



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Minutes of the Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting Held on December 17, 2025

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 09:30 AM in the Town Council Chambers.

Members Present: Alexander Griswold, Julie Herzig Desnick, Jacqueline Albarran, Henry Ittleson, Catherine Brooker, Brittain Damgard, Jane Lindsay-Scott, Kim Coleman, Alexander Ives, Patrick Segraves

Staff Present: Friederike Mittner, Abraham Fogel, Kelly Churney, and Assistant Town Attorney Lainey Francisco

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Damgard led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES

1. Minutes of the November 19, 2025, Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and seconded by Ms. Albarran to approve the minutes of the November 19, 2025, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Coleman to approve the consent agenda as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

2. ZON-25-0090 345 BRAZILIAN AVE. The property owners, Randi and Rob Valerious, have filed an application requesting a variance from the floodplain requirement from Chapter 50, Floods, to maintain the existing primary structure and accessory structure at a finished floor elevation below the current FEMA requirement for the landmarked property.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Mittner stated that the March meeting date was changed to March 18, 2026. She stated that the COA-25-0032, 210 Dunbar Road, will be deferred to March 18, 2026.

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and seconded by Mr. Segraves to approve the agenda as amended. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH

Town Clerk Churney swore in all those intending to speak and continued to do so throughout the meeting, as necessary.

COMMENTS

3. OFFICIALS

Ms. Coleman asked if the signs had been approved for Glaser Hall, to which Ms. Mittner confirmed they had.

4. STAFF

Ms. Mittner indicated that 18 administrative approvals had been completed over the last year. She announced that three properties were designated as landmark properties by the Town Council. These included 303 Pendleton Avenue, 220 Eden Road, and 246 Tangier Avenue. She announced that the tax exemption for 318 Australian Avenue had been approved by the Town Council. She thanked the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach for hosting their event, which honored landmarked properties and presented plaques to those landmarked properties within the last 10 years.

5. PUBLIC - 3 MINUTE LIMIT

Rick Smith of 130 Sunrise Avenue asked to reserve his time for public comment to use during the Paramount project.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6. COA-23-003 (ZON-23-020) 139 N COUNTY RD—THE PARAMOUNT THEATER (COMBO). The applicant, WEG Paramount LLC, has refiled an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of the renovation, including window and door replacement, roof replacement, installation of awnings, railing replacement, selective demolition, reconstruction of original features, as well as landscape and hardscape improvements, and adaptive re-use of an existing Landmarked theater structure. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval. The consideration of which is part of a facilitated resolution by the magistrate under Florida's Land Use and Environmental Dispute Resolution Act.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Attorney Seth Behn of Lewis, Longman, and Walker, and special counsel to the Town of Palm Beach, explained that the project is proceeding under the FLEUDRA process following an earlier denial and related litigation. He stated that the Town required the applicant to submit a full application to provide complete information for review and noted that the Town Council requested the commission's input before taking further action. Mr. Bain clarified that the commission's role is to review the project under applicable landmarks criteria, and that the matter will return to the Town Council for final consideration.

Attorney Jamie Crowley, on behalf of the applicant, asked to reserve time to respond to public comment. He introduced the architect for the project.

Rick Gonzalez of REG Architects presented the architectural plans proposed for the landmarked property. Cory Meyer of Nievera Williams Design presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site. He addressed the letter that was written, which claimed the building should be considered for demolition by neglect. He showed two different gate designs for the main gate that would be used at night.

Ms. Coleman asked clarifying questions about the gates. Mr. Gonzalez and Ms. Mittner provided further clarification.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick asked about any physical separation of the public and club spaces. Mr. Gonzalez responded.

Mr. Griswold inquired about the material for the windows and confirmed that they would be made of clear glass. Mr. Gonzalez responded. Mr. Griswold thought it was important that the window glass was clear.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott inquired about the gates and wondered if they were necessary during the day. Mr. Gonzalez stated that there were issues with the courtyard in the early morning, and the owner was concerned about his safety. Ms. Lindsay-Scott wondered if the gates could be incorporated into the stairwell design. Mr. Gonzalez responded. Ms. Lindsay-Scott inquired about access to the courtyard and the shops, and whether they would remain open. Mr. Gonzalez stated they would remain open. She asked if there would be a kitchen in the private apartment. Mr. Gonzalez responded.

Attorney Francisco stated that the Landmarks Preservation Commission needed to focus on the exterior alterations, which were guided by Code Sections 54-123 and 54-122.

Mr. Ives asked clarifying questions about where the gates would be installed and when they would be used. Mr. Gonzalez provided clarification. He inquired about the roof enclosure and its height in relation to the mechanical closure height. Mr. Gonzales discussed the proposed change.

Mr. Segraves asked several architectural questions regarding the restoration, including confirmation that the dome would be restored in place without altering its height, and whether the front façade windows would reflect the building as originally constructed, rather than as

depicted in the original drawings. Mr. Gonzalez confirmed that the dome would remain in situ and that the restoration would follow the building as built, noting historic modifications reflected in early photographs. Mr. Segraves also inquired about window materials, and Mr. Gonzalez confirmed that the windows would be wood and closely matched the original profiles. Additional discussion addressed the increased height of rooftop screening to conceal new mechanical equipment, proposed improvements to soften the parking area through added tabby and brick detailing and landscaping, as well as gate designs. Mr. Segraves requested elevation views of all gates to better evaluate their appearance.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick thought the mechanical equipment enclosure with terracotta clashed with the dome. Mr. Gonzalez stated that the Preservation Foundation suggested the use of terracotta.

Ms. Coleman inquired about the height of the dome versus the height of the mechanical equipment enclosure. She requested further clarification on the gates. Mr. Gonzalez reviewed the gate proposal.

Mr. Ittleon inquired if the Paramount sign would remain. Mr. Gonzalez confirmed it would remain.

Ms. Albarran asked about stuccoing the bottom half of the roof enclosure. Mr. Gonzalez showed a drawing of the option. Ms. Albarran stated she would like to see the rendering of that option with the stucco.

Mr. Griswold stated that density and use are outside the Commission's purview and should not influence the review of the restoration. He noted the building's longstanding disrepair and expressed that the proposal reflects significant effort and investment to restore the structure's original character, with remaining details to be addressed.

Ms. Damgard indicated that the previous proposals showed wood windows, and the commission usually prefers wood windows. Mr. Gonzalez discussed the heavy maintenance for wood windows in commercial buildings. He showed pictures of the Colby windows at Norton Museum and advocated for this material. He added that he would bring a sample of the window to the next presentation. Ms. Damgard questioned the need for the gates and wondered if they could be placed inside so they would not be seen. Mr. Gonzalez discussed options and locations for the gates.

Ms. Coleman confirmed options for gates. She also confirmed that no reflective glass would be used. Mr. Gonzalez stated he would not propose any reflective glass.

Mr. Ittleon asked if the architect had explored different security measures without gates.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Rick Smith, 130 Sunrise Avenue, stated his opposition to the project, asserting that it does not meet the criteria for a special exception or conform to the Comprehensive Plan. He raised concerns regarding rooftop mechanical equipment visibility and noise impacts on nearby residences, citing expert information on potential health effects. While acknowledging positive

aspects of the proposed plans and drainage improvements, he expressed ongoing concerns about aesthetics, maintenance history, and impacts to the surrounding residential area, and submitted exhibits for the record.

Mr. Gonzalez stated the dumpsters would be rolled out to the street, and there would be no trucks backing up into the space.

Katie Jacobs of Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach stated that the Foundation strongly supports the restoration of the historic Paramount Theatre, emphasizing its iconic and public significance. She expressed a preference for preserving or replacing existing windows with authentic wood windows, noting that this approach aligns with best preservation practices and would help maintain the building's historic integrity as a National Historic Landmark.

Anita Seltzer, 44 Cocoanut Row, expressed concerns about stewardship of the historic building and urged the Board to ensure full compliance with Town ordinances. She cited inconsistencies in the application materials, questioned the timing and availability of required permits, and noted the absence of site, staging, and traffic plans. She requested that the Board fully review all information and protect the building's historic features before proceeding.

Attorney John Eubanks, representing many of the surrounding condominium owners, acknowledged the strong community passion surrounding the Paramount Theatre and expressed concern about the extent of interior demolition that has occurred, noting reports of long-term water intrusion and the potential risk to historic materials. He stated that it was unclear what measures were currently being taken to protect the building and emphasized the importance of preservation during the review process. Mr. Eubanks indicated that the application appeared premature, given outstanding issues, and requested that the matter return with additional information, noting that traffic and other related concerns would be addressed at the Town Council level.

Mr. Crowley stated that the primary issues requiring further review were the gates, windows, and rooftop elements. He refuted claims that the owner had neglected the building, noting substantial financial investment and professional efforts toward restoration. He emphasized that traffic and parking matters would be addressed by the Town Council and requested guidance or direction from the Board to allow the restoration process to move forward.

Attorney Francisco requested to close public comment.

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and seconded by Ms. Albarran to defer the project to the meeting on January 21, 2026. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

7. COA-25-0030 (ZON-25-0067) 801 S COUNTY RD (COMBO). The applicant, LaBerge & Menard Inc., has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of modifications to the existing garage to add a second-story guest house, as well as landscape and hardscape modifications, including a variance to allow an additional guest house for the landmarked property. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Daniel Menard of LaBerge and Menard Architects presented the architectural modifications proposed for the accessory structure on the landmarked site.

Ms. Coleman thought the garage was beautiful.

Mr. Griswold thought the professional listened to the comments from the Commissioners. He asked about the existing entrance way. Mr. Menard stated that it was an important element for the main house and explained the gate's function. Mr. Griswold thought the element felt oversized and underutilized. He recommended removing that portion and sliding the home east, using the eastern arch.

Mr. Segraves asked about the width of the driveway to the garage; he recommended reducing the opening to 12 feet. Mr. Menard agreed. Mr. Segraves thought the building was much more attractive.

Mr. Ives agreed with Messrs. Griswold and Segraves. Mr. Ives inquired about the roof height and the length of the home away from the ocean. Mr. Menard responded. Mr. Ives thought the accessory structure fought for attention with the main house. He thought the hardscape was too important for the subservient structure.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment. No one indicated a desire to speak.

Mr. Griswold agreed with Mr. Segraves' solution for the entrance driveway. He did not understand the need for the large opening on a side street. Mr. Menard responded and provided his view on the large opening, advocating for keeping the large arch.

Mr. Segraves agreed with Mr. Griswold but also understood that the site plan was large. He thought the new accessory structure could stand on its own.

A motion was made by Mr. Segraves and seconded by Ms. Albarran to approve the project with the conditions that the driveway width be reduced to 12 feet, and the landscape and hardscape plans return to the meeting on January 21, 2026. The motion was carried 5-2, with Mr. Ives and Ms. Damgard dissenting.

A motion was made by Mr. Segraves and seconded by Ms. Albarran that the implementation of the proposed variances will not cause a negative architectural impact on the subject property. The motion was carried 5-2, with Mr. Ives and Ms. Damgard dissenting.

NEW BUSINESS

8. COA-25-0031 (ZON-25-0031) 340 S COUNTY RD (COMBO). The property owner, 340 S COUNTY LLC (James Crowley, Representative), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of exterior modifications, a one-story addition, landscape and hardscape improvements to an existing service station, and a floodplain variance for the property located within the

Town Hall Square Historic District. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Caroline Forrest of MHK Architecture presented the architectural modifications proposed for the commercial structure. John Schmidt of Schmidt Nichols presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Mr. Ives asked the staff about the building and whether it was non-contributing, to which the staff confirmed.

Mr. Segraves inquired about the variances that had been approved. Ms. Forrest responded and explained the variances. He supported the changes and liked the change to the garage bay. Mr. Segraves wondered if the commission needed to approve the flood plain variance, to which Attorney Jamie Crowley confirmed.

Ms. Coleman asked about windows in the bathroom and wondered if they could be enlarged. Ms. Coleman thought the area looked a little bare. Ms. Forrest stated that planters could be added on each side of the bike rack. Ms. Coleman asked about the name Palm Petrol. Ms. Forrest explained the ownership and brand, adding that signage would be approved by the staff in coordination with the Chair.

Ms. Damgard agreed that jasmine or bougainvillea would provide a nice look on the south side, where the bathrooms are located. Ms. Damgard wondered if the signage would be added to the garage bays as they had historically existed.

Ms. Albarran was impressed with the drawings. She thought the change would look elegant.

Ms. Brooker appreciated the efforts to improve the gas station.

Mr. Ittleson congratulated the professional. He thought the design stellar.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment. No one indicated a desire to speak.

A motion was made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

A motion was made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Ives that the implementation of the proposed flood plain variance will not cause a negative architectural impact on the subject property. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

9. COA-25-0032 210 DUNBAR RD. The applicant, Caleb Laux, has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations, renovation, and additions, as well as landscape and hardscape improvements, and a variance from the floodplain requirement from Chapter 50, Floods, for the landmark property containing

a residence and accessory structure. *[This item has been deferred to the January 21, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting.]*

****Note: This item was deferred to January 21, 2026, at the approval of the agenda.***

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

10. 105 NORTH COUNTY ROAD DESIGNATION HEARING Owner: PB105 LLC

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history of the Mediterranean-Revival style commercial building. Ms. Stillings pointed out the design features of the residence. Ms. Stillings testified that the residence 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,

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Coleman to make the designation report for 105 North County Road part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Mittner provided confirmation of proof of publication.

Ms. Damgard asked if the owner had expressed thoughts about the designation. Ms. Mittner stated that the owner had been properly notified, but the staff had yet to hear from them. Ms. Damgard thought it was a wonderful block. Ms. Stillings stated that the building was the only one on the block that had not been designated as a landmark.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment. No one indicated a desire to speak.

Mr. Ives commented that landmark designations in the area have been increasing and noted that the subject property is among the last remaining in the area to be considered. He suggested that the Town may eventually consider establishing a historic district to address the area comprehensively. He stated that, as presented by the Town's consultants and reflected in the designation report, the property exemplifies the broad cultural, political, economic, and social history of the nation, state, county, and Town, and embodies distinguishing architectural characteristics and craftsmanship representative of its period and use of indigenous materials. Based on these criteria, he supported designation under Section 54-161.

Ms. Damgard thought the building was special and should be landmarked like the adjacent buildings.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Albarran to recommend 150 North

County Road 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, and with the acknowledgment that there had been no support or objection from the building's owners. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

11. 306 SEABREEZE AVENUE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: Ralph J. Greco, Ralph J. Greco Revocable Trust

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history of the Craftsman Bungalow-style residence. Ms. Stillings pointed out the design features of the residence. Ms. Stillings testified that the residence 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.

Ms. Damgard requested confirmation of proof of publication. Ms. Mittner provided confirmation.

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and was seconded by Mr. Ives to make the designation report for 303 Seabreeze Avenue part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Coleman asked about the pillars in the architecture. Ms. Stillings thanked Ms. Greco for the tour of the home. She explained that the columns shown were the original porch columns and remain intact within the enclosed front porch area. She stated that the columns were infilled but continue to support the roof structure and referenced architectural elements visible beneath the three windows on the lower left.

Ms. Lindsay Scott asked about the flood elevation for the site. Ms. Mittner thought the owner was exploring this, but has not yet obtained a flood elevation certificate at this time.

Ms. Damgard thought the home was a charming structure, and there were few left in the town.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick stated that she had concerns because the original front porch was no longer present and did not view the remaining elements as a defining feature of the house as currently presented. She noted that there are stronger examples of similar houses that retain front porches and stone bases, and for these reasons, she expressed opposition to the proposed designation.

Mr. Ives asked if there were other Bungalow-style homes that were landmarked in the Town. Ms. Stillings confirmed there were others and stated she would research the number for Mr. Ives.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Anne Pepper, 333 Seaspray Avenue, expressed strong personal and emotional support for

preserving the house, stating that she values the character of the neighborhood and is concerned about the continued loss of smaller historic homes being replaced by much larger residences. She noted that such redevelopment permanently alters the character of the Sea Streets area and described the cumulative impact as a loss of the neighborhood's historic fabric. While acknowledging the circumstances of the property's heirs, she emphasized the importance of the Town's landmarking program in preserving the distinctive character of the community and stated that she would be saddened if the house were lost.

Katie Jacobs of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach stated that they support the designation of the property and emphasized the importance of preserving the Town's character. She indicated agreement with the consultants' report and noted that the property is particularly unique because it was owned by the same individual for a long period and represents an era in Palm Beach when working residents, such as teachers and Town employees, lived within the community. She added that the smaller scale of the structure helps illustrate the historic development of the area as a true residential community with convenient access to workplaces.

Ms. Damgard stated her continued support for landmark designations and noted that, in recent years, landmarked homes that have been refurbished and sold have often commanded a premium. She suggested that if the subject property were restored and subsequently sold, landmark designation could have a positive impact on its value.

A motion was made by Mr. Segraves and was seconded by Ms. Coleman to recommend 306 Seabreeze 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, and with the acknowledgment of the owners' objection to the designation. The motion was carried 5-2, with Mr. Ives and Ms. Herzig-Desnick dissenting.

12. 345 SEABREEZE AVENUE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: Ramsey C. Speer

[This item has been deferred to the January 21, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting.]

****Note: This item was deferred to January 21, 2026, at the approval of the agenda.***

13. 409 SEABREEZE AVENUE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: William E. Betts, III and Nicole K. Betts

[This item has been deferred to the March 19, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting.]

****Note: This item was deferred to March 19, 2026, at the approval of the agenda.***

14. 410 SEABREEZE AVENUE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: Deborah E. Glass

[This item has been deferred to the January 21, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting.]

****Note: This item was deferred to January 21, 2026, at the approval of the agenda.***

MEETING SCHEDULE

15. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 21, 2026.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Albarran to adjourn the meeting at 01:03 PM. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Respectfully Submitted,


Brittain Damgard, Chair

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME Griswold, Alexander		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE Landmarks Preservation Commission	
MAILING ADDRESS 161 Main Street		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY Palm Beach	COUNTY Palm Beach	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED 12/17/25		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: Town of Palm Beach	
		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, Alexander Griswold, hereby disclose that on December 17, 2025:

(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:

COA-25-0031 (ZON-25-0031)
340 S. County Rd.

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.

12/17/25
Date Filed


Signature

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