



## MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

October 21, 2021

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairperson Salter, Board Member McCorvey, Board Member Courtney, Board Member Fogarty, Board Member Ramos, Board Member Yee

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Vice Chairperson Mead

**STAFF PRESENT:** Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Senior Planner Statler, Advisor Pristera, Assistant City Clerk Tice, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay, Digital Media Specialist Johnston, Help Desk Technician Russo

**STAFF VIRTUAL:** Planning Director Morris

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Elizabeth Bush, Jason Strahan, Nick Koch, R. Scott Holland, Jesse' LaCoste, Robert Hogan, Larry Scapecchi, Bobby Dawson, Dan Martin

### **CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT**

Chairperson Salter called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m. with a quorum present.

Board Members Courtney and McCorvey were sworn in by the Clerk's Office.

**Board Member Courtney nominated Chairperson Salter to remain as Chairperson, and it carried 6 to 0. Board Member Ramos nominated Board Member Mead as Vice Chairperson, seconded by Board Member Fogarty, and it carried 6 to 0.**

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve the September 16, 2021 minutes, seconded by Board Member Courtney, and it carried 6 to 0.**

**OPEN FORUM** - None

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Item 4

1390 N. Spring Street

NHPD

Contributing Structure

PR-1AAA

**Action taken: Approved with Possible Abbreviated Review.**

Jason Strahan is requesting approval for new garage doors on a detached accessory building.

Mr. Strahan presented to the Board and advised the garage doors would be two single car which

would match as closely as possible to the historic structure. Advisor Pristera referred to the selection sheet and asked if he was willing to use the 4-pane windows. Mr. Strahan stated the website would not allow another choice, but they would be the same as the historic square windows. Board Member Courtney questioned the proportion on the rendering, and Mr. Strahan advised the ceiling height was shortened to meet Code, and the door would probably consist of three panels, with the top panel being the window panel. Chairperson Salter indicated what was shown was the 3:3 window option, so it was a horizontal mullion and two vertical mullions, and the concern was that the door would read more horizontal than the original doors, but Mr. Strahan advised it would appear like the original. Chairperson Salter pointed out the exact information had not been provided to the Board, and he was concerned that the visual characteristic design of the doors remained as close to the original as possible. Staff confirmed the final door elevation could be approved through an abbreviated review. Board Member Yee asked in the event that the door could not be manufactured with lights in the two upper panels with three sections as opposed to four, would the Board be agreeable with the 3-pane option assuming it had to be a four-section door. Chairperson Salter stated the verticality of the individual glass pieces was the primary objective, and he would be comfortable leaving it up to the abbreviated review to determine that. **Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve as long as the top panel was a 3-pane or 4-pane, and if it became a different design, the application be submitted for abbreviated review.** Chairperson Salter clarified that the motion contained an option which would not require an abbreviated review. Board Member Ramos advised if the applicant chose to proceed with the 3-pane or the 4-pane as the top panels, it would be approved, but the Board was not approving the 3:3 as shown; a different drawing would require an abbreviated review. **Board Member Fogarty seconded the motion, and it carried 5 to 1 with Board Member Courtney dissenting.**

#### Item 5

411 S. Florida Blanca St

PHD

#### Noncontributing Structure

HC-1 / Wood Cottages

#### Action taken: Approved with Possible Abbreviated Review.

Dan Martin is seeking approval to replace the windows at a noncontributing structure.

**(The Board proceeded to the next item since the applicant was not present.)**

Mr. Martin presented to the Board and advised the house was renovated in 1978, but the windows seemed to have been replaced since then. Virtually, every window in the house, regardless of which model, was leaking. He also explained in this location, they receive a lot of wind from the bay. Advisor Pristera indicated there were pictures of the house from when it was renovated, and he believed the original structure was the part which is set back with the porch and chimney that would have been the original footprint; the picture on file had a platform, and everything was torn down and renovated.

Chairperson Salter indicated his only concern was the 2:2 window pattern, and he was not familiar with the window brand. The Board had approved several vinyl windows; the manufacturer did not list simulated divided lite as an option – only grills between the glass, and with this being in the historic district and resembling a historic structure, it was very important that the mullions be simulated or true divided lites so that it had depth to it. Mr. Martin indicated it was his understanding that the window selection was grills between the glass. On the windows that are being replaced were plastic snap-in divided lites on the interior. Chairperson Salter felt that a window that does not have at least the simulated divided lite would not be appropriate; even though the house was noncontributing, it was clearly meant to read as a historic cottage. Mr. Martin observed that one in three homes on Bayfront actually had divided lites, and he would be happy to remove the simulated divided lite and proceed with the clear glass. Chairperson Salter explained the proposal would be a single 1:1 with no mullions, but he felt the 2:2 or 6:6 was more

architecturally appropriate; 1:1 had been approved for new construction. Mr. Martin explained in a neighborhood of all types, the 1:1 was not the oddity in the neighborhood. He advised the window was impact rated with the more decorative divider which should provide some depth to allow for the desired look.

Board Member Yee stated the window almost had an angle profile designed to shed water. Mr. Martin advised the installation guide should show the profile of the window as it is installed. Advisor Pristera did not feel the 1:1 was appropriate for a cottage style structure, and this would be more associated with Zarragossa, Intendencia or Romana Street; the 1:1 was a modern type replacement and never intended for this type of structure. Chairperson Salter explained the 2:2 or 6:6 as explained in the LDC would be a significant factor in staying with the true historic look. Board Member Courtney agreed the window should be a 2:2 or 6:6, and Chairperson Salter stated that this manufacturer did make windows with simulated divided lites, and it would not surprise him if they could also do that on this particular window. **Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve with the 2:2 or 6:6 simulated divided lite, and if the manufacturer of this window cannot provide that detail, the applicant may return for an abbreviated review with a different window manufacturer that will meet the requirements. Board Member Courtney seconded the motion and it carried 6 to 0.** Chairperson Salter advised he or staff could provide a list of possible manufacturers.

**Item 6**

**210 S. Alcaniz Street**

**PHD**

**Contributing Structure**

**HC-1 / Wood Cottages**

**Action taken: Approved.**

Christian Voelkel is seeking approval for an addition to a contributing structure and the installation of an accessory structure. All work to the primary structure will take place at the rear of the property and includes removal of the existing deck and adding a new rear porch, brick courtyard, and fence. All work is proposed to match the existing historic structure in materials and colors. The new shed will be pushed to the back of the property and is also designed to reflect the historic building.

Mr. Koch presented to the Board and advised he would match the brick on the piers and clarified the new wood infill fence would be on the courtyard and would consist of brick columns to match the piers and wood planks, with the other existing fence remaining as is. Board Member Courtney indicated it would be a very attractive addition. Mr. Koch advised the back porch would look like the front porch with the same type columns, and the shed was for storage only. **Board Member Courtney made a motion to approve as submitted, seconded by Board Member Yee, and it carried 6 to 0.**

**Item 7**

**815 N. Baylen Street**

**NHPD**

**Contributing Structure**

**PR-2**

**Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review.**

Scott Sallis is seeking approval to renovation a two-story contributing structure. **(The Board proceeded to the next item since the applicant was not present.)**

Mr. Sallis presented to the Board and stated he had received approval from the Board, and demolition and construction were going quite well; the efforts to keep portions of the building were continuing. The owner wanted another dormer upstairs for his family which would be on the southeast side. The result was that one of the two remaining chimneys would come down, which was a concern of North Hill. He indicated it was most important to retain the chimney which was most prominent from the street elevation; the masonry near the second chimney was in poor condition, so this chimney would be removed. They also found evidence of original colors, so they had changed the colors slightly since those were appropriate for the structure. Board Member

Courtney asked the reason for the chimney removal, and Mr. Sallis explained they were adding a bedroom upstairs in the former attic which resulted in a closer look at that chimney. He further advised they were going to keep and expose the original masonry of the fireplace in the living room which would not be used as a fireplace. Board Member Ramos asked if the chimney on the second floor could be restored and retained, would it be located in space next to closet three, and Mr. Sallis agreed. He also clarified that they were not using any chimney as a functioning chimney, but the chimney they were keeping was for maintaining the character of the house.

