



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

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

**June 8, 2021
Tuesday
2:00 P.M.**

MINUTES

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

Commissioners Absent: Keisha A. Bell
Christopher “Chris” A. Burke, 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
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 2:00 p.m., a quorum was present.

- I. OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIR**
- II. ROLL CALL**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. MINUTES**

The minutes from the May 13, 2021 meeting were approved unanimously.

VI. QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARING

A. City File 21-90200097

Contact Person: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470

Commissioner Gerdes recused himself due to proximity.

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the alteration of the Alexander Hotel, a local historic landmark

Staff Presentation

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

Applicant Presentation

George Rahdert, owner, spoke on behalf of the project and explained why he chose to replace only the courtyard mansard roof. Requested the application be modified to replace the failed roof system within the courtyard only. Mr. Rahdert was available for questions.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

Jessica Rumore, Bayside Roofing, 5439 Mile Stretch Dr., Holiday, FL 34690, spoke on behalf of the project

Cross Examination:

Waived

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Waived

Executive Session

A discussion regarding the mixed materials on the mansard, the front consisting of asbestos tile and the courtyard Ludowici brand French tile. The application was never for partial replacement on for full replacement of the mansard portion of the roof. To keep the roof historically consistent mixed roofing would not have been recommended or approved from a historic view. The color consistency, if mixed tiles are approved, what future tiles would be used for the front elevations

and keeping consistency with the courtyard. Placing future conditions on a possible approval, possible lack of materials in the future. The owner's willingness to purchase the Ludowici tile when the asbestos roof does fail. Future permitting needing a COA for any future work. Possible change to code due to criteria or weather and the current Ludowici tile. The type of style that should be used in the future for the front mansard, motions were made.

Motion: *Commissioner Wolf made a motion adding a condition, when a permit is applied for to replace the front mansard, the current Ludowici tile located in the courtyard, similar in color, is available and meets criteria and code, it is to be used for the front mansard, if it is not available and does not meet code and criteria, the entire mansard is to be replaced for consistency.*

Commissioner Rogo Second.

VOTE: YES - 5 – Michaels, Rogo, Whiteman, Winters, Wolf
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: *Commissioner Wolf made a motion approving a Certificate of Appropriateness for the alteration of the Alexander Hotel subject to the additional condition and the original Staff conditions.*

Commissioner Rogo Second.

VOTE: YES - 5 – Michaels, Rogo, Whiteman, Winters, Wolf
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

B. City File 21-90200034 Contact Person: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470

Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a single-family residence at 620 10th Ave. S., a contributing resource to a local historic district.

Staff Presentation:

Kelly Perkins gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report

Applicant/Owner Presentation

Mr. Tobias Bacaner 1695 Castlewood Lane, Palm Harbor, requested this item be deferred so that he might work with Staff to settle a few items.

Executive Session

MOTION: *Commissioner Whiteman made a motion to defer for up to two months.*

Commissioner Wolf seconded

VOTE: YES - 6 - Michaels, Rogo, Whiteman, Winters, Wolf, Michaels
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

C. City File 21-90300003 Contact Person: Derek Kilborn, 893-7872

Request: Review of an owner-initiated request to remove the Tenth Street Church of God (HPC 00-01) from the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places

Staff Presentation

Derek Kilborn gave a presentation based on City Code and rescinding a local landmark designation and how an applicant is to go about proving the designation should be rescinded.

Applicant Presentation

Pastor, Carl Mobley, Sr., owner spoke to why the church should no longer have the designation and why he has made the request. He addressed the cost of keep up and the lack of outreach, to help the congregation.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

Mrs. Carolyn Brayboy, 144 23rd Ave. S., spoke in support of the de-designation, highlighting the cost of upkeep, the possibility of moving the building so the church can rebuild on the property.

Mr. Elihu Brayboy, 144 23rd Ave. S., spoke in support of the de-designation and the cost of upkeep and the effect the pandemic has had on the church’s finances.

Ms. Emily Elwyn, member of the Preserve the “Burg: spoke in support of keeping the building designated. Stressing the building still meets the qualifications for listing on the designation.

Cross Examination:

Waived

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff/Derek Kilborn: The pastor and I did speak on the telephone a couple of times; we went through a number of different options that would be available to the church. We discussed to different things, the pastor asked, what are we going to do from here, that is what I have been trying to figure out in the discussions with the pastor and the church. One option we spoke about is to first help them with the repairs and maintenance issues they are having. We started to go down a line of questions, about what are some of the different incentives or alternatives that might be available to the church to try and raise funds.

There are specialized grant opportunities, one time grant opportunities that we can try to secure from the City to help assist with the issues they are having at the building. It is hard to define what that one time grant might be because it is a one time type of situation, those tend to be highly specialized. We do have other incentives such as an Ad Valorem Tax Exemption, it does not have an immediate benefit to the church but if the property was transferred ownership to another entity and they were using it for a profit fashion, that buyer would have access to an Ad Valorem Tax Exception also a federal income tax credit if it was used for income generating purposes, that is not going to help us here.

We did discuss putting City resources behind some kind of community fundraising a capital campaign to help the church raise money in partnership with local organizations. Preserve the 'Burg is our private organization that focuses and prioritizes the preservation of historic buildings. We could partner with them and try to come up with a campaign for raising money. Ms. Gwendolyn Reese, you used to be a commissioner on this CPPC grew up in the Methodist Town neighborhood and has a very personal connection to that neighborhood. The African American Heritage Association of St. Petersburg that she runs might also be an excellent partner in trying to recruit money from the community to help offset the costs on the maintenance. The City has a transfer of development rights program, where the church could sell off undeveloped potential or air rights above the building. There is a very active market right now in downtown and we are seeing hundreds of thousands TDR credits move historic preservation program. When we started talking about some of these different options and how we might line up our City Staff or City resources, the conversation always drifted into the congregation selling the property and moving to another location and starting over in another location. Every time I would start to get some traction some of these different options, we would stumble into a conversation about moving on.

That takes us back to the first option which is, do you have to de-designate the building in order to sell the property. The short answer is no. You can sell the property with the designation on there. In fact, typically what would happen here is there would be a contract of sale, or the property would be sold, and the buyer is the one who would pursue a certificate of appropriateness for either renovation or demolition. There is a wing on the building that could be considered for removal, that would be a COA for partial demolition. If the new buyer is proposing full demolition they would go through the normal process, which you heard in the earlier case requires different survey work and other things to be submitted.

I want to bring Laura (Duvekot) up because I want to correct the record. I think that there was a

comment that we have not been out to the site, that is not correct. I have personally been out to the site multiple times, I have worked in this department for 21 years, I used to live downtown, I used to be by that site all the time and it is true, I have not been inside, but I do know in just this application process alone Laura was involved and had been out on this site. I just wanted to give her the opportunity to speak.

Laura Duvekot: Good afternoon, I did also meet with the pastor at the site, I believe three times through the application process. We also conducted a site visit to review the damages that was noted earlier.

Applicant/Pastor Mobley: I am not aware of Mr. Kilborn ever being out to the site. Maybe he was outside, you can't really see the damage outside as well as on the inside. I think we are all missing the point here today, the insurance company that we pay has given us 45 days, you have the paper, 45 days to respond to this. What he is standing up there saying to me now, maybe, maybe, maybe, Preserve the 'Burg, maybe. The insurance company is not going to wait for more than 45 days for the maybes. They gave me a time limit to get this stuff done. We do not have a maybe, we have a time limit, 45 days. You have a copy of the letter, look at your letter. There are no maybes in here, so Preserve the 'Burg, I heard from them one time, and it was 2 days prior to coming in. Gwen Reese, she called me one time, Darrel Rouson called me one time, no one gave me anything guaranteed, that we would be getting some funds. I understand Mr. Derek Kilborn's job is to get up and say what he has to say. My job is to say to you all what I am saying today, about God's building, God's people, there are no maybes in none of this. If the funds were available, why did we come to this point, why did I not come up earlier, that is when you say I have funds for this, not now, to prolong this. What is the next step, City Council? Does the City want the building? Since you want to keep it historic, you want to save the building, do you want the building? That is my question today. Do you want the building, the congregation is willing to give it to you, do you want the building? Laura came put to the site twice, and I asked if she wanted to go in, see the steps, and she said no we do not need to do that. She is a lady, she did not get up on the roof like the insurance company did. She did not see all the termite droppings, that the professionals came out and gave me a quote on. She does not know anything about an electric panel being upgraded, I don't either. Mr. and Mrs. Brayboy came out and did construction on the sidewalk that the insurance company wanted done. They want the whole building, you have a picture, the whole building, steeple and everything painted so I have a time limit, I do not have maybes. So, the hood system, I am not sure if you are all familiar with churches, I hope you are. We have functions there we have people; we have been closed down because of the hood system, eating there, the hood system is out of order, they can no longer serve food in there. I gave you all, all I can give you. I gave you pictures, I am giving you facts, it is on you all. If we walk away from that building, I do not know if you know that neighborhood, that is a transient neighborhood. Urinating, sleeping on the property, smoking dope, all of that, we have to police, we have cameras there, we are going to take our cameras down. We cannot maintain it, I have letters in here, wrote the copy machine people, telling us we could not do that, they let us out of the lease, because I showed them all this stuff that I am dealing with. The City has the letters that I wrote, due to the pandemic, committee, our hands are tied. I think Mr. Kilborn and Preserve the 'Burg ought to be held accountable, you keep saying, maybe and maybe and maybe, but when? Can I get the insurance company off of me, we are going to fix the building up, we do not have the funds. I have said it as nice as I can, does the City want the building?

Executive Session

Commissioner Gerdes: Thank you pastor, we will move into executive session, any questions or comments?

Commissioner Winters: I will ask first; can we pull up a picture of the building? I think many of the people here do not know it and I think it is really incredible example of carpenter gothic. All the focal points from the application packet, my understanding on the insurance company, they did cite the church for a number of overdue maintenance items but none of those are actually mandatory, so I guess I am going to question the, we have a time limit of forty five (45) days, I am not really clear on that. I will ask the staff a little later, to talk a little bit about a very similar situation with a much less distinguished architectural church that was recently purchased by a developer who wanted to tear it down. There was a bit of an uproar in the neighborhood about it because it was a much beloved building and the developer actually decided to rehab that building and sold it recently with a queue of people in line waiting to get in and see it for over a million dollars. There are people out there that are willing to work on churches. I will say this case really resonated for me Pastor Mobley, I am a member of a church very close to yours, The Unitarian Universalist Church on Mirror Lake. We have some really similar conditions when it comes to homeless on the street a lot of activity immediately around us, makes it difficult to keep the outside of our building looking good. Very similar challenges, 1923 building, lots of deferred maintenance, lots of issues. We have however made the decision, because we really like being downtown, we are really connected to the community down there, there is a lot of housing going in we think the location and the architectural quality of our building, a mission revival, really make us stand out from the rest of the community. It really draws people through our doors, but we are faced with many of the same challenges, I understand. I also have experience in Tacoma, Washington, I worked with about a dozen congregations there lots of different denominations, lots of different churches, but they all had historic churches or synagogues that were typically in urban areas and everyone one of those congregations felt that the church was a liability to them because they wanted to preach the word of God or whatever they needed to be in the community. It was really hard for them to keep up with the maintenance of the building and there were a lot of people in those congregations that I think who I talked with who were, just give me a break here, take the building, I have heard your story so many times, and I understand it. However, these are real assets in the community and it is easy for me to tell you that, it is an asset for the community and you want the community to do something about it. I do feel like the City and Preserve the 'Burg are willing to step in. It really is an incredible piece of architecture, do we have a picture of the whole building? Maybe Google maps or something. It is something that I really feel you can find a developer who wanted to make an investment in it and maybe turn it into some apartments or condos. There have been a lot of project across the country where people have taken old churches, you know people, they don't go to church anymore they want to be rid of this giant historic building. There are people out there doing restoration and I think Preserve the 'Bur and the City can connect you with some of those organizations. There is a ton of history, a ton of architectural character, I know we see all the stuff you have to fix. I think other people see the potential in this building, the potential to rehab it, and really make it, right on the edge of downtown, into a real community asset, that is a transition neighborhood, you have to be a pioneer. You know where we are and where you are, but the potential is there, I hope we can continue conversations, but I

cannot support de-listing this, as Mr. Kilborn said, I think there is a real opportunity here to sell it to a developer who will want to rehab this building. You might see it as an economic challenge, I think other people will see it as an opportunity.

Commissioner Wolf: We have a set of guidelines, laws that define what our duties are and what we are supposed to do, and we have not heard anything today that would give us any basis for de-listing the building. We have had some reference to some bad conditions, we have not had any documentation as to how bad the conditions are or that they rise to the level of making the building unusable or not restorable. The fact that it needs maintenance does not really change the fact that it has been found to be a historic building and there has been no evidence presented to show that it is no longer historic for whatever reasons that might justify it. We do not have any basis to make that decision, that is just following out guidelines and procedures. On a separate issue I do not see the de-listing the building is going to change the salability of the building, it may make it, not as valuable because of somebody who can work with the tax credits or the preservation credits, transferred development rights. De-listing certainly is not going to change any limitations the insurance company is putting on it for providing coverage. I just do not see that we have had any evidence that was presented today that would allow us to prove a justification that this building should no longer be listed. So, unfortunately, I could not support that either.

Commissioner Rogo: I am going to second what Commissioners Wolf and Winters just said, the applicant has not demonstrated any loss of historic significance or integrity. We cannot therefore, I cannot therefore vote in favor of rescinding or removing the designation. Maybe there should have been a discussion today about the appropriateness of demolishing the structure. There we could have entered into a conversation about what needs to be done, what are, if any, sources of revenue to help you in fixing it up and preventing demolition, but that is not what we were asked to do today. I would like to put Emily Elwyn on the spot if I can and ask her to come forward and maybe answer a question for me. I have been on this commission for awhile and can think of a couple of examples, maybe St. Peter's Episcopal and the name of the church that is now 4 Square, I think on Central or First Ave North which have been repurposed.

Emily Elwyn: Yes.

Commissioner Rogo: And I think maybe one of the services that Preserve the "Burg as well as the City can provide is identifying how the particular structure can be reused and identifying, maybe that there are some folks out there who look to do that sort of thing.

Emily Elwyn: Absolutely, we're here we have worked with the African American Heritage Trail and Gwen Reese. Trying to decide if you want to sell the building, there are I believe a number of folks that can reuse it. We have a number of examples in St. Pete of historic churches that have been reused for something different, that remain historic churches. I also understand the congregation and the importance of place to that congregation, so if it is important to you all to remain in this neighborhood, I think as well, we can, lets slow this process down a little bit. I understand you want to have answers immediately but anything that we can do to try and help this happen, whether it is remaining in the structure and rehabbing it or whether it is selling it to another group that would use it and take in that money and using it for your mission we understand. Preserve the 'Burg is here to help, this is our mission, what we try and do is help folks with historic

land. We would be more than happy to continue that conversation.

Commissioner Rogo: Thank you. If I may Mr. Chairman can I reiterate the point, if the congregation were to make the decision to sell, I think there are resources that can assist you in finding potential buyers, finding a new home, that was not the question we were posed today. With the question we have been posed, I am afraid that I must also vote to not rescind the historic designation. It really is not going to solve your problem; it is only going to present new problems for the community.

Commissioner Winters: I just want to comment, that on the de-listing request too, I know there are a lot of realtors out there who say, oh it is on the register, you will never be able to sell it. You will not get as much money for it, this is not true. I actually have owned some historic properties on the register and they always carry a premium actually. It does depend on location of course, but you cannot buy that argument that, this is just the kiss of death here. There are realtors who actually specialize in finding historic properties and marketing them and finding a buyer. Some people say, lets just tear it down and want to build a forty (40) story building. There are a lot of different perspectives on this, I think we have presented the alternative here but I would encourage you to investigate, if you need to move, if you need to find another spot, put it on the market, but leave it listed and that will preserve this building and help conserve it for all of us. It is an incredible asset, it is the history of our city and the history of Methodist Town that is embodied in that building.

[Pastor Mobley asked to speak]

Commissioner Gerdes: I am sorry pastor we are past that point.

Commissioner Winters: I am just making a comment on there is different ways to look at this issue of de-listing.

Commissioner Michaels: I join in on some of the comments of the other members of the commission here. We have policies that have been established by the city that the commission needs to follow. Those policies in this case talk about documenting the loss of historic integrity. That has not been done, I hear your appeal, but that has not been done. That is something that can still be done if you want to pursue this, but we are obligated to carry out the policies of the city. We might want to change them, but until that happens, we have to follow what is in place currently. I also cannot support this request that is before us today, but I do hear what you are saying here. I also belong to a small struggling church down in south Saint Petersburg, and I look at your letter and I see your writing, due to the COVID pandemic our church has lost nearly fifty percent (50%) of its income, our membership has dwindled to about fifteen (15) active members, and we are not receiving the funds it takes to maintain the building. I understand, I realize what this incredibly difficult situation is that you are in. Alternatives have been pointed out her and I think the alternatives need to be pursued. I do hear the urgency that you are bringing before us here today. Meeting with Preserve the 'Burg, looking at these alternatives, there is a time line here for you, I recognize that and this is something that needs to be done urgently and if does not work out, if they are not the results that we pray will occur then you do have the opportunity to come back to us with an application that does meet the requirements of city policy. Thank you for coming.

Commissioner Gerdes: I have a question for pastor. Is this the latest insurance notification that you have gotten? The one that is dated November of 2020.

Pastor Moley: Yes.

Commissioner Gerdes: Okay, these are alerts, they are not mandatory, I am wondering why, are you worried about losing coverage, are you worried about your premiums going up? Am wondering why this is a centerpiece for you on why this has to be done like tomorrow.

(some banter re. questions)

Pastor Mobley: You can ask questions, but I cannot say anything.

Commissioner Gerdes: I know, listen, I don't think they should give me the power to do that either, but they do.

Pastor Mobley: What is your question again?

Commissioner Gerdes: Okay, these are all alerts from your insurance company, they are not mandatory, why is this the centerpiece of why this needs to get done tomorrow? This is dated seven (7) months ago.

Pastor Mobley: Because it is raining in the building, we have termites in there, we had the pest control people come out.

Commissioner Gerdes: Okay, so it is the building, it is not the insurance.

Pastor Mobley: Well, it is the insurance too and the building, they brought everything to our awareness, when it rains, when we get a downpour, it just come in. I mean I showed you the hole in the church.

Commissioner Gerdes: My next question is, lets live in a hypothetical world for a second, this commission approves this request and you go to City Council and they approve that and you are no longer historic, what are you going to do?

Pastor Mobley: Sell the building.

Commissioner Gerdes: Okay, here is my, I appreciate the answers, here is my concern. All of these people know buildings backwards and forward and forth, I do not, I will be the first to admit it. The struggle I have with this, if you are going to sell the building if we take the historical off, why wouldn't you just sell it now? That is a rhetorical question, I love you, that is what is going on in my head.

Pastor Mobley: You are not going to let me answer?

