



Fort Myers Beach Local Planning Agency

**Town Hall Council Chambers
2731 Oak Street
Fort Myers Beach, FL 33931**

Minutes

**Tuesday, February 11,
2025**

9:00 AM

I. CALL TO ORDER ORDER OF BUSINESS

Members present: Chair Cereceda, LPA Member Boan, LPA Member Dunlap, LPA Member Eckmann, LPA Member McLean, LPA Member Plummer and LPA Member Sudduth

II. INVOCATION

Chair Cereceda.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. APPROVAL OF FINAL AGENDA

LPA Member Dunlap moved to approve the final agenda, seconded by LPA Member Boan.

The motion carried unanimously.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Local Planning Agency - January 9, 2025

LPA Member Sudduth moved to approve the minutes, seconded by LPA Member McLean.

The motion carried unanimously.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Town Attorney Stuparich explained the quasi-judicial procedures and the expedited variance process. Town Clerk Baker confirmed that all agenda items were properly advertised and noticed and she swore in members of the public providing testimony.

A. VAR20240304; 7205 Estero Blvd.

**A RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF FORT MYERS BEACH,
FLORIDA APPROVING/ APPROVING WITH CONDITIONS/ DENYING A**

VARIANCE FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 7205 ESTERO BLVD., GENERALLY IDENTIFIED AS STRAP NUMBER 03-47-24-W1-00011.0000 IN FORT MYERS BEACH, TO ALLOW A MULTI-UNIT COMPLEX TO DEVELOP INDIVIDUAL UNIT SIGNS THAT ARE A MAXIMUM OF 32-SQUARE FEET AS WELL AS DEVELOPING A 32-SQUARE FOOT GROUND SIGN TO DISPLAY THE COMPLEX NAME AND BRANDING, ALLOWING FOR THE STRUCTURE TO BE DEVELOPED ON THE PROPERTY LINE; PROVIDING FOR OTHER CLARIFICATIONS AS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS OF LAW, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, SEVERABILITY AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Chair Cereceda read the title of the resolution. No ex parte communications were disclosed; however, Chair Cereceda disclosed a conflict of interest and submitted Form 8B to the Town Clerk.

Community Development Senior Planner, Jason Smalley, reviewed the background of the request as stated on the yellow sheet. He pointed out that the staff included a condition of approval asking that they discuss maximum square footage in case a current unit was split.

Cara Stewart represented the applicant and noted there were 20 units in the complex rather than 32 and they would like to change the square footage to 800 regarding condition number three. Ms. Stewart clarified that two signs totaling 32 square feet would be allowed if the unit split in two, but this could affect consistency and uniformity.

Public comment:

Carrie Smith, owner of Leani's, supported the aesthetics and conformity of signs.

Public comment closed.

Senior Planner Smalley did not object to changing the units from 750 to 800 square feet.

LPA Member Plummer moved to approve the resolution, finding that it met the findings and conclusions with the third condition modified, seconded by LPA Member Boan.

The motion carried unanimously.

B. DCI20240137.2, Mobile Vending/Food Truck Park CPD Amendment

1. AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF FORT MYERS BEACH, FLORIDA APPROVING WITH CONDITIONS THE COMMERCIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (CPD) ZONING FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 2500, 2510 AND 2518 ESTERO BLVD. AND 2543 COTTAGE AVENUE, GENERALLY IDENTIFIED AS STRAP NUMBERS 19-46-24-W3-0120A.0100; 19-46-24-W3-01302.0000; 19-46-24-W3-01301.0000; 19-46-24-W3-0120A.013A IN FORT MYERS BEACH, TO ALLOW A MOBILE VENDOR/FOOD TRUCK PARK WITH SHARED PARKING; PROVIDING FOR OTHER CLARIFICATIONS AS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS OF LAW, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, SEVERABILITY AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

2. Request from Pelican Watch Condominium Association, Thomas F. and Debra Danford as managers and members of Coastal Cottages LLC, and Edwin T. French III, to have Intervenor Status.

Chair Cereceda read the title of the ordinance. Town Attorney Stuparich explained the Intervenor status and noted that documents were submitted before the agenda was distributed. The LPA would have to vote to allow them into the record. She added that there were expert witnesses who needed to be qualified.

