



Planning & Zoning Agenda

October 12th, 2026

Parking Workshop II

5:00 P.M.

Parking Requirements: Table of Known Issues, Potential Solutions, and Recommendations

City of Apalachicola Planning & Zoning Board | Parking Workshop II

October 12, 2026

Issue	Priority Level ¹	Potential Solutions	P&Z's Recommended Solution(s)	Notes
Example: [0] Current requirements do not support non-motorized pedestrian traffic. ²	Low	1. Increase distance allowed for off-site, off-street parking. 2. Require off-site parking distance from new business to be measured along existing/planned sidewalks. 3. Create new zoning overlay to support and encourage pedestrian traffic.	#2	Issue identified at 9/14 workshop.
[1] Institutional knowledge and records management (e.g., there is no map of public parking or mitigated spaces).		1. Direct staff to create/re-create a digital map of all public parking in the C-1 District, or hire contractor (traffic engineer, transportation planner, etc.). 2. Direct staff to create/re-create a digital map of all parking claimed by paid mitigation, or hire contractor.³		Issue identified in City Planner's 2023 report.
[2] High cost for new pervious, public parking.		1. Continue to apply for grant funding for parking lot construction. 2. Ensure mitigation fees are paid and deposited into the mitigation fund before issuance of certificate of occupancy.		Issue identified in City Planner's 2023 report.

¹ Priority level is based on a combination of (1) the urgency or significance of the issue, (2) the potential cost of implementation of the solution, and (3) the potential impact the recommended solution would have on the issue. E.g., a relatively low-cost solution which would significantly improve an urgent issue should be a high priority for potential implementation.

² All references to "requirements" refer to Section 111-288 subsection (i) Parking Requirements unless noted otherwise.

³ All references to "mitigation" refer to Section 111-294. Parking Mitigation unless noted otherwise.

		3. Increase cost per space for paid parking mitigation to accurately reflect cost of construction of new parking. 4. Implement other new measure(s) (e.g., metered street parking with dynamic pricing/demand pricing, increased ticketing for illegal parking, etc.) and dedicate these revenues to construction and maintenance of new public parking or other street improvements.		
[3] Property owner vs. lessee, responsibility for mitigation.		1. Amend mitigation section to clearly require property/building owner to pay mitigation. 2. Amend mitigation section to clearly require lessee / business (use) owner to pay mitigation.		Issue identified in City Planner's 2023 report.
[4] Structure vs. business, mobility of mitigation.		1. Amend mitigation section to allow paid mitigation to move with the 'use' which initially paid for it. (Dependent on solution recommended for issue [3].) 2. Amend mitigation section to permanently associate paid mitigation with a building/structure, until such structure is renovated, removed, destroyed, etc. (Dependent on solution recommended for issue [3].)		Issue identified in City Planner's 2023 report.
[5] Requirements do not account for decreased intensity of use.		1. Amend the mitigation section to clarify that fees are not refundable in the event that a given use requires less parking. 2. Amend the mitigation section to clarify what will happen if the intensity of a use		Issue identified in City Planner's 2023 report.

		decreases, or if a less intense use moves into a location vacated by a more intense use (i.e., a use that requires more total off-street parking).		
[6] Unclear definition of 'increased intensity of use.'		1. Amend requirements to define increased intensity of use (e.g., addition in square footage, increased hours of operation, capacity, etc. which requires the use to provide more off-street parking).		Issue identified in City Planner's 2023 report.
[7] Requirements do not consider golf cart parking.		1. Amend definition of off-street parking to include golf carts in addition to passenger automobiles. 2. Create new standards for golf cart parking (e.g., where permitted, space dimensions, etc.).		Issue identified in City Planner's 2023 report, also mentioned at 9/14 workshop.
[8] Requirements are difficult to find.		1. Remove the requirements from the supplementary regulations and create a dedicated parking requirements section. 2. Amend the land development code to define "parking plan" and include this in the parking requirements section. 3. Direct all parking inquiries to the planning department.		Issue identified by ARPC Planner for 9/14 workshop.
[9] Parking plan review and approval process is not codified.		1. Amend the land development code to define "parking plan" and designate a body with authority to review and approve such plans.		Issue identified by ARPC Planner for 9/14 workshop. Same solution as issue [8].
[10] Off-site parking distance limit (500') limits use of existing and planned public		1. Increase allowed distance for off-site parking (e.g., 600', 700').		Issue identified by ARPC Planner for 9/14 workshop, also mentioned at 9/14 workshop.

parking lots in the north of the C-1 district.		2. Change method of measuring distance for off-site parking (e.g., walking distance, property line to property line, air line). 3. Install signage directing visitors to existing northern parking lots within walking distance of the more developed downtown. (This may require other measures to support pedestrian safety and walkability downtown.)		
[11] Parking minimum calculation requires a number of spaces which is difficult for businesses to mitigate without reducing staff, capacity, etc.		1. Change method of calculating parking minimums (e.g., maximum occupancy, gross floor area rather than number of tables, stools, or staff on shift). Or offer different calculation methods and allow whichever produces a lower total. 2. Exempt historic buildings in the C-1 District from parking requirements. 3. Exempt certain uses in the C-1 District from parking requirements.		Issue identified by ARPC Planner for 9/14 workshop, also mentioned at 9/14 workshop.
[12] Number of spaces available under current waivers limits growth of businesses.		1. Increase amount of spaces available under historic structure restoration waiver [from maximum of 8 to ?]. 2. Increase percentage of spaces which can be mitigated with paid mitigation [from maximum of 50% to ?]. 3. Change the method of calculating parking minimums (see [11] for examples). 4. Modify the current required parking minimums for all uses, or select uses (e.g., 3 tables:1 space instead of 2 tables:1 space).		Issue identified by ARPC Planner for 9/14 workshop. Same solution(s) as issue [11].

		5. Exempt certain areas, structures, or uses from off-street parking requirements.		
[13] Requirements do not clearly allow for shared parking agreements.		1. Amend the requirements to allow for formal shared parking agreements between business owners. This should include standard(s) to determine that peak usage/demand does not overlap between use and clearly define the form the agreement must take.		Issue identified by ARPC Planner for 9/14 workshop.
[14] New businesses do not know about parking mitigation requirements.		1. Direct all parking inquiries to the planning department; provide direct link to parking mitigation section of the code upon request. 2. Create one-page flyer or handout on commercial parking requirements, including the option of paid mitigation. Place this handout on the City's website.		Issue identified at 9/14 workshop.
[15] Difficulty administering the parking mitigation program.		1. Create standard administrative procedure or checklist for staff to utilize when recording / collecting mitigation fees. 2. Direct staff to create/re-create a digital map of all public parking in the C-1 District, or hire contractor (traffic engineer, transportation planner, etc.). 3. Direct staff to create/re-create a digital map of all parking claimed by paid mitigation, or hire contractor.		Issue identified at 9/14 workshop. Same solution(s) as issue [1].
[16] Requirements do not match the reality in the historic downtown and do not		1. Exempt the entire C-1 District from parking requirements.		Issue identified at 9/14 workshop. Same solution(s) as issue [11].

allow for efficient use of existing space.		2. Exempt historic buildings in the C-1 District from parking requirements. 3. Exempt certain uses in the C-1 District from parking requirements. 4. Amend the code to prohibit certain types of large vehicles (e.g., boats, trailers, RVs, etc.) from being parked downtown and create or establish dedicated parking for such vehicles elsewhere.		
[17] Businesses no do meet the requirements for their type of use.		1. Increase enforcement of requirements or improve mechanism for enforcement. 2. Confirm businesses have approved parking plans before issuing new business licenses and when renewing licenses. 3. Create a procedure to assess potential increased intensity of use at annual renewal of business licenses.		Issue identified at 9/14 workshop.
[18] Multiple businesses utilize the same parking spaces.		1. Amend the requirements to allow for formal shared parking agreements between business owners. 2. Amend the requirements to allow for formal shared parking agreements between business owners and the city (for the use of public parking) or create another means by which mitigated spaces may be shared if usage doesn't overlap.		Issue identified at 9/14 workshop. Same solution as issue [13].

Mayor
Brenda Ash

City Manager
Travis Wade

Commissioners
Anita Grove
Adriane Elliott
Despina George
Donna Duncan

CITY OF APALACHICOLA



192 Coach Wagoner Boulevard . Apalachicola, Florida 32320 .
850-653-9319 . Fax 850-653-2205 . www.cityofapalachicola.com

Finance Director

City Clerk
Lee Mathes

City Attorney
Dan Hartman

Bree Robinson – City Planner
10/24/23

Report referenced at September 14, 2026 Workshop

Parking Mitigation Workshop Notes + Topics of Discussion

Background:

Ordinance 2018-02 is currently on Municode and the consensus from the first traffic workshop (9/27) was to follow it. With this ordinance in mind, this creates a scenario where any existing building that intensifies use in the C-1 zone has to comply with the current parking requirements. (examples: adding more restaurant tables, adding bar stools, going from a retail establishment to a bar or restaurant, adding more retail floor space, adding slips at marinas, etc.) Questions have been raised on if the current parking ordinance is holding local businesses back from any expansion and the issue of internal memory of City records has been raised.

Expanding businesses have the option of providing on-site parking, finding another parcel to hold their parking requirements on within 500' of their site, or utilizing the parking mitigation option outlined in Ordinance 2018-02 which allows business owners to pay into the Apalachicola Parking Mitigation Fund in the amount of \$5,000 per required spot. The ordinance does give some options regarding the payment, such as instituting a payment plan over 2 years max, deferring construction or occupancy of floor space for which parking hasn't been mitigated, or other arrangements that would provide the parking requirements within 12 months of the application. It stipulates that the "other arrangements" cannot include a parking variance in any case.

Current Parking Requirements:

Type	Spots Required:
Dwelling	1 per dwelling unit or room for rent
Office, Studios, & Financial Institutions	1 off-street for every 2 employees on peak shift 1 for each 500SF of floor place open to public
Retail Establishments	1 off-street for every 2 employees on peak shift 2 for first 1,000SF of floor space 2 for each additional 300SF of floor space
Eating/Drinking Establishments	1 off-street for every 2 employees on peak shift 1 for each 2 tables for service 1 for each 4 stools at service counter
Child Care Centers	1 off-street for every 2 employees on peak shift 1 for each 500SF of floor space + adequate provisions for loading and unloading of children – site plan approval needed by the P&Z Board
Marinas	1 off-street for each wet slip 1 off-street for every 3 dry slips
All Other Permitted Uses and Structures	1 off-street for every 2 employees on peak shift + additional spaces as determined by the P&Z Board

Staff Comments/Recommendations:

City does not possess a complete map of past assigned parking mitigation and has not made an annual determination on the number of publicly-owned parking spaces that are available for use as parking mitigation in C-1, C-4, and RF zones, as required by City code. As the City does not possess an old copy of the map of parking spots, this will require staff to create a new map of all publicly-owned parking. The City Code states that parking mitigation should be available on a first-come, first served basis, up to a maximum of 15 spaces per development until all spaces have been subscribed. It continues to say that the City may make additional spaces available or suspend the availability of parking mitigation.

In the past there have been cases where the City agreed to let businesses mitigate their parking requirements by using City ROW for their needed parking – in return it was the applicant’s responsibility to improve the ROW for purpose of parking. (Ex: The City agreed to let Water Street Hotel & Marina mitigate 36 parking spots by improving City ROW along Avenue I) Internal memory is an issue with COA records – many files and documents were lost after Hurricane Michael due to flooding. Current staff is not able to locate the map with noted parking mitigation on it as mentioned by former staff.

City staff is tasked with 2 maps, one likely requiring an engineer opinion. The first map is a map of the C-1, C-4, and RF zones showing all public parking and the number of available spots. This is in progress but currently, staff is aware of current public parking as well as upcoming public parking at the old VFD location. The VFD location is slated for demolition soon via CDBG funding and is in the engineering stage currently. Attached is a very preliminary idea on how many public parking spots are going to be available, 26, subject to change. The City is also applying for legislative appropriations and a DEO RIF grant for a pervious parking lot where Avenue H would continue if paved – if funded, this project would provide 37 standard spots and 2 handicap spots with access from Water Street. The estimated project cost is \$270,026.04 – if this were broken down into price per spot this would cost roughly \$6,923.74 with no acquisition costs as this is City owned property or lighting factored in. The City is actively working on creating and applying for funding for public parking, but the costs is high as pervious parking is a priority for the City due to stormwater drainage issues.

The second map eventually needed would contain any ROW or City owned property in the C-1, C-4, and RF zones that could potentially be improved for more parking either through APMF funding or for future grant opportunities. In the past, the City has allowed business owners to improve ROW for their own parking use if they paid for the improvement costs.

Once the map is completed, or while it is still in progress, the City could consider an ordinance amendment for parking mitigation. Discussion topics/suggestions below:

Possible Discussion Topics:	Comments:
Parking Mitigation Pricing	• Q: Does the City Commission want to explore changing the \$5,000 per parking spot fee for parking mitigation? • Q: Does the City Commission want to continue with a pay-for-mitigation approach? It is not uncommon for City’s to go this approach with new or expanded development. • If the City were to continue with the cost for true new construction development, will this continue to apply to existing buildings expanding uses? • Options: ○ City Commission discuss the \$5,000 fee and if it should be lowered, raised, consistent, or explore other methods. ○ Q: Does this place a burden on local entrepreneurs renting their business space and intensifying the use from a former use? ○ Other methods could include a certain % of no cost mitigation ‘allowance’ to go towards parking requirements, a scaled pay

	scale for parking mitigation that would go up with the # of spots being mitigated with a capped \$\$ amount, other methods? • Please see attached engineer quotes on the cost of a parking spot that is pervious vs. impervious. The averages are higher than \$5,000 when all of the elements noted in Ordinance 2018-02 are accounted for: acquisition, design, drainage, etc.
Parking Mitigation Ownership	• The question has been raised on who claims the parking mitigation – the property owner or the business owner? • Many businesses rent their space in downtown and the building owner may not be willing to pay the parking mitigation fee for an expanded/intensified use. • This needs to be clear, but the current code states that the owner of the principal building, structure, or use shall deposit the funds. This leaves some wiggle room on what/who the mitigation is attached to. • If the City allows for the actual businesses to buy into the parking mitigation plan, then it is possible that if the business ever moves to a different location then they could “carry” their allocated spots with them. Or if the business moves to a location with adequate parking or closes indefinitely, that a refund for the parking mitigation could be requested. If this is not an option, the City code needs to be clear on “ownership” of the parking mitigation. • Staff opinion is that parking mitigation should be tied to property addresses and not specific businesses. If a business is renting space, then the burden of parking mitigation would ultimately fall on the property owner to provide parking and once they have it then it should not be an issue again unless the use continues to expand. If the property owner wants to rent the space as an expanded use, then expanded parking would also need to be supplied in some form.
Increased/Decreased Density	• A local business owner asked “What happens to assigned parking spots for decreased density? (Ex: a restaurant becomes a retail store or office).” ○ Our current code does not speak to this situation. The assumption would be that they then have excess parking, which is a good thing, but doesn’t grant the business a right to a refund for parking mitigation, etc. ○ The decreased business would have the option of aiding another local business in selling or giving the right to any unneeded parking spots to help another meet their parking requirement, which has been done in the past. This can only happen if the original business is in good standing with the parking requirements and truly has excess parking space – however, if the original business were to ever expand in use again then they would find themselves also having to find a way to remedy their parking. • Increased Density – City code states that ‘an allowable commercial use of an existing building upon adoption of Ord 91-7 adopted Dec 3, 1991 may use on-street parking as part of its required parking. An increase in the intensity of use of an existing building after the adoption of Ord 91-7 must comply with the parking requirements as provided in subsection (i)(2).’ (Ex: retail becomes a bar or marina, or bar becomes retail space) ○ Q: What defines an increase in the intensity? Staff has been tracking this by comparing parking requirements, but should one category be more “intense” than the others? ○ Retail is a very walkable category with many shoppers visiting several, while marinas and dining/drinking establishments are a

	little more directed and people are likely visiting that one location at a time. The code is not clear on how this is defined or who defines it.
Golf Carts	• Golf Cart parking could be acknowledged in some form as we are golf cart friendly and golf cart parking spots are often smaller than car spots. • Potential issues could involve cars attempting to park in golf cart parking even with signage in place. Golf cart sizes also vary. • Current City Code states that golf carts must comply with all applicable local and state traffic laws and may be ticketed for traffic violations in the same manner as a motor vehicle.
Current Parking Requirements (listed above)	• Does the City Commission want to explore updating these parking requirements? • Does the City Commission want these to be more lenient or strict towards existing buildings or new developments? • Some municipalities keep these vague on purpose and some go into detail. • Questions regarding why there is 1:1 requirement for wet boat slips have come up in prior P&Z meetings. Comments about transient boat slips being a different category have been made. • Restaurants/Bar parking is only evaluated based on barstools and tables – it leaves room for interpretation when it comes to headcount on the tables. Moving this to a square footage allocation could be discussed.
Building Occupancy Rates	• This is not discussed in the City code in relation to parking requirements, but it could be if the commission wants to look into this route. • It would likely increase the parking requirements from the current standard, as several local businesses in the C-1 zone don't have many tables/chairs to count, but standing room is plentiful.

Note: During the Traffic Workshop in 9/27 the idea of eliminated parking on one side of the street on Commerce for safety was discussed – we need to include something in any potential amendments that would give business owners losing any on-street parking spots credit through the parking mitigation map for any spots lost.

Attachments:

- New Business Checklist
- Updated Business Licenses with Link to parking Requirements on Back
- # of Parking Spots Provided by CDBG-Riverfront revitalization project at old Volunteer Fire Department location
- Quote for Avenue H Parking Lot (Appropriations Requested)
- HALFF Parking Cost Analysis including acquisition
- CDG Parking Cost Analysis including acquisition
- Dewberry Parking Cost Analysis not including acquisition
- Sec. 111-288(i) & Sec. 111-294 (Municode)
- Ordinance 2018-02
- Documents from Former Staff:
 - Workshop Notes leading to Ordinance 2018-02
 - Parking Needs Analysis (Needs updates to evaluate current parking situation.)
 - 2017 Downtown Vacant Parcel Map (Also needs to be updated to current situation.)
- Email from Commissioner Grove on Former Staff projects

Code Examples:

- St. Augustine -
https://library.municode.com/fl/st._augustine/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH28ZO_ARTIVSURE_DIV2OREPALO_S28-373REOREPA
- Port St Joe -
https://library.municode.com/fl/port_st._joe/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIILADERECO_ARTVII_COCODE_S7.13PRFAARMI
- Ft. Lauderdale (Parking fee schedule/calculator) -
<https://www.fortlauderdale.gov/government/departments-a-h/development-services/dsd-fee-schedules/park-impact-fee-calculator>
- Key West, FL -
https://library.municode.com/fl/key_west/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=SPBLADERE_CH108PLDE_ARTVIIOREPALO_DIV2RERESP_SDIINGE_S108-572SCOREPAREUSGE
 - Key West specifies 'historic commercial pedestrian oriented areas' which have separate parking requirements from the standard. In these areas they do not require additional off-street parking for change of existing commercial pedestrian uses. However, if additional floor space is added or another non-residential floor is added. They also go into detail on how to compute the parking spots.
 - Q: Should COA establish a pedestrian oriented area with limited requirements? Should certain business types in that area still be required to provide parking? (ex: marinas, hotels, restaurants, etc.)
- Sarasota, FL -
https://library.municode.com/fl/sarasota/codes/zoning?nodeId=ARTVIIREGEAP_DIV2OREPALO_SVII-203GEPARE

