



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

Council Chambers  
City Hall

October 10, 2017  
Tuesday, 2:00 p.m.

*Approved as written 11/7/17*

MINUTES

**Present:** Robert "Bob" Carter, Chair  
Jeff Rogo, Vice Chair  
Keisha A. Bell  
Christopher "Chris" A. Burke  
Will Michaels  
Gwendolyn "Gwen" Reese  
Jeffery "Jeff" M. Wolf  
Lisa Wannemacher, Alternate  
Thomas "Tom" Whiteman, Alternate  
Sharon Winters, Alternate

**Commissioners Absent:** None <sup>1</sup> *excused*

**Staff Present:** Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation  
Larry Frey, Historic Preservationist II, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation  
Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist II, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation  
Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney  
Vicky Davidson, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Economic Development

The public hearing was called to order at 2:06 p.m., a quorum was present.

**I. OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIR AND SWEARING IN OF WITNESSES**

**II. ROLL CALL**

**III. MINUTES**

The minutes from the August 8, 2017 meeting were approved as written by a consensus vote.

**IV. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. City File HPC 17-90300003**

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

**Request:** Owner-initiated application for the designation of a local historic district to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places.

**Location:** The proposed district includes all parcels facing Seminole Park and roughly bounded by the alley between 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue North and 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North (northern boundary), the alley between 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North and Burlington Avenue North (southern boundary), rear (east) parcel lines of properties between the two above-described alleys (eastern boundary), and rear (west) parcel lines of properties between the two above-described alleys (western boundary).

**Staff Presentation**

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the staff report.

**Applicant Presentation**

Brenda Gordon, representing multiple owners, gave a PowerPoint presentation in support of the request.

**Public Hearing**

The following people spoke in favor on the request:

- Charla Cribb, 2218 8<sup>th</sup> Ave N and representing Historic Kenwood NA
- Earl Waters, 2901 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave N
- Darrell Gordon, 2934 Burlington Ave N and representing Historic Kenwood NA
- Elizabeth Sise, 2945 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave N
- Traci Boyle, 261 29<sup>th</sup> St N
- Linda Kellett, 242 30<sup>th</sup> St N and representing Historic Kenwood NA
- Laura McGrath, 2900 Burlington Ave N
- Howard Hansen, 3810 20<sup>th</sup> Ave N
- Peter Belmont, 102 Fareham Place N

**Cross Examination**

By City Administration

Waived

By Applicant

Waived

**Rebuttal/Closing Remarks**

By City Administration

Waived

By Applicant

Waived

**Executive Session**

Commissioner Wannemacher thanked the residents for coming out to speak so passionately and eloquently; she really enjoyed listening to their stories.

Commissioner Rogo asked about the two non-contributing properties (a building and a property). Ms. Duvekot explained that in one case the primary structure was demolished after fire damage in the 1980s before the National Register District was created and the existing structure is a garage apartment; the other non-contributing property had been altered with stylistic changes.

Commissioner Michaels added his congratulations to the neighborhood and staff for a very well-written report; he will support.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Michaels moved and Commissioner Rogo seconded a motion to approve the “Kenwood Section-Seminole Park” to be designated as a local historic district to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places in accordance with the staff report.*

**VOTE:** *YES – Bell, Burke, Michaels, Rogo, Wolf, Wannemacher, Carter*  
*NO – None*

*Motion passed by a vote of 7 to 0.*

*Note: Commissioner Wolf was recused from the following item (HPC 17-90300004) due to a conflict.*

**B. City File HPC 17-90300004** **Contact Person: Larry Frey, 892-5470**  
**Request:** Owner-initiated application for the designation of a local historic district to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places.

**Location:** The proposed district includes all parcels roughly bounded by the south half of the alley between 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast and 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast (northern boundary), the north half of the alley between 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast and 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast (southern boundary), east parcel lines of properties facing Oak Street Northeast between the two above-described alleys (eastern boundary), and west parcel lines of properties facing Bay Street Northeast between the two above-described alleys (western boundary).

**Staff Presentation**

Larry Frey gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the staff report.

**Applicant Presentation**

Zoe Wilkinson and Robin Reed, representing multiple owners, spoke in support of the request.

**Public Hearing**

The following people spoke in favor of the request:

Charleen McGrath, 376 18<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

Howard Hansen, 3810 20<sup>th</sup> Ave N  
Peter Belmont, 102 Fareham Place N  
Emily Elwyn, 836 16<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and representing St. Petersburg Preservation  
Kimberly Wolfe, 600 1<sup>st</sup> St N

Dr. Frey addressed district size by stating that there are no precise formulas or definitions for how large or small a district can be; the National Register of Standards suggest that they be clearly definable areas and this is how staff looks at it.

Three email messages in support were received and distributed to the Commission Members prior to the meeting.

**Cross Examination**

By City Administration

Waived

By Applicant

Waived

**Rebuttal/Closing Remarks**

By City Administration

Waived

By Applicant

Waived

**Executive Session**

Commissioner Burke asked how a non-contributing structure in a district is treated differently than a contributing structure (i.e. alterations, additions, etc.). Mr. Kilborn explained that when a resident applies for a COA, a chart outlining the procedure of review is referenced which could be from “no review at all,” to “staff review,” and in the most significant cases a “public hearing review by the CPPC.” For non-contributing resources, staff can be more flexible in keeping it to staff review or no review required.

Commissioner Michaels congratulated the neighborhood for an excellent application; he will support the request.

Commissioner Wannemacher thanked Ms. Elwyn for her comment of large, unsympathetic new homes just suck away the value and integrity of a historic district; a very sensitive, properly designed new home on maybe an empty lot can, in fact, contribute to the value of a historic district.

Commission Chair Carter stated that it seems that the passion of residents of smaller districts is much greater and thanked them and staff for a good job.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Michaels moved and Commissioner Rogo seconded to approve the “North Shore Section-200 Block of 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast” to be designated as a local historic district to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places in accordance with the staff report.*

**VOTE:** *YES – Bell, Burke, Michaels, Rogo, Wannemacher, Whiteman, Carter  
NO – None*

*Motion passed by a vote of 7 to 0.*

*Note: Commissioners Winters and Wolf were recused from the following item (HPC 17-90200031) due conflicts.*

**C. City File COA 17-90200031**

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

**Request:** Certificate of Appropriateness approval for the demolition of a contributing property to the “North Shore Section – 700 Block of 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast Local Historic District” and to the “North Shore National Register Historic District,” located at 736 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast.

**Staff Presentation**

Laura Duvkot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the staff report.

One email message from a resident outside of the district and one letter from St. Petersburg Preservation were received in opposition of the request and were distributed to the Commissioners prior to the meeting.

**Applicant Presentation**

Don Mastry representing the owner, Richard McGinniss, spoke in support of the request.

**Public Hearing**

The following people spoke in opposition of the request:

Robin Reed, 705 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and representing Historic Old Northeast NA  
Peter Belmont, 102 Fareham Place N and representing St. Petersburg Preservation  
Emily Elwyn, 836 16<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and representing St. Petersburg Preservation  
Kendall Reid, 806 18<sup>th</sup> Ave NE  
Howard Hansen, 3810 20<sup>th</sup> Ave N was not present but submitted a card against

The following people spoke in support of the request:

William (Britt) Cobb, 726 18<sup>th</sup> Ave NE  
Joe Toph, 5006 S. Elberon St  
Dr. Donna Jamieson, 736 18<sup>th</sup> Ave NE  
Arnie Cummings, 715 18<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

**Cross Examination**

By City Administration

Waived

By Applicant

Waived

**Rebuttal/Closing Remarks**

By City Administration

Mr. Kilborn pointed out that the comment made earlier inferring that removal of the particular structure would not negate the district's overall significance is an opinion and not a statement of fact based on how staff evaluates whether properties and districts are contributing or non-contributing. Mr. Kilborn went on to say that more importantly in one of the comments there was a characterization of a comment from Rick Dunn, the City's Building Official and who was not present to respond which quoted "that he concurred with the report content." There is a lot of content in this report that goes beyond just an evaluation of numbers and Mr. Kilborn wanted to be clear that in the Building Official's email, what he referred to or stated was "estimates provided appeared to be accurate and fair."

By Applicant

Mr. Mastry stated that the quote he read from Rick Dunn was in the staff report; he did not have the email. Mr. Mastry stated again that the applicant is agreeable to having the house approved prior to demolition, to show evidence of financing and is agreeable to a time limit. Mr. Mastry then outlined the loss of economic feasibility if the house remains; it is not livable. Comments from pages 5, 6, 7, 8 and 12 of the staff report were cited in support of the request.

**Executive Session**

Commissioner Burke stated that raising the current house is not feasible and with the replacement of all of the damaged infrastructure you are ending up with a new house anyway.

Commissioner Wannemacher referred to one of the articles (written by Emily Elwyn) within the supporting documentation submitted with the COA request citing the following statements: However, we should not expect desirable neighborhoods to be stagnant with no new development. A well-designed contemporary house can be compatible with our neighborhoods' evolving character if it has the same scale, mass and relative size as its neighbor. Commissioner Wannemacher went on to say that she would not really recognize the existing home as having inherently good design and believes that the new home is a sympathetic and a very appropriate infill design solution. It is not very fair to deny the existing homeowners the opportunity to live in this neighborhood surrounded by very supportive neighbors.

Commissioner Michaels voiced his agreement that the cost of rehabilitation versus the cost of demolition should be taken into consideration, and it is clear that serious work needs to be done to rehabilitate this particular home. He asked staff to briefly summarize why this house should be saved. Ms. Duvekot stated that this house

is a contributing resource to the district; it does have issues with individual integrity but its design and relationship to the district, as a whole, does make it contributing.

Commissioner Michaels asked if an inspection was done when the house was originally purchased and were the findings the same as what is being presented today. Mr. McGinniss, owner, stated that he did have an inspection but did not care; he bought the house to tear-down because that is the only thing that can be done with it. He has personally renovated six historical homes and if this house could be renovated with any sense, he would do it; the house has no structural integrity. Mr. McGinniss reiterated that he will work with staff and the neighbors to come up with the best design for this neighborhood.

Commissioner Michaels asked the applicant about the statements (cited) on pages 14 and 15 of the application relating to the assessed value of the property. Mr. McGinniss stated that the issue is that the market is not going to realize the amount of money it would cost to rehab this house; the market will see a 1,900 sq. ft. house with 8-foot ceilings along with other dysfunctional issues associated with the floorplan. Mr. McGinniss went on to say that the house was on the market for two months and people did not want to buy it because of what was involved.

Commissioner Rogo stated that he believes that they are facing a possibility of demolition by prohibitive cost to renovate (not demolition by neglect); there will likely be continued deterioration of the home because it does not make economic sense to renovate as well as facing the likelihood of a rental in the home which is a condition that no one really wants – question of looking at a preservation of a property or a preservation of a neighborhood. The applicant wants to live the neighborhood in a home that fits the neighborhood and because the applicant is agreeable to the staff's condition, he supports the COA for demolition.

Commissioner Whiteman asked if they could grant the COA contingent upon the approval of plans and permitting to the scale and size of Exhibit "M" and acknowledge that the elevation will be higher, and subject to either a bond or mortgage approval to go along with the approved plans. Mr. Dema noted that there will have to be another COA for new construction which will come before the CPPC. A motion to condition the demolition on approval of those plans would solidify the sequence of events that the code says we have to do.

Commissioner Whiteman asked if a motion can be made contingent on a COA for the new construction to which Mr. Dema replied, yes. Mr. Dema stated that essentially the COA for demolition would be conditioned on the granting of the COA for the new construction at an interim point before the demolition could occur.

Commissioner Reese understands that they have no objections from residents within the historic district and that the current owners are very willing to comply with all of the conditions so they can live in this neighborhood. She does agree that they may be setting a precedence as well as preparing for future situations that are similar but does not think it should be at the expense of these owners. She will support the COA.

**MOTION:**

*Commissioner Michaels moved and Commissioner Rogo seconded to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a contributing property to a local historic district upon the condition that a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction be approved and a complete set of drawings for a building permit be submitted prior to the demolition permit is granted.*

**VOTE:**                    **YES – Bell, Burke, Michaels, Reese, Rogo, Wannemacher, Carter**  
                                  **NO – None**

*Motion passed by a vote of 7 to 0.*

**V. CPPC MEMBER/STAFF COMMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS**

No comments/announcements

**VI. ADJOURN**

With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 4:48 p.m.