TOWN OF PALM BEACH

PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 17, 2017.

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.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Cooney called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Edward Austin Cooney, Chairman	PRESENT
Richard Rene Silvin, Vice Chairman	PRESENT
Jacqueline Albarran, Member	PRESENT
Page Lee Hufty, Member	PRESENT (left at 12:40 p.m.)
Anne Fairfax, Member	PRESENT (arrived at 9:37 a.m.)
Patrick Segraves, Member	PRESENT
John T. Gannon, Member	PRESENT
Jacqueline Weld Drake, Alternate Member	PRESENT (left at 1:30 p.m.)
Kim Coleman, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Sue Patterson, Alternate Member	PRESENT (left at 1:15 p.m.)_

Staff Members present were:
John S. Page, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building
John Lindgren, Planning Administrator
Kelly Churney, Secretary to the Landmarks Preservation Commission

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Cooney led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 19, 2017 MEETING

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Silvin to approve the minutes of the April 19, 2017 meeting. Motion carried with all in favor.

V. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Ms. Churney stated that the Town received a letter requesting a deferral for COA-003-2017 101 El Brillo Way. Mr. Cooney asked about the number of past deferrals granted. Mr. Lindgren responded.

Mr. Cooney requested a deferral to the June 21, 2017 meeting for COA-003-2017 101 El Brillo Way.

Motion made by Mr. Silvin and seconded by Ms. Albarran to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried with all in favor.

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

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

VII. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC AND COMMISSION MEMBERS: (Please limit comments to 3 minutes):

Anita Seltzer, 44 Cocoanut Row, showed the Commission historic and current photos of the fountain located in Bradley Park. She expressed concern about the current state of the fountain.

Mr. Cooney asked Ms. Seltzer for more information regarding the statue. Ms. Seltzer responded.

Ms. Hufty recounted the conversation regarding the Paramount Theater murals with Dwight Stevens and stated he sent her a file on the murals. She asked for guidance from the Commission on how to procure the murals. She also questioned whether the Town could pursue their retrieval. There was a discussion between Mr. Page and Ms. Hufty regarding whether or not the Town could pursue the retrieval of the murals. Mr. Gannon volunteered to begin negotiations to see if the retrieval of the murals is possible. Ms. Hufty stated she would forward the file she received to Mr. Gannon for his use.

Mr. Silvin began a conversation regarding the different standards when an owner applies for a tax abatement. He also commented on their recent 4-3 vote and the message it sends to the Town Council. He felt the Secretary of Interior Standards are a bit ambiguous and felt a brief presentation would help to provide the Commission with a base of knowledge that they may use when making their decisions.

Mr. Gannon provided his opinion on the 4-3 decision. Mr. Cooney stated that the Code states that tax abatement projects are to be viewed differently.

A discussion took place on the standards in which should be applied when making a decision for an approval on a tax abatement.

Mr. Page stated if the Commissioners agreed he would arrange a 15-minute presentation on tax abatements at their next meeting.

Ms. Fairfax provided her reasons that she voted against the tax abatement request. More discussion continued.

Ms. Hufty asked for bullet points that speak to the advantages of Landmarking and Tax Abatement.

More discussion continued on the standards in which should be applied when making a decision for an approval on a tax abatement.

Amanda Skier, Preservation Foundation, stated the Foundation would be happy to hold a training session that would include tax abatements. Mr. Cooney suggested holding the training in the Council Chambers so that it could be recorded and noticed. Mr. Silvin requested that the training occur on a normally scheduled meeting day if held in the summer months.

Mr. Page stated that he would still schedule a 15-minute presentation at the next meeting in addition to the Foundation training.

Mr. Page stated that Ms. Albarran declared a conflict for a project, COA-019-2017 212 Sunset Avenue at the April 19, 2017 meeting and had correctly completed the 8B form in accordance with State Law.

VIII. INFORMAL REVIEW

1. Review samples for cornice at the Warden House (COA-014-2017, 200 N. Ocean Blvd.)

   Bijan Parssi, Botkin, Parssi and Associates, reviewed the cornice restoration at the Warden House. He presented the Commission with molds, both old and new, for the restoration.

   Mr. Cooney thought that the new sample was a much better match. The other members agreed.

   Ms. Albarran provided an ex parte disclosure and stated she met with Mr. Parssi at her office to discuss the samples.

   Mr. Parssi expressed his appreciation for Ms. Albarran's assistance with the molds.

   Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Ms. Hufty to approve the new sample as presented. Motion carried with all in favor.

IX. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #003-2017
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S) - Done 1/18/17
Address: 101 El Brillo Way
Owner/Applicant: The Palm Trust, c/o Maura Ziska Trustee
Architect: Jose Luis Gonzalez-Perotti/Portuondo Perotti Architects, Inc.
Landscape Architect: Fernando Wong/Fernando Wong Outdoor Living Design
Project Description: Proposed improvements include demolition of existing two-story kitchen, staff and laundry portion of residence. This area will be replaced with proposed two-story kitchen, family room and guest wing as well as basement

storage. The existing residence will also be remodeled in interiors. Landscape improvements are also proposed. Other associated changes as proposed. ***Please note: this is a tax abatement project***

At the January meeting, a motion carried that the implementation of the proposed variance would not cause negative architectural impact to the subject landmarked property. At the February meeting, a motion carried to defer the project for one month to the March 16, 2017 meeting. At the March meeting, a motion carried to approve the project as presented with the caveat for the architect to bring back details for the gates and fountains. At the April meeting, the project was deferred for one month to the May 17, 2017 meeting.

Please note: This item was deferred to the June 21, 2017 meeting at the approval of the agenda, Item V.

B. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #017-2017
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EXCEPTION WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW - Done 4/19/17
Address: 1 S. County Rd.
Owner/Applicant: The Breakers Palm Beach, Inc.
Architect: Steve Pollio/Peacock and Lewis, AIA
Project Description: Construction of a 404 sq. ft. new retail shop in the Palm Court. It will be named Mary Lily's and will sell ice cream and candy. The location is currently a breezeway connecting the Palm Court and the Porte Cochère at the main hotel entrance. This space falls within our overall commercial square footage approved in 1990 for the Palm Court. We believe it will be a valuable addition to our hotel.

At the April meeting, a motion carried that the implementation of the special exception with site plan review would not cause negative architectural impact to the subject landmarked property.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: None.

Mr. Pollio requested a final approval for Mary Lily's, which will be located within a breezeway at the hotel. He stated the project did receive an approval from the Town Council. Mr. Pollio reviewed the proposed modifications for the hotel, presented a floor plan, existing and proposed elevations and details of the area.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Silvin to approve the project as presented. Motion carried with all in favor.

C. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #020-2017
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE - Done 4/19/17
Address: 139 N. County Rd.
Owner/Applicant: Harvey E. Oyer, III, Esq. (Agent)

Architect: Gene Pandula/The Pandula Architects, Inc.
Project Description: A request by the Paramount Church, Inc. ("Paramount") for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing Paramount sign with an identical business sign of the same size, height, number of bulbs, color, appearance and location.

At the April meeting, a motion carried that the implementation of the variance would not cause negative architectural impact to the subject landmarked property.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by Ms. Hufty.

Mr. Pandula stated he presented the replacement of the Paramount sign last month and received a 7-0 informal approval. He stated that he also received a favorable approval from the Town Council as well. He reviewed the modifications proposed to the building. He presented historic photos, details of the proposed modifications, an aerial map, a current photo, a drawing of the north elevation and details of the proposed sign.

Mr. Cooney stated that he was in favor of the project.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Silvin to approve the project as presented. Motion carried with all in favor.

D. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #023-2017
Address: 100 Bradley Place
Owner/Applicant: Town of Palm Beach
Architect: Brian Vertesch/SMI Landscape Architecture
Project Description: Modifications to the west façade of the previously approved proposed bathroom facility that include the addition of decorative tile.

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

Jorge Sanchez presented the proposed modifications for the project. He showed the Commission a site photo, a rendered site plan, previously approved bathroom elevations, photos of the current Tea House and the proposed additions to the bathroom elevation. He discussed the details and presented a detail board of the materials.

Ms. Hufty requested to make sure the proposed green matched the green on the Tea House. She also questioned whether the folly under the pediment should be added to the elevation. Mr. Sanchez stated the intent was to mimic but not copy the Tea House.

Mr. Cooney stated he thought it livened up the bathroom.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Ms. Hufty to approve the project as presented with the caveat that the green color used matched the green in the Tea House. Motion carried with all in favor.

E. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #024-2017
Address: 301 Australian Ave.
Owner/Applicant: CSC Brazilian LP
Architect: None
Project Description: The Brazilian Court Hotel (CSC Brazilian LP) is presenting to the Landmark Preservation Commission for the approval to replace the existing selected exterior (white-painted-wood and tempered glass windows) with (white-aluminum and tempered glass windows) due to the extreme deterioration of the existing exterior windows.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by Ms. Fairfax.

Richard Schlesinger, managing partner of The Brazilian Court Hotel, requested approval of the replacement of the existing window sashes. He provided a history of the previous window replacement, including his code violation due to not obtaining a permit for the replacements. He stated that the proposed window sash and muntin configuration is the same as the existing window.

Nick Spinelli, from Copperline Partners, presented an aerial map, a site map, existing photos and elevations of the hotel.

Mr. Cooney asked how many windows had been already replaced and how many still need to be replaced. Mr. Spinelli stated he would ask the Director of Engineering to answer that question. Mr. Cooney asked if the proposed windows were impact glass. Mr. Spinelli stated they were not but the windows had armor screen on them.

Mike Williams, Director of Engineering for The Brazilian Court Hotel, stated that they had replaced 59 window sashes and have another 90 plus to replace. Ms. Albarran asked what material had been used for the windows that had already been replaced. Mr. Williams stated the original window sashes were wood and they had been replaced with a vinyl material.

Mr. Segraves asked for clarification regarding the condition of the window frames and the sashes. Mr. Segraves asked about the specifications of the windows. Mr. Spinelli and Mr. Williams responded.

Ms. Albarran asked if the new PGT windows matched the previously replaced windows. Mr. Williams responded that they were identical.

Mr. Segraves asked about the sample that was shown.

Ms. Coleman asked to see a picture of the replacement window that reflected the vinyl sash with a wood frame.

Ms. Fairfax asked if the windows were tinted.

Ryan Roman, Eagle Construction, confirmed that the windows were clear glass. Ms. Albarran stated that the drawings reflected single glazing but she asked for confirmation that the windows would be divided lights to match existing. Mr. Roman provided confirmation.

Ms. Fairfax asked if the Commission approves vinyl windows. Mr. Cooney stated he does not recall approving vinyl windows. Ms. Fairfax asked if aluminum windows were acceptable. Mr. Cooney and Ms. Albarran stated that they have previously approved aluminum windows, especially on commercial buildings.

Mr. Segraves asked about the outcome of the Code Enforcement board. Mr. Lindgren responded with the Code Enforcement process. Mr. Lindgren discussed the options the Commission had in the approval and/or denial process.

Mitch Krasne, Owner of Monogram Windows & Doors, spoke about his experience with historical window changes. He spoke about the changes that were made to the windows at the hotel and the material that was used.

Ms. Fairfax asked for the location of the windows that had been replaced. Mr. Krasne responded.

Mr. Segraves asked about the intent for the window replacement. Mr. Krasne responded.

Mr. Lindgren talked about what has historically been approved for window replacements on both Landmark and ARCOM projects.

Ms. Albarran spoke to the quality of the windows that are acceptable for Landmarked buildings.

Mr. Cooney expressed his frustration about the current and historical window replacements that have occurred without approval and permits.

Mr. Schlesinger stated that former building director, Bob Moore, authorized him to replace the window sashes without a building permit. Mr. Lindgren asked if Mr. Moore indicated this in writing. Mr. Schlesinger stated he did not.

Mr. Segraves asked if any full windows had been replaced. Mr. Schlesinger stated he could not confirm this.