Chairperson Salter pointed out that North Hill had no objections except for the chimney removal which had been explained by Mr. Sallis. However, he did question the cobblestone wall and its removal for the driveway. He asked if something could be constructed, possibly turning the wall in so it looked like it was intentionally created for the driveway. Mr. Sallis was agreeable to that idea. **Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve as submitted. Chairperson Salter amended the motion to incorporate that some element of the wall be used to readdress the entry of the driveway and return in an abbreviated review for final clarification. The amendment was accepted, and Chairperson Salter seconded the motion; it carried 5 to 1 with Board Member Ramos dissenting.**

#### Item 8

412 E. Belmont Street

OEHPD

#### Contributing Structure

OEHC-1

#### Action taken: Approved with Comments.

Jesse LaCoste is requesting approval to replace the existing board and batten wood siding with board and batten fiber cement siding. A rear addition and exterior modifications to this structure were approved in January 2020 and following an abbreviated review in February 2020. At that time, board and batten wood siding was approved for the addition, along with any required board for board repairs to the existing building, with the intent to match the historic elements. Since then and during the renovation project, the building was destroyed by Hurricane Sally. The applicant has provided an engineering letter recommending that cement board siding be used, as well as photographs showing the condition of the existing structure and its condition after the hurricane. Comments from Old East Hill were provided.

Mr. LaCoste presented to the Board and stated there was heavy structural damage during Hurricane Sally, with the left elevation landing on the structure next door. He explained the Building Official had ruled this project to be new construction; the issue was if they were maintaining the original siding of the home or replacing it with the Hardie component. At this point, since so much of the home was brand new, they were looking at maintaining brand new sheathing and not original siding. The only siding left was on the front elevation around the bay window. He asked were they being held to both new construction standards (artificial components) and historic preservation (wood components); were they preserving a historic structure or rebuilding to historic use. He pointed out 80% of the structures in the area were new construction with Hardie materials. Advisor Pristera explained when the project was first presented, he was concerned none of the original house would be left, and this would be new reconstruction based on what was existing before, so essentially, we let a renovation go to a demolition and now a new construction and noncontributing. He did not know how it could keep its contributing status when nothing was left. He was glad they were keeping its essence and wished it could have been simply renovated. Board Member Courtney explained this was a favorite structure in the neighborhood the way it was. Mr. LaCoste indicated they had shored up the structure before the hurricane, and their hearts were in the project. Chairperson Salter pointed out the intent of this project in the beginning was to maintain a historic contributing structure status, and he believed the applicant put forth the effort to commit to that, however, uncontrollable forces took control of the project, and he believed as

the City and Mr. Pristera saw it, it now became new construction. He was glad the applicant chose to maintain the architectural style of the project, but with new construction, the Board allowed the use of this type of material as long as it was used consistent with the historic styling.

Board Member Yee was trying to understand what condition the building was in when the hurricane happened. Mr. LaCoste explained the battens were new and installed over wood, which was the original design of the structure, but it did not meet current Code; using sheathing as siding under the current Code was an issue. It was clarified that the Board never approved the use of plywood as the board element of the new board and batten; it should have been a true wood product. Mr. LaCoste explained it was a true plywood product. He pointed out that was the difference between the current condition and the condition pre-storm – the original siding was damaged, framing was not complete, and the entire project was close to 65% with framing close to 90% complete. Due to the hurricane, they reframed to look like the original design but with new standards of framing to meet Code. Advisor Pristera explained when the proposal was submitted to raise the roof and there were foundation issues, he was concerned it would be a new build. It was determined the board and batten at that time was 1x12. Advisor Pristera advised the battens should look intentional and line up; he wanted to make sure the look was intentional and of high quality to be considered a good reconstruction. Mr. LaCoste advised they would recreate the board and batten Hardie application to the original with spacing at 11.5” on each batten strip.

**Board Member Yee made a motion to allow Hardie board and batten siding given the loss of the contributing structure status, and that the board and batten pattern should be deliberately and carefully created and appropriately spaced.** He appreciated the efforts of the applicant to maintain the overall look of the house. **Board Member Fogarty seconded the motion, and it carried 5 to 1 with Board Member Courtney dissenting.**

#### Item 9

#### 29 S. Palafox Place

PHBD

#### Contributing Structure

C-2A

#### **Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review.**

Scott Holland is requesting FINAL approval of exterior modifications to a contributing structure. Chairperson Salter asked about the color for the canopy, and Mr. Holland presented samples for the trim band, brackets, and canopy to the Board and illustrated the locations of those colors. Board Member Courtney asked if they had considered accenting the keystones, and Mr. Holland advised he was not a fan of the keystones and wanted it one color; he explained the keystones were an applied ornament. Chairperson Salter asked for clarification on the new entry pilaster, and Mr. Holland stated he designed the three-dimensional ornament, powder-coated aluminum, to go on the face of the new columns on either side of the main entry. Chairperson Salter asked instead of using the pilasters to mark the entryway, would they consider doing something to engage those pilasters with the new proposed cornice or do something with the cornice that would come down and engage the pilasters. Mr. Holland explained he would probably like to see the pilasters going all the way up to the trim band. **Board Member Courtney made a motion to approve as submitted, seconded by Board Member Ramos who amended the motion to state that the new entry pilaster design return for an abbreviated review as well as the final color palette approved by the owner; the amendment was accepted. The motion then carried 6 to 0.**

**Item 10**

**223 S. Palafox Street**

**PHBD**

**Contributing Structure**

**C-2A**

**Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review.**

Carter Quina is requesting approval to remove all awnings over the windows and to remove the top flagpole. The awnings and flagpole are not planned to be replaced.

Mr. Quina and Ms. Bush presented to the Board. Mr. Quina stated the awnings were there to shade from the sun, and the windows were replaced in the 1960s with appropriate insulated windows. He advised storms had damaged the awnings, and FEMA had offered to help with some of the costs, but the County preferred the awnings not to be replaced and risk having them damaged again. Risk Management explained they could not go on the roof to raise and lower the flag any longer since the base was damaged and requested a relocation of the flagpole; he advised they had a more specific location between the cannon in the grass area of the plaza. It was also noted the pole would be set in a 4' square pad with appropriate lighting which was not a part of this request.

Advisor Pristera explained this building was on a prominent corner and on the National Register as an individual structure. It underwent a major restoration in the 1990s, and all of those documents had been maintained; a decision was made to bring it back to the early 1900s. He indicated he had received questions every month about the condition and future of the awnings pro and con, and felt it was now time to discuss the situation. Ms. Bush advised the awnings were not original and were added around 1905. The awnings were damaged during Hurricane Ivan, and the colors could not be matched, thus the solid and striped variations. They were damaged once again during Hurricane Sally, and they desired to eliminate them. She also indicated they were removed periodically for different festivals. Advisor Pristera stated since they were taken down during different occasions and the windows were not operable, it made it necessary for a lift. He felt the Board should review the exterior change on that prominent corner.

Board Member Ramos asked if the awnings provided shading, and Ms. Bush advised all the windows were replaced, and Mr. Quina explained the windows were tinted and insulated. Ms. Bush further stated the awnings were only on the south and east portions and would only affect 50% of the building. Mr. Quina pointed out the occupants preferred removal of the awnings to enjoy the view and use natural light. **Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve the elimination of the awnings and flagpole, seconded by Board Member Courtney.** The applicants asked that the new location of the flagpole be included in the motion. Staff advised this could be approved or return in an abbreviated review. Chairperson Salter confirmed the flagpole would be on a 4' x 4' pad with lighting; the flagpole would be 35' in height and just short of the third-floor windows. **Board Member Fogarty amended the motion to include the approval of the relocation of the flagpole with an abbreviated review on the location and lighting. Board Member Ramos seconded the amendment with Advisor Pristera to perform the abbreviated review. The motion then carried 6 to 0.**

**Item 11**

**319 N. Tarragona Street**

**PHBD**

**Contributing Structure**

**C-2A**

**Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review.**

Philip Partington is seeking approval for exterior modifications to a contributing structure.

Mr. Partington presented to the Board and explained this building had been many things over the years with many entertainers using the facility. It had also been three different retail shops. A fire gutted the structure around ten years ago, and a metal building was inserted inside with the original brick exterior remaining on three sides; the west side would now contain the courtyard. This project was designed to breathe new life into the building. In order to make the building handicap

accessible, they intended to place the entrance through the courtyard. Chairperson Salter addressed the windows, and Mr. Partington stated the storefront window frames would have simulated divided lites with smaller muntins for an industrial look. Chairperson Salter pointed to the interior furr out on the floorplan and wanted to make sure the furring stopped at the windowsill and would not cover the inside of the window; Mr. Partington confirmed the window would not be covered. He also explained the door on the storage building would be a barn type door. Regarding the courtyard, he indicated there was an existing building on the west side which was a repair shop, and they intended to install a green wall for coverage. Chairperson Salter indicated the plans called for the exterior paint to be dark grey with a black accent which would make the entire building very dark. The Tarragona elevation had some old brick work, and he wondered if the applicant would consider using a lighter color accent so the shadow lines would not disappear but would give some texture to the building. Mr. Partington agreed with this and would obtain an approval. Chairperson Salter pointed out only one elevation was painted stucco over brick. Mr. Partington advised the brick was in bad shape on the north and south elevations, and the west side had been completely removed when the metal building was inserted inside. Chairperson Salter explained he was not a fan of painted brick but understood it was probably in the best interest of this particular building since in this case, you would have to repair the brick. It was determined the applicant would return for the signage. Chairperson Salter clarified he preferred to see a lighter accent color which could return in an abbreviated review. Mr. Partington agreed and stated they wanted to test out some of the colors on the building. **Board Member Yee made a motion to approve as submitted with final color selections to return in an abbreviated review. Chairperson Salter amended the motion to clarify the final signage was not included in this approval. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion, and it carried 6 to 0.**

**Item 12**  
**Demolition**

**11 E. Garden Street**

**PHBD**  
**C-2A**

**Action taken: Approved with Comments.**

SMP Architecture is seeking approval to demolish a noncontributing structure. Since the structure is noncontributing, the applicant is not required to seek approval of replacement plans prior to receiving a demolition permit so long as the Board does not find any historical, cultural, architectural, or archaeological significance. If no significance is found, a demolition permit may be issued per Sec. 12-3-10(1)j. Staff advised because of the location of the structure, the applicant was requested to bring conceptual plans for what would be put in its place.

Board Member Yee recused himself and presented to the Board. Mr. Yee also clarified that this project was not a SMP Architecture project and Historic Preservation Planner Harding confirmed this. Chairperson Salter explained this project came before the Board as a partial renovation with the intent to salvage the exterior skeleton. As the work proceeded, a lot of the structural elements were uncovered and compromised. Mr. Yee advised the façade facing Garden had been replaced with loadbearing masonry concrete block; that block as well as the new concrete block on the west elevation had significant settling and cracking of the slab; the bottom chord of the roof trusses was sagging as much as 12" so the structural engineer deemed the entire structure unsafe and in need of demolition. He explained the intent of the new project was to construct an outdoor gathering space with landscaping to match the existing on Garden Street.

Advisor Pristera hoped something would replace this in the future instead of a yard space fronting Garden; he appreciated the plan but hoped it would be a place holder for a future building. Historic Preservation Planner Harding explained when the project was first presented, there was hope something could be salvaged. Mr. Yee agreed given the location and value of the land, he could

not imagine that this would remain a courtyard development. Chairperson Salter understood the need to remove the building and appreciated the enclosure was set back from Garden Street; he appreciated the landscaping but wanted additional information which could be provided in an abbreviated review. Mr. Yee anticipated the proposed conceptual plan would return for Board approval and possibly through abbreviated review.

Staff advised the Board could deem the structure as noncontributing based on the facts presented which would open it up to considering it noncontributing. But as a contributing structure, he felt it could be approved for demolition with the conceptual plans based on unusual circumstances involved around the project. Chairperson Salter also stated the Board had conceptual plans which were not detrimental to the neighborhood. He was also hesitant to take on the responsibility of reclassifying a structure. Advisor Pristera explained when the district was surveyed in the 1970s and 1980s, a lot of the facades were covered up, with the original façade behind them and were deemed contributing since they had the same footprint and same overall scale and could be restored in the future. Staff advised the Board could approve the demolition with the understanding that the final plan would return to the Board next month. Regarding the contributing status, Advisor Pristera stated his mind changed after seeing the interior down to the structure. In some cases, it was hard to determine what was under the modern skin and how much was remaining. But when he saw this structure gutted, it could be verified there was little of the original structure left, and the main façade was the key piece that had been obliterated. Also, the new material did not qualify as historic as well. **Board Member Ramos respected Advisor Pristera's opinion and made a motion to approve the demolition and whatever is new and proposed be returned for full Board review illustrating how the new fence and elevations work with the rest of the site. Chairperson Salter clarified the motion was to grant demolition based on reclassification of the building from contributing to noncontributing based on information provided that nothing of the original building is there and the advice and assessment of Advisor Pristera. Board Member Ramos agreed and also that the new proposed work return for a full Board review. Staff advised this would allow the applicant to pull a demolition permit, and the motion was supported by the LDC. The motion was seconded by Board Member Fogarty and carried 5 to 0 with Board Member Yee recusing. (The Board then considered Item 7.)**

### Item 13

400 BLK Cevallos Street

PHD

#### New Construction

HC-1 / Wood Cottages

#### Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review.

Brian Spencer is requesting final review for a new two-family residential structure. This project received conceptual approval in September 2017 and again in June 2021 as well as a variance which increased the allowed height from 35 feet to 42.5 feet. The current plans are consistent with the June 2020 plans with further developed details on the materials and finishes.

Mr. Spencer presented to the Board and clarified that the windows were clad. He also stated there was a suggestion on the north elevation to change the horizontal quality of the transoms which had been addressed; there were more finished elevations along with a site plan showing landscaping and the green area. Chairperson Salter thought the comments from the previous submittal had been addressed. He pointed out the roof profile based on the elevations looked like a pyramid with no traditional vertical eave, and Mr. Spencer advised there would be a small fascia. He also clarified the siding would be smooth and not textured. He explained the fascia roof color appeared to be a deep bronze, but it was meant to be the white color which matched the siding. The guest suite consisted of brick piers with a fence for Jasmine and rectangular custom-made planters to be placed between the piers. There was no cap detail for the brick. Board Member



Yee confirmed the roofing material was silver, and the soffit and 4" fascia were white.

**Board Member Courtney made a motion to approve. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion with the amendment that brick pier details return in an abbreviated review. The amendment was accepted, and the motion carried 6 to 0.**

**(The Board returned to item 5 since the applicant was present.)**

**ADJOURNMENT** – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:18 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Gregg Harding*

Historic Preservation Planner Harding  
Secretary to the Board

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME Yee, Jordan		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE Architectural Review Board	
MAILING ADDRESS 1904 E. Leonard Street		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY Pensacola	COUNTY Escambia	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CITY <input type="checkbox"/> COUNTY <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED October 21, 2021		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: NA	
		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, Jordan Yee, hereby disclose that on October 21, 20 21 :

(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:

Item 12 -  
11 E. Garden Street  
Palafox Historic Business District / Zone C-2A  
Demolition of a Contributing Building

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

10/21/21

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.