



**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
CITY OF ST. PETE BEACH
COMMISSION CHAMBERS**

155 Corey Avenue
St. Pete Beach, FL 33706

Monday, September 15, 2025
4:00 PM

Call to Order
Pledge of Allegiance
Roll Call

REGULAR MEETING

1. Approval of the Agenda -

Action Request: Motion to approve the September 15, 2025 agenda.

2. Audience Comments -

Comments shall be limited to 3 minutes for general or agenda items. Public comment on agenda items will be allowed when that item is called. Please complete and submit a public comment card to the Clerk.

3. Approval of Minutes

a. August 18, 2025 Meeting

4. Action Items -

5. Discussion Items

a. Density pool unit valuation study

Staff will share details on a proposed density pool valuation range study, to be conducted by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council.

b. Front yard stair encroachment for elevated-in-place homes

At the direction of the City Commission, Staff will present on current challenges faced with installing stairs on homes elevated in place or reconstructed with the living level above the floodplain, and solicit Planning Board feedback on potential solutions.

c. Community Redevelopment Area update

Providing updates on the finding of necessity and other initial work associated with

evaluating the City's potential for a community redevelopment area in and around its core downtown and resort areas.

d. Limitation on fill update

Discussing updates, if available, on the 16-inch fill placement limitation in the Code of Ordinances, which applies to construction types other than stemwall construction.

6. Adjournment -

APPEAL: In accordance with 286.0105, Florida Statute (Notices of meetings and hearings must advise that a record is required to appeal), if a person decides to appeal any decision made by this committee, board, agency, or commission with respect to any matter considered at this meeting or hearing, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, he or she may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA): In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Florida Statutes, if any person with a disability defined by the ADA needs special accommodation to participate in this proceeding, then not later than two business days prior to the proceeding, he or she should contact City Hall at (727) 367-2735.

The public is cordially invited to attend this meeting.

All agenda material is available for review at City Hall or www.stpetebeach.org.

DRAFT PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

August 18, 2025 4:00PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Hubbard, Chair
Sam Angelides, Jr., Vice Chair
Terri Grocott, Member
Cindy Perry, Member
Shawn Rae, Member

STAFF PRESENT: Brandon Berry, Senior Planner
Laura Canary, Community Development Director
Ginny Bodkin, Deputy City Clerk
Gil Martinez, Senior Planner

Chair Hubbard called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. Approval of the Agenda –

Member Perry asked to add an item for an update on the priorities for resiliency and outdated ordinances that were discussed in the June 16th meeting. Mr. Berry requested to move item 5.c. before 5.a. as there was a consultant present on Zoom.

Motion: Member Rae moved, and Vice Chair Angelides seconded, to approve the August 18, 2025 agenda as amended; the motion carried unanimously.

2. Audience Comments – There were no comments.

3. Approval of Minutes –

Although the June 16th minutes were not included in the packet, they were emailed to the members for review prior to the meeting; consensus was to vote on them.

Motion: Member Perry moved, and Chair Hubbard seconded, to approve the June 16, 2025 minutes as presented; the motion carried unanimously.

4. Action Items – None.

5. Discussion Items

a. Town Center Zoning & Land Use Comprehensive Plan Evaluation

Senior Planner Brandon Berry explained that this evaluation is still in the discussion phase, defining a framework. At the July 22nd City Commission meeting, staff were directed to pause work with Calvin, Giordano & Associates on the Large Resort and Town Center (TC) zoning districts due to impacts from SB 180. Staff were directed to move forward with evaluation but narrow the scope of focus to the TC zoning districts, to address unintended land use and zoning consequences made evident from recent storm impacts; his presentation on that is part of the record.

The Town Center zoning and land use area is comprised of two distinct districts and three defined areas - TC-1, TC-2, Coquina West (6.1 acres), and Corey Circle (4.67 acres). The guiding documents are the Special Area Plan, Comprehensive Plan, 2015 Corey Ave Vision Study, 2023 Complete Streets Study, and the forthcoming Corey Area Historic Resources Survey (State grant). The presentation reviewed the ways in which the documents guide the development of the district. Member Perry commented that the Vision Study of 2015 was rejected by the public at the time and should not be a guiding document. There should be a differentiation between wants and needs.

The presentation explained the zoning/Land use challenge of nonconforming uses in the TC area with some of the highest density of legal nonconforming uses in the city including single-use residential, single-use temporary lodging, storage and adult entertainment establishments; others are permitted only with a conditional use permit under redevelopment – gas stations and existing uses with drive-thru service. The city's non-conforming use regulations are strict and prohibit redevelopment, major remodeling, and additions. He reviewed the property consolidation allowed in the Town Center, and TC1 and TC2 districts. He finally touched on use compatibility. Many moderate and higher-intensity uses can be located adjacent to one another with sufficient buffers under current code requirements, however, the City has strict standards for most commercial and mixed-use next to detached single- and two-family residences.

