



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

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

**January 12, 2021
Tuesday
2:00 P.M.**

MINUTES

Present: Christopher “Chris” A. Burke, Chair
C. Copley Gerdes
Will Michaels, Alternate
Thomas “Tom” Whiteman
Sharon Winters, Vice Chair
Jeffery “Jeff” M. Wolf

Commissioners Absent: Keisha A. Bell
Jeff Rogo
Gwendolyn “Gwen” Reese, Alternate
Lisa Wannemacher, Alternate

Staff Present: Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist II
Kelly Perkins, Historic Preservationist II
Ann Vickstrom, Planner II
Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney
Heather Judd, Assistant City Attorney
Katherine Connell, Administrative Assistant, Planning &

Development Services

The public hearing was called to order at 2:47 p.m., a quorum was present.

I. OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIR

II. ROLL CALL

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

V. MINUTES

The minutes from the December 8, 2020 meetings were approved unanimously.

VI. QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARING

**A. City File 20-90200098 & 20-54000060 Contact People: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451
& Ann Vickstrom, 892-5807**

COA Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a garage addition at 125 23rd Ave. NE, a noncontributing resource to a local historic district.

Variance Request: Approval of a 10.5-ft variance to the required front yard setback from 30-ft to 19.5-ft and a 3-ft variance to the required side yard from 7.5-ft to 4.5-ft to construct an attached garage in the NT-3 zoning district at 125 23rd Ave NE.

Staff Presentation

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Certificate of Appropriateness portion of the Staff Report. Ann Vickstrom gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Variance portion of the Staff Report.

Applicant Presentation

R. Donald Mastry, Esq. made a presentation on behalf of Calvin B. Samuel and Vivian V. Laliotis

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination:

Waived by City Staff and Applicant

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Waived by City Staff

R. Donald Mastry, Esq. closed outlining his request for modifications to the staff conditions.

Executive Session

Variance Motion #1: Commissioner Wolf made a motion to modify the front variance request from 29.5 feet to 21.5 feet for a total variance of 8 feet.

Commissioner Gerdes Second.

VOTE: YES – 4 – Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Winters, Whiteman, Wolf,
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

Variance Motion #2: *Commissioner Whiteman made a motion approving the modified request set for the variance subject to conditions in the Staff Report as amended to condition number 4 (of the applicant presentation). The roof form of the addition shall feature a pitch compatible with the roof forms at the primary residence and the roof height shall not exceed 13’8”, which is the height of the adjacent neighbor’s garage. The revised roof form is to be approved administratively with Commission review upon request of staff or the applicant.*

Commissioner Wolf: Seconded

VOTE: YES – 4 – Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Winters, Whiteman, Wolf,
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

COA Motion #1: *Commissioner Gerdes: Amend the Staff’s recommendations of approval with conditions with the addition to the roof form of the addition shall feature a pitch compatible with the roof forms at the primary residence and the roof height shall not exceed 13’8”, which is the height of the adjacent neighbor’s garage. With the addition of a seventh condition of approval the modification of the living room window shall be administered at Staff level.*

Commissioner Whiteman Seconded

VOTE: YES – 4 – Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Winters, Whiteman, Wolf,
NO – 0

COA Motion #2: *Commissioner Gerdes: Motion to approve the COA with amended conditions.*

Commissioner Whiteman: Second

VOTE: YES – 4 – Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Winters, Whiteman, Wolf,
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

B. City File 19-90200040

Contact Person: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470

Request: Review of a revision to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a permanent art installation in the north creek bank parkland, between 7th Street South and 6th Street South, consisting of five sculpted disks. Each sculpture is approximately 40 inches tall by 42 inches wide.

Staff Presentation:

Kelly Perkins gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report

Applicant/Owner Presentation

Susan Ajoc, Community Services Director for the City of St. Petersburg, gave a presentation and was available for questions.

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 made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a permanent art installation in the north creek bank parkland, between 7th Street South and 6th Street South, consisting of five sculpted disks, subject to staff conditions.*

Commissioner Winters seconded

VOTE: *YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Whiteman, Winters, Wolf*
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

C. City File 20-90200107

Contact Person: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470

Request: After-the-fact review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement of front door at 3250 9th Ave N, a contributing resource to Northwest Kenwood Historic District.

Staff Presentation:

Kelly Perkins gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report

Applicant/Owner Presentation

Karen Sheen gave a presentation and was available for questions.

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 Wolf made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of a front door at 3250 9th Ave N., subject to staff conditions.*

Commissioner Gerdes seconded

VOTE: *YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Whiteman, Winters, Wolf
NO – 0*

Motion passed unanimously.

D. City File 20-90200108

Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of a front door at 230 30th St. N., a contributing property to a local historic district.

Staff Presentation:

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report

Applicant/Owner Presentation

Applicant was not present

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination:

Waived by City Staff.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Waived by City Staff.

Executive Session

MOTION: *Commissioner Winters made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of a front door at 230 30th St. N., subject to staff conditions.*

Commissioner Gerdes seconded

VOTE: *YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Whiteman, Wolf, Wannemacher
NO – 0*

Motion passed unanimously.

E. City File 20-90200109 Contact Person: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of a new garage at 2151 4th Ave N., a contributing resource to Southeast Kenwood Historic District.

Staff Presentation:

Kelly Perkins gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report

Applicant/Owner Presentation

Pamela Scherer, spoke in support of the Staff Report and was available for questions.

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 Wolf made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new garage at 2151 4th Ave N., subject to staff conditions.*

Commissioner Whiteman seconded

VOTE: *YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Whiteman, Wolf, Wannemacher
NO – 0*

Motion passed unanimously.

F. City File 20-90200115 Contact Person: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of seven windows and the front door at 2728 2nd Ave N, a property proposed for inclusion as a contributing property to a local historic district currently pending public hearing.

Staff Presentation:

Kelly Perkins gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report

Applicant/Owner Presentation

Robert Mehan, applicant was available for questions.

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 Michaels made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of seven windows and the front door at 2728 2nd Ave N., subject to staff conditions.*

Commissioner Gerdes seconded

VOTE: *YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Whiteman, Wolf, Wannemacher
NO – 0*

Motion passed unanimously.

G. City File 20-90200120 Contact Person: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the rehabilitation of historic buildings and structures at Sunken Gardens, an individually listed landmark of the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places

Staff Presentation:

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report

Applicant/Owner Presentation

Lauren Kleinfeld, Manager of Sunken Gardens, spoke on behalf of the project and was available for questions.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

Robin Reed spoke in support of the project.

Cross Examination:

Waived by City Staff and Applicant

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Waived by City Staff and Applicant.

Executive Session

MOTION #1: *Commissioner Michaels made a motion to amend the Staff recommendations to include Staff considers the Suncoast Gardens*

Foundation recommendations to extent they are feasible.

Commissioner Wolf seconded

VOTE: YES – 2 – Michaels, Wolf
NO – 0 - Burke, Gerdes, Whiteman, Winters

Motion failed to pass.

MOTION #2: *Commissioner Wolf made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for the rehabilitation of historic buildings and structures at Sunken Gardens, subject to staff conditions.*

Commissioner Gerdes seconded

VOTE: YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Whiteman, Winters, Wolf
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

H. City File FLUM 60

Contact Person: Derek Kilborn, 893-7872

Request: An amendment to the Future Land Use Map from IL (Industrial Limited) to PR-MU (Planned Redevelopment - Mixed Use) with a concurrent amendment to the Official Zoning Map from IS (Industrial Suburban) to CCS-1 (Corridor Commercial Suburban) for a 29.11-acre parcel located at 1501 72nd Street North. Development Agreement: In addition, a proposed Development Agreement is summarized as follows:

- Development under the requested CCS-1 designation of a 150,000 square feet (minimum) Sports Tourism Facility (Commercial Recreation Facility) and ancillary retail/restaurant uses; multi-family buildings comprised of 623 apartment units with a minimum of 30% of the units being workforce housing; and a public lagoon with beach area; the combined intensity shall not exceed 0.55 FAR and the total density shall not exceed 623 units.
- In accordance with the CCS-1 designation, building height is limited to 48-feet; however, additional height can be achieved pursuant to the Large Tract Planned Development Overlay regulations, set forth in Chapter 16 of the City Code.

Staff Presentation:

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

Applicant/Owner Presentation

Robert Pergolizzi, Les Porter, were in attendance and gave a presentation in support of the project.

Registered Opponent

James Schattman, President Crossroad Area Neighborhood Association gave a presentation in opposition to the project.

Public Hearing

Linnea Sennott, 107 Fareham Place N., chose not to speak, was present and was for the project.

C. Olson-Adams, 1448 68th St., had to leave and was not sure of their position on the project.

Les Porter, 1645 Monterey Dr., for Porter Development spoke in support of the project.

Greg Schultz, 380 Park Place Blvd., Suite 300, spoke in support of the project.

Greg Holzwart, 6801 14th Ave. N., spoke against the project.

Todd Johnson, 6916 Stonestrow Circle N., spoke against the project.

Sean Cashen, 13825 Icot Blvd., spoke in support of the project.

Mike Meidel, Pinellas County Economic Development, spoke against the project.

Dr. Ed Carlson, 7691 30th Ave. N., spoke in support of the project.

Melanie Goodman, 6916 Stonestrow Cir, N, spoke against the project.

Cross Examination:

Waived by City Staff and Applicant

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Waived by City Staff and Applicant.

Executive Session

Commissioner Burke: Alright Commissioners I think we have had a lot of great information presented from all angles on this particular issue I'm sure that you have a lot of questions and we have City, the Opponent the Applicant here so we have plenty of opportunity to ask questions. Anybody ready to kick this off?

Commissioner Whiteman: Yes, I have a bunch of questions for Derek.

Commissioner Burke: Mr. Kilborn, will you come up to the podium please?

Commissioner Whiteman: My first question is, what is the use of an IS (industrial suburban) zoning right now? right now, what would be used there would be on that property?

Derek Kilborn: Sure. The current zoning is Industrial Suburban and Industrial Suburban is a category where we can accommodate different industrial and employment-related type uses. Under the Industrial Suburban category uses tend to be more of a clean industrial type of operation, an office headquarters for example. That did play into our assessment here because when we looked at the existing IS and what uses are allowed and specifically, under that target employment center which is important, and then what are those uses if we carry them over to the CCS-1, what happens? What we found out is that those uses would still be allowed under that change. For us that brought some comfort knowing that we were not necessarily taking away the employment industrial opportunity it can still go there under the CCS-1 zoning and that was important to us. I didn't mention that office temporary labor though is one that did not translate over, but that is not one of our targeted economic sectors and so we didn't consider that too much of a negative impact.

Commissioner Whiteman: Okay, thank you for clarifying, I do have some more questions for you.

In the talks about the maximum building height of forty eight (48) feet I see three buildings that are 57 ft plus the parking garage is more than forty eight (48) feet and I would assume that the sports facility would be higher than that, what are we doing here?

Derek Kilborn: This is where I want to give some caution about site plans and looking at renderings because they are not fully vetted yet against what might be the code restrictions or regulations. They do have an avenue to get to taller heights above forty eight (48) feet if they use the Large Tract Plan Development option and if needed, we can pull the diagram up and I can walk you through that. That diagram was also included in your staff report, essentially the Large Tract Plan Development overlay allows taller buildings at the center of a property in exchange for providing transitional buffers on the perimeter. For example, if they were thinking of using the Large Tract Plan Development option to get to the 50 some feet that you see in the one rendering, there are some parking spaces out in what would be defined as the buffer for the Large Tract Plan Development option and that is going to require some design change because those, parking spaces would not be something that could be accommodated and meet the requirements definition of that buffer space. There are some things here that might have to change or be tweaked if they are going to try to use the Large Tract Plan Development option. In another section of the code that we have, called allowable height encroachments, there are some minor exemptions in there to the maximum height so, for example, if you have mechanical rooms on the roof of a building for elevator shafts that is an example of an allowable height encroachment. There are few of those articulated in the table and so we do have a section reference in the staff report for that as well, you can go to that chart and see what those might be.

Commissioner Whiteman: Okay, and my last question at this point is, there was a man here from the Pinellas, I did not get his name, Pinellas County Economic Development.

Derek Kilborn: Yes, Mike Meidel.

Commissioner Whiteman: He's not in favor, I assumed he was trying to say was not in favor of converting this from IS (Industrial Property) to the CCS-1. I hate to see industrial property go too far for future development we need. Can you address that, I mean is this property, it has been vacant for twenty (20) years, from what I am hearing. I thought it was used just a few years ago.

Derek Kilborn: Well, you know these applications come in and they usually get turned around fairly quick and brought to the Commission for a consideration. In this case obviously COVID-19 was the cause for some delay. Prior to that, there had been some long discussions between the Applicant, the City, also the County staff including Mike Meidel. economic development office and the Forward Pinellas planning office because industrial land is considered important to the future of the county and so not only in the City's Comprehensive Plan, but also in the Countywide Rules, there are separate criteria and thresholds for approving these types of map changes. Very early on in the process, all these different individuals were engaged at the city and county level to make sure that whether they supported it or not, they were familiar with what was going to be brought forward. I know that as staff we had several meetings with individuals at County planning and economic development, including Mike Meidel, but I believe that the applicant has as well and they can speak to the finer details of that but he does raise important points and considerations. Industrial land is important and that's represented in the Comprehensive Plan and Countywide Rules and how they deal with these types of map changes.

Commissioner Whiteman: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Gerdes: I have a follow up, I have a lot of questions, but I have a follow up to that one for the Applicant. Mike Meidell is opposed, I mean he did not say it outright but seems like it and then Tim Ramsberger is for it, at least you said so. It seems like the county is a bit split.

Brian J. Aungst, Jr.: Yes sir, I guess I want to just kind of go back to the fact that this has been extremely comprehensive in terms of vetting and discussing this application as Mr. Kilborn said not just with the city not just with the neighborhood's been also with the county. We have met with a majority of the County Commissioners about the legislative nature of the of the Land Use Amendment we have met with Mr. Blanton and Mr. Chapman at Forward Pinellas. We have met with Mr. Meidel, we have met with Mr. Ramsberger. I am extremely confident, and I know I'm saying this on the record, that with the extremely good work of your Staff in terms of the Staff Report the very strong Development Agreement the pro-forma and feasibility and economic analysis of sports facilities advisors who the county themselves hired to attract a project like this as Mr. Sullivan said back in 2019, that if this application is approved by the City Council in First Reading and is transmitted to Forward Pinellas and to Pinellas County to the County Commissioners that the County Commissioners will support it. I believe that and that is why we're here we didn't think that we were going to get to that point we would not have put all the effort into getting this point.

Commissioner Gerdes: Thank you.

Brian J. Aungst, Jr: Thank you sir.

Commissioner Gerdes: Also Robs last name is Gerdes, it just happens to be mine too. But not the same person.

Commissioner Burke: Do you have any other questions?

