

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting June 20, 2024

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, June 20, 2024, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Gaere MacDonald, Chairperson, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL:

Gaere MacDonald, Chairperson
Brad Beach, Vice-Chairperson
Paul Weaver, III
Catherine Duncan
Linda Potter

City Staff:

Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Officer
Candice Seymour, Historic Preservation Planner
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Elyse Weimann, Recording Secretary

Mr. MacDonald welcomed Linda Potter to the Board.

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

Leslee Keys spoke about the demolition of 11 Bridge Street.

Melinda Rakoncay requested that HARB discuss 11 Bridge Street at the end of the meeting.

John Valdes spoke about the danger of Formosan Termites.

BJ Kalaidi

Mr. Weaver commented that anytime the Building Official informed the Board about public safety it was taken very seriously. He said that if 11 Bridge Street had not been handled appropriately then there should be an investigation. He said there was no collusion between HARB and the City Commission.

Mr. MacDonald noted that personally he was not in favor of the demolition, and he had written a letter to provide his opinion;

however, he thought it was left up to the City Commission.

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the April 18, 2024 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Potter, Duncan, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the May 16, 2024 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Potter, Duncan, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Agenda as proposed. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Potter, Duncan, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Recommended Expedited Hearing items (to be recommended one week in advance):

None

6. Certificate of Appropriateness for a Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption.

6.(a) HP2022-0027 – Historic Property Associates, Inc. – Applicant Bridge Street Estates LLC – Owner 115 Bridge Street

To review Part III of a Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption Application to certify the completion of rehabilitation work for a contributing building to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, constructed c. 1800, and recorded in the Florida Master Site File.

Mr. Weaver recused himself from the application.¹

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the previous review and approval of Parts I and II of this application, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds the board can APPROVE a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS for the Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption at 115 Bridge Street, if the HARB finds:

1. The completion of work to the exterior and interior of the existing c.1800 building, which is a contributing structure to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, complies or is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

2. The proposed work meets the criteria established by the Department of State (see #6 of attachments)

Steven Porter reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- Project was beautiful blend of existing and new
- Scale and proportion had been maintained
- Appeared to comply with the Department of State requirements, and the Secretary of the Interior standards
- In favor of going forward with a recommendation to the City Commission
- Changes to the property were amazing
- Thought it was a great restoration project
- In historic restoration coquina was never left exposed as it was porous and that was traditional at the time, but thought it was beautiful

MOTION

Mr. Beach MOVED to APPROVE HP2022-0027 part three of the historic preservation tax exemption because it met the requirements of the Secretary of the Interior Standards for rehabilitation as well as the Department of State regulations, the Board would APPROVE a recommendation to the City Commission.

¹ Recusal form attached to original minutes.

The motion was **SECONDED** by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Beach, Duncan, Potter, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Certificates of Appropriateness

7. (a) HP2024-0026 – Fidus Roofing & Construction LLC - Applicant
Cuna Properties, LLC - Owner
20 Cuna Street

To replace an existing wood shingle roof with a new material.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 20 Cuna Street:

1. APPROVE if the HARB determines that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence that the proposed new material meets the AGHP requirements for alternative/substitute materials and the new material meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design.

2. DENY if the HARB determines that the proposed new material does not meet the AGHP requirements for alternative/substitute materials and is not consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

Mark Alexander and Mitch Heich reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened.

Melinda Rakoncay spoke in opposition to the application and said she was sympathetic to the situation but thought replacing a roof

three times in fifty years was normal. She said the proposed material looked fake and did not fit the historic area. She felt a wood composite might tend to fit the area better.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Alexander provided his rebuttal.

The Board discussed:

- Property was not contributing
- The wood shingle roof was a character defining feature of the downtown Historic Preservation (HP) 3 district
- The authenticity of the downtown buildings was what made them valuable
- This was one of the first buildings that was seen in the historic district
- Not in favor of changing the material of the roof and thought the investment was worthwhile
- The building was in a prominent location
- Roof was very much exposed but had a patina that helped it fit into the HP district
- The proposed material did not fit the Secretary of the Interior Standards
- Suggested purchasing a thicker wood shingle to help prolong the life of the roof
- Roof was visible from many different locations
- Proposed material seemed to be too uniform and perfect as the patina made the building stand out
- Treat the shingles to keep the moss from growing
- Suggested using tile as an alternative product as it was approved, and would last
- Provided several alternatives to help keep the cedar shakes or cut wood shingle on the building and make them last longer

Mr. Heist commented that this was an option that gave a similar appearance; however, it would never be exact. He said wood shake shingles were becoming harder and harder to source.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to DENY application HP2024-0026 20 Cuna Street to replace an existing wood shingle roof with a new material because this was not an appropriate substitute material. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Duncan, Potter, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION TO DENY CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b) HP2024-0029 – 44 Avenida Menendez LLC - Applicant and Owner 44 Avenida Menendez

To modify previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness application PL2021-0121 with a different proposed interior courtyard surface material and design and to use salvaged exposed coquina for a portion of the east property wall instead of block and stucco.

Mr. Weaver recused himself from the application.²

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, the previous discussions of the HARB for the previous OOA and COA applications, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions regarding a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS at 44 Avenida Menendez:

1. APPROVE if the board finds that the revised plans are compatible with the AGHP and/or Manucy's Houses of St. Augustine and meets Secretary of the Interior's Standard's for Rehabilitation #3 and 9.

2. CONTINUE with a finding that the overall design is not compatible with the AGHP

and/or Manucy's Houses of St. Augustine and to allow time for the applicant to alter the proposed design modifications or opt to stay with the previously approved plans and materials.

John Arbizzani, Cliff Duch and Christopher Clark reviewed the application.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

Mr. Beach questioned the reason for the change of materials.

Mr. Arbizzani said there needed to be an area of transition between the ticket booth and the building. He thought it would cost more money but also thought it would help the building look more uniform and historic by making the entire wall coquina. He said they wanted to repurpose the coquina that was taken out of the building so that the building would look historic and be completed properly.

Mr. MacDonald asked about the coquina wall being removed from within the building.

Ms. Courtney said the interior wall and the way it was constructed helped to determine that it was not an original coquina wall.

Mr. Duch said the intent of the building was to represent all three periods of Spanish Colonial and having the coquina helped tell the story.

The Board discussed:

- Looking at the elevations it made sense, there was wrapping and terminating, and texture involved
- Hardscape was breaking things up, so the building did not appear so monolithic

² Recusal form attached to the original minutes.

- Concrete should be hand tooled to make it more natural looking
- In the courtyard shellcrete would be used to avoid a trip hazard for visitors
- Drainage was fully engineered and approved
- Coquina was porous, how would that affect the life expectancy of the new wall
- Normally walls were built with stucco but did not feel it was a major issue
- Concerned with the bricks and if they were appropriate to introduce to the site
- Did not think bricks should be laid in the portico

Ms. Courtney noted that the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation (AGHP) typically wanted to see the difference between the old and the new and, in HP-2 and HP-3 districts, there was a requirement to build within the British Colonial style. She said that it was important the new and old materials should be compatible.

Mr. Duch thought that overtime the bricks would have been introduced and justified from a Historical Preservation point of view; however, not opposed to what the Board wanted.

Ms. Courtney pointed out that the AGHP recommended poured coquina concrete or tabby for loggia and gallery floors.

MOTION

Mr. Beach MOVED to APPROVE application HP2024-0029 on the findings that the coquina wall would be continued as proposed with a wood lintil in the gate as designed, also the hardscape with the brick pavers in designated areas and changes to include tabby stone in the Espinoza portico and the flatwork would be shellcrete. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Beach, Duncan, Potter, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY³

7. (c) HP2024-0030 – 58 Charlotte Street LLC - Applicant **58 Charlotte LLC – Owner 58 Charlotte Street**

To replace the existing wood fence and gates along Charlotte Street, construct an addition on the rear/west elevation of the building, and make exterior site alterations including a new paved patio space with associated fencing, trellis, landscaping, and furniture, and a fenced service yard with parking and screened mechanical equipment.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 58 Charlotte Street:

1. APPROVE if the HARB finds that the proposed work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation # 9 as a Compatible Contemporary Design.
2. CONTINUE to allow the applicant to provide additional information and/or modify the proposed design as directed by the HARB.

Milan Malinovic and Beth Angelo reviewed the application.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

Public hearing was opened.

Melinda Rakoncay asked if an addition would be added to the building with a flat roof. She said if canvas was allowed the umbrellas should be fine.

Mr. MacDonald said the drawings were of a pitched roof.

³ Break from 2:48p.m.-3:01p.m.

Ms. Seymour clarified that at the rear of the building there was a flat roofed area that was proposed to be closed in and extended.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- The gate was installed in 2014 but did not fit the style of the building
- Suggested replacing with a different style to help fit the Spanish Colonial style
- The project scope was substantial and thought the gate could be changed
- Questioned what the gate looked like when reconstruction was done
- Florida Master Site File states that the house was called the Herrera House and the foundation still existed under the structure.
- Thought the architect of the building was Craig Thorne and thought it would assist with baseline documentation as a reference point
- Felt the packet submitted was very thorough
- Proportions of the additions and slopes worked with the existing structure
- Agreed the gate should be changed
- Materials were compatible with the guidelines
- Cedar shingles and stucco to match the existing
- Felt the applicant understood the Secretary of the Interior Standards
- Was lot coverage an issue, that only applied to residential structures and the space was under the allowance of 2,000 square feet
- Very well done and was in favor of changing the gate to a wooden gate as that fit the colonial style
- Felt the proposal was done well and the new addition was tucked in the back and was not obstructive
- There was a photograph on page 26 of staff report that would be the basis for the gate design
- What was the plan for the landscaping

- Because of the potential for flooding, most of the plantings would be in pots
- Preferred the masonry wall and the landscaping over the wall

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE item HP2024-0030 58 Charlotte Street to replace the existing wood fence and gates along Charlotte Street, construct an addition on the rear/west elevation of the building, and make exterior site alterations including a new paved patio space with associated fencing, trellis, landscaping, and furniture, and a fenced service yard with parking and screened mechanical equipment, with the basis for the new fence and gateway entrance to be taken from page 26 of the staff report and the walls to be of masonry construction. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Potter, Duncan, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

8. (a) HP2024-0027 – Colour Homes LLC – Applicant Siefken Living Trust - Owner 66 Saragossa Street

To demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1904-1910, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and contributing to the Model Land Company National Register Historic District.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following action for a Certificate of Demolition at 66 Saragossa Street:

1. CONTINUE to allow the applicant time to submit additional condition or economic hardship details and/or to explore whether incentives such as the Ad Valorem Tax Exemption program would make rehabilitation more feasible; OR,

2. APPROVE if the HARB finds that sufficient structural and economic hardship information was provided by the applicant to justify demolition of the contributing structure with the following conditions:

a. Salvage and preservation of significant building materials, architectural details and ornaments, fixtures, and the like for reuse in restoration of other historic properties

b. That no permit be issued for the demolition until drawings sufficient for a building permit and all necessary requirements for the construction of a new building have been submitted for the new construction.

Jason Stancil reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

27 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 1 was returned opposed and 1 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

Melinda Rakoncay asked what the city was willing to do to protect these structures that were old and in disrepair. She understood that restoration was not inexpensive, however it was important to try to save these buildings. She was in opposition to this application because it appeared to be demolition by neglect. She said that if enough of these structures came down, there would not be an historic district anymore.

Nancy Pellicer spoke in opposition to the application and asked if there was a way to protect the homes that we had. She wanted to see that the new structure would be appropriate to the neighborhood.

David Lee Sellers, Jr spoke in favor of the application; however, he shared the same feelings to save the structures. He said this home had a lot of history but was in disrepair.

Mr. Weaver asked how long the home had been neglected.

Mr. Sellers said the home had been in disrepair for at least 6 years.

Christa Amman said this would be their forever home. She said that much of the house was not original and she had wanted to rehab the structure but was unable.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

Mr. Weaver confirmed that the property was currently controlled by the Seifken Family Trust and determined that the contractor was representing the current owner. He asked the contractor if any of the financial incentives such as the Ad Valorem Tax Credit or the Federal Tax Credit had been factored into the equation for the economic hardship.

Mr. Stancil advised the board that no tax credits had been included in the claim of financial hardship.

- No mention that the house was a certified historic structure under the Florida Building Code
- The historic structure would also have an effect under FEMA requirements
- Contributing building in a National Register District, which gave the building special status
- Thought the report was not complete because of missing information
- House was important as it was built by the Model Land Company which was a Henry Flagler company and had historical value
- This appeared to be a speculative demolition

- This was a classic case of demolition by neglect and was a long term issue as noted by the neighbors
- Did not agree that there was an economic hardship
- Thought that the house should be restored
- The windows appeared to be original
- Not everyone was able to take on a restoration project and that should be decided before purchasing any property
- Thought it was wise to update the foundation and the structure but did not think it should be demolished
- Felt the opinion of the condition of the home was subjective interpretation of conditions as listed on the Florida Master Site file, and, was there a definite explanation available of when a home was beyond repair or restoration
- The building had a lot of termite damage, and the foundation was very bad
- The building was still square and level
- The only thing missing was half the chimney
- Understood it was a lot of money but there would be benefits from the Ad Valorem Tax Program
- Felt that the owner should not profit off neglect

Ms. Courtney read the code regarding Demolition and Partial Demolition.

Ms. Lopez directed the Board to the staff report where there were ways for the applicant to prove undue economic hardship.

Mr. MacDonald said denying the application was an option. He also said the Board could continue the application for a partial demolition and a rehabilitation plan to be brought back to the Board for consideration.

Mr. Weaver pointed out that the structure was historical and contributing. He felt that the application was not complete, and he did not support wholesale demolition. He said the Board was willing to work with the applicant.

Ms. Duncan thought the new proposed plans, that were slab on grade would take away the character of the new area.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2024-0027 to the July 18, 2024 meeting of the HARB. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Potter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Potter, Duncan, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Planning and Building Staff Communications

9.(a) Staff Approved permits and Report

(Provided for informational purposes)

10. Other Business

10. (a) Request for support of a FY26 Small Matching Grant application for "Exploring St. Augustine's Post-Emancipation Black Schools: An Archaeology Pop-Up Exhibit" submitted by the Archaeology Program

Ms. Courtney reviewed the topic and explained the Small matching grant application and the importance of the Board's support of the letter to the Grantor.

There was consensus with the Board to support the letter for the grant.

Ms. Courtney advised the Board that the city had been awarded two grants and explained what they would involve.

b) City Project to install a COSA interpretive/historical marker that highlights the 100th anniversary on the international sisterhood collaboration between Avilés, Spain and St. Augustine proposed to be placed next to the mosaic

panel on Aviles Street and a smaller marker to explain the significance of the mosaic.

Melissa Wissel, City of St. Augustine Communications Director, presented two markers that would be placed on Aviles Street to celebrate the relationship between St. Augustine and Aviles, Spain, and requested feedback from the Board. She also asked for approval for a vertical panel to have one side in English and other in Spanish.

Mr. MacDonald suggested placing the Mosaic on the wall with the identifying signage in front.

There was additional discussion expanding on Mr. MacDonald's idea.

There was consensus with the Board in support of the temporary proposal.

c) Review the nomination update of the 1983 designated Abbott Tract National Register Historic District for recommendation to the State Historic Preservation Office: purpose is to update the above-ground count of resources, document alterations and new infill within the district, and to add information under the Criterion B for the district's association with Lucy Abbott.

Ms. Courtney reviewed the topic for the Board.

Mr. Beach asked what determined the boundaries and wanted to know what the geographical landmarks denoting the area would be also, he asked what criteria were used to determine if a building was contributing or non-contributing.

Mr. Weaver indicated that there were no boundary changes, and Spanish land grants formed the Abbott Tract. He pointed out that the boundaries were as follows; San Pablo

Road (now San Marco) the Fort Resort, the Top Hill Creek, and man-made and natural landmarks.

There was consensus with the Board to support the update; however, Mr. Weaver abstained from voting.

Ms. Lopez presented a synopsis of the different ways a demolition could happen and what could be done by the Board, Code Enforcement, and the Property Maintenance Code.

Ms. Lopez advised the Board that Florida law allowed for Building Officials to make determinations in emergency situations.

Further discussion explained that a Building Official could make a determination of demolition, but there had to be sufficient evidence in place to support the decision.

Melinda Rakoncaj was given permission by the Chair to speak about demolition. She told the Board she knew they were not responsible for 11 Bridge Street but thought any demolition should be presented to HARB. She said her hope was that HARB would always be involved. She added that her concern was this would set precedence.

11. Next Scheduled Meeting Date(s):

11. (a) July 18, 2024 - Regular Meeting

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:47 P.M.⁴



Gaere MacDonald, Chairperson

⁴ Transcribed by Michele Fudo

FORM 8B MEMORANDUM OF VOTING CONFLICT FOR COUNTY, MUNICIPAL, AND OTHER LOCAL PUBLIC OFFICERS

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME WEAVER PAUL L.		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE HARB	
MAILING ADDRESS 5 MILITON ST		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: ☒ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☐ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
CITY St. Augustine	COUNTY St. Johns	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: COA	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED 06/20/2024		MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ APPOINTIVE	

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

This form is for use by any person serving at the county, city, or other local level of government on an appointed or elected board, council, commission, authority, or committee. It applies to members of advisory and non-advisory bodies who are presented with a voting conflict of interest under Section 112.3143, Florida Statutes.

Your responsibilities under the law when faced with voting on a measure in which you have a conflict of interest will vary greatly depending on whether you hold an elective or appointive position. For this reason, please pay close attention to the instructions on this form before completing and filing the form.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

A person holding elective or appointive county, municipal, or other local public office **MUST ABSTAIN** from voting on a measure which would inure to his or her special private gain or loss. Each elected or appointed local officer also **MUST ABSTAIN** from knowingly voting on a measure which would inure to the special gain or loss of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he or she is retained (including the parent, subsidiary, or sibling organization of a principal by which he or she is retained); to the special private gain or loss of a relative; or to the special private gain or loss of a business associate. Commissioners of community redevelopment agencies (CRAs) under Sec. 163.356 or 163.357, F.S., and officers of independent special tax districts elected on a one-acre, one-vote basis are not prohibited from voting in that capacity.

For purposes of this law, a "relative" includes only the officer's father, mother, son, daughter, husband, wife, brother, sister, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, and daughter-in-law. A "business associate" means any person or entity engaged in or carrying on a business enterprise with the officer as a partner, joint venturer, coowner of property, or corporate shareholder (where the shares of the corporation are not listed on any national or regional stock exchange).

* * * * *

ELECTED OFFICERS:

In addition to abstaining from voting in the situations described above, you must disclose the conflict:

PRIOR TO THE VOTE BEING TAKEN by publicly stating to the assembly the nature of your interest in the measure on which you are abstaining from voting; *and*

WITHIN 15 DAYS AFTER THE VOTE OCCURS by completing and filing this form with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

* * * * *

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

Although you must abstain from voting in the situations described above, you are not prohibited by Section 112.3143 from otherwise participating in these matters. However, you must disclose the nature of the conflict before making any attempt to influence the decision, whether orally or in writing and whether made by you or at your direction.

IF YOU INTEND TO MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION PRIOR TO THE MEETING AT WHICH THE VOTE WILL BE TAKEN:

- You must complete and file this form (before making any attempt to influence the decision) with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who will incorporate the form in the minutes. (Continued on page 2)

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING:

- You must disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You must complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who must incorporate the form in the minutes. A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency, and the form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Paul L. Wew, hereby disclose that on 06/20, 20 24:

(a) A measure came or will come before my agency which (check one or more)

- ☐ inured to my special private gain or loss;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my business associate, _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____;
- ☒ inured to the special gain or loss of 44 Avenida Menéndez, LLC, by whom I am retained; or
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

I am a paid consultant to the applicant on this and other projects.

If disclosure of specific information would violate confidentiality or privilege pursuant to law or rules governing attorneys, a public officer, who is also an attorney, may comply with the disclosure requirements of this section by disclosing the nature of the interest in such a way as to provide the public with notice of the conflict.

