

## CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

### Planning and Zoning Board Regular Meeting November 4, 2025

The Planning and Zoning Board met in formal session Tuesday, November 4, 2025, 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:** Ashleigh Barnes, Chairperson  
Susan Johns, Vice- Chairperson  
Charles Pappas  
Carl Blow  
Christina Tucker

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**

none

### **3. Approval of Minutes**

#### **MOTION**

Mr. Blow MOVED to APPROVE the September 2, 2025 Regular Meeting minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas and PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

### **4. Modification and Approval of Agenda**

Item 5.a. PZB2025-0070 at 67 S. Dixie Highway was administratively withdrawn.

Item 6.a. PZB2025-0072 at 241 San Marco Avenue requested a continuance to the January 6, 2026 Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

Item 8.a. PZB2025-0086 at San Sebastian View / PID 073581-0040 requested a continuance to the December 2, 2025 Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

Item 9.a. PZB2025-0082 at 130 Pelican Reef Drive was administratively continued to the December 2, 2025 Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

#### **MOTION**

Mr. Blow MOVED to APPROVE the Agenda as amended to include the continuation to the January 6, 2026 meeting for item PZB2025-0072; to continue PZB2025-0086, PZB2025-0082 to the December 2, 2025 meeting and PZB2025-0070 was administratively withdrawn. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Barnes and PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

### **5. Variance**

**5. (a) PZB2025-0070 – Rebecca Faunce DMD c/o Antigua Orthodontics / Faunce Orthodontics LLC – Applicant Faunce Orthodontics LLC c/o Antigua Orthodontics / Faunce Orthodontics LLC – Owner 67 S. Dixie Highway**

**To approve a variance to the side yard setback requirement.**

This item was administratively withdrawn. See item four.

**5. (b) PZB2025-0075 – Jeremy Butcher – Applicant  
Judith and Charles Butcher c/o  
Schooners Seafood House – Owner  
3560 N. Ponce De Leon Boulevard**

**To approve a variance to the off-street parking requirement.**

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

- APPROVE this variance request to the minimum off-street parking requirements if a singular disadvantage is identified.
- CONTINUE this variance request to the minimum off-street parking requirement to allow the applicant additional time to present additional information, or
- DENY this variance request to the minimum off-street parking requirements as a singular disadvantage has not been identified at 3560 N. Ponce de Leon Boulevard / PID 150170-0000

Jeremy and Judy Butcher reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

Ms. Barnes reviewed the certified notices and emails received for the application.

Public hearing was opened.

Barbara Douglas was concerned that there were many pine trees that were marked in the area, and she wanted to be sure that the trees would not be disturbed as there were also eagle nests in the area.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Butcher advised that there was a survey conducted and no trees would be removed.

The Board discussed:

- There was a lot of support for the farmers' market in the area.
- Confirmed the number of spaces was 51 on site.
- Could not identify any disadvantages on the site
- Code did not specifically address businesses doing multi-use
- Did not think that the board needed to prove a disadvantage as the uses would be at different times

Mr. Fredriksson said it was a policy issue and staff could not make the judgement.

Ms. Johns supported this application and asked if a condition could be added to the variance to be sure that the business would not be open on Sunday.

Ms. Lopez suggested that the motion could be drafted to say that the variance was granted only for the specifics of this applicant and application; specifically, the market on Sunday.

- Confirmed that the property was one parcel
- This variance was giving relief from the code
- Wanted a creative solution for this variance
- Confirmed that if the motion was worded correctly the variance would end if the property was sold

**MOTION**

**Ms. Tucker MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2025-0075 at 3560 N. Ponce De Leon Boulevard for the variance request to eliminate the off-site parking requirement for the proposed**

farmers market and will specify that this variance is granted for this application only for Sundays only, as Schooners was not open on Sunday. The motion was **SECONDED** by Ms. Barnes.

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES:** NONE

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**5. (c) PZB2025-0079 – Lisa Reagan – Applicant & Owner  
Magnolia Avenue / PID 191850-0000**

**To approve a variance to the side and rear setback requirements.**

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff find that the Board can **CONTINUE** until the applicant has explored other locations that may reduce the encroachment into setbacks, **DENY** as variance criteria is not met, or **APPROVE** as variance criteria is met for the variance request to reduce the rear yard and side yard setback at Magnolia Avenue / PID 191850-0000.

Lisa Reagan reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: presented

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

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

The Board discussed:

- Confirmed the structure was originally a garage and all changes had been permitted
- Reviewed the four criteria for a variance
- Did not see a singular disadvantage

- Verified the need for the variance was the change of use of the structure, which required the setbacks be adjusted
- Confirmed that there was a sink and a refrigerator in the structure as well as a stove and oven
- Having a kitchen negated this being an accessory structure
- Preferred a smaller building with a bigger open space
- There was no disadvantage shown on the property
- The setback variance would live on with the property
- Zoning did not allow for two primary structures
- Environmentally, it was better to use an existing building

Ms. Lopez advised that if an additional structure was built, it could extend into the variance setbacks. She reminded the board that this variance was not for a change of use and the variance would stay with the property and in the future someone could build and extend the new structure to encompass most of the property.

Mr. Pappas Moved to **APPROVE** this application; however, there was no second and the motion failed.

**MOTION**

**Ms. Barnes MOVED to DENY application PZB2025-0079 as there was ample space to build a primary structure and because the variance stays with the land it would make the four criteria essential. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Johns.**

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES:** Barnes, Johns, Blow, Tucker

**NAYES:** Pappas

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**6. Use by Exception**

**6. (a) PZB2025-0072 – Luis Garcia – Applicant**

**Leland Company's LLC – Owner**

**241 San Marco Avenue**

Continued from the October 7, 2025  
Regular Meeting

**To approve a use by exception for a business that offers for sale, new or used automobiles, trucks, boats, and tractors.**

The applicant had requested a CONTINUANCE to the January 6, 2026, Planning and Zoning Board meeting. See item four.

**6. (b) PZB2025-0080 – Stephen Content – Applicant & Owner**

**303 S. Ponce De Leon Boulevard & 330 ½ Lewis Boulevard**

**To approve a use by exception for a commercial parking facility.**

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE the commercial parking facility use at 303 S. Ponce de Leon Boulevard / PID 119320-0000 and 330 ½ Lewis Boulevard / PID 119330-0000 if it finds that the proposal promotes the public health, safety, welfare, morals, order, comfort, convenience, appearance, prosperity or general welfare of the City of St. Augustine.

Adam Lynne reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

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

The Board discussed:

- Verified that the use would be during the Nights of Lights season

- Reviewed the requirements for a parking lot and advised that the applicant would have to meet those requirements
- Confirmed the lot would not be paved
- There was a small, paved area existing on the site at this time
- Confirmed the lot would be left as is
- Wanted a time frame on the use by exception
- Approval could be granted for this year and then revisited for future use
- This was a commercial lot

**MOTION**

Ms. Barnes MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2025-0080 for the use by exception for a commercial parking lot with the following conditions: the time frame for use would be limited to January 30, 2026. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES:** NONE

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**6. (c) PZB2025-0087 – Paul Thompson c/o Pierre's Pub / Auntie Annes / Cinnabon – Applicant**

**French Connection LLC – Owner**  
**69 St. George Street**

**To approve a use by exception for a cocktail lounge / tavern.**

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said staff finds that the continued use as a tavern at 69 St. George Street would be consistent with the provisions for a use by exception. Based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE the Use by Exception request for a cocktail lounge, tavern at 69 St. George Street / PID 196610-0000.

Paul Thompson reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

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

The Board confirmed that the sale of only beer and wine would continue.

There was consensus with the Board for approval

### **MOTION**

**Ms. Barnes MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2025-0087 for use by exception for a cocktail lounge / tavern. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.**

### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY<sup>1</sup>**

### **7. Land Use Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Use by Exception and Conservation Overlay Zone Development**

**7. (a) PZB2025-0081 – Andre Green c/o San Sabastian Dog and Bog – Applicant Flagler Multifamily LLC – Owner 725 Flagler Crossing Drive / PID 084560-0010**

**To recommend a land use plan map amendment to change the future land use from Residential Medium Density to Commercial Low Intensity, a compatible rezoning from Residential General-One (RG-1) to Commercial Low-One (CL-1); a use by exception for off-site parking within 400 feet; a use by exception for the sale of alcoholic beverages with alcoholic**

**content not more than fourteen (14) percent for consumption, either on the premises or off the premises; conservation overlay zone 1 & 2 development to construct a bulkhead and to remove significant trees and tree canopy.**

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-30 staff finds that the Board may make POSITIVE RECOMMENDATIONS to the city commission to both amend the city's land use plan map from Residential Medium Density to Commercial Low Intensity and rezone that property from Residential General-One: RG-1 to Commercial Low-One: CL-1.

The required Board report as part of a potential positive recommendation could include that the Board has studied and considered:

1. The need and justification for the change stems from the fact that the proposed commercial use is not permitted within the RG-1 zoning district, the current zoning designation of the property.
2. The positive relationship of the proposed amendment and rezoning to the city's general planning program.
3. These requests and proposal's consistency with the comprehensive plan as analyzed, documented, and found above in this report.

Based on a review of Sec. 28-2 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE the use by exception request for off-site parking within four hundred (400) feet contingent upon the adoption of the land use and rezoning.

Based on a review of Sec. 28-2 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE the use by exception request for the sale of alcoholic beverages with alcoholic content not more than fourteen (14) percent for consumption,

<sup>1</sup> Break 2:08 – 2:15

either on the premises or off the premises, which is contingent upon the City Commission approving the rezoning from RG-1 to CL-1.

Review of Sec. 11-29 is the responsibility of the PZB for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 & 2. This application includes requests to construct a new bulkhead and remove a significant tree canopy for the northern portion of the property at 725 Flagler Crossing Drive / PID 084660-0010.

Andre Green and Nasha Myers reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

Ms. Barnes reviewed the certified notice responses and emails received for the application.

Public hearing was opened.

David Denham was familiar with the property and was dismayed that it had been destroyed in the past several years to build the housing development.

BJ Kalaidi said that this was what happened when property was annexed into the city. She did not want to allow all the trees to be removed.

Public hearing was closed.

Elijah George was sworn in for the record and provided a rebuttal regarding the removal of trees on the property stating that there was a slash pine, which was not a significant tree and the grade change would require the removal.

The Board discussed

- There had been an osprey nest in the area, however, it was verified that the nest no longer existed

- The city was only looking at a small portion of the property as the county had already approved their portion to go forward
- Confirmed that there would be a playground for children
- The bulkhead was not a problem as it would help the site to maintain elevations
- Landscape requirement would be met
- This project would protect the area from further development
- There was an exception to offsite parking so there was control by the city
- Only the entrance gate part of the dog park would be in the city
- There would be turf, not natural grass, to prevent the spread of disease
- Proposed operation time would end at 10pm
- Clarified that the on-site and off-site consumption reference was because the dog park portion was in St. Johns County

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Blow MOVED to MAKE A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION to the City Commission to amend the future land use map from Residential Medium Density to Commercial Low Intensity and rezone that property from Residential General-One: RG-1 to Commercial Low-One: CL-1. for application PZB2025-0081. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Barnes**

#### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Blow MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2025-0081 use by exception for off-site parking within 400 feet; a use by exception for the sale of alcoholic beverages with alcoholic content not more than fourteen (14) percent for consumption, either on the**

premises or off the premises, limited to the dog park only, the sale of alcohol would be limited to 10:30 am to 10:00pm seven days a week; conservation overlay zone 1 & 2 development to construct a bulkhead as submitted and to remove one 20-inch slash pine the exceptions and conservation development would be contingent on the approval by the city commission. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES:** NONE

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**8. Use by Exception, Variance and Conservation Overlay Zone Development**

**8. (a) PZB2025-0086 – Dave Urena c/o KPM Franklin – Applicant  
Cd St. Augustine Gas LLC – Owner  
San Sebastian Vw / PID 073581-0040**

To approve a use by exception for a self-storage facility, a variance to the off-street parking requirements, and conservation overlay zone 2 development for the removal of significant trees and tree canopy.

The applicant requested a CONTINUANCE to the December 2, 2025, Planning and Zoning Board meeting. See item four.

**9. Conservation Overlay Zone Development**

**9. (a) PZB2025-0082 – Ryan Carter c/o Carter Environmental Services – Applicant  
David Meck – Owner  
130 Pelican Reef Drive**

To approve the construction of a bulkhead within Conservation Overlay Zone 2.

This item was administratively continued to December 2, 2025, Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

**9. (b) PZB2025-0083 – Ryan Carter c/o Carter Environmental Services – Applicant  
Thomas Borzilleri – Owner  
27 Dolphin Drive**

To approve the modifications of a dock and bulkhead cap 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 modification of an existing dock and bulkhead in COZ 1 and 2 at 27 Dolphin Drive / PID 220060-0000.

Ryan Carter and Mike Davis reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

Ms. Barnes reviewed the certified notices and emails received for the application.

Public hearing was opened.

Greg Trunell wanted to determine why the size of the proposed dock was greater than the one that existed on his property.

