STAFF REPORT
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION - VARIANCE REQUEST
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 scheduled on Wednesday, September 9, 2020 at 2:00 P.M., by means of communications media technology pursuant to Executive Order 20-192 issued by the Governor on August 5, 2020, and Executive Order 2020-30 issued by the Mayor on July 8, 2020. Authorization for a virtual meeting has been extended through October 1st by Governor’s executive order. The City’s Planning and Development Services Department requests that you visit the City website at www.stpete.org/meetings and/or contact the case planner for up-to-date information pertaining to this case.

CASE NO.: 20-54000039  PLAT SHEET: E-8

REQUEST: Approval of a reduced side yard setback from 5-feet required to 2-feet proposed to construct an in-ground pool.

OWNER: Adam Lessey
205 11th Avenue N.
Saint Petersburg, Florida 33701

ADDRESS: 205 11th Avenue N.

PARCEL ID NO.: 18-31-17-43560-002-0080

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: On File

ZONING: Neighborhood Traditional Single-Family-3 (NT-3)
BACKGROUND: The subject property consists of one plated lot (Lot 8, Jackson Subdivision) and is located within the Downtown Residents Civic Association and the Historic Old Northeast Neighborhood Association boundaries. The property has a lot width of 50-feet and a lot depth of 127.5-feet with approximately 6,464 square feet of lot area.

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a variance to the minimum interior side yard setback requirements in order to construct an in-ground swimming pool behind an existing single-family residence. The minimum required interior side yard setback is 5-feet and the applicant's request is to place the pool 2-feet from the side property line. This request proposes a 60 percent deviation from the allowance depicted in the code.

CONSISTENCY REVIEW COMMENTS: The Planning & Development Services Department staff reviewed this application in the context of the following criteria excerpted from the City Code and found that the requested variance is inconsistent with these standards. Per City Code Section 16.70.040.1.6 Variances, Generally, the DRC's decision shall be guided by the following factors:

1. Special conditions exist which are peculiar to the land, building, or other structures for which the variance is sought and which do not apply generally to lands, buildings, or other structures in the same district. Special conditions to be considered shall include, but not be limited to, the following circumstances:

   a. Redevelopment. If the site involves the redevelopment or utilization of an existing developed or partially developed site.

      The request involves the utilization of an existing developed site. The property currently has a 2-story single family home, a grandfathered accessory dwelling unit on the site and a carport that serves the ADU.

   b. Substandard Lot(s). If the site involves the utilization of an existing legal nonconforming lot(s) which is smaller in width, length or area from the minimum lot requirements of the district.

      The site has a lot width of 50-feet and approximately 6,464 square feet of lot area. The minimum lot width and area requirements for a property zoned NT-3 are 60-feet and 7,620 square feet, respectively. Therefore, the lot is considered substandard in terms of the minimum zoning district requirements for lot size.

   c. Preservation district. If the site contains a designated preservation district.

      This site is located within the North Shore National Register of Historic Districts

   d. Historic Resources. If the site contains historical significance.

      This criterion is not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>5-feet</td>
<td>2-feet</td>
<td>3-feet</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e. Significant vegetation or natural features. If the site contains significant vegetation or other natural features.

The request does not directly involve significant vegetation or other natural features.

f. Neighborhood Character. If the proposed project promotes the established historic or traditional development pattern of a block face, including setbacks, building height, and other dimensional requirements.

The proposed setback variance and related pool installation does not promote the established neighborhood development pattern. The Land Development Regulations require a 7.5-foot side setback, the code also allows for a 2.5-foot encroachment into the side setback which attempts to set the standard development pattern for accessory structures. Thus allowing a 5-foot interior side yard setback for a pool.

  g. Public Facilities. If the proposed project involves the development of public parks, public facilities, schools, public utilities or hospitals.

There are no public facilities involved in this application.

2. The special conditions existing are not the result of the actions of the applicant;

While the property is substandard in terms of minimum lot size requirements for the zoning district, the proposed pool could be designed to conform to the required setbacks.

