



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 24, 2024

Please be advised that in keeping with a directive from the Town Council, the minutes of all Town Boards and Commissions will be "abbreviated" in style. Persons interested in listening to the meeting once it has concluded may access the audio of that item via the Town's website at www.townofpalmbeach.com.

I. **CALL TO ORDER**

Vice Chair Sammons called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

II. **ROLL CALL**

Jeffrey W. Smith, Chairman	ABSENT (Excused)
Richard F. Sammons, Vice Chairman	PRESENT
John David Corey, Member	PRESENT
Betsy Shiverick, Member	PRESENT
Thomas Kirchhoff, Member	PRESENT
Kenn Karakul, Member	PRESENT
Elizabeth Connaughton, Member	PRESENT
Dan Floersheimer, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Joshua L. Martin, Alternate Member	ABSENT (Unexcused)
Katherine "KT" Catlin, Alternate Member	PRESENT

Clerk's note: It was noted that Mr. Floersheimer voted in the absence of Mr. Smith.

Staff Members present were:

Friederike Mittner, Design and Preservation Manager
Sarah Pardue, Design & Preservation Planner
Bradley Falco, Planner II
Kelly Churney, Acting Town Clerk

III. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Vice Chair Sammons led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion was made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the minutes of the December 15, 2023, meeting as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

V. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Ms. Pardue indicated that the staff would pull the following items from the consent agenda and would be heard immediately following the approval of the consent agenda: ARC-23-163, 615 Crest Road, ARC-24-011, 301 Plantation Road, ARC-24-012, 212 Worth Avenue and ARC-24-013, 230 Brazilian Avenue.

A motion was made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the agenda as amended. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

VI. **ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH TO PERSONS WHO WISH TO TESTIFY**

Ms. Churney administered the oath and continued to do so throughout the meeting as necessary.

VII. **COMMENTS FROM THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEMBERS**

No comments were heard at this time.

VIII. **COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS REGARDING NON-AGENDA ITEMS (3 MINUTE LIMIT PLEASE)**

No comments were heard at this time.

IX. **PROJECT REVIEW**

A. **CONSENT AGENDA**

The following projects were pulled by commission members from the consent agenda: ARC-23-136, 1350 N. Lake Way, and ARC-24-017, 269 Queens Lane.

A motion was made by Mr. Corey and was seconded by Mr. Kirchhoff to approve the consent agenda as amended, which only included ARC-24-005, 1214 N. Ocean Blvd. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Clerk's note: The six consent items pulled from consent were immediately heard.

1. **ARC-23-136 1350 N LAKE WAY** The applicant, 1350 North Lake Way Acquisitions LLC, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the replacement of a vehicular gate, front door, and balcony railings and landscape and hardscape modifications.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by Mr. Floersheimer.

Mr. Kirchhoff stated he was not in favor of the railings as presented. Mr. Floersheimer agreed and was not in favor of the existing artificial turf.

Cory Meyer, Nievera Williams Design, indicated that he was unaware of the artificial turf but would make sure it was removed.

A motion was made by Mr. Corey and was seconded by Mr. Kirchhoff to approve the project with the original railings. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

2. **ARC-23-163 615 CREST RD.** The applicants, Richard and Ellen Richman, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a one-story addition to an existing two-story residence.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The architectural presentation was made by M. Mark Marsh with Bridges and Marsh Architects. The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Cory Meyer, with Nievera Williams Design.

Ms. Pardue stated that the staff removed the item from consent because they had received a letter about the project.

A motion was made by Mr. Floersheimer and was seconded by Mr. Corey to approve the project as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

3. **ARC-24-005 1214 N OCEAN BLVD.** The applicant, John and Diane Scully, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the installation of a second-floor pergola on an existing single-family residence.

Clerk's note: This project was approved on consent.

4. **ARC-24-011 301 PLANTATION RD.** The applicant, 301 Plantation LLC, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for exterior modifications to the previously approved façade and roof of a single-family residence.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

Clerk's note: Mr. Sammons declared a conflict of interest and left the dais during the discussion.

The architectural presentation was made by Jaime Torres-Cruz with Fairfax and Sammons.

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

Ms. Shiverick was in favor of the changes but preferred the original front door.

Mr. Floersheimer asked about fenestration changes on the north and south elevations. He discussed the fenestration designs with Mr. Torres-Cruz.

Ms. Catlin was in favor of the changes.

Mr. Kirchhoff had issues with the fenestration on the front elevation and the thinner chimney shown on the rear elevation. He also preferred the cabana previously shown. A short discussion ensued about the proposed cabana building.

Ms. Connaughton thought some of the detailing and character had been lost in the changes. She preferred the previously proposed cabana building.

Mr. Karakul was in favor of most of the changes. He questioned the columns by the bay windows and the redesign of the cabana.

Mr. Corey questioned the material for the doors and windows. He also questioned the doors on the north elevation and recommended removing the transoms. He was in favor of the previously proposed bay window on the east elevation. He asked about the changes to the garage doors, questioned the windows on the west elevation, and preferred the previously existing cabana.

There was a discussion about the motion.

A motion was made by Mr. Floersheimer and was seconded by Mr. Kirchhoff to defer the project to the meeting on February 28, 2024. The motion was carried 6-1, with Mr. Karakul dissenting.

5. **ARC-24-012 212 WORTH AVE.** The applicant, Mauro Brothers on behalf of 212 Worth Avenue LLC, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a minor project for the replacement of existing storefronts and windows with an aluminum product.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The architectural presentation was made by Tony Mauro with Mauro Brothers.

Ms. Connaughton thought the professional should change the material for the proposed windows. She thought a historically accurate window was most appropriate.

Mr. Corey thought the transoms should be restored. He stated he could not support the application as presented.

Mr. Kirchhoff agreed with his fellow commissioners. He thought the material should return to painted Mahogany.

Mr. Floersheimer agreed and thought the pecky cypress outlookers on the building needed attention.

Mr. Karakul thought the simple sash windows were inappropriate for the building.

A motion was made by Mr. Corey and was seconded by Mr. Floersheimer to defer the project to the meeting on February 28, 2024. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

6. **ARC-24-013 230 BRAZILIAN AVE.** The applicants, Jon & Patricia Baker, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for landscape and hardscape modifications to an existing residence.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Dustin Mizell with Environment Design Group.

Mr. Karakul asked if taller palm trees could be added. Mr. Mizell responded.

Mr. Sammons called for public comment.

Marisa Arredondo, 232 Brazilian Avenue, discussed the issues with removing the existing landscape between the subject property and her property.

Mr. Mizell stated he was happy to meet with the neighbor and would accept a deferral.

Mr. Corey asked if the plans showed the existing and proposed plans. He asked the professional to provide those plans to the commission.

Mr. Kirchhoff asked to see photographs at the next presentation.

Ms. Catlin wondered if something could be planted to add a buffer until additional items could be planted. Ms. Arredondo appreciated the suggestion but said she would rather wait for the board to decide.

Mr. Floersheimer wondered if a green construction screen could be added until a plan was implemented. Mr. Shiverick agreed.

A motion was made by Ms. Shiverick and was seconded by Mr. Corey to defer the project to the meeting on February 28, 2024, with the condition that Mr. Mizell and the neighbor meet to discuss a plan that works for both parties and that a 16–20-foot green construction fence shall be installed until the landscaping can be replaced. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

7. **ARC-24-017 269 QUEENS LANE** The applicant, Kevin and Elizabeth McNamara, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the installation of a generator and required screening walls.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by Ms. Connaughton and Mr. Karakul.

Ms. Shiverick asked if the generator enclosure could be relocated so that it was behind the home. Ms. Forrest explained it would not be visible because of the number of plants that would surround the unit.

Caroline Forrest, with MHK Architecture, presented the architectural plans. She confirmed that the enclosure would not be seen from the street.

A motion was made by Mr. Corey and was seconded by Mr. Floersheimer to approve the project as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

B. MAJOR PROJECTS-OLDBUSINESS

- 1. ARC-23-094 (ZON-23-072) 247-251 WORTH AVE (COMBO)** The applicant, Holbrook Real Estate LLC, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a two-story addition to an existing one-story commercial building under the Special Allowances in accordance with the Worth Avenue Design Guidelines, including several variances from lot coverage, floor area square footage, commercial and residential use locations, parking requirements, landscape open space, and loading space requirements. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.
Clerk's note: Ms. Catlin and Mr. Floersheimer declared a conflict of interest and left the dais during the discussion.

James Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, Zoning and Building, provided information on the Worth Avenue Design Guidelines.

Mr. Corey confirmed that the special exceptions would be decided by the Town Council. He then confirmed that the Commission should review the special allowances, the variances, and the general architecture.

Maura Ziska, the attorney for the project, advocated for a positive decision and a positive recommendation to the Town Council.

Mr. Karakul thought the proposed project was in line with the Worth Avenue Design Guidelines and thought density should be added in town to infill where there was already intensity rather than granting variances for a new building on a vacant lot. Mr. Sammons agreed.

Roger Janssen, with Dailey Janssen Architects, presented the architectural plans. Dustin Mizell, with Environment Design Group, presented the landscape and hardscape plans.

Mr. Sammons called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny, Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, thanked the applicant and the owners for working with her organization on the proposed changes. She thought the changes had been significant, and the first floor had been restored to reflect the historic design. She also commented on the changes to the additional floors.

Mr. Karakul liked the project and supported it. He expressed concern about the fenestration as proposed. He thought the windows on the 2nd and 3rd floors needed work because they were not consistent.

Mr. Corey asked about the special allowances. Given the first variance being sought, he wondered if the guidelines envisioned more of a varied height project. Mr. Janssen said they were using the existing conditions since there was a larger

ground level. Secondly, he thought it was imperative for the second floor to stretch from property line to property line in terms of urban design. Mr. Corey asked how the third floor worked with the special allowance to rent the third floor. He noted that public amenities must be provided according to the guidelines. Mr. Janssen stated the amenities he believed were being exchanged under the request for a special allowance. Mr. Corey was also concerned about the staircase in the courtyard.

Ms. Shiverick thought the owner should be recognized for changing the first floor to reflect the historic nature of the building. She thought the proposed changes would enhance Worth Avenue. She agreed with Messrs. Karakul and Sammons that the additional intensity on Worth Avenue was appropriate. She asked about the awnings proposed. She agreed that the black windows should be made of different materials.

Ms. Connaughton agreed with the comments about the owner changing the first floor to reflect the historic nature of the building. She questioned the width of the façade and the larger shops on the second floor. She requested more information on three-story Art Deco buildings. She also asked to see additional elevations from the Worth Avenue perspective. She thought the building seemed very large. She was not in favor of removing the courtyard stairs. Mr. Janssen provided his response.

Mr. Kirchhoff thought it was a nice project for the street. He appreciated the owner changing the first floor and that the second floor was subservient. He agreed a restudy of the fenestration was needed and wondered if the second floor should be residential. Mr. Janssen provided his response.

Mr. Corey agreed with Ms. Connaughton's comments. He agreed that the courtyard would seem dark. He also wondered if the second floor should be changed to residential.

Mr. Karakul wondered if the east and west wings with the terraces above could be pushed back. He wondered if that change would align the design more with Art Deco.

Mr. Sammons thought the changes were a vast improvement to the street. He discussed the setbacks and wondered if pushing back the middle of the building would be more appropriate. He thought the details of the design would be significant. He made a suggestion for the awning and eyebrow window designs. He thought the stairs in the courtyard needed to be restudied. He commented on the pilasters in the courtyard.

Ms. Ziska stated that the owner had agreed to change the color of the windows on the second and third floors.

Mr. Corey asked the staff to comment on the second floor and whether it should be for residential or commercial use.

A motion was made by Mr. Kirchhoff and was seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the project, with a restudy of the following items, which will return

to the meeting on February 28, 2024: the stairs in the courtyard, the fenestration on the Worth Avenue façade, the setbacks of the middle portion and wings of the front façade of the building, and the eyebrow windows. The motion was carried 4-2, with Mr. Corey and Ms. Connaughton dissenting.

A motion was made by Mr. Kirchhoff and was seconded by Mr. Karakul that the subject redevelopment project is consistent with the adopted urban design goals for Worth Avenue, the East-End Development Area objectives, and, more specifically, the criteria for approval for granting special allowances, subject to any imposed conditions are endorsed. The motion was carried 4-2, with Mr. Corey and Ms. Connaughton dissenting.

A motion was made by Mr. Kirchhoff and was seconded by Mr. Karakul that the implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject property. The motion was carried 5-1, with Mr. Corey dissenting.

Clerk's note: A short break was taken at 10:58 a.m. The meeting resumed at 11:15 a.m.

Council President Zeidman commented on the reasons that the Town Council sent the project back to the Commission prior to their ruling.

2. ARC-23-145 (ZON-23-113) 123 CHILEAN AVE (COMBO) The applicant, Robert & Perri Bishop, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new two-story single-family residence and one-story accessory cabana structure with final hardscape, landscape and swimming pool, requiring Special Exception approval to develop a nonconforming parcel and variances to reduce the required side setbacks and to exceed the maximum cubic content ratio (CCR) permitted. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The architectural presentation was made by Patrick Segraves, SKA Architect + Planner. He explained the variances requested for the design. The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Steve West, Parker Yanette Design Group.

Mr. Sammons called for public comment.

Jarrett Kling, 360 S. Ocean Avenue, thought the home was charming. He expressed concern about the setbacks because he thought it was too close to his pool. He requested screening on the east side of the property during construction to protect his vegetation.

Mr. Kirchhoff referred to the rendering of the front of the house where two windows with shutters were paired together. He did not feel that it worked, as shown. He liked the Monterey design style. He questioned the four doors on the front elevation. Mr. Segraves responded.

Mr. Karakul questioned the character of the front door with the Monterey design style. He thought a more authentic door was appropriate.

Ms. Shiverick thought a different design style would have been more appropriate for this location. Mr. Segraves responded.

Mr. Corey thought the variances made sense for the home. He questioned the small gable proportions on the front elevation.

Ms. Connaughton thought the variances were necessary for the lot. She questioned whether the second floor could be slightly reduced in height. She thought a reduction would help with the proportions of the front façade. She recommended aligning the loggia and the kitchen.

Mr. Floersheimer agreed with Ms. Connaughton's comments on the height of the second floor. He wondered if the professional considered a single-story home. Mr. Segraves responded. Mr. Floersheimer wondered if the mechanical equipment could be moved to the rear of the cabana. Mr. Segraves responded.

Ms. Catlin suggested that the motion include a condition for construction screening.

Ms. Connaughton thought the accessory building was appropriate for the neighborhood.

Mr. Sammons questioned the proportions of the front door. He thought the second-floor height should be reduced. He questioned some details, such as the rafter and the lintel. He provided suggestions to improve the design, front gable, the stucco band, and the string course.

A motion was made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Connaughton to defer the project to the meeting on February 28, 2024. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

3. **ARC-23-052 (ZON-23-092) 300 COLONIAL LN (COMBO)** The applicants, Dragana & Richard Connaughton, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new two-story single-family residence requiring (2) variances from east side yard setback and (1) variance from mechanical equipment regulations and construction of a detached accessory structure requiring (2) setback variances, (1) lot coverage variance and (1) angle of vision variance, together with final hardscape, landscape, and swimming pool. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Clerk's note: Ms. Connaughton declared a conflict of interest and left the dais during the discussion.

Maura Ziska, the attorney, explained the variances and requested a positive recommendation to the Town Council. The architectural presentation was made by Patrick O'Connell with Patrick Ryan O'Connell Architects. The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Dustin Mizell with Environment Design Group.

Mr. Sammons called for public comment.

Susan Leas, 292 Colonial Lane, expressed opposition to the proposed project.

Ken Franklin, 1105 N. Lake Way, expressed opposition to the proposed project.

Dragana Connaughton, the property owner, responded to the comments made by neighbors and advocated for approval of her proposed project.

Richard Connaughton, the property owner, advocated for approval of his proposed project.

Ms. Catlin was in favor of the changes to the front elevation. She thought the two-story home was appropriate and was sized appropriately for the lot. She acknowledged that the slat house triggered many of the variances. She wondered if it could be moved. Mr. O'Connell responded.

Mr. Kirchhoff thought the slat house was charming, and the variances should be left to the Town Council. He made a design suggestion for the garage. He also questioned the four windows grouped together on the second floor on the east elevation. He questioned the fenestration on the south elevation. He wondered if the porch on the south elevation was too high. He questioned the need for a variance on the main house.

Mr. Karakul liked the house and thought it was interesting. He agreed with Mr. Kirchhoff's comments on the slat house. He supported the variances requested. He thought the house was in keeping with the north end.

Mr. Corey agreed with Mr. Kirchhoff's comments. He had an issue with the east setback.

Ms. Shiverick thought the home was cute and thought it would be approved on other streets. However, she questioned the two-story home on the lot. She had an issue with the shed roof over the garage.

Mr. Floersheimer agreed with many of the Commissioners' comments. He thought the slat house should be made of wood rather than masonry.

Mr. Sammons supported the variances. However, he did have a problem with the design scale; he thought the scale should be domestic. He provided some suggestions for the fenestration.

A motion was made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Floersheimer to defer the project to the meeting on February 28, 2024. The motion was carried 6-1, with Mr. Karakul dissenting.

4. **ARC-23-167 (ZON-24-009) 350 SEABREEZE AVE (COMBO)** The applicant, Judith Goodman (Contract Purchaser, Justin Besikof /Rep. Maura Ziska), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the design of a new two-story single-family residence and sitewide landscape and hardscape improvements, requiring a variance to not provide garage parking. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to the zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The architectural presentation was made by Patrick Segraves, SKA Architect + Planner. The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Dustin Mizell with Environment Design Group.

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

Mr. Corey thought the home was charming, and he was in favor of the carport. He questioned the gable on the design. He asked about the hardscape material. Mr. Mizell responded. Mr. Corey recommended a solid material for the steps.

Ms. Shiverick wondered if the owner would consider a painted trim rather than a Mahogany trim. Mr. Segraves provided an alternate color for the trim and the front door.

Mr. Kirchhoff asked about the trim around the walkway. Mr. Segraves stated he could study the hardscape.

Mr. Sammons questioned the recess of the front door and the proportions of some of the design elements on the front façade. He provided suggestions to change some of the elements on the front façade.

A motion was made by Mr. Kirchhoff and was seconded by Mr. Corey to approve the project, with a restudy of the front hardscape and with the condition that the colors of the doors and windows are changed, as presented. The motion was carried 6-1, with Mr. Sammons dissenting.

A motion was made by Mr. Kirchhoff and was seconded by Mr. Karakul that the implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject property. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Clerk's note: A lunch break was taken at 12:48 p.m. The meeting resumed at 1:57 p.m.

5. **ARC-23-144 216 TRADEWIND DR.** The applicant, 216 Tradewind Trust

(Rep. Carl Sabatello), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new two-story single-family residence with sitewide landscape and hardscape improvements.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The architectural presentation was made by Rafael Portuondo, Portuondo Perotti Architects. The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Dustin Mizell with Environment Design Group.

Mr. Sammons called for public comment.

Tom Parker, 215 Jamaica Lane, provided supportive comments for the proposed home.

Anthony Beyer, 200 Tradewind Drive, noted that he had submitted a letter and provided comments of concern for the proposed home. Messrs. Portuondo and Mizell responded to the comments.

Jamie Crowley, the attorney for the owner, stated that the one-story portion of the home was on the side of Mr. Beyer, and he did not believe the neighbor would be affected.

Mr. Kirchhoff asked about the buffer between Mr. Beyer and the subject property. Messrs. Portuondo and Mizell responded. Mr. Kirchhoff asked about the roof material proposed. Mr. Kirchhoff provided suggestions on the cap for the stucco wall as well as the alternative for the rear of the property, which was shown with arches. He questioned the height of the one-story portion of the home.

Mr. Corey thought the home was over-scaled for the site. He thought the bulk of the home was too tall. He questioned the scale of the fenestration. He thought the two-story portion of the home needed to be restudied, as well as the roof material. He requested a specimen tree for the site.

Ms. Shiverick thought the home was nice but felt the home did not fit in on the north end of the island. She thought the home was too tall. She recommended more of a compound rather than one large mass.

Mr. Floersheimer questioned the site wall on the southwest corner of the lot.

Ms. Connaughton thought the home suited the street. She asked about the width of the two-story portion of the home. She thought the two-story portion was a bit tall compared to the one-story.

Mr. Karakul thought the home was well-designed. He thought the landscaping was sensitive. He thought the home was appropriate for the site. He did agree with the comments about the roof material.

Mr. Sammons asked for scale figures on the drawings. He thought the house design was excellent but was concerned about the scale. He thought the width and depth could be reduced. He thought the roof pitch issue would be resolved if the scale was reduced.

Mr. Karakul suggested the addition of tall trees on the site to mitigate any imposing issues.

A motion was made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to defer the project to the meeting on February 28, 2024. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

6. **ARC-23-140 (ZON-23-118) 2278 IBIS ISLE RD (COMBO)** The applicant, Angel Arroyo, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for exterior modifications to an existing one-story residence, including the demolition of an existing screen porch, a new roof, façade and window alterations, and a variance to not provide the required garage enclosure for two vehicles. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The architectural presentation was made by Kyle Fant, Bartholemew + Partners. The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Dustin Mizell with Environment Design Group.

Mr. Sammons called for public comment.

Lawrence Kaplan, 2299 Ibis Isle Road, representing many neighbors, expressed several concerns about the proposed plans and lack of updates to the home.

Ms. Catlin thought the elimination of the garage was a mistake. Mr. Fant responded.

Mr. Kirchhoff thought the home should have a garage. He stated he could not support the project.

Mr. Sammons did not believe a homeowner should be forced to have a garage.

Mr. Karakul wondered if a variance would be required to add more square footage in a different area of the home. Mr. Fant responded.

Ms. Connaughton thought it was up to the homeowner whether they had a garage. She also thought more landscaping should be added.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the previous concern for the front bedroom window. Mr. Mizell responded.

Mr. Corey agreed and thought the landscaping should be a statement for the neighborhood. He questioned the removal of the garage.

Mr. Kaplan requested a hedge to be planted around the entire property.

A motion was made by Mr. Corey and was seconded by Ms. Shiverick to approve the project as presented, with the following conditions: larger landscaping shall be added to the site, and a hedge shall be installed to wrap around the property. The motion was carried 5-2, with Mr. Floersheimer and Ms. Catlin dissenting.

A motion was made by Mr. Corey and was seconded by Ms. Connaughton that the implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject property. The motion was carried 5-2, with Mr. Floersheimer and Ms. Catlin dissenting.

Clerk's note: Mr. Kirchhoff left the meeting at 2:45 p.m. He returned at 3:22 p.m. Ms. Catlin voted in his absence.

7. **ARC-23-092 (ZON-23-070) 217 BAHAMA LN (COMBO)** The applicant, James and Sarah McCann, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new two-story single-family residence and associated landscape and hardscape on a lot substandard in lot depth in the R-B zoning district. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The architectural presentation was made by Roger Janssen, Dailey Janssen Architects. The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Cory Meyer with Nievera Williams Design.

Mr. Sammons called for public comment.

Sarah McCann, the homeowner, discussed her intent with the renovations.

Ms. Shiverick thought the changes had enhanced the home. She thought the cabana took up much of the landscape. She wondered if it could be altered. Ms. McCann discussed the intent for the cabana space. Ms. Shiverick wondered if the garage doors could be changed to look a bit nicer.

Mr. Corey thought the changes were good, and he was in favor of the gables and dormers. He was in favor of the landscape plan as well. He supported the home.

Mr. Karakul agreed and liked the changes. He supported the home.

Mr. Sammons took issue with the roof plan and the garage on the street. He questioned many of the details.

Mr. Floersheimer disagreed with Mr. Sammons. He liked the different design of the roof. He understood that a few tweaks could enhance the design.

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

8. **ARC-23-090 (ZON-23-068) 206 CARIBBEAN RD (COMBO)** The applicant, Walter Wick, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new two-story single-family residence with landscape, hardscape, and pool on a nonconforming parcel. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The architectural presentation was made by Roger Janssen, Dailey Janssen Architects. The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Dustin Mizell with Environment Design Group.

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

Ms. Connaughton asked about the little balcony over the garage. She thought the roof of the balcony on the front should be an extension of the eave. She thought the design had been improved and liked the alternate entry as submitted.

Mr. Floersheimer asked about the proposed awning. Mr. Janssen responded.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the colors proposed for the home. She liked the previous window over the garage door. She liked the alternate entry as submitted.

Mr. Corey stated he did not receive any landscape details in his plans. He thought the changes were good but did not think he could decide without the plans.

Mr. Sammons questioned the height of the doors. He provided suggestions on the fenestration.

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and was seconded by Ms. Shiverick to approve the project, as presented, with the alternate sketch of the front door as shown. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

9. **ARC-23-135 225 WELLS RD.** The applicant, LLPB Trust (Andrea Lenczner, Trustee), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new two-story single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape, and swimming pool.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The architectural presentation was made by Daniel Menard with LaBerge and Menard.

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

Mr. Corey asked about the balconies and railings. Mr. Menard responded. Mr. Corey thought the home fit on the street. He thought the home would have been very nice as a courtyard home. He stated he would support the home.

