

CITY OF APALACHICOLA
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING

Monday, September 14th, 2026

City Meeting Room – 74 6th Street

Agenda

Attendance: Greg Gologowski, Elizabeth Milliken, Bobby Miller, Lee McLemore, Greg Perkins, Al Ingle

Regular Meeting: 6:00 PM

1. Amendment to the agenda at the request of the City Planner.
 - a. Motion to amend the agenda to add appointment of a new vice chair as an item of new business by Bobby Miller; 2nd by Elizabeth Milliken – all in favor, motion carried.
2. Approval of August 10th, 2026 regular meeting minutes.
 - a. Motion to approve by Bobby Miller; 2nd by Greg Perkins – all in favor, motion carried.
3. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness, Accessory Structure & Fence. (R-1) @ 136 17th Street. Block 117 Lots 3-4. Owner: R Stephen Paterson; Contractor: Self.
 - a. City Planner summarized staff report.
 - b. Steve Paterson, Owner – Present. Summarized the request for a simple fence, lean-to for a boat, and driveway expansion.
 - c. Motion to approve by Bobby Miller; 2nd by Elizabeth Milliken – all in favor, motion carried.
4. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness & Accessory Structure. (R-1) @ 132 Sawyer Lane. Block 117 Lot 9. Owner: Nicholas Avossa; Contractor: Kilgore Pavers and Tile.
 - a. City Planner summarized staff report.
 - b. Nick Avossa, Owner – Present. Stated that it is no issue to remove 12 square feet from the proposed driveway to be at or under the 2,400

square feet maximum. He confirmed that the driveway gets wider as it approaches the street and right-of-way.

- c. Bobby Miller asked about the material used for the deck and the spacing between the boards. Owner stated that it is pressure treated lumber. He also stated that the 3/8-inch spacing between the deck boards was done on the advice of someone he knows who is familiar with municipal code requirements.
- d. Motion to approve by Elizabeth Milliken; 2nd by Greg Perkins – all in favor, motion carried.

5. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness, Accessory Structure & Fence. (R-1) @ 160 Avenue D. Block 55 Lot 5. Owner: Anna Bull; Contractor: Self.

- a. City Planner summarized staff report.
- b. City Attorney stated that the Board should make two separate motions for the fence and the deck.
- c. Motion to approve the fence as proposed by Bobby Miller; 2nd by Lee McLemore – all in favor, motion carried.
- d. Anna Bull, Owner – Present. Asked for clarification from the Board as to why the request for the deck might be denied, because it is in the rear yard and will be hidden by the fence. She also stated that the deck will not be structurally attached to the house.
 - i. City Attorney read aloud Sec. 111-322, subsection C, expansion of historic and nonhistoric, nonconforming structures. He further stated that the task before the Board is to decide if the proposed deck constitutes an extension of a nonconforming structure. He concluded that a variance is typically warranted when a hardship occurs as a result of circumstances beyond the control of the owner or applicant.
 - 1. Bobby Miller stated that if the two structures are not attached, the deck cannot be considered an extension of the

nonconforming house. He also stated that there are many nonconforming structures all over the City.

- ii. Al Ingle shared a previous example about an old proposal for the Boss Oyster complex: Demolish the existing restaurant for a new restaurant, at the maximum permitted building footprint of 8,000 square feet. To also build an attached deck on the lot, the applicant proposed a 3-inch gap between the restaurant building and the accessory deck. This request was previously approved by the P&Z Board.
- iii. Al Ingle also stated that adding a deck which encroached into either front setback would be problematic, as both front setbacks are not currently met. However, because this is a proposal involving the rear yard only, the request can be approved if the deck is not attached. It does not necessarily constitute an expansion of a nonconforming structure, as the nonconformity is not worsened by the work proposed.

- 1. Bobby Miller stated that, in his opinion, the intent of this section of the Code is primarily to prevent someone from expanding on a nonconformity.

- e. Motion to approve the deck as proposed by Al Ingle; 2nd by Bobby Miller – all in favor, motion carried.

6. Review, Discussion and Decision for New Construction (Residential). (R-2) 235 11th Street. Block 155 Lot 8. Owner: Inspire Innovations LLC; Contractor: Alex Meca.

- a. City Planner summarized staff report.
- b. Owner and Contractor not present.
- c. Elizabeth Milliken asked if this is a heavily wooded lot, as she could not find the location when looking for it. Planner confirmed that it is a wooded lot, and that a tree survey was provided with the application.
- d. Motion to approve by Greg Perkins; 2nd by Lee McLemore – all in favor, motion carried.

7. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness. **(R-1) 71 13th Street**. Block 85 Lot 8 and ½ Lot 9. Owners: Richard and Belinda Christopher; Contractor: N/A.

- a. City Planner summarized staff report. Planner also stated that this work was originally referred to the Building and Planning Departments by Code Enforcement.
- b. Owners not present.
- c. Lee McLemore asked the City Attorney if the Owners would need to have something in writing from the City, like a formal encroachment agreement, to get this work approved.
 - i. City Attorney stated an encroachment agreement would not be required. He further stated that he would enquire with Code Enforcement as to why this issue was referred to the P&Z Board. Arguably, this work could be considered landscaping, which the City does allow in the right-of-way, at risk, because no one has an inherent right to build in the City's right-of-way.
- d. Elizabeth Milliken gave an example of stormwater improvements done around the Lafayette Park area which required the destruction of landscaping elements installed by surrounding property owners.
- e. Bobby Miller gave an example of a fire hydrant which had been nicely hidden by landscaping, which the City had to destroy to access the hydrant. He stated that the City should have property owners sign a written agreement acknowledging that anything built or installed in the right-of-way could potentially be destroyed.
- f. City Attorney further stated that it could be unsightly if people started putting gravel in the right-of-way all over the City but concluded that that would ultimately be a problem the City Commission has to address.
- g. No motion was made for this item.

8. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness, Alteration/Renovation, Addition & Fence. **(R-1) 172 11th Street**. Block 149 Lot 2. Owner: Charles Leonard; Contractors: Ashley Leonard, Tyler Poloronis.

- a. City Planner summarized staff report.
- b. Greg Krinovak, Contractor – Present on behalf of Ashely Leonard, Contractor.
- c. Al Ingle commented that the lot adjacent to this property is completely vacant, and that the existing one-foot setback to the property could negatively impact the adjacent property in terms of economic value and fire risk. He also stated that the improvement of the single-car enclosed lean-to or carport clearly represented an expansion of a nonconforming structure, and that the structure would be more noncompliant after the proposed work is completed.
- d. Elizabeth Milliken asked about the location of the vacant lot in relation to the subject property.
 - i. Contractor confirmed the vacant lot is on the right side of the existing house, if you're looking from the street.
 - ii. Elizabeth Milliken further stated that the two structures are clearly attached via the roof, if nothing else.
- e. Contractor stated the carport is proposed to be renovated into a screen-in porch, and that the footprint of the existing structure is not being changed.
- f. City Planner also requested that the Board decide whether modifications to the roofline which result in increased area covered under the roof constitute an expansion or extension of a nonconforming structure.
- g. Bobby Miller stated that the Board would be setting a precedent in approving the renovations as proposed, which would be difficult to defend in the future.
- h. Motion to table the item until (1) the Owner receives a variance from the Board of Adjustment or (2) revisions are made to the application to bring the proposal into conformance with current Code requirements by Bobby Miller; 2nd by Greg Perkins – all in favor, motion carried.

Other/New Business:

1. Appointment of a new vice chair.
 - a. Following the resignation of the former vice chair Jim Bachrach, the Board must elect a new vice chair. The role of the vice chair is primarily to facilitate the Board's meetings in the absence of the chair.
 - i. Motion to elect Al Ingle as the new vice chair by Elizabeth Milliken; 2nd by Greg Perkins – all in favor, motion carried.

Outstanding/Unresolved Issues:

N/A

Motion to adjourn the meeting by Bobby Miller; 2nd by Greg Perkins.

All in favor - meeting adjourned at 6:55 PM.