

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Planning and Zoning Board Special Meeting July 16, 2025

The Planning and Zoning Board met in session Tuesday, July 16, 2025, at 1:30 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
Charles Pappas
Mike Davis
Carl Blow
Matthew Shaffer

Absent Ashleigh Barnes (Excused)
Susan Johns

City Staff: Amy Skinner, Director, Planning & Building Department
Jacob Fredriksson, Planning Manager
Sarah Daugherty, Senior Planner
Richard Buddy Schauland, Building Official
Ray Drechsler, Flood Plain Coordinator
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Michele Fudo, Recording Secretary

2. General Public hearings for Items Not on the Agenda

none

3. Discussion and Recommendation Regarding an Initiative to Develop more Resilient Criteria for Building for Flood Prevention

3.(a). Discussion related to developing criteria in the land development code to incorporate more resilient types of construction and site development techniques in flood prone areas

Amy Skinner introduced the discussion. She summarized the changes to the code language related to lot grading, fill, and flood plains.

Sarah Daugherty gave an overview of the plan so the board would be aware of when the codes would come before the board. She

presented a lot grading flowchart to help determine when commercial or multiunit projects would have to have civic review of the lot grading plan. She advised that there were some new guidelines related to Chapter 28 changes. She then reviewed the Overlay Zone flowchart, which included a different flowchart for Conservation Overlay Zone 2. She continued her review of the changes in Chapter 28-357 of the code. She highlighted that some of the items could be approved by staff and there was a different criterion for an application to be brought to the board. She advised that applicants had to demonstrate the drainage plan for any property to staff and there would be some requirements to build on stem walls in certain situations to maintain proper drainage. She said that fill requirements had been set and described those limits for the board. She went on to highlight Chapter 11 changes.

Ms. Skinner advised that the fill requirements came from the draft created by the

environmental attorney that assisted with the new changes.

3.(b). Public Comment

none

3.(c). Planning and Zoning Board discussion and recommendation

Mr. Davis referenced the section for impact on the flood plain, he asked if this would give the board the ability to stop the construction of retaining walls with fill added to the top. He confirmed that lot coverage would stay the same at seventy percent (ISR). He supported the uniform standard for bulkheads. He asked if there needed to be language for garages that were going to be constructed on fill. He was in favor of having thirty percent of the property that would stay outside flood walls. He asked if there could be a provision in the code that would allow certain homeowners to leave a trench with a drainpipe in the back of the property to alleviate flooding. He verified that the language referencing exceeding requirements for drainage needed to be restated for clarification.

Mr. Blow verified that any lot grading plan needed to be provided by a surveyor or engineer. He continued and clarified the guidelines for swales. He asked for a definition of a green roof and was advised that it would be an actual living roof, he was not able to confirm if it would be accepted by homeowners' insurance. He questioned the practice of diverting drainage from single family homes into the street rather than into wetlands or waters of the state.

Ms. Daugherty said that in neighborhoods without a stormwater plan, the residents were encouraged to continue the current drainage.

Ms. Tucker wanted to know if the board should be confirming that any proposals match or meet existing master drainage plans for neighborhoods.

Mr. Shaffer asked what the responsibility of the board would be in relation to areas like Pelican Reef. He wanted guidance on the issue going forward. He said that the staff had done a great job addressing the problems that the board had faced in the past and thought that the changes would provide more tools for the board to work with.

Ms. Skinner advised that the Water Management District had taken enforcement action with the HOA of Pelican Reef for maintenance of ditches and swales.

Mr. Shaffer asked if the adjustment to the twenty-five-foot buffer for scenic vistas would be determined by staff.

Ms. Lopez said that the regulations would allow for scenic vista within a 25-foot buffer if there was a desire to provide it as a public benefit.

Mr. Pappas said that there was nothing overly restrictive in the plan. He asked that the city be mindful of changes in the neighborhoods that would affect the positive flow of water to the inlet. He thought that in the future there may be a need to add swales on those areas.

Mr. Blow questioned the standards for review regarding the distance language for adjacent salt marshes and the vegetative communities contained therein. He felt that the word nearby should be stricken from the language.

Ms. Lopez advised her suggestion would be to remove the word owners as well as the intent was to protect property. She then advised the board of a new law that did not allow for passage of new code changes that would be more burdensome to the property owners. She asked staff to advise if there was anything in the plan that would be more burdensome, because it could not be done if that was the case. She then polled the panel and determined that there was consensus that the proposed changes would not be more burdensome.

MOTION

MOVED to RECOMMEND the Initiative to Develop more Resilient Criteria for Building for Flood Prevention to the City Commission as it made the process less burdensome for homeowners and staff would review the average size of garages for category one to determine the percentage of fill allowed based on a predetermined percentage and include other items concerning wording as staff had noted. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION

AYES: Davis, Pappas, Shaffer, Blow, Tucker

NAYES:

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

4. Discussion Regarding the Requires Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) of the City's Comprehensive Plan

4.(a). Discussion related to the required evaluation of the city's adopted 2040 Comprehensive Plan

Jacob Fredriksson advised that every seven years the city was required to update the Comprehensive Plan, and he explained the process for the update.

4.(b) Public Comment

none

4.(c). Planning and Zoning Board discussion and recommendation

Ms. Tucker opened the floor to the board for any questions.

Ms. Lopez explained that Comprehensive Plans were a look at what the future could be. She said that today there may be better foresight based on the experience in the

past. She advised that there would have to be an evaluation of changes to be sure that they were not more burdensome and said that she would have to verify if that law applied.

Ms. Skinner said that there had been some small changes to the plan, and she did not anticipate any major changes going forward.

Ms. Lopez said that comprehensive plans were a collection of goals, policies and objectives and sometimes there would be contradictions; however, there was a balance that would be established going forward.

5. Adjournment

Having no further business, Ms. Tucker adjourned the meeting at 3:08 P.M.²


Christina Tucker, Chairperson

¹ Break 2:43 – 2:56

² Transcribed by Michele Fudo