Ms. Shiverick wondered about the gardens on the second floor. Todd Maclean, with Todd Maclean Outdoors, responded.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the changes to the front façade. Mr. Menard stated no changes had been made.

Mr. Sammons thought the garages were too small and preferred the previous design. Mr. Sammons made a recommendation for the fenestration. He wondered if the addition of rafter tails would enhance the design. He agreed with Mr. Corey and thought a courtyard house would be nice.

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and was seconded by Mr. Corey to approve the project as presented with the conditions that the following items will return to the meeting on February 28, 2024: a reconsideration to make the front parapet taller, a restudy of the rear parapet elevation, and to modulate the eaves around the home. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

10. **ARC-23-075 389 S LAKE DR.** The applicant, Cooperative Apartments of Three Eighty-Nine Corporation, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the permanent removal of the decorative concrete brise soleil architectural feature of an existing six-story residential building and other exterior building modifications including window opening enhancements and the addition of a new decorative metal grilles and associated improvements. This item has been deferred to the February 28, 2024, meeting.

Clerk's note: This item was deferred to the February 28, 2024, meeting at Item V., Approval of the Agenda.

11. **ARC-23-142 318 SEASPRAY AVE.** The applicants, Robert and Elizabeth Russell, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the design of a new two-story single-family residence with sitewide landscape and hardscape improvements. This item has been deferred to the February 28, 2024, meeting.

Clerk's note: This item was deferred to the February 28, 2024, meeting at Item V., Approval of the Agenda.

12. **ARC-23-109 (ZON-23-084) 600 TARPON WAY (COMBO)** The applicants, Frank and Annie Falk, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new two-story single-family residence over 10,000 SF with sitewide landscape and hardscape improvements, requiring variances for mechanical equipment placement,

building height plane, and site wall height, and a Special Exception for vehicular gate placement. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval. This item has been deferred to the February 28, 2024, meeting.

Clerk's note: This item was deferred to the February 28, 2024, meeting at Item V., Approval of the Agenda.

C. MAJOR PROJECTS-NEWBUSINESS

Clerk's note: Ms. Mittner requested to move the following project to fall first under major projects – new business.

1. **ARC-24-007 (ZON-24-017) 222 WORTH AVE (COMBO)** The applicants, Louis Vuitton America, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for exterior façade alterations, including a new ground floor storefront system, awnings, and new signage. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The architectural presentation was made by Ludovica Douglas from Atmosphere.

Mr. Sammons called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny, Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, provided some original drawings of the structure. She talked about how the building elements had evolved from 1945 into the 1960's. She thought the transom and the wood door were original, and the transom was indicative of early architecture.

Mr. Sammons discussed the Worth Avenue Design Guidelines in relation to the proposed project. He thought the individual branding of the stores should be second to the architectural cohesiveness of the building itself and the street.

Mr. Floersheimer wondered if the historical nature of the design, which included a beautiful symmetrical relationship between the first and second floors, could be brought back to Worth Avenue. Mr. Floersheimer questioned the need for two Louis Vuitton signs plus the logo. Ms. Douglas stated a tree obstruction was the reason for some of the signage.

Mr. Corey asked about the windows on the second floor. Mr. Corey stated he had issues with the application and wished the large plated glass windows could retain some of the original character.

Ms. Shiverick thought the panel door with the transom needed to remain or be replaced as it existed. She was not in favor of the black trim for the windows. Mr. Douglas stated that the window sizes would remain the same size. Ms. Douglas advocated for the black awning.

Ms. Connaughton agreed with Ms. Shiverick to maintain the front door.

Mr. Karakul agreed with Ms. Shiverick and thought the door should be retained. He also was not in favor of the door with the side light. Ms. Douglas responded. He questioned whether the awnings were special enough for the store.

Mr. Kirchhoff liked the original symmetrical design. He thought the windows should be painted white. He also wondered if the doors should be arranged to reference the historic drawing.

Mr. Sammons thought corporate identity should come second to architecture. He thought the design should reflect the historic drawings.

The commissioners provided some suggestions for the redesign.

A motion was made by Mr. Floersheimer and seconded by Mr. Karakul to defer the project to the meeting on February 28, 2024. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

2. **ARC-24-003 232 LA PUERTA WAY** The applicant, La Puerta Project LLC (Peter Burt), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new two-story single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape, and swimming pool.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The architectural presentation was made by Roger Janssen, Dailey Janssen Architecture.

Mr. Sammons called for public comment.

Mr. Floersheimer asked about the difference in proposed fenestration.

The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Cory Meyer with Nievera Williams Design.

Mr. Corey asked about the trees proposed for the front of the site. Mr. Meyer responded. Mr. Corey supported the landscaping and thought the home was interesting. Mr. Corey recommended reducing the second-floor height.

Ms. Catlin thought the home had charm. She also wondered if the second-floor elevation would appear too high, as shown in the rendering. Mr. Janssen agreed to make an adjustment.

Ms. Connaughton agreed the two-story portion of the home was too tall. She asked about a new roof detail. Mr. Janssen explained the design. She recommended simplifying the massing of the home.

Mr. Kirchhoff liked the design of the home. He agreed the second floor was too tall. He had some issues with the fenestration as designed. He discussed the fenestration with Mr. Janssen. He was not in favor of the three doors on the first floor on the west elevation.

Mr. Floersheimer asked about the family room fireplace without a chimney. Mr. Janssen responded.

Ms. Shiverick expressed concern about the shutter color. She recommended a taupe color. Mr. Janssen said they would look at other options.

Mr. Sammons questioned the pitch of the roof with the cedar shingles. He also questioned the fenestration as proposed. He agreed the two-story portion of the home was too tall.

A motion was made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Karakul to defer the project to the meeting on February 28, 2024. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

3. **ARC-23-104 (ZON-23-076) 1295 S OCEAN BLVD (COMBO)** The applicant, WEMIO LLC (Tom Waller, Chief Operating Officer), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the installation of a clay tennis court with viewing platform along with related hardscape and landscape improvements, including new site entry walls, columns, vehicular gates, and supplemental parking area. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Dustin Mizell with Environment Design Group.

Ms. Shiverick wondered if the tennis court would be lighted. Mr. Mizell indicated that it would not be lit.

Mr. Floersheimer asked about the drainage next to the seawall or if any thought had been given to increasing the height of the seawall. Mr. Mizell responded.

Mr. Karakul asked about the piers and wondered if they matched what was across the street. Mr. Mizell said yes, they would match.

Ms. Catlin asked about the large parking lot. Mr. Mizell responded.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and was seconded by Mr. Floersheimer to approve the project as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

A motion was made by Ms. Connaughton and was seconded by Mr. Karakul that the implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject property. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

4. **ARC-23-161 (ZON-24-006) 129 CHILEAN AVE (COMBO)** The applicant, Ch1129 LLC (George Mykoniatis), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new two-story single-family residence on an existing non-conforming parcel requiring a special exception with site plan review and (3) variances related to proposed setbacks and garage parking. This is a combination project that shall be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to the zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

Mr. Timothy Hanlon, the attorney, explained the variances and requested a positive recommendation to the Town Council. The architectural presentation was made by Kyle Fant, Bartholemew + Partners. The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Dustin Mizell with Environment Design Group.

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

Ms. Connaughton was very supportive of the project. Her only critique was the amount of proposed paving.

Mr. Corey asked about the height of the second-floor ceiling. Mr. Corey asked about the stucco vents on the gable. Mr. Fant responded the vents were nonfunctioning.

Mr. Shiverick asked about the copper pipes. Mr. Fant responded. Ms. Shiverick thought the home was charming.

Mr. Floersheimer supported the project.

Mr. Sammons asked about the design of the windows and the walls. He provided a suggestion for the design of the columns. He asked about the color of the home. Mr. Sammons suggested a lower door for the arched door. Mr. Fant responded.

Mr. Kirchhoff wondered how the home would be air-conditioned. Mr. Fant responded there would be four air handlers, one for each floor.

Mr. Sammons commented on the proportions of the structure.

A motion was made by Mr. Kirchhoff and was seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the project as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

A motion was made by Ms. Connaughton and was seconded by Mr. Karakul that the implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject property. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Clerk's note: Mr. Corey left the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

5. **ARC-23-166 1150 N OCEAN WAY**. The applicant, 1150 N Ocean Way LLC (Michael Burns, Authorized Member), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the design of a new two-story single-family residence with sitewide landscape and hardscape improvements.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The architectural presentation was made by Clemens Schaub, Clemens Bruns Schaub Architect & Associates. The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Jeffrey Haviland, The Associates Studio LLC.

Mr. Sammons called for public comment.

The following individuals spoke in concern and/or opposition to the proposed project:

Mary Carlino, 210 La Puerta Way
Carrie Murray, 200 La Puerta Way
JB Murray, 200 La Puerta Way
Liza Pulitzer, 263 El Pueblo Way

Mr. Schaub stated the letter had been received from the Murrays. He showed a sun study that his team performed, acknowledging that the sun would not be blocked on their property by the proposed design.

Mr. Karakul thought the developer had been gracious about the square footage but thought there was a cleverer way to bring the back pieces forward and make them part of the courtyard.

Ms. Catlin thought there was too much hardscape around the driveways. She thought the proposed home was too much house for the neighborhood. She was not in favor of the stretch of the main mass proposed. She did not believe the home fit into the neighborhood.

Mr. Floersheimer expressed concern about the number of garages proposed. He thought the scale of the home was inappropriate and would loom over the neighbors. He thought there were many solutions for the site, and a major revision was needed.

Ms. Shiverick agreed with Mr. Floersheimer and Ms. Catlin. She thought it was the wrong style and much too big for the neighborhood.

Mr. Kirchhoff asked for better details and dimensions to be submitted in any future submittals. He questioned the sense of whimsy and style. He did not believe the materials proposed were commensurate with Palm Beach. Mr. Schaub responded. Mr. Kirchhoff thought the home needed a major restudy.

Ms. Connaughton thought that the neighbors would lose their light due to the massing against their neighbors.

Mr. Floersheimer asked about the ceiling heights proposed. Mr. Schaub responded.

Mr. Sammons thought the house was well done. However, given the style, he thought it would be a lot more successful if it were lower and more horizontal. He said whether the second-story masses were moved, they needed to move away from the setback.

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to defer the project to the meeting on February 28, 2024. The motion was carried 6-1, with Mr. Floersheimer dissenting.

6. **ARC-24-004 (ZON-24-014) 334 CHILEANAVE (COMBO)** The applicant, Overflow Pad Too LLC (Bradley McPherson, Authorized Representative), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications to previously approved hardscape, landscape, and site walls with incorporation of new vehicular gates at a previously approved new-single family residence; with variances required to exceed maximum site wall heights and minimum equipment setbacks. The Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Grace Walton with Environment Design Group.

Mr. Sammons called for public comment.

Paul Dassenko, 328 Chilean Avenue, expressed objections to the proposed project.

Ms. Walton responded.

Mr. Sammons inquired whether the proposed wall was taller than what was approved. Dustin Mizell, Environment Design Group, responded.

Ms. Shiverick was not in favor of the vehicular gate on Chilean; she did not think it was appropriate for the neighborhood. Ms. Walton explained why the gate was requested.

Ms. Catlin asked about the relocation of the equipment. Ms. Walton responded.

Mr. Floersheimer agreed with Ms. Shiverick and did not believe the area was appropriate for a vehicular gate. Mr. Floersheimer asked the neighbor if he preferred a taller wall or to see the equipment.

Mr. Dassenko accepted a taller wall where the equipment was located.

Mr. Floersheimer continued to discuss the location of the pool equipment.

A motion was made by Mr. Kirchhoff and seconded by Ms. Connaughton to approve the project; however, the vehicular gates and the trash enclosure were not included in the approval. The motion was carried 6-1, with Ms. Shiverick dissenting.

A motion was made by Mr. Kirchhoff and was seconded by Mr. Karakul that the implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject property. The motion was carried 5-2, with Ms. Shiverick and Mr. Floersheimer dissenting.

Clerk's note: Mr. Corey returned to the meeting at 6:58 p.m.

7. **ARC-24-009 260 MIRAFLORES DR.** The applicant, KEAN Development of Palm Beach, Inc. (Giorgio Citarella, Agent), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new two-story single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape, swimming pool and spa.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The architectural presentation was made by Patrick Collins, Kean Designs Ltd. The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Dustin Mizell with Environment Design Group.

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

Ms. Shiverick thought the garages were too large, and the roofs on the home and garage made the home look bigger. She thought the front door pediment was overly ornate. The embellishments on the portico over the front door were also overly ornate.

Mr. Karakul stated that with the elevation from the street, the dormers and the crown piece seemed unnecessary. The driveway entrance could be interesting with vegetation, mitigating the white driveway and home.

Mr. Kirchhoff asked about the size of the front door and windows. Mr. Collins responded. He recommended reducing the roof pitch and thought the details needed to be refined.

Ms. Catlin liked the house but thought it overpowered the other homes in the neighborhood.

Mr. Floersheimer agreed that the front façade was too ornate for the neighborhood. He questioned the flat roofs and wondered if the home needed to be reduced.

Mr. Corey thought the home was too big and tall for the site. He thought the home needed to be reduced in scale. He stated he could not support the home.

Ms. Connaughton thought the home was incongruent with the neighborhood.

Mr. Sammons thought the details were not consistent throughout the design. He thought the home needed to be scaled down.

A motion was made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Mr. Floersheimer to defer the project to the meeting on March 27, 2024. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

8. **ARC-24-010 243 SEASPRAY AVE.** The applicant, 243 Seaspray LLC (Larry Meyer, Manager), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new two-story single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape, and swimming pool.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Ex-parte communication was disclosed by several members.

The architectural presentation was made by Rafael Portuondo, Portuondo Perotti Architects. The landscape and hardscape presentation was made by Dustin Mizell with Environment Design Group.

Mr. Sammons called for public comment.

Maisie Grace, 247 Seaspray Avenue, provided her comments and concerns about the project.

Anne Pepper, 333 Seaspray Avenue, provided her comments and concerns about the project.

Ms. Catlin thought the home was a bit formal and needed to be dressed down so that the home fit onto the street.

Mr. Karakul thought the professional had worked with the neighbors. However, he felt some details seemed too fancy and unnecessary.

Mr. Corey thought the home was beautiful and thought the massing and scale worked on the street. He thought the home could be toned down a bit. He recommended removing the vehicular gate. Mr. Corey asked about the specimen tree and if the professional would consider adding an additional tree where the Pidgeon Plums were proposed.

Mr. Kirchhoff asked about the trees in front of the pergola: he wondered if they were too formal. He liked the architecture of the home; he wondered if the pergola was too formal and thought the living room ceiling was too tall.

Ms. Connaughton questioned how the house occupied the site. She was in favor of the proposed architecture.

Ms. Shiverick liked the home. She agreed it could be a little showy but wondered what could be removed. She asked about the muntins on the east elevation windows. Mr. Portuondo responded. She liked the suggestion to remove the vehicular gates but to add a pedestrian gate.

Mr. Sammons thought many elements of the design were too tall and needed to be reduced. He also suggested toning down the design elements.

A motion was made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Mr. Floersheimer to defer the project to the meeting on February 28, 2024. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

X. **Unscheduled Items**

A. **Public**

No comments were heard at this time.

B. **Staff**

No comments were heard at this time.

C. **Commission**

Mr. Karakul expressed concern about the lighting at the north entrance of the Palm Beach Country Club.

XI. **NEXT MEETING DATE:** Wednesday, February 28, 2024

XII. **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Floersheimer to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 p.m. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, February 28, 2024, at 9:00 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 S. County Road.

Respectfully Submitted,



Richard F. Sammons, Vice Chairman
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

kmc

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME <i>Floersheimer, Dan</i>	NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <i>Architectural Commission</i>
MAILING ADDRESS <i>125 Chateaux Dr.</i>	THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: ☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY
CITY COUNTY <i>Palm Beach Palm Beach</i>	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <i>Town of Palm Beach</i>
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED <i>January 24, 2024</i>	MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ APPOINTIVE

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

This form is for use by any person serving at the county, city, or other local level of government on an appointed or elected board, council, commission, authority, or committee. It applies to members of advisory and non-advisory bodies who are presented with a voting conflict of interest under Section 112.3143, Florida Statutes.

Your responsibilities under the law when faced with voting on a measure in which you have a conflict of interest will vary greatly depending on whether you hold an elective or appointive position. For this reason, please pay close attention to the instructions on this form before completing and filing the form.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

A person holding elective or appointive county, municipal, or other local public office **MUST ABSTAIN** from voting on a measure which would inure to his or her special private gain or loss. Each elected or appointed local officer also **MUST ABSTAIN** from knowingly voting on a measure which would inure to the special gain or loss of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he or she is retained (including the parent, subsidiary, or sibling organization of a principal by which he or she is retained); to the special private gain or loss of a relative; or to the special private gain or loss of a business associate. Commissioners of community redevelopment agencies (CRAs) under Sec. 163.356 or 163.357, F.S., and officers of independent special tax districts elected on a one-acre, one-vote basis are not prohibited from voting in that capacity.

For purposes of this law, a "relative" includes only the officer's father, mother, son, daughter, husband, wife, brother, sister, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, and daughter-in-law. A "business associate" means any person or entity engaged in or carrying on a business enterprise with the officer as a partner, joint venturer, coowner of property, or corporate shareholder (where the shares of the corporation are not listed on any national or regional stock exchange).

* * * * *

ELECTED OFFICERS:

In addition to abstaining from voting in the situations described above, you must disclose the conflict:

PRIOR TO THE VOTE BEING TAKEN by publicly stating to the assembly the nature of your interest in the measure on which you are abstaining from voting; *and*

WITHIN 15 DAYS AFTER THE VOTE OCCURS by completing and filing this form with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

* * * * *

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

Although you must abstain from voting in the situations described above, you are not prohibited by Section 112.3143 from otherwise participating in these matters. However, you must disclose the nature of the conflict before making any attempt to influence the decision, whether orally or in writing and whether made by you or at your direction.

IF YOU INTEND TO MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION PRIOR TO THE MEETING AT WHICH THE VOTE WILL BE TAKEN:

- You must complete and file this form (before making any attempt to influence the decision) with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who will incorporate the form in the minutes. (Continued on page 2)

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING:

- You must disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You must complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who must incorporate the form in the minutes. A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency, and the form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Dan Floerschheimer, hereby disclose that on January 24, 20 24:

(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, NA;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, by whom I am retained; or
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

* I WRITE A LETTER TO Town Council PRIOR TO THE PRESENTATION OF THIS PROJECT TO
ARISE OBJECTIVE TO MULTIPLE REQUESTS TO VARIANCE & SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS.

ARC-23-094 (ZON-23-072)

247-251 Worth Avenue

Continuing conflict

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.

1/24/24
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.

