City of St. Petersburg Community Planning \& Preservation Commission Public Hearing

Council Chambers, City Hall<br>July 12, 2022<br>Tuesday<br>2:00 P.M.

## MINUTES

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{ll}\text { Present: } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Sharon Winters, Chair } \\
\text { Lisa Wannemacher, Vice Chair } \\
\text { Valarie Nussbaum-Harris } \\
\text { Jeffery "Jeff" M. Wolf, Alternate } \\
\text { Will Michaels, Alternate }\end{array} \\
\text { Commissioners Absent: } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Thomas "Tom" Whiteman } \\
\text { Manitia Moultrie }\end{array}
$$ <br>

E. Alan Brock, Alternate\end{array}\right\}\)| Britton Wilson, Interim Manager, Urban Planning |
| :--- |
| \& Historic Preservation |
| Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist, II |
| Kelly Perkins, Historic Preservationist, II |
| Ann Vickstrom, Planner II |

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 $7 / 12$ Minutes)

The minutes from the May 12, 2022, meeting were approved unanimously

## V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

## VI. DEFERRAL(S)

1. City File ZM-12
2. City File 22-90200041

Amendment to the Official Zoning Map from Corridor Commercial Suburban (CSS-1) to Corridor Commercial Traditional-1 (CCT-1) for a 14.5 -acre site consisting of two separate parcels located at $43506^{\text {th }}$ Street South and $57545^{\text {th }}$ Ave. S.

Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for alterations at 1001 Bay St NE, a contributing property to a local historic district.

## VII. QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARING

A. City File 22-90200049

Contact People: Laura Duvekot 892-5451

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for the enclosure of an attached garage (after the fact), the installation of a rear wood fence, and the replacement of three windows at $73028^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St} \mathrm{N}$, a contributing property to a local historic district.

## Staff Presentation

Laura Duvekot gave presentations based on the Staff Report.

## Applicant/Agent Presentation

Owner, Sean O'Brien was unavailable for comments or questions.

## Registered Opponent

None.

## Public Hearing

None.

## Cross Examination:

City Staff and Owner Waived.

## Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff and Owner Waived.

## Executive Session

Discussion was had regarding approving after the fact improvements and the circumstances surrounding this particular item. The size of the garage and garage door and the inability for the garage to fit the size of current vehicles. The understanding that the owner is creating two new parking spots off of the alley, accommodating the required parking spaces. A suggestion was made, painting the recessed area where the garage door used to be white matching the trim around the windows and the recessed opening replicating a garage door. The look of the infill and the window banding being improved with the suggestion of painting the enclosed garage white and staying consistent with the neighborhood.

## Motion: Commissioner Wannemacher moved approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness application for the enclosure of an after the fact attached garage, the installation of a rear wood fence, the replacement of three windows subject to staff requirements and suggested painting the enclosed garage white to match the window and recess trim, for the property located at $730 \mathbf{2 8}^{\text {th }} \operatorname{St} \mathbf{N}$.

Commissioner Wolf, Second.
YES-5 - Winters, Wannemacher, Nussbaum-Harris, Michaels, Wolf $N O-0$

## Motion passed unanimously.

B. City File 22-90200052

Contact People: Laura Duvekot 892-5451

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for a rear addition to $33287^{\text {th }}$ Ave N, a non-contributing property to a local historic district.

## Staff Presentation

Laura Duvekot gave presentations based on the Staff Report.

## Applicant/Agent Presentation

Applicant was not available for comments or questions.

## Registered Opponent

None.

## Public Hearing

None.

## Cross Examination:

City Staff Waived.

## Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff Waived.

## Executive Session

Discussion was had regarding the appreciation of staff's requirement to include a recess along the front façade which will show a break between the original building and the addition.

Motion: Commissioner Wolf moved approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for a rear addition to $33287^{\text {th }}$ Ave $N$ with staff requirements.

Commissioner Michaels, Second.
YES - 5 - Winters, Wannemacher, Nussbaum-Harris, Michaels, Wolf NO-0

Motion passed unanimously.
C. City File 22-90200054

Contact People: Kelly Perkins 892-5470

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for the replacement of windows and after-the-fact replacement of a front door at $32349^{\text {th }}$ Ave N, a contributing property to a local historic district.

## Staff Presentation

Kelly Perkins gave presentations based on the Staff Report.

## Applicant/Agent Presentation

Applicant was not available for comments or questions.

## Registered Opponent

None.

## Public Hearing

None.

## Cross Examination:

City Staff Waived.

## Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff Waived.

## Executive Session

Discussion was had regarding opening up the supports at the front of the home and what an improvement that was. The color of the fan light trim and the suggestion to paint the trim the same color as the rest of the door which would be consistent with the style at the time the home was built. The staff report's example of a door with a fanlight window, which matches the color of the door was used as an example.

Motion: Commissioner Wolf moved approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for the replacement of windows and after-the-fact replacement of a front door and the recommendation to match the trim with the rest of the door, at $32349^{\text {th }}$ Ave N, subject to staff conditions.

Commissioner Brock, Second.
YES-5 - Winters, Wannemacher, Nussbaum-Harris, Michaels, Wolf NO - 0

Motion passed unanimously.
D. City File ZM-14

Contact People: Ann Vickstrom 892-5807

Request: An amendment to the Official Zoning Map from Corridor Residential Traditional-1 (CRT-1) to Corridor Commercial Traditional-1 (CCT-1) on the western 100 feet of the property ( 0.25 acre) at 1626 and $162818^{\text {th }}$ Avenue South.

## Staff Presentation

Ann Vickstrom gave presentations based on the Staff Report.

## Applicant/Agent Presentation

Applicant was available for comments or questions.

## Registered Opponent

None.

## Public Hearing

None.

## Cross Examination:

City Staff and Applicant Waived.

## Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff and Applicant Waived.

## Executive Session

Commissioner Winters: Any comments, questions, concerns from the commissioners?
Commissioner Michaels: Yes, I have a few questions about this. I think I am supportive of it but, there are a couple of issues that I thought needed some discussion. First, Policy LU3.6, which is a key policy, that reads: Land use planning decisions shall weigh heavily on the established character of predominately developed areas where changes of use or intensity of development are contemplated. The staff comment was that the subject property is located along the $18^{\text {th }}$ Avenue Corridor in the south CRA district where a zoning amendment from CRT-1 to CCT-1 would further this policy by making the western portion of the property consistent to the eastern portion and allow for a restaurant on the entire property. So you are referring to the east and the west portions of the property but there is no address of the north and the south. (Speaking to the clerk) Maybe if you could put up the map that shows the proposed zoning. Here you will see that to the north you have the Corridor Residential Traditional not commercial immediately to the north and then to the south you have Neighborhood Traditional which again is residential. I see where this partially meets that criteria but I think there are areas where it significantly does not meet the criteria. Again, I think I am going to vote for this but I just wanted to get staff's thinking on this.

Ann Vickstrom: You have a good point, when you look at it, when you drive down the corridor you see that some of the development, while it is Corridor Residential it really has more of an office, or a retail feel to it. There are several large parking lots associated with some of the commercial that really kind of look vacant, but it is being used for parking for commercial buildings. We also spoke with Economic Development to make sure what the impact of this would be, on the CRA, they indicated that they would like to be meeting and talking about this whole corridor, and pretty much looking at the corridor of perhaps being a turning point from that residential to commercial some time in the near future, it is something they will be looking at. With the, with the amount of commercial and then of course the commercial is at the intersection which extends from that intersection and really starts that corridor, it really is a corridor, we have a vacant parcel right next to it and then we have a very heavy commercial use which is an auto body shop, also at the corner. I think this really gives a clean extension of those commercial uses.

Commissioner Michaels: Let me ask a different question, why not extend this Commercial Corridor all the way to $17^{\text {th }}$ Street? Why leave that piece hanging there?

Ann Vickstrom: The reason we are doing that is because this is owner initiated and usually when
we have an owner initiated, we do not extend it further. This could go even further as we look at our 2050 Land Use and Zoning, but we have not reviewed all of the different corridors in the city, yet. We do not like to take them once piece at a time but when we get an owner initiated, we do not typically extend that further.

Commissioner Michaels: I understand it is a matter of the process. In other places in the report you emphasize that this was actually zoned Commercial General at the time the building was built, and it was a commercial building. It would seem to me if that was the zoning at the time the zoning ought to continue into the 2007 zoning that has occurred, I would give a lot of weight to that. In fact I am basing my decision on that, what I think is very significant point there. I had one other question which had to do with the stormwater level of service (LOS), and thank you for your updated statement, I appreciate that. You mention that the city will be working towards a credit based stormwater rate system for commercial and residential property to implement LID and rain harvesting elements, can you tell me some more about that, what exactly is that? That reference was on the bottom of page 9 of the staff report.

Ann Vickstrom: I think this is the language that we received, that we are given by public works as they are implementing their Stormwater Master Plan, I am not in that division but these are some of the things that they will be implementing in the Stormwater Master Plan, and I can bring you more, not for this, but I can bring you more details at our next meeting about these rain harvest...

Commissioner Michaels: I believe Commissioner Winters that we are having a workshop at the end of next meeting on the flood planning generally, the climate change and flood planning.

Commissioner Winters: I have not heard an update on that, do you know, Kate?
Kate Connell: To the best of my knowledge, yes, it should be nest month.
Commissioner Michaels: Okay, that would be helpful, we have not had that for some time. Thank you very much, it was a meticulous report and I appreciate it.

Commissioner Winters: Thank you, okay so we are at the point of asking for a motion unless there are other comments.

Commissioner Nussbaum-Harris: Yes, I am curious how a building would get two, an established building would get two separate zonings, how would that happen? Was there an intent behind it to reduce the intensity, but it is consistent?

Ann Vickstrom: This is a, we were too, we did a lot of research, how did this happen. It just appears that the property was, before 2007 it was General Commercial, and the other portion was retail/office/residential. I think it may have been just a piecemealing of this together. In 2006 they got the permit and built this building, and I am just guessing, we went through files and could not find anything that spoke to the zoning, but they said well it allows retail so they went forward with that and in 2007 when the zoning code changed, I think, now I am just assuming, somebody said, okay, all the CG will go to this designation and all the ROR goes to this. I looked down the zoning page and that is exactly what happened. So, nobody looked, I do not think, at the individual uses
that were associated with that CG that were kind of taken away through the CRT.
Commissioner Nusbaum-Harris: Okay so the stepping process.
Ann Vickstrom: Yes, and it was one of those that kind of fell through the cracks and then they had already built their commercial building so nobody questioned it, it had already been permitted for commercial and they came in several months ago and wanted to put a restaurant in, and somebody so oh, a restaurant is not allowed on this portion, so yes.

Commissioner Nussbaum-Harris: Okay, thank you for that.
Ann Vickstrom: It is not typical.
Commissioner Nussbaum-Harris: I did not thinks so.

Motion: Commissioner Michaels moved approval of amending the Official Zoning Map from Corridor Residential Traditional-1 (CRT-1) to Corridor Commercial Traditional-1 (CCT-1) on the western 100 feet of the property ( 0.25 acre) at 1626 and $162818^{\text {th }}$ Avenue South, subject to Staff conditions.

Commissioner Nussbaum-Harris, Second.
YES - 5 - Winters, Wannemacher, Nussbaum-Harris, Wolf, Michaels NO-0

Motion passed unanimously.

## VIII. UPDATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

## IX. ADJOURN

With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 3:40 pm.