3. Owing to the special conditions, a literal enforcement of this Chapter would result in unnecessary hardship;

Enforcement of the code would not result in an unnecessary hardship. The applicant is permitted to construct a pool provided it meets the required 5-foot side setback per Code Section 16.60.050.2. The existing conditions of the property provide for a sufficient area for a pool that conforms to required setbacks.

4. Strict application of the provisions of this chapter would provide the applicant with no means for reasonable use of the land, buildings, or other structures;

A strict application of the Code regarding setback requirements would not provide the applicant with no means for reasonable use of the land. The applicant could reduce the length of the proposed pool, or could alter the current design by moving the pool an additional 3-feet away from the property line and reducing the deck to comply with required setbacks.

5. The variance requested is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building, or other structure;

The request is not necessary to make reasonable use of the property. Although the proposed pool is located between the principle structure, accessory dwelling unit and carport, there are no existing conditions relating to the site or other structures that interfere with applicant’s ability to construct a pool on the property.
6. The granting of the variance will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this chapter;

The variance is not in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the code to provide sufficient setbacks from adjacent properties for accessory structures.

7. The granting of the variance will not be injurious to neighboring properties or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare; and,

The granting of the variance may be injurious to neighboring properties and could alter drainage patterns. The applicant was able to obtain a signature from one of the neighboring property owners.

8. The reasons set forth in the application justify the granting of a variance;

Staff finds that the reasons set forth in the application do not justify the granting of a variance.

9. No nonconforming use of neighboring lands, buildings, or other structures, legal or illegal, in the same district, and not permitted use of lands, buildings, or other structures in adjacent districts shall be considered as grounds for issuance of a variance permitting similar uses.

None were considered.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: The subject property is within the boundaries of the Downtown Residents Civic Association and the Historic Old Northeast Neighborhood Association. Staff has not received any correspondence from neighbors at this time. The applicant has shared a response from the Historic Old Northeast Neighborhood Association (HONNA) stating that they can support the request if the Impervious Surface Ratio complies with the code and if the abutting neighbor supports the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Based on a review of the application according to the stringent evaluation criteria contained within the City Code, the Planning and Development Department Staff recommends DENIAL of the request AS PROPOSED. Staff recommends approval of a variance of two feet, thus a 3-foot setback for a 40 percent deviation from the standard instead of the 60 percent proposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: If the variance 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:

1. The plans and elevations submitted for permitting should substantially resemble the plans and elevations submitted with this application.
2. Maximum impervious surface on the site must not exceed 65%, all plans submitted for permitting on this site must show the extent of all improvements on site and the Impervious Surface Ratio. An updated survey must be provided prior to permit approval.
3. This variance approval shall be valid through September 9, 2023. Substantial construction shall commence prior to this expiration date. A request for extension must be filed in writing prior to the expiration date.
4. Approval of this variance does not grant or imply other variances from the City Code or other applicable regulations.
5. An approved tree removal permit is required if a tree removal is needed to construct the proposed pool.

ATTACHMENTS: Variance application, applicant's narrative, Location map, site plan, floor plan, signatures of support, Neighborhood Participation Report, Email correspondence

Report Prepared By:

Candace Scott, Planner I
Development Review Services Division
Planning & Development Services Department

Report Approved By:

Jennifer Bryla, AICP, Zoning Official (POD)
Development Review Services Division
Planning & Development Services Department
VARIANCE

Application No. 20-54000039

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 Fourth Street North.

GENERAL INFORMATION

NAME of APPLICANT (Property Owner): Adam Lessey

Street Address: 205 11th Ave. N.
City, State, Zip: St. Petersburg, FL 33701
Telephone No: 540-818-3651 Email Address: alessey@gmail.com

NAME of AGENT or REPRESENTATIVE: N/A

Street Address: 
City, State, Zip: 
Telephone No: 
Email Address: 

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Street Address or General Location: 205 11th Ave. N.
Parcel ID#(s): 18-31-17-43500-002-0080

DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST: A variance to interior side yard set back from 5 feet required to 2 feet to construct an inground pool

PRE-APPLICATION DATE: 07/01/20 PLANNER: Candace Scott

FEE SCHEDULE

1 & 2 Unit, Residential - 1st Variance $350.00 Each Additional Variance $100.00
3 or more Units & Non-Residential - 1st Variance $350.00 After-the-Fact $500.00
Docks $400.00
Flood Elevation $300.00
Cash, credit, checks made payable to “City of St. Petersburg”

AUTHORIZED

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*: Adam Lessey Date: July 2, 2020
*Affidavit to Authorize Agent required, if signed by Agent.
Typed Name of Signatory: Adam Lessey
VARIANCE

NARRATIVE (PAGE 1)

All applications for a variance must provide justification for the requested variance(s) 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. Responses may be provided as a separate letter, addressing each of the six criteria.

ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA MUST BE ANSWERED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT NARRATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address: 205 11th Ave, N., St. Petersburg, FL 33701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Detailed Description of Project and Request:**
requesting variance from 5 feet setback to 2 feet setback for an inground pool.

1. **What is unique about the size, shape, topography, or location of the subject property? How do these unique characteristics justify the requested variance?**

   The lot is 50X127.5, with two structures, leaving only a small area to place a swimming pool. Because of the size of the yard and the need to place the pool five feet from the two structures, the two feasible options for pool placement include running east-west in between the two structures or north-south running along the east side of the southern structure and abutting neighbors' property. The former option minimizes the amount of variance requested by 17 feet while allowing a reasonable use of the property.

2. **Are there other properties in the immediate neighborhood that have already been developed or utilized in a similar way? If so, please provide addresses and a description of the specific signs or structures being referenced.**

   Yes. The neighbor two doors west at 209 11th Ave. N. A copy of their pool design is included.

3. **How is the requested variance not the result of actions of the applicant?**

   The size of the lot and placement of the structures were fixed when I purchased the property.
ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA MUST BE ANSWERED.

4. How is the requested variance the minimum necessary to make reasonable use of the property? In what ways will granting the requested variance enhance the character of the neighborhood?

Without the variance, it would not be worth the economic expense to install a pool. In fact, without the variance, the available square footage would be so small as to render a pool impracticable. The pool will be positioned in between two residential structures and behind a 6-foot tall privacy fence. There would be no public-facing evidence of a pool.

On average, a pool can add 5-6% to home value. Since many homes in Old Northeast are on relatively small lots (1/8 acre), and have small pools, or pools designed to fit into the smaller spaces that Old Northeast lots present, the variance to allow the pool would be consistent with the character of the neighborhood.

5. What other alternatives have been considered that do not require a variance? Why are these alternatives unacceptable?

See #4

6. In what ways will granting the requested variance enhance the character of the neighborhood?

See #4
Project Location Map
City of St. Petersburg, Florida
Planning and Development Services Department
Case No.: 20-54000039
Address: 205 11th Avenue North

North (nts)
A BOUNDARY SURVEY OF: Lot 8, Block B, JACKSON SUBDIVISION, as recorded in Plat Book 1, Page 5 of the Public Records of Pinellas County, Florida.

According to the maps prepared by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, this property appears to be located in Flood zone: X Comm. Panel No.: 125145 0217 G Map Date: 8/03/03 Base Flood Elev.: NA

