



**CITY OF COCONUT CREEK  
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MINUTES**

**Government Center  
4800 West Copans Road  
Coconut Creek, FL 33063**

**Date: August 9, 2023  
Time: 7:00 p.m.  
Meeting No. 2023-0809**

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Jeffrey Barker at 7:00 p.m.

**2. PRESENT UPON ROLL CALL:**

Chair Jeffrey Barker  
Vice Chair Colleen LaPlant  
Mikkie Belvedere  
Alfred Delgado  
Jeffrey Light  
Nancy Fry, Alternate

Also present: Deputy City Attorney Kathy Mehaffey, Sustainable Development Director Scott Stoudenmire, Sustainable Development Assistant Director Justin Proffitt, Principal Planner Lizet Aguiar, and Deputy City Clerk Marianne Bowers.

Chair Barker noted that the meeting was being conducted live with a quorum physically present, and Deputy City Attorney Kathy Mehaffey explained the procedures for public participation and comment for the meeting.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A MOTION APPROVING THE MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING(S). (2023-0614)

**MOTION:** LaPlant/Belvedere – To approve the Minutes of the June 14, 2023, Planning and Zoning Board Meeting as presented.

**Upon roll call, the Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.**

Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey explained the City's quasi-judicial procedures that would be applied to Agenda Items 4, 5, and 8. Deputy City Clerk Marianne Bowers confirmed the public notice requirements for Agenda Items 4, 5, and 8 had been met and swore in the witnesses.

**AGENDA ITEMS**

- 4. APOSTOLIC MISSION OF CHRIST: A SITE PLAN APPLICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF AN ADDITIONAL BUILDING LOCATED AT 2730 HAMMOCK BOULEVARD. (QUASI-JUDICIAL)(PUBLIC HEARING)**

Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey asked for any ex-parte disclosures from the Board related to Agenda Item 4, and there were no disclosures.

Sustainable Development Assistant Director Justin Proffitt presented the item, explaining the site plan approval request for the development of a house of worship. He provided a brief history of the subject site located at 2730 Hammock Boulevard, noting the property was approximately 9.08 acres and the proposal was to construct a new 11,795 square foot building consisting of six (6) classrooms, administrative office space, and a 75-seat worship hall. He noted the plan was to maintain the existing 111 parking spaces and the two (2) existing access points on Hammock Boulevard. Mr. Proffitt noted a community outreach summary was provided as part of the application. He stated staff found the application to be in compliance with the City's Land Development Code, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and recommended approval with two (2) conditions, as outlined in the staff report.

Project Engineer Albert Capellini, of Crain Atlantis, presented a brief *PowerPoint* on behalf of the owner, Apostolic Mission of Christ Church. He stated no variances or changes in zoning were being requested and shared images of the site and proposed renderings.

Board Member Jeffrey Light asked for clarification on the stormwater plan, which utilized the Wynmoor Canal, and Mr. Capellini provided additional detail on connection to the canal.

Board Member Mikkie Belvedere inquired as to the use of the word modular in reference to the building addition. Mr. Capellini explained the building was prefabricated and received approval separate from the church itself.

Chair Barker opened the public hearing. There were no questions or comments from the public, and the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Belvedere asked about the structure's ability to withstand hurricane wind loads, and Mr. Capellini responded briefly regarding the safety ratings of the structure.

Staff, nor the applicant, had closing remarks.

**MOTION:** Belvedere/LaPlant – To approve Agenda Item 4, as presented.

**Upon roll call, the Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.**

**5. EMMANUEL BAPTIST CHURCH: A SITE PLAN APPLICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF AN ADDITIONAL BUILDING LOCATED AT 5391 JOHNSON ROAD. (QUASI-JUDICIAL) (PUBLIC HEARING)**

Chair Barker disclosed that he had a working relationship with the applicant and helped prepare the application. He recused himself from the discussion on Agenda Item 5 and abstained from the vote. He passed the gavel to Vice Chair Colleen LaPlant.

Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey asked for any ex-parte disclosures from the Board related to Agenda Item 5. Vice Chair LaPlant and Board Member Nancy Fry stated they had driven by the site.

Mr. Proffitt presented the item, explaining the request for site plan approval for a 20,382

square foot expansion of the existing house of worship. He noted the property owner received plat, special land use, and rezoning approval in 1999 for a 23,400 square foot worship center. He stated the property was designated Office Professional (OP) on both the City and County Land Use Plan, which included a place of worship as a permitted use. Mr. Proffitt stated that the property was approximately five (5) acres located at 5391 Johnson Road. He explained the proposal was to construct a new sanctuary, along with the addition of 66 parking spaces and additional landscape enhancements. He noted the applicant had submitted a community outreach summary, and staff had not received any resident inquiries related to the project. He stated staff found the application to be in compliance with the City's Land Development Code, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and recommended approval with one (1) condition, as outlined in the staff report.

Pastor Jeff Smith presented on behalf of Emmanuel Baptist Church. He shared a *PowerPoint* presentation, including images of the existing property and renderings of the proposed improvements. He noted the second phase of the original approved plan had not been completed, and the church was outgrowing the building as proposed. He reviewed the changes briefly.

Vice Chair LaPlant opened the public hearing. There were no questions or comments from the public, and the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Fry asked if there were any attempts to directly notify Tradewinds Elementary School or to meet with the school. Pastor Smith responded that he had not had any meetings with the school. He discussed the relationship between the two (2) entities related to parking. Ms. Fry stated the additional parking lot could be a hindrance for some people who walk their children to school.

Mr. Light asked for clarification regarding wastewater on the site and the 2006 agreement referenced in the backup. Pastor Smith outlined the wastewater plan briefly. John Cooper, civil engineer on the project, and Mr. Proffitt provided additional explanation. Principal Planner Lizet Aguiar noted that wastewater would be addressed as part of the engineering permit. She explained staff had removed the comment related to the 2006 wastewater agreement between the second and third rounds of Development Review Committee (DRC) review.

Ms. Belvedere asked about the pond on the site, and how water for the landscaping was sourced. Mr. Cooper stated the water for irrigation came through the City meter. He added that the pond was not used for irrigation, and would be filled in.

Ms. Belvedere inquired as to whether the traffic study was completed when Tradewinds Elementary School was open. Mr. Cooper referenced the traffic statement and noted the number of trips measured was on Sunday, not during the school day. Ms. Belvedere asked for clarification that the parking agreement was also limited to Sunday, and Mr. Cooper confirmed.

Vice Chair LaPlant commented on current parking capacity and the addition of the 66 parking spaces. She asked whether both buildings would be open at the same time for worship on Sundays. Pastor Smith stated the entire facility would be open on Sunday. He noted if the church were to outgrow the 600-person capacity, they would have to look at alternatives.

Mr. Delgado asked whether the church operated a school during the week. Pastor Smith stated they did not. He discussed weddings, a homeschool co-op, and other events held

on days other than Sunday.

Vice Chair LaPlant asked whether the intent was to add any weekday services. Pastor Smith responded that the church held Wednesday evening prayer meetings, but no traditional services and did not have plans to add any.

Staff, nor the applicant, had closing remarks.

**MOTION:** Fry/Belvedere – To approve Agenda Item 5, as presented.

**Upon roll call, the Motion passed by a 5-0 vote, with Ms. Fry voting as the alternate.**

A copy of Chair Barker's abstention, Form 8B, is attached hereto and incorporated herein.

Mr. Proffitt asked if there were any objections to hearing Agenda Items 6 and 7 together, as they were related, and there were no objections

**6. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SCHOOL CONCURRENCY): AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES ELEMENT OF THE CITY OF COCONUT CREEK COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO UPDATE SCHOOL CONCURRENCY STANDARDS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE THIRD AMENDED AND RESTATED INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITY PLANNING OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA. (PUBLIC HEARING)**

**7. LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SCHOOL CONCURRENCY): AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CITY'S CODE OF ORDINANCES, BY AMENDING CHAPTER 13, "LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE," ARTICLE II, "SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS," DIVISION 1, "GENERALLY," TO AMEND SECTION 13-147, "PUBLIC SCHOOL CONCURRENCY," IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE THIRD AMENDED AND RESTATED INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITY PLANNING OF BROWARD COUNTY AND THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. (PUBLIC HEARING)**

Mr. Proffitt reviewed a *PowerPoint* presentation, outlining the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code to be consistent with the Third Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement for Public School Facility Planning of Broward County, which the City adopted in 2017. He explained the agreement was a tool for growth management to ensure public school facilities were available to serve new residential development.

Vice Chair LaPlant asked for clarification on the changes to be made to the maps. Mr. Proffitt explained the updated County maps were being adopted and incorporated into the City's Comprehensive Plan by reference.

Ms. Fry asked when the plan was last updated, and Mr. Proffitt responded that it was updated in 2011 or 2012. He stated there had been two (2) previous amendments.

Mr. Delgado asked for clarification on the new level of service standards, and Mr. Proffitt explained that the greater of 110% permanent capacity or 100% gross capacity would be applied.

Chair Barker opened the public hearing. There were no questions or comments from the public, and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION:** Delgado/Light – To approve Agenda Item 6, as presented.

**Upon roll call, the Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.**

**MOTION:** Light/LaPlant – To approve Agenda Item 7, as presented.

**Upon roll call, the Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.**

**8. POMPANO AUTOPLEX, LLC: A REQUEST TO APPEAL AN ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION REGARDING THE APPROVED MAZDA SITE PLAN FOR THE PROJECT LOCATED AT 4101 WEST SAMPLE ROAD. (QUASI-JUDICIAL)(PUBLIC HEARING)**

Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey asked for any ex-parte disclosures related to Agenda Item 8, and there were no disclosures.

Sustainable Development Director Scott Stoudenmire presented the item, providing a brief overview of the appeal process for an administrative interpretation and the history of the application before the Board. He stated the Coconut Creek Mazda site plan was approved by the City Commission on October 14, 2021, and was now under construction. He explained the appeal specifically addressed the landscape plan, which was included as an element of that approval. Mr. Stoudenmire noted that the applicant's position was that the site plan could be modified by administrative approval to remove four (4) specimen oak trees and several palm trees, but staff's position was that because the oak trees were specifically preserved during the DRC process and subsequently approved during the Planning and Zoning Board review and the City Commission review, there was not a simple administrative remedy. He stated that the trees represented a substantial piece of the plan, and simply removing them would alter the original character and intent of the site plan and landscape plan. He discussed the specimen trees and the reasons their preservation was originally requested. Mr. Stoudenmire explained the role of the Board in the administrative appeal process. He stated Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey had prepared a Board Order as to whether the issue could be addressed administratively. He noted the question of removal of the trees was not before the Board at this time, but the administrative decision that removal of the trees would constitute a substantial site plan modification and formal application process.

Tom Curtin, co-owner of Coconut Creek Mazda, outlined obstacles in the construction of the project, noting issues with installation of the light poles and completing the site work due to the roots of the four (4) oak trees, and overall visibility of the site due to the canopy of the trees. Mr. Curtin noted the project Arborist was present to answer questions.

Mr. Light spoke to the legal argument being requested of the Board, and commented the Board did not have enough information, including reference to an enhanced landscape plan. Mr. Stoudenmire responded that the appeal process was unusual. He stated the applicant was willing to present an enhanced landscape plan if the appeal was approved, though that was not a part of the record at this time. He discussed the original review of the project.

Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey further clarified the issue before the Board. She stated the question was whether the removal of the trees substantially changed the intent and character of the approved site plan.

Vice Chair LaPlant commented that the applicant was not asking to remove the trees because they did not like the trees, but because they were impeding work and stopping the project. She asserted that she was uncomfortable with the wording of the first finding in the Board Order.

Mr. Delgado asked if there was a metric for substantially altering the intent and character of the site plan. Mr. Stoudenmire provided additional detail on the intentional effort to preserve the specimen trees and the nature of the trees on the site. Discussion ensued. Mr. Delgado asked whether the trees remaining on site were a fundamental cornerstone of the City agreeing to approve the site plan, and Mr. Stoudenmire responded, noting the preservation of the specimen oak trees had started in the DRC review and was agreed to at that time. Mr. Delgado inquired as to next steps if the Board determined that Mr. Stoudenmire was incorrect in his decision. Mr. Stoudenmire explained that if the Board found he was incorrect, he would appeal that decision to the City Commission. He stated if the City Commission finds that the Director's decision was incorrect, there would be an administrative process to work through removal, mitigation, and a new plan.

Ms. Belvedere asked whether the issue with the trees could have been foreseen, and Mr. Stoudenmire responded that the design approved should have anticipated the impact of the trees on construction. Mr. Stoudenmire indicated that during DRC review, staff asked the trees be preserved, and the pedestrian walkway be designed around the trees, and the applicant agreed. He stated, at that point, there was no anticipation that there would be construction impacts.

Ms. Fry asked for clarification on how many of the trees specifically affected the site structurally and which were a visibility issue. Mr. Curtin responded that the four (4) specimen oak trees were impacting the site structurally, and the palms and oaks on the other side of the site that they were requesting removal were the source of visibility issues the applicant did not anticipate. Ms. Fry asked Mr. Stoudenmire whether separating out the two (2) issues and addressing only the four (4) oak trees still constituted a substantial change in his view. Mr. Stoudenmire stated the original discussion with the applicant for removal of trees was only about the four (4) oaks. He stated that the additional trees added by the applicant when submitting the appeal only strengthened his position. Ms. Fry inquired as to the timeline for the appeal compared to going back through the DRC process. Mr. Stoudenmire stated the appeal was tentatively scheduled for the August 24, 2023, City Commission meeting, so the process would move forward quickly.

Mr. Light asked for clarification whether the applicant was requesting four (4) trees to be removed or eleven (11) trees, and Mr. Curtin responded that it was a total of eleven (11).

Ms. Belvedere asked whether the applicant would be able to finish the project if the trees were not removed, and Mr. Curtin stated the four (4) live oaks had the project at a standstill.

Mr. Delgado stated it was unclear whether the Board was doing a substantive review of Mr. Stoudenmire's decision, or a procedural review. Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey responded that the Board did not need to weigh in on substance beyond whether the removal of the eleven (11) trees on the site plan would substantially alter the intent and character of the site plan, the standard provided by the Code was whether the decision was correct or incorrect.

Ms. Fry asked whether there had been other appeals like this. Deputy City Attorney

## Planning and Zoning Board Minutes

August 9, 2023

Page 7

Mehaffey explained it was the third in approximately twenty (20) years. Discussion continued as to whether the original decision was reasonable and next steps.

Chair Barker stated he and Vice Chair LaPlant were the only Board members present at the time of the original decision. He noted he did not recall the trees being an important aspect of the site plan at that time, but the trees were significant, and he could see why staff had taken the position that the request constituted a substantial modification. Chair Barker asked whether Mr. Stoudenmire would have found that the removal of only one (1) of the oak trees qualified as an administrative decision. Mr. Stoudenmire responded that all the trees were of different caliper and canopy, so it was hard to say what he would have found. Chair Barker asserted the trees were significant. He asked for clarification on negotiation within the administrative process. Mr. Stoudenmire explained that in any situation, staff would work hard to preserve as many of the existing trees as possible. Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey provided additional clarification on next steps after a potential City Commission action. She stated there was an ongoing negotiation during a site plan modification process.

Chair Barker stated the applicant was asking to make a substantial change and noted he was in favor of staff having the ability to negotiate with the applicant. He commented that the applicant had said they would not be able to continue if all four (4) specimen oak trees did not come out, so if staff does not administratively approve that removal, they would be coming back with a site plan revision anyway. Mr. Stoudenmire commented that any field adjustments, which would be required to modify the plan, had not been evaluated at this time. Chair Barker suggested there may be a way that the applicant could review the issue and come to a compromise that identifies a specific tree that is having the most impact.

