

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Planning and Zoning Board Regular Meeting
May 5, 2026

The Planning and Zoning Board met in formal session Tuesday, May 5, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. in the Alcazar Room at City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Susan Johns, Chairperson, and the following were present:

- 1. Roll Call:** Susan Johns, Chairperson
 Charles Pappas, Vice- Chairperson
 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 APPROVED the April 7, 2026 regular meeting minutes with the following change: remove Ashleigh Barnes as Chairperson opening the meeting and add Susan Johns as opening the meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and Approval of Agenda

Item 7.b PZB 2026-0027 5 N. Whitney Street was withdrawn by the applicant.

Item 7.c PZB 2026-0031 500 Anastasia Boulevard was continued at the request of the applicant to the June 2, 2026 meeting.

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE the Agenda with the following modifications: item 7.b PZB 2026-0057 5 N. Whitney Street was withdrawn by the applicant and item 7.c PZB 2026-0031 500 Anastasia Boulevard was continued to the June 2, 2026 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Johns.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES:

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Variance

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

Continued from the April 7, 2026 Regular Meeting

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 APPROVE as variance criteria is met for a request to increase the allowable lot coverage for an accessory structure.

Scott Ross reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

The Board discussed:

- the application had been revised to reduce the size of the carport to match the size of the RV
- The neighbors supported the project
- This was a small increase in the lot coverage
- The applicant had done a good job revisiting the criteria
- confirmed the height would be thirteen feet to the eaves

MOTION

Ms. Tucker **MOVED** to **APPROVE** application PZB2026-0018 to increase the lot coverage from twenty-five percent to twenty-six-point one percent. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Pappas, adding that the disadvantage was due to the building date of the home and the zoning laws that were written much later.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Use by Exception

**6. (a) PZB2026-0030 – Greg Charalambous c/o Runny Ink Printing – Applicant
Thompson Bros Realty Inc – Owner
1095 Anastasia Boulevard
Continued from the April 7, 2026 Regular Meeting**

To approve a use by exception of 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 request for a professional and business office located at 1095 Anastasia Boulevard.

Greg Charalambous reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

The Board discussed:

- Recommended that all the items listed in the staff report be included in the motion i.e. printer size, locked doors, no public access, etc.
- There was ample parking at the site
- Any change in the volume of the business would have to be reviewed
- All deliveries would be made on Casa Nova

MOTION

Mr. Davis **MOVED** to **APPROVE** application PZB2026-0030 at 1095 Anastasia Boulevard for the Use by Exception for professional and business office with the following conditions: the

business would be operated by one employee; the office would be locked; all client meetings would be by appointment; deliveries would be made on the Casa Nova parking area. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Ms. Lopez advised all present about the email problem requesting high permitting fees and told everyone to ignore them.

**6. (b) PZB2026-0033 – Lamanda Sears – Applicant & Owner
70 Abbott Street**

To approve a use by exception for off-site parking within the Municipal Parking Garage and off-site parking within a private facility.

Ms. Thompson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may **APPROVE** a use by exception request for one (1) municipal garage parking permit at 70 Abbott Street / PID 194985-0100 to satisfy the requirements of Sec. 28-151.

In the event this request is approved by the Board, staff also recommend the following conditions:

1. Approval of this use by exception is contingent upon providing proof of one municipal garage parking permit at the time of vacation rental registration.

2. When registering the short-term rentals at 70 Abbott Street, proof of purchase of one municipal garage parking permit for the duration of the vacation rental registration period is to be provided to the Code Enforcement Division

Lamanda Sears reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

24 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:

- Confirmed that all requests for off-site parking had been verbal in nature
- The applicant had been unable to procure any off-site parking
- Was there a requirement to find off-site parking

Ms. Lopez advised that there were no requirements for off-site parking, however, there needed to be evidence presented that showed efforts had been made to obtain it.

Mr. Pappas thought this unit was close enough to the garage to be feasible. He asked staff if there were any special rules or regulations for parking during the Nights of Lights season.

Ms. Lopez advised that there was a process to request parking on the street in that area during the Nights of Lights season.

Ms. Kelly confirmed the Air B&B had been in operation for approximately one month and tenants were parking on the street for now.

Mr. Blow suggested requiring the advertisements to specifically state that parking was not guaranteed.

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2026-0033 with the stipulation that all advertising state that parking was located off-site in the parking garage. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Davis.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Conservation Overlay 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**

Continued from the April 7, 2026 Regular Meeting

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.

Obioma Esomonu reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

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

The Board discussed

- The drawing in the packet did not show the updated position of the proposed building
- The current drawing was presented for the board to view
- Confirmed that the new position had moved the building to fifteen feet from the property line
- Confirmed that the new building would have the same footprint of the new construction on the adjacent property

- Questioned the removal of one of the branches on the oak in the back of the property

Austin Spivey, the arborist, was sworn in for the record. He advised that there was no way to build any home on the lot without removing the limb on the oak tree. He explained the process required to remove the limb and save the tree

Mr. Blow asked about any follow-up activities.

Mr. Spivey advised the board what would be done to assist the tree in a quick recovery, including a deep root treatment after the root pruning.

Mr. Pappas asked if the tree ultimately dies, should some type of mitigation be placed in the motion to be sure that the tree would be replaced. He confirmed the cut was based on the new location of the house and there would be only one cut. He did not agree that the cut should be made in the place suggested by the arborist.

Ms. Kelly confirmed that the construction equipment would enter at the back of the property. She confirmed that the limb proposed for removal extended to the west and because this was a two-story home, it would have to be removed.

Mr. Spivey explained the root protection process and pruning.

Mr. Esomonu explained the problems with the previously constructed home regarding the removal of trees that had not been approved and he advised the board that he was no longer using the same contractor.

Ms. Tucker asked if removing the large limb would make the tree unbalanced or unstable. She confirmed that the canopy reduction would be about fifteen percent on the west side. She also confirmed that there would be fill used to bring the garage to the right level, as well as a stem wall and fill in the front;

however, no fill would be used at the rear of the property unless there was a requirement to do so.

Mr. Davis thought cutting the limb now would be the best thing for the tree as the insurance company would come in later and have the owner remove it. He asked staff if verification of the soil treatment could be required prior to issuing a Certificate of Occupancy. He suggested that the landscape plan included the treatment of the tree in writing. He wanted to be sure that the front setback of fifteen feet was clearly marked and wanted confirmation that there would be no fill necessary at the back of the property.

MOTION

Mr. Davis MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2026-0010 E. Park Avenue for the removal of a significant tree in Conservation Overlay Zone 3 with the following conditions: that everything listed in the arborist report from April 13, 2026 had to be listed on the landscape plan and must be done prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy and the applicant would provide the information, pictures and invoices, to satisfy staff that work had been completed; also a plan that showed the front setback was fifteen feet and the rear of the house had been moved forward accordingly; no fill at the rear of the property or around the tree and a licensed arborist was on staff to complete the work on the tree. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Davis, Pappas, Blow, Tucker, Johns

NAYES: Kelly

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 5/1

7. (b) PZB2026-0027 – Christina Evans, AICP 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 item was withdrawn by the applicant. See item four.

7. (c) 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 trees within Conservation Overlay Zone 3.

This item was continued to the June 2, 2026 meeting, at the request of the applicant. See item four.

7. (d) PZB2026-0035 – Ryan Carter c/o Carter Environmental Services – Applicant
Charles Osborne – Owner
Pelican Reef Drive / PID 158573-0110

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.

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

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

The Board discussed

- Confirmed that the dock was considered an accessory structure and could not be constructed until there was a plan for a house on file
- The dock was extended because of the concern of the shallowness of the water due to sand accumulation
- The change of the ingress egress from the north to the south was related to the proposed pool deck when the house was constructed
- Confirmed that the bulkhead had been built

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2026-0035 for a modification of an earlier permit. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (e) PZB2026-0036 – William Tunstall c/o Tunstall Construction – Applicant Kevin Vandyke – Owner Fancher Court / PID 160660-0120

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

Ms. Thompson 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.

William Tunstall reviewed the application

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

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

The Board discussed

- Site plan appeared to allow for shifting if necessary to save trees
- Some of the trees were in the footprint
- Some of the trees were in decline
- Twenty-five laurel oaks on the north-east corner of the lot, the tree canopy extended behind the house next door, this tree was a significant risk to the construction and was diseased
- Efforts should be made to preserve remaining trees on the property

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2026-0036 as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Land Use Plan Amendment & Rezoning

8. (a) PZB2026-0038 – Kyle Campbell – Applicant Kyle Campbell c/o Dream Wedding Suites LLC – Owner 112 Martin Luther King Avenue

To recommend a future land use plan map amendment to change the future land use from Residential Low Density to Commercial Low Intensity and a compatible rezoning from Residential Single Family-Two (RS-2) to Commercial Low-One (CL-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 map from Residential Low Density to Commercial Low Intensity and rezone the property from Residential Single-Family-Two: RS-2 to Commercial Low-One (CL-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-2 zoning district, the current zoning designation of the property.

2 The positive relationship of the proposed amendment and rezoning 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.

Kyle Campbell reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

Public hearing was opened.

Steve Seibert was opposed to the application because this was a residential area and did not want the change to be made from residential to commercial.

Michelle Blossvik was concerned that the zoning change could cause other issues in the future. She had concerns about the potential parking problems and said that noise could be a problem as well. She did not think that the outdoor seating was realistic

and was fairly certain the building was not ADA compliant.

Melinda Raconcaj said that this was another case of upzoning and the city needed to send a message that there would no changes to upzone any property. She pointed out that the proposed address was surrounded by single-family homes and no hardship had been presented. She said that there were other areas in Lincolnville that would allow a juice bar. She asked the board to deny the application.

Mr. Campbell provided his rebuttal.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed

- Cannot support changing the zoning when nothing around the area matches the requested zoning.
- Zoning was forever and any future owners could have a lot of flexibility because of the CL-1 zoning
- The ideas were excellent; however, could not support the requested rezoning
- This property had an historical marker in front of it and a zoning change would be detrimental to the area
- Felt that this would change the feeling in the area and any future owner could change the business model causing problems

Ms. Lopez advised the board that there were two distinct steps; first the future land use map amendment which was a legislative decision which would set policy. She said that the second step was the rezoning and would need to have two separate motions.

MOTION

Ms. Kelly presented a motion that bundled the two issues together and was seconded by Mr. Blow; however, Ms. Lopez advised that the Future Land Use Plan Amendment should be done in a separate motion.

Ms. Lopez suggested to the Board that there be a Future Land Use Map recommendation for or against.

Ms. Johns MOVED to RECOMMEND DENIAL for application PZB2026-0038 a future land use plan map amendment to change the future land use from Residential Low Density to Commercial Low Intensity. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow.

Mr. Pappas asked if there needed to be a reason attached to the motion.

The motion was amended to include that the requested change to the land use map would be inconsistent with the criteria of policy in the future land use development.

Ms. Johns motion was so amended, and Mr. Blow allowed his second to stand.

Ms. Kelly withdrew her motion.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION

Ms. Kelly MOVED to RECOMMEND A DENIAL application PZB2026-0038 to rezone from Residential Single Family-Two (RS-2) to Commercial Low-One (CL-1) as the rezoning would not be compatible with the neighborhood and there was no other contiguous zoning in the area. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Johns.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Campbell asked what options were available for him and Ms. Lopez recommended that he attend the Friday

Review meeting to determine what was allowed under the current code.

9. Other Business

none

10. Adjournment

Having no further business, Ms. Johns adjourned the meeting at 3:04 P.M.¹

Susan Johns, Chairperson

¹ Transcribed by Michele Fudo