

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting
November 20, 2025

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, November 20, 2025, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Brad Beach, Chairperson, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

- 1. ROLL CALL:** Brad Beach, Chairperson
Linda Potter, Vice-Chairperson
Paul Weaver, III
Catherine Duncan
Gaere MacDonald

City Staff: 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

None

3. Approval of Minutes

None

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

MOTION

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

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Duncan, Weaver, MacDonald
Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

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

**5. (a) Certificate of Demolition HP2025-0069 – Rolling Oaks Property Group, LLC – Applicant & Owner
16 Ferry Place**

To demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1949, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site 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 find that the board can **APPROVE** a Certificate of Demolition at 16 Ferry Place because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building.

James Thomas waived his right to a public presentation.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

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

There was a brief discussion regarding the possibility of salvaging historical materials.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the demolition for application HP2025-0069 at 16 Ferry Place with no conditions other than a good faith attempt to salvage any historic materials. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Duncan, Weaver, Potter, Beach
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**5. (b) Certificate of Demolition HP2025-0075 – Casey Welch – Applicant
Casey Welch & Michael Mckoy – Owner
78A Chapin Street**

To demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1917-1924, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site 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 find that the board can APPROVE a Certificate of Demolition at 78A Chapin Street because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building

Casey Welch waived his right to a public presentation.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

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

There was a brief discussion regarding the possibility of salvaging historical materials.

MOTION

Ms. Duncan MOVED to APPROVE the demolition for application HP2025-0075 at 78A Chapin Street with a good faith effort to salvage any historic materials. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Duncan, Weaver, MacDonald, Potter, Beach
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

**6. (a) HP2025-0068 – John Valdes & Associates, Inc – Applicant
Melissa & Patrick Sullivan – Owner
103 Marine Street**

To construct a decorative balconet with shed roof extending from existing second-story windows on the front façade of the detached garage apartment.

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 103 Marine Street if the HARB finds that the scope of work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design mitigated by the balconet's limited visibility from Marine Street.

Steve Porter reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board agreed that the design was acceptable and there was consensus for approval.

MOTION

Ms. Duncan MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness HP2025-0068 at 103 Marine Street. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Duncan, Weaver, MacDonald, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**6. (b) HP2025-0074 – Central Southern Construction Services, LLC – Applicant & Owner
264 St. George Street**

To install a new metal gate across an existing driveway.

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 at 264 St. George Street to allow the applicant time to provide additional information including clarification of the gate height and concrete post design and footer detail.

Kevin Brock reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

Mr. MacDonald advised he had had a conversation with the applicant's representative discussing the cost of the permitting as well as the fence. It was determined that the applicant had received a phishing scam email.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said that when you come to live in the city there was an expectation of the costs to maintain the historic value of the city.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

Ms. Duncan asked about the width of the new gate and was advised that it would be approximately sixteen feet. She said that there needed to be an elevation drawing provided for review. She thought that the gate should be narrower and she confirmed that the height would be three to four feet.

Mr. Weaver agreed that more detailed drawings needed to be provided. He thought the posts should be more substantial.

Mr. MacDonald suggested a twelve-foot gate with columns on both sides at four feet high to give the perception of height.

Mr. Potter thought that the proposal was lopsided because there was a wall on one side of the fence and only a column on the other.

The board discussed the style of the proposed gate to try to match the man gate in design. The consensus was that gate number 8213 was the closest match.

Mr. Beach said that the most important thing was to have two masonry columns for the gate to frame it for a better appearance.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2025-0074 at 264 St. George Street with the request for more detailed drawings, with the suggestion from the board to institute two masonry columns to mount the gates and four feet for the height with decorative finials at the top to match the existing man gate. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Duncan, Weaver, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**6. (c) HP2025-0070 – Design Cooperative, LLC – Applicant
58 Charlotte Street – Owner
58 Charlotte Street**

To increase the height of an existing masonry wall along the south property line and modify the previously approved flat roof design to screen proposed mechanical equipment; and, to construct a pergola across the previously approved rear courtyard space.

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 58 Charlotte Street if the HARB finds that proposed scope of work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design.

Milan Milanovic reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- The proposed pergola was huge and out of proportion compared to the small trellis that was approved previously
- Suggested calling this a grape arbor rather than pergola as an arbor would have been present in historic St. Augustine
- The pergola would have been post-civil war era
- The drawings from Manucy's showed the arbors to be much smaller
- There could be a need for a cross bar for support that would add mass to the structure
- With the wall being raised the arbor would not be visible from the street
- The bright white color was a concern
- Removing the end bays and letting the edges cantilever to keep them from touching the walls would reduce the mass

- Confirmed that the material would be wood and the applicant was agreeable to whatever the board suggested for the color
- Agreed that while this was very large, it was hidden from the street
- The poles needed to be rougher and more worn to fit the period
- Cedar or Cypress would be acceptable materials for the arbor construction
- Enclosing the flat part of the roof would be acceptable
- Agreed with the suggestions of the board regarding reducing the overall size and the materials used
- Brackets would have to be used to support the arbor and keep it from swaying
- Place a pole by the wall and in the center and then cantilever from the center pole about three feet to the other bay area

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE HP2025-0070 at 58 Charlotte Street the existing flat roof on the original structure to be a space to hide and shield the air conditioning unit; the arbor would be CONTINUED to the December 18, 2025 meeting to allow the applicant time to provide a new rendition that was more rustic and separated from all structures with bracketing as suggested by the HARB. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Duncan, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (d) HP2025-0073 – Bar Harbor Cheesecake Company LLC – Applicant Authentic Old Jail, Inc – Owner 6 Cordova Street

For temporary installation of wooden pergolas in the front and side yards

facing the Historic Preservation-Three (HP-3) zoning 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 Appropriateness at 6 Cordova Street if the HARB finds that the proposed temporary pergola installation, as proposed or modified by the HARB, are a reasonably compatible contemporary design with the following conditions:

1. Proposed visqueen or plastic material is visually screened by plant material(s)
2. The pergolas be completely removed by January 30, 2026
3. Pergolas can be installed in the same locations for subsequent Nights of Lights seasons with any modifications subject to HARB approval.

Amy Tilbury reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said she was concerned that code enforcement had been involved with this applicant in 2024. She felt that the HARB should have been involved from the beginning.

Ms. Tilbury provided her rebuttal.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Did not like the idea of temporary construction but would support permanent
- Verified that one pergola was in front of the building
- There was concern with crowd control

- People were purchasing cheesecake under the pergola to take with them
- Based on the pictures in the packet, the placement of the pergolas seemed out of place
- The pergolas would be in places that met code
- The coloring should be more authentic
- This would be temporary through Nights of Lights
- The decorations on the pergolas would be white Christmas lights with pine boughs on the top

MOTION

Ms. Duncan MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0073 at 6 Cordova Street to install temporary wooden pergolas without lights to have a canvas cover and be removed by January 30, 2026. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Duncan, Weaver, MacDonald, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

**6. (e) HP2025-0072 – Matthews | DCCM – Applicant
Sisters of St. Joseph, Inc – Owner
241 St George Street**

To construct a new institutional building on the northern portion of the property with associated alterations and repairs to existing masonry perimeter walls and new hardscape and landscape designs.

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 241 St. George Street:

¹ Break 2:44 – 2:58 pm

1. APPROVE if the board finds that the new structure meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design along the streetscape and within the HP-1 district as presented or modified by the HARB; OR,
2. CONTINUE to allow the applicant time to submit additional details as required by the Board for approval

Shane Larsen and Hal Bowers reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- The process was going in the right direction
- Looked at the elevations in general and specifically wanted to pause to make sure there would be a rhythm and pattern for the hierarchy of the building
- Would like to see fewer competing elements in the design
- Proposed fewer porches in the wrap around style or simplifying them so that they were not the main feature
- The red color of the brackets was shared with the windows and doors throughout the building
- Was it possible to remove some of the brackets, there appeared to be too many
- The façade could be emphasized in a different way
- The inspiration for the wrap around porch had come from Flagler College
- The original footprint of the school was being used for the new building
- Removing the brackets that were not needed structurally was a good idea
- The scale and setbacks were compatible compared to what had existed before with the school

- The guiding principles were to mirror the existing mother house in the new construction
- A wood clad window was being considered, specifically Pella
- The wood window was appropriate and would add authenticity
- The clad window could be used on the third floor
- There was flexibility on the upper floors with window choices
- The second and third floor would be the sister's private quarters
- The first-floor windows would have a flat arch and would be somewhat hidden from Cadiz Street because of the coquina wall
- The new design fenestration had been articulated well
- The Kolby window was a good choice as they had a history of lasting longer with the weather conditions in the area
- The profile would match well with the existing structure regarding the windows
- Windows were usually approved on a case-by-case basis, especially with historic buildings
- New construction had more flexibility; however, the Secretary Standards of Rehabilitation should be respected
- Construction was slab on grade
- There would be no steps going into the building

Mr. Beach had noted some changes on the applicants' drawings and displayed those changes with an explanation of what he was thinking for the applicant. He suggested that his ideas would make the fenestration less busy.

- The suggestions seemed to give a balance to the building
- The existing south column would be kept for the gate on St George Street with an expansion to thirty-two feet from the current size of eighteen feet to allow access for emergency vehicles

- It would be a rolling gate that would not be seen when open and was no taller than the wall surrounding the property
- The gate would be open in the daytime and closed at night
- The current gate was not in its original position
- There was a fence around the retaining wall near the pond that seemed out of place
- Code required a three-foot fence with this type of pond
- Elongating the pond could possibly lessen the height requirement
- Roof tile and window samples would be provided
- Wanted to see the proposed landscape plan on the rendering especially at the porta cochere and the corner of St. George and Cadiz Streets
- Materials for the driveway would be pervious paver in brick
- Mechanical area on top of the roof had a substantial wall to conceal any equipment
- There was an opportunity to lower the roof over the stair

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2025-0072 at 241 St. George Street to the December 18, 2025 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Duncan, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Continued Items from the previous HARB meetings

7. (a) Certificate of Appropriateness HP2025-0057 – 44 Avenida Menendez,

LLC/Riverview Partners One, LLC – Applicant

44 Avenida Menendez, LLC – Owner

44 Avenida Menendez

Continued from September 18, 2025

For after-the-fact approval of rooftop cabana structures, lighting fixtures, and other design elements that were not previously approved under Certificate of Appropriateness PL2021-0121.

Mr. Weaver recused himself from this application.²

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, the previous discussions of the HARB for earlier 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 additional features/design elements installed after the approved plans are compatible with the AGHP and/or Manucy's Houses of St. Augustine and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #3 and #9
2. CONTINUE with a finding that the overall design of the added elements are not compatible with the AGHP and/or Manucy's Houses of St. Augustine and to allow time for the applicant to alter the existing designs or placement, as recommended by the HARB

John Arbizanni and Chris Duche reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

² Recusal form with original minutes

BJ Kalaidi said that this owner had been in this town long enough to know what was expected. She asked why this owner did what was done without going to HARB and making them aware of what they wanted to do. She said that this town was historical and it was important to maintain that history and the HARB was there to accomplish that.

Mr. Arbizanni provided his rebuttal.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Initially this applicant came to HARB for approval
- The applicant had chosen not to get approval for the changes they had made
- Reminded the applicant that though this was the 21st century, the city was an historic city
- Thought that the previously approved design was very good and there was never the intention of having a roof top bar on the building
- In the period of the building, people did live on the second floor, but there were no roof top bars
- The blue canvas umbrellas were a nice feature
- The other changes were a violation that had been continued, and should have gone to code
- Many of the historic buildings had become restaurants and bars and roof top entertainment was a thing
- Not in favor of having that feature as it was not a part of the history of the city
- If it could be done without drawing attention it would be acceptable
- The cabanas were not acceptable the way they were presented
- A roof top terrace with planters would be more fitting
- Lighting was to be approved in every situation to be sure that it was period appropriate

- If the lighting in the courtyard was not visible, it could work
- A rooftop terrace should have a simpler design and presentation
- Agreed roof top simplicity was the key and the more modern elements should be removed
- The gutter on the second floor should be removed
- The globe lights in the courtyard could stay as long as they were not visible from the street
- The cabanas should be removed or moved out of the view of the sight lines completely.
- A trellis type structure could be used in place of the cabanas
- The applicant said the seating would be kept and the cabanas would be removed
- The green wall on the parapet wall would be removed and replaced with live plants

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0057 at 44 Avenida Menendez with the following conditions: the green screening would be removed on the second floor; the cabanas would be removed from the second floor as well as the globe lighting; live plants were acceptable. The horizontal gutter would be removed from the front of the building; the K-gutter in white was acceptable the globe lights in the rear courtyard were acceptable; staff would approve the metal screen for the window; the blue umbrellas would be acceptable. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Duncan, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY³

**7. (b) Certificate of Appropriateness
HP2025-0053 – Rogers Towers, PA –
Applicant**

³ Break 5:10 – 5:24 pm

Kasam Hospitality, Inc – Owner
24 Cathedral Place and Charlotte Street
(PID 1972000000)

Continued from August 21, 2025

To construct commercial buildings on the west side of Charlotte Street and south side of Treasury Street to flank a new parking garage on the existing parking lot, related to an adaptive use project of the existing buildings.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, reviews and discussions by the HARB during the previous Opinion of Appropriateness and Certificate of Appropriateness hearings, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the HARB can take the following actions related to the existing historic building, the new buildings, site plan, landscape, hardscape, and streetscape plans, and other related features and design elements proposed in a Certificate of Appropriateness at 24 Cathedral Place and Charlotte Street:

To CONTINUE to allow the applicant time to provide more specifications of the proposed elements and to incorporate any revisions recommended by the HARB to the proposed new buildings fronting Charlotte and Treasury Streets, the landscape, hardscape and streetscape plans, and the proposed rehabilitation/restoration for the existing historic buildings

Les Thomas, Freemont Latimer, Mike Koppenhafer and Ellen Avery-Smith reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

Mr. Weaver had a call from John Regan to go to a meeting with other board members; however, he declined to attend, and then had a brief conversation regarding the roof top.

Mr. Beach had a video call with Mr. Regan to review the project.

Mr. MacDonald also had a brief call with Mr. Regan; their conversation was about windows.

Ms. Potter had a call from Mr. Regan; she declined, saying that it should be before the entire board.

Ms. Duncan also declined to meet, saying that the board wanted more visual samples for clarification.

Mr. Koppenhafer reviewed the application focusing on the comments from the board at the previous meeting.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi commented that putting a bar on the roof made it a fourth floor. She asked if the umbrellas would be stationary or portable.

Mr. Koppenhafer provided his rebuttal.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Could umbrellas be used for shade rather than the roof feature
- The style of architecture was period appropriate
- The connecting structure between the stair and elevator gave the appearance of a fourth floor
- The structure would not be visible from the street, and should blend in when viewed from the Bridge of Lions
- It seemed that the height was too much
- This was part of an approved PUD that allowed for higher limits
- HARB had the discretion to determine mass and scale
- This was an open structure that allowed a view of the pool area from the tower building
- The hip roof with tile looked heavy and would have a prominent view from the Bridge of Lions

- This structure needed to blend with the level of the parapet
- The style of Spanish Mediterranean would be seen from the Bridge
- The location of the pool should not change
- The elevator shaft and the staircase were for ADA (American with Disabilities Act) compliance and could not be moved
- Removing the connecting roof would decrease the mass and visibility of the structure or changing to a flat roof with a stucco color
- Tiles from the original building would be repurposed into the new building
- The windows were shown that would be used in the colonial style building
- These were mahogany wood windows to be used on the first floor
- An aluminum clad wood window would be used on the second and third floors, this was for the colonial building only
- Second and third floor could use a composite window with muntins or the Pella Aluminum Clad Wood window
- The louvres on the Treasury Street side of the building would be a wide metal louvre

MOTION

Ms. Potter MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2025-0053 to the December 18, 2025 meeting including the alterations for the construction on the fourth floor i.e. removing the roof structure. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Potter, MacDonald, Weaver, Duncan, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (c) Certificate of Appropriateness-City Owned Property HP2025-0011 – CBVR Telecom Design Group and Celco Partnership Successor in Interest to Verizon Wireless – Applicant

Various areas within/adjacent to existing City rights-of-way within Historic Preservation Zoning Districts 1 through 5

To install new cell antennas and related cellular equipment in proposed locations.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, the previous discussions of the HARB, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed small cell antennas limited to the locations at the Toques Place parking lot and adjacent to 69a Cordova Street:

1. APPROVE if the board finds that the designs are compatible with the AGHP and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards of Rehabilitation #9 (Compatible Contemporary Design for New Alterations and Additions)
2. CONTINUE with a finding that the overall designs are not compatible with the AGHP and to allow time for the applicant to alter the existing designs or placement, as recommended by HARB
3. DENY if the HARB determines any of the following:
 - a. The proposed overall design of the cell antennas and related equipment is inappropriate within the historic context of its proposed location and the high visibility within the right-of-way will have a negative impact to the architectural, historical, and cultural integrity of the significant Town Plan National Historic Landmark (NHL) area and the St. Augustine National Register Historic District (NRHD), and the proposed locations within HP-2 and HP-3
 - b. The cellular equipment does not meet the criteria of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SOIS) for Rehabilitation 2, 5, 8, or 9
 - c. The proposed design and location cannot be mitigated in a desirable way that would meet the requirements of the AGHP and/or SOIS

Per State Statute 337.401(7)(k), HARB's authority is not limited to enforce historic preservation zoning regulations consistent with the preservation of local zoning authority under 47 U.S.C.s.332(c)(7) (see language in attachments).

Courtney Barnard, Jack Finch, and Chris Milnes reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

Mr. Weaver asked for a recap of the criteria that the board should be using to decide this application.

Mr. Beach asked why the light on Cordova was Cobra Hang rather than the updated fixture to match Toques Place.

Mr. Milnes explained that because it was an actual streetlight and that fixture would not change until the upgrades to the streetscape were completed.

Mr. Weaver described the antenna on Riberia Street that was screened with a palm tree and he thought that was appropriate.

Ms. Lopez summarized for the applicant, the HARB suggested an additional palm tree in the Toques Place parking lot to add extra screening for the antenna in that lot.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0011 with the following conditions: when the new streetscape plan was implemented the fixture on Cordova was changed to match and a palm tree was added to the Toques

Place parking lot and that tree would be maintained in perpetuity. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Duncan, MacDonald, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Planning and Building Staff Communications

8. (a) Staff Approved Permits Report

(Provided for informational purposes)

9. Other Business

9. (a) Review and Approval of 2026 HARB Meeting Schedule

The board approved the 2026 calendar with consensus

9. (b) Follow-up to Model Land Company National Register Historic District Update:

Public Informational Meeting to be held on Tuesday, December 9, 2025, at 5:30 pm

10. Next Scheduled Meeting Date

10. (a) December 18, 2025 – Regular Meeting

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:03 P.M.⁴



Brad Beach, 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 <i>Wenow, Paul L.</i>	NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <i>HARB</i>
MAILING ADDRESS <i>5 Milton St.</i>	THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CITY <input type="checkbox"/> COUNTY <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER LOCAL AGENCY
CITY COUNTY <i>St. Augustine, FL 32084</i>	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <i>COSA</i>
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED	MY POSITION IS: <input type="checkbox"/> ELECTIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 11/18/2025, 20 25:

(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 Aowich Menendez, 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 retained by John Arbazonni, owner of 44 Aowich Menendez, as a consultant in pursuit of federal historic tax credits.

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.

11/18/2025
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.