   - Existing: 7415 Sq. ft. 42.0 % of site
   - Proposed: 8525 Sq. ft. 47.0 % of site

10. **Interior Green Space of Vehicle Use Area** (include all green space within the parking lot and drive lanes)
    - Existing: 415 Sq. ft. 14.0 % of vehicular area
    - Proposed: 1602 Sq. ft. 45.0 % of vehicular area
## DATA TABLE (continued page 2)

### 11. Paving Coverage
(include sidewalks within boundary of the subject property; do not include building footprint(s))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>% of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,940 Sq. ft.</td>
<td>8082 Sq. ft.</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12. Impervious Surface Coverage
(total square feet of all paving, building footprints and other hard surfaced areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Permitted</th>
<th>% of site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,466 Sq. ft.</td>
<td>9,568 Sq. ft.</td>
<td>13,575 Sq. ft.</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13. Density (units per acre)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sq. Ft. or Acre(s)</th>
<th>No. of Employees</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing: 52.4</td>
<td>Existing: 0</td>
<td>Existing:</td>
<td>Proposed: 47.6</td>
<td>Proposed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed: 30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 14 a. Parking (Vehicle) Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>% of vehicular parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

includes 0 disabled parking spaces

### 14 b. Parking (Bicycle) Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>% of vehicular parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of vehicular parking

### 15. Building Height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Permitted</th>
<th>Stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.0 Feet</td>
<td>34.0 Feet</td>
<td>36.0 Feet</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 16. Construction Value

What is the estimate of the total value of the project upon completion? $2,700,537.

Note: See Drainage Ordinance for a definition of "alteration." If applicable, please be aware that this triggers Drainage Ordinance compliance. Please submit drainage calculations to the Engineering Department for review at your earliest convenience. The DRC must approve all Drainage Ordinance variances.
All applications for redevelopment must provide justification for the requested redevelopment based on the criteria set forth by the City Code. It is recommended that the following responses be typed. Illegible handwritten responses will not be accepted. A separate letter addressing each of the criteria may be provided as a supplement to this form.

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

#### APPLICANT NARRATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address: 5060 Grove St. + 715-5th Ave. N.</th>
<th>Case No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Description of Project and Request:</td>
<td>Redevelopment of Existing 22 Unit with New 20 Unit Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Building Type.** Describe how the proposed building type (e.g. single-family homes with garage apartments, duplexes, multi-family uses, etc.) will match the predominate building type in the block face across the street, for projects less than a city block. For projects equal to or greater than one city block, describe how the proposed building type for perimeter structures will match the predominate building type in the block face across the street.

   **The proposed building will replicate the existing three story building and match its neighbor.**
   **The block face across the street is the Interstate 375 on ramp.**

2. **Building Setbacks.** Describe how the proposed building setbacks (including both perimeter and interior setbacks) will match the predominate building setbacks in the block face across the street, for projects less than a city block. For projects equal to or greater than one city block, describe how the proposed building setbacks for perimeter structures will match the predominate building setbacks in the block face across the street.

   **The proposed building setbacks will be similar to existing, an attempt to save existing trees.**
   **The block face across the street is the Interstate 375 on ramp.**

3. **Building Type.** Describe how the proposed building scale (one-story or two-story principle structures) will match the predominate building scale in the block face across the street, for projects less than a city block. For projects equal to or greater than one city block, describe how the proposed building scale for perimeter structures will match the predominate building scale in the block face across the street.

   **The proposed three story building replaces the existing three story building and matches the neighbor building.**
   **The block face across the street is the Interstate 375 on ramp.**
All applications for redevelopment must provide justification for the requested redevelopment based on the criteria set forth by the City Code. It is recommended that the following responses be typed. Illegible handwritten responses will not be accepted.

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

### APPLICANT NARRATIVE

| 4. Site Development and Orientation. | Describe how the proposed site development and orientation (e.g., location of buildings, front entries, driveways, parking, and utility functions) will match the predominate development pattern in the block face across the street, for projects less than a city block. For projects equal to or greater than one city block, describe how the proposed development pattern for perimeter structures will match the predominate development pattern in the block face across the street. If alley access exists on the proposed site, garages and parking areas shall be designed for alley use.

**THE PROPOSED BUILDING WILL HAVE FRONT ENTRY FACING 5TH AVENUE NORTH, SAME AS BUILDING TO THE WEST. DRIVEWAY OFF THE ALLEY, PARKING LOCATED IN THE REAR.** |

| 5. Floor area Ratio Bonuses. | FAR bonuses shall only be allowed for originally platted lots which have not been joined together. Structures on joined or combined lots (two or more originally platted lots) shall not be allowed FAR bonuses. If bonuses are required, please complete the following questions:

- **FAR Bonus of 0.10** – An FAR bonus of 0.10 shall be granted when structures are located in a traditional neighborhood context and designed in a traditional building style as defined by the City’s Neighborhood Design Review Manual or the Land Development Regulations. Describe the principle architectural style of the proposed building and explain how it uses the correct proportions, fenestration patterns, details, and materials of the recognized style.

**THE PROPOSED BUILDING IS IN A TRADITIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT AND DESIGNED IN TRADITIONAL STYLE. THREE STORY BUILDING ON SETBACK LINE AND ORIENTED TO THE STREET. STREET FACADE DESIGNED WITH ONE TO ONE PROPORTIONS AND TRADITIONAL DETAILS.**

- **FAR Bonus of 0.05** – Describe whether the proposed building is finished with decorative wall finishes typical of traditional development. This includes clapboard or single products of real wood “Hardi-Plank” or the equivalent, rough textured or exposed aggregate stucco, tile, brick, or stone. Vinyl or aluminum siding and smooth or knock down stucco shall not qualify for this bonus.

**THE PROPOSED BUILDING IS FINISHED WITH A COMBINATION OF ROUGH TEXTURED STUCCO AND HARDI-PLANK SIDING.** |
In accordance with LDR Section 16.70.040.1.F.2. "It is the policy of the City to encourage applicants to meet with residents of the surrounding neighborhoods prior to filing an application for a permit requiring review and public hearing. The applicant, at his option, may elect to include neighborhood mediation as a preparatory step in the development process. Participation in the public participation process prior to required public hearings will be considered by the decision-making official when considering the need, or request, for a continuance of an application. It is not the intent of this section to require neighborhood meetings, but to encourage meetings prior to the submission of applications for approval and documentation of efforts which have been made to address any potential concerns prior to the formal application process."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Address:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Details of techniques the applicant used to involve the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Dates and locations of all meetings where citizens were invited to discuss the applicant's proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Letter written to HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Content, dates mailed, and number of mailings, including letters, meeting notices, newsletters, and other publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Letter explaining proposed sent to HOA 6/10/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Where residents, property owners, and interested parties receiving notices, newsletters, or other written materials are located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Uptown Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summary of concerns, issues, and problems expressed during the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT expressed to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Signature or affidavit of compliance - President or Vice-President of any neighborhood associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check one: ( ) Proposal supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Do not support the Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Unable to comment on the Proposal at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Other comment(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Your Comment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Your Association Name]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>President or Vice-President Signature</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Your Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the President or Vice-President of the neighborhood association are unavailable or refuse to sign such certification, a statement as to the efforts to contact them and (in the event of unavailability or unwillingness to sign) is required as to why they were unable or unwilling to sign the certification.
June 10, 2019

Kristy Anderson
Historic Uptown Neighborhood Association
Via Email: historicuptown@gmail.com

RE: Butterfly Grove

Dear Ms. Anderson,

I represent the owner of the two structures located at 715 5th Ave North (known as the Butterfly Apartments) and 506 Grove Street North (known as the Grove Street Apartments). These two buildings have been owned by Boley Centers for the past 24 years. I am writing today to let you know the exciting news that we intend to redevelop these two buildings.

As you may be aware, both buildings are very old, and we have begun to relocate the current tenants. Boley Centers has transferred ownership to Pinellas Affordable Living, Inc.- which is a sister corporation to Boley Centers that is dedicated to providing affordable housing. Our plans are to demolish both buildings and, working with the City, rebuild twenty, one-bedroom units on this site in one building.

We would be happy to meet with you and the neighborhood association membership if you so desire to further discuss our plans.

Please advise if any additional information is needed to process this request. I can be reached at (727) 821-4819 ext. 5717.

Sincerely,

Jack D. Humburg
Executive Director, Pinellas Affordable Living, Inc.
Executive Vice President, Boley Centers, Inc.

Pinellas Community Foundation

445 31st St. N. St. Petersburg, Florida 33713
Telephone (727) 821-4819 • Fax (727) 822-6240
www.Boleycenters.org
\begin{center}
\textbf{SITE PLAN}
\end{center}

\textit{SCALE: 1"=30'-0"}

\hspace{1cm}

\textbf{5TH AVENUE NORTH}

\begin{itemize}
  \item GRASS PARKING
    \begin{itemize}
      \item ALLOWED: 25\% TOTAL REQ'D = 25\% \times 20 = 5 SPACES
      \item PROVIDED: 5 SPACES
    \end{itemize}
  \item BICYCLE PARKING
    \begin{itemize}
      \item 1 PER 4 UNITS = 20/4 = 5
      \item PLUS 1 VISITOR = 6
      \item COMPENSATION FOR
      \item 2 CAR SPACES = 6 \times 2 = 12
      \item REQUIRED: 18
      \item PROVIDED: 22
    \end{itemize}
  \item SITE = 18,083 SF
  \item FAR = 0.65
  \item ALLOWABLE AREA =
  \item 18,083 SF \times 0.62 = 11,754 SF
  \item GROUND FLOOR = 11,118 SF
  \item 2ND FLOOR = 5,318 SF
  \item 3RD FLOOR = 5,318 SF
  \item TOTAL = 11,754 SF
\end{itemize}
OFFICE / LAUNDRY / MEETING / ELEVATOR / LOBBY BUILDING

1118 SQ. FT. GROSS
(Room areas on plan are net)
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SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"
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264 SF

158 SQ. FT. GROSS
(Room area on plan is net)

158 SQ. FT. GROSS

ROOM AREA ON PLAN IS NET)

OFFICE

LAUNDRY

MEETING

ELEVATOR

LOBBY
LANDSCAPING TO MEET ALL REQUIREMENTS OF ST. PETERSBURG CODE OF ORDINANCES SECTION 16.40.060 INCLUDING:

- 5' GREEN YARD ABUTTING STREETS WITH 1 SHADE TREE PER 35 LINEAR FEET.
- 5' GREEN YARD AT INTERIOR AND ABUTTING ALLEYS WITH 1 SHADE TREE PER 50 LINEAR FEET.
- FOUNDATION LANDSCAPING WITH 1 PLANT PER 3 LINEAR FEET AND 1 UNDERSTORY TREE PER 30 LINEAR FEET.
- PARKING LOT PERIMETER WITH CONTINUOUS HEDGE AND 1 SHADE TREE PER 35 LINEAR FEET.
- TREE SPECIES DIVERSITY OF THREE SPECIES IF MORE THAN 20 TREES ARE REQUIRED.
- ALL NEW PLANTS TO BE AS LISTED IN LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS 16.40.060.2.1.6.

EXISTING TREE LEGEND

SYMBOL TYPE

- OAK
- PALM
- CAMPHOR
- EXISTING TREE TO BE REMOVED

PLANTING SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>SPACING</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>LIVE OAK</td>
<td>QUERCUS VIRGINIANA</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2&quot; DBH  10' HT.</td>
<td>AS SHOWN CONTAINER GROWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>BALD CYPRESS</td>
<td>TAXODIUM DISTICHUM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2.5&quot; CAL. 10'-12' HT.</td>
<td>AS SHOWN 30 GAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CRAP MYRTLE</td>
<td>LAGERSTROEMIA INDICA</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1.15&quot; DBH  8' HT.</td>
<td>AS SHOWN CONTAINER GROWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SWEETBAY MAGNOLIA</td>
<td>MAGNOLIA VIRGINIANA</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2&quot; DBH  10' HT.</td>
<td>AS SHOWN CONTAINER GROWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>WALTER VIBURNUM</td>
<td>VIBURNUM OBOVATUM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>3' HT.  30&quot; O.C.</td>
<td>HEDGE (LEAF-TO-LEAF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>INDIAN HAWTHORN</td>
<td>RAPHIOLEPSIS INDICA</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>3 GAL.  24&quot; O.C.</td>
<td>FOUNDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MINIMA JASMINE</td>
<td>TRACHELOSPERMUM ASIATICUM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1 GAL.  24&quot; O.C.</td>
<td>GROUND COVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SOD</td>
<td>ARGENTINE BAHIA</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 6, 2019

Boley Centers Inc
445 31st St N
Saint Petersburg, FL 33713-7605

Zoning Letter: 19-42000014

Property Located At:  Legally Described As:
715 5TH AVE N       18/31/17/72288/000/0190/
506 GROVE ST N      18/31/17/72288/000/0190/

To Whom It May Concern:

A Zoning Verification Letter has been completed for this property. The subject property is zoned CRT-1 (Corridor Residential Traditional) and has an underlying future land use of PR-MU (Planned Redevelopment Mixed-Use). Generally, CRT zoned districts promote townhomes, condominiums, apartment buildings and mixed-use buildings that are appropriately scaled to the context of the corridor. Use permissions can be referenced using the “Use Permissions, Parking Requirements, and Zoning Matrix” section 16.10.020.1 of the Land Development Regulations available at www.stpete.org/ldr.

CRT-1 zoning districts allow a maximum residential density of 24 units per acre. The subject parcel is .41 acres and can have 10 units by right. There are two (2) existing buildings on this parcel: 506 Grove St N and 715 5th Ave N. Per the property card interpretation completed on October 18, 1994, and Business Tax Division records, there are ten (10) existing units at 506 Grove St N that are all operated by Boley Centers, a non-profit charitable organization. Per the property card interpretation completed on September 28th, 1993, there were fourteen (14) units at 715 5th Ave. Business Tax Division Records reflect that twelve (12) units are operated by Boley Centers at this address. Thus, two (2) units at 715 5th Ave N are abandoned and twelve (12) units are grandfathered. Therefore, a redevelopment plan can include twenty-two (22) total units on the subject property.

There are no variances or special permits related to the subject property. There are no code enforcement cases currently open on this property.
This information is effective as of the date of this letter and is subject to change upon any future amendment to the Land Development Regulations or Comprehensive Plan. Future development on the subject parcel shall be subject to all applicable codes at time of permitting; including, but not limited to, Land Development Regulations and Building and Life Safety Codes.

If you have additional questions, please contact Jaime Jones at (727) 892-5096.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jennifer C. Bryla, AICP
Zoning Official
Development Review Services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING</th>
<th>ELECTRICAL</th>
<th>PLUMBING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Location: 506 Grove Street North  
B/A - 10/14/49 - Granted to 
encroach on front yard with rooming 
house (510 Grove St. No.)  
#39951A-RC - 11/1/63 - $1300  
Owner Evelyn Bee - Reroof existing 
apartment building Class A (Type V)  
W. L. Albritton, Contr.  
#63604-RO-1- 5/4/79 - $1900  
Owner Roy Pacatte - Reroof apt 
bldg; built up 5 ply roof guaranteed 
for 15 yrs; replace all flashing 
1\1/4 gravel stock (Type V) Stewart 
Roofing, Contractor (506-Grove St No)  
#5-01351-RO-1-11/20/84-$3000.00  
Owner Thomas Dixon- Fire damage 
(Type V) Honey & Foster Contr./Contr.  
(BLC/Irw)  
Bus CO #90-0633 10/30/90  
506 Grove Street N mlg  
Name of Business: 10 rental appts  
#E9573F- 9/20/77- Roy Pacatte-  
Kelly Elec - 10-meter of 60-amp each  
#8444H - 7/8/60 - E. Bee:  
Perry Plbg. - Replace ewh 
#2215L - 10/30/62 - Bee 
Economy Plbg. - Replace ewh  

**PROPERTY CARD INTERPRETATION**

506 GROVE STREET NORTH 94-0324  
OCTOBER 18, 1994 TEN (10)DWELLING 
UNITS LEGALLY EXIST ON SITE PROVIDING 
A C.O. AND OCC. LIC. ARE OBTAINED PRIOR 
TO DECEMBER 18, 1994. IF C.O. AND OCC. LIC. 
ARE NOT OBTAINED BY SAID DATE PROPERTY 
WILL BE CONSIDERED ABANDONED AND ONE (1) 
DWELLING UNIT WILL BE CONSIDERED LEGAL ON 
SITE. TEN (10) DWELLING UNITS WERE LEGALLY 
CONSTRUCTED ON SITE. 10/26/94 /dah
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>755 5th Ave. N.</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>1436-08-00 E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>F. W. Weyman</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>H. Drake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td>Woodward &amp; Smith</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td>Irons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architect</td>
<td></td>
<td>FIXTURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIND BLDG.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>O.K. DATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>Adn. of 6 apartments</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>C.J. Godsey, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td>3 Sinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOMS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>RATE PER CU. FT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupyancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUNDATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>CERTIFICATE NO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTITIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td>ISSUED TO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#56230-F</td>
<td>4/9/46</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVE TOMAS</td>
<td>install 3 cabinet in kitchen &amp; install plbg</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#62662-F</td>
<td>10/9/50 $424</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>Herman Kenwood</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENCE</td>
<td>Reroof residence; Security, Inc., Contr.</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#95991-F</td>
<td>11/13/52 $100</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td>C.C. Irons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>H.W. Kenwood</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair porch</td>
<td>14' x 10'</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#60353A-F</td>
<td>6/30/61 $350</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Herman W. Kenwood</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing apartment; Rite Way Roofing, Contr.</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN PERMIT NO.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>10/21/61</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL PWC</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>10/04/61</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUMBING PER. NO.</td>
<td>21922-41-11/14/35</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>11/25/51</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS PERMIT NO.</td>
<td>2625 B</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>1/28/57</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWER PER. NO.</td>
<td>4258</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>11/25/51</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTIC TANK PER. NO.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUED TO</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Electric Repair

Owner H. W. Kenwood - Remove old roof and reroof existing apartment building Class A (Type V & VI) Krauss Roofing, Contractor

C & O LETTER SENT 8-24-75
715 5th Ave. No. - COMMERCIAL APTS. APT. #6
REPAIRS COMPLETE 6-26-75
715 5th Ave. No. - COMMERCIAL APTS. APT. #6

ELECTRICAL

E7487C - 9/3/71 - Luther Escalby
Mitchell Elec. - 150-amps 1-phase
1-meter 24-p (715 5 Ave. N.)

E7488C - 9/3/71 - Prersley
Mitchell Elec. - 60-amps 1-phase
1-meter 1-sw 2-p (South #1)

E7489C - 9/3/71 - Prersley
Mitchell Elec. - 60-amps 1-phase
1-meter 1-sw 2-p (North #2)

INSTALLATION

#6173-10/18/56 - Butterfly Apts.
Southern Iron Wks. - 1 Steel Fire Escape

#20655-9/11/35 - Drake
Keesler - 9 m loops; 3 ws-Ok 9/18/35-0 7500

Economy Plbg. - (replacements)
#3855G - 5/15/59 - Herman Kenwood
Economy Plbg. - replace c-1-b
#5338C - 7/26/77 - Butterfly Apts
R & L Plbg. - Relocate 5-sinks
PROPERTY CARD INTERPRETATION
715 5th Avenue North
IN-93-0241
FOURTEEN (14) DWELLING UNITS ON SITE ARE NOT CONSIDERED ABANDONED.
FOURTEEN (14) DWELLING UNITS ON SITE CURRENT OCCUPATIONAL LICENSES ARE REQUIRED. 14TH UNIT SHALL REQUIRE A LICENSE IF IT IS NOT OWNER/MANAGER OCCUPIED.
September 28, 1993  RS/dah
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLUMBING (SEWER/SEPTIC/GAS)</th>
<th>ELECTRIC</th>
<th>MECHANICAL (INSTALLATION)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#9148016 - date issued 9/14/88</td>
<td>1- fire alarm panel, 1-B-back-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-p/stat/, 4-F/horns, 3-E/lgh.</td>
<td>1-cir for e/lights - issued in computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPECIAL EXCEPTION
PUBLIC HEARING

According to Planning & Development Services Department records, Commission Matt Walker resides or has a place of business within 2,000 feet of the subject property. All other possible conflicts should be declared upon the announcement of the item.

REPORT TO THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION FROM DEVELOPMENT REVIEW SERVICES DIVISION, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT, for Public Hearing and Executive Action on September 4, 2019 at 2:00 P.M. at the Sunshine Center (Auditorium), located at 330 5th Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

CASE NO.: 19-32000011
PLAT SHEET: B-22, B-24

REQUEST: Approval of a Special Exception and related Site Plan to demolish the existing recreation center and construct a new 20,924 square-foot recreation center. The applicant is requesting variances for: 1) building setbacks, 2) building height, 3) landscape buffer, 4) impervious surface, and 5) wall height.

OWNER: Patrick Green
City of St. Petersburg
P.O. Box 2842
Saint Petersburg, Florida 33731

AGENT: Raul Quintana
City of St. Petersburg
One 4th Street North
Saint Petersburg, Florida 33701

ADDRESS AND PARCEL ID NOS.: 4230 Shore Acres Boulevard Northeast; 04-31-17-67860-002-0100
4001 14th Lane Northeast; 04-31-17-67860-002-0010
0 14th Lane Northeast; 04-31-17-67860-002-0090

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: On File

ZONING: Neighborhood Suburban Estate (NS-E) and Neighborhood Suburban-1 (NS-1)
SITE AREA TOTAL: 105,316 square feet or 2.4 acres

GROSS FLOOR AREA:
- Existing: 7,986 square feet, 0.08 F.A.R.
- Proposed: 20,924 square feet, 0.20 F.A.R.
- Permitted: 23,450 square feet, 0.22 F.A.R.

BUILDING COVERAGE:
- Existing: 7,986 square feet, 7% of Site MOL
- Proposed: 6,589 square feet, 6% of Site MOL
- Permitted: N/A

IMPERVIOUS SURFACE:
- Existing: 51,923 square feet, 49% of Site MOL
- Proposed: 63,189 square feet, 60% of Site MOL
- Permitted: 45,430 square feet, 43% of Site MOL

OPEN GREEN SPACE:
- Existing: 53,393 square feet, 51% of Site MOL
- Proposed: 42,127 square feet, 40% of Site MOL

PAVING COVERAGE:
- Existing: 43,937 square feet, 42% of Site MOL
- Proposed: 56,600 square feet, 54% of Site MOL

PARKING:
- Existing: 52; including 3 handicapped spaces
- Proposed: 114; including 5 handicapped spaces
- Required: 116; including 5 handicapped spaces
* Every six bicycle parking spaces equal one vehicle parking spaces.

BUILDING HEIGHT:
- Existing: 26 feet
- Proposed: 45 feet
- Permitted: 36 feet

APPLICATION REVIEW:

I. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS: The applicant has met and complied with the procedural requirements of Section 16.10.020.1 of the Municipal Code for an active park which is a Special Exception use within the NS-1 and NS-E Zoning Districts.

II. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Request: The applicant seeks approval of a Special Exception and related site plan to demolish an existing recreation center and construct a new 20,924 square foot recreation center. The applicant is requesting variances for: 1) building setbacks, 2) building height, 3) landscape
buffer, 4) impervious surface, and 5) wall height. The subject property is located at the northwest corner of 40th Avenue Northeast and Shore Acres Boulevard Northeast.

**History:**
In 1964, the subject property was originally developed as a private recreation center and included: a pool, amenity building and tennis court. In 1971, the private recreation center was sold to the City of St. Petersburg and became Shore Acres Park.

**Current Proposal:**
The City is proposing to demolish the existing recreation center and construct a new recreation center. The new recreation center will be more than 2.5 times larger than the existing center. The new recreation center will be two-stories, elevated above B. F. E., 20,924 square feet, with an indoor gymnasium, an outdoor in-ground pool, an outdoor playground and play court and multi-purpose lawn. The new building will be designed to meet current FEMA regulations.

The proposed building will be located towards the southern portion of the subject property. The eastern section of the second floor of the proposed building will span over a portion of the surface parking lot. The in-ground pool will be along the west side of the property adjacent to the proposed building. An outdoor playground and play court, and multi-purpose lawn will be located northeast of the proposed building. Vehicular parking will be located along the east and south sides of the subject property underneath the building. Ingress and egress will be from 40th Avenue Northeast and Shore Acres Boulevard Northeast.

The proposed building will be of a contemporary style of architecture. The proposed building is "L" shaped, elevated to meet FEMA regulations and is two-stories. The design of the building is a simple box that utilizes different materials, roof slopes, cantilevers and overhangs, and glazing to articulate the building. The proposed roof is mostly flat with a slope at the northern end of the building. The sloped roof provides for an overhang. A portion of the building overhangs the surface parking lot on the eastern side of the property and the outdoor terrace on the western side of the property. These architectural elements and voids under the building help to minimize the overall mass of the building. The building is finished with stucco, metal and Hardie Board to create texture and includes large storefront windows along three sides of the building. The western façade has minimal glazing to reduce and mitigate any impacts to the abutting single-family residential properties.

**VARIANCES:**

1. **Building Setbacks**
   - Required: 35 feet
   - Proposed: 3.5 feet
   - Variance: 31.5 feet

2. **Building Height**
   - Required: 36 feet or 41.25 feet BFE including free board
   - Proposed: 45 feet or 50.25 feet BFE including free board
   - Variance: 9 feet
3 Exterior Green Yard
   Required: 10-feet
   Proposed: 5-feet
   Variance: 5-feet

4 Impervious Surface
   Required: 43%
   Proposed: 60%
   Variance: 17%

5 Fence Height
   Required: 6-feet
   Proposed: 8-feet
   Variance: 2-feet

The applicant is requesting five variances for the proposed recreation center. The proposed building will not comply with the building setbacks along Shore Acres Boulevard Northeast and the proposed pool slide and play equipment will not comply with the setbacks along the western property line, the building height, exterior green yards along Shores Acres Boulevard Northeast and 40th Avenue Northeast, maximum impervious surface ratio and maximum fence height.

The variance criteria in the City Code provide some flexibility when the project involves public facilities and the redevelopment or utilization of an existing developed or partially developed site. In this case, the site is developed with a public recreation center. The applicant proposes to utilize the existing recreation center while the new recreation center is under construction on another portion of the site.

The existing property is 2.4 acres site. The subject property abuts four roads, with two of these roads being major roads as defined by the Comprehensive Plan. The major roads are Shore Acres Boulevard Northeast and 40th Avenue Northeast. Both of these roads are located in a right-of-way with a width of 80-feet. The existing area between the back of curb and property line along Shore Acres Boulevard Northeast is 25-feet and the existing area between the back of curb and property line along 40th Avenue Northeast is 19 feet. The green area between the back of sidewalk and property lines along both Shore Acres Boulevard and 40th Avenue Northeast is 14-feet.

The code requirements for these residential zoning districts for building height, impervious surface ratio and fence height regulations are primarily intended to regulate single-family development. Recreation centers are unique, which is why it is required to obtain a Special Exception approval. To provide the programming desired by the neighborhood, utilize the existing recreation center during construction and to minimize the impacts of the new recreational center, some variances to the code requirements are warranted.

The variance to the building setback and building height could have a potential detrimental effect on pedestrians that are walking along the Shore Acres Boulevard Northeast and for the single-family residents that are located on the west and east of the subject property. The proposed building was located closer to Shore Acres Boulevard Northeast to maintain a 35-foot setback to the building along the west side of the property, which directly abuts single-family residences. The pool slide and playground equipment will be 15 feet from the western property.
line but is required to be 35-feet. The right-of-way width of 80 feet will help to mitigate the impact that the building could have on the residential properties on the west side of Shore Acres Boulevard Northeast. The City Code allows playground equipment to meet the accessory structure setbacks when associated with a child care facility. In this case, the accessory setback would be 15 feet and the location of the slide and playground equipment are proposed to be 15 feet. Staff is also recommending additional landscaping along the east side of the building to help mitigate for the additional height and reduced setback. The additional wall height and landscaping along the western side of the property will help mitigate for the reduced setbacks.

The variance to impervious surface is significant but is an outcome of providing code required parking and impervious materials for the play courts. The proposed recreation center has been designed to accommodate the programming needs of the neighborhood. The impervious surface sought is the maximum that is permitted for the abutting NS-1 zoned residential properties. Therefore, the requested ISR is consistent with neighboring properties.

The reduction in the exterior green yard is compensated by the existing large green yard in the right-of-way. The additional fence height is warranted since it will provide additional privacy for the abutting residential uses.

The granting of the variances can be justified pursuant to the applicable review criteria and will be consistent with the overall purpose and intent of the City Code.

Public Comments:
Staff received multiple emails both in support and objection to the proposed project. Objections include: mass and size of the building, privacy, lighting, noise and ingress/egress onto 40th Avenue Northeast.

III. RECOMMENDATION:
A. Staff recommends APPROVAL of the following:
   1. Variance for building setbacks;
   2. Variance for building height;
   3. Variance for landscape buffer
   4. Variance for impervious surface ratio
   5. Variance for wall height; and
   6. Special Exception and related site plan, subject to the Special Conditions of Approval.

B. SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:
   1. Evergreen trees shall be planted every 25 feet long the northern and western property lines that directly abut the single-family residences.
   2. Evergreen trees shall be installed every 20 feet in the green yard along Shore Acres Boulevard Northeast for the section that abuts the proposed recreational center building.
   3. The required exterior green yard landscaping can be installed within the Shore Acres Boulevard Northeast and 40th Avenue Northeast rights-of-way.
   4. The plans submitted for permitting shall comply with the lighting section of the code, Section 16.40.070.
5. The plans submitted for permitting shall comply with the bicycle parking section of the code, Section 16.40.090.4.1.
6. The subject application shall comply with the noise ordinance.
7. There shall be no amplification of sound after 10 p.m.
8. Plans shall be revised as necessary to comply with the Engineering Department’s memorandum dated June 25, 2019.
9. This Special Exception/Site Plan approval shall be valid through July 10, 2022. Substantial construction shall commence prior to this expiration date, unless an extension has been approved by the POD. A request for extension must be filed in writing prior to the expiration date.

C. STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

(All or Part of the following standard conditions of approval may apply to the subject application. Application of the conditions is subject to the scope of the subject project and at the discretion of the Zoning Official. Applicants who have questions regarding the application of these conditions are advised to contact the Zoning Official.)

ALL SITE PLAN MODIFICATIONS REQUIRED BY THE DRC SHALL BE REFLECTED ON A FINAL SITE PLAN TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT BY THE APPLICANT FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF PERMITS.

Building Code Requirements:
1. The applicant shall contact the City’s Construction Services and Permitting Division and Fire Department to identify all applicable Building Code and Health/Safety Code issues associated with this proposed project.
2. All requirements associated with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) shall be satisfied.

Zoning/Planning Requirements:
1. The applicant shall submit a notice of construction to Albert Whitted Field if the crane height exceeds 190 feet. The applicant shall also provide a Notice of Construction to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), if required by Federal and City codes.
2. All site visibility triangle requirements shall be met (Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.160).
3. No building or other obstruction (including eaves) shall be erected and no trees or shrubbery shall be planted on any easement other than fences, trees, shrubbery, and hedges of a type approved by the City.
4. The location and size of the trash container(s) shall be designated, screened, and approved by the Manager of Commercial Collections, City Sanitation. A solid wood fence or masonry wall shall be installed around the perimeter of the dumpster pad.
Engineering Requirements:
1. The site shall be in compliance with all applicable drainage regulations (including regional and state permits) and the conditions as may be noted herein. The applicant shall submit drainage calculations and grading plans (including street crown elevations), which conform with the quantity and the water quality requirements of the Municipal Code (Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.030), to the City's Engineering Department for approval. Please note that the entire site upon which redevelopment occurs shall meet the water quality controls and treatment required for development sites. Stormwater runoff release and retention shall be calculated using the rational formula and a 10-year, one-hour design storm.

2. All other applicable governmental permits (state, federal, county, city, etc.) must be obtained before commencement of construction. A copy of other required governmental permits shall be provided to the City Engineering & Capital Improvements Department prior to requesting a Certificate of Occupancy. Issuance of a development permit by the City does not in any way create any rights on the part of the applicant to obtain a permit from a governmental agency and does not create any liability on the part of the City of St. Petersburg for issuance of the permit if the applicant fails to obtain requisite approvals or fulfill the obligations imposed by other governmental agencies or undertakes actions that result in a violation of state or federal law.

3. A work permit issued by the Engineering Department shall be obtained prior to commencement of construction within dedicated rights-of-way or easements.

4. The applicant shall submit a completed Storm Water Management Utility Data Form to the City's Engineering Department for review and approval prior to the approval of any permits.

5. Curb-cut ramps for the physically handicapped shall be provided in sidewalks at all corners where sidewalks meet a street or driveway.

Landscaping Requirements:
1. The applicant shall submit a revised landscape plan, which complies with the plan approved by the DRC and includes any modifications as required by the DRC. The DRC grants the Planning & Development Services Department discretion to modify the approved landscape plan where necessary due to unforeseen circumstances (e.g. stormwater requirements, utility conflicts, conflicts with existing trees, etc.), provided the intent of the applicable ordinance(s) is/are maintained. Landscaping plans shall be in accordance with Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.060 of the City Code entitled "Landscaping and Irrigation."

2. Any plans for tree removal and permitting shall be submitted to the Development Services Division for approval.

3. All existing and newly planted trees and shrubs shall be mulched with three (3) inches of organic matter within a two (2) foot radius around the trunk of the tree.

4. The applicant shall install an automatic underground irrigation system in all landscaped areas. Drip irrigation may be permitted as specified within Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.060.2.2.
5. Concrete curbing, wheelstops, or other types of physical barriers shall be provided around/within all vehicular use areas to protect landscaped areas.

6. Any healthy existing oak trees over two (2) inches in diameter shall be preserved or relocated if feasible.

7. Any trees to be preserved shall be protected during construction in accordance with Chapter 16, Article 16.40.060.5 and Section 16.40.060.2.1.3 of City Code.

IV. CONSIDERATIONS BY THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION FOR REVIEW (Pursuant to Chapter 16, Section 16.70.040.1.4 (D)):

A. The use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

B. The property for which a Site Plan Review is requested shall have valid land use and zoning for the proposed use prior to site plan approval;

C. Ingress and egress to the property and proposed structures with particular emphasis on automotive and pedestrian safety, separation of automotive and bicycle traffic and control, provision of services and servicing of utilities and refuse collection, and access in case of fire, catastrophe and emergency. Access management standards on State and County roads shall be based on the latest access management standards of FDOT or Pinellas County, respectively;

D. Location and relationship of off-street parking, bicycle parking, and off-street loading facilities to driveways and internal traffic patterns within the proposed development with particular reference to automotive, bicycle, and pedestrian safety, traffic flow and control, access in case of fire or catastrophe, and screening and landscaping;

E. Traffic impact report describing how this project will impact the adjacent streets and intersections. A detailed traffic report may be required to determine the project impact on the level of service of adjacent streets and intersections. Transportation system management techniques may be required where necessary to offset the traffic impacts;

F. Drainage of the property with particular reference to the effect of provisions for drainage on adjacent and nearby properties and the use of on-site retention systems. The Commission may grant approval, of a drainage plan as required by city ordinance, County ordinance, or SWFWMD;

G. Signs, if any, and proposed exterior lighting with reference to glare, traffic safety and compatibility and harmony with adjacent properties;

H. Orientation and location of buildings, recreational facilities and open space in relation to the physical characteristics of the site, the character of the neighborhood and the appearance and harmony of the building with adjacent development and surrounding landscape;

I. Compatibility of the use with the existing natural environment of the site, historic and archaeological sites, and with properties in the neighborhood as outlined in the City's Comprehensive Plan;

J. Substantial detrimental effects of the use, including evaluating the impacts of a concentration of similar or the same uses and structures, on property values in the neighborhood;
K. Substantial detrimental effects of the use, including evaluating the impacts of a concentration of similar or the same uses and structures, on living or working conditions in the neighborhood;

L. Sufficiency of setbacks, screens, buffers and general amenities to preserve internal and external harmony and compatibility with uses inside and outside the proposed development and to control adverse effects of noise, lights, dust, fumes and other nuisances;

M. Land area is sufficient, appropriate and adequate for the use and reasonably anticipated operations and expansion thereof;

N. Landscaping and preservation of natural manmade features of the site including trees, wetlands, and other vegetation;

O. Sensitivity of the development to on-site and adjacent (within two-hundred (200) feet) historic or archaeological resources related to scale, mass, building materials, and other impacts;

1. The site is not within an Archaeological Sensitivity Area (Chapter 16, Article 16.30, Section 16.30.070).

2. The property is within a flood hazard area (Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.050).

P. Availability of hurricane evacuation facilities for developments located in the hurricane vulnerability zones;

Q. Meets adopted levels of service and the requirements for a Certificate of Concurrency by complying with the adopted levels of service for:
   a. Water.
   b. Sewer (Under normal operating conditions).
   c. Sanitation.
   d. Parks and recreation.
   e. Drainage.

The land use of the subject property is: **Residential Urban and Recreation/Open Space**

The land uses of the surrounding properties are:

North: **Residential Urban**

South: **Residential Urban**

East: **Residential Urban**

West: **Residential Urban**
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**EAST ELEVATION**

3/64" = 1'-0"

1. **STUCCO WITH REVEALS**
2. **HORIZONTAL ALUMINUM LOUVERS**
3. **CONCRETE COLUMN CAST IN PLACE CONCRETE**
4. **LANDSCAPED PLANTER**
5. **PARAPET ROOF 8'-0"**
6. **LVL 2 ROOF 43'-0"**
7. **LVL 2 ELEV. 24'-0"**
8. **LVL 1A ELEV. 11'-0"**
9. **BASE FLOOD ELEV. 9'-0"**
10. **GRADE ENTRY ELEV. 5'-0"**

*All elevation references are from NAVO*
WEST ELEVATION
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RAINSCREEN (HARDOEBARD) PAINTED WITH REVEALS

PAINTED METAL COLUMNS

VENDING

1. SHELTER - WEST ELEVATION
   3/32" = 1'-0"

MURAL / ENVIRONMENTAL GRAPHIC

2. SHELTER - SOUTH ELEVATION
   3/32" = 1'-0"

RAINSCREEN (HARDOEBARD) PAINTED WITH REVEALS

MURAL / ENVIRONMENTAL GRAPHIC PAINTED METAL COLUMNS

3. SHELTER - NORTH ELEVATION
   3/32" = 1'-0"

4. SHELTER - EAST ELEVATION
   3/32" = 1'-0"
SHORE ACRES CENTER REPLACEMENT 17203-017

Code Data, Variances Request and Narratives  Updated 07.29.2019

Lot Area:
All lots (3) combined 2.417 Acres (105,316.3 S.F.) refer to survey for reference.
NS1 lots area (16,316.3 s.f.) + NSE lot (89,900 s.f.) = 105,316.3

Zoning Actual:
NSE Neighborhood Suburban Estate + NS1

Permitted Uses:
Park Active: Special Exception (SE)
Publicly owned lands officially designated for active recreational use as set forth in Chapter 21
Recreation Use: Accessory to Public Park (A)

Future Land Use:
(R/O/S) Recreation/ Open Space

Setbacks SE Uses:
35' All yards, including waterfront

1. Proposed Setback Variance

A - Primary Building - setback
Shore acres Blvd frontage 5'-0" setback to building wall, 3'-6" to edge of decorative elements and roof edge. All other setbacks are 35' or more – refer to site plan A001 for proposed dimensions

B - Accessory Building / structures - setback
Playground play equipment / pool slide equipment
Per SE zoning code – setbacks are the same as the main structure (35')

Proposed setback reduction to from 35' to 15' along the west property boundary only. See proposed site plan for reference

Narrative Support: Because of the narrow lot configuration, Maximum impervious area and min parking requirements, the location of for this popular park features need reduced setback along the west side of the property to allow for flexible pool and activity lawn placement.

Building Height: (top of flat roof)
Max building height is 24' at beginning – 36' top of Ridge from BFE + Freeboard (11'-0" NAVD)

2. Proposed Building Height Variance

44.5' to flat roof plus 24" freeboard above BFE or 11.0' NAVD – parapet height is 1' above roof – mechanical equipment and solar panels will be placed on roof tops
Narrative Support: The Community has requested a Gymnasium during previous public outreach performed during the masterplan phase. To accommodate any Gymnasium at this location will require a variance. Additionally, the building is required to conform to FEMA and City of St. Petersburg resiliency requirements and goals which require inhabitable spaces to be placed above the flood plane and 2' additional freeboard.

**FEMA Flood Zone:**

AE, Base Flood Elevation: 9.00' NAVD, Building FFE is 11'-0" NAVD (w/24" of freeboard)

**Max FAR:**

0.2 NSE \((17,760.16 \text{ s.f.})\) + 0.35 NS1 \((7,780.25 \text{ s.f.})\) = \(23,450.41 \text{ s.f.}\)

\((23,450.41 \text{ s.f.})\) non-residential use – Proposed building area for both levels is \((20,924 \text{ S.F.})\)

**Parking Requirements:** (Recreation Use, Accessory to Public Park)

- 10 spaces per athletic field or large group court;
- 1 per 200 sf GFA for any building, group seating, or activity areas
- Park, Active - None where park is less than 50,000 sf; if greater, 1 per 5,000 sf site area and 1 per 500 sf building GFA

**Required parking:**

Building 106 spaces \((21,064 \text{ S.F.} / 200 \text{ S.F.})\) = 106 spaces

Pool 10 spaces

Park - N/A

**Total required parking = 116**

Proposed parking:

- Proposed Off-street parking = 114 (with required parking reduction of 2 parking stalls)

(2) additional parking space will be compensated per the Bicycle Parking Reduction (Section 16.40.090.3.2 with \((12)\) bicycle parking spaces in addition to the required bike parking.

Bicycle parking, reduction. Bicycle parking may substitute for up to 20 percent of required motor vehicle parking as set forth herein. For every six bicycle parking spaces above the minimum number of required spaces that meet the bicycle parking standards, the motor vehicle parking requirement is reduced by one space.

**Landscape Buffer:** 10' street side, 5' all others

3. **Proposed Parking lot Landscape Buffer Variance**

5' Buffer along Shore acres Blvd and 40th Avenue NE, existing right of way provides additional green space between back of sidewalk and proposed parking lot

Narrative Support: Because of the narrow lot and the minimum size requirements of the building footprint to provide a full 10' variance would push the building west and require encroachment within the west setback. We believe would be detrimental to the adjacent homeowners. This Variance allows a full 35' setback to be maintained on the west lot line.

4. **Proposed Impervious Surface Variance**
Maximum Impervious Surface: (Site area ratio) NSE 0.4 + NS1 0.6

ALLOW: (NS1 9,909 S.F. + NSE 17,760.16 S.F. = 45,429.62 S.F.) 43.13%

PROPOSED: 60% (63,189 S.F.) - NS1 zoning allows for 0.6 impervious

Narrative Support:

The existing recreational center development exceeds the .40 Impervious ratio for the NSE lot only, 0.6 is permitted for NS1 lots. The Size of the minimum building footprint and minimum number of parking spaces requires this amount of Surface Variance. The new building is placed over the parking lot and is two stories to reduce pervious surfaces. The size of this parcel will not accommodate any recreational center development without an Impervious Variance.

5. Proposed Existing CMU Perimeter Fence Height variance

Existing CMU fence height

Proposed new height increase from 6' to 8' feet, additional 24 inches will be composite plank (Hardie Board) - refer to site plan A001 for proposed location.

Narrative Support: This Variance is a response to neighbor's requests for additional privacy.

Master Plan - Narrative:

Supplemental Project Variance Narrative Support:

The City of St. Petersburg has been planning for the replacement of the Shore Acres Recreation Center for several years. The existing facility has exceeded its useful service life and requires full replacement. The existing center has limited programming capabilities due to its size and lacks some of the fundamental recreational elements found in the other ten City Recreation Centers.

In 2016 and 2017, the City's Parks and Recreation Department conducted several public input meetings with the Shore Acres Community and City leadership to determine the future of this Center. This included exploring several locations within proximity to the current location in Shore Acres and evaluating the Recreation and Aquatic program offerings for the future. Based on significant input, the result of this effort was a master plan that proposed rebuilding the Recreation Center at its current location, continuing to provide an Aquatics component, and adding a gymnasium to the Recreational offerings. Based on this direction, cost estimates were prepared, and a budget established for the replacement of the Center. This project was included in the list of requested funding in the Penny for Pinellas - Fourth Round Extension, which was unanimously approved.

Rebuilding the Shore Acres Recreation Center at this location while adding program elements, results in circumstances that challenge the strict application of the provisions of the Land Development Regulations. Special conditions exist which are peculiar to the site for which the variances are sought.

A. Since this is a redevelopment of an existing developed site, the parameters of the site are fixed. The existing Shore Acres Recreation Center is unique in that no other Recreation Center in the city has as many program elements on as small of a site. The current Recreation Center has several existing conditions that are either operationally insufficient (such as the number of existing parking spaces) or are not in compliance with current Land Development Regulations (such as existing rear setback and the percentage of impervious surface area). Other existing conditions that would be non-compliant if constructed today include parking lot stormwater collection beyond the property boundary (within the Snell Isle Blvd. right-of-way), exterior playground, trash enclosure, park shelter and a finished floor elevation that is approximately 4.5' below the current FEMA Base Flood Elevation requirement. Finally, no other Recreation Center...
shares a property boundary on any side with single family residential homes. The noisiest equipment (the existing pool pump room) is less than 20' from the property line of the adjacent single-family home. The size of the parcel cannot accommodate the increased program requirements and respect the privacy of neighboring properties without the Setback and Impervious Surface Area variances.

B. The proposed redevelopment involves the construction of public facilities that have been long sought after by the community. These include the addition of a full indoor gymnasium along with the multi-purpose program and support spaces such as a catering kitchen, the replacement of the existing swimming pool, the increase in parking spaces required to meet code and the construction of open outdoor play courts, a children’s play equipment and a multi-purpose lawn.

C. Because of the special conditions, a literal enforcement of the Land Development Regulations would result in additional impact to the adjoining residential single-family homes. In addition to meeting the program requirements, the building has been designed to minimize the impact on the adjoining residential single-family homes along the western and northern boundary. The decision to maintain the 35’ setback along the entire west side of the property results in the need to request a setback variance of 5’ along Shore Acres Blvd (3.5’ to the decorative concrete ribbon). A strict application of the required front yard setback would result in encroachment within the rear yard setback.

D. The variances requested are the minimum variances that will make possible the reasonable use of the land. A gymnasium requires a clear ceiling height of 25’ for basketball and volleyball play, and long uninterrupted structural roof spans resulting in a structure that is taller than the maximum building height allowed by the district. Given the location, a key project objective was to construct a facility that is resilient, meaning that the facility can return to full operations with minimal damage in the event of a catastrophic storm or flooding. Locating the gymnasium, along with the major program rooms, on the second level meets this goal. The variance required due to the height from BFE + freeboard to the gymnasium’s flat roof is the minimum variance necessary to construct the gymnasium at this location.

Additional Site Narrative

Site:

- Building location – The proposed new recreational building is located away from the residential edge along the west side, and near the intersection of Shore acres Blvd and 40th Avenue NE were the intersection. This location provides a 35’ setback along the west side of the property where there are adjacent single family residential. A setback variance is only requested on the public right of ways where there is a minimum of 75’ right of way separation from the single home residences across Shore Acres Blvd. The gymnasium volume has been elevated to provide a continuous parking lot area that allows for vehicular access along Shore Acres Blvd and 40th Ave. Additionally, the proposed new building and pool location allows for the existing recreation building and parking lot to remain in service during the initial sequence of construction.

- Off-street Parking – the proposed site plan provides the code minimum required vehicular parking within the existing property. This will avoid unwanted parked vehicles along the public right of way of neighboring streets.
• Existing CMU perimeter fence – the proposed master plan maintains the existing CMU wall. For areas along the new pool and building deck the existing CMU wall height will be increased from 6' to 8' to reduce unwanted lines of sight into the single home rear yards. In addition, landscape elements will be provided to create a green buffer between the park and the neighboring homes along the west and north side of the property.

• Stormwater Management – the stormwater management plan proposes a combination of storm vault(s) on the south side and two dry ponds. Pond 1 is located on the west side of the project area and Pond 2 is located on the north side. The outfall points for the project are existing inlets on the east and northeast property lines. Stormwater treatment and attenuation for the entire project area will be managed using the proposed ponds and stormwater vault(s). All stormwater treatment is provided within the property as required by code.

• Right-of-Way – the proposed site plan proposes to increase the sidewalk along Shore Acres Boulevard to 6' per the St. Petersburg Land Development Code Section 16.40.140.4.2 Sidewalks. In addition, the entry along Shore Acres Boulevard is proposed to be relocated to the intersection of Delaware Avenue NE and Shore Acres Boulevard to provide better connectivity through the parking area.

• Landscape – The proposed landscape plan meets City of St. Petersburg minimum code requirements while going above and beyond to create buffers and natural aesthetic to meld into the adjacent neighborhood. A dense buffer has been provided between the adjacent neighbors and interior of the property consisting of evergreen trees, shade trees and palms. Due to the proposed right of way improvements, the existing Crape Myrtles along Shore Acres Boulevard are shown as relocated along the Western Edge of the parking lot adjacent to the play field. The proposed vehicular use area perimeter planting consists of a continuous hedge along 40th Street and Shore Acres Boulevard. Due to the existing overhead power lines, understory trees have been provided at a ratio of 1.5 to 1 Shade Tree. The required foundation planting is only 30 LF due to the exclusion of the proposed overhangs and building entry. Since the sidewalk is immediately adjacent to the building, the required foundation planting will be provided in the planter north of the building, south of the playground. Where applicable, a small area will be cut out of the sidewalk and planted with green screen vines along the south façade of the building. Proposed tree and shrub species will be native and adaptive.

• Tree Mitigation – The proposed plan exceeds tree mitigation requirements and saves as many large native trees as possible to accommodate the site.
TO: Iris Winn, Administrative Clerk, Development Review Services  
Jennifer Bryla, Planning & Development Services Department, Zoning Official  
Corey Malyszka, Planning & Development Services, Development Review Services

FROM: Nancy Davis, Engineering Plan Review Supervisor

DATE: June 25, 2019

FILE: 19-32000011

LOCATION 4230 Shore Acres Boulevard Northeast; 04-31-17-67860-002-0100  
AND PIN: 4001 14th Lane Northeast; 04-31-17-67860-002-0010  
0 14th Lane Northeast; 04-31-17-67860-002-0090  
ATLAS: B-22, B-24  
PROJECT: Special Exception

REQUEST: Approval of a Special Exception and related Site Plan to demolish the existing recreation center and construct a new 20,924 square-foot recreation center. The applicant is requesting variances for: 1) building setbacks, 2) building height, 3) landscape buffer, 4) impervious surface, and 5) wall height.

The Engineering & Capital Improvements Department (ECID) has no objection to the proposed special exception provided that the following special conditions and standard comments are added as conditions of approval:

SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. The scope of this project will trigger compliance with the Drainage and Surface Water Management Regulations as found in City Code Section 16.40.030. Submit drainage calculations which conform to the water quantity and the water quality requirements of City Code Section 16.40.030. Please note the volume of runoff to be treated shall include all off-site and on-site areas draining to and co-mingling with the runoff from that portion of the site which is redeveloped. Stormwater runoff release and retention shall be calculated using the Rational formula and a 10-year 1 hour design storm.

Stormwater systems which discharge directly or indirectly into impaired waters must provide net improvement for the pollutants that contribute to the water body’s impairment. The BMP Trains model shall be used to verify compliance with Impaired Water Body and TMDL criteria.

Prior to approval of a plan, the owner’s engineer of record is responsible to verify that existing public stormwater infrastructure has sufficient capacity or will have sufficient capacity prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, to convey the drainage flow after considering the current and proposed infrastructure demand.

2. The narrative indicates the intent “to mill and overlay the existing parking area on the east side of the site and maintain historic flows to the existing ditch system that runs north along Shore Acres Boulevard”. Necessary stormwater ponds which provide treatment and attenuation for the site runoff should be located within the private property boundary since the public right of way must be maintained for public infrastructure. If this ditch was initially designed and approved as necessary treatment and attenuation for the existing parking lot and was located in the public right of way due to site constraints and because this
is a City owned facility, consideration should now be given to relocating the treatment and attenuation facility onto private property as part of the redevelopment plan and unencumbering the right of way. This could be accomplished by redirecting runoff from the existing pavement as part of the mill and overlay design, designing additional underground treatment, or utilization of additional pervious pavement design.

3. Per land development code 16.40.140.4.6 (9), habitable floor elevations shall be set per building code requirements to at least two feet above the FEMA elevation. The construction site upon the lot shall be a minimum of one foot above the average grade crown of the road, which crown elevation shall be as set by the ECID director. All ramps and/or stairs or hand rails required for access to the building must remain within the private property boundary.

4. Public sidewalks are required by City of St. Petersburg Municipal Code Section 16.40.140.4.2 unless specifically limited by the DRC approval conditions or unless a variance is approved through the City's Zoning division. Within the NS zoning district, a 6-foot wide sidewalk is required along the western parkway of Shore Acres Boulevard and a 6-foot wide public sidewalk is required along the northern parkway of 40th Avenue NE since both are collector roadways.

Existing sidewalks which do not meet the width required by City Land Development code must be completely removed and replaced per current City Engineering Standards and Specifications.

Sidewalks require curb cut ramps for physically handicapped and truncated dome tactile surfaces (of contrasting color to the adjacent sidewalk, colonial red color preferred) at all corners or intersections with roadways & alleys that are not at sidewalk grade and at each side of proposed and existing driveways per current City and ADA requirements. Concrete sidewalks must be continuous through all driveway approaches. All existing public sidewalks must be restored or reconstructed as necessary to be brought up to good and safe ADA compliant condition prior to Certificate of Occupancy.

5. All existing redundant (abandoned) driveway approaches or drop curbing which exist within the public right-of-way around the perimeter of this project development shall be removed. Pavement surfaces associated with these approaches shall be completely removed from within the right-of-way and any existing drop curbing shall be removed and replaced with a raised curb to match existing curb type per current City Engineering Standards.

6. Wastewater reclamation plant and pipe system capacity will be verified prior to development permit issuance. Any necessary sanitary sewer pipe system upgrades or extensions (resulting from proposed new service or significant increase in projected flow) as required to provide connection to a public main of adequate capacity and condition, shall be performed by and at the sole expense of the applicant. Proposed design flows (ADF) must be provided by the Engineer of Record on the City’s Wastewater Tracking Form (available upon request from ECID, phone 727-893-7238). If an increase in flow of over 3000 gpd is proposed, the ADF information will be forwarded to the City Water Resources department for a system analysis of public mains less than 10 inches in size which are proposed to be used for connection. The project engineer of record must provide and include with the project plan submittal 1) a completed Wastewater Tracking form, and 2) a capacity analysis of public mains less than 10 inches in size which are proposed to be used for connection. If the condition or capacity of the existing public main is found insufficient, the main must be upgraded to the nearest downstream manhole of adequate capacity and condition, by and at the sole expense of the developer. The extent or need for system improvements cannot be determined until proposed design flows and sanitary sewer connection plan and capacity analysis are provided to the City’s for system analysis of main sizes 10” and larger. Connection charges are applicable and any necessary system upgrades or extensions shall meet current City Engineering Standards and Specifications and shall be performed by and at the sole expense of the developer.

7. Submit a completed Stormwater Management Utility Data Form to ECID with the submittal of construction plans for permitting. Form available upon request from the City Engineering & Capital Improvements Department front counter, phone 727-893-7238, email Martha.Hegenbarth@stpete.org.
8. A work permit issued ECID must be obtained prior to the commencement of construction within dedicated right-of-way or public easement, however this permit requirement is waived when associated with an ECID project. All work within right of way or public utility easement shall be in compliance with current City Engineering Standards and Specifications and shall be installed at the applicant's expense in accordance with the standards, specifications, and policies adopted by the City.

STANDARD COMMENTS: Water service is available to the site. The applicant's Engineer shall coordinate potable water and/or fire service requirements through the City’s Water Resources department. Recent fire flow test data shall be utilized by the site Engineer of Record for design of fire protection system(s) for this development. Any necessary system upgrades or extensions shall be performed at the expense of the developer.

Water and fire services and/or necessary backflow prevention devices shall be installed below ground in vaults per City Ordinance 1009-g (unless determined to be a high hazard application by the City’s Water Resources department or a variance is granted by the City Water Resources department). Note that the City’s Water Resources Department will require an exclusive easement for any meter or backflow device placed within private property boundaries. City forces shall install all public water service meters, backflow prevention devices, and/or fire services at the expense of the developer. Contact the City’s Water Resources department, Kelly Donnelly, at 727-892-5614 or kelly.donnelly@stpete.org. All portions of a private fire suppression system shall remain within the private property boundaries and shall not be located within the public right of way (i.e. post indicator valves, fire department connections, etc.).

Plan and profile showing all paving, drainage, sanitary sewers, and water mains (seawalls if applicable) to be provided to the Engineering Department for review and coordination by the applicant's engineer for all construction proposed or contemplated within dedicated right of way or easement.

Development plans shall include a grading plan to be submitted to ECID including street crown elevations. Lots shall be graded in such a manner that all surface drainage shall be in compliance with the City's stormwater management requirements. A grading plan showing the building site and proposed surface drainage shall be submitted to the ECID director.

It is the developer’s responsibility to file a CGP Notice of Intent (NOI) (DEP form 62-21.300(4)(b)) to the NPDES Stormwater Notices Center to obtain permit coverage if applicable.

Submit a completed Stormwater Management Utility Data Form to the City Engineering Department.

The applicant will be required to submit to the Engineering Department copies of all permits from other regulatory agencies including but not limited to FDOT, FDEP, SWFWMD and Pinellas County, as required for this project. Plans specifications are subject to approval by the Florida state board of Health.

NED/MJR/meh
pc: Kelly Donnelly
Correspondence File
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REPORT

Application No. 19-32000011

In accordance with LDR Section 16.70.040.1.F. "It is the policy of the City to encourage applicants to meet with residents of the surrounding neighborhoods prior to filing an application for a permit requiring review and public hearing. The applicant, at his option, may elect to include neighborhood mediation as a preparatory step in the development process. Participation in the public participation process prior to required public hearings will be considered by the decision-making official when considering the need, or request, for a continuance of an application. It is not the intent of this section to require neighborhood meetings, but to encourage meetings prior to the submission of applications for approval and documentation of efforts which have been made to address any potential concerns prior to the formal application process."

APPLICANT REPORT

Street Address:

1. Details of techniques the applicant used to involve the public
   (a) Dates and locations of all meetings where citizens were invited to discuss the applicant's proposal
   The proposed design was presented to the Shore Acres Civic Association Board Members on 6/3/19. The design is scheduled to be presented to the surrounding community on 6/20/19.

   (b) Content, dates mailed, and number of mailings; including letters, meeting notices, newsletters, and other publications
   Postcards will be sent out next week and the Civic Association will advertise on Nextdoor, Facebook and on their website. The Civic Association also moved their monthly community meeting to coincide with our public meeting on 6/20.

   (c) Where residents, property owners, and interested parties receiving notices, newsletters, or other written materials are located
   Shore Acres and Patrician Point Neighborhoods.

2. Summary of concerns, issues, and problems expressed during the process
   Some concerns about noises and lighting spillage from the exterior court during the night and shadow casting concerns for the west neighbors during the morning. People exiting and entering the site on 40th ave. might not observe the right in, right out only requirement.

3. Signature or affidavit of compliance - President or vice-president of any neighborhood associations
   Check one: ☑ Proposal supported
   ( ) Do not support the Proposal
   ( ) Unable to comment on the Proposal at this time
   ( ) Other comments(s):

   Association Name: Shore Acres Civic Assoc
   President or Vice-President Signature: Elena Rogachevsky

   If the president or vice-president of the neighborhood association is unavailable or refuses to sign such certification, a statement as to the efforts to contact them and (in the event of unavailability or unwillingness to sign) why they were unable or unwilling to sign the certification:
From: Raul Quintana  
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 12:16 PM  
To: Jennifer C. Bryla; Corey D. Malyszka  
Cc: Richard L. Craft; Patrick Green; Harold Somarriba; Jason@wjarc.com; Brejesh Prayman; Michael J. Jefferis; Lynn M. Bittner  
Subject: RE: Project No. 17203-017: Shore Acres Center Replacement - Supplemental Project Variance Narrative for DRC Application 19-32000011  
Attachments: Appendix A Shore Acres Recreation Center Replacement Poll Results.pdf

Jenn and Corey,

Please see attached results of a poll that was conducted by the Shore Acres Neighborhood Association in 2016 as part of the public outreach during the master plan evaluation on the Shore Acres Recreation Center. If ok with you, I would like to have this information added to the record as part of the DRC application. I believe it speaks to the City’s early engagement of the community and the community’s response to the programmatic elements leading to the development of the ultimate project scope.

Please let me know if this is acceptable.

Raul Quintana, AIA  
City Architect  
City of St. Petersburg  
727.893.7913  
raul.quintana@stpete.org

From: Raul Quintana  
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2019 12:14 PM  
To: Jennifer C. Bryla <Jennifer.Bryla@stpete.org>; Corey D. Malyszka <corey.malyszka@stpete.org>  
Cc: Richard L. Craft <Richard.Craft@stpete.org>; Patrick Green <Patrick.Green@stpete.org>; Harold Somarriba <Harold@wjarc.com>; Jason@wjarc.com; Brejesh Prayman <brejesh.prayman@stpete.org>; Michael J. Jefferis <Michael.Jefferis@stpete.org>  
Subject: Project No. 17203-017: Shore Acres Center Replacement - Supplemental Project Variance Narrative for DRC Application 19-32000011

Jenn and Corey,

Attached please find a Supplemental Project Variance Narrative to be added to the City’s DRC application for the Shore Acres Center Replacement project to explain the reason the variances being requested are essential to moving forward with this project as intended and requested by the community. Please let me know if this is sufficient or if additional information is required.
Harold Somarriba will follow up with a revision to the Code Data, Variance Request and Narrative sheets addressing adjustments that have been made on several of the variance requests. In addition, a revised site plan reducing the proposed impervious surface area by utilizing grass overflow parking and other measures will be provided.

Thank you for all your assistance on this and do not hesitate to reach out to Patrick or myself if you have any questions or concerns.

Raul Quintana, AIA
City Architect
City of St. Petersburg
727.893.7913
raul.quintana@stpete.org
173 responses

What is your zip code? (173 responses)

Please select any of the programs that your family participates in at the Rec Center.
(172 responses)

Regarding the building, is an indoor gym important? (170 responses)

Regarding the building, are multiple classrooms and meeting rooms important?
(158 responses)
Regarding the outdoor facilities, is a basketball court important? (168 responses)

Regarding the outdoor facilities, is a full playground important? (171 responses)

Regarding the outdoor facilities, is a shaded playground important? (173 responses)

Regarding the outdoor facilities, is a soccer/football field important? (168 responses)

Regarding the outdoor facilities, is a covered picnic pavilion important? (168 responses)
Do you feel that having a pool provides a significant benefit to your community?
(173 responses)

Yes: 87.3%  
No: 12.7%

Would you like to expand on your answer above? (52 responses)

Smaller pool with a splash zone
While many homes have a pool, it is still a nice option to have a pool available to the community to use.
A community pool is a cornerstone for shore acres for swim lessons and swim team.
Very much appreciate and use both pools
Please have better hours on the weekend including Sunday. Only being open during the hottest time of the day during the weekend isn't useful.
Not open enough
Water slide, splash pad, being able to do laps - the pool is GREAT
The pool is the center of the community and provides a place for my children to swim on the swim team, meet friends to play safely and at one time, was instrumental in their water safety instruction.
It is great for swim team. Closes to early in the year.
Would like to see an annual pass, extends hours and lap swim access
Many homes in the area can NOT afford a pool of their own and this offers kids and adults a like to enjoy the luxury.
The pool is central to summer activities. A pool is a MUST, and many people would appreciate extended hours at the pool as well.
Shore Acres needs this rec center with the pool. It ties our community together. After losing Big Dan's I would hate to lose this as well.
I wish the pool was open longer, and more evenings. Can't use it often because it is closed by the time we get home from work.
Also would like to see a splash pad
Would LOVE to have a splash pad! We come for swim lessons to the rec center but there's no splash pad in north st.
Park. We would be there daily.
It gives families and kids something to do in the summer. We are a waterfront community and teaching children to swim is important.
Larger pool with amenities
It's never open. And the hours it's available are so few.
A community pool is a draw for residents and new home buyers.
Current swim courses can be provided at North Shore. The city (and citizens) should not subsidize a pool that is hardly ever open.
Wish that the pool could accommodate swim meets
Not everyone has a pool
Swim lessons and swim team provide a gathering place and collaborative spirit.
We use the pool each summer.
We have our own pool but a splash pad would be incredible.
We do not have a pool so we like to use the pool during the summer.
A Splash pad would be wonderful.
I think it increases the value of the community for home owners.
Most of the families in this neighborhood have a private pool and there are two city owned full size pools nearby.
Especially if we could increase the hours.
no.
All our children spent many hours on the swim team. It was so convenient that they could ride their bikes when I couldn't drive them.
I like having life guards- my children use the facility when I am not available to supervise them (12, 15 yrs).
Northshore Aquatics is so close, we need a splash pad on THIS side of town!
We would like to use the pool more, but it seems like it is rarely open.
This pool feels much more intimate than other Rec pools since the pool is rarely swarmed.
The SA Pool is the heart of the SA community. It is a valuable asset that had had limited hours available for adults and family use. It has been mainly used for swim lessons, swim team practice, and summer camps during the work week. The public swim hours offered have been insufficient.
Pool is great and would like more availability.
no.
Swim lessons should be available due to our close proximity to water.
Swim lessons should be available due to our close proximity to water.
Swim classes.
Use the pool all summer long!
yes, pool is very important to our community, especially during the summer months.

Does your home have a pool? (172 responses)

If funding were an issue, would a splash pad be a suitable replacement to a full-service pool? (168 responses)
Pool Questions

Regarding the pool, how do you feel about the open date of May 23, 2015
(167 responses)

Regarding the pool operation hours, how do you feel about the hours listed below
(164 responses)

Regarding the pool, is a diving board important? (166 responses)

Would you like to expand on your answers above regarding hours/dates?
(49 responses)

For those of us who have small children, the pool opens during nap time. I don't want to then pay to be able to go for only an hour once they wake up. I would love for it to open at 11 am

If you had it open longer, it would be easier for people to actually come

We do not use the pool at all

The hours do not work for those of us working 9-5 families
obviously a need for another pool to support the swimming/triathlon community of time. It also holds part of the day and through dusk. The 4pm close precludes many children and families, same with no Sundays. When the pool is open from 1-4pm, the pool is split into diving and slide areas, so there is no lanes for exercisers.

In 2014, the pool was not open for public swim from 9:30-11am, Monday-Thursday. The current pool hours are insufficient to support the needs of the community. The SA Pool hours during the weekdays cater to the summer camps. The Saturday swim hours are from 1-4pm. This is an inconvenient time for families with small children (nap time). It is also the hottest part of the day and the least desirable time to swim. Additionally, there is limited shade at the SA pool and the chairs are chained to the walls, so they can not be moved to the one umbrella that provides shade. There are adults who live in this community who would use the pool to swim laps. The North Shore pool has been the only pool available for people who desire to swim laps. However, that pool is overcrowded. There are never any lap lanes and to swim there you have to be comfortable swimming with three to four people per lane. There is obviously a need for another pool to support the swimming/triathlon community of St Petersburg. It makes sense to me to provide that type of swim program at the SA pool. I would also suggest keeping the pool open year round (or at least thru November and reopen in March). The volume at the North Shore pool again supports the need to have another city pool available throughout most of the year. I think you could add early swim hours for just lap swimming.

need Sunday hours

Nedds to be open on Sunday and in the mornings. The weather is bad in the afternoon and the pool gets packed with summer camps then too. We came a couple of times at the beginning of the summer and the pool was packed with summer camps (and some of those kids were poorly behaved).

For parents who work, only time to take kids to the pool is on Saturday from 1-4

The pool is not open enough hours and we aren’t able to enjoy it. We work full time and only have the weekends off.

it’s a right of passage when you are a kid!!!

I think on Saturdays it should start at 10am, for smaller kids who can’t handle the heat of mid day

I feel if they are gonna have a pool, they should open it sooner than 5/23 and have more hours of operation available to the community.

The 4pm close precludes many children and families

I would go if it was open when I wasn’t at work

Have an area to jump from the edge

It seems to be open only during the hours that stay at home moms and nannies could use it. What is the point then?

Only if lessons were given including skills such as diving

I feel that more people would use the pool weekdays past 4pm/families to beat the heat before dinner time and adults for lap swims after work

With school/work hours the times it is closed are the times I would use during the week.

Would like longer weekend hours and evenings

longer hours, weekends

I would personally benefit from more evening hours, but for kids and teens, daytime hours are most important

Due to being a working professional, I have been unable to use the current pool for lap swim during the day. Would love for it to be open earlier/later (and would pay additional dues for that availability).

Appears to me that Sat & Sun the pool should be open longer than 1-4

More hours on Saturdays and possibly open Sundays

Would like morning open swim for laps

Would like to have the pool open all year, all summer, have extended hours and low cost summer passes for kids and teens

There should be more friendly pool hours for kids in school.

The pool should be open on Sunday too. Kids and parents are off on those days and I’m more likely to go during the
Regarding the pool, is a 50-meter length important? (163 responses)

Regarding the pool, is a 25-meter length sufficient? (162 responses)

Regarding the pool, would early morning lane availability be important to you? (164 responses)

Regarding the pool, is the flume slide important? (162 responses)

Regarding the pool, is a shaded bleacher important? (162 responses)
Are there other important amenities that are important to you? If so, please use the box below.

(12 responses)

Restroom
mostly it's the pool
I would prefer a facility that offered an indoor exercise facility.
Be more like Robert's center. Offer more adult classes!
Be more like Robert's center. Offer more adult classes!
lanes for adult swim for work out would boost usage
Multi-purpose gym for basketball, pickleball, aerobics, volley ball, gymnastics, meetings and safe zone for people affected by storms, after school program
The changing room is important
It would be nice if the pool had a zero entry area
Cleaner bathrooms with more circulation of air in summer
Sloped walk in versus ladders better for elderly
Chairs you can move around
Racket Ball courts
No, but I also question the need to have everyone leave the pool after 45 minutes of time has passed. The kids under 16 have to sit out for almost 15 minutes. The pool is only open for 3 hours. The adults are able to stay in the pool but it would be impossible for them to swim laps at that time because the pool is roped off for slides, etc. The SA pool as it currently is designed can only serve one function at a time: lap swimming or diving board/slide use. It seems to me that they are just trying to sell ice cream during this time. Is this really necessary?
TAEKWONDO!!!!
Shade over the baby pool. It gets so hot its neither refreshing nor accommodating. Open cubbies so that kids can use them instead of putting towels on an empty chair.

It was a nightmare registering for swim lessons last summer. I stood in line for a half hour and left. I came back an hour later and the class I needed for my kids wasn't offered. Also, communication needs to be improved. They should be posting on the SAC Facebook page their hours and events.

Larger pool to accommodate more people

In my personal opinion, a pool is a requirement. This is Florida. Swimming is the best summertime activity for children and families. A splash pad is not an acceptable replacement for a pool.

Clean bathrooms

Splash pad In addition to pool not to replace pool.

Tennis Courts

More rooms would be great maybe a second story. It would be great to have more programs/activities offered.

Piano lessons would be great for one or two.

Splash pad!

It would be great to have a fitness center- treadmills, ellipticals, weights, circuits. people who wanted to utilize could pay a monthly charge or buy a punch pass, other cities have done this and been very successful (dunedin has a very nice one). exercise classes like spin would also be great

Shore Acres just needs the rec center with a pool or water activities. If we lose it does not tie our neighborhood together or bring in new potential buyers, especially with young children and family gatherings etc

Better changing bathroom area

Splash park/pad!!!

my neighborhood community and kids would love a pool area with several slides and a splash pad as well as a pool area with diving board... we frequent the pool area and consider ourselves regulars, we have our birthday parties there. More hours would also be nice because most of us do not get out of work until 5, we would love a rec center that is very similar to Highland Rec Center!
Alison,

Please see the image below.

The proposed master plan keeps the same type of wood fence along the north and west sides (see image below for reference). The blue line show the extend of the area of CMU fence that we are proposing for height increase to (8') – the rest of the CMU wall remains as is (6').

Red – wood fence
Blue – area of CMU fence to be extended to 8'
We are not proposing to extend the height of the wall two feet at all of the adjoining homes, but rather only at the locations where the new recreation center building and pool are immediately adjacent. All other walls remain the same.

I hope this is clear. Please let me know if any further questions.

Thanks

Raul Quintana, AIA
City Architect
City of St. Petersburg
727.893.7913
Alison,

Let us look into your specific condition and get back to you. Generally speaking, we would like to extend the height of the wall between the City’s property and the adjoining homes by two feet if the wall can structurally support that. This is one of the variances that we are asking for at the DRC meeting and if approved we can do so.

Raul Quintana, AIA
City Architect
City of St. Petersburg
727.893.7913
raul.quinta@stpete.org

From: Alison Moulding <moulding@nova.edu>
Sent: Friday, June 28, 2019 4:52 PM
To: Raul Quintana <Jose.Quinta@stpete.org>; Corey D. Malyszka <Corey.Malyszka@stpete.org>
Cc: elopomorph@hotmail.com; Patrick Green <Patrick.Green@stpete.org>; Richard L. Craft <Richard.Craft@stpete.org>; Harold Somarriba <Harold@wjarc.com>
Subject: Re: Shore Acres Rec Center

Raul,

Thank you for the clarification about the exits from the new rec center and for sending the site plan. It was very helpful, and I am glad that there is already a planned exit onto Shore Acres Blvd.

I have another question about the barrier(s) between the north side of the parking lot and our adjacent property. There is currently a fence in poor condition separating our back yard from the rec center property, and I see there is planned landscaping that will be added, too. What is the plan for the fence? Would you consider extending the wall to replace the fence? I am concerned that with the location of the entry from Shore Acres Blvd, car headlights will shine into two of our bedrooms through the fence. I hope that replacing the fence with a wall might also be a cost savings for the city in the long run as I assume there would be less maintenance cost over time for a wall versus a fence.

Sincerely,
Alison Moulding
4251 14th Ln NE
St. Petersburg, FL 33703
904-945-9060
Alison,

Thanks for reaching out to us and sorry you could not make the meeting. Attached is a pdf of the site plan that we presented. The entrance off Shore Acres Blvd. at Delaware Ave. is not a one-way entry. It is designed as both an entrance and an exit. The exit on 40th Ave. is a right turn only due to proximity to the intersection at Shore Acres Blvd. I hope this answers your question, but please feel free to email back if you have other questions or concerns.

Raul Quintana, AIA
City Architect
City of St. Petersburg
727.893.7913
raul.quintana@stpete.org

Hello Corey and Raul.
I received a notice about a Public Hearing for the reconstruction of the Shore Acres Rec Center on July 10. I have not seen the construction plans as I was unable to attend the meeting held at the rec center last week because we were away on vacation. However, I did get a summary from a board member of our neighborhood association. He said that in the new design, there will be a one-way entry into the parking lot from Shore Acres Blvd and a right turn only entry and exit on 40th Ave NE. If this is true, I am concerned this will greatly increase traffic on 14th Ln NE, the street we live on, as people will have to go around the block to re-enter the majority of the neighborhood when leaving the rec center. There are many children on our street, including my own, who play out in front yards. There is a bend in the road that is difficult to see around, so my concern about increased traffic is both from a nuisance and safety perspective. I would like to request that the plans for the new construction include an exit from the rec center onto Shore Acres Blvd to prevent increased traffic on 14th Ln NE and to provide greater convenience to people who need to return to the neighborhood after leaving the rec center.

I am writing to inquire if attending the hearing is the only way to submit public comments, or if they can be submitted in writing either through email or regular mail. I also have a few questions about the plans for
buffers (fence, wall, landscaping) between the rec center and adjoining houses. Can I call one of you to get details?

Sincerely,
Alison Moulding
4251 14th Ln NE
St. Petersburg, FL 33703
904-945-9060

Your Sunshine City
Jessica,

Eliminating the right turn only onto 40th Ave NE. has two primary concerns. First, allowing left turns (both in and out) was determined to be unsafe given the traffic conditions at the 4-way stop. Second, eliminating the right turn only entrance and exit onto 40th would require all vehicles (including busses) to turn around internally in order to exit onto Shore Acres Blvd. Given the number of parking spaces required for the project, the exit onto 40th Ave NE. headed west is necessary.

We then considered adding a second driveway on Shore Acres Blvd. to see if this would provide some relief from the potential of vehicles cutting through 14th Lane NE. This second curb cut (entry and exit) would have resulted in the loss of six parking spaces putting the project below the parking requirements of the code. The need to provide ample parking for peak times is a critical concern of the Recreation staff. While theoretically a second curb-cut onto Shore Acres Blvd could draw more cars headed north, it really would not change the fact that the proposed exit at the northeast corner of the site already serves that function and a second curb-cut would be one more driveway for pedestrians to cross.

To better understand the parking dynamics, we discussed operating behavior with the Recreation staff, and they pointed out that the vast majority of parking users (i.e. parents) come to either drop off or pick up a child. The new parking lot is designed to allow ample distance to pull in and backout of the parking spaces. The south parking lot will be for overflow and staff parking, therefore the east lot (along Shore Acres Blvd.) will serve as the primary parking for most users. The point is, if a parent lives within Shore Acres, and were to drive in to the site from either Shore Acres Blvd. or 40th Ave NE., and park anywhere along the east parking lot, they are more likely to backout of the space and exit through the north driveway on to Shore Acres Blvd. A second driveway onto Shore Acres Blvd. would not affect that behavior.

Finally, Recreation staff has committed to reaching out to all the parents and users of the new Recreation Center to encourage the use of the Shore Acres Blvd. as the primary exit for pick-ups and drop-ffs and discourage access on 14th Lane NE.
Please know that we have taken this issue seriously and believe that the proposed parking layout is not only the safest but also best for the community as well as adjoining neighbors. I appreciate your concern and feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Raul Quintana, AIA
City Architect
City of St. Petersburg
727.893.7913
raul.quintana@stpete.org

From: Jessica Cortez Fox <jess.cortez7@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 4:51 PM
To: Corey D. Malyszka <Corey.Malyszka@stpete.org>
Cc: Raul Quintana <Jose.Quintana@stpete.org>
Subject: Re: 4230 Shore Acres Blvd. NE

Thanks Corey,

Raul, what are the next steps that need to be taken to address the neighborhood’s concern? That said, what was the reason behind putting in a one way turn out that exit?

On Aug 13, 2019, at 3:05 PM, Corey D. Malyszka <Corey.Malyszka@stpete.org> wrote:

Jessica,

Feel free to contact Raul Quintana with the City to discuss these issues. He is the lead on this. I have cc’d him on this email.

Corey

From: Jessica Cortez Fox <jess.cortez7@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 1:31 PM
To: Corey D. Malyszka <Corey.Malyszka@stpete.org>
Subject: Re: 4230 Shore Acres Blvd. NE

Ok, thank you. Do you know the reason behind that?

Also, I know people on my street of 14th Lane NE. (the street behind the rec center) are concerned that the current plan has a right out ONLY turn on the side exit (I think that’s the south side of the lot) which could drive traffic down our street if people want to turn around and go east. In other words, they will have to drive down our street to get to where they want to go and that will create added traffic and potential accidents. People already have a tendency to use our street as a cut through to 40th AVE (and drive fast!) so we’re concerned this will create even more traffic making our residential street with kids even busier.

Have you heard this concern and are their plans to revise it?

Thank you!
On Aug 13, 2019, at 1:10 PM, Corey D. Malyszka <Corey.Malyszka@stpete.org> wrote:

Jessica,

They did some minor revisions to the site plan. The proposed slide and play equipment will be 15 feet from the western property line instead of 35 feet. Attached is the revised site plan for your review.

Corey Malyszka, AICP
Urban Design and Development Coordinator, Planning and Development Services
City of St Petersburg
727.892.5453
corey.malyszka@stpete.org

From: Jessica Cortez Fox <jess.cortez7@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 10:00 AM
To: Corey D. Malyszka <Corey.Malyszka@stpete.org>
Subject: Re: 4230 Shore Acres Blvd. NE

Hi Corey. I saw that the Shore Acres Rec meeting was postponed. Are there updated site plans that we should take into consideration?
Thanks!

On Mon, Jun 24, 2019 at 9:15 AM Corey D. Malyszka <Corey.Malyszka@stpete.org> wrote:

Jessica,

Attached is the application material for your review. If you have any questions please feel free to call or email me.

Corey Malyszka, AICP
Urban Design and Development Coordinator, Planning and Development Services
City of St Petersburg
727.892.5453
corey.malyszka@stpete.org

From: Jessica Cortez Fox <jess.cortez7@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 23, 2019 2:11 PM
To: Corey D. Malyszka <Corey.Malyszka@stpete.org>
Subject: Fwd: 4230 Shore Acres Blvd. NE

Hello,
I live on 14th Lane NE. behind the Shore Acres Rec Center and I’m inquiring about the plans for the new one. Received a letter in the mail to contact you. Can you send me the plans please so I can make an informed decision.? Thanks!

Jessica Fox

*Your Sunshine City*

<A-001 ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN - 07-29-2019.pdf>
July 9, 2019

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing in regards to the redevelopment plan for the Shore Acres Recreation Center. I live on the adjoining property on the north side. Currently, there is a fence in poor condition separating our back yard from the rec center property. I understand that the fence will remain in the new development plans and that landscaping will be added along the fence. I would like to request that the wall that separates the rest of our property from the rec center property be extended to replace the fence. I am concerned that the new location of the entry to the rec center from Shore Acres Blvd will result in car headlights shining into two of our bedrooms through the fence. I hope that replacing the fence with a wall might also be a cost savings for the city in the long run as I assume there would be less maintenance cost over time for a wall versus a fence. Please take this request into consideration in the plans for redevelopment of the site.

Sincerely,

Alison Moulding
4251 14th Ln NE
St. Petersburg, FL 33703
904-945-9060
Objections
From: Jeff Rabbia <jrabbia44@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 28, 2019 2:15 PM
To: Corey D. Malyszka
Cc: Raul Quintana; Ed Montanari; Mayor
Subject: Request to Deny Special Exception & Variances at Shore Acres Rec Center Redevelopment
Attachments: Letter to St Pete Regarding Rec Center Development.docx

3992 Shore Acres Blvd NE
St Petersburg, FL 33703

June 28, 2019

Mr. Corey Malyszka
City of St Petersburg Case Planner
Re: Shore Acres Rec Center Redevelopment
Corey.Malyska@StPete.org

Dear Mr. Malyszka,

I recently received a letter from the City of St Petersburg regarding intentions for the redevelopment of the site known as the Shore Acres Rec Center. Your name was listed as a point of contact.

My property lies at the corner of 40th Ave and Shore Acres Blvd NE. This lies adjacent to the current rec center, but separated by 40th Ave. My view from the front looks out to the Rec Center. So I have a very vested interest in any changes made to that property.

I am asking that the City of St Petersburg NOT grant Approval of a Special Exception and related Site Plan, and especially that it not grant variances for 1) building setbacks & 2) building height.

When I purchased my home, I viewed living next to the rec center/park with the green space and large beautiful oak trees as a positive attribute. This played a role as a component of my decisioning criteria when I purchased this home. My initial reaction on hearing about changes to the site with plans for redevelopment of the property were not positive. However, I felt that if the project were done correctly this could be good for both parties.

My initial concerns were centered around 4 components; Aesthetics, Lighting, Noise, and Function. However, after attending a meeting on June 20th that unveiled plans for the proposed center I was astonished to learn of the proposed height of the new rec center and the intent relocate it to the other side of the rec center site closer to my home! I was shocked at so many components of this site plan, but by far the most alarming is the size and height of the proposed center and the intent to reposition it to the current park/green space that lies next to me today with a building that is way too tall and big for the area and for the space available on site. After attending the meeting on June 20th and seeing the site plans I am very concerned about how this will affect my home and my property value, and I am urging the city to not move forward with the plans under the current proposal!
Some of the major concerns that stem from the proposal:

- This area is a residential neighborhood consisting of mostly 1 story single family houses and some 2 story single family houses. Don’t make the rec center taller than a large 2 story house! Keep it fitting with the size and scale of the other structures in the neighborhood. Perhaps with a larger plot of land with a lot more setback, the height of the building could work, but you don’t have a lot of land and you’re asking to reduce the setback requirement. What’s being planned feels like a superstructure with enough height on the ground level for a bus to drive under it and tall enough for a gymnasium on the 2nd floor. Sounds like the gym I go to on 4th street! The last thing I want to do is walk out my house and look up to see a 3 story plus building that ruins the residential feel of the neighborhood and dominates the everything else around it. Keep large structures like this for the commercial sector not a residential neighborhood.

- Seems to me the City is trying to do too much for what the available space is, and therefore it’s trying to go vertical. One of the attendees at the June 20th meeting gave this feedback, and I think she is spot on. I paraphrase what my neighbor said – “We already have parks nearby – if you need to add more function, then maybe allocate the add-ons to another park. Seems like you’re trying to be everything to everyone and perhaps you’re trying to do too much. This is a residential neighborhood and want to keep it feeling that way.” The current park already has a green space, a park, a pool and a gymnasium. If you want to rebuild everything as it lies today with the same layout and scale, no problem - if you want to build it the way it is proposed trying to be everything to everyone – big problem, and it’s not fair to the people that reside next to the changes!

- It was mentioned in the presentation, that a lot of the what the City is trying to accomplish was from input of residents. I was never asked for input. In fact, the first I officially learned of any planned changes was at the June 20th meeting. I’m not sure how the City selected the resident advisory committee for this project, but it sounded like there may be some special interests steering the direction. When you ask someone what they’d like and there is no cost or give and take involved, they’ll likely want it all – if you asked me if I’d like a pool, a tennis courts, multipurpose rooms, a jogging track, etc etc etc – I’d say yes if there was no cost to me and it didn’t adversely affect me. I think this is how some residents gave input. But there is a give and take and some aspects of this project come at too great a cost. By the way, there is a planned YMCA going up on nearby 62nd Ave that will have some of the same components that are proposed for the Shore Acres Rec Center site. So perhaps not everything trying to be included in these plans needs to be there for this reason...

- Also with regards to resident input, it sounded like the city received feedback from neighbors on the other side of the rec center that want the structures moved away from their homes and the green space brought closer to it. This benefits them at a cost to others. This is not right. Nobody should be able to jockey around the site plan for the new rec center site for their own self benevolence at the expense of someone else. In this case, the changes being proposed could adversely affect my property value.

- The City SHOULD NOT make any changes that could ADVERSELY AFFECT residents’ home values! I’m very concerned about components of this project will affect the ambiance of the neighborhood but also how it could adversely affect my home value. I will not sit idle on this.

As for my concerns on Aesthetics, Lighting, Noise, and Function. I brought these up at the June 20th meeting and the Architectural firm addressed the concerns for Aesthetics (landscaping) and Lighting. I’m still concerned about noise and the entrance planned on 40th Ave

- Aesthetics – As I understand it, the area along 40th is intended to be used for parking. Please, Please, Please – focus on landscaping. Make it beautiful. I don’t want my current view of a park with beautiful Oak trees to be replaced by an asphalt parking lot filled with cars. Make it beautiful and attractive to look at instead.
• Lighting – Low impact lighting!!! Bright white flood lighting is so awful and disturbing! Light pollution is a real concern and there is a growing appetite among civic minded municipalities to reduce light pollution. White Light is obstructive and ugly. Keep it in commercial zones not residential zones. I’ve seen examples of municipal projects that have done an outstanding job of incorporating lighting to be safe and low impact on the environment. An excellent example of this is the job they did with the Jackson Hole, WY Airport. It is the only airport inside a National Park and they took the approach to reduce the light pollution there and it turned out to be very well done.

• Noise – I don’t any changes in usage that would result in more noise. However, with a parking lot that means almost every time some parks their car and locks it, we’re going to hear a beep. Over and over again. That is going to be really annoying. Please keep this in mind.

• Function – no entry off 40th Ave or 14th Lane NE is of paramount importance.

Based on the concerns I’ve outlined, I ask that the City should NOT grant Approval of a Special Exception and related Site Plan, nor grant variances for 1) building setbacks & 2) building height.

On my own property I have a dock with a boatlift. Initially, I had to get a variance to the setback signed and certified by all the surrounding neighbors, and if one of them didn’t sign it then I couldn’t move forward with it. I’d like a bigger lift to accommodate a bigger boat, but I can’t because it doesn’t fit into the size and scope of the space. I think the City should think about site plan in the same way. There are limitations that exist for a reason and should not be deviated from if that is the sentiment of a neighboring resident.

I have added some key contacts as a carbon copy to this letter in hopes of gaining some assistance with my concerns and slowing down the timeline of this project so that we can move forward in a way that works for everyone.

Thank you for your consideration. I am a reasonable person and willing to help move this project along in an amicable way for everyone, but I feel that in its current proposed state of design there are too many misses to be able to move forward. I give this feedback with all due respect to those that have been involved. I hope these concerns will be factored into the redevelopment if it does indeed go forward. I hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Jeff Rabbia
813-635-6894
Jrabbia44@hotmail.com

cc: Raul Quintana, Architect, City of St Petersburg. raul.quintana@stpete.org
Ed Montanari, District 3 Council, City of St Petersburg. ed.montanari@stpete.org
Rick Kriseman, Mayor, City St Petersburg. mayor@stpete.org
3992 Shore Acres Blvd NE  
St Petersburg, FL 33703  

June 28, 2019  

Mr. Corey Malyszka  
City of St Petersburg Case Planner  
Re: Shore Acres Rec Center Redevelopment  
Corey.Malyska@StPete.org  

Dear Mr. Malyszka,  

I recently received a letter from the City of St Petersburg regarding intentions for the redevelopment of the site known as the Shore Acres Rec Center. Your name was listed as a point of contact.

My property lies at the corner of 40th Ave and Shore Acres Blvd NE. This lies adjacent to the current rec center, but separated by 40th Ave. My view from the front looks out to the Rec Center. So I have a very vested interest in any changes made to that property.

I am asking that the City of St Petersburg NOT grant Approval of a Special Exception and related Site Plan, and especially that it not grant variances for 1) building setbacks & 2) building height.

When I purchased my home, I viewed living next to the rec center/park with the green space and large beautiful oak trees as a positive attribute. This played a role as a component of my decisioning criteria when I purchased this home. My initial reaction on hearing about changes to the site with plans for redevelopment of the property were not positive. However, I felt that if the project were done correctly this could be good for both parties.

My initial concerns were centered around 4 components; Aesthetics, Lighting, Noise, and Function. However, after attending a meeting on June 20th that unveiled plans for the proposed center I was astonished to learn of the proposed height of the new rec center and the intent to relocate it to the other side of the rec center site closer to my home! I was shocked at so many components of this site plan, but by far the most alarming is the size and height of the proposed center and the intent to reposition it to the current park/green space that lies next to me today with a building that is way too tall and big for the area and for the space available on site. After attending the meeting on June 20th and seeing the site plans I am very concerned about how this will affect my home and my property value, and I am urging the city to not move forward with the plans under the current proposal!

Some of the major concerns that stem from the proposal:

- This area is a residential neighborhood consisting of mostly 1 story single family houses and some 2 story single family houses. Don’t make the rec center taller than a large 2 story house! Keep it fitting with the size and scale of the other structures in the neighborhood. Perhaps with a larger plot of land with a lot more setback, the height of the building could work, but you don’t have a lot of land and you’re asking to reduce the setback requirement. What’s
being planned feels like a superstructure with enough height on the ground level for a bus to
drive under it and tall enough for a gymnasium on the 2nd floor. Sounds like the gym I go to
on 4th street! The last thing I want to do is walk out my house and look up to see a 3 story plus
building that ruins the residential feel of the neighborhood and dominates the everything else
around it. Keep large structures like this for the commercial sector not a residential
neighborhood.

- Seems to me the City is trying to do too much for what the available space is, and therefore it’s
trying to go vertical. One of the attendees at the June 20th meeting gave this feedback, and I
think she is spot on. I paraphrase what my neighbor said – “We already have parks nearby – if
you need to add more function, then maybe allocate the add-ons to another park. Seems like
you’re trying to be everything to everyone and perhaps you’re trying to do too much. This is a
residential neighborhood and want to keep it feeling that way.” The current park already has
a green space, a park, a pool and a gymnasium, If you want to rebuild everything as it lies
today with the same layout and scale, no problem - if you want to build it the way it is proposed
trying to be everything to everyone – big problem, and it’s not fair to the people that reside next
to the changes!

- It was mentioned in the presentation, that a lot of the what the City is trying to accomplish was
from input of residents. I was never asked for input. In fact, the first I officially learned of any
planned changes was at the June 20th meeting. I’m not sure how the City selected the resident
advisory committee for this project, but it sounded like there may be some special interests
steering the direction. When you ask someone what they’d like and there is no cost or give and
take involved, they’ll likely want it all – if you asked me if I’d like a pool, a tennis courts,
multipurpose rooms, a jogging track, etc etc etc – I’d say yes if there was no cost to me and it
didn’t adversely affect me. I think this is how some residents gave input. But there is a give
and take and some aspects of this project come at too great a cost. By the way, there is a
planned YMCA going up on nearby 62nd Ave that will have some of the same components that
are proposed for the Shore Acres Rec Center site. So perhaps not everything trying to be
included in these plans needs to be there for this reason...

- Also with regards to resident input, it sounded like the city received feedback from neighbors
on the other side of the rec center that want the structures moved away from their homes and
the green space brought closer to it. This benefits them at a cost to others. This is not right.
Nobody should be able to jockey around the site plan for the new rec center site for their own
self benevolence at the expense of someone else. In this case, the changes being proposed
could adversely affect my property value.

- The City SHOULD NOT make any changes that could ADVERSELY AFFECT residents’
home values! I’m very concerned about components of this project will affect the ambiance of
the neighborhood but also how it could adversely affect my home value. I will not sit idle on
this.

As for my concerns on Aesthetics, Lighting, Noise, and Function. I brought these up at the June 20th
meeting and the Architectural firm addressed the concerns for Aesthetics (landscaping) and Lighting.
I’m still concerned about noise and the entrance planned on 40th Ave

- Aesthetics - As I understand it, the area along 40th is intended to be used for parking. Please,
Please, Please – focus on landscaping. Make it beautiful. I don’t want my current view of a
park with beautiful Oak trees to be replaced by an asphalt parking lot filled with cars. Make it
beautiful and attractive to look at instead.

- Lighting – Low impact lighting!!! Bright white flood lighting is so awful and disturbing!
Light pollution is a real concern and there is a growing appetite among civic minded
municipalities to reduce light pollution. White Light is obstructive and ugly. Keep it in commercial zones not residential zones. I’ve seen examples of municipal projects that have done an outstanding job of incorporating lighting to be safe and low impact on the environment. An excellent example of this is the job they did with the Jackson Hole, WY Airport. It is the only airport inside a National Park and they took the approach to reduce the light pollution there and it turned out to be very well done.

• Noise – I don’t any changes in usage that would result in more noise. However, with a parking lot that means almost every time some parks their car and locks it, we’re going to hear a beep. Over and over again. That is going to be really annoying. Please keep this in mind.

• Function – no entry off 40 th Ave or 14 th Lane NE is of paramount importance.

Based on the concerns I’ve outlined, I ask that the City should NOT grant Approval of a Special Exception and related Site Plan, nor grant variances for 1) building setbacks & 2) building height.

On my own property I have a dock with a boatlift. Initially, I had to get a variance to the setback signed and certified by all the surrounding neighbors, and if one of them didn’t sign it then I couldn’t move forward with it. I’d like a bigger lift to accommodate a bigger boat, but I can’t because it doesn’t fit into the size and scope of the space. I think the City should think about site plan in the same way. There are limitations that exist for a reason and should not be deviated from if that is the sentiment of a neighboring resident.

I have added some key contacts as a carbon copy to this letter in hopes of gaining some assistance with my concerns and slowing down the timeline of this project so that we can move forward in a way that works for everyone.

Thank you for your consideration. I am a reasonable person and willing to help move this project along in an amicable way for everyone, but I feel that in its current proposed state of design there are too many misses to be able to move forward. I give this feedback with all due respect to those that have been involved. I hope these concerns will be factored into the redevelopment if it does indeed go forward. I hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Jeff Rabbia
813-635-6894
Jrabbia44@hotmail.com

cc: Raul Quintana, Architect, City of St Petersburg. raul.quintana@stpete.org
Ed Montanari, District 3 Council, City of St Petersburg. ed.montanari@stpete.org
Rick Kriseman, Mayor, City St Petersburg. mayor@stpete.org
Mr. Corey Malyszka  
City of St Petersburg Case Planner  
Re: Shore Acres Rec Center Redevelopment  
Corey.Malyska@StPete.org

Dear Mr. Malyszka,

I recently received a letter from the City of St. Petersburg regarding intentions for the redevelopment of the site known as the Shore Acres Rec Center. Your name was listed as a point of contact.

My property lies at the corner of 40th Ave and Shore Acres Blvd NE. This lies adjacent to the current rec center, but separated by 40th Ave. My view from the front looks out to the Rec Center. So I have a very vested interest in any changes made to that property.

I am asking that the City of St. Petersburg NOT grant Approval of a Special Exception and related Site Plan, and especially that it not grant variances for 1) building setbacks & 2) building height.

When I purchased my home, I viewed living next to the rec center/park with the green space and large beautiful oak trees as a positive attribute. This played a role as a component of my decisioning criteria when I purchased this home. My initial reaction on hearing about changes to the site with plans for redevelopment of the property were not positive. However, I felt that if the project were done correctly this could be good for both parties.

My initial concerns were centered around 4 components; Aesthetics, Lighting, Noise, and Function. However, after attending a meeting on June 20th that unveiled plans for the proposed center I was astonished to learn of the proposed height of the new rec center and the intent relocate it to the other side of the rec center site closer to my home! I was shocked at so many components of this site plan, but by far the most alarming is the size and height of the proposed center and the intent to reposition it to the current park/green space that lies next to me today with a building that is way too tall and big for the area and for the space available on site. After attending the meeting on June 20th and seeing the site plans I am very concerned about how this will affect my home and my property value, and I am urging the city to not move forward with the plans under the current proposal!

Some of the major concerns that stem from the proposal:

- This area is a residential neighborhood consisting of mostly 1 story single family houses and some 2 story single family houses. Don’t make the rec center taller than a large 2 story house! Keep it fitting with the size and scale of the other structures in the neighborhood. Perhaps with a larger plot of land with a lot more setback, the height of the building could work, but you don’t have a lot of land and you’re asking to reduce the setback requirement. What’s
being planned feels like a superstructure with enough height on the ground level for a bus to drive under it and tall enough for a gymnasium on the 2nd floor. Sounds like the gym I go to on 4th street! The last thing I want to do is walk out my house and look up to see a 3 story plus building that ruins the residential feel of the neighborhood and dominates the everything else around it. Keep large structures like this for the commercial sector not a residential neighborhood.

• Seems to me the City is trying to do too much for what the available space is, and therefore it’s trying to go vertical. One of the attendees at the June 20th meeting gave this feedback, and I think she is spot on. I paraphrase what my neighbor said – “We already have parks nearby – if you need to add more function, then maybe allocate the add-ons to another park. Seems like you’re trying to be everything to everyone and perhaps you’re trying to do too much. This is a residential neighborhood and want to keep it feeling that way.” The current park already has a green space, a park, a pool and a gymnasium. If you want to rebuild everything as it lies today with the same layout and scale, no problem - if you want to build it the way it is proposed trying to be everything to everyone – big problem, and it’s not fair to the people that reside next to the changes!

• It was mentioned in the presentation, that a lot of the what the City is trying to accomplish was from input of residents. I was never asked for input. In fact, the first I officially learned of any planned changes was at the June 20th meeting. I’m not sure how the City selected the resident advisory committee for this project, but it sounded like there may be some special interests steering the direction. When you ask someone what they’d like and there is no cost or give and take involved, they’ll likely want it all – if you asked me if I’d like a pool, a tennis courts, multipurpose rooms, a jogging track, etc etc etc – I’d say yes if there was no cost to me and it didn’t adversely affect me. I think this is how some residents gave input. But there is a give and take and some aspects of this project come at too great a cost. By the way, there is a planned YMCA going up on nearby 62nd Ave that will have some of the same components that are proposed for the Shore Acres Rec Center site. So perhaps not everything trying to be included in these plans needs to be there for this reason...

• Also with regards to resident input, it sounded like the city received feedback from neighbors on the other side of the rec center that want the structures moved away from their homes and the green space brought closer to it. This benefits them at a cost to others. This is not right. Nobody should be able to jockey around the site plan for the new rec center site for their own self benevolence at the expense of someone else. In this case, the changes being proposed could adversely affect my property value.

• The City SHOULD NOT make any changes that could ADVERSELY AFFECT residents’ home values! I’m very concerned about components of this project will affect the ambiance of the neighborhood but also how it could adversely affect my home value. I will not sit idle on this.

As for my concerns on Aesthetics, Lighting, Noise, and Function. I brought these up at the June 20th meeting and the Architectural firm addressed the concerns for Aesthetics (landscaping) and Lighting. I’m still concerned about noise and the entrance planned on 40th Ave

• Aesthetics - As I understand it, the area along 40th is intended to be used for parking. Please, Please, Please – focus on landscaping. Make it beautiful. I don’t want my current view of a park with beautiful Oak trees to be replaced by an asphalt parking lot filled with cars. Make it beautiful and attractive to look at instead.

• Lighting – Low impact lighting!!! Bright white flood lighting is so awful and disturbing! Light pollution is a real concern and there is a growing appetitive among civic minded
municipalities to reduce light pollution. White Light is obstructive and ugly. Keep it in commercial zones not residential zones. I’ve seen examples of municipal projects that have done an outstanding job of incorporating lighting to be safe and low impact on the environment. An excellent example of this is the job they did with the Jackson Hole, WY Airport. It is the only airport inside a National Park and they took the approach to reduce the light pollution there and it turned out to be very well done.

- Noise – I don’t any changes in usage that would result in more noise. However, with a parking lot that means almost every time some parks their car and locks it, we’re going to hear a beep. Over and over again. That is going to be really annoying. Please keep this in mind.
- Function – no entry off 40th Ave or 14th Lane NE is of paramount importance.

Based on the concerns I’ve outlined, I ask that the City should NOT grant Approval of a Special Exception and related Site Plan, nor grant variances for 1) building setbacks & 2) building height.

On my own property I have a dock with a boatlift. Initially, I had to get a variance to the setback signed and certified by all the surrounding neighbors, and if one of them didn’t sign it then I couldn’t move forward with it. I’d like a bigger lift to accommodate a bigger boat, but I can’t because it doesn’t fit into the size and scope of the space. I think the City should think about site plan in the same way. There are limitations that exist for a reason and should not be deviated from if that is the sentiment of a neighboring resident.

I have added some key contacts as a carbon copy to this letter in hopes of gaining some assistance with my concerns and slowing down the timeline of this project so that we can move forward in a way that works for everyone.

Thank you for your consideration. I am a reasonable person and willing to help move this project along in an amicable way for everyone, but I feel that in its current proposed state of design there are too many misses to be able to move forward. I give this feedback with all due respect to those that have been involved. I hope these concerns will be factored into the redevelopment if it does indeed go forward. I hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Jeff Rabbia
813-635-6894
Jrabbia44@hotmail.com

cc: Raul Quintana, Architect, City of St Petersburg. raul.quintana@stpete.org
Ed Montanari, District 3 Council, City of St Petersburg. ed.montanari@stpete.org
Rick Kriseman, Mayor, City St Petersburg. mayor@stpete.org
Corey, 

Resubmitting my request to DENY the variance requests for the proposed new Shore Acres Rec center. Most especially for building setbacks and building height.

I do not know if the re-scheduled meeting includes revised plans from the original proposal, but I've heard the plans have not changed. I've reached out to City representatives on this to offer guidance and input.

Sincerely,

Jeff Rabbia

From: Jeff Rabbia
Sent: Friday, June 28, 2019 2:14 PM
To: Corey.Malyszka@StPete.org <Corey.Malyszka@StPete.org>
Cc: Raul.Quintana@StPete.org <Raul.Quintana@StPete.org>; ed.montanari@stpete.org <ed.montanari@stpete.org>; mayor@StPete.org <mayor@StPete.org>
Subject: Request to Deny Special Exception & Variances at Shore Acres Rec Center Redevelopment

3992 Shore Acres Blvd NE
St Petersburg, FL 33703

June 28, 2019

Mr. Corey Malyszka
City of St Petersburg Case Planner
Re: Shore Acres Rec Center Redevelopment
Corey.Malyszka@StPete.org

Dear Mr. Malyszka,

I recently received a letter from the City of St Petersburg regarding intentions for the redevelopment of the site known as the Shore Acres Rec Center. Your name was listed as a point of contact.
My property lies at the corner of 40th Ave and Shore Acres Blvd NE. This lies adjacent to the current rec center, but separated by 40th Ave. My view from the front looks out to the Rec Center. So I have a very vested interest in any changes made to that property.

I am asking that the City of St Petersburg NOT grant Approval of a Special Exception and related Site Plan, and especially that it not grant variances for 1) building setbacks & 2) building height.

When I purchased my home, I viewed living next to the rec center/park with the green space and large beautiful oak trees as a positive attribute. This played a role as a component of my decisioning criteria when I purchased this home. My initial reaction on hearing about changes to the site with plans for redevelopment of the property were not positive. However, I felt that if the project were done correctly this could be good for both parties.

My initial concerns were centered around 4 components; Aesthetics, Lighting, Noise, and Function. However, after attending a meeting on June 20th that unveiled plans for the proposed center I was astonished to learn of the proposed height of the new rec center and the intent to relocate it to the other side of the rec center site closer to my home! I was shocked at so many components of this site plan, but by far the most alarming is the size and height of the proposed center and the intent to reposition it to the current park/green space that lies next to me today with a building that is way too tall and big for the area and for the space available on site. After attending the meeting on June 20th and seeing the site plans I am very concerned about how this will affect my home and my property value, and I am urging the city to not move forward with the plans under the current proposal!

Some of the major concerns that stem from the proposal:

- This area is a residential neighborhood consisting of mostly 1 story single family houses and some 2 story single family houses. Don’t make the rec center taller than a large 2 story house! Keep it fitting with the size and scale of the other structures in the neighborhood. Perhaps with a larger plot of land with a lot more setback, the height of the building could work, but you don’t have a lot of land and you’re asking to reduce the setback requirement. What’s being planned feels like a superstructure with enough height on the ground level for a bus to drive under it and tall enough for a gymnasium on the 2nd floor. Sounds like the gym I go to on 4th street! The last thing I want to do is walk out my house and look up to see a 3 story plus building that ruins the residential feel of the neighborhood and dominates the everything else around it. Keep large structures like this for the commercial sector not a residential neighborhood.
- Seems to me the City is trying to do too much for what the available space is, and therefore it’s trying to go vertical. One of the attendees at the June 20th meeting gave this feedback, and I think she is spot on. I paraphrase what my neighbor said – “We already have parks nearby – if you need to add more function, then maybe allocate the add-ons to another park. Seems like you’re trying to be everything to everyone and perhaps you’re trying to do too much. This is a residential neighborhood and want to keep it feeling that way.” The current park already has a green space, a park, a pool and a gymnasium. If you want to rebuild everything as it lies today with the same layout and scale, no problem - if you want to build it the way it is proposed trying to be everything to everyone – big problem, and it’s not fair to the people that reside next to the changes!
- It was mentioned in the presentation, that a lot of the what the City is trying to accomplish was from input of residents. I was never asked for input. In fact, the first I officially learned of any planned changes was at the June 20th meeting. I’m not sure how the City selected the resident advisory committee for this project, but it sounded like there may be some special interests steering the direction. When you ask someone what they’d like and there is no cost or give and take involved,
they’ll likely want it all — if you asked me if I’d like a pool, a tennis courts, multipurpose rooms, a jogging track, etc etc etc — I’d say yes if there was no cost to me and it didn’t adversely affect me. I think this is how some residents gave input. But there is a give and take and some aspects of this project come at too great a cost. By the way, there is a planned YMCA going up on nearby 62nd Ave that will have some of the same components that are proposed for the Shore Acres Rec Center site. So perhaps not everything trying to be included in these plans needs to be there for this reason...

- Also with regards to resident input, it sounded like the city received feedback from neighbors on the other side of the rec center that want the structures moved away from their homes and the green space brought closer to it. This benefits them at a cost to others. This is not right. Nobody should be able to jockey around the site plan for the new rec center site for their own self benevolence at the expense of someone else. In this case, the changes being proposed could adversely affect my property value.
- The City SHOULD NOT make any changes that could ADVERSELY AFFECT residents’ home values! I’m very concerned about components of this project will affect the ambiance of the neighborhood but also how it could adversely affect my home value. I will not sit idle on this.

As for my concerns on Aesthetics, Lighting, Noise, and Function. I brought these up at the June 20th meeting and the Architectural firm addressed the concerns for Aesthetics (landscaping) and Lighting. I’m still concerned about noise and the entrance planned on 40th Ave

- Aesthetics — As I understand it, the area along 40th is intended to be used for parking. Please, Please, Please – focus on landscaping. Make it beautiful. I don’t want my current view of a park with beautiful Oak trees to be replaced by an asphalt parking lot filled with cars. Make it beautiful and attractive to look at instead.
- Lighting – Low impact lighting!!! Bright white flood lighting is so awful and disturbing! Light pollution is a real concern and there is a growing appetite among civic minded municipalities to reduce light pollution. White Light is obstructive and ugly. Keep it in commercial zones not residential zones. I’ve seen examples of municipal projects that have done an outstanding job of incorporating lighting to be safe and low impact on the environment. An excellent example of this is the job they did with the Jackson Hole, WY Airport. It is the only airport inside a National Park and they took the approach to reduce the light pollution there and it turned out to be very well done.
- Noise – I don’t any changes in usage that would result in more noise. However, with a parking lot that means almost every time some parks their car and locks it, we’re going to hear a beep. Over and over again. That is going to be really annoying. Please keep this in mind.
- Function – no entry off 40th Ave or 14th Lane NE is of paramount importance.

Based on the concerns I’ve outlined, I ask that the City should NOT grant Approval of a Special Exception and related Site Plan, nor grant variances for 1) building setbacks & 2) building height.

On my own property I have a dock with a boatlift. Initially, I had to get a variance to the setback signed and certified by all the surrounding neighbors, and if one of them didn’t sign it then I couldn’t move forward with it. I’d like a bigger lift to accommodate a bigger boat, but I can’t because it doesn’t fit into the size and scope of the space. I think the City should think about site plan in the same way. There are limitations that exist for a reason and should not be deviated from if that is the sentiment of a neighboring resident.

I have added some key contacts as a carbon copy to this letter in hopes of gaining some assistance with my concerns and slowing down the timeline of this project so that we can move forward in a way that works for everyone.

Thank you for your consideration. I am a reasonable person and willing to help move this project along in an amicable way for everyone, but I feel that in its current proposed state of design there are too many misses to be
able to move forward. I give this feedback with all due respect to those that have been involved. I hope these concerns will be factored into the redevelopment if it does indeed go forward. I hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Jeff Rabbia
813-635-6894
Jrabbia44@hotmail.com

cc: Raul Quintana, Architect, City of St Petersburg. raul.quintana@stpete.org
Ed Montanari, District 3 Council, City of St Petersburg. ed.montanari@stpete.org
Rick Kriseman, Mayor, City St Petersburg. mayor@stpete.org
Hi, Corey.

I own a house at 4100 14th Ln NE, and I am writing to express concern about the plans for the new Shore Acres Recreation Center. Upon review, I see the plans include an exit for a right turn onto 40th Avenue NE. This will adversely impact the safety of our street.

People driving in and out of Shore Acres already use our street as a cut through to get around the four-way stop next to the recreation center, often driving over the speed limit and causing concern for the safety of my children and the other young children on our street. The addition of a recreation center parking lot exit onto 40th will inevitably lead to more cars driving down 14th Lane NE to get to their homes in Shore Acres. I am concerned that this will make unsafe conditions for my children as they ride their bikes and play outside, and I am concerned about the safety of the many young families on our street. I respectfully request you eliminate the 40th Avenue exit from the Shore Acres Recreation Center plans.

Respectfully,

Jennifer Brouillet
Good Afternoon Corey,

I am the homeowner of 4090 14th Lane NE. We look directly at the decorated wall of the Rec Center from our front porch, which we enjoy. We bought this home just four months ago and are starting our family in this neighborhood. Having the Rec Center just right across the street was a major selling point for us as a young family. However, the new proposed traffic pattern that will direct those exciting onto 40th Ave and making a right onto 14th Lane will negatively impact our daily lives. The increase in traffic flow will create havoc for myself and my neighbors, as well as disrupt the quiet street we all greatly appreciate and love. I am emailing you with hopes of reconsideration for these plans.

I understand there is a hearing scheduled for September 4th, and look forward to being in attendance.

Thank you,
Hannah Finnigan

--
Hannah Finnigan
hmsullvn@gmail.com
865.679.0663
Corey D. Malyszka

From: Raul Quintana
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 3:52 PM
To: Corey D. Malyszka
Cc: Jennifer C. Bryla; Richard L. Craft; Patrick Green; Jason@wjarc.com; Harold Somarriba
Subject: FW: Shore Acres Rec Center - NEW BUILD OPPOSITION

Corey,

Please see the email below.

Raul Quintana, AIA
City Architect
City of St. Petersburg
727.893.7913
raul.quintana@stpete.org

From: Jaimie Kane <jaimie711@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 3:38 PM
To: Raul Quintana <Jose.Quintana@stpete.org>; Ed Montanari <J.Montanari@stpete.org>
Cc: Bob Kane <bobkane@tampabay.rr.com>
Subject: Shore Acres Rec Center - NEW BUILD OPPOSITION

Gentlemen, I am writing out of concern for the proposed building plans in the above subject line. I know the 7/10/19 meeting was cancelled as plans are being tweaked/re-worked, but I feel the need to express some concerns.

My husband and I, Bob Kane, reside at 1480 40th Ave NE directly facing the current rec center park/green space. We have been in this home and watched this community grow for well over 10-13+ years. We want what is best for the community and its residents, but the monstrosity that has been presented is just that and does not fit the neighborhood in too many ways to count. I will summarize my major concerns below.

TOO BIG!
We live in an area with 1-2 story homes, single family residential for the most part. Some houses are getting grander on the water as old homes are torn down and bigger builds ensue. Why would a 3-4 story commercial building make sense in such a quaint neighborhood? It would look and feel ODD and be an eye soar for those surrounding the property or worse those that back up to it.

NO 40TH AVE NE ACCESS!
40th Ave NE is a BUSY and FAST road. Sure, the sign before the bridge (traveling eastbound) decreases to 25 mph but us residents on this street/thoroughfare, we are far too aware of the DAILY abuse of such speed zone. We have a semi-circle drive way to assist in entry/exit for our own well being and safety, and often that is not even enough; and I am honked at, flipped off or bumper ridden by many. AND, getting out in the AM if I have to back out? I often have to sit in the center turn lane and hope a kind neighbor lets me in and/or someone approaching from either direction is paying full attention and does NOT hit me! I cannot fathom what an entry or exit for the rec center would do for my livelihood and safety, besides risk it further.

NOISE!

1
Luckily, the park and green space is something I get to see everyday and it is relatively peaceful. However, the current summer and after school programs can be quite noisy with the children rustling and playing near the fences, often screaming at cars to honk their horns (I have called to complain) and often loud music playing from rec center speakers for the kids playtime.

HOME VALUES!
I don not want a rec center to be a deterant to our property value. The current building is set back a bit from the roads, and there are lush trees and green space facing roadways. If a 3-4 story complex is built and I have nothing to look at besides concrete parking lots and an over-sized building, along with the noise, it will be a lose/lose for us.

Please talk to the real people FACING this site and understand our needs, wishes and concerns. ONE neighborhood Rec Center can't be everything to everyone and we cannot build one for that reason solely.

What about the LARGE and VACANT lot on 62nd Ave NE that is to house a YMCA? Where are THOSE plans and actions? It has been vacant for YEARS. The Shore Acres Rec Center should be for OUR community and not built to encompass the entire Northeast area of St. Petersburg and the surrounding communities. ALL are welcome, obviously, but let's NOT overbuild something that isn't broken to begin with. I am all in for improvements and growth, but in a tasteful fashion and with the support of its community.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Jaimie Kane
813-299-2164
July 19, 2019

To Whom It May Concern,

As a neighboring homeowner we want to express our concerns with regards to the proposed design of the recreation center complex at 4230 Shore Acres Boulevard Northeast, 0 and 4001 14th Lane Northeast.

When we moved to the neighborhood 3 years ago on 40th Avenue Northeast, we accepted that it is a busy street with a nearby 4-way stop sign. The recreation center was appealing to us as we have a young child. The size and placement of the facility and its layout fit in with residential neighborhood’s one and two story homes. The recreation center’s parking lot entrance on Shore Acres Boulevard Northeast seemed ideal.

When we received the notice of the proposed structure changes, we were very upset. This neighborhood is a residential neighborhood bordering Patrician Point and Shore Acres communities. The proposed recreational center structure will be the same height and size as the 4th Street LA Fitness Gym. This will be a monstrosity amongst the quaint St. Petersburg homes. Furthermore, 40th Ave Northeast is a busy street. It especially congested during school hours and 5 o’clock rush hour. The proposed parking lot entrance off 40th Avenue Northeast would only aggravate the situation causing more back-ups/traffic, more horn honking, and accidents. The proposed parking lot entrance is very close to the four way stop sign and drivers are accelerating after the stop sign and will have to slow down or stop for traffic attempting to drive into or come out the recreation center’s new parking lot. Also, moving the pool closer to 40th Ave will increase the noise in the neighborhood and the children in the pools will be more visible to possible pedophiles. Finally, placing a large parking lot where there is currently a grass field creates more noise, detracts from the aesthetic appeal, and will add more light pollution to the corner. The parking lot it will have to be lighted adequately for safety at night. This is a residential neighborhood not a business section of the city. With all these proposed changes listed in the letter, the property value of home near the recreation center will decrease. A large structure high enough to fit a school bus underneath it is like having an office building in the middle of a beautiful residential neighborhood.

We understand that it is advantageous for the community to have a recreation center that can accommodate more activities and day care but it should not be at the expense of creating more traffic, more accidents, more noise and light pollution. We would like to propose that the size of the building to limited to a two level structure. The playground could easily be moved towards the grassy areas near the existing pool. The existing parking lot can expanded to where the existing playground. In summary, keeping the pool in its existing place, re-locating the playground nearer to the recreation center’s building so it is visible to staff, and keeping the
parking lot entrance on Shore Acres Blvd and away from 40th Avenue Northeast is vital for the safety of the children and community. Thank you for considering our concerns.

Warm Regards,

Mark Bitkowski and Dr Kim Faulkner
Hi Corey,

I'm a home owner near the shore acres rec center and pool. Having grown up in shore acres and attended this facility I think that it's a treasure and can not wait to see the new facility. I am without a doubt in favor of an updated facility. This facility has run its course.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Corey,  

As a Shore Acres resident, I just wanted to reach out to say how thrilled our family is to be getting a new & improved Rec Center. It is long overdue and it will benefit so many.  

Many thanks for making this project a priority. We can’t wait to see it come to fruition.  

Best,  

Katie Hale  

Sent from my iPhone
I am in total support of the new rec center! My one request and one that would make me use the center more would be for extended pool hours. This is Florida, why do we close part of the year, why no Sunday and why close so early during the week.

Thank you,
Darla Grimes
Please approve the variance for our new rec center on shore acres blvd.

Thank you Danny Pollack, 5001 14th st NE 33703

Sent from my iPhone
Corey D. Malyszka

From: Michael Rogers <xmrogers@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2019 1:28 PM
To: Corey D. Malyszka
Subject: Shore Acres Rec Center - Variance Requests

Corey,

My name is Michael Rogers. I live at 4100 14th Way NE, two blocks directly west from the Shore Acres Rec Center. I am very much looking forward to the renovated center and wanted to express my support for the variance requests being made that are required to enable the renovation as planned.

I understand during the construction I'm sure the area will experience some noise and traffic issues. These are very short term concerns that are greatly outweighed by the benefits of a spacious, up-to-date community center.

As the footprint is pretty much in line with the current center, there should be minimal long term negative impact to residents even closer than my house, and everyone in the area will gain enrichment from the huge increase in potential activities available.

Thank you for your consideration

Michael Rogers
4100 14th Way NE
St. Petersburg, FL 33703
727 526 1552
Dear Corey,

I attended the May 20, 2019 presentation of the proposed Rec Center and its requested variances. Although I heard a few questions and objections from the audience members, I believe that all of them were fully answered by the city staff and the architect. The variances being requested appear to be not only reasonable, but take in the concerns of the entire neighborhood. It appears that they have found a good sweet spot in the design to accommodate the needs of the community and the expressed neighborhood feelings.

I favor fully granting these variances so that the project can continue on its present course.

Michael E. Higgins, PE. Retired
1906 Arrowhead DR NE
Saint Petersburg, FL 33703
727-526-9805 tel
Corey D. Malyszka

From: HAVERY <mike@haverty.name>
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2019 12:56 PM
To: Corey D. Malyszka
Subject: Shore Acres Rec Center

Corey we are residents in Shore Acres 16+ years, 3300 Overlook Drive NE.
Am very excited about seeing new Rec Center. Why?:

1) Basketball court - great sport for adults to keep in shape and socialize with neighbors. Great for kids if we can hold camps, leagues, etc in a suitable facility - just like Roberts, Walter Fuller, Gladden etc (which is where I have to drive to currently to get my fix). Possible revenue opp to rent out on open selective evenings to Tampa Bay Club Sports? [http://www.tampabayclubsport.com/team/258006/Meet-The-Press](http://www.tampabayclubsport.com/team/258006/Meet-The-Press)

2) Would be another serious positive factor for families choosing Shore Acres to purchase house, rent, etc. So theoretically good for real estate value increase (higher demand) which drives up prices and ultimately higher tax revenues for county which funds schools etc (all speculative of course). While some residents may have a different perspective - I'm personally ok with all that only if Homestead exemption remains in place of course.

3) Have volunteered past 2 summers at various St Pete Rec Centers under Summer Olympics competition for kids (my sport was 🏊‍♂️ rugby), coaching and demonstrating. Shore Acres was by far the most outdated and poorly equipped (and attended) of all the centers I went to. Local kids deserve much better and I believe an updated facility would draw more kids to participate in programs like that (any sport). Just my personal and real observation.

Mike HAVERTY
7273089180 mobile
Mr. Malyszka,

My family highly requests that you and your team approve our Shore Acres Rec Center. We believe that it will help not only the community but also the families and kids in our area. We all know that idle hands are the devil's playground so giving the kids and adults a place to go and improve themselves and to play with others is highly needed and necessary.

Thanks so much for your time,

--

Travis Failey
Shore Acres Resident for 12 years
My husband and I have live on Horseshoe Place NE for 35 years. We raised our three sons, one of whom also lives in Shore Acres, in this neighborhood and would have loved to have used more recreation center programs. Our center is outdated, unattractive and limited! Thank you for the efforts being made to build a new one. Teens and adults need this I am happy for my tax dollars to be used for this project. Please help our neighborhood see this improvement.

Mary K Wilson, 5173 Horseshoe Place NE, St Petersburg, 33703
This site should be updated.

I would compare the need for the update to NW’s center and Azalea’s center and every other center that has been updated prior.

NW site is amazing more space for the kids when school is out for an extended time.

The available space for classes and sports teams for all ages.
Dear Corey,

I wanted to send you a brief note and tell you, as a resident, SACA member, and long-time user of the Shore Acres Recreation Center, that I'm very excited and supportive of the renovation. I am in favor of approving the variance requests required to get the updated design moving forward. I'm excited to see more space and opportunities at the Rec Center and a safer parking lot.

Thank you,

Nick

Nicholas A. Farmer, Ph.D.
1405 47th Ave NE, St. Petersburg, FL 33703
Dear Corey,

I wanted to send you a brief note and tell you, as a resident, SACA member, and long-time user of the Shore Acres Recreation Center, that I'm very excited and supportive of the renovation. I am in favor of approving the variance requests required to get the updated design moving forward. I'm excited to see more space and opportunities at the Rec Center and a safer parking lot.

Thank you,

Nick

Nicholas A. Farmer, Ph.D.
1405 47th Ave NE, St. Petersburg, FL 33703
Corey D. Malyszka

From: Matt Schneider <mattschneider79@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2019 9:10 AM
To: Corey D. Malyszka
Subject: Shore acres variance request

Corey - I'm not sure I will be able to make the meeting in August. Just Incase I would like to make it known that I am in favor of the variance request.
Thank you

Matt Schneider
911 eden isle blvd ne
St. Petersburg fl 33704
Dear Corey,

I have been a resident of Shore Acres for over 8 years. My son has utilized the current recreation center each school year and summer that we have lived in the neighborhood. The staff is always above and beyond but they lack a facility that meets their needs and those of our children. I am in strong favor of approving the variance requests required for the updated design. I think the current design, with variance approval, will also provide a much safer parking lot. My child has almost been hit in the parking lot by a car several times and I, myself, have had multiple close calls with almost backing into a child. The current situation is not sustainable and will eventually lead to a horrible accident. Please consider the variance not only to provide an updated facility to fit the needs of our community but more so, to promote the safety of our children.

If my schedule allowed, I would be at the meeting to show my support in person. However, I hope you consider my opinion.

Thank you,
Jessica Powell
1405 47th Ave NE, St. Petersburg, FL 33703
618 530 6346
Hi Corey

I am in favor of approving the Shore Acres Rec Center's variance requests. Building looks nice and modern. Would be a great addition to shore acres. 😊

Kind Regards.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. Please allow up-to 36 hours to receive an email response from our staff.
Corey D. Malyszka

From: Linwood Gilbert <linwood@urbanrealtyolutions.com>
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2019 12:02 AM
To: Corey D. Malyszka
Subject: Shore Acres Rec Center

Hello Corey

I hope all is well. I would fully support whatever variances were needed to provide the new rec center.

Thank you for all your hard work!

Best regards,

Lin
1904 Arrowhead Drive, NE

H. Linwood Gilbert, MAI
Urban Realty Solutions
6161 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Street North
Suite 200
St. Petersburg, FL 33703
www.urbanrealtyolutions.com
Office 727-289-5782
Fax 813-358-1055
Cell 727-415-5331
Hi Corey,

We live in Venetian Isles and our children are attending shore acres rec center this summer. We are in favor of approving the Shore Acres Rec Center's variance requests so that a new rec center can be built.

Thank you.
Melissa

Sent from my iPhone
Corey D. Malyszka

From: David Delrahim <ddelrahim@eflegal.com>
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2019 9:46 AM
To: Corey D. Malyszka
Subject: Shore Acres Rec Center

Corey,

I will likely not be able to make the DRC meeting, but wanted to provide my public comment to the DRC. I am a Shore Acres Resident and was president of the civic association for the immediate prior four years. I fully support the rec center and the variance requests that are necessary to build the new rec center. With 2200 homes in our area and a building beyond its useful life, we are in desperate need of the building which require these variances.

Thanks,

David S. Delrahim
Partner

Englander Fischer
attorneys

721 First Avenue North
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701
P: 727.898.7210 | F: 727.898.7218
eflegal.com | ddelrahim@eflegal.com | Sidebar Blog

Confidentiality Statement: The information contained in this e-mail message may be privileged and confidential information and is intended only for the use of the individual and/or entity identified in the alias address of this message. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby requested not to distribute or copy this communication. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone or return e-mail and delete the original message from your system.
Hello Corey,

I would like to voice my support for the construction of the Shore Acres Rec Center. Our neighborhood needs a larger and more modern space to accommodate the many families and children who use the Rec Center for camps, aftercare, organizational, and recreational purposes. The current size of the rec center fails to accommodate the needs of our neighborhood.

Thanks,
Stephanie Cox
Shore Acres Elementary PTA Past President
Hello Corey,
I am the owner of property located at 4200 14th LN NE, and will be immediately impacted if an exit is added for the Rec center parking lot to turn right onto 40th ave NE. I am asking the city to delete this exit from the plans. Thank you,
Rupal Nyland
Hello Corey,
I am the owner of property located at 4250 14th LN NE, and will be immediately impacted if an exit is added for the Rec center parking lot to turn right onto 40th ave NE. I am asking the city to delete this exit from the plans.
Thank you,
Hiten Parmar
SPECIAL EXCEPTION
PUBLIC HEARING

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

REPORT TO THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION FROM DEVELOPMENT REVIEW SERVICES DIVISION, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT, for Public Hearing and Executive Action on September 4, 2019 at 2:00 P.M. at The Sunshine Center (Auditorium), located at 330 5th Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

CASE NO.: 19-32000013 PLAT SHEET: I-11
REQUEST: Approval of a Special Exception and related Site Plan to operate a child care facility for 77 children at an existing community center in the NSM-1 zoning district.
OWNER: James B. Family Service Center 2335 22nd Avenue South Saint Petersburg, Florida 33712
AGENT: Celeste Thomas 2335 22nd Avenue South Saint Petersburg, Florida 33712
ADDRESS: 2335 22nd Avenue South
PARCEL ID NOS.: 26-31-16-00000-440-1200
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: On File
ZONING: Neighborhood Suburban Multifamily (NSM-1)
SITE AREA TOTAL: 202,120 square feet or 4.64 acres
GROSS FLOOR AREA: Existing: 23,281 square feet 0.12 F.A.R. Proposed: 23,281 square feet 0.12 F.A.R.
Permitted: 101,060 square feet  

BUILDING COVERAGE:
Existing: 23,281 square feet 12% of Site MOL
Proposed: 23,281 square feet 12% of Site MOL
Permitted: N/A

IMPERVIOUS SURFACE:
Existing: 46,756 square feet 23% of Site MOL
Proposed: 48,053 square feet 24% of Site MOL
Permitted: 131,378 square feet 65% of Site MOL

OPEN GREEN SPACE:
Existing: 155,364 square feet 77% of Site MOL
Proposed: 154,067 square feet 76% of Site MOL

PAVING COVERAGE:
Existing: 23,475 square feet 12% of Site MOL
Proposed: 24,772 square feet 12% of Site MOL

PARKING:
Existing: 22; including 2 handicapped spaces
Proposed: 38; including 4 handicapped spaces
Required: 20; including 1 handicapped spaces

BUILDING HEIGHT:
Existing: 13 feet
Proposed: 13 feet
Permitted: 48 feet

APPLICATION REVIEW:

I. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS: The applicant has met and complied with the procedural requirements of Section 16.10.020.1 of the Municipal Code for a child-care facility which is a Special Exception use within the NSM-1 Zoning District.

II. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:
The Request:
The applicant seeks approval of a Special Exception and related site plan to add a child-care facility use to an existing building. The subject property is currently developed with the James B. Family Service Center, Inc. The subject property is located on the north side of 22nd Avenue South between Walton Street South and 23rd Street South.

Current Proposal:
The center is a neighborhood service center, with the mission of cultivating a community where children and families are valued, loved and destined to succeed. The applicant is seeking to add a child-care facility use for 77 children to the existing center. The existing facility offers an after-care program for children ages 6 to 14 years old, GED program, computer faculties, community garden, summer camp, food pantry, clothing, office, event and community meeting spaces targeting our underserved populations. There is an existing 988 square foot mulched playground located east of the existing building that will be used by the child-care facility.
Located to the east of the subject property is a private school. The location of the playground should not have an impact to the adjacent single-family residences. The applicant was recently approved for a circular entry drive and parking area on the southside of the building. This parking area and the large parking lot on the west side of the building will provide ample area for vehicle stacking and drop-off and pick-up. No other changes to the site are proposed at this time.

Special Exception
The proposed use, as mentioned above, is a Special Exception use in the NSM-1 zoning district. The DRC is required to review the project for any possible adverse impacts such as noise, light, traffic circulation, traffic congestion and compatibility. The subject property has been developed with a community center which has been in place since 1990 and is located along a major street that is serviced by mass transit. The City's Transportation Planner has reviewed the proposal and determined that the existing road network is adequate to support the proposed use. The properties to the north and west are developed with residential uses, the property to the east is developed with a private school and the property to the south is developed with a public school. Staff finds that the proposed use complies with the Special Exception criteria as outlined in Section 16.70.040.1.5.

Public Comments:
No comments or concerns were expressed to staff at time this report was prepared.

III. RECOMMENDATION:
A. Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Special Exception and related site plan subject to the Special Conditions of Approval.

B. SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:
1. This Special Exception/Site Plan approval shall be valid through September 4, 2022. Substantial construction shall commence prior to this expiration date, unless an extension has been approved by the POD. A request for extension must be filed in writing prior to the expiration date.
2. The plans submitted for permitting shall comply with the child care section of the code, Section 16.50.070.
3. The plans submitted for permitting shall comply with the lighting section of the code, Section 16.40.070.
4. The plans submitted for permitting shall comply with the bicycle parking section of the code, Section 16.40.090.4.1.
5. There shall be no amplification of sound after 10 p.m.

C. STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

(All or Part of the following standard conditions of approval may apply to the subject application. Application of the conditions is subject to the scope of the subject project and at the discretion of the Zoning Official. Applicants who have questions regarding the application of these conditions are advised to contact the Zoning Official.)

ALL SITE PLAN MODIFICATIONS REQUIRED BY THE DRC SHALL BE REFLECTED ON A FINAL SITE PLAN TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES DEPARTMENT BY THE APPLICANT FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO THE IssuANCE OF PERMITS.

Building Code Requirements:
1. The applicant shall contact the City's Construction Services and Permitting Division and Fire Department to identify all applicable Building Code and Health/Safety Code issues associated with this proposed project.
2. All requirements associated with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) shall be satisfied.

Zoning/Planning Requirements:
1. The applicant shall submit a notice of construction to Albert Whitted Field if the crane height exceeds 190 feet. The applicant shall also provide a Notice of Construction to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), if required by Federal and City codes.
2. All site visibility triangle requirements shall be met (Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.160).
3. No building or other obstruction (including eaves) shall be erected and no trees or shrubbery shall be planted on any easement other than fences, trees, shrubbery, and hedges of a type approved by the City.
4. The location and size of the trash container(s) shall be designated, screened, and approved by the Manager of Commercial Collections, City Sanitation. A solid wood fence or masonry wall shall be installed around the perimeter of the dumpster pad.

Engineering Requirements:
1. The site shall be in compliance with all applicable drainage regulations (including regional and state permits) and the conditions as may be noted herein. The applicant shall submit drainage calculations and grading plans (including street crown elevations), which conform with the quantity and the water quality requirements of the Municipal Code (Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.030), to the City's Engineering Department for approval. Please note that the entire site upon which redevelopment occurs shall meet the water quality controls and treatment required for development sites. Stormwater runoff release and retention shall be calculated using the rational formula and a 10-year, one-hour design storm.
2. All other applicable governmental permits (state, federal, county, city, etc.) must be obtained before commencement of construction. A copy of other required governmental permits shall be provided to the City Engineering & Capital Improvements Department prior to requesting a Certificate of Occupancy. Issuance of a development permit by the City does not in any way create any rights on the part of the applicant to obtain a permit from a governmental agency and does not create any liability on the part of the City of St. Petersburg for issuance of the permit if the applicant fails to obtain requisite approvals or fulfill the obligations imposed by other governmental agencies or undertakes actions that result in a violation of state or federal law.
3. A work permit issued by the Engineering Department shall be obtained prior to commencement of construction within dedicated rights-of-way or easements.
4. The applicant shall submit a completed Storm Water Management Utility Data Form to the City’s Engineering Department for review and approval prior to the approval of any permits.

5. Curb-cut ramps for the physically handicapped shall be provided in sidewalks at all corners where sidewalks meet a street or driveway.

**Landscaping Requirements:**

1. The applicant shall submit a revised landscape plan, which complies with the plan approved by the DRC and includes any modifications as required by the DRC. The DRC grants the Planning & Development Services Department discretion to modify the approved landscape plan where necessary due to unforeseen circumstances (e.g. stormwater requirements, utility conflicts, conflicts with existing trees, etc.), provided the intent of the applicable ordinance(s) is/are maintained. Landscaping plans shall be in accordance with Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.060 of the City Code entitled “Landscaping and Irrigation.”

2. Any plans for tree removal and permitting shall be submitted to the Development Services Division for approval.

3. All existing and newly planted trees and shrubs shall be mulched with three (3) inches of organic matter within a two (2) foot radius around the trunk of the tree.

4. The applicant shall install an automatic underground irrigation system in all landscaped areas. Drip irrigation may be permitted as specified within Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.060.2.2.

5. Concrete curbing, wheelstops, or other types of physical barriers shall be provided around/within all vehicular use areas to protect landscaped areas.

6. Any healthy existing oak trees over two (2) inches in diameter shall be preserved or relocated if feasible.

7. Any trees to be preserved shall be protected during construction in accordance with Chapter 16, Article 16.40.060.5 and Section 16.40.060.2.1.3 of City Code.

**IV. CONSIDERATIONS BY THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION FOR REVIEW (Pursuant to Chapter 16, Section 16.70.040.1.4 (D)):**

A. The use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

B. The property for which a Site Plan Review is requested shall have valid land use and zoning for the proposed use prior to site plan approval;

C. Ingress and egress to the property and proposed structures with particular emphasis on automotive and pedestrian safety, separation of automotive and bicycle traffic and control, provision of services and servicing of utilities and refuse collection, and access in case of fire, catastrophe and emergency. Access management standards on State and County roads shall be based on the latest access management standards of FDOT or Pinellas County, respectively;

D. Location and relationship of off-street parking, bicycle parking, and off-street loading facilities to driveways and internal traffic patterns within the proposed development with particular reference to automotive, bicycle, and pedestrian safety, traffic flow and control, access in case of fire or catastrophe, and screening and landscaping;
E. Traffic impact report describing how this project will impact the adjacent streets and intersections. A detailed traffic report may be required to determine the project impact on the level of service of adjacent streets and intersections. Transportation system management techniques may be required where necessary to offset the traffic impacts;

F. Drainage of the property with particular reference to the effect of provisions for drainage on adjacent and nearby properties and the use of on-site retention systems. The Commission may grant approval of a drainage plan as required by city ordinance, County ordinance, or SWFWMD;

G. Signs, if any, and proposed exterior lighting with reference to glare, traffic safety and compatibility and harmony with adjacent properties;

H. Orientation and location of buildings, recreational facilities and open space in relation to the physical characteristics of the site, the character of the neighborhood and the appearance and harmony of the building with adjacent development and surrounding landscape;

I. Compatibility of the use with the existing natural environment of the site, historic and archaeological sites, and with properties in the neighborhood as outlined in the City's Comprehensive Plan;

J. Substantial detrimental effects of the use, including evaluating the impacts of a concentration of similar or the same uses and structures, on property values in the neighborhood;

K. Substantial detrimental effects of the use, including evaluating the impacts of a concentration of similar or the same uses and structures, on living or working conditions in the neighborhood;

L. Sufficiency of setbacks, screens, buffers and general amenities to preserve internal and external harmony and compatibility with uses inside and outside the proposed development and to control adverse effects of noise, lights, dust, fumes and other nuisances;

M. Land area is sufficient, appropriate and adequate for the use and reasonably anticipated operations and expansion thereof;

N. Landscaping and preservation of natural manmade features of the site including trees, wetlands, and other vegetation;

O. Sensitivity of the development to on-site and adjacent (within two-hundred (200) feet) historic or archaeological resources related to scale, mass, building materials, and other impacts;

1. The site is not within an Archaeological Sensitivity Area (Chapter 16, Article 16.30, Section 16.30.070).

2. The property is not within a flood hazard area (Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.050).

P. Availability of hurricane evacuation facilities for developments located in the hurricane vulnerability zones;

Q. Meets adopted levels of service and the requirements for a Certificate of Concurrency by complying with the adopted levels of service for:

   a. Water.
b. Sewer (Under normal operating conditions).
c. Sanitation.
d. Parks and recreation.
e. Drainage.

The land use of the subject property is: **Intuitional**

The land uses of the surrounding properties are:

North: **Planned Redevelopment – Residential**

South: **Institutional**

East: **Institutional and Residential Medium**

West: **Planned Redevelopment – Residential**

REPORT PREPARED BY:

[Signature]

Corey Małyszka, AICP, Urban Design and Development Coordinator
Planning and Development Services Department
Development Review Services Division

REPORT APPROVED BY:

[Signature]

Jennifer Bryla, AICP, Zoning Official (POD)
Planning and Development Services Department
Development Review Services Division
SPECIAL EXCEPTION
PUBLIC HEARING

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

REPORT TO THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION FROM DEVELOPMENT REVIEW SERVICES DIVISION, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT, for Public Hearing and Executive Action on September 4, 2019 at 2:00 P.M. at the Sunshine Center, located at 330 5th Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

CASE NO.: 19-32000014
PLAT SHEET: F-54, F-56
REQUEST: Approval of a modification to a previously approved Special Exception to demolish an existing fuel station and car wash and construct a new 4,351-square foot fuel station with a car wash in the CCS-2 zoning district.

OWNER: Circle K Stores, Inc
Attn: Rent and Property Tax
1130 W. Warner Road BLDG B
Tempe, Arizona 85284

AGENT: Thomas Engineering Group, LLC
5830 W. Kennedy Blvd, Suite 600
Tampa, Florida 33609

ADDRESS: 10600 Roosevelt Boulevard North

PARCEL ID NO.: 18-30-17-30371-001-0010

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: On File

ZONING: Corridor Commercial Suburban (CCS-2)
SITE AREA TOTAL: 65,341 square feet or 1.50 acres

GROSS FLOOR AREA:
- Existing: 2,314 square feet .03 F.A.R.
- Proposed: 5,838 square feet .09 F.A.R.
- Permitted: 49,073 square feet .75 F.A.R.

BUILDING COVERAGE:
- Existing: 2,300 square feet 0.03 % of Site MOL
- Proposed: 5,838 square feet 0.09 % of Site MOL
- Permitted: N/A square feet N/A % of Site MOL

IMPERVIOUS SURFACE:
- Existing: 28,211 square feet 43 % of Site MOL
- Proposed: 39,628 square feet 61 % of Site MOL
- Permitted: 58,887 square feet 90 % of Site MOL

OPEN GREEN SPACE:
- Existing: 37,129 square feet 57 % of Site MOL
- Proposed: 25,713 square feet 39 % of Site MOL

PAVING COVERAGE:
- Existing: 25,911 square feet 40 % of Site MOL
- Proposed: 35,277 square feet 54 % of Site MOL

PARKING:
- Existing: 12; including 1 handicapped spaces
- Proposed: 24; including 2 handicapped spaces
- Required: 22; including 1 handicapped spaces

BUILDING HEIGHT:
- Existing: 11 feet
- Proposed: 12 feet
- Permitted: 36 feet

APPLICATION REVIEW:

I. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS: The applicant has met and complied with the procedural requirements of Section 16.10.020.1 of the Municipal Code for a car wash which is a Special Exception use within the CCS-2 Zoning District.

II. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Request: The applicant seeks approval of a site plan modification to a previously approved Special Exception to allow removal and reconstruction of an existing single bay carwash. The subject property is located at the Southeast corner of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street North and Roosevelt Boulevard North.
Current Proposal:

The applicant proposes to demolish and reconstruct an existing fuel station, fuel station canopy and carwash. The subject property previously received Special Exception approval for the existing 2,300 square feet fuel station, carwash and fuel station canopy in 1989 according to SE-1310B.

As proposed a new 4,351 square foot convenience store will be built north of its existing location to allow for the addition of 13 on site parking spaces abutting the store’s primary entrance. A new fuel station canopy will be constructed generally in the same location as the existing canopy with an increase in the number of fuel pumping terminals, from 12 to 16 pumping stations. A new detached car wash building will be constructed west of the new convenience store. A dumpster enclosure designed to accommodate new dumpsters will be built on the east side of the new convenience store building. There are three existing ingress/egress driveways located on the property. One of the three existing driveways located on the east side of the property will be removed to accommodate the five parking spaces and the drive isle entrance to the carwash. A separate drive isle for the car wash is proposed along the rear of the convenience store, extending from the northeast corner of the proposed parking lot to the northwest corner of the parking lot. Vehicles will enter the car wash on the north side of the car wash bay and exit on the south side of the car wash bay. Code requires five (5) stacking spaces for the carwash. The applicant will comply with the stacking requirements.

The proposed convenience store building is a modern vernacular style of architecture. The building will have a slow sloped shed roof with a parapet walls atop the structure, finished with stucco and stone veneering. There

Public Comments:
Staff has received one phone call and no emails regards the proposed carwash. The one phone call received was from a property owner with concerns for the overall size of the fuel station and canopy cover.

III. RECOMMENDATION:
B. Staff recommends APPROVAL of the following:
   1. Site Plan Modification, subject to the special Conditions of Approval.

C. SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:
1. Plans shall comply with Section 16.50.050 Car Wash and Detailing, including the hours of operation between 8AM to 8PM.
2. Plans shall comply with Section 16.50.165 Gas and Fuel Stations.
3. Exterior lighting shall comply with Section 16.40.070.
4. Bicycle parking shall comply with Section 16.40.090.4.1.
5. Pedestrian walkways shall be provided, connecting from the entrance of the convenience store to the existing sidewalks abutting Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street North and Roosevelt Blvd North.
6. The proposed dumpster compound shall have opaque gates.
7. Prior to permitting the applicant shall address the location of the dumpster facilities and receive a letter of no objection from the City’s Sanitation Department.
8. Plans shall be revised as necessary to comply with the requirements of the Building Design standards of CCS-2 zoning district per Section 16.20.090.
9. Plans shall be revised as necessary to comply with comments provided by the City's Engineering Department. Comments are provided by the attached Engineering Memorandum dated August 9, 2019.

10. Plans shall be revised as necessary to comply with the requirements of the City's Transportation and Parking Management Department. Comments are provided via the attached email correspondence from the Transportation and Parking Management Department dated August 14, 2019.

11. This Special Exception approval shall be valid through September 4, 2022. Substantial construction shall commence prior to this expiration date, unless an extension has been approved by the POD. A request for extension must be filed in writing prior to the expiration date.

D. STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

(All or Part of the following standard conditions of approval may apply to the subject application. Application of the conditions is subject to the scope of the subject project and at the discretion of the Zoning Official. Applicants who have questions regarding the application of these conditions are advised to contact the Zoning Official.)

ALL SITE PLAN MODIFICATIONS REQUIRED BY THE DRC SHALL BE REFLECTED ON A FINAL SITE PLAN TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT BY THE APPLICANT FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF PERMITS.

Building Code Requirements:

1. The applicant shall contact the City's Construction Services and Permitting Division and Fire Department to identify all applicable Building Code and Health/Safety Code issues associated with this proposed project.

2. All requirements associated with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) shall be satisfied.

Zoning/Planning Requirements:

1. The applicant shall submit a notice of construction to Albert Whitted Field if the crane height exceeds 190 feet. The applicant shall also provide a Notice of Construction to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), if required by Federal and City codes.

2. All site visibility triangle requirements shall be met (Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.160).

3. No building or other obstruction (including eaves) shall be erected and no trees or shrubbery shall be planted on any easement other than fences, trees, shrubbery, and hedges of a type approved by the City.

4. The location and size of the trash container(s) shall be designated, screened, and approved by the Manager of Commercial Collections, City Sanitation. A solid wood fence or masonry wall shall be installed around the perimeter of the dumpster pad.

Engineering Requirements:

1. The site shall be in compliance with all applicable drainage regulations (including regional and state permits) and the conditions as may be noted herein. The applicant shall submit drainage calculations and grading plans (including street...
crown elevations), which conform with the quantity and the water quality requirements of the Municipal Code (Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.030), to the City's Engineering Department for approval. Please note that the entire site upon which redevelopment occurs shall meet the water quality controls and treatment required for development sites. Stormwater runoff release and retention shall be calculated using the rational formula and a 10-year, one-hour design storm.

2. A work permit issued by the Engineering Department shall be obtained prior to commencement of construction within dedicated rights-of-way or easements.

3. The applicant shall submit a completed Storm Water Management Utility Data Form to the City's Engineering Department for review and approval prior to the approval of any permits.

4. Curb-cut ramps for the physically handicapped shall be provided in sidewalks at all corners where sidewalks meet a street or driveway.

Landscaping Requirements:

1. The applicant shall submit a revised landscape plan, which complies with the plan approved by the DRC and includes any modifications as required by the DRC. The DRC grants the Planning & Development Services Department discretion to modify the approved landscape plan where necessary due to unforeseen circumstances (e.g. stormwater requirements, utility conflicts, conflicts with existing trees, etc.), provided the intent of the applicable ordinance(s) is/are maintained. Landscaping plans shall be in accordance with Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.060 of the City Code entitled "Landscaping and Irrigation."

2. Any plans for tree removal and permitting shall be submitted to the Development Services Division for approval.

3. All existing and newly planted trees and shrubs shall be mulched with three (3) inches of organic matter within a two (2) foot radius around the trunk of the tree.

4. The applicant shall install an automatic underground irrigation system in all landscaped areas. Drip irrigation may be permitted as specified within Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.060.2.2.

5. Concrete curbing, wheelstops, or other types of physical barriers shall be provided around/within all vehicular use areas to protect landscaped areas.

6. Any healthy existing oak trees over two (2) inches in diameter shall be preserved or relocated if feasible.

7. Any trees to be preserved shall be protected during construction in accordance with Chapter 16, Article 16.40.060.5 and Section 16.40.060.2.1.3 of City Code.

IV. CONSIDERATIONS BY THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION FOR REVIEW (Pursuant to Chapter 16, Section 16.70.040.1.4 (D)):

A. The use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

B. The property for which a Site Plan Review is requested shall have valid land use and zoning for the proposed use prior to site plan approval;

C. Ingress and egress to the property and proposed structures with particular emphasis on automotive and pedestrian safety, separation of automotive and bicycle traffic and control, provision of services and servicing of utilities and refuse collection, and access in case of fire, catastrophe and emergency. Access
management standards on State and County roads shall be based on the latest access management standards of FDOT or Pinellas County, respectively;

D. Location and relationship of off-street parking, bicycle parking, and off-street loading facilities to driveways and internal traffic patterns within the proposed development with particular reference to automotive, bicycle, and pedestrian safety, traffic flow and control, access in case of fire or catastrophe, and screening and landscaping;

E. Traffic impact report describing how this project will impact the adjacent streets and intersections. A detailed traffic report may be required to determine the project impact on the level of service of adjacent streets and intersections. Transportation system management techniques may be required where necessary to offset the traffic impacts;

F. Drainage of the property with particular reference to the effect of provisions for drainage on adjacent and nearby properties and the use of on-site retention systems. The Commission may grant approval of a drainage plan as required by city ordinance, County ordinance, or SWFWMD;

G. Signs, if any, and proposed exterior lighting with reference to glare, traffic safety and compatibility and harmony with adjacent properties;

H. Orientation and location of buildings, recreational facilities and open space in relation to the physical characteristics of the site, the character of the neighborhood and the appearance and harmony of the building with adjacent development and surrounding landscape;

I. Compatibility of the use with the existing natural environment of the site, historic and archaeological sites, and with properties in the neighborhood as outlined in the City's Comprehensive Plan;

J. Substantial detrimental effects of the use, including evaluating the impacts of a concentration of similar or the same uses and structures, on property values in the neighborhood;

K. Substantial detrimental effects of the use, including evaluating the impacts of a concentration of similar or the same uses and structures, on living or working conditions in the neighborhood;

L. Sufficiency of setbacks, screens, buffers and general amenities to preserve internal and external harmony and compatibility with uses inside and outside the proposed development and to control adverse effects of noise, lights, dust, fumes and other nuisances;

M. Land area is sufficient, appropriate and adequate for the use and reasonably anticipated operations and expansion thereof;

N. Landscaping and preservation of natural manmade features of the site including trees, wetlands, and other vegetation;

O. Sensitivity of the development to on-site and adjacent (within two-hundred (200) feet) historic or archaeological resources related to scale, mass, building materials, and other impacts;

1. The site is not within an Archaeological Sensitivity Area (Chapter 16, Article 16.30, Section 16.30.070).
2. The property is within a flood hazard area (Chapter 16, Article 16.40, Section 16.40.050).

P. Availability of hurricane evacuation facilities for developments located in the hurricane vulnerability zones;

Q. Meets adopted levels of service and the requirements for a Certificate of Concurrency by complying with the adopted levels of service for:
   a. Water.
   b. Sewer (Under normal operating conditions).
   c. Sanitation.
   d. Parks and recreation.
   e. Drainage.

The land use of the subject property is: Planned Redevelopment Commercial

The land uses of the surrounding properties are:
North: Residential Medium
South: Planned Redevelopment Commercial
East: Planned Redevelopment Commercial
West: Industrial Limited

REPORT PREPARED BY:

[Signature]
Shervon Chambliss, Planner I
Planning and Development Services Department
Development Review Services Division

REPORT APPROVED BY:

[Signature]
Jennifer Bryla, AICP, Zoning Official (POD)
Planning and Development Services Department
Development Review Services Division
SPECIAL EXCEPTION
SITE PLAN REVIEW

Application No. 19-32000014

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

GENERAL INFORMATION

NAME of APPLICANT (Property Owner): CIRCLE K STORES, INC.
Street Address: 1130 W. WARNER RD. BLDG B
City, State, Zip: TEMPE, AZ, 85284
Telephone No: 813-910-5366 Email: RFIELDS@CIRCLEK.COM

NAME of AGENT OR REPRESENTATIVE: THOMAS ENGINEERING GROUP, LLC
Street Address: 5830 W. KENNEDY BLVD, SUITE 600
City, State, Zip: TAMPA, FL, 33609
Telephone No: 813-379-4100 Email: EMCDONALD@THOMASEG.COM

NAME of ARCHITECT or ENGINEER:
Company Name: THOMAS ENGINEERING GROUP, LLC
Contact Name: EDWARD M. MCDONALD
Telephone No: 813-379-4100 Website: 813-379-4100
Email: EMCDONALD@THOMASEG.COM

PROPERTY INFORMATION:
Address/Location: 10600 ROOSEVELT BLVD N Email: RFIELDS@CIRCLEK.COM
Parcel ID(s): 18-30-17-30371-001-0010

DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST: This is a SPR for the redevelopment of an existing gas station and includes a SE request to redevelop the existing carwash facility located on site.

PRE-APP MEETING DATE: 6/10/19 STAFF PLANNER: Corey Malyszka

FEE SCHEDULE

SPECIAL EXCEPTION (SE)
Special Exception (SE), General Application: $1,000.00
Special Exception (SE), Modification: $ 500.00
Concurrency: $ 25.00

SITE PLAN REVIEW (SPR)
Site Plan Review (SPR), General, By Commission: $1,000.00
Site Plan Review (SPR), General, By POD: $ 500.00
Site Plan Review (SPR), Modification, By Commission: $ 500.00
Site Plan Review (SPR), Modification, By POD: $ 250.00

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

AUTHORIZATION

City staff and the designated Commission may visit the subject property during review of the requested variance. Any Code violations on the property that are noted during the inspections will be referred to the City's Codes Compliance Assistance Department. The applicant, by filing this application, agrees he or she will comply with the decision(s) regarding this application and conform to all conditions of approval. The applicant's signature affirms that all information contained within this application has been completed and that the applicant understands that processing this application may involve substantial time and expense. Filing an application does not guarantee approval, and denial or withdrawal of an application does not result in remittance of the application fee.

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

Signature of Owner/Agent*: 07/10/2019
*Affidavit to Authorize Agent required, if signed by Agent.

Page 3 of 8 Updated 05-17-17
I am (we are) the owner(s) and record title holder(s) of the property noted herein

Property Owner’s Name:
CIRCLE K STORES, INC.

This property constitutes the property for which the following request is made

Property Address: 10600 ROOSEVELT BLVD N.

Parcel ID#: 18-30-17-30371-001-0010

Request: Development of a new Circle K gas station / convenience store and car wash facility.

The undersigned has(have) appointed and does(do) appoint the following agent(s) to execute any application(s) or other documentation necessary to effectuate such application(s)

Agent’s Name(s): THOMAS ENGINEERING GROUP, LLC

This affidavit has been executed to induce the City of St. Petersburg, Florida, to consider and act on the above described property

I(we), the undersigned authority, hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct

Signature (owner): ____________________________

Identification or personally known:

Notary Signature: ____________________________

City of St. Petersburg – One 4th Street North – PO Box 2842 – St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2842 – (727) 893-7471

www.stpete.org/ldr
ONLY COMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL BE ACCEPTED. FAILURE TO COMPLETE THIS FORM WILL RESULT IN DEFERRAL OF YOUR APPLICATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA TABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Zoning Classification: CCS-2 - Corridor Commercial Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Existing Land Use Type(s): Convenience Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proposed Land Use Type(s): Convenience Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Area of Subject Property: 1.50 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Variance(s) Requested: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gross Floor Area (total square feet of building(s))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing: 2,300 Sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed: 4,351 Sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted: 37,244 Sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Floor Area Ratio (total square feet of building(s) divided by the total square feet of entire site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing: 0.035 Sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed: 0.067 Sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted: 0.57 Sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Building Coverage (first floor square footage of building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing: 2,300 Sq. ft. 3.5 % of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed: 4,351 Sq. ft. 6.7 % of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted: 37,244 Sq. ft. 57.0 % of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Open Green Space (include all green space on site; do not include any paved areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing: 37,129 Sq. ft. 56.53 % of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed: 25,713 Sq. ft. 39.35 % of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Interior Green Space of Vehicle Use Area (include all green space within the parking lot and drive lanes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing: 3,157 Sq. ft. 10.39 % of vehicular area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed: 5,126 Sq. ft. 16.88 % of vehicular area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Paving Coverage (including sidewalks within boundary of the subject property; do not include building footprint(s))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing: 25,911 Sq. ft. 39.66 % of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed: 35,277 Sq. ft. 53.99 % of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DATA TABLE (continued page 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Impervious Surface Coverage (total square feet of all paving, building footprint and other hard surfaced areas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong>: 28,211 Sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.18 % of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Density (units per “x”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sq. Ft. or Acre(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong>: 2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong>: 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14 a. Parking (Vehicle) Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong>: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong>: 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permitted</strong>: 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14 b. Parking (Bicycle) Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong>: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong>: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permitted</strong>: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. Building Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong>: 11 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong>: 21.3 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permitted</strong>: 36 Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Construction Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the estimate of the total value of the project upon completion? $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Note: See Drainage Ordinance for a definition of “alteration.” If yes, please be aware that this triggers Drainage Ordinance compliance. Please submit drainage calculations to the Engineering Department for review at your earliest convenience. The DRC must approve all Drainage Ordinance variances.
Project Location Map
City of St. Petersburg, Florida
Planning and Development Services
Department
Case No.: 19-32000014
Address: 10600 Roosevelt Boulevard North
ALL TREES ARE TO BE REMOVED OR TRIMMED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF AN ISA CERTIFIED ARBRESTER.

DURING LAND ALTERATION AND CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES, IT SHALL BE UNLAWFUL TO REMOVE VEGETATION BY GRUBBING OR TO PLACE SOIL DEPOSITS, DEMOLISH, DISMANTLE, CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL, MACHINERY OR OTHER EQUIPMENT OF ANY KIND WITHIN THE ORBIT OF A TREE TO REMAIN ON THE SITE UNLESS OTHERWISE APPROVED BY THE CITY.

UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, ALL SHRUBS, GROUND COVER ACCENT PLANTS NOT DEPICTED ON SUBJECT PARCEL ARE TO BE REMOVED FROM THE SITE.

NOTE: ALL TREES SCHEDULED TO BE REMOVED OR THAT HAVE BEEN PREVIOUSLY REMOVED AND HAVE REMAINING STUMPS, SHALL BE CUT DOWN, STUMP GROUND AND SHALL HAVE ALL ROOTS REMOVED.
NO SUPPLEMENTAL IRRIGATION NEEDED FOR BAHIA SOIL AREAS IN STORMWATER RETENTION PONDS POST-EINSTALLMENT

ALL IRRIGATION EMMITTERS SHALL BE ADJUSTED PRIOR TO FINAL INSPECTION SO AS TO ELIMINATE OVERSPRAY ONTO IMPERVIOUS SURFACES, PARTICULARLY PEDESTRIAN AREAS.

ALL AREAS SHALL BE IRRIGATED PER CITY CODE'S REQUIREMENTS, & SHALL HAVE A 100% COVER, WITH MAX 35% OVERLAP. A RAIN SENSOR IS REQUIRED BY FLORIDA LAW.

WATERING SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
<th>TENSION</th>
<th>FT/HR</th>
<th>WT</th>
<th>RT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000</td>
<td>0030</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0030</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100</td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0130</td>
<td>0200</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200</td>
<td>0230</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0230</td>
<td>0300</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IRRIGATION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>WATERING TIME</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
<th>TENSION</th>
<th>FT/HR</th>
<th>WT</th>
<th>RT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0000 - 0030</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0030 - 0100</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0100 - 0130</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0130 - 0200</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0200 - 0230</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CRITICAL ANALYSIS

ALL WORK SHALL COMPLY WITH APPENDIX "D" OF THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE.

CONTRACTOR SHALL ENSURE THAT THE EXISTING PAVING AS REQUIRED. EXISTING SEWER/& SEWER LINES ARE MARKED,

CONTRACTOR SHALL ENSURE THAT THE EXISTING PAVING IS FULLY OPERABLE & HAVING BEEN REPLACED AS REQUIRED.

CONTRACTOR TO ENSURE THAT THE EXISTING IRRIGATION SYSTEMS ON EQUIPMENT REMAINS OPERABLE & FULLY OPERATIVE & HAVING BEEN REPLACED AS REQUIRED.
The Transportation and Parking Management Department has reviewed this case. The applicant needs to provide two long-term bicycle parking spaces.

Tom Whalen, AICP CTP, ENV SP
Planner III
City of St. Petersburg
727-893-7883

From: Iris L. Winn
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2019 9:16 AM
To: Michael J. Frederick <Michael.Frederick@stpete.org>; Thomas M Whalen <Tom.Whalen@stpete.org>; Kyle Simpson <Kyle.Simpson@stpete.org>; Mark Riedmueller <Mark.Riedmueller@stpete.org>; Nancy Davis <Nancy.Davis@stpete.org>; Martha Hegenbarth <Martha.Hegenbarth@stpete.org>; Troy D. Davis <Troy.Davis@stpete.org>; Kelly A. Donnelly <Kelly.Donnelly@stpete.org>; Kirsten J. Corcoran <Kirsten.Corcoran@stpete.org>; Aaron M. Fisch <aaron.fisch@stpete.org>
Cc: Shervon A. Chambliss <shervon.chambliss@stpete.org>
Subject: Incoming Case No. 19-32000014 - Special Exception Modification to Demolish Existing Fuel Station and Car Wash - 10600 Roosevelt Boulevard North

Good afternoon all,

Please review the attached documents:

Application, Site and Landscape Plans, Location Map, and Routing sheet for Case no. 19-32000014.

Please return your comments to Shervon Chambliss (at Shervon.Chambliss@StPete.org) by August 9, 2019.

This application is currently scheduled to be heard by the Development Review Commission on September 4, 2019. Your comments are needed to complete the Staff Report.

Thank you,

Iris Winn
Administrative Clerk
City of St. Petersburg
727.892.5498
Iris.Winn@stpete.org
CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG
MEMORANDUM
ENGINEERING AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS DEPARTMENT

TO: Iris Winn, Administrative Clerk, Development Review Services
Jennifer Bryla, Planning & Development Services Department, Zoning Official
Shervon Chambliss, Planning & Development Services, Development Review Services

FROM: Nancy Davis, Engineering Plan Review Supervisor

DATE: August 9, 2019

FILE: 19-32000014

LOCATION: 10600 Roosevelt Boulevard North
AND PIN: 18/30/17/30371/001/0010
ATLAS: F-54, F-56
PROJECT: Special Exception

REQUEST: Approval of a modification to a previously approved Special Exception to demolish an existing fuel station and car wash and construct a new 4,351-square foot fuel station with a car wash in the CCS-2 zoning district.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: The Engineering and Capital Improvements Department (ECID) has no objection to the Special Exception and related Site Plan provided that the following special conditions and standard comments are added as conditions of approval:

1. The proposed project appears to substantially reduce the size of the existing storm drainage system ponds shown on the survey and increase the impervious area on the site. The drainage system on this existing site is part of a master planned system that serves the entire shopping center to the south. The applicant’s engineer will be required to submit drainage calculations that analyze the entire drainage system and the proposed changes to the system to verify compliance with the previous master drainage plan and with the requirements of the City Drainage and Surface Water Management Regulations found in City Code Section 16.40.030. Submit drainage calculations which conform to the water quantity and the water quality requirements of City Code Section 16.40.030. Please note the volume of runoff to be treated shall include all off-site and on-site areas draining to and co-mingling with the runoff from that portion of the site which is redeveloped. Stormwater runoff release and retention shall be calculated using the Rational formula and a 10-year 1-hour design storm. Stormwater systems which discharge directly or indirectly into impaired waters must provide net improvement for the pollutants that contribute to the water body’s impairment. The BMPTrains model shall be used to verify compliance with Impaired Water Body and TMDL criteria.

2. Upon development or redevelopment, the applicant is required to provide potable water service to each proposed lot if not existing. The City shall install necessary potable water services (up to and including the necessary meter and backflow prevention device) as required to service the proposed lots at the sole expense of the applicant/property owner.

3. Upon development or redevelopment, the applicant/property owner is required to provide a connection to the public sanitary sewer if not existing.

4. The applicant is responsible to verify legal access for use of all shared private utility infrastructure where utility services cross one property to service another.
5. Public sidewalks are required by City of St. Petersburg Municipal Code Section 16.40.140.4.2 unless specifically limited by the DRC approval conditions or a sidewalk variance is obtained from the City’s Zoning division. Within the adjacent rights-of-way of Dr. M.L. King Jr. Street North and Roosevelt Blvd. a 6-foot wide public sidewalk is required.

6. Existing sidewalks and new sidewalks will require curb cut ramps for physically handicapped and truncated dome tactile surfaces (of contrasting color to the adjacent sidewalk, colonial red color preferred) at all corners or intersections with roadways that are not at sidewalk grade and at each side of proposed and existing driveways per current City and ADA requirements. Concrete sidewalks must be continuous through all driveway approaches. All existing public sidewalks must be restored or reconstructed as necessary to be brought up to good and safe ADA compliant condition prior to Certificate of Occupancy.

7. Upon development or redevelopment, per land development code 16.40.140.4.6 (9), habitable floor elevations for commercial projects must be set per Florida Building Code requirements to at least two feet above the FEMA elevation. The construction site upon the lot shall be a minimum of one foot above the average grade crown of the road, which crown elevation shall be as set by the engineering director. Adequate swales shall be provided on the lot in any case where filling obstructs the natural ground flow. In no case shall the elevation of the portion of the site where the building is located be less than an elevation of 103 feet according to City datum.

8. Wastewater reclamation plant and pipe system capacity will be verified prior to development or redevelopment permit issuance. Any necessary sanitary sewer pipe system upgrades or extensions (resulting from proposed new service or significant increase in projected flow) as required to provide connection to a public main of adequate capacity and condition, shall be performed by and at the sole expense of the applicant. Proposed design flows (ADF) must be provided by the Engineer of Record on the City’s Wastewater Tracking Form (available upon request from the City Engineering department, phone 727-893-7238). If an increase in flow of over 3000 gpd is proposed, the ADF information will be forwarded to the City Water Resources department for a system analysis of public main sizes 10 inches and larger proposed to be used for connection. The project engineer of record must provide and include with the project plan submittal 1) a completed Wastewater Tracking form, and 2) a capacity analysis of public mains less than 10 inches in size which are proposed to be used for connection. If the condition or capacity of the existing public main is found insufficient, the main must be upgraded to the nearest downstream manhole of adequate capacity and condition, by and at the sole expense of the developer. The extent or need for system improvements cannot be determined until proposed design flows and sanitary sewer connection plan are provided to the City’s Water Resources department for system analysis of main sizes 10” and larger. Connection charges are applicable and any necessary system upgrades or extensions shall meet current City Engineering Standards and Specifications and shall be performed by and at the sole expense of the developer.

9. A work permit issued by the Engineering Department must be obtained prior to the commencement of construction within dedicated right-of-way or public easement. All required improvements shall be installed at the applicant’s expense in accordance with the standards, specifications, and policies adopted by the City. A work permit issued by the City Engineering Department must be obtained prior to the commencement of construction within dedicated right-of-way or public easement.

STANDARD COMMENTS:
Water service is available to the site. The applicant’s Engineer shall coordinate potable water and/or fire service requirements through the City’s Water Resources department. Recent fire flow test data shall be utilized by the site Engineer of Record for design of fire protection system(s) for this development. Any necessary system upgrades or extensions shall be performed at the expense of the developer.

Water and fire services and/or necessary backflow prevention devices shall be installed below ground in vaults per City Ordinance 1009-g (unless determined to be a high hazard application by the City’s Water Resources department or a variance is granted by the City Water Resources department). Note that the City’s Water Resources Department
will require an exclusive easement for any meter or backflow device placed within private property boundaries. City forces shall install all public water service meters, backflow prevention devices, and/or fire services at the expense of the developer. Contact the City's Water Resources department, Kelly Donnelly, at 727-892-5614 or kelly.donnelly@stpete.org. All portions of a private fire suppression system shall remain within the private property boundaries and shall not be located within the public right of way (i.e. post indicator valves, fire department connections, etc.).

Plan and profile showing all paving, drainage, sanitary sewers, and water mains (seawalls if applicable) to be provided to the Engineering Department for review and coordination by the applicant's engineer for all construction proposed or contemplated within dedicated right of way or easement.

Development plans shall include a grading plan to be submitted to the Engineering Department including street crown elevations. Lots shall be graded in such a manner that all surface drainage shall be in compliance with the City's stormwater management requirements. A grading plan showing the building site and proposed surface drainage shall be submitted to the engineering director.

Development plans shall include a copy of a Southwest Florida Water Management District Management of Surface Water Permit or Letter of Exemption or evidence of Engineer's Self Certification to FDEP.

It is the developer's responsibility to file a CGP Notice of Intent (NOI) (DEP form 62-21.300(4)(b)) to the NPDES Stormwater Notices Center to obtain permit coverage if applicable.

Upon development or redevelopment, submit a completed Stormwater Management Utility Data Form to the City Engineering Department.

The applicant will be required to submit to the Engineering Department copies of all permits from other regulatory agencies including but not limited to FDOT, FDEP, SWFWMD and Pinellas County, as required for this project. Plans specifications are subject to approval by the Florida state board of Health.
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