



**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**

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

**MINUTES**

**Present:** C. Copley Gerdes, Chair  
Sharon Winters, Vice Chair  
Christopher “Chris” A. Burke  
Jeffery “Jeff” M. Wolf  
E. Alan Brock, Alternate  
Will Michaels, Alternate  
Lisa Wannemacher, Alternate

**Commissioners Absent:** Jeff Rogo  
Thomas “Tom” Whiteman

**Staff Present:** Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation  
Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist II  
Kelly Perkins, Historic Preservationist II  
Britton Wilson, Planner II  
Heather Judd, Assistant City Attorney  
Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney  
Elizabeth Abernethy, Director, Planning & Development Services  
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 AND SWEARING IN OF WITNESSES**

**IV. MINUTES (Approval of 09/14 Minutes)**

The minutes from the September 14, 2021, meeting was approved unanimously

**V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**VI. LEGISLATIVE HEARING**

**A. City File 21-90600001**

**Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451**

**Request:** Review of a Non-Standard Marker to commemorate the Women's Suffrage march that took place during the Kermess Parade of March 4, 1919.

**Staff Presentation**

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

**Applicant Presentation**

Nancy Hewitt, 199 Dali Blvd. Unit 406, the applicant spoke on in support of the project and the suffrage movement and was available for questions and comment.

**Registered Opponent**

None.

**Public Hearing**

None.

**Executive Session**

A discussion regarding the proper grammar for the sign, woman's vs. women's, the historic language of a woman's right to vote and the difference from today's language. The importance of honoring local, and national history and all the women who participated in the suffrage movement. The contributions of the women of St. Petersburg who organized and helped build and shape the City of St. Petersburg, a motion was made:

**Motion:** *Commissioner Wolf moved to approve the marker, that it does meet the requirements for the City's Markers and Monuments Policy and approve the contents of the marker with either spelling of woman.*

*Commissioner Michaels, Second*

**VOTE:** *YES -7 – Gerdes, Winters, Burke, Wolf, Michaels, Brock, Wannemacher  
NO – 0*

*Motion passed unanimously.*

**B. City File LGCP 2021-01**

**Contact Person: Britton Wilson, 895**

**Request** Private application proposing to amend the text of the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to the Residential High (RH) land use designation and its allowed locational criteria.

**Staff Presentation**

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

**Applicant Presentation**

Craig Taraszki, Esq., 490 1st Ave S, Johnson Pope, spoke in support of the project and was available for questions.

**Registered Opponent**

None.

**Public Hearing**

None.

**Executive Session**

Commissioner Gerdes: We will move into executive session, commissioners...

Commissioner Michaels: As I look at this, it seems to be very similar to the extensive discussion that are going on right now in the community regarding multi-family housing, also referred to as the missing middle housing, located on major transit routes and future major streets, existing major streets and streets that may become major streets in the future. My basic question is, how is this different from that?

Britton Wilson: Yes, thank you Mr. Chair, Commissioner Michaels, it is different in a couple of ways, the missing middle housing is applicable only to property within 175 feet within a major corridor and it is restricted to specific types of housing development of four (4) units per building.

Commissioner Michaels: That proposal being circulated by City Staff have it extending as much as a half mile, there are options up to a half mile.

Britton Wilson: At the moment the option is not up to a half mile and the property also has to have alley access. It is intended for smaller projects that resemble more single family housing type. The residential high is a different type of apartment complex. It is not necessarily more dense it

is just a different type housing compatibility not meant to fit in with an existing single family neighborhood, the neighborhood will be mixed use.

Elizabeth Abernethy: If I may, the intent and purpose behind the NTM (Neighborhood Traditional Mixed Residential) as we brought it forward in our code and as we move forward, City Council later this week is for individual lots that are backed by alleys to face a major street. The layout of this parcel is not really conducive to that type of development pattern, not that it couldn't be platted and set up in a way that could create an NTM type of layout but it is not really envisioned for this type of property where it is a larger property that is more appropriate for an apartment or multi-family or townhouse type of project.

Commissioner Michaels: So you are saying the distinction is how far back it would be from the street?

Elizabeth Abernethy: And the type of housing product that you can build under the NTM 1 which is limited to a building with no more than four (4) units, that has frontage on a street with an alley behind it. That layout, that pattern of development for the NTM 1 is not conducive to this particular property and the way it is configured and laid out.