Mr. Berry concluded that staff will be handling this round of amendments. Amendments will likely require updates to the Comp Plan and LDC and potentially the Special Area Plan. There is an upcoming historic survey that might open other avenues for a main street and some other development promotion strategies that are not currently in place. Staff plans to present this content in a community meeting format to solicit feedback from residents and business owners. The recommended focus is the TC-2 Coquina West only. He asked for feedback from the board.

Mr. Berry answered questions – he confirmed that current, legal non-conforming owners are not allowed to repair substantially damaged structures; they would have to change to a conforming use. The zoning has changed several times and is variable in the area. One of the opportunities that is available with the current use provisions is working through the LDC to relax standards, particularly for standalone single family and duplex. Building back single-family homes would significantly limit commercial and office structures. Regarding changes in the district lines, owner-initiated changes (with a compatibility review by the city) could be allowed, but city-initiated would likely be considered more restrictive.

Member Grocott inquired where the intersection of all the plans and studies (vision study, comp plan, the comp plan review, the CRA plan, etc.) overlaps with the priorities and goals. Mr. Berry answered that a community meeting is the first step; from there it would be a more expansive visioning. They do not want to piece-meal address this district – the Commission's direction is to look at the parcel-level, simple solutions in the next 6 months to a year to allow property owners to move forward with logical redevelopment of their parcels.

Member Perry mentioned that it should be a priority to look at ordinances that are preventing residents from storm recovery (as an unintended consequence). Bringing in more consultants and doing more studies takes away from completing what we need to complete now.

b. 2025 Legislative Wrap-up

Mr. Berry indicated that SB 180 had been discussed previously and is the most encompassing of this board's work and provided a brief overview. It prohibits, statewide, until October of 2027 more burdensome amendments to development in the Comp Plan or LDC, moratoriums on development and reconstruction, and more burdensome review, approval or issuance processes for development permit issuance. It also prohibits impact fee increases when replacement development is of similar impact, and permit fee increases within 180 days of an emergency.

SB 1730 – Live Local Act Amendments

Preemptions - Limits required square footage of mixed-use affordable housing residential projects approved under Live Local to 10% project floor area, requires 15% Live Local Act parking reduction for affordable housing, sets a July 2023 “lookback” for FAR, height, and density limitations for affordable housing projects.

Permissions - Allows municipalities to limit Live Local project height in pre-2000 NRHP Districts (PAG south of 13th Ave) to the highest allowed within three-fourths of a mile.

SB 1622 – Customary Use - Restores right to recreational customary use when use of beach landward of the mean high tide line has been established as “ancient, reasonable, without interruption and free from dispute.” Repeals more arduous, hearing- and court-driven process.

SB 1080 – Impact Fees and DO Issuance - Requires increases in impact fees that exceed phase-in thresholds to be incremental (2-4 years) and ties phase-in to updates within the past five years. Sets five-day timeframe for application acknowledgement, retains 120/180 day timeframe for site plan, CUP, etc., reviews.

HB 683 – Artificial Turf - Preempts stricter local regulations of synthetic turf after DEP has introduced regulations; Does require FDEP to consider stormwater management, permeability, water quality, tree proximity, etc. Applies only to single-family homes under one acre.

SB 582 – Historic Structure Demolition - When a historic structure (contributing or individually-listed) has been demolished willfully and without approval, and not due to a natural disaster, Cities can impose fines of up to 20% of the just market value of the property. It is an option.

SB 948 – Flood Disclosures - Requires landlords disclose flood damage, risk, and insurance to tenants in specified circumstances.

SB 784 – Platting - Requires plats and replats to be administratively approved when they comply with Sec. 177.091, F.S.

SB 954 – Certified Recovery Residences - Requires Cities to pass an ordinance providing for standards to and specifying means of obtaining exceptions for certified recovery residences. It sets minimum application standards and prohibits excessive public hearings.

Following the update, Mr. Berry answered questions. The city has been speaking with the Sea Turtle Conservancy, which works with the FDEP and shared our ordinance with them. The framework is there despite being adopted 2007 vs. cities that do not have one. The city is looking to define parameters for what existing and new development is. His interpretation of part of SB 1080 was that if a development use existed previously or is not an intensification of what was there before, cities cannot charge impact fees.

c. Community Redevelopment Area Discussion (this item was heard first)

Mr. Berry introduced Matt Lewis, Consultant with Stantec, who is working with the city on the Finding of Necessity (FON) which is the first step in the potential establishment of a Community Development Area (CRA). Mr. Lewis reviewed a presentation, which is part of the meeting record.

The FON is the first step in establishing a CRA, with the local government saying that there are conditions that exist in the geography within the municipality that necessitate a plan and a tax increment finance strategy to overcome whatever those conditions might be. The statute looks for three broad areas. 1) Inadequate provision of for ventilation, light, air, sanitation, open spaces (which may not be an issue in St. Pete Beach). 2) High density of population compared to the density of adjacent areas within the county or municipality and overcrowding (which is unlikely, but there may be some lotting patterns that might be obsolete that would point towards this) and 3) The existence of conditions that endanger life or property by fire or other causes. "Other causes" is the operative phrase because there are known issues in the area. There is a large amount of infrastructure and buildings vulnerable to major storms and storm surge, which is true of any barrier island – and there is an availability of affordable workforce housing in that problem area.

Mr. Lewis referred to a map showing the areas that are inundated in a category 1 storm – areas where the infrastructure is at risk from major storm events. That is the fundamental thing that will be examined in the FON – the level of risk the buildings and infrastructure, to establish a risk to life and property.

Once that data is gathered, Stantec will meet with staff and assess the potential for a CRA in the city. A FON would need to match what Pinellas County would be looking for in terms of a tax increment financing (TIF) district and would gather the revenue needed to make the necessary improvement. If that is the case, the city would put together a resolution saying conditions exist that are detrimental to life and a CRA plan is appropriate to move forward with. After the resolution is complete, the plan is put together. The FON is the list of things to deal with, and the plan is the approach to dealing with it – including revenue projections and projects, along with public and stake holder input. When and if that plan is accepted and adopted, revenue collection and making improvements would begin. Mr. Lewis opened the floor for questions.

Member Perry stressed that resiliency and infrastructure are largest piece because of the effect on life and property. She asked about the flexibility of the defined CRA area and whether the subaqueous pipe that carries sewage off island could be included. Mr. Lewis noted that failures of pump stations would be part of the consideration, but Member Perry questioned whether that was enough. He added that the County would look at the proposed CRA and determine eligible areas. Any CRA supply improvements would be examined at the plan making stage. Member Perry also noted the city needs to focus and prioritize vs. continuing with studies that just look at a broad scope. The data needs to be filtered down to whether projects contribute to resiliency or fix the infrastructure – anything else is a distraction.

Member Grocott mentioned that the southern border of the proposed CRA leaves out two low-lying districts that are at risk of loss and property and life. Community Development Director Laura Canary explained that the map is the proposed area's preliminary boundary and is subject to change upon review; it is not parcel specific. Ms. Canary stated that this would be the first infrastructure and

resiliency-centric CRA in Pinellas County. The plan would look at how the city's goals and objectives compare with the county's and how we marry that up with capital improvement projects from their perspective as an investment in this area, from which the county and visitors both benefit. She also explained the concept of flexibility of funding, i.e., the pump station is funded as part of the CRA, but previous funding that had been intended for that can be reallocated to the subaqueous pipe, for example. County parameters have what TIF dollars can be spent on, so there can be shuffling of funding from what is and not covered. The intent of the CRA is to see property values increase. It is a reinvestment area.

Ms. Canary concluded that the city should move forward rapidly to address the conditions and be able to sit down with the County to consider shared goals and objectives. If/when approved, that becomes the base year for the CRA, and the County would take the valuations for the properties collectively.

d. Update on Priorities Discussion from June 16th (Added)

Mr. Berry explained that staff are scheduling a meeting with State Emergency Services to discuss some of our current LDC flood, stormwater-related ordinances. The previously mentioned 16" of fill limitation is in the code of ordinances, but they will address those items. He expects the meeting by the end of the month. They will be evaluating the LDC to ensure its compliance with the state guiding standards and requirements and in line with the code of ordinances. In doing that, the standards in the code of ordinances will be reviewed.

6. Adjournment - Next meeting September 15, 2025.

There being no further business, Chair Hubbard adjourned the meeting at 5:30 PM.

These minutes will be considered for approval at the September 15, 2025 meeting of the Planning Board.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
CITY OF ST. PETE BEACH
COMMISSION CHAMBERS**

Agenda Report

Agenda Title Name: Density pool unit valuation study

Action Request: N/A - for discussion purposes.

Strategic Objective:

Date: September 15, 2025

Prepared By: Brandon Berry, Senior Planner

Through: Laura Canary, Community Development Director

Summary of Issue: Staff has been working with the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council to conduct a study to provide a clear and defensible framework for public amenities in exchange for the allocation of bonus units from the City's four discretionary density pools. The intent is to equip the Commission with a consistent decision standard, and the other benefits included in the study proposal.

Staff will discuss the proposal and its potential impact on the Planning Board's decision-making criteria.

Funding: \$12,000 for the study from the Planning & Zoning budget.

Attachments: 1. Proposal TBRPC



Density Pool Valuation Decision Support Study

Prepared for: City of St. Pete Beach
Prepared by: Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council
Date: August 22, 2025

Contact:
Sarah Vitale, AICP - Director of Civic Technology
sarah@tbrpc.org | 727-570-5151 x27



Purpose & Outcomes

The City maintains a pool of 195 bonus residential units available for allocation under varying requirements. To guide future approvals, the City seeks to establish a clear, defensible framework that sets an upper-bound (maximum) value for public amenities provided in exchange for bonus units. The framework will:

- Equip the Commission with a consistent decision standard;
- Assure the public that added density is tied to tangible community benefits;
- Provide developers with transparent, predictable expectations; and
- Give staff clear, implementable criteria and methodology.

Approach

We propose a streamlined, four-task study:

Task 1— Kickoff & Data Collection

- Confirm Commission’s priorities for public benefits.
- Collect fee schedules, assessed value data, recent development examples, and relevant fiscal information (e.g., service cost data, revenue sources).

Task 2 — Economic & Fiscal Analysis

- Model representative development scenarios (e.g., small infill, mid-rise condo, mixed-use).
- Estimate construction-phase and ongoing household impacts using IMPLAN/REMI PI+.
- Cross-check against local revenues and service costs to calculate net fiscal impact.

Task 3 — Per-Unit Valuation Framework

- Derive a defensible maximum per-unit value based on scenario results.
- Present a reasonable range (low/base/high) with sensitivity testing (i.e., testing under different assumptions to ensure robustness).
- Link per-unit values to public benefit categories (housing, resilience, public realm, mobility).

Task 4 — Written Report

- Prepare a concise written report, including:
 - Executive summary (Commission-focused).
 - Methodology, assumptions, and data sources.
 - Results and recommended valuation framework.
 - Suggested criteria for linking units to public benefits.

Deliverables

1. Written Report (~10-15 pages) — core product, Commission-ready.
2. Executive Summary (stand-alone, 1-3 pages) for public and developer communication.

Investment

Option	Scope	Fixed-Fee*
Core	Tasks 1-4: report and summary	\$12,000

*Payment is due upon completion and acceptance of final deliverables.

Schedule

- By August 25: Kickoff and data collection.
- By September 8: Complete scenario modeling and fiscal analysis.
- By September 15: Deliver draft per-unit valuation framework.
- By September 19: Submit draft report to City for review.
- By September 26: Deliver final report and executive summary.

Next Steps

TBRPC appreciates the opportunity to support St. Pete Beach in establishing a fair, transparent, and easy-to-use framework for allocating its density pool.

As procurement is already satisfied through our Interlocal Agreement, we can begin work once the City provides formal authorization (typically a purchase order and notice to proceed).

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
CITY OF ST. PETE BEACH
COMMISSION CHAMBERS**

Agenda Report

Agenda Title Name: Front yard stair encroachment for elevated-in-place homes

Action Request: None - for discussion purposes.

Strategic Objective:

Date: September 15, 2025

Prepared By: Brandon Berry, Senior Planner

Through: Laura Canary, Community Development Director

Summary of Issue: Prior to the 2024 hurricanes, the City received approximately one application per year to elevate a home in place, and fewer than one to convert an existing near-grade living level to parking, storage and access, and reconstruct the living level above. Since late spring, the City has received as many as ten applications per month.

The City relaxed its nonconforming structure standards in late 2024 to allow for in-place elevation or living level additions and ground-floor conversions for most structures nonconforming to setbacks, without need for a variance. It also allowed for minimal exterior stair encroachment beyond the three feet currently permitted for new construction when stairs cannot reasonably be accommodated within the footprint of the structure. These encroachments apply only to elevated or reconstructed homes, not homes that have been redeveloped or newly-developed.

Due to an increase in variance requests pertaining to stairs, Staff has been directed to review options for allowing context-sensitive stair encroachment on elevated or reconstructed homes. Staff will solicit Planning Board input to help engage with the City Commission, with intent to bring back an ordinance for consideration at a meeting in the near future.

Funding: N/A

Attachments: