



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

**The Sunshine Center, Auditorium  
330 Fifth St. N.  
St. Petersburg, FL 33701**

**FEBRUARY 11, 2020  
TUESDAY  
2:00 PM**

**MINUTES**

- Present:** Jeff Rogo, Chair  
Christopher “Chris” A. Burke, Vice Chair  
Keisha A. Bell  
Will Michaels  
Sharon Winters  
Jeffery “Jeff” M. Wolf
- Commissioners Absent:** C. Copley Gerdes  
Gwendolyn “Gwen” Reese, Alternate  
Lisa Wannemacher, Alternate  
Thomas “Tom” Whiteman
- Staff Present:** Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation  
Laura Duvekot, Planner II  
Kelly Perkins, Planner II  
Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney  
Heather Judd, 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. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Robin Reed, 705 16<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE:

I am currently the President of The Sunken Gardens Forever Foundation and we were formed after bringing flamingos to Sunken Gardens and also so that people would be able to donate to The Sunken Gardens Project because otherwise, they can donate of course to Sunken Gardens, but the money would go into the





**C. City File 19-90300008****Contact People: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470**

**Request:** Review of a City-initiated application for the designation of Westminster Church to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places.

**Staff Presentation**

Kelly Perkins gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

Commissioner Michaels: I have two (2) questions, one (1) with respect to the architecture and the other with respect to the parking which is being excluded. In your Staff Report on page 10 you make an extremely strong statement there, you say:

Westminster is a unique form of gothic revival and has no local comparison with its style.

Can you elaborate on that some?

Kelly Perkins: Yes, I meant Late Gothic Revival. I do not know that was excluded from the Staff Report, but in regard to its form compared to other Gothic Revival churches, normally you have a front gable parapet often as exposed masonry or brick. You often have a tower right next to it. It is more high style form, this is more vernacular version of the Gothic style that is typically later period. I could not find any other examples of it in the City other than the St. Bartholomew Church which is a wood frame building which also represents a more traditional style, it is a different time period.

Commissioner Michaels: Thank you, the other question is, with respect to the parking area, which is being excluded. You did touch upon the boundaries, what I am hearing is that the guidelines that we are operating under, would not allow the parking area to be included as part of the designated landmark. I am trying to balance that with re-adaptive use. I notice that the neighborhood association also brought up that point that if this is designated as a landmark to exclude the parking area and perhaps have that developed. Would significantly negatively effective the use of the landmark.

Kelly Perkins: I will touch on the boundary recommendations and Derek will touch on the parking requirements. We follow the recommendations that are set before the National Park Service, that is for designation of National Registered Properties, we use that at the local level. When it comes to boundaries, they recommend using physical boundaries or legal boundaries as part of the development. This shows the 1926 aerial on the left side and on the right side the current Google aerial, from late 2019. It shows that the sanctuary is located on four (4) parcels that were originally part of the plat. There were six (6) evenly spaced parcels all across but the development did not follow that plat. Recommendations as you can see on the eastern side houses were all split facing 8<sup>th</sup> Street which was not part of the original plat. The rest of the block development did not follow the original plat, which is not really unusual for a four (4) parcel plat. As you can see all the other parcels do not follow the legal development of the property, by legal development I meant the platted lots. They follow a different type of development so using the legal argument or the legal boundary does not really make sense. Also, that parking lot over time has lost any sort of integrity if there ever was one relating to the historic structure of the parking lot. It never contributed to the historic significance of the property and therefore would not be appropriate to include as part of the boundary designation. I think Derek can touch on parking requirements and what this designation boundary line would mean for redevelopment of the property.

Derek Kilborn: Thank you Kelly, In this case I think the question was probably more design orientated but the

second part of the answer is, totally separate from any designation any future development plan for the property has to show compliance with the minimum parking requirements, whether that is grandfathered spaces or they meet the minimum number. What we did here is we looked at it strictly from an academic perspective in terms of where the designation boundary should be. That does not exempt the property owner from meeting any related parking requirements. With any future changes they are going to have to go through the normal zoning process to show that they can meet whatever is required by Code. If they cannot, then there is a variance process that is available to them as well.

Will Michaels: Thank you.

Commissioner Rogo: Any other questions of Staff at this time? Representative of the Applicant Owner of the Presbytery of Tampa Bay, Inc. I will say I am very pleased to have you hear with us today. We did not get your letter until yesterday, Monday, very anxious to hear what you have to tell us.

### **Applicant Presentation:**

Presbytery of Tampa Bay, Inc., Reverend Elizabeth Shannon, Chair for the Administrative Commission spoke expressing neither support nor opposition to the designation.

### **Registered Opponent**

None.

### **Public Hearing**

Amber Brinkley, representing Indi-Ed School, 121 33<sup>rd</sup> Ave. N., spoke in support of the application;  
William Matthews, 125 11<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, spoke in opposition to the application;  
Christine Laurenzi, representing Indi-Ed School, 230 17<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, did not oppose or support the application;  
April Cabral, 206 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, spoke in support of the application;  
Anna Brosheers, 226 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, spoke in support of the application;  
Emily Elwyn, as a board member of Preserve the 'Burg, 836 16<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, spoke in support of the application;  
John Johnson, President of HONNA 117 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, spoke in support of the application;  
Doug Gillespie, 145 10<sup>th</sup> Ave. N., spoke in support of the application;  
Robin Reed, 705 16<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, spoke in support of the application;  
Catherine Landstra, 515 11<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, spoke in support of the application;  
Mary Dowd, 205 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, spoke in support of the application;  
Ben DeLozier, 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, spoke in support of the application;  
Angie Chevalier, 16<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, spoke in support of the application;  
Natalie DeVicente, 18<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE, spoke in support of the application.

### **Cross Examination:**

City Staff:

Waived.

Applicant:

Waived.

### **Rebuttal/Closing Remarks**

City Staff:

Kelly Perkins: I would like to clarify, based on a few things that were said during the public comment portion. The Historic Designation does not dictate use. Local historic designation will only require a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) review for exterior alterations in the hopes that the building retains its historic integrity and character. Being that this is a local landmark does allow for certain incentives that this property already qualifies for because it is a contributing resource to a National Register Historic District. Local landmark would allow for the adaptive reuse overlay provision to be applied for in the future.

Applicant/Owner:

Reverend Elizabeth Shannon: Good afternoon again, I will say on behalf of the Presbytery it has always been our preference that a church or a school remain on the property. We do also have a fiduciary responsibility, however, so our preference cannot proceed or preclude all of the wide variety of things. We are not opposed to the designation, we are not in favor of the designation, we have always had preferences. As for the thought that was brought up that there have been overtures made about possible alternative uses of the space, as the Chair of the Charity Administrative Commission since 2014, none of those were ever brought to my attention. All I can do and say is I am sorry, I did not know. My name is, or was on the building for a while, my name was on the voicemail for a while, so all I can say is that, this has not been my experience. It is our hope that the building might remain a church or a school. It is our hope, that the Westminster Presbyterian Church would have continued to thrive and build more of this community. It is our hope that whatever happens now, happens as expeditiously as possible. I am appreciative of your patience and if there is anything that I can do moving forward, please know I am at your disposal.

### Executive Session

Commissioner Rogo: Commissioners we are now in Executive Session, questions, comments, motion?

Commissioner Michaels: Just to be responsive to some of the comments that have been made here, I always thought that ninety percent (90%) of our problems are communications problems. I get the feeling that there have been some communications issues here. With respect to the interaction between the Church and the Neighborhood Association, reading the Neighborhood Association letter, and this surprised me. I have been the President of my Neighborhood Association, I have also been the president of Council of the Neighborhood Association for the City and it is stated in the letter that HONNA, actually contributed several thousand dollars, three thousand dollars, \$3,000.00 to the Church, to help maintain the Church over the last few years. I have never heard of that before, I have never heard of a neighborhood association with cash that is supporting a church. I see that as being very commendable. The tax revenue argument, statement, was raised here, and we do have, those of us on the Commission have seen several studies and the Staff brought several studies to our attention that have been done, that show that landmarked buildings and neighborhoods that are designated as historic districts do command a higher real estate values than those that are not. I believe that information is on the website, I would encourage you to take a look at that. Just intuitively here, to me, the Old Northeast is probably the hottest real estate market in the City and to me the big reason for that is because of the historic character that you have there, the historic buildings that are there. That is what is attracting a lot of people to want to live there and in some case to want to build there. It seems to me that this is a positive thing from an economic standing point. Finally, I do think the mission of the Church, probably even the desire of the Church to serve the community that can best continue by designation of the Church as a local landmark, I think that will make it more likely than other was to have that tradition continue. Most of these things that I am talking about are not really in the criteria. We as Commission members have to abide by the City's ordinance and the criteria for designation. The Staff made the case that this application meets the minimum age requirement by double

actually for the nine (9) criteria and six (6) of the seven (7) integrity factors so, I am going to support the request here to designate this as a local landmark.

Commissioner Burke: I think historically I have never been a big fan of the third-party of the non-owner-initiated application, that has always bothered me a little bit, especially when we go against the current owner wishes. I think this one is a little bit different. I think this is the first time I have ever heard an owner that has not taken a position on either side of the issue which I think is unique. The neighborhood certainly deserves special attention when it comes to historic preservation, the district is within the neighborhood and the neighborhood as a whole, I think that this is really an excellent use of this ordinance to designate this as a historic property. I will vote in favor of it.

Commissioner Winters: I will move approval of the nomination as presented by Staff.

Commissioner Michaels: Second.

*Commissioner Burke moved recommending approval of the request subject to Staff recommendations.*

*Commissioner Whiteman seconded.*

**MOTION:** *Motion passed.*

**VOTE:** *YES – 5*  
*NO – 0*

**D. City File FLUM-58 Contact Person: Derek Kilborn, 893-7872**

**Request:** An amendment to the Future Land Use Map from Institutional (I) and Residential Urban (RU) to Residential Medium (RM) and Official Zoning Map amendment from Neighborhood Single-family-1 (NS-1) to Neighborhood Suburban Multi-family (NSM-1) for the subject property.

**Staff Presentation**

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

Commissioner Rogo: Thank you very much Derek, and maybe I can ask you a question before you sit down. You talked a bit about surrounding areas and surrounding uses, this is one of the first times I recall that we have a jurisdiction on the boarder, another jurisdiction on the boarder of a piece of property that we are considering for rezoning. To what extent do we look to the South to see how appropriate proposed rezoning might be?

Derek Kilborn: Sure, we are looking at the entire area. In this case, the Commissioners are aware from the Staff Report there is a mobile home park immediately to the South. The mobile home park, we looked up at the state has 196 licensed lots which translates to a density of 20.4 units per acre, we also look at the surrounding municipalities for public notification. In this instance the City of Gulfport and unincorporated Pinellas County received email notification at the time that we received the application. They also received direct mail notice at the time that the information came in as well as the mailer went out. Everyone else in the notification area received notice.

Commissioner Rogo: Thank you sir. I want to acknowledge that Commissioner Wolf has returned to our dais, is it appropriate to do another roll call?

Attorney Dema: Not necessary sir.

Commissioner Rogo: We once again have six (6) Commissioners. Any other questions?

Commissioner Burke: I have a question for the City please. You have broken this parcel into three (3) pieces A being the bulk, I understand C, can you explain again why B is being chiseled away?

Derek Kilborn: C is the north section, the ribbon at the top...

Commissioner Burke: In the Coastal High Hazard.

Derek Kilborn: It is located in the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA), so that cannot be approved for any change that increases residential density.

Commissioner Burke: So that B, why is B?

Derek Kilborn: B is, it is a small sliver, that currently has RL-M, Future Land Use Map (FLUM) category and we are just trying to clean up the line to synchronize with the Coastal High Hazard Area.

Commissioner Burke: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Rogo: Thank you very much Mr. Kilborn and on behalf of the Applicant/Owner, I believe Don Mastry.

**Applicant Presentation**

Donald “Don” Mastry, Esq. spoke on behalf of the application.

**Public Hearing**

- Larry Galantis, 6647 Bougainvilla Ave. S., spoke in opposition to the application;
- Carol Plisea, 6174 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. S., spoke in opposition to the application;
- Darlene Setticase, 6401 Bougainvilla Ave. S., spoke in opposition to the application;
- Lisa Wright, 6630 Bougainvilla Ave. S., spoke in opposition of the application;
- David Kelly, 6711 Bougainvilla Ave. S., spoke in opposition to the application;
- Patricia Profeto, 1111 60<sup>th</sup> At. S., spoke in opposition to the application;
- Jeffrey “Jeff” Williams, 6227 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. S., spoke in opposition to the application;
- Chelsea Fairbank, 6403 Renaldo Way S., spoke in opposition to the application;
- Patrick Carney, 6231 Fairfield Ave. S., spoke in opposition to the application;
- Mitchell Carney, 1202 63<sup>rd</sup> St. S., spoke in opposition to the application;
- Kailyn Bigby, 901 Hull St. S., spoke in opposition to the application;
- Wendy Snyder, 6407 Sandpiper Way S., spoke in opposition to the application;
- Mary Frazier, 6482 Bougainvilla Ave. S., spoke in opposition to the application;
- Zach Willis, 6430 Bougainvilla Ave. S., spoke in opposition to the application;
- Keri Nelson, 6285 10<sup>th</sup> Ave. S., spoke in opposition to the application;

Joe Thompson, 6263 Fairfield Ave. S., spoke in opposition to the application;  
Stephen Colbert, 300 59<sup>th</sup> Lane S., spoke in opposition to the application;  
Pastor, Timothy “Tim” Kelley, 6781 30<sup>th</sup> Ave. N., spoke in support of the application.

**Cross Examination:**

City Staff:  
Waived.

Applicant:

Don Mastry, Esq., on behalf of the Applicant: Yes, I would like to ask Tom Whalen of the Transportation Department to come down, I would like for him to speak to whether this site, 64<sup>th</sup> Street has the capacity to handle a multi-family development.

Tom Whalen: Good afternoon, Tom Whalen City Transportation and Parking Management Department. We did take a look at this site, we did run the numbers from Forward Pinellas’ *Countywide Rules* and there was a slight reduction in estimated p.m. peak hour traffic but we took a more detailed look and instituted transportation to the nearest strict generation annual and also ran LOS (Level of Service) numbers came up with a higher group of trips generated by a multi-family development. We looked at the carrying capacity of the roadway, it has capacity to carry more trips. This development will generate approximately 40 or so more trips per peak hours, then the existing development. This is less than one trip per hour, less than one per minute, there is no reason why the road cannot carry that amount of traffic.

Don Mastry, Esq.: I have one more question, Mr. Carney referred to a crime report stating statistics about crime and BlueSky Communities. I would like to see that report, I would like to know where we can find that report, I would like to know what communities he is talking about.

Commissioner Rogo: We had two Mr. Carney’s who were back to back one was Mitchell, I do not know if you made reference to that. So again, Mr. Mastry is looking for some proof of the crime statistic.

Mr. Carney: I do not have a printout, I did not think it was going to be an issue like that. But what I did is I went to Blue Sky’s page and I looked to see where their actual sub-divisions were, where they have built things. The first one I spoke about, it is for veterans and then you go a little further and you see their affordable housing. I actually called two of them and I believe, I actually called to get in touch with Shawn Wilson, who is listed as the contact, I believe that is the President. I tried to get in touch with them, no connection, no way to get in touch with him, no way to call him. I asked them and they gave me a Clarabelle, they said she was secretary or something like that. She said someone would get in touch with me and call me. So I said, my question is if there is crime in the area, if there is somewhere we see, maybe, someone has committed a crime, are they immediately...unintelligible. She said well we would have to call, go through a paperwork process to see. I said, is that monitored. She said there is a process where they go into the place. The twenty percent (20%) came in to, I was looking at actual 911 records. When you look them up you can look at different areas, not every area, obviously, can I find. The ones I looked up I can find, you can actually see there are spikes, after that timeline. We can see...

Don Mastry, Esq.: Spikes, where? I would like to know where the spikes are. In the neighborhood or in this community?

Mr. Carney: In the neighborhood, surrounding.

Don Mastry: Okay.

Mr. Carney: That is what I said, I said wherever it ends up being, in the neighborhood surrounding there could be a spike. There is a spike we have seen. Some of that is due to the number of people coming to the neighborhood that were not there before. Which you will see in any neighborhood. Which I did actually say, I said any kind of neighborhood you are going to have a spike in crime.

Commissioner Rogo: Can you give us an indication where those neighborhoods are? Are they in St. Petersburg?

Mr. Carney: No, well one I got in touch with was, Gibsonton, do you have one in Boca Raton? Those are two places I was looking at.

Don Mastry, Esq.: We do not have one in either of those places.

Mr. Carney: Okay, can I pull up on my phone for a second, to see where they actually are...What is Blue Sky's website because the one I have here is not, did you note that somewhere?

Commissioner Rogo: We should allow you a few seconds to sit down in a more peaceful circumstance. Thank you. Mr. Mastry do you have any more questions?

Don Mastry, Esq.: No, I do not.

**Rebuttal/Closing Remarks**

City Staff:

Derek Kilborn: Okay, thank you, a couple of points I want to walk through. First there have been some comments about why perhaps Staff is not working on behalf of the citizens. Obviously, I disagree with the characterization of the point that was made, but what happens procedurally, when the City receives an application for a Map Amendment the City is obligated, by City Code, to process that application to the Commission within a specific time period. As part of that process, Staff is required to look at the request, compare it to the Comprehensive Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies, evaluate the Levels of Service (LOS) and then make a finding of consistency with the Comp Plan applying the Level of Service standards. We received an application, we fulfilled our obligation to process it, in the assessment we felt that it met the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan. It certainly met the Level of Service standards that are outlined. Based on those findings we made a recommendation in our Report to approve the request. In terms of timing, this Commission always meets on the second Tuesday of the month at 2:00 pm. The City Council meeting which will follow in March is required to be, by State Statute, and by practice at the City to be an evening meeting. That will be an evening meeting. According to the City Council scheduled this year, starting in March those meetings begin at 5:00 pm. After the City Council meeting there are still two (2) additional public hearings at the County. One with the County's, Forward Pinellas planning agency and then with the Countywide Planning Authority. There are still three (3) public hearings in this process, this is just a first step. In terms of transparency, and timeline, in this particular instance I was part of the April meeting that was a courtesy information meeting that the City put together and hosted at the Church. It was easy for us to host it at the Church because that was not required to be recorded and documented the way that this Commission hearing is. For us, the only way we can conduct this meeting is here in this chamber where we are set up to do a televised live feed and record the information we need. That does explain the location difference between that courtesy information meeting we hosted in the spring and this quasi-judicial hearing which we are required to

have here today. Also, in terms of transparency, I put a detailed timeline in the Staff Report, identifying when different notifications went out, because of the crowd that attended the spring meeting, we created a special section on our current planning projects webpage to assist the neighbors in sharing information, so that as they became aware of the information through the different notices that were going out, they could go to this centralized website and share the different documents that are associated with this report. We will continue to update that webpage as this application moves through the process. There were some comments about other multi-family projects in the area, those residents are absolutely correct. Those other multi-family projects are two story in character as they are currently built. The one thing that we look at in our analysis is not always what is built but also what could be. In those cases where the zoning is NSM-1 there is a 36-foot height allowance, today, if those sites are redeveloped, they could do a three-story building on those sites. They could also do fifteen (15) units per-acre standard plus six (6) workforce housing bonus units at those existing NSM-1 locations. The CCT-1 zoning that I showed you is just west of 64<sup>th</sup> Street where it intersects with the Pinellas Trail. That zoning today permits up to twenty-four (24) units per acre plus a workforce housing bonus. The vacant parking lot across from the American Legion Post, the industrial warehouse that has a sign up right now showing that it is currently for sale. Those properties could be redeveloped at twenty-four (24) units an acre plus the workforce housing bonus which is in excess of plus six (6). Those are some of the details we look at in our analysis, it is not always what is built, it is what could be. Finally, I have spoken to a number of callers throughout this process. You did hear today age restricted, but I did remind each of those that our consideration today is related to a map amendment to multi-family only. There is no control mechanism to limit that to age restricted. I have cautioned people during this review process that the consideration here is only for multi-family and does not put any age restriction on the map. Thank you.

Applicant/Owner:

Don Mastry, Esq.: In spite of what Derek just said Blue Sky is the developer of this site, it will be over fifty-five (55) because that is what they do. There is, there already is spot zoning, this is industrial, sorry institutional, it is spot zoning right now. There is no right that zoning will never be changed in the City. I do think that, I think, there are, and this is not a site plan prospect. You are not approving a building. If the zoning is changed the DRC (Development Review Commission) will have, and the City Staff will approve whatever is to be built. There are many multi-family developments in Saint Petersburg that are near single-family and that are affordable. There are two (2) in Kenwood. There is one on 13<sup>th</sup> Street, 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 25<sup>th</sup> Street, one on 1<sup>st</sup> Street and 71<sup>st</sup> Avenue North, one on 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, they are compatible. All over the town we have multi-family and single-family that are compatible uses with each other. This site, again, I will briefly repeat is insulated. I do not think that you can ignore the creek. You cannot ignore the heavy trees, you can't ignore the trailer park, the mobile home park to the south. It is twenty point four (20.4) units an acre. It is there, it is going to be there, and this neighborhood seems to have been, to co-exist with that kind of density already.

Public verbal objection...

You have heard from your own Transportation Department that 64<sup>th</sup> Street can handle the traffic impact. On my soap box again, if we are going to have affordable housing, we are going to have to create density. You cannot have affordable housing and single-family developments with the requirements of the size of developments and so forth and minimum size of lots, it just is not going to happen. What I would say is that if site was developed thirty-five (35) single family residences it would probably have the same amount of residences that would be in the proposed what is proposed to be a multi-family development. I would think 35 houses is going to have 2 residents per person and we have already said that these number of units would have less than two. There is not going to be that many more people. Anything I would say would just be repetition. I am happy to answer any questions you have. (disruption from the public) I am sorry the neighbors feel the way they do, I do not think there is any way that I can say anything that is going to solve their problem. Only your Staff can solve their

problem or the people that work for the City.

### **Executive Session**

Commissioner Rogo: Commissioners we know go into Executive Session, any comments, questions or a motion?

Commissioner Burke: I just, before we speak to this subject, I wanted to take a minute and compliment the City Staff and compliment Mr. Kilborn for just getting up to that podium and reacting in the professional manner that you did. Today from the audience, you were at best, accused of working on behalf of the developer and at worst being accused of being involved in corruption. The fact that you were able to get up there and to handle those objections so professionally I think speaks a lot for you and you Staff. Thank you very much for handling that the way you did.

Commissioner Rogo: Thank you Commissioner Burke, I will certainly second that comment.

Commissioner Bell: I have a question for City Staff, just for clarification. Just to be sure I understood you correctly, because the Church is no longer, I understood you to say that there needs to be a map change, so that is pretty much an automatic thing that needs to happen. After that, the question is what to change it to. There was a couple of people who spoken, one lady in particular, but I forget her name, she emphasized the point of a reasonable designation. In her comment she made reference to Residential Urban designation. What I am trying to understand, is that, according to procedure, is that an option that the City could have looked at and then initiated that particular designation or did the City require a particular designation and then it responded to the designation that it received. That is my first point. The second is, because I am conditioned to or to sit here and keep neighborhoods, I have voted in the past, to keep the characteristics of different neighborhoods the way that they were. To me, what is being presented today, seems to be in conflict in some ways as to what I have experienced in the past to do. I am trying to understand how, how this does go forth with that particular conflict that I am dealing with. I have not have had the experience sitting here where there have been two (2) applications at one time so depending on what you answer is about, if the City were to give a particular designation and then you respond to the particular request, the B. part of that question is that if the residents of this particular community that initiated on their own a request for the Residential Urban designation then, in the event that you are presented with two (2) designation at one time, would we then have to decide, where would we be as a Commission confronted with that? Is it the first designation that comes first that goes through the procedure, do the residents have options to then present? This might not apply to this particular case because I do understand timelines and things like that but this is just for my information and maybe those who have an interest like I do if they are presented in a situation where there is something in their communities that designates that community to be a particular thing, and then that thing goes away, then should the residents then know that they are neighborhood associations, should they then know if they have a particular designation in mind, that they need to initiate something with the City to get whatever outcome that they look to pursue or achieve.

Derek Kilborn: I think I understand your question, so I will try to answer it and if I do not please, let me know. First, one of the easy answers is that residents can not file applications to re-designate the land use on someone else's private property. Typically, when we have a church or a school that is closing, normally then the institutional category is coming off because there is a proposal to do something with it, that is not church or school related. Sometimes churches close and they have an institutional category on them, that category will sit there for years until something that happens with that site that is different then what the institutional category was designated for. Ed White Hospital is an example of that. When there is a proposal to do something, we

have someone come forward with a private application, we have to look at their request, consider it against the Comprehensive Plan and consider is it the appropriate category to put on the map. Now in this case you already have single family zoning there, so all you would be doing under normal circumstances is changing the institutional category to the Residential Urban (RU) category because Residential Urban is the compatible Future Land Use Map (FLUM) category with the NS-1 Single Family zoning category. Here the applicant has come forward and have requested Multi-Family use, so they have included the map amendment for the Official Zoning Map and the Future Land Use Map which is why it is going to (RM) because (RM) is the compatible Future Land Use Map category with NSM-1 zoning. Does that...?

Commissioner Bell: It does.

Commissioner Michaels: I have a few comments here, I would echo, very strongly, what was said earlier about professionalism and integrity of our Staff. I know they work very diligently at presenting all of the recommendations here in a thorough and professional way and do a good job documenting as best they can the rationale that goes with the recommendations. I certainly do commend them. Affordable housing has been brought up here and it is a very serious need in our community, we need to find ways to try and provide more affordable housing throughout the City. The downtown area, the rental prices there right now are like they are in Manhattan. Throughout the City we need to find a way for folks who are not [indecipherable], to be able to live and work in our City and we did pass a few months ago a new zoning overlay which has the effect of making it possible to have greater affordable housing. Unfortunately, it is confined to a very small part of the City and maybe one of the answers for getting to that place that we want to be at with affordable housing is to expand that particular overlay. I do think that this is, again, one of those issues that calls for additional dialogue and additional communication, I would really like to see the developer spend more time with the neighborhood and try to come up with, or the church, try and come up with a consensus proposal here that would better satisfy all of the competing interests that we have. I hear that the insulated rational or argument here about the creek and so forth, I am having a hard time seeing that as a reason to go forward with this recommendation so, for those reasons I am going to vote against this, unless I hear a compelling argument from other Commissioners who are going to make me change my mind.

Commissioner Wolf: I have to say, I share Commissioner Michael's concern, it is the interpretation, I went back to find those specific policies:

3.4 is we should ensure a compatible transition between existing established neighborhoods and new neighborhoods;

3.6 I think is the one you were referring to that says, we should weigh very heavily the established character of the neighborhood;

3.8 we should protect existing and future residential uses from incompatible uses.

Generally, I think our Staff does a good job of trying to weigh those elements in this case, I think we have a fairly substantial weight of evidence given how many people have taken their time from the neighborhood to show up and talk about the impact on their neighborhood. Given the comments we have seen I would have to say, I would take a somewhat different interpretation on, then Staff, in terms of whether the level of density proposed is a compatible transition. I am having a difficult time saying that, that transition is appropriate in this case. I share your concerns there.

Commissioner Winters: One of the things I love about St. Petersburg and one of the reasons I moved here is because of the level of engagement. I want to thank all of you for showing up today and expressing your concerns and expressing your interest. I am always just very struck on this Commission how many people

show up and showing up is really important. What I really love is how much you love your neighborhood and how much you value what it is all about. I love my neighborhood too. Sometimes change is inevitable, I think you are open to some of that, but I find your arguments pretty compelling. I do want to say, I am kind of conflicted about this too because I am very concerned about the workforce housing issue in this City. I have a few questions, the major road piece, as I Google Street View around the neighborhood, I just do not see this as being a major road. I also have some concerns about the traffic, but my larger concern is that this is really a distinctively single family, low density, one story, mostly kind of neighborhood. I find the sharp contrast which Commissioner Wolf pointed out to be too much to go three (3) of four (4) story in this particular neighborhood. The lots are clearly large, there is a good bit of green space and I just think it is not going to take it. One question I do have for Staff, I thought we were really trying to increase density along commercial corridors and I really see this as being outside of a commercial corridor. Could you please talk a little bit about that?

Derek Kilborn: Sure, first I will just repeat that this road segment is on a Map 20 in the City's Comprehensive Plan, Map 20 is the Future Major Streets Map. It is identified as an area that we recognize as a major street. It is true that with the NTM discussion, the Missing Middle discussion that we have been having with the mixed-use categories, there has been a lot of discussion about corridors. Because this is on the Future Major Street Map when we have those other conversations, we are usually referring to that Map in the Comprehensive Plan for guidance on where is existing infrastructure, where are the transportation investments happening, we are all working off of that Future Major Streets Map. Since this road segment is on there, that was one component of the overall review and recommendation. If it was not on that Future Major Street Map it would be a much stronger case against but because this property is on one of those segments, we thought that that contributed to the final recommendation.

Commissioner Winters: Okay thank you, I just sense there is a really strong sense of place right now in this particular neighborhood and it has to do with that low profile distinctively single-family kind of environment. The Workforce Housing issue, could you talk a little bit about where the City is targeting, if they are targeting particular areas of the City to develop this kind of housing.

Derek Kilborn: I would say we are not intentionally targeting anywhere, the Comp. Plan generally recommends that the City consider areas in all geographic locations throughout the City. Our zoning categories are set up, many of them to have a Workforce Housing Bonus, whether that is the Neighborhood Suburban Multi-family categories or the mixed-use corridor and centers. All of those have Workforce Housing Bonus options in them. We are looking for geographic distribution throughout the entire City. Those are voluntary proposals, it is not inclusionary zoning, it is not mandated.

Commissioner Winters: Okay, thank you. My final comment has to do with finding places for this Workforce Housing. I am really concerned about it, we do get into this "Not in My Backyard" kind of question but I think that the neighborhood is really struggling with this and this kind of opposition it would echo what Commissioner Michaels said about, I think it would be great if the developer could work with the community and the neighborhood associations, though, there is not a neighborhood association, is there?

Derek Kilborn: There is not a neighborhood association for this area but we regularly communicated with Pasadena Bear Creek Neighborhood Association which is located just to the north.

Commissioner Winters: Just because of this need to identify some affordable, some Workforce Housing, in our City. It is a challenge all over the country and I think we have to come up with ways to tackle it. I would hope that the site could be redeveloped in some way and I since that the neighborhood is open to having a conversation but with some kind of lower density.

Commissioner Burke: I get it, I don't want a seventy (70) story, seventy (70) foot concrete monolith built behind my house either because I like someone in the audience, I enjoy laying out by my pool too, I get it. We just came through a City Council election, we elected four new City Council people and all four of those people, if you read their platform, Workforce, Affordable Housing and finding and providing that in this City was the key to everyone of those people and we as a City elected those four people, in turn we said, this is important to us. This is a unique parcel, it does have some elements that do in some ways buttress it from the surrounding neighborhood. No trees and a small creek do not make, it is not like there is 100 yards in between it. Sometime we are going to have make a decision that this is important to us and we are going to have to make some hard decisions and there are going to be some people that are upset about that and we recently turned down an increase in density in the Coastal High Hazard Area, if we turn this one down, here is another. When are we going to say yes? When are we going to say that we need affordable Workforce Housing? If we turn this one down, we just need to know, eventually we have to say yes at some point.

Commissioner Wolf: I have a quick question about that, not that I want to discriminate against senior housing, but we are talking about this as a senior housing, over 55, I am not sure that necessarily equates to Workforce Housing. I would say the Workforce Housing certainly is a good goal, I am still not sure that I would, what appears to be in the middle of a single family type, or I can certainly see it as a somewhat lower density in this location, but I think with all the bonuses that are available it potentially is fairly intrusive in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Michaels: I agree that Workforce Housing is paramount issue for our community, and we need to focus on it and we need to come up with a plan that is effective and perhaps something that would be subject to a workshop. I know the Commission here would like to spend some time on it and look at this comprehensively and maybe come up with some policy ideas that will get us where we want to be with an increase with workforce density in the City as a whole.

Commissioner Rogo: Commissioner Burke I wanted to be sure we did not take you off track, I do not know if you had additional points that you wanted to make.

Commissioner Burke: No, Workforce Housing I mentioned I also mentioned Affordable Housing, Affordable Housing for people over 55 and Affordable Housing for people under 55 is a big focus of our City Administration and we are going to have to make some decisions that allow that to happen pretty soon or it is just going to continue to be pushed down the road.

Commissioner Rogo: I have had the opportunity to serve on three occasions on the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee for the City of St. Petersburg. I used to work for the Bay Area Apartment Association, so I have an affinity with the whole concept of Workforce Housing. I have a belief in apartment communities and their value in a community, a community's character. I just have trouble with height versus density in this particular case. I am comfortable with the density idea, in this neighborhood, I am not as comfortable with the height potential in this particular neighborhood. I am also concerned about the density being increased on this one property without any mass transit present. I think it is a big component for the success of Affordable or Workforce Housing to have mass transit in easy reach of those people who live in that kind of housing, so they can get to their jobs, to the doctor, wherever they might need to get. For those two reasons particularly the height and the lack of mass transit I cannot support this particular change in zoning. Any other comments from Commissioners? Do we have a motion?

Commissioner Winters: We have to move approval?

Commissioner Rogo: We have to make a positive motion.

Commissioner Winters: I move approval of the request as submitted by Staff.

Michael Dema: As submitted by the Applicant.

Commissioner Winters: As submitted by the Applicant.

Commissioner Wolf: For purposes of discussion because our motions have to be in the affirmative before we can vote, I will second.

*Commissioner Winters moved approval finding the map amendments consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan.*

*Commissioner Whiteman seconded*

**VOTE:**                    *YES – 1 – Burke*  
                                  *NO – 5 - Bell, Rogo, Winters, Wolf, Michaels*

*Motion failed*

**VII. PUBLIC HEARING - None**

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

**X. NOMINATION & ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR**

Commissioner Burke was nominated to Chair the Commission, he accepted, the Commission unanimously approved the nomination. Commissioner Winters was nominated as Vice Chair, she accepted, the Commission unanimously approved the nomination.

**XI. ADJOURN**

With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 5:40 P.M.