

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Corridor Review Committee Meeting
April 7, 2022

The Corridor Review Committee met in formal session at 2:07 P.M., Thursday, April 7, 2022, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Michael Dixon, Chair, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

- 1. ROLL CALL:** Michael Dixon, Chair
Vaughn Cochran
- Absent: Lorna MacDonald, Vice- Chair, excused
- City Staff: Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Officer
Candice Seymour, Historic Preservation Planner
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Elyse Wiemann, Recording Secretary

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. Cochran MOVED to APPROVE the March 3, 2022 meeting minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Dixon.

VOTE ON MOTION:
AYES: Cochran, Dixon
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Dixon announced the next meeting date would be May 5, 2022.

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

MOTION

Mr. Dixon MOVED to APPROVE the modifications to the Agenda. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Cochran.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Dixon, Cochran
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. New Business

(None)

6. Other Business

6. (a.) Election of Committee Chair and Vice Chair

Mr. Cochran nominated Mr. Dixon to be the Chair of the CRC Board.

MOTION

Mr. Cochran MOVED to Elect Mr. Dixon as the Chair of the CRC Board. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Dixon.

VOTE ON MOTION:
AYES: Cochran, Dixon
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Dixon nominated Mr. Cochran to be the Vice-Chair of the CRC Board.

MOTION

Mr. Dixon MOVED to Elect Mr. Cochran as the Vice- Chair of the CRC Board. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Cochran and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

b. Overview of how the CRC fits into the work of the Planning & Building Department

Ms. Courtney reviewed the Design Standards for the Entry Corridor. She discussed the purpose and how the Board fit into the Planning and Building Department and the City as a whole. She reviewed when the design standards applied and reminded the Board, they were a part of the Local Government and they had to abide by certain criteria. She provided an overview of the application process and which Boards review each type of application. She reviewed some tips with the Board on best way to prepare for upcoming meetings and encouraged the Board members to speak openly, voice concerns, and provide justification for an approval or denial.

Ms. Seymour discussed how important it was for the Board to craft their motions clearly and provided the ingredients for a motion:

- Identify the finding of fact
- Identify criteria for the decision
- Identify the scope of work
- Identify if the Board would either approve, deny, or continue the application

Ms. Courtney presented a proposed motion for the Board to use when approving an application based on the recommendations from the staff report.

Ms. Courtney encourage the Board to keep learning and reviewed the different programs that could assist the Board and how to access the information on a National

and Local level. She urged the Board to participate as these programs were very educational.

The Board discussed:

Mr. Dixon complemented the staff regarding the staff reports and said they he appreciated the work that was done to put those together. He said he had visited the sites before but had taken photos for reference and asked if that needed to be disclosed.

Ms. Lopez replied that site visits were considered ex parte communication and if photos were taken, that needed to be disclosed and the photos should be brought to the meetings in order to be part of the record. She said she preferred Board members not become fact finders; however, if photos were taken, they needed to be brought to the meeting and those would be public record.

Mr. Dixon said parking was an issue with most of the projects they reviewed; however, it might not be in their purview, but it was difficult to not look at it since it was such a problem.

Ms. Lopez agreed; however, she pointed out in the presentation, there were different Boards that handled different applications, but everyone needed to stay within their purview and decisions had to be based on the design criteria for the Corridor.

Mr. Dixon said at the prior meeting there was an issue with widening a step and the criteria states to not focus on the design, but he felt that was more of a functional aspect a thought the design included function. He said he thought the guidelines focused more on the commercial properties and not residential uses, but this particular project was residential and did not want their entry on the street.

Ms. Lopez stated that was great mixed-use project on the Corridor and felt the Board

worked through the issues well and thoroughly. She said the Board identified the issues and why a strict reading of the guidelines did not work and how to accommodate the application.

Ms. Seymour said the orders and what was approved at the meetings was set in stone for the developer when permits were pulled, and staff approvals were based on the motions the Board indicated. She said that was why they encouraged the Board to be precise.

Mr. Cochran said he appreciated the motion wording and format as it was helpful.

Public comment was opened.

Mr. Pappas said he had attended the workshops regarding CRC guidelines and some of the issues the Board was dealing with was mobility and changing the City from being automobile driven. He said the streets were very important and it needed to be open and inviting to the streetscape. He said it may not all apply to the residents, but it applied to the streetscape and neighborhoods, which should encourage walking spaces for the people. He said there was a strong focus of making the business area inviting to the neighborhood to encourage people to walk or bike further.

Mr. Cochran said he was on the 2015 Vision Committee for the City and most of the discussion was about mobility and how the walking traffic would interact with everything and eliminate cars; however, that was not realistic, but it was important to review the Vision Plan often. He said he felt there were a lot of things that could still be done to help with the streetscape.

Public comment was closed.

Ms. Courtney reiterated the next meeting would be on May 5, 2022 and the deadline for that meeting was April 8, 2022; however, if no applications were received the May meeting would not take place. She thanked

the Board for their service and time as committee members.

7. Adjournment

MOTION

Mr. Cochran MOVED to adjourn the meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Dixon and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:42 P.M.¹

¹ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann