

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Planning and Zoning Board Regular Meeting
April 7, 2026

The Planning and Zoning Board met in formal session Tuesday, April 7, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. in the Alcazar Room at City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Susan Johns, Vice-Chairperson and the following were present:

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

City Staff: Amy Skinner, Director, Planning & Building Department
Sarah Daugherty, Senior Planner
Jennifer Thompson, Senior Planner, AICP, MPA, CFM
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. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE the February 3, 2026 and the March 3, 2026 minutes with the following change: remove Ms. Tucker and add Ms. Barnes as the person who adjourned the meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Davis and PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

Ms. Lopez advised that a strike through would be sufficient for the change and the correction was made.

4. Modification and Approval of Agenda

7.d. PZB2026-0027 requested a continuance to the May 5, 2026 Regular Meeting.

7.e. PZB2026-0031 requested a continuance to the May 5, 2026 Regular Meeting.

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE the Agenda with the following modifications: continuance of PZB 2026-0027 and PZB 2026-0031 to the May 5, 2026 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Johns and PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

5. Variance

**5. (a) PZB2026-0018 – Scott G Ross c/o Home Sweet Accessible Home, Inc – Applicant
Scott and Kim Ross – Owner
28 Montrano Avenue**

To approve a variance to the side yard setback requirement and maximum lot coverage.

Ms. Thompson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff find that the Board can CONTINUE until the

applicant identifies how they meet the four variance criteria, or APPROVE as variance criteria is met, or DENY the application based on the variance criteria not being met for a variance request to reduce the side yard setback and increase the allowable lot coverage for an accessory structure.

Scott Ross reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

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

The Board discussed:

- No singular disadvantage was identified
- There was no other area to place the structure
- The neighbors were in favor of this structure
- This accessory structure would have to meet the primary structure's setbacks
- A possible disadvantage would be the trees in the area that would have to be removed
- Roofed structure with open walls that could be enclosed
- The motion could include the specifics of leaving the walls open
- The applicant had the burden of proof to meet the criteria of variance
- The property line was at an angle; however, there was no evidence to show disadvantage
- The criteria was explained to the applicant
- Planting bamboo on the property line would mask the RV

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to CONTINUE application PZB2026-0018 to the May 5,

2026 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Johns.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (b) PZB2026-0026 – Karen Cowart c/o Karen Cowart Design Associates, Inc – Applicant

Stephen Kelly – Owner

15 Avista Circle

To approve a variance to reduce the setback of a retaining wall.

Ms. Thompson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff find that the Board can APPROVE the variance request to reduce the side yard setback for a retaining wall as the variance criteria are met.

Karen Cowart reviewed the application. She advised that fill that would be added to the garage only and this would be the owner's primary residence.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

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

The Board discussed:

- The garage would remain the same
- The existing drainage patterns would not change
- The letter from flood plain coordinator was persuasive

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2026-0026 based on the review of Section 28-29 that this met the

criteria. The motion was **SECONDED** by Ms. Kelly.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Ms. Lopez advised the applicant not to respond to any email requests for payment of permits. She reminded the applicant that this was not the final step in the permitting process.

6. Use by Exception

6. (a) PZB2026-0025 – Gary McGeddy c/o Harvest of St. Augustine – Applicant Trinity Episcopal Parish – Owner 17 King Street

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

Ms. Thompson read the staff report and said staff finds that the use as a cocktail lounge/tavern at 17 King 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 or APPROVE with CONSIDITIONS the Use by Exception request for a cocktail lounge/tavern at 17 King Street.

Steven Husson reviewed the application. The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

21 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:

- The applicant explained the different liquor licenses available for restaurants

- No issue if the stated intentions were adhered to
- Confirmed that the lease had restrictions

Ms. Lopez advised that the city did not enforce private leases. She said that conditions could be added to the order that could be enforced.

- Square footage for bottle sales was 20% of the total space
- The total square footage of the leased space was 4,500 square feet
- Live music should only be inside the restaurant

MOTION

Mr. Pappas **MOVED** to **APPROVE** application PZB2026-0025 with the condition that the bottle sales do not exceed twenty percent of the current 4,500 square feet and the food sales must be at least fifty-one percent of the gross sales. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Blow

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Pappas, Bowl, Davis, Tucker, Johns

NAYES: Kelly

MOTION CARRIED 5/1

Ms. Lopez advised that this approval was not the final step, that building permits would need to be obtained and approved.

6. (b) PZB2026-0030 – Greg Charalambous c/o Runny Ink Printing – Applicant Thompson Bros Realty Inc – Owner 1095 Anastasia Boulevard

To approve a use by exception for professional and business offices.

Ms. Thompson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff find that the Board can APPROVE, APPROVE with CONDITIONS, a use by exception for a

professional and business located at 1095 Anastasia Boulevard.

Greg Charalambous reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

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

The Board discussed:

- This building had always been some type of low use office
- Stated possible problems because of light manufacturing as well as possible retail and delivery
- There appeared to be room for the delivery truck
- Must enforce no parking on Casa Nova or blocking the street
- Parking appeared to be an issue that needed to be discussed

Ms. Skinner advised that this was a Residential Medium District. She told the Board that printing and manufacturing was not allowed in this district.

Ms. Kelly asked that because different uses of the building had come to light, would this require further review from the staff.

Ms. Skinner advised that the applicant should come to the Friday review to provide more details of how they propose to use the building to determine if it would still come under an office use as defined by the zoning code.

Ms. Johns asked the applicant if they would like to ask for a continuance, and the response was affirmative.

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to CONTINUE application PZB2026-0030 the May 5, 2026 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Davis.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Conservation Zone Development

7. (a) PZB2026-0010 – Frederic Depuydt c/o Atlantic Property Builders LLC – Applicant Integrated Property Holdings Inc – Owner E. Park Avenue / PID 152400-2030

To approve the removal of significant trees within Conservation Overlay Zone 3.

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 3.

Frederic Depuydt reviewed the application

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

Ms. Johns reviewed the certified notice responses and emails for the application.

Public hearing was opened.

Ruby Railey had two concerns, the first one was the safety in the area as the trees were being taken down and also thought that the trees had been damaged purposely so that they could be removed.

Kelsey May questioned the method used by the construction company. She wanted to know if there was a fee structure for companies that removed trees without approval.

Debbie Wiles was concerned with the safety practices of the contractor.

Tawny Kern said that the company was working in the dark and one tree was not savable. She told the board that there was a large oak that needed to be saved. She thought there would be habitat loss and noise pollution.

Gina Burrell, a member of the street tree advisory committee, expressed confusion that the city was planting trees everywhere and yet others were taking down significant trees.

BJ Kalaidi said if there were any dollars for mitigation, the money should go to the Fullerwood area as this was where the tree had been removed.

Sueann Webber thought that one of the trees could be revived. She said that the removal of the trees was a disservice to the previous owner of the property.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Depuydt provided his rebuttal.

The Board discussed

Ms. Kelly said that developers did not understand that tree roots assisted with reducing flooding. She did not want to see the area become an area that was clear cut in order to build new structures.

Ms. Tucker confirmed with staff that there was a twenty-foot setback requirement for the front yard. She thought that reducing the front yard setback would allow for the tree to be saved. She confirmed that the building would be on stem wall construction.

Mr. Davis agreed that changing the setback requirement would be a good option. He referenced the arborist report stating that

tree number two could be retained if the grade was not altered significantly.

Ms. Lopez advised that there needed to be reasonable economic use of the property available to the property owner.

Mr. Pappas pointed out that this property backed up to a conservation area that the city had recently purchased. He felt that moving the house closer to the street would not adversely affect the streetscape.

Ms. Tucker asked if the applicant had enough tree credits and confirmed that they would need to add some; however, if the trees at the rear of the property were saved, there would be enough tree credits.

Ms. Lopez said that a motion could grant the removal of one tree and not the other.

Ms. Tucker preferred changing the setback to save one tree and approve the removal of only one tree.

MOTION

Ms. Johns MOVED to CONTINUE application PZB2026-0010 to the May 5, 2026 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Kelly.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

7. (b) PZB2026-0019 – James Lee c/o J Lee Construction LLC – Applicant
Renato Sindjic – Owner
73 Magnolia

To approve the removal of a significant tree within Conservation Overlay Zones 2 & 3.

¹ Recess 2:56 – 3:09 p.m.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said review of Sec. 11-29 is the responsibility of the PZB for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zone 3. This application includes a request to remove a significant tree at 73 Magnolia Avenue / PID 154300-0000.

James Lee reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

10 certified notices were sent, 3 were returned in favor, 0 returned opposed and 2 had comments.

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

The Board discussed

- Based on the arborist report the tree should be removed
 - The tree was too close to the house
- The tree was a risk to the safety of the structure on the property

MOTION

Ms. Tucker MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2026-0019 for the removal of a significant tree within Conservation Overlay Zone 3. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**7. (c) PZB2026-0020 – Craig Marlowe – Applicant & Owner
E San Carlos Ave / PID 192035-0050**

To approve the construction of a dock 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 Zones 1 & 2.

Ryan Carter reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

Ms. Lopez asked for clarification of one of the illustrations containing the riparian lines.

Brian Sparr was sworn in for the record to discuss the riparian line issue with the city. He explained how the outcome of the litigation had determined the position of the dock.

Ms. Lopez explained the settlement agreement, giving the boundaries of the docks in the area orientation in relation to the riparian line. She advised that from the city's perspective, the alignment was fine.

Mr. Pappas said that he would prefer to have information from the Public Works Department.

18 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 discussed

Mr. Blow said that the applicant needed to establish the actual city right of way at the corners of the proposed dock to eliminate any confusion going forward

Mr. Carter agreed and would accept a condition to have a professional survey completed and recorded.

MOTION

Mr. Davis MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2026-0020 to construct a dock within Conservation Overlay Zones

1 & 2 at E. San Carlos Avenue because it met the requirements; public works approval for the pipe location would be provided and a survey to denote the corners of the dock as well as an as-built rendering would also be provided. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (d) PZB2026-0027 – Chistina Evans c/o Gulfstream Design Group, LLC – Applicant
William Lazar c/o St. Johns Housing Partnership, Inc. – Owner
5 N Whitney Street

To approve the removal of significant trees within Conservation Overlay Zone 3.

This application requested a CONTINUANCE to the May 5, 2006 meeting. See item four.

7. (e) PZB2026-0031 – Matthew H. Lahti, P.E. c/o Gulfstream Design Group, LLC – Applicant
City of St. Augustine – Owner
500 Anastasia Boulevard

To approve the removal of significant tree within Conservation Overlay Zone 3.

This application requested a CONTINUANCE to the May 5, 2026 meeting. See item four.

7. (f) PZB2026-0023 – Ryan Carter c/o Carter Environmental Services – Applicant
Richard and Tracey Hardy – Owner
117 Inlet Drive

To approve the modification of an existing dock 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 Zones 1 & 2.

Ryan Carter reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

20 certified notices were sent, 5 were returned in favor, 0 returned opposed and 2 had comments.

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

There was consensus with the board for approval

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2026-0023 a Conservation Overlay Zone Development. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Davis.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Applications Involving Madiera at St. Augustine Phase 3

8. (a) PZB2026-0024 – Ryan Carter c/o Carter Environmental Services – Applicant
Toll Southeast LP Company Inc – Owner
902 Pantano Drive

To approve the removal of significant trees within Conservation Overlay Zones 2 & 3.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said 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 902 Pantano Drive / PID 073433-1070.

Because the application is missing pertinent information Staff recommends CONTINUATION for additional information or reconsideration or DENIAL of the application if the Board finds they do not have sufficient information to review the application.

The applicant should provide the following information:

- The tree mitigation plan should include all easements including utility, drainage, and conservation easements so that the Board can accurately determine if the structure can be moved to save trees.
- An arborist report so that the Board can assess the health and condition of the trees to make accurate determination on the value of retaining (Sec. 11-29 (d)(1)(a)).
- Lot grading plan with limits of fill and tree protection measures.

Ryan Carter and Nate Bydell reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

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

The Board discussed

- This application was before the board because the owner wanted to add a pool and this would require the removal of nine additional trees
- It did not appear that there was any other way to position the house and the pool
- This application had positive tree credits

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2026-0024 for the removal of nine additional trees. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Johns.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (b) PZB2026-0028 – Ryan Carter c/o Carter Environmental Services – Applicant Toll Southeast LP Company Inc – Owner 1017 Pantano Drive

To approve the removal of significant trees within Conservation Overlay Zone 3.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said 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 1017 Pantano Drive / PID 073433-1160.

Because the application is missing pertinent information staff recommends CONTINUATION for additional information or RECONSIDERATION or DENIAL of the application if the Board finds they do not have sufficient information to review the application.

The applicant should provide the following information:

- The tree mitigation plan should include all easements including utility, drainage, and conservation easements so that the Board can accurately determine if the structure can be moved to save trees
- An arborist report so that the Board can assess the health and condition of the trees to make accurate determination on the value of retaining (Sec. 11-29) (d)(1)(a).

- Lot grading plan with limits of fill and tree protection measures.

Ryan Carter reviewed the application

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

3 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

Mr. Davis asked if there was any way to save the large oak at the front of the property. He said he had no problem with the application as presented, but if possible, he would like to save that tree.

Mr. Bydell confirmed that he was able to submit lot grading plans as well as a tree removal at the same time.

MOTION

Mr. Davis MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2026-0028 for the removal of significant trees in Conservation Overlay Zone 3 for 1017 Pantano Drive as presented, with a caveat that if it is possible to move the house back from the front property line to save the 38-inch Live Oak, which would include removing the 11-inch SPN, the 11-inch CED, the 8-inch CED and the 15-inch CED in the back of the house. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Land Use Plan Amendment & Rezoning

9. (a) PZB2026-0032 – Huyen Le – Applicant c/o Me Lieu Property Management

Huyen Le – Owner

19 E San Carlos Avenue / PID 191730-0000

To recommend a future land use plan map amendment to change the future land use from Residential Low Density to Residential Medium Density and a compatible rezoning from Residential Single Family-One (RS-1) to Residential General-One (RG-1).

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said review of Sec. 28-30 is used to determine whether to make a positive recommendation to the city commission to both amend the city's land use plan map from Residential Low Density to Residential Medium Density and rezone the property from Residential Single-Family-One: RS-1 to Residential General-One: RG-1. This review is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board.

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 use is not permitted within the RS-1 zoning district, the current zoning designation for 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.

Huyen Le reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

Public hearing was opened.

Melinda Raconcaj said that this request was more intense and would cause there to be an island in the middle of residential areas. She said that the parking lot was also zoned RS-1. She pointed out that once a property was upzoned it could not be downzoned in the future. She said that there was no justification for the rezoning request. She asked for a denial for both requests.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed

- Agreed with Ms. Raconcaj's analysis
- Saw no justification for this change in zoning
- This was not contiguous with similar zoning and would represent a spot zone
- The RG-1 requirements for lot size was a minimum of 5,450 square feet this lot was only 3,875 square feet, indicating the lot was not big enough to qualify for RG-1.

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to DENY application PZB2026-0032 for both the zoning and land use because the lot size did not meet RG-1 zoning, would not be contiguous to any RG-1 zoning, the land use would intensify the current use, therefore it was not consistent with the city's goal of preserving a sense of place. This was also not consistent with the city's comprehensive plan to change from the least intense to more intense. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Tucker.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. Other Business

² Transcribed by Michele Fudo

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to NOMINATE Ms. Johns for chairperson The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow; and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to NOMINATE Mr. Pappas for vice chair. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Davis and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

11. Adjournment

Having no further business, Ms. Johns adjourned the meeting at 4:26 P.M.²



Susan Johns, Vice - Chairperson