

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Planning and Zoning Board Special Meeting April 25, 2023

The Planning and Zoning Board met in formal session Tuesday, April 25, 2023, at 1:00 p.m. in the Alcazar Room at City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Mike Davis, Chairperson and the following were present:

1. Roll Call: Mike Davis, Chairperson
Charles Pappas, Vice- Chairperson
Jon DePreter
Carl Blow
Christina Griggs
Matthew Shaffer

Absent: Ashleigh Barnes (arrived at 1:42p.m.)

City Staff: Amy Skinner, Director, Planning & Building Department
Jacob Fredriksson, Planning & Building Planner
Tracey Mullins, Planning & Building Planner
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Reuben Franklin, Public Works Director
Kelly Trainor, Assistant City Attorney
Elyse Wiemann, Recording Secretary

2. General Public hearings for Items Not on the Agenda

(None)

3. Consideration and Discussion Related to Updating the City's Parking Code Regulations

a. Presentation regarding the results of the recently conducted Parking Code Survey

Ms. Skinner provided a brief overview of the topic and noted the parking code had not been updated; however, it needed to be to support the Mobility Plan. She reviewed the results of the recently conducted Parking Code Survey and discussed what was lacking in the City regarding parking and alternative modes of transportation. She noted all the comments from the survey were provided to the Board for review and feedback.

Board Discussion:

- Clear there was a lack of parking in the downtown area
- Public seemed frustrated, concerned and worried and these problems could hinder it from being livable
- General responses were able to capture more data from the public
- Residents seemed to be open to satellite parking which made it easier to be in the City
- Tourist wanted the area to be more walkable
- Create a location for more convenience parking either valet or drop off parking or a City residence only parking lot
- Unable to eliminate parking without having alternatives available
- Only heard from 7% of the businesses in the area and felt it would be beneficial to hear their feedback

- Could have parking lots for the business staff in the downtown area
- Survey responses were evenly divided on how to set policy
- Questioned what qualified as walking distance
- Thought some of the issues could be a perception instead of a problem
- Would need to have ADA accessible vehicles to move people from the satellite areas
- Suggested if on street parking were removed could expand sidewalks and add landscaping for a multiuse sidewalk
- Felt bicycle riding would increase if they felt safer

Ms. Skinner reviewed the shuttle and parking information from the 2022 Nights of Lights season. She noted over the past four years between 2016-2020 the parking garage daily car counts. In 2021 and 2022 noted how often it closed because it was full. She added that the garage had never been closed for an entire day.

The Board continued to discuss the results of the survey and noted the different outcomes for each number on the survey.

Reuben Franklin, Public Works director, noted there was a grant that would help assist with parking to help provide real time information. He said they were in the final stages with Department of Transportation (DOT) with the City circular.

Mr. Blow asked if they were reviewing adding variable priced parking.

Mr. Franklin said that was something they were interested in this idea in the future; however, it was not being done as of yet. The Board briefly discussed how important variable pricing could be and how to provide the data to the public.

Ms. Skinner noted that was a concept of the Mobility Plan.

b. Discussion with city Mobility Consultant Jonathan B. Paul, AICP, MA2 NUE Urban Concepts related to potential updates to the City's Parking Code to incorporate mobility concepts adopted in the City's Mobility Plan and the Comprehensive Plan

Ms. Skinner introduced the topic and reviewed the Map Series¹ provided to the Board. She said according to the taxable value, there was an increase of around 9%. She said from the February Meeting the Board wanted to update the Parking Code. She introduced consultant, Jonathan Paul Urban Concepts.

Mr. Paul noted the different Historic Preservation (HP) zoning and the current parking requirements in those districts. He stated that there were a few areas in the City that were required to meet parking code requirements but suggested for those to be exempt from having parking regulations.

Mr. Paul provided a presentation for the parking code. He discussed the following topics with the Board:

- Historic District Parking requirements to consider
- Historic District paid off-street parking
- Outside Historic District Parking Considerations
- Residential Parking Rate Comparison
- Office, Recreation and Hotel Parking Rate Comparison
- Higher Education Parking Rates Comparison
- Retail Parking Rate Comparison
- Restaurant Parking Rate Comparison
- Coffee Shop and Drinking Establishments Parking Rate Comparison

¹ Maps attached to original packet

c. Planning and Zoning Board discussion

Mr. Davis asked what types of pervious surfaces were allowed, because the ones in City Code were expensive and it was very difficult to improve a parking lot in the HP district.

Mr. Franklin replied it was hard in the HP district; however, there were many factors that went into addressing parking lots. He said the Parking Code was vague and was open to having more definitions as to what could be used.

Mr. Davis said many lots were over 40 or 50 spaces which held water and thought that could be something the City was not as strict on, and instead focus on having the best parking lots possible.

Ms. Griggs asked if they could require water treatment from the initial flush instead of full treatment. She questioned if a small swale could be added if the parking lot was just over the ten spaces.

Mr. Franklin explained the policy only captured the first flush, and there was a policy currently in place in the historic downtown area to help elevate it. He said there was a difference between the smaller coquina parking lots versus the larger ones. Staff and Board Discussion:

- Commercially zoned property with a parking lot could cause more issues for the City
- Proposed Local Ordinance bill could make it more difficult to regulate business operations which could be an issue
- Parking lots were businesses
- Questioned if this would be for new applications and not to the current lots downtown
- Off street paid parking was not a Comprehensive Land Use
- Not supposed to encourage nonconforming uses and if the lot was

altered or expanded, it would have to meet current standards

- Commercial Medium lots on US1 allowed parking facilities but this was mainly the downtown area, but the lots have evolved overtime
- Questioned why it was not currently an allowable use
- Not opposed to making it an allowable use to allow for any future projects for those to be shaped properly
- Many churches leased parking lots which provided significant income and felt the Board should be cautious
- Did not feel asking Code Enforcement to review signage was the best use staff time
- Did not want to encourage the building of more parking lots in the HP districts
- Code was historic but there was a parking issue which was stringent; however, did not see a reason to change the current code

Ms. Skinner said the accessory uses for parking only played a role when a hotel had a public restaurant or store that was not specific to only hotel guests.

Board discussion:

- Could change the parking requirement for dental/medical offices to include time span and the square footage
- Medical/dental were less restrictive than the County Code and there was never enough parking for these types of facilities
- Would only affect new or a modification to an existing building
- Code would only apply to the expansion of the building not the existing part
- Medical offices should be kept the same; however, felt the community center parking requirement was higher than average and could be reduced
- The amount of parking required at doctors' offices could be linked to exam rooms
- Felt the combination of shifts and square footage was a common use

- Surprised to see the parking requirements for Grocery stores were higher than what the ITE trip generator suggested
- Did not see a need to change these as parking lots were full and not a lot of excess parking
- Not in favor of reducing the amount of parking spaces
- Felt the requirements for parking could change for neighborhood stores
- Did not see a reason to change the parking requirements at a restaurant
- City should be open to negotiate with fast food if it was only drive-thru²

Mr. Paul response:

- Was done that way for medical or vet locations
- Questioned if the standard should be updated or left along or consider the different types of uses
- Community Centers were less most of the time and had open parking
- None of these were outrageously higher than the average but thought many other cities were looking at reducing some of the parking requirements
- Would come back to the Board with other options

Mr. Paul said his understanding from the Board was, there should be a different approach to doctors' offices, neighborhood retail, and restaurants with drive-thru only. He said if a hotel had a general public restaurant or store it should be tied to that use.

Mr. Davis said West King did not have a whole lot of parking and felt that the parking requirement might need to be limited.

Mr. DePreter said there was a recent article regarding San Marco Avenue that suggested having a parking garage; however, was unsure if that would work. He said there was

a need for more density along the corridors where transit stops would be located. He thought the City was in a transitional period; however, the concern was for residents as there could be an issue with parking if it were eliminated.

Mr. Blow said a shuttle might not work if the traffic was an issue. He said the main roads needed to have less vehicles on them.

Mr. Pappas supported the idea of eliminating the restrictions on West King and felt that could encourage the development of the area.

Mr. Paul noted residential parking programs could be extended. He noted the area being referenced on San Marco Avenue was only a half mile from the parking garage and not the entire Avenue.

Mr. Paul said other options available for the Board to consider adding to the Code were:

- Shared Use Parking
- Multimodal Off-Sets for Required Parking
- Mobility Hubs
- On-street parking
- Valet parking
- Annual rental of offsite parking spaces to encourage redevelopment and meet parking standards

Mr. Paul recapped final comments from the Board regarding the presentation:

- Shared use for parking made sense
- Very interesting ideas and some items have been passed through under PUDs
- Priority was to have vehicles off the road as it was not good for the businesses or residences
- Should reduce parking but increase it in the proper places
- Wanted more information for the shared parking, multimodal offsets
- Questioned how these would be implemented

² Break from 3:45p.m.-3:50p.m.

- Felt it should be as easy as possible for people to apply

4. Discussion and Recommendation Related to Drafted Ordinance Updating Sections in the Land Development Code Regarding Food Truck Regulations

Tracey Mullins, Planning and Building Planner, introduced the topic and noted they had worked with the business community.

Mr. Davis asked if there was any input from the Food truck organization.

Ms. Skinner noted it was sent to them; however, there was no response. She said this was a request for a recommendation to the City Commission.

Staff and Board Discussion:

- Tracked the Florida Code and did not see much of an issue with the document
- Felt a Use by Exception for land zoned Open Land district and Maritime Use District (MUD) could apply
- Not all MUDs were the same and they should be treated individually
- Not able to be located in a City Right of way unless there was an event
- Questioned if there were hours associated and if so, should be limited to midnight
- Should change the operating time to 10:00p.m. and if later hours were needed could be a Use by Exception
- Should keep the distance of 150 feet from a residential neighborhood as there was many STR's in the City
- Questioned if Food trucks were allowed on private property

Staff Response:

- Did not want food trucks to be on sidewalks or roadways

- Would be allowed on the street in neighborhoods with a permit
- Food trucks were not allowed in the HP districts
- Food truck park was in alignment with the bars and being open until 2:00a.m.
- Could have an operation time unless approved for later through a Use by Exception
- Could have a food truck on an improved surface but could not hinder life safety

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to Recommend Food Truck Ordinance to the City Commission with the suggested changes. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

Mr. Blow said the changes were as follows:

- Maritime Use District mobile food dispensing vehicles would be a Use by Exception
- Change private property or other listed zone until no later than 10:00p.m.
- Hours of operation food courts should be changed to 6:00a.m.-10:00p.m.
- Hours of operation could be altered through a Use by Exception

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Pappas, DePreter, Shaffer, Barnes, Griggs, Blow, Davis

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Adjournment

Having no further business, Mr. Davis adjourned the meeting at 4:46 P.M.³



Mike Davis, Chairperson

³ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann