

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Planning and Zoning Board Regular Meeting September 3, 2024

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

1. Roll Call:

Charles Pappas, Chairperson
Christine Tucker, Vice- Chairperson
Mike Davis
Carl Blow
Ashleigh Barnes
Matthew Shaffer (Excused)

Absent

City Staff:

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

2. General Public hearings for Items Not on the Agenda

Jason Corpron and Nick Sargeant of the Wellbrook Building Corporation appeared before the Board to request an amendment to the sign code, that would allow them to have signage above the first floor of their hotel.

Ms. Lopez confirmed that the request was to ask the Planning and Zoning Board as the land planning agency to make a recommendation to amend the code for everyone under those circumstances. She questioned the speaker if he was asking the PZB to consider changing the code as a whole to allow for different or larger signage.

Mr. Pappas advised the speaker that the Board could take their request under consideration at the end of the meeting.

BJ Kalaidi updated all present and the board on the changes at Anastasia State Park. She asked everyone to be vigilant.

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. Davis MOVED to APPROVE the July 2, 2024 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow and PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

MOTION

Ms. Tucker MOVED to APPROVE the August 6, 2024 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow and PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

4. Modification and Approval of Agenda

There was consensus with the Board to move item 5.a PZB2024-0060 115 Arricola to be heard after item 5.c.

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to APPROVE the agenda as amended. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Tucker and PASSED by UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

5. Variance

5. (a) PZB2024- 0060 – Alex Fisher c/o Fisher Enterprises – Applicant Garrett Morrell c/o GRGP Rentals LLC– Owner 115 Arricola Avenue

To approve a variance request to increase the maximum lot coverage.

Ms. Murphy read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board can **CONTINUE** until the applicant has explored other options that may reduce the lot coverage, **DENY** as variance criteria is not met, or **APPROVE** the variance request to the maximum lot coverage at 115 Arricola Ave / PID 219410-0000.

Alex Fisher reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

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

The Board discussed:

- The criteria did not allow for this request to be approved
- Criteria was not met
- The pool was allowed to be five feet from the setback
- Did not see a singular disadvantage that would justify the need for the variance
- Lot coverage could be an issue
- This was not an unreasonable request, however, the criteria was not met

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to DENY variance PZB2024-0060 for an increase of lot coverage as there was no disadvantage

and the owner was able to make reasonable use, the condition did not exist prior to this owner. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Davis.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Pappas, Davis, Barnes, Blow, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (b) PZB2024- 0063 – Donald Poling Jr. – Applicant & Owner 148 Cunningham Avenue

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

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff recommends that the Board **CONTINUE** the variance request for reduced setbacks and increased lot coverage until a site plan documenting these conditions is provided. Staff finds that a continuance would be beneficial to accurately document the permitting process for the after the fact construction of a shed at 148 Cunningham Avenue / PID 190020-0000

Donald Poling reviewed the application. He explained that he had moved the shed and was now in compliance with the setbacks and was only requesting the increase in the lot coverage.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

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

The Board discussed:

- Original shed was eight by eight and new shed was twelve by sixteen

- No proof that the shed had been moved
- The survey had been submitted late and was now available
- Property backs up to commercial property
- Did not see any potential negative impacts
- Lot was very small and prior structure was in very bad shape
- Confirmed that the main building was a single-family house
- Verified that the house was homesteaded properly
- Advised that demolitions went to HARB not PZB.
- Noted the disadvantage of the small lot
- Wanted to see the survey of the property
- Would the applicant be amenable to a continuance
- Verified impervious percentage for the lot size to be seventy percent
- Agreed to amend the request to lot coverage and impervious coverage.
- No building plans to review, and the inspector did not see the impervious problem
- Needed an as built survey for review
- Confirmed with staff that approval for lot coverage was ok and if necessary a return to approve impervious surface
- New shed was on top of coquina block, not a concrete slab
- There was a space for water to percolate under the shed

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE the variance to increase the maximum lot coverage for item PZB2024-0063 and staff would verify the location and impervious surface. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Pappas, Blow, Barnes, Davis, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (c) PZB2024- 0065 – Frank O'Rourke c/o Gypsy Cab Company – Applicant 828 & 830 Holdings LLC – Owner 828 Anastasia Boulevard

To approve a variance request to reduce the required off street parking requirements for a restaurant.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said for promotion of multimodal options at 828 Anastasia Boulevard, staff recommends that:

- The provision of one (1) bike rack, which accommodates two (2) bicycles, for every ten (10) off-street parking spaces.
 - With the current sixteen automobile parking spaces two (2) bike racks should be provided
- For each additional automobile parking space reduced one bike rack could be provided
 - Therefore, the eight (8) automobile parking spaces currently required for the addition of thirty-two (32) patron seats would require eight (8) additional bike racks

Based on a review of Sec. 28-29, the City of St. Augustine's Comprehensive Plan 2040, and the City of St. Augustine's 2040 Mobility Plan, staff recommends that the Board

- **APPROVE** a variance request to reduce the minimum requirement of off-street parking spaces to a specific number
- This number will be based on Board discussion, the site is currently grandfathered for sixteen (16) off-street spaces
- **INCLUDE THE SITE-SPECIFIC USE LIMITATION** that these approvals at 828 Anastasia Boulevard / PID 157765-0000 are not only for the current owner but remain in place for restaurant uses with a maximum of one hundred twenty-two (122) patron seats, site specific parking requirements and site-specific multimodal transportation parking

facilities as described in the Board order.

- **SITE SPECIFIC USE LIMITATIONS** are included in the order and that violation of these site-specific use limitations shall be deemed a violation of this chapter and punishable as provided in this chapter.

An approval of this request would allow for a pedestrian oriented use within the CL-2 zoning district to preserve and maintain this early 20th century structure at 828 Anastasia Boulevard.

Frank O'Rourke reviewed the application and provided history of the property for the Board.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

35 certified notices were sent, 1 was returned in favor, 1 was returned opposed and 1 had comments. Mr. Pappas noted for the record that there were many emails received that were in favor of the application, and a few that were opposed.

Public hearing was opened.

Robert Thousand spoke in favor of the applicant and said that he had not seen any parking issues.

Jane Edwards said that parking on Palmetto had been a problem for years, but the city had changed things to keep big trucks out of the area. She showed photos of the parking on the street. She advised that she was opposed to the change.

Mark Matthews advised that he had never had a problem parking at the restaurant.

Mary Ellen Zeidel spoke about the outdoor dining as a benefit in the area.

BJ Kalaidi did not think that parking in the right of way should be allowed. She thought that the use of bike parking was a good idea.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. O'Rourke provided he rebuttal.

Mr. Blow had concerns with the variance because a variance would stay with the land. He questioned what effect that would have on future development of the property. He said that he would prefer for the variance to specific to the owner.

Mr. Fredriksson said, if the property was bulldozed, the future conditions may not be applicable to leave the variance in place.

Ms. Lopez advised that she and the staff had coordinated on the variance request, wording it so that it would open the door for the board to articulate site specific use limitations and if things changed in the future, those exceptions or the variance would go away.

The Board discussed:

- There needed to be signage asking patrons to not park in the surrounding neighborhood
- Suggested approaching other businesses in the area for more shared parking
- Repainting the yellow curbs would help to reduce parking on Palmetto Avenue
- Spaces provided were to code
- Signage would direct patrons to show one way in and out.
- If there were shared parking with other businesses, leases should be provided
- There was signage indicating no parking on the north side of the street, parking was available on the south side only

MOTION

Mr. Davis MOVED to APPROVE variance request PZB2024-0065 to allow for off

street parking and the expansion of the outside dining provided that this variance runs with 828 Anastasia Boulevard PID 157765-0000 and is to remain in place for restaurant uses with a maximum of 122 patron seats. Site specific parking requirements and site-specific multi-modal transportation parking facilities as described in the broader order preserving the historical layout of the Gypsy Cab Restaurant. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Davis, Pappas, Barnes, Blow, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Use by Exception

6. (a) PZB2024-0062 – Andrea Brown c/o Ancient City Hideaways – Applicant Michael Wilcox c/o Masa Properties LLC – Owner 72 Abbott Street

To approve one (1) off-site parking space within the Municipal Parking Garage.

Ms. Murphy read the staff report and said Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board can **CONTINUE** the application until the applicant provides information regarding the attempt to contact surrounding parking facilities or **APPROVE** a use by exception for on (1) parking space within the Municipal Parking Garage at 72 Abbott Street / PID 094990-0000 to satisfy the requirements of Sec. 28-151.

The applicant was not present and there was consensus with the board to continue this application.

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to CONTINUE application PZB2024-0062 to the October 1, 2024. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow and PASSED by UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

7. Conservation Zone Development

7. (a) PZB2024-0046 – James Pantling – Applicant & Owner 81 Coquina Avenue

Continued from the August 6, 2024 Regular Meeting

To approve a request to construct a dock and boat lift 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 Zone 1. This application is for the after the fact installation of a boatlift at 81 Coquina Avenue / PID 221410-0000.

