MINUTES
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
IN THE
TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2ND FLOOR, TOWN HALL
360 S. COUNTY ROAD, PALM BEACH

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2014, 9:30 a.m.

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, after the fact, may access the audio of that item via the Town's website at www.townofpalmbeach.com or may obtain an audio recording (CD) of the meeting by contacting Cynthia M. Delp, Secretary to the Landmarks Preservation Commission at (561) 227-6408.

I. CALL TO ORDER: (09:30 a.m.)

Chairman Cooley called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL:

William O. Cooley, Chairman	PRESENT
Nikita Zukov, Vice Chairman	PRESENT
Jacqueline Albarran, Member	PRESENT
Edward Austin Cooney, Member	PRESENT
John T. Gannon, Member	PRESENT
Page Lee Hufty, Member	PRESENT
Rachel Lorentzen, Member	PRESENT
Richard Rene Silvin, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Carol N. Wyett, Alternate Member	PRESENT
William J. Strawbridge, Jr., Alternate Member	PRESENT

Staff Members Present: John S. Page, Director of Planning, Zoning and Building, John Lindgren, Planning Administrator, Janet Murphy and Emily Stillings, Staff Historic Preservation Consultants, Bill Bucklew, Building Official (part of meeting), and Debby Morakis, Recording Secretary for this meeting. John C. Randolph, Town Attorney, was present for the majority of the meeting. Cynthia Delp, Secretary to the LPC, was absent. *These minutes were transcribed by Cynthia Delp, Secretary to the Landmarks Preservation Commission, pursuant to the recording of the meeting.*

Let the record show that a court reporter, Paul McGuirk, was present regarding the Tew & Taylor agenda item.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

IV. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 19, 2014 MEETING:**

Let the record show that this agenda item was not called and no action was taken. As such, approval of the November minutes will be carried on the January 21, 2015 agenda.

V. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: (9:32:44 a.m.)**

MOTION BY MR. COONEY FOR APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GANNON.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

Ms. Morakis administered the oath at this time and throughout the meeting as necessary.

Mr. Page referenced the Voting Conflict forms filed by Mrs. Albarran at the last meeting.

VII. **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC AND COMMISSION MEMBERS: (Please limit comments to 3 minutes): (09:33:26 a.m.)**

Chairman Cooley asked for the following to be placed on the next agenda: Consideration to recommend to the Town Council that the Memorial Fountain be placed on the National Register of Historic Places.

VIII. **DISCUSSION RELATIVE TO NEW PROCEDURES TO BE IMPLEMENTED REGARDING DEMOLITION AT LANDMARKED PROPERTIES:(09:34:55 a.m.)**

Mr. Page displayed his December 10, 2014 memorandum on the Elmo projector relative to suggested measures which might be taken to prevent situations as just occurred at 105 Clarendon Avenue. He explained this most recent version of the suggested procedures. After LPC review and approval, these procedures will ultimately be forwarded to the Town's Ordinance, Rules, and Standards Committee. When passed by the ORS, the new procedures would be incorporated into the Application for Certificate of Appropriateness, rather than into the LPC ordinance.

Commission members offered their comments and questions relative to the suggested procedures: Penalties are appropriate in response to arrogant disregard of historic structures; concern that the process should not be made so onerous as to scare people away from remodeling historic properties; have respect for the citizens who are willing to spend the time and money to restore and renovate; practical measures with flexibility should be enacted which allow the embrace and re-birth of the original "loved" architecture, rather than an original, very deteriorated 2x4, for example; these procedures are appropriate for the Building Department, not the Landmarks Preservation Commission; better supervision and auditing of private providers is needed; and, it is part of the purview of the LPC to look at materials and determine what should be saved.

Mr. Randolph discussed the LPC's role relative to enforcement.

Lori Volk, 206 Phipps Plaza, asked that it not be made easier for applicants to move toward replication rather than restoration. She advocated against changing our rules because of any one case.

MOTION BY MRS. LORENTZEN THAT THIS BE PASSED ON TO THE ORS COMMITTEE FOR ACTION.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ZUKOV.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Page thanked Gene Pandula for all of his assistance and input toward development of these procedures.

IX. PUBLIC HEARINGS: (10:03:15 a.m.)

A. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #035 - 2014
Reconstruction/Addition/Interior/Exterior Demolition/Landscape Hardscape
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S)
Owner/Applicant: Burke and Susan Ross
Address: 172 South Ocean Boulevard
Architect: Saladrigas & Cohen Architecture, Inc.
Project Description: Request approval for reconstruction, addition to historic structure, interior and exterior demolition, and landscape/hardscape which is further described as: Alteration and partial demolition of the Western 1 story bedroom conversion of the original two-car service garage and attached site wall to allow for a new family pavilion and 3 (net) additional bedrooms. The pavilion and ancillary program proposes to match and/or incorporate details from the 1929 Fatio-Trainor cloister enclosure and elements of the original 1926 Wyeth, King Johnson primary residence through the use of quarried keystone cornices, wood cornices, trim, arches, sills, keystone columns, mahogany casement windows, quatrefoil stained glass inserts, cypress outlookers, clay barrel tile roof, chimney cap, stucco and assorted details. The southwest corner of the addition proposed a modification of the 2005 single story addition to incorporate an (1) additional upstairs bedroom directly over the existing footprint. The original 1926 northwest second (2) story guest quarters above the garage will be altered internally and incorporate an additional bedroom on the west side of the proposed family pavilion facing west. The modifications to the second story include the replacement of previously modified single sash casement windows with new impact resistant mahogany split casement windows and a new entry door with similar muntin pattern. The total net area of the proposed addition is 1,512 square feet. Other associated changes as presented.

At the September meeting a motion carried that implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impacts to the subject landmarked property. At the October meeting, a motion carried for deferral to the November meeting at the request of the attorney for the property owner. At the November meeting, a motion carried for deferral to the December meeting at the request of the attorney for the owner.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosures by several members

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Raphael Saladrigas, Saladrigas and Cohen Architecture
ATTORNEY PRESENT: Maura Ziska for the applicant
LANDSCAPE PRESENTATION BY: Brian Vertesch, SMI Landscape Architecture

Mr. Saladrigas confirmed that the Town Council, last week, granted unanimous approval of the requested variances for this project. He stated that very few changes have been made since the last time the Commission saw this project. He presented the revised project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described in detail above. Mr. Saladrigas mentioned the changes made (removal of some windows) in response to requests from the neighbors. The agreement with the neighbor also includes a hedge that will be planted at 23 feet in height. Other changes include

dropping the cornice by 1 foot; eliminating some details in the hyphens between the two buildings; and, adjusting the chimney caps.

Brian Vertesch continued with the revised landscape/hardscape pursuant to the submitted plans. He placed a rendering on the Elmo projector which more clearly shows how the landscaping will look. Design elements include: Bougainvillea on majority of facade; simple low hedges along base of house; addition of pleached hedge (Ficus); Sea Plum espaliers; large Bridal Veil tree for shade and privacy; 23 ft. tall Ficus hedge per agreement with neighbor; and, in general, simple landscape.

MOTION BY MR. ZUKOV FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #048 - 2014 **(10:16:21 a.m.)**
New accessory structure and interior/exterior demolition
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S)
Owner/Applicant: Terry Taylor
Address: 780 S. Ocean Boulevard
Architect: Brasseur & Drobot Architects, P.A., Jason P. Drobot
Project Description: Request approval for new accessory structure and interior/exterior demolition which is further described as: The project consists of the demolition of an existing 1,538 (+/- square foot detached accessory structure located at the northwest corner of the property. A new 3,104 square foot (+/-) guest house with 3 car garage will added at the approximate location of the demolished structure. Existing hardscape and landscape will be removed to accommodate the new structure. Other associated changes as presented.

At the November meeting, a motion carried that implementation of the proposed variance will not cause negative architectural impacts to the subject landmarked property.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: No new disclosures

ATTORNEY PRESENT: Peter S. Broberg, for the applicant
ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Jason Drobot, Brasseur & Drobot Architects

Attorney Peter Broberg reported that the Town Council has approved the requested variance. Jason Drobot continued with the architectural presentation in accordance with the revised plans submitted for the project described above. The new structure includes an entry, stair tower, a 3 car garage and a workshop for the maintenance crew, with a two bedroom apartment on the second floor. He noted that since the last meeting, he reduced the height of the arches by 18", and changed the square top garage doors to an ellipse top.

Commission Comments: Much better; beautiful small project...you made this accessory structure special; concerned that we keep have additional projects coming back relative to this property...the scope of work seems to keep growing there.

MOTION BY MR. ZUKOV FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GANNON.
MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH MR. COONEY OPPOSED.

C. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness # 053 – 2014 **(10:23:04 a.m.)**
Reconstruction and exterior demolition
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S)
Owner/Applicant: The Breakers Palm Beach Inc. (Alex P. Gilmurray, CPA: CFO)
Address: 1 South County Road
Architect: Brasseur & Drobot Architects, P.A., Jason P. Drobot
Project Description: This project consists of demolishing an existing 548 square foot fountain including its pool, plaza steps, and two flanking benches located west of the main porte cochere at the Breakers Hotel. The project also consists of new fountain and benches which will be reconstructed at the same location and to the same dimensions and height of the existing. Other associated changes as presented.

At the November meeting, a motion carried that implementation of the proposed variance will not cause negative architectural impacts to the subject landmarked property.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: No new disclosures

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Jason Drobot, Brasseur & Drobot Architects
OTHERS WHO TESTIFIED: Bill Bucklew, Building Official

Mr. Drobot presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above. This project had been presented at the November meeting in detail. He provided historical information relative to the fountain which is now quite deteriorated as to structural elements, plumbing and electrical systems. As such, demolition and reconstruction of the fountain is requested to match the original fountain, along with reconstruction of the flanking benches. The reconstruction will incorporate stainless steel and fiberglass rebar, and additives will be used in the mix to prolong the life of the materials of the new fountain. Mechanical systems for the fountain will be relocated to a remote location. Mr. Drobot anticipated that the work will begin next summer and will take 4-5 months.

Ms. Hufty expressed her general concern that when landmarked properties are demolished and then reconstructed, they should be re-built to match the original structure in every way. Bill Bucklew, Building Official, stated that when buildings are reconstructed, they must meet current hurricane standards, and those standards change as new building codes are enacted. Ms. Hufty continued with her concern that when such reconstructions have to include modifications due to building code requirements, that should be noted in the LPC presentation.

Commission Comments: Comments comparing this fountain to the Memorial Fountain reconstruction issue; let's protect the design...be flexible on how it gets reconstructed with today's codes and the materials...the design will emanate the beauty...let's make sure that happens no matter what materials are used...this is one of my favorite fountains in the world.

MOTION BY MR. COONEY FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN.
MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH MR ZUKOV OPPOSED.

D. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #054 - 2014 **(10:39:58 a.m.)**
Exterior Pole Lighting and Exterior Demolition
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S)
Owner/Applicant: Everglades Club, Inc. (Scott Lese, General Manager)
Address: 350 Worth Avenue
Architect: Brasseur & Drobot Architects, P.A.
Project Description: This project consists of the removal of existing light fixtures and poles at the three easterly tennis courts located south of the corner of Worth Avenue and Golfview Road. The project also consists of the addition of new exterior light fixtures and poles for the same tennis courts at new locations. Other associated changes as presented.

At the November meeting, a motion carried that implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impacts to the subject landmarked property.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: No new disclosures

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Jason Drobot, Brasseur & Drobot Architects
ATTORNEY PRESENT: Maura Ziska for the applicant

Ms. Ziska reported that the Town Council, last week, granted the variances for this project for the height of the light poles and to allow the existing hedge to remain at a lower height. Mr. Drobot continued presenting the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above for this light pole project. The number of poles will be reduced from the existing 12 poles to 10 new light poles.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. COONEY.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

E. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #056 - 2014 **(10:43:41 a.m.)**
Window Change
Owner/Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Marion Antonini
Address: 920 South Ocean Boulevard
Architect: Smith Architectural Group, Jeffery W. Smith
Project Description: Request approval for window change which is further described as: New impact rated window design for living room window, and other associated changes as presented.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosures by several members

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Jeffery W. Smith, Smith Architectural Group

Mr. Smith presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above to replace the living room window. This had been presented in the past and the proposed window at that time matched the original transom bar. Now, the request is to eliminate that original transom bar, but maintain the same window height. The original transom windows were sliding, but now the windows will be fixed. Mr. Smith stated that without the transom bar, the window looks more appropriate as a cloister-type window.

Commission Comments: Disagree with Mr. Smith...we try to keep what was there, per the original drawings...we are getting big panes of glass which are not in character with the original building...would be happier to see the transom bar back in to reduce the scale of a big open window; this sets a precedent that we should stay away from; in many of Fatio's projects, he used large panes of glass, even on Classical designs; the aesthetics are much nicer; at that time, he wanted it as an open cloister...if he could have, he would have not had the transom.

Mr. Smith defended the choice to remove the transom bar.

MOTION BY MR. ZUKOV TO APPROVE AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GANNON.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

F. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #057 - 2014 **(10:49:58 a.m.)**
Awning
Owner/Applicant: The Breakers Palm Beach Inc.
Address: 1 S. County Road
Architect: Peacock and Lewis Architects
Project Description: Request approval for awnings which is further described as: Replacement of the awnings on the south side of the Breakers Hotel property at the retail shop display windows. The existing awnings are faded and need a refreshed look. The new awnings will be slightly smaller and will be Breakers colors. Other associated changes as presented.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: No disclosures

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Steve Pollio, Peacock and Lewis Architects

Mr. Pollio presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above for this awning replacement on the south side of the hotel at the retail spaces. The new awnings will be dropped down from the existing locations and will be done in the Breakers brand blue. He noted that although awnings do not occur on other facades, awnings had been in place on this south facade since 1995.

Commission Comments: Why didn't they just change the color of the existing awnings?...these look a little modern and a little skimpy; I can't vote for it...it should be something substantial and less modern on this building...the existing ones are more gracious; it's an awning....a temporary, removable thing which will end up getting changed in short fashion; I believe that the Chesterfield Hotel also has this style of awning...it's so removable and momentary...no problem with it; the new awnings are beautiful, but contemporary...the old awnings match the style of the building better; the new awning actually accents and draws your eye to how pretty the cornices are...prettier architectural statement; it makes the building snap better and shows off the architecture better.

MOTION BY MR. COONEY FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN.
MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH MR. COOLEY OPPOSED.

G. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #058 - 2014 **(10:59:59 a.m.)**
Fence
Owner/Applicant: Rehabilitation Center for Children & Adults Inc.
Address: 300 Royal Palm Way
Architect: Glidden Spina + Partners
Project Description: Request approval for fence which is further described as: Install white vinyl fence with gates at southwest side of property between parking lot and neighboring properties to south and west. Other associated changes as presented.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by Mr. Cooley

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Danny Brown, Glidden Spina + Partners
ATTORNEY PRESENT: Maura Ziska for the applicant

Mr. Brown presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above for the requested fence with gates. He explained that a southern neighbor's request for a screening fence was the genesis for this project. The proposed white vinyl fence would replace the existing chain link fence and provide a visual screen of the parking lot from the residential neighbors. The project includes removal of the existing chain link fence and some scrubby landscaping in favor of the new white vinyl fence and sod.

Commission Comments: Recall that ARCOM required another property owner to remove a vinyl fence in favor of wood; what is sad is that the chain link fence provides an opportunity for landscaping to grow through it, and it disappears; this type of fence is OK for a garbage enclosure, but have a problem with this type of white fence; is there any reason you can't replace the existing fence and plant some Ficus...this looks very stark.

Mr. Page reminded that when this applicant requested the canopy over the parked cars, and it required a variance, the neighbor expressed concern about being able to see headlights through the hedging and asked for a wall or fence instead. That is what has prompted this application. Mr. Lindgren stated that ARCOM will not allow PVC vinyl fencing anywhere on any site, unless it is a single family home, in the rear, completely covered with landscaping so it cannot be seen.

Commission Comments (continued): What about other colors? Other materials?

Ms. Ziska stated that a wall cannot be constructed because of an easement. The proposed fence was the easiest way to satisfy the neighbor because the chain link fence and landscaping was not doing the job.

Commission Comments (continued): Suggest that we turn this down and they just increase the planting back there; CBS would be preferred, but is expensive...wood has never been a preference; what if they just work on changing the color...then the starkness goes away and it accomplishes the goal from a practical standpoint; PVC comes in dark green and black; and, for general aesthetics throughout the town, we ought to be consistent with ARCOM.

MOTION BY MR. ZUKOV TO DEFER TO NEXT MONTH (TO COME UP WITH OTHER ALTERNATIVES).
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN.

Commission Comments (continued): Vinyl is often a good alternative in odd spots; support vinyl...in black because it will disappear.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

X. OTHER BUSINESS: (11:15:09 a.m.)

Review of Tew & Taylor Audit relative to 105 Clarendon Avenue

Mr. Page stated that several months ago, the LPC had asked for an audit of Tew & Taylor, the private provider at 105 Clarendon Avenue. Bill Bucklew, Building Official, has prepared that audit and will address his findings today.

Prior to Mr. Bucklew's remarks, Mr. Cooley noted that he had sent out a memo yesterday that was somewhat critical of the audit, and he discussed his reasoning. Ultimately, in the memo, Mr. Cooley suggested that the audit be re-done.

Prior to Mr. Bucklew's remarks, a short recess was called. The meeting resumed at 11:22 a.m.

*****

Regarding 165 Seaspray Avenue

Mr. Lindgren stated that one of the property owners present, who was unable to remain for the rest of the meeting, wanted to speak relative to the Designation Hearing for 165 Seaspray. First, Chairman Cooley asked that Ms. Morakis administer the oath to any persons wishing to speak during this meeting who were not previously sworn.

Mrs. Katherine McLennan, 165 Seaspray Avenue, testified to her support for the landmarking of her home. She regards the home as an "addition to a rather modest side of Palm Beach", and she does not want the home changed or demolished. She was pleased with the Town's prepared Designation Report relative to the property. She stated that the home has been part of her life for so long, for her parents, for herself, and now for her grandchildren, and she requested favorable consideration of the landmarking.

*****

Mr. Bucklew stated that he conducted the Tew & Taylor audit, as requested by the LPC, in accordance with state statutes. He explained his methods in performing the audit. Based on the information that he reviewed, and conversations with Tew & Taylor, Mr. Bucklew found that Tew & Taylor did not violate Florida statutes in performing the inspections at 105 Clarendon Avenue. They performed them according to statutory requirements and they performed them according to the policies that have been set up by the Town with regard to private providers.

Mr. Cooley noted that there was no record of inspections related to disconnection of the utilities.

James K. Green, attorney for Tew & Taylor, stated that Tew & Taylor was not hired until after the July 7 inspection that Mr. Bucklew was just questioned about.

Mr. Cooley suggested that the members be given more time to read the audit and his memorandum relative to the audit. As such, he recommended for deferral of this discussion for one month.

Let the record show that Mr. Strawbridge returned to the meeting at 11:33 p.m.

Mr. Bucklew clarified that the job of the private provider is to do inspections in accordance with the Florida Building Code. It is the Town's job to monitor the job for LPC, ARCOM, or zoning requirements. He noted that the Town performs audit inspections throughout the course of the job and several inspections at the end of a job. The Town retains the authority to deny a Certificate of Occupancy for any building if it is not built in conformance with the building code, the plans, and also all other approvals.

MOTION BY MR. ZUKOV TO DEFER AND DISCUSS THIS AT THE END OF OUR MEETING NEXT MONTH.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. LORENTZEN.

Lori Volk, 206 Phipps Plaza, questioned who was responsible to inspect the utility disconnects at 105 Clarendon, if they occurred before July 7th, prior to Tew & Taylor being hired. She questioned if Tew & Taylor was doing inspections appropriately, as the audit would indicate, who was inspecting the basement room?

Alexander Ives, Director of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, questioned why this subject is proposed for deferral again. Ms. Hufty also spoke against continuing to defer this item.

Mr. Zukov stressed that this is a Building Department issue, which is then applied to the LPC and ARCOM alike.
MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH MS. HUFTY OPPOSED.

IX. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED): (11:45:00 a.m.)

H. Reconsideration of Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #026 - 2014
Owner/Applicant: 105 Clarendon Road Revocable Trust
Address: 105 Clarendon Avenue
Architect: Smith and Moore Architects, Inc., Harold Smith
Project Description: Request approval for "changes to previous approvals, including replacement of double-hung windows with casement windows; extension of living space above the garage; floor plan modifications; other associated changes" as presented, including the removal and replacement of walls/structure. ***Please note that this is a tax abatement project.***

At the November meeting, a motion carried to defer this matter for one month, and ask the applicant to come in with a full presentation at the December meeting, showing what has been done and what is intended to be done, and that would include the as-builts. A second motion carried for demolition of the southeast portion of the structure, as determined by the Building Official.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosures by several members

ATTORNEY PRESENT: Maura Ziska for the applicant
ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Harold Smith, Smith and Moore Architects

Maura Ziska stated that the LPC had asked the applicant, last month, to return with as-builts to be compared with the LPC approved plans. She stated that after review and comparison of the plans, it was determined that there were 3 areas of work completed without approval by the Town or the LPC: (1) The 20 ft. section of the wall on the east facade; (2) Room in the basement and (3) Laundry room that was re-constructed on the northwest side of the residence. Mr. Rossi performed this work without following proper procedure or protocol. As such, he has been replaced by Wildes Builders as the new contractor on the job.

Harold Smith, Architect, provided the presentation of the project explaining what has been done and what is intended to be done. He provided chronological details relative how the job progressed since February, the approvals granted along the way, and particular circumstances which occurred at this jobsite.

Members inquired as to what remains of the landmarked house. Mr. Smith responded that the far north walls, the loggia that had been added in the 1990's, the kitchen area, the laundry room, the connecting loggia, the tennis pavilion, and the tool shed remain. He noted that only the kitchen and part of the laundry are actually part of the original main house, but the other areas were later additions to the original house.

Emily Stillings stated her belief that the project may not be able to be considered for tax abatement any longer as tax abatement does not apply to reconstruction. This was also the opinion of a Palm Beach County representative regarding reconstruction. Lori Volk offered her comments relative to the tax abatement issue.

MOTION BY MR. ZUKOV FOR APPROVAL OF COA-026-2014.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GANNON.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

I. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #055 - 2014
Restoration, Reconstruction, Addition
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S)
Owner/Applicant: 105 Clarendon Road Revocable Trust
Address: 105 Clarendon Avenue
Architect: Smith and Moore Architects, Inc., Harold Smith
Project Description: Request approval for restoration, reconstruction, and addition to historic structure which is further described as: Demolition and reconstruction of the foundation, east wall and portion of the second floor structural system of the main section of the existing residence. Demolition and reconstruction of a majority of the foundations, walls, second floor and roof framing systems of the service wing of the existing residence. This request includes raising the kitchen area ceiling height and second floor roof bearing point six inches, and adding infill roof trusses to change the roof line at the westernmost, one story staff wing. Other associated changes as presented. ***Please note that this is a tax abatement project.***

At the November meeting, a motion carried that implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impacts to the subject landmarked property.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosures by several members

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Harold Smith, Smith and Moore Architects, Inc.
OTHERS WHO TESTIFIED: Chuck Schumacher, property owner, and Beverly Tew of Tew & Taylor

Mr. Smith reported that the requested variances (west side yard setbacks, north street yard setback, building height, and approval to allow for demolition beyond the December 1 deadline) for this project were approved by the Town Council. He presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described in detail above. In addition to the description above, the project includes widening the garage doors by 6" each. Mr. Smith noted that a free standing building had been added to the property in the 40's or 50's and then it was eventually linked to the existing staff laundry area by a flat roof, but no permit could be found for that connection. The current plan would replace that roof structure with new simpler roof trusses to eliminate low beams and leakage. Mr. Smith stated that a new space had been created in the basement. He had directed the contractor to backfill that space until approvals were obtained. It is that space that needs to be converted into basement space, and then excavate under the living room for an additional game room. Both of these rooms are below grade, invisible from the exterior, and do not require variances.

Commission Comments: Don't you want to make all the windows casements instead of all of these double hung windows?; originally, there was a hierarchy of windows in a lot of these structures where the staff wing received a lower status window, like the double hung, so I'm inclined to keep it as it is; despite everything that has gone on, they have just progressed forward doing what they want to do; any sanctions?; they will appear before the Code Enforcement Board tomorrow.

Lori Volk comments: Mentioned the neighbor's recent testimony at the Town Council relative to the new roof at the garage or staff portion in the back; suggested that the applicant swear and attest that this is all they are going to do; stated that it is very disturbing to keep blaming it on one person; this site is a travesty; why reward their bad behavior by allowing these basement rooms?; step back and appreciate how much has been lost; this is a big stab in the program of historic preservation for those that are landmark owners; and, it is a disappointment that there is still misinformation coming out.

Commission Comments: Regardless of what has happened, will support the project so it moves toward completion; it is frustrating, but the alternative of not doing anything will not help the situation; look at the intent...when you look at the history of the project, I don't see a lot of villains in this case...I don't find anything in the drawings that violates what was there; keep the two sets of variances clear and distinct; intent is important...the owner wants to see a beautiful project completed, and we should not stand in the way of that...it will turn out to be a great project; want to see the project go forward, but how can you not see a roof go on, especially when mentioned in a Town Council meeting; we don't want to be told another time that "I don't know how that happened." ; and, happy that Wildes Builders was chosen to complete the job.

MOTION BY MR. ZUKOV TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED, AND TO HAVE ALL CASEMENT WINDOWS (ALL DOUBLE HUNG WINDOWS CHANGED TO CASEMENT WINDOWS).
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN.
MOTION AND SECOND WITHDRAWN.

MOTION BY MRS. LORENTZEN FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. COONEY.
MOTION WITHDRAWN BY MRS. LORENTZEN DURING THE ROLL CALL.

MOTION BY MRS. LORENTZEN FOR APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED, EXCEPT FOR THE DOUBLE HUNG WINDOWS WHICH WILL BE HANDLED SEPARATELY.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN.
MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH MS. HUFTY OPPOSED.

There was more discussion relative to the issue of the windows. (Mr. Smith had previously explained that casement windows had been previously requested, but it was feared that the tax abatement would not be accepted with casement windows. As such, the plans moved forward with double hung windows.) Today, casement windows were encouraged by the LPC, except for Mrs. Albarran who questioned the proportions of the casement windows. She felt they looked so much thinner than any other casements in the whole house. The LPC asked Mr. Schumacher for his opinion relative to the windows. He commented that the casement windows look much better than the double hung windows.

Mr. Cooney expressed his concerns: The LPC must be consistent in making decisions; in other applications, we have asked that the double hung windows remain...it is important to retain the historic fenestration...it is part of the Mediterranean Revival style that the windows be inconsistent.

Chairman Cooley asked that the former motion remain as is, and if Mr. Smith would like to move forward with a change to the windows, he should discuss the issue with some of the members first, and then bring them to the LPC for approval. It was pointed out that the motion that passed excluded the windows, so it was thought that another motion was necessary regarding the windows.

MOTION BY MR. COONEY FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED ON THE WINDOWS (with the double hung windows as indicated).
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ZUKOV.

There was further discussion relative to the windows. Some members thought there should be no action on the windows today and that the windows should be decided at a later date after additional consideration was given to them. In the end, Mr. Smith asked that the motion move forward as stated, and if they want to request a change later, they will return to the LPC.

MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH MS. HUFTY OPPOSED.

Beverly Tew of Tew and Taylor stated she wanted to clarify a comment that was made earlier. Tew and Taylor did not contract with Mr. Schumacher as a private provider inspection service until July 10, 2014. She also noted that the new room that was added with the roof was done prior to that date.

XI. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Informal Review: 322 Seaspray Avenue **(12:47:03 p.m.)**
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S)

Project Description: Demolish one-story addition to southeast corner of residence, wood deck, swimming pool and pool deck. Add two-story addition at rear of existing residence. Demolish existing one-story cabana and re-construct as new master bedroom so it is connected to main residence. Interior modifications. Install new roof finish, windows and repair existing stucco and details as required which will match existing.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by Mrs. Albarran

ATTORNEY PRESENT: Maura Ziska for the applicant
ARCHITECT PRESENT: Eugene Pandula
OTHERS WHO TESTIFIED: Nadine Netter and Barbara Chevallard

Ms. Ziska explained why this project was before the LPC again...basically, due to a re-design of the project between the first LPC informal review and the scheduled Town Council meeting. The re-design changed the project and the variances requested, so the project was re-advertised in its new form. Most of the variances were reduced, except the one for lot coverage which has increased because of the new connector between the main house and the guest house/cabana. This project has been at the LPC level three times informally, but has not yet gone to the Town Council for approval of the variances. Ms. Ziska listed the variances for lot coverage, cubic content ratio, rear yard setback, west side yard setback, and east side yard setback.

MOTION BY MR. ZUKOV THAT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED VARIANCES WILL NOT CAUSE NEGATIVE ARCHITECTURAL IMPACTS TO THE SUBJECT LANDMARKED PROPERTY.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Later in the meeting, persons who were in the audience asked to comment about this project.

Nadine Netter, neighbor from across the street, offered her comments: The house was landmarked because of its symmetry; concern regarding other 50 ft. lots in neighborhood; what is being planned here will make this house unbalanced; concerned about the volume and height of the proposed structure; worried about setting precedent in allowing landmark properties to change; have a problem with people coming into this section of town, buying a 50 ft. wide lot, and then deciding they can feel like they can build whatever they want; and, the changes done thus far, like filling in the swimming pool, have affected the way that water flows in the neighborhood. She also stated that there was some inconsistency with respect to notice as she had received only 2 notices, rather than 3.

Mr. Cooley advised Ms. Netter to discuss these issues with Mr. Pandula prior to the Town Council meeting. Mr. Lindgren indicated that drainage has not yet been installed at the site, but those requirements must be satisfied. Mr. Lindgren stated that he investigated the notice issue, and it was confirmed that the required notices were sent.

Barbara Chevallard, 330 Seaspray Avenue, objects to the variances as she feels the property owner is trying to put too much house on the lot that affects her property in different ways. She stated that if you let one property do this, then all the properties in the neighborhood will want to do it as well. Mr. Cooley gave a similar recommendation to Ms. Chevallard to discuss these issues with Mr. Pandula and/or attend the Town Council meeting of January 14, 2015.

B. Informal Review: 210 El Brillo Way **(12:52:36 p.m.)**
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S)

Project Description: Two-story elevator addition with second story cantilevered enclosed balcony. Roof stucco color and all detailing to match existing.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosures by several members

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Jacqueline Albarran
ATTORNEY PRESENT: Maura Ziska for the applicant

Ms. Ziska explained the requested variance for side yard setback needed for this project.

Mrs. Albarran declared a conflict of interest with regard to this project. (As such, Mr. Silvin will be voting relative to this matter.) She presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above for this new elevator/balcony addition with details to match the existing structure.

MOTION BY MRS. LORENTZEN THAT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED VARIANCE WILL NOT CAUSE NEGATIVE ARCHITECTURAL IMPACTS TO THE SUBJECT LANDMARKED PROPERTY.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GANNON.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Several members complimented the architect on an artful solution.

C. Informal Review: 280 N. Ocean Boulevard **(12:59:51 p.m.)**
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S)

Project Description: Replacement of damaged and already removed driveway gates. New wrought aluminum gates to replicate Fatio's 1928 design to be installed in original location.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosures by several members

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Jacqueline Albarran
ATTORNEY PRESENT: Maura Ziska for the applicant

Maura Ziska explained the requested variances for setback and gate height.

Mrs. Albarran stated that this project is part of a continuing conflict for her. (As such, Mr. Silvin will be voting relative to this matter.) She presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above for this new gate project. She explained that the original gate was

the original Fatio gate, but that had been replaced at some point by a wooden gate. Those gates were in disrepair for quite some time, and were eventually removed. The current proposal would identically replicate the original Fatio gate design.

MOTION BY MR. COONEY THAT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED VARIANCES WILL NOT CAUSE NEGATIVE ARCHITECTURAL IMPACTS TO THE SUBJECT LANDMARKED PROPERTY.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. LORENTZEN.
MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH MR. COOLEY OPPOSED.

XII. DESIGNATION HEARINGS: (01:15:24 p.m.)

Mr. Cooney asked that the designation reports be forwarded to the members approximately one week prior to the meetings, rather than approximately one month prior to the meetings.

Item 1: 165 Seaspray Avenue
Owner: Katherine S. McLennan

Janet Murphy confirmed that Mrs. McLennan is very supportive of the designation, as indicated by her testimony earlier today. Ms. Murphy stated that this property meets the following criteria for landmark designation:

Sec. 54-161 (1) Exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, economic or social history of the nation, state, county or town; and,

Sec. 54-161 (3) Embodies the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or is a specimen inherently valuable for the study of a period, style, method of construction or use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.

Ms. Murphy testified to the architecture, history and architectural history of this Colonial Revival two story home constructed in 1919.

MOTION BY MR. COONEY THAT THE DESIGNATION REPORT BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ZUKOV.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY MR. COONEY THAT 165 SEASPRAY AVENUE BE RECOMMENDED TO THE TOWN COUNCIL FOR DESIGNATION AS A LANDMARK OF THE TOWN OF PALM BEACH, AND THAT THE CRITERIA, AS PRESENTED, BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ZUKOV.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Item 2: 133 Seaspray Avenue
Owner: James G. Pressly Jr. & Kathryn S. Pressly

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: No disclosures

Janet Murphy stated that the property owners are in favor of the landmark designation. She testified to the architecture, history and architectural history of this two-story Dutch Colonial Revival style home constructed in 1918.

Ms. Murphy stated that this property meets the following criteria for landmark designation:

Sec. 54-161 (1) Exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, economic or social history of the nation, state, county or town; and,

Sec. 54-161 (3) Embodies the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or is a specimen inherently valuable for the study of a period, style, method of construction or use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.

MOTION BY MR. COONEY THAT THE DESIGNATION REPORT BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ZUKOV.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY MR. COONEY THAT 133 SEASPRAY AVENUE BE RECOMMENDED TO THE TOWN COUNCIL FOR DESIGNATION AS A LANDMARK OF THE TOWN OF PALM BEACH, AND THAT THE CRITERIA, AS PRESENTED, BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ZUKOV.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

XIII. COMMENTS OF THE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING ZONING & BUILDING DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR: (01:25:28 PM)

Mr. Strawbridge commented, with regard to variances, that he found it bothersome, with respect to houses on small, 50 ft. wide lots, that at a certain point, additions to such houses may cause the property to lose the architect's original intent and historical character.

Mr. Page updated the LPC relative to the three properties (189 Bradley Place, 177 Clarendon Avenue, and 1545 N. Ocean Way) which were forwarded to the Town Council most recently for ratification of landmark designation. The first two properties were ratified, but 1545 N. Ocean Way was not ratified as a landmark.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT: (1:27:17 PM)

MOTION BY MR. COONEY TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 1:27 P.M.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GANNON.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be held on Wednesday, January 21, 2015 at 9:30 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 S. County Road, Palm Beach.

Respectfully submitted,

William O. Cooley, Chairman
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

cmd

FORM 8B MEMORANDUM OF VOTING CONF
COUNTY, MUNICIPAL, AND OTHER LOCAL PUBLI

FOR MINUTES

NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME ALBARRAN JACQUELINE	NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AU LAND MARKS PRESER
MAILING ADDRESS 384 ROYAL PALM WAY #227	THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHOF WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: ☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY
CITY: PALM BEACH — COUNTY: PALM BEACH	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: TOWN OF PALM BEACH
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED 12/17/14	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, JACQUELINE ALBARRAN, hereby disclose that on 12/17, 20 14:

(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:

COA-002-2015 (Informal Review only)
280 N. Ocean Blvd.
(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.

12/17/14
Date Filed

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	NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE
ALBARRAN JACQUELINE	LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MAILING ADDRESS 324 ROYAL PALM WAY #227	THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: ☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☑ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY TOWN
CITY: PALM BEACH — COUNTY: PALM BEACH	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: TOWN OF PALM BEACH
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED 12/17/14	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, JACQUELINE ALBARRAN, hereby disclose that on 12/17, 2014:

(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:

COA-001-2015 (Informal Review Only)
210 EL BRILLO WAY

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.

12/17/14
Date Filed

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.