CITY OF APALACHICOLA

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD

REGULAR MEETING

Monday, June 8th, 2026

City Meeting Room – 74 6th Street

Minutes

Attendance: Joe Taylor, Jim Bachrach, Greg Golgowski, Elizabeth Milliken, Bobby Miller, Ashley Leonard, alternate (*voting*)

Regular Meeting: 6:00 PM

1. Approval of May 11th, 2026 regular meeting minutes.
    a. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2nd by Greg Golgowksi – all in favor, motion carried.
2. Review, Discussion and Decision for Accessory Structure. **(R-3) @ 280 24th Avenue**. Block 232 Lots 1-3. Owner: Tomas Juan; Contractor: Self / TBD.
    a. Tomas Juan, Owner – Present. In response to a question from Greg Golgowski, stated that he was not sure of the spacing between the deck boards. Planner explained that 1/8-inch spacing allows an additional 10% maximum impervious surface on the property. Owner further clarified that there is an existing porch in poor condition in the same location, that will be removed and replaced.
    b. Motion to approve by Bobby Miller; 2nd by Elizabeth Milliken – all in favor, motion carried.
3. Review, Discussion and Decision for Accessory Structure. **(R-2) @ 121 Ellis Van Fleet Street**. Block 251. Owners: Melissa Fox & Sean McDermott; Contractor: TideWater Pools & Spas Inc.
    a. Elizabeth Milliken asked for confirmation that the pool would not be located in the front yard. Planner stated that, according to the provided site plan, the pool would be located in the interior side and rear yards.
    b. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2nd by Greg Golgowski – all in favor, motion carried.

4. Review, Discussion and Decision for New Construction (Residential) & Accessory Structure. **(R-1) @ 222 Center Street**. Neels Addition Block 8 North Part Lots 7-8. Owners: Daniel and Mary Lynn Walker; Contractor: America's Home Place.
   a. Daniel and Mary Lynn Walker, Owners – Present. In response to a question from Joe Taylor, stated that the detached garage does not contain any bonus rooms and is intended only to store a golf cart.
   b. Jim Bachrach stated that the property seemed level and not necessarily wet in any specific area. Planner clarified that there are no wetlands on the property, though a portion is in Zone AE and has the potential to flood.
   c. Ashley Leonard stated that the covered porch shown on the site plan was not included in the impervious surface calculation, though even with this addition they do not exceed the maximum permitted impervious surface area. She also requested additional information about the presence of protected trees on the property. Planner stated that the City's Building Department had worked with the Owners to determine the presence or absence of protected trees on the property.
   d. Greg Golgowksi asked if any modifications were made to the stormwater management plan by the Planner. Planner confirmed that no changes were made to the plan following submission by the Owners. Owners confirmed that the red lines on the plan indicate water being diverted to the road rather than the neighbor's property. Owner agreed to modify the plan to direct runoff into rain barrels on equivalent catchment on the property instead.
   e. Motion to approve on the condition that the stormwater management plan be revised to retain runoff on the site and not direct it into the street by Jim Bachrach; 2nd by Bobby Miller – all in favor, motion carried.
5. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness, Alteration / Renovation & New Construction (Commercial). **(C-1) @ 155 Commerce Street**. Block G-1 Lots 12-13. Owner: Waddell Family; Contractor: Galloway Construction Inc.

a. Jim Waddell, Representative – Present. Provided the following contextual information. The property is not owned by the Waddell Family directly, but rather by a nonprofit associated with the family. A 6-month extension on the grant deadline from the Division of Historical Resources was requested and received. The historic use of the building was as a general store selling marine supplies, fresh food, and other goods. The adjacent vacant lot will remain vacant and may be used for outdoor space for the subject property.
    i. Chase Galloway, Contractor – Present. Provided additional information about the grant funding. The funding is to rebuild the structure as it is, with the addition of one new room at the rear.
b. Jim Waddell addressed the stormwater management plan. Many other buildings in the downtown areas have gutters that send water directly into the street. The gravel retention bed proposed on the south side of the property can hold approximately 4" of water. Currently, gutters from the adjacent White Sands property direct water onto the subject property. The intent is to modify the gutter system on both buildings so that they converge into the same downspout and drain onto Commerce Street instead.
    i. Greg Golgowski clarified that the south side of the property drains into the gravel area, and the north side drains into a downspout.
c. Jim Waddell also addressed the parking plan. The parking calculation was not done correctly and should be less than presented on the agenda. The new total number of spaces required should be 13, rather than 19. Up to 8 spaces can be waived using the historic building exception. The remaining 5 would need to be mitigated. The parking plan does not consider space that may be available on the shoulder of the road, or in nearby grassy or unpaved areas. When the original commercial lots downtown were platted, it could not have been imagined nor intended that off-street parking be made available on those lots. Additionally, he believes there is sufficient parking availably on the street and in the nearby city-owned parking lot.

According to his measurement, the city-owned lot is within 500’ of the intersection of Commerce Street and Avenue G. Further, the intent when constructing this lot was to provide overflow parking.

   i. Jim Bachrach clarified that the measurement was taken from the intersection of the two streets, not from the subject lot to the city-owned lot.

      1. Ashley Leonard added that by her measurement, it is around ~568’ from the subject lot to the city-owned lot. She also noted that the city-owned parking lot is always empty.

d. Bobby Miller stated that the principal issue concerns parking. The City has the authority to approve the plan and must do so. P&Z cannot supersede the City on this issue.

e. Joe Taylor suggested that the site plan be modified to include the location of the stools and tables. Ashley Leonard also noted that this would avoid the potential to overestimate the number of bar stools. She also stated that any potential outdoor seating must be accounted for on the site plan and parking plan.

f. Susan Keith, Resident – Present. Stated that the issue of parking has once again come back before the Board. While she appreciates that the Waddell family wants to bring life and activity back to this area, she emphasized the importance of having the exact number of tables, stools, and outdoor seating on the parking plan. Additionally, the Owners must provide documentation the subject property is a historic structure. Finally, she stated that the City should not dedicate 13 street parking spaces to this one establishment, as future businesses wanting to operate in this area may have issues obtaining their own parking.

g. Joe Taylor stated that the parking plan must go before the City Commission for approval, and that parking can be negotiated with the City Commission but not the Planning and Zoning Board. He emphasized that the stormwater issue is not resolved, as the submitted stormwater management plan states that the north half of the building will drain directly into the street.

i. Greg Golgowksi asked if the large gravel bed will provide excess storage of water on the site? Representative stated it would be sufficient, and that based on his experience as an engineer the stormwater runoff provisions of the Land Development Code (LDC) were flawed, especially for commercial lots with 0' lot line setbacks and high impervious surface coverage. Greg Golgowski responded that managing stormwater on small lots like these is very difficult.

ii. Joe Taylor asked if there is an exception from stormwater requirements for historic buildings. Planner responded that the stormwater chapter of the LDC only differentiates between residential and nonresidential uses. There is no exception specifically for historic buildings.

h. Jim Bachrach stated that parking is available in the city-owned lot nearby. Further, the LDC clearly defines standards for parking and stormwater. The Board has always followed what is stated in the Code.

i. Bobby Miller added that conditional approvals have not always worked well for the Board in the past. When there are lots of moving parts, the phrasing of the conditional approval may be subject to criticism. He also raised the potential for the vacant lot at the rear of the subject property to be developed in the future, noting that parking will eventually be required for that property as well.

i. Representative agreed to modify the stormwater management plan to not direct water into the street and retain water on the subject property instead.

j. Elizabeth Milliken noted that new development in this area presents an opportunity for tourists and other visitors to start using the nearby city-owned lot.

k. <u>Motion to approve on the condition that (1) the stormwater management plan be revised to retain runoff on the site and not direct it into the street</u>

and (2) the City Commission approve a parking plan which meets the minimum parking requirements for the proposed use as a restaurant by Jim Bachrach; 2nd by Bobby Miller – all in favor, motion carried.

Other/New Business:

N/A

Outstanding/Unresolved Issues:

1. Update on P&Z Board term length and composition issue following June 2nd City Commission meeting.
   a. Planner explained that no action is needed at this time. The City Commission will hold a workshop on Tuesday, June 16th at 4:00 p.m. to discuss a draft amendment to the Code of Ordinances, Sections 2-38 through 2-48, addressing the Planning and Zoning Board. Attendance of current board members is encouraged, if possible, as the City Commission would like feedback about how any proposed changes may impact the Board.

Motion to adjourn the meeting by Jim Bachrach; 2nd by Greg Golgowski. All in favor – meeting adjourned at 7:24 p.m.