James Pantling reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication : none

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

The Board discussed:

Ms. Tucker and Ms. Barnes had no issue with the application as presented.

Mr. Davis reminded the applicant that he had requested documentation showing the dock had been constructed per the provided design in relation to mean high tide. He expressed frustration that information had not been provided and said he would struggle with an approval without the information.

Mr. Blow said that the pilings would have to be cut down to meet code and the lift would have to be reinstalled.

Mr. Pappas felt that the code had been met and asked the Board for a motion.

MOTION

Mr. Blow moved to approve the application 2024-0046 based on the testimony from the applicant that they will reduce the distance down to three feet for the boat lift maximum height above the deck. The motion **FAILED** for lack of a second.

Ms. Daugherty advised the board that the dock had been approved and the after the fact was for the boat lift.

Mr. Davis told the board that the dock was not built the way it was supposed to be built. He took issue with the applicant that had not supplied the requested information.

Mr. Pappas suggested to the applicant to go to the design company to get the information showing that the dock had been built as permitted.

Mr. Davis, to meet the applicant halfway, said that if he went to Mr. Carter, who had designed the original dock and provided it to the staff before obtaining a permit, he could move forward with an approval.

Mr. Davis MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0046 at 81 Coquina Avenue provided that the owner supply the letter from the engineer of record that the dock was built as designed and the owner is going to remove the boatlift height down to meet code which is under thirty-six inches from the dock. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Davis, Pappas, Barnes, Blow, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b) PZB2024-0053 – Hayden Whetstone
– Applicant & Owner
223 Pelican Reef Drive / PID 158573-0040
Continued from the August 6, 2024
Regular Meeting

To approve the construction of a new single-family home and retaining wall within Conservation Overlay Zones 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 Zone 1 and 2. This application is for the construction of a bulkhead, single-family home, and the removal of significant trees at 223 Pelican reef Drive / PID 158573-0040.

Staff recommends Continuation for additional information or reconsideration or Denial of the application as the applicant has not submitted the information requested by the Board.

1. Tree survey with a tree number associated with arborist report
2. Trees (type and dbh) proposed to be planted to meet the 10-cedar tree requirement for Pelican Reef and/or required tree credits.
3. All trees color coded by status of retained, removed, or dead.
4. Development details including building footprint, driveways, and fill limits.
5. Information clarifying if any portion of the retaining wall would encroach on the Conservation Easement.

Hayden Whetstone reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi would like to see applicants provide information in a more timely manner.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Needed an explanation of the twenty-nine tree credits
- Used credits in the staff agenda and deducted the three cedars to get to the twenty-nine credits

- The tree requirements appear to have been met
- Proposed retaining wall would assist with raising the elevation and grade of the property on the side where the garage would be located
- Maximum height of the fill would be approximately six- and one-half feet
- Wanted to preserve as much of the natural canopy as possible
- Retaining wall would not encroach on the conservation easement
- Pictures showed that most of the trees in question were not in good shape
- The applicant had provided information that satisfied any previous concerns

MOTION

Ms. Tucker MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0053 to approve the construction of a new single-family home and retaining wall within conservation overlay zones 2 & 3 and to remove significant trees. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Tucker, Pappas, Barnes, Blow, Davis

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

7. (c) PZB2024-0055 – Kevin Marks c/o Shoreland Home Builders – Applicant Stephen and Lindsey Hutson – Owner 209 Pelican Reef Drive / PID 1585273-0020
Continued from the August 6, 2024 Regular Meeting

To approve the construction of a new single-family home within Conservation Overlay Zones 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 Zone 1 and 2. This application is for

the removal of significant trees at 209 Pelican Reef Drive / PID 158573-0020

Stephen Hutson reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

The Board discussed:

The Board confirmed with staff that all requested information had been provided

MOTION

Ms. Barnes MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0055 to approve the construction of a new single-family home within Conservation Overlay Zones 2 & 3. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Barnes, Blow, Davis, Tucker, Pappas

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (d) PZB2024-0058 – Joseph D Weed III – Applicant & Owner 32 Mulberry Street
Continued from the August 6, 2024 Regular Meeting

To approve the construction of a new dock within Conservation Overlay Zone 1.

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 1. This application is for the construction of a dock at 32 Mulberry Street /PID 195780-0000.

Staff recommends a **CONTINUATION** for additional information or reconsideration or **DENIAL** as the applicant has not submitted a site plan for the proposed dock that

¹ Break 3:32 – 3:49

included bathymetric contours as requested by the Board.

Joseph Weed reviewed the application, providing the requested information from the previous meeting.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

The Board discussed:

Mr. Blow thought that there was now enough information to show that the new dock would not impede neighbors from having egress to the creek.

There was consensus with the other Board members.

MOTION

Mr. Davis MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0058 at 32 Mulberry Street for the construction of a dock in a Conservation Overlay Zone. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Davis, Blow, Barnes, Tucker, Pappas

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (e) PZB2024-0059 – Ryan Carter c/o Carter Environmental Services – Applicant Richard I & Tracey Y Hardy – Owner 117 Inlet Drive

To approve the extension of an existing dock, construct a boat lift and add rip rap to shoreline 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 Zone 1 and 2. This application is for

the expansion of the dock, addition of a boatlift and deck and the after the fact installation of a rip rap at 117 Inlet Drive / PID 213919-0010.

Ryan Carter reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

Public hearing was opened.

Wilder Ruffin, 120 Inlet Drive, spoke in favor of the improvements that the applicant had completed on the property.

Paricia Young was also in favor of the upgrades.

BJ Kalaidi wanted to see a better picture of the rip rap that was installed without a permit.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Wanted an explanation of the rip rap
- The level of the grade had not been raised; the new rip rap had been added to the existing as a maintenance measure
- Dock revisions would match the neighboring existing docks
- Boat lift would be six feet over mean high
- Boardwalk area over the rip rap was ok
- Wall would not change, and the rip rap would not alter the drainage. No new wall proposed
- A smaller terminal platform would be added to the dock
- New square footage would be 3775 for a change of 747 square feet.
- The wetland line was at the toe of the rip rap
- Currently working with the DEP (Department of Environmental

Protection) for clarity regarding the rip rap

- No fill associated with this project
- The change would have the new dock at the same distance with the neighbors existing docks

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to APPROVE Conservation Overlay Zone Development PZB2024-0059. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Blow, Pappas, Barnes, Davis, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (f) PZB2024-0061 – Ryan Carter c/o Carter Environmental Services – Applicant William Wolkoff – Owner 186 Pelican Reef Drive / PID 158573-0130

To approve a request to construct a bulkhead and 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 Zone 1 and 2. This application is for the construction of a bulkhead single-family home and the removal of significant trees at 186 Pelican Reef Drive / PID 158573-0130.

Because the application is incomplete Staff recommends CONTINUATION for additional information or reconsideration or DENIAL of the application.

The applicant should provide the following information:

1. Tree survey and tree mitigation table
2. Trees (type and dbh) proposed to be planted to meet the 10 cedar requirements for Pelican Reef and required tree credits.

3. Development details including building footprint, driveways and fill limits
4. Erosion Control Plans
5. Structural plans of bulkhead including height and details on how they will tie connect to the bulkhead to the south

Ryan Carter reviewed the application

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

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

The Board discussed:

- No issues with the proposed dock
- Site grading plan showed an elevation of 10 feet, and would there be a retaining wall around the property
- Elevation would have to be brought to the same level on the neighboring property as well
- Needed to see a landscape plan
- Needed a better answer regarding the bulkhead because it would affect drainage
- Staff had indicated that the report was incomplete and favored a continuance
- The amount of fill going on the property was an issue that continued to be problematic in the area
- Needed more information for the bulkhead and retaining wall for approval
- Retaining wall on the lot to the south had been approved
- Agreed with other Board members that more information was needed
- Flood plain permit was approved and allowed for fill to be brought on to the property

Mr. Carter agreed to a continuance.

MOTION

Mr. Davis MOVED to CONTINUE application PZB2024-0061 to the October 1, 2024 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Davis, Pappas, Barnes, Blow, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (g) PZB2024-0064 – Arthur Wells c/o AJ Wells Roofing and Construction – Applicant Arthur Wells – Owner Arricola Avenue / PID 219010-0270

To approve the removal of significant trees and tree canopy within Conservation Overlay Zone 3.

Mr. Fredriksson 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 at Arricola Avenue / PID 219010-0270.

At this time the application does not include enough information to determine the feasibility of meeting either on-site or off-site tree mitigation requirements and recommends that the Board CONTINUE this request to allow time for the applicant to provide the following:

1. A site plan or survey documenting all existing trees on-site
 - a. Each tree on-site will be identified with a number
2. A table that corresponds to the above referenced site plan, with details of tree species, diameter at breast height (d.b.h.) and health condition
 - a. Each tree in this table to be provided will be labeled either "REMOVE" or "PRESERVE"
 - b. For Cabbage Palms the height will need to be included as there are additional deficits for those trees over twelve (12) feet tall
3. An arborist report

- a. This will be needed to complete the "health condition" information required in the above referenced table
4. A site plan for the proposed development; this site plan will need to meet the requirements of Sec. 25 in the City's Code of Ordinances
 - a. Identification of any trees that are proposed to be preserved
 - b. Each new tree planted will need to be labeled as either "BUFFERYARD TREE" or "MITIGATION TREE" this is because bufferyard trees do not count towards mitigation requirements
5. A table that corresponds to the above referenced site plan
 - a. This table will include details of:
 - i. Landscaping classification that applies to the property
 - ii. Calculation of bufferyard planting requirements
 - iii. Tree species and size proposed to be planted
 - iv. Diameter of all trees at planting

Arthur Wells reviewed the application.

Jay Devine was sworn in for the record and presented the landscape design in reference to the removal of the significant trees on the property.

Jim Cornell was sworn in for the record to discuss the drainage plan for the proposed development.

Ex Parte Communication: presented

11 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:

- Reviewed the staff requests to determine if all the information had been provided
- Confirmed that lot coverage was within acceptable limits

- Needed the tree survey for the record
- Drainage plan was good, but wanted to see the pattern of the drainage
- Roof water would be routed to the back of the property and water from the driveway to the front
- Did not want to push water to the neighboring properties
- Keeping as much water on the property would be helpful to the neighbors
- Needed to consider putting in a curb to retain water on the property

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to CONTINUE application PZB2024-0064 to the October 1, 2024 meeting of the PZB. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Davis

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Blow, Davis, Barnes, Tucker, Pappas

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Other Business

8.(a) Information and project schedule regarding the process to update the City's current 2014 Vision Plan

The board addressed the request from Wellbrook Builders

Mr. Pappas advised the Board the sign code had been updated recently and had been simplified.

Mr. Blow felt that it may be premature for the Board to get involved at this point.

Ms. Skinner explained for the Board that the Wellbrook Builders were looking for a city code change and were seeking a sponsor. She queried the Board to direct staff to move forward with a code change. She told the Board that this project was seeking to be incorporated into another sign zone, that would allow signs above the ground floor.

Mr. Pappas thought that this might cause changes to continue to affect the inner part of the city.

Mr. Davis said that this was a unique structure that had taken some time to get started and while he did not oppose the request, he wanted to know what type of control there would be going forward.

Mr. Blow gave some history of the PUD that had existed previously and said that he would not be willing to sponsor any new changes.

Mr. Pappas recommended that the commission be approached for sponsorship.

Amy Skinner gave an update to the Board regarding the 2014 Vision Plan. She highlighted the presentation that had been given to the City Commission and told the Board about the scheduled joint meeting in December with HARB and CRC. She thanked the Board for their interest and continued support for this project.

Mr. Blow said that he wanted to see demographic information related to Air B & B, single-family and homesteading, licensing for businesses, how many students were at Flagler and the School for the Deaf and Blind. He would like to see a comparison between 2014 and 2024.

Ms. Barnes agreed and said that this would help to use the four pillars to set core values for the plan going forward that would benefit the city.

Mr. Davis asked for data related to how many parking spaces were available 10 years ago as compared to today. He also wanted to know how tourism had changed. He said that knowing how much of an increase in the number of bars and restaurants was good information to have.

8.(b) Discussion and Recommendation regarding language to clarify review process for historic and regulated

**structures outside of historic
preservation zoning districts**

For Christine Tucker
Charles Pappas, Chairperson

Amy Skinner told the board that they were looking at this item as a cleanup item for the code. She said that they needed to clarify the definition of historic structures. She mentioned that there had been language added to the code and that the changes now threatened historic structures that existed out of the preservation districts. She asked that the PZB make a formal recommendation to the city commission so that the new amendment could be added before October 1, 2024. She reviewed the definition of an historic building.

Ms. Barnes said that she would be okay with making a recommendation to the commission.

MOTION

Mr. Davis moved to RECOMMEND these changes regarding language to clarify the review process for historic and partial demolition applications outside Historic Preservation Zoning Districts.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Davis, Pappas, Barnes, Blow, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Davis asked for follow up on the project to bring together a panel for Flood Plain management guidelines.

Ms. Skinner provided an update.

9. Adjournment

Having no further business, Mr. Pappas adjourned the meeting at 6:05 P.M.²

² Transcribed by Michele Fudo