



CITY OF  
**ST. AUGUSTINE**  
EST. 1565

## CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE CORRIDOR REVIEW COMMITTEE

### A G E N D A - \*AMENDED

THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 2022 - 2:00 PM

ALCAZAR ROOM - 75 KING STREET

---

1. Roll Call
2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes – March 3, 2022
4. Modification and Approval of Agenda
5. New Business – None
6. Other Business\*
  - a. Election of Board Chair and Vice Chair
  - b. Overview of how the CRC fits into the work of the Planning & Building Department\*
7. Adjournment

**Notices:**

In accordance with Florida Statute 286.0105: “If any person decides to appeal any decision made by the Corridor Review Committee 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 three business days prior to the proceeding at the address given on the notice. Telephone 904-825-1007; 1-800-955-8771 (TDB) or 1-800-955-8770 (V) via Florida Relay Services.

*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  
March 3, 2022

The Corridor Review Committee met in formal session at 2:03 P.M., Thursday, March 3, 2022, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Michael Dixon, Chair, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

**1. ROLL CALL:** Michael Dixon, Chair  
Lorna McDonald, Vice-Chair, arrived at 2:27 p.m.  
Vaughn Cochran

City Staff: Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Officer  
Candice Seymour, Historic Preservation Planner  
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney  
Amy Skinner, Director, Planning and Building  
Elyse Wiemann, Recording Secretary

---

**2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda**

(None)

**3. Approval of Minutes**

**MOTION**

Mr. Cochran **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the November 10,2021, meeting minutes as presented. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Dixon and **APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.**

**4. Modification and approval of Agenda**

Mr. Dixon announced the next meeting would be April 7, 2022.

**MOTION**

Mr. Cochran **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the modifications to the Agenda. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Dixon and **APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.**

**5. New Business**

**5. (a)HP2022-0007- Argyle Forrest Blvd., LLC, Applicant & Owner 24 & 26 Palmetto Avenue**

**To construct a new two-story mixed-use commercial and residential development on two vacant lots along the Anastasia Boulevard Entry Corridor to include any associated modifications to the Standards.**

Ms. Seymour 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 **APPROVE** the modifications requested by the applicant and identified by staff if the CRC can make the following finding for each modification under the review criteria in section 3.7.5:

Strict application of the Standards is not warranted and granting a modification will fulfill the intent of the standards. Staff is not clear on the expectations for justifying this Criteria and seeks the direction of the CRC. Staff has found the following criteria to be justified with the above finding by the CRC:

a. The Modifications are not prohibited types of modification listed in Section 3.7.4.

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

c. The Modifications will not have a material negative impact on adjacent uses, or the can applicant propose to mitigate the negative impact to be created by the modification.

Based on a review of the Anastasia Boulevard Design Standards for Entry Corridors and without evidence to the contrary the CRC may APPROVE the proposed design if the CRC finds the design 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 with the following conditions:

a. Modifications as requested by the applicant or detailed by staff are approved by the CRC

b. The variance for the window along Busam Street is moving forward to the PZB or the applicant has adjusted the plans for approval of a modification at this hearing.

c. Alterations are made to the proposed solid waste screening wall to meet requirements.

d. 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.

Elijah George and Brian Lathrop reviewed the application.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Cochran asked if an arborist had reviewed the footers?

Mr. George replied the footer layouts had not been reviewed; however, they were staying away from the tree as the health and longevity of the tree was most important for this project.

Mr. Dixon asked if the City had an arborist on staff.

Ms. Lopez stated the City was able to retain professional arborist on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Dixon felt it was a great presentation and it had been explained clearly. He said this was a unique situation as it was both commercial and residential.

<sup>1</sup> Photos of materials attached to packet

Mr. Cochran asked about access into the mechanical area.

Mr. George replied access would be on the east side by a gate not visible from either street

Public hearing was opened.

Charles Pappas said he was not concerned with having doors on the Boulevard but with how the building interacted with the street and the sidewalk. He thought the stairway was narrow and uninviting.

Mr. Dixon agreed that the front stairs could be angled to be more inviting for pedestrians.

Public hearing was closed.

Staff did not receive any letters or emails regarding the project.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Board Discussion:

- Entry way off Anastasia Boulevard could be wider and more inviting
- Felt the front door made sense
- Flaring the wall or adding an angle on the south end
- Good to have the two buildings separate and using the tree as a focal point
- Access to the doors were on decks and water could drain
- Most pedestrian traffic would come from the parking lot
- Windows on the south side had been remedied
- Agreed to expanding the entrance at the stairs to be more inviting
- Signage was undetermined but would follow guidelines

Ms. Seymour clarified the width of the stair's dimensions with the Board.

Mr. Dixon said he thought it would be best to do the same width and create a forty-five-degree angle off the top of the step to the south.

Mr. George asked if it need to be an additional thirty to forty-six inches at the bottom and a similar height at the top. He said currently it was eight feet.

Mr. Dixon said he wanted it to be around ten feet or whatever forty-five-degrees would make it and just on the one side as the other side led into the ramp.

Mr. George agreed they would be open to the modification.

Ms. Seymour said the focus was on what the Board was approving the modifications, design approval, and if the applicant addressed everything that needed to be dealt with. She said staff recommended the dumpster enclosure in the rear parking lot be adjusted as there were specific dimensions required.

Mr. Dixon said the dumpster requirements would be reviewed by Building department.

Mr. George indicated the opening would be seven foot and would abide with the overall requirements. He said they would not be requesting a variance for the enclosure.

Ms. Seymour indicated the visibility triangles were updated in the applicant's plans. She informed the Board about the visibility triangles on the corners of the rights-of-way and the applicant had to be out of those for driver visibility.

Ms. Seymour discussed the modifications with the Board and asked if the photos provided of the view shed were substantial enough for the Board to consider approval. There was Board consensus that the photos provided were substantial enough for approval.

Ms. Seymour said the applicant had adjusted the setbacks and heights a little bit, but a plan shown to staff had the building height that was in the setback was taller than allowed. She said it was in the range the Board could approve as a modification.

Mr. Dixon said the modification would be a lower sloped roof and right now it was one to twelve and he was not in favor of lowering the roof.

There was Board consensus to keep the roof at twenty-seven and half feet tall.

Ms. Seymour stated the Board heard the justification for the building entrances and was that sufficient for the Board.

Mr. Dixon said he appreciated the justification and the design as it was a unique situation and it took advantage of the beautiful tree.

Ms. Seymour said the mechanical equipment was addressed and the glazing along the Busam Street had been adjusted to be within the allowed modifications.

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Cochran MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0007 to adopt the design and modification as presented with the addition of a modified front staircase and adopt the finding and conditions in the staff report. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. McDonald.**

#### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: Cochran, McDonald, Dixon**

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**5. (b) HP2022-0006 – Lion Gate of St. Augustine, LLC– Applicant & Owner West King Street (PID:1124300000 & 1124200000)**

**To construct a new two-story residential development on two vacant lots along the**

#### **King Street Entry Corridor, to include any associated modifications to the Standards.**

Ms. Courtney 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 take the following actions regarding the Design Review Application for West King Street (PID:1124300000 & 1124200000):

1. The CRC may APPROVE the modifications requested by the applicant and identified by staff if the CRC can make the following finding for each modification under the review criteria in section 3.7.5: Strict application of the Standards is not warranted and granting a modification will fulfill the intent of the standards. Staff is not clear on the expectations for justifying this Criteria and seeks the direction of the CRC. Staff has found the following criteria to be justified with the above finding by the CRC:

a. The Modifications are not prohibited types of modification listed in Section 3.7.4.

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

c. The Modifications will not have a material negative impact on adjacent uses, or the can applicant propose to mitigate the negative impact to be created by the modification.

2. The CRC may APPROVE the proposed design if the CRC finds the design is consistent with the review criteria in section 3.3.2:

a. The proposed project meets the intent of the King Street 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 with the following conditions:

a. Modifications as requested by the applicant or detailed by staff are approved by the CRC

b. Alterations are made to the proposed solid waste screening wall to meet 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 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.

3. 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.

Elijah George and Les Thomas reviewed the application

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

Staff did not receive any letters or emails regarding the project.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

The Board discussed:

- Air conditioning units were similar to those in a hotel
- No screening in front of them but would not stand out
- Understood not having front doors opening to the corridor, even though it was against the standards it made sense
- Was a unique use for the property and was needed in the area
- Guidelines were for commercial property and this was residential
- Applicant would comply with the landscaping requirements
- Landscaping was podocarpus hedge on the side
- Buffer would have more native landscaping
- Back landscaping would be magnolia trees to help with train noise

Ms. Lopez reviewed what the staff was looking for in terms of a motion if the Board felt the applicant had met the requirements. She said they would be approving the design and modifications as presented and adoption of the findings and conditions in the staff report.

#### **MOTION**

**Ms. McDonald MOVED to APPROVE application 2022-0006 adopt the design and modifications as presented and adopt the finding and conditions in the staff report. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Cochran.**

#### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: McDonald, Cochran, Dixon**

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **6. Other Business**

**(None)**

**7. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 P.M.<sup>2</sup>

DRAFT

---

<sup>2</sup> Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann