

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Planning and Zoning Board Regular Meeting December 3, 2024

The Planning and Zoning Board met in formal session Tuesday, December 3, 2024, at 1:00 p.m. in the Alcazar Room at City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Christina Tucker, Chairperson and the following were present:

1. Roll Call:

Christina Tucker, Chairperson
Ashleigh Barnes, Vice- Chairperson
Charles Pappas
Mike Davis
Carl Blow
Absent Matthew Shaffer (Excused)
Susan Johns

City Staff:

Amy Skinner, Director, Planning & Building Department
Jacob Fredriksson, Planning & Building Planner
Sarah Daugherty, Senior Planner
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Michele Fudo, Recording Secretary

2. General Public hearings for Items Not on the Agenda

BJ Kalaidi spoke about changes in the agenda and felt that there should be no changes moving forward with the board meetings.

Julianne Worling spoke about the petty cab industry; she highlighted that there were two types of petty cabs that did not meet regulations and was concerned that their customers were not safe in the event of an accident. She pointed out that these cabs were not used in other municipalities because of the safety issues.

Ms. Lopez suggested that Ms. Worling contact Rueben Franklin, the assistant city manager, who was currently looking at all of those modes of transportation. She said that he would be the person that would be able to effect any changes.

3. Approval of Minutes **NONE**

4. Modification and Approval of Agenda

Item 5.a. PZB2024-0101 was withdrawn

Item 5.b. PZB2024-0087 at 173 Inlet Drive had requested a continuance to the January 7, 2025 Regular PZB Meeting

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED CONTINUE item 5.b. PZB2024-0087 to the January 7, 2025 meeting and to APPROVE the modification to the agenda. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow and PASSED by UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

5. Conservation Overlay Zone Development

5.(a) PZB2024-0101 – City of St. Augustine & FDOT– Applicant
City of St. Augustine, State of Florida, & United States Government (NPS) – Owner
111 Avenida Menedez & PID's 1961800000 & 1961700000 (Waterfront along A1A/ Avenida Menendez, beginning south of

the Bridge of Lions north to Charlotte Street)

This application was withdrawn

See Item 4

To replace the existing seawall and posts and chains with a new seawall and solid pedestrian barrier to tie into a proposed new National Park Service seawall to the north and to the City seawall to the South of the Bridge of Lions; and to lower the elevated promenade adjacent to the existing seawall on the north side of the bridge.

5. (b) PZB2024-0087 – Tom Bartlett c/o Matthews | DCCM– Applicant
Agan Prameshuber – Owner
173 Inlet Drive

Continued from the November 5, 2023, Regular Meeting

This item was continued to the January 7, 2025 Meeting. See Item 4.

To approve the construction of a retaining wall within Conservation Overlay Zones 2 & 3.

5. (c) PZB2024-0085 – Kevin Marks c/o Shoreland Home Builders – Applicant
Mark and Janice Matrazzo – Owner
171 Inlet Drive

Continued from the November 5, 2024 Regular Meeting

To approve the construction of a retaining wall within Conservation Overlay Zone 2 & 3.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said review of Section 11-29 is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 and 2. This application is for the construction of a retaining wall and associated fill at 171 Inlet Drive / PID 213920-0070

Mark Matrazzo and Kevin Marks reviewed the revised application for the board, based on the feedback from the previous meeting.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- The applicant had done a very good job addressing the concerns of the Board
- The finished floor elevation had been lowered
- Fill had been brought down to match existing grades
- Swales and rain gardens had been added to address drainage
- Lot coverage was increased
- Lot coverage was below the 25%
- The rear retaining wall met the height of the adjacent wall
- The proposed retaining wall was higher than had been recently approved
- Drainage needed to be retained on the site
- The rain gardens and swales could not be in the right of way
- Secondary seawall set back 10 feet; secondary wall would tie into the wall for the neighboring property to the south
- The plan for the seawall would be uniform from the street
- Liked the idea of pulling back the seawall to the proposed 10 feet and tying it in with the neighbor so there would be no gap
- Would rather see the runoff water to the inlet not the right of way
- Lowering the grade down was a great compromise
- The water management plans had incorporated some good ideas

MOTION

Ms. Tucker MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0085 at 171 Inlet Drive to approve the construction of a

retaining wall within Conservation Overlay Zones 2 and 3 using the latest calculations and removing the rains gardens from the right of way. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Pappas

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Tucker, Pappas, Johns, Blow, Davis, Barnes

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (d) PZB2024-0061 – Ryan Carter c/o Carter Environmental Services – Applicant William Wolkoff – Owner 186 Pelican Reef Drive / PID 158573-0130
Continued from the November 5, 2024 Regular Meeting

To approve a request to construct a bulkhead and dock within Conservation Overlay Zone 1 & 2.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said review of Section 11-29 is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 and 2. This application is for the construction of a bulkhead, single-family home and the removal of significant trees.

Ryan Carter reviewed the application, giving the history of the property for the board. Ms. Daugherty spoke to Mr. Fox with Code Enforcement regarding the payment to the tree fund. She advised that direction was needed from the board.

direction needed from the board/code enforcement

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said solving the problem with Pelican Reef, would be to build a smaller house. She asked if there would be 10 new cedar trees on the property. She added that she would have liked to see the 1988 survey.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Carter provided his rebuttal

The Board discussed:

- Needed clarification of the height of the bulkhead
- The proposed height of the bulkhead would be five feet of face from existing, which would make it between eight or nine feet and this was consistent with the existing wall to the south
- The drainage plan matched what the water management district had permitted
- The landscape plan looked good
- Tree mitigation would be handled through Code Enforcement
- Had there been an investigation of a violation with water management district
- The contractor had cleared to far along the wetland line. A survey had been done to place the silt fence on the wetland line and allow for natural revegetation
- There was a gap of representation in the process
- The height of the fill was four to five feet
- Finished floor would be ten- and one-half feet
- There was already five feet of fill on the site because of a flood plain permit
- With the entire site covered with fill, would the drainage change during a flood event
- There were swales to control the water flow
- The bulkhead cap would match the elevation of the adjacent property owner
- Accepted the findings of code enforcement

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0061 as presented with the condition that the plan would match the elevation to the south. The motion was **SECONDED by Mr. Blow.**

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Pappas, Blow, Johns, Davis,
Barnes, Tucker
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**5. (e) PZB2024-0081 – Ryan Carter c/o
Carter Environmental Services –
Applicant
35 Mulberry Street – Owner
35 Mulberry Street**

Continued from the November 5, 2024
Regular Meeting

**To approve a request to construct a dock
within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 & 2.**

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said review of Section 11-29 is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 & 2. This application is for the construction of a dock at 35 Mulberry Street/PID195790-0000.

Ryan Carter reviewed the application

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi wanted everyone to understand that after the fact approval was wrong and people should be dealt with that continually do work that was not permitted.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- The applicant had moved the additions outside of the right of way as requested
- This design did not impede on the natural navigation of the creek
- The 1,800 square foot dock was all in front of the owner's home and did not impede the neighbor to the south
- Would there be any blockage for kayaks to get through the gap shown

- The gap in question was probably filled with mangrove trees
- The changes made to the application were acceptable

Ms. Lopez advised that the bottom lands were owned by the city; however, the state managed the water above the bottom lands.

MOTION

**Mr. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE
application PZB2024-0081. The motion
was SECONDED by Mr. Davis.**

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Pappas, Davis, Johns, Blow,
Barnes, Tucker
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

**5. (f) PZB2024-0090 – Ryan Carter c/o
Carter Environmental Services –
Applicant
Erik Worthmann – Owner
134 Pelican Reef Drive**

**To approve the modification of an
existing dock within Conservation Overlay
Zones 1 & 2.**

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said review of Section 11-29 is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 & 2. This application is for the modification of a dock at 134 Pelican Reef Drive/PID158571-4060.

Ryan Carter reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

10 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 0 returned opposed and 0 had comments.

¹ Break 2:29 – 2:39 pm

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- The proposed floating dock was not in the no wake zone
- The poly-dock system or materials would attenuate the wave action

Ms. Lopez advised that the board would not be able to dictate what type of material to use for the dock.

After further discussion, there was consensus for approval.

MOTION

Ms. Tucker MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0090 at 134 Pelican Reef Drive to approve the modification of an existing dock within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 & 2. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Davis.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Tucker, Davis, Johns, Blow, Pappas, Barnes

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (g) PZB2024-0092 – Ryan Carter c/o Carter Environmental Services – Applicant
Kyle Cregan – Owner
67 Water Street

To approve a request to construct a dock within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 & 2.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said review of Section 11-29 is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 & 2. This application is for the construction of a dock at 67 Water Street/PID 196000-0000.

Ryan Carter reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

27 certified notices were sent, 3 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 5 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

Hurley Haywood spoke of his own dock and how it was constructed as well as how it weathered the recent storms. He was concerned that the use of the old dock as a base for the new dock was a bad idea. He provided photographs of the area showing established oyster beds.

Steve Hill showed pictures of the damage that the current dock had received. He also had photos of the existing pilings that remained on site. He wanted to be sure that the new dock would have sufficient strength to stand in the future.

Mr. Blow asked where the photos were taken from, and was advised that they were taken from the neighboring dock

Jeremiah Mulligan referred to the navigability of the channel and thought that the proposed dock would in fact block the waterway. He did not feel that this was a benefit to the public.

BJ Kalaidi felt that the people living in the area were concerned with the proposed dock, and they did not want the owners to not have a dock, just one that would not interfere with the people that were already in the area.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Carter provided his rebuttal saying that he would like to address the concerns of the neighbors. He requested a continuance.

MOTION

Mr. Davis MOVED to CONTINUE application PZB2024-0092 to the January 7, 2025 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Davis, Pappas, Johns, Blow, Barnes, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**5. (h) PZB2024-0088 – Darren & Christina DeGuire – Applicant and Owner
207 Carver Street**

To approve the removal of a significant tree within Conservation Overlay Zone 3.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said review of Section 11-29 is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zone 3. This application is for the removal of one significant tree at 207 Carver Street West/PID 222180-0170.

Darren DeGuire reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

16 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 0 returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- There were eight other cedar trees on the property and new ones would be planted
- The arborist report indicated that the tree was in fairly good shape, having suffered significant canopy loss
- The tree being removed would be replaced with two new ones
- Property had a fairly dense coverage of trees
- There was a sewer easement connecting to the main sewer line that ran under the house, but would not interfere with the proposed project

MOTION

Ms. Tucker MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0088 at 207 Carver Street to approve the removal of a significant tree and include two new cedar trees. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Davis.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Tucker, Davis, Johns, Blow, Pappas, Barnes

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**5. (i) PZB2024-0095– Scott Michaels – Applicant and Owner
89 Dolphin Drive**

To approve the modification of an existing bulkhead and construct a new dock within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 & 2.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said review of Section 11-29 is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 & 2. This application is for the modification of an existing bulkhead and construction of a dock at 29 Dolphin Street/PID 219910-0000.

Abby Burgos of P&G construction reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

26 certified notices were sent, 3 were returned in favor, 0 returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- Initial observation was that the application seemed to meet the criteria
- Confirmed that the proposed dock height would be seven and one-half feet

- The new cap would not affect the drainage, drainage flowed out through the wall
- The boatlift was existing and would be moved
- Wanted to see the cross-section diagram with better measurements and dimensions
- The dock was being moved to a more central location on the property
- The relocation of the dock was fine
- Needed a description of materials that would be used for the additional height on the seawall
- Needed information on how the new dock would tie into the existing seawall
- Needed details to show the reconfigured plans
- Look at the drainage on the lot so that no new drainage conditions would be created
- Needed to see the detail for the tie ins for the walls

MOTION

Mr. Davis MOVED to CONTINUE application PZB2024-0088 at 89 Dolphin Drive to the January 7 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Davis, Blow, Johns, Pappas, Barnes, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Use by Exception

**6. (a) PZB2024-0097 – Stephanie Angel
c/o Capybara Café / Noah's Ark Anctuary
– Applicant**

Jena Dennis – Owner

105 S. Ponce De Leon Boulevard, Suite C

To approve a use by exception for a tourist attraction.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds

that the Board may APPROVE, APPROVE with conditions, CONTINUE, or DENY as tourist attraction use by exception at 105 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, Suite C/PID 11928-0000.

Jena Dennis and Stephanie Angel reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

8 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 0 returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- This was more of an educational opportunity than a tourist attraction; however, favored an approval
- Should the use by exception be limited to specific things
- There were 14 parking spaces and one handicap space
- The mission statement spoke of native wildlife and exotic animals surrendered by previous owners
- No rescue animals would be available for the public to interact with
- There were no large animals
- Each tour group was limited to six persons
- Thought this was a novel concept
- The website would provide the information for directions and parking

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0097. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Tucker.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Pappas, Tucker, Johns, Blow, Davis, Barnes

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Variance

7. (a) PZB2024-0082 – Stephen Bradshaw c/o Honey Tree Properties – Applicant Jim & Deborah Craggs – Owner 402 Old Quarry Road

Continued from the November 5, 2024
Regular Meeting

To approve a variance request to reduce the side yard setback requirement, increase the maximum lot coverage and increase the guest house square footage limitation.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may DENY the variance requests to reduce the minimum side yard setback and increase lot coverage to allow for the permitting of a guest house at 402 Old Quarry Road/PID 164420-0000 as no singular disadvantage has been identified.

Steve Bradshaw reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- Advised the applicant that they must meet every condition in section 28-29 before approval could be granted
- Questioned what the previous surface coverage was, and Mr. Fredriksson advised that was not a concern because of the lot size
- There was no singular disadvantage exhibited in the application.
- Asked for confirmation of the square footage of the proposed guest house
- The entire square footage was not livable space, there were stairs and landings
- The square footage of the guest house would be determined using the A/C space

- The survey with trees and the location of the septic system was provided as requested
- The zoning of open land could be considered a disadvantage
- Increasing the distance from two feet to eight feet was a positive change in the side yard setback
- The block wall that surrounded the property blocked any visibility from the outside of the property
- The house was built in 1925 and had been restored
- Current code issues did not exist when the house was built

MOTION

Mr. Davis MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0082 at 402 Old Quarry Road to approve a variance request to reduce side yard setback requirements and increase the maximum lot coverage and increase the guest house square footage limitation. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Davis, Pappas, Johns, Blow, Barnes, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b) PZB2024-0079 – Edward Bowman – Applicant and Owner 21 Miruela Avenue

Continued from the November 5, 2024
Regular Meeting

To approve a variance request to reduce the side yard setback requirement and increase the maximum lot coverage.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE the variance requests to reduce the minimum side yard setback and increase lot coverage to allow for the permitting of an addition of a closet

and covered patio at 21 Miruela Avenue/PID 215080-0000.

Edward Bowman reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

16 certified notices were sent, 1 were returned in favor, 0 returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response

After a brief discussion it was determined there was consensus with the Board for approval.

MOTION

Ms. Tucker MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0079 at 21 Miruela Avenue to approve a variance request to reduce the side yard setback requirement and increase the maximum lot coverage as it met the criteria. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Tucker, Blow, Johns, Pappas, Davis, Barnes

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY²

7. (c) PZB2024-0089 – Matthew Brown – Applicant and Owner 19 Hope Street

To approve a variance request to reduce the front and side yard setbacks.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE the variance request to reduce the minimum side and front yard setback requirements to allow for the permitting of additional office space at 19 Hope Street/PID 192180-0000.

Matt Brown, Katie Mann, and Conner Dowling reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

26 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 0 returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- This application met the criteria for a variance
- The proposal would stay within the footprint of the existing garage
- Met livability goals
- There would be an additional 150 square feet of impervious coverage

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0089 at 19 Hope Street. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Davis.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Blow, Davis, Johns, Pappas, Barnes, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (d) PZB2024-0093 – Kimberly J Hartwick – Applicant and Owner 228 Riberia Street

To approve a variance request to reduce the side yard setback and to increase the maximum fence height within the front and side yard setback.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE the variance request to reduce the minimum side yard requirement and exceed the maximum

² Break 4:09 – 4:23 pm

height of fences at 228 Iberia Street/PID 213280-000.

Kimberly Hartwick reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

16 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 1 returned opposed and 1 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi was concerned with the proposed height of the fence which was between ten and twelve feet.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Could not see a disadvantage with the property
- The placement of the proposed pool was in the smallest area on the property
- The height of the proposed fence was inconsistent with the rest of the area
- Having a creative design for the deck might help to screen the pool
- There were other ways to achieve the goals stated in the application
- Did not see a singular disadvantage for the increase in the fence height
- There were other options for the placement of the pool that would better accommodate the applicant

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to DENY application PZB2024-0093 because it did not meet the criteria of the code. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Blow, Pappas, Johns, Davis, Barnes, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (e) PZB2024-0099 Karen Cowart c/o Cowart Design Associates Inc – Applicant Ashely Cregan – Owner 67 Water Street

To approve a variance request to the maximum building height and reduce the front and side yard setback requirements.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may

APPROVE the variance requests to the building height, front yard setback requirement, and side yard setback requirement at 67 Water Street / PID 196000-0000 if it finds that the disadvantage as a nonconforming lot is one that applies to other properties in the vicinity, or

DENY the variance requests to the building height, front yard setback requirement, and side yard setback requirement at 67 Water Street / PID 196000-0000 if it finds that the disadvantage as a nonconforming lot is not unique to this property and applies to other properties in the vicinity.

Karen Cowart and Ashley Cregan reviewed the application. She advised that the request for the side yard setback was being removed.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

9 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 2 were returned opposed and 5 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

Steve Hill said he saw no practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship demonstrated by the applicant. He felt the applicants had not done their due diligence prior to purchasing the property.

Hurley Haywood mentioned that 9 palm trees had been removed without a permit. He said

that a stop work order was issued; however, the contractor did not heed the warning and the trees were removed.

BJ Kaladi told the chair that she appreciated that the comments on the response letters had been read into the record. She said that the proposed house did not fit the character of the area. She did not think that a real hardship existed on the property.

Jeremy Mulligan spoke as a representative for the neighbors to the south of the property in the application. He felt that there was no disadvantage and that the owner should build in a way that met local requirements and met their needs. He asked for a denial of the variance request.

Public hearing was closed.

Ms. Cowart presented her rebuttal.

The Board discussed:

- Did not see undue hardship
- Appreciated the concern for flooding
- Did not think that the criteria had been met
- Appreciated that the request for the side yard had been removed
- New construction had the option to get the front stairs into the current code
- No support currently as presented
- Was a tree survey available for review
- There were no protected trees removed; however there had been no permit issued for the removal
- Agreed that the criteria were not met
- Thought that there could be minimal changes that would negate the request for any variance
- The existing driveway would allow for two cars

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to DENY application PZB2024-0099 at 67 Water Street as it did not meet the criteria presented in the

city's code. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Barnes.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Blow, Barnes, Johns, Pappas, Davis, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Appeal of Staff Determination and Variance

8. (a) PZB2024-0100 – Julia Moiseeva – Applicant
Craig Van Horn – Owner
3 South Street

To appeal staff determination limiting one (1) guest house on a property with a residential single-family one: RS-1 zoning designation and a variance request to the maximum square footage of a guest house and reduce the side yard setback.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said a review of Sec. must be conducted by the Board to

- 1) Determine the regulation for number of houses allowed on a property with an RS-1 designation as well as
- 2) Review the associated variance requests related to the proposed construction at 3 South Street/PID 201230-0000.

Julia Moiseeva reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

12 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 2 returned opposed and 3 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said that there was already one house on the property as well as a guest house. She felt that given the fact that there

was no way to know what the property would be used for, this was too much for the property. She was concerned that this could possibly be a short term rental.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Guest houses had been limited to 500 square feet because there was no way to control the use of the property
- Felt that the new structure overwhelmed the existing structures
- Did not see a disadvantage that existed to meet the criteria
- It appeared that there was other space available to build this structure on the property.
- Did not see any attempts to meet the code requirements
- This was an appeal of a previous determination by staff limiting development to only one guest house
- No need to exceed the side yard setback
- Needed to get back to 500 square feet for the guest house
- Needed to address the parking in the area
- No justification for the variance

Mr. Blow made a motion to deny; however, the applicant, Ms. Moiseeva requested continuance.

Ms. Lopez confirmed that the applicant was withdrawing the appeal.

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to CONTINUE variance request PZB2024-0100 to the January 7, 2025 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Barnes.

Mr. Pappas advised the applicant how to modify the request going forward.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Blow, Barnes, Johns, Pappas, Davis, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Other Business

9.(a) FDOT project update related to replacing the existing seawall with a new seawall between the proposed ne National Park Service seawall to the north and to the City seawall to the south of the Bridge of Lions. (No PZB discussion or recommendation)

Darrell Locklear, FDOT project manager for the St. Augustine seawall project, gave a presentation for the Board as an update to the proposed seawall renovations.

Mr. Blow asked if the new wall would be seaward of the existing wall or would there be a demolition of the current wall.

Ms. Barnes asked for the fundamental motivations for the project to be stated in order.

Ms. Lopez advised that one of the motivations was the obsolete state of the current wall. She stated that public safety was also an issue.

Mr. Davis asked what the new elevations would be. He also asked what the height of the new wall would be

Mr. Locklear advised that the new wall would be eight to eight and one-half feet.

There were concerns that traffic would be affected in a negative way. The Board was told that no deliveries would occur during peak times.

9.(b) Approval of 2025 Planning and Zoning Board Meeting Schedule

MOTION

Ms. Tucker moved to APPROVE the 2025 Meeting Schedule for the PZB. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Johns and PASSED by UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

10. Adjournment

Having no further business, Ms. Tucker adjourned the meeting at 6:03 P.M.³



Christina Tucker, Chairperson

³ Transcribed by Michele Fudo