

**CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE**

Corridor Review Committee Meeting  
January 14, 2021

The Corridor Review Committee met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, January 14, 2021, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Michael Dixon, Chairperson, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

**1. ROLL CALL:** Michael Dixon, Chairperson  
Lorna McDonald, Vice-Chair  
Vaughn Cochran

City Staff: Jenny Wolfe, Historic Preservation Officer  
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney  
Candice Seymour, Recording Secretary

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

Heard after Approval of the Minutes.

The Board heard from the following member of the public:

- B.J. Kalaidi

**3. Approval of Minutes**

**MOTION**

Ms. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the November meeting minutes. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Cochran.

**VOTE ON MOTION**

**AYES: MacDonald, Cochran, Dixon**

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**4. Modification and approval of Agenda**

**MOTION**

Ms. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the Agenda as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Cochran.

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: MacDonald, Cochran, Dixon**

**NAYES: NONE**  
**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**5. New Business**

**5. (a) Modification to the Standards F2020-0130**

**Sarah Ryan Architect, LLC – Applicant**  
**Clukey and Tebault LLC – Owner**  
**251 San Marco Avenue**

**Request for a modification to allow removal of a main entrance facing San Marco Avenue which will be replaced with windows.**

Ms. Wolfe read the staff report and said based on a review of the San Marco Avenue Design Standards for Entry Corridors and without evidence to the contrary the CRC may approve the modification if the CRC can make the following finding under the review criteria in section 4.7.5:

- Criteria 1: Strict application of the Standards is not warranted and granting a modification will fulfill the intent of the standards

Sarah Ryan and Michael Clukey gave a brief presentation regarding the subject.<sup>1</sup>  
The Board discussed:

<sup>1</sup> Presentation attached to original minutes

- Reason for the side access was due to a use that catered mostly to customers that would utilize the parking lot to the rear of the structure
- Proposed design was an upgrade to the building

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Charles Pappas noted that a key element of the Corridor Standards was how the building interacted with the neighborhood. He said moving the door to the front would also mitigate interactions between pedestrian and vehicle interaction. He recommended altering the floorplan to allow for a front entrance in conjunction with the proposed side door.

B.J. Kalaidi spoke against the application since the Standards required access from San Marco Avenue. She was concerned that approval of the application would set a precedent.

Public hearing was closed.

Ms. Ryan, in response to public comment, noted that the subject location did not see heavy pedestrian traffic and the use as a professional office building did not cater to pedestrian traffic. She added that she did not wish to put an additional door along the front to prevent entry door confusion.

The Committee discussed:

- Proposed application as an adaptive re-use project
- The design with side-entry made sense in regard to the office use
- Proposed awnings corresponded to the guidelines and helped the scale of the building

- Planters would soften the front
- Recommendation to give more emphasis to side entry of the structure
- Profile and outline of the parapet remained unchanged
- Staff-recommended conditions including planters and a brick pathway to emphasize a path to the entry door

## **MOTION**

**Ms. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application F2020-0130 as presented with planters and brick pavers. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Cochran.**

### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: MacDonald, Cochran, Dixon**

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

## **6. Other Business**

### **6. (a) Approval of 2021 meeting schedule**

Ms. Wolfe reviewed the meetings as being the second Thursday of each month at 2p.m. if there were applications to be heard. She noted there was a conflict to the November 10, 2021 meeting and that date would be changed to a date to be determined.

There was board consensus to approve changes to the meeting schedule.

## **7. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:32 P.M.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Transcribed by Candice Seymour