



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Minutes of the Architectural Commission Meeting Held on May 28, 2025

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 09:00 AM in the Town Council Chambers.

Members Present: Betsy Shiverick, Elizabeth Connaughton, Jeffery Smith, Kathy Georgas, Sue Patterson, David Phoenix, Richard Sammons, and Claudia Visconti (arrived at 9:02 a.m.)

Members Excused: Kenn Karakul

Staff Members Present: Sarah Pardue, Bradley Falco, Kelly Churney, and Town Attorney Lainey Franscisco

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Smith led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES

1. Minutes of the April 23, 2025, Architectural Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Ms. Catlin to approve the minutes of the April 23, 2025, meeting as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to approve the agenda as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH

Ms. Churney swore in all those intending to speak and continued to do so throughout the meeting, as necessary.

COMMENTS

2. OFFICIALS

No one indicated a desire to speak.

3. STAFF

Town Attorney Lainey Francisco outlined the rules for order for quasi-judicial meetings and asked the commissioners to adhere to the new procedure as much as possible.

Mr. Smith stated that he would be allowing 10 minutes for presentations, including landscaping presentations.

4. PUBLIC - 3 MINUTE LIMIT

Fred Wright, 44 Coconut Row, discussed his history in town and stated he previously lived on Plantation Road. He discussed a larger home being built on Plantation Road that he believed was out of scale for the neighborhood. He presented pictures of the new house and asked the Commission to be prudent about what is approved in the future.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5. ARC-24-0090 (ZON-24-0046) 2720 - 2730 S OCEAN BLVD—EDGEWATER / AMBASSADOR SITE (COMBO). The applicant, Palm Beach Edgewater Fee Borrower LLC and Palm Beach Ambassador Fee Borrower LLC, has filed an application for Architectural Commission review and approval of a new multifamily, multibuilding residential development on the east and west sides of S Ocean Boulevard with a new multi-story residential building with five residential levels and a subterranean parking level and rooftop penthouse mechanical equipment to replace two existing five- and eight-story buildings on the east side of S Ocean Boulevard and to replace an existing three-story building on the west side of S Ocean Boulevard, to be demolished. This project includes multiple variances related to building height, building setbacks, building length, lot coverage, maximum amount of fill, rooftop generators, and rooftop mechanical equipment. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. James Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, Zoning, and Building, provided staff comments and answered questions about the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Nelo Freijomel of Spina O'Rourke + Partners introduced the project. Yusef Dennis of OMA discussed the adjustments to the design based on the Commissioners' comments made during the last presentation.

Ms. Shiverick was not impressed with the new design and did not believe the Aman brand was recognizable. She felt the design looked like an office building and lacked creativity.

Ms. Connaughton asked if the footprint and mass had changed since the last presentation, and was told they remained the same.

Mr. Sammons questioned the stone slabs supported by stone corbels, how the element would be fastened and supported, and whether it would last more than 10 years. He did not believe the design contributed to Palm Beach's charm.

Mr. Phoenix asked about the inspiration for the geometry and shape of the buildings. He thought the design was too monochromatic and suggested incorporating more variation. Mr. Phoenix asked about the wow factor that would identify this building as an Aman brand. Mr. Dennis responded.

Ms. Catlin challenged the architect by asking what the design would look like without a rectangle or a corner. Mr. Dennis responded.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the large plate-glass windows and wondered how the professional felt about the elements in this tropical climate. Mr. Dennis responded and explained the intent behind the design. Ms. Connaughton recommended larger overhangs on the south elevation.

Mr. Phoenix asked if a different shape or breaking up the buildings had been considered. Mr. Dennis discussed how the building was designed with consideration of the neighboring buildings.

Mr. Sammons commented that the building's units would be dark because of the design. He asked how the program of the building shaped the building. Mr. Dennis responded and commented on the design.

Ms. Georgas wondered if the window shapes could be changed. Mr. Dennis stated he could study that suggestion, but maximizing the views was an important direction in the design.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the setbacks and variances requested. Mr. Smith thought the question was premature because the commission was reviewing concepts and noted that staff had not reviewed any of the plans. Mr. Murphy confirmed this statement.

Mr. Smith thought the building looked more like an office building, which was enhanced by the many columns next to the glass. He was not in favor of placing stone on the ceiling, especially next to the ocean.

Ms. Visconti expected something more from the design and thought the Commission would be wowed. She thought the project needed to be entirely restudied. She thought the repetitiveness of the buildings was a mistake. She thought that there was a lack of special materials in the design. She recommended looking at the Mediterranean vernacular design and

walking through Palm Beach to understand the essence of the town. She thought the gold colors were hurting the design; she recommended using Florida coral. She questioned the terracotta columns and the concrete ceilings. She recommended working with landscape architects on the vertical elements.

Ms. Patterson preferred the previous design but liked the idea of opening the balconies.

Ms. Connaughton thought there was an unsuccessful attempt to break up the mass and thought the scale was overblown; she thought more buildings with courtyards or intimate spaces would be nicer than three large buildings. She thought the rectangular shape was fine. She thought more delineated buildings with gardens would be preferred. She was not in favor of the terracotta columns. She thought the ways the buildings presented themselves were all identical and suggested more creativity.

Mr. Sammons argued that the design was flawed and disconnected from the human scale and artistic intention. He thought the concrete slab design resembled Maison Dom-Ino. He thought the previous designs at the south end were a historical mistake and should not be repeated. He called for a complete restudy of the project.

Ms. Catlin agreed with Mr. Sammons that the buildings on the south end were boring. She wondered what could be built if the commission allowed the designer to design out of the box, different from what currently existed in the area. She predicted that many south end condominiums would soon be following suit.

Ms. Georgas recommended incorporating Moorish influences into the design.

Ms. Patterson agreed with Ms. Catlin's comments and thought the designer should have comments that provide direction.

Ms. Sammons thought the entire design was wrong and that an entire restudy should be given to the design.

Mr. Phoenix thought the opportunity to change the landscape of S. Ocean Blvd. was exciting. He recommended breaking up the design and possibly adding some wood materials to the design. He urged the professional to seek the WOW factor in the design.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Attorney Megan Wegerif, representing 2770 S. Ocean Blvd, provided general support for the aesthetics of the project.

Attorney Maura Ziska, representing Beach Point, provided general support of the project, deferring the architectural design to the Commission.

Cathy Hershkopf, 2773 S. Ocean Blvd., asked the Commission to provide real direction to the developers. She disagreed that the south end was a mistake.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to defer the project to the July 23, 2025, meeting for a complete restudy. The motion was carried 6-1, with Mr. Sammons dissenting.

6. ARC-24-0129 288 QUEENS LANE The applicant, Steven Rosenberg, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a one-story addition on an existing single-family residence.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Shilun Zhou of LUN Architects presented the proposed architectural plans.

Ms. Visconti asked about the previously proposed plans, to which Mr. Zhou stated he did not. She asked if landscape material would be added. Mr. Zhou stated plantings would be added under the tree. Ms. Visconti asked about the material for the walkway and how the home would appear differently from the street. Mr. Zhou responded.

Ms. Catlin asked for full renderings for the rear of the home without landscaping. Mr. Zhou responded.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the south tree and its proximity to the home. Mr. Zhou said it was 10 feet from the home.

Ms. Georgas asked about the floating square window on the side of the building. Mr. Zhou explained the design.

Ms. Connaughton was not against the addition, although she questioned its siting. She asked for more details to be added to the front of the building. She questioned the fenestration and thought the front windows should be restudied. She also questioned the form of the addition.

Mr. Phoenix thought the design missed the mark and questioned some of the design and functionality. He stated he could not support the project.

Ms. Shiverick thought the house was oddly shaped and thought the addition worked. She supported the design.

Ms. Patterson did not like the cut corner in the design, which she thought was odd. She also did not like the small bathroom window.

Ms. Catlin thought the addition needed to seem like an extension of the home without a connector. She thought more detailing was needed on the exterior. She requested to see previous designs along with the proposed ones, and added that at this time, she could not support the project.

Mr. Sammons thought the addition was harmless.

Mr. Smith agreed that the addition was harmless. He recommended finding a different location for the mechanical unit that could be seen in the glass connector.

A motion was made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Mr. Sammons to approve the project as presented. The motion failed 3-4, with Mses. Catlin, Connaughton, Visconti, and Mr. Phoenix dissenting.

