

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

October 20, 2025 - 4:00PM

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

STAFF PRESENT: Brandon Berry, Senior Planner
Ginny Bodkin, Deputy City Clerk

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

Chair Hubbard announced that Member Shawn Rae had resigned from his seat on the Board. He thanked Member Rae for his service to the Planning Board and welcomed Commissioner Marriott's new appointee, Grant Izzi.

1. Approval of the Agenda –

Member Perry requested an update on land fill, and Member Grocott a status update on the Phase I Density Pool valuation discussions at the last meeting.

Motion: Member Perry moved, and Vice Chair Angelides seconded, to approve the October 20, 2025 agenda as amended; the motion carried unanimously.

2. Audience Comments – No one came forward to comment.

3. Approval of Minutes –

Motion: Member Grocott moved, and Member Perry seconded, to approve the September 15, 2025 minutes as presented; the motion carried unanimously.

4. Action Items –

a. Review and Approval 2026 Meeting Dates

Chair Hubbard indicated that he had conflicts with the February and March meeting dates as presented. The members discussed their availability for those months, and February 26 and March 23, 2026 were agreed upon.

Motion: Member Izzi moved, and Vice Chair Angelides seconded, to approve the 2026 Board meeting dates as amended; the motion carried unanimously.

b. Ordinance 2025-21: Modifying stair, accessory structure, and equipment setbacks for residential development (Sitting as Local Planning Agency)

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ST. PETE BEACH, AMENDING THE ST. PETE BEACH LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE SECTIONS 3.10., 6.13., 6.14., AND 6.22. TO INCREASE FRONT YARD STAIR ENCROACHMENTS FOR SPECIFIED ELEVATED RESIDENCES AND

NEWLY-CONSTRUCTED SINGLE- AND TWO-FAMILY HOMES, ALLOW RETENTION OF SPECIFIED NONCONFORMING RESIDENTIAL ACCESSORY STRUCTURES FOLLOWING SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT TO THE PRIMARY RESIDENCE, MODIFYING RESIDENTIAL STORAGE BUILDING STANDARDS, Page 1 of 24 2 MODIFYING RESIDENTIAL EQUIPMENT SETBACK STANDARDS, AND PROVIDING A FRONT YARD SETBACK LINE ALTERNATIVE FOR RESIDENTIAL CUL-DE-SAC LOTS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, CODIFICATION AND SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Senior Planner Brandon Berry reviewed a presentation of the proposed amendments to the Land Development Code (LDC) based upon directions received in September from the Planning Board and City Commission. These amendments address some of the most common issues encountered when redeveloping and elevating homes; he was seeking feedback on the drafted standards. His presentation is part of the meeting record and included:

Sec. 3.10 Vested Rights and Nonconformities – Stair Encroachment

- Allows front yard stair encroachment by right for homes with nonconforming front setbacks that are elevated in place.
 - Currently left to Staff discretion, which is not effectively defined.
- Stairs must be (examples provided):
 - Unroofed, except by extension of primary home's eaves.
 - Open base (80% transparency between treads, landing, and footer).
- Stairs for nonconforming homes may encroach to:
 - 10' from front property line (all districts)
 - 5' from front property line (residences in Pass-A-Grille)
 - No closer than the front wall of the residence (3').

The existing standards require that all additions must meet the required setbacks, even if the residence is nonconforming to setbacks. The proposed standard would allow open stairs to encroach to the existing nonconforming, front setback, and up to seven feet into the front setback from the location of the front door of the residence, not to have a setback of less than 10 feet.

Sec 3.10 Vested Rights and Nonconformities - Accessory Structure Retention

- Allows nonconforming deck covers, gazebos, and pools to remain in required yards when:
 - The home is being substantially improved but adding no more than 10% in living area (excluding finishing of garage/carport).
 - The accessory structure is not being substantially improved (i.e., residence is being voluntarily elevated).
 - Accessory structure does not cross property line or exist in easement.
- Does not allow for nonconforming accessory structures to be substantially improved or replaced without setback compliance. (primary improved, accessory left alone)

Sec 6.13 Residential Storage Buildings – (there was consensus here and at the City Commission)

- Increases storage building size from 80 to 120 square feet.
- Height remains at eight feet.
- Requires all storage buildings to be tied down to meet wind loads following substantial improvement of the residence, regardless of size.

Sec. 6.14 Ancillary Residential Equipment

- Cleans up language.
- Allows in-place elevation of existing equipment for all residences that are substantially improved or required by Florida Building Code to elevate.
 - Front yard encroachment limited to five feet.
 - Pedestal/column elevation setbacks are limited to three feet.
 - Equipment limited to one foot above lowest floor or Design Flood Elevation
- Newly installed equipment must meet all yard setbacks.
- Newly constructed homes' equipment must meet all yard setbacks.

Section 6.22 Yard and Measurement Requirements – Stairs

- This standard applies to all single- and two-family residences, unlike Sec. 3.10.
- Allows three-foot encroachment for stairs without independent roof overhangs.
- Allows seven-foot encroachment into the front yard for stairs without roofs and with open base (80%+ transparent).

Sec 6.22 Yard and Measurement Requirements – Cul-de-sacs

- Requested by City Commissioner.
- Provides option for owners of cul-de-sac lots to reduce front yard setback to 15 feet from tangent line of arc when developing.
- Allows typical encroachments (stairs, etc.) into that yard.
- More beneficial for lots with more aggressive arcs (smaller cul-de-sac radii)

Member Hubbard suggested, using an example of corner waterfront lots which have as tight a turn as a cul-de-sac, that the measurements do not need to be specific to cul-de-sacs if there is a mathematical formula that could be set on the pie-shaped lots. Mr. Berry made note.

Comp Plan Consistency

- The Comprehensive Plan does not directly address accessory structures but does address residence suitability. The City shall review ordinances, codes, regulations and permitting processes, as required, in order to increase the efficiency and economy of meeting the housing needs of the City, while continuing to ensure the health, welfare and safety of the residents.

If the Board finds these amendments suitable, presentation to the City Commission for first reading would be October 28th. Staff found that stair encroachment and equipment elevation were the major priorities based on the current challenges that residents face with redevelopment and floodplain compliance.

Chair Hubbard closed the meeting as the Planning Board at 4:22 p.m. and reconvened as the Local Planning Agency to review the presented amendments.

Member Izzi spoke about stair landing options, suggesting plus 4 feet on either side of the door on the landings, and that second story doors do not need to open outward once elevated. Member Perry interjected to present some working papers on research that she prepared using the Florida Building Code which outlines requirements such as the width of landings, elevation differences, and other standards for residential structures. She referred to Sec. 311.7.6 which says that doors can open inward above the floodplain, yet in high-wind areas, high winds can blow them in. Sec. 101.1.6 covers the relationship between the width of landings and stairways and notes that a landing is required within every 12 feet, 7 inches in a residential setting. She referred to her drawing which

calculated stair dimensions using 10" treads and 7½" risers, to show how following code recommendations provides design options - for example, a single three-foot-wide door swinging outward requires a landing of at least 4 feet 6 inches deep, though 5 feet is preferable. Based on previous discussions, she felt that these dimensions align with what the Board has been considering for landing recommendations. The options that meet code are generally - Option 1: 6 feet wide by 5 feet deep and Option 2: 4 feet 6 inches by 4 feet 6 inches.

Member Perry went on to show other drawings showing stair placement. Examples were a home 10 feet above grade with a 6-foot landing, 11 stairs down, then a 3-foot landing, and a different layout with stairs split side-by-side instead of extending straight out. Both comply with code but illustrate different approaches.

Chair Hubbard called a recess at 5:15 PM and reconvened at 5:20 PM.

Member Izzi raised the matter of outdoor living space and setbacks, which he considered a quality-of-life issue; easy access to outdoor space is lost when elevating a home. He raised whether the Board should consider allowing balconies within setbacks for that reason. Member Grocott voiced concern for the quality of life of neighbors and balancing property values across the neighborhood with added balconies. Member Izzi suggested allowing the existing balconies to remain in the same footprint. Following discussion, it was decided that Mr. Berry would bring forward the recommendation to the Commission to allow for balconies being reestablished in setbacks, in the same footprint, openness, design as the original.

When asked by the Chair, the members felt that the section on landings could use some modification and fleshing out (including reference to Florida Building Code requirements), based on discussions, and trusted that Mr. Berry could implement the additions.

Member Grocott asked for clarification on non-conforming uses, particularly in the Town Center area. Mr. Berry explained that no changes are proposed – currently if someone has a single-family home located in a commercial district, they can maintain it as-is. They cannot add onto or elevate it unless they bring the property into a conforming use. She also asked for clarification on accessory structures, specifically Sec. 6.13 regarding mechanical equipment; she felt the definition was too broad and could use better definition. Electricity in accessory structures was discussed.

Member Perry reviewed, page by page, a comprehensive list of items for clarification, correction, and discussion from the meeting packet. The members added comments, suggestions, and discussion.

Mr. Berry explained that the Board's initial feedback will go to the City Commission next week.

Mr. Berry reviewed his working list of the suggested changes provided by the members:

- Look at allowing an additional balcony encroachment into the rear yard in the same footprint and enclosure as the original that existed prior to elevation.
- Look at depth of permitted landings – stairs can be accommodated with less than 7 feet.
- Will look at removing 7-foot encroachment for new home stairs (addressing only homes that are being elevated or reconstructed).
- Maximum 7-foot projection maximum off front of home; minimum 5-foot setback for most areas of the city (5-foot minimum set back Pass-A-Grille, where setbacks are less)
- Better define mechanical equipment in context of storage buildings.

- Scrivener's errors (repetitions).
- Ensure that the language on pg. 14 of agenda packet re: non-conforming structures is consistent with Code.
- Clarify that elevation above the floodplain (above the design flood) (Pg. 15) is a minimum, not a requirement.
- Remove same floor height limitation for homeowners who choose to abandon the first level, turning it into parking, storage, and access – and reconstruct the living level above. If they had an 8-foot floor height previously, they could go to 9 or 10 if desired, provided they are compliant with the height limitation for the zoning district.
- Clean up repeat sections in
- Look at maximum 7-foot front extension in Sec. 3.10
- Look at the use of the terms 'substantial improvement' and 'substantial damage' throughout the Code – clarify that it is not only a floodplain requirement and applies to accessory, ancillary structures as well.
- Pg. 19 of packet – change to allow that repair and maintenance of non-conforming structures are allowed (or not something that is related to building permits).
- Top of page 22 Change to 'lowest living floor' or clearer language
- The Board recommends that new homes should not be allowed the proposed additional stair encroachments (therefore Section 6.22 would be stricken and some parts of that moved into Sec.3.10 openness requirements, etc.).
- Strike 'cul-de-sacs' from Sec. 6.22(g).
- 6.14 and 6.22 scrivener's errors in new language (add 'setback' to 'yard').

Motion: Member Perry moved, and Vice Chair Angelides seconded, to recommend approval of Ordinance 2025-21 to the City Commission with the modifications discussed and listed; the motion carried 5-0.

Chair Hubbard adjourned as the Local Planning Agency and reconvened as the Planning Board at 5:35 PM.

5. Discussion Items -

a. October 9th Town Center: Coquina West Community Forum Follow-up

Mr. Berry explained that this is a follow-up to the 10/9/25 meeting with local residents and business owners to discuss the TC-2 Coquina West District. TC-2 currently promotes large, block-level parcel assemblage that has been realized on the east side (Corey Landings) but not on the west side. This effort is intended to address short- and medium-term code permissions for redevelopment, but not address significant visioning, which may follow under future efforts (CRA, historic district). He provided a brief presentation, which is part of the meeting record.

Challenges:

- Horizontal mix of uses, where vertical is preferred.
- Significant setback and buffering requirements for commercial adjacent to standalone residential.
- Large concentration of nonconforming standalone residential/lodging.
- Single-parcel redevelopment may preclude large mixed-use projects (if still desired).

Comments from the forum:

- There was some consensus on redevelopment (floodplain-compliant buildings, beautified streetscape).
- Desire to allow multi-family development without mixed-use or full block consolidation.
- Reconsider height and number of floors (3-4 floors instead of 7-8) for smaller projects.
- Interest in preserving and allowing commercial development, multi-tenant if possible (e.g., smaller John's Pass).
 - Concerns about rooftop uses adjacent to residential.
 - Residential property owners waive some buffering requirements if new permissions.
- Commercial property owners are disinterested in redeveloping at-grade commercial.
- Interest in allowing lodging to remain and redevelop.
- District faces unique pressures due to extent of damage and nonconformities.

Staff will present meeting outcomes to City Commission with concept ideas in November, then engage with Forward Pinellas to discuss the amendment process and receive input. The process is likely to be 4-6 months after consensus on direction is reached and a draft is prepared. He welcomed input from the members. Member Perry thought that the meeting went well and that the residents understood the issues and potential solutions. Member Izzi suggested that the vision for the Town Center needs to be updated. The vision is the starting point to guide the direction and avoid wheel spinning.

b. Update on Fill (added)

Mr. Berry indicated that the first discussion took place last week, which was largely about Land Development Code updates, but fill will be part of a future meeting. The City Commission is going to be scheduling a discussion on fill as part of their strategic visioning and staff expect more direction from that.

c. Density Evaluation (added)

Mr. Berry reported that a follow-up meeting is scheduled for 10/22/25 with Sarah Vitale of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council (TBRC) to discuss the real estate analysis, which has not yet been completed, and discuss the next potential steps regarding valuation and applicability. Those findings will be added to the next agenda. Staff and the TBRC researched other communities but found no direct comparables that match our city's conditions (size, floodplain limits). Clearwater has a density pool, but it is 12 times larger and includes more bonus options. Tampa and other cities use density bonuses or fee-in-lieu systems, rather than a shared pool. Many communities base bonuses on providing public benefits (e.g., commercial space, streetscape improvements, affordable housing). The valuation process for bonuses is key. The city aims to create a portable valuation framework applicable to different project types (including lodging and workforce housing). There is a need to balance economic return with community benefits and housing diversity.

6. Adjournment - Next meeting November 17, 2025.

There being no further business, Chair Hubbard adjourned the meeting at 6:00 PM.

These minutes were approved at the December 15, 2025 meeting of the Planning Board.