



# CITY OF FORT PIERCE HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD

---

## Minutes

OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF FORT PIERCE HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD HELD ON **TUESDAY, July 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2013**, IN FORT PIERCE CITY HALL, COMMISSION CHAMBERS, 100 NORTH US HIGHWAY 1, FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA.

**1. Call to Order**

---

**2. Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

---

**3. Roll Call**

Upon roll call those present were: Ms. Jackson, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.

Those absent: Mr. Culverhouse, Mr. Enns, Ms. Wilson and Chairwoman Gates.

Staff present: Karen Emerson, Board Attorney; Kori Benton, Historic Preservation Officer

---

**4. Approval of Minutes**

**Mr. Sampson makes a motion and is seconded by Mr. Boardman** – to approve.

**A roll was taken.**

**All those in favor:** Mr. Sampson, Ms. Boardman, Ms. Jackson, Vice-Chair Harris.

**Motion passes unanimously.**

---

## 5. Public Hearing

### a. Certificate of Appropriateness 13-14, 211 Orange Avenue - Installation of a door.

The proposal is to remove an existing, non-original window and enlarge an existing opening to install a door for rear access to an upstairs apartment. The upstairs apartment currently has to be accessed through the interior store front. The proposed alteration does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The modifications are not visible from the right-of-way nor do they adversely impact the historic character of the structure, however, there has been a concern addressed with the applicant regarding access to the proposed door. The initial plans did not show any steps to the entry way. Staff recommends approval with the following conditions: The applicant coordinate with staff regarding an appropriate door design, coordinate on a plan to provide access to the door without encroaching on other property and the applicant address any safety concerns from the overhead utility lines that are in close proximity to the proposed doorway.

Mr. Sampson asks about the staircase and how they are going to access the apartment.

Mr. Benton explains that the initial discussions were to have a small wooden staircase accessing the apartment. They are currently coordinating with Danny Hawkins on the requirements; whether it needs to have ADA accessibility etc. They are perusing various exemptions from the state, but there are no plans that have been formally formulated. Those alterations that are pending the proposal have the capacity for administrative approval if they do meet the standards within the Historic Preservation guidelines.

**Mr. Sampson makes a motion and is seconded by Ms. Jackson**– to approve the COA 13-14 for the door installation with staff conditions.

**A roll call was taken.**

**Those in favor:** Ms. Jackson, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.

**Motion was passed unanimously.**

-----

### b. Certificate of Appropriateness 13-17, 407 N 2<sup>nd</sup> Street – Fence.

The proposed fence is presented as a blockade fence. The applicants begin erecting the fence until they were contacted by City staff and were told that they had to acquire a Certificated of Appropriateness and a building permit. They have coordinated with the office, however, the proposal does not meet the standards of the Secretary of Interior for Rehabilitation of Historic Structures and Sites. The materials presented (stockade fence) is not historically appropriate. They are proposing 4 ft. height for the first 25 ft. of property setback from the right-of-way. For the remaining length of the northern property line they are proposing a 6 ft. tall fence. The proposal for the fence is to offer a visual and audible buffer for the neighboring residential properties to the north in hopes of eliminating some of the negative externalities of noise. The fence does not meet the requirements set by the Secretary of Interior for Rehabilitation of Historic Structures and Sites; therefore staff recommends two options for the Board to consider: To revise a style of fence to provide a natural or wood picket fence for the first 25 ft., the remaining could be as proposed by the applicants further providing landscaping along the remaining stockade fence to prevent a broad stretch of unbroken fence area which would minimize the visibility of the stockade fence from the right-of-way. Option 2: Substitute the first 25 ft. of

fence with vegetation providing the same landscaping along the remaining stockade fence to prevent the long stretch of unbroken fence and to minimize its visibility from the right-of-way.

Charlie Hayek (1701 Gulf Stream Ave.): The first concern we had was the fact that there are two separate lots. It came to our attention that a permit could not be issued because of this, plus the prohibition of fences on vacant lots. We built a handicapped ramp to become ADA accessible for the buildings we currently have. The ramp is located on the vacant property and that issue never came up. Subsequently, I visited the Tax Appraiser's office and filled the necessary forms, but I was told they don't vacate the property lines until it comes closer to tax time. As far as the two recommendations, I cannot suggest either way for the tenants because they are the ones that really want the fence. They probably would rather have the landscaping up front for the first 25 ft. and then the stockade fence in the rear portion.

Ms. Boardman asks if there is a low retaining wall between the two properties.

Mr. Hayek explains that there is a wall there but, it is only 1-2 ft. high of natural rock. It doesn't give the buffer that the owners of the brewery were looking for to keep the noise levels down. Even though they don't play loud music, they are cognizant of the fact and want to keep any noise within the property.

Ms. Boardman asks would there be a problem to put landscaping in front of the "wall" that's there.

Mr. Hayek states that it would have to stay on his property and not encroach on the neighbors.

Mr. Sampson asks if the tenant has been approached by the neighbors regarding issues with noise.

Mr. Hayek states that currently the neighbor is a vacant house. The current owner bought it about a year ago and hasn't done any remodeling and doesn't plan on living in it any time soon. She is waiting to sell some property in Ocean Village so she can accrue enough money to do the remodel, but that itself is going to take about a year. So they are thinking of the neighbors, but they also want to enhance the property. They want to put more landscaping along the side and the buffer between the neighbors.

**Mr. Sampson makes a motion and is seconded by Ms. Harris** - to approve with staff conditions.

**A roll call was taken.**

**All in favor:** Mr. Sampson, Ms. Jackson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.

**Motion passes unanimously.**

-----

**c. Certificate of Appropriateness 13-19, 702 Atlantic Avenue – Demolition.**

Mr. Benton: The site is located within the Sample Oaks historic district. It was constructed in 1918 based on surveys in the Sanborn maps, however, the Florida master site file suggests that it was constructed in 1930. The City Commission adopted the Sample Oaks historic district in 2003 and the property owners originally purchased the property in 2004. Then earlier this year they transferred the property into the hands of a LLC company, essentially retaining the same ownership just under a separate entity.

Ms. Emerson: If you look at the property record card the LLC jointly owned the property in 2004 with a trustee. Just recently the trustee transferred everything to the limited liability company. In that regard it is solely owned by the company now.

Mr. Benton: Furthermore, the applicants have provided a proposed redevelopment plan. I had an opportunity to perform a site visit with David Cleveland. The exterior conditions are very similar due to what they have been through the last several years in the previous requests for demolition. There is quite a bit of deterioration on the siding. It's a wood frame structure. There is quite a bit of mold and mildew on the structure. The windows have been boarded up and painted according to a code enforcement violation and compliance with that violation. The roof is caving in, there is exposed insulation and the wood floors have been saturated with rain water from the open roof. The windows have quite a bit of damage. The kitchen has been stripped.

The City Code provided criteria for the Historic Preservation Board to review and consider any application for demolition. There are criteria for the consideration of the demolition of a structure. The first is whether or not the structure is of interest or quality that would reasonably meet national, state, or local criteria for designation as significant historic or architectural site and/or structure. The structure is listed as a contributing structure in the Sample Oaks historic district based upon its architectural significance and the history. It was further researched that it is significant based on local person. William Reid formally lived in this structure. He was a local politician and leader for the city of Fort Pierce as well as a business owner throughout Florida. The criteria has not been met because it is significant.

Additional criteria are whether or not the structure is in such design and craftsmanship or material that could be reproduced only with great difficulty or expense. The materials and workmanship would be difficult to reproduce to an extent. The high quality wood that was in the interior that was originally placed in the structure and complimenting doors would be difficult to reproduce, however, the neglect of the structure has significantly contributed to the decay which would cost quite a bit to rehabilitate and improve those features, so the criteria has not been met. There are quite of few structures within the city that have the same frame vernacular and architecture which is the city's most prevalent architectural style, therefore the criteria has been met.

This has been documented as one of the earliest structures found in the Sample Oaks district, therefore the criteria has not been met. There's a great deal of documented history attached to this structure. The previous owner was a very influential business and political leader locally, therefore that criteria is only partially met. The applicant has submitted a plan for redevelopment of the site and neighboring sites that are under common ownership, however, the plans are not to build a new structure on site, they have prepares preliminary plans to adaptively reuse the existing 2 story-structure immediately to the north as a neighborhood café and restaurant. The subject site is being incorporated with those plans and being proposed as the parking lot to serve the proposed café and restaurant, however, there has been no formal request for Certificate of Appropriateness for the rehabilitation and adaptive re-use of that structure, therefore it is independent of this subject site and is separated by an existing alleyway. The Historic Preservation Board has heard this request for demolition in similar capacity two times in the past. The HPB heard and denied an application to demolish the structure in 2006. Denied it based on architectural significance with an encouragement to look into moving the structure. Minutes were provided from that meeting in the staff report. Later the applicants requested a demolition in 2012, the Board rendered a decision to denying the application based on historical significance and the additional historical significance based on research which showed it being tied with the former residence of William Reid. The Board at the time rendered a decision based on the historical significance, lack of redevelopment plans. They further encouraged the sale of the relocation of the structure. During this consideration, the City Code Enforcement dept. has sited the property for affirmative maintenance and neglect. The Special Magistrate has heard the Code Enforcement violations and rendered numerous decisions. At the September 10, 2012 the Magistrate agreed to amend a previous order based on the owner's testimony. The owner made commitments to repair and rehabilitate that structure as stated in the hearing minutes which states "We're in agreement that we will go ahead and put a roof on the structure to

help preserve it for whoever is going to do something with it. We are in agreement to replace the rotten siding and paint everything white again to match the existing color that we have. There are a couple of sheets of ply-wood on the windows that have started to delaminate. We agree to replace those few sheets in the windows. They are kind of getting disrepair anyway, so we'll change those out again."

To this date, the only confirmed action taken by the owner is the submittal for two building permits for the reroof which have inevitably been voided. It has been cited by the applicant, representatives and owners that contractors did not feel safe being on top of the roof in an attempt to repair it. The applicants have painted the exterior white as well as placed the boards on the windows, however those commitments stated have not been followed through with to this date. The conceptual site plan shows rehabilitation of the structure to the north and the contributing structure as well in the Sample Oaks District that front Orange Avenue. It is currently vacant. It was previously a two-story residence, but the plans show that it was adaptively reused as a café restaurant with an outdoor seating area and a few landscape features. The subject structure is shown in the rendering as being demolished and then provided improvements to show the parking lot to support the adaptive reuse of the structure to the north, however, we do not have a Certificate of Appropriateness at this time submitted for the rehabilitation of the structure and for the specific improvements as they encompass several properties and the existing alley way and right-of-way that separates the property ownership.

Ms. Boardman asks if it is a city alley that separates the properties.

Mr. Benton explains that that is correct. It is believed to be 10 feet wide and runs anywhere from 120 to 170 feet. That would require the applicants to request abandonment by the city of Fort Pierce. They do own all the property surrounding the alleyway, therefore if the city wanted to pursue and grant an abandonment of that property they would have the potential to purchase or acquire that entire alleyway with an exception of a piece to the west.

The structure is one of the earliest contributing structures in the Sample Oaks Historic Districts based on a survey and analysis. Its significance is further enhanced through its association with local persons; therefore staff recommends denial of the request for demolition of 702 Atlantic Ave. It is noted that if the Board elects to consider approval of the demolition based upon the proposed plans for reuse of the project and existing condition of the structure, the following conditions of approval shall be deliberated: The property owners obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness and building permit approval for the proposed redevelopment plan prior to demolition. That would require them the request and have approval of the abandonment of the alleyway in question as well as have an application before the Board for approval or administrative approval. The property owner must submit payment or otherwise resolve the code enforcement fines prior to demolition of the structure.

David Cleveland: I have spent the last 35 years in this community doing historic preservation work and trying to raise awareness of the historic preservation issues. I've spent a high percentage of my professional career on historic preservation issues as well as a high percentage of funds that I had available when I started this pursuit when I was 23 years. All of the historic preservation issues I have ever done and purchased were purchased with my heart. Gregg Boggs was hired about three months ago by the owners of this piece of property. It encompasses the 702 Atlantic property as well as the house that is immediately north of 702. We were asked by the owners because they have obviously had problems with receiving the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition in the past, to evaluate the properties and give them a very fair evaluation as well as look to the future of the properties to see what we can recommend doing with it. We went in and conducted surveys and determined that the property has lead based paint which is not unusual. There is presence of asbestos and black mold due to water infiltration. There are compromised structural issues. The original home was initially designed to accommodate winds up to 125 mph, but when you breach the envelope of the building we see that the wind load capabilities of the existing structure are around 65 mph which makes it a hazard to exist. I feel that the recommendation of the historic preservation officer have been influenced by past reports that have been drafted by previous historic preservation officers that have been

