STAFF REPORT
Community Planning and Preservation Commission
Certificate of Appropriateness Request

Report to the Community Planning and Preservation Commission from the Urban Planning and Historic Preservation Division, Planning and Development Services Department, for Public Hearing and Executive Action scheduled for Tuesday, October 13, 2020 at 2:00 p.m., by means of communications media technology pursuant to Executive Order 20-69 issued by the Governor on March 20, 2020, and Executive Order 2020-12 issued by the Mayor on April 9, 2020. Everyone is encouraged to view the meetings on TV or online at www.stpete.org/meetings.

According to Planning and Development Services Department records, no member of the Community Planning and Preservation Commission resides or has a place of business within 2,000 feet of the subject property. All other possible conflicts should be declared upon the announcement of the item.

AGENDA ITEMS: CITY FILE NO.: 20-90200085 (GARAGE DEMOLITION)
CITY FILE NO. 20-90200086 (GARAGE NEW CONSTRUCTION)

REQUESTS: Review of Certificates of Appropriateness for a property proposed for inclusion as a contributing property to a local historic district currently pending public hearing:
- Demolition of a contributing historic detached garage building;
- Construction of a detached garage building.

OWNER: Susan E. Eubanks
AGENT: Michael Miano, General Contractor
PARCEL ID NO.: 23-31-16-35082-009-0120
ADDRESS: 2725 3rd Ave. N.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: HALL’S CENTRAL AV NO. 1 BLK 9, LOT 12 & W ½ of LOT 13
ZONING: NT-2
Historic Significance

The Craftsman bungalow at 2725 3rd Avenue North ("the subject property") was constructed circa 1924. The house takes the double front gable form fairly typical to bungalows constructed locally during the 1920s, with a gabled front porch distinguished from the primary roof structure. The property’s builder is unknown.

The subject property is a contributing property to the Kenwood National Register Historic District (Florida Master Site File No. 8PI08003). The area generally bounded by 1st Avenue North, 5th Avenue North, 26th Street North, and 28th Street North is subject to a complete application for local historic district designation as the Kenwood Section - Southwest Central Kenwood Local Historic District (City File 19-90300002), which is pending public hearing. The subject property is recommended for inclusion in this district as a contributing property by this application, and staff concurs with this evaluation of the resource’s contributing status. Because of the prolonged duration of the proposed district’s pending status.

Project Description and Review

Project Description

The Kenwood neighborhood is dominated by early-twentieth century suburban development with features houses with street-facing facades largely geared toward pedestrian access and featuring publicly visible front porches, whereas vehicle access is limited to alley-facing garages and driveways. These accessory garages vary in size, ranging from individual one-car units to two-story garage apartments, though the buildings are fairly consistently frame, gable-roofed buildings. The subject property’s existing detached one-car garage appears to be historic to the property. Although the permit card is not available, a building of the same size and location is visible in the 1952 Sanborn map of the area, as seen in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Property as shown in 1952 Sanborn Map

The proposal involves both demolition of the existing accessory garage building (Figure 2), and the new construction of a fairly similar building roughly in its place (Figure 3). The total demolition of a contributing
building within a historic district is perhaps the most impactful action on a historic district’s integrity possible, followed by new construction. Because of the substantial effects that these actions can have on a district’s historic integrity, it is common practice for proposals for demolition to be considered separately from replacement new construction by the Community Planning and Preservation Commission. In the recent past, these separate actions have been presented to Commissioners entirely separately and at two successive hearings. However, in the case at hand, staff has determined it appropriate for these aspects of the proposal to be heard at a single meeting, although separate motions will be required from the Commission for the demolition (case 20-90200085) and new construction (20-90200086). This joint processing was determined to be appropriate because of the building’s status as an accessory building, as well as the subject district’s pending status.

The demolition and new construction have been reviewed by the Building and Zoning departments as permits 20-07002175 and 20-07002180, respectively, and found to be compliant.

The existing garage is 15 feet wide by 18 feet long, according to the Pinellas County Property Appraiser’s Office, for 270 square feet. It features a rectangular footprint and a front-gabled roof facing the alley, frame construction on a concrete base, and aluminum siding cladding which appears to be a non-historic alteration. Visible windows and the single-car-width garage door both appear to have been replaced. The building is approximately centered at the northern (alley-adjacent) edge of the parcel. The paver parking pad visible to the right of the building is roughly the proposed location of the new construction.

The proposed new construction is 20 feet wide by 19 feet deep, creating a building of 380 square feet. This constitutes an increase of 110 square feet, or 41%. Like the existing building, it will feature a front-gabled roof facing the alleyway. The proposed exterior cladding is cementitious fiberboard, replicating the aesthetic of the primary residence’s wood siding.

The south elevation, which faces the primary residence, features a single, centered, window, and the east and west side elevations are punctuated by a paired set of half-glazed doors and one window, and a decorative panel, respectively (Figure 4).
Figure 4: Elevations of Proposed New Construction
General Criteria for Granting Certificates of Appropriateness and Staff Findings

1. *The effect of the proposed work on the landmark or the property upon which such work is to be done.*

   **Consistent**

   The subject property is proposed to be included in the pending Kenwood Section – Southwest Kenwood Local Historic District, whose early twentieth century architectural character is largely derived from its collection of highly intact Craftsman bungalows.

   The cultural landscape of the subject district is representative of the area’s origin as a streetcar suburb, with residences oriented toward pedestrian connections to the street, and vehicular access generally provided through rear alleys.

   The proposal will replace the existing detached garage with another, which will also be alley-facing and not highly visible from the street. The surrounding alley features historic one- and two-story accessory buildings, including both garages and garage-apartment buildings.

   ![Figure 5: Alley adjacent to subject property, facing southeast](image)

   ![Figure 6: Alley across from subject property, facing northeast](image)

2. *The relationship between such work and other structures on the landmark site or other property in the historic district.*

   **Consistent**

   The proposed demolition and replacement will generally retain the rhythm of the alleyway, which is defined by a variety of fairly vernacular accessory buildings.

3. *The extent to which the historic, architectural, or archaeological significance, architectural style, design, arrangement, texture and materials of the local landmark or the property will be affected.*

   **Consistent**

   Although the replacement garage building will be slightly larger in scale than the existing building and clad in the alternative material of cementitious fiberboard (“Hardie board”), its overall design and placement on the property are consistent with the accessory buildings in the district.
4. **Whether the denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness would deprive the property owner of reasonable beneficial use of his or her property.**

   **Generally consistent**  The application for demolition notes the existing garage suffers irreparable deterioration, citing damage from settling, water intrusion, mold/mildew, and termites. No evidence beyond the condition statement was provided.

5. **Whether the plans may be reasonably carried out by the applicant.**

   **Consistent**  There is no indication that the applicant cannot carry out the proposal.

6. **A COA for a noncontributing structure in a historic district shall be reviewed to determine whether the proposed work would negatively impact a contributing structure or the historic integrity of the district. Approval of a COA shall include any conditions necessary to mitigate or eliminate negative impacts.**

   **Not applicable**  The subject property is a proposed to be listed as a contributing property, as is the detached garage.

### Additional Guidelines for Demolition

In approving or denying applications for a COA for demolition, the Commission and the POD shall also use the following additional guidelines:

1. **The purpose and intent of these additional requirements is to determine that no other feasible alternative to demolition of the local landmark or contributing property can be found.**

2. **No COA for demolition shall be issued by the Commission until the applicant has demonstrated that there is no reasonable beneficial use of the property or the applicant cannot receive a reasonable return on a commercial or income-producing property.**

3. **The Commission may solicit expert testimony and should request that the applicant furnish such additional information believed to be necessary and relevant in the determination of whether there is a reasonable beneficial use or a reasonable return. The information to be submitted by a property owner should include, but not be limited to, the following information:**

   a. **A report from a licensed architect or engineer who shall have demonstrated experience in structural rehabilitation concerning the structural soundness of the building and its suitability for rehabilitation including an estimated cost to rehabilitate the property.**

   b. **A report from a qualified architect, real estate professional, or developer, with demonstrated experience in rehabilitation, or the owner as to the economic feasibility of rehabilitation or reuse of the property. The report should explore various alternative uses for the property and include, but not be limited to, the following information:**
i. The amount paid for the property, date of purchase, remaining mortgage amount (including other existing liens) and the party from whom purchased, including a description of the relationship, if any, between the owner of record or applicant and the person from whom the property was purchased, and any terms of financing between the seller and buyer.

ii. The most recent assessed value of the property.

iii. Photographs of the property and description of its condition.

iv. Annual debt service or mortgage payment.

v. Real estate property taxes for the current year and the previous two years.

vi. An appraisal of the property conducted within the last two years. The City may hire an appraiser to evaluate any appraisals. All appraisals shall include the professional credentials of the appraiser.

vii. Estimated market value of the property in its current condition; estimated market value after completion of the proposed demolition; and estimated market value after rehabilitation of the existing local landmark for continued use.

viii. Evidence of attempts to sell or rent the property, including the price asked within the last two years and any offers received.

ix. Cost of rehabilitation for various use alternatives. Provide specific examples of the infeasibility of rehabilitation or alternative uses which could earn a reasonable return for the property.

x. If the property is income-producing, submit the annual gross income from the property for the previous two years as well as annual cash flow before and after debt service and expenses, itemized operating and maintenance expenses for the previous two years, and depreciation deduction and projected five-year cash flow after rehabilitation.

xi. If the property is not income-producing, projections of the annual gross income which could be obtained from the property in its current condition.

xii. Evidence that the building can or cannot be relocated.

c. The Commission may request that the applicant provide additional information to be used in making the determinations of reasonable beneficial use and reasonable return.

d. If the applicant does not provide the requested information, the applicant shall submit a statement to the Commission detailing the reasons why the requested information was not provided.

4. The Commission may ask interested individuals and organizations for assistance in seeking an alternative to demolition.
5. *The Commission shall review the evidence provided and shall determine whether the property can be put to a reasonable beneficial use or the applicant can receive a reasonable return without the approval of the demolition application. The applicant has the burden of proving that there is no reasonable beneficial use of the property or that the owner cannot receive a reasonable return. If the applicant fails to establish the lack of a reasonable beneficial use or the lack of a reasonable return, the Commission shall deny the demolition application except as provided below.*

6. *The Commission may condition any demolition approval upon the receipt of plans and building permits for any new structure and submission of evidence of financing in order to ensure that the site does not remain vacant after demolition.*

7. *The Commission may grant a COA for demolition even though the local landmark, or property within a local historic district has reasonable beneficial use or receives a reasonable return if:*
   
   a. *The Commission determines that the property no longer contributes to a local historic district or no longer has significance as a historic, architectural or archaeological local landmark; or*
   
   b. *The Commission determines that the demolition of the designated property is necessary to achieve the purposes of a community redevelopment plan or the Comprehensive Plan.*

8. *The Commission may, at the owner’s expense, require the recording of the property for archival purposes prior to demolition. The recording may include, but shall not be limited to, video recording, photographic documentation with negatives and measured architectural drawings.*

**Insufficient evidence** Although little evidence to support the necessity of demolition has been provided to staff as part of the application, the attached statement cites a deteriorated foundation that has caused settling, water intrusion, and mold, as well as termite damage. Staff observation from the Right-of-Way could not confirm such drastic condition issues.

Deterioration at the garage’s soffit and fascia was reported by the City’s Codes Enforcement Department in 2002 but repaired that same year. No other violations of Code related to the garage’s condition have been registered.

Despite the lack of detailed evidence showing the deterioration of the existing structure, however, staff suggests that the Commission weigh several additional factors in its decision of whether or not to grant the demolition:

1. The existing structure, although it retains its contributing form and footprint, has been altered through the application of aluminum siding and replacement of its original door, thus suffering diminished integrity of materials and craftsmanship;

2. The structure is ancillary in nature on the subject property; the primary residence will not be affected;

3. The proposed replacement is of similar height and scale, therefore presenting little increased visibility from the front street or elsewhere in the district; and
4. The subject property is located within a district that is pending designation, with public hearings being held due to the rescheduling of in-person meetings as a result of pandemic closures.

Additional Guidelines for New Construction

In approving or denying applications for a COA for new construction (which includes additions to an existing structure), the Commission and the POD shall also use the following additional guidelines:

1. The height and scale of the proposed new construction shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.
   
   Consistent  
   The proposed new construction will be one story with a height of 8’ 8” at the beginning of roofline and 12’ 10” at the top of roof peak. This is consistent with single-story garages in the district. The roof’s 5:12 pitch will match that of the primary residence on the property.

2. The relationship of the width of the new construction to the height of the front elevation shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

Consistent  
The proposed garage building faces the alley running between two avenues in this district; other, similar buildings vary in width and include one-car garages, two-car garages, and, like the proposed, buildings featuring one-car openings with storage to one side, as shown in Figure 5.

3. The relationship of the width of the windows to the height of the windows in the new construction shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

Consistent  
The proposed windows are shown to be 3’ 1” by 3’ 2”, roughly square. This is consistent with the windows on the existing detached garage, as well as those at adjacent accessory buildings, as seen in Figure 6.

4. The relationship of solids and voids (which is the pattern or rhythm created by wall recesses, projections, and openings) in the front facade of a building shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

Generally consistent  
Detached garages and accessory buildings in the district tend to be utilitarian in design and feature varied patterns of fenestration that does not necessarily follow a distinct rhythm. As noted, above, there is nearby precedent for the asymmetrical garage door opening proposed. The rear (south) and east side elevations feature relatively typical fenestration, including a centered window beneath a gable end and a dual-action door beside a window, respectively. The proposed “decorative hardiplank panel” at the west elevation is not typical to the district, but staff does not consider it substantially impactful to the building’s overall design.
5. **The relationship of the new construction to open space between it and adjoining buildings shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.**

   **Consistent**  
   The proposed new construction is to be closer to the west property boundary than the existing garage, following a 6’ setback rather than being roughly centered at the alley-facing edge. Placement of accessory buildings at a rear corner, but within allowable setbacks, is consistent with other examples in the district.

6. **The relationship of the entrance and porch projections, and balconies to sidewalks of the new construction shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.**

   **Consistent**  
   As a detached accessory building, the proposal features no porch. It is positioned close to the rear alley. Vehicular access to garages being provided by similar alley-facing garages is a character-defining feature of the district’s designed landscape.

7. **The relationship of the materials and texture of the facade of the new construction shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials used in contributing resources in the district.**

   **Consistent**  
   The proposed building employs “hardiplank” fiber siding vinyl windows, and a roll-down garage door presumably made of metal or fiberglass, which are modern materials not historically present in the district. However, given the building’s status as an accessory building, staff finds the overall historic appearance presented by the building to be appropriate to the district and consistent with other proposals that have been reviewed and approved by this Commission.

   Staff recommends that the Commission condition approval upon staff review of the garage and side doors, as well as requiring the windows to be recessed within the wall plane 2” to 3” to reference historic construction.

8. **The roof shape of the new construction shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.**

   **Consistent**  
   The proposed roof is a 5:12 gable, which is consistent with the primary residence and other contributing accessory buildings.

9. **Appurtenances of the new construction such as walls, gates and fences, vegetation and landscape features, shall, if necessary, form cohesive walls of enclosures along a street, to ensure visual compatibility of the new construction with contributing resources in the district.**

   **Not applicable**  
   No information has been provided regarding changes to fencing or other enclosures resulting from this project. Staff suggests that any such changes undertaken as part of this construction be reviewed administratively as part of the approval of this application.
10. The mass of the new construction in relation to open spaces, the windows, door openings, porches and balconies shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district.

**Consistent** The proposed new construction is rectangular and without articulation. This form is consistent with the fairly utilitarian contributing accessory buildings in the district.

11. The new construction shall be visually compatible with contributing resources in the district in its orientation, flow, and directional character, whether this is the vertical, horizontal, or static character.

**Consistent** The garage’s orientation toward the alley is a significant aspect of the district’s significance and will be retained with the proposed new construction.

12. New construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the local landmark or contributing property to a local landmark district. The new construction shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the local landmark and its environment, or the local landmark district.

**Consistent** The contemporary materials, while referencing those of historic contributing buildings, differentiate this new construction. Staff finds this approach to be appropriate for an accessory building of this small size and relatively low visibility within the district.

13. New construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the local landmark and its environment would be unimpaired.

**Consistent** The existing garage must be demolished for this proposal to be constructed, but the future removal new construction would not substantially deteriorate the district’s integrity further.

**Summary of Findings**

Staff evaluation yields a finding of the following criteria being met by the proposed project:

- **General Criteria for Granting Certificates of Appropriateness:** 5 of 5 relevant criteria met or generally satisfied.

- **Additional Guidelines for Demolition:** Although a statement was provided, staff did not receive evidence of the deterioration noted at the existing garage. However, due to the accessory status of the resource, the pending designation of the subject district, and the submittal of a proposal for a fairly similar replacement, staff recommends approval of the demolition.

- **Additional Guidelines for New Construction:** 12 of 12 relevant criteria met or generally satisfied.

**Staff Recommendation and Conditions of Approval**

Based on a determination of general consistency with Chapter 16, City Code of Ordinances, staff recommends that the Community Planning and Preservation Commission approve both the application
for demolition of the existing garage and the application for new construction of a detached garage. Two motions will be required:

1. Staff recommends the Commission **approve with conditions** COA application 20-90200085 for the demolition of the existing detached garage at 2725 3rd Ave. N., subject to the following conditions:
   i. Construction plans for the replacement garage be approved by Development Review Services, Construction Services and Permitting, and Historic Preservation prior to demolition taking place;
   ii. All other permits be obtained as necessary, including administrative approval of the conditions set forth for the new construction application below;
   iii. This approval will be valid for 24 months beginning on the date of revocation of the local Emergency Declaration.

2. Staff recommends the Commission **approved with conditions** COA application 20-90200086 for the new construction of a detached garage at 2725 3rd Ave. N., subject to the following conditions:
   i. Administrative review and approval be granted for any necessary or related alteration, removal, or new construction of fencing or other enclosures undertaken as part of the demolition and new construction;
   ii. Windows and doors are to be set back approximately 2” to 3” in the wall plane to replicate the historic texture of frame construction;
   iii. Administrative review and approval be granted for proposed roll-down garage and side door units. Staff suggests that these doors replicate the appearance of panel construction.
   iv. All other necessary permits shall be obtained. Any additional work shall be presented to staff for determination of the necessity of additional COA approval.
   v. This approval will be valid for 24 months beginning on the date of revocation of the local Emergency Declaration.
Appendix A:

Application No. 20-90200085 and Submittals
# Certificate of Appropriateness

**Application**

All applications are to be filled out completely and correctly. The application shall be submitted to the City of St. Petersburg's Planning and Development Services Department, located on the 8th floor of the Municipal Services Building, One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida. Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist II, (727) 892-5451 or Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org

## General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Parcel Identification No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2725 3rd Ave N, 33713</td>
<td>03-31-16-35082-009-012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic District / Landmark Name</th>
<th>Corresponding Permit Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Kenwood</td>
<td>20-07006A175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner's Name</th>
<th>Owner's Address, City, State, Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Eubanks</td>
<td>2925 3rd Ave N, St. Pete, FL, 33713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorized Representative (Name &amp; Title), if applicable</th>
<th>Owner's Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Miaga, General Contractor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmiaga4@gmail.com">mmiaga4@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative's Address, City, State, Zip Code</th>
<th>Representative's Daytime Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1126 16th St. N, St. Pete, FL, 33705</td>
<td><a href="mailto:office@sundaybuilders.com">office@sundaybuilders.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Application Type (Check applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addition</th>
<th>Window Replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Door Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Roof Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation</td>
<td>Mechanical (e.g. solar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Type of Work (Check applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repair Only</th>
<th>In-Kind Replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Installation</td>
<td>Other: Demolition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Authorization

By signing this application, the applicant affirms that all information contained within this application packet has been read and that the information on this application represents an accurate description of the proposed work. The applicant certifies that the project described in this application, as detailed by the plans and specifications enclosed, will be constructed in exact accordance with aforesaid plans and specifications. Further, the applicant agrees to conform to all conditions of approval. It is understood that approval of this application by the Community Planning and Preservation Commission in no way constitutes approval of a building permit or other required City permit approvals. Filing an application does not guarantee approval.

**NOTES:**

1. It is incumbent upon the applicant to submit correct information. Any misleading, deceptive, incomplete or incorrect information may invalidate your approval.
2. To accept an agent's signature, a notarized letter of authorization from the property owner must accompany the application.

**Signature of Owner:** Susan C. Eubanks  
**Date:** 08/17/2020

**Signature of Representative:** Mr. V. Miaga  
**Date:** 8/18/2020
**PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK**

Please provide a detailed description of the proposed work, organized according to the COA Matrix. Include information such as materials, location, square footage, etc. as applicable. Attach supplementary material as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building or Site Feature</th>
<th>Photo No.</th>
<th>Proposed Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Structures, historic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demolition of detached garage (270 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Add new detached garage per plans (330 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The detached garage structure is in extremely poor condition. The concrete foundation of this building is greatly deteriorated, and the many failures have caused moisture intrusion when rain occurs. The building has settled below the median grade of the property causing this moisture intrusion. It has become a mold and mildew hazard due to the excessive amount of water intrusion.

In addition to the foundation failures, the 2x wood sill plates and 2x4 supporting walls have deteriorated due to the moisture damage. Sequentially, this has caused wood rot along with termites' infestation to the structure. The termite damage is evident throughout the whole building.

There is no feasible alternative to rehab this building and that is why we are proposing demolition and the new construction of detached garage. The new building will conform similarly to the current detached structure and is only increasing in size to accommodate a modern-day vehicle. It will conform to the existing historic home using similar characteristic in the construction design.
Appendix B:

Application No. 20-90200086 and Submittals
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

APPLICATION

All applications are to be filled out completely and correctly. The application shall be submitted to the City of St. Petersburg’s Planning and Development Services Department, located on the 8th floor of the Municipal Services Building, One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida. Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist II, (727) 892-5451 or Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org

GENERAL INFORMATION

2725 3rd Ave. N., 33713
Property Address

Historic Kenwood
Historic District / Landmark Name

Susan Eubanks
Owner’s Name

2725 3rd Ave. N., St. Pete, FL, 33713
Owner’s Address, City, State, Zip Code

Michael Miano, General Contractor
Authorized Representative (Name & Title), if applicable

1126 16th St. N., St. Pete, FL, 33705
Representative’s Address, City, State, Zip Code

23-31-16-35082-009-0130
Parcel Identification No.

-20-0703160
Corresponding Permit Nos.

813-765-4061
Property Owner’s Daytime Phone No.

seubanks4@gmail.com
Owner’s Email

727-525-2405
Representative’s Daytime Phone No.

office@sundaybuilders.com
Representative’s Email

APPLICATION TYPE (Check applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Window Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Door Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roof Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical (e.g. solar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TYPE OF WORK (Check applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Repair Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-Kind Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUTHORIZATION

By signing this application, the applicant affirms that all information contained within this application packet has been read and that the information on this application represents an accurate description of the proposed work. The applicant certifies that the project described in this application, as detailed by the plans and specifications enclosed, will be constructed in exact accordance with aforesaid plans and specifications. Further, the applicant agrees to conform to all conditions of approval. It is understood that approval of this application by the Community Planning and Preservation Commission in no way constitutes approval of a building permit or other required City permit approvals. Filing an application does not guarantee approval.

NOTES:
1) It is incumbent upon the applicant to submit correct information. Any misleading, deceptive, incomplete or incorrect information may invalidate your approval.
2) To accept an agent’s signature, a notarized letter of authorization from the property owner must accompany the application.

Signature of Owner: Susan E. Eubanks Date: 08/17/2020

Signature of Representative: [Signature] Date: 08/17/2020
All applications are to be filled out completely and correctly. The application shall be submitted to the City of St. Petersburg's Planning and Development Services Department by emailing directly to Historic Preservationists Laura Duvekot (Laura.Duvekot@stpete.org) or Kelly Perkins (Kelly.Perkins@stpete.org).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Photo No.</th>
<th>Proposed Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessory structures, historic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demolition of detached garage (270 s.f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>a, 3, 4</td>
<td>Add new detached garage per plans (380 s.f.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A boundary survey of Lot 12 and the west 1/2 of Lot 13, Block 9, Hall's Central Avenue Subdivision 1, as recorded in plat Book 3, Page 39, of the Public Records of Pinellas County, Florida.

Job Number: MAXVII016
Telephone: (727) 360-0636
Date of Field Survey: 1/09/18
Scale: 1 inch = 20 feet

David C. Harner
Professional Land Surveyor
9925 Gulf Boulevard
Treasure Island, FL 33706
Panel Number: 0218 G

Certified to: Sun Title Insurance Agency, Inc.
Old Republic National Title Insurance Company
Susan Eubanks

I hereby certify to thehereon named party or parties, and only to those named thereon that the boundary survey represented herein meets the standards of practice as set forth by the Florida Board of Professional Surveyors and Mappers in Chapter 55-17, Florida Administrative Code, pursuant to Florida Statute 723.057.

Notes: Underground foundations and/or improvements, if any, are not shown. Other elements affecting property may exist in the public records of this county. Only those elements known to me or supplied to me by the hereon named party or parties are depicted hereon.

Legend:
B.C.I. = Base Flood Elevation
A.W. = Elevation
A.L. = Above
G.I. = Grade
A.H. = Above
C.L. = Centerline
C. = Center
F. = Foundation

NOTES: Ground truth is not verified. The survey shall be for the use of the registered surveyor and the owner thereof.
Appendix C:
Maps of Subject Property
Kenwood Section – Southwest
Central Kenwood Local Historic
District (Proposed local historic district
subject to complete designation application
as of January 27, 2020 and pending public
hearing by CPPC and City Council)
Kenwood Section – Southwest Central Kenwood Local Historic District (Proposed local historic district subject to complete designation application as of January 27, 2020 and pending public hearing by CPPC and City Council)