



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

**Council Chambers  
City Hall**

**May 8, 2018  
Tuesday, 2:00 p.m.**

*Approved as written 7/10/18*

**MINUTES**

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

**Commissioners Absent:** Keisha A. Bell<sup>1</sup>  
Sharon Winters, Alternate<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> *excused*

**Staff Present:** Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation  
Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist II, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation  
Robyn Keefe, Planner II, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation  
Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney  
Heather Judd, Assistant City Attorney  
Vicky Davidson, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Economic Development

The public hearing was called to order at 2:03 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 March 13, 2018 meeting were approved as written by a consensus vote.

#### IV. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARING

**A. City File HPC 18-90300001**

**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 bounded by 20<sup>th</sup> Street North to the east, 22<sup>nd</sup> Street North to the west, the alley between 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North and Burlington Avenue North to the south, and the alley between 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North and Dartmouth Avenue North to the north.

#### Staff Presentation

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

#### Applicant Presentation

Brenda Gordon gave a PowerPoint presentation in support of the request.

#### Public Hearing

The following people spoke in support of the request:

Earl Waters, 2901 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave N

Maria Herrera, 2058 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave N

Brenda Gordon, 2934 Burlington Ave N

James Woodfield, 2253 Central Ave, #105

Bob Jeffrey, 2302 1<sup>st</sup> Ave N

Mary Jo Baker, 2225 4<sup>th</sup> Ave N and representing Historic Kenwood NA Artist Enclave

Caryn Nesmith, 2059 Burlington Ave N

Laura McGrath, 2900 Burlington Ave N

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

John Stewart, 2130 Burlington Ave N

Joel Rhodes, 2120 4<sup>th</sup> Ave N

Arwen Saxon, 2135 & 2143 Burlington Ave N

Madeline Gulliver, 2027 Burlington Ave N

#### Closing Remarks

Derek Kilborn stated that this is a great opportunity to say that every small contribution from a resident in a neighborhood has a long meaningful arc over time. This process today began over 20 years ago with individual investments by people who resides in that neighborhood and those investments grew to become what was a National Register designation in the early 2000s and lead up to this process that we have to consider today. So, never discount how small your contribution is to the neighborhood. He also complimented the applicants who have done an exceptional job organizing this effort on the way they have put this application together; it will be a model for other neighborhood associations to follow as well as a model for staff to refer to. Finally, in reference to the encouragement of City Council to City-initiate future applications by Peter Belmont, he acknowledged the Historic Preservation staff, Laura Duvekot and Larry Frey, who continue to provide assistance on each of these applications and help the residents understand the general designation process as well as the possible outcomes.

**Executive Session**

Commissioner Rogo asked if the approval of today's designation will diminish the ability of other districts within the Historic Kenwood neighborhood to bring forward similar applications and wanting to avoid an

enclave within Historic Kenwood that would have a greater number of new structures than historic structures. Ms. Duvekot stated that she did not believe so; there is a procedure for expansion of Local Historic Districts and there is no concentration large enough in Historic Kenwood that would create such a challenge.

Commissioner Rogo stated that he would like to see the entire Kenwood neighborhood designated but does understand the challenges; he would like to find a way to help the neighborhood get there.

Commissioner Michaels stated that he would like to see the entire Kenwood neighborhood designated as a Local Historic District and understands the difficulties; he feels that the policy issues need to be addressed. He congratulated all for their efforts in this process; very aspiring and a terrific achievement.

Commissioner Burke asked how small a district can be. Mr. Kilborn stated that staff has had that discussion with City Council and currently they are comfortable with the criteria in place already. He believes that a lot of that was influenced by a recent application of Mediterranean Row in the Old Northeast neighborhood on 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue. That was clearly an example where half of the block made sense and if any minimums were in place, which would have prevented that application from being considered.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Reese moved and Commissioner Michaels seconded a motion to approve the designation of Southeast Kenwood Local Historic District to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places in accordance with the staff report.*

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

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

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

**B. City File COA 18-90200016 Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451**

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

**Staff Presentation**

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the staff report. Seven email messages in opposition to the request were received and forwarded to the Commissioners prior to the meeting.

**Applicant Presentation**

Don Mastry, attorney and representing the owner/applicant, Richard McGinniss gave a presentation in support of the request.

**Opponent Presentation**

Dr. W.T. (Britt) Cobb, Jr. gave a PowerPoint presentation in opposition of the request.

**Public Hearing**

The following people spoke in favor of the request:

Arnold Cummings, 715 18<sup>th</sup> Ave NE  
Dr. Donna Jamieson, 763 18<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

The following people spoke in opposition of the request:

Teresa Cromwell, 706 18<sup>th</sup> Ave NE  
Mary Dowd, 205 8<sup>th</sup> Ave NE  
Ward Boston III, 745 18<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and representing 700 Block of 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE LHD  
Matthew Grecsek, 756 18<sup>th</sup> Ave NE  
Emily Elwyn, 836 16<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and representing Preserve the Burg  
Robin Reed, 705 16<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and representing Historic Old Northeast NA  
David Skidmore, 746 18<sup>th</sup> Ave NE  
Joe Reed, 705 16<sup>th</sup> Ave NE  
John Barie, 2121 1<sup>st</sup> St NE  
MJ Robinson, 705 18<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

**Cross Examination****By Administration:**

Waived

**By Opponent:**

Where are the additional front yard or additional setback in the plans that were presented to the City by the applicant? Mr. McGinniss answered that they are approximately 2 ½ feet back from the average setback. Their setbacks from both the front and alley are less than the setbacks of the adjacent house as well as with zoning.

How long have you owned the property and how long have you lived there and when you moved away? Mr. Mastry answered that the property was purchased in April 2015 and Mr. McGinniss stated that they have lived there ever since and has never moved.

Why is there a code violation as of Wednesday stating “not owner occupied?” Mr. McGinniss was unable to explain. Heather Judd explained that she had pulled up the code cases and found a violation letter was sent and was marked as non-owner occupied. If no contact is made with the ownership then the codes investigator will go to the Property Appraisers website and look for a homestead designation. At this time Mr. McGinniss is not claiming homestead but it does not necessarily mean that he does not reside there, only that they were not able to confirm.

**By Applicant:**

It was stated that this house which was submitted this last time is taller than the other houses that had been submitted; is this correct? Ms. Duvekot answered that the house in the current plans appear to be about one (1) foot taller than the house plans submitted in March but, overall, has decreased from the plans submitted earlier.

By four (4) feet? Ms. Duvekot answered that she believes so, yes.

Have you confirmed the square footage of the proposed house? Ms. Duvekot answered, yes.

Is it consistent with what is in the staff report? Ms. Duvekot asked with the house or with the parcel because there was a discrepancy with the parcel which she had confirmed; the site plan provided by the applicant has the parcel as 54.22 feet by 110.08 feet which is different from the Property Appraisers office.

Did you compute the FAR? Ms. Duvekot answered, yes.

Did you compute the floor area ratio of the house? Ms. Duvekot answered, yes.

And, what is the amount in the staff report? Ms. Duvekot answered it was consistent with what was submitted, .595.

Mr. Cobb stated that there was 3,800 square feet in the house and that is not the number listed in the staff report; what is it? Ms. Duvekot answered 3,551 square feet.

3,551 including the garage, is that correct? Ms. Duvekot answered that is correct.

And the livable area is 3,092 square feet? Ms. Duvekot answered she believed so; the garage is 459 square feet, so, yes.

Did you compute the impervious surface? Ms. Duvekot answered, no, not specifically. I computed the first floor ground coverage.

That's ok that you didn't. It was just said it was 67% and wondered if that number was verified. Ms. Duvekot stated that that was not a calculation made by her.

If any of the numbers in the application are incorrect and if the COA is granted, they will have no leeway to increase those numbers. They have to be what was sent forth in the application and in the staff report, don't they? Ms. Duvekot answered, yes.

Without getting a variance? Ms. Duvekot answered, yes.

No variance has been asked for, has there? Ms. Duvekot answered that there was a setback variance.

On the setback, but no variance as to the application before you? Ms. Duvekot answered that's correct.

A big deal was made about them asking for an FAR that is not permitted in the NT-3 district, saying it should be 40 and not .6. Is it not .6 with bonuses? Ms. Duvekot answered, yes.

**Rebuttal / Closing Remarks****By Administration:**

Derek Kilborn stated that there is some subjectivity with this process which is the nature of historic preservation, itself; it is not unique to the City of St. Petersburg. When a similar application was brought before the CPPC in March, the focus of that discussion was the mass and scale of the building, and it was particularly focused on the rear portion of that building and the two-story section that was proposed there; the carport and the open air space on the second level of the front portion of the house. Following that unanimous decision against the application and based on the substance of that conversation, the applicant made amendments to the building that they are proposing for this site and are back here today. The applicant, in staff's opinion, has addressed those two major concerns; they have eliminated the second floor air space from the front portion of the building and the rear two-story portion has been removed and changed to a single story addition, and the carport that was subject to some controversy has been removed completely from the application. Staff believes that the applicant has directly responded to the nature of the discussion with the CPPC at the March hearing.

You have also heard today about floor area ratio with a number of speakers talking about the open air walkway suggesting that it should be included in the FAR consideration. Staff disagrees; this is not what the code directs staff to do in terms of calculating FARs and it is staff's opinion that this is no different than a covered porch or patio that might exist on other properties in this District or throughout the City, itself.

There was a reference to a corner house at 756 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and it is correct that the lot dimension had changed during the timeline for this application; the lot was originally 6,000 square feet and is still represented this way in the Property Appraisers website, but there was recently a vacation of a portion of the right-of-way which has added approximately 800 square feet to that lot. The FAR number for that particular property that had been presented is consistent with what existed at the time when the District was established and at the time the discussion about the subject property began.

In regards to impervious surface ratio, the applicant has not asked for a variance so the approval today for a COA, if given, does not grant the property owner the right to violate the impervious surface ratio; they still need to show compliance at the time of permitting providing evidence to that effect.

In regards to the builder, photos were shown of very contemporary-style buildings; most know that this particular applicant develops a contemporary-style house throughout other portions of the City and the fact that this particular application is much more traditional in style and outside of the normal character of what this particular applicant constructs, staff thinks this demonstrates that the applicant has tried to respond to the concerns that have been expressed related to traditional architecture in the historic neighborhoods. The motivations of the applicant/builder and whether or not he lives there are not considerations of staff when evaluating the application and should not be considered by the CPPC when making their decision.

And, finally Mr. Kilborn wanted to address one of the quotes heard today, "The validity of the Local Historic District process is being tested." He does agree with that statement and believes that this particular application, given the builder's history of contemporary-style architecture demonstrated that the Local Historic District process is working. He further cautioned that this opinion does go both ways. As we go forward, staff needs to be able to go out to neighborhoods and present to them reasons why they should consider becoming a Local Historic District; their job becomes much more difficult when cases such as this one are perhaps denied when there was an opportunity to approve.

**By Opponent:**

Dr. Cobb gave a PowerPoint presentation depicting the current conditions of the subject property which are the concerns of the neighbors (dead lawn, dying grapefruit tree, front yard mud pit from parked cars, shrubs growing over the door & windows, blocking sidewalk with parked car; debris in the alley and garbage in the front of the house which prompted a call to the Codes Dept., pool is green with screens ripped out causing a major mosquito problem). He feels that this is a demolition by neglect scenario and new construction should be held to a higher standard for an historic district; the proposed house is still too big in mass and scale for this neighborhood. No efforts have been made by the applicant to try to match the character of the neighborhood but has made every effort to try to maximize zoning FARs. Approving this application would be precedent-setting for all of the historic districts in St. Petersburg; the applicant should be denied.

**By Applicant:**

Mr. Mastry used the doc camera showing charts comparing the FAR, livable square footage, footprint and height of the proposed building to the surrounding houses and how the proposed building falls within the middle range. The house will have to be elevated to meet FEMA requirements; FEMA does not grant waivers. Mr. Mastry then read a quote from an article by Emily Elwyn with Preserve the Burg, entitled Preserving the Character of the Old Northeast, "However, we should not expect desirable neighborhoods to be stagnate with no new development. Modern style infill homes can and should be built in a neighborhood and, if well built, not take away from our historic character. 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 neighbors. These homes are clearly contemporary but use an architectural vocabulary that mimic the surrounding structures." The article then gives two examples of which the applicant is the builder to which Ms. Elwyn is complimenting. The proposed structure is a Monterey home of which there are several in the Old Northeast area. The proposed building is within the range; not the biggest nor the smallest and is visually compatible. Mr. McGinniss has offered the neighbors to meet with his architect, Don Cooper, to tell him what they want and the response was no, let the City decide. This building falls within the perimeters with staff's agreement.

**Executive Session**

Mr. Kilborn pointed out that the height dimensions that were presented in the table were different from the table in the staff report. A number of the neighboring properties were represented in the 35-foot range and the their table has them at 27ish range, and that goes to the disparity between base flood elevation line and how they measure height versus physical height from the ground.

Commissioner Whiteman asked for an explanation of the FAR bonus the applicant is receiving and why. The following reasons for the bonus were given by Ms. Duvekot: (1) for reduction of the height of both the peak and roof line of a two-story building from the maximum allowed height; (2) style, materials and detailing consistent with an architectural style in St. Petersburg's Design Guidelines for Historic Properties; (3) planting of larger shade trees behind the front façade and the curb; and (4) solar ready.

Commissioner Michaels asked if staff has any disagreement with the accuracy of the CAD schematics presented by Dr. Cobb, to which Ms. Duvekot replied, no.

Commissioner Rogo asked about criteria #12 (The new construction shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the

local landmark and its environment or the local landmark district.) Ms. Duvekot stated that she interprets this to mean compatibility with the remaining contributing properties within the district as opposed to recreating the existing property.

Commissioner Reese voiced her concern regarding the timing of the purchase; the applicant had purchased the subject property prior to the area being designated as a Local Historic District. She does not believe that approving the request would set a precedence due to the timing of the purchase; consideration should be given to the proposal.

Commissioner Wannemacher stated that there was a lot of opposition to the character or style of the proposed home which she believes is not relevant because many of the Kenwood residents voiced how the diversity of architectural styles adds to the character of the neighborhood. Architectural styles really should be embraced; this home is being built in 2018 and not in 1927. The diversity of architectural styles adds to the character of the neighborhoods. She thinks that the proposed home has the qualities (design with good proportion, compatible style, has character, and has overall visual appeal) for the District. Her concerns with the prior proposal have been addressed and the applicant has made strides toward reducing the overall impact of the home, especially in the back.

Commission Chair Carter stated that he had walked the block and the homes on either side of the proposed new home are considerable; really significant mass. The City had rendered a very positive report with a limited amount of conditions which he thinks are very thoughtful; City staff has brought them true and accurate information. In this case, he feels that the owner has bent over backwards to get this job done. The proposed home is a handsome representation, done by a quality architect from Tampa who understands historic structures, and have met every hoop that they have been asked to jump.

Commissioner Michaels voiced his difficulty with the COA request; he agrees with one of the speakers pertaining to the vague element within the criteria and feels it could be tightened up; maybe there should be some specific address to the FAR issue. He was hoping that the parties would be able to work out their differences and come to some kind of agreement; unfortunately, that has not happened. His concern is with the visual compatibility of what is being proposed. He is not concern with the style; he feels that a number of steps have been taken to improve upon. However, it is the scale and mass that he is having difficulty with and will vote against.

Commissioner Burke asked staff if they had considered size and scale before they made their recommendation. Ms. Duvekot answered that they were a primary part of the recommendation.

Commissioner Burke asked staff if they considered this higher standard for an historic district when making that recommendation. Ms. Duvekot stated that this smaller District is somewhat of a challenge because there is a variety of homes with different sizes and architectural styles within it versus a district that is primarily one style (e.g. craftsman) which make the direction more obvious. That is why staff compared the numbers of the FAR and square footage to ensure the proposed house falls within the range.

Commissioner Burke asked if the impervious surface issue will be taken care of during the permitting process, to which Ms. Duvekot replied, yes.

Commissioner Burke stated that with the reliance of City staff's recommendation and with what he has heard today, he is voting in favor of moving this forward.

Derek Kilborn clarified the prior reference to exemptions pertaining to FEMA and base flood elevation line. When improvements are being made to buildings that are below the base flood elevation line, there is a threshold value beyond which the building has to be brought into compliance, including elevating that structure up to meet the base flood elevation line. Where this is most seen is along the waterfront and explains why most small homes along the waterfront are torn down and replaced with three-story buildings due the cost of elevating. When dealing with historic districts, there is an exemption in place to that threshold value (e.g. If making renovations or improvements to an individual local landmark or contributing resource to a local historic district, there is an exemption where if the value of those improvements exceed the threshold, you are not required to elevate the structure and come into compliance with the base flood elevation line.). Some of those exemptions do not carry forward to tear-down/rebuild when there is new construction; new construction has to comply.

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

**VOTE:** *YES – Burke, Reese, Rogo, Wannemacher, Whiteman, Carter  
NO – Michaels*

*Motion passed by a vote of 6 to 1.*

**D. City File FLUM-51**

**Contact Person: Derek Kilborn, 893-7872**

**Location:** The subject property, estimated to be 2.38 acres in size, is located at 5908 4<sup>th</sup> Street North.

**Request:** A private application to amend the Future Land Use Map designation from Residential Medium to Planned Redevelopment Mixed-Use and the Official Zoning Map designation from NSM-1 (Neighborhood Suburban Multi-Family-1) to CCS-1 (Corridor Commercial Suburban-1), or other less intensive use.

**Staff Presentation**

Derek Kilborn gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the staff report.

**Applicant Presentation**

Marilyn Healy, Attorney and Kyle Hehenberger with ARC3 Architecture, both representing the client, LA Fitness, gave a presentation in support of the request. Informational packets were distributed to the Commissioners prior to the hearing.

**Public Hearing**

No speakers present.

**Executive Session**

Commissioner Rogo asked if it is a two-story parking structure. Mr. Hehenberger answered that it will be three stories with staggered floors.

Commissioner Wannemacher stated the proposed design is an improvement over what is there now; much nicer. She then asked if any of the parking spaces will be available for the public or adjacent businesses. Ms. Healey stated that they would be open to shared parking.

Commissioner Wannemacher asked about the architectural aesthetics of the parking garage. Mr. Hehenberger stated that their current intent is to have more of a panelized architecture around the perimeter to coordinate with the proposed building structure. He is aware of the City's requirements for structured parking and how it relates to the adjacent proposed building design.

Commissioner Michaels commended the applicant and staff pertaining to the covenant that was established to maintain the current density on this site in the future as well as the sensitivity expressed regarding the neighbors and neighborhood association. He then asked staff about the wastewater LOS; a pending revision of the LOS standard for wastewater to address peak periods rather than average day capacity was talked about and asked for an update. Mr. Kilborn stated that he did not have a calendar update; they are following the lead of Public Works and where they are going with those improvements. This will be brought back to the CPPC with an update and following the update, those numbers will be reflected in future reports. At the present time, they are following the normal procedures based on the annual updates through the concurrency review.

Commissioner Wolf stated that it is an increase in the commercial corridor depth from 4<sup>th</sup> Street, but in this case, it is really not a change of what the existing use of the property is (a very active parking lot); structured parking is a very good way to address the parking issues and does not see this as an additional intrusion.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Reese moved and Commissioner Wolf seconded a motion to approve the amendment to the Future Land Use Map designation from Residential Medium to Planned Redevelopment Mixed-Use and the Official Zoning Map designation from NSM-1 (Neighborhood Suburban Multi-Family-1) to CCS-1 (Corridor Commercial Suburban-1), or other less intensive use, for the subject property located at 5908 4<sup>th</sup> Street North in accordance with the staff report.*

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

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

**E. City File FLUM-50**

**Contact Person: Robyn Keefe, 892-5255**

**Location:** The subject property, estimated to be 12.26 acres in size, is located at 2901 54<sup>th</sup> Avenue South.

**Request:** A private application to amend the Future Land Use Map designation from Institutional to Planned Redevelopment-Mixed Use and the Official Zoning Map designation from CRS-1 (Corridor Residential Suburban-1) to CCS-1 (Corridor Commercial Suburban-1), or other less intensive use.

### **Staff Presentation**

Robyn Keefe gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the staff report.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Daniel Epperly with ARO Engineering and representing the applicant/owner, Bethel Community Baptist Church stated is agreement with staff's recommendations and was available to answer questions.

### **Registered Opponent Presentation**

Judy Ellis was not present.

### **Public Hearing**

John Adams, 2703 Bethel Ct S, spoke in opposition of the request.

Michael Fosnight, 1400 Alhambra Way S, was not present but submitted a card in opposition of the request.

### **Executive Session**

Commissioner Rogo stated that he has no issues with the commercial infill; it makes sense for this location. He does have a concern about the LOS impact pertaining to traffic. Publix parking lot is busy and there is an active sports complex west of 31<sup>st</sup> Street; he has seen traffic backed up at certain times beyond the Walgreens and toward the proposed site. He then asked staff about the LOS impact. Ms. Keefe explained that under the existing zoning there are approximately 37.25 peak hour trips and under the proposed amendment they are looking at approximately 155 peak hour trips, which would result in an estimated net increase of 117.85 peak hour trips.

Commissioner Rogo asked if the rating system grade is still used. Ms. Keefe replied, yes. Currently the adjoining portion of 54<sup>th</sup> Avenue South is operating at a LOS "B" and the volume of trips would not result in an increase to that grade. Commissioner Rogo stated that all he has to go on is experience and the road is crowded during certain times of the week and certain times of the day, and hopes that certain design components may be incorporated to ease the congestion. Ms. Keefe noted that because it is a church, there is a special exception on the property and a modification to that special exception would most likely be required by zoning going forward so the rezoning today would not impact that process.

Mr. Epperly stated that currently they have no definitive tenants for the property based on the current designation. If it were to become a drive-thru, they would do every measure they can come up with to make sure that traffic staging is maximized around the property.

Commissioner Michaels voiced his concurrence with Commissioner Rogo's remarks and then asked staff if the following from prior presentations to the CPPC is true: That intersection (31<sup>st</sup> Street & 54<sup>th</sup> Avenue S) is one of

the most heavily used in the City achieving 90% capacity. Ms. Keefe stated that it was noted in the staff report that there is a deficient segment of roadway from 34<sup>th</sup> Street South to 31<sup>st</sup> Street South, which is directly adjacent to the segment in question today. When looking at this, they also took in consideration of where I-275 currently exists and how that divides the two segments. Commissioner Michaels stated that this is a major concern to him and would like to be reassured that this is not going to add to traffic safety and congestion issues at that particular intersection.

Commissioner Michaels asked staff if it is correct that the Future Land Use designation of Institutional does allow for multi-family dwelling units, to which Ms. Keefe replied, yes, that is correct. Mr. Kilborn further explained that some Institutional uses propose as an accessory to their function multi-family units, so that is the basis for why it's in there. Typically though once the Institutional use goes away or ceases operation of that portion of the site, then the Institutional category would be removed from the Future Land Use Map.

Commissioner Reese stated that she did not see from the presentations any residential homes in the area around the subject property and does not see an impact to any residential area as stated in a presentation. She then asked the location of the residential area that was referenced. [*Response inaudible – not at microphone*]

Commissioner Reese stated that she assumes the drive-thru would ingress and egress from 54<sup>th</sup> Ave South and wondered what would be the impact of the rezoning of the subject property as the residents see it. Mr. Adams responded that the concern is a drive-thru makes it sound like a fast food establishment which opens up at 6:00 in the morning and with the exception of the one commercial parcel at the intersection, the remainder of 54<sup>th</sup> Avenue going east is residential.

Commissioner Reese stated that her question was answered to some degree; she understands they are most concerned about foot traffic and noise.

Derek Kilborn stated, in response to Commissioner Michaels' question about the capacity of the roadway, with a more detailed answer. The portion that is adjoining the application (from 31<sup>st</sup> Street moving east to Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street South), the volume to capacity ratio is .490 which means it is operating at a 49% capacity. The segment moving to the west from 31<sup>st</sup> Street to 34<sup>th</sup> Street South, is currently scored an "F" which means the volume to capacity ratio is at or in excess of 90%; this is not adjacent or adjoining the application under consideration today.

Commissioner Michaels asked if staff could provide at the next meeting an actual analysis or report of the impact of the additional 117 peak road trips on this section. Mr. Kilborn stated that additional information could be provided and, depending upon today's action, supplement the CPPC staff report with additional information for City Council advising them that this is being provided in response to the question asked for their consideration in the final determination. Commissioner Michaels expressed his appreciation.

**MOTION:**

*Commissioner Reese moved and Commissioner Wolf seconded a motion to approve the amendment to the Future Land Use Map designation from Institutional to Planned Redevelopment-Mixed Use and the Official Zoning Map designation from CRS-1 (Corridor Residential Suburban-1) to CCS-1 (Corridor Commercial Suburban-1), or other less intensive use, for the subject property located at 2901 54<sup>th</sup> Avenue South in accordance with the staff report.*



Commissioner Michaels stated that he concurs with the comments made; in rear and side yard, not in the front, and what additionally could be done for landscaping to mitigate that wall/fortress look.

Commission Chair Carter asked if the guidance given was enough. Mr. Kilborn replied that it was and will go back to work on the policy statement giving more detailed direction so when more districts are brought forward for consideration by the Commission, this will be worked into the staff reports giving clear direction to the CPPC when considering the designation, and to the neighborhood and staff after designation.

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

Commissioner Reese stated that the section set aside in the Jordan Park Housing Complex area, Senior Village, is now being proposed to be torn down to build a mid-rise complex. Unfortunately, these buildings are not historically designated; does not meet the architectural requirements but does have the cultural and historic significance. Those were the first decent housing for African-Americans in the City when first built and saving Senior Village was an effort to maintain some of the historic part of Jordan Park. She then asked staff if they thought it was too late in the process to seek historic designation for that part of the complex known as Senior Village. Mr. Kilborn replied that he did not know where the conversation is at this point in time. He knows that there is a conversation in the community between several different entities and City Administration and City Council about the future of those single-story garden villas. Early on in the conversation, the Historic Preservation office was asked about the qualification for designation of those buildings. Relating to the architecture, the initial feedback was that the buildings have been so significantly altered that the Historic Preservation office could not justify designation on architecture alone. If there were any acts toward designation, he feels that the only opportunity would be on the cultural side. Recently, he did have several Councilmembers contact his office to discuss this further and was provided this same information.

Commission Chair Carter asked if an update could be given at the next meeting, to which Mr. Kilborn replied, yes.

Commissioner Wannemacher suggested that maybe one garden villa could be created as it was originally built to be placed somewhere within the area. Commissioner Reese thought that was an excellent idea will share with the community, as well. Commission Chair Carter stated that this could be a private initiative.

A meeting date for the Demolition-by-Neglect Committee will be scheduled upon the return of Commissioner Winters on May 22<sup>nd</sup>.

## **VI. ADJOURN**

With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 6:23 p.m.