CITY OF APALACHICOLA

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD

WORKSHOP

Monday, October 12th, 2026

City Meeting Room – 74 6th Street

Agenda

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

Workshop: 5:00 PM

1. ARPC Planner introduced the goal for this workshop:
    a. Identification of recommended solution or solutions for issues (1) discussed at the September workshop, (2) identified by City Planner in the 2023 report, and (3) identified by ARPC planner in preparation for September workshop. The notes column of the table identifies where the issue originates for future reference.
    b. Identification of an approximate priority level for each issue and solution pairing. See the criteria for priority level on the first page of the table. Note, cost is not precise; it's a rough estimate. E.g., it's more expensive to hire a consultant to create a new paid street parking program than it is for the City's staff to draft an amendment to the Land Development Code to add a definition of "increased intensity of use."
2. **Issue #1 Discussion**:
    a. Al Ingle stated that the City needs a base knowledge of the number of spaces is necessary to determine whether there is a lack of parking or a surplus of parking. From there, a determination can be made regarding how critical it is that the City provide additional parking.
        i. Elizabeth Milliken added that ideally this work could be done by City staff, without hiring a new contractor.
    b. Anita Grove, Resident. Stated that former City Planner Cindy Clark already has access to digital maps with information about the number of City-owned parking spaces.

i. Al Perkins commented that because multiple businesses have paid mitigation for the same spaces, it seems that it would be difficult to create a map showing which spaces have been 'claimed' using paid mitigation for each business.
ii. Greg Golgowski also added that it would be difficult to maintain these maps once created and would require a regular effort by City Staff to update them.

c. The Board identified solution #1 as the recommended solution and identified the priority level as high. If possible, a contractor should not be hired to complete this work.

3. **Issue #2 Discussion**:
   a. Micah Priest, Planning and Operations Director. Stated that a project to construct a new pervious parking lot by Avenue H, funded by legislative appropriation from the Florida Department of Transportation, will soon go out for bid. More information can be found about this work in the October report prepared by the Grants Coordinate Leslie Glaze, Item #12.
   b. Greg Golgowski stated that the City could consider offering a different or reduced parking mitigation fee for the creation or use of pervious parking, to incentivize the creation of more previous parking.
   c. Myrtis Wynn stated that there is not a lot of room for growth downtown, and that the parking for businesses downtown will not necessarily be on the same lot as the business.
   d. Micah Priest asked for clarification from the Board: What is the issue we are trying to address?
      i. Greg Golgowski summarized the issues that P&Z has seen with applications in the past year, primarily that businesses struggle to provide the required parking minimums and are then forced to downsize in terms of number of staff, tables, etc.
   e. Greg Perkins stated that using square footage of the building to determine the required number of parking spaces would eliminate the need for the City to continuously assess whether the intensity of use has increased.

i. Anita Grove gave more background about the City's past discussion about parking in the winter of 2023 and spring of 2024 and stated that basing parking on square footage instead of use was already discussed. However, the City ultimately did not proceed with the recommendations created at that time because the subject of parking and paid parking mitigation was unpopular.

f. The Board identified solutions #1 and #2 as the recommended solutions. The priority level was not determined.

4. For the sake of time, and to avoid repetitive discussion of issues already considered by the City Commission in 2023, ARPC Planner suggested the Board move ahead to focus on those issues specifically identified at the most recent workshop in September 2026.

5. **Issue #10 Discussion**:
    a. Christopher Aitken stated that increasing the limit is a no-brainer for the City if the desire is to encourage people to park further away and walk to their destination. He would recommend the limit be increased to the greatest distance possible.
        i. Al Ingle stated that people can generally be expected to walk around a quarter of a mile.
    b. Greg Perkins added that there is always overflow parking that exists around the City; once all available parking is taken in a given area, then designated overflow parking further away can be used instead.
    c. Attorney Hartman clarified the legal requirements for the different methods of measuring this distance (e.g., property line to property line, pedestrian walking distance from door to door, etc.). In his experience, it is simpler to measure the distance from property line to property line.
    d. The Board identified solutions #1 and #2 as the recommended solutions and identified the priority level as high. Specifically, the location of off-street parking distance limit should be increased to 1,200 feet and be measured from property line to property line.

6. Chair Golgowski asked Anita Grove if the City had considered metered parking and impact fees in the past. She stated that these things had been discussed in the past, and that it would be easier to implement a paid parking program now that physical meters are not required (i.e., users can pay with their phones).

Workshop adjourned at 5:56 P.M.