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Ms. Catlin to defer the project to the June 25, 2025, meeting. The motion was carried 4-3, with Messrs. Smith, Sammons, and Ms. Shiverick dissenting.

7. ARC-24-0098 301 POLMER PARK RD. The applicant, Patrick Carney, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new, split-level, two-story, single-family residence of over 10,000 square feet; with final hardscape, landscape and swimming pool improvements.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Patrick O'Connell of Patrick Ryan O'Connell Architects presented the architectural plans for the project.

Ms. Visconti asked about the change to the awning structure. Mr. O'Connell explained the changes.

Ms. Shiverick asked Mr. O'Connell if he considered a small water feature where the cabana bath had been proposed. Mr. O'Connell stated he would consider the suggestion.

Mr. Sammons asked about the setback of the windows from the frame. Mr. O'Connell stated the setback was six inches. Mr. Sammons asked if the finial width was wider than the column below, adding that they should not be wider.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

M. Timothy Hanlon, attorney for many of the owners on Polmer Park Road, indicated that five items had been previously agreed upon with the developer, and he would like them included in the record. His clients also asked to be included in the construction management meetings.

Attorney Frank Lynch, representing the owner of 301 Polmer Park, agreed to the five conditions and stated that they had been read into the record at previous meetings. He stated that his client would make efforts to minimize the traffic to the site, but was confused about which road was the most important to Mr. Hanlon's clients.

Mr. Hanlon clarified that his clients were most concerned about access to North Lake Way during the season.

Town Attorney Lainey Francisco confirmed that the neighbors could be included at the construction management meeting if the Commissioners wanted to include that condition in their motion.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to approve the project as presented with the condition that the professional consider replacing the tree behind the pool with a small water feature, which should return to the June 25, 2025, meeting for approval. The motion was carried 6-1, with Mr. Sammons dissenting.

8. ARC-24-0128 (ZON-24-0093) 203 VIA VIZCAYA (COMBO) The applicant, PAUL Z. OKEAN (Trustee, under Trust Agreement dated 5/21/91 as the Paul Z. Okean Revocable Living Trust), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review for the design of a new, two-story, single- family residence with final hardscape, landscape and swimming pool improvements, with special exception approval required for redevelopment of a nonconforming parcel and a variance request for deficient landscape open space. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Mr. Phoenix disclosed ex parte communications.

Jonathan Parks of Solstice presented the architectural plans for the project and how he responded to the comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Sammons asked about the setback of the windows from the stucco. Mr. Parks responded. Mr. Sammons recommended a larger setback to improve the expression of the building's mass.

Mr. Phoenix thought the facade had improved and supported the choice of sconces. He thought the fountain was still a little large, but better.

Ms. Connaughton thought the changes improved the design.

Catlin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Sammons, to approve the project as presented, with the condition that the architect may increase the setback of the windows. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Mr. Falco called for public comment. No one indicated a desire to speak.

9. ARCS-24-0681 160 ROYAL PALM WAY (PALM HOUSE HOTEL). The applicant, LR Palm House LLC (Natalie Le Clerc, General Manager), has filed an application requesting ARCOM review and approval for signage on the hotel's front façade and for the approval of the design of the previously approved bollard lights in the rear courtyard.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Mses. Catlin and Visconti disclosed ex parte communications.

Sean McClendon of Cooper Carry presented the plans for the proposed signage.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the number in the signage and wondered if it was required. Mr. McClendon stated it was mandatory.

Ms. Visconti asked about the font and wondered if there was any consideration for a different font and spacing. Mr. McClendon responded and discussed the design.

Mr. Phoenix wondered if the professional considered centering it on the span of the overhang rather than up against the Porte Cochère. He thought it needed a backing and thought it lacked uniqueness. Mr. McClendon responded.

Ms. Patterson liked the idea of a bronze back panel. She wondered if the signage could be placed lower, but Mr. McClendon stated that it would be blocked by landscaping.

Ms. Connaughton agreed that it felt too pushed in next to the Porte Cochère.

Ms. Visconti recommended adding a bronze plaque that hangs below the Porte Cochère.

Mr. Smith called for public comment. No one indicated a desire to speak.

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Mr. Phoenix to defer the project to the June 25, 2025, meeting. The motion was carried 4-3, with Messrs. Sammons, Smith, and Ms. Catlin dissenting.

10. ARCS-24-0622 225 VIA LINDA. The applicant, John and Heather Rogers, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for window and door replacement.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Mses. Catlin, Georgas, and Mr. Phoenix disclosed ex parte communications.

Patrick Segraves of SKA Architect + Planner presented the architectural plans for the project.

Mr. Sammons asked if there were mullions on the four doors at the front elevation. Mr. Segraves responded.

Ms. Shiverick asked if the muntin on the bay window could be thinner. Mr. Segraves responded with the dimensions and said that graphically, they looked thicker.

Mr. Smith called for public comment. No one indicated a desire to speak.

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Mr. Phoenix to approve the project as presented. The motion was carried 6-1, with Ms. Connaughton dissenting.

11. ARC-24-0125 936 N LAKE WAY The applicant, Pamela Cline, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for new garage door and pedestrian gate designs, driveway material changes and landscape modifications. *This item has been deferred to the June 25, 2025, meeting.*

**Note: This item was deferred to the meeting on June 25, 2025, at the Approval of the Agenda.*

12. ARC-24-0071 224 VIA MARILA The applicant, Adrian Tauro, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new, two-story single-family residence and attached accessory structure with final hardscape, landscape and swimming pool. *This item has been deferred to the June 25, 2025, meeting.*

**Note: This item was deferred to the meeting on June 25, 2025, at the Approval of the Agenda.*

13. ARC-25-0001 640 ISLAND DR. The applicant, 640 Florida Land Trust, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for fenestration changes, modification of entry gates with landscape and hardscape improvements. *This application has been removed from the agenda.*

**Note: This item was withdrawn from the meeting at the Approval of the Agenda.*

NEW BUSINESS

14. ARC-25-0015 12 VIA VIZCAYA. The applicant, County Down Trust (Environment Design Group), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for installation of a vehicular gate.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Dustin Mizell presented the plans for the vehicular gates for the site.

Ms. Shiverick raised the complaint from the neighbor, and Mr. Mizell responded.

Ms. Visconti wondered why the project was a new application. Mr. Mizell responded. She asked for confirmation that the landscape border between the two lots would remain the same. Mr. Mizell provided confirmation.

Mr. Sammons confirmed the gate width was still 12 feet, to which Mr. Mizell provided confirmation.

Mr. Smith called for public comment. No one indicated a desire to speak.

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Ms. Catlin to approve the project with the condition that the landscape is extended from the northeast corner to screen the proposed gate. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

15. ARC-25-0019 318 SEASPRAY AVE. The applicants, Robert & Elizabeth Russell, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications to the design of a previously approved new two-story residence and site improvements, including the incorporation of an attached cabana structure.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

There was no disclosure of ex parte communications.

Daniel Clavijo of Wadia Associates presented the architectural plans, and Cory Meyer of Nievera Williams presented the site's landscape and hardscape plans.

Ms. Catlin asked if the cabana could be reduced in height. Mr. Clavijo stated that the proposed height was required by FEMA.

Ms. Visconti asked if the trellis was removed to meet the cubic content requirements. Mr. Clavijo responded and stated that it was part of the reason.

Mr. Smith called for public comment. No one indicated a desire to speak.

Ms. Connaughton did not have any issue with the design. She wondered about the detail of the roof design for the cabana, and asked Mr. Clavijo about the design. Mr. Clavijo responded and stated he could lower the element.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Visconti to approve the project as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Churney announced that Claudia Visconti had declared a conflict of interest for 147 Dunbar Road at the April 23, 2025, meeting and correctly filled out the required state form.

Ms. Catlin asked about the zoning code reform and wondered if it was close enough to be sent to the commission for their review. Mr. Falco stated that it was not ready to be reviewed. Ms. Catlin thought that the design commissions should have the ability to review the changes.

Ms. Connaughton stated that the historical districts in West Palm Beach do not allow low-E windows on street facades. She wondered if Palm Beach could entertain the suggestion, as she thought this element created an eyesore. A short discussion ensued about this element.

MEETING SCHEDULE

16. The next meeting will be on Wednesday, June 25, 2025.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Phoenix to adjourn the meeting at 12:00 p.m. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Respectfully Submitted,



Jeffery W. Smith, Chair