

City Commission Meeting
February 10, 2026
6:00 p.m.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT:

Adrian Pettila, Mayor
Karen Marriott, Vice Mayor, Commissioner, District 1
Lisa Robinson, Commissioner, District 2
Betty Rzewnicki, Commissioner, District 3
Jon Maldonado, Commissioner, District 4

STAFF PRESENT:

Frances Robustelli, City Manager	Laura Canary, Community Development Director
Ralf Brookes, City Attorney	Brandon Berry, Senior Planner
Renee Rose, City Clerk	Gil Martinez, Senior Planner
Kristin Coman, Planning Manager	

Mayor Pettila called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Commissioner Robinson requested to add three items for discussion: 3 times permit fees on after the fact permits, Mike Twitty presenting at the next meeting, and historic designation. These were added as 7a, b, and c.

City Attorney Brookes requested to continue item 5a, Final Reading of Ordinance 2025-24. He reported that an expert report was received after agenda packets had been distributed and that proposed ordinance revisions from legal counsel for citizen stakeholders were also received but not yet circulated. He requested a continuance to allow time to review the new materials, incorporate them into the agenda packet, and provide the Commission and the public adequate opportunity to review the expert report and proposed changes prior to action. He summarized the substantive issues under review, including compliance with state law regarding separation requirements for replacement utility towers, avoidance of state preemption, and ensuring that setback requirements from adjacent property lines do not operate as a de facto prohibition, which is not permitted under statute. Additional tables and charts will be prepared to illustrate spacing and setback impacts, particularly as they relate to small wireless facilities within the public right-of-way. There was consensus to continue the 2nd reading of Ordinance 2025-24. There was consensus to amend item 5a to a discussion item.

Motion: **Commissioner Robinson moved, Commissioner Rzewnicki seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the February 10, 2026 City Commission Agenda, as amended.**

2. PRESENTATIONS

a. Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council (TBPRC) Presentation on the Bonus Density Valuation Calculator

Laura Canary, Community Development Director, introduced Sarah Vitale, Director of Civic Technology with the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, highlighting her partnership in developing the City's density bonus pool evaluation tool. She clarified that the tool applies only to density bonus pool units and is separate from economic modeling used for by-right projects. The tool is intended as a flexible, staff-level resource rather than a formal action item, allowing refinement over time as City priorities change.

Sarah Vitale presented a decision-support framework for St. Pete Beach to evaluate requests for bonus density units. She explained TBPRC's role is to provide technical assistance and decision tools, not to regulate land use or set policy, and recognized Commissioner Rzewnicki's leadership on their council and the City's liaison, Meghan Blancher. The framework uses a spreadsheet-based template to estimate the incremental market value created by City approval of bonus units and compare that value to the public benefits offered by an applicant. Ms. Vitale explained that the framework treats bonus density as a discretionary public action that creates private value not available by right. The tool isolates the "unearned increment" created by the City's vote and applies standard real estate valuation methods, depending on project type, to estimate that value. A capture rate is then applied to

determine the City's minimum expectation for public benefits, with tiers ranging from development-friendly to public-first, reflecting market strength and the scarcity of remaining density pool units. The framework introduces the concept of a "Zone of Possible Agreement" (ZOPA), showing whether a proposed public benefits package falls within a range that meets the City's expectations while remaining financially feasible for the developer. The spreadsheet template allows staff to input project data, document and benchmark public benefits, align proposals with City strategic priorities, and generate a summary illustrating whether a proposal meets minimum thresholds. Ms. Vitale emphasized that the tool is an internal, staff-driven aid intended to improve consistency, transparency, and defensibility in negotiations, without replacing Commission discretion.

Discussion highlighted that while many jurisdictions have bonus density programs, St. Pete Beach is unique in its strict, unit-by-unit negotiation approach rather than relying on height, FAR, or other development concessions. Ms. Vitale advised that a companion written document with case studies will be provided to supplement the spreadsheet tool. TBRPC's assistance was appreciated and Commissioner Rzewnicki's leadership was noted in advancing the project. Discussion supported the framework, noting it provides a consistent, data-driven, and transparent method for evaluating bonus density requests, offers predictability for redevelopment and reinvestment, and reduces guesswork in negotiations. It's important to keep assumptions, benchmarks, and market data current, as the accuracy and usefulness of the tool will depend on regular updates by staff. Discussion confirmed the tool is intended to be a living document that staff can begin using now and continue refining over time, including during early discussions with applicants and throughout negotiations as public benefit packages evolve. Ms. Vitale explained that refinement will require collaboration across departments to ensure benchmarks reflect local costs and conditions. There was discussion of potential future enhancements, including the possibility of using the framework beyond the density pool context for other discretionary density approvals, and whether technology or data integrations, including AI tools, could assist with maintaining and updating assumptions. Ms. Vitale noted the template was intentionally built in a flexible, online format to allow for future integrations and data updates.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Russell Boring, 43rd Ave, criticized the Mayor's conduct at a recent League of Women Voters forum, alleged the Mayor has past financial/legal issues and improperly accessed the island post-storm to conduct home repairs, and urged residents to oppose the toll proposal and support another mayoral candidate.

City Attorney Brookes read the Rules of Decorum printed on the speaker cards.

Todd Webb, Belle Vista Dr, commended Scott Tate's post-storm community support and personal assistance after a family tragedy; expressed concern about the tone of the mayoral race; and requested improved civility, criticizing the mayor's name-calling at the forum.

Tracy McGaughey, S. Tessier Dr., shared disappointment with personal attacks at the forum, commended Scott Tate's professionalism and restraint, and criticized the current mayor's tone. She questioned a statement she characterized as false about performances at local resorts, raised concerns about unresolved drainage maintenance on her street, and asked for focus on solutions, facts, and respectful leadership.

Deb Schechner, Boca Ciega Isle Dr., requested the League forum recording be shared. She voiced concerns about the upcoming Thunder concert's impacts on shorebirds and sea turtle nests, asked for added Sheriff presence, continuous code enforcement, lighting controls, strict cleanup, confirmation that music/alcohol service end by 10 p.m., and consideration of ordinances to limit large beach concerts.

4. CONSENT

- a. Approval of the January 27, 2026 City Commission Meeting Minutes
- b. Approval of Engagement Letter – Municipal Finance Support Services (James Moore & Co.)

Motion: Commissioner Robinson moved, Commissioner Rzewnicki seconded, and the motion

carried 5-0 to approve the February 10, 2026 City Commission Consent Agenda, as presented.

5. ORDINANCES

a. Final Reading of Ordinance 2025-24: Revising Code of Ordinances Chapters 131 & 132 Pertaining to Communication and Small Wireless Facilities (Continued to February 24, 2026)

5. DISCUSSION (ADDED)

a. Discussion of Ordinance 2025-24: Revising Code of Ordinances Chapters 131 & 132 Pertaining to Communication and Small Wireless Facilities (Added)

The 2nd reading ordinance has been continued to March 9, 2026. The agenda was amended to have a discussion and public comment on this item.

Attorney Brookes advised that revised ordinance language (pages 81–83, and potentially page 84) was received from legal counsel the prior day, along with an expert report dated February 6, received after agenda packets had been distributed. These materials will be included in the next agenda packet. He provided a high-level overview of the key revisions, noting changes to setback language to ensure compliance with state law. The revised language clarifies that setbacks from property lines are based on site-specific aesthetic concerns, while establishing a minimum 30-foot setback from existing developed structures for structural safety purposes, with the option for applicants to request a variance. Additional revisions address the location of ground-mounted small wireless facilities, encouraging reasonable spacing while acknowledging that state statute prohibits cities from imposing minimum separation distances. The revisions are intended to avoid acting as an absolute prohibition, which is preempted by state statute, and to align the ordinance with the limited areas of regulation expressly allowed under Florida law, including traffic safety, sight lines, ADA compliance, FDOT utility accommodation standards, applicable codes, and objective design standards.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Lauren Mones, Pass-a-Grille, expressed frustration that the item was removed from the agenda, stating it could have been discussed and voted on with the revised language. She asserted that no substantive new information was received, reiterated support for a 30-foot minimum setback from residential property lines for small wireless facilities and requested the City to prioritize resident protections over telecommunications providers' objections.

Discussion included proposed wireless ordinance provisions, focused on setbacks and separation distances for small wireless facilities, and the constraints imposed by state preemption. Mr. Brookes explained that setbacks from property lines and minimum separation distances present the greatest legal risk, as Florida statute expressly limits a city's ability to impose minimum separation requirements. Drafting compliant language was described as "threading a needle," given statutory prohibitions on public hearings, limits on separation distances, and the risk that provisions could be deemed an unlawful prohibition. The City has been working through multiple meetings with counsel for resident stakeholders to identify defensible language acceptable to all parties. It was asked if the ordinance were legally challenged after adoption, enforcement could be stayed and whether legal defense costs would be covered by insurance. Mr. Brookes advised that insurance coverage would depend on the nature and timing of any lawsuit and could not be confirmed until a claim is filed. There was frustration with the volume and placement of wireless facilities within the City, concerns about public safety, aesthetics, residential impacts, and the lack of local control under state law. Comparisons were made to other barrier island communities with fewer facilities, and questioned why St. Pete Beach appears disproportionately impacted. Discussion highlighted the need for the City to be more vocal at the state level and to advocate for residents. Discussion included whether the ordinance could be divided to allow adoption of the largely uncontested provisions while deferring the setback and separation language. Mr. Brookes confirmed that this was possible, though separation and setback provisions could be addressed in a separate ordinance to avoid jeopardizing the remainder if challenged.

PUBLIC COMMENT (CONT.)

Ron Vignault, Pass-a-Grille, spoke in opposition to small wireless facilities, expressing concern about potential

health and safety impacts and criticizing state preemption and telecommunications companies. He urged the City to prioritize resident safety over statutory constraints and corporate interests and encouraged officials to take a firm stance on the issue.

Mayor Petrila said the City takes the issue seriously, highlighting the extensive time and meetings devoted to it, and emphasized the need to carefully craft an ordinance that provides strong resident protections and is defensible when addressing large telecommunications companies.

Kelly Lee McFrederick, E. Maritana Dr., stated that her neighborhood qualifies as historic and should be considered in tower siting decisions. She explained the 30-foot setback was based on a prior tower located about 24 feet from her home and was intended to keep facilities out of residential neighborhoods, with variances available as needed. She reported strong resident opposition based on neighborhood outreach and insisted the City adopt protections prioritizing residents.

Jack Rice, E. Maritana Dr., raised concerns about potential impacts to homeowners and property insurance. He stated that insurers may consider proximity to wireless towers when setting premiums. He said that towers located close to homes could result in higher insurance costs for residents and businesses and encouraged the City to consider these impacts when making decisions.

Deb Schechner, Boca Ciega Isle Dr., said the number of wireless towers may be tied to anticipated large-scale development and increased demand for service. She shared concern about towers being placed near homes and suggested they should be limited to hotel or commercial areas. Additional concerns were raised about broader impacts to health, infrastructure, and resources, and she said that protecting public health and safety should be a primary City responsibility.

Claudine Reece, E. Vina Del Mar, agreed with prior comments raising concerns about the influence of telecommunications companies and supported the consensus among residents. She supported moving the ordinance forward and noted that additional residents support the issue and are sharing their views with the City.

Matt Mucci, Lakeland, representative for AT&T stated he attended expecting the ordinance to move forward based on prior discussions and believed an agreement had generally been reached with the City. He was surprised the item was pulled and that new language was introduced, noting AT&T had not yet reviewed that language. He emphasized AT&T's willingness to work with the City and residents but stressed that any ordinance must comply with state law, which has guided AT&T's position throughout discussions.

Mayor Petrila clarified that the item was previously continued to allow adequate time for residents and the City Attorney to review ordinance language requested by the telecommunications companies. He said no agreement has been reached because no vote has occurred, and discussions have been ongoing through the City Attorney. He said the extended discussions are intended to allow all parties to review proposed changes, ensure legal compliance, and work toward an ordinance that provides meaningful protections for residents.

There was further discussion on options for advancing the wireless ordinance and minimize legal risk under state preemption. Attorney Brookes confirmed that the ordinance could be divided into two separate ordinances, allowing the City to address contested provisions independently while keeping the overall schedule intact. It was noted that prior comments from Verizon focused on vagueness rather than violations of state preemption, and that some intentional vagueness was necessary to avoid crossing statutory limits. AT&T had largely agreed to the ordinance language after detailed review, including provisions preserving private property rights and requiring compliance with all applicable building and safety codes. AT&T's primary objections related to minimum separation distances (previously 300 feet, later proposed at 500 feet) and a 30-foot setback from property lines, which they argued could function as an outright prohibition in many rights-of-way due to limited usable space. Recent revisions from citizen representatives proposed changing the setback standard to 30 feet from an existing structure rather than from property lines, which may be more defensible and less likely to prohibit installations outright. There was discussion on right-of-way widths, pole height limitations and the added challenges in