LEGEND:
- BOUNDARY DETERMINED DURING SURVEY
- PERMANENT MARKERS DETERMINED DURING SURVEY
- BOUNDARY DETERMINED FROM RECORDS
- BOUNDARY DETERMINED BY DESCRIPTION
- BOUNDARY DETERMINED BY SURVEY AND RECORDS
- BOUNDARY DETERMINED BY SURVEY ONLY
- BOUNDARY DETERMINED BY SURVEY AND PHOTOGRAPHIC
- BOUNDARY DETERMINED BY PHOTOGRAPHIC
- BOUNDARY DETERMINED BY CURRENTLY MAINTAINED MARKERS
- BOUNDARY DETERMINED BY SURVEY AND CURRENTLY MAINTAINED MARKERS
- BOUNDARY DETERMINED BY SURVEY AND CURRENTLY MAINTAINED MARKERS AND PHOTOGRAPHIC
- BOUNDARY DETERMINED BY SURVEY, CURRENTLY MAINTAINED MARKERS, AND PHOTOGRAPHIC
- BOUNDARY DETERMINED BY SURVEY, CURRENTLY MAINTAINED MARKERS, PHOTOGRAPHIC, AND RECORDS

BEARINGS SHOWN ARE ASSUMED
Graveled
Pool with 3' variance
Copy of Neighbor's

215 11th Ave. N.

CUSTOMER ADDRESS: 215 11th Ave. N.
STRENA KLEIN

Customer Name:

Scale 1/2 = 1'
Current Impervious Area (sq. ft.): 3000 sq. ft.
Pool area = 25’ x 8’ = 200 sq. ft.
Total Property Area = 6,375 sq. ft.

Current Impervious Area percentage = 47%
New Impervious Area with pool = 50%
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REPORT

Application No.

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."

### APPLICANT REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Friday, July 3: met with and discussed the variance with both neighbors along the property line affected by the variance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Content, dates mailed, and number of mailings, including letters, meeting notices, newsletters, and other publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, July 2: sent the following a copy of the application and a notice of variance application: Certified mailed Kimberly Frazier-Legget at the Federation of Inner-City Community Organizations; emailed Judy Landon at the Council of Neighborhood Associations, Dan Hoekenga at the Downtown Residents Civic Assoc., and John Johnson at HONNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Where residents, property owners, and interested parties receiving notices, newsletters, or other written materials are located</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Summary of concerns, issues, and problems expressed during the process |
| May need to do some work on the fence on my property that is between my house and the neighbors' house. |

| 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 comment(s): |
| I have only received a response from Dan Hoekenga: "no objection to the variance as described below" |
| Association Name: 
| President or Vice-President Signature: |
| 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) why they were unable or unwilling to sign the certification. |
Applicants are strongly encouraged to obtain signatures in support of the proposal(s) from owners of property adjacent to or otherwise affected by a particular request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD WORKSHEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Address:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Request:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The undersigned adjacent property owners understand the nature of the applicant’s request and do not object (attach additional sheets if necessary):

1. Affected Property Address: 201 11th Ave North  
   Owner Name (print): Rob Bohan  
   Owner Signature: [Signature]

2. Affected Property Address:  
   Owner Name (print):  
   Owner Signature:

3. Affected Property Address:  
   Owner Name (print):  
   Owner Signature:

4. Affected Property Address:  
   Owner Name (print):  
   Owner Signature:

5. Affected Property Address:  
   Owner Name (print):  
   Owner Signature:

6. Affected Property Address:  
   Owner Name (print):  
   Owner Signature:

7. Affected Property Address:  
   Owner Name (print):  
   Owner Signature:

8. Affected Property Address:  
   Owner Name (print):  
   Owner Signature:
Good morning Adam,

The Committee can support your variance request assuming the following criteria are met:

- The impervious surface ratio complies with the code.
- The neighbor abutting the pool supports your application.

We will confirm our support with the City once we have been officially noticed of your application.

Thank you for contacting HONNA about your plans.

Robin

From: Adam Lessey <alessey@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:36 AM
To: Robin Reed <rreed@tampabay.rr.com>
Cc: John Johnson <jtj2@mail.usf.edu>; Charleen McGrath <treasurer@honna.org>; kimbyflies@yahoo.com; John Peter Barie <jpbarie.architect@gmail.com>; Doug Gillespie <dgillespie602@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Variance
Photo 1: View from the right side of the home looking toward the ADU
Photo 2: Location of the proposed pool
Photo 3: View of the fence that will adjacent to the proposed pool.