



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Minutes of the Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting Held on April 22, 2026

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Members Present: Julie Herzig Desnick, Henry Ittleson, Catherine Brooker, Brittain Damgard, Jane Lindsay-Scott, Alexander Ives, Patrick Segraves, Katherine Bryan, Kristin Kellogg

Members Absent: Kim Coleman

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 March 18, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Segraves and seconded by Ms. Brooker to approve the minutes of the March 18, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Mittner announced two deferrals of the landmark designations for 315 Pendleton Lane and 322 Pendleton Lane, with both owners requesting a deferral to the November 18, 2026, meeting. She also corrected a Scrivener's error for item 18, 2780 S. Ocean Blvd, indicating that the item will be deferred to the February 2027 meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives 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

2. OFFICIALS

Mr. Ives relayed community concerns regarding recent and potential development activity, including tenant displacement and the loss of longstanding businesses, and clarified that the role of the Landmarks Commission is limited to historic preservation, not preventing development or protecting businesses, noting such concerns should be directed to the Town Council or Planning and Zoning Commission.

3. STAFF

Ms. Mittner indicated that 12 administrative approvals have been completed over the last month.

3.1 Public Works Presentation: Sight Triangles and Corner Clips

Adam Kerr of Kimley Horn provided an overview of updates to the Town's right-of-way manual, explaining the purpose and function of sight triangles and corner clips in ensuring visibility and safety at intersections and driveways. He noted revisions include refined standards for driveways, added corner clips at sidewalk crossings, and guidance to improve stop sign visibility, emphasizing that all updates are intended to enhance safety for motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists.

Ms. Brooker asked if there were any exceptions to the sight triangles. Mr. Kerr clarified that existing nonconforming conditions, such as older driveways lacking sight triangles, are generally grandfathered, and that updated requirements are applied only when modifications or new driveways are proposed.

4. PUBLIC - 3 MINUTE LIMIT

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

GENERAL BUSINESS

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5. COA-26-0002 (ZON-26-0006) 1100 SOUTH OCEAN BLVD – MAR-A-LAGO. The applicant, Mar-a-Lago Club, LLC. (Harvey E. Oyer, III, Authorized Representative), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness review and approval for a new generator building housing two new 400KW generators 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.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Ms. Brooker and Ms. Damgard disclosed ex parte communications.

Roger Ramdeen of Shutts and Bowen, on behalf of the applicant, introduced the overall modifications to the project. Rick Gonzalez of REG Architects presented the architectural modifications. Mr. Gonzalez presented a slide for the overhead projector depicting a new guard gate at the south entrance. Ms. Mittner and Town Attorney Francisco stated that the photo should not be shown since the town had not received an application for that change.

Mr. Ives asked about the louvers on the south side and wondered whether it would be possible to match them on the north side. Mr. Gonzalez responded and explained the reason for the small louvers on the south side.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick thought the building looked much better with the painted louvers, but wondered why the building's doors and windows were still dark brown. She stated she would prefer lighter colors for the doors and windows, as they would look better. Mr. Gonzalez stated that the doors and windows match other buildings on the property.

Mr. Segraves believed the changes were made as requested by the commission. He agreed with the National Trust that simplifying the building led to a much better project.

Ms. Damgard asked about the landscaping around the generator's exhaust. Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group responded and discussed the proposed material.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Segraves and seconded by Ms. Lindsay-Scott to approve the project as presented. The motion was carried 6-1, with Ms. Herzig-Desnick dissenting.

NEW BUSINESS

6. COA-26-0007 1500 S OCEAN BLVD. The applicants, Leo A. Vecellio Jr. and Kathryn C. Vecellio (Mark Marsh with Bridges, Marsh & Associates, Representative), have filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of the installation of exterior doors to enclose a loggia within the landmarked property.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

M. Mark Marsh and Gui Vasquez of Bridges and Marsh Architects provided an overview of the request and presented the architectural plans for the proposed project.

Mr. Ives inquired whether the proposed loggia enclosure doors are the same design as the original Fatio design. Mr. Marsh confirmed the new doors would match.

Mr. Segraves thought the approach was sensitive. He asked about the west-facing glass and wondered if the second story was always a glass enclosure as well. Ms. Mittner stated that the second floor had been modified from the original plans.

Ms. Damgard wondered if the doors were recessed behind the columns. Mr. Vasquez responded and discussed the design.

Ms. Kellogg asked about the stone work and the modifications to the columns. Messrs. Marsh and Vasquez responded.

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

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

7. COA-26-0008 1 S COUNTY RD – THE BREAKERS. The applicant, Breakers Palm Beach Inc. (James M. Crowley with Gunster, Representative), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness review and approval for modifications to the porte-cochere arrival area for the landmarked property.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Planner John Lindgren, on behalf of the applicant, stated that the request was a re-approval of a previously approved but expired request. John Schmidt of Schmidt Nichols presented the landscape and hardscape modifications for the site.

Ms. Brooker asked if there were additional requests for the driveway in the previous approval. Mr. Schmidt stated that it had been previously presented but was now removed from the application as the applicant is still reconsidering the modifications. He indicated that it would return at a later time. Ms. Brooker expressed concern about only seeing a portion of the request and indicated that at the last presentation, there were lengthy discussions about meeting the greenspace requirements, and that the greenspace calculations are now unknown without the driveway element. Mr. Schmidt stated he would bring those calculations during the driveway application.

Mr. Ives agreed with Ms. Brooker's questions. Mr. Ives asked for confirmation that it is the same presentation as the previously approved project. He asked whether any colored lighting was proposed for the parking spaces. Mr. Schmidt confirmed that the lighting would be solid and standard, with no flashing or colored lights proposed.

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

Mr. Ittleson expressed concern that the proposal would alter the character of the entrance and reduce green space, noting the potential impact on what he considers an iconic feature, and questioned whether additional changes may follow.

Mr. Segraves acknowledged concerns regarding the loss of landscaping but noted existing conditions with heavy vehicle presence are also unattractive, expressed confidence that the design has been properly considered, and indicated general support for the proposal.

Mr. Ives agreed with his fellow commissioners.

Ms. Damgard encouraged consideration of preserving and enhancing green space in future design reviews, particularly in relation to the driveway and parking improvements.

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

8. HSB-26-0003 125 BRAZILIAN AVE. The applicants, Joseph R. Bagby and Martha G. Bagby, Trustees of the Joseph R. Bagby Revocable Trust (Pat Seagraves with SKA Architect + Planner, Representative), have filed an application requesting review and approval of exterior alterations, a second-story addition, selective demolition of features, as well as landscape and hardscape improvements for the property containing a Historically Significant Building.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications. **Note: Mr. Segraves declared a conflict of interest for the project and left the dais during the discussion.*

Eric Broberg of SKA Architect + Planner presented the architectural modifications to the existing home. Peter Coyle of SMI Landscape Architecture presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Ms. Brooker asked about the owner's preferred roof material. Mr. Broberg stated the owner preferred the copper roof.

Mr. Ives questioned the design elements, including the use of copper at the parapet, and raised concerns about whether the proposed addition sufficiently differentiates from the original structure in accordance with applicable preservation standards. Mr. Broberg explained that the design was revised from a barrel tile roof to a copper roof to better differentiate the addition from the original structure, while maintaining compatibility with traditional architectural elements.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick thought the renovation was nice and that the house's flow had improved without jeopardizing the exterior. She thought the buildings were nicely integrated.

Mr. Ittleson asked about a structure on the south side of the home. Mr. Broberg stated that the loggia was original to the site.

Ms. Kellogg asked about the three types of railings to be used and wondered whether the professional had studied ways to simplify them. Mr. Broberg stated that it had been studied and explained the rationale for the proposal. He agreed they could be restudied further.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott thought the project was done thoughtfully, particularly the landscaping. She asked about the different fencing materials. Mr. Coyle responded and discussed the design. Ms. Lindsay-Scott asked why the owner is keeping the Australian pines and why they were not being replaced with something more native. Mr. Coyle discussed that the trees were old, part of the neighborhood, and provided privacy screening; however, he stated that new material could be restudied.

Ms. Damgard asked about the reason for the copper roof rather than a parapet, which she believes was more in keeping with the house. Mr. Broberg stated that the material and roof design were selected to align with the client's preferences. However, he indicated willingness to proceed with the parapet design.

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

Ms. Kellogg expressed general support for aspects of the application, including removal of later additions and historical analysis, but raised concerns regarding the proposed changes to the front entry, identifying it as a character-defining feature and questioning consistency with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, specifically 2, 3, 5, and 9. She also recommended retaining the Wyeth balcony as part of the structure's evolution and simplifying design elements.

Mr. Ives concurred with Commissioner Kellogg's concerns, emphasizing that the proposal does not appear to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, particularly regarding the front façade and design elements. He indicated that significant revisions are needed and stated he could not support the application in its current form.

A motion was made by Ms. Herzig-Desnick to approve as presented. The motion died for the lack of a second.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Kellogg to defer the project to the May 20, 2026, meeting, with direction to restudy it in coordination with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the railings. The motion was carried 6-1, with Ms. Herzig-Desnick dissenting.

9. LPCS-26-0022 151 GRACE TRL UNIT 4. The applicant, Elizabeth G. Kuensell, Trustee of The Scott L. Kuensell GST Exempt Residuary Trust (Jason Summers with Window & Door Design Center of Florida, Representative), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of window replacement for unit 4 within the landmarked property.

This item has been withdrawn from the agenda and will be reviewed administratively

****Note: This item was withdrawn upon the Approval of the Agenda.***

10. COA-26-0004 (ZON-26-0015) 151 ROOT TRAIL (COMBO). The applicant, Julie Phillips (Brian Brady with Brady Design, Representative), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of a new second-story addition to the existing one-story residence, requiring a landmark adjustment to maintain existing nonconforming setbacks (front, side, and rear yards) and lot coverage of the one-story residence, requiring a landmark adjustment to

decrease the rear yard setback for the second-story addition, and requiring variances to reduce the side yard setbacks of the second-story addition for the property under consideration to be landmarked. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval. *This item has been deferred to the May 20, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting.*

****Note: This item was deferred to the meeting on May 20, 2026, upon the Approval of the Agenda.***

11. COA-26-0005 (ZON-26-0016) 1047 S OCEAN BLVD (COMBO). The applicant, Maura Ziska (Trustee of 1047 South Ocean Boulevard Trust), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of a two-story addition on the east side (rear) of the residence as well as landscape improvements, requiring a landmark adjustment to decrease the side yard (south) and rear yard (east) setbacks, and a variance to increase lot coverage for the landmarked property. This is a combined project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council with respect to zoning relief/approval. *This item has been deferred to the May 20, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting.*

****Note: This item was deferred to the meeting on May 20, 2026, upon the Approval of the Agenda.***

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

12. 333 PENDLETON LN DESIGNATION HEARING
Owner(s): Charles Sieving and Alison Beimler

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified about the architecture and history of the Monterey style residence. Ms. Stillings pointed out the residence's design features and 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,

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.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Lindsay-Scott to make the designation report for 333 Pendleton Lane part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Mittner provided confirmation of proof of publication.

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

Mr. Ives expressed support for the designation, noting the Town's consultant provided a strong presentation. He emphasized the property's significance within the Town's architectural history,

highlighting it as an important early example of a developing architectural style and its relevance to the architect's work and the broader historical context.

Ms. Brooker expressed support for the designation, noting the street's cohesive and historic character, and emphasized the value of designating properties individually to highlight each home's unique contribution and significance to the Town's architectural history.

Mr. Segraves expressed support for the designation, noting the area's consistency and character and highlighting the subject property as a particularly strong example, given its original design for an owner rather than as a speculative build.

Ms. Damgard stated she knew the owners, who are preservationists and support landmarking their home.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Herzig-Desnick to recommend 333 Pendleton Lane 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. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

13. 315 PENDLETON LN DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner(s): Shelby de P. Wyckoff, Trustee of the Shelby de P. Wyckoff Revocable Trust

****Note: This item was deferred to the meeting on November 18, 2026, upon the Approval of the Agenda.***

14. 322 PENDLETON LN DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner(s): William D. Bone

****Note: This item was deferred to the meeting on November 18, 2026, upon the Approval of the Agenda.***

15. 141 CHILEAN AVE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner(s): CHANT (PALM BEACH) CORP

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified about the architecture and history of the Bungalow style residence. Ms. Stillings pointed out the residence's design features and 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. Mittner provided confirmation of proof of publication.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Lindsay-Scott to make the designation

report for 141 Chilean Avenue part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Attorney Maura Ziska, representing the property owner, spoke in opposition to the proposed landmark designation, arguing the property lacks sufficient historical or architectural significance, has been substantially altered, and does not meet applicable criteria. She also raised concerns regarding potential economic impacts and property value, and introduced Kyle Fant, an expert witness, to provide additional testimony.

Architect Kyle Fant of Bartholemew Partners and testifying as an expert for the property owner, opposed the landmark designation, comparing the subject property to well-preserved bungalow examples in the Town and stating that the structure has been significantly altered over time, lacks architectural integrity, and does not meet the standards for designation. He also described various modifications and additions to the property, asserting that the current condition does not reflect a meaningful historic resource.

Ms. Ziska reiterated opposition to the landmark designation, summarizing expert testimony that the property does not meet the applicable criteria and emphasizing the extent of alterations, the property's lack of historical significance, and economic concerns. She also noted the owner's strong objection and contrasted the property with recent landmark designations involving more significant or preserved structures.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach spoke in support of the landmark designation, stating that despite alterations, the property retains key character-defining features and continues to convey its historical and architectural significance. She noted its importance as an early example of pre-1920s development and bungalow-style architecture, and asserted that it meets the applicable designation criteria.

Ms. Ziska asked Ms. Sunny if the bungalow-style homes that they presented were landmarked with the owner's consent. Ms. Sunny stated she was unable to comment on them since she was seeing them for the first time. Ms. Mittner stated that the home at 357 Seabreeze Avenue, which was shown, was not a landmarked residence.

Mr. Ives asked about the 100 block of Chilean and asked how many homes, particularly Bungalow-style homes, were designated. Ms. Stillings discussed another landmarked home in the area, on Brazilian Avenue. Mr. Ives noted that prior landmark designations have included properties with additions and enclosed features, and sought confirmation that such modifications do not preclude designation. Mr. Ives sought clarification regarding the reference to the property as the "ninth building," questioning the timeframe of that designation, and Ms. Stillings responded that a 1955 article described the residence as reputed to have been the ninth dwelling constructed in Palm Beach. Mr. Ives asked if Mr. Fant had more examples in the Royal Park area, to which he said he did not. Mr. Ives wasn't sure if it was the greatest example of the bungalow style. Mr. Ives acknowledged elements of the designation report but expressed that the property is not a strong example of the bungalow style and stated he does not support its preservation or landmark designation.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott stated she was conflicted, noting the property's charm and remaining

bungalow features, but expressed concern that significant alterations may prevent it from meeting the designation criteria.

Mr. Segraves expressed reservations about the designation, stating the property is not a strong or exemplary representation of the bungalow style and questioning its historical and architectural significance.

Ms. Kellogg expressed support for the designation, stating that despite alterations, the property retains its original massing and key character-defining features. She noted that changes to materials such as roofing and windows are common and do not detract from its significance, and concluded that the structure remains a substantially intact example of early bungalow architecture with Prairie-style influences.

Ms. Brooker cautioned that alterations, poor maintenance, or the absence of a notable architect should not, alone, be reasons to deny designation, noting that such conditions can be remedied. She discussed similar situations with her own home, which she renovated and restored. She emphasized that the decision should be based on the property's architectural merit and rarity, and encouraged careful consideration of the Commission's reasoning.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick expressed support for the designation, noting the structure's massing remains intact and its style is sufficiently distinct to warrant designation, and added that landmark status could encourage more sensitive future renovations.

Ms. Damgard expressed support for the designation, emphasizing the importance of preserving the Town's historical character and noting the property's rarity and age. She stated that prior landmarked properties have been successfully restored and have not diminished in value, and concluded that the property aligns with the Commission's preservation goals.

A motion was made by Ms. Herzig-Desnick and was seconded by Ms. Kellogg to recommend 141 Chilean 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 that the owner opposed the designation. The motion was carried 4-3, with Messrs. Ives, Segraves, and Ms. Lindsay-Scott dissenting.

16. 151 ROOT TRL DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner(s): Julie Phillips

This item has been deferred to the November 18, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting.

****Note: This item was deferred to the meeting on November 18, 2026, upon the Approval of the Agenda.***

17. 306 PENDLETON LN DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner(s): Christian J. Angle and Ann-Britt Angle

This item has been deferred to the November 18, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting.

****Note: This item was deferred to the meeting on November 18, 2026, upon the Approval of the Agenda.***

18. 2780 S OCEAN BLVD (AMBASSADOR II) DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner(s): See Designation Report for Complete List of Owners

This item has been deferred to the February 2026 Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting.

****Note: This item was deferred to a meeting in February 2027, upon the Approval of the Agenda.***

MEETING SCHEDULE

19. The next meeting is scheduled for May 20, 2026

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Segraves to adjourn the meeting at 11:50 AM. 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 Segraves Patrick		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE Landmarks Preservation Commission	
MAILING ADDRESS 2500 S. Ocean Blvd. Apt 2A1		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 April 22, 2026		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, Patrick Segraues, hereby disclose that on April 22, 20 26:

(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:

HSB-26-0003
125 Brazilian Avenue

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

4/22/26

Signature

Patrick Segraues

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.