



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

Via Zoom

**SEPTEMBER 8, 2020
TUESDAY
2:00 PM**

MINUTES

Present: Christopher “Chris” A. Burke, Chair
Sharon Winters, Vice Chair
C. Copley Gerdes
Jeff Rogo
Jeffery “Jeff” M. Wolf
Will Michaels, Alternate
Lisa Wannemacher, Alternate

Commissioners Absent: Keisha A. Bell
Gwendolyn “Gwen” Reese, Alternate
Thomas “Tom” Whiteman

Staff Present: Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Elizabeth Abernethy, Director, Planning and Development Services
Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist II
Kelly Perkins, Historic Preservationist II
Britton Wilson, Planner II
Ann Vickstrom, Planner II
Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney
Heather Judd, Assistant City Attorney
Katherine Connell, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Development Services
Iris Winn, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Development Services

The public hearing was called to order at 2:02 p.m., a quorum was present.

I. OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIR

II. ROLL CALL

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. MINUTES

The minutes from the August 11, 2020 meetings were approved unanimously

V. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARINGS**A. City File 20-90200075 Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451**

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement of front door and sidelights to 217 27th St N. The subject property is proposed for inclusion as a contributing resource to the *Kenwood Section – Southwest Central Kenwood Local Historic District*, a pending local historic district.

Staff Presentation

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

Applicant Presentation

Regina Myers, owner, spoke on behalf of the project.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination:

City Staff:
Waived.

Applicant:
Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff:
Waived.

Applicant:
Waived

MOTION: *Commissioner Wolf* made a motion approving the application for the Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement of a front door and sidelights to 217 27th St N. subject to Staff conditions:

1. The existing entryway opening and trim will be preserved, as proposed.
2. Sidelights will be recessed in wall plane approximately 2"-3" to provide consistency with existing historic windows.
3. All other necessary permits shall be obtained. Any additional work shall be presented to staff for determination of the necessity of additional COA approval.

- This approval will be valid for 24 months beginning on the date of revocation of the local Emergency Declaration.

Commissioner Rogo Seconded.

VOTE: *YES – 7 –Burke, Gerdes, Rogo, Winters, Wolf, Michaels, Wannemacher*
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

B. City File 20-90200056 & 20-5400035

Contacts: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470 & Ann Vickstrom, 892-5807

Request:

20-90200056, Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a front circular driveway at the property of 315 22nd Ave NE, a contributing resource to the Granada Terrace Local Historic District

20-54000035, Approval of three (3) Variances to the Land Development Regulations in the City Code for a circular driveway in the front yard at 315 22nd Avenue NE:

- A variance to the Neighborhood Traditional (NT-3) zoning district Building Design Standards to allow a circular driveway and vehicular parking to be located in the front yard
- A variance to increase the maximum 45% impervious surface allowance for front yards to 51%; and
- A variance to eliminate the minimum lot width requirement of 60 feet for a circular driveway.

Staff Presentation 20:20

Kelly Perkins gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Certificate of Appropriateness Staff Report. Ann Vickstrom gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Variance Staff Report.

Applicant/Owner Presentation

Owner, Craig Provencher spoke in support of the application

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

William Norris 306 22nd Ave. NE, St. Petersburg, spoke in support of the application

Robin Reed on behalf of HONNA, 705 16th Ave. NE , St. Petersburg, spoke in opposition of the application

Cross Examination:

City Staff:
Waived.

Applicant:
Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff:

Ann Vickstrom spoke to Mr. Norris' comment regarding a circular driveway approved in the past. The circular driveway was on the side of the property not in front of the property as this application requests.

Applicant/Owner:

Craig Provencher spoke about the conditions that are spoken about the lot split for 16 and 17, I would love to see some sort of official capturing or notation, I have seen it in an email string, but I have never seen it captured in some official form at the time, I could be wrong. I am not sure that those conditions really should apply.

Public hearing and rebuttal: *(technical difficulties earlier in the meeting called for public hearing later in the meeting.)*

Robin Reed, on behalf of HONNA: Spoke in opposition to the request, stating precedent.

Executive Session:

MOTION #1: *Commissioner Wolf made a motion to approve COA (Certificate of Appropriateness)
Commissioner Rogo seconded*

VOTE: *YES – 0
NO – 7 –Burke, Gerdes, Rogo, Winters, Wolf, Michaels, Wannemacher*

Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Motion failed.

Motion #2: *Commissioner Winters mad a motion to approve the three (3) Variances to the Land Development Regulations in the City Code for a circular driveway in the front yard at 315 22nd Avenue NE.*

Commissioner Wannemacher Seconded.

VOTE: *YES – 0
NO – 7 – Burke, Gerdes, Rogo, Winters, Wolf, Michaels, Wannemacher*

Variance Motion failed.

C. City File 20-90300001

Contact Person: Kelly Perkins, 892-5470

Request: Owner-initiated designation and listing of the Smalley-Green Auto Building as a local historic landmark in the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places [Quasi-Judicial]

Commissioner Gerdes was present for the public meeting, he should have recused due to business proximity. His vote and comments have been stricken from the record.

Staff Presentation

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

Applicant/Owner Presentation

No one present to speak on behalf of the owner or applicant.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

Michael Tillman, Member, Collective Edge, LLC., immediately adjacent to the subject property spoke in support of the application.

Cross Examination:

City Staff:

Waived.

Applicant:

None.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff:

Waived

Applicant/Owner:

None.

Executive Session:

Commissioner Burke: We will now go into executive session, if you do not mind, I do have a question first. Ms. Perkins, maybe you can help me. The tax advantages realized by this designation; can you give me some idea on what monetary value these might amount to?

Kelly Perkins: No, sorry, to answer your question, no I have spoken with the property appraiser. How property appraisers decide what is an improvement to a building and what the value is, really is up to them. I am not trained in appraising property values, so I do not feel comfortable in assessing the value. A lot of the work that was done on this building was systems and infrastructure, plumbing and mechanical, so I am not sure what the value that would, what that would add to a property. It will be done as a part of the Ad Valorem Tax program.

Commissioner Burke: What exactly is that tax break? Can you explain to us how that works?

Kelly Perkins: Yes, pretty much, if you have a building, and let's say it is valued at one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000.00), you do a lot of improvements to the building, as approved under this tax program, the property appraiser will assess it prior to construction began and then they will come back and assess it post construction. Let's say they determine that from the value added by the rehabilitation added another one

hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000.00), that would be exempted from your property taxes for ten (10) years. Your property value may still increase as general property values will increase, even if you don't prove a value, but that value that the property appraiser said was added because of your rehabilitation project will be exempted for ten (10) years.

Commissioner Burke: And this, in your example of one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,00.00) rehabilitation, does that only apply to money spent on the historic renovation or is everything in the renovation included in that dollar figure?

Kelly Perkins: From what I understood, the property appraiser includes everything. I don't, that is what one person told me from the Property Appraiser's office. Our qualified improvements that they have to meet that threshold is different, but the property appraiser, just does their own assessment prior and post construction.

Commissioner Burke: So, money spent, replacing the sewer line and money spent improving the façade would count the same towards this tax exemption, is that correct?

Kelly Perkins: For us, to make sure it meets that ten percent (10%) threshold that you have to meet, yes. I do not know, a sewer replacement would equal the same amount of qualified, the same amount of improvement as a complete façade restoration.

Commissioner Burke: Right, okay, I am just trying to, I am not trying to put you on the spot, I am just trying to get an understanding, because we have a number of buildings that are eligible, to be included in the local register. Maybe my concern is unfounded, that we are in some way eroding our tax base, but I don't know that it is significant enough to worry about that.

Kelly Perkins: I mean we generally have one or two a year, that go through the entirety of the process so I would say no. There really is only a very small percentage of the buildings that would qualify. I think less than 1% that are actually designated either locally or as a contributing, or contributing to a national registered district, or as a registered individually on the national register. I am not sure I would agree that... but if anyone has any questions about what the value of rehabilitation might add, I would encourage you to contact your local property appraiser, they will be happy to speak with you about it.

Commissioner Burke: I appreciate you helping me understand how that works. We are in the executive session section and we have an opportunity for any other commissioners to chime in with any questions, or anything like that. Does anyone have anything they would like to add? Commissioner Rogo.

Commissioner Rogo: Mr. Chairman, thank you, just a quick comment, I would like to commend the owner for initiating this designation, for all the times that I have driven by that building, I would have never known or noticed all of the unique characteristics of the building unless this designation was considered today, so thank you very much to the owner, even though they are not with us today. I am very much in support of this designation, thanks.

Commissioner Burke: Well, I am sure somewhere around 2:00 am this morning the owners will be watching this broadcast and they will hear that, so thank you for getting that on the record. Mr. Wolf!

Commissioner Wolf: Just to, respond to, a member from the public had mentioned, it sounds like the property group is going to be coming in with something that may impact the rear or side of the existing building and I would be in general agreement in terms of the record, if it comes down to something later that the, I think the front of the building is the important historic element. I would just like to hear from staff if there is any concern

about the side or the rear, if future development impacts the side or rear of the building that the adjacent property, if there is concern about that. It may save some time down the road if we are on record one way or the other as to how we value the side and rear of the property versus the front.

Kelly Perkins: I think that is a hard question to answer, without knowing what the development is. I do think that the low scale of the building is really important so, I would not want something that could affect the scale how the building is read. I do agree the side and rear are very totalitarian, making sure they capture that vertical projection that does, and circle around, I think that should remain open. The designation battery will go along the property line. I am not sure what official review we would have of anything that is connected to it, I am not sure at this point.

Commissioner Wolf: Okay, it sounds like that question might come up so I thought it might be worthwhile to have staff express some view on that. I am not sure, that was not from the owner, so it sounds to me like anything occurring would be on an adjacent property. Really, I am not sure our designation of this property would be, would have much of an effect on an adjacent property in any case. The question was raised, and it sounds like there might be activity there sooner rather than later

Commissioner Burke: I do understand exactly why you are bringing that up, Ms. Perkins, you are correct, the historical element the front façade does wrap a bit around, to, I think the west side of the building a few feet, but it is still on our property. I do not know if we have the ability to put any type of conditions about what is more historic or what is less historic here, but I do understand what the general public, I think, Mr. Tillman was coming from. Mrs. Winters, your comments please.

Commissioner Winters: I just want to echo commissioner Rogo's comments, this is a really special building. The Italian, Spanish revival with art deco, you think, can this really work. It really does work, it is a beautifully proportioned building, the detail is really stunning. To have it on Central Avenue with a lot of pedestrian traffic, where people can rally appreciate it, it is a real jewel for the City, so, I move approval of the nomination to the registry.

Commissioner Burke: Okay, we have a motion on the floor, do we have a second?

Commissioner Rogo: I would like to second please.

Commissioner Burke: I do think we have some discussion that we need to take into consideration.

Commissioner Burke: We appreciate you sharing your knowledge with us, Commissioner Wannemacher.

Commissioner Wannemacher: I just wanted to add, because there is a window located on that west façade, up at the corner, the fire code, the life safety code, the building code will prevent an adjacent building from being smacked right up against that. There is some, anything that happens there, right on that corner, immediately adjacent to that window is going to be governed by the safety and fire codes. I just wanted to mention that.

Commissioner Burke: Thank you and I have said this before, the diverse make up of this board is really important and having an architect who does a bunch of historic work in the City or commercial work in the City is a valuable asset, so thank you for sharing that.

I think that we have a motion and a second on the floor to approve this application, I think we are ready to do a roll call.

Executive Session:

Commissioner Burke: Thank you, we will move into executive session, commissioners this is where you get to ask questions or comment, you can raise your hand via Zoom. Would anyone like to speak on this issue? Commissioner Rogo, you have raised your hand, do you have a comment?

Commissioner Rogo: Mr. Chairman, I was going to make a motion because this particular property meets the three (3) criterion of age, significance and integrity. I move approval of the owner-initiated designation in listing of the Coronet, Smith-Empire Building to our St. Petersburg register of historic places.

Commissioner Wolf: I second.

Commissioner Burke: We have a motion and a second on the floor, is there any additional discussion? Seeing none, we can go to a vote. It seems we can do this quickly, if you can please do a roll call.

MOTION: *Commissioner Rogo made a motion approving the owner-initiated designation and listing of the Coronet 300/Smith-Empire Building to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places*

Commissioner Wolf Seconded.

VOTE: *YES – 6 – Burke, Gerdes, Rogo, Winters, Wolf, Michaels*
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

E. City File 20-90300004

Contact Person: Laura Duvokot, 892-5451

Request: Owner-initiated designation and listing of the Springstead Warehouse/Station House to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places.

Staff Presentation

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

Applicant Presentation

Nicholas Gavaluc, and Michael Joyce spoke on behalf of the project.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination:

City Staff:

Waived.

Applicant:

Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff:

Waived.

Applicant:

Waived

Executive Session:

Commissioner Burke: Okay we will move into executive session of the CPPC where commissioners will have a chance to chime in. I would just like to say I thought those pictures were incredible, I love seeing them and I have a question for Commissioner Michaels. Mr. Michaels, the train that was going in front of the Stationhouse, is that the same track that used to lead out to the pier that was there?

Commissioner Michaels: That is correct, yes, that went right out to Demon's Landing, not the pier but Demon's Landing. There was a trolley that went out to the old Million Dollar Pier. But the railroad went out to Demon's Landing.

Commissioner Burke: Wow, thank you very much. Any commissioners interested in speaking on this? Mr. Wolf, are you ready, please go ahead?

Commissioner Wolf: Yes, kind of a blast from the past, I was running the construction division for the, for a while it was Honeycutt Energies, Talbert Development and then it was, became Echelon, I did a lot of the work on that building when we first converted it and restored it back in the 80s.

Commissioner Burke: Well that is interesting, you have a long history of working on these buildings and that is why we are lucky to have you. It is a great building; I do not see any other comments. I would just mention that this idea of feel comes up quite a bit, certainly when we are talking about the Bodega building earlier today, we had commissioners commenting as well, what a lovely building it is when they walk by it, the detail, that to me shows feeling. This building, I think has tremendous feeling, I am not so sure how much feeling was on the last application that we had, the 300 Coronet, LLC. I just hope we are not backing ourselves into a corner by passing these things very easily. I don't know that there is a downside and I hope that there is not. I just wanted to mention that, we should be careful of that. Any other comments... Mr. Rogo.

Commissioner Rogo: Maybe to just follow up on your thought there, Mr. Chairman. Certainly, the staff has shown us the age, significance and integrity are in play with this particular building with this particular property. I am wondering if Mr. Joyce can address this, is there any display or any plaque, anything that would show someone in the community, the link to the Orange Belt Railway. I always thought the Stationhouse had been a former fire station or a police station and was amazed to see the photographs and to learn the history of

the building. So, Mr. Joyce, maybe to address this connection, this feeling, what does one see when one enters Stationhouse?

Joyce: We actually have, and Steve Gianfilippo can actually speak to this more than I can. He is the founder of Gianco companies. We did, and with all of our historic building we try and tie it to at least some part of its history. Whenever you walk into the ground floor in the back, we have all of the historic pictures on display. We actually have a bathroom on the second floor and every time we do a tour for businesses and developers, stuff like that, we walk everyone back there and go through the story of how the name Stationhouse came about and back to the 300 Central Building, we do have some potential future development plans. Obviously, we will work with you guys and walk through the approval process. As an example, on that building the name is going to be Masen and that goes back to builder Frank Masen who actually built the first building, the first skyscraper in St. Pete, that is just to give you an example of the idea that we take this very seriously and I have always pushed towards the knowledge of historic buildings

Commissioner Burke: Thank you very much Mr. Joyce. Any other questions Mr. Rogo?

Commissioner Rogo: No, thank you.

Commissioner Michaels: Yes I just wanted to comment that for a number of our historic buildings downtown for example, the open air post office or the church on Williams Square, there are appropriate plaques that give a brief history of what that building is all about and why it is important and significant to the City. Perhaps the applicant here would consider doing that, with this particular, very important landmark. This is one of the most important landmark actions that, I think, we are considering today. Perhaps that is something they could consider, thank you.

Michael Joyce: Absolutely.

Commissioner Burke: I think that is a great idea. I will tell you; I am almost positive that I very confidently told my wife one time that the old stationhouse was an old firehouse and that is why it was so significant. So, if she is not watching, I will have to mention that. Anyway, it is a beautiful building and if anyone has been t the businesses in the Stationhouse, my business used it for some off-site meetings. I took a UF class, and the staff were great, it really is a great business. Any other discussion or do we have someone who would like to put forward a motion?

Commissioner Wolf: To clarify I believe the southeast corner, southwest corner of that block was the first fire station it was, when we were redoing it, we called it McNulty's Station because the first fire chief was McNulty. It is kind of an intracule part of the block, but the first fire station was on that southwest corner.

Commissioner Burke: No kidding, so that is where Ford's Garage is now?

Commissioner Wolf: No, it is diagonally south, what is the restaurant name just escaped me, Red Mesa Cantina. Accenture for a while, that was the stationhouse and it used to have a hose drying tower on top of it as part of the building.

Commissioner Burke: Wow, that is very interesting.

Commissioner Wolf: To address your other question, I would like to make a motion to move approval.

MOTION: *Commissioner Wolf made a motion approving the owner-initiated designation and listing of the Springstead Warehouse/Station House to the St. Petersburg Register of Historic Places*

Commissioner Michaels Seconded.

VOTE: *YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Rogo, Winters, Wolf, Michaels
NO – 0*

Motion passed unanimously.

F. City File ZM-11

Contact Person: Ann Vickstrom, 892-5807

Request: An amendment to the official Zoning Map to change the zoning designation from Neighborhood Mobile Home (NMH) to Corridor Commercial Suburban (CCS-1) located at the site of the Pine Oak Mobile Home Park located at 340 40th Avenue North

Staff Presentation

Ann Vickstrom gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

Applicant Presentation

Jay Miller, owner, spoke on behalf of the project.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination:

City Staff:
Waived.

Applicant:
Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff:
Waived.

Applicant:
Waived

Executive Session:

Commissioner Burke: We can start out executive session, is there any commissioners that would like to chime in, Mr. Michaels we will start with you.

Commissioner Michaels: Thank you, first thing, I have a question for staff, I read the application that was attached to the Staff Report. I was very impressed with the proactive manner in which the applicant sought to relocate and do it with sensitivity and provide support, even financial support to the mobile home residents on that site. I think that was a very good thing of him to do. The other point I would like to make is, of course, this is a mobile home site here and whether it is in the coastal high hazard area or not, it looks like it is right on the edge there, these are nevertheless highly vulnerable housing units. Whatever can be done to locate them out of the coastal high hazard area is extremely important, I think maybe this is not that category. The Staff referred to various policy that this application meets, not in the presentation but in the memo itself, it mentioned Land Use Policy 3.6, which to me is the most important land use policy, that is cited. That policy is the one that talks about planning decisions shall weigh heavily the established character of predominately developed areas. If you look at the zoning for this particular area you will find that this particular site is surrounded on four sides by the CCS-1 the corridor commercial suburban zoning which they are seeking so it meets that particular criteria, at a very high level, a very high standard. I did want to address the level of service here, in particular the drainage issue. This is directed to Staff, I am wondering where we are with the revisions to the level of service for drainage. As you will recall, we had an average, a standard that was established a number of years ago, and in 2016 we had the major flooding in the City and I am wondering, are we still using the same standard that we used back in 2016?

Ann Vickstrom: I see that Derek just came in and I think he is going to address that portion.

Derek Kilborn: Thank you Commissioner Michaels, we continue to work with the Public Works and Engineering and Capital Improvements Departments to make sure that as they continue with their updates those are reflected in the comprehensive plan and we do that through the annual concurrency update. Right now we are continuing to work with them and make those updates and adjustments as new information becomes available from them.

I also have an answer to the question about the coastal high hazard area, I think there was reference on page 3 of the Staff Report to the coastal high hazard area and I do want to clarify for the commission that the coastal high hazard area is at the end of the alley and that is to the east, that is not within the subject boundary of what you are considering today. It is in proximity, but it is not within the boundary, that is an important distinction for you to know as you move forward with your consideration of the application.

Commissioner Michaels: So again, we are still using the standard for drainage that was in place in 2016, is that correct?

Derek Kilborn: I believe that has been updated through our annual concurrency management updates that we do, but you are correct we are not using 2019 numbers, 2018 numbers because we are following the lead of the City's Public Works Department and the data and information they are getting back in their studies and work.

Commissioner Michaels: Okay, the last time we discussed this there was the proposal to add the standard that dealt with peak weather capacity as opposed to average capacity has that been done?

Derek Kilborn: Right, some of that referenced, has been added through the annual concurrency updates and

you will see that typically there is some description to that in the Staff Reports that we are generating and the level of service standard that we are performing.

Commissioner Michaels: I did not see it in this application or the other two (2), I would appreciate, and if I the rest of the Commission would like, to have a good concise statement on what the level of service standard is presently for drainage and whether or not there is any further consideration being given to amending that further, thank you.

Derek Kilborn: In response to that, maybe one thing we can do for the commission is schedule a update and come back with you and have a standalone update item and we can present to you where we are with those different items right now and the level of service with drainage.

Commissioner Michaels: That would be very helpful, thank you.

Derek Kilborn: Okay, we will do that.

Commissioner Burke: Yes, that would be very helpful. In the application it did reference that the City sits 15 and 16 and increased the rainy-day capacity by 40% and that was a little confusing so we would love to hear what that is all about. Do any other Commissioners have any other comments? I see none, so we could entertain a motion for the amendment to the zoning map, do we have a motion? Yes, Commissioner Rogo.

MOTION: *Commissioner Rogo made a motion finding the amendment to the official Zoning Map to change the zoning designation from Neighborhood Mobile Home (NMH) to Corridor Commercial Suburban (CCS-1) located at the site of the Pine Oak Mobile Home Park located at 340 40th Avenue North consistent with the City's comprehensive plan*

Commissioner Wolf Seconded.

VOTE: *YES – 7 –Burke, Gerdes, Rogo, Winters, Wolf, Michaels, Wannemacher
NO – 0*

Motion passed unanimously.

G. City File FLUM-59

Contact Person: Britton Wilson, 551-3542

Request: A City-initiated application to amend the Official Zoning Map and Future Land Use Map resulting from annexation of the subject property

Staff Presentation

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

Applicant Presentation

None.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination

None.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

None.

Executive Session

Commissioner Burke: Commissioners do we have any comments on the City's desire to clean up this little sliver of land? I do not see any comments, do we have a motion? Yes, Mr. Rogo.

MOTION: *Commissioner Rogo made a motion finding the City-initiated application to amend the Official Zoning Map and Future Land Use Map resulting from annexation of the subject property consistent with the City's comprehensive plan.*

Commissioner Wolf Seconded.

VOTE: *YES – 7 –Burke, Gerdes, Rogo, Winters, Wolf, Michaels, Wannemacher
NO – 0*

Motion passed unanimously.

H. City File FLUM-61

Contact Person: Britton Wilson, 551-3542

Request: An application to amend the Official Zoning Map and Future Land Use Map from Neighborhood Traditional Single family – 1 (NT-1) to Corridor Residential Traditional – 1 (CRT-1) and from Planned Redevelopment – Residential (PR-R) to Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use (PR-MU):

1. Official Zoning Map amendment: Neighborhood Traditional Single family – 1 (NT-1) to Corridor Residential Traditional – 1 (CRT-1)
2. Future Land Use Map amendments: Planned Redevelopment – Residential (PR-R) to Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use (PR-MU)

Staff Presentation

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

Applicant Presentation

None.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination

None.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

None.

Executive Session

Commissioner Burke: Do we have any comments from Commissioners? We do, Mr. Michaels.

Commissioner Michaels: This again is for the Staff, I am looking again at policy 3.6, the predominate established character, and your report is saying that it does meet that standard, but we do have that single family zoning to the south and to the east, maybe it is a 50/50 situation here. Why did you come down on the side of the proposed zoning being more compatible with the commercial to the west?

Britton Wilson: It provides a transition to the intensities which is the ideal layout for zoning districts. You would have commercial and then higher intensity, multi-family and then to the single family. The property to the south that is single family, it is actually zoned CRT-1. It could be redeveloped to multi-family or commercial as it stands now.

Commissioner Michaels: Okay, I do not think it is totally clear cut, but those are good points.

Commissioner Burke: Any other comments from the Commissioners? If there are no other comments, we are going to throw this wide open to any commissioner that is available that would like to propose a motion. So we will look back to Mr. Rogo.

Commissioner Rogo: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

MOTION: *Commissioner Rogo made a motion approving the amend the Official Zoning Map and Future Land Use Map from Neighborhood Traditional Single family – 1 (NT-1) to Corridor Residential Traditional – 1 (CRT-1) and from Planned Redevelopment – Residential (PR-R) to Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use (PR-MU) consistent with the City’s comprehensive plan.*

Commissioner Winters Seconded.

VOTE: *YES – 7 –Burke, Gerdes, Rogo, Winters, Wolf, Michaels, Wannemacher
NO – 0*

Motion passed unanimously.

VII. UPDATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

VIII. ADJOURN

Commissioner Whiteman made a motion to adjourn.
Commissioner Rogo seconded.

With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 4:47 P.M.