

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting July 18, 2024

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, July 18, 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:

<u>1. ROLL CALL:</u>	Gaere MacDonald, Chairperson
Absent	Brad Beach, Vice-Chairperson (Excused)
	Paul Weaver, III
Absent	Catherine Duncan (Excused)
	Linda Potter
	Barbara Wingo (Alternate)

<u>City Staff:</u>	Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Officer
	Candice Seymour, Historic Preservation Planner
	Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
	Michele Fudo, Recording Secretary

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

George Selmont spoke about historic preservation and how the livelihood of the residents depended on the preservation of the buildings in the St. Augustine. He felt that there were many things that went wrong which led to the total demolition of 11 Bridge Street.

Leslee Keys said the same structural engineering firm provided all the reports for 11 Bridge Street.

Melinda Rakoncaj gave some history of the 11 Bridge Street demolition.

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. Weaver **MOVED to APPROVE** the June 20, 2024 with the following changes, correct the spelling on page 4 for Chris Duch. The motion was **SECONDED** by Ms. Potter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Potter, MacDonald, Wingo

NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

MOTION

Mr. Weaver **MOVED to APPROVE** the Agenda as presented. The motion was **SECONDED** by Ms. Potter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Potter, Wingo, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

6. Staff Presentation

6.(a) Presentation by Building Official Regarding the 50% Rule

Buddy Schauland, the city's building official gave a presentation explaining the 50% rule in reconstruction or renovation. He said that in anything other than level three alterations, the requirement was to make the structure

fire safe. He explained that level three alterations covered life safety issues and dealt with commercial properties; however, half of the building that was being altered had to be brought to code. He defined the historical building. He said that the goal for historic preservation was to preserve the original quality of the structure.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness

7. (a) HP2024- 0025 – Trademark Signs LLC – Applicant Bank of America, N.A. – Owner 60 Cathedral Place

To install signage using colors and materials that are not pre-approved.

The applicant was not present; the Board agreed to hear the item later to allow the applicant time to arrive.

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 60 Cathedral Place:

1. CONTINUE to allow the applicant time to consider alternative materials and colors that are more consistent with the AGHP and the surrounding district.

2. APPROVE if the HARB finds that the materials, font, and colors as proposed or modified at the Board's recommendation meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design.

After item 7.d. was heard Ms. Seymour advised the Board that the applicant was unable to attend in person but was willing for the application to be heard without a representative. Mr. Weaver and Mr. MacDonald were not comfortable with this option.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2024-0025 to the August 15, 2024 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Potter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Potter, Wingo, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b) HP2024-0039 – Jason Canning Architect Inc. – Applicant Bishop of the Diocese of St. Augustine – Owner 35 Treasury

To construct two pergolas with retractable covers in the south courtyard between the existing rectory and the Cathedral Basilica.

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 CONTINUE a Certificate of Appropriateness applicant at 35 Treasury Street to allow the applicant time to consider a more appropriate design and/or material for the proposed pergolas based upon HARB recommendations.

Kejsi Bebri representing Jason Canning Architects reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened.

Melinda Rakoncay commended the staff for advising a continuance. She pointed out that all others in the HP districts were required to use wood.

Kevin Partel contrasted the style of the building with the chosen materials for the pergolas. He said that the church was trying to upgrade the outer appearance of the courtyard.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- The choice for the pergola was historic or modern
- If modern was chosen, it should be compatible architecturally
- Did not see compatibility in the concept pictures
- No consideration of the context of the area
- Function could be achieved as well as the architectural compatibility
- Building was constructed in the 1920's, a contemporary design was acceptable, but this did not match
- Felt that a wooden pergola would better fit with the style of the building
- The Board had been consistent in not accepting modern materials
- Masonry columns with wood on top would be a better alternative
- Applicant requested a continuance

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE Certificate of Appropriateness HP2024-0039 35 Treasury Street to the August 15, 2024 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, Potter, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (c) HP2024-0038 – Donald Crichlow – Applicant 18 Saint George Street, LLC – Owner 18 St. George Street

To modify a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness with a retaining wall, removal of an approved swinging gate to allow for widening of a previously approved rolling gate, and relocation of an access ramp.

Mr. Weaver recused himself from this item.¹

¹ Recusal form with original minutes

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 APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness at 18 St. George Street if the HARB finds that the proposed gate and site modification meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design with the following conditions:

- Railing design for retaining wall was provided and is found to be appropriate
- Retaining wall color was clarified and confirmed to be a pre-approved color or found appropriate by the HARB
- The swinging gate proposed be lessened in size to the appropriate 50" width

William Smith and Joseph Macetta reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

The Board discussed:

- Confirmed that the paint color would be an approved color
- Confirmed elevations
- Confirmed that the applicant would go forward with staff recommendations
- Originally there were two separate gates and those had been combined into one gate of the appropriate size

MOTION

Ms. Potter MOVED to APPROVE application HP2024-0038 with the provisions the same railing design would be retained, the wall color would be the same as previously approved, and the swinging gate would be the appropriate

size of 50". The motion was **SECONDED** by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Potter, Wingo, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (d) HP2024-0040 – Mark Williams – Applicant

St. Augustine Foundation, Inc. – Owner
91 St. George Street

To construct a new covered patio space, wood fencing to screen mechanical equipment, and use of a non-approved paint color.

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 91 St. George Street:

1. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to provide additional information and/or modify designs as recommended by the HARB; OR,

2. APPROVE the application if the HARB finds that the proposed site changes meet the Secretary for the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design with the following conditions:

- Trellis specifications are clarified, height is confirmed to be lower than the existing building, and all hardware is hidden or painted black.

- Confirm which AGHP-approved paving material will be used for the proposed patio pad

- Outdoor tables and chairs be simplified designs using only wood materials

Mark Williams and Rich Hardman reviewed the application

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi questioned the color selection for trim on the building

Melinda Rakoncay commented and told the board the Spanish style table would be nice for the project

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- The Spanish style table was preferred
- Would the applicant be accepting of any Board decisions
- Wanted to see a better rendering of the pergola and it was provided in the application

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE item 7.d. HP2024-0040 to construct a new covered patio space, wood fencing to screen mechanical equipment, and use of an approved paint color as staff conditions were addressed as follows; the trellis specifications had been clarified, the height would be lower than the existing building, all hardware would be hidden or painted black, the paving materials would be crushed shell, and the table would be the Spanish style. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Potter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Potter, Wingo, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (e) HP2024-0033 – A.D. Davis Construction Corp. – Applicant
TIITF/Department of State c/o University of Florida – Owner
53 St. George Street

To remove an existing ticket booth along St. George Street; to make site changes

to the rear of the existing structure, including bathroom and storage additions, new mechanical equipment and grease trap with associated screening, and relocation of an access ramp.

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 53 St. George Street:

1. CONTINUE the application to allow for additional time to review new information submitted by the applicant; OR,

2. APPROVE the application if the HARB finds that sufficient details were provided to determine the proposed scope of work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design with the following condition:

- Proposed addition heights are subordinate to the existing building heights; and,
- Better screening be provided for the hood vent visible from Cuna Street

Cindy Stavely, Mike Davis and Ethan Davis reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

The Board discussed:

Mr. Weaver said he was on board with all the proposed changes. He felt that the items proposed for removal were more recent construction. He said that the changes were needed to make the building functional.

Ms. Potter thought that the proposed changes were utilitarian and would benefit visitors.

There was consensus with the Board for approval.

MOTION

Ms. Potter MOVED to APPROVE application HP2024-0033 to remove an existing ticket booth along St. George Street; to make site changes to the rear of the existing structure, including bathroom and storage additions, new mechanical equipment and grease trap with associated screening, and relocation of an access ramp. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Potter, Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (f) HP2024-0035 – PQH Group, Inc. – Applicant SAR 2020 Partners, LLC – Owner 7 Aviles Street

To construct a rooftop deck with exterior spiral stair, reconstruct the existing two-story covered front porch, replace existing windows and exterior doors with new, add new window openings on the north and south elevations, enclose an existing second-story rear porch with screening, replace existing garage doors, install a new concrete pad, and repair damage to exterior walls, fences, and gates.

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 7 Aviles Street:

CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to provide additional information requested by the HARB and/or modify proposed designs per HARB recommendations

Mr. Weaver asked if there had been any update to the sufficiency checklist and was advised that there were no changes.

Frank Renhauffer reviewed the application

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened.

Melinda Rakonca commented that she was pleased to see that the building was being restored. She said that she wanted to encourage the applicant to try to restore the existing windows and doors if possible.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- There needed to be more details provided and more due diligence
- No fundamental understanding of what was historic on the building
- Thought that many of the changes to the building had taken place in the 1960's and 1970's.
- Needed to know what was original
- More research would show how much flexibility was available to the applicant
- Leaning toward a continuance
- Spiral staircase visibility was an issue
- Work with staff and the St. Augustine Historical Society
- Masonry feature was proposed as a removal
- Changes had been made and the masonry wall was not going to be removed
- Looking at the options available for a secure gate
- Height of the building twenty-five feet.
- Consider a widows walk
- Restore old windows and doors as much as possible
- The building would be used for a residence
- Wood picket for the balcony would be fine

- Spiral staircase was inappropriate and impractical
- Crisscrossed railing was probably from the 1930's, but had no problem with the change

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE item 7.f. HP2024-0035 7 Aviles Street to the August 15, 2024 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, Potter, MacDonald
NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Certificates of Demolition and Partial Demolition

8. (a) HP2024-0041 – Alexcia M. Smith – Applicant George and Ollie Smith Irrevocable Trust – Owner 97 South Street

For after-the-fact partial demolition of a residential building, constructed c. 1899-1904, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and contributing to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, including wholesale removal and replacement of the previously existing awning and jalousie windows with windows of a new material and design.

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 **APPROVE a Certificate of Demolition for Partial Demolition at 97 South Street** if the HARB finds that the design, material, and fenestration changes to the previously altered windows will not compromise the overall historic character and integrity of the structure and does not impact the architectural integrity of the structure such that it would no longer contribute to the Lincolnville National Register District in a future update.

Charles Sampson reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication : none

25 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response

The Board discussed:

Mr. Weaver said he felt that this was an unintentional error, and the awning windows that had been replaced were not original. He said that while the replacement windows were not necessarily the best choice, there was no harm done to the appearance of the building.

There was consensus with the Board to approve the application.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE item 8.a. HP2024-0041 at 97 South Street for after the fact approval of non-historic windows. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Potter.²

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Potter, Wingo, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (b) HP2024-0034 – Kevin Partel – Applicant Partel Family Trust – Owner 23 Bay View Drive

To demolish a garage building, constructed c. 1953, that is not recorded in the Florida Master Site File but is contributing to the Fullerwood Park 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 **APPROVE a Certificate of Demolition at 23 Bay View Drive** if the HARB finds that the applicant has provided sufficient information regarding the building's condition and loss of this secondary structure will not negatively impact the Fullerwood Park Residential National Register Historic District due to loss of the primary structure, alterations over time, and fire damage sustained.

Tim Partel reviewed the application

Ex Parte Communication: none

17 certified notices were sent, 3 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 1 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response

The Board discussed:

- Participated in the Fullerwood assessment of historical structures
- This was an ancillary structure
- There was no issue with the demolition of an ancillary building

There was consensus with the Board to approve the application.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Demolition HP2024-0034 at 23 Bay View Drive with no conditions. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Potter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Potter, Wingo, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (c) HP2024-0031 – Authentic Old Jail, Inc. – Applicant & Owner 7 Williams Street

² Break 3:04pm to 3:17pm

To demolish a building, constructed c. 1885-1894, that is recorded in the Florida Master File and not located in a 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 **APPROVE** a **Certificate of Demolition** at **7 Williams Street** because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building.

Edwin Swift reviewed the application

Ex Parte Communication: none

12 certified notices were sent, 1 was returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

Suzanne O'Toole advised the Board that there was a double wide trailer on the property. She wanted to know if the applicant was going to rebuild at 7 Williams Street.

Melinda Rakoncay said this house was in her neighborhood and the neighborhood was not part of the National Landmark Register. She thought that the building had great historic significance and did not think it should be torn down.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- The building was originally constructed 1885 -1894 and many things were changed in later years
- Some renovations were from the 1960's
- How much of the original building remained
- After several reviews, no one had found anything significant with the building
- There was no evidence that this was an historic structure
- Questioned that if the application was approved, could there be conditions that

would require a building permit for new construction before the building could be removed

- There were no plans to rebuild the property
 - The school was considering their options
- Mr. Weaver asked if having conditions was a standard option or an option of HARB.

Ms. Courtney advised that HARB had the option of adding conditions.

- Wanted to discourage speculative demolition but that was not the case with this application
- At least 50% was not original
- Would the school continue at the property
- Would like to see a second report from an independent structural engineer
- Confirmed that there was a shared responsibility for the maintenance of the building
- There was a joint responsibility for the care of the property
- Owner was responsible for upkeep for the property

Mr. Swift told the Board that there would have to be a conversation with the Montessori school about construction of a new building.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE a Certificate of Demolition for HP2024-0031 as this was not an historical building, with the condition that there be a permit for new construction prior to the demolition, and the applicant would be able to request an extension for one year if needed. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Potter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Potter, Wingo, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (d) HP2024-0027 – Colour Homes LLC – Applicant

Siefken Living trust – Owner

66 Saragossa Street

Continued from June 20, 2024

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.

Beth Theoli and Justin Ammad were sworn in for the record

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

Beth Theoli, a representative of Colour Homes, reviewed the application and stated she had two engineering reports that indicated the building should be demolished

because it exceeded the 50% requirement for the Level three renovation. The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

Public hearing was opened.

George Selmont spoke against demolition and stated that he did not want to demolish houses because it was expeditious. He felt that the house could be saved.

Leslee Keys stated that the Seifkin Family Trust was still the owner of the property in question. She thought that getting Code Enforcement involved would be a way to try to motivate the current owner.

Melinda Rakoncay agreed with HARB. She thought the house had real historic value. She said that the Flagler Landmark District held great historic significance for the city.

Christa Ammad told the Board that the question of affordability was not valid. She said that the cost of renovation was the issue because it was more than the actual renovated value.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

Ms. Wingo asked for confirmation of the ownership of the house and clarification if the current representatives had standing to come before the Board.

Ms. Lopez advised that there was an agent's authorization in the record from the owner.

Mr. Weaver thought that if the actual owner had an economic hardship he/she should come to the Board to show that hardship.

Mr. Weaver read a letter from the buyer to the Building Official for the city, including the building official's response which stated that the owner had the responsibility to care for the property. Mr. Weaver said that this was a classic case of demolition by neglect.

Ms. Wingo asked if the house had been on the market for a long period of time and was told that the house was never on the market.

Mr. Ammad stated his case for the dilapidated state of the house

Mr. Weaver asked if the buyer had discussed, with the building official, any of the incentives that were available for reconstruction of an historic home. He then asked staff if there had been any complaints from the neighbors prior to this application in relation to the safety of the house and was advised that complaints were related to the overgrown state of the property.

Mr. Ammad stated that there were other parts of the application besides the economic hardship, he said that the structure of the house itself was something that he was focused on.

Mr. MacDonald said that the quote for raising the building that the buyer provided was not realistic. He went on to say that building requirements were one foot over FEMA flood elevation which was ten feet over mean high tide.

Mr. Weaver told the buyer that he needed to do more research before the building could be demolished. He felt that the financial analysis was incomplete and due diligence had not been done.

Ms. Lopez said that through code enforcement, there could be a situation when the city finds that there was a dangerous situation then the city could step in and make repairs. She advised that a lien could be placed on the property if that occurred.

Ms. Courtney gave some history of the previous requests to rehabilitate the building.

Ms. Wingo asked if there was a more detailed accounting of the cost of rehabilitation.

Ms. Seymour advised that there was a cost analysis in the packet.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to DENY application HP2024-0027. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Potter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Potter, Wingo, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Planning and Building Staff Communications

9. (a) Staff Approved Permits Report

(Provided for informational purposes)

10. Other Business

10. (a) Presentation Regarding Temporary String Lighting for the September Aviles Street Festival and Nights of Lights

Payson Tilden was representing shop owners of Aviles Street for a proposed festival on Aviles Street to celebrate the upcoming hundredth anniversary of the relationship with Aviles, Spain. She said the proposal would close the street for one day, September 8, 2024, for a street festival. She told the Board that there were agreements in place with police and fire departments. She explained the plan for the decorations which would include bunting, flowers, and lighting. She noted that lighting was being proposed to go over the street and no building on the street would be affected as the lighting would be attached to balconies and balustrades. She told the Board that the shop owners wanted to leave the lights up during Night of Lights as an attempt to bring awareness to the tourists that this was the oldest platted street in the United States.

Mr. MacDonald suggested the use of festoon lighting overhead while keeping Christmas lights on the sides.

Ms. Lopez reminded Ms. Linden that there needed to be an air rights agreement.

Ms. Linden advised that she was in the process of having that in place.

Ms. Courtney told the Board that discussions had only included the time frame of the festival.

There was consensus with the Board to allow for the festoon lighting from September 8, through October 15, 2024.

10. (b) Discussion regarding Goal D of the 2018 Adopted Historic Preservation Master Plan on Reducing Historic Building Demolition

Ms. Courtney opened the discussion for reducing the demolition of historic buildings. She told the Board that a city-wide assessment was conducted every 5 years with the latest having been done in 2019. She highlighted the fix it up programs available in Lincolnville managed by the CRA. She spoke about the comments by the City Manager and the City Commission that would give more flexibility to the HARB to better work with future demolition requests. She also told the Board about the International Property Maintenance Code, which allowed the Building Official to order demolition if certain conditions existed.

Mr. MacDonald recounted the issue with 11 Bridge Street. He thanked Ms. Lopez for her work in Tallahassee to ensure that the historic value of the city would not be lost. He thought that the owner should be cited and fined for items showing disrepair. The fines should be cumulative and would cause the homeowner to move to get the repairs done.

Ms. Wingo felt that communication needed to be improved interdepartmentally. She felt that there were several changes that should

be made in the process. There needed to be a way to avoid demolition by neglect.

11. Next Scheduled Meeting Date(s):

a) August 15, 2024 – Regular Meeting

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 P.M.³



Gaere MacDonald, Chairperson

³ 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 MILTON STREET	THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: ☒ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☐ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY
CITY ST AUGUSTINE	COUNTY HARB
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED 07/18/2024	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. Weaver, hereby disclose that on July 18, 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 _____, 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 have a consulting agreement with the owner
18 Saint George Street LLC.*

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.

07/18/2024
Date Filed

Paul L. Weaver
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.