

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Corridor Review Committee Meeting April 3, 2025

The Corridor Review Committee met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, April 3, 2025, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Vaughn Cochran, Vice-Chair, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL:

Vaughn Cochran, Vice-Chair
Lorna MacDonald

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

Ms. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the November 7, 2024, meeting minutes as presented. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Cochran.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Cochran

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Seymour announced the date for the May CRC meeting had passed; therefore, there would not be a May meeting as indicated on the agenda.

MOTION

Ms. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the modifications to the agenda. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Cochran.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Cochran

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. New Business

5.(a) HP2025-0022 Boat Drinks -
Applicant
123 San Marco LLC - Owner
123 San Marco Avenue

To modify neon signage previously approved by the CRC.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said Based on a review of the San Marco Avenue Design Standards for Entry Corridors and without evidence to the contrary the CRC may approve the proposed modifications if the CRC can make the following findings under the review criteria in section 4.7.5:

Criteria 1: Strict application of the Standards is not warranted and granting a modification will fulfill the intent of the standards.

Criteria 3: The Modifications are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and generally consistent with the purpose of the city's Land Development Regulations and the Standards.

Criteria 4: The Modifications will not have a material negative impact on adjacent uses, or the applicant proposes to mitigate the negative impact to be created by the modification. All findings must be proven by the applicant and accepted by the CRC in order 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.

Rob Crabtree and Whitney Hobbs reviewed the application.

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

Board Discussion:

- Felt the new sign looked better than before
- In support of the change to the sign as it met the criteria

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

MOTION

Ms. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0022 as the sign met the criteria. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Cochran and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

5.(b). HP2025-0021 City of St. Augustine - Applicant and Owner
Various addresses throughout the city, including but not limited to areas within/adjacent to the existing right-of-way of and intersecting streets with Entry Corridors: King and West King Streets, San Marco Avenue, and Anastasia Boulevard.

To install intelligent transportation systems improvements as part of the SMART St. Augustine project in St. Johns County. Proposed elements include new roadside units to existing mast arms, power service poles, pull boxes, pole mount cabinets, digital kiosks, arterial dynamic messaging signs, rapid flashing beacons, mobility hubs, parking information signs, electric vehicle charging stations, flood sensors, cell modems, bicycle racks, and information kiosks, and open trench and directional bore conduit installation.

Ms. Courtney advised that staff does not make recommendations regarding city projects. The HARB should make a determination based on evidence provided. She said as the Board had any concerns or questions staff were available.

Reuben Franklin, Assistance City Manager, reviewed the SMART St. Augustine project.

Mr. Cochran asked who would be responsible for the information provided on the message Boards and could it be hacked.

Mr. Franklin replied that there would be several different departments that would have access to it but it would be monitored mostly by the Mobility Department. He said the signs could be hacked but they would be monitored closely.

Mr. Cochran asked if there were other locations where the parking signs worked, especially since the signage would be exposed to salt water.

Mr. Franklin replied that it was not new technology, but it would be used to help assist with parking for the public. He said reliability was not in question and the ones that were in operation had been used for the past four years.

Ms. MacDonald said she was in support of the project and thought it would be beneficial to people.

Mr. Cochran asked if there was a timeline.

Mr. Franklin replied there was a tight timeline as federal dollars were attached to it. He said construction would start in the fall of 2025. He said the construction, since most of it was signage, was minimal but the impacts to traffic was not as difficult as a large construction project.

Mr. Cochran asked if there would be a single crew member or if there would be several crew members.

Mr. Franklin said that had yet to be determined. He said after the bidding process, a contractor would be selected, and they would be responsible for how many crew members would be assigned the job; however, archeological monitoring was required, which could limit how many areas they could work in at a time.

Ms. MacDonald asked when it would be complete.

Mr. Franklin replied that the project began in fall 2025 and should be in operation by spring 2026. He said the project was federally funded and hopefully the funding would remain throughout the project but depending on what took place at the federal level, funding could change.

Mr. Cochran asked if the project could start pieces at a time or if it all had to start at the same time.

Mr. Franklin replied that it could be done pieces at a time. He said if federal funding was lost, the City would break it up into smaller projects that could be budgeted for and prioritized. He said the way it was currently laid out, it would all be installed and brought online simultaneously.

Mr. Cochran asked for clarification on what they should be concerned with for the project.

Ms. Courtney replied that the Board was responsible for the entry corridors, and this project was in each of them. She said in the King Street Design Standards, section 5.8 Mechanical Equipment stated 'for the purpose of this section, mechanical equipment shall include, but is not limited to, a heating, ventilation, or air conditioning unit placed outside of a building; vehicular/parking equipment (except for gate arms, if applicable); and any utility-related equipment such as pumps, meters, transformers and similar equipment required to be installed on a development site. Mechanical equipment shall be located so that noise and visual impacts upon abutting residential property are minimized' which was relevant to this project. She suggested focusing on the mobility hubs, which she tried to outline for them in their packets.

Ms. MacDonald said the signage was not beautiful; however, she felt it was very much needed. She said the signs shown were rather larger but thought that maybe the only way to for them to be legible. She did not feel there were many choices but thought people had to be guided on where to go, which should be a priority.

Mr. Franklin said with the large dynamic message signs, they were trying to use a decorative black fluted pole which was normally not used with a message board. He said the message board itself was as shown but as technology changed then signs could change in the future, but this was the best option they had currently.

Mr. Cochran asked if the decorative part of the pole was determined.

Mr. Franklin replied that it would be the black fluted pole to match more of the historic downtown area,

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

MOTION

Ms. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0021 for modification to the standards including concurring with the findings of the Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) Findings and no adverse impact to the design standards. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Cochran

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Macdonald, Cochran

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Other Business

a) Annual reorganization: Selection of new Chair and Vice-chair

Ms. Courtney said the annual reorganization took place every April and this was the time to select a new chair and vice-chair for the Board. She said since the Board was down to two members, an advertisement would be posted by the City Clerk, and applications would be accepted for the vacant position. She said the new board member would be appointed by the City Commission.

Ms. Lopez said they were able to self-nominate.

Ms. MacDonald nominated Mr. Cochran to be the chairperson and herself as vice-chair.

MOTION

Ms. MacDonald Nominated Vaughan Cochran to be the Chairperson and herself to be the Vice- Chairperson. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Cochran and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

Ms. Courtney expressed her gratitude for the work Michael Dixon had done while serving on the Corridor Review Committee and for his community. She said he was very active in the community and was in the Peace Corp volunteers top ten. She said he would be sorely missed.

7. Next Tentative Meeting Date(s):

May 1, 2025 - Regular Meeting

8. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:49 P.M.¹

¹ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann