

Technical Review Committee Meeting

September 10, 2025 - 9:45 a.m.

Upstairs Conference Room, City Hall, 155 Corey Ave. St. Pete Beach

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brandon Berry  
Kristin Coman  
Kelly Intzes  
Gil Martinez  
Luke Curtis  
Peyt Dewar  
Mandy Edmunds

STAFF PRESENT:

Frances Robustelli, City Manager  
Ralf Brookes, City Attorney  
Laura Canary, Community Development Director  
Ginny Bodkin, Deputy City Clerk  
Camden Mills, Public Services Director joined the meeting late

Member Berry called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

1. Resubmittal of Conditional Use Permit 25069: Corey Landings (0, 10, 71, & 75 Corey Avenue; 0 & 85 Corey Circle; 73 75th Avenue; & 0 & 7345 Bay Street - see parcels)

Mr. Berry opened this item by asking Attorney Batsel for a summary of changes since their original submittal in June. She stated that in response to the City attorney's letter with respect to the vacation of right of way, they removed that portion and realigned the plan to leave the right of the way as it was, which resulted in a decrease in the number of units and additional public parking spaces. Mr. Berry asked the applicant's team for a review of staff comments that had been included in the Memorandum, which is attached to the meeting minutes.

Public Works:

Engineer Scott Gilner of Kimley Horn stated that there are no capacity issues but asked that a map of all manholes and pipes be sent to them so he can review with Public Services Director Mills.

City Attorney Ralf Brookes informed the applicant that the City of St. Petersburg had contacted St. Pete Beach regarding I&I (inflow and infiltration) issues; the amount of chloride in the wastewater being sent to them is too high, although not at total capacity. This is being investigated but may possibly add as much as \$16 million in costs that are not in the budget. Mr. Gilner asked that Mr. Mills send him that information as well.

Building Department: No comments.

City Attorney: No comments.

Code Enforcement: No comments.

Recreation: No comments

Fire:

Fire Marshall Intzes requested that the fire lane be an all-weather, non-permeable driving surface. Brian Van Slyke of the Kolter Group stated that they have ways to achieve that. Ms. Intzes was specific that the city does not want to be responsible for the maintenance of any engineered surface, it should be asphalt or concrete.

Planning & Zoning:

1. Attorney Batsel explained that commercial space (retail/office – lobby area) is being added to the ground floor of the northern building in the right of way area which addresses activation on the roadway.
2. Attorney Batsel stated that the two temporary lodging units have been removed, and those units will go back to typical one-bedroom units.
3. Comment #3 is no longer relevant, but there are design requirements. The applicant's representatives acknowledged and understood the need for art, benches, or other features to support the Comp Plan policies and features in the 2015 Vision plan, to align any bare sides of the structure with the architectural quality of the project. They will comply with the design criteria along the right-of-way.
4. The applicant's representatives acknowledged an understanding of LDC Sec. 39.3(d) and will update the façades to meet the criteria.
5. and 6. (together) Mr. Berry noted the disparity of an estimated gallons per minute (GPM) flow from the original submission to the county in 2022 prior to the addition of the restaurant. Mr. Gilner requested that Mr. Berry send him the data he is referring to and it can be recalculated if necessary.
7. Attorney Batsel confirmed that they will meet the parking requirements. There are 49 confirmed public parking spaces on Corey Avenue plus 4 on Bay Street.; the total has gone from 32 to 53. Parking for the boat slips was discussed. Attorneys Batsel and Kevin Reali found that code does not have an apt description of this property type; staff should work on an interpretation. They explained the boat slip owners will already own units in the building, so will not need additional parking.
8. Steve Barber of the Kolter Group confirmed that they will be certified to the Florida Green Building Coalition certification standards as well as adhering to city codes.
9. Mr. Berry noted that the financial sufficiency letter for green reuse development was received. He inquired if the Kolter Group had any other mixed-use projects that are comparable. Mr. Van Slyke commented that commercial use is not generally permitted on the water, however they are compliant with the zoning requirements.
10. Regarding logistical or space constraints with the inclusion of a restaurant, Mr. Van Slyke commented that the restaurant does not want to be a destination; this is designed as casual walk-by. The restaurant will be located farther away from the right-of-way.
11. Mr. Gilner explained that the side setback is at podium level and then steps back to the tower, for a wedding cake effect. Mr. Berry specified that they would need to provide the basis for the setback at the site plan stage.
12. Attorney Batsel explained that the 19' rooftop appurtenances are the elevator shafts; she referred to Code Sec. 7.2(k) which specifies "not inclusive of elevator shafts." Any area utilized by guests would be under 10'. The floor heights of the units are 10'8" per code.
13. City Attorney Ralf Brookes mentioned some maintenance concerns that the City Manager raised for the project. The assumption is that once built, maintenance will be turned over to the condo association. Brick pavers look nice, but asphalt is easier to maintain. Will the condo CC&Rs address that maintenance as well as the park, i.e. lighting, sod, etc.? Mr. Van Slyke responded that the owners of the condos will be paying millions of dollars toward the tax base. Homeowners do not maintain roads or public parks – the city asked for the public park as a

community benefit, and they are providing it. The condo owners cannot assume liability for injuries, etc. that could happen in a public park. City Manager Frances Robustelli appeared via Teams and suggested that a compromise plan be devised, i.e. the city would be liable for trips and falls, and the condo, retail and restaurants maintain the landscaping at the park for their guests. Otherwise, the park would be maintained as a city park. There can be a middle ground. Attorney Reali stated that there are other condo developments in the city that have more density and intensity than this project with less burden being put on them.

Mr. Brookes mentioned the sculpture in the rendering. Mr. Van Slyke stated if it is approved, they would want a dollar value put on it as part of the over \$5 million dollar value they are contributing to the community. Attorney Batsel stressed that they do not want to end up in another situation with a prolonged vote on the type of sculpture, since the garage design at a different project was delayed unnecessarily. Mr. Brookes suggested they write that up for the Commission in their presentation.

Mr. Brookes mentioned the possibility of a ferry docking area in the future. Mr. Gilner stated that this is a private development with a small kayak or boat launch; they do not want to be liable for fees, taxes, ADA, etc. The residential section is closed off. The private transient slips are to the North and have an ERP (Environmental Resource Permit) and a sovereign lands lease. Mr. Brookes suggested that be noted to the Commission.

Regarding enforcement of the daytime only use of the transient slips, Attorney Batsel stated that the condo association will be managing their property. Signage will be provided; that is all that is necessary as proof to justify removal or citation.

Maintenance of the public park landscaping was discussed – palms and grass only for the city to maintain. The applicant may redesign the edge portion of the landscaping on their property line.

#### Transportation Analysis:

Kimley Horn Transportation Engineer Becca Bond acknowledged that she read the staff comments, and they were understood.

Mr. Berry summarized that as the two transient units have been removed, the project will not need to go to the Planning Board. This will go directly to the City Commission for two meetings – 10/14 and 10/28. He requested the applicant's revisions by Friday, 9/19 so staff can meet the legal advertising deadline. He added that the City Commission would like to hear the CUP at the first meeting to talk through and then action at the second meeting.

#### 2. Conditional Use Permit 25112: 8665 Boca Ciega Dr (Master Pump Station 1 - Phase I)

*Adam Porrier for the City of St. Pete Beach requests an expansion of Master Pump Station 1, including but not limited to replacing four (4) existing 140 HP pumps with four (4) 215 HP pumps, a new diesel backup generator and generator platform, new odor control unit, electrical upgrades, site improvements, and applicable site restoration.*

Mr. Berry reported that no staff comments were submitted.

Marshall Intzes reviewed the permit and approved with notes for the contractors that will need to be addressed during the final inspection.

Mr. Berry confirmed with Mr. Mills that the training exercise for dampening for the generator will be 15 minutes per week. The decibel level will be comparable to lawn service equipment.

Technical Review Committee

September 10, 2025

Page 4 of 4

Mr. Mills also confirmed that landscaping will be included in phase 2 and in order to keep costs down, planting will be done in-house.

There were no other staff comments.

Mr. Mills agreed to a November starting schedule.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:27 a.m.