Derek Kilborn: If I may add to that answer, just kind of reflecting on an earlier question too. When this application first came in, it did not have a Development Agreement and so as the conversation moved through these different levels and concerns were being expressed about the loss of the industrial land and the need for affordable workforce housing, that is at the point where the Development Agreement was introduced by the applicants as consideration to address those concerns. These have been taken seriously at the different levels and that is why you have a Development Agreement that is going along with the application and that's why we felt comfortable enough recommending approval because that Development Agreement is addressing those issues specifically.

Commissioner Burke: Mr. Gerdes, anything else?

Commissioner Gerdes: Sure, I will fire mine off. I am sorry if you don't mind stepping up again. I noticed that the walkways from the trail through the property they have been referenced a couple of times and, I know this is you know this is broad, right but it seems like they only walk to the restaurants and then there's no like real pass through to the park. Do you think that'll be continued,

here is where I am coming from, I live four blocks from here, I walk my kids on that trail everyday. I would love to be able to walk not through a parking lot.

Brian J. Aungst, Jr: Yes, of course.

Commissioner Gerdes: Yeah so that's it that's kind of where I'm coming from with that with that question.

Brian J. Aungst, Jr: Mr. Pergolizzi, can Respond to that.,

Robert Pergolizzi: Thank you again. For the record Gulf Coast Consulting. This is a maximum development option conceptual plan. As we move through this site plan we will work with Staff about providing that pedestrian connection enumerated in the Development Agreement by Mr. Kilborn to get from the Pinellas Trail over to Azalea Park.

Commissioner Gerdes: Thank you, I just kind of needed to hear it, frankly. Then I guess it would not be a question it would be more of a comment, to me, living so close to this and walking by it every day there is a big question here and I say this really to the commission there's a big question here, I guess this is a question. Do we keep it industrial or do we let this plan you know take its trail onward? From my perspective, I think about somebody like Amazon coming in and trucks going in and out, I would much rather have this, if I had a choice. I'm not sure that if I had to pick for my neighborhood, and I had a lot of my questions that I wrote down, I probably wrote down 47 questions but, I appreciate both sides. I think this can be done correctly I think we have got trust in the City and we've got to trust in the applicant to do it that way. I appreciate, I might have one more question, but I appreciate all of the input is very thorough and I feel significantly better about it thank you.

Commissioner Burke: Thank you.

Commissioner Wolf: Just a follow up on Mike Meidel's comments, one thing that he said that I wanted to ask about, there was, I guess some potentially new incentives that were offered by I'm not sure if it was the state to try and make this Industrial and more attractive for its current uses. I know it's been vacant for 20 years, so obviously it hasn't been very attractive to anybody so far, but do any of those incentives change your evaluation of that Industrial attractiveness or lack thereof for the industrial zoning?

Derek Kilborn: I would say at this time it does not, provided that the map amendment is considered in conjunction with the Development Agreement.

Commissioner Michaels: I have a couple of statements and questions, maybe to start with if you could put the diagram on page 25 up that is the future land use diagram. I do want to just preface this by saying that I very much appreciate the time and energy and investment already that the Development Group here has put into this. I also want to say that I very much appreciate the Crossroads Neighborhood effort here. Mr. Schattman, it is very difficult to master and understand and get to the point where you got a grasp of a project as complicated as this, and I think you have done a valiant job of trying to do that, you did it with no resources to speak of. You are entirely a volunteer operation and that is very much appreciated. The result here today might not be what you

would like, I think you should be proud of what you have done here today. One of the points that I have been struggling with here is established character Land Use Policy, Land Use 3.6, which speaks to the extent to which this project fits in with the surrounding neighborhoods and this is the diagram here which shows the existing Future Land Use and then we see the proposed the Future Land Use here. Obviously, we have a high-density project being proposed for the site, the thirty-acre site, and I kind of get it with respect to the east side of this project that there is a fit there, but I am still wavering here about whether or not there's a bad fit on the west side. We have a park there, recreation open space there, and then right after that we have got the RU the Residential Urban, very low-density housing there. We had a case like this before with the Lakewood Townhouses where originally, they were proposing to build those in the middle of recreation open space and at least for me it was a major consideration that that was not appropriate because it did not fit in with the established character in the surrounding area. There we did get the applicant to change the location so that it was adjacent to the residential housing rather than in the middle of a recreation open space, so briefly here I know we have been here for a long time, but if the Staff could just try to help me get beyond my hesitation on this particular point?

Derek Kilborn: We do think that it is a natural fit. Our start point is property that has industrial zoning on it. That could be any number of things, as you have heard in the Commission discussion tonight. It could be other industrial uses that are not necessarily compatible with the neighboring single-family and multi-family that is there. In this case you have a proposal that is a sports recreation facility. It is recreation in nature, which is compatible with the activities that are happening in Azalea Park and are also compatible with the primary purpose and function of the Pinellas Trail, which is recreation. Having that linkage required in the Development Agreement for recognizing the importance of recreation here, and a need for those different elements to connect and be unified together, we think that recreation is a very important piece of this. In terms of residential on the north you do have multi-family that's being proposed, and we believe that is entirely consistent with multifamily that exists to the east. We talked about some of the density numbers being in the approximate range of 20 and 25 units per acre which is consistent and then in terms of the single-family to the west they do have the buffer of over 500 feet and the parklands. We did think that there were some compatible fits here in the proposal that has been put forward and again I'll say with the Development Agreement included, we do think that's important for maintaining that compatibility and consistency in this example.

Commissioner Michaels: Alright, thank you. I have got two other comments, one is that we have got a toxic site here, and that to me is huge and it raises the question of a risk to public health. Can you assure us that this development will not end up being a risk to a public health because it's being built on toxic waste site?

Derek Kilborn: That is a difficult and challenging question for me. I think the way for me to answer it is, I can assure you that the proper procedures will be followed with local and state and any potential federal agencies to make sure that as this project moves forward, it's getting reviewed in the way that it needs to ensure the public safety. For the work that we do in our office, I hesitate to give you that guarantee from a personal position, but I can assure you that it will follow all proper permitting procedures or else this project cannot be built. I think what you are seeing in the layout of the site plan reflects feedback that has been received over the years. In my position with the City I obviously have been here a while and I have seen a number of plans come forward on this site that are conceptual in nature. Early on, they included mostly 100% residential including on the

south portion of the site. In more recent years, we have seen that modified and some of the concept plans coming in were concentrating the residential units on the north end which is outside of the contaminated area. I think it is reflecting some of the feedback that has been received by these potential applicants, both from state and federal agencies.

Commissioner Michaels: Again, thank you just a final comment I am not asking for any response on this, we've had some information presented to us, comments, about level of service standards drainage and stormwater for this particular site and again that is a huge issue to me, and I just want to put that out there to be recognized. Thank you.

Commissioner Burke: Any other comments?

Commissioner Winters: Yes, just quickly many of my concerns have been address so I appreciate all the presentations and I apologize if someone covered this, but I have to say my attention is flagging at this moment. Noise, can you talk a little bit about noise abatement specifically between the outdoor amenity area? I know you got the Container Park which spans half of that length, but what kind of sound barriers, to address the neighborhoods concern?

Brian J. Aungst, Jr: I am going to ask Mr. Sullivan or Les to come up in and more specifically address that but I know that again in a site plan approval process will be required to go through a noise mitigation plan which is part of the Land Development Code. That plan will be a formal plan, it will not just be me up here standing and talking, you will have it in your hands to review. Not you the DRC, it will be also open to public scrutiny and public comment so that is a very important part of the site plan approval process, it is something that we are very much concerned about considering. As I mentioned earlier, the sports facility itself is all indoors so there is no activities, but I do understand there is concern with the container park and there's also concern with the lagoon and I do understand that. The hours of operation another thing we will be talking about through the site plan approval process, The only other comment I will make and I think it's responsive is that it's important to remember that this property abuts the Tyrone Activity Center and as such, the activity center was designed for high intensity uses and we think this is a really good transition from the activity center and towards the park. I think the Staff really focused on the fact that this is abutting the activity center as part of their recommendation for approval. I am not sure if that answers your question, but I hope it did.

Commissioner Winters: That is good, yes, thank you.

Commissioner Burke: Alright, if it is okay with everyone else I would like to comment, I think the questions I have here are for a later date when you are doing site plan approval on a final design approval but I would love to see more sports tourism in Pinellas County, and especially in the City of St Petersburg. Do we have a current sports director in Pinellas County used to be Kevin Smith is there a sports director in Pinellas County now, do we know?

Someone in the audience: He is the sports director.

Commissioner Burke: He is a sports director, I grew up with my kids going to all these sporting events and you know it was either four or eight of us traveling with these kids it's whether there's a grandma or grandpa there, go to Winter Haven or Auburndale where they built six baseball fields and a couple cheap hotels and it changed those cities completely. Go to North Shore pool this weekend and see the 200 little kids swimming and the 800 moms and dads and brothers and sisters

that are all with him. I think we should do more of this, these are tough decisions though, you've got people that have been living in these neighborhoods and that have serious concerns. As we listen to the public we've got about half in favor and we have about half against, so everything is a compromise. We have land use, we have we have ordinances in place, we have the noise ordinance in place that's been one of the biggest complaints the noise ordinance in the city of St Petersburg has been a big issue for the last few years and we all think of the noise ordinance as being bars at downtown at 2:00 am in the morning making too much noise but it is so much more than that. It is noise from rooftop air conditioners, it's noise from Canterbury Baseball Field being next to Puryear Park neighborhood all those things are governed by the noise ordinance and we as a City have to have faith in our City Staff that these things are going to be followed. I might think that this can be a very good project for this area I would love to see it go in there. I understand the concerns of the registered opponent and the other people that have spoken against it and I think that your concerns are being heard, the traffic, the noise those are those are big things and those are very real when you live in that area and I would encourage you to stick with the process as the site plans are approved, as this thing moves up through the ranks and I think that a lot of your concern should be addressed I hope they are. I definitely would be in favor of moving forward with a Future Land Use Map Amendment rezoning and a Development Agreement as presented by the City, if we have a motion to that effect. Do we have a motion?

Commissioner Whiteman: So moved.

Commissioner Burke: Commissioner Whiteman moved to approve...

Commissioner Whiteman: Move to approve the proposed Future Land Use Map from IL (Industrial Limited) to PR-MU (Planned Redevelopment - Mixed Use) while retaining the existing target employment center overlay and the proposed Official Zoning Map amendment from IS (Industrial Suburban) to CCS-1 (Corridor Commercial Suburban) and approve the associated Development Agreement

Commissioner Burke: We have a motion on the floor.

Commissioner Gerdes: Second.

Commissioner Burke: And we have a second from Commissioner Gerdes, let's go ahead and vote by roll call please.

Commissioner Burke: Mr. Schattman thank you very much for participating in the system and I can assure you have been heard, you have been heard, so thank you very much. and to the applicants good luck with your project and thanks for listening to the comments today.

MOTION: *Commissioner Whiteman made a motion approving an amendment to the Future Land Use Map from IL (Industrial Limited) to PR-MU (Planned Redevelopment - Mixed Use) with a concurrent amendment to the Official Zoning Map from IS (Industrial Suburban) to CCS-1 (Corridor Commercial Suburban) for a 29.11-acre parcel located at 1501 72nd Street North and approving the Development Agreement:*

Commissioner Gerdes seconded

VOTE: **YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Whiteman, Winters, Wolf**
 NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

VIII. UPDATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no updates.

VIII. ADJOURN

Commissioner Wolf made a motion to adjourn.
Commissioner Whiteman seconded.

With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 7:00 pm