Date Filed _____

Signature _____

NOTICE: UNDER PROVISIONS OF FLORIDA STATUTES §112.317, A FAILURE TO MAKE ANY REQUIRED DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR AND MAY BE PUNISHED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION FROM OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT, DEMOTION, REDUCTION IN SALARY, REPRIMAND, OR A CIVIL PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000.

FORM 8B MEMORANDUM OF VOTING CONFLICT FOR COUNTY, MUNICIPAL, AND OTHER LOCAL PUBLIC OFFICERS

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME WEAVER, PAUL L.	NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE HARB
MAILING ADDRESS 5 MILTON ST	THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: ☒ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☐ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY
CITY St. Augustine	COUNTY St. Johns
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED 06/20/2024	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: COSA
	MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ APPOINTIVE

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

This form is for use by any person serving at the county, city, or other local level of government on an appointed or elected board, council, commission, authority, or committee. It applies to members of advisory and non-advisory bodies who are presented with a voting conflict of interest under Section 112.3143, Florida Statutes.

Your responsibilities under the law when faced with voting on a measure in which you have a conflict of interest will vary greatly depending on whether you hold an elective or appointive position. For this reason, please pay close attention to the instructions on this form before completing and filing the form.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

A person holding elective or appointive county, municipal, or other local public office **MUST ABSTAIN** from voting on a measure which would inure to his or her special private gain or loss. Each elected or appointed local officer also **MUST ABSTAIN** from knowingly voting on a measure which would inure to the special gain or loss of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he or she is retained (including the parent, subsidiary, or sibling organization of a principal by which he or she is retained); to the special private gain or loss of a relative; or to the special private gain or loss of a business associate. Commissioners of community redevelopment agencies (CRAs) under Sec. 163.356 or 163.357, F.S., and officers of independent special tax districts elected on a one-acre, one-vote basis are not prohibited from voting in that capacity.

For purposes of this law, a "relative" includes only the officer's father, mother, son, daughter, husband, wife, brother, sister, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, and daughter-in-law. A "business associate" means any person or entity engaged in or carrying on a business enterprise with the officer as a partner, joint venturer, coowner of property, or corporate shareholder (where the shares of the corporation are not listed on any national or regional stock exchange).

* * * * *

ELECTED OFFICERS:

In addition to abstaining from voting in the situations described above, you must disclose the conflict:

PRIOR TO THE VOTE BEING TAKEN by publicly stating to the assembly the nature of your interest in the measure on which you are abstaining from voting; and

WITHIN 15 DAYS AFTER THE VOTE OCCURS by completing and filing this form with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

* * * * *

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

Although you must abstain from voting in the situations described above, you are not prohibited by Section 112.3143 from otherwise participating in these matters. However, you must disclose the nature of the conflict before making any attempt to influence the decision, whether orally or in writing and whether made by you or at your direction.

IF YOU INTEND TO MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION PRIOR TO THE MEETING AT WHICH THE VOTE WILL BE TAKEN:

- You must complete and file this form (before making any attempt to influence the decision) with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who will incorporate the form in the minutes. (Continued on page 2)

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING:

- You must disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You must complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who must incorporate the form in the minutes. A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency, and the form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Paul L. Warner, hereby disclose that on 06 / 20 /, 20 24:

(a) A measure came or will come before my agency which (check one or more)

- ☐ inured to my special private gain or loss;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my business associate, _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____;
- ☒ inured to the special gain or loss of Bridge Street Estates, LLC, by whom I am retained; or
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

I was retained by the owner as a paid consultant.

If disclosure of specific information would violate confidentiality or privilege pursuant to law or rules governing attorneys, a public officer, who is also an attorney, may comply with the disclosure requirements of this section by disclosing the nature of the interest in such a way as to provide the public with notice of the conflict.

06/20/2024
Date Filed

Paul L. Warner
Signature

NOTICE: UNDER PROVISIONS OF FLORIDA STATUTES §112.317, A FAILURE TO MAKE ANY REQUIRED DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR AND MAY BE PUNISHED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION FROM OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT, DEMOTION, REDUCTION IN SALARY, REPRIMAND, OR A CIVIL PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000.