



Caitlin Copeland <ccopeland@juno-beach.fl.us>

Form submission from: PUBLIC COMMENTS

1 message

Town of Juno Beach Florida <juno-beach-fl@municodeweb.com>
Reply-To: Town of Juno Beach Florida <ccopeland@juno-beach.fl.us>
To: ccopeland@juno-beach.fl.us

Tue, Oct 21, 2025 at 7:30 PM

Submitted on Tuesday, October 21, 2025 - 7:30pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 99.38.95.133

Submitted values are:

First Name Aldo
Last Name Rovere
Address 400 Uno Lago Drive
Email Address AldoForJuno@gmail.com
Agenda Item Number (Ex: 1, 2, 3) Public Comments
Public Comment / Question
Reflections on the Legal Advisor Interviews

Interviewing the candidates for the position of Legal Advisor to the Town—one of the most important roles in Town service—was a well-run and enlightening process. The questions from Council were, in many cases, probing and insightful. Of course, a few softballs were tossed in, but overall the process provided a strong look at three well-qualified firms and sufficient depth to make an informed choice.

Here are my impressions of the firm ultimately selected, TG Law, and the approach that distinguished them in the process:

Position on SB 180

Their stance aligns closely with that of the Florida League of Cities—strongly in favor of maintaining local government control while acknowledging the noble intent of the legislation to address recovery issues. They clearly articulated the difference between legislative intent and the unintended consequences municipalities now face.

Firm Composition and Culture

They effectively countered the “size advantage” of larger competitors by highlighting a team built from the ground up rather than the top down. Their attorneys and staff include former teachers, town managers, and civil servants—people who understand how local government truly works and who entered the law for the right reasons.

Operational Processes

TG Law emphasized the importance of implementation—not just providing legal opinions but ensuring those opinions are actionable and followed through. Their municipal experience reinforces a commitment to practical processes, accountability, and clear communication.

User-Friendly Risk and Code Analysis

Their collaborative approach—working closely and in person with staff—stood out. Their aim is to make Council, staff, and everyone they advise more effective at what they do, fostering a more informed and cohesive operation.

Surprises

They reviewed six months of our Town meetings before even applying—and still wanted the job.

They encouraged real-time responses to citizens who raise substantive points during meetings.

They even endorsed extending Council meeting times to allow more public participation. One of their client councils reportedly operates with nearly a 2-to-1 ratio favoring citizen input over council discussion. Imagine that! What’s their secret sauce for making that work so well?

I'm genuinely looking forward to seeing what comes next. These are, of course, just my personal reflections, but I believe TG Law—and particularly Gemma and Zack—have set expectations that align well with our Town's values and needs. I hope they can deliver on them.

Respectfully,
Aldo Rovere

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.juno-beach.fl.us/node/2951/submission/20003>

Memorandum

TO: Town Council

FROM: Diana Davis, Vice Mayor Pro Tem

DATE: 10-22-2025

RE: Harmony Reviews as outlined in 34-116(3)(b)2. For single family homes

Section 34-116(3)(b)(2), in its entirety, requires that any proposed dwelling: [i]s of a design and proportion which enhances and is in harmony with the area. The concept of harmony shall not imply that buildings must look alike or be of the same style. Harmony can be achieved through the proper consideration of setback, scale, mass, bulk, proportion, overall height, orientation, site planning, landscaping, materials, and architectural components including but not limited to porches, roof types, fenestration, entrances, and stylistic expression. For the purpose of this section, the comparison of harmony between buildings shall consider the preponderance of buildings or structures within 300 feet from the proposed site of the same zoning district[.]

