



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

**Council Chambers
City Hall**

**March 13, 2018
Tuesday, 2:00 p.m.**

Approved as written 5/8/18

MINUTES

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

Commissioners Absent: Jeff Rogo, Vice Chair¹
Jeffery "Jeff" M. Wolf¹ ¹*excused*

Staff Present: Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist II, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Luis Teba, Planner II, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Heather Judd, Assistant City Attorney
Vicky Davidson, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Economic Development

The public hearing was called to order at 2:07 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 February 13, 2018 meeting were approved as written by a consensus vote.

IV. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARING

Note: The following item was a continuation from the February 13, 2018 meeting and the process began with the 3-minute public hearing portion. Commissioner Winters was recused due to a conflict.

A. City File COA 17-90200047

Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451

Request: Approval of Certificate of Appropriateness for new residential construction located at 736 18th Avenue Northeast in the North Shore Section – 700 Block of 18th Avenue Northeast Local Historic District.

Public Hearing

City Administration – Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the addendum to the staff report. Two letters and one e-mail message were received in opposition and were distributed to the Commissioners prior to the meeting.

Applicant – Don Mastry, Attorney representing the property owner, Richard McGinniss, gave a presentation of the changes made to the new construction in response to the concerns of the neighbors.

Registered Opponent – Dr. Britt Cobb gave a PowerPoint presentation in opposition of the request. Copies of the presentation were distributed to the Commissioners.

The following people spoke in favor of the request:

Don Cooper, 102 S 12th St, Tampa and representing the applicant

Richard McGinniss, property owner

Dr. Donna Jamieson, property owner

The following people spoke in opposition of the request with concerns about character, size, mass, and scale:

Doug Gillespie, 145 10th Ave N

Ward Boston, 745 18th Ave NE and representing 700 Block of 18th Avenue NE LHD

Kim Cromwell, 706 18th Ave NE

Elizabeth Skidmore, 746 18th Ave NE

Joe Reed, 705 16th Ave NE

Mary Dowd, 205 8th Ave NE

Charlotte Meaders, 515 11th Ave NE

Catherine Landstrom, 515 11th Ave NE

Emily Elwyn, 836 16th Ave NE and representing Preserve the Burg

Peter Belmont, 102 Fareham Pl N and representing Preserve the Burg

Robin Reed, 705 16th Ave NE and representing Historic Old Northeast NA

Matthew Grecsek, 756 18th Ave NE

John Barie, 2121 1st St NE

Catherine Cobb, 726 18th Ave NE

Mary Anne Boston, 745 18th Ave NE and representing 700 Block 18th Avenue NE LHD (declined to speak)

Executive Session

Commissioner Michaels cited a paragraph from page 21 of the staff report “The proposed dwelling contains two 2-story spaces. As referenced earlier... So, setting a benchmark of comparison remains difficult.” He then asked staff to speak further to this last point. Derek Kilborn explained that when referring to a benchmark there is no current metric for staff to compare measurements of volume using existing structures in the neighborhood. What we have are building setbacks and floor area ratio measurements but no comparable list of volume measurements that staff could bring forward to the CPPC. Staff knows that this is an important issue to be considered relating to the CPPC’s decision.

Commissioner Michaels asked if staff sees it as being relevant to the compatibility standard. Mr. Kilborn stated that it is certainly something to consider when comparing the proposed structure to the existing structures. City staff went through the analysis when they looked at the structures in the block. It was noted at the last hearing that there are larger structures to the east and to the north that staff felt were comparable and came to the determination that it met the minimum criteria necessary for staff to recommend approval.

Commissioner Wannemacher asked for confirmation if the CAD model prepared by the opponents utilized the amended modified building design and not the previous design, to which Ms. Duvekot confirmed.

Commissioner Reese asked why there was a disparity between what was presented by the applicant versus what was presented by the opponents. Mr. Kilborn stated that the opponent of this application indicated to staff that they were using a list of numbers provided by the applicant for their graphics and those numbers were prepared by a surveyor and certified with a surveyor stamp.

Commissioner Reese asked if City staff had verified the documentation from the engineers and architects submitted by the owners. Mr. Kilborn stated that he believes the disparity is much tighter this month than last month. In terms of building heights, there were two different measurements taken; the surveyor was sent by the applicant to obtain those numbers and certified with a surveyor’s stamp. Separately, City staff went out with a laser-measuring tool to record each of the building heights and the outcome was very similar to what the surveyor provided on their certified document; no discrepancy seen. There was a minor discrepancy in the three-dimensional modeling presented by the opponent which occurred at the peak of the roof looking at that particular street façade. Otherwise, the numbers are very close.

Commissioner Whiteman asked about the 343 square footage of the carport. Ms. Duvekot explained that the carport square footage is not included in the numbers and one of the recommended conditions does express that this area is to remain open.

Commission Chair Carter commented that the carport does contribute to the mass of the building and the open 2-story spaces does make the building look much larger although the FAR does not change; it is a legitimate argument. He went on to say that he believes the applicant has tried very diligently to meet a lot of these requirements that have been imposed. He found the carport issue very interesting and feels that this may be a way to reach a compromise.

Commissioner Wannemacher stated her support of the design and has no problem with the building height or actual street elevation but does have a concern with the carport calling for a gypsum wallboard ceiling which is the same material called for the garage; the gypsum wallboard ceiling is not an exterior material but an interior finish material. A typical carport seen in the Historic Old Northeast neighborhood is an appendage (attached) to

the edge of the volume, it does not have a second floor above it as proposed in this application, and it really adds to the mass. A proposed building in a local historic district should be held to a higher standard.

Commissioner Michaels stated that he felt progress has been made but is concerned about the volume, and feels that the scale, mass and volume should be considered. The City code states that new construction in a historic district should have visual compatibility and the resolution passed last year states that the design of the new buildings should be compatible in scale, size, etc. He feels that these regulations give adequate emphasis to volume and scale, and he will vote against the application.

MOTION: *Commissioner Michaels moved and Commissioner Whiteman seconded a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for new residential construction located at 736 18th Avenue Northeast in the North Shore Section-700 Block of 18th Avenue Northeast Local Historic District with the conditions of approval in accordance with the staff report.*

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

Motion failed by a vote of 7 to 0.

V. CPPC MEMBER/STAFF COMMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. **Information:** Driftwood Neighborhood Local Historic District Application and Demolition Request for 2700 Driftwood Road South.

Derek Kilborn explained that there are two issues; (1) There is an active application to designate Driftwood as a Local Historic District with the ballot process certified as meeting the minimum threshold. The neighborhood has submitted the required narrative as well as the fee; the Driftwood application has been deemed complete. There were four properties on the west end that were excluded from the proposed district boundary with the Gandy House (aka the Mullett Farm property) at 2700 Driftwood Rd S. (2) There was a demolition permit that was submitted on December 21st. After reviewing the material, staff determined that the application was incomplete. Then the entity representing the owner went back to obtain the information they needed for the application to be deemed complete; specifically, to include a site plan application which is required to be submitted to the zoning office for review at the same time the demolition permit is requested due to this address being on the Potentially Eligible List of Properties for Designation. Once the application was deemed complete, a letter of notification was sent to the registry of contacts who have requested notice of all demolition requests on potentially eligible properties; that starts the 30-day clock which expires 5:00 p.m. Friday, March 23rd with the demolition permit released on Monday, March 26th.

Commission Chair Carter asked about the location of the four properties excluded from the application. Mr. Kilborn explained that the four properties are west of the north-south connection of Driftwood before it comes around the corner and goes east.

Heather Judd stated that there is a completed application for the district, so any discussion or questions related to the district will need to wait until that public hearing. The Gandy House, which is not included in the district application, is the discussion for today.

Commissioner Michaels stated that he had asked on February 26th to have the Gandy House put on today's agenda for consideration of some type of action on it. This property is on the Potentially Eligible List for landmarking because of the association of George Gandy (Gandy Bridge, Le Plaza Theater) and the home has significant architecture. He feels that consideration should be given to designating this property as a local landmark.

Ms. Judd explained that if the Commission takes a vote in support of the motion, then it will be noted to City Council at the time if or when an application is submitted.

Commissioner Michaels stated that his motion is for City Council to consider initiating a landmark application; it should at least be considered due to its significance. We are dealing with the clock; March 23rd is the deadline which is before the Commission meets again.

MOTION: *Commissioner Michaels moved that the Commission recommend to City Council that consideration be given to initiating a landmark application for the Gandy House*

The motion died due to lack of a second.

B. Report: March 22, 2018 Committee Meeting Demo-by-Neglect Report.

Commission Chair Carter outlined the meeting attended by him, Commissioners Michaels and Winters, as City staff. Commissioner Michaels spoke with Chris Steinocher with the Chamber of Commerce regarding the Potentially Eligible List and staff's effort to update the listing several months ago; this has sat on the table for some time. One of the issues constantly being dealt with is a balance between preservation and development; how to protect the historical significant assets of the City and at the same time allow for reasonable and responsible development within the City. The response from Mr. Steinocher was very positive; he is very sensitive about the importance of the City's character and landmarks, and sees the utility of the Potentially Eligible Listing as a tool for preservation in our community. According to Commissioner Michaels, Mr. Steinocher stated that what the business community is looking for is certainty so if there is a new enterprise within the community looking at a site, they will know up front if it is a high priority for possible future landmarking; it would be very helpful to the development of the community to have that certainty. Commissioner Michaels stated his optimism of getting to a better place than where they are now with both the demo-by-neglect and the Potentially Eligible List. Another meeting was suggested.

The new structure in Granada Terrace with concern of the depth of the muttons profile: All future cases will consist of not only reference to the 3-diminsional exterior muttons but will also include more specific detail about the profile dimensions.

The Melrose Clubhouse located on the Melrose School property: The Melrose School is being redeveloped and staff has reached out to the architectural firm to let them know the importance of the building and the City has information that could be helpful to them. The new school site and building orientation and design has been

completed and the proposal includes to retain and preserve the Clubhouse, and to incorporate it into the school's programming.

The YMCA building is continuing to be monitored through the Codes Compliance office and the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division. From time to time, the UPHP Division also receives inquiries from individuals and entities who are interested in acquiring ownership of the property for renovation or partnering with the current owner; City staff forwards each inquiry to the current property owner. With regard to demo-by-neglect, Commissioner Winters asked to have a report sent via email by the end of the month to the CPPC of the building's condition; particularly about the structural integrity, condition of the roof, and if the building is secured. Mr. Kilborn stated that a staff member from Historic Preservation along with a Codes Compliance staff member can perform a walk-through and will provide an itemized list of the maintenance issues they normally look for.

Ms. Judd stated that, as part of a larger process, the owner's permission is needed before Codes Compliance can enter a building or to have an administrative order from a judge which are usually based on prior codes compliance cases. If there are conditions relative to the building observed by Codes Compliance, a demolition case through Codes would have to be initiated.

The possibility of using a drone to survey the condition of a roof was asked. Ms. Judd stated that drone regulations are first governed by Federal regulations and then by State regulations, and they are becoming a bit tighter about where you can and cannot fly drones. Codes Compliance does not have a drone.

VI. ADJOURN

With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.