

CITY OF APALACHICOLA
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING

Monday, July 13th, 2026

City Meeting Room – 74 6th Street

Minutes

Attendance: Joe Taylor, Jim Bachrach, Lee McLemore, Myrtis Wynn, Elizabeth Milliken, Greg Golgowski, Ashley Leonard, alternate (*non-voting*)

Regular Meeting: 6:00 PM

1. Approval of June 8th, 2026 regular meeting minutes.
 - a. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2nd by Greg Golgowski – all in favor, motion carried.
2. Review, Discussion and Decision for Accessory Structure. (R-1) @ 27 Myrtle Avenue. Neels Addition Block 8 Lot 16. Owners: Al and Donna Ingle; Contractor: Self.
 - a. Al Ingle, Owner – Present. Explained the difference between the required front yard inside versus outside the Historic District
 - b. Greg Golgowski asked whether the two existing structures in this area of the property will be replaced with the new construction. Owner did not clearly confirm whether these structures would stay or be removed.
 - c. Motion to approve by Jim Bacahrach; 2nd by Lee McLemore – all in favor, motion carried.
3. Review, Discussion and Decision for Fence. (R-1) @ 226 Center Street. Neels Addition Block 8 Lot 5 less south 76'. Owner: Emily Spear; Contractor: Self / TBD.
 - a. Emily Spear, Owner – Not present.
 - b. Motion to approve on the condition that any fencing running past the front façade of the house must not exceed 4' in height and must use the same material as the existing fence by Greg Golgowski; 2nd by Jim Bachrach – all in favor, motion carried.

4. Review, Discussion and Decision for Fence. **(R-2) @ 224 17th Street**. Block 123 Lot. Owner: Carolina Narine; Contractor: Big Scrimpin'.
 - a. Owner, Carolina Narine – Present. No comment or questions for the Board. Contractor also present, no comment or questions for the Board.
 - b. Motion to approve by Jim Bachrach; 2nd by Lee McLemore – all in favor, motion carried.
5. Review, Discussion and Decision for New Construction (Residential). **(R-2) @ 228 17th Street**. Block 123 Lot 5. Owner: RG Building and Framing Inc.; Contractor: Self.
 - a. Contractor – Present. Greg Golgowksi asked if it would be possible to keep the 20” pine in the front center of the lot by modification of the site plan. Contractor confirmed it was not possible but explained that new trees may be replanted to replace those removed.
 - b. Motion to approve by Myrtis Wynn; 2nd by Jim Bachrach – all in favor, motion carried.
6. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness and Parking Plan. **(C-1) @ 155 Commerce Street**. Block G-1 Lots 12-13. Owner: Waddell Family Apalachicola Historical Preservation Society Inc.; Contractor: Galloway Construction Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

- a. Jim Waddell, Representative – Present. Stated that, historically, the awnings covered the entire sidewalk. The columns currently proposed are in the middle of the sidewalk. The intent is to revise the elevation to show the column placed on the edge of the sidewalk. The encroachment would be from the back of the curb to the property line, covering the columns and the awning overhang entirely. This was not pursued further with the City Commission at the July 7th meeting, as the elevation needs to be revised.
 - i. Greg Golgowski stated that the Code objects to obstructions in the sidewalk, and that many buildings in Apalachicola have a very similar overhang.

- b. Greg Golgowski also asked how much of the original structure would be retained, as it is in very bad shape currently. Representative stated that the corrugated metal siding from the original building will be reused for the exterior of the new building. Additionally, the line, grade, walls, and finished floor elevation will be retained. However, much of the existing structure is not built to current Code standards and will have to be redone accordingly. The finished structure will look like the old building, especially the front elevation facing Commerce Street.
- c. City Attorney summarized discussion and decision from the July 7th City Commission meeting. The canopy shown on the submitted elevations can be reviewed and approved for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The City Commission will provide final approval or denial for the encroachment over the sidewalk.
- d. Motion to approve the certificate of appropriateness by Greg Golgowski; 2nd by Lee McLemore – all in favor, motion carried.

PARKING PLAN

- e. Jim Waddell, Representative. Summarized the changes to the submitted material following the June 8th Board meeting. 20 total spaces will be required for the interior and exterior of the building. The previous request was for 19. He also discussed the impact of the historic and current landscape on parking in Apalachicola. Right-of-way widths on the original City plat from the 1800s are incredibly wide considering the lack of automobiles at that time. Today it would be nearly impossible to provide off-street parking on narrow 30' wide lots. Parking for lots like these must be on the street itself or on other property. Very few or none of the buildings downtown have enough parking to support the current use. For example, the parking spaces in front of buildings are intended for the residential use on the second floor. The commercial use on the ground floor relies on other street parking. Additionally, though Commerce Street is narrow and lacks a sidewalk, it may be possible to utilize parallel parking on both sides of the street depending on how the width of the

travel lanes is measured. Lastly, the vacant lot adjacent to the subject lots cannot be utilized for parking as the Owners have a different plan for it.

- f. City Attorney discussed the examples of the Gibson Inn and the Yacht Club. The subject lots together have 60' of frontage on the street and therefore can claim three on-street parking spaces. In the case of the above examples, on-street parking adjacent to the applicant's property was allowed to be claimed/utilized for the parking plan. The historic structure parking waiver accounts for up to 8 additional spaces. Any remaining spaces can be paid for in accordance with Sec. 111-294 parking mitigation. Lastly, he noted it is not the fault of the applicant that the street is narrow.
- g. Elizabeth Milliken asked about the two new parking lots proposed for this area. Neither the City Attorney nor the Planner could provide additional details.
 - i. Jim Bachrach asked if either of those two parking lots existed today, would there be any issue approving the parking plan as proposed? City Planner stated that as they are within 500 ft. of the subject property, so potentially no, there would not be an issue. City Attorney added there may be an issue with double-counting parking spaces for multiple different businesses in the same parking lot, especially if the parking lot in question is publicly, not privately, owned. At the same time, the parking available in these lots is not used all the time by every business in a given area. He also stated that though there is certainly room for improvement in the existing parking regulations, the City must interpret and enforce them as written.
- 1. Lee McLemore noted that this is a very underutilized area of the City, and there is a lot of empty space accordingly. The existing parking lot is almost never full, except during holidays or other special events. The commercial district

should be drawn back to that area, to improve the local tax base.

- ii. City Attorney stated that a business cannot claim City parking without paying parking mitigation. The only way around this would be to make an agreement with the City, wherein a portion of the City's parking lot is dedicated to that specific business. He clarified that the Board will approve the parking plan, and the City Commission will decide on the historic structure parking waiver.
- h. Representative stated that he isn't confident that the historic structure parking waiver will be approved. As a result, and to make sure the grant deadline is met, he is willing to reduce the total number of required spaces from 20 to 12. All of the exterior tables and chairs will be removed, and the number of staff working on shift will also be reduced by half. Between the three spaces immediately adjacent to the property and the historic structure parking waiver, the remaining spaces will be accounted for with paid mitigation. The Owner can reapply in the future for additional exterior tables and chairs. Representative stated that he is willing to do so because the intent behind this project is not to make money with this business, but to preserve the legacy of his family which built the waterfront district.
 - i. The City Attorney stated that the City's parking regulations have put the Board in this position of requiring applicants to reduce the number of tables/chairs, or else pay into the mitigation fund. Unless this project is different from others (i.e., the Gibson Inn or the Yacht Club), the Board should not hold it to a different standard or make concessions which were not given to past projects.
 - 1. Lee McLemore asked who these parking lots are being built for, if not for local businesses to use. City Attorney stated that if the City grants the historic structure parking waiver to a maximum of 8 spaces, it is as if those spaces no longer exist. Instead, those future customers will park in the City

parking lots. Parking mitigation dollars are further used to build and maintain City parking lots.

- i. Joe Taylor asked for confirmation that the Owner can request to amend the parking plan in the future for additional outdoor tables and seating.
 - i. City Attorney confirmed this is possible, and summarized the modified parking plan as follows:
 - 1. 3 spaces on Commerce Street (60' of street frontage; 20' = 1 parking space).
 - 2. Up to 8 spaces waived using the historic structure parking waiver.
 - 3. All remaining spaces addressed with paid parking mitigation.

The total number of spaces requested is 12.

- j. Greg Golgowski asked why the existing street parking on Commerce Street cannot be utilized. Joe Taylor stated that the Board must follow established past precedent.
- k. Motion to approve a parking plan for 12 spaces as described above in (i)(i), and to support positive consideration for the issuance of the historic structure parking waiver by the City Commission by Jim Bachrach; 2nd by Elizabeth Milliken – all favor, motion carried.

Other/New Business:

1. Overview of current stormwater management requirements and permitting process.

- a. Planner summarized the prepared agenda item and asked for comments or feedback from the Board.
- b. Joe Taylor stated one common problem is that fill has already been placed on the property before it comes to the Board. Additionally, he noted that in the past there have been issues with neighbors and flooding, prompting the Board to require the submission of engineered stormwater plans. In complex situations like these, there should be a clear option for the Board to request engineered stormwater plans.

- c. City Attorney stated that in the past during disputes, no one has been required to submit a plan up to the standards of NFWFMD, for example. Depending on the best management practice chosen for the site, different levels of engineering and technical expertise must be utilized. He further stated that single-family lot owners cannot be expected to treat stormwater runoff from neighbor's properties or adjacent roads.
 - i. Joe Taylor clarified that there are certain elements on certain lots that the Board does not have the technical capacity to review.
 - ii. City Attorney stated that in such cases engineered stormwater documents can be requested for review by the City's engineer.
- d. Dennis Winterringer, Attendee. Commented on existing issues in the City's permitting process: the involvement of other external reviewers is not easily verified, and accordingly it is difficult to know whether steps or tasks outlined in the Land Development Code are completed properly. For example, the Building Inspector may review only for compliance with the Florida Building Code and not necessarily the fill and lot grading requirements of the City's Code. Finally, he noted that it is the Board's responsibility to determine which BMP is best for a specific piece of property based on the existing and proposed environmental conditions.
- e. Elizabeth Milliken stated that there are numerous historic streams around Apalachicola; these areas would never have been considered buildable in the past. However, these are the only remaining lots yet to be developed. Neighbors adjacent to these lots experience flooding problems when they are eventually improved.
 - i. City Attorney stated that in the past property owners simply filled in their lots without any permits.
 - ii. Lee McLemore commented that many properties in the Apalachicola area were filled with oyster shells.
- f. Alexandria (76 Avenue G), Attendee. Commented that she lives in a historic home surrounded by other historic homes. The property across the street is essentially surrounded by a moat after it rains. These property

owners intend to fill in their lot to fix this flooding problem, which in turn has created tension with other adjacent property owners. She stated that those who can afford to fix their flooding problems can and will; in the process this creates new problems for others who have to pay for a solution of their own.

- i. Joe Taylor added that the City has submitted a series of grant applications to address stormwater problems. While it may take time to benefit from these applications, this demonstrates the City is aware of the problem and actively working on it.
- g. City Attorney and Planner summarized the potential issue created by SB 180's prohibition against changes to the Land Development Code or Comprehensive Plan which may be considered more restrictive or burdensome to property owners.
- h. Greg Golgowski requested that the Planner prepare a pamphlet or handout summarizing the City's stormwater requirements which might be posted on the City's website as a resource for developers and property owners.
- i. The Board requests that the City Commission consider allowing the Board to conduct a workshop on the topic of clarifying the existing stormwater requirements in the Land Development Code.

2. Appointment of a new Chair from the full-time members.

- a. Joe Taylor expressed desire for the new Chair to gain experience running the meetings before the longest serving Board members leave in the coming months.
- b. Jim Bachrach, the current Vice Chair, stated that he has served as Chair twice in the past, and has served on the Board for more than eight years. He is not interested in serving as Chair again.
- c. City Attorney explained that the role of the Chair is largely to facilitate meetings. The Chair typically does not make motions and shares input at the end of any discussion amongst the other members.

- d. Lee McLemore stated that Greg Golgowski always comes to prepared to the Board's meeting.
- e. Christopher Aitken (76 Avenue G), Attendee. Commented that he applied to serve on the Board and wanted to see how the meetings are run.
- f. Motion to appoint Greg Golgowski as the new Chair of the Planning and Zoning Board by Jim Bachrach; 2nd by Elizabeth Milliken – all in favor, motion carried.

3. Workshop to discuss revisions to the current commercial parking requirements.

- a. In light of the above discussion concerning the parking plan for 155 Commerce Street, the Board requests that the City Commission consider allowing the Board to conduct a workshop on this topic.

Outstanding/Unresolved Issues:

- 1. Attorney update on P&Z Board term length and composition issue following June 16th City Commission workshop.
 - a. The amendment to the existing ordinance will eliminate the school board member. The board will have seven members, and one alternate member. Members will be able to serve two consecutive four-year terms. After two years off, the member can be nominated to serve again.
 - b. The City Commission will review a draft of this ordinance in August. This will not be considered the first reading of the ordinance; the ordinance will not go into effect until later this year.

Motion to adjourn the meeting by Lee McLemore; 2nd by Jim

Bachrach. All in favor – meeting adjourned at 8:03 PM.