



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

**Council Chambers
City Hall**

**May 14, 2019
Tuesday, 2:00 p.m.**

MINUTES

Present: Keisha A. Bell
Will Michaels
Gwendolyn “Gwen” Reese
Jeffery “Jeff” M. Wolf
Lisa Wannemacher, Alternate
Sharon Winters, Alternate
Thomas “Tom” Whiteman, Alternate

Commissioners Absent: Jeff Rogo, Chair
Christopher “Chris” A. Burke, Vice Chair

Staff Present: Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist II, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Britton Wilson, AICP, Planner, II
Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney
Katherine Connell, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Development Services

The public hearing was called to order at 2:01 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

The minutes from the April 9, 2019 meeting were approved by a consensus vote.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

VI. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. City File 19-90200006

Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451

Request: Continuation of an Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alterations to the Ground Floor of the Detroit Hotel, a Local Historic Landmark.

Commissioner Wannemacher stepped away due to a conflict

Staff Presentation

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

Applicant Presentation

Applicant brought a presentation but did not present at the meeting

Public Hearing

None

Cross Examination

By Administration:

Waived.

By Applicant:

Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

By Administration:

Waived.

By Applicant:

Waived.

Executive Session

Commissioner Michaels: I would like to thank the Applicant for working with the City and showing sensitivity to this important cultural resource, it is virtually the first building built in St. Petersburg and has a long and storied heritage. I hope at some future date additional attention will be given to the signage (referencing the Caddy's sign) on the building as it does not mesh with what this building represents to the City. Thank you for the sympathetic modification.

MOTION: *Commissioner Winters moved on approval of the Staff recommendation
Commissioner Reese seconded*

VOTE: *YES – 6
NO – 0*

Motion passed by a vote of 6 to 0.

B. City File 19-90200009 Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Partial Window Replacement at 2311 Andalusia Way NE, a Contributing Property to the Granada Terrace Local Historic District.

Condition: Evidence will be presented to confirm that the replacement windows satisfy requirements for impact resistance and Energy Star Certification for southern cities;

Windows will feature six-over-one configuration and PGT's Traditional Simulated Divide Lite styles, as shown in the application materials; and

Windows will be set back within wall plane to replicate placement of existing.

Staff Presentation

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

Owner/Applicant Presentation

Owner, William Broom was present but did not make a presentation.

Public Hearing

None

Cross Examination

By Administration:
Waived.

By Applicant:
Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

By Administration:
Waived.

By Applicant:
Waived.

Executive Session

Commissioner Wannemacher: I wanted to confirm the Owner is okay with the conditions in the Staff Report.

Owner, William Broom: Yes.

Commissioner Winters: I didn't see in the packet, and Laura you may have mentioned it and I did not hear you, I see the simulated divided light, are these dimensional muntins or are they flush?

Laura Duvekot: They are exterior three dimensional.

Commissioner Winters: Thank you for confirming that.

MOTION: *Commissioner Winters moved approval with Staff conditions
Commissioner Wannemacher seconded*

VOTE: *YES – 7
NO – 0*

Motion passed by a vote of 7 to 0.

C. City File 19-90200015 Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations of a local historic landmark.

Commissioner Wannemacher stepped away due to a conflict.

Staff Presentation

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

Applicant Presentation:

None

Owner Presentation

Mark Andrews and Bennett Andrews, Owner of Big Tucker Holdings, LLC. gave a PowerPoint presentation

Public Hearing

Lisa Cunningham, 2110 Burlington Ave. N., Opposed

Brenda Gordon, 2934 Burlington Ave. N., Support

*Letter of Support from Nicole Carlisle, President of the Historic Kenwood Neighborhood Association

Cross Examination

By Administration:
Waived.

By Owner:
Waived

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

By Owner, Mark Andrews: Sometimes these things come down to subjectivity, we can look at a lot of the documents filed and pick things apart. We tried to identify we felt putting the metal roof, would not be non-conforming. We are trying to improve the property dramatically it does not have a lot of character, slapping on a three-tab brown roof is going to leave it as what it is today. It is dull, but I think it has a lot possibilities and we are trying to bring out those possibilities and doing things that are a little different. Cheery colors on the outside, nice landscaping, a metal roof, something that really makes it pop. The example from page 15, the orange house with the metal roof, it is a 1930s/1800 significantly older property that really makes it look nice. They were not painting things orange and putting metal roofs on back then. We are trying to do things to enhance the neighborhood. There is some subjectivity, I appreciate the consideration.

By Administration, Laura Duvekot: I would suggest that if metal is going to be considered as a material in this case that the appearance might be tempered by conditioning a finish that is a bit less brilliant and more in keeping with the sheen and historic texture.

Commissioner Wolf: Do you have any thoughts on what that might be in terms of color?

Laura Duvekot: A darker grey or brown might be a bit less out of context with what is typical to those roofs.

Commissioner Whiteman: Wouldn't oxidation take the brightness away after a fairly short period of time?

Laura Duvekot: I believe a lot of modern metal roofs are coated to prevent oxidation. I am not sure if that is the case here.

Commissioner Michaels: I have a question for the Applicant, would the suggestion that the metal be dark grey or brown would that be acceptable?

Applicant: These roofs they are not like mirrors they are muted. There is a coating but that is to prevent rusting not to take reflection away. It is a matter metal there is not a sheen that reflects sunlight. To answer, no, we would be opposed to doing a brown, if there is a darker grey metal that would work but we would like to stay as true to the examples we showed you, such as the house on page 15. I think we would need to look at a color chart to now for sure what would be acceptable.

Commissioner Wolf: I assume this would be a galvalume, which means it is not mirror finish and it does dull down over time. The long-term would be a dove grey color. I do have a question for Staff, regarding other roof choices if this was not to be approved. From an energy perspective I encourage people to use the lightest roofs they can, theoretically someone can put a very light shingle on and get the same reflectivity. Does Staff have an opinion on dimensional shingle verses three tab, would there be an opinion on color as far as preservation standards?

Laura Duvekot: We generally recommend the color is maintained, however the material change is what elevates this to a Commission level. We generally try not to be too involved when it comes to color. The local historic district is mostly mid to darker greys and browns, keeping within that pallet would be most appropriate in my opinion.

Commissioner Wolf: If this was a shingle application it would have been Staff level instead of coming before the Commission?

Laura Duvekot: Correct.

Commissioner Winters: Requested a review of the photo of the house and the photos of the examples.

Executive Session

Commissioner Michaels: I would like Staff to speak to the contributing/non-contributing argument that has been presented to us, I do not believe that was covered in the Staff Report. I would also like them to speak to the precedent that has been shared with us by the Applicant of the other properties in the general vicinity that has metal roofing.

Laura Duvekot: The property was listed as a non-contributing property in the National Register, it was under fifty (50) years old, it could not be considered as potential contributing during that survey. At the time that the Local Designation was approved last year, it was listed as contributing and is a contributing property. It is now over fifty (50) years old and does exhibit a good deal of integrity. It may not be the highest style, but it certainly does exhibit the mid-century infill, especially the duplexes that were being built throughout the neighborhood at that time. This is the property in our contributing map, I believe the presentation had the wrong property circled. The property is contributing, I believe the Applicant presentation showed the pink house on the block as the subject property, if I am not mistaken.

Owner: Yes, we did.

Laura Duvekot: It is listed as contributing locally, which is what is being reviewed right now. To speak to the other metal roofs within in the district, none of them were approved since the date the district was designated locally, which means they would not have been considered. Most of the examples that were given and discussed appeared to be a bit earlier Craftsman or frame vernacular which as we discussed recently with this Commission, metal roofs were sometimes used. Given the style and era of construction that is one of the reasons I believe metal is an inappropriate material for this subject property.

Commissioner Wolf: To what extent does the individual property get controlled by our regulations in terms of its impact on the rest of the neighborhood. In other words, we have questions about whether it had a particular style, there is a question about how much it approaches any type of particular style. I am wondering if there are other criteria regarding how that roof material presents itself within the district and whether, for instance if someone was to build a new home, I think they would still need to conform to the design requirements for the district.

Laura Duvekot: That is correct.

Commissioner Wolf: To what extent does that metal roof impact on the district as a whole?

Laura Duvekot: An out of place material can negatively impact the group as a collection. Currently, it is a property that maintains the integrity of that roofing material. Changing that would decrease the integrity of the property therefore it would erode the integrity of the district as a whole.

Commissioner Bell: Can you clarify something for me? Are you implying that if this was approved, the metal roof, that if someone built a new structure on a property, the metal roof would be appropriate at that point because this would set precedent?

Laura Duvekot: No, separately from one another new construction would require a Certificate of Appropriateness and we would evaluate the appropriateness of the materials involved in that. In this case we have a property that is designated and is contributing and historic. Maintaining the integrity of those materials which currently exist, is the goal of this COA.

Commissioner Wolf: My questions was more, the Applicant bringing into question whether there was a defined architectural style for this home. If there was a question about that we might still have the applicability of our review as the home presents within the neighborhood as opposed as to the style of that specific home. If the Applicant was to prevail and the Commission was to agree the home does not have a defined architectural style we do not have much to say about what goes on the roof, except to say a roof is inappropriate in its presentation as part of the historic character of the neighborhood.

Laura Duvekot: I think it is possible for a building to not be particular to a high academic architectural style and still speak to the time it was built and to have a pallet of materials that are typical to that era of construction. That is the question of vernacular architect which does not have a lot of ornamentation but still draws from the lines and the massing and the materials that were typical to the era that it represents. That is why buildings like this are considered contributing.

MOTION: *Commissioner Winters moved on approval of the Application
Commissioner Whiteman seconded*

VOTE: *YES – 3
NO – 3*

Application denied due to not obtaining 4 concurrent votes.

**D. City File 19-90700001 Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451
Request: Nomination of the Register of Historic Places**

Staff Presentation

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

Applicant Presentation

None

Public Hearing

None

Executive Session

Commissioner Wannemacher: The scoreboard that currently exists in the outfield, is that historic? Should that be identified separately on the key plan?

Laura Duvekot: I believe it is within the fence line which is the boundary for that part of the resource for both the National and Local.

Commissioner Wannemacher: I know it is within the fence line, I wonder if it should be identified separately, as a significant element. I want to ensure protection.

Laura Duvekot: I believe the sign has been altered, however I am not sure of the dates of alterations of the scoreboard.

Commissioner Wannemacher: I ask because it is a vertical element.

Commissioner Whiteman: Laura, on the National Register the second paragraph states the City of St. Petersburg is also the County seat of Pinellas County.

Laura Duvekot: The nomination was prepared in part by architectural historians for the Florida Historic Preservation Office. I will forward that comment to them because, that is not accurate.

MOTION: *Commissioner Michaels moved on approval of the Staff recommendation with correction of the county seat
Commissioner Bell seconded*

VOTE: *YES – 7
NO – 0*

Motion passed by a vote of 7 to 0.

E. City File FLUM-55 Contact Person: Derek Kilborn, 892-7872

Request: Private-initiated application to amend the:

- Future Land Use Map from I (Institutional) to RU (Residential Urban) and the Official Zoning Map from NSM-1 (Neighborhood Suburban Multifamily-1) to NT-3 (Neighborhood Traditional-3), for portions of parcels generally located northwest of Pasadena Avenue North and south of Burlington Avenue North.

- Future Land Use Map from RU (Residential Urban) to I (Institutional) and the Official Zoning Map from NT-3 (Neighborhood Traditional-3) to NSM-1 (Neighborhood Suburban Multifamily-1), for a northern portion of 111 Pinellas Way North.

Staff Presentation

Derek Kilborn gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

Applicant Presentation

Not present

Public Hearing

Lori Hawkshead, 6750 Burlington Ave., N. Oppose

Cross Examination

By Administration:
Waived.

By Applicant:
Waived

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

By Administration:
Waived

By Applicant:
Waived

Executive Session

Commissioner Michaels: I believe Staff has done a good job reviewing this and developing a recommendation. It seems to be well founded and there seems to be a need on the part of the church.

Commissioner Wannemacher: I believe this to be a mutual benefit to the neighborhood as well as the church. Having one side residential homes, it is better to have neighbors, watching out for each other. I think this is beneficial to a residential neighborhood, adding more homes to this neighborhood.

MOTION: *Commissioner Winters moved on approval of the Staff recommendation
Commissioner Michaels seconded*

VOTE: *YES – 7
NO – 0*

Motion approved by all present

F. City File LGCP 2019-01 Contact Person: Britton Wilson, 551-3542

Request: City-initiated text amendments to the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to housing initiatives; updating the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) map; and up dating the Vision 2020 Special Area Plan (SAP).

Staff Presentation

Britton Wilson gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

Executive Session

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you, I think this is a positive change, how does this effect the parking requirements? Will there be any potential modification or reduction in parking requirements with this Missing Middle category, so that we are not requiring one per one, again wondering if there will be flexibility.

Britton Wilson: Yes Commissioner, following through, after the comprehensive plan text amendments there will be amendments to the Land Development Regulations on the building design side that may look at reducing parking requirements, et cetera.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you.

Derek Kilborn: I will add to that, we are already in the middle of that process. Text amendments to Chapter 16 go to the Development Review Commission (DRC) and similar to your role here they make a finding of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and then they make a recommendation to City Council. We proposed to the DRC last month and they approved and recommended to Council that we reduce the minimum parking requirement for multi-family projects in all zoning categories, traditional, suburban and downtown. We split the parking requirement and created a carve out for units that are 750 sq. ft. or less. For those units the parking requirement is a lower standard than units that are greater than 750 sq. ft. Council also asked us to reduce the parking requirement for units more than 750 sq. ft. In addition to creating the carve out, both standards are now reduced. As an example, downtown, will continue to be one parking space for large units but for a unit of 750 sq. ft. or less there will be a zero parking requirement. In the traditional category, the formula becomes a decimal formula. For two bedrooms it is a .75 calculation rather than a 1, and for units that are 750 sq. ft. or less it is a .5 requirement per unit. We are starting with those numbers; we will see how it works. Perhaps make additional adjustments later as part of the Vision 2050 discussion and process. Since I have the floor, I will also add there are two additional parking reductions, the second is a reduction to workforce and affordable housing units. If you are providing workforce and affordable housing in your project and they comprise at least 50% of the overall number of units, there will be an additional 10% reduction and if those units are age restricted to will be an additional 5% reduction, stacking those to 15% reduction. There is also a reduction for proximity to high-frequency transit routes. When located within an 1/8th of a mile of a high-frequency transit route which was described before the DRC as 30 minutes or less, there will be an additional 10 % reduction. Since submitting the DRC Staff Report, the Transportation and Parking Management Department completed additional research and has suggested modifying the description to include all routes up to 35-minute headway time. Those are the changes that were recommended and will be going to City Council shortly for their review.

Commissioner Wolf: On the accessory dwelling units, they can now be inserted into some of the NT designations and that was at Council, did I understand that correctly?

Britton Wilson: Yes Commissioner, the accessory dwelling units are already permitted in the NT-1 and NT-2 zoning districts.

Commissioner Wolf: I am in NT-3, which is why I ask.

Britton Wilson: Not in NT-3 currently.

Commissioner Wolf: Will those parking requirements be reviewed? For accessory dwelling units, .75 and .5, is that what you were referring to the accessory dwelling units on that comment?

Derek Kilborn: I do not believe we reduced the parking requirement for the ADU line item, I think it is only specific to the multi-family units. We have introduced into the conversation, but it is not formally part of the application that is moving right now. We want to consider accessory dwelling units in other categories where it is not allowed today, including neighborhood suburban, there are some large suburban neighborhoods that could benefit from an allowance for accessory dwelling units but we think that conversation is more appropriate for the broader Vision 2050 discussion that we will be having through the late summer/fall rather than try and have that discussion now and compromise the other changes that we think are fairly minor.

Commissioner Winters: Accessory Dwelling Units I understand they are excluded from the regular density calculation the maximum units per acre but what is the impact on the floor area ratio? I know there were a lot of discussions about floor area ration with the LDR updates and I know that some neighborhoods have concerns about that.

Elizabeth Abernethy: Good afternoon Commissioners, Elizabeth Abernethy, Director of Planning and Development Services. I am going to jump in here, a couple of things, the first LDR package that we have reduces the minimum lot size requirement for accessory dwelling units from 5800 sq. ft. to 4500 sq. ft. this comprehensive plan amendment will allow us to effectuate that change to the Land Development Code and allow it on smaller lots. That is going to open almost 10,000 additional lots to qualify for accessory dwelling units in the NT-1 and the NT-2. When we did the major amendment to the land development regulation in 2017, and added FAR limits in NT-1, 2 and 3 we specifically excluded the first 500 sq. ft. of an accessory dwelling unit towards counting towards that total

FAR for the house. They will be allowed an extra 500 sq. ft. beyond the FAR limits. If they want an accessory dwelling unit a little bit larger they are allowed up to 750 sq. ft. under current code. They want the extra 250 sq. ft. they will have to count it.

Commissioner Winters: To follow up on Commissioner Wannemacher's question, I am happy to see the parking requirements reduced too. I do have concerns on the mobility issue, the bottom of page 8 in the packet. The public transportation options continue to be really limited, this is just an editorial comment, that I am concerned with our ability to really provide methods for people to move around the city who chose to not have a car or bicycle.