Attorney David Moscota from Becker & Poliakoff represented the intervenors, who lived next to the proposed project. Attorney Noel Davies represented the applicant and objected to them having some sort of special status.

Tom & Deb Danford stated they were represented by Attorney Moscota. Attorney Moscota indicated they were intervenors because they were residents who lived in Pelican Watch and were immediately impacted by the project.

LPA Member Boan asked whether the intervenor had the right to cross-examine the petitioner directly and Town Attorney Stuparich replied that it was up to the LPA. Chair Cereceda did not wish to allow cross-examination because the LPA had to make the decision. LPA Members agreed.

LPA Member Plummer moved to approve intervenor status, seconded by LPA Member Boan.

The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Cereceda limited the intervenor discussion to five minutes.

Max Forgey was previously qualified as an expert witness in planning.

Mohsen Salehi reviewed his qualifications and experience in his field.

LPA Member Eckmann moved to accept Mr. Salehi as an expert in his field, seconded by LPA Member Dunlap.

The motion carried unanimously.

Matt Simmons reviewed his experience and qualifications as an appraiser and broker.

LPA Member Dunlap moved to accept Mr. Simmons as an expert in his field, seconded by LPA Member McLean.

The motion carried unanimously.

Attorney Davies objected to any appraisal or valuation report because the LPA was not allowed to consider that since it was not part of the criteria. LPA Member Dunlap explained that they were not required to give the information any weight at all, but he preferred to hear the background information for context. Attorney Davies stated that the information should not sway their vote because they had to look at the substantial competent evidence.

LPA Member Plummer moved to enter the additional items in the agenda materials into the record, seconded by LPA Member McLean.

The motion carried unanimously.

Attorney Moscota described the materials in the box and noted they were copies of documents already entered into the record, except for an updated map and opposition letters.

LPA Member Dunlap moved to accept the map and letters into the record, seconded by LPA Member Boan.

The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Cereceda stated that the four intervenors were allowed five minutes each. Ex parte communications: LPA Member Dunlap disclosed numerous emails for and against, he visited the site organized by the residents and spoke to several of them and spoke to The Neighborhood Company; LPA Member Sudduth received numerous emails for and against, he visited the site organized by the residents and spoke to several of them and spoke to The Neighborhood Company; LPA Member Eckmann met with Ed French and Carolyn McKeown at the property and had a virtual meeting with Ken Gallander from The Neighborhood Company; LPA Member Plummer met with Carolyn McKeown and Mr. French at Pelican Watch, walked the property and spoke to Mr. Gallander over the phone; LPA Member Boan met with the petitioner and Mr. Gallander and received emails for and against the project; LPA Member McLean met with the petitioner, met with the Pelican Watch Association, Carolyn McKeown and Mr. French and walked the property and Chair Cereceda spoke to Patrick Vanasse, Carolyn McKeown and was familiar with the property.

Principal Planner Judith Frankel reviewed the background of the request as stated on the yellow sheet and noted the applicant had made changes to the proposed schedule of uses and master concept plan. The changes will be addressed during the applicant's presentation.

Attorney Davies began the presentation with an Introduction of the Project Team and Request. Mr. Gallander continued with the Subject Property, Location, Site Design & Compatibility, Master Concept Plan Variations, Master Concept Plan 1-28-25, Master Concept Plan with Green Space/Buffers and Aerial Overlay, Concept View - Overall Site, Concept View - South, Concept View - Corner of Estero & Chapel, Concept View - Ground View of Chapel Street, Concept View - Corner of Chapel & Cottage, Concept View - North along Cottage, Concept View - Cottage Ave., Concept View - Southwest from Estero, Concept View - South from Estero Blvd. Pathway, Concept View - Southeast from the parking area, Concept View - West from the parking area, Concept View - Southwest from Estero Pathway, Concept View - Southeast from Estero Pathway, Location, Site Design & Compatibility, Transportation & Parking, Parking - Revised, Proposed Conditions/Commitments and Findings & Conclusion. Mr. Gallander described how he worked with the neighbors at Pelican Watch. LPA Member Plummer requested a condition that the music must be played inside the building.

Dan Myers, applicant, told LPA Member Plummer that the music would be contained in the building. He addressed how they have interacted with their neighbors over the years and had improved their property. They gave up frontage along Estero for the improvements, agreed to reduced setbacks for the Whiteheads and let the Dandfords use a portion of their property to help ease their construction congestion. They also allowed the town to use their

lot for cleanup after Ian. He described the growing trend of food trucks after the hurricane and the vision for their property.

James Hotka, applicant, stated they were asking for a family food truck park and acknowledged this was out of the norm, but he thought it was necessary for the town. He indicated that they would try to mitigate the noise for the residents and would create a landscape buffer to direct people to the beach access. He described the benefits to the community and took every email seriously. Chair Cereceda asked whether they would agree to provide ambient music and no live music. Mr. Myers responded that he could find a way to mitigate the music if that was a major sticking point. He was not opposed to having music on scheduled days.

Mr. Salehi reviewed the history of the comp plan and discussed the impact the proposed development would have on Estero Blvd., Chapel and Mango. He indicated a traffic impact study should be done. LPA Member Sudduth asked whether a traffic study was done with the original CPD, and the staff was unsure.

Mr. Simmons stated they did a value impact study and that, in his opinion, approving the project would negatively influence the surrounding residential properties. He described how the development would negatively influence the value. He expressed concerns regarding how the noise amplification would affect Pelican Watch. He cited the negative results of a 2017 study of food truck parks in Portland, Oregon.

Mr. Forgey indicated the staff report did not address the adequacy or inadequacy of the owner's existing entitlements or analyze the potential impacts of the changed use on the neighbors in the immediate vicinity. He noted there was no ordinance regulating food truck parks in Fort Myers Beach and there should be one so the community can judge the service and location. He discussed the statutory definition of compatibility and noted that if there were 27 conditions on 7/10 of an acre, maybe they were trying to do too much. He summarized negative comments from some of the neighbors. Randy Bryce, president of the HOA at Pelican Watch, described good calls with the owner, but the owners of Pelican Watch were still opposed to public parking, the amount of traffic in the neighborhood and the noise factor. He described hearing the music at a food truck from 150 feet away and asked how they could sit at their pool in peace with the food trucks next door.

Mr. Danford noted he submitted a letter detailing his position on February 4, 2025. He agreed with all the experts. He stated he purchased his place at the location because it was away from the busy commercial areas. He discussed the lack of parking at beach accesses to benefit pedestrians, the potential traffic congestion, negative property values for the neighborhood and the conditions and deviations were inappropriate and inconsistent with the comp plan and future land use. He asked that the application be denied. Ms. Danford thought they should encourage more variety and brick-and-mortar businesses. She discussed the reduction of land values and stated they were 31 feet from the development and that nothing they could do would mitigate the noise from the food trucks and traffic. She supported

development but not when it hurts the neighbors. She asked that they deny the request.

Ed French was concerned about the same issues as everyone else.

Town Attorney Stuparich stated they could recess for two hours while LPA Member Sudduth completed his previously scheduled phone call. All members involved agreed to a recess.

Chair Cereceda called for a recess at 12:21 p.m. and reconvened at 2:00 p.m. Attorney Moscota stated that there were no guarantees that the project would be family friendly because they did not guarantee that there would be no live music, no agreement regarding the maximum number of food trucks and no limitations on the hours of the comfort station to discourage vagrants from using the facilities. He thought the concept was excellent, but not in that neighborhood. He noted the applicant chose not to live in the area with the food court. He asked that they deny the application.

Public comment:

Susan Bonfigli, a resident, lived 100 feet away from the project. She emailed the LPA with her concerns and created a Pinterest board to share photos and videos of the neighborhood. She indicated they could hear the sounds of businesses further away. She pointed out that there was a public parking lot on the corner of Mango and Estero Blvd. and the lot where Moms was set up. Those two businesses have restrictions to lessen the impact on the residential neighborhood and were doing just fine. She described how the project would affect them and how the neighborhood was already affected by traffic from the Mango parking lot and Mom's food truck. She stated her driveway on Cottage was blocked this morning at 7:25 a.m. She did not think alcohol was appropriate abutting a residential neighborhood and she was not happy about the music.

Steven Whitehead was building his home next to the project and expected to retire to a nice, quiet neighborhood. He did not expect that he would have to look over food trucks and experience the smells of everything there. He asked whether the LPA would want to live like that.

Gary Fields lived adjacent to the project and he was a professional musician. He discussed the sound impact of his music and the way sound traveled. He measured the sound level from the pedestrian walkway approximately 20 yards outside La Ola and it was consistently over 75 decibels. He discussed how surrounding properties would be affected and noted the decibel level was unacceptable for the neighborhood.

Jan Krause urged the LPA to vote no on the project.

Derek O'Loughlin, resident, stated that the applicant has never contacted him and he has the most impact because he's the closest to the trash enclosure and everything else. He noted that Ordinance 10-416 required a minimum 15-foot buffer and the applicant requested a 10-foot buffer. He indicated there was no specific planning with the plan, just a rendering. He questioned safety surrounding traffic and the restrooms and asked who would pay to secure the parking lot. He discussed the decreased value of his and surrounding properties.

Jerry Weaver discussed food trucks after Ian. He asked whether the LPA wanted to go in the direction of allowing permanent food trucks instead of brick-and-mortar businesses in residential areas.

Jordan Hester indicated there would be drone aerials and a video in the packet that Becker sent the LPA.

Randy Bryce, resident, played a video of music from 150 feet away at the food truck by Lani Kai. He stated that since the plans were made public, at least one prospective buyer backed out from purchasing a unit at Pelican Watch. He asked that they disallow live music and not exceed 58 decibels for ambient music. He added that ingress and egress off Chapel with proper design could be a forced right-hand turn towards Estero instead of turning either way.

Public comment closed.

Principal Planner Frankel stated they did not require a traffic study because of the small scale; however, the LPA could add it as a condition. She indicated the conditions will become regulations for the site and specific to this property. She reviewed compatibility with the comp plan and explained why the proposal was a reduction in intensity. Chair Cereceda stated that when discussing the comp plan, a huge element was protecting residential neighborhoods from commercial intrusion, which is the objection to the project. She added that even though there was approved commercial expansion there, it was enclosed and the intrusive element of that commercial activity was contained. Principal Planner Frankel replied that it was important to consider all elements. She reviewed the deviations, findings and conclusions and noted that staff recommended approval with conditions. She read the conditions.

Mr. Gallander stated there was an approved traffic study in 2008 and they would do a trip generation study to compare with the traffic study. They were committed to having amplified music within the building and oriented toward Estero Blvd. LPA Member Dunlap asked whether they would agree to no live music as a condition of approval for everything else. Mr. Gallander replied that they wanted amplified music and outdoor entertainment. Mr. Myers was open to considering options.

Attorney Davies disagreed with the experts on the intervenors' side. He addressed the number of conditions and said that was part of the process. He indicated the LPA had to balance what the applicant was entitled to with what the proposal was and look at the specific rezoning criteria. He noted they were not asking for more than they had and they provided public restrooms.

LPA Member McLean thought there was less control over the environment with an open-air facility and the ordinance should address the location next to a residential neighborhood. He did not believe it was compatible with the neighborhood and was intrusive and a nuisance to the neighbors. He did not think a traffic study made an impact, but having the music within a semi-enclosed structure would help mitigate the nuisance. He suggested that amplified music could be managed.

LPA Member Boan noted it was less intensive but more intrusive than the existing CPD would be with an enclosed building because the music would be less intrusive on the neighbors. He felt the food trucks were a great concept, and there was a place for them, but he did not know if this was the right spot. The food truck in Naples was not adjacent to a neighborhood and was less intrusive.

LPA Member Plummer thought it was hard not to be intrusive on Estero Blvd. since it was entirely commercial. She wanted to change the hours in condition 8 to 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. and stop the music at 8:00 p.m., add required to the grid in condition 11 and discuss the generator issue in condition 16. She did not think a trip generator study would help, she asked that the bathrooms be locked up when the business closed, add a condition that the music must be inside the building with two sides covered and possibly only acoustical music on weekends and ambient music. She was not worried about the open tables and thought a restaurant would be more intrusive because floors would probably be open with music inside like others being built.

LPA Member Eckmann struggled with this, but he felt it might not be as bad as imagined and agreed with LPA Member Plummer about a restaurant. The open bar would be facing Estero Blvd. and would mitigate the noise. He felt they should do a limited traffic analysis because they might want a right turn only on Cottage. He thought it was pedestrian-friendly, was resilient because the trailers could be moved and they were not food trucks in a parking lot with generators and wires all over the place. He felt it would be popular and people would walk to it. As far as the expert witnesses, property value was speculative and did not make sense to talk about because it was unknown. He felt they should be allowed to have music and manage it with the town's noise ordinance. He felt the project added value.

LPA Member Sudduth also struggled, but the applicant had property rights along with the neighborhood. He brought up traffic coming through the property and thought there were ways to address that. He felt for the single residences because they would be affected, but it was a commercial property. He stated that the design was much better this time and that a lot was addressed. He brought up limiting the music to restrict the noise.

LPA Member Dunlap stated what mattered to him was not only what they were doing but who they were doing it with. The applicant was a local person with local at-risk capital who had tried to have conversations that were beneficial and compromised biased against the concerns and issues. There were a lot of criteria that had to be complied with and the LPA needed to put as much responsibility on the owners and operators as possible. He thought there should be a quarterly meeting with code enforcement to provide a list of verifications, validations and modifications to prove that what they agreed to was being followed. He would like to include a requirement that for the first two years of operation, they had to show that it was consistent, complied with and aligned with everything the applicant agreed to do. The applicant had to own the responsibility and prove they were adhering to the conditions.

The hours of operation were discussed and the consensus was 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., with music stopping at 8:00 p.m. Services were not included in the hours of operation.

Chair Cereceda agreed it was less intense, but it was more intrusive. She loved the project but did not think it fit in that location. She asked about locking up the bathrooms and shutting off the water to the showers. A consensus was reached to limit the music to the three-sided structure and to require quarterly meetings with code enforcement for the first two years.

LPA Member Dunlap moved to approve the ordinance with the changes discussed and approved, seconded by LPA Member Eckmann.

The motion carried 4-3 by roll call vote, with Chair Cereceda, LPA Member Boan and LPA Member McLean dissenting.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A. Public Notice Ordinance

DISCUSSION OF A DRAFT ORDINANCE RE NOTICES

Continued to the next scheduled meeting of March 11, 2025.

B. Application Review Fees and Payment

DISCUSSION OF A DRAFT ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH, FLORIDA AMENDING SECTION 34-53 OF CHAPTER 34, ARTICLE II, DIVISION 1 OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE REGARDING ACCEPTANCE OF PAYMENT OF FEES AND CHARGES FOR REVIEW OF ANY APPLICATION OR ISSUANCE OF A PERMIT, INCLUDING INSPECTIONS, UNTIL ALL FEES AND CHARGES DUE THE TOWN INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO EXPENDITURES FOR NOTICING, ADVERTISING, ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, OUTSTANDING UTILITY BILLS OR CODE ENFORCEMENT FINES OR LIENS HAVE BEEN PAID AND THE PROPERTY IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE TOWN CODES AND ORDINANCES UNLESS REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION IS NEEDED FOR SAFETY PURPOSES OR FOR COMPLIANCE WITH TOWN CODES AND ORDINANCES; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, CODIFICATION, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS; CONFLICTS OF LAW; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Continued to the next scheduled meeting of March 11, 2025.

IX. LPA MEMBERS ITEMS/REPORTS

No items.

X. LPA ATTORNEY ITEMS/REPORTS

No items.

XI. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ITEMS/REPORTS

No items.

XII. ITEMS FOR NEXT MONTHS AGENDA

No items.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

LPA Member Dunlap moved to adjourn, seconded by LPA Member Sudduth.
The motion carried unanimously.
Meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

Minutes adopted as presented, March 11, 2025; Motion by LPA Member Sudduth and seconded by LPA Member McLean. Passed 7-0.



Amy Baker, Town Clerk

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME <i>Cerceda Amato T</i>	NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <i>Local Planning Agency</i>
MAILING ADDRESS <i>185 Jefferson St</i>	THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:
CITY <i>Hamlet Beach</i>	☒ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☐ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY
COUNTY <i>Lee</i>	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <i>Town of Ft Myers Beach</i>
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED <i>2/11/25</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, Aimee Grecco, hereby disclose that on February 11, 20 25:

(a) A measure came or will come before my agency which (check one or more)

- ☒ inured to my special private gain or loss;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my business associate, _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, 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:

Sign ordinance change which could allow greater expense to my business if passed

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.

2/11/25
Date Filed

Aimee Grecco
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.