flawed. A high percentage of the information that was given to the Board is flawed. Ms. Wood in her report identifies the structure as a significant architectural structure in bungalow style architecture. Indeed it is bungalow style architecture, but at best it is a very minimal representation of bungalow style architecture. The recitation of the interior wood work and the quality of the interior wood work has been extremely overstated. I find very little significance inside this structure. There's a reference I believe by Ms. Olsen as to the diagonal pine wall covering that has been hand cut. In reality that is a 1x3 cedar that has chatter marks from an electric planer on the surface. I don't believe that since my owner has owned this house since 2004, this house has ever been through requirements to be placed on the national historic register and is most likely only significant to us here locally that recognize the historical significance for Mr. Reed, but I have been here for 35 years and I am unaware of Mr. Reeds significance in the community. I believe that the timeline that has been presented shows that the property acquisition was in 2004. A couple elements that are pretty significant for the Board to recognize is that in 2004 Hurricane Francis and Hurricane Jean came and both of the storms took substantial amount of roofing off of the roof which is evident by the pictures that were provided from 2006. There were breeches in the roof that allowed the water to come in.

In 2005 the utility meters were removed from the structure. The electricity was removed, the water line was capped and the sewer line was terminated. When my owners purchased this property in 2004 this was an occupy able structure. After 2004 hurricanes this became an inhabitable structure and the structure has sat empty since the 2004 hurricanes. The property owners have complied with Code Enforcement issues. They boarded up the outside of the windows and doors. Special Magistrate suggested they put a roof on it and they committed to put a roof on it in 2012, they pulled the building permits and the permits were issued and the roofers refused to repair because of the extent of the damage on the roof. The structure, in my opinion, really needs to come down.

It causes blight and is a hazard in the neighborhood. The property that is on the north side that the schematics have been prepared for request the elimination of this building, it puts a parking lot in its place. We do not have access to the front piece of property without the elimination of this building. The beauty of the property is the magnificence of the front property. Mr. Benton and I toured the property several weeks ago. The property has mature Oaks on the front of it. I haven't heard a recommendation as to what the proposal is if the applicants are not allowed to take the structure down. If we are not allowed to takedown the structure, the applicants would spend around \$180,000 to renovate the existing building. The most the client can obtain from renting the residence is \$500 a month. Insurance would have to be placed on the house which could cost up to \$8,000. It could bring financial hardship for my client. If there are significant architectural elements within the building we will very carefully remove those remaining elements, we will gladly donate those items or place them in storage. What I am requesting that the Board allow for my client to tear the building down and not make it contingent upon anything. I would be happy to answer your questions.

Vice-Chair Harris asks if the fines have been paid.

Cleveland responds that the fines have not been paid. The Special Magistrate will be hearing from us after the results of this meeting and I can almost count on the fact that we will go back in front of the Code Enforcement Board and try to negotiate the amount of fines. I don't think Code Enforcement will waive all of the fines, but I think with the additional information that we have come up with we might be able to reduce the amount fines that we will pay.

Ms. Emerson responds that nothing can be done with the reduction on any lien until the property is in compliance. They will not even consider it because it's in the code. Chapter 23 is not the National Register for historic properties. What you consider is if it meets local regulations. I understand it could have been a misleading statement and I would like to clarify.

Mr. Cleveland states that of the criteria of demolition, is the structure in such interest or quality that would reasonably meet national, state or local criteria. Of those items, the only element that the building meets is

the local criteria designated as a significant structure and it's based on purely upon the fact that Mr. Reed lived there. I have defended multiple applications with the Historic Preservation Bureau and the Department of State in Florida and it's in my opinion that at any time would this ever be eligible to be put on a national registry.

Ms. Boardman asks that before the hurricanes in 2004 was there a tenant?

Mr. Cleveland answers yes.

Ms. Boardman asks if there were \$8,000 in insurance costs a year.

Mr. Cleveland states that if he were to put insurance on the house that is what it would come out to be.

Ms. Boardman asks if the roof came off as the result of the hurricanes, why weren't there insurance money to then replace the roof at that time?

Mr. Cleveland explains that there was no insurance on the building at that time.

Ms. Boardman asks if there were tenants occupying the building while it wasn't insured.

Mr. Cleveland states that there was a tenant in the building that was owned solely by the owners and they were not required to put insurance on the building when they bought it. What I was referencing was that if I were to put insurance on the building today it would cost \$8,000 in order to borrow monies to renovate the house per requirement of the mortgage lenders and the insurance would come solely from the secondary insurance market that is approximately \$8,000 a year.

Ms. Boardman asks if he would be able to get construction loan insurance.

Mr. Cleveland answers no, not without having permanent insurance available.

Ms. Boardman asks the City Attorney about the alley way in question.

Ms. Emerson responds that she asked Mr. Sweeney about the problems of site planning a property with an intervening street. The City Code addresses parking lots pretty specifically. I didn't realize that there was now (?) remember the other property is not in front of you nor are there concrete plans. This is the first time that I've seen an alley. I understand that that is in fact a city alley.

Mr. Benton states that the applicant would have the administrative capacity to submit an abandonment of the alley which would provide them the opportunity and the land capability to pursue the redevelopment plan that is presented to the Board. Currently they would not have the true capacity to redevelop in that alleyway outside of a special agreement with Public Works and Engineering Department.

Ms. Emerson corrects that it would be a document with the City. Alley abandonment is disfavored by the city. It's not a guarantee. It is something that you are just allowed to ask for.

Mr. Benton explains that the C-3 zone does permit off-street commercial parking lots, however, that term in the city code would suggest that it's paid for parking like you would see in more urban and dense communities than what the city of Fort Pierce is. The process of abandonment takes a minimum of 90 days and it is not something that the City Commission will determine. The applicant is required to obtain an

appraisal for the land value and if the City Commission grants approval of the abandonment the applicant will have to pay the administrative fees as well as the full 100% cost of that land to be abandoned.

Mr. Cleveland states that the site plan is not contingent upon the abandonment of either the alley on the north side of the property or the ally of the west side of the property. The only thing that we would be doing is crossing over that alley to periodically access delivery trucks for the northern most property. The alley stops at our property on the east side.

Mr. Sampson states that this is truly a demolition by neglect. It has been there with an open roof for over 10 years. It hasn't been fixed. I don't see any definite re-use of the area.

**Mr. Boardman makes a motion and seconded by Ms. Jackson** – to allow for a demolition permit to be pursued with the condition that they obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness for the conceptual site plan for that property and the other property, must pay all Code Enforcement fines, must donate any items that may be architecturally historical, pursue the Certificate of Abandonment.

Ms. Boardman asks if the motion is addressing that unless the COA for redevelopment of the property to the north is before this Board and granted. There are 4 prerequisites before the demolition. The orders for demolition have to be specific and have to base on your criteria in the code.

**A roll call was taken.**

**All in favor:** Mr. Sampson, Ms. Jackson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.

**Motion passes unanimously.**

## **6. New Business**

### **a. Distribution of Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness**

Mr. Benton states that the distribution will be done electronically and they consists of new signage for Thai Pepper and some minor window decals and signage on the Renaissance building for a new business. There is also an administrative COA for bollards that are in the River's Edge historic district.

### **b. Edgar Town Historic Street Name change.**

Mr. Benton states that at an early meeting a proposal was made to rename some of the streets only within the Edgar Town district. The opportunity was to change two streets back to their original name: Avenue D to Selene Street, Cedar Place to Cedar Avenue and Avenue E to Spruce Street. There was also a proposal to change North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street to High Street. In speaking with some property owners, it was suggested that N 2<sup>nd</sup> Street remain as so based on constituency in the city of Fort Pierce to the North, however, property owners were in support of the reversion back from Spruce Street and Selene Street. The Board's recommendation would be followed up with a report to be submitted to the City Commission. They are tasked any formal adoption of the street names via an ordinance.

I met with the owner of Down South Check Cashing that is located on the corner of Avenue D and U.S. Hwy 1. He expressed no opposition in the street name reversion if it were to happen eastward of U.S. Hwy 1 to Indian River Drive. It was suggested by staff to facilitate the name change from U.S. Hwy 1 eastward.

Vice-Chair Harris asks if it means that Avenue E will commence from U.S. Hwy 1 east.

Mr. Benton states that the right-of-way was abandoned. A section of Avenue E terminates just east of the FEC right-of-way. It would commence from that point to Indian River Dr. Selene Street would commence from U.S. Hwy 1 to Indian River Drive. Coordination has been established with the USPS regarding dual addresses for delivered mail.

Vice-Chair Harris asks if it is Cedar Street or Cedar Place.

Ms. Emerson states that on the first plat it is called Cedar Place.

Mr. Benton states that on the plat that is not the oldest one, but the oldest on legal record. I will have to do additional research to confirm. I can coordinate with Chris Blackwelder, the city's plat manager as well as surveyor, to gain more insight.

Ms. Jackson asks why the name change is being considered.

Mr. Benton states that the discussion took place from a few property owners via historic preservation about the importance of the reversions back to Edgar Town.

**Mr. Sampson makes a motion and is seconded by Ms. Boardman** – to forward a recommendation to the City Commission and that consistency is obtained by the results of Cedar Street or Cedar Place.

**A roll call was taken.**

**All in favor: Mr. Sampson, Ms. Jackson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.**

**Motion passes unanimously.**

### **Update on 604 Beach Ct.**

There is quite a bit of interest in the potential sale of the property. Wells Fargo released the mortgage. If staff can get in contact with the previous owner, there is the potential for them to move forward with sale of the property. The building official expressed that he found people who may be interested along with another building department employee. Any updates will be provided via email and hopefully it will come before the Board as a formal update prior to the deadline in September.

Coordination with the city grant writer has begun to prepare a grant application to petition the state for nonmatching funds to pursue a community workshops regarding Edgar Town historic district. A potential overlay discussions or alterations of zoning regulations in property rights and allowances, however, that application was terminated. There was not enough time to present the application to the City Commission for their approval. It was on the agenda for the Historic Preservation Board meeting in June, however, we did not have quorum so it was not formerly heard. Hopefully, we will be ahead of the game next year for the funds.

Also, the outreach project via social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.) to bring forth different structures that may be in danger of demolition, may experience rehabilitation or go up for sale etc.

in the designated historic districts as well as providing photographs, informing the public with Historic Preservation Board Meetings, Historic Society progression etc. to incorporate more of a positive image.

There was an outstanding award for funding the replacement of windows for the old Saint Anastasia School and Old City Hall. Those two building were incorporated in the funds allocation. There have been a few setbacks in hiring a contractor, but hopefully we will have it comprehensively complete and present it formerly before the Board in August depending upon the actual presentation as far as the materials for the windows, there may be potential for support for staff for those applications. In my visit to Saint Anastasia it was indicated that 80% of the windows were missing or needed replacement so the building is in dire need of the funds. We have hopes in retaining the structure and providing some viability to the building in the near term.

Ms. Jackson asks what is going to happen with the St. Anastasia building.

Mr. Benton states that the building has been abandoned as far as use, however, it has had a reroof done. The property is owned by the FPRA which is headed by the City Commission and the former director Jon Ward. It has been suggested that it be the structure for the federal court house along with other proposals. It was suggested that the St. Lucie County Historical Society be transferred to that building with partnership with entities that specialize in community outreach, economic development, small business development etc. There is a lot of potential for the building to have the interior redeveloped as well as the exterior and hopefully the grant can accomplish a percentage of that. The project has been handed to Linda and Libby, the two remaining employees for the FPRA and I will keep in close contact with over the course of the project.

## **7. Consideration of Absences.**

Mr. Sampson asks if in the circumstances where the Board excuses or does not excuse, what is the outcome if somebody does not have an excused absence.

Mr. Benton explains that at a certain level of unexcused absences within a 12 month period would render an immediate dismissal from the Board.

Mr. Sampson asks how many absences will that take.

Mr. Benton answers three. It is believed that the language references consecutive absences.

Mr. Sampson asks if there is a limit on excused absences.

Mr. Benton answers that any member may be removed for cause by the majority vote of the City Commission. Appointments of any member due to death, resignation or removal shall be made by the City Commission for the unexpired term. Upon failure of the Board member without excuse to attend three consecutive meetings, Commission may declare the membership vacant and shall arrange for a new appointment. I can take a look at the attendance records after this meeting. If there are any members that meet that standard I will prepare a report to be submitted by the City

Commission to consider their removal from the Board. In the circumstance of Mr. Culverhouse, he did provide an excuse for the July meeting. Perhaps a follow up email the day after the meetings could be sent out to the members to notify them about the decisions regarding excused absences. It has garnered the attention of the City Commission based on a recent conversation with the Commissioners.

**Ms. Boardman makes a motion and is seconded by Mr. Sampson** – to disapprove the absences for Mr. Culverhouse.

**A roll call was taken.**

**All in favor: Mr. Sampson, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.**

**Motion passes unanimously.**

-----

**8. Adjournment**

**Vice-Woman adjourns the meeting.**

