CITY OF APALACHICOLA

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD

REGULAR MEETING

Monday, October 12th, 2026

City Meeting Room – 74 6th Street

Agenda

Attendance: Greg Golgowki, Al Ingle, Elizabeth Milliken, Myrtis Wynn, Greg Perkins, Christopher Aitken

Regular Meeting: 6:00 PM

1. Approval of September 14th, 2026, workshop meeting minutes.
    a. Motion to approve by Elizabeth Milliken; 2nd by Myrtis Wynn – all in favor, motion carried.
2. Approval of September 14th, 2026, regular meeting minutes.
    a. Motion to approve by Greg Perkins; 2nd by Elizabeth Milliken – all in favor, motion carried.
3. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness, Sign & Parking Plan. **(O/R) @ 92 Avenue E**. Block 30 Southwest ½ Lots 4-5. Owner: Jehu Westmark; Contractor: N/A
    a. ARPC Planner summarized staff report.
    b. Elizabeth Milliken asked if the parking area on this property is regularly flooded.
        i. Jehu Westmark, Owner – Present. Stated that the middle of the lot, where the parking is located, doesn't regularly flood.
    c. Motion to approve by Al Ingle; 2nd by Greg Perkins – all in favor, motion carried.
4. Review, Discussion and Decision for Accessory Structure. **(R-2) @ 20 Adams Street**. Neels Addition Block 5 North 150' Lots 1-2 and West 20' Lot 3. Owner: Anna Keel; Contractor: Dan's Aluminum.
    a. ARPC Planner summarized staff report.
    b. Anna Keel, Owner – Present. Received no questions from the Board and made no comments.

c. Motion to approve by Myrtis Wynn; 2nd by Greg Perkins – all in favor, motioned carried.

5. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness & Accessory Structure. **(R-1) @ 114 8th Street**. Block 69 Lot 3. Owner: Graham Knox; Contractor: Self.
    a. ARPC Planner summarized staff report.
    b. Graham Knox, Owner – Present. Stated that the shed will go in behind the house, and no trees will be trimmed or cut down to do so.
    c. Motion to approve by Elizabeth Milliken; 2nd by Myrtis Wynn – all in favor, motion carried.
6. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness, Relocation, Addition & Accessory Structure. **(R-1) @ 120 7th Street**. Block 60 Lot 5. Owners: Karen Jumonville & Jay Townsend; Contractor: Erin Rodriguez.
    a. ARPC Planner summarized staff report.
    b. Erin Rodriguez, Contractor – Present. Received no questions from the Board. He commented that the Owners value the historic character of the structure and thus opted to move it rather than demolish it and build new construction on the same lot.
    c. Greg Golgowski asked the Planner to confirm if this is a historic structure. Planner stated that this address is not listed on the Florida Master Sile File Cultural Resource Roster for the City of Apalachicola. Accordingly, it does not meet the definition of historic structure in the City's Land Development Code, unless it is listed separately on the National Register of Historic Places.
    d. Motion to approve by Al Ingle; 2nd by Greg Perkins – all in favor, motion carried.
7. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness & Fence. **(R-1) @ 87 Avenue D**. Block 23 Lots 9-10. Owners: Glen Perkins & Amelia Hodges; Contractor: GeoFlora Group LLC.
    a. ARPC Planner summarized staff report.

b. Drew Robertson, Contractor – Present. Commented that sheet 3 of the presentation submitted with the application shows the site layout very well; and confirmed there is no concern about the distance from the intersection. All of the fence styles offered fit the historic character of the house.
c. Motion to approve by Greg Perkins; 2nd by Elizabeth Milliken – all in favor, motion carried.

8. Review, Discussion and Decision for Accessory Structure, Addition & Fence. **(R-2) @ 6 Ellis Van Fleet Street**. Block 264 60 x 174 ft. Owners: Eric & Cristin Walker; Contractor: GeoFlora Group LLC.

a. ARPC Planner summarized staff report, and recommended that the Board make two motions, one for the detached accessory structures and fence; another for the attached accessory structure/addition.
b. Drew Robertson, Contractor – Present. Asked if it would be possible to bring the existing screen porch back and into compliance with the front setback. Planner confirmed yes, and that the setback distance is measured from the property line to the vertical support of the roof covering the structure.
    i. Attorney Hartman read the definitions of 'building setback' and 'building line' from Section 101-8 of the Land Development Code to confirm the accuracy of the Planner's statement.
c. Motion to approve the detached accessory structures and fence by Christopher Aitken; 2nd by Greg Perkins – all in favor, motion carried.
d. Bryce Ward, Contractor (see item #9) asked when the City began enforcing the provisions about expansion of nonconforming structures, as many properties in the City would be considered nonconforming and therefore could not be expanded legally without a variance.
    i. Attorney Hartman stated that this is language in the Land Development Code as written, and that the Board does not have the authority to change this language. The City Commission is the appropriate body for requests to change language in the Code.

ii. He also stated that there is the option of obtaining a variance, and roughly outline the requirements for doing so. He noted that variances can be very difficult to obtain.

e. Elizabeth Milliken asked about the approval for 160 Avenue D at the previous meeting.
    i. Planner explained that this item was approved because the deck was not structurally attached to the house and therefore not an expansion in square footage of a nonconforming structure.

f. Motion to approve the attached accessory structure/addition on the condition that the existing covered porch which encroaches into the front setback must be brought into conformance with the required setback (15 ft) before the requested attached structure/addition may be built by Greg Perkins; 2nd by Christopher Aitken – all in favor, motion carried.

9. Review, Discussion and Decision for Certificate of Appropriateness, Demolition & Addition. **(R-1) @ 211 Avenue G**. Block 117 Lots 1-2. Owner: Carolyn Johnston; Contractor: Bryce Ward.

a. ARPC Planner summarized staff report.

b. Bryce Ward, Contractor – Present. Stated that the subject property consists of two lots, with a large portion of the area at the rear of the property unused. The right-of-way is quite wide in front of this property. Additionally, he stated that it doesn't seem fair to prevent a property owner from doing something with their property because of something that was done 100 years ago. He asked what could be done with the property.
    i. Planner stated that it is only the nonconforming structure which cannot be expanded; a detached accessory structure can be placed in the rear yard without issue as long as all other applicable requirements are met (i.e., setbacks, impervious surface).
    ii. Planner also stated that if the footprint is not changed, the existing porch can be converted to heated/cooled area.
        1. Contractor stated that the existing covered porch is too small to be useful to the Owner.

c. Attorney Hartman summarized the options for application: Table the item to specific date (e.g., next month's meeting), withdraw the application for revisions, resubmit the same application once a variance has been obtained, or request that the City Commission imitate an amendment to the Land Development Code.
    i. Contractor asked for more information about the City potentially changing the Code.
        1. Attorney Hartman stated that the issue would have to be presented to the City Commission during public comment. The Commission would direct City Staff to draft revised language, at the Commission's discretion. At a minimum, this process would take 90 days but would likely take longer.
d. Greg Golgowski asked if the encroachment ordinance the City is working on has any bearing on this situation; Attorney confirmed it does not.
e. Contractor stated that it doesn't make sense that additions cannot be added onto the sides of the building which are not nonconforming or encroaching into the setbacks. In his opinion, this requirement will have a negative impact on development within the City given the number of existing structures which are nonconforming.
    i. Al Ingle stated that the Owner can always consider putting a detached accessory building next to the existing house. He gave an example of a home he used to live in, where the bathroom was in a detached structure very close, but not structurally attached to, the principal building.
f. Item withdrawn by Applicant.

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

a. ARPC Planner summarized staff report.
b. Ashley Leonard, Contractor – Present. Stated that the existing house has a roof issue, with a series of shed roofs which have all been patched

together. The existing attached carport discussed at the September meeting will be converted into a screened porch, but the footprint will not be changed.

c. Motion to approve Al Ingle; 2nd by Greg Perkins – all in favor, motioned carried.

Other/New Business:

1. Attorney Hartman will prepare an overview for the new members / a refresher the current members on the basic functions and responsibilities of Board members. E.g., how to make motions, applicability of Sunshine law to the Board, etc.

Outstanding/Unresolved Issues:

N/A

Motion to adjourn the meeting by Elizabeth Milliken; 2nd by Greg Perkins. All in favor – meeting adjourned at 7:00 P.M.