There was a discussion about how to move forward. Some of the Commissioners requested a site visit to allow them to look at the newly installed windows.

Mr. Randolph suggested that the Commission take a visit to the site with the clerk, who could record any conversations. There was a discussion about the possibility of a site visit.

Ms. Albarran requested to see a CGI sample to show the newer Commissioners.

Mr. Roman stated he hosted several manufacturers at the project site and found that no one could produce a sash with a muntin similar to what they have proposed.

Some discussion continued on appropriate window replacement material.

Mr. Segraves suggested that the owner have a plan in place for any future window replacement. He also offered that if the Commission decides to approve aluminum, he would like the owner to remove the vinyl windows already installed.

Mr. Cooney asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

Mr. Cooney deferred the item to the end of the meeting until they could visit the property.

Mr. Page stated he would ask the building official to join the site visit.

F. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #021-2017
Address: 3 Four Arts Plaza
Owner/Applicant: Society of the Four Arts
Architect: Thomas M. Kirchhoff/Kirchhoff & Associates Architects
Project Description: At the October 19, 2016 Landmarks meeting, The Commission approved the rehabilitation of the Four Arts Library. They requested that the architect return to the commission to provide the following: 1) a drawing of the front entrance door, 2) Dominican stone samples, 3) A mural removal and restoration update, 4) other associated changes.

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

Mr. Kirchhoff stated the project received approval in October and he returned to provide an update on four items. He showed the Commissioners a site plan and reviewed the plan to remove three power poles. He reviewed some hardscape changes and window changes. He stated that work started on May 1. He showed pictures of work that is taking place. Mr. Kirchhoff showed the Commissioners a photo of the proposed front door, existing and proposed elevations, detail of a balcony section and explained the modifications.

Ms. Fairfax asked about the murals and some possible modifications to the entryway. Mr. Kirchhoff responded.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, asked about lowering the floor. Mr. Kirchhoff responded.

There was a discussion between Ms. Hufty, Ms. Fairfax and Mr. Kirchhoff about modifications to the front entrance, the columns and the balusters.

Ms. Fairfax asked about the proposed balusters compared to existing. Mr. Kirchhoff stated the intent was to copy the balusters identical to existing, with the exception to scale down the height. He stated he would remove one of the balusters to use as a sample when recreating the new ones.

Mr. Randolph asked the Commissioners not to have any sidebar conversations and to speak into their microphones.

Ms. Fairfax asked if Mr. Kirchhoff could bring by the new, corrected drawing for the balusters. Mr. Kirchhoff stated that the Four Arts is a non-profit organization and reviewed the cost associated with presenting to the Commission. Mr. Cooney stated that Mr. Kirchhoff could return informally. Mr. Lindgren added that it could be a condition of an approval.

Mr. Kirchhoff presented the modification to the windows and other modifications.

Mr. Kirchhoff reported on the mural restoration process and answered the Commissioners questions.

Mr. Kirchhoff stated the intent when replacing the cast stone is to make it look original. He brought samples of the proposed cast stone. He stated that they are being very particular when choosing the cast stone.

Ms. Hufty asked about the proposed grout. Mr. Kirchhoff responded.

Mr. Kirchhoff then discussed the stone proposed for the front entry. He showed the Commission a sample from Florida Coral. He stated they are suggesting a Dominican coral from Palm Beach Cast Stone and showed the Commissioners a sample.

Ms. Albarran expressed concern about the Dominican coral.

Mr. Cooney called for public comment and there was none.

Motion made by Ms. Hufty and seconded by Ms. Albarran to approve the project as presented with the caveats to use the stone from Florida Coral, that the new balusters matches the existing in design but not dimension and that Mr. Kirchhoff present a shop drawing of the new balusters. Motion carried with all in favor.

G. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #025-2017
Address: 4 El Bravo Way
Owner/Applicant: JAN Holdings LLC
Architect: Thomas M. Kirchhoff/Kirchhoff & Associates Architects
Project Description: Requesting glass panels in previously approved garage doors in lieu of solid panels.

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

Mr. Kirchhoff presented a site plan, elevations, and a photo of the existing garage doors. He stated Mr. Lindgren administratively approved the addition of glass to the other two garage doors. He presented the modification of additional glass to the three garage doors.

Motion made by Ms. Fairfax and seconded by Mr. Segraves to approve the project as presented. Motion carried with all in favor.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Informal Review – Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #022-2017
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EXCEPTION WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW
Address: 340 Royal Poinciana Way, Ste. 337A
Owner/Applicant: RPP Palm Beach Property, LP, a DE Limited Partnership
Architect: Keith Spina/Glidden Spina + Partners
Project Description: Proposed Landmark Preservation Commission approval for outdoor dining at Coyo Taco in The Royal Poinciana Plaza. Now that Sant Ambroeus' outdoor dining has reinvigorated the east courtyard patio, Up Markets desires to bring to life the west courtyard patio. Coyo Taco will offer its guests award winning Mexican cuisine for breakfast, lunch and dinner while being able to enjoy freshly made Mexican food on the newly renovated fountain patio and terrazzo walkway. Coyo Taco will accommodate 26 outdoor dining seats, both as community style seating and smaller tables, in order to allow the Palm Beach community to take advantage of the beautiful setting and magnificent weather. Just as John Volk originally dreamed of courtyards bustling with activity, Coyo Taco and Up Markets look forward to the next step in restoring his vision for The Royal Poinciana Plaza.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW INFORMATION: The applicant is requesting a special exception with site plan approval to allow 26 seats, of the previously approved 80 seats, to be shifted from inside Coyo Taco and relocated to the exterior for outdoor dining, when weather permits. The proposed restaurant is located in the southwest corner of the Plaza and outdoor dining will be adjacent to the restaurant in the newly created patio area around the west fountain. The outdoor dining will have the proposed hours of: Monday through Friday – Brunch, Lunch and Dinner – 10 a.m. to 10 p.m., Friday through Sunday – brunch, Lunch and Dinner – 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. A further request to revise the previously approved hours for the restaurant to accommodate breakfast service to be one hour earlier: Monday through Thursday – Brunch, Lunch and Dinner – 10 a.m. to 1:00 a.m., Friday through Sunday – Brunch, Lunch and Dinner – 10 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. A further request to allow the restaurant to have catering as an additional service of the restaurant. The catering service will utilize existing employee vehicles and will operate under the same hours of the restaurant.

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

Mr. Spina presented the request for the project. He showed the Commissioners a site plan, floor plan, showed the outdoor seating location and proposed furniture and umbrellas.

Mr. Cooney asked if the umbrellas would be movable. Mr. Spina stated they are movable. Mr. Cooney stated that the signage had to be deleted from the umbrellas.

Ms. Hufty stated she was in favor of the blue and white tables but not the proposed wood tables. Ms. Albarran agreed with Ms. Hufty.

Alexandra Patterson, UpMarkets, stated she would speak to the clients.

Mr. Silvin asked when the restaurant would be open. Ms. Patterson stated she hoped it would be November.

Ms. Hufty expressed concern about the chairs and their comfort.

Mr. Cooney called for public comment and there was none.

Motion made by Ms. Hufty and seconded by Ms. Albarran that the implementation of the proposed special exception with site plan review would not cause negative architectural impact to the subject landmarked property. Motion carried with all in favor.

A short break was taken at 11:50 a.m. The meeting resumed at 12:04 p.m.

XI. DISCUSSION ITEM

1. Presentation of potential properties to consider for Landmark Designation.

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, stated that the owner at 142 Seaspray Avenue approached them to inquire about having their home landmarked. She provided a brief history on the home and showed the Commissioners a photo of the home.

Ms. Albarran asked if other properties by the architect, Kemp Caler, had been landmarked. Ms. Murphy stated that another property on Cocoanut Row had been landmarked. Mr. Cooney stated the address was 153 Cocoanut Row.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Silvin to place 142 Seaspray Avenue under consideration for landmark designation.

Ms. Fairfax asked a question regarding filing a tax abatement for a landmarked home. Mr. Cooney responded. A discussion regarding the tax abatement process ensued.

Ms. Fairfax asked if a home needed to be a certain age to be landmarked. Mr. Cooney responded.

Motion carried with all in favor.

Ms. Murphy presented several properties for the Commission to consider placing under consideration for landmark status. She provided a brief description and showed the Commission photos of the following properties: 127 Kings Rd., 137 Kings Rd., 145 Kings Rd., 455 Australian Ave., 225 S. County Rd., 147 Seabreeze Ave., 124 Clarke Ave., 259 Pendleton Ln., 311 Pendleton Ln., 475 N. County Rd., 244 Nightingale Ln. and 1510 N. Ocean Blvd.

Mr. Page stated that he would ask Bill Bucklew, Building Official to attend a future meeting to provide an update on the FEMA flood plain standards.

Mr. Silvin asked whether owner approval is necessary when recommending homes for landmark status. Mr. Cooney responded by stating that neither the ordinance nor the policy of the Town require owner approval to landmark a property. He did indicate that when owner approval is given, the process becomes simpler. A short discussion ensued regarding this topic.

Ms. Murphy stated that the Preservation Foundation was planning to hold a cocktail party for owners whose homes have been landmarked.

Mr. Cooney told the Commission that May was Historic Preservation Month.

XII. COMMENTS OF THE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING, ZONING & BUILDING DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR.

Mr. Silvin stated that he believes a LPC member should attend the Town Council meetings to represent the Commission. He stated he had been attending but will be going out of town until October. Mr. Cooney stated he would attend the Town Council meetings while he was away.

Mr. Silvin provided an update to the Commission regarding the landmark projects that were presented at the last Town Council meeting.

Mr. Silvin asked for a follow up from Mr. Page regarding the protection of the fountain pieces in Bradley Park. Mr. Page stated he did email Paul Brazil. He provided the Commissioners a copy of the correspondence.

Anita Seltzer, 44 Cocoanut Row, expressed concern about the status of the railing from the bridge that had been landmarked. Mr. Cooney responded. Ms. Seltzer asked the Commission to find out the status of the railing. Mr. Cooney stated he would reach out to FDOT.

Mr. Cooney and Mr. Randolph reviewed the guidelines for the field trip to 301 Australian Ave.

Mr. Randolph suggested that the meeting break and resume at 301 Australian Ave. He also suggested that this trip would be used as a viewing rather than a question and answer session on site. He thought the questions and answers should be raised in the Chambers so that the discussion is recorded.

Mr. Cooney suggested visiting the site to look at the three types of windows and to bring all questions and discussions back to the Chambers.

Mr. Page asked an inspector to join the field trip.

The meeting was paused at 12:40 p.m. and resumed at 301 Australian Ave.

Discussion continued on Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #024-2017

Once at the property, Mr. Spinelli showed the Commissioners the three different windows, which included the old windows, the Pela windows and the new PGT windows that were on the building.

Mr. Krasne pointed out the Pela windows that have a wood frame and aluminum sashes. He stated that they tried to find a similar window but finding a similar window with the same muntin design was a factor. He also pointed to the original windows and discussed the problem when their guests try to use the windows. Mr. Krasne then showed the new vinyl window installed. He talked about the installation of the windows and told the Commissioners that the new windows were brown on the interior and white on the exterior.

Ms. Fairfax stated that the windows appeared to be tinted and questioned if they were ordered with the tint. Mr. Krasne stated that the windows were not tinted and that they were clear glass.

Ms. Patterson asked about the caulking on the windows. Mr. Krasne responded.

Mr. Segraves stated that it appeared that the whole window had been replaced rather than just the sash. Mr. Krasne disagreed.

The group looked at the north elevation of the building as well.

Ms. Albarran stated that PGT bought CGI and wondered if they had a replacement window that would be comparable. Mr. Spinelli stated that PGT was the only manufacturer that would make a window with two different sides.

The meeting was paused and resumed in the Council Chambers at 1:18 p.m.

Discussion continued on Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #024-2017

Ms. Albarran questioned whether other window options were available and was hesitant to make a decision without any research for other replacements.

Ms. Albarran stated she would prefer an aluminum window and was not in favor of the vinyl windows.

Ms. Fairfax expressed concern about the color of the glass in the vinyl window and felt tinted windows should not be approved.

Mr. Schlesinger stated that the new windows were not tinted. Ms. Fairfax stated she would like to see a sample of the window that shows the non-tinted window. She indicated that the sample shown to the Commissioners was tinted.

Mr. Roman stated that the windows installed are PGT's clear windows. Mr. Roman stated that the sun is reflecting off the plantation shutters making the window appear to be tinted. Ms. Fairfax stated she would like to see a sample of the clear glass window with specifications.

Ms. Albarran asked them to research aluminum windows. Mr. Roman stated that CGI Sentinel Series would not make a non-impact window. Ms. Albarran asked for time to do some research. She stated she would prefer an aluminum window with clear glass and the look of the CGI Estate windows.

Ms. Fairfax stated the best scenario would be a mahogany wood window.

Mr. Cooney stated that the Commission has approved aluminum on commercial buildings but best practice would be to replace like materials with like materials. A short discussion ensued.

Mr. Schlesinger expressed his concern about replacing the windows with a wood product. He asked why he could not use the vinyl product as he felt the vinyl was a better match than the aluminum.

Mr. Segraves stated the difference on the windows. He questioned whether the Commission wanted to begin approving vinyl windows. He also suggested using impact glass, regardless of the armor screens, for other beneficial reasons.

Mr. Gannon stated that from a quick observation, the vinyl looks acceptable. However, he questioned whether the Commission should begin to approve the vinyl material.

Mr. Cooney stated he was struggling to accept the vinyl material.

Ms. Coleman stated she noticed gaps where the vinyl connected to the wood frame. Mr. Cooney stated he found issue with the muntin bars.

Mr. Silvin asked about the cost difference between materials that were good, better and best. Ms. Fairfax responded.

Mr. Cooney stated he did not think the Commission should lower their standards because an owner did not follow procedures and began replacing windows without a permit or approval.

Mr. Schlesinger stated that the vinyl window matched the wood window exactly. He also stated the aluminum window were slightly different from the wood window, particularly with the muntin configuration. He expressed concern about trying to find an aluminum window that was non-impact with the correct muntin pattern.

Mr. Gannon stated he understood but the Commission had a responsibility to make sure there are no other options for replacement.

Mr. Schlesinger stated he could find a replacement if money was not an issue. Mr. Cooney stated he understood the practicality of finding a reasonable replacement.

Ms. Albarran stated she needed a month to look into other options.

Mr. Randolph stated it would be appropriate to defer the project but cautioned the Commission on focusing the approval on only one item.

Ms. Coleman asked if the Commission has a standard for building maintenance. Mr. Cooney stated that Code Enforcement addressed those issues. Mr. Randolph stated that there is a provision in the ordinance that addressed deterioration by neglect.

Ms. Fairfax asked the Commissioners opinions on the aluminum windows. Ms. Albarran suggested that the three architects on the Commission independently research possible window replacements for this project.

Ms. Fairfax asked if the Commission is ready to approve vinyl windows. Mr. Randolph stated that question should remain pending based upon the findings in the meeting next month.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran to defer the project to the June 21, 2017 meeting with a caveat that the applicant return with a clear glass window sample while the architects research other window replacement options.

Mr. Schlesinger restated Ms. Albarran's motion for clarification. He requested that the Commission advise Code Enforcement of their deferral.

Mr. Lindgren stated that the Landmarks Commission does not get involved with Code Enforcement issues. Mr. Randolph stated that the Code Enforcement has the ability to take into consideration other boards' recommendations. Mr. Lindgren stated he could update the Code Enforcement board.

Motion seconded by Mr. Gannon. Motion carried with all in favor.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourn at 1:30 p.m. without the benefit of a motion.

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be held on Wednesday, June 21, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 South County Rd. Palm Beach.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward A. Cooney, Chairman
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

kmc