Ms. Belvedere asked whether the trees could be transplanted somewhere else at the cost of the applicant. Mr. Stoudenmire stated that was always a possibility, but these were quite large trees. Chair Barker commented that moving the trees would not help the City's position that those trees were there and were part of the site plan and view corridor.

Mr. Delgado asked how long the process would take to get to a conclusion based on the decision of the Board. Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey clarified the question was how long an administrative site plan modification would take and how long a formal site plan modification would take. Mr. Stoudenmire stated it depended on how motivated the applicant was, and noted in most instances the administrative process would move briskly as there were no public hearings. He reviewed the process briefly.

Mr. Delgado asked the applicant to make the argument that removal of the eleven (11) trees did not substantially alter the intent of the original site plan. Mr. Curtin stated he had met with a number of residents and Homeowners Associations, and the main concern was that the tree canopy buffering the site from the surrounding area remained. He noted they liked the trees and had paid \$350,000 in tree mitigation. He discussed impacts of the construction on the four (4) specimen oak trees and asserted they would become a liability and come down eventually from damage from the construction. Mr. Delgado asked staff to comment on the adverse impacts on the trees as outlined. Mr. Stoudenmire stated the City believed that with a watchful eye, the construction could be done properly with the trees in place.

Chair Barker highlighted Ms. Belvedere's comment that the trees had been there during the entire review process, and the applicant was aware of them. He noted that the rarity

**Planning and Zoning Board Minutes**

**August 9, 2023**

**Page 8**

of the appeal process lead him to believe that staff was reasonable and does all they can to keep applicants out of the lengthier process. He stated Mr. Stoudenmire's position was hard to argue with and the applicant should consider a reduction of the request if they wanted to pursue an administrative review.

Chair Barker opened the public hearing. There were no questions or comments from the public, and the public hearing was closed.

Kristin Simeone, arborist with Phil's Expert Tree Service, shared her assessment of the four (4) oak trees. She stated she agreed that they were specimen trees based on size and height, but upon dissecting the trees, there were issues. She stated she would prefer trimming a tree to removing it, but in this case that was only an option for possibly one (1) of the trees.

Chair Barker clarified that Mr. Stoudenmire was not a tree expert but had consulted staff and made the decision based on the advice of other professionals. Mr. Stoudenmire added that it was a situation where arborists have differing positions and agree to disagree, which was not uncommon.

Mr. Delgado stated when looking at the criteria, the removal of the trees would constitute a substantial altering of the intent. He agreed it was foreseeable that the applicant would have to work with the trees. He commented that the Board substituting their opinion for the expertise of staff should be rare and sparing. He stated he hoped that some accommodation between the parties could be arrived at. Mr. Light agreed and added the fact that there were eleven (11) trees, not four (4), was important.

**MOTION:** Delgado/Belvedere – To confirm that the administrative decision by Director of Sustainable Development Scott Stoudenmire related to the approved Coconut Creek Mazda site plan was correct.

**Upon roll call, the Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.**

**9. COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS**

There were no communications or reports from the Board or Staff.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.



*Marianne E. Bowers*  
Marianne E. Bowers, CMC  
Deputy City Clerk

9/13/23  
Date



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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME <b>BARKER JEFFREY S</b>	NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <b>Planning &amp; Zoning Board</b>
MAILING ADDRESS <b>4575 SAN MELLINA DR</b>	THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CITY <input type="checkbox"/> COUNTY <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER LOCAL AGENCY
CITY      COUNTY <b>Coconut Creek</b> <b>Broward</b>	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <b>City of Coconut Creek</b>
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED <b>8/9/23</b>	MY POSITION IS: <input type="checkbox"/> ELECTIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> APPOINTEE

## 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, Jeffrey S Barker, hereby disclose that on August 9, 2023:

(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 EMMANUEL BAPTIST CHURCH, 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:

I AM A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH AND I PREPARED AND PROCESSED THE SITE PLAN APPROVAL APPLICATION:

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.

8/9/23  
Date Filed

[Signature]  
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.