



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

**Council Chambers, City Hall  
175 – 5<sup>th</sup> Street North  
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701**

**May 9, 2023  
Tuesday  
2:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Lisa Wannemacher, Chair  
Robert “Bob” Jeffrey, Vice-Chair  
Ashley Marbet  
Cassie Gardner  
Michael Huston, Alternate

**Commissioners Absent:** Manita Moultrie  
Joseph Magnello, Alternate  
Will Michaels, Alternate

**Staff Present:** Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation  
Britton, Wilson, Planner II  
Kelly Perkins, Historic Preservationist II  
Heather Judd, Assistant City Attorney  
Katherine Connell, Clerk, Planning & Development Svcs.  
Iris Winn, Clerk, Planning & Development Svcs.

The public hearing was called to order at 2:00 p.m., a quorum was present.

- I. OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIR**
  - II. ROLL CALL**
  - III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND SWEARING IN OF WITNESSES**
  - IV. MINUTES** (Approval of 4/11/2023 Minutes)
- The minutes from the April 11, 2023, meeting were approved unanimously
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**
  - VI. QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARING**

**Request:**

Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for the replacement of historic windows and non-historic doors in existing openings in the Mathis Residence, a local historic landmark.

**City Staff Presentation:**

Kelly Perkins gave a presentation based on the Staff Report.

**Applicant/Agent Presentation:**

Susan Ann Schmitt (Owner) did not give a presentation but was available for questions.

**Public Comment:**

None.

**Cross Examination:**

City Staff and Owner waived.

**Rebuttal/Closing Remarks:**

City Staff and Owner waived.

**Executive Session (09:32):**

The Commission discussed having an informational window replacement session to review all of the product options due to the frequency of window replacement applications and complexity of the matter. The homeowner's window contractor advised [City Staff] that a number of window contractors are currently reducing their supply. The homeowner has been a good steward of the home and has owned it for several years and kept it in really good condition. The homeowner has also applied for multiple COA's just for repairs to the windows and spent a lot of time, money, and consideration to keep it historical. The lead times for custom windows are significant and costly.

***Motion: Commissioner Jeffrey moved to approve the replacement of historic windows and non-historic doors in existing openings, subject to Staff conditions.***

***Commissioner Huston, Second.***

***YES – 5 – Wannemacher, Jeffrey, Gardner, Marbet, Huston.***

***NO – 0 – None.***

***Motion passed unanimously.***

**Request:**

Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for the installation of a solid masonry wall around the perimeter of the property and installation of a storage shed at 2209 Brevard Rd NE, a contributing resource to a local historic district.

**City Staff Presentation:**

Kelly Perkins gave a presentation based on the Staff Report.

**Applicant/Agent Presentation:**

Karen L. Trapane did not give a presentation but was available for questions.

**Public Comment:**

None.

**Cross Examination:**

City Staff and Owner waived.

**Rebuttal/Closing Remarks:**

City Staff and Owner waived.

**Executive Session (22:19):**

The Commission commended the homeowner for all of the improvements and maintenance to the house. There is currently a wood fence that has been there for at least 20 (twenty) years, and this would be a vast improvement. When the fence ordinance was written, there was great consideration given to the notion that every property should have some space to use – that they can privatize. There was concern about the precedence that this would set if there have not been many applications with solid walls of this nature. It seems that this would apply to any front yard and there would be a precedent. Nearly all of the other solid walls [of adjacent properties] have some kind of articulation or embellishment; to include caps, pilasters, control joints, columns at the corner, some additional elevation change where they meet the gates and transparency. There are no details as to what this wall looks like in sections or close up in elevation and may need further study as to the actual design of the wall. This is certainly more important on the front façade where there is a gate and where it is visible from the street. The homeowner confirmed that for the top [wall], the stucco would just be rounded or canted – enough to drain the water, as the rest of the house does not have caps or pillars. The stucco finish should match the house and the style of the iron gate should match the style of the two (2) iron gates in the breezeway. The sprinkler system and wells will be redone as they are in bad shape. The house will also be landscaped.

