Planning & Zoning Agenda

November 9th, 2026

Parking Workshop III

5:00 P.M.

Parking Requirements: Table of Known Issues, Potential Solutions, and Recommendations City of Apalachicola Planning & Zoning Board | Parking Workshop III November 11, 2026				
Issue	**Priority Level**[1]	**Potential Solutions**	**P&Z's Recommended Solution(s)**	**Notes**
[**1**] Institutional knowledge and records management (e.g., there is no map of public parking or mitigated spaces).	High	**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.[2]	#1	Issue identified in City Planner's 2023 report. Complete work in house if possible.
[**2**] Requirements are difficult to find and new businesses don't know about them.[3]		**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 designate a body with authority to review and approve such plans. **3.** Create one-page informational flyer or handout on commercial parking requirements, including the option of paid mitigation. Place this handout on the City's website.		Issue identified by ARPC Planner for 9/14 workshop.

[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 "mitigation" refer to Section 111-294. Parking Mitigation unless noted otherwise.

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

[**3**] Off-site parking distance limit (500') limits use of existing and planned public parking lots in the north of the C-1 district.	High	**1.** Increase allowed distance for off-site parking (e.g., 600', 700'). **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.)	#1 & #2	Issue identified by ARPC Planner for 9/14 workshop, also mentioned at 9/14 workshop**. Increase distance to 1,200' and measure property line to property line**.
[**4**] 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 certain areas, structures, or uses from off-street parking requirements.		Issue identified by ARPC Planner for 9/14 workshop, also mentioned at 9/14 workshop.
[**5**] 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 [6] 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 [**4**].

		5. Exempt certain areas, structures, or uses from off-street parking requirements.		
[**6**] Requirements do not 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.
[**7**] 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**].
[**8**] Requirements do not match the reality in the historic downtown and do not allow for efficient use of existing space.		**1.** Exempt certain areas, structures, or uses from off-street parking requirements. **2.** 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.		Issue identified at 9/14 workshop
[**9**] 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		Issue identified at 9/14 workshop.

		business licenses and when renewing licenses. **3.** Create a procedure to assess potential increased intensity of use at annual renewal of business licenses.		
[**10**] 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 [**6**].


CITY OF APALACHICOLA
1831
FLORIDA