



**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**

**August 10, 2021  
Tuesday  
2:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** C. Copley Gerdes, Chair  
Sharon Winters, Vice Chair  
Jeff Rogo  
Will Michaels, Alternate  
Christopher “Chris” A. Burke, Alternate

**Commissioners Absent:** Thomas “Tom” Whiteman  
Jeffery “Jeff” M. Wolf  
Lisa Wannemacher, Alternate

**Staff Present:** Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation  
Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist II  
Kelly Perkins, Historic Preservationist II  
Britton Wilson, Planner II  
Ann Vickstrom, Planner II  
Heather Judd, Assistant City Attorney  
Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney  
Katherine Connell, Admin. Asst., Planning & Development Svcs.

The public hearing was called to order at 2:01:54 p.m., a quorum was present.

- I. OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIR**
- II. ROLL CALL**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND SWEARING IN OF WITNESSES**
- IV. RULES OF PROCEDURE DISCUSSION & VOTE**

Commissioner Winters moved adoption of the Rules of Procedure, Commissioner Rogo seconded. Motion passed unanimously

**V. MINUTES (Approval of 07/13 Minutes)**

The minutes from the July 13, 2021, meeting were approved unanimously

**VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**VII. PUBLIC HEARING**

**A. City File No. LGCP 2021-02**

**Contact Person: Britton Wilson, 551-3542**

**Request:** City initiated application requesting to amend the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to House Bill 59, which requires local governments to adopt a new Property Rights Element for which to incorporate a model statement of private property rights into their Comprehensive Plans.

**Staff Presentation**

Britton Wilson gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

**Registered Opponent**

None.

**Public Hearing**

None.

**Executive Session**

Commissioner Michaels: Does this cause the need for a change in any of the other rules and regulations that we have? The land development regulations particularly how they affect historic preservation?

Britton Wilson: No, this Comprehensive Plan amendment is consistent, internally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations. The State of Florida Constitution already protects private rights, property rights as well as The Burt Harris Act. This is kind of duplicative, but it is necessary to be in line with House Bill 59.

Commissioner Michaels: Thank you.

Commissioner Winters: I understand the need to comply, I guess I have a question for Mr. Dema. What overrides what? When it comes to the Land Development Regulations, the work we do, the work that DRC does, because if you took some of this really literally you could say, well we are

not going to do setbacks, we are not going to do zoning. I am trying to understand what prevails here.

Attorney Dema: Commissioner, I agree with Ms. Wilson's statement that this is duplicative, it is superfluous, it is a restatement of the law as it is right now. There is a legislative agenda here, to state the obvious, in my opinion. What we are doing here is basically, copying verbatim, just to comply with state law, the state constitution, the Burt Harris Act, it is always things that we have to consider. In the context of zoning in historic preservation etcetera, we still have those police powers to regulate the health, safety and welfare of our citizens, and this changes absolutely nothing. There is always, to this day the judicial stands for at least a federal taking is too far, that is literally what the standard is. What we have in terms of zoning, and whatnot, we think that that is in line with our traditional powers to do so. We will be still following our Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations as we have been.

Commissioner Winters: Thank you, I just want to make a comment about the legislature's continuing attempts to essentially seize local control from the municipalities and it sounds like that is not the case here but it is a political statement.

Attorney Dema: I think it is in the spirit of that, what they are trying to do in terms of making a statement here. I and my colleagues, both in planning and legal agree that there is no fundamental change or any change at all.

Commissioner Winters: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Rogo: Mr. Chair thank you, I was going to follow up on Commissioner Michaels' question and I think Mr. Dema has answered that question by saying that our historic preservation ordinances do take, not necessarily precedence but they are not negatively impacted by the language of these changes.

Attorney Dema: No, we always consider private property rights, I mean that's the balance, that is what we do at the DRC and CPPC, is to strike that balance between private property rights and the regulations that have been reasonably adopted over the years to protect planning and zoning here in the City. That calculus is going to continue to happen at both commissions and city council as well.

Commissioner Rogo: Thank you.

Commissioner Gerdes: Any further questions or comments?

Commissioner Burke: I would like to make a motion that we adopt the amendment as written.

Commissioner Rogo: Second.

Commissioner Gerdes: Any questions or comments before we vote? Okay, lets vote.

***VOTE: YES -5 – Gerdes, Burke, Michaels, Rogo, Winters***

*NO – 0*

*Motion passed unanimously*

**B. City File No. LGCP 2021-03**

**Contact Person: Robert Gerdes, 893-7876**

**Request:** City initiated application requesting to amend the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to House Bill 1339, which allows the governing body of a municipality to approve affordable housing in single family and industrial zoning districts. Requesting that the Community Planning and Preservation Commission (“CPPC”), in its capacity as the Local Planning Agency (“LPA”), make a finding of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

**Staff Presentation**

Robert Gerdes gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

**Registered Opponent**

None.

**Public Hearing**

None.

**Executive Session**

Commissioner Gerdes: Thank you Mr. Gerdes, any questions?

Commissioner Michaels: Yes, thank you, I need some additional background to fully understand what we are doing. I am very much in favor of increasing affordable housing within the City, I see that as being a top priority need and we need to address that in many ways. My understanding is this, that would allow for a affordable housing development that would have twenty (20) units or more on one acre in a, lets say, suburban zoned neighborhood which now has the maximum seven (7) units pre acres, as I understand it, is that correct?

Robert Gerdes: I would say that is accurate, yes sir, a good example of this would be the Bear Creek Property on 64<sup>th</sup> Street in West St. Petersburg that recently went through rezoning and change of Future Land Use Map (FLUM) application. Under this process they would have qualified, based on the land size, they could have come to City Council and went through this process as opposed to the rezoning and Future Land Use, which took well over a year I believe in that process.

Commissioner Michaels: So, the other model here is the neighborhood traditional mixed zoning, which was adopted back in 2019, I believe. That I think is a similar approach to expanding affordable housing within the city in the residential areas. With that particular zoning there were some very strong statements about the need to maintain the character of the community, to respect

the character of the community, setbacks and height, architectural style all of those particular elements. I am not seeing that language in this proposal. Is that not being addressed and if it is being addressed, how is it being addressed?

Robert Gerdes: I believe it is being addressed sir, it is being addressed through the site plan review criteria. That site plan review criteria has quite a bit of language related to orientations of buildings, compatibility with surrounding uses. There will be a staff review of any application where we would work through those issues and then City Council will ultimately be the ones to decide on that compatibility.

Commissioner Michaels: Alright but there is no language in the Comprehensive Plan to that affect or in the actual zoning, well I guess there is a zoning overlay here so I guess there is no language in the zoning overlay to that affect, is that correct?

Robert Gerdes: Well this is completely outside of chapter 16. It is not in the Land Development Regulations it is completely separate as provided for by state statute, so the review criteria is only contained in the ordinance for Chapter 17.5.

Commissioner Michaels: Okay and where is that specifically in the materials that you are presenting to us?

Robert Gerdes: If we could go back to the power point presentation, (PowerPoint presentation pulled up), so this is the site plan review criteria and you have the ordinance which goes through the full language. You are going to be looking at ingress and egress, where it comes from, where vehicles enter/exit, you are going to be looking at transit opportunities, walkability, all the off-street parking, is that compatible with the neighborhood, is there enough parking being provided. The impact report, drainage there is the orientation, the heightened location of the buildings in relation to the character of the neighborhood, compatibility of the use any detrimental effects, now those are the three big ones right there. Where you are going to be looking at any compatibility with the surrounding neighbors, I mean I think if the concern is about compatibility with single family residential, I think that is definitely going to be taken into consideration. If you have an abutting single family residential on the site, that is not going to be favorable towards vertical construction. What this is really intended for is larger properties that happen to be zoned single family, so I will give you some examples the Bear Creek Property is one, maybe take a look at Tyrone Middle School, that has residential zoning, The Science Center property. There are a number of properties like that, they are not single family, but they have single family zoning. This process, I think, would be beneficial in those instances.

Commissioner Michaels: So the intent is not to purchase, let's say four lots that would amount to one acre and build on that.

Robert Gerdes: Absolutely not the intent sir.

Commissioner Michaels: Thank you

Commissioner Burke: Mr. Gerdes, thank you for boiling it down, it really made a lot of sense.

That Bear Creek property, is that the church property?

Robert Gerdes: Yes sir.

Commissioner Burke: They jumped through a lot of hoops to get through this process. There was a lot of public input, there was a lot of the, “Not in my Back Yard (NIMBY)” attitude, how would that whole application process have changed, if these changes to Chapter 17.5 are adopted?

Robert Gerdes: The neighborhood would have been notified; they absolutely would have had the opportunity to comment. There would have been a review of the application by City Staff, they would have brought that to City Council, City Council would have reviewed the actual site plan...what they are actually proposing to build. City Council could have approved that site plan, approved it with conditions or rejected it. If it was approved, they would have had to build exactly what was on the plan. The residents in the neighborhood, whether they supported or did not support it would have had every right to come to that City Council meeting and still voice their opinion, they would have been notified on the issue. One point I was trying to make, because I personally find it interesting is, let's just take a look at that specific property. That property has now been rezoned; I know because I had an appraisal done on the property that under the single family residential it was about \$1.75 million. Now it is multi family zoning, I am sure that appraisal has gone much higher. If for whatever reason that developer walks away, that property is rezoned. The neighborhood could end up with something completely different than what this 18 month process was about on that property. If they would have went through this, they have to build what they say they are going to build, or it cannot be built, and the zoning doesn't actually change. I just think that is interesting, so I mentioned it.

Commissioner Burke: Well it is more than interesting, it is really important. On that particular property then, in this instance, on Bear Creek, there is no Development Agreement, that zoning was just changed, and it is done. Where under these type of circumstance, it would be a one time deal.

Robert Gerdes: It is, basically, it is actually a de facto Development Agreement on site plan. It is one hundred percent (100%) affordable housing and work force housing it is not market rate housing.

Commissioner Burke: It makes a lot of sense to me, thank you.

Commissioner Winters: I am really supportive of this proposal. I have few questions, can you kind of quantify the need at this moment in time for affordable housing in the City?

Robert Gerdes: Yes, I think I can, we are hovering somewhere between, probably thirty seven percent (37%) to forty percent (40%) of our households being cost burdened, which means that they are paying more than thirty percent (30%) of their gross income for housing. If you look at census material there is somewhere between one hundred and five (105) and one hundred and ten (110) households in the City of St Petersburg, so you can do the math, you are looking at somewhere 37 to 42,000 households that are cost burdened in the city. Some of those are cost burdened by choice. You are never going to get to zero households cost burdened, but if you

could get down to twenty percent (20%), I think you are doing fantastic. The need for units, honestly, is probably in the 12 to 15,000 range.

Commissioner Winters: Given the criteria, it seems like a fairly high bar to reach but I could be wrong, can you give us a sense of, are there that many parcels that actually meet the criteria, today, where somebody could actually do this?

Robert Gerdes: So, most of the discussion related to parcel availability has been around the industrial zoning. There has been input provided by the City's Economic Development Team, by the County's Economic Development Team and Forward Pinellas, through those four (4) City Council meetings, that I mentioned, there was significant concern brought forward related to the use of industrial land because it is job creating land. Under the proposal that you are seeing today, there is currently twelve (12) industrial properties in the City of St. Petersburg that qualifies based on size and location. Working with those different economic development teams, I believe that everybody felt like we came to a place that balanced those issues and was satisfactory. In our discussions with council, we have also said that we want to be conservative to start with this approach. We would like to get this approved and let's see what happens. If the development community is interested let's see how does it work, we can always look at it later. On the residential side I do not have the number, but there is significantly more, there are a lot of church properties a lot of school properties would meet that criteria. One thing, and I have talked to the Pinellas County Schoolboard about this, they have not committed to doing it, but under this proposal I believe they could build teacher/employee housing right off the school campuses, maybe one day they will do that.

Commissioner Winters: That is really helpful, my final comment, and it might be somewhere in the language and I missed it, noise abatement for the residential properties being placed in industrial. Some kind of sound buffer, is that actually a component.

Robert Gerdes: That is actually, I thought in the environment analysis we did include noise but I may have to defer to Liz on that specific.

Elizabeth Abernethy: Hello, Elizabeth Abernethy Director of Planning and Environmental Services, I know we had that conversation of that specific language but I think that the environmental report and analysis is both to protect future residents as well as to protect existing industrial uses and provide that level of compatibility. There certainly will be depending on the location for potential requirement of a noise study for the future residential or mitigation if we already know that there is a noise producing type use in the vicinity. I think it will really depend on the specifics. That is definitely one of the categories, whether it explicitly says noise, I would have to double check, but that is the intent.

Commissioner Winters: Thank you very much.

Commissioner Gerdes: Any other questions or comments?

Commissioner Winters: I will move adoption of City File LGCP 2021-03.

Commissioner Rogo: Second.

Commissioner Gerdes: I have one quick question, the reason we all are only focusing on the four (4) zoning areas, is that part of the test feature of this?

Robert Gerdes: Yes, great question, it is part of the test feature. Another issue that comes up is if you get into mixed use commercial zoning, it already allows residential, housing affordability, we already have density bonuses in those districts to allow for greater density if you are doing affordable or workforce housing. We would like to see those tools be used as opposed to a developer coming in and saying, I want to go significantly higher than what you are already providing, we do not think that is best place to start and we would just like to start with these districts.

Commissioner Gerdes: Yes, keep away from the overlap.

Robert Gerdes: For right now.

Commissioner Gerdes: Okay, any other questions or comments before we vote?

Commissioner Michaels: I would like to see stronger language protecting the character of the neighborhoods in the ordinance but I will support this to move it forward.

***VOTE: YES -5 – Gerdes, Burke, Michaels, Rogo, Winters  
NO – 0***

Motion passes unanimously

Commissioner Burke: Sir could you just clarify, did he just define cost burdened as a household that spends more than 30 percent (30%) of their income, that is the definition?

Robert Gerdes: Yes thirty percent (30%) of the gross income.

## **VIII. QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARING**

### **C. City File FLUM 62**

**Contact Person: Ann Vickstrom, 892-5807**

**Request:** An amendment to the Future Land Use Map from IL (Industrial Limited) to PR-C (Planned Redevelopment - Commercial) with a concurrent amendment to the Official Zoning Map from EC-1 (Employment Center) to CCS-2 (Corridor Commercial Suburban) for a 17.91 acre property located at the northwest corner of the Gandy Boulevard and Interstate-275 interchange.

**Termination of Development Agreement:** The Development Agreement entered into by and between Jabil Circuit, Inc. and the City of St Petersburg on October 1, 2010, is proposed to be terminated. The existing Development Agreement related specifically to the proposed development at that time and the development conditions were tailored accordingly. The existing Development Agreement requested for termination covers the subject property, which is generally located at the northwest corner of Gandy Boulevard and Interstate-275, east of 28<sup>th</sup> Street North, totaling 93.38 acres.



**New Development Agreement:** A new Development Agreement is proposed to cover the same subject property, which is generally located at the northwest corner of Gandy Boulevard and Interstate 275, east of 28<sup>th</sup> Street North, totaling approximately 93.38 acres, and includes among other items:

- 1) development under the CCS-2 designation (approximately 17.91 acres) is proposed to be limited to a maximum of 500 multifamily residential dwelling units (a density of 27.92 units per acre), a height of 84 feet, and uses which are permitted in such designation;
- 2) development under the EC-1 designation (approximately 61.10 acres) is proposed to be limited to 1,000,000 gross square feet of industrial uses (an intensity of 0.37 FAR), a height of 84 feet, and uses which are permitted in such designation; and,
- 3) no density, intensity or height is proposed to be provided for the Preservation (P) portion of the property (approximately 14.37 acres), which may be used as permitted in such designation.

**Staff Presentation**

Ann Vickstrom gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

**Applicant Presentation**

R. Donald Mastry, Esq., representative for Jabil, Inc. and Greystar Development East, LLC. spoke in support of the project.

**Registered Opponent**

None.

**Public Hearing**

None.

**Cross Examination:**

City Staff and Applicant: Waived

**Rebuttal/Closing Remarks**

City Staff: Waived

Applicant: R. Donald Mastry, Esq.:

**Executive Session**

Commissioner Gerdes: We will move into executive session, any questions or comments from the Commission?

Commissioner Michaels: I wholeheartedly support the proposal; I especially like the provision for

workforce housing, I think that is an extremely significant contribution to addressing that priority need in our community. I have gone through all of the policies and I agree that the overwhelming majority of the policies are addressed by this project. I am still troubled by the stormwater management Level of Service standard; I notice the language on that has changed from “existing conditions” that we discussed several months ago now in this Commission, and there is no reference to the ten-year one-hour storm standard. That is probably out of date and needs to be revised as well. I appreciate that there are a range of initiatives backed-up by millions of dollars to try and enhance and improve our infrastructure dealing with flooding in particular, throughout the city. But I am still troubled, still not sure that we are on top of that yet. But I will not hold that against the applicant.

I did have one question for Staff. I noticed on page 14 that the recently approved Vision2050 [StPete2050] plan is addressed which states, we are assuming a demand for new development between one thousand (1,000) and one thousand five hundred (1,500) new residential units per year. There is a statement there that the five hundred (500) multi-family units is below that projected density buildout and proposed growth for the city, and that a development build-out that projects 75 units an acre would be in the City’s high growth rate projections. Do we have a figure on the total number of units that have been approved this year? We talk about the five hundred (500) new units that this would approve but do we have an aggregate figure for what has been done this year? If not, maybe you can supply that to us at a later date. I would be interested to see that.

Derek Kilborn: Commissioner, perfect setup, I do not have that on immediate recall, but we can get that number for the Commission and report afterwards.

Commissioner Michaels: Thank you.

Commissioner Rogo: I too support the finding of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan as well as a recommendation to City Council to go forward with this Development Agreement. I have a question and a comment please, and maybe the question would be for Ms. Vickstrom. I know that we have indicated in the Staff Report that there is no negative impact on traffic, no LOS (level of service) negative impact, for traffic in the area. Is there a traffic signal at 28<sup>th</sup> and Gandy?

Ann Vickstrom: Yes, there is.

Commissioner Rogo: Okay, I thought there might be, I know that all the new construction has really streamlined traffic and the whole Gandy Blvd. corridor.

Ann Vickstrom: I am going to amend that comment, as 28<sup>th</sup> Street follows south to Gandy there is a frontage road that takes you over to the traffic signal. You can’t actually access Gandy from 28<sup>th</sup>, it goes around the corner as a frontage road and then goes to the Gateway Center main entrance with a traffic signal.

Commissioner Rogo: So, the traffic signal coming out of the apartment community going on to 28<sup>th</sup> and then will be somewhat guided by the traffic signal as it gets a little further down closer to Gandy, correct?

Ann Vickstrom: That is correct.

Commissioner Rogo: Okay, my comment, would be that I found the use of the word shell in this Staff Report, that the Certificate of Completion would be for the construction of a shell of the building. The more I thought about it, I think the construction of even the shell of a building will encourage both the success of the multi-family as well as the success of any potential industrial uses in that area. The industrial uses need to have proximity to people who are working there and a multi-family certainly would provide that. With the industrial there is a motivation to get that industrial developed into actual businesses operating, employing, because we want to get some folks to move into that multi-family property. I am very comfortable with the proposal presented today, thank you.

Commissioner Gerdes: Thank you Commissioner, Commissioner Winters.

Commissioner Winters: I am also really supportive of this proposal, and I especially appreciate the housing, essentially integrated into the employment centers and the minimization of vehicular trips. I want to thank Greystar for this really ambitious proposal and Ms. Vickstrom and Mr. Mastry for their detailed presentations. I will make a motion that we, one by one...

Commissioner Gerdes: Yes, I was going to clarify, I think it is three (3).

Attorney Dema: Yes, I would like them separate please.

Commissioner Gerdes: We are going to speak about the approval of the land use, excuse me the termination of the current Development Agreement, the approval of the comprehensive future land and then the approval of the new Development Agreement.

Attorney Dema: That is correct.

Ann Vickstrom: And the zoning too.

Commissioner Gerdes: I am sorry, and the zoning map, I just did not read the whole sentence. Thank you for keeping me honest. Is that the order we want to do it in?

Attorney Dema: Yes, lets terminate the Development Agreement first, then we can do the new Development Agreement, and the lock in the zoning and future land use.

Commissioner Gerdes: Okay, got it, thank you.

Commissioner Burke: Chair? Have we heard from anybody from Jabil Circuit that says that they want this to be terminated? [Jabil rep speaks up] Could you please just tell me if they want this survey?

Attorney Don Mastry: It is in the application.

Commissioner Burke: Thank you, okay. I wanted to be sure we had that on the record.

Attorney Dema: Obsolete DA where a whole new direction.

Commissioner Burke: Yes, thank you.

Commissioner Winters: I will move termination of the Development Agreement between Jabil and the City of St. Petersburg from 2010.

***Motion #1: Commissioner Winters moved to terminate the 2010 Development Agreement between Jabil and the City of St. Petersburg.***

***Commissioner Rogo Second.***

***VOTE: YES -5 – Gerdes, Burke, Michaels, Rogo, Winters  
NO – 0***

***Motion passed unanimously.***

Commissioner Gerdes: I have two quick questions for Staff. They were not pertinent to that vote, so I waited. I feel like I should know the answer to this, but the twenty percent (20%) affordable housing inside of the Development Agreement are we doing that on any land change? Such as Comprehensive Plan, land zoning changes where we are talking about mixed development, industrial, or is that just this specific agreement?

Attorney Dema: It is this specific agreement.

Commissioner Gerdes: This specific agreement, thank you. What is the AMI (area median income) standard for workforce housing? Is there a specific one?

Derek Kilborn: I do not have an actual dollar amount but when the workforce housing is applied to any of these projects it is like a ladder rotation.

Commissioner Gerdes: So, there will be some at eighty percent (80%), some at one hundred percent (100%), some at one hundred and twenty percent (120%), things like that? A ladder like that?

Derek Kilborn: Yes eighty percent (80%), one hundred percent (100%), and one hundred and twenty percent (120%), are the applications to the workforce housing units. The exact rotation, I do not recall but they start with the first two being eighty percent (80%), the next two being one hundred twenty percent (120%), the next two being one hundred percent (100%), and you keep rotating through the last ladder of units.

Commissioner Gerdes: Got it. Thank you, I was just curious. I feel that sometimes workforce and affordable housing, the words get muddled

Derek Kilborn: Right, and affordable can mean something lower than eighty percent (80%). In this case it is eighty percent (80%), one hundred percent (100%), and one hundred and twenty percent (120%)

Commissioner Gerdes: Perfect that is all I was trying to grasp, thank you.

**Motion #2:** *Commissioner Rogo made a motion to approve the proposed Development Agreement between the City of St. Petersburg and Greystar Development.*

*Commissioner Winters Second.*

**VOTE:** YES -5 – Gerdes, Burke, Michaels, Rogo, Winters  
NO – 0

*Motion passed unanimously.*

**Motion #3:** *Commissioner Burke made a motion approving consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and the Future Land Use Map and official Zoning Map amendments.*

*Commissioner Winters Second.*

**VOTE:** YES -5 – Gerdes, Burke, Michaels, Rogo, Winters  
NO – 0

*Motion passed unanimously.*

**D. City File No. 21-902000074 Contact Person: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470**

**Request**

**Staff Presentation**

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

**Applicant Presentation**

Brad Hussung, Hussung Construction, 246 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE. spoke in support of the project.

**Registered Opponent**

None.

**Public Hearing**

None.

**Cross Examination:**

City Staff and Applicant: Waived

**Rebuttal/Closing Remarks**

City Staff and Applicant: Waived

**Executive Session**

A discussion regarding the house's style and of a certain era having divided light windows, possibly adding divided lights a condition, window design guidelines, the original configuration and what is acceptable as original configuration. The staff conditions being acceptable to the applicant including the wood siding being maintained where possible, new architectural features, setbacks on the windows and the trim a motion was made.

***Motion:***                                ***Commissioner Burke made a motion approving the application as written subject to the seven (7) Staff conditions.***

***Commissioner Michaels Second.***

***VOTE:***    ***YES -5 – Gerdes, Burke, Michaels, Rogo, Winters***  
***NO – 0***

***Motion passed unanimously.***

**E.    City File No. 21-902000079                                Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451**

**Request**

**Staff Presentation**

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

**Applicant Presentation**

Liza Conrad, 3100 9<sup>th</sup> Ave. N. spoke in support of the project.

**Registered Opponent**

None.