BJ Kalaidi was concerned that if this dock was approved that others would do the same thing.

Mr. Carter provided his rebuttal.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed

Mr. Pappas asked if the goals could be achieved if the boardwalk was shortened, and what was the tie in on each side of the bulkhead.

Mr. Carter indicated that the goals could be met if the boardwalk was shortened.

Mr. Davis advised that there would be a wingwall to stabilize the bulkhead as there were no existing walls to tie into.

- There would be no pilings on the deck as the lift was a no profile lift
- The limit by code was thirty-two feet long on a lift and 12,000 pounds
- Suggested continuance to allow information to be distributed to neighbors
- Bulkhead was ok
- In favor of shortening the dock
- Not in favor of continuing
- Confirmed that ten feet would be acceptable for reducing the length of the boardwalk on the dock
- Based on the aerial photos, it did not look like a good idea to shorten the dock

**MOTION**

Mr. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2025-0083 for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 & 2 for the modification of an existing dock as presented and the modification of the bulkhead as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow.

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES:** NONE

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY<sup>2</sup>**

**9. (c) PZB2025-0084 – Ryan Carter c/o Carter Environmental Services – Applicant  
Mary Soha – Owner  
84 Water Street**

To approve the modification of a 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 Zone 1 & 2. This application is for the modification of an existing dock at 84 Water Street / PID 195900-0000.

Ryan Carter reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

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

There was consensus with the Board for approval

**MOTION**

Mr. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2025-0084 for the modification of a dock within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 and 2 as it was consistent with policies 2.1.1 and 2.1.3. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Barnes.

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES:** NONE

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**9. (d) PZB2025-0085 – Ryan Carter c/o Carter Environmental Services – Applicant  
Ponce Associates LLC & Toll Southeast LP Company Inc – Owner  
PID / 073430-0000 Limited to the northeast portion of the property referenced as the Madiera at St. Augustine Phase 3 subdivision – See specific list attached**

<sup>2</sup> Break 3:24pm – 3:42pm

**To approve the removal of significant trees and significant tree canopy within Conservation Overlay Zones 2 & 3.**

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said review of Section 11-259 is the responsibility of the Board for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zones 2 and 3. The specific request for Conservation Overlay Zone development is for the removal of nine hundred ninety-one (991) trees within the recently replatted Madeira at St. Augustine Phase 3 subdivision, PID / 073430-0000.

Staff recommended that following a public hearing this application for Conservation Overlay Zone development be CONTINUED to allow the applicant time to address and provide the following:

1. Identification of trees between the Tree Credits & Debits table and the Proposed Tree Removal figures with corresponding numbers.
2. Correction of the common name abbreviation for trees.
  - a. Currently SGY represents two different significant trees, Sugarberry in the credits table and Sweetgum in the debits table
3. Documentation of compliance with Ordinance No. 2015-34 Exhibit "A"
4. Calculations of lot coverage for each lot.
  - a. Lot 102 was replatted as a 10,131 square foot lot, the proposed 4,875 square foot house footprint showed results in a lot coverage of forty-eight (48) percent.
5. Documentation of the provision of front yards which comply with minimum requirements.
  - a. Specific examples include, but are not limited to, Lots 101, 115, 92, and 81 which all appear to have reduced front yards.
6. Rationale behind the decision to include pools in the proposed Typical Lot Detail diagram.

7. Rationale behind not utilizing tree wells for tree retention.
8. Explanation of the differences in the square footage between the house plan provided and the Stemwall House Footprint used.

Nate Bydell and Ryan Carter reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

Ms. Barnes reviewed the certified notices and emails for the application.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi asked who the arborist was that performed the updated tree survey. She was not in favor of a wholesale approval for tree removal. She also did not want staff to make the final decision on the tree removal.

Shawn Triplet had purchased one of the properties. He said that they picked that area because of the trees. He favored each lot being heard separately.

Mary Senese requested that as many trees be saved as was possible. She was concerned that flooding could be a problem as trees were removed.

Paul Hamil had new information about the acres in question. He spoke about clear cutting trees to put the new development in. He thought that the developer was selling land that was not suitable for building. He supported continuance.

Art Redding spoke about the preservation of the birds in the area, and that they live in the trees behind his property. He said that there had been a promise that the area would be preserved.

Jeff Fox said that he had dropped off 156 forms in opposition of the proposed development and tree removal. He thought that many had not received the appropriate

notices. He thought that the notice was directed to selective tree removal rather than lot by lot.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Ryan provided his rebuttal. He asked the Board if the focus could be centered on the five lots that had been sold thus far.

Ms. Lopez said that in theory, a subset could be approved and continue the rest.

Mr. Bydell presented site plans for five lots that had been sold at this point.

Ms. Johns confirmed that an arborist report existed with details of the trees to be removed.

Mr. Carter explained that the entire property had been inventoried by an arborist and then surveyed by a professional licensed land surveyor.

Ms. Johns wanted an arborist report for each lot being proposed for construction, detailing the tree removal. She advised that she was not prepared to discuss the application without the proper reports for review.

Mr. Blow explained the process of the tree survey that accompanies the plans for the structure. He felt that the applicant was looking for a "blank check" and he wanted to see each lot to be evaluated separately.

Mr. Pappas thought these approvals should be reviewed in smaller groups.

Ms. Barnes said that this could not be processed in total. She said that based on the criteria, there was not enough information to go forward with the application today.

Mr. Carter wanted guidance from the board on how to proceed with approvals in the future.

Ms. Tucker wanted to see better explanations of the stem wall construction as well as the reasoning for the dimensions for the plans.

Ms. Johns thought that the current plans were based on the smallest model available for sale.

Ms. Tucker suggested that each plan be brought before the board one by one.

Mr. Pappas was ok with five at a time.

Ms. Lopez asked that board to clarify if a reasonable bundle would be acceptable for the board to review.

Mr. Blow preferred one by one approval.

Ms. Barnes put forth the idea of a bundle of five plans to include the arborist report and an explanation of trees and credits for those five by December 2, 2025

#### **MOTION**

**Ms. Barnes MOVED to CONTINUE application PZB2025-0085 to the December 2, 2025 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.**

#### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **10. Other Business**

##### **10.(a) Discussion and recommendation related to the required City of St. Augustine Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) letter to Florida Commerce (Florida Department of Economic Opportunity)**

Mr. Fredriksson provided a summary of the required report that would be sent to the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Blow confirmed that there would be no changes to the city's Comprehensive Plan at this time.

Ms. Lopez summarized a bill (Senate Bill 180) that had been passed last year at the state level that said if any changes were made in the comp plan or code that were more burdensome than the prior rule, those new rules/regulations would be considered against the law.

Ms. Skinner advised that the Comp Plan had been updated in 2020 and the city's plan was very complete. She said that because of the rewrite, she did not anticipate any upcoming changes to the Comprehensive Plan, and she was comfortable submitting the letter to the state that the plan was in compliance. She said that over the next year of 2026, the data analysis would be updated, and the board would be included in the process to make updates or changes. This was in connection with the law that did not allow for changes to be made that would be more burdensome to the residents in the area.

Ms. Lopez advised that there had been challenges to Senate Bill 180, and there was a process in place in Tallahassee that would try to address some of the more egregious parts of the law.

#### MOTION

**Mr. Pappas MOVED to MAKE A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION to the City Commission to submit the letter to Florida Commerce as noted in the attached letter and affidavit for the EAR (Evaluation and Appraisal Report) for acceptance. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Johns and PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.**

**10.(b) Discussion and recommendations related to draft language to adopt an ordinance establishing procedures for the review and approval of certified**

#### **recovery residences as required by F.S. 397.487(15)(a)**

Ms. Skinner explained that this was an acknowledgment there were areas where civically allowed certified recovery residences could be located, such as a multi-family zoning district. She said that an entity that was establishing a recovery residence had the right to request that it be given reasonable accommodation based on the proposed situation; for example, more unrelated individuals to live in the residence or to relax parking regulations, and there were to be no hinderances to the establishment of these types of residences. She further explained that there were no fees connected to these requests and there would be an appeals process as well. She said the language would be written into the supplementary regulations as required by Florida Statutes.

Ms. Lopez advised that none of the requests would come before the board and would be handled administratively.

#### MOTION


**Ms. Barnes MOVED to MAKE A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION to the City Commission for FS397.387.(15)(a) the proposed Ordinance 2025-XX language for acceptance. The motion was SECONDED BY Mr. Pappas and PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.**

Mr. Pappas asked that the shared parking plan be revisited by staff so that it could be discussed at the December meeting. Mr. Blow agreed

#### **11. Adjournment**

Having no further business, Ms. Tucker adjourned the meeting at 5:02 P.M.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Transcribed by Michele Fudo

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ashleigh Barnes, Chairperson