

Tonia Wilcox

From: Carroll Ann Bennett <cab1228@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 2:59 PM
To: TampaCityCouncil
Cc: poynorwife9819@yahoo.com; Debbie Zomermaand; armorygardensnow@aol.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Plan Amendment TA/CPA 24-11 conundrum

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

Dear Councilmembers,

Please do not continue this Plan Amendment to January 15th, because it is the same night as the rezoning for the Marisol on Davis Islands. Both hearings will probably take hours so they should not be scheduled for the same night.

In addition, it is absolutely unacceptable that they are asking for a fifth continuance, giving them a sixth date! This means they have been stringing along this neighborhood for a year and a half!

Multiple continuances put neighborhoods in impossible situations. Since there is no guarantee the continuance will be approved or denied, they cannot prepare. It is a Herculean task for a neighborhood to organize when there is certainty of the date. It is impossible when that certainty is taken away. **Therefore, I will not appear before you to fight the continuance, because the neighborhood will not be able to properly mount a defense if you hear this on Thursday.**

This is a completely unacceptable situation, and I believe it shows a spectacular disregard for this community. **But I see no option but to grant the continuance (but not to January 15th).** Since it is legislative instead of QJ, and the Council rules for continuances do not apply.

Here is the history of this plan amendment.

The first hearing was scheduled for September 26, **2024**.
It was continued the first time to January 30, 2025.
Continued second time to June 12, 2025.
Continued third time to August 21, 2025.
Then continued for the fourth time to November 13, 2025.

If Council grants this continuance, it will be the **fifth continuance**, and they will have had **SIX scheduled dates** for this Plan Amendment.

I am also including an email you got from Dana Jasper which excellently outlines this situation.

Thank you,
Carroll Ann Bennett

Dear Councilmembers,

The applicant for Comprehensive Plan Amendment TA/CPA 24-11 has once again requested another continuance—the fifth—from November 13, 2025, to January 15, 2026, so it can be heard alongside requested continuances for vacating and rezoning applications (VAC 25-08 and REZ 25-48).

Whenever TA/CPA 24-11 eventually comes before Council, I urge you to hear and vote on it first and independently—before any presentation or discussion by staff or the applicant for the vacating or rezoning requests.

Council should not be presented with any materials related to VAC 25-08 or REZ 25-48 until after a vote on the TA/CPA 24-11 has been taken. If the amendment is denied, there would be no basis or need to consider either the vacating or rezoning requests.

A comprehensive plan amendment is a **major legislative policy decision**, not a project pitch. Council should evaluate it on its own merits and in accordance with the City's established criteria for such changes. City Council must consider the full potential of the property under a land use change—what **any** developer could build—which is why Council should not simultaneously be presented with what the applicant claims they intend to build. Allowing the applicant and staff to present vacating and rezoning information in conjunction with the comprehensive plan amendment application would be inappropriate.

Please ensure that Council first deliberates and votes on TA/CPA 24-11 independently, and do not permit any presentation of vacating or rezoning materials until after that vote has been taken.

Thank you for your time and for upholding accountability in this process.

Sincerely,

Dana Jasper
Tampa Resident

Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS

Tonia Wilcox

From: Kathy Durdin <kathydurdin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2025 2:09 PM
To: TampaCityCouncil
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Continuance Request Re Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment TA/CPA 24-11

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

November 10, 2025

City of Tampa City Council

315 E. Kennedy Blvd.

Third Floor

Tampa, FL 33602

Re Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment TA/CPA 24-11

Dear Councilmembers,

The applicant for Comprehensive Plan Amendment TA/CPA 24-11 has once again requested another continuance from November 13, 2025, to January 15, 2026.

I am the president of Tampa Realistic Artists, Inc., located at 705 W. Swann Ave. This is in the block immediately to the west of the subject property. I have lived at 1820 W. Richardson Place for the past 36 years. Both properties are within the Hyde Park Historic District. I also previously served as president of the Historic Hyde Park Neighborhood Association.

My neighbors and I have quite a few concerns about the subject Comprehensive Plan Amendment request as well as the related proposals for vacating or rezoning of the subject property (VAC 25-08 and REZ 25-48). I will limit my current letter to several immediate concerns.

1. Repeated request for continuance and inadequate notice.

I have lost track of how many requests for continuance the applicant has made related to appearances in front of the Architectural Review Commission and City Council. Many of these requests have not been adequately noticed, or, if noticed, not re-noticed after a request for a continuance. Neighbors have spent substantial time researching issues and organizing presentations. **If this request for continuance is granted, I would request that the applicant be required to re-notice all neighbors.**

2. Requested continuance date of January 15, 2026

The applicant has requested that the hearing be continue until January 15, 2026. My understanding is that the law firm for the applicant has already requested the continuation of the hearing regarding another major project that it also represents, the Mirasol on Davis Island, (TA/CPA 24-18) to that same date. The strategy of putting two major projects on the same City Council agenda, which will result in a hearing long into the early morning

hours, appears to be designed to wear out neighbors appearing in opposition. By the early morning hours, no one involved, including the City Council members, will be able to coherently voice their opinions or consider the issues. **I would request that the City Council not acquiesce to this strategy but instead require that the subject request be moved to another date.**

3. Inclusion of requested Comprehensive Plan Amendment with request for vacation and rezoning/ PD request.

The applicant's strategy has been to present the application for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and the request to vacate and the rezoning request to the ARC separately and then to present all of these to the City Council at the same meeting. This has the effect of muddying the waters regarding the application for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

The Comprehensive Plan Amendment would represent a permanent change to the property. It would encompass all the potential changes to the property in perpetuity. This requested change needs to be considered separate and apart from the applicant's current specific proposal for the property. A change to the Comprehensive Plan for the property would open up a wide variety of uses for the property that are completely inconsistent with the Historic District or the neighborhood. Council should evaluate the requested Comprehensive Plan Amendment changes on its own merits and in accordance with the City's established criteria for such changes. City Council must consider the full potential of the property under a land use change—what any developer could build, not what this developer plans to build. It is why Council should not simultaneously be presented with what the applicant claims they intend to build. A comprehensive plan amendment is a **major legislative policy decision**, not a project pitch. Allowing the applicant and staff to present vacating and rezoning information in conjunction with the comprehensive plan amendment application would be inappropriate.

Whenever TA/CPA 24-11 eventually comes before Council, I urge you to hear and vote on it first and independently—before any presentation or discussion by staff or the applicant for the vacating or rezoning requests. Council should not be presented with any materials related to VAC 25-08 or REZ 25-48 until after a vote on the TA/CPA 24-11 has been taken. If the amendment is denied, there would be no basis or need to consider either the vacating or rezoning requests.

Please ensure that Council first deliberates and votes on TA/CPA 24-11 independently, and do not permit any presentation of vacating or rezoning materials until after that vote has been taken.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Durdin

Kathy Durdin

kathydurdin@gmail.com

www.kathydurdin.com

813.220.5800

Tonia Wilcox

From: Fern Rabil <fernrazil@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 11:56 AM
To: TampaCityCouncil
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 613 S Magnolia Hotel Proposal

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

As a homeowner in Hyde Park, I urge you all to shut down the hotel proposal for 613 S Magnolia, in the Swann Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard area.

I am the owner of a beautifully renovated 1916 bungalow at 711 S. Rome Ave. As a proud resident of Historic Hyde Park, I have so many issues with this hotel proposal.

From a need standpoint, we are in such close proximity to all the downtown hotels and Harbour Island. We are a ten minute drive from Midtown and Dale Mabry where there are plenty of existing hotels. We have the Pali House and The Epicurean also within walking distance, not to mention all the Airbnb's in the area.

As for how our streets will be impacted, because Hyde Park Village is thriving, we already have so many drivers who have no idea where they're going or where to park, often due to garages at capacity. I live at a four-way stop, which is constantly and dangerously treated as a two-way stop by Swann Ave drivers. My street is partially one way and this largely goes ignored. My street is parking on one side only, however many drivers choose to take the \$30 parking ticket, just to get a parking spot.

When I renovated my home in 2020, I worked with the ARC and followed their rules and guidelines accordingly. I installed wood windows in a day and age when that makes no sense, with our harsh climate or financially, because I believe in and respect the historic nature of where I live. Will this hotel have to adhere to the guidelines of Spanishtown Creek or my historic area?

Please do not allow this large commercial structure to come into our area. I welcome each and every one of you to my home during prime hours, to walk around the neighborhood, to

witness what traffic and parking, to get a sense of the charm and pride my community has. Let's sit on my porch and you'll be convinced that there is no need to bring that behemoth structure into our already very busy and congested area.

Respectfully,
Fern Rabil

Tonia Wilcox

From: donna morrison <donnamorrisonart@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2025 10:22 PM
To: TampaCityCouncil
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comprehensive Plan Amendment TA/CPA 24-11

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

November 10, 2025

City of Tampa City Council

315 E. Kennedy Blvd.

Third Floor

Tampa, FL 33602

Re Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment TA/CPA 24-11

Dear Councilmembers,

The applicant for Comprehensive Plan Amendment TA/CPA 24-11 has once again requested another continuance from November 13, 2025, to January 15, 2026.

I am the vice president of Tampa Realistic Artists, Inc. (TRA), located at 705 W. Swann Ave. This is in the block immediately to the west of the subject property. I also have taught in this location for over 15 years and feel I understand the neighborhood well for its historical preservation distinction and feel.

TRA has quite a few concerns about the subject Comprehensive Plan Amendment request as well as the related proposals for vacating or rezoning of the subject property (VAC 25-08 and REZ 25-48). History proves that developers use continuances to create adverse situations that aid their ultimate objective as they wear down the opposition through time delays, changes, and misinformation. In the meantime, the developer has been sending out press releases and getting press coverage that makes the average, uninformed reader, think that the development is a "done deal". They are using the time delays to sway the public in less than truthful ways.

I will limit my current letter to several immediate concerns.

1. Repeated request for continuance and inadequate notice.

There have now been five requests for continuances that the applicant has made related to appearances in front of the Architectural Review Commission and City Council. Many of these requests have not been adequately noticed, or, if noticed, not re-noticed after a request for a continuance. Neighbors have spent substantial time researching issues and organizing presentations. **If this request for continuance is granted, I would request that the applicant be required to re-notice all neighbors.**

2. Requested continuance date of January 15, 2026

The applicant has requested that the hearing be continued until January 15, 2026. My understanding is that the law firm for the applicant has already requested the continuation of the hearing regarding another major project that it also represents, the Mirasol on Davis Island, (TA/CPA 24-18) to that same date. The strategy of putting two major projects on the same City Council agenda, which will result in a hearing long into the early morning hours, appears to be designed to wear out neighbors appearing in opposition. By the early morning hours, no one involved, including the City Council members, will be able to coherently voice their opinions or consider the issues. **I would request that the City Council not acquiesce to this strategy but instead require that the subject request be moved to another date.**

3. Inclusion of requested Comprehensive Plan Amendment with request for vacation and rezoning/ PD request.

The applicant's strategy has been to present the application for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and the request to vacate and the rezoning request to the ARC separately and then to present all of these to the City Council at the same meeting. This has the effect of muddying the waters regarding the application for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

The Comprehensive Plan Amendment would represent a permanent change to the property. It would encompass all the potential changes to the property in perpetuity. This requested change needs to be considered separate and apart from the applicant's current specific proposal for the property. A change to the Comprehensive Plan for the property would open up a wide variety of uses for the property that are completely inconsistent with the Historic District or the neighborhood. Council should evaluate the requested Comprehensive Plan Amendment changes on its own merits and in accordance with the City's established criteria for such changes. City Council must consider the full potential of the property under a land use change—what **any** developer could build, not what this developer plans to build. It is why Council should not simultaneously be presented with what the applicant claims they intend to build. A comprehensive plan amendment is a **major legislative policy decision**, not a project pitch. Allowing the applicant and staff to present vacating and rezoning information in conjunction with the comprehensive plan amendment application would be inappropriate.

Whenever TA/CPA 24-11 eventually comes before Council, I urge you to hear and vote on it first and independently—before any presentation or discussion by staff or the applicant for the vacating or rezoning requests. Council should not be presented with any materials related to VAC 25-08 or REZ 25-48 until after a vote on the TA/CPA 24-11 has been taken. If the amendment is denied, there would be no basis or need to consider either the vacating or rezoning requests.

Please ensure that Council first deliberates and votes on TA/CPA 24-11 independently, and do not permit any presentation of vacating or rezoning materials until after that vote has been taken.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Donna Morrison

donnamorrisonart@gmail.com

www.donnadukemorrison.com

813.230-5676