**Motion:** *Commissioner Jeffrey moved to approve the installation of a solid masonry wall around the perimeter of the property and installation of a storage shed, subject to Staff conditions.*

*Commissioner Gardner, Second.*

*YES – 5 – Wannemacher, Jeffrey, Gardner, Marbet, Huston.*

*NO – 0 – None.*

*Motion passed unanimously.*

**3. City File 23-90200022**

**City Staff; Kelly Perkins, 892-5470**

**Request:**

Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for the installation of a front porch screen enclosure and awning above streetside entrance at the Thomas Whitted House, a local historic landmark.

**City Staff Presentation:**

Kelly Perkins gave a presentation based on the Staff Report.

**Applicant/Agent Presentation:**

Kent and Joan Ulrich gave a presentation based on the Staff Report.

**Public Comment:**

1. Lesley Northup, 657 1<sup>st</sup> Street Northeast, spoke in support of the application.

**Cross Examination:**

City Staff and Owners waived.

**Rebuttal/Closing Remarks:**

City Staff and Owners waived.

**Executive Session (42:45):**

The Commission discussed the imaginative and outstanding front porch screen enclosure and also took notice to the individually painted surfaces with multiple colors. The homeowners wanted it to look nice as it is their home, and they are proud of having it. The awnings blend in with the green trim and is purposeful. Their intention is not to bring any false property on it. They hope to have the rest of the work done before the summer. It is amazing, transparent, and a great idea. It also helps to keep the animals and insects out. Concerns were made regarding other properties that

have screens that divide the porch opening, which was not done by this homeowner, in this case, which makes a big difference. A question was raised to what the screen looks like at an angle or obliquely and whether it looked somewhat opaque. The homeowner explained that they have an overlap in the way the roofline is with the porch, the gutter, and the shading. An image of the front porch was displayed [to the Commission] illustrating two sides of the front porch with the screen and a portion without the screen.

**Motion:**            *Commissioner Jeffrey moved to approve the installation of a front porch screen enclosure and awning above streetside entrance, subject to Staff conditions.*

*Commissioner Gardner, Second.*

**YES – 5 – Wannemacher, Jeffrey, Gardner, Marbet, Huston.**

**NO – 0 – None.**

*Motion passed unanimously.*

#### **4. City File FLUM-69**

**City Staff; Britton Wilson, 551-3542**

#### **Request:**

Private-initiated application requesting an amendment to the Future Land Use Map from Residential/Office General (R/OG) to Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use (PR-MU) and a concurrent amendment to the Official Zoning Map from Corridor Residential Suburban – 1 (CRS-1) to Corridor Residential Traditional -1 (CRT-1) for a 0.79-acre site, which consists of two eastern facing platted lots located at 118 66<sup>th</sup> Street North. As stated by the applicant, the purpose of the proposed amendments is to allow for redevelopment of the property in support of multifamily housing in the form of 19 townhomes with the potential for retail or other permitted mixed uses.

#### **City Staff Presentation:**

Britton Wilson gave a presentation based on the Staff Report.

#### **Applicant/Agent Presentation:**

Griffin Goudreau did not give a presentation but was available for questions.

#### **Public Comment:**

1. Juli Steinocher, 6601 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue North, expressed concerns regarding the traffic issues, pedestrian safety, greenspace, and excess water runoff.

#### **Cross Examination:**

City Staff and Applicant waived.

**Rebuttal/Closing Remarks:**

City Staff and Applicant waived.

**Executive Session (1:02):**

Commissioner Wannemacher: Who would like to start? Commissioner Gardner? You don't have to start if you are not ready.

Commissioner Gardner: How many units was it, again?

Britton Wilson: 19 total. It is going to increase from 12 to 19.

Griffin Goudreau: 19 is just what would be allowed under the zoning. If it doesn't make sense to put 19 there, we won't. It's just...that's what the zoning allows. I didn't want to put 16 and then build 19. We still have a lot of research to do. We worked on small...smaller shops, we don't want to keep spending thousands of dollars in site plans and techs and civil unless we have assurance that this would go through. Wish I had more information.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Would any other Commissioner like to continue? Okay, Commissioner Jeffrey?

Commissioner Jeffrey: Understanding that this is a private application, I know Mr. Kilborn, that this was changed already once previously, I think in 2012. Was there any consideration of looking at those other lots adjacent to it?

Derek Kilborn: The properties to the north? Yes.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Maybe we could bring up that site plan again that shows the adjacent land uses of the zoning. The zoning land uses.

Griffin Goudreau: They were interested in what we're doing. I didn't really ask if they want to be apart of this. They didn't reach out and tell me they wanted to be apart of it. I talked to all of them, and they are all in favor. They're actually all looking to sell their property as well. They'd benefit from this as well.

Derek Kilborn: To add to that answer, as...just a matter of general practice. We do have inquiries about rezoning like this that are maybe half of a block or a portion of a block where there is an opportunity to possibly square-off a corner or something. We do inquire about talking to additional properties and bringing them in as co-applicants so that they can consider that together and maybe make a decision that is more compatible with the Comp Plan goals, objectives and polices for having a reasonable land use pattern that maybe doesn't just stop at a non-traditional location.

Commissioner Jeffrey: Again, I know it's a private application, so it's hard to get other people to sign up onto that. You know what? I look at that context there, especially driving around in that area, it is sort of an island of major roadways. I was surprised. I never realized there was a 3-story apartment building behind it, even though I drive that route quite a bit. In the new construction

that's gone in, I think it's quadplex or duplex, again, I was sort of shocked. I don't know where that came from. It does make sense to me that that area does have a consistency or should have a consistency, especially with the SunRunner stop right there to see that this is so close. I see a lot of benefit there. I am concerned, Ms. Steinocher, you know that the whole idea of what needs to take place during that site plan review is important because that being a suburban area, it lacks the traditional things such as sidewalks and that really needs to be addressed. Again, that's not our purview, that's into the site plan review process

Commissioner Wannemacher: Yes, Commissioner Huston?

Commissioner Huston: Sorry. I did read the letters in opposition and a lot of the familiar concerns about traffic and noise and things, and I guess I would ask those folks to consider what other uses can go in there that might be a lot more of obnoxious. With the zoning, it's not going to be a gas station, it's not going to be a mid-rise building, it's not going to be a CVS. I think this use is adding some housing along the transit route makes a lot of sense, complies with the Comprehensive Plan. I think it's a very reasonable request. I am all with the speaker on the pedestrian safety. I know we can't really require that now, but it definitely needs to be addressed. In fact, I think the Staff report said all that's required right now is a 4-foot sidewalk, which seems willfully inadequate for an urbanizing area, so maybe down the road, we need to look at those standards and maybe some street trees and things like that as well. I feel like it's in the spirit of development that we are trying to get along the SunRunner and would definitely support that application.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you. Commissioner Gardner, anything else to add?

Commissioner Gardner: I agree.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Okay. Commissioner Marbet?

Commissioner Marbet? I think that...yeah, I would just agree that the SunRunner's location nearby and the need for additional housing...I think it'll make sense. It seems like a great thing to rezone.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you. I to believe that this application makes a lot of sense in that specific area around 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue North and 66<sup>th</sup> Street North and the adjacency to the SunRunner stop. I would ask that the Applicant...when you get ready to do your due diligence and do your planning – that you communicate with your neighbors, reach out to the residents of the condominium, reach out to Ms. Steinocher, and anybody else who owns a property in that area. Make them aware of what you are doing, and you hopefully would have their support and you can listen to their concerns. It would be very helpful...it may smooth a way for whatever development you do end up proposing. And Ms. Steinocher, hopefully you will continue to be concerned about this development and go to the DRC meeting when they eventually are reviewing the site plan for this development. Any other discussion or comments? With that, I will accept a motion.

***Motion:***        ***Commissioner Jeffrey moved that the Community Planning and Preservation Commission in its capacity as the local Planning Agency make the finding of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and recommend to City Council APPROVAL of the following Future Land Use Map amendment from Residential/Office General (R/OG) to Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use (PR-MU) and a concurrent amendment to the Official Zoning Map from Corridor Residential Suburban – 1 (CRS-1) to Corridor Residential Traditional-1 (CRT-1) for a 0.79-acre site located at 118 66<sup>th</sup> Street North based on the Staff Report.***

***Commissioner Gardner, Second.***

***YES – 5 – Wannemacher, Jeffrey, Gardner, Marbet, Huston.***  
***NO – 0 – None.***

***Motion passed unanimously.***

**IX.    UPDATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**X.    ADJOURN at 3:24 P.M.**