

**CITY OF APALACHICOLA**  
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING  
Monday, April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2026  
**City Meeting Room – 74 6<sup>th</sup> Street**  
Agenda

**Attendance: Joe Taylor, Jim Bachrach, Greg Gologowski, Lee McLemore, Bobby Miller, Ashley Leonard.**

**Regular Meeting: 6:00 PM**

1. Approval of March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2026 regular meeting minutes.
  - a. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Greg Gologowski – All in favor, motion carried.
2. Review, Discussion and Decision for Accessory Structure. (R-2) @ 170 19th Avenue. Block 247 Lots 1-13 and Lots 29-30. Owner: Edward Pearsall; Contractor: Self.
  - a. Edward Pearsall, Owner – Present. No comment or questions from the Board.
  - b. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Greg Gologowski – all in favor, motion carried.
3. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness & Fence. (R-1) @ 126 Avenue D. Block 43 Lots 4-5. Owner: Conrad Walser; Contractor: Self.
  - a. Conrad Walser and Kathryn Chesser, Owners – Present. Confirmed that the height of the fence would not exceed 6'. As indicated on the survey, the fence will only run through the rear yard.
  - b. Motion to approve by Bobby Miller; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Lee McLemore – all in favor, motion carried.
4. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness & Fence. (R-1) @ 140 Avenue D. Block 48 NW 15' Lot 14 and Lot 15. Owner: John Cooke; Contractor: Self.

- a. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bobby Miller – all in favor, motion carried.
5. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness & Fence. (R-1) @ 179 Avenue F. Block 93 Lots 1-2. Owner: Marjorie Howard; Contractor: Curtis Allen.
  - a. Joseph Howard, Owner's Son – Present. Confirmed to the Board that a new contractor will be hired to resolve all existing issues with the current fence. The Owners are willing to comply with all of the City's requirements and want everything to be done correctly.
  - b. Motion to approve on the conditions that: (1) the fence in the front yard shall not exceed 4' in height; (2) the finished face of the fence shall face the street; (3) the chain link fence shall not be visible from the street; and (4) the fence shall be located entirely on the lot of the owner by Lee McLemore; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bobby Miller – all in favor, motion carried.
6. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness & New Residential Construction. (C-2) @ 190 7<sup>th</sup> Street. Block 170 Lot 3. Owners: Robert and Joyce Hall; Contractor: Hall Contracting and Construction Inc.
  - a. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Lee McLemore – all in favor, motion carried.
7. Review, Discussion and Decision for New Residential Construction (Renewal). (R-2) @ 197 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. Block 263 Lots 16-19. Owners: Ron and Regina Ramfjord; Contractor: Tyler Poloronis.
  - a. Ron and Regina Ramfjord, Owners – Present. Confirmed to the Board that there are no major changes proposed to the site plan. Any changes would be to the interior of the house only. Also confirmed that the front porch will be screened.
  - b. Motion to approve by Bobby Miller; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Jim Bachrach - all in favor, motion carried.
8. Review, Discussion and Decision for New Residential Construction. (R-2) @ 126 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Block 251. Owners: Robert and Andrea Brown; Contractor: Bryce Ward.

- a. Bryce Ward – Contractor. Present. Bobby Miller asked for clarification about the location of the property and Contractor provided more detailed information.
  - b. Greg Golgowski commented that the attached garage sticks out past the front façade of the building. Contractor confirmed that it did.
  - c. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bobby Miller – all in favor, motion carried.
9. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness & Fence. (R-1) @ 112 7<sup>th</sup> Street. Block 60 Lot 3. Owner: Josh Porter; Contractor: NRG Industries.
- a. Dennis Winterringer, Attendee – Presented the following concerns to the Board. There is no approved stormwater management plan. The Owners placed fill on this property without a sealed grading plain or floodplain management permit. The placement of the fill will cause drainage issues because one side of the lot is higher than the other. A drainage ditch may be necessary where the fence is proposed. The Board should not approve this application and should wait for the decision of the Floodplain Administrator.
  - b. Bobby Miller stated that there is no alley on this block, instead there is a drainage ditch.
  - c. Joe Taylor and Jim Bacrach confirmed that the application on the agenda is for the fence, and that the fence meets all the requirements of the Land Development Code.
    - i. Attorney confirmed that the Owners would proceed with construction of the fence at risk, if it turns out drainage or anything else is necessary on the recommendation of the Floodplain Administrator.
  - d. Ashley Leonard asked if the approval could be conditioned on compliance with the Land Development Code. Attorney stated that if there is an issue with compliance, it becomes a Code Enforcement problem. No development would be allowed if out of compliance. Additionally, it is not

necessary to condition approval on compliance with the Code because compliance with the Code is already required. Further, the Attorney stated there is a difference between stormwater standards for residential and nonresidential developments; if the review of the stormwater management plan is more technical in nature than the Board may defer to Staff review and recommendation.

- i. Bobby Miller stated that the Board is not in the business of stormwater engineering.
- e. Greg Golgowski stated that if the current request is approved but the stormwater management plan / floodplain management permit requires alterations to the site plan, the applicant must come back before the Board.
- f. Jim Bachrach questioned on what basis the fence could be denied, as it is unrelated to the stormwater management plan.
- g. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bobby Miller. Following discussion, motion amended to read as follows:
  - i. Motion to table this item until the next meeting the Owners or Contractor can attend by Jim Bachrach; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bobby Miller – all in favor, motion carried.

**10. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness, New Residential Construction, Accessory Structure & Fence. (R-1) 104 9<sup>th</sup> Street. Block 70 Lot 1. Owners: Stephen and Betty Bailey; Contractor: Construct Group SE Inc.**

- a. City Planner summarized changes made to the application following the February meeting.
- b. Stephen and Betty Bailey, Owners – Present. Confirmed that the sabal palm is on their property and that they intend to retain it where it is. Confirmed that the intent with the fill is to level the property. Clarified that the Army Corps permit took a long time to obtain because the property had to be inspected for historical and archaeological resources. None were found.

- c. Glen Coxwell, Contractor – Present. Stated that the purpose of the 3' brick wall is to help mitigate stormwater issues; directional weep holes could be added to the wall to further help with drainage. Additionally, he reaffirmed that all City requirements would be met in addition to those outlined in the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) permit.
- d. Ashley Leonard expressed concern about the requirements of the FDEP and the impact of the brick wall on undisturbed wetlands. City Attorney clarified that the City does not regulate wetlands; if the Owners are found to violate their permit with FDEP, there would be consequences from FDEP.
- e. Tom Brocato – Attendee. Stated that this area has experienced flooding problems for the past 50 years. Further stated that even though vacant properties in this area can hold water, it isn't enough to mitigate flooding problems.
- f. Caroline Widen – Attendee. Explained how the drainage changed after the lot next to hers was cleared for development. As a result, the water backs up into the lot and doesn't drain the way it did before it was cleared. Her concern is that the brick wall will prevent the water from draining and hold it in the lot.
- g. Matt Tucker – Attendee. Stated that allowing fill on this lot will increase the flood risk for the surrounding lots and potentially increase insurance rates accordingly. There are no brick fences or walls in this neighborhood. Additionally, though reduced from the previous meeting the height of the building is still too large compared to the surrounding area.
- h. Dennis Winterringer – Attendee. Presented the following concerns to Board. There are no brick walls in the City, so this proposal would look out of place. Bobby Miller clarified there is a brick wall by the Chapman house. The elevations don't show an enclosure around the bottom of the building; open foundations may be allowed but the Board should require an enclosure. The stormwater management plan is inadequate and the floodplain management permit has not been obtained. The sabal palm

should be relocated out of the path of the brick wall. The concrete apron around the driveway should be removed, as it will result in extra runoff. Permeable pavers or brick would be more suitable.

- i. The Contractor stated that there are houses in the Historic District with brick pilings; brick could be added to the pilings here if required. He also confirmed (1) that weep holes could be built into the brick wall to facilitate the movement of water and drainage of that water and (2) that the brick wall will sit on a concrete footer installed below grade. The brick will not sit on the ground.
- i. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bobby Miller – Lee McLemore opposed, motion carried 5-1.

**Other/New Business:**

N/A

**Outstanding/Unresolved Issues:**

N/A

**Motion to adjourn the meeting by Jim Bachrach; 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bobby Miller.**

**All in favor - meeting adjourned at 7:35 PM.**