

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Planning and Zoning Board Regular Meeting January 6, 2026

The Planning and Zoning Board met in formal session Tuesday, January 6, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. in the Alcazar Room at City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Ashleigh Barnes, Chairperson and the following were present:

1. Roll Call: Ashleigh Barnes, Chairperson
Susan Johns, Vice - Chairperson
Charles Pappas
Mike Davis
Carl Blow
Jan Kelly
Christina Tucker

City Staff: Amy Skinner, Director, Planning & Building Department
Sarah Daugherty, Senior Planner
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Michele Fudo, Recording Secretary

2. General Public hearings for Items Not on the Agenda

BJ Kalaidi had a concern across the street from 33 Davis in the west King area. She said that construction had been allowed and the canopy was gone. She asked for a review of the activities at that address.

John Veetro spoke about the Nights of Lights and parking in the Davis Shores area. He said that google had information advising visitors to park in the Davis Shores area and walk across the bridge. He was concerned that the city had posted information about the additional parking in the area.

Ms. Lopez advised that there was a city commission meeting on Monday January 12 at 5:00 pm and he could come and speak there or contact Reuben Franklin as he would like to have the feedback. She said that the city did not post on google any information about parking in the Davis Shores area.

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to APPROVE October 7, and November 4, 2025 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas and PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

4. Modification and Approval of Agenda

Item 6.a. requested a continuance to the February 3, 2026 Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

Item 5.c. 500 Anastasia had a change in the variance request. The variance request had been modified to include only the maximum building placement.

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE the Agenda with the stated modifications including PZB2025-0072 would be continued to February 3, 2026. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Davis and PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

5. Variance

5. (a) PZB2025- 0097– Jamie Pantling – Applicant & Owner 81 Coquina Avenue

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

Ms. Daugherty 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 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 the side yard setback at 81 Coquina Avenue / PID 221410-0000.

Jamie Pantling reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

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

The Board discussed:

- There was no survey prior to construction
- The placement was measured from an existing stake on the property
- The shed was a fully wood, fully framed 150 square feet on pilings
- This structure would not be easy to move
- This was the second after-the-fact application for this applicant
- Two inches was a minor amount
- There had been no response from neighbors that would have been most affected
- The criteria were not met, there did not seem to be a singular disadvantage
- An accessory structure for nonresidential use was allowed to be within three feet of the setback

- The placement of the shed appeared to have been somewhat careless
- Concerned with the integrity of the code
- Concerned about the variance as it stays with the land in perpetuity
- Because the plats had been done in the 1800's, there were a lot of disagreements on where corners exist
- Had the surveyor made the mistake it would be easier to approve
- The owner did not create the problem as there had been metal stakes placed previously
- The variance could be crafted for the shed only by specifying that this was for an accessory structure only, related to this application
- The three-foot setback was limited to nonresidential accessory structures
- Clarified the distance of the variance

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2025-0097 based on the fact that the variance only applied to the storage shed related to the use of the dock and nothing else. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Blow, Pappas, Kelly, Davis, Tucker, Johns

NAYES: Barnes

MOTION CARRIED 6/1

5. (b) PZB2025-0098 – Ellen Avery-Smith c/o Rogers Towers, P.A. – Applicant Mark M Arnold Living Trust of 7-17-2007 – Owner

109 Washington Street

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

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE the variance request to reduce the side yard setback from 4.7 feet to 2.8 feet at 109 Washington Street / PID 200060-0000.

Ellen Avery-Smith and Mike Koppenhafer 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:

- This house was built in the 1920's prior to any codes being in place
- This application was typical of others that had been heard when a home was quite old and existed prior to codes
- This application appeared to meet the four criteria
- Confirmed that the front deck would be extended approximately four to five feet
- The singular disadvantage was the fact that it was constructed prior to codes
- This was a non-conforming lot

MOTION

Ms. Tucker MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2025-0098 to approve a variance request to the side yard setback requirement as it met the four criteria and was a non-conforming lot, the condition existed already, the disadvantage did not exist because of the owner, and there would be no adverse effect in the neighborhood.. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Tucker, Pappas, Kelly, Davis, Blow, Johns, Barnes

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**5. (c) PZB2025-0100 – Gulfstream Design Group LLC – Applicant
City of St. Augustine – Owner**

500 Anastasia Boulevard

To approve a variance request to the maximum building placement and minimum building frontage per the Anastasia Entry Corridor Design Standards.

Ms. Skinner advised the variance request for the minimum building frontage would not be heard as it was determined not necessary.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE the variance request to the maximum building placement per the Anastasia Entry Corridor Design Standards at 500 Anastasia Boulevard / PID 218570-0000.

Christina Evans reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

Public hearing was opened.

Roger White said that the neighborhood had been waiting for this project for over a decade and understood the need for the variance.

Stephen Foss lived very close to the proposed fire station and felt that this compounded the problems with property values and was opposed to having the fire station at this location.

Ms. Evans provided her rebuttal, including an explanation of the proposed drainage system that would be installed on the property.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- This was not the first location choice; however, the state did not approve the previously selected site.
- Confirmed the zoning to be CL-2 and would allow for a restaurant or bar
- The four criteria were met
- The proposed storm water retention system should be able to handle typical rainwater
- There would be an extensive review of the drainage by the state
- Twelve feet was the proposed elevation for the fire station

MOTION

Mr. Davis MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2025-0100 on the grounds that the four requirements were met, the lots were designed in the 1920's prior to current setbacks, with the justification that the station would meet the setbacks and the required elevation for flooding. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Davis, Pappas, Kelly, Blow, Tucker, Johns, Barnes

NAYES: NONE

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.

This item was continued to the February 3, 2026 meeting at the applicant's request. See item four.

7. Use by Exception, Variance and Conservation Overlay Zone Development

7. (a) PZB2025-0086 – Dave Urena c/o KPM Franklin – Applicant

Cd St. Augustine Gas LLC – Owner

San Sebastian Vw / PID 073581-0040

Continued from the December 2, 2025 Regular Meeting

To approve a use by exception for a self-storage facility, a variance to the off-street parking requirements, and conservation overlay zone 3 development for the removal of significant trees and tree canopy.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec.28-29 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE as exception criteria is met for the self-storage use by exception request at San Sebastian View / PID 073581-0040.

Based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may CONTINUE until the applicant has provided additional information meeting the variance criteria, DENY as variance criteria is not met, or APPROVE as variance criteria is met for the variance request to the minimum number of required off-street automobile parking spaces at San Sabastian View / PID 073581-0040

Review of Sec. 11-29 is the responsibility of the PZB for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zone 3. This application includes requests to remove significant trees and tree canopy for the property at San Sebastian View / PID 073581-0040.

Robbie Moon and James Whitehouse reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi asked the board to go into the details of this application. She asked where the off-street parking would be. She felt that the tree canopy should be left in place. She

confirmed that the physical address for the location was 120 San Sebastian View.

Mr. Whitehouse provided his rebuttal.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed

- Agreed that there were a number of self-storage units in the area and did not think that there was a need for a new one
- The type of on-site restaurant had not yet been determined

Mr. Davis advised the board that the application should be continued until the city had an opportunity to conduct their own study regarding the need for an additional storage facility.

- Did not have an issue with the parking variance
- Felt that there should be more on-site parking because of the addition of a restaurant to the site
- Would like to have more large trees preserved on site
- Confirmed that one hundred and thirty trees would be removed from the property
- The tree mitigation needed to be verified
- The layout of a quick service restaurant was odd and possibly would not get permitted as it was proposed
- The dumpster location was problematic
- The information provided for tree removal and mitigation was not clear
- Parking may have been reduced too much in this plan, this facility would have six hundred units
- Confirmed the property was under contract contingent on the approval of this application
- The exception would have to be stated specifically for this application. There were certain requirements for certain business uses

- Any restaurant would have to meet the requirements of the land development code
- Current code for mini warehouse self-storage was one parking space for every ten storage units
- Advised the board that the application could be partially approved and partially denied
- The expert report provided in the packet only addressed the economic feasibility of the business and did not address the items contained in the criteria
- Confirmed that three significant trees would be removed and eighteen would be saved
- Could not approve the reduction in the on-site parking
- Using underground drainage would allow for additional parking because there would be no need for a retention pond
- There should be a study of what the parking should be on the site
- If the space on the lot was not maximized, trees would be saved
- Needed to confirm the numbers of units in the building to be able to determine the parking requirements
- Any disagreement with a provided study was not a valid reason to deny the application
- Evidence in the studies would have to connect to the code criteria to be valid
- Any study could be used to support any application; however, the evidence had to be competent to relate to the code
- The zoning adjacent to this property was CM-2

MOTION

Ms. Barnes MOVED to CONTINUE application PZB2025-0086 to the February 3, 2026 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Tucker.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Barnes, Tucker, Kelly, Davis, Blow, Pappas, Johns
NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Other Business

8.(a) Information and Discussion related to Planning items for 2026

Ms. Skinner provided an update to the board in reference to the Comprehensive Plan. She advised the new board members that she was available to meet with them to discuss these projects in more detail. She told the board that she would work with them to set a schedule for any special meetings if necessary and there was consensus to do so. She confirmed with the board that she would be able to simplify the parking plan and then submit it to the city commission.

Ms. Lopez provided a legislative update.

9. Adjournment

Having no further business, Ms. Tucker adjourned the meeting at 3:56 P.M.¹



Ashleigh Barnes, Chairperson

¹ Transcribed by Michele Fudo