



PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING

City Hall – Council Chamber
405 Bagshaw Way, Edgewood, Florida
Monday, January 12, 2026 at 6:30 PM

David Nelson
Chair

Caleb Castro
Vice-Chair

Evan Franco
Board Member

Todd Nolan
Board Member

Angie Sharp
Board Member

MINUTES

These minutes provide a summary of the key discussions and decisions made during the January 12, 2026 Planning & Zoning Board Meeting. A complete audio recording of the meeting is available for public review for one year. After one year, the City will dispose of the recording in accordance with applicable regulations. To access the recording, please contact Edgewood City Hall at 407-851-2920.

CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice Chair Nelson called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Administrative Project Manager Sollazzo confirmed a quorum with all five (5) board members present. He recognized new members Caleb Castro and Evan Franco. Vice Chair Nelson also thanked previous Board Members David Gragg and Ryan Santurri for their years of service, and welcomed the new Board Members.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Chair David Nelson
Vice Chair Caleb Castro
Board Member Evan Franco
Board Member Todd Nolan
Board Member Angie Sharp

STAFF PRESENT

Brett Sollazzo, Administrative Project Manager
Holli New, City Attorney
Ellen Hardgrove, City Planner
Michael Fraticelli, Police Sergeant

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 10, 2025 Planning & Zoning Meeting Minutes

Vice Chair Nelson made a motion to approve the November 10, 2025 Planning and Zoning meeting minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Board Member Nolan. Approved (5/0) by voice vote.

NEW BUSINESS

1. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR 2026

Administrative Project Manager Sollazzo explained that the Planning and Zoning Board is required to nominate and elect a Chair and Vice Chair each year. The Board discussed options for filling the positions and agreed on an approach. There was no public comment. Following discussion, the Board took the following actions to elect a Chair and Vice Chair for 2026:

MOTION & ROLL CALL VOTE

Board Member Sharp made a motion to nominate Vice Chair Nelson as Chair for 2026. The motion was seconded by Board Member Franco and approved by a (5/0) voice vote.

Newly elected Chair Nelson made a motion to nominate Board Member Castro as Vice Chair for 2026. The motion was seconded by Board Member Nolan and approved by a (5/0) voice vote.

2. SPECIAL EXCEPTION 2026-01: TATTOO STUDIO 4712 S ORANGE AVE.

Planner Hardgrove presented Special Exception 2026-01, a request to allow a tattoo establishment at 4712 South Orange Avenue, within the Orange Holden Plaza, which is zoned Edgewood Central District (ECD).

Planner Hardgrove explained that tattoo establishments were recently permitted within the ECD zoning district through adoption of Ordinance No. 2024-06, subject to approval through the Special Exception process by the Planning and Zoning Board and City Council. She outlined the required review criteria, which include consistency with the ECD Vision, compatibility with surrounding uses, and the availability of public services and facilities, including off-street parking. Planner Hardgrove stated that the ECD Vision is intended to transform South Orange Avenue into a pedestrian-oriented, human-scale commercial corridor.

Planner Hardgrove described the surrounding land uses, noting that the subject property is located within a multi-tenant strip center containing service-oriented commercial uses. Adjacent and nearby uses include a tire store, a shopping center, Cypress Grove Park, and several vacant commercial properties. Based on this context, staff determined that the proposed use would be compatible with the surrounding area and would not constitute a detrimental intrusion.

Planner Hardgrove reviewed applicable operational standards, noting that the City Code limits tattoo establishment operating hours to between 8:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. and requires a minimum separation distance of 1,500 feet from other tattoo establishments. Staff confirmed that the nearest tattoo business is located well beyond the required separation distance.

Planner Hardgrove discussed parking conditions at Orange Holden Plaza, explaining that the shopping center contains fewer parking spaces than required under current code standards. However, staff anticipates that parking demand for the proposed tattoo establishment would be similar to the prior hair salon use, which is permitted by right. She noted that the applicant proposed nine tattoo stations within a 1,200-square-foot suite. She commented that if there was concern related to the quantity of parking onsite, the number of tattoo stations could be limited as a condition of approval.

Planner Hardgrove concluded by outlining staff's recommended conditions should the Board recommend approval. These conditions include requiring full transparency of street-facing windows to support the ECD's pedestrian-oriented goals, strict compliance with permitted operating hours.

Bruno Lahr, the applicant and owner of the proposed tattoo studio, addressed the Board and stated that this would be his first business venture. Mr. Lahr acknowledged a language barrier but expressed appreciation for the opportunity to present. He described the proposed tattoo studio as a new, visually appealing business that would be a positive addition to the shopping center.

Mr. Lahr explained that although the studio is designed with nine tattoo stations, the business would operate on an appointment-only basis and would be low intensity. He stated that artists typically work with one client at a time and that overall daily activity is expected to be limited to approximately four to five clients per day, not all present at the same time. Based on this operational model, Mr. Lahr indicated that parking demand would be minimal and not anticipated to create issues for the plaza.

Anthony Artica, the property manager representing the shopping center's property owner, addressed the Board and stated that he manages the property on the owner's behalf. Mr. Artica acknowledged that the approval process was not followed in the correct order and accepted responsibility for that oversight, noting that the applicant should have been directed to the City earlier in the process.

Mr. Artica stated that the property owner supports the proposed tenant and believes the business would be a positive addition to both the shopping center and the City. He indicated that the ownership group shares the City's goal of improving the overall appearance of the corridor and attracting higher-quality businesses and tenants.

While acknowledging that tattoo establishments can sometimes be viewed as controversial, Mr. Artica emphasized the quality of the artists and the scale of their work, noting the studio's strong social media presence and professional approach.

Mr. Artica stated that he understands the City's compliance requirements and is committed to ensuring all applicable rules are followed. He indicated that he would personally work with Mr. Lahr to ensure full compliance with City regulations moving forward and noted that Mr. Lahr is not originally from the United States, which contributed to some initial misunderstandings of the approval process.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tina Demostene, an Edgewood resident, addressed the Board and stated that she was not opposed to a tattoo establishment at the subject location, but expressed concerns regarding its operation and consistency with the Edgewood Central District vision. She emphasized the City's efforts to create a walkable, family-oriented environment within the ECD.

Ms. Demostene expressed support for limiting hours of operation, such as 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., and requested that any conditions of approval remain in effect for future tattoo establishments at the site. She also raised concerns that the shopping center is substantially out of compliance, including an improperly restriped parking lot, and stated that these issues should be addressed. In addition, she supported conditions requiring clear street-facing windows, a reduction in the number of tattoo stations, and improvements to the parking lot and landscaping to better align the property with ECD goals.

Megan Milligan, an Edgewood resident, addressed the Board and stated that she agreed with the comments presented by Ms. Demostene. Ms. Milligan expressed concern that the business opened without the proper permits and stated that the proposed limitations on hours of operation would help address those concerns.

Ryan Smith, an Edgewood resident addressed the Board and stated that he has four young children. He expressed concerns regarding existing issues in the area, including parking problems, odors, and the presence of nearby uses he characterized as problematic. Mr. Smith stated that, in his view, the addition of another such use would exacerbate existing conditions and commented that "enough is enough." He concluded by stating that he agreed with the comments presented by Ms. Demostene.

DISCUSSION AFTER PUBLIC COMMENT

After the public comments, Mr. Artica came back up and addressed the Board and public to answer some of the questions/concerns. He acknowledged that tattoo establishments can be controversial uses. He stated that tattoo studios are lawful businesses and noted that similar or more intense uses, such as bars, are permitted throughout the area. Mr. Artica emphasized that hours of operation play an important role in mitigating impacts and stated that Mr. Lahr has agreed to comply with any limitations on operating hours imposed by the Board. Mr. Artica further noted that the condition of the property was worse at the time it was purchased by the current owner and that renovations have since been made to the site.

Board Member Franco questioned Mr. Artica regarding the specific renovations that had been completed. Mr. Artica responded that he was not able to speak to the details of the renovations on behalf of the property owner. Board Member Castro raised questions regarding overall compliance of the shopping center, particularly with respect to the Quick Stop use on the property.

Discussion ensued between the Board and Planner Hardgrove regarding the condition of the property and the owner's long-term intentions. Planner Hardgrove stated that when the property was purchased, the owner expressed an interest in redeveloping the site and that this remains a long-term goal. She explained that, in the interim, the owner is seeking to generate rental income from the existing suites.

Planner Hardgrove clarified that City Code requires a minimum separation distance of 1,500 feet between tattoo establishments and noted that if the proposed tattoo establishment is approved, no additional tattoo establishments would be permitted within that separation radius for the duration of the approved use.

Discussion continued regarding potential conditions of approval, with the Board agreeing that the only condition to be placed would be to maintain clear visibility through street-facing windows, consistent with staff’s recommendation. P&Z commented that requiring a single tenant to improve the parking lot as a condition of approval would constitute an undue burden on the applicant. Similarly, P&Z commented that limiting the number of stations could artificially hinder the establishment’s growth and success and that a hair salon (a comparable "by-right" use) would not be subject to such chair restrictions, making the suggested condition inequitable.

There was no additional public comment.

MOTION & ROLL CALL VOTE

Chair Nelson made a motion to recommend approval of Special Exception 2026-01 to allow a tattoo-establishment at 4712 South Orange Avenue subject to the following condition:

- The street-facing windows and doors shall maintain transparency, including but not limited to: no use of opaque window tints, curtains, or "blacked-out" vinyl wraps, and no placement of interior fixtures or furniture that would obstruct views into the studio from the exterior.

The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Castro and approved (5/0) by roll call vote.

Chair Nelson	Favor
Vice Chair Castro	Favor
Board Member Franco	Favor
Board Member Nolan	Favor
Board Member Sharp	Favor

3. ORDINANCE 2026-01: SCRIVENER’S ERROR TATTOO & BODY PIERCING

Planner Hardgrove presented Ordinance No. 2026-01, which serves to correct a scrivener’s error found within Chapter 134 (Zoning) of the City Code. She clarified that Ordinance 2024-06 contained a drafting error that misaligned the code with the City Council's original legislative intent. Specifically, while the Council intended to allow tattoo establishments as a Special Exception in the Edgewood Central District (ECD), the final ordinance language inadvertently included body piercing in that same category.

The current ordinance is an administrative correction intended to ensure that body piercing remains a prohibited use in the ECD, as originally planned. She emphasized that this action does not constitute a new policy or an expansion of uses, but rather rectifies the code language to accurately reflect prior Council decisions. All other zoning regulations regarding these uses remain in full effect.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tina Demostene, an Edgewood resident, addressed the Board and stated that tattooing was prohibited back in the day and should go back to that, as the original change to code only benefited one specific business and scenario.

Megan Milligan, an Edgewood resident, addressed the Board regarding concerns about a local church utilizing the former Le Coq Au Vin property at 4800 S. Orange Avenue for overflow event parking. The Board noted the comment; however, the issue was determined to be unrelated to the ordinance under consideration.

MOTION & ROLL CALL VOTE

Vice Chair Castro made a motion to recommend approval of Ordinance 2026-01 as presented. The motion was seconded by Board Member Nolan and approved (5/0) by roll call vote.

Chair Nelson	Favor
Vice Chair Castro	Favor
Board Member Franco	Favor
Board Member Nolan	Favor
Board Member Sharp	Favor

4. ORDINANCE 2026-02: OFF STREET PARKING REGULATIONS

Due to time constraints, the Board decided to have light discussions on some specific topics in the proposed parking regulations, as opposed to going into detail on everything. They plan to have the proposed regulations return at the next meeting to review and discuss more in detail.

Discussion on Market-Driven Parking

Planner Hardgrove explained that there has been some interest in making the parking quantity requirements more "market-driven." Some local governments have totally eliminated parking minimums. She cautioned the Board that while larger jurisdictions are adopting this trend, it remains a high-risk strategy for Edgewood at this time. Supporting data presented showed that Edgewood households own an average of two vehicles, and 76% of residents drive alone to work, while public transit and bicycle usage currently stand at 0%. Additionally, Planner Hardgrove noted that the City lacks the necessary public parking infrastructure to absorb overflow, which could result in negative impacts to adjacent properties and residential neighborhoods. She also pointed out that financial institutions are often unwilling to fund projects lacking dedicated parking in areas without robust transit. Board members discussed balancing these realities by considering reductions to specific parking ratios, which will be reviewed in detail during the February meeting.

Regulations for Shopping Centers and Legacy Sites

The Board reviewed the triggers for applying parking regulations, specifically regarding changes in occupancy. Significant discussion centered on Shopping Centers that were built prior to modern parking regulations and do not have a conforming supply of spaces; the proposed regulation allows for the interchange of suites without a new parking analysis, provided that high-demand uses—such as medical offices, gyms, and restaurants—do not exceed 65% of the total gross square footage. These shopping centers are proposed to be classified as "Legacy Shopping Centers," defined as those approved before 1985 with at least 150 paved spaces and a ratio of 4.2 spaces per 1,000 GSF. Currently, only Community, Fort Gatlin, and portions of Edgewood Isle meet these criteria. Planner Hardgrove noted that a Parking Functional Adequacy report would be required for these sites if a new tenant exceeds 10,000 GSF or requires more than 10 additional spaces.

Adaptive Reuse and Unpaved Parking Standards

The Board engaged in a robust debate regarding other structures built prior to modern regulations, particularly along Orange Avenue whether to allow parking reductions in exchange for site improvements or to utilize a simple waiver system. Discussion ensued relative to perpetuating the existing land use pattern along Orange Avenue instead of

encouraging redevelopment/the ECD vision and the creating of negative impacts from allowing substandard parking. The Board directed staff to revisit options for future Board consideration.

Regarding the allowance of unpaved parking, the Board reached a consensus to permit such surfaces in only two specific instances: for special events and for environmental necessity. For special events, unpaved parking shall be limited to twice per calendar year per property, business, or applicant, for a duration not to exceed 72 hours per event. Furthermore, professional traffic control is required for any event exceeding 50 vehicles. Failure to adhere to these standards, or a failure to restore the site to its original condition, will result in a \$5,000.00 daily fine. On a permanent basis, the Board determined that unpaved parking should be allowed strictly for documented environmental reasons.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tina Demostene, an Edgewood resident, addressed the Board and expressed concerns regarding the restrictive nature of the "Legacy Shopping Center" definition, suggesting that the flexibility currently reserved for the three identified sites—Community, Fort Gatlin, and Edgewood Isle —should be extended to all older shopping centers in the city. She advocated for a broader application of these exemptions to foster city-wide commercial stability. Additionally, she recommended that the Board "move up" or prioritize the bike rack requirements in the exchange to have reduced parking to better address alternative transportation.

Regarding the proposed waiver process for sites with substandard parking, Ms. Demostene suggested a more structured timeline where the applicant must explicitly identify the requested length of the waiver, not to exceed a five-year period. She proposed that at the end of this five-year term, the property owner should be required to either initiate redevelopment in line with the ECD vision or reapply for the waiver. She emphasized that any such application or renewal should require the applicant to provide a rigorous justification for the continued parking deficiency to ensure the city isn't merely perpetuating existing land-use patterns without progress.

Following public comment, the Board held a brief final discussion. It was agreed that Planner Hardgrove would compile the Board's discussion notes and present them to City Council for feedback. That feedback will be brought back to the Board for further consideration at the February meeting.

MOTION & ROLL CALL VOTE

Chair Nelson made a motion to continue discussion of proposed Ordinance 2026-02 to the next meeting scheduled for February 9, 2026. The motion was seconded by Board Member Sharp and approved by a 5–0 roll call vote.

Chair Nelson	Favor
Vice Chair Castro	Favor
Board Member Franco	Favor
Board Member Nolan	Favor
Board Member Sharp	Favor

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:28 PM.



David Nelson, Chair



Brett Sollazzo, Administrative Project Manager