neighborhoods such as Pass-a-Grille with narrower separations. Mr. Brookes advised that separating the ordinance could allow adoption of the largely agreed-upon provisions while isolating setback and separation requirements into a second ordinance, reducing the risk that a legal challenge would invalidate the entire regulatory framework. Discussion included using the statutory negotiation period, discouraging installations in residential areas while encouraging them in hotel or non-residential districts, and relying on expert distinctions between coverage and capacity needs to inform negotiations.

Motion: Commissioner Rzewnicki moved, Commissioner Maldonado seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to continue the second reading of Ordinance 2025-24 to February 24, 2026.

There was consensus to prepare a second ordinance to be considered for first reading on February 24, 2026.

6. ACTION ITEMS

a. Resolution 2026-04: Accepting the Finding of Necessity report for a proposed Community Redevelopment Area

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF ST. PETE BEACH, FLORIDA, ACCEPTING THE FINDING OF NECESSITY REPORT PREPARED BY STANTEC CONSULTING SERVICES INC. FOR A PROPOSED COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AREA; MAKING THE FINDINGS REQUIRED BY CHAPTER 163, PART III, FLORIDA STATUTES; FINDING THAT CONDITIONS OF BLIGHT EXIST WITHIN THE PROPOSED AREA; DECLARING RESILIENCY, INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS, HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AS PRIMARY REDEVELOPMENT PURPOSES; DECLARING A NEED FOR A COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY TO CARRY OUT THE PURPOSES OF CHAPTER 163, PART III, FLORIDA STATUTES; DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO TAKE ALL ACTIONS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THE CREATION OF THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AREA; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSTRUCTION, CORRECTION OF SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attorney Brookes read Resolution 2026-04 in title only.

Laura Canary, Community Development Director, provided a high-level overview of the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) process and current status. She explained that the Finding of Necessity (slum and blight) study before the Commission represents the required first step in establishing a CRA under state law. If approved, the next phase would involve extensive stakeholder and community engagement to develop a community-driven redevelopment plan, which functions as a strategic vision rather than a regulatory document. Identified initiatives would later be implemented through updates to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code. Ms. Canary emphasized the importance of coordination with Pinellas County, particularly regarding tax increment financing (TIF). Staff has initiated discussions with the County and Forward Pinellas, and further collaboration would occur following approval to align shared goals and understand County delegation criteria, contribution levels, CRA term length, and required midpoint reviews. She noted that development of the redevelopment plan may require issuance of an RFP, which would return to the Commission for direction once costs are defined. She outlined anticipated steps including community workshops, stakeholder engagement, preparation and Commission adoption of the redevelopment plan, County delegation of authority, and adoption of a redevelopment trust fund ordinance establishing CRA terms and funding structure. Ms. Canary addressed common concerns regarding the "slum and blight" terminology, noting that CRAs do not negatively impact property values and highlighting successful examples statewide and locally. She encouraged reference to the Florida Redevelopment Association for additional context. She noted that the proposed CRA would be unique in its strong focus on resiliency and infrastructure, developed in close partnership with Public Services staff, with TIF intended as a key funding source for infrastructure and resiliency investments.

Matt Lewis, Stantec, presented the Finding of Necessity (slum and blight) study supporting an infrastructure- and resiliency-focused Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) for St. Pete Beach. He explained that a Finding of Necessity is a data-driven, statutory first step that identifies objective conditions contributing to

slum/blight and noted that Florida's CRA framework evolved from older urban renewal programs toward targeted reinvestment rather than demolition. Mr. Lewis described St. Pete Beach's unique challenges as a small, barrier-island city experiencing disproportionate tourism-driven demand on infrastructure and services relative to its permanent population. He stated the City's geography and Evacuation Zone A exposure make the community highly vulnerable to storm surge and repetitive storm impacts, with limited redundancy and higher costs to build and rebuild resilient infrastructure. He also highlighted demographic vulnerability, noting a large senior population, and discussed how limited access to basic goods and services increases impacts for residents.

Mr. Lewis reviewed how the proposed CRA boundary was developed using storm surge/inundation vulnerability mapping and documented infrastructure damage from 2024 storms, highlighting heavy impacts in downtown and the tourist/resort areas. He stated the boundary is intended to help capture value from tourism activity and reinvest it locally to address infrastructure and resiliency needs. He summarized statutory criteria and stated the study found the area meets multiple factors under FS 163.340(7) and (8), including: inadequate sanitation/open space and conditions endangering life/property; defective or inadequate streets/transportation facilities; unsanitary/unsafe conditions; deterioration of site improvements; higher vacancy indicators and economic decline; and an older building stock more vulnerable to code issues. He cited specific storm-related infrastructure impacts, including damage to wastewater and lift station assets and widespread utility-related damage points, and noted indicators such as increased code violations after storms and reduced sales activity as signs of post-storm deterioration and economic stress.

Mr. Lewis provided examples of other communities using CRA/TIF-type tools to support resiliency-related projects and noted that resiliency investments can serve multiple purposes, like parks that also provide flood mitigation. He referenced prior local planning efforts, including the Corey Avenue Vision Plan and special planning areas in the Comprehensive Plan, as foundations for the downtown portion of the CRA. Mr. Lewis stated the study supports a legislative finding that CRA designation is necessary in the interest of public health, safety, and welfare, and explained that, if approved, the next step would be development of a community-driven redevelopment plan that is realistic and implementable, focusing on investments that improve infrastructure, resiliency, and the City's ability to recover more quickly after disasters.

Commission discussion focused on how a proposed infrastructure- and resiliency-focused CRA would function, what the boundary captures, and how the process would move forward. Commissioners asked whether historically designated areas would be affected. It was confirmed that historic areas can be included within a CRA and would be considered during plan development; resiliency improvements would need to be designed sensitively to protect historic character while improving resilience. Discussion included asking whether several documented conditions, like revenue decreases, are typical after any natural disaster. Mr. Lewis agreed disasters commonly cause revenue loss and business closures and emphasized the purpose of the CRA approach is not to prevent disasters, but to support investments that help the community recover more quickly, which is important given St. Pete Beach's role in the County's tourism economy. Commissioners also asked why some areas were included and others excluded. Mr. Lewis explained the boundary was designed to: (1) include areas most likely to generate TIF revenue (primarily non-residential and less likely homesteaded), (2) include key economic drivers and adopted planning areas (including the Corey Avenue/downtown core), and (3) capture coastal/tourism districts and infrastructure hot spots most impacted by recent storms. Clarification was provided that the boundary includes the downtown core and resort/hotel areas, including businesses along Blind Pass, while excluding most residential areas outside those districts. Discussion continued with inquiry as to why prior CRA efforts did not reach completion and what is different now. Ms. Canary explained multiple factors. Pinellas County adopted CRA delegation criteria beginning around 2019 and memorialized them in 2021. Several County CRAs were nearing statutory time limits, prompting the County to standardize review and alignment criteria. The recent storms made infrastructure and resiliency needs more visible and urgent, supporting clearer documentation of conditions. She also highlighted St. Pete Beach's significance to the County's tourism economy and described the effort as more of a "community rebuilding" initiative. Property values are not expected to decline and may increase with successful reinvestment.

Discussion included inquiries about the boundary excluding the southern portion of the City and whether boundaries must be contiguous. Ms. Canary confirmed CRA areas must be contiguous and noted statutory/County limits, including a cap that a CRA cannot exceed 80% of the City's geographic area. She said the intent is to start strategically with the core area and potentially consider future expansion or additional districts, noting implications for base year calculations and trust fund structure. Questions were raised about the 80% threshold relative to the current proposal, and discussion on potential long-term considerations for including additional historic and boutique hotel areas, while noting the need to keep an approvable scope. Ms. Canary confirmed the current proposal is well below the 80% limit, and that there is flexibility to refine boundaries before finalizing, but recommended a strategic, phased approach.

Commissioners discussed the importance of using tourism contribution data and the CRA framework to help advocate with Pinellas County for reinvestment in St. Pete Beach. Ms. Canary noted CRA revenue is reinvested within the generating area and described the value of identifying "champions" and aligning County criteria to better account for coastal hazard/resiliency needs. A question was raised regarding preliminary revenue projections. Ms. Canary stated formal projections were not yet completed, but referenced a rough early estimate based on total taxable value within the boundary and a conservative annual growth assumption; she indicated more detailed TIF scenarios would be presented during the next phases, including differing County contribution tiers and timeframes.

Commissioners asked where the City is in the process and when community engagement occurs. Ms. Canary said the Finding of Necessity is the initial step. Next steps include seeking Commission authorization to proceed with development of the redevelopment plan, coordinating with Pinellas County, and, if needed, issuing an RFP for plan preparation. She said community engagement begins at the start of the redevelopment plan process. She noted that if County approval is not granted, the work would still inform Comprehensive Plan/LDC updates and other potential TIF approaches, and the City could pivot to alternative funding/structure options.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Gregory Premer, Moody St., encouraged revisiting the CRA effort and suggested softening terminology such as "blight" and "slum" to improve community support. He referenced prior planning efforts for Corey Avenue and emphasized the importance of hotels to the City's tourism economy, noting that while many condominiums have been built over the years, no new hotels have been constructed. He expressed concern that reinvestment in hotels has lagged and stated support for moving the CRA forward to strengthen the City's long-term economic vitality.

Deb Schechner, Boca Ciega Isle Dr., said the prior CRA effort failed due to concerns over eminent domain and expressed opposition to using CRA funds to benefit hotels. CRA resources should focus on residential neighborhoods, infrastructure, housing improvements, streetscapes, traffic, parking, and small businesses, not large hotels. She noted potential negative impacts such as increased short-term rentals and lack of enforcement. The city should consider a CRA only if it includes strong safeguards, clear boundaries, and restrictions to ensure funds benefit residents.

Kathy Garchow, Casablanca Ave., asked why the Don CeSar Hotel area was not included in the proposed mapping and suggested it could be considered in the future due to its significance to the community. She noted the site's location on the Don CeSar plat and related vulnerabilities, including impacts to the nearby boat ramp, and suggested it may be a relevant area to evaluate as planning efforts move forward.

Mayor Petrilá noted the City's identified \$213 million infrastructure need and thanked City staff, the University of Florida, and the Commission for advancing efforts to address it. He highlighted the importance of securing additional revenue, potentially generating \$2.5 million or more annually, to help fund infrastructure improvements over time. The City is committed to working with County Commissioners and leveraging existing relationships to move the effort forward, highlighted the need for responsible redevelopment and economic revitalization following recent storms, and expressed support for continued community engagement through town halls and public discussions as the process continues.

Motion: Mayor Petrila moved, Vice Mayor Marriott seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to adopt Resolution 2026-04.

b. Resolution 2026-01: Vacating a three-foot easement located at the rear of Lots 5 and 6 of Block C of Sunset Park Replat as recorded in Plat Book 18, Page 6, of the Public Records of Pinellas County, Florida (103 24th Avenue) (Continued from the January 27, 2026 City Commission meeting)

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF ST. PETE BEACH VACATING A THREE-FOOT PLATTED EASEMENT AT THE REAR OF LOTS 5 AND 6 OF BLOCK C OF SUNSET PARK REPLAT, RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 18, PAGE 6, OF PINELLAS COUNTY PUBLIC RECORDS, LOCATED WITHIN THE PROPERTY BOUNDARIES OF 103 24TH AVENUE; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSTRUCTION, CORRECTION OF SCRIVENER'S ERROR, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attorney Brookes read Resolution 2026-01 in title only.

Brandon Berry, Senior Planner, reported that there have been no changes to the resolution since the prior meeting when the item was continued. Since that time, a building permit has been issued to relocate the sewer line, which will remain on the subject property and be moved to the east side adjacent to the neighboring lot. The property owner has recorded a license agreement, reviewed by the City Attorney, to preserve sewer access to the rear manhole for neighboring residents. Attorney Brookes confirmed that the agreement adequately protects the City's interests.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Michael Pezza, owner, thanked staff for the update and explained the background of the request related to sewer infrastructure affecting his property. He and his family are willing to fully fund the necessary sewer work to avoid impacts to neighboring properties. He described the history of the issue since purchasing the home, decisions made following recent storms, and plans to relocate the existing house so the lot can be vacated and redeveloped. He appreciated staff assistance and requested approval to allow the project to move forward and proceed with plans for a new, appropriately scaled home consistent with the neighborhood.

Motion: Commissioner Maldonado moved, Rzewnicki seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to adopt Resolution 2026-01.

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

a. 3x permit fees (Added)

Commissioner Robinson raised concerns about the upcoming enforcement of triple permit fees for after-the-fact permits related to unpermitted hurricane repair work, scheduled to take effect February 16. Prior notifications did not clearly state that triple fees could apply and communication to residents has been confusing and insufficient, particularly with overlapping notices from the City and Pinellas County. There was support for extending the compliance period and establishing an amnesty period through June 30, consistent with Pinellas County and other municipalities. Under this approach, residents who completed unpermitted hurricane-related repairs would be encouraged to come forward, obtain required permits, and pay standard permit fees without being subject to the triple-fee penalty. This would apply only to hurricane-related repairs and not to unrelated or knowingly unpermitted construction. City Manager Robustelli said the City's intent has been to achieve compliance rather than impose penalties and that situations vary. Approximately 250 property owners have not responded to prior notices, though not all have completed unpermitted work. Commissioners stressed the importance of additional outreach and clearer messaging to reduce confusion and encourage compliance. Commissioners agreed to personally assist residents identified in their districts. Staff requested clarification on how to handle cases identified through inspections or complaints versus voluntary disclosures. There was consensus to provide an amnesty from triple permit fees through June 30 for unpermitted hurricane-related work, provided the resident voluntarily comes forward to obtain the required permits. Properties that become code enforcement cases would not be eligible for the amnesty.

b. Mike Twitty Presentation scheduled for February 24, 2026 (Added)

Commissioner Robinson said Pinellas County Property Appraiser Mike Twitty has agreed to attend the February 24 meeting to provide a presentation. His presentation will address the condition status letters sent to property owners, FEMA wind mitigation issues for 2025, and the 100–110% rebuild provisions. If Mr. Twitty is called to Tallahassee, a representative from his office will attend in his place. She announced that the Property Appraiser’s Office will host an educational presentation on Thursday, February 12, at noon at the South County Building, 2500 34th Street North. The session will be streamed and recorded and will cover exemptions, condition status letters, and related topics. A registration link will be provided to the City Manager for posting on the City’s website. She encouraged the Commissioners to review storm-related information and FAQs available on the Pinellas County Property Appraiser’s website in advance of the February 24 meeting, including information on repairs, replacement, damaged or destroyed property, and assessed value increases or decreases. Questions and concerns can be compiled for discussion with Mr. Twitty, particularly regarding property valuation impacts following storm damage.

c. Historic Designation (Added)

Commissioner Robinson requested commissioners promote historic designation within their districts, particularly to homeowners who may still be undecided. Any home 50 years old or older is eligible to apply, there is no cost to apply, and designation can be especially beneficial for properties that are not being elevated. Historic homes add value and preserve the character of the community. She can host an additional public workshop on historic designation, if there is interest, having held a previous workshop at the library.

8. CITY CLERK, CITY MANAGER, CITY ATTORNEY, AND CITY COMMISSION REPORTS

Renee Rose, City Clerk – no report

Frances Robustelli, City Manager – no report

City Attorney Brookes – no report

Commissioner Maldonado – no report

Commissioner Rzewnicki – She reported ongoing efforts to expand volunteer programs and noted interest from a group of residents in the Belle Vista area who want to organize a trash pickup along Gulf Boulevard. The group expressed pride in the community and a desire to help improve the appearance ahead of the spring season. Several local businesses have expressed interest in participating in similar cleanup efforts along the beach side.


Commissioner Robinson – She announced upcoming library events, including a presentation on Florida’s Highwaymen by Elizabeth Britt on February 11, a feature film screening of *Roofman* at noon on February 13, and a Valentine’s event with the St. Pete Sax Quartet on February 13.

Vice Mayor Marriott – She reported that a “Beer with a Commissioner” event will be held at Mastry’s Brewing on February 17. She also noted that a new small grocery store, Beach Meats, recently opened on Gulf Boulevard and encouraged the public to visit.

Mayor Petrila – He reported a recent increase in new business openings and reopenings in St. Pete Beach, highlighting several new establishments and others completing renovations, and expressed appreciation for the renewed business activity and support for local businesses.

Mayor Petrila adjourned the meeting at 9:33pm.

MINUTES APPROVED: FEBRUARY 24, 2026


RENEE ROSE
CITY CLERK


ADRIAN PETRILA
MAYOR