1. Keep our long-standing codes for the harmony reviews for single family homes that have been in place since 1992. Nineteen homes have been reviewed with one denial under existing harmony reviews, the codes are working for “visual continuity” and “consistent neighborhood character” with no unreasonable denials.
2. Do not go to base zoning or 34-268 review only that will result in .72-.74 Floor Area Ratio structures based on 35% lot coverage, much larger than existing homes in our neighborhoods. My survey showed that existing residents believe that codes that measure the size of new construction in context of the neighborhood are important safeguards to maintain their property values and quality of life.
3. Use guidance to implement our existing codes that have metrics, but not as a go- or no-go decision, as the final decision is made by the review of the subjective criteria within the code language (above code and attached power point to show review)

Who Makes the Final Decision on single family home applications:

If our Planning and Zoning Volunteer Board are not comfortable with subjective decision-making, the answer is not to get rid of long standing codes protections for existing residents: Two Options (1) use qualifications for selections of the planning and zoning volunteer board in March 2026, **OR** (2) Change our code to have staff review as our final authority for single family homes – but require a presentation to the planning and zoning volunteer board (residents) who can vote at their meeting regarding the review as recommendation only back to staff – if staff makes final decisions, then all appeals go to Town Council.

Harmony – Staff Tests for Bulk and Mass

Test One

Is the sq. ft. & FAR within the study area range? (Y or N – go to 2)

Test Two

Are calculations less than double the average? (Yes Approved, No go to test 3)

Test Three

Are calculations within 10-20% of the largest structure? (Y- likely approve, go to 4; No – probable denial go to 4)

Test Four

Are Mitigating factors present to compensate such as setbacks, orientation, landscaping, architectural features; more subjective features? (Y- Approval N- Denial)

Harmony – Staff Tests for Scale (height)

Test One

Are more than half the structures in the 300' study area the same stories or higher? (Yes approve or No go to 2)

Test Two

Are the immediately adjacent structures the same stories or higher? (Yes Approved, No go to test 3)

Test Three

Is the scale within the allowable limits of 34-268? (Y- likely approve, go to 4; No – probable denial)

Test Four

Are Mitigating factors present to compensate such as orientation, landscaping, architectural features; step-backs, limits on 2nd floor area? (Y- Approval, N- Denial)

Single Family Homes Appearance Review 34-116(3)(b)(2)

Bulk & Mass Tests using Comparative analysis

1. Is Sq Ft & FAR within Study Area Range (Y or No - go to 2)
2. Are calculations less than double the average? (Y approved, No go to 3)
3. Are calculations within 10%-20% of the largest structure? (Y – go to 4, No probable denial - go to 4)
4. Are other mitigating factors present to compensate (setbacks, orientation, site planning, architectural features, landscaping) (Y-approval N-denial) [purple boxes more subjective criteria. see, workshop guidance 5-2-25]

Scale Tests for Height/Stories

1. Are more than half the structures in the 300' study area the same stories or higher? Y approval, No – go to 2)
2. Are the immediately adjacent structures the same stories or higher (Y approval, No go to 3)
3. Is the scale within allowable limits of 34-268 (Y – go to 4, No denial)
4. Are other mitigating factors present to compensate (setbacks, orientation, site planning, architectural features such as step-backs or 2nd floor limits on area, landscaping,) (Y-approval N-denial) [purple boxes more subjective criteria. see, workshop guidance 5-2-25]

10-10-2025

RE: Len Rubin Response to VMPT Davis' Newsletter

Dear Attorney Rubin,

I am truly sorry that quoting your prior comment regarding the unusual nature of a Town Manager advocating a policy not yet supported by a majority of the Town Council caused you any personal discomfort. My intent was not to create difficulty for you, but rather to provide transparency to our residents regarding the extraordinary policy actions and communications that have occurred.

Your comment appeared in a section of my newsletter specifically addressing policy advocacy, separate from other matters, so as not to imply any statement from you regarding whether the Town Manager's conduct violated our Charter. I fully understand that you did not state that the Town Manager "override" a vote of Council, nor did I claim that you had made such a legal conclusion. I also included your full legal memorandum concerning architectural review and harmony codes, precisely to avoid any mischaracterization. My purpose was to give residents full access to the complete legal analysis—especially in contrast to the Town Manager's official newsletters of September 8 and September 10, which presented as "facts" that our appearance review codes and/or their implementation were "illegal." I did ask that these newsletters be taken down for review by Town Council. My concern remains the correction of substantive and procedural errors as a solution to resolve the division within the Town:

- **Substantively**, because the Town Manager declared existing, long-standing Town codes to be "illegal" without clear legal guidance or Council action.
- **Procedurally**, because a September 26 policy issued under his authority instructed staff to disregard the Town's adopted appearance review standards for single-family homes—despite at least four Council votes to retain harmony review under Section 34-116(3)(b)2. This policy was published in a Town Official Newsletter September 30

In that context, your general observation about advocacy in the Council-Manager form of government was relevant, not twisted. I quoted you in good faith, believing that our residents deserve to understand the broader framework of how Town policy should be set and implemented. My advocacy for preserving appearance review is not one Councilmember's agenda, it is consistent with the majority direction of Council and the expressed views of over 90% of the more than 200 residents who responded to my recent survey. These residents overwhelmingly value "harmony" review as essential to maintaining the scale, character, and property values of our neighborhoods.

With gratitude for your years of legal wisdom, I wish you every happiness in all of life's future adventures.

With respect and sincerity, **Diana L. Davis, Vice Mayor Pro Tem, Town of Juno Beach**

To: Mayor and Town Council and Town Manager

From: Vice Mayor Pro Tem Diana Davis

Date: 10-22-2025

Subject: Response to “The Facts” — Official Town Newsletter Publication
Mischaracterization of Council Authority and Public Information

Purpose

This memorandum corrects the false narrative presented in the October issue of *The Facts*, the Town Manager’s official newsletter, which framed a Council-authorized discussion of policy as a personal attack. This response clarifies that the issue at hand is **governance**, not personality — specifically, the Town Manager’s issuance of a unilateral policy directive that conflicts with a majority vote of the Town Council.

Background

At the September 24, 2025 Council meeting, the Council took no action to alter single-family *harmony review*. Under **Robert’s Rules of Order (12th ed.)**, when a motion fails, the status quo remains. Thus, our existing codes and interpretations for harmony review continue in effect.

On September 26, 2025 — two days later — the Town Manager issued a staff directive instructing that base zoning (§ 34-268) alone should be applied to single-family home reviews and that staff should no longer reference the harmony review criteria. This policy effectively **nullifies** the Town’s adopted code provisions (§ 34-116(3)(b) 1–2) and reverses prior Council direction given in four separate meetings (May 2, May 28, July 23, and Sept 16) to maintain our harmony reviews.

Clarification of the Record

1. Council Policy Authority:

Under the Town Charter, *policy direction rests with the Town Council*. The Manager executes, but may not substitute his personal interpretation or opinion for adopted policy.

2. Accuracy of the Davis Newsletter:

The newsletter in question accurately reported Council votes, cited public legal opinions by the Town Attorney (Leonard G. Rubin) and land-use counsel (Nancy E. Stroud, P.A.), and raised legitimate questions of administrative overreach.

3. Improper Use of Official Platform:

The Town Manager’s October issue of *The Facts* converted the Town’s official communication channel into a personal grievance piece. The inclusion of personal

accusations and emotional characterizations against an elected official was **unprofessional, non-neutral, and inconsistent** with the role of a Town Manager under the Council–Manager form of government.

4. Substantive Issue Remains Unaddressed:

The central question is whether a Town Manager may issue and publish a policy directive that directly contradicts the majority vote of Council. The answer is no.

Conclusion

This matter is not about personalities — it is about process, law, and the preservation of public trust. The Town’s newsletters should be 100% accurate where this has not been true of previous publications. The Town’s newsletter should present neutral information about adopted policy, not individual opinions or personal grievances.

Request:

That the Town Council direct that the Town Manager obtain preapproval of newsletter content for positive updates regarding adopted policy and public programs.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Davis

Vice Mayor Pro Tem, Town of Juno Beach

TOWN OF JUNO BEACH MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and Members of the Town Council

FROM: Diana Davis, Vice Mayor Pro Tem

DATE: October 16, 2025

SUBJECT: Response to Defamatory Mischaracterization by Mr. Carp and Bosso Realty

Purpose

The purpose of this memorandum is to correct the record concerning recent public commentary at the September 2025 Council meeting by commercial developer Michael Carp and a widely circulated email from Anne Bosso of Bosso Realty that wildly mischaracterizes an April 16, 2025 email response to a resident inquiry.

1. No Ethical or Legal Impropriety

The April 16, 2025 email contains no ethical violation and no instance of legal representation. The email in question was provided to Mr. Michael Carp, (real estate developer) solely in response to a **public records request**, consistent with the disclosure requirements of **Chapter 119, Florida Statutes**. Forwarding an existing public record to fulfill a lawful request is a routine administrative act and does not constitute advocacy, representation, or advisory conduct.

2. No Attorney–Client Relationship

At no time did I act as an attorney for, or undertake representation of, any party in litigation involving the Town of Juno Beach. The content of the email was **general procedural information** describing the writ of certiorari process—information readily available from online public resources. If an attorney–client relationship had existed, it would have been **an ethics violation** to disclose such communication publicly. The fact that this record was released under Chapter 119 confirms that it was **not privileged** or confidential legal advice. Mr. Carp who is an attorney as well as a developer knows that attorney-client communications would be exempt from a public records request, yet he deliberately misrepresented the communication in a public comment at a Town Council meeting, that was repeated in the Anne Bosso of Bosso Realty correspondence. I typically would respond to such allegations at the time, but I was prevented by our Town Mayor from responding at the Town Council meeting in September at the time, and then not given rebuttal time at the end of the meeting.

3. Context of the Communication The April 16 correspondence to a Juno Beach resident was a routine resident inquiry response regarding our codes, which are unclear and

resulted in the need for me to clarify an earlier answer I had given on this same question. The communication provided general context in response to a resident inquiry and clarified applicable time frames. It did not instruct, advise, or encourage any legal action against the Town.

4. Misstatements Regarding “Advice” and “Representation”

Allegations that the email constitutes legal advice or representation are **factually incorrect** and legally unsupported. Assertions that this action breached an oath of office, fiduciary duty, or ethics standard are **without foundation** and misrepresent the purpose, audience, and administrative handling of the record. I consider these allegations to be defamatory toward my professional reputation by both developer Mr. Carp and real estate broker Ms. Bosso.

5. Commitment to Transparency and Professional Responsibility

As Vice Mayor Pro Tem, I remain fully committed to the highest standards of **ethical governance, transparency, and compliance** with Florida law. My record reflects consistent adherence to open government principles and to the lawful fulfillment of my duties as an elected official and public servant.

Conclusion

There were **no ethical issues, no attorney-client legal representation established, and no misuse of Town resources or position**. These unfounded and wild accusations appear to be intended to dissuade me in representing our over 200 residents who filled out my newsletter survey regarding preserving our codes. The overwhelming majority want to Keep Our Codes that protect the character of our Town instead of letting developers decide the size and scale of new construction projects. Both Mr. Carp and Ms. Bosso are opposed to keeping our codes for new construction, but instead of engaging in the substantive issues, they are resorting to unfounded accusations and personal attacks.

Juno Beach deserves better than this and as a community we should come together to insist upon mutual respect and address the substantive issues, not petty personal baseless attacks. The April 16, 2025, email was properly disclosed under Florida’s Public Records Act as requested by Mr. Carp, and the allegations by Mr. Carp and repeated by Ms. Bosso are **factually and legally unfounded**.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Davis

Vice Mayor Pro Tem
Town of Juno Beach