

**CITY OF APALACHICOLA**  
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING

Monday, February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2026

**City Meeting Room – 74 6<sup>th</sup> Street**

Minutes

**Attendance: Joe Taylor, Elizabeth Milliken, Greg Golgowski, Lee McLemore, Jim Bachrach**

**Regular Meeting: 6:00 PM**

1. Approval of January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2026 meeting minutes.
  - a. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Lee McLemore – all in favor, motion carried.
2. Review, Discussion and Decision for Fence. (R-2) @ 278 Prado Street. Block E Unit 5 of Palmer Pointe. Owner: Marie Garrett; Contractor: All Pro Fence + Deck LLC.
  - a. Marie Garrett, Owner – Present. No comment or questions from the Board.
  - b. Greg Golgowski asked the City Planner if the proposed fence was consistent with existing neighboring fences. City Planner confirmed it was.
  - c. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Elizabeth Milliken – all in favor, motion carried.
3. Review, Discussion and Decision for Accessory Structure & Alteration / Renovation. (R-1) @ 36 Myrtle Avenue. Block 8 Neels Adn South Part Lots 7-10. Owner: Jerry Hood; Contractor: Self.
  - a. Jerry Hood, Owner – Present. No comment or questions from the Board.
  - b. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Lee McLemore – all in favor, motion carried.
4. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness, New Residential Construction & Accessory Structure. (R-1) @104 9<sup>th</sup> Street. Block 70 Lot 1. Owners: Stephen and Betty Bailey; Contractor: Construct Group SE Inc.

- a. Glen Coxwell, Contractor – Present on behalf of owners. Asked the Board why it was permissible for other citizens to bring comments on an application right before the meeting, without time for Staff or the Applicant to review.
  - i. City Attorney explained that the monthly Planning and Zoning Board Meeting is the appropriate forum to raise concerns about an application. Staff would review the comments and present a revised motion pursuant to that review.
  - ii. Jim Bachrach also stated that ideally additional material or concerns would be presented or raised earlier than the day of the meeting, but this cannot be guaranteed.
- b. Dennis Winterringer, Attendee – Presented a list of comments to the Board, summarized as follows:
  - i. A protected sabal palm on the southeast corner of the lot, near the intersection of Avenue F and 9<sup>th</sup> Street.
  - ii. Proposed concrete driveway would unnecessarily increase runoff from the lot. It should be permeable or semi-permeable material instead.
    - 1. Contractor clarified that the area of the driveway was not included in the impervious surface calculation.
  - iii. The covered porch on the Avenue F side of the property encroaches 2 ft into the front setback and must be reduced to meet the 15 ft front setback.
  - iv. The front porch steps on the 9<sup>th</sup> Street side encroach into the front setbacks 13 or 14 ft.
    - 1. City Planner stated that setbacks are measured from the vertical support of the covered roof per the definition of building line. Uncovered stairs may therefore extend into setbacks.
  - v. The Board should review the floodplain management permit and FDEP permit.

1. City Attorney stated that the Floodplain Administrator issues floodplain management permits and reviews applications for compliance with Section 115-2 of the City's Land Development Code.
  2. Greg Golgowski asked if there was an exemption from stormwater calculations for single-family homes, as other jurisdictions have.
    - a. Jim Bachrach stated that the City's requirements are stricter than the State's.
  3. Elizabeth Milliken stated that past problems with fill and flooding on adjacent properties have been caused by single-family homes.
    - a. Chair Joe Taylor noted that this was before the City hired a Floodplain Administrator.
- vi. The building height is very close to 35 ft, based on the front elevation.
1. City Planner stated that the Contractor provided an estimate of 25 to 27 ft from calculations he received from his draftsman.
  2. Contractor also clarified that Owners' intent is to minimize the height of the piers; the 9 ft measured indicated in the front elevation will be revised. Instead, the piers will be no more than 4 or 5 ft. The total height will be less than 35 ft.
    - a. Elizabeth Milliken stated that the Board is deciding based on the information presented in the agenda, which indicates the piers will be 9 ft.
- vii. The proposed structure is not visually compatible with the surrounding area, largely due to the height.
- c. Matt Tucker, Neighbor – Raised concern with the scale and mass of the proposed structure in comparison with his smaller 850 square foot home built in 1935, 106 9<sup>th</sup> Street. Both the size and height of the proposed

structure are disproportionate with the surrounding homes. Additionally, authorization was still needed from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

- i. City Attorney stated that the City cannot condition processing or approval of a development permit on an applicant obtaining a state or federal permit, according to State law.
- d. Elaina Tucker, Neighbor – Stated that while clearing the lot, heavy equipment entered onto her property, 106 9<sup>th</sup> Street. Additional concerns included increased energy costs for her home due to the clearing of the subject property and the lack of a mitigation plan to address the construction nuisance (e.g., noise, vibrations, etc.). The latter point is especially important because she works fully remotely, from home.
  - i. The Board recommended that Owners at 104 9<sup>th</sup> and 106 9<sup>th</sup> Street should discuss these concerns with each other, or with the Contractor.
- e. City Planner summarized potential motion for conditional approval, on the following four conditions:
  - i. Verify the location of the Sabal Palm. If on the subject property, a tree permit is required for removal.
  - ii. Revise impervious surface calculations to include the concrete driveway. Maximum permitted is 2,400 square feet. Alternatively, opt for a pervious driveway.
    1. Greg Gologowski asked the Contractor if consideration had been made to accessing the subject property from the alley side. This had not been considered.
  - iii. Reduce the size of the covered porch on the Avenue F side to meet the minimum 15 ft front setback.
  - iv. Affirm the building height will not exceed 35 ft. Alternatively, less than 28 ft for the Certificate of Appropriateness.
    1. Contractor noted that the Owners may also be willing to lower the pitch of the roof.

- f. Chair Joe Taylor asked Lee McLemore to share his input on the discussion. He stated that because there are so many variables needing to be addressed, it would be best for the Contract and the Owners to come back with a revised application.
    - i. Elizabeth Milliken stated that she agreed.
  - g. Motion to table this item to the March 9<sup>th</sup> meeting to allow for revisions to the application by Greg Gologowski; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Jim Bachrach – all in favor, motion carried.
5. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness & Alteration / Renovation. R-1 @ 96 Avenue D. Block 29 ½ Lot 6. Owners: Christopher and Sabrina Fornes; Contractor: Evergreen Construction of North Florida.
- a. LaRaela Lee-Coxwell, Contractor – Present on behalf of owners. Noted that the screened in porch will be closed in. Additionally, the replacement siding, trim, roof, etc. will all match the existing to maintain the appearance of the structure. Wood siding will be used.
  - b. Motion to approve by Greg Gologowski; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Lee McLemore – all in favor, motion carried.
6. Review, Discussion and Decision for New Residential Construction & Accessory Structure. R-2 @ 260 6<sup>th</sup> Street. Block 174 Lot 5. Owner: Thomas Griffith; Contractor: Self.
- a. City Planner explained the Owner had a schedule conflict and could not attend the meeting.
  - b. Greg Gologowski asked if the impervious surface calculations included the proposed driveway. City Planner stated that the driveway will be a mix of gravel and sand, so it was not included in the calculation.
  - c. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Greg Gologowski – all in favor, motion carried.

**Other/New Business:**

1. Select a new vice-chairperson from the regular board members; the vice-chair presides if the chairperson is unable to attend.
  - a. Motion to elect Jim Bachrach as the new vice-chairperson by Elizabeth Milliken; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Lee McLemore. All in favor – motion carried.

**Outstanding/Unresolved Issues:**

N/A

**Motion to adjourn the meeting by Lee McLemore; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Elizabeth Milliken. All in favor – meeting adjourned at 7:46 P.M.**