Commissioner Michaels: Okay, but we are not just taking action that relates to this next proposal which is coming up. This would be a change in the Comprehensive Plan that could affect all kinds of projects in the future, right?

Elizabeth Abernethy: The change to the RH (residential high) category you mean?

Commissioner Michaels: Yes, we are adding this wording here to the Comprehensive Plan RH wording, or when abutting multi-modal corridors or future transit corridors established by the land use component of the Countywide Plan strategies.

Elizabeth Abernethy: Right so the Residential High is a category that allows for multi-family development, multi-story, multi-family development, it is distinct and different from the NTM that we put into the Land Development Code which is allowed in certain land use districts including the RM (Residential Medium) and the PR (Planned Redevelopment) and the PRR (Planned Redevelopment-Residential), as bonus density under the Countywide Rules. It is a different distinct pattern, Residential High is not a category that we would necessarily be looking for city wide in order to implement the NTM. I think, maybe that is what you are asking?

Commissioner Michaels: I would feel a lot more comfortable with the proposal if it were included in the reviews that are going on right now with NTM, multi-family housing. To me it is overlapping, I just think you would have better coordination if that were the case.

Elizabeth Abernethy: The staff is considering changes along our corridors to the underlying density categories, that is something we are having discussions with council and we will be moving forward over the next three (3) to six (6) months. This applicant needed to move forward on their project on their timeline so they are here to ask for this privately initiated amendment for this particular property but I would say it is in line with recommendations that staff is going to be

making for increasing density and intensity along the multi-modal corridors to be more consistent with the county's multi-modal classification and their allowances. Part of the whole 2050 package.

Commissioner Michaels: Thank you.

Elizabeth Abernethy: You are correct this is something that is being discussed and considered for our city.

Commissioner Michaels: I just think that if you looked at everything on the table at the same time you would have a higher comfort level that we are making the right decisions here, then doing this as kind of a side issue, and then dealing with other similar issues in this dialogue which is occurring in the community right now. Thank you.

Commissioner Wolf: I would say, I kind of understand what Commissioner Michaels concern was when I first read it, I was thinking well we are actually making an amendment that is going to apply to multiple situations, not just this one. After reading and realizing we are, well, I followed the staff's logic that we are bringing the definition in line with what the county is asking for now. Looking at the goals, which were to put higher density housing in places where transportation is easier to get, especially the folks who have a harder issue getting to and from work and housing in locations where it makes it easier for them to get to and from work whether that is by mass transit or at least being able to get on a corridor. So, after reading, I had much more of a comfort level with it then when I first saw it. Thinking, what are the circumstances with this may be applied, but I think it is going to be somewhat of a limited application. Again, it is high density first off and it is only those that are adjacent, so I am comfortable with it having read the staff logic on it.

Commissioner Burke: A quick comment, we are talking about this with the missing middle and this particular issue here, we talked about, this is going to be great reducing the cost and burden of transportation it is on a multi-modal corridor, come on, we do not have multi-modal corridors in St. Petersburg. We have horrible public transportation in St. Petersburg, I don't know this to be a fact but I bet you if you check that a ride, a mile on the PTSA is the most costly mode of transportation that we have in the city. What are we doing for that? I mean we had the sewers overflowing and we had projects come before us where we are questioning that all the time we are doing great things in our city to increase capacity and sewers and things like that, what is happening to increase the capacity of public transportation in our city. We had the opportunity with Green Light Pinellas, if you remember that received on of the great public approval but when they went to the voting booth everyone voted it down. What are we doing to truly create multi-modal corridors in City of St. Pete? 32:08

Britton Wilson: Yes, thank you Commissioner Burke, you make a good point. Land use and transportation go hand in hand but only recently have we been starting to look at the two together in cohesion, you need the ridership in order to make the transportation successful so adding that density near where transit is, it is like the chicken before the egg, do you need the ridership there first and then that will generate the need for actual transit service or do you have the transit service there and then put the housing in. Not to jump ahead to the next item, but that particular PSTA route, route number 4, has the highest ridership in all of PSTA with 15 minute headways. If we can build more transit services at that level, you might have more ridership. Which might create

an actual alternative to the automobile.

Commissioner Burke: I don't have an answer, and I think that if people did have the answer, then we would be talking about it. I just wish we were putting as much effort and thought into that as we are putting into these new developments and things. I do not have any reason to not support this issue, I am just...

Britton Wilson: Well, I think you are right, the county as a whole does recognize our lack of transit and that is why we are putting a lot of infrastructure and resources into the Bus Rapid Transit SunRunner and trying to bring that along with transit orientated developments where you have the high density in close proximity and walkable distance to the transit stops.

Commissioner Burke: I see the infrastructure going in along 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, okay, thank you.

Commissioner Gerdes: Commissioner Wannemacher did you have something?

Commissioner Wannemacher: I was actually going to speak to the lack of successful public transit in our city, but I also wanted to say that, higher density is not a bad thing. People are learning to live with smaller units, renting smaller units, because third spaces are becoming more and more popular, coffee shops, community spaces, outdoor parks, so higher density is a good thing. It means the units or the homes could be made less costly, they are more affordable and putting higher density near transportation hubs is also a good thing. We also need to remember multi-modal transportation doesn't mean just buses or cars, it is also everything from one wheels to scooters to bicycles. We are all getting around in many different ways than we used to. These transportation corridors have to also have to take into consideration bicycle lanes, safe bicycle lanes, that can be used for many other types of transportation.

Commissioner Gerdes: Thank you commissioner.

Commissioner Wolf: If there are no other comments, I will move approval.

Commissioner Gerdes: I just have one quick question, before we vote, I just want to make sure I am getting it, I think and I hope I am, Ms. Connell, could you put the map with the activity centers back up on the screen please? This kind of ties into what Commissioner Michaels was saying. Essentially right now we can put RH near activity centers not on corridors, right? NTM 1 really is character driven to the neighborhood, four (4) units or less, which I think some people, even though yes it is multi-family, in this instance it is much higher density, but this gives us the opportunity to take RH away from just the dots (activity centers on the map) and put it on these corridors. I wanted to put the map up because I think that is important, if you look at where our RH currently sits on this map, and I am bias I live on the west side of town, we don't have any, so I think this is a huge opportunity for a big portion of our city where we need density and RH especially up to the thirty (30) units, where it is not massive, but it increases our stock. I think it is super important, so, do I have that pretty close?

Britton Wilson: Yes, thank you Mr. Chair and that allows me to make a really good point. We only have two applications of the Residential High Land Use in the city right now and that is within

The Gateway Activity Center and within the Downtown Activity Center and that is because most of our development that we like in activity centers is to be multi-use and multi-use, land use and zoning allows for a higher residential density so the areas that have RH applied to them right now are kind of a default land use from older developments. So RH isn't really getting used at all.

Commissioner Gerdes: We are not, yes, it is almost dead in the water just like it is today. Thank you very much, I appreciate it.

Commissioner Michaels: If I could just, on my last comment here, I am sympathetic to increases in density provided they are supported by the complete neighborhoods concept, and provided they do not do damage to the character of the surrounding neighborhood. My major concern with this is the process, I just think this would work better if it was considered along with the other similar proposals that are now being debated within the community and for that reason, I am going to vote no on it.

***Motion:*** ***Commissioner Wolf moved to approval finding the amendment to the text of the pertaining to the Residential High (RH) land use designation is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.***

***Commissioner Wannemacher, Second***

***VOTE: YES -7 – Gerdes, Winters, Burke, Wolf, Brock, Wannemacher  
NO – 1 – Michaels***

***Motion passes***

Derek Kilborn: If I may I just want to make a general comment, there was a question in consideration of that application and that referred to staff putting forward discussion about a half mile buffer from different roadway types. I just wanted to clarify for anybody that is following the discussion, staff has put forward as part of the StPete2050 discussion multiple options that have been and presented to our office for consideration by City Council. Staff itself is not necessarily recommending amending a half mile buffer we are simply putting forward multiple options that have been discussed. It is not critical to that last application that was under consideration, but it was a clarification that I wanted to make for the record. I wanted that to be understood properly going forward.

Copley Gerdes: Is that for, just for clarities sake, not to get lost in the weeds, is that just for Florida Statute 1339 or is that throughout 2050 when looking at density?

Derek Kilborn: No, there have been different options presented as part of the StPete2050 discussion about where housing typologies or increased densities should or could happen. We simply received packaged that material up and we are presenting it out as different options, whether that is a half mile or a quarter mile, an eight mile, 500 feet or abutting, there are multiple options that are being discussed. We are simply putting it all out for the commissions and the council to consider in their debates.

Commissioner Gerdes: Thank you Mr. Kilborn.

Commissioner Michaels: Is staff then not recommending the half mile option?

Derek Kilborn: Staff is not in the position right now where we are recommending a half mile option. We do have an important Housing, Land Use and Transportation (HLUT) Committee meeting, a subset of City Council members this Thursday and they will be taking up that discussion at that time.

Commissioner Michaels: You may recommend that in the future is what I am hearing.

Derek Kilborn: It is possible that staff would receive that direction.

Commissioner Michaels: I am just trying to clarify what staff recommendations are as opposed to council decisions.

Elizabeth Abernethy: Our recommendation to council for application of NTM 1 at this time is abutting the major streets in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan changes and zoning changes we made in 2019. We are recommending we move forward with that at this time and City Council will provide us with direction on Thursday if they would like us to move forward on that or to consider any other options beyond that. That is what staff is considering now for the application. The presentation I believe has been posted that we are providing on Thursday, you can take a look at that now or I would be happy to email it to you if you would like. It should be posed under the HLUT back up materials for Thursday.

Commissioner Michaels: Thank you.

## **VII. QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARING**

### **A. City File FLUM 63**

**Contact Person: Britton Wilson, 895-**

**Request:** Private initiated application to amend the Future Land Use Map and Official Zoning Map

- Future Land Use Map Amendment  
From Residential Medium (RM) and Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use (PR-MU) to residential High (RH)
- Official Zoning Map Amendment  
From Neighborhood Suburban Multifamily – 1 (NSM-1) and Corridor Commercial Traditional – 1 (CCT-1) to Neighborhood Suburban Multifamily – 2 (NSM-2)

### **Staff Presentation**

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

### **Applicant Presentation**

Craig Taraszki, Esq., 490 1st Ave S, Johnson Pope, and Mark Rios, Stoneweg spoke in support of



the project and were available for questions.

### **Registered Opponent**

None.

### **Public Hearing**

Kenneth Conklin, 4036 8<sup>th</sup> St. S., President of the Lakewood Terrace Neighborhood Association, spoke to the concerns of the neighborhood including, lack of access to food shops, clothing shops and the need to leave the community in order to access doctors, hospitals, and lack of crosswalks including one to get to Lake Maggiore. How PSTA is not bring anyone into the S. St. Pete area to bring in money, simply to bring people downtown and to the beach. The association is concerned about the amount of people coming when there is nothing in the community for them to spend their money. He supports redeveloping the area, he just would like access to food, doctors, etc. be addressed as well.

Nancy Dowling, 5027 Sunrise Dr. S., spoke in support of the project and agreed with everything stated by Mr. Conklin. She was concerned about the additional traffic, lack of traffic signals with limited visibility or designing the exits for traffic safety.

### **Cross Examination:**

City Staff: Waived

Agent: Waived

### **Rebuttal/Closing Remarks**

City Staff: Waived

Craig Taraszki, Esq.: yes, the comments about ingress egress signalization, those are site plan issues that certainly will be worked out with staff when the time comes.

### **Executive Session**

Commissioner Gerdes: We will move into executive session, Commissioner Wannemacher.

Commissioner Wannemacher: This is a comment about the preliminary site plan, and I understand a lot of this will be worked out in the future, but it seems that we are really talking about transportation and connecting the PSTA routes. Route 4 is on 6<sup>th</sup> Street, but there is Route 20 on MLK and I notice the site plan does not include a link, a sidewalk link, all the way over to the west towards MLK and I am wondering if that is really a goal that maybe, that sidewalk should continue all the way from 6<sup>th</sup> Street all the way west to MLK to link that site, even though you are not developing the western portion of the site. It just seems like it would be very beneficial for the community.

Craig Taraszki, Esq.: We will definitely consider that when developing the plan.  
Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you.

Commissioner Wolf: I really think that the two members of the public who spoke on this, I thought both brought up excellent points. It is not in our prevue here, but they definitely need to be addressed at a city level. I appreciate you coming up and speaking.

Commissioner Michaels: We have approved the High Residential and looking over the policies that are addressed, with this particular project, I think it does comply with the ordinance and policies that need to be addressed. I do live in this area, in Bahama Shores, which is a little south, of the Coquina Key Shopping Center. The Coquina Key Shopping Center is basically a food desert, there is very little there. There is a new owner and we are hopeful perhaps that will be enlivened and provide healthy food services to the immediate neighborhood, much of which is low income, as the association president mentioned. I think it is important for the services that are there to be affordable. We are not just talking about affordable housing, we are talking about affordable food, affordable clothing and other necessitates. The think that strikes me here, again, we have this discussion going on right now about the multi-family housing along the corridors, the multi-modal corridors, and the future major streets but it is kind of like a jigsaw puzzle with all these pieces out there but we really have not put them together in a coherent fashion yet. One of the pieces that is out there is the concept of complete neighborhoods and you don't have a complete neighborhood at this site that would support this particular project at this time. Maybe we can do a synergy here, the project could bring about a complete neighborhood there but from the other vantage point, the city certainly needs to do everything within its capability to see that, that is accomplished. That piece that is out there right now with the multi-family housing that is being considered on these corridors, it is not connected yet, it is not definite, it is floating out there. My hope would be that that is fact something that is well defined as criteria and is tied to the additional multi-family housing along these corridors. I am putting out a plea and underlining the importance of that complete neighborhood concept. Right now, I am still fearful that we are going to have zoning changes that will not be tied to complete neighborhoods, and I think they must be tied to complete neighborhoods.

Commissioner Winters: I just want to go back to the multi-modal conversation a bit, specifically around pedestrian and bicycle networks, the Complete Streets implementation plan includes future trail facilities along MLK and 6<sup>th</sup> Street South and I think many of us are well aware that for pedestrians and cyclists it is just harder to get around in south St. Pete. Are there timelines for actual building out Complete Streets implementation plan that you can share with us Ms. Wilson or Abernethy?

Britton Wilson: Yes Mr. Chair, Commissioner Winters, at this time I do not have a timeline for Complete Street development in this area, but as you noted there are plans and they are looking into these sites of accommodations for bike lanes and for crosswalks. I know crosswalks are planned on both MLK and 6<sup>th</sup> Street by 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Craig Taraszki, Esq.: If I may, I did look at the plan and I did find that the 6<sup>th</sup> St, S, 4<sup>th</sup> St. was tagged to be part of a linear project included with Phase 1 of the five (5) year Capital Improvement Program Complete Streets, so, five (5) years.

Commissioner Winters: Within five (5) years, okay thank you. I just want to comment too, I appreciate Mr. Taraszki's explanation around the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) because that has been a huge conversation for several years now, this really is the first test case so thank you for that detail.

Commissioner Brock: I just have one quick question, the applicants proposed a declaration of restrictive covenant do we need to include any reference to that in whatever motion we move forward that, that is the plan that actually happens?

Britton Wilson: I will defer to legal.

Michael Dema: Can you please repeat that?

Commissioner Brock: The applicant has proposed they are going to move forward with a declaration of restrictive convenance, if we approve the proposed density, do we need to stipulate to that in any motion when we approve this that they actually have to move forward with that, to make sure that it happens.

Michel Dema: I believe that requirement is actually in the Comprehensive Plan or is it in the LDRs.

Elizabeth Abernethy: Yes and it is our intent when this goes to council that those will be scheduled on the same agenda and there will be language about recording that within a certain timeframe of the adopted motion of the ordinance. I think we have a comfort level that they have to stay together. I am not sure it is necessary for this board to make a motion, but that is the intent on how we will bring that forward to assure the covenant goes with the property.

Michael Dema: There is text that specifically requires our office to review and approve that for,

Commissioner Wolf: Thank you.

Commissioner Burke: Just quickly, when the general public comes into speak on these issues, I do appreciate that you come in. We go through so many of these issues we do not hear from the public, and just to address the person here who is the President of the homeowner's association, I apologize for not remembering your name, maybe this project will be that 300 to 1,000 people that push some of the numbers over the edge and allow for some of these grocery chains and restaurant chains to come into the neighborhood. My only hope is that is what happens down there. Maybe the Coquina Key Shopping Center with these new customers there might be more viable, thank you for coming.

Commissioner Gerdes: If there are no other questions commissioners, I have a couple questions real quick. My guess this is for Mr. Taraszki pr from Stoneweg, this is just pure curiosity, there are units between 600 sq. ft and 1600 sq ft, they are all concrete built, what is the rent going to be?

Mark Rios: Yes, since thirty percent (30%) of the building is going to be work force housing,

between \$1,100 to \$2,000.

Commissioner Burke: I would hate to be a young person just getting started, thank Mr. Rios.

Commissioner Gerdes: I lived in Coquina Key, on the water in a two bedroom townhouse for eight hundred dollars (\$800) a month. Now obviously the city has changed a little bit since then. I don't know, well I couldn't do it again. That is general cost that is not the work force cost?

Mark Rios: That is included.

Commissioner Gerdes: That includes the workforce cost. I guess for my own personal comment, I think, I don't think any city council is watching, but my plea to them, we have got to come up with a number of what is actually affordable rather than just a percentage of AMI (Area Median Income), because when I think about a starting point of \$1,100 it is workforce housing for someone like a teacher, they are still house burdened. That really has nothing to do with what we are deciding I just think it is important to point out. I too would like to thank the residents that came out, I travel 4<sup>th</sup> that turns into 6<sup>th</sup> often and I travel it everyday for a period of two years, I do not think I ever realized there is not crosswalks. I am looking at the satellite map right now in amazement that there is not, so thank you for bringing those type of things up. That is stuff we have to fix and we have to do it fast and I hope city council will take this, please go to the city council meeting and say the same things, I hope they take this seriously. I know you guys are here to listen in too, I appreciate that and thank you for the openness and the transparency of what you guys are trying to build. I do think we need more like this, I agree with Commissioner Burke, when you look at the food desert in St. Petersburg you need dentistry with living wages in order to attract grocery stores and again, it is the chicken or the egg, of which comes first and we can only hope that is exactly what happens, is that a grocery store and other retail stores come in because of the density. Okay, if there is no other comment I will entertain a motion.

Commissioner Wolf: I will try and create it,

***Motion:*** ***Commissioner Wolf moved approval to amend the Future Land Use Map from Residential Medium (RM) and Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use (PR-MU) to Residential High (RH) and to amend the Official Zoning Map from Neighborhood Suburban Multifamily – 1 (NSM-1) and Corridor Commercial Traditional – 1 (CCT-1) to Neighborhood Suburban Multifamily – 2 (NSM-2) in accordance with the Staff Report.***

***Commissioner Brock, Second.***

***VOTE: YES - 7 - Gerdes, Winters, Wolf, Burke, Wannemacher, Brock, Michaels***  
***NO – 0***

***Motion passed unanimously.***

**B. City File No. 21-90200092**

**Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451**

**Request:** Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for vinyl fencing at front, rear, and interior and street side yards at 3200 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. N., a contributing property to the Kenwood Section – Northwest Kenwood Local Historic District (18-90300008).

**Staff Presentation**

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

**Applicant Presentation**

Mr. Joseph Warpinski, owner, spoke on behalf of the project and was available for questions.

**Registered Opponent**

None.

**Public Hearing**

None.

**Cross Examination:**

City Staff: Waived

Applicant: Had a number of questions for Laura Duvekot, staff, including the visibility triangle must have a fence no taller than 3 feet, what code considers to be 3 feet, Muni-code Section 16.40.040. Fences, Walls, and Hedge Regulations of the City, exceptions in the code regarding fence height, grade and decorative features and arches.

**Rebuttal/Closing Remarks**

City Staff: Laura Duvekot: Discussed some conditions of approval that were brought up in the report, the intention of including comments from other departments were to create clarity and consistency.

Derek Kilborn: Spoke to some of Mr. Warpinski's questions during cross examination re. fencing code.

Applicant: Mr. Warpinski had some follow up comments re. timing of his request, the existing fences in his neighborhood, the consistency of the fences in the neighborhood and working with the Building Department and or Code Department.

## **Executive Session**

A discussion regarding the pergola and a gate with the front pergola, compromise between applicant and City Staff, prior applications for this property, child safety, pre-preservation fences and construction in the neighborhood, maintain the character of the district, basic approval language, a ribbon driveway and possible curb, how three feet is measured from grade, and the visibility triangle a motion was made.

***Motion:*** ***Commissioner Winters moved approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for vinyl fencing at front, rear, and interior and street side yards at 3200 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. N., subject to Staff conditions.***

***Commissioner Wannemacher, Second.***

***VOTE: YES - 7 - Gerdes, Winters, Wolf, Burke, Wannemacher, Brock, Michaels  
NO - 0***

***Motion passed unanimously.***

**C. City File No. 21-902000096 Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451**

**Request:** Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a wooden front fence and alterations associated with the conversion of a detached garage at 3040 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. N., a contributing property to a local historic district.

The wooden front fence was deferred to the November 8, 2021, meeting.

## **Staff Presentation**

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed project.

## **Applicant Presentation**

The applicants were not present.

## **Registered Opponent**

None.

## **Public Hearing**

Joseph Warpinski, Jr., 3200 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. N., spoke about the fence height in the application.

## **Cross Examination:**

City Staff: Waived

**Rebuttal/Closing Remarks**

City Staff: Addressed that the application stated the front fence was a 3 foot fence.

**Executive Session**

A discussion regarding staff condition number 2 and adding the word exterior for the three-dimensional muntins, the after the fact fence being separated out from the application, measuring the average of the fence, and deciding to defer the front fence to the November meeting, two motions were made.

***Motion:*** ***Commissioner Michaels made a motion deferring the wooden front fence portion of the application until the height and construction is known.***

***Commissioner Wolf, Second.***

***VOTE: YES - 7 - Gerdes, Winters, Wolf, Burke, Wannemacher, Brock, Michaels  
NO - 0***

***Motion passed unanimously***

***Motion:*** ***Commissioner Wolf made a motion approving the alterations associated with the conversion of a detached garage at 3040 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. N., including the addition of exterior muntins, subject to Staff conditions.***

***Commissioner Brock, Second.***

***VOTE: YES - 7 - Gerdes, Winters, Wolf, Burke, Wannemacher, Brock, Michaels  
NO - 0***

***Motion passed unanimously***

**D. City File 21-90200101**

**Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451**

**Request:** Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement of the shingle roof of a detached garage with metal at 2660 Dartmouth Ave. N., a contributing property to a local historic district.

**Staff Presentation**

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

**Applicant Presentation**

Amy C. Durand, owner, spoke in support of the proposed project and consistency.

**Registered Opponent**

None.

**Public Hearing**

Alexander Smith, 2624 Burlington Ave. N, spoke in support of the project.

**Cross Examination:**

City Staff and Applicant: Waived

**Rebuttal/Closing Remarks**

City Staff and Applicant: Waived

**Executive Session**

A discussion regarding the garage roof matching the home being beneficial to the neighborhood specifically because of consistency, a matte finished metal roof, design guidelines, inconsistency and consistency in the neighborhood as a whole, not setting a precedent for metal roofs in the neighborhood simply allowing for the metal roof due to the main house having a metal roof prior to historic designation, a motion was made.

***Motion:*** ***Commissioner Burke made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement of the shingle roof of a detached garage with metal, to match the existing home, at 2660 Dartmouth Ave. N., subject to Staff conditions three and four.***

***Commissioner Wannemacher Second.***

***VOTE: YES - 7 - Gerdes, Winters, Wolf, Burke, Wannemacher, Brock, Michaels  
NO - 0***

***Motion passed unanimously***

**E. City File 21-90200115**

**Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451**

Commissioner Wolf recused due to proximity.





F. City File 21-90400002

Contact Person: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470

**Request:** Review of an Ad Valorem Tax Exemption request for an addition to, and rehabilitation of, the property at 458 Joyce Terr. N., a contributing property to the Round Lake National Register Historic District.

**Staff Presentation**

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

**Applicant Presentation**

Alexander Smith, 2624 Burlington Ave. N, Boone Architecture, Architect and Agent, 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 transforming an existing building, a multi-family project, the opportunity to take advantage of the AVT, a motion was made

**Motion:** *Commissioner Michaels moved to approve Ad Valorem Tax Exemption request for an addition to, and rehabilitation of, the property at 458 Joyce Terr. N.*

*Commissioner Wolf, Second*

**VOTE:** *YES - 7 - Gerdes, Winters, Burke, Wolf, Wannemacher, Brock, Michaels*  
*NO - 0*

*Motion passed unanimously*

**VII. UPDATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

## **VIII. ADJOURN**

With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 5:52 pm