**A copy of the agenda memorandum with a list of questions by each Committee member is made a part of the record.**



## MEMORANDUM

To: Elise Batsel, Esq. c/o Stearns Weaver for KT Corey Ave, LLC

From: Brandon Berry, Planner  
Community Development Department  
City of St. Pete Beach - (727) 363-9229

Date: September 8, 2025

Re: **Conditional Use Permit No. 25069: Corey Landings [0, 10, 71, & 75 Corey Avenue; 0 & 85 Corey Circle; 73 75th Avenue; & 0 & 7345 Bay Street]**

A conditional use permit, pursuant to LDC Sec. 39.18., Sec. 37.7.(a), and 37.5.(a)&(d), to construct a mixed-use condo residential and commercial development on the nine subject parcels, containing a 132-unit (previously 158-unit) residential and two-unit temporary lodging development of four buildings on 4.51 buildable acres (29.3 units/buildable acre), Class A (four slip) and B (35 slip) docks, 6,600 sq. ft. (previously 8,500 sq. ft.) retail building and 5,000 sq. ft. (previously 4,000 sq. ft.) restaurant space, and associated site improvements, which will draw 24 of the requested 132 residential units from the Community Redevelopment District Residential Density Pool and both of the requested temporary lodging units from the combined Activity Center, Town Center Corey Circle and Coquina West, and Bayou Residential District Temporary Lodging Unit Density Pool.

---

The City's Technical Review Committee will meet on September 10, 2025 at 10 AM to discuss the following comments regarding the application. Additional comments may be shared at the meeting.

### **Public Works:**

Sewer infrastructure downstream of the development is shown to have sufficient capacity per the wastewater model capacity report. Upstream impacts will be evaluated during site plan review. Several manholes and pipes are in need of rehabilitation between connection and Pump Station 1.

### **Building:**

Comments have not been shared, but may be shared at the meeting.

## **Code Enforcement:**

No comments.

## **City Attorney:**

Comments have not been shared, but may be shared at the meeting.

## **Recreation:**

No comments.

## **Fire:**

Response letter dated 7/3/2025 acknowledged all comments to be addressed during site plan review.

During the TRC on 6/4/25 a concern was brought up regarding maintenance of the N end fire lane since Grass Pave. If project will not be responsible for maintenance of this fire lane, an all-weather driving surface shall be provided, nonpermeable such as asphalt or concrete surface per NFPA 1: 18.2.3.5.2

## **Planning & Zoning/Transportation:**

1. Referencing narrative on resubmitted application page 7: Staff does not have the authority to waive requirements using the words “shall” (LDC Sec. 1.2.(d)). There may be some flexibility if the primary frontage of the northern structure at the intersection also provided commercial, similar to the initial submittal’s arrangement with the restaurant. The mix of retail/commercial/restaurant uses in the primary building is also the basis for the project’s structures to be built with a height of up to 86 feet (LDC Sec. 37.8.). Unless the City Attorney accepts an argument on how this requirement can be administratively waived, a hardship variance or compliance is required.
2. Staff presumes the temporary lodging units are to be classified as resort condo “friends and family units” of the three allowable types (LDC Sec. 37.5.(a)), as the structure does not contain enough units to qualify as a hotel or motel. Please explain how they will function. As the building containing the temporary lodging use exceeds 50 feet in height, the project must proceed to Planning Board for recommendation prior to City Commission, which will also increase the cost of the application. See LDC Sec. 4.7., citing 39.6.(p).
3. Following on from the prior comment, the northern building is now apparently entirely a private development and private space, with the exception of the walking path/easement along the seawall. Staff recognizes walkers often use the path to detour from the route over the Corey Causeway, but it is not clear why the path would otherwise be used frequently as a significant amenity, as all commercial space has been eliminated from this side of the development. Staff would like to see art or other features that promote visual interest like living walls, or at least the benches and other features referenced in the July TRC response, to support Comprehensive Plan policies and features promoted in the 2015 Vision Plan. This would also help to bring what appear to be relatively bare sides of the structure more in line with the architectural quality of the interior of the project.
4. The north and west elevations of the retail space are bare. If the interior of this structure is to be used for back of house/storage space please consider grillwork, living walls, or other façade improvements that will make the structure compliant with LDC Sec. 39.3.(d).
5. There has been a public focus on sewer impacts from new development due to the effects of the 2024 storms, both generally and toward this project. Staff has recalculated the 2022 approval for comparison

purposes using the calculations submitted for this project and found them to result in effectively the same estimated gallons per day, due to the approximately-halved unit count but doubled unit size. Please let staff know if you disagree with this comparison. Is the development team amenable to committing to use of low-flow fixtures or other water reduction measures to increase the gap in sewer impacts between projects?

<b>2022 Corey Landings Project</b>			
<b>Residential</b>	<b>Flow</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Resultant Flow</b>
<b>&lt;750 sq. ft.</b>	100	90	9,000
<b>751-1,200 sq. ft.</b>	200	91	18,200
<b>1,201 -2,250 sq. ft.</b>	300	62	18,600
<b>Commercial/Office</b>			
<b>Restaurants &lt;16 HPD</b>	40	250	10,000
<b>Retail</b>	200	2	400
<b>Office</b>	15	40	600
<b>Total</b>			<b>56,800 GPD</b>

6. The total of the numbers above significantly undercalculate what was submitted to Pinellas County in 2022 for the original development when applying the peaking factor of 4.0, especially because the application at the time excluded the 5,000 sq. ft. restaurant. An estimate would provide a peak of 130 GPM using a 4.0 factor, while the 2022 application calculated 185 GPM peak. Is that difference explained by the entire retail space at the time being fitted as an A-2 restaurant?
7. Please submit updated parking calculations as soon as possible, particularly if the project will be deficient to required parking or if you are seeking an exception or variance for tandem-style spaces. This project is eligible for the compact parking provisions in LDC Sec. 39.11.(c), including motorcycle and golf cart parking if desired (up to 2.5% of required spaces).
8. Narrative notes that green and wellness principles are to be included in the project but does not specify the actual certifications to be pursued. The 2022 project included Florida Green Building Coalition certification for the residential facility and restaurant to meet code requirements. Is it known if the same will be pursued for this development?
9. Looking at Kolter Urban’s project portfolio, it appears that 3300 Gulf Shore is likely the closest in terms of scale, bulk, and location (on a bay with docks instead of beachfront), although to Staff’s knowledge it has not yet been completed. Are similar commercial spaces included in any of your lower-rise developments? Have you seen success with retail specifically in your other recent mixed-use projects that are not in dense urban areas? Do you have tenants chosen for the restaurant and retail spaces?
10. Staff reiterates a comment shared at the July TRC meeting that the restaurant’s placement along the park might provide better activation of that space. With the choice to not move forward with the street vacation, are there still significant logistical or space constraints with placing the restaurant where it was proposed in the 2022 approval?
11. Basis for side setback for southeastern building shall be demonstrated at the site plan stage. The former project showed a 30’ side setback (maximum at any building height) to the building, whereas the subject project appears to have a building with a 21-foot side setback.

12. Height of building seems to exceed the 10 feet permitted for non-habitable architectural features per LDC Sec. 7.2.(k). Rooftop facilities that do not constitute habitable space may be allowed a limited overrun, but the listed rooftop features appear to exceed the allowable height. Greater overruns are permitted for spaces not intended for human occupancy per Sec. 7.2.(k), but the listed features in the response letter are clearly intended to be occupied..
13. The following comments are shared on behalf of the City Manager and City Attorney:
  - a. If the future condo association is not going to assume maintenance responsibilities for the roundabout in the City's right-of-way, the surface should be a standard asphalt.
  - b. Maintenance, irrigation, uplighting, mowing, and sod maintenance and replacement in the park should be the responsibility of the future condo association. Staff can discuss responsibility for larger maintenance or capital responsibilities like palm replacement as part of a maintenance agreement.
  - c. A sculpture art piece in the roundabout space shall be a condition of approval.
  - d. Staff asks for the center seven-slip dock to be transient (for public use in association with the commercial facilities with no overnight mooring), with the pull-up mooring slip for future potential use as space for a water taxi disembarkment or other waterborne transit as promoted by Policy 4 for the Town Center Corey Circle Land Use District in the Comprehensive Plan.

### **Transportation Analysis Comments – Reiterated from 9/3/25 email**

#### **Analysis Comments**

- 1) Add Tradewinds, Miramar and Sirata projects to Table 4.
- 2) Use NCHRP Report 684 to estimate internal capture, and show unadjusted rates when they were rounded down to 25% per Forward Pinellas methodology.
- 3) Perform turn lane/queue analysis at 75<sup>th</sup> Ave and Mangrove St. Switch the Percentile Queue,veh/ln from 50% to 95% for all scenario HCM 7 Signalized Summary reports.

#### **Design Comments**

- 1) Show auto turns at Bay and Corey for trucks.
- 2) Provide crosswalk with stop sign at western intersection of Bay and Corey.