Commissioner Michaels: I applaud the intent to provide more affordable housing. I think it is tremendously needed and we are going in the right direction. The impact of this change on the maximum density for the City and on the population side this would not allow for an additional 2,300 people to live in St. Petersburg, is that approximately, that would be the maximum.

Britton Wilson: The maximum at a rate of 1.5 per unit at maximum build out of all the potential acreage.

Commissioner Michaels: Tying that to the parking, auto and transportation issue do you have an analysis on what the additional number of autos would likely be? I noticed in the material that was provided, there is back-up from the County, where they discuss a one parking space per unit, it sounds like that is not what we are anticipating here.

Britton Wilson: Correct, no specific transportation analysis was done, very general impact was provided in this report.

Commissioner Michaels: We do not really know what the additional auto impact would be then?

Britton Wilson: Not at this point.

Commissioner Michaels: Under level of service standards on page 8, we have the service standards for sanitary sewer water, it states that a standard for peak wet weather capacity and evaluating the need for additional annual average capacity is in the works, that has been in the works for three (3) years, why is there a hold up? We are approving more density for the City when we do not have a fleshed-out service standard for sanitary sewer water.

Britton Wilson: I can put together the more recent efforts that the City has put towards the sanitary sewer improvements and can add it as a supplemental analysis that goes forward to Council.

Commissioner Michaels: You can get it back to us prior to. Regarding sanitary sewage, there is a statement that there is a 40% excess capacity for sanitary sewage based on current average daily use. If these changes are approved, how will that affect 40% excess capacity? Can you give us an estimate?

Britton Wilson: Between 9.2% on the high end and 6.5% on the low end.

Commissioner Michaels: If this is approved, we are looking at having a 30% excess capacity?

Britton Wilson: Correct and those numbers I just read to you include additional numbers when we calculated residential median, so those would be lower numbers.

Commissioner Michaels: I understand we are discussing maximum and not necessarily going to reach maximum. Finally, on page 9 it is stated that the proposed changes could potential support the City's growth rate for the next 5 to 7 years, what about after that?

Britton Wilson: That could be worded better, to state not in the next 5 to 7 years but the equivalent of 5 to 7 years' worth of population expansion, not necessarily happen in the next 5 to 7 years. It represents a growth rate between 5 to 7 years, again, not necessarily will that growth rate occur in the next 5 to 7 years.

Commissioner Michaels: Thank you for clarifying.

Commissioner Whiteman: What affect does this have on potable water bill? Is there going to be a separate meter? Will it be on the main meter?

Britton Wilson: In reference to the ADU? They can be on either. An individual household could meter the ADU with the primary single family home or they can separate them.

Commissioner Whiteman: What affect does that have on garbage fees and the dumpsters?

Britton Wilson: At this time, it is negligible. If there is a significant impact that might be revisited on those fees.

Michael Dema: I believe you can request a second garbage can for a nominal fee each month if you have a ½ unit for the ADU. With respect to potable water, I believe a lot of it is age. A lot of the existing ADUs are converted garages, they would not have needed to bifurcate the system. Whereas now if they are being created as ADUS there is a higher likelihood of having a dedicated water line for that unit.

Commissioner Whiteman: On the garbage, if they use the same garbage can, our garbage volume would go up and no additional fees at that point. What affect does this have on the new impervious surface tax? Because you would have a bigger impervious surface so that tax would go up, right?

Elizabeth Abernethy: I had a long conversation with one of the representatives today about the new fee and how we are going to track impervious surface moving forward, so we know when someone changes from one level fee to the next. My understanding is it is a tiered system depending on how much of your lot is covered you have a different rate, the more impervious surface you might jump up into the next tier and have to pay the higher rate. If someone is adding an accessory dwelling unit when they come through permitting they have to provide us with the data of the additional impervious that could push them into the next rate category. That is something that will be monitored and accessed at the time of permitting and tracked through the permitting system.

MOTION: *Commissioner Michaels moved on approval of the Staff recommendation
Commissioner Winters seconded*

**Original Motion includes changes presented by City Staff during the public hearing and included in the updated Staff Report*

VOTE: *YES – 7
NO – 0*

Motion passes by a vote of 7 to 0.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

VI. REPORT

Coastal High Hazard Area Update on Proposed Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) Design Guidelines

Update regarding the Storefront Conservation Corridor Overlay approved by City Council on April 18, 2019

VII. CPPC MEMBER/STAFF COMMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

VIII. ADJOURN

With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 4:02 P.M.