

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

Via Zoom

OCTOBER 13, 2020 TUESDAY 2:00 PM

#### MINUTES

Present:	Christopher "Chris" A. Burke, Chair Sharon Winters, Vice Chair Keisha A. Bell Jeff Rogo Thomas "Tom" Whiteman Lisa Wannemacher, Alternate
Commissioners Absent:	Jeffery "Jeff" M. Wolf C. Copley Gerdes Will Michaels, Alternate Gwendolyn "Gwen" Reese, Alternate
Staff Present:	Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation Elizabeth Abernethy, Director. Planning and Development Services Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist II Kelly Perkins, Historic Preservationist II Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney Heather Judd, Assistant City Attorney Katherine Connell, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Development Services Iris Winn, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Development Services

The public hearing was called to order at 2:02 p.m., a quorum was present.

# I. OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIR

II. ROLL CALL

# III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

#### **IV. MINUTES**

The minutes from the September 8, 2020 meetings were approved unanimously

#### V. **POSTPONEMENTS**:

1.	Development Agreement 3 <sup>r</sup>	<sup>d</sup> Amendment: AH St. Petersburg, LLC & West Florida – PPH NE Corner of 9th Avenue and 66th Street North Postponed to November 10, 2020 Contact Person: Elizabeth Abernethy, 893-7868
2.	City File FLUM-60	Postponed until further notice Contact Person: Derek Kilborn, 893-7872
3.	City File 20-90200087	Postponed until November 10, 2020 Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451

# VI. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARINGS

<b>A.</b>	City File 20-90200054	<b>Contact Person: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470</b>
1		Contact I croom Reny I cramb, 0/2 c 1/0

**Request:** Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of historic windows at 2734 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave N, a property proposed for inclusion as a contributing property to the *Kenwood Section – Southwest Central Kenwood Local Historic District*, a pending local historic district

#### **Staff Presentation**

Kelly Perkins gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

#### **Applicant Presentation**

Frederick J. Dion, General Contractor, spoke on behalf of the project.

#### **Registered Opponent**

None.

#### **Public Hearing**

None.

#### **Cross Examination:**

Waived by City Staff and Applicant.

#### **Rebuttal/Closing Remarks**

Waived by City Staff and Applicant.

# MOTION: Commissioner Rogo made a motion <u>approving</u> the application for the Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement of historic windows to 217 27<sup>th</sup> St N. subject to Staff conditions:

1. Replacement windows will feature contoured, three-dimensional external muntins that replicate the

existing configuration.

- 2. Windows will be installed to be setback within the wall plane and feature a reveal of at least two inches, to match existing window reveal.
- 3. Wooden exterior casing and trim will be reinstalled in kind.
- 4. All other necessary permits shall be obtained. Any additional work shall be presented to staff for determination of the necessity of additional COA approval.
- 5. This approval will be valid for 24 months beginning on the date of revocation of the local Emergency Declaration.

#### Commissioner Wannemacher Seconded.

*VOTE:* YES – 5 – Bell, Burke, Rogo, Whiteman, Wannemacher NO – 1 - Winters

#### Motion passed.

# B. City File 20-90200083 Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451

**Request:** Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement of front door at 2726 Burlington Avenue North. The subject property is proposed for inclusion as a contributing resource to the *Kenwood Section* – *Southwest Central Kenwood Local Historic District*, a pending local historic district.

#### **Staff Presentation:**

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report

#### **Applicant\Owner Presentation**

Owner, Don Chambers spoke in support of the application

#### **Registered Opponent**

None.

#### **Public Hearing**

None.

#### Cross Examination:

Waived by City Staff and Applicant.

# **Rebuttal/Closing Remarks**

Waived by City Staff and Applicant.

#### **Executive Session:**

**MOTION:** 

Commissioner Winters made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for

# replacement of a front door at 2726 Burlington Avenue North, subject to staff conditions.

- 1. The existing entryway opening and trim will be preserved, as proposed.
- 2. Sidelights will be recessed in wall plane approximately 2"-3" to provide consistency with existing historic windows.
- 3. All other necessary permits shall be obtained. Any additional work shall be presented to staff for determination of the necessity of additional COA approval.
- 4. This approval will be valid for 24 months beginning on the date of revocation of the local Emergency Declaration.

#### Commissioner Rogo seconded

*VOTE:* YES - 6 - Bell, Burke, Rogo, Whiteman, Winters, Wannemacher <math>NO - 0

#### Motion passed unanimously.

#### C. City File 20-90200085/86 Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451

**Request:** Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition and construction of a detached garage at 2725 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue North.

#### **Staff Presentation**

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on both 20-90200085 and 20-90200086 Staff Reports.

#### Applicant\Owner Presentation

Susan E. Eubanks, owner, spoke in support of the requests.

Michael Miano, applicant, spoke in support of the requests.

# **Registered Opponent**

None.

#### **Public Hearing**

None.

#### **Cross Examination:**

Waived by City Staff and Applicant.

#### **Rebuttal/Closing Remarks**

Waived by City Staff and Applicant.

#### **Executive Session:**

MOTION #1: Commissioner Whiteman made a motion <u>approving</u> the Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a detached garage at 2725 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue North, subject to staff conditions.

- 1. Administrative review and approval be granted for any necessary or related alteration, removal, or new construction of fencing or other enclosures undertaken as part of the demolition and new construction;
- 2. Windows and doors are to be set back approximately 2" to 3" in the wall plane to replicate the historic texture of frame construction;
- 3. Administrative review and approval be granted for proposed roll-down garage and side door units. Staff suggests that these doors replicate the appearance of panel construction.
- 4. All other necessary permits shall be obtained. Any additional work shall be presented to staff for determination of the necessity of additional COA approval.
- 5. This approval will be valid for 24 months beginning on the date of revocation of the local Emergency Declaration.

#### Commissioner Rogo seconded the motion.

# *VOTE:* YES – 6 –Bell, Burke, Rogo, Whiteman, Winters, Wannemacher NO – 0

#### Motion passed unanimously

# MOTION #1: Commissioner Winters made a motion <u>approving</u> the Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a detached garage at 2725 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue North, subject to staff conditions.

- 1. Construction plans for the replacement garage be approved by Development Review Services, Construction Services and Permitting, and Historic Preservation prior to demolition taking place;
- 2. All other permits be obtained as necessary, including administrative approval of the conditions set forth for the new construction application below;
- 3. This approval will be valid for 24 months beginning on the date of revocation of the local Emergency Declaration.

#### Commissioner Rogo seconded the motion.

*VOTE:* YES – 6 –Bell, Burke, Rogo, Whiteman, Winters, Wannemacher NO – 0

#### Motion passed unanimously

D. City File 20-90300002, AR 2020-01 Contac

Contact Person: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470

**Request:** Owner-initiated designation and listing of the Glenoak Elementary School as a local historic landmark in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places, and adaptive reuse with variance (AR 2020-01) converting the property into multi-family residential units.

# **Staff Presentation**

Kelly Perkins and Derek Kilborn gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

#### **Applicant Presentation**

Kori Monroe, Manager of a Place of Potential, LLC. spoke in support of the request.

#### **Registered Opponent**

None.

# Public Hearing

Emily Elwyn, 836 16<sup>th</sup> Ave NE., on behalf of Preserve the 'Burg, spoke in strong support of this request.

#### **Cross Examination:**

Waived by City Staff and Applicant.

# **<u>Rebuttal/Closing Remarks</u>**

Waived by City Staff

Applicant: Mr. Monroe: I wanted to thank you all very much for your time. I would also like to thank Kelly, Derek and Laura, did a great job they helped me out, they assisted me and held my had the entire way. Just kudos to them as well.

#### **Executive Session:**

Commissioner Burke: We will move on into executive session. I am going to imagine that we are going ot have some discussion with this particular request. Remember, that there could be up to three votes. Do we have any commissioners that are interested in speaking regarding this item?

Commissioner Rogo: Mr. Chairman, I guess we cannot require someone to do something like this, but I would hope that the owners would consider it. I am very supportive of the creative reuse of the school as an affordable housing project for veterans, for the veteran's community as you have called it. We are considering the designation of Glenoak Elementary School, a school. It is likely that as the adaptive reuse takes place, it is not going to look much like a school in the future. I am hopeful that the owners would consider, in the future, some sort of landmark designation to let the people who are in the neighborhood who are visiting the community, ler them know this was once a school, a historic school, in the City of St. Pete, thanks.

Commissioner Burke: Thank you Commissioner Rogo, any other comments?

Commissioner Wannemacher: Really what a wonderful project., thank you Emily for your comments and your support for this project. I assume that if renovations or changes are to be made to the exterior of the building that, will they come back before our committee? Or will this be handled via staff? Personally, I would like to see how this project progresses and when and if there are any modifications made to the exterior, I would love to see those and follow this as it goes forward, thanks.

Kelly Perkins: I can address that comment we met with the applicant, at this point, a lot of the work to be undertaken is constructional interior as well as some window replacements, because it will be some window replacements these are not historic windows we anticipate that it will be done at the administrative level. At this point we have not discussed anything that would warrant needing to go to commission. We are hopeful that it could be done administratively.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Just a follow up, when the existing, non-compliant windows are replaced, will the new windows fill up the existing historic opening? It looks like the newer windows do not go jam to jam, sill to head and I am just, maybe, I am hoping that the newer windows will fill in that full historic opening.

Kelly Perkins: We have discussed it, I think the issue is because all of the replacement windows have to be hurricane impact, the cost prohibitive nature of having to refill the entirety, but we are working with the architect, the architect and the applicant to try and create the correct proportion to make sure the original openings are still apparent, so at some point in the future, you know what were the original window openings, so it could be restored. At this point with the amount of work that the building, that is needed I think it would be too cost prohibitive to put in windows that would fill the full space. I do agree, it would be fantastic if that could happen.

Commissioner Burke: Okay, any... Ms. Winters.

Commissioner Winters: Yes, I just have a couple of comments, and a couple of questions. First, to follow on Commissioner Rogo's suggestion, which I think is a good one, it could be as simple as putting some historic photos of the school and perhaps some artifacts, if they are laying around, in a common area. I do really think people would get that connection. I just want to applaud the City for having this adaptive reuse ordinance on he books. It makes it a lot easier for a developer to move forward with a project. I used to live in a city where we did not have one and sometimes the hoops you have to jump through to get all the rezoning to happen actually prevent really good projects from happening. This is a great tool that we have, so thank you again for the explanation on it, Mr. Kilborn. I also just want to applaud the project in general. I had no idea that this was a historic school, you can't really tell when you drive past it. It is a great reuse, I think the commissioners being really attentive to recent reuse affordable housing and this is a project that checks off all of the boxes for us, on that, especially the veterans housing prospective so I appreciate the applicants comments. I do have a question, maybe a suggestion on the parking variance request, I actually can support the variance request, but I wonder if any bicycle parking is being included on the site, my understanding is that you can make that count towards parking spaces.

Derek Kilborn: That is correct, bicycle parking would be reviewed at the time that the project comes through for any other site improvements. It would be calculated at that time; we did not anticipate any issues with bicycle parking but vehicle parking was an obvious one to us this stage in the process. It is required by City Code and it is something that will be looked at as part of the regular permitting.

Commissioner Winters: Thank you.

Commissioner Burke: Okay, thank you, any other comments form other commissioners? I do have a question, it appears the application has been submitted just based on this being a traditional multi-family structure that may have some social service to it down the road, with the parking variance. It sounds like this project is going into that social service arena right from the start, is there a difference, will there be another approval, down the road, how are those two distinguished?

Derek Kilborn: Sure, we have had a lot of conversations with the applicant to try to distinguish where exactly the services would fall on that description and it is very close to the line. What we understand, from time to time, an individual may come to visit a resident on the site, just as individuals may come to our individual homes to provide one-on-one counseling or care, but in the future if there are proposals to use some of those common area spaces for some type of group therapy sessions, or where there might be a group activity where they are receiving services, those are the instances where they would start to transition into a social service agency. When we go into the City Code and we look at the Social Services Section [Section 16.50.390], that social service agency is broken down into different types. One of those types is long term housing. Under the long term housing option, there are some types of long term housing that would require a special exception use. In order to be approved for that special exception use, that would require the proposal to go to your companion commission the Development Review Commission for a public hearing review and approval. At this time, based on what they are proposing, we have not interpreted this as a social service agency extension of the multifamily units. Because it is so close to the line, we thought that it was responsible and reasonable to recommend the variance to include those three additional parking spaces to accommodate and give some flexibility so that they do not have to come back to this commission for a variance on parking later and then have to go to the other commission [Development Review Commission] for a potential special exception. I will close that answer by also just reminding the commissioner, because of time, we didn't spend a lot of time walking through the five criteria of granting a variance, those details are included in our staff report. Those reason outline why Staff recommends approval on the application.

Commissioner Burke: Thank you for clarifying that. Do we have any other comments, yes Ms. Winters.

Commissioner Winters: Just one question, Is this one of the earliest buildings, built in 1914 or are there existing schools that pre-date this one?

Kelly Perkins: I think St. Pete High is older. I know there are some around the county, but I have not gone through to see how many of these early schools are left, but I would say this is one of the earlier ones.

Commissioner Winters: Thank you, I would like to make a motion approving the designation of the elementary school to be added as a local historic landmark.

Commissioner Wannemacher: I second.

Commissioner Burke: Do we have any further discussion on this vote?

Derek Kilborn: Chair if I may, I would ask that the Commissioner clarify her motion to specifically reference the Staff's amended boundary, rather than the boundary submitted with the original application

Commissioner Burke: Okay, what I think might be easier Ms. Winters, if you would be willing, is it possible for her to withdraw her motion and we could take a second stab at this?

Heather Judd: She can do that, or she can just amend her motion to specify that their designation is for the

boundary as suggested in the Staff Report.

Commissioner Burke: Amended Staff Report, okay, Ms. Winters it is up to you.

MOTION#1: Commissioner Winters made a motion <u>approving</u> the designation (20-90300002) of the Glenoak Elementary School (20-90300002), as described by the proposed land boundary included in the Staff Report, to be added as a local historic landmark building to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places.

Commissioner Wannemacher Seconded.

*VOTE:* YES – 6 – Bell, Burke, Rogo, Whiteman, Winters, Wannemacher NO – 0

#### Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION#2: Commissioner Rogo made a motion <u>approving</u> the Adaptive Reuse (AR 2020-01). Approval of the adaptive reuse shall not constitute approval of any variance for elements of the proposed site plan, except as noted within this report.

Commissioner Winters Seconded.

*VOTE:* YES - 6 - Bell, Burke, Rogo, Whiteman, Winters, Wannemacher <math>NO - 0

Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION#3:	Commissioner Wannemacher made a motion <u>approving</u> the variance to the minimum number of parking spaces required. (37 required, 32 proposed, 5 variance requested)	
	Commissioner Rogo Seconded.	
VOTE:	YES – 6 – Bell, Burke, Rogo, Whiteman, Winters, Wannemacher NO – 0	

#### Motion passed unanimously.

#### VII. UPDATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Derek Kilborn gave the Commission updates re. past matters that have come before the Commission and the status of each matter; upcoming CIE update, and the upcoming public works updated from the director.

#### VIII. ADJOURN

Commissioner Whiteman made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Rogo seconded. With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 4:30 P.M.