Commissioner Gerdes: No, it is not that I do not want you to answer, it is just that the answer is the same to me. You are going to sell it whether it is historic or not and listen, what you are doing is awesome, I was a religion major in college, it is awesome. I hope you get to continue to do it, but you have made the decision that you are not going to do it in this building, and I wish I could give you another answer, but I do not think we are going to. Here is my request before I am sure someone is going to put this up for a vote, keep doing it, our community needs it, we need you, I will be the first to say it, we need you in the community, but you are going to sell this building regardless so do not let this get in the way of you doing you.

Commissioner Whiteman: Mr. Dema, we have to make a motion in the affirmative, correct? So we have to make a motion to approve.

Attorney Dema: Yes.

Commissioner Wolf: Understanding that we have to make a motion in the affirmative, I move approval of the request.

Commissioner Rogo: Quick comment, I am going to vote no, I am voting no so that we can preserve one of the finest homes that God has here in Saint Petersburg.

Motion: ***Commissioner Wolf made a motion approving the owner-initiated request to remove the Tenth Street Church of God (HPC 00-01) from the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places subject to Staff conditions.***

Commissioner Whiteman Second.

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

Motion fails.

D. City File 21-90200045\21-90400004 Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451

Commissioner Wolf recused himself due to proximity

Request: **21-90200045:** Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for window replacement, pool and fence construction, and other rehabilitation at a contributing property to a local historic district.
21-90400004: Review of a Part 1 Application for an Ad Valorem Tax Exemption for Rehabilitation at a contributing property to a local historic district.

Staff Presentation:

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report

Applicant/Owner Presentation

Michael Hussey, 217 10th Ave NE, spoke in support of the project and was available for questions.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination:

Waived

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Waived

Executive Session

Discussion regarding the finish of the vinyl fencing to be matte or display a wood texture, adding a color condition if possible, wood versus vinyl windows and adding a condition to include three dimensional muntins to the windows. Any advantages to installing vinyl windows as opposed to wood such as durability as opposed to cost, a motion was made:

MOTION #1: Commissioner Winters made a motion to amend the conditions to include contoured external grid in the affixed windows and doors for window replacement at 217 10th Ave NE.

Commissioner Rogo seconded

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

Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION #2: Commissioner Rogo made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for window replacement, pool and fence construction, and other rehabilitation at a contributing property to a local historic district located at 217 10th Ave NE., subject to the added amended condition and Staff conditions.

Commissioner Whiteman seconded

VOTE: YES – 5 – Gerdes, Rogo, Winters, Whiteman, Michaels
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION #3: *Commissioner Winters made a motion approving Part 1 Application for an Ad Valorem Tax Exemption for Rehabilitation at a contributing property to a local historic district., subject to Staff conditions.*

Commissioner Rogo seconded

VOTE: YES – 5 – Gerdes, Rogo, Winters, Whiteman, Michaels
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

E. City File 21-90200048

Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a front porch addition at a contributing property to a local historic district.

Staff Presentation:

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

Applicant/Owner Presentation

Joseph Warpinski spoke in support of the project and were available for questions.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination:

Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Waived.

Executive Session

Discussion regarding the consistency of the pillars on a traditional style home, working with the Applicant to approve the railings and pillars on an administrative level, the neighborhood style, between post-war infill or craftsman bungalows, the stepdown on the proposed porch, ornamentation ideas that might be more consistent with the style of the home and suitable to the owner a motion was made:

MOTION #1: Commissioner Whiteman made a motion to amend Staff condition number one (1), removing all language regarding the columns.

Commissioner Rogo seconded

***VOTE: YES – 3 – Rogo, Whiteman, Michaels
NO – 3 – Gerdes, Winters, Wolf***

Motion failed.

MOTION #2: Commissioner Wolf made a motion to amend Staff condition number one (1) regarding the columns to be reviewed Staff level.

Commissioner Winters seconded

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

Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION #3: Commissioner Wolf made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition of a front porch subject to Staff conditions with the additional condition that the columns be reviewed at Staff level.

Commissioner Whiteman seconded

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

Motion passed unanimously.

**F. City File 21-90200049\21-54000032 Contact People: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470
Ann Vickstrom, 892-5807**

Request: COA 21-90200049: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the partial conversion of a detached garage to Accessory Living Space at a contributing property to a local historic district.

Variance 21-54000032: Approval of a 6.2 feet rear yard variance for the conversion of a portion of the detached garage into an Accessory Living Space at the property of 261 29th Ave N.

Staff Presentation:

Kelly Perkins 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/Owner Presentation

Alexander Smith, 2624 Burlington Ave. N., Architect spoke in support of the project and was available for questions.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination:

Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Waived.

Executive Session

Commissioner Wolf briefly discussed the approved variances are for an existing building, voting in favor of the request is simply allowing the applicant to change the interior use.

MOTION #1: Commissioner Winters made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for the partial conversion of a detached garage to Accessory Living Space. subject to Staff conditions.

Commissioner Wolf seconded

VOTE: YES – 6 – Gerdes, Rogo, Winters, Whiteman, Wolf, Michaels

NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION #2: *Commissioner Wolf made a motion approving a 6.2 feet rear yard variance for the conversion of a portion of the detached garage into an Accessory Living Space at the property of 261 29th Ave N.*

Commissioner Winters seconded

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

Motion passed unanimously.

G. City File 21-90200051

Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a side and rear fence at a contributing property in a local historic district

Staff Presentation:

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

Applicant/Owner Presentation

Lori Letzring gave a PowerPoint presentation and spoke in support of the project and was available for questions.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination:

Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Waived.

Executive Session

Discussion regarding fence location, whether to move it back behind the porch or keeping the footprint as is due to design guidelines, landscaping, regulating color and the lack of permeance requirements a motion was made:

MOTION #1: *Commissioner Wolf made a motion amending staff condition number 2 that the fence cannot be moved any further forward than its current footprint.*

Commissioner Whiteman seconded

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

Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION #2: *Commissioner Wolf made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a side and rear fence at a contributing property with the amended second condition and all other staff conditions.*

Commissioner Wannemacher seconded

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

Motion passed unanimously.

H. City File 21-90400003 & 21-54000033

Contact People: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451 & Ann Vickstrom, 892-5807

Request: A Review of a Part 1 Application for an Ad Valorem Tax Exemption for Rehabilitation at a contributing property to a historic district.

Approval of three (3) Variances for the conversion of an existing detached garage to Accessory Living Space and the addition of a storage area at the property of 2500 Burlington Ave N:

1. A 2 feet variance to the interior side yard setback from 5.3 feet to 3.3 feet;
2. A 6.9 feet variance to the rear yard setback from 10 feet to 3.1 feet; and,
3. A variance to reduce the required parking from 2 spaces to 1 space.

Staff Presentation:

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

Applicant/Owner Presentation

Alexander Smith, 2624 Burlington Ave. N., Architect spoke in support of the project and was available for questions.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination:

Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Waived.

Executive Session

Discussion regarding the accessory structure and its permanence, the existing setbacks, and the approval of the setbacks simply address the change in use of the building, reduction of parking requirements, housing affordability and the use of public transportation two motion were made:

MOTION #1: Commissioner Rogo made a motion approving Part 1 Application for an Ad Valorem Tax Exemption for Rehabilitation

Commissioner Whiteman seconded

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

Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION #2: Commissioner Rogo made a motion approving three (3) Variances for the conversion of an existing detached garage to Accessory Living Space and the addition of a storage area at the property of 2500 Burlington Ave N:

- 1. A 2 feet variance to the interior side yard setback from 5.3 feet to 3.3 feet;***
- 2. A 6.9 feet variance to the rear yard setback from 10 feet to 3.1 feet; and,***
- 3. A variance to reduce the required parking from 2 spaces to 1 space.***

Subject to staff conditions.

Commissioner Wannemacher seconded

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

Motion passed unanimously.

VIII. UPDATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

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 5:31 pm