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME Catlin, KT		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE Architectural Commission	
MAILING ADDRESS 266 Fairview Road		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: ☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
CITY Palm Beach	COUNTY Palm Beach	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: Town of Palm Beach	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED January 24, 2024		MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ 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, KT Catlin, hereby disclose that on January 24, 20 24:

(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, N/A _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, by whom I am retained; or
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

✓(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

ARC-23-094 (ZON-23-072)

247-251 Worth Avenue

Continuing Conflict - I spoke to the intensity issue as it relates to the Comp Plan at a T.C. Meeting

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.

1/24/24
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.

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME <i>Connaughton, Elizabeth</i>		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <i>Architectural Commission</i>	
MAILING ADDRESS <i>226 Brazilian Ave Apt C</i>		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY <i>Palm Beach</i>	COUNTY <i>Palm Beach</i>	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED <i>January 24, 2024</i>		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <i>Town of Palm Beach</i>	
		MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ APPOINTIVE	

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

This form is for use by any person serving at the county, city, or other local level of government on an appointed or elected board, council, commission, authority, or committee. It applies to members of advisory and non-advisory bodies who are presented with a voting conflict of interest under Section 112.3143, Florida Statutes.

Your responsibilities under the law when faced with voting on a measure in which you have a conflict of interest will vary greatly depending on whether you hold an elective or appointive position. For this reason, please pay close attention to the instructions on this form before completing and filing the form.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

A person holding elective or appointive county, municipal, or other local public office **MUST ABSTAIN** from voting on a measure which would inure to his or her special private gain or loss. Each elected or appointed local officer also **MUST ABSTAIN** from knowingly voting on a measure which would inure to the special gain or loss of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he or she is retained (including the parent, subsidiary, or sibling organization of a principal by which he or she is retained); to the special private gain or loss of a relative; or to the special private gain or loss of a business associate. Commissioners of community redevelopment agencies (CRAs) under Sec. 163.356 or 163.357, F.S., and officers of independent special tax districts elected on a one-acre, one-vote basis are not prohibited from voting in that capacity.

For purposes of this law, a "relative" includes only the officer's father, mother, son, daughter, husband, wife, brother, sister, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, and daughter-in-law. A "business associate" means any person or entity engaged in or carrying on a business enterprise with the officer as a partner, joint venturer, coowner of property, or corporate shareholder (where the shares of the corporation are not listed on any national or regional stock exchange).

* * * * *

ELECTED OFFICERS:

In addition to abstaining from voting in the situations described above, you must disclose the conflict:

PRIOR TO THE VOTE BEING TAKEN by publicly stating to the assembly the nature of your interest in the measure on which you are abstaining from voting; and

WITHIN 15 DAYS AFTER THE VOTE OCCURS by completing and filing this form with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

* * * * *

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

Although you must abstain from voting in the situations described above, you are not prohibited by Section 112.3143 from otherwise participating in these matters. However, you must disclose the nature of the conflict before making any attempt to influence the decision, whether orally or in writing and whether made by you or at your direction.

IF YOU INTEND TO MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION PRIOR TO THE MEETING AT WHICH THE VOTE WILL BE TAKEN:

- You must complete and file this form (before making any attempt to influence the decision) with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who will incorporate the form in the minutes. (Continued on page 2)

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING:

- You must disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You must complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who must incorporate the form in the minutes. A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency, and the form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Elizabeth Connaughton, hereby disclose that on January 24, 2024:

(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, Parents;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, by whom I am retained; or
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

ARC-23-052 (ZON-23-092)
300 Colonial Lane
Continuing Conflict

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.

Date Filed

Jan 24, 2024

Signature

Elizabeth Connaughton

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.

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME <i>Simmons, Richard</i>		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <i>Architectural Commission</i>	
MAILING ADDRESS <i>455 Worth Ave</i>		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY <i>Palm Beach</i>	COUNTY <i>Palm Beach</i>	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED <i>January 24, 2024</i>		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <i>Town of Palm Beach</i>	
		MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ APPOINTIVE	

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

This form is for use by any person serving at the county, city, or other local level of government on an appointed or elected board, council, commission, authority, or committee. It applies to members of advisory and non-advisory bodies who are presented with a voting conflict of interest under Section 112.3143, Florida Statutes.

Your responsibilities under the law when faced with voting on a measure in which you have a conflict of interest will vary greatly depending on whether you hold an elective or appointive position. For this reason, please pay close attention to the instructions on this form before completing and filing the form.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

A person holding elective or appointive county, municipal, or other local public office **MUST ABSTAIN** from voting on a measure which would inure to his or her special private gain or loss. Each elected or appointed local officer also **MUST ABSTAIN** from knowingly voting on a measure which would inure to the special gain or loss of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he or she is retained (including the parent, subsidiary, or sibling organization of a principal by which he or she is retained); to the special private gain or loss of a relative; or to the special private gain or loss of a business associate. Commissioners of community redevelopment agencies (CRAs) under Sec. 163.356 or 163.357, F.S., and officers of independent special tax districts elected on a one-acre, one-vote basis are not prohibited from voting in that capacity.

For purposes of this law, a "relative" includes only the officer's father, mother, son, daughter, husband, wife, brother, sister, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, and daughter-in-law. A "business associate" means any person or entity engaged in or carrying on a business enterprise with the officer as a partner, joint venturer, coowner of property, or corporate shareholder (where the shares of the corporation are not listed on any national or regional stock exchange).

* * * * *

ELECTED OFFICERS:

In addition to abstaining from voting in the situations described above, you must disclose the conflict:

PRIOR TO THE VOTE BEING TAKEN by publicly stating to the assembly the nature of your interest in the measure on which you are abstaining from voting; *and*

WITHIN 15 DAYS AFTER THE VOTE OCCURS by completing and filing this form with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

* * * * *

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

Although you must abstain from voting in the situations described above, you are not prohibited by Section 112.3143 from otherwise participating in these matters. However, you must disclose the nature of the conflict before making any attempt to influence the decision, whether orally or in writing and whether made by you or at your direction.

IF YOU INTEND TO MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION PRIOR TO THE MEETING AT WHICH THE VOTE WILL BE TAKEN:

- You must complete and file this form (before making any attempt to influence the decision) with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who will incorporate the form in the minutes. (Continued on page 2)

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING:

- You must disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You must complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who must incorporate the form in the minutes. A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency, and the form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Richard Sammons, hereby disclose that on January 24, 20 24:

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

- ☒ inured to my special private gain or loss;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my business associate, _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, by whom I am retained; or
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

ARC-24-011 301 Plantation Rd

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.

1/24/24
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.