

## 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Member Perry asked to add an item for an update on the priorities for resiliency and outdated ordinances that were discussed in the June 16<sup>th</sup> 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 16<sup>th</sup> 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 22<sup>nd</sup> 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 13<sup>th</sup> 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 16<sup>th</sup> (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 were approved at the September 15, 2025 meeting of the Planning Board.*