

The meeting was called to order at 3:10pm, a quorum was present

1. Roll call of committee members present.

- a. Mr. Lindsay Boswell and Mr. Frederic Samson were not present.
- b. All other members were present with a Quorum.

2. Motion to approve the agenda by Ms. Jillian Bandes and seconded by Mr. Jack Humburg

- a. All voted in favor.

3. Approval of minutes from the May 19, 2020 meeting

- a. Motion for approval of May 19, 2020 meeting minutes from Mr. Ken Rush.
- b. Motion seconded by Ms. Jillian Bandes.
- c. The minutes from the May 19, 2020 meeting were approved as written by a consensus vote.
- d. No one opposed.

4. Summary of incentives

5. Incentive - Allowance of Flexible Lot Configurations, including Zero Lot Line Configurations

- a. Mr. Derek Kilborn, Planning and Historic Preservation Manager provided a review of incentives.
- b. Discussion about new neighborhood category for small neighborhood projects could be built infill around existing single family.
- c. Type of development anticipated to be incremental smaller projects as identified in public meeting input and have existed in St. Petersburg during its history.
- d. Mr. Kilborn discussed there will be change to the Land Development Regulations (LDR) and have a base template from Pinellas County and the City's comprehensive plan with the LDR. This requires coordinating with the County in this process and type of intended development.
- e. The County did accommodate the City with several changes to move forward with this new Zoning category.

- f. Mr. Kilborn presented several slides discussing the County's coordination, examples, and process that has been followed to reach the current conclusions and Zoning category with plans to start in the Fall of 2020.
- g. Two types of development are anticipated in phases. First, with smaller building duplex, triplex etc. and then move to Phase II with larger scale building types 10 or more units, and small developments.
- h. First steps in process for new category would be the applicability of development.
- i. Full slide overall.
- j. Questions and Comments following Presentation:
 - i. Mr. Humburg asked who the city would be working with on the project. Mr. Kilborn responded that it would be Forward Pinellas as it is the grant offeror and will be working with them directly on these ideas and lending analysis.
 - ii. Chair Scott Macdonald asked when is the City planning on implementing the new Zoning category?
 - iii. Mr. Mallory asked are any designated more towards the South St. Petersburg area?
 - iv. Mr. Kilborn responded yes there is. And as identified in the slide for Future Land Use Map areas that are potentially best suited for the new zoning and locations.
 - v. Mr. Mallory also asked for a copy of the map and Mr. Kilborn responded he will be able to provide it to Ms. Lampe to forward.
 - vi. Chair Macdonald asked if there was another map showing areas where the new category would be excluded in order to easier reference/read. Mr. Kilborn responded that there are several different types of maps of which may best serve each committee member's needs.
 - vii. Chair Scott asked what was the thinking regarding the strategy of rolling this out in different Phases?
 - viii. Derek stated information about a neighborhood applying in whole.

- ix. Chair Scott asked did the neighborhood come to the City? Mr. Kilborn responded that they did come directly to the City through the neighborhood association leaders who had taken the initiative, however, the City wants them to work with neighborhood first as a whole and then move forward with requesting from the City. This way neighborhood in coordination and not just neighborhood “leaders”.
- x. Chair Scott asked where limitations came from as stated?
- xi. Mr. Kilborn responded that one of the reasons is due to coordination needs based on County written requirements in addition to getting results to move forward within reasonable timeframes.
- xii. Mr. Humburg asked why is this not looking at it as a broader perspective and not just corridors or small steps?
- xiii. Mr. Kilborn responded that they are looked at as identified County requirements and also starting point to get support to move forward and framework to any expansion as time moves forward.
- xiv. Chair Scott agrees that he would like in a broader sense but understands the smaller phasing to move forward.
- xv. Vice Chair Rush responded as importance as corridors are the primary focus from his experience with families and Habitat is that the corridors may not be the best course for many persons/families. He also asked why not Citywide instead of to select areas that are so close to primary thoroughfares?
- xvi. Mr. Kilborn responded that there was consideration of this in the original discussions, but the decision is currently based more on the feedback to utilize the major neighborhood streets.
- xvii. Mr. Macdonald asked what were concerns regarding moving closer to the “inner” neighborhood streets.

- xviii. Mr. Kilborn discussed concerns such as traffic and the incompatibility with the existing neighborhood characteristics (existing single-family properties are majority). These were two main objections/concerns.
- xix. Mr. Kilborn also mentioned there was discussion regarding some of the exiting size of the neighborhoods these developments would greatly change the as a whole.
- xx. Ms. Bandes responded she believes it is important to take a stand for more affordable housing and to move forward in a meaningful way to take a stand for a greater implementation/broader implementation of the Zoning change.
- xxi. Mr. Kilborn discussed that he believes the committee information and feedback is helpful and by providing this information can assist in the committees' future narrative and internal decisions/recommendations.
- xxii. Chair Scott asked if Ms. Bandes was asking for a motion. Ms. Bandes stated it does not seem a motion is needed as Mr. Kilborn stated this was for more program status and Chair Scott and Ms. Bandes with the committee will look to bring something forward at the next meeting.

6. CONA/NIMBY discussion

- a. Ms. Bandes responded that she is not sure the discussion of NIMBY is an appropriate forum for the committee to either support or promote these issues and was asking as a committee member is this something to discuss in more detail in any manner for affordable housing efforts?
- b. Vice Chair Rush responded that he doesn't believe this discussion fits what Habitat does on a daily basis and believes Habitat has come up with innovative ways to develop. He further responded that he believes it is an educational process and an opportunity for the committee to promote/market ideas to affordable housing
- c. Ms. Bandes stated that believes this committee is a platform to support YIMBY as a whole. She made motion for the committee to support the idea and move forward.

- d. Mr. Humburg seconded the motion for “Yes In My By Yard”. However, he stated that he did not agree with all highlighted points of the document but did support the general concept of the platform.
- e. Chair Macdonald responded that he is favor of doing it, but concerns regarding simply moving forward with it as a platform in totality versus a discussion to move forward at future meetings and determine committee’s specific position(s).
- f. Chair Macdonald asked what Ms. Bandes role is for YIMBY?
- g. Ms. Bandes responded that she and another partner are working towards advocating for it’s success and support on a greater scale community-wide.
- h. Chair Macdonald asked for legal guidance and whether it is necessary for someone other than Ms. Bandes to make the motion based on her current involvement/position on YIMBY? Is there any conflict?
- i. Mr. Bradley Tennant, Assistant City Attorney responded that any conflict of interest is a personal decision regarding whether the individual feels it could be. Most noteworthy, whether there is monetary gain.
- j. Ms. Bandes responded that there is no expectations or monetary gain based on the support for YIMBY.
- k. Ms. Lampe asked for a clarification of the motion
- l. Ms. Bandes asked if can revise the document provided to reflect the actual Housing numbers and statistics.
- m. Mr. Joshua responded that he sees no problem with the existing numbers provided on the handout.
- n. Mr. Humburg discussed that his Seconding of the Motion was on the general platform of YIMBY to promote affordable housing and the strategies.

- o. Ms. Bandes responded that she is ok with the proposal to promote a platform of YIMBY to promote affordable housing and further discuss specific strategies at future committee meetings.
- p. Ms. Bandes made a revised motion to promote the general platform of YIMBY to promote affordable housing and to further discuss specific strategies at future committee meetings. Mr. Humburg seconded the motion.
- q. Mr. DePugh had to leave. All other members present voted in favor of the motion.

7. Open Discussion/Questions/Comments/Announcements

- a. Chair Macdonald stated as anticipated in the agenda to discuss YIMBY and as a committee to move forward with its discussion at future meetings
- b. Chair Macdonald discussed that anything can be done to modify existing Zoom policy of only 1 person talking with all other being muted, so the committee can be more open for discussion as a group and that the persons on the committee are volunteers whose efforts should be considered.

8. Adjourn

- a. **Meeting adjourned at 4:50pm**