

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Corridor Review Committee Meeting October 5, 2023

The Corridor Review Committee met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, October 5, 2023, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Michael Dixon, Chair, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL:

Michael Dixon, Chair
Vaughn Cochran

Absent:

Lorna MacDonald, excused

City Staff:

Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Officer
Candice Seymour, Historic Preservation Planner
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Elyse Wiemann, Recording Secretary

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. Cochran MOVED to APPROVE the May 4, 2023, meeting minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Dixon and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

MOTION

Mr. Cochran MOVED to APPROVE the agenda as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Dixon.

VOTE ON MOTION:

Ayes: Cochran, Dixon

Nayes: NONE

5. New Business

5. (a) HP2023-0070– T.N. Lee Services, LLC - Applicant
Gary Northrup - Owner
550 W King Street

Design Review for construction of a new commercial development along the King Street Entry Corridor.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the King Street Design Standards for Entry Corridors and without evidence to the contrary, the CRC may approve the proposed design if the Committee finds that it meets the purpose and intent of the Standards with architecture that is appropriate and compatible with the Corridor and surrounding structures. Any approval of the design should include the following conditions:

- A street wall be added along King Street to, at minimum, screen the visible portion of the parking lot.
- The design elements that do not meet the DSEC as determined by staff, including the frontage and glazing, require approval by the Planning and Zoning Board or will be modified to a threshold which can be approved by the CRC and meets the review criteria under section 3.7.5.
- All findings must be proven by the applicant and accepted by the CRC to grant a modification. In doing so, the CRC recognizes that the approval is

unique to this property and its conditions and does not establish any precedent.

If these findings cannot be made based upon this application and any additional testimony the Modification can be denied and the applicant may seek an appeal before the City Commission.

Nick Lee and Gary Northrop reviewed the application.

Mr. Cochran asked how much glazing was shown in the updated drawings. He questioned if the windows would be solid glass or have panes.

Mr. Lee replied the two large windows were at 80% glazing and would be panes. He said the smaller window was in a bathroom and suggested changing it from one window to sidelite as there was a concern with privacy.

Ms. Lopez asked if the applicant wanted to be heard by the Planning and Zoning Board (PZB) for the frontage. She said the glazing was also something the PZB could handle if the applicant requested, or they could stay within the perimeters of the CRC.

Mr. Lee replied in the affirmative and advised they were moving forward with an application for the PZB based on comments from staff. He said they wanted a variance for the glazing as well. He said what they had designed was what they wanted to go with but ideally, they wanted less. He said the CRC could decide on the windows as a backup if not approved by the PZB.

Ms. Lopez clarified the frontage would be presented to PZB and based on the CRC regulations for glazing that could be provided and used if PZB did not approve a full variance, and the other design elements were also within the purview of the Board.

Mr. Cochran said the wall was not an issue as PZB would provide approval for that.

Ms. Seymour said the frontage that PZB would be required to approve has to do with the front elevation of the building, as it was not as wide as the entry corridor standards required. She said it could be mitigated with a street wall if a variance was permitted by PZB.

Ms. Courtney said, regarding the glazing, if a variance was permitted, the original design was modified to be more incorporated; however, if the Board thought the original elevation was more aesthetically pleasing, that should be noted. She said it would be beneficial to provide guidance of where the front elevation should be.

Ms. Lopez reiterated the Board did not have to approve the frontage of the building; however, if the revised glazing was appropriate the Board could approve that, and it could be a backup to the decision granted by the PZB or if it detracted overall, they could recommend the original design. She said they could recommend the wall to PZB if they felt it was appropriate.

Mr. Cochran said the wall seemed to be cheaper than expanding the building; however, felt there was no room to expand the building and do what the applicant wanted. He said the proposed design was most sensible.

Ex Parte Communication :

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi asked for clarification regarding obtaining a variance from PZB. She said she was unsure if this would fit into the neighborhood. She noted her concern was the corridor in West City.

Ms. Lopez said the issue was the lot was pie shaped and was along King Street. She said the corridor requirements asked for the frontage to be filled; however, the applicant was asking for a smaller building and the

CRC was unable to grant that small of a building therefore the application had to be heard by PZB for a variance. She noted staff mentioned having masonry wall for mitigation purposes even though that was not a requirement.

Mr. Cochran clarified they were able to recommend to the PZB for the wall to be considered.

Ms. Seymour replied in the affirmative.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Lee presented the rebuttal. He noted they were not in favor of the masonry wall.

Discussion:

- Property was triangular shaped with train tracks in the back
- Board could not provide the requested frontage; therefore, the applicant would seek an approval from PZB
- Felt the building worked the best it could with the parking on the side and the landscaping
- Felt the wall would distract from the building
- Building would have landscaping in front
- If a wall were needed, landscaping could be done in front and behind

Mr. Northrop said the windows in the back of the building provided access the garden and the displayed art.

MOTION

Mr. Cochran MOVED to APPROVE the design review for the application with recommendations to be forwarded to PZB about the glazing and not utilize a wall to mitigate the frontage but use the landscaping for application HP2023-0070. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Dixon.

Mr. Dixon said the original design had a better rhythm in front. He said he was in favor of adding a side lite to a door only to meet the fenestration requirement. He said the door was a full lite.

Mr. Cochran clarified the recommendation was for the design to be reviewed as shown.

Ms. Lopez reiterated the Board wanted no wall conditioned with having the landscaping, the original design and all other elements the Board was in support of.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Cochran, Dixon

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Dixon felt this would be a beautiful addition to West King Street.

7. Other Business

Ms. Courtney provided the proposed meeting schedule for the fiscal year (FY) 2024. She said if there was a change, it could be modified if needed.

MOTION

Mr. Cochran MOVED to accept the meeting schedule for FY 2024 as shown. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Dixon and approved by UNIAMIOUS VOICE VOTE.

8. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:40 P.M.¹

¹ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann