



CITY OF
ST. AUGUSTINE
EST. 1565

CORRIDOR REVIEW COMMITTEE

A G E N D A

THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 2026 - 2:00 PM

ALCAZAR ROOM

1. Roll Call
2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes
 - a) February 5, 2026 - Regular Meeting
4. Modification and approval of Agenda
5. Other Business
 - a) Annual reorganization: Selection of new Chair and Vice-chair
6. Next Tentatively Scheduled Meeting Date:
 - a) May 7, 2026 - Regular Meeting (if applications are received)
7. Adjournment

Notices: In accordance with Florida Statute 286.0105: "If any person decides to appeal any decision made by the Historic Architectural Review Board with respect to any matter considered at this scheduled meeting or hearing, the person will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose the person may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based." In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons needing a special accommodation to participate in this proceeding should contact the individual or agency sending notice not later than seven days prior to the proceeding at the address given on the notice. Telephone: (904) 825-1007 or 1-800-955-8771 (TDD).

Please note that one or more members of the City Commission or its appointed boards or committees may attend this meeting and participate, however they may not engage in a discussion or debate amongst themselves on any issue that will likely come before their respective elected or appointed body.

The materials prepared and presented are part of the City's ongoing Florida Public Records and Government in the Sunshine compliance, and are not intended to be relied upon or to reach investors or the trading markets.

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Corridor Review Committee Meeting
February 5, 2026

The Corridor Review Committee met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, February 5, 2026, 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
Candice Seymour, Historic Preservation Planner
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Elyse Wiemann, Senior Recording Secretary

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

(NONE)

3. Approval of Minutes

- a) December 4, 2025 - Regular Meeting
- b) January 8, 2026 - Regular Meeting

MOTION

Lorna MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the December 4, 2025, and the January 8, 2025, meeting minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Michael Blake and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

MOTION

Vaughn Cochran MOVED to APPROVE the Agenda as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. MacDonald and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

5. Continued Items from Previous Meetings

5.(a) HP2025-0085 Christopher Way – Applicant

**City of St. Augustine – Owner
Davis Shores Park (PID 2134101000)**

To install a new decorative entrance sign for Davis Shores along the Anastasia Boulevard Entry Corridor

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the Anastasia Boulevard Design Standards for Entry Corridors and the City of St. Augustine’s sign code, and without evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the CRC may APPROVE the proposed sign design for Davis Shores Park if the CRC finds the design and required modifications meet the review criteria under Section 3.7.5 of the Design Standards.

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.

Chris Way and James Garrard reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Roger White spoke in support of the project and felt the sign fit into the area. He said the sign fits the special nature of Davis Shores and liked that the font used on the sign was the same as it was in the 1920's.

Tom Driesbach thanked Chirs Way for moving forward the project. He asked if the property the sign would be located on City property or State property. He noted there was no park at the end of the bridge but encouraged the creation of one as there were homeless people that slept in the colonnade.

Public hearing was closed.

Ms. MacDonald asked if the property belonged to the City.

Ms. Seymour replied that was the understanding.

The Board discussed:

- Did not see any issues with the project
- Sign did not seem to be oversized
- Though the backlighting of the sign was appropriate and did not present as too modern
- Keep with the historic development
- Asked if other Boards or committees had to review the project

Ms. Seymour replied that the City Commission would have the final review of the project; however, since it was in the entry corridor, they referred to the CRC for a recommendation.

Mr. Cochran asked why Davis Shores was chosen instead of Anastaisa Island.

Mr. Way replied that he grew up and lived on Davis Shores most of his life. He felt that having a sign identifying Davis Shores would be a good idea and he thought there was something similar to this when entering Davis Island in Tampa, Florida.

MOTION

Ms. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0085 for design review and modification to the standards to allow a monument sign along the Anastasia Boulevard Entry Corridor. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blake.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Blake, Cochran

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Ms. Lopez advised that no construction could take place without a building permit and approval from other Boards was required.

Mr. Way replied in the affirmative.

5.(b) HP2025-0086– Maryrose LaCaverat– Applicant
131 King Street LLC– Owner
131 King Street

To After-the-fact approval of a sign using colors that are not pre-approved for the King Street Entry Corridor.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the King Street Design Standards for Entry Corridors and without evidence to the contrary the CRC may APPROVE the proposed design if the CRC can make the following findings under the review criteria in section 3.3.2:

Criteria 1: The proposed project meets the intent of the King Street Design Standards

Criteria 2: 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.

Criteria 3: 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.

With any modifications as identified by staff or the Committee if the CRC finds that such modifications meet the criteria detailed in section 3.7.5:

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

Criteria 2: The Modification is not a prohibited type of modification listed in Section 3.7.4.

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

Criteria 4: The Modification 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.

Maryrose LaCaverat reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- There were other colorful signs in the area
- Colors were in the range of the historic colors; however, not a perfect match
- Even though the application was an after-the-fact application, felt the owner wanted to protect the character of the street; however, should have applied for approval in the correct order
- Questioned what the consequence was for the application

Ms. Seymour stated there would be a double fee since the sign was installed without a permit.

Mr. Cochran advised that he checked on the patented trademark and the colors for the sign were not included. He told her she may want to refile her trademark, as it could be important for her business.

MOTION

Mr. Blake MOVED to APPROVE Preliminary Design Review application HP2025-0086 finding that the necessary modifications, including the color adjustments, can meet the review criteria for approval with the conditions stated in the staff report. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Blake, MacDonald, Cochran

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Ms. Lopez advised that this was the Board approval; however, final approval was needed by the building department

Ms. LaCaverat replied in the affirmative.

6. Next Scheduled Meeting Date(s):

a) March 5, 2026 - Regular Meeting (if applications are received)

7. Other Business

(None)

8. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:25 P.M.¹

DRAFT

¹ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann