



**TOWN OF PALM BEACH
PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING
DEPARTMENT**

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2022.**

Please be advised that in keeping with a directive from the Town Council, the minutes of all Town Boards and Commissions will be "abbreviated" in style. Persons interested in listening to the meeting, after the fact, may access the audio of that item via the Town's website at www.townofpalmbeach.com.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Silvin called the meeting via Zoom to order at 9:30 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Richard Rene Silvin, Chairman	PRESENT
Sue Patterson, Vice Chairman	PRESENT
Jacqueline Albarran, Member	PRESENT
Patrick Segraves, Member	PRESENT
Kim Coleman, Member	PRESENT
Anne Fairfax, Member	PRESENT
Brittain Damgard, Member	PRESENT
Anne Metzger, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Fernando Wong, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Bridget Moran, Alternate Member	PRESENT

Staff Members present were:

Wayne Bergman, Director of Planning, Zoning and Building
James Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, Zoning and Building
Sarah C. Pardue, Historic Preservation Planner
Jordan Hodges, Planner II
Kelly Churney, Board Secretary to the Landmarks Preservation Commission
Emily Stillings, Preservation Consultant
Janet Murphy, Preservation Consultant

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Silvin led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 22, 2022 MEETING

Motion made by Ms. Patterson and seconded by Ms. Coleman to approve the minutes of the December 22, 2021 meeting. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

V. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Murphy requested the following modifications to the agenda:

- *Defer HSB-21-004 (ZON-21-018) 245 Barton Ave. to the February 16, 2022*
- *Designation Hearing of 4 Via Vizcaya be deferred to the March 16, 2022 Meeting*

- *Designation Hearing of 287 Pendleton Avenue be deferred to the March 16, 2022 Meeting*
- *Designation Hearing of 686 Island Dr. be deferred to the March 16, 2022 Meeting*

Motion made by Ms. Patterson and seconded by Ms. Coleman to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

VI. ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH TO PERSONS WHO WISH TO TESTIFY

Ms. Churney swore in all professionals before each presentation and throughout the meeting as necessary.

VII. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS REGARDING NON-AGENDA ITEMS (3 MINUTE LIMIT PLEASE)

Aimee Sunny, Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, informed the Commission that the Foundation currently had a free exhibit on Marion Sims Wyeth. She added that the exhibit would run until March 31, 2022. She also indicated an event on January 20, 2022, which was the premiere of the Craftsmen Series in collaboration with Oliveri Millworks and hosted by Bob Vila. She stated the event was almost sold out.

VIII. COMMENTS FROM THE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEMBERS

Mr. Silvin discussed the Town Council's decision to move the Commission meeting to a virtual meeting rather than meeting in person. He indicated that the Town Council would reevaluate this decision on February 9, 2022. Mr. Silvin touched on staff's conversation with Sarah Wetenhall, The Colony Hotel, regarding the gates to be temporarily installed and later, permanent gates, to shield the garbage from the street. Mr. Silvin reviewed a conversation he had at the beginning of the month with former President Trump, who indicated the need for the additional bathrooms to the Post Ballroom at Mar-a-Lago and expressed his appreciation to the Commission for the approval.

Ms. Patterson discussed the article that she requested staff to send to the Commissioners regarding the Deauville Hotel in Miami Beach. She reminded her fellow Commissioners of the Landmark plaque unveiling at The Colony Hotel on Thursday, February 3, 2022 at 9 a.m. She encouraged her fellow Commissioners to attend, if possible.

Ms. Coleman discussed the nice email that she received from Sarah Wetenhall at The Colony Hotel. She inquired if the new gates to be installed would cover the unsightly garbage dumpsters at Saks Fifth Avenue in the Esplanade. Mr. Murphy indicated he would look into this item.

Ms. Moran thanked staff for the recent project memos and the new processes that have recently been implemented.

Ms. Damgard requested to be introduced to David Rivera, the new Administrative Specialist. Staff introduced Mr. Rivera to the Commissioners.

IX. PROJECT REVIEW

A. CONSENT AGENDA

1. **COA-002-2021 500 REGENTS PARK – TIME EXTENSION** An application has been filed requesting an Extension of Time for a previously issued COA Approval for the raising and renovation of an existing two-story landmarked residence. (*Item was originally approved at the January 20, 2021 LPC Meeting*)

Please refer to staff memo for additional information on this project.

2. **COA-22-001 174 VIA DEL LAGO** The applicant, 174 VDL Investment LLC, has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness approval for modifications to a previously approved COA to update the landscape and hardscape of the service court and motor court.

Please refer to staff memo for additional information on this project.

Motion made by Mr. Segraves and seconded by Ms. Patterson to approve the consent agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

B. CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS – OLD BUSINESS

None

C. CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS – NEW BUSINESS

1. **COA-22-002 1568 S. OCEAN BLVD.** The applicant, Gary B Knapp, has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness approval for the exterior modifications to an existing two-story landmarked home including new entry door, new garage doors, a new window and new decorative metal grilles.

Please refer to staff memo for additional information on this project.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members. *Please note: Ms. Fairfax declared a conflict of interest for the project and left the Zoom meeting. It was noted that Ms. Metzger would vote in her absence.*

Jaime Torres-Cruz, Fairfax and Sammons, presented the plans for the architectural modifications proposed for the existing, landmarked residence.

Mr. Silvin called for staff comments. Mr. Murphy provided staff comments for this project.

Mr. Silvin called for public comment. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Silvin stated that at last month's meeting, Mr. Segraves pointed out the addition to the historic structure. He also noted that most of the current modifications were proposed for the addition. He was happy that the Town and the owner had preserved the home.

Ms. Metzger discussed her site visit of the property and added she was impressed with the sensitive changes proposed. She thought that all of the changes were in keeping with the historic nature of the home. She provided her support for the project.

Ms. Moran thought the change in color of the fireplace took away from some of the weight or pattern of the home. Mr. Torres-Cruz thought that the current color of the chimney competed with the home. He believed the new color would soften the home.

Mr. Segraves thought the architect has done a good job with the changes and thought they were appropriate and sensitive. He provided his support for the project.

Ms. Metzger added that Mr. Torres-Cruz informed her that the Cypress material would be old Cypress, which she believed to be a good choice.

Ms. Albarran added her support for the project.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Ms. Metzger to approve the project as presented. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

2. **COA-22-004 (ZON-22-020) 8 S. LAKE TRAIL (COMBO)** The applicant, The Lakeside Trust dated November 19, 2020 (Patrick Emans, Trustee), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness approval for the installation of driveway gates and columns. Town Council will review the Special Exception portion of the application.

Please refer to staff memo for additional information on this project.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: There were no disclosures made for this project.

Maura Ziska, Attorney for the applicant, explained the special exception request and advocated for a positive recommendation to the Town Council.

Tom McManus, Ferguson & Shamamian Architects, presented the architectural plans for two vehicular gates proposed to be added to the existing, landmarked home.

Ms. Patterson understood the need for gates and thought the proposed gates were handsome.

Ms. Albarran agreed with Ms. Patterson. She thought the gates were beautiful.

Ms. Coleman thought that gates were appropriate for the property but wondered if there were a bit ornate.

Ms. Damgard also thought the gates were a bit ornate but supported the request to install the gates.

Ms. Fairfax pointed out that the rise in the center of the gate caused too much weight for the middle of the gate. However, she added that she would support the gate request. She thought the wrought iron gate would be less obtrusive than what was shown in the line drawings.

Ms. Metzger agreed with Ms. Fairfax and her comments. She also inquired about the gate on Primavera Way, which she noticed was currently opaque. Mr. McManus said the opaqueness was only temporary.

Ms. Moran originally thought the gates were too ornate but now thought they were pretty.

Mr. Segraves agreed with Ms. Fairfax but also thought the gates were lighter than how they appeared in the graphics.

Mr. Silvin inquired if the gates would slide rather than swing. Mr. McManus provided confirmation that the gates would slide. Mr. Silvin inquired about the shifting of the piers. Jason Bibens, Ferguson & Shamamian Architects, provided an explanation of the piers. Mr. Silvin inquired if the neighbor to the north had any comments about the project. Ms. Ziska stated that she had not received any comments from the neighbor; however, the neighbor knew how to contact her if they had any concerns.

Mr. Silvin inquired about the Zoning request. Ms. Ziska responded further with an explanation of the request. Mr. Murphy provided staff comments for this project.

Mr. Silvin called for public comment. There were no comments heard at this time.

Ms. Fairfax requested to see the plan on how the gates would slide open. Mr. Bibens provided an explanation of how the gates would slide open.

Motion made by Ms. Patterson and seconded by Ms. Damgard to approve the project as presented. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

C. ITEMS PULLED FROM CONSENT

D. HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT BUILDINGS – OLD BUSINESS

1. **HSB-21-004 (ZON-21-018) 245 BARTON AVE. (COMBO)** The applicant, Elizabeth Sorrel, has filed an application requesting Landmarks Preservation Commission review and approval for the construction of a new 35 SF covered ground floor entry addition to a historically significant building including variances from the setback, CCR and lot coverage requirements. The variance portion of the application shall be reviewed by Town Council.

Please note: This item was deferred to the February 16, 2022 meeting at the approval of the agenda, Item V.

E. HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT BUILDINGS – NEW BUSINESS

1. **HSB-22-001 249 SANDPIPER DR.** The applicant, Alec Sheiner, has filed an application requesting Landmarks Preservation Commission review and approval for the exterior modifications to a historically significant building.

Please refer to staff memo for additional information on this project.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: There were no disclosures made for this project.

Yianni Varnava, Varnava Design Studio, presented the plans for the architectural modifications proposed for the historically significant residence.

Mr. Silvin called for staff comments. Mr. Murphy stated he did not have any comments at this time.

Mr. Silvin called for public comment. There were no comments heard at this time.

Ms. Patterson understood the need to decrease the size of the entrance; however, she believed the design departed a bit from the three windows to the left of the front doors. She also questioned the proposed sliders rather than French doors, which she felt might be more in keeping with the original design.

Ms. Albarran was supportive of the changes. She thought the changes to the front helped the home to look more gracious. She also supported the proposed sliders.

Ms. Coleman thought the changes were a great improvement. She thought the sliders were acceptable. Ms. Damgard agreed.

Ms. Fairfax questioned the historic nature of the home. She thought the changes would be nice and allow more light into the home. She liked the change from the double to the single front door. She asked that the shutters be correctly sized so that each shutter is exactly half of the size of the window. She inquired if the shutters would be operable. Mr. Varnava stated that they were not operable but were correctly sized. Ms. Fairfax inquired about the material of the shutters. Mr. Varnava stated they were aluminum. Ms. Fairfax stated that the shutters could be hurricane rated and closed, if needed, during a storm.

Ms. Metzger thought the changes were an improvement.

Ms. Moran agreed with Ms. Fairfax and wondered why this home was considered a historic home. Since it was a historic home, she wondered if the changes met the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Mr. Segraves also thought the changes were nice. Mr. Segraves thought the single front door was more successful than the double front door. He thought the changes were appropriate and provided the reasons.

Mr. Wong thought the changes to the front door and windows on the front façade were successful. He liked Ms. Fairfax's suggestion and wondered if the professional could ask the homeowner if they would consider operable shutters.

Mr. Segraves stated that the fixed shutters could appear as operable if hinges were applied. He further described this installation.

Mr. Silvin inquired if the new windows would be impact glass. Mr. Varnava stated that the glass would be impact glass. Mr. Silvin thought the changes nicely simplified the home. Mr. Silvin inquired about the material and color for the garage doors. Mr. Varnava stated the garage doors would be aluminum and painted white.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, stated that the three windows to the left of the front door were not shown on the original plans of the home.

Motion made by Ms. Coleman and seconded by Ms. Patterson to approve the project as presented. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

X. DESIGNATION HEARINGS

ITEM 1: 4 Via Vizcaya

Owner: Monnie and Thorne Donnelley

Please note: This item was deferred to the March 16, 2022 meeting at the approval of the agenda, Item V.

ITEM 2: 250 Algoma Road

Owner: Cortright and Janice Wetherill

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: There were no disclosures at this time.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history for this Georgian Revival style home. Ms. Stillings pointed out the design features of this building. Ms. Stillings testified that the building met the following criteria for designation as a landmark:

Sec. 54-161 (1) Exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, economic or social history of the nation, state, county or town; and,

Sec. 54-161 (3) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or is a specimen inherently valuable of the study of a period, style, method of construction or use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship; and

Sec. 54-161 (4) Is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer or architect whose individual ability has been recognized or who influenced his age.

Mr. Silvin asked for confirmation on proof of publication. Ms. Churney provided confirmation.

Motion made by Ms. Coleman and seconded by Ms. Damgard to make the designation report for 250 Algoma Road part of the record. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0

All of the Commissioners agreed that the home was beautiful and would be a nice addition to the landmarked homes in the Town.

Mr. Silvin inquired about the guest home on the property and wondered if it was also designed by Maurice Fatio. Ms. Stillings responded. Mr. Silvin inquired if the guest home would also be landmarked. Ms. Stillings confirmed that the entire property would be landmarked.

Mr. Silvin called for any public comment on the designation. There were no comments heard at this time.

Motion made by Ms. Damgard and seconded by Ms. Patterson to recommend 250 Algoma Road to the Town Council for designation as a Landmark of the Town of Palm Beach based on criteria 1, 3 and 4 in Section 54-161. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

ITEM 3: 107 Dolphin Road
Owner: Irwin B. Ackerman

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by Ms. Metzger.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history for this Mid-Century Moderne style home. Ms. Stillings pointed out the previous modifications to this home and the reasons she did not believe it met the criteria as a Landmarked home in the Town of Palm Beach.

Motion made by Mr. Segraves and seconded by Ms. Patterson to make the designation report for 107 Dolphin Road part of the record. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0

Mr. Silvin called for any public comment on the designation. There were no comments heard at this time.

Many of the Commissioners agreed with Ms. Stillings and agreed that the home had a number of changes that did not meet criteria for landmark designation.

Ms. Fairfax inquired about the method that the home was placed under consideration. Mr. Stillings responded.

Motion made by Ms. Patterson and seconded by Mr. Segraves that the property at 107 Dolphin Road not be recommended to the Town Council for designation as a landmark of the Town of Palm Beach because it does not meet the Criteria in Section 54-161. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

ITEM 4: 287 Pendleton Avenue
Owner: Susan C. Lee

Please note: This item was deferred to the March 16, 2022 meeting at the approval of the agenda, Item V.

ITEM 5: 266 Atlantic Avenue
Owner: Peter Kaupe

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: There were no disclosures at this time.

Mr. Silvin asked for confirmation on proof of publication. Ms. Churney provided confirmation.

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history for this Frame Vernacular style home. Ms. Murphy pointed out the design features of this building. Ms. Murphy testified that the building met the following criteria for designation as a landmark:

Sec. 54-161 (1) Exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, economic or social history of the nation, state, county or town; and,
Sec. 54-161 (3) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or is a specimen inherently valuable of the study of a period, style, method of construction or use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.

Motion made by Ms. Coleman and seconded by Ms. Damgard to make the designation report for 266 Atlantic Avenue part of the record. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0

Mr. Silvin called for any public comment on the designation. There were no comments heard at this time.

Ms. Patterson thought the home was interesting and had nice details.

Ms. Albarran thought it was nice to preserve a frame vernacular home.

Many of the Commissioners were supportive to landmark the home.

Motion made by Ms. Patterson and seconded by Ms. Damgard to recommend 266 Atlantic Avenue to the Town Council for designation

as a Landmark of the Town of Palm Beach based on criteria 1 and 3 in Section 54-161. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Murphy thanked the owner Mr. Kaupe for his confidence and support of the designation.

ITEM 6: 686 Island Drive
Owner: Robert Greenhill

Please note: This item was deferred to the March 16, 2022 meeting at the approval of the agenda, Item V.

ITEM 7: 357 Crescent Drive
Owner: Juliette De Marcellus

At this time, staff indicated that while the owner, Ms. De Marcellus, requested to attend during this discussion of her home, she had a prior engagement and would not be able to participate at this time. Staff deferred to Chairman Silvin on how to proceed in her absence.

Mr. Murphy laid out the three options on how to proceed with this item.

Mr. Silvin thought a one-month deferral was the best option. After polling all of the Commissioners, they also felt a one-month deferral was the best option.

Motion made by Mr. Segraves and seconded by Ms. Coleman to defer the designation hearing for 357 Crescent Drive to the February 16, 2022 meeting. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

XI. UNSCHEDULED ITEMS (3 MINUTE LIMIT PLEASE)

1. Public

There were no comments heard at this time.

2. Staff

Ms. Churney stated that Patrick Segraves declared a continuing conflict of interest for the project at 360 Seaspray Avenue at the December 22, 2021 meeting and had correctly completed the 8B form in accordance with State Law.

Ms. Churney stated that Sue Patterson declared a continuing conflict of interest for the project at 720 S. Ocean Blvd. at the December 22, 2021 meeting and had correctly completed the 8B form in accordance with State Law.

Ms. Churney stated that Anne Fairfax declared a conflict of interest for the designation hearing at 1568 S. Ocean Blvd. at the December 22, 2021 meeting and had correctly completed the 8B form in accordance with State Law.

Mr. Murphy reviewed the Landmark projects and issues presented at the January 2022 Town Council Meetings.

3. Commission

Ms. Albarran inquired about staff's recommendation for a 6 month time extension for the project at 500 Regents Park. Mr. Murphy stated that staff felt the time extension was appropriate and had no objections to the request.

Mr. Silvin agreed with Mr. Murphy's comments on Mr. Bergman's presentation on the condominium collapse in Surfside, Florida. He thought the presentation was excellent and recommended that the Commissioners view the presentation if they had the time.

Ms. Coleman inquired about the applicant for the Palm Beach Hotel project. Mr. Murphy provided further information for clarification.

XII. NEXT MEETING DATE: Wednesday, February 16, 2022

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion made by Ms. Patterson and seconded by Ms. Damgard to adjourn the meeting at 11:35 a.m. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be held on Wednesday, February 16, 2022, at 9:30 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 S. County Road.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard Rene Silvin, Chairman
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

kmc

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME <i>Fairfax, Anne</i>		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <i>Landmarks Preservation Commission</i>	
MAILING ADDRESS <i>455 Worth Ave, #303</i>		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY <i>Palm Beach</i>	COUNTY <i>Palm Beach</i>	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED <i>January 19, 2022</i>		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <i>Town of Palm Beach</i>	
		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, Anne Fairfax, hereby disclose that on January 19, 20 22:

(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 Gary B Knapp, 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:

COA-22-002
1568 S. Ocean Blvd.
Continuing Conflict

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 1/19/2022

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.