



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

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

**February 14, 2023
Tuesday
2:00 P.M.**

MINUTES

Present:

Lisa Wannemacher, Chair
Robert “Bob” Jeffrey
Casey Gardner
Manita Moultrie
Todd Pressman
Ashley Marbet
Michael Huston, Alternate
Joseph Mangello, Alternate
Will Michaels, Alternate

Staff Present:

Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Britton Wilson, Planner II
Ann Vickstrom, Planner II
Elizabeth Abernethy, Director, Planning and Development Services
Heather Judd, Assistant City Attorney
Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney
Katherine Connell, Clerk, 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 01/14 Minutes)

The minutes from the January 14, 2023, meeting were approved unanimously

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

VI. QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARING

A. City File FLUM-68

Britton Wilson

Request: Private-initiated application to amend the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use map from Planned Redevelopment – Residential (PR-R) to Residential Medium (RM) with a concurrent amendment to the Official Zoning Map from Neighborhood Traditional - 2 (NT-2) to Neighborhood Suburban Multifamily – 1 (NSM-1) for a 0.42-acre site located at 423, 429 and 437 11th Avenue South

City Staff Presentation:

Britton Wilson gave a presentation based on the Staff Report.

Applicant/Agenda Presentation:

Agent gave a presentation in support of the project.

Public Comment: 15:34

Elizabeth Shuh spoke in opposition to the zoning change.

Todd Reinert spoke in opposition to the zoning change.

Michelle Gehrig spoke in opposition to the zoning change.

Cross Examination:

City Staff and Agent waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks:

City Staff and Agent waived.

Executive Session:

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you Ms. Wilson, does anyone have a question for Ms. Wilson?

Commissioner Pressman: I do Madam Chair of the two letters in opposition Where are they located? In regard to the site?

11:26

Britton Wilson: Kate, can you pull up the zoning map or the aerials, probably the second aerial. I do know that one of the letters offhand they do not live nearby they live in Old Northeast, The other letter lives, diagonal to the north. And then the third letter it about a block to the west. So one of them is right here. And another one is off this map over here and another one is Old Northeast.

Commissioner Pressman: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Any other questions for staff? Would the applicant like to speak or make a presentation? As a reminder, please come to the come to the podium, state your name, your address and whether you've been sworn in.

12:20

Applicant, Sergio DeSanto: I've been sworn in my name is Sergio DeSanto Renker Eich Parks Architects. We represent TRB development as their architects, I simply brought with us today some renderings to illustrate what TRB development has in store for the three sites. They are proposing six townhomes essentially six homes, two townhomes per site symbol fee and so you can see this rendering this is 11th Avenue you're looking due North this would it be facing that Innovation Center incubator and we just want to illustrate that essentially you know the design is in keeping with NT-2 it is, it could pass it for NT-2 right now.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Sorry to interrupt, can we please get the lights. Thank you.

13:10

Applicant, Sergio DeSanto: So, you know, we established you know, historical precedents with recessed porches meets the new flood code for FEMA. Two feet above base flood elevation, which is nine (9) feet so we're at eleven (11) feet, datum, four (4) feet above grade and with variation so just wanted to walk you through that. This is the site. These are the letters that were sent out for public notice. A detached garage and the rear with ten (10) foot, nine (9) foot setbacks ten (10) feet, excuse me. Four bedroom townhomes, so you're looking at the townhome split down the middle. Variation, character, gable, a cornice roof, and the other one is a hip. Different materials such as stucco and some has siding creating a neighborhood feel and vernacular. Here's your base flood elevation. The three sites architectural diversity, traditional elements covered front porch diverse and complementary finished materials, scale and massing appropriate again, very NT-2 and neighborhood feel. Some other images as well, landscaping will meet code as well, and trees. But each one has a distinct character and feel and bringing again, six family homes, single family homes. That is what I have for you all, unless anyone has any questions.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you very much. Does anyone any of the commissioners have any questions for the applicant at this time? Thank you very much.

I do have three cards, public comments so when I call your name please step to the podium and once again please state your name, your address and whether you've been sworn in. First is Elizabeth Shue.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you. Is there anybody else wishing to speak on this application?

Okay. I guess we can. We don't have any registered opponent, but is there any cross examination from city staff?

Cross Examination:

City Staff and Applicant Waived.

Closing Arguments\Rebuttal:

City Staff Waived.

Applicant, Sergio DeSanto: I just wanted to appreciate those that could see what TRB is proposing. Again, in spite of the zoning change, the intent, which will be seen through, is in keeping with the historical precedence in that area as duplex design. I hope all can see that and keep that in mind for the council as well. Thank you all.

23:40

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you. With that, we will move into Executive Session. Is there any of my fellow Commissioners that would like to begin?
Yes, Commissioner Jeffrey.

Commissioner Jeffrey: I have a question. I'm not sure whether it's for legal or for Mr. Kilborn, but it's my understanding that once demolition takes place, there's no going back and going through a redevelopment plan process. Is that accurate?

Attorney Heather Judd: Well, I will say, I'll let staff go first, if they want to answer that.

Britton Wilson: Madam Chair, Commissioner, that's correct that once those structures are demolished, a redevelopment plan to reinstate the grandfathered use is no longer an option.

Attorney Heather Judd: And then I will also say that the application as it sits right now is for a change to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and a companion zoning change and while you were shown some renderings you're not voting on those renderings, that would be a site plan review. That's not the subject of this board, so if the zoning change and the Future Land Use Map plan change were approved, then the applicant or future owner of that property would be able to utilize any of the development potential of that Future Land Use Map category and zoning category. I just wanted to make that clear for all the commissioners.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you. Any other comments? Yes, Commissioner.

Commissioner Pressman: Yes, I was wondering if I get asked staff to clarify why the existing zone NR-2 is not compatible with the proposed development? I think I understand why, but maybe for the opponents, they would like an explanation.

25:30

Britton Wilson: Sure, Commissioner. NT-2 is a single family form of housing development. So, you can have a primary house and then a secondary accessory dwelling unit. The accessory dwelling unit has to be subservient to the main unit, it can't be equal in size, whereas the multifamily allows for equal sized duplexes to be side by side, which is what's been historically in place on site.

Commissioner Michaels: There were a couple of notice concerns that were raised. Could you review the notice process on this for us, please?

Britton Wilson: Yes, mail notices were sent to all neighbors within 300 feet of the subject property. We did receive a certificate of mailing proof that mail notices were sent out, and signs were placed on the property.

Derek Kilborn: There are two addresses you are provided in the testimony during public comments. While they were talking, I checked those two addresses and have confirmed that one address is on the stamped certificate of mailing. The other address was a redacted address. Both of the properties according to our records have been properly noticed.

Commissioner Michaels: What does the redacted address mean?

Britton Wilson: That means that staff is responsible for sending out that notice and the name is redacted because they are some sort of profession that is a protected service.

Commissioner Michaels: Thank you. Thank you.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Are there any other comments or questions? Yes,

27:13

Commissioner Pressman: I would just say the one slide by the staff showed compatibility it showed compatibility with the F.A.R. doesn't change. I believe the height was included. So it was very clear to me that there's good compatibility for future land use and zoning from what's existing was proposed.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Any other comments? Well, I will comment that I did, I'm quite familiar with the Roser Park. Historic District. I've spent a lot of time spent a lot of time there. Just this morning, I drove back through the neighborhood for quite a while, really circled the site up and down all of the alleys. The roadways and what is so striking about that area is the eclectic mix of homes and residential stock that you see there. There are contemporary homes. There are one story bungalows, there are new, two story almost even two and a half story homes. There are some smaller duplexes, but that entire neighborhood is quite diverse in its housing stock. It really makes that neighborhoods so interesting. I believe that this developer, along with their architect will create a development that will add to the value of the character and that neighborhood, rather than take away. They are not proposing anything more dense than what has historically been there and

I truly believe that this new development will be an asset to the neighborhood. I will be voting in favor of this zoning change. If there are no more comments, then I will accept a motion.

Motion: *Commissioner Michaels moved approval of the private-initiated application to amend the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use map from Planned Redevelopment – Residential (PR-R) to Residential Medium (RM) with a concurrent amendment to the Official Zoning Map from Neighborhood Traditional - 2 (NT-2) to Neighborhood Suburban Multifamily – 1 (NSM-1) for a 0.42-acre site located at 423, 429 and 437 11th Avenue South.*

Commissioner Moultrie: *Second.*

YES – 7 – Wannemacher, Gardiner, Jeffrey, Marbet, Moultrie, Pressman, Michaels
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

VI. LEGISLATIVE

A. City File ZM-15

Ann Vickstrom

Request: Approval of a city-initiated application amending the Official Zoning Map for Neighborhood Traditional (NT) properties within the Planned Redevelopment – Residential (PR-R) Future Land Use category located within 175 feet of the centerline of a Future Major Street and following NTM locational criteria from Neighborhood Traditional (NT) to Neighborhood Traditional Mixed Residential-1 (NTM-1)

City Staff Presentation:

Derek Kilborn gave a presentation based on the Staff Report.

49:05

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you very much,

49:07

Attorney Michael Dema: Madam Chair. Pardon me?

Commissioner Wannemacher: Yes.

Attorney Michael Dema: I would like to make a correction to the record. If we could go back to the recommendation page of the presentation. The CPPC was identified as the Land Development Regulation Commission, that is generally our DRC. For things like this, you are the local planning agency, and they're both legal terms of art defined in Chapter 163. I just want to make the change that in its capacity as the local planning agency, instead of Land Development Regulation Commission.

Derek Kilborn: That was on me. Sorry about that.

Attorney Michael Dema: No problem. Derek.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you.

Michael Dema: You were on a roll, I didn't want to interrupt you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Do any of the commissioners have any questions for staff? There will be an opportunity later as well.

Commissioner Wannemacher: There is no Registered Opponent, we will go ahead and just move into public comment. Kate, do we have any more green cards?

Commissioner Wannemacher: Okay, thank you. As we are collecting those, please, I'll remind you all. When you step up to the podium, please state your name, your address, and whether you have been sworn in.

Actually, is there anybody wishing to speak who has not been sworn in yet? If you will, please stand. Kate can swear you in now.

Clerk, K. Connell: Do you swear or affirm any testimony you're about to give will be the truth.

50:45

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you. I'm going to call two names at the same time. If one of you will please step up to this podium and the other person step up to this podium. You will each have three minutes, one more reminder, please be respectful of those speaking. Keep your comments to yourself if you're in the audience. If you want to speak please come to the podium and you will have three minutes. Thank you very much.

Public Comment:

Alexis Baum, 2420 7th Avenue North, opposed.

Ross Mabry indicated that he is opposed.

Stephanie Pitts, 860 24th Avenue North, opposed.

Michael Pavlovich, 4526, 4534, 4554 14 Avenue North, 4525, 4565 13th Ave. opposed.

Gregory Cahanin, 6731 1st Avenue South, opposed.

Bob Midowsky at 1095 22nd Avenue and 1086 23rd Avenue, opposed.

Seymore Gordon, 245 Palm Lane North, opposed.

Michelle Gehrig. 1021 10th Street North, opposed.

Henry Richardson. 2435 4th Avenue North, opposed.

Deborah Martohue, 1036 23rd Avenue North, opposed.

Tina de Barbieri, 2425 9th Ave. North, opposed.

Mark Carmen, 3127 8th Avenue North., opposed.

Judy Windish 4809 6th Avenue North, opposed.

Darrell Gordon, 2934 Burlington Avenue North, opposed.

Jean Anschuetz Oakley, 4800 6th Avenue North, opposed.

Domenico Pontoriero 670 10th Avenue South, opposed.
George Wilsey, 3950 11 Street North, opposed.
Martha Joy Rose, 538 28th Street North, opposed.
Steve Nichols, 6335 Lakeshore Drive North, opposed.
Orlando Acosta, 1155 53rd Avenue North, support.
Charles Samaha, Allendale Terrace, opposed.
Andre Correa, 6044 22nd Avenue North, Apt. 3, opposed.
Barbara Stark, 4746 25th Avenue South, opposed.
Judith Turner, 1411 35th Street South, opposed.
Nick Allea, 331 61st Street North, opposed.
Jeff Danner, 2351 Dartmouth Avenue North, opposed.
Linda Callahan, 801 22nd Avenue North, opposed.
Marit McKnight Parker, 1924 Michigan Avenue Northeast, opposed.
Patricia Dillon, registered as opposed.
Catherine Parks, 608 3rd Avenue North, opposed.
Brooke Fait, 1027 6th Street North, opposed.
Linda Callahan, registered as opposed.
Jeff Danner 2351 Dartmouth Avenue North, opposed.
Neil Allen, 331 61st Street North, opposed.
Judith Turner, 1411 35th Street South, opposed.
Barbara Stark, 5817 21st Avenue South, opposed.
Andre Correa, 6044 22nd Ave North, opposed.

Executive Session:

Commissioner Wannemacher: Welcome back. We will now go into Executive Session. I know that we have a lot of expertise up here on this dais, planning, architecture, real estate construction. I'm very interested in hearing what my colleagues have to say. I think we also heard a lot of very, very passionate commentary from the audience. I want to thank you all very much for attending, and for giving us all something to think about. I also would like staff to maybe comment on some of those comments, I want to make sure that everybody truly understands what this application entails and what it does not entail. So let's go into Executive Session. Is there anybody who would like to begin?

2:23:03

Commissioner Pressman: I have a couple questions. There seems there's difference between historic designation and national historic designation one's included what's not. I would like to ask why that is and what that entails, please.

2:23:20

Derek Kilborn: Okay, what I'm going to show you on the map is there are two different historic preservation designations, one of them is national register, and the other is what we formally call the St. Petersburg Register, but commonly referred to it as local landmark. When you are a local landmark on the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places, there is something called a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) that is required for all exterior modifications. On this map, you'll see there are these cream colored boxes, these boxes are designated Local Historic Districts. Whenever

somebody comes in, and they are proposing exterior modifications, in this case, let's say an addition to the back of the property, maybe they want to build an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) under the current zoning, or in the cases where we have the dark brown parcels, if they want to develop under this zoning, it's going to most likely include some new square footage, and so that goes through the COA. It's a public hearing requirement, and it comes through this commission and this commission gets to review each of those proposals for compatibility. Where the question has been raised is that, and in fact, referring back there was a proposal in one of these local historic districts recently that this commission upon the first public hearing determined that it was incompatible with the surrounding existing buildings and that application was denied. The applicant then came in with an entirely new design, a much smaller, more compatible design, and that was subsequently approved. You do have that protection in place with local landmarks. But the concern that's been raised is related to, again, these dark brown parcels, and I'll do it on both screens. so if you're in the audience here, you'll see too. There are some dark brown parcels over here, right here, and just for the audience, real quick, right here, up across the top here, and then over in here, these brown parcels. Those are not part of a local district. They are in the National Register, there is no regulation on how those properties are developed other than just the underlying zoning category itself.

Commissioner Pressman: But my question was, why didn't you include the National Historic in as I understand the national historic is not included? Or is included with the ordinance isn't exempted like the local is is that correct?

Derek Kilborn: The National Register and the local were both included in the NTM language when it was written in 2019 and adopted at that time. The discussion at that time was focused on the ability for these structures to be adaptively reused or repurposed from single family to multifamily. That could happen within the existing four walls of the building. It doesn't have to be new construction. Where we've been challenged is now that we're at this point, and we're working on implementation of the actual zoning category, there's been a little confusion about how the language is to be interpreted. What I've been seeing in the public comments is that the language that was adopted in 2019, seems to suggest that in those parcels, the only thing that could happen is adaptive reuse of the existing building. As we implement the standards that we've been talking about, and going through this exercise and getting feedback, as we've gone through the workshop sessions, it's clear to us that there is some opportunity to do new construction. So, what do we do with that, when we don't have the COA process to guide compatibility. That is why in this chart, let me pull this chart up so you can see, one of the ways that we have proposed dealing with this challenge is that you have this companion application that has some text amendments that are going through your sister commission, the Development Review Commission. One of the things that we have proposed in that text amendment to address this issue is that if you are adaptively reusing the existing building, you can add new units within the existing building, and that would be okay. If you're proposing new construction, whether that's an addition or it's a new building on a vacant lot, or it's a new building resulting from demolition, you will not get the benefit of the reduced setbacks and the greater floor area ratio that comes with the NTM-1 zoning. In this, for the audience, I'm looking at this line right here, and then down here. Okay, so right here, you'll see that the NT-2 building setbacks today are twenty five (25) feet in the front twelve (12) feet on the street side, six (6) feet interior side and then the rear yard is six (6) to ten (10) feet. Our suggestion is that the any new construction that's in the National Register or Local is subject to the greater

setbacks, which are already existing today in the NT-2 zoning so it would be no change to the existing rule. The same thing with the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) the floor area ratio on the zoning today on these parcels that we're talking about is point four zero (.40), those parcels do qualify for a up to a point two (.2) FAR bonus. You can see in the NTM-1, when that was drafted and adopted, it was increased to allow point five (.5) FAR. Our recommendation would be to take that back down to the point four (.4), where everything is back down to the exact same standard that exists today in NT-2, and you leave open the potential for adaptive reuse of the existing buildings to create or convert the interior spaces to make additional units.

Commissioner Pressman: You have answered my question, thank you.

Derek Kilborn: Hopefully that captures everything that we've been receiving in the public comments. I think that it does.

2:30:50

Commissioner Wannemacher: So the city has thought very carefully about this and put safeguards in place in the text amendments to ensure that at least in Historic Districts and National Register Districts that too much development does not happen... over development.

2:31:13

Derek Kilborn: Yes, I would say that we have tried to address the concern, by returning the setbacks in the Floor Area Ratio to the existing requirement that it's there today in NT. I think it does merit some discussion about whether that is sufficient or not. If they are removed from the NTM rezoning package, then they retain their existing NT zoning, with the larger setbacks in the lower FAR I just showed you. They do not have the ability to create the additional units then. So they would be essentially limited to the single family primary unit, and then the accessory unit in the side or rear of the property.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Right. Thank you. Okay. Questions.

2:32:07

Commissioner Jeffrey: I have one question, one of the speakers mentioned, the capacity that already exists. I remember several rezonings that have gone forward that have significantly increased zoning along Central Avenue. Yet, we haven't had a lot of that development occur yet. Do we know what the capacity is at this point without any zoning changes?

Derek Kilborn: I don't have the exact number for you, but I can confirm that what was presented in the public comment is correct. In 2012, the Central Avenue Revitalization Plan was created and adopted that increased the allowable density along Central Avenue from essentially what was 24 units per acre, up to 60 units per acre. It increased the allowable building height from approximately 48 feet up to 72 feet. Since that time, obviously, as was stated, we haven't seen new construction developing to those allowances west of 34 Street, there is a project 6090 that's been clearing the site now and I think beginning some of their preliminary construction. They are taking advantage of those allowances, but it has been some time and I have asked that question in

our meetings with the development community as well, trying to get some answers and figure out why we haven't seen the type of development in that corridor that we expected to see back then.

Commissioner Wannemacher: I also have another question related to the last question. You showed us Kenwood, the Local Historic District, the National Register District. Are there any other of our Local Historic Districts, Lang Court, for instance, that have parcels that will be affected by this zoning change.

Derek Kilborn: There are several National Register Districts that have parcels. So you have Historic Kenwood, you have Uptown Round Lake, you have just a handful of parcels in North Shore. I believe there's one parcel in Roser Park, and I don't believe there were any parcels in the downtown St. Petersburg National Register District. In total, as much shown on the slide, there are 169 parcels within the National Register Districts.

2:35:13

Commissioner ?: Question. I was wondering if you could review again, the bulk and height metrics for the new zoning, and how it compares to the existing. Particularly though the building width I'm kind of interested in, because I think there might be some concern that this is going to lead to garden style apartments, which I know is not the intent of the zoning.

Derek Kilborn: You guys are doing great, I had five key things I heard that I wanted to address. and that was the second of the five that you've already asked. Okay. On this chart, you can see now this table says existing and NT-2, it is and NT-1 and NT-2, but for this chart, I am showing you the NT-2 standards. Then you see NTM-1 on the right side, the first thing that is important to look at when we're talking about neighborhood character, of course, is lot width. One change you see here is a minimum lot width reduction to twenty (20) feet. The reason that twenty (20) feet is identified here and was adopted in 2019 is because there was a lot of discussion at that time about side by side duplexes taking an existing single family lot and splitting it into two fee simple side by side units. We had a number of lots, we I think We started looking at lots that were 60-foot wide, so they could (split) be two 30-foot lots. Then we have many 45-foot lots, and they would be 22.5 feet (wide) each. It was ultimately decided that the NTM-1 should have twenty (20) feet to accommodate side by side fee simple duplex on 45 foot wide lots, that is the first line item. The second one that we look at our building setbacks, you can see that there are similarities and building setbacks, there are some reductions, so you can go a little closer to the property lines. Overall, we felt that these were still compatible with neighborhood character in the traditional areas.

One of the things that came up in public comments was about the interior side yard, and three feet being too low. Now the individual who made those comments was very credentialed in code and building and fire safety work. We did consult with our Construction Services and Permitting Division at the time that these were being drafted to make sure that what was being considered was in accordance with the different building codes, we don't want to ever do something that we can't do otherwise. The discussion at that time was that you would be required a minimum six feet of separation between exterior walls on adjoining properties before you had to do additional

enhancements to those walls per the building code at that time. That's why you see three feet, we took six feet divided that by the two part properties and three feet per side.

Building height, no change to the building height. This was really important to us that we keep the building height, the same as it is today. So there are some side by side duplexes on the first avenues that many people are familiar with. They go up three and a half stories, the zoning there allows 36 to 48 feet in height. You cannot build those at these parcels. Your roofline has to start at 24 feet. There is a roof peak of 36 feet. But we felt that was very important to the character.

There is a new standard that we added here, the new standard is a building with a maximum building width of 40 feet. One of the reasons this was put into the regulations in 2019 is we wanted to make sure that the buildings that were proposed, still had a detached, lower scale residential feeling to them, rather than having, for example, a series of townhomes lined up in a contiguous row. By breaking down the width of the buildings, this would create and maintain more of a residential character. Now separate from the code citation, another individual who spoke was talking about 50 foot wide lots, and referring to fourplexes. This 40 foot number, I can tell you comes directly from our field work in the historic uptown neighborhood, where we looked at fourplexes in that neighborhood, the fourplexes, there were built on 50 foot wide lots, they had five foot side yard setbacks, a 40 foot building width and in those cases, they had a 10 foot front yard, but we felt that was going to be too shallow for compatibility here.

That is the basis for the 40 foot, maximum building width. Finally, floor area ratio, we talked about that a little bit already a slight increase to the floor area ratio from .4 to .5, that was simply to accommodate, the proposal here to do additional units. There is a little change in building coverage 5% and impervious surface from 65% to 75%.

2:41:30

Commissioner Wannemacher: Other questions for city staff?

Commissioner Moultrie: I have a question. The impervious surface area from 65% to 75% is a rationale for the number that was used, was there modeling conducted? To determine the upside?

Derek Kilborn: We were looking at some of our other multifamily categories. What are the other multifamily categories accommodating? In this case, we have a proposal to do up to four units per building, and that is going to require more parking on the site. Since there would be a need for more parking on the site, we thought it was appropriate to slightly increase that number to allow for the type of buildings that we're talking about here in this application.

2:42:19

Commissioner Moultrie: But did your stormwater engineering group evaluate that increase to see what the overall impact would be? If you did that to all the properties proposed.

Derek Kilborn: Not on an individual parcel basis? When we do have new text that is proposed for the code, that text is evaluated across the different departments? We are seeking input from all the departments on the work that's being proposed. In that case, I don't recall specific study or analysis that was performed by the engineering or public works department, other than a more

general discussion about here's what the proposals are, and soliciting feedback based on that information.

2:43:12

Commissioner Houston? I had one more question. I don't know if you've done this calculation or not, but I was curious as to I believe this impacts 2,897 Lots. Do you know what percentage of parcels that are zoned NT-1 and NT-2? That comes out to be because I'm guessing it's a pretty low, percentage?

Derek Kilborn: Keep asking questions, we might be able to get that number for you.

Commissioner Houston: Okay, not critical. I was just thought that might be informative.

Derek Kilborn: Three point approximately 3.7%. Okay. We have approximately 80,000 parcels in the city. So it's a much smaller number.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Go ahead and explain, state that fact. One more time, please.

Derek Kilborn: Okay. Did you want to come up into that? Sorry. 3.7% is a quick calculation of the number of parcels as a percent of the total number of parcels in the city.

Commissioner Houston 2:44:23

Okay, so not a percentage of the NT-1 and NT-2 line.

Derek Kilborn: I think your question was a breakdown of how many of the parcels under consideration the 3000 plus our NT-1 and NT-2 correct?

Commissioner Houston: No, it was a question of how many we'll get this new zoning as a percentage of all of the lots that currently have the NT-1 and NT-2 because it only applies to those lots correct.

Derek Kilborn 2:44:55

I'm sorry, I'm trying I'm just trying to understand the nature of the question.

Commissioner Houston: If you take the number of lots that were considering and divided by all of the parcels that have the current zoning, I'm just looking at what percentage of lots are going to be impacted as. If that's not if you don't know what that number is, I thought maybe that had come up in your evaluation.

Derek Kilborn: Okay, we're going to try to get that number,

Commissioner Houston: I think I was thinking it's probably a much smaller percentage than people might consider that it is. So, I thought that might.

Derek Kilborn 2:45:34

Okay. We're gonna see if we can get that for you.

Commissioner Jeffrey: Okay, while you're looking at that, could I ask another clarifying question? I think you said there's little under 3000 parcels that we're talking about as this application, and 169 parcels are in the National Register Historic Districts, so less than 1%?

Derek Kilborn: 169 parcels within National Register Districts. There are 70 parcels within Local Historic Districts. There are 2,895 parcels total.

Commissioner Jeffrey: Thank you.

2:46:22

Commissioner Wannemacher: So those 70 parcels would come before this committee if any change was to occur, but not the ones that are in the national districts, the remaining ones.

Other questions or clarifications from staff?

Derek Kilborn: I was able to cover four of the five in that long answer, there was 1/5, there was an individual spoke during public comments, identified a specific address off 22nd Avenue. indicated they didn't did not receive a postcard we did in the interim, look up and confirm that we do have a stamped certificate of mailing with that name and address on it. I just wanted to point that out for the record.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you.

Commissioner Pressman: I did one follow up, Derek, one concern I have is we've heard from a lot of people from Historic Kenwood who've come down here, that always raises concerns me. In terms of national historic, short answer, national, historic and local historic, how are they affected by this in regard to number of parcels that would be able to just move forward with the new zoning.

Derek Kilborn: How are they I'm sorry,

Commissioner Pressman: I'm trying to better understand how many parcels in Historic Kenwood are going to be affected and be able to move forward with development under this proposal?

Derek Kilborn: I don't have the number for you in just Historic Kenwood, I think our recommendation would be that if we're going to talk about national register and local historic district that we not assign an exclusion to just one neighborhood, that it'd be some principal position that applies to all national register and or all local.

2:48:31

Commissioner Pressman: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Jeffrey: Are you looking for comments now? Or just

Commissioner Wannemacher: I was just going to open it back up and why don't we open it up for discussion among us?

Commissioner Gardner: First of all, I can completely respect everyone here. Clearly, there's a love of St. Pete and your homes in your neighborhoods. I to have this, I'd like to see further discussion on neighborhoods such as that proposed that are proposed on this in the nationally designated on the nationally designated register. So that would be my comment about homes on the National Register.

Commissioner Michaels: This is certainly a major proposal that's before us and has been before us for some time and we've struggled with it. It has gotten to the point where we have it today. As I looked through the various policies that are cited, there's one that I always kind of look at first and see it as being the most important one, and that's policy LU: 3.6, which says that land use planning decisions shall weigh heavily on the established character of predominantly developed areas where changes of use or intensity of development are contemplated. As we have heard many arguments here today, many comments here today that the proposal does not fit the established character of the neighborhood. The staff report says that it does. The staff report states that the NTM-1 development standards are intended to maintain neighborhood compatibility, in building placement, scale and design. I respect that and a lot of work has been done to, to address what the buildings are going to look like, so that in terms of appearance, they would, they would blend in at least to some degree, with the surrounding neighborhood.

What I don't think is addressed is the impact of the change in the number of units from one up to potentially, four on that one particular site. I think in that regard, this proposal does not meet the policy. The staff report goes on to say that when applied to official zoning map, the qualified properties are located along future major streets. That is a point, but as you dig into what a future major street is, there's a wide difference. This proposal would I think better fit those major streets where you've got, say four lanes, that is my definition of a major street. In fairness, here, they're talking about future major streets, still, we're dealing here in the present, with many of these future major streets are really only two lanes, I think it's there's a big difference between whether or not this is done, where there's a four lane street or even a three lane street of some type, and just a two lane, two lane street. There's also discussion about in the staff report about mass transit, bus transit is what we're really talking about here. Again, bus transit is not on every, quote future major street. I think we're trying to, to kind of come up with a one size fits all approach where we need to be more differentiated. We've got the historic issues that have been raised here today. I think that's another special feature that needs to be given consideration. We, I think also have that that needs to be weighed here is the emotional attachment of the residents in the neighborhood, to their, to their neighborhood. I think it's been pretty clear here today with most of the folks who have spoken, that your emotional attachment is not meeting what you would consider to be the established character of the neighborhood. This is changing your emotional attachment to the to the neighborhood. I'm inclined to vote against this or at least to ask the city council to significantly address some of these major differences between neighborhoods throughout the city before finally enacting it.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you any others? Yes, Commissioner,

Commissioner Pressman: Madam Chair. This this issue boils down to density, and where we are going to put density and the direction of the staff which is good reason specifically, to allow the

potential for accessory dwelling units, small scale multifamily developments to increase housing diversity. With all due respect to gentlemen, the comp plans are inches thick, and you read a good policy and there's many policies on the other side. You can always try policies on one side the other side question is how's the density work when you cast a like net, like the staff is doing across entire city, you're gonna have incongruency there's no way to avoid them. Partly what we've heard today, and this may sound like a negative connotation not meant to be what we've heard today is the haves versus the have nots. We've heard from the folks who own property, and who are citizens and lived here a long time and great respect for you. But this proposal directs for the people who have not spoken today, which are small scale multifamily developments to increase housing diversity and housing supply. That's an important and critical aspect. I would say that's a forefront of what the city has been looking for, to address housing. It's not affordable housing, some of maybe it's housing for the missing middle, which I think is admirable. My only great concern is the impacts on Historic Kenwood, they've come down here, so I agree with you. I would support it, but I think we have to either address it now or send the message city council that they need to address the concerns of groups like Historic Kenwood, and we've come down here in total, with great concern, and I think that cannot be ignored.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you. Commissioner Moultrie?

2:56:19

Commissioner Moultrie: Yes, Madam Chair, I also appreciate the comments that were made. I guess I was a bit, I am a bit more concerned about us not targeting housing, in areas that we've already up zoned versus impacting neighborhoods where there existing housing and properties. Very concerned about what this looks like with developers coming in and I'm sure everyone's already getting offers for their homes and what this will look like five years from now, and what the neighborhoods will look like five years from now. I certainly recognize what this looks like with traffic and environmental issues, which is my background. While I understand the need, I think we could have come up with a better solution than casting a wide net. That's a good I think that's the issue here. Is this not targeted enough or focused enough in areas where it makes sense to actually do so. The net is a bit too broad, and I'm inclined to vote no.

2:57:29

Commissioner Wannemacher: Commissioner Huston,

Commissioner Houston: I also live in Kenwood and I'm one of those transit and renters, I guess. But the other day, I had a couple of people over to my back patio, and three of the five of us were renters. One young lady was an immigrant from Kenya, she worked for a nonprofit, and she rented a duplex catty corner from my house, and the other was a musician. Both of them without any prodding for me started talking about having to look for other places to live, because of rising rents. One of the ladies' houses was going to be renovated and probably to rent was going to be raised. One was looking at moving out to Gandy Boulevard, because that's where the most affordable housing was, and the other one was going to move out of state. I think there is a population, even in Kenwood that benefits from more housing options. I'm not voting today, I'm an alternate, but I'd like to register my support for the zoning amendment. I think we need more housing diversity. I think this is a very sensitive way to do it because of the height and bulk standards that the staff has made. The whole idea is that these are house size buildings that may

have more than one unit in them, but they're small scale. I believe the building code issues can be handled, architects kind of know how to do that. I don't think the alleys will be overwhelmed, I've lived in much denser places with alleys with apartments on every lot. There is never a traffic jam in the alley. I think, you know, it's important to keep in mind that Kenwood and other neighborhoods like it are filled with these types of small residential buildings already. This is really not out of character. You can find fourplexes and duplexes and all over these historic neighborhoods, the old Northeast is the same. So those are my comments.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you very much. Any other Commissioner wish to make some comments? Yes. Commissioner Jeffrey

Commissioner Jeffrey: So I'm going to start back with our vision 2020 plan, which was done quite a while ago. We recognize that corridors were our, I guess worst asset or best, best in need of improvement. We also recognize that neighborhoods were sacrosanct, and I think that even though we've got vision 2050, now that talks about the need for additional housing, with 30, or 45,000 units in the next 30 years, I think we already have a tremendous amount of capacity that we're not seeing being built in the appropriate places. I think that's an important thing, because if we just do that broad brush approach again, or cast a wide net, it just scattered, which then doesn't support mass transit, the way we need to incrementally grow that, as we, you know, as we develop more densely in spots. I appreciate actually what staff has done, because this has been going on for three or four years now and there have been significant changes that have been made. They're getting a lot of pressure from people in the community, and other groups that want to see more housing as a way to make housing affordable. Well, that works if you have farmland surrounding you, but it doesn't work in a build out community where we're surrounded by water. The only way we're going to do this is to go up, and densify. That is not going to be affordable, I don't think, you know, everything I see being built right now is in excess of 600 to 900 thousand to a million dollars, I'm not sure developers are going to come in and build a little 500 square foot unit. Even though there are design restrictions on this, that keeps a building it at a smaller scale and breaks it down towards the neighborhood scale, you're still on a typical lot talking about a 4,000 square foot potential building. I'm really concerned about the impacts. I think that you know, when this or whatever gets implemented, gets implemented, real design standards that have to do with where's the trash can going? How is the parking being done? I mean, these are all the devils in the detail that, you know, we haven't really thought about so much at this point. I know staff has and I know they've been very diligent on it. But outside pressures again, you know, I think we have to admit, we're still auto-oriented community here. If you've got, as we saw in one of our early proposals, a four bedroom unit, that's not going to have a single car. I think we have to recognize I think there's other things that are important. I mean, here, we're supposed to be looking at the Comprehensive Plan, and is my fellow commissioner brought up there's many, many pages in that. There's also some we have a historic preservation element, in that historic preservation element, it talks about the importance of preserving place and keeping the character these neighborhoods. I think we have to weigh that in as well, and then I guess, finally, well, two things. One, if we're talking about National Register Districts in the city, we're talking about less or less than 1% of the properties that are being proposed today. So I think that's the first start that we look at National Register Districts is exempt from this, but I think it also has to go farther, at least in my opinion. You know, maybe there needs to be a minimum amount of block space, meaning that you know, if there's, as one of the community members pointed out, only 18 units, and then it becomes spot zoning, I think

we have to be very careful about spot zoning. I think that's it and maybe is Commissioner Michael suggests maybe major streets or future major streets need to be at least four lane before things like that. So I think there's a lot of criteria here. I am in support of the idea at some point. We need to address these corridors, but I think we need to be much more thoughtful in how we do that.

3:04:07

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you. anybody else on the dais?

All very thoughtful comments, and I really appreciate you participating. I too have some comments. One thing I'm concerned with is that many of the speakers seem to feel that anything other than a single family home it is not a neighborhood, that if your neighborhood or your community has duplexes or quadplexes that it somehow does not constitute a neighborhood. I think we all really need to understand and embrace the fact that housing comes in all different kinds of forms, including accessory dwelling units and carriage houses and garage apartments, and duplexes and quadplexes. One speaker mentioned that a neighborhood, it's made up of the people, it's not the building, it's not the built environment, it's really the people. So if, if you are, if you are the kind of neighbor that goes out and sits on your porch and greets your neighbor and walks your dog and says, hello, that alone will help foster community and neighborhood in the areas where we live. That was one of my concerns.

I am also very sensitive to this issue of historic districts, the National Districts and our Local Districts. I'm wondering if maybe there's a way that we could incrementally apply this new zoning, maybe instead of allowing quadplexes that we only allow duplexes or just access accessory dwelling units so that in an in a historic district, only two residential units are allowed not four. So maybe there's a way that we can incrementally step up to, to that and maybe that is something we can look at, even in some of the areas, other areas that were mentioned, I'd be real interested to hear what somebody else here might think about that. So maybe, let me just put that out on the table. Instead of going to for going to two allowing two.

3:06:52

Commissioner Jeffrey: Let me address that for a second. In most cases, in the historic districts, both national and local. You're already allowed an accessory dwelling so you've already accomplished that for the most part. I think the reality is that to me, to have it where okay, yes, you can have it, but no, we're gonna have different criteria or whatever. Zoning needs to be very clear cut. It doesn't need to be something where it's like, sort of, maybe, kinda, and that's the problem we had with the 70s and 80s zoning here was that, you know, was trying to address every situation. I think in cases like this, where you've already got that character and neighborhoods that have been developed uptown 25% already have a historic ADUs. Kenwood, I think is 20%, Old Northeast is about 18%. You know, I think that character exists, but what's nice about that character, it's not 100%, it provides that opportunity. So, I just think it's important that whatever, and I guess maybe this is a question for legal here, because we're here to talk about whether this is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Can we make some suggestions, recommendations on edits to the actual text or is that beyond our scope at this point?

3:08:10

Attorney, Michael Dema: I do believe, you know, as a body, you can speak through a motion to City Council, for instance, to maybe provide some additional feedback, that is maybe outside of the final vote that you take on the recommendation. Because we were talking about this a little earlier, kind of anticipating that this might be something with the historic aspect, particularly. I like what you had to say their Commissioner about zoning, you can't micromanage it down to you know, and I think that's a credit to what Derek's team did here is to, you know, it was I think it was called one size fits all it really wasn't, it was parameterized on those five things that they're talked about, so that it had brought an equal a applicability citywide. To the extent that the commission wants to discuss maybe what next could happen with the historic properties, both National Register and Local Districts, you know, if you're unsatisfied by the design, and building envelope constrictions that were put in there, you know, you do have that power and if you want to make a motion to kind of additionally recommend something to council, absolutely.

Britton Wilson 3:09:39

Commissioner Wannemacher: And please, will you confirm all of the parcels currently in the historic districts both national and local? By right, can they have accessory dwelling units,

Attorney Michael Dema: The ones that you're looking at here today, they're like NT-1 and NT-2. We've we basically expanded ADUs to every single family district in the in the city last year. These NT-1s and NT-2s have had that for a few years. What the big differences particularly with the local districts is that that new construction of an ADU is going to be subjected to a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the new construction for the addition. So it would get that heightened level of design review by this board. From a foundation of fundamental what the zoning district allows, the ADU is already there.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Right, okay. Thank you for confirming that. I guess a couple other comments. Many comments have been made about density as if it's a bad word, density is not a bad word. It can be done properly, it can be done well. Density in itself is not bad. Even if this does take effect, this zoning change, this density change is not going to happen overnight, we're not going to wake up tomorrow morning, and all the lots on either side of you have been sold and quadplexes have gone up. This will happen incrementally, slowly, it may not even happen in our lifetime. But it's in place and it could potentially be in place as an opportunity for those who come after us. I am again concerned about the historic districts, but I do genuinely support this, this zoning change. If I'm honest, I would like to see it affect even more parcels than just 2,800. That's my that's my opinion. So, if there are any other comments, or questions,

Commissioner Magnello: 3:12:09 One please thing here. You know, I think it's important just hearing everybody, my first day on the job happy to be here. You know, the one thing we haven't talked about on either side of the table, and I do want to add that, you know, we equally sit on this side and we cherish the city and we're all trying to do the right thing here is resiliency, you know, living in tons of different areas of the country, St. Petersburg, my home now architect and builder locally, homeowner, I'm very invested in in this community. But we also need to think about the future and being adaptive and that is, when you look at one of the really important things that staff did about this is everything that we're proposing that the city is proposing rather, is, you know, outside of that coastal that flood zone, because we need to be really cognizant about the future and

taking these, you know, multifamily areas that are in flood zones. People can't afford the flood insurance, and they're having to move to other areas. So, you know, I'm at this moment staying neutral on this, but I do want to say that it's an important approach that we collectively as a community really needs to be thoughtful about. About where we're putting these and that was one thing that staff did really well. We didn't really mention that at all today and I think looking to the future 10, 15, 20 years, knowing where we live, seeing what happened unfortunately a few months ago, you know, and when we look at not only residential but commercial, aviation, transportation, how everybody nationally are really, it buzzword resiliency, really looking at this right now. So, something just to kind of keep on both sides in our head when this decision is going through, I think is really important.

3:13:52

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you, all very good comments very much appreciate that. And again, very much appreciate all of you coming out to speak today. I know it's very time consuming, but you will all have more opportunity to speak to city council when this topic comes up in front of them, two times actually,

Attorney Michael Dema: Including one after five o'clock. There will be another opportunity to speak before City Council after five o'clock.

Commissioner Wannemacher: If there are no more comments or questions from my colleagues, may I hear a motion?

3:14:38

Commissioner Jeffrey: I'd be happy to attempt it. Staff recommends that the Community Preservation and Community Planning and Preservation Commission in the capacity as the Community Planning Agency did I get that local planning, a Local Planning Agency make a finding of consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan and recommending to city council approval of the NTM-1 map amendment to the Official Zoning Map as illustrated with the addition of exempting Local National Register Properties and Districts, further finding exemptions from the Future Major Roadway Map with a minimum of four lanes required.

Commissioner Michaels: Second.

3:15:30

Commissioner Pressman: What was that last part?

Commissioner Jeffrey: That, on the Future Major Roadway Map, that would be limited to only being applicable where there are four lanes of roadway not two?

Commissioner Wannemacher: I cannot visualize where that will occur and where it can't occur? And...

Commissioner Pressman: Is that part of the SAP proposal or have you changed that:

Commissioner Jeffrey: I have added those two criteria.

Commissioner Wannemacher: So, we have got a, we have got a motion on the table, we've got a second. Is there any discussion on that particular motion? I want to add that we can, if this fails, or if it is approved, we can come back and modify it. Let's say it fails, can we come back and modify this?

Attorney Michael Dema: No, the way the motion is currently constructed? It's asking for a final recommendation on the entirety of the package. Those conditions were put in there, you know, for complex issues, and I've advised this board in the past that I think it's a little cleaner if we take conditioning language and address them separately prior to a motion on the main, Commissioner. and that's just that's my recommendation, both legally and kind of like a clean procedure.

3:16:55

Commissioner Jeffrey: Oh, can I amend my

Commissioner Wannemacher: I agree. So let's, let's take this motion off the table.

Attorney Michael Dema: And Commissioner Jeffrey would have to be the one who withdraws his motion if he chooses.

Commissioner Jeffrey: Let me withdraw that motion.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Hold on one second. Do you withdraw your second?

Commissioner Michaels: Withdraw the second? Yes.

Commissioner Jeffrey: Okay. So, now, I believe we are recommending to exempt Local and National Registered Districts and properties.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Okay, do I have a second on that motion?

Commissioner Michaels: Yes.

Commissioner Wannemacher: We have a motion, we have a second. Let's hear a roll call on that motion to exempt Local and National Historic Districts. And I'd

Michael Dema: I would like to just state that that would be a recommendation. That's

Commissioner Wannemacher: That is a recommendation. Yes. That we would make to city council. Roll call please.

Motion: Commissioner Jeffrey moved approval to exempt properties within a Local Historic District or National Register from the city-initiated application amending the Official Zoning Map for Neighborhood Traditional (NT) properties within the Planned Redevelopment – Residential (PR-R) Future Land Use category located within 175 feet of the centerline of a

Future Major Street and following NTM locational criteria from Neighborhood Traditional (NT) to Neighborhood Traditional Mixed Residential-1 (NTM-1).

Commissioner Michaels: Second.

YES – 7 – Wannemacher, Gardiner, Jeffrey, Marbet, Moultrie, Pressman, Michaels
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you. Commissioner, Jeffery, would you like to make a second motion?

Commissioner Jeffrey: I motion that we recommend to city council that Future Major Roadway Map application be limited to only four lanes of traffic. Is that affirmative?

Attorney Michael Dema: Of those future major streets with four more lanes or more lanes? Okay.

Commissioner Michaels: Second.

Commissioner Wannemacher: 3:18:33 We, have a motion and a second. May we please have a roll call on that motion for a recommendation?

Motion: Commissioner Jeffrey moved approval to limit the properties to include roadways with four or more lanes only in the city-initiated application amending the Official Zoning Map for Neighborhood Traditional (NT) properties within the Planned Redevelopment – Residential (PR-R) Future Land Use category located within 175 feet of the centerline of a Future Major Street and following NTM locational criteria from Neighborhood Traditional (NT) to Neighborhood Traditional Mixed Residential-1 (NTM-1).

Commissioner Michaels: Second.

YES –4 – Jeffrey, Marbet, Moultrie, Michaels
NO – 3 - Wannemacher, Gardiner, Pressman

Motion passed by a vote of four.

3:19:07

Commissioner Wannemacher: Okay, and now, we need a motion on the overall to recommend to city council. The overall comprehensive plan zoning change, but knowing that it will include both of our motions as recommendations as well Correct?

Attorney Michael Dema: Correct.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Okay. May I have a motion please?

3:19:41

Commissioner Jeffrey: Staff recommends that the Community Planning and Preservation Commission in its capacity as the Local Planning Agency make the finding of consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan and recommending to city council approval of the NTM-1 map amendments to the Official Zoning Map as illustrated.

Commissioner Michaels: Second.

Attorney Michael Dema: So that's a motion? Commissioner, I think you started by just kind of reading the recommendation. So...

Commissioner Jeffrey: I make the motion that.
Commissioner Michaels: Second.

Motion: Commissioner Jeffrey moved approval of a city-initiated application amending the Official Zoning Map for Neighborhood Traditional (NT) properties within the Planned Redevelopment – Residential (PR-R) Future Land Use category located within 175 feet of the centerline of a Future Major Street and following NTM locational criteria from Neighborhood Traditional (NT) to Neighborhood Traditional Mixed Residential-1 (NTM-1).

Commissioner Michaels: Second.

***YES – 6 – Wannemacher, Gardiner, Jeffrey, Marbet, Pressman, Michaels
NO – 1- Moultrie***

Motion passed by a vote of five.

VII. UPDATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

VIII. ADJOURN