

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Corridor Review Committee Meeting
December 4, 2025

The Corridor Review Committee met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, December 4, 2025, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Vaughn Cochran, Chair, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL: Vaughn Cochran, Chair
Lorna McDonald, Vice Chair
Michael Blake

City Staff: Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Officer
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Elyse Wiemann, Senior Recording Secretary

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Lorna MacDonald **MOVED to APPROVE the November 6, 2025, meeting minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Michale Blake and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.**

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

MOTION

Ms. MacDonald **MOVED to APPROVE the modifications to the agenda. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blake and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.**

5. New Business

**5. (a) HP2025-0071 – Gulfstream Design Group, LLC - Applicant
City of St. Augustine - Owner
500 Anastasia Boulevard**

Matt Lotti Gulf Stream Design, Johnny Lohrum JL2 Architecture, and Carlos Aviles

Chief St. Augustine Fire Department were present and sworn in for presentation of the application.

To construct a new fire station and public use facility along the Anastasia Boulevard Entry Corridor.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the Anastasia Boulevard Design Standards for Entry Corridors, and without evidence to the contrary the CRC may take the following actions for the proposed development design at 500 Anastasia Boulevard:

1. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to submit additional details including scaled drawings of the building portion along Anastasia Boulevard with window sizes provided, details regarding lighting fixtures for the exterior structure, parking, and other site areas, and a visual rendering of the building along Anastasia Boulevard and to redesign any elements as requested by the CRC; OR,

2. APPROVE the proposed design if the CRC finds the design, as proposed or amended by the CRC, is consistent with the review criteria in section 3.3.2:

a. The proposed project meets the intent of the Anastasia Boulevard Design Standards as defined in Section 1;

b. Approval of the proposal will not set an unintended precedent; Note: Unique qualities of the application will be identified to substantiate the approval and avoid a perceived assumption of precedence.

c. Approval of the request will not be detrimental to the physical characteristics of the neighboring sites or the overlay district as a whole, with respect to the physical characteristics prescribed within the authority of this document. and if the CRC can make the following findings for proposed or staff indicated Modifications to the Standards under section 3.7.5:

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

b. The modifications are not prohibited types of modification listed in Section 3.7.4.

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

d. The Modifications will not have a material negative impact on adjacent uses, or applicants proposes to mitigate the negative impact(s) to be created by the modification. and with the following conditions:

a. Approval of a variance application for the reduced building frontage along Anastasia Boulevard and the extended setbacks along Moultrie Place be obtained, or the building be redesigned to meet requirements.

b. Window sizes are provided to staff, and glazing is determined to meet DSEC requirements.

c. All other DSEC and zoning requirements are met and any changes to the design that do not meet the Standards or zoning requirements will trigger additional hearings by the CRC and/or PZB prior to the issuance of a permit for development.

All findings must be proven by the applicant and accepted by the CRC in order to grant modifications and design approval. 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 application can be continued to allow the applicant time to provide the necessary details for approval or denied in which case the applicant may seek an appeal before the City Commission.

Mr. Lotti and Mr. Lohrum provided a brief overview of the project and presented a presentation.

Mr. Cochran asked if there would be a signal to allow entry from Moultrie Place to help make it easier for entry and exit from the site.

Mr. Lohrum replied that the project was in the early stages and they were in the vetting stage for a signal for that intersection. He said a warrant study had been conducted, which indicated a signal was not needed and Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) was not in support of having one in this area. He said it would be determined by the City and by the Team what type of light would be needed, if there was any.

Mr. Cochran commented that he owned a business in the corridor and it was very difficult to enter the boulevard and even harder if trying to turn left. He said he understood it would be hard to deal with FDOT. He asked if the driveway was asphalt or solid concrete.

Mr. Lotti replied that the driveway was solid concrete. He pointed out the parking area for the pedestrian vehicles would have turf block or paved drain type solutions to help with the low impact component of the standards.

Mr. Cochran asked if signage would be added and suggested using the tower for additional signage as it would be easily seen.

Mr. Lohrun replied that there were a couple of locations for signage, one place was on the second building facing the road and the major place was on the front of the building. He said the intent was to use the building as the signage instead of a marquee sign.

Mr. Cochran asked if the landscaping that was in the packet would be exact to what would be used onsite.

Mr. Lotti replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Cochran questioned what public use facility meant and asked for further explanation.

Mr. Lohrun replied that any fire station was considered 'public use' but would have very minimum amount of public coming to the facility, as it would mostly be city staff and fire crew. He said the building had to be compliant with the American of Disabilities Act (ADA), so if the public needed to access it, they could without any issues.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

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

Mr. Blake said regarding the colors, every time there was a change in material the colors would vary ever so slightly, and would that be considered a different color. He said the modification to the standard was that the applicant was allowed a total of six colors.

Ms. Courtney replied that the design standards were not super specific; however, the maximum was four colors, which included natural materials. She advised reviewing the colors provided and deciding

if they varied drastically enough to be considered a separate color.

Mr. Blake asked the applicant how many colors they felt they had within the design.

Mr. Lohrun replied that he understood that six colors could be approved and agreed that varying shades of colors if drastic should be counted separately. He noted the application had a total of six colors.

Ms. Courtney pointed out that in the staff report there were a few more colors and staff wanted to clarify that the finish design would have no more than six total colors.

Mr. Lohrun replied that was correct.

Ms. Courtney said the grey colors were not in the preapproved colors, which meant the Board would have to approve those colors along with the red color.

Mr. Cochran said the building was industrial and the grey colors would vary.

Ms. Courtney said she understood but thought if the grey colors were high contrast they should count as two colors. She said if the application was not six colors total, staff could work with the design team. She advised the Board that since the grey colors were not preapproved nor was the red, if they were willing to approve them that would need to be specified.

Mr. Blake asked the applicant to point out the different finishes for clarification.

Mr. Lohrun said the following materials and colors would be used on the building:

- Natural light-weight concrete panel
- Glazing material that would be anodized aluminum
- Large Bermuda Breeze Block
- Finished concrete block
- Facia

- Soffit material would be wood; elevating other material that would last longer
- Red Coloring
- Retaining Wall would be linen colored but intent was to resemble coquina

Ms. MacDonald asked for clarification on what else had to be approved other than a modification to the number of colors.

Ms. Courtney replied that there were three categories where modifications to the standards were needed if the Board saw fit which were:

- Building Color
- Building Entrances
- Stormwater Facilities

Board Discussion:

- In support of the finishes as presented
- Not having an entrance directly off Anastasia was an issue
- Understood that the retention pond could be an issue since it seemed that only one could fit onsite

Ms. Courtney said the design standards provided other options to assist with low key retention of stormwater. She said the plans identified a rain garden, and she asked if that would meet one of the stormwater facility requirements. She said the standards normally required two locations for stormwater. She said the requirement was to have the stormwater element at the back of the property and this one was at the front. She said this would be a modification for both of those items if the Board was amenable.

Ms. MacDonald asked if this met the engineering requirements.

Ms. Courtney advised that they would be working closely with the design team, civil engineers, and the Public Works Department, as the applicant would have to meet all the requirements.

Mr. Cochran said if the elevation were raised, he thought the water would run onto the surrounding properties or streets.

Mr. Lotti said the reason for raising the site to meet the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) guidelines, was to have separation from the groundwater. He said all the water that fell would be routed to retention facilities onsite. He said vaulted stormwater storage was being proposed in the parking lots along Comares Avenue. He said he did not feel that there was a need for much discussion about the wall as that would be presented to the Planning and Zoning Board (PZB) as a variance.

Ms. Courtney pointed out page three in the staff report that identified the need for calculations regarding glazing. She said with the angle of the building as shown, it made it difficult for that to be understood but it needed to be met. She advised that in the motion if approved the glazing calculations had to be noted to meet the design standards. She said bicycle parking had been recommended by staff but was not a requirement; however, the project had to meet the design standards. She said the landscape buffer yard and screening elements met the standards and the landscape code was required.

Mr. Cochran reiterated the items the Board would be deciding on which were as follows:

- Colors and Building material
- Glazing
- Stormwater retention
- Retaining wall, which could be addressed by staff
- Building entrance from Anastasia Boulevard

Ms. Courtney encouraged the Board to discuss any item that they felt needed more information on and pointed out the proposed recommendation from the staff report.

Mr. Cochran felt there were many elements to the project and after hearing the report from the applicant and after Board discussion, he was satisfied with the explanations.

Mr. Blake asked if the frontage needed to be discussed and approved or would approval for it be heard by the PZB.

Ms. Courtney replied that a minimum of 115 feet could be approved by the Board, and currently the frontage had been calculated at 110 feet. She said the standards required a minimum of 70% frontage or 164 feet.

Mr. Lanni felt that the frontage overlapped with the other approvals needed from the PZB, which were for raising the building and the slope. He stated everyone was content with the building layout and how it had been designed.

Ms. Lopez suggested that the Board could approve what was permitted in their standards and anything that needed further review or approval could be done by the PZB.

MOTION

Mr. Blake MOVED to APPROVE Preliminary Design Review application HP2025-0071 finding that the project overall was consistent with the intent of the Design Standards and the necessary modifications including the four plus the extra two colors as allowed by the standards, the stairs at Anastasia Boulevard, stormwater facilities and retention pond, the frontage setbacks, glazing calculation and frontage, bicycle parking and lighting items as presented all based on the minimum criteria that falls under the CRC jurisdiction. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Blake, MacDonald, Cochran

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Other Business

(None)

7. Next Scheduled Meeting Date(s):

7. (a) January 8, 2026 - Regular Meeting (pending application submittal)

8. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:16 P.M.¹

¹ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann