



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 2022

Please be advised that in keeping with a recent 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

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

II. ROLL CALL

Jeffrey W. Smith, Chairman	PRESENT
Richard F. Sammons, Vice Chairman	PRESENT (left 5:09 p.m.)
John David Corey, Member	PRESENT
Maisie Grace, Member	PRESENT
Betsy Shiverick, Member	PRESENT
Thomas Kirchhoff, Member	PRESENT
Kenn Karakul, Member	PRESENT
Dan Floersheimer, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Elizabeth Connaughton, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Joshua L. Martin, Alternate Member	PRESENT

Staff Members present were:
Sarah Pardue, Design & Preservation Planner
Jordan Hodges, Design & Preservation Planner
Kelly Churney, Deputy Town Clerk

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Smith led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 29, 2022 MEETING

Motion made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Mr. Corey to approve the minutes from the June 29, 2022 meeting as amended. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

V. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Ms. Pardue asked for a motion to approve the agenda with the following changes listed on the agenda modification sheet:

Pull ARC-22-119, 150 Worth Avenue from the consent agenda

Deferral of ARC-22-029, 411 Brazilian Avenue to the August 24, 2022 Meeting
Deferral of ARC-22-099 (ZON-22-065), 360 El Brillo Way to the August 24, 2022 Meeting
Deferral of ARC-22-022 (ZON-22-021), 160 Seaview Ave. to the August 24, 2022 Meeting
Deferral of ARC-22-148 (ZON-22-105), 150 Seminole Ave. to the August 24, 2022 Meeting
Deferral of ARC-22-126 (ZON-22-088), 240 Oleander Ave. to the August 24, 2022 Meeting
Withdrawal of ARC-22-133, 482 Island Drive

Motion made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

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 ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Mr. Corey pointed out the digital plans online were helpful and a wonderful resource.

Mr. Bergman discussed the updated notice sent to the neighbors. He stated that the architectural firms were no longer included in the notice and the agenda to pare down the length. He reminded the Commission that this information was included in the staff memos provided to them.

Mr. Bergman also provided an update on the ARCOM Project Designation Manual. He indicated the changes to this manual were adopted at the July Town Council Meeting.

Mr. Floorsheimer inquired about the neighbor consent process. Mr. Bergman responded.

Ms. Grace still believed that the architectural firms' information would be helpful on the agenda. Mr. Bergman responded. Ms. Grace also objected to the neighbor's consent of a project for approval.

Mr. Sammons thought that listing the architectural firms on the agenda could illicit prejudice.

VIII. **PROJECT REVIEW**

A. **CONSENT AGENDA OF MINOR PROJECTS**

1. **ARC-22-077 2276 IBIS ISLE RD.** The applicants, Sue and Sheldon Gering, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for roof replacement with an alternate material.

This item was pulled from consent and was not approved with the consent agenda.

2. **ARC-22-119 150 WORTH AVE.** The applicants, Wilson 150 Worth LLC, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the installation of new second floor window openings along the south elevation and the installation of new service gates.

This item was pulled from consent and was not approved with the consent agenda.

3. **ARC-22-134 325 SEASPRAY AVE.** The applicant, Jeffrey Cohen, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications to existing landscape and hardscape.
4. **ARC-22-138 353 PERUVIAN AVE.** The applicant, Lifestyle Holdings, LLC, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a modification to the existing interior hardscape and landscape, that will include new paving and water features within the interior courtyard and increasing the open space and landscaping on site.

This item was pulled from consent and was not approved with the consent agenda.

5. **ARC-22-139 525 N COUNTY RD.** The applicant, Mr. & Mrs. Flowers, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications to a previously approved design of entry wall and gate as well as interior fountains.

This item was pulled from consent and was not approved with the consent agenda.

6. **ARC-22-145 241 JUNGLE RD.** The applicant, RH Real Estate Organization (Marc Schmidt), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the installation of two (2) new vehicular gates and for fenestration alterations to the existing one-story residence.

This item was pulled from consent and was not approved with the consent agenda.

7. **ARC-22-150 150 BRAZILIAN AVE.** The applicant, Patrick Ryan, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for landscape and hardscape alterations at the single-family residence and the installation of new driveway gates.

This item was pulled from consent and was not approved with the consent agenda.

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the consent agenda as amended, which only included ARC-22-134, 325 Seaspray Avenue. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

Please note: This approval did not include the following projects: ARC-22-077, 2276 Ibis Isle Road, ARC-22-119, 150 Worth Avenue, ARC-22-138, 353 Peruvian Avenue, ARC-22-139, 525 N. County Road, ARC-22-145, 241 Jungle Road and ARC-22-150, 150 Brazilian Avenue.

B. ITEMS PULLED FROM CONSENT

1. **ARC-22-077 2276 IBIS ISLE RD.** The applicants, Sue and Sheldon Gering, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for roof replacement with an alternate material.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: There were no communications disclosed at this time.

Ms. Grace requested the Commission review the item due to the S-tile proposed.

Penny Paine, representing the homeowner, presented the proposed material for the roof replacement.

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

Ms. Shiverick inquired if the s-tile was the original roofing material. Ms. Paine responded and stated that the homeowner would like to replace the tile and return to what they believed was the original material.

Mr. Corey thought the material was high quality.

A roofing representative from Diversified Roofing stated that the material presented had been designed to replicate a true clay barrel tile.

Mr. Kirchhoff wondered why the professional was not using a clay tile. The roofing professional responded.

A short discussion ensued about the quality of the tile.

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the project as presented. Motion carried 4-3, with Mses. Grace, Shiverick and Mr. Kirchhoff dissenting.

2. **ARC-22-119 150 WORTH AVE.** The applicants, Wilson 150 Worth LLC, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the installation of new second floor window openings along the south elevation and the installation of new service gates.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several Commissioners. *Please note: Mr. Sammons declared a conflict of interest for this project and left the dais during the discussion.*

Ms. Pardue indicated that staff removed the project from the consent agenda due to the neighbor's concerns.

Yvonne Jones, on behalf of the owners at 150 Worth Avenue, presented the reasons for the newly proposed second floor window openings.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Bruce Siegel, The Colony Hotel, indicated his concerns for the proposed plans and indicated that the two groups have been in conversations trying to come to an amicable solution.

Ms. Jones discussed her hardship for the proposed windows. She also indicated that they would like to continue discussions with the neighbor regarding the window treatments and coverings.

Ms. Shiverick inquired further about the objections by Mr. Siegel. Mr. Siegel responded. Ms. Shiverick asked if Mr. Siegel objected to the proposed gate, to which Mr. Siegel responded no.

Mr. Floersheimer inquired about the shutters for the windows. Ms. Jones stated that her architectural firm did have another presentation and requested to show the plans to the Commission. Mr. Floersheimer objected to seeing new plans since neither staff nor the Commission had reviewed them.

Mr. Corey inquired about the site plan and whether a variance was needed. Ms. Jones responded. Mr. Corey recommended the use of landscaping next to the windows.

Ms. Grace was concerned that there were no other views of the building shown in the presentation. Ms. Jones responded and stated that there were no other changes proposed to the remainder of the building.

Mr. Floersheimer suggested painting the location of the windows on the building so that the Commission can understand the placement of the windows.

Motion made by Mr. Floersheimer and seconded by Mr. Karakul to defer the project to the August 24, 2022 meeting. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

3. **ARC-22-138 353 PERUVIAN AVE.** The applicant, Lifestyle Holdings, LLC, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a modification to the existing interior hardscape and landscape, that will include new paving and water features within the interior courtyard and increasing the open space and landscaping on site.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments.

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

Mr. Corey indicated his concerns for the project.

Dustin Mizell, Environment Design Group, presented the reasons for the removal of the Alexander palms.

Mr. Corey requested that the palms be replaced with Coconut palms.

Ms. Shiverick inquired about the proposed fireplace. Mr. Mizell discussed the overview of the space and how it would be used. Ms. Shiverick questioned the functionality of the fireplace.

Mr. Floersheimer inquired if the vehicular entrance would be removed, and therefore, the curb cut. Mr. Mizell responded. Mr. Floersheimer inquired if the property would be commercial or residential. Mr. Mizell responded.

Ms. Grace inquired about the newly proposed paving. Mr. Mizell responded. Ms. Grace asked about the water feature, to which Mr. Mizell responded.

Ms. Shiverick thought the use of the property should be determined before the proposal was brought to the Commission. Mr. Mizell responded.

Mr. Sammons inquired if the grade would be raised. He also inquired about the parking for this site, to which Ms. Pardue responded. Mr. Mizell indicated that the grade was not going to be changed.

Ms. Grace agreed with Ms. Shiverick and thought a determination of the property should be made prior to the presentation to the Commission.

Mr. Martin inquired if there was a possibility to clean up the existing site while the owner was seeking approval for the proposed changes.

Mr. Kirchhoff agreed with Ms. Shiverick but thought the design was nice. He recommended an approval without the fireplace.

Ms. Connaughton agreed with Mr. Kirchhoff.

Ms. Grace requested to see more details in the plans.

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

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to defer the project to the August 24, 2022 meeting. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

4. **ARC-22-139 525 N COUNTY RD.** The applicant, Mr. & Mrs. Flowers, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications to a previously approved design of entry wall and gate as well as interior fountains.

Mr. Hodges provided staff comments.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several Commissioners. *Please note: Mr. Smith declared a conflict of interest for the project and left the dais during the construction.*

Leslie Peirce, Smith Architectural Group, presented the architectural modifications to the residence.

Claudia Visconti, SMI Landscape Architecture, presented the landscape and hardscape modifications proposed for the site.

Mr. Karakul wondered if the landscape would be increased with the removal of the gatehouse. Ms. Visconti responded.

Mr. Floersheimer inquired about the walls in front of the home. Ms. Peirce responded.

Ms. Shiverick inquired about the Live Oaks proposed. Ms. Visconti responded.

Mr. Sammons offered his objections to the crest proposed atop the gate.

Motion made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the project as presented. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

5. **ARC-22-145 241 JUNGLE RD.** The applicant, RH Real Estate Organization (Marc Schmidt), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the installation of two (2) new vehicular gates and for fenestration alterations to the existing one-story residence.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments.

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

Daniel Kahan, Smith and Moore Architects, presented the architectural modifications to the residence.

Ms. Grace inquired if the professional would consider a softer color for the gate. Mr. Kahan responded.

Ms. Shiverick stated she did not believe a gate was appropriate on this street.

Mr. Corey agreed with Ms. Shiverick and thought the proposed gate was urban and cold.

Mr. Karakul agreed and stated he design the home without the gate as he did not feel it was necessary.

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

Motion made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Mr. Corey to approve the project, except for the Jungle Road vehicular gate, which was not approved. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

6. **ARC-22-150 150 BRAZILIAN AVE.** The applicant, Patrick Ryan, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for landscape and hardscape alterations at the single-family residence and the installation of new driveway gates.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments.

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

Dustin Mizell, Environment Design Group, presented the landscape and hardscape alterations to the site.

Mr. Floersheimer thought the gate was too big and could be scaled down. He did not believe there were many gates in the surrounding area. He also thought the gate was too similar to the gate adjacent to the property.

Mr. Mizell stated that the gate was 13 feet wide, not 17 feet.

Ms. Grace thought the gates were heavy and dark. She was not in favor of the gate. However, she added that if there were to be a gate, it should be lighter.

Mr. Corey thought the gates were too foreboding and did not belong on the street. He also thought the gate would appear very large in its location on the street.

Mr. Kirchhoff agreed that the gate was too large and dark.

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

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Karakul to defer the project to the August 24, 2022 meeting. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

C. MAJOR PROJECTS – OLD BUSINESS

1. **ARC-22-029 411 BRAZILIAN AVE.** The applicant, Holy Union PB Limited (Sean Sheridan), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new approximately 3700 SF two story residence designed in a mix of modern and classical style architecture.

Please note: This item was deferred to the August 24, 2022 meeting at Item V., Approval of the Agenda.

2. **ARC-22-032 (ZON-22-017) 1237 N LAKE WAY (COMBO)** The applicant, Frank H. Pearl and Geryl T. Pearl, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new 5800 SF two story residence and two-story accessory structure in the modern/classical style of architecture including variances for a two-story accessory structure to replace an existing two-story residence to be demolished. The variance portion of the application will be reviewed by Town Council.

Mr. Hodges provided staff comments on the project.

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

Daniel Clavijo, SKA Architect + Planner, presented the architectural modifications for the newly proposed residence.

Corey Meyer, Nievera Williams Design, indicated that there were no changes to the landscape and hardscape plans.

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

Mr. Floersheimer inquired about the pictures of the rooflines of the proposed and neighboring properties. Mr. Clavijo responded.

Mr. Corey stated he struggled with the home and found the garage too close to the street. He thought the main home lacked charm. Mr. Clavijo responded about the setbacks. Mr. Corey questioned the hip roof and proportions of the main body of the home.

Mr. Sammons questioned the moldings on the proposed home and the proportions of the windows.

Mr. Kirchhoff agreed with Mr. Sammons. He questioned the scale of the windows on the west elevation. He suggested using the inspiration photographs shown as reference.

Mr. Karakul thought the professional made strides to make the changes that the Commission requested.

Motion made by Mr. Karakul to approve the project as presented with further detailing to be made to the residence. Motion failed for lack of a second.

Motion made by Mr. Kirchhoff and seconded by Mr. Corey to defer the project to the August 24, 2022 meeting. Motion carried 6-1, with Mr. Karakul dissenting.

Please note: A short break was taken at 10:45 a.m. The meeting resumed at 11:01 a.m.

3. **ARC-21-038 (ZON-21-002) 218 ROYAL PALM WAY (COMBO)** The applicant, 218 Holdings LLC (Susan Hudson, Manager) has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the expansion of a third floor to an existing three-story building including variances from the parking, generator and wall height, and setback requirements. Town Council shall review the variance portion of the application. The application will require special exception and site plan reviewed by Town Council.

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

Nelo Freijomel, Spina O'Rourke + Partners, presented the architectural modifications proposed for the commercial building.

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

Mr. Sammons inquired about the dimensions to the second-floor columns. Mr. Freijomel responded.

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Grace to approve the project as presented with a slight adjustment to the second-floor columns. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

4. **ARC-22-072 (ZON-22-083) 965 N OCEAN BLVD. (COMBO)** The applicant, 965 North Ocean Boulevard, LLC (Matthew Sellick), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new two-story residence with a basement exceeding 10,000 sq ft with associated landscape and hardscape improvements. Site Plan Review for 150 kW generator will be performed by Town Council.

Mr. Hodges provided staff comments on the project.

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

Roger Janssen, Dailey Janssen Architects, presented the architectural modifications for the newly proposed residence.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

John Dyson, 970 N. Ocean Blvd., expressed his objections to the proposed project.

Derek Limbocker, 977 N Ocean Blvd., expressed his objections to the proposed project.

John C. Dotterrer, 1470 N. Ocean Blvd., expressed his objections to the proposed project.

Bill Metzger, 277 Esplanade Way, expressed his objections to the proposed project.

Ms. Shiverick thought the aerial shots were telling and did not believe there had been enough reduction in the mass or bulk. She stated she would entertain a denial.

Mr. Sammons thought the scale of the guesthouse was appropriate; however, the main house's scale was out of proportion.

Ms. Grace leaned toward a denial as she did not believe enough reductions had been made.

Ms. Connaughton questioned whether the proposed was too dissimilar to the other homes in the neighborhood.

Ms. Grace reminded the professional that the Commission suggested removing the guesthouse at the prior meeting.

Mr. Karakul thought the home's scale was too large for the narrow lot. He also was not in favor of the towers on the main home.

Mr. Corey agreed with his fellow Commissioners. He also supported a motion to deny the project.

Mr. Floersheimer thought the house was too large for the lot, particularly the buildable lot.

Mr. Smith stated he could not see any reductions made to the design.

Mr. Janssen showed the Commissioners alternate drawings and advocate for the proposed home. Mr. Janssen showed photographs of the home on the street, which he believed had similar lot coverage to the proposed home.

Mr. Kirchhoff responded and suggested to Mr. Janssen that the other properties shown had a relief in their design, which he believed Mr. Janssen's design did not.

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Grace to deny the project based on Section 18-205a (1), (6e), and (6f). Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

5. **ARC-22-099 (ZON-22-065) 360 EL BRILLO WAY (COMBO)** The applicant, El Brillo Way Trust uad September 24, 2021 (David Klein, trustee), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new two-story residence over 10,000 sq ft including variances from the angle of vision, front setback for a pool, and building height plane, with related sitework, landscape and hardscape improvements. Town Council will review Variance portion of the application.

Please note: This item was deferred to the August 24, 2022 meeting at Item V, Approval of the Agenda.

6. **ARC-22-105 (ZON-22-071) 124 COCOANUT ROW (COMBO)** The applicant, Nedim Soylemez and Rebecca Ann Soylemez, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the demolition of an existing two-story residence and the construction of a new two-story residence including variances from the cubic content ratio (CCR), height and overall height, with related landscape and hardscape improvements. Town Council will review the variance portion of the applications.

Mr. Hodges provided staff comments on the project.

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

Andrew Kochen, Workshop APD, presented the architectural modifications for the proposed new residence.

John Lang, Lang Design Group, presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

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

Mr. Karakul thought the professional had addressed the requests of the Commission and expressed his support.

Ms. Grace thought the changes were good and was in favor of the front entrance.

Mr. Sammons thought the proportions still needed some work.

Ms. Shiverick thought the proposed home was dark and foreboding. She suggested changing the color of the trim to white.

Mr. Kirchhoff expressed concern for the second-floor terrace on the rear of the home as he believed it could affect the neighbor's privacy.

Mr. Corey agreed that the home had a cold feeling and wondered if the home fit into the area. He wondered if a change in the color of the windows, as well as the type of window, would help the design.

Mr. Smith questioned the detailing on the home and the windows proposed. Mr. Kochen responded.

Mr. Karakul disagreed with the Commissioners. He thought the windows were fine and the landscape plan was good.

Ms. Grace supported the window trim color change to white.

Mr. Martin thought double hung windows with white trim would be more appropriate.

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to defer the project to the August 24, 2022 meeting. Motion carried 6-1, with Mr. Karakul dissenting.

7. **ARC-22-129 (ZON-22-089) 515 N LAKE WAY (COMBO)** The applicant, Roberto and Joanne DeGuardiola (Contract Purchaser) has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the partial demolition, enlargement and second floor addition to an existing one-story residence, including (1-5) to reduce setback requirements, (6) to exceed the angle of vision, (7) to exceed site wall height, and (8) to exceed the maximum Cubic Content Ratio (CCR) allowance. Town Council will review the variance portion of the application.

Mr. Hodges provided staff comments on the project.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.
Please note: Ms. Churney indicated that Mr. Sammons declared a conflict of interest for the project and left the dais during the discussion.

Maura Ziska, attorney for the applicant, explained the zoning requests and advocated for a positive recommendation to the Town Council.

Jamie Torres-Cruz, Fairfax & Sammons, presented the architectural modifications for the newly proposed residence.

Cory Meyer, Nievera Williams Design, presented the landscape and hardscape modifications for the site.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

James Green, representing the Margolis Family at 528 N. Lake Way, stated that his client did not object to the project but requested that a 14-foot hedge be installed between the two properties. Mr. Green submitted a letter, which outlined the request.

Mr. Corey asked about the two variances requested. Mr. Torres-Cruz responded and provided explanation. Mr. Corey inquired if the existing house was being retained. Mr. Torres-Cruz responded. Mr. Corey found the home too large for the lot and expressed a concern for the increase of CCR. He added that he could not support the current project.

Ms. Grace inquired about the hedging material proposed and wondered if breaks in the hedging could be offered. Mr. Meyer responded.

Joanne DeGuardiola, owner, understood Ms. Grace's concern but stated that they spoke to most of the neighbors and the landscape plan addressed all of the requests, which included tall hedging material.

Mr. Karakul thought the house was very tasteful and well balanced. He supported the project.

Mr. Floersheimer agreed with Mr. Corey on the CCR variance. He wondered if a reduction in the floor heights would help. He also agreed with Mr. Karakul that the home was well designed. He wondered if additional greenspace could be retained by reducing some hardscape. Mr. Meyer responded.

Mr. Kirchhoff thought the home was nicely designed. He also thought this was a brand-new home rather than a rebuilt home. He provided a suggestion for the awning on the south elevation.

Ms. Connaughton also supported the home. She expressed a slight concern for the awning over the garage.

Ms. Shiverick wondered if the property had been expanded to the north. Mr. Torres-Cruz responded. Ms. Shiverick expressed concern about a possible traffic concern with the hedge along Tangier. She also agreed with Mr. Floersheimer in his suggestion for a reduction in the hardscape.

Mr. Smith was in favor of the changes. He was supportive of the location of the garage and the dark trim.

Mr. Corey expressed a concern about the increase in CCR for this lot.

Mr. Martin cautioned against reducing the ceiling heights to obtain the correct CCR.

Mr. Karakul agreed with Mr. Martin and thought the proportions were correct in this design.

Ms. Shiverick agreed with Mr. Karakul and thought good design should supersede calculations. She inquired about the colors of the awning. Mr. Torres-Cruz responded. Ms. Shiverick suggested changing the window trim to white and using black/white awnings.

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

Motion made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to approve the project as presented with the following conditions: the window trim shall be changed to a white color, the hardscape around the pool shall be reduced and a 14-foot hedge shall be installed adjacent to 528 N. Lake Way

at the request of the neighbor. Motion carried 6-1, with Mr. Corey dissenting.

8. **ARC-22-022 (ZON-22-021) 160 SEAVIEW AVE. (COMBO)** The applicant, Coral Beach Corporation (Angela Feldman, President) (160 Seaview Ave) and Seaview Holdings, Inc. (David Feldman, Director) (170 Seaview Ave), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval of the construction of a new two-story guest house including variances from setback and point of measurement requirements on a unified site of 160 and 170 Seaview Avenue. Town Council will review the variance portion of the application.

Please note: This item was deferred to the August 24, 2022 meeting at Item V., Approval of the Agenda.

Please note: Mr. Sammons returned to the meeting at 12:44 p.m.

9. **ARC-22-122 239 EMERALD LN.** The applicant, Buck House Limited, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval to construct a new two-story addition to the west and rear of the existing two-story residence, and for alterations including new windows and doors, hardscape, and landscape modifications.

Mr. Hodges provided staff comments on the project.

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

Taylor Smith, Smith Kellogg Architecture, Inc., presented the architectural modifications for the newly proposed residence.

Claudia Visconti, SMI Landscape Architecture, presented the landscape and hardscape modifications for the site.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Dr. Jerome Klein, 225 Emerald Lane, expressed his concerns for the proposed changes.

Mr. Kirchhoff thought the changes were good and was in full support of the project.

Ms. Grace was supportive of the project.

Mr. Karakul agreed with Mr. Kirchhoff and was in full support of the project.

Ms. Connaughton inquired about the pitch break in the roof. She also wondered if the professional would consider using the same motif as the louvers. She also suggested increasing the shutter size adjacent to the French doors.

Mr. Corey inquired about 3-D renderings. Mr. Smith showed the renderings on the overhead projector.

Mr. Floersheimer inquired about the number of mechanical units proposed. Mr. Smith responded.

Mr. Sammons expressed concern for the removal of the screen porch.

Motion made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Ms. Grace to approve the project as presented. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

Please note: A lunch break was taken at 12:59 p.m. The meeting resumed at 2:03 p.m. Mr. Floersheimer and Ms. Grace returned at 2:05 p.m.

10. **ARC-22-127 234 LIST RD.** The applicant, Valley Property Management, LLC. (Phil Cambo), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the demolition of the existing one-story residence and the construction of a new one-story residence with related landscape and hardscape improvements.

Mr. Hodges provided staff comments on the project.

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

Gregory Bonner, B1 Architect, presented the architectural modifications for the newly proposed residence.

Grace Walton, Environment Design Group, presented the landscape and hardscape modifications for the site.

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

Ms. Grace inquired about the neighbor's concerns for the mechanical equipment. Mr. Bonner responded. Ms. Grace inquired if the equipment could be placed in the rear setback. Mr. Bonner responded and indicated that adequate screening had been provided.

Mr. Corey asked if the equipment would be covered. Ms. Walton responded.

Ms. Grace suggested moving the equipment north by 10 feet. Mr. Bonner agreed to the suggestion.

Mr. Kirchhoff thought the home exceeded the allowable cubic content. Mr. Kirchhoff asked about the height of the windows. Mr. Bonner responded.

Ms. Shiverick thought the brackets had been brought down too much. She also questioned the choice of color for the window trim. She suggested using a different front door as well. She inquired about whether the water table would be painted white, to which Mr. Bonner replied yes.

Ms. Connaughton thought that inspiration images could be helpful.

Motion made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Ms. Grace to defer the project to the August 24, 2022 meeting in accordance with the comments from the Commissioners, including the direction to meet with the neighbor to resolve any issues with the location of the mechanical equipment. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

D. MAJOR PROJECTS – NEW BUSINESS

1. **ARC-22-094 249 MONTEREY RD.** The applicant, Michael Peacock, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the demolition of an existing single-family residence and the construction of a new single-family residence with related hardscape and landscape improvements.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

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

Rick Gonzalez, REG Architects, presented the architectural plans for the newly proposed residence.

Adam Mills, Environment Design Group, presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Dragana Connaughton, 267 Merrain Road, expressed her objections to the proposed project.

Ms. Grace was disappointed to see the demolition of the existing home. She wondered if the professional considered the historic building designation. She questioned the design style proposed for the new home and wondered if the new home would appear boxy on the site. She questioned the bay window on the front façade as well as the fenestration.

Ms. Shiverick thought it was a fantastic opportunity to save the home. She advocated for the existing home to be saved.

Mr. Sammons was not in favor of the proposed garage. He thought the house was too wide and questioned the design style.

Mr. Kirchhoff questioned the cubic content calculations. He also agreed with the other comments on the proposed design style. He also questioned the bay window proposed.

Ms. Connaughton was not in favor of the removal of the large trees in the front yard. She also was not in support of the demolition of the existing Fatio home. She questioned the ratios and proportions of the design.

Please note: Mr. Martin returned at 2:46 p.m.

Mr. Karakul thought the design was unsuccessful in the material choices as well as in the scale and design.

Mr. Corey agreed with his fellow Commissioners. He thought the Monterey style was the best choice but was not in favor of the front facing garage as well as the chimney. He also questioned some of the proportions in the design. He suggested if the large trees were to be removed, to replace them with large shade trees.

Mr. Smith suggested eliminating the Mission style. He recommended restudying the proportions and returning with a Monterey design.

Motion made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Mr. Sammons to deny the project based on Section 18-205a (1). Motion failed 3-4, with Messrs. Corey, Kirchhoff, Karakul and Smith dissenting.

Motion made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Mr. Kirchhoff to defer the project to the September 28, 2022 meeting. Motion carried 4-3, with Mr. Sammons and Ms. Grace and Shiverick dissenting.

2. **ARC-22-098 (ZON-22-064) 742 SLOPE TRL (COMBO)** The applicant, John R. Tozzi, Trustee of the Tozzi Family Trust u/a/d December 29, 1980, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for two (2) one (1)-story 273 square foot additions to create two (2) new front-loading single car garages to an existing one-story residence, including a variance to exceed the maximum Cubic Content Ratio (CCR) to permit 5.99 in lieu of the existing 5.7 and the 3.91 maximum allowed in the R-B Zoning District. Town Council will review the variances portion of the application.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

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

Rich Leja, ACI Architecture, presented the architectural modifications to the existing residence.

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

Ms. Grace inquired about the reason for the request. Mr. Leja responded.

Mr. Sammons wondered if the issues could be resolved with a driveway realignment. He thought the solution was acceptable but wished the garage door could be nicer.

Mr. Floersheimer thought there were other ways to resolve the issue. He thought the addition of the garages unbalanced the home and would be unsightly.

Mr. Corey thought the garage design could work and could even add to the façade. He thought the proposed columns were too boxy. He recommended moving the driveway to the middle of the property.

Ms. Shiverick saw the opportunity to make the front façade more pleasant looking. She recommended adding some plants on the upper balcony. She understood the request and did not believe it would disturb many neighbors.

Mr. Karakul agreed with Ms. Shiverick and thought the design could be very successful. He liked Mr. Corey's idea of the center driveway. He suggested adding some vertical landscaping around the garage doors.

Mr. Kirchhoff also liked the idea of the center driveway. However, he added that he could support the project. He recommended moving the garages so that they centered under the windows above.

A discussion ensued about a possible motion with the requirement of a center drive aisle.

Motion made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to approve the project with the following conditions: the columns will be proportional to the entablature and the two center columns will be round. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

3. **ARC-22-123 (ZON-22-078) 231 BRADLEY PL (COMBO)** The applicant, Bradley Palm LLC, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for exterior design modifications and additions to the existing two-story office building including façade alterations and the construction of a new second floor balcony and new exterior stair, including variances from the parking requirements, setback requirements and lot coverage requirements. The variance and Special exception with site plan review portion of the application shall be reviewed by Town Council.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

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

M. Timothy Hanlon, attorney for the applicant, explained the zoning requests and advocated for a positive recommendation to the Town Council.

Pablo Garcia, Gensler, presented the architectural modifications proposed for the existing commercial building.

Jonathan Hague, Kimley Horn, presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Mr. Hanlon discussed the change to the stairwells. He discussed his contact with the neighbors.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Bill and Anne Metzger, 277 Esplanade Way, expressed their concerns for the proposed project.

Mr. Garcia addressed the concerns made by the Metzgers.

Ms. Shiverick thought the changes were an improvement and was in favor of the proposed materials. She recommended changing the window trim to a white color.

Ms. Grace thought the existing design felt more like Palm Beach than the proposed. She thought the new entrance lacked charm.

Mr. Sammons was in favor of the changes. He requested that the professional enclose the first-floor parking structure. He also recommended reducing the scale of the front entrance.

Mr. Smith discussed the balustrades. He was not in favor of removing the trees on the street.

Mr. Martin thought the mechanical equipment on the rooftop was the worst part of the building. Mr. Garcia responded. Mr. Martin agreed with Mr. Sammons on the first-floor parking. Mr. Martin also agreed with the comments about the front entrance and recommended restudying this design feature. He also recommended revisiting the proportion of the lights as well.

Mr. Corey was not in favor of the enclosed, two-story entrance. He provided some design suggestions for this feature. He also agreed with Mr. Smith and was not in favor of the removal of the front trees. He provided further design suggestions.

Ms. Connaughton agreed with many of the Commissioners and thought the front entrance design needed some restudy.

There was a short discussion regarding the front entrance design.

Mr. Floersheimer inquired about the design of the interior space in the front entrance. Mr. Garcia responded.

Mr. Karakul was not in favor of the hip roof over the front entrance. He also recommended adding taller landscaping around the building.

Motion made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Ms. Grace to defer the project to the August 24, 2022 meeting for a restudy in accordance with the comments of the Commissioners. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

4. **ARC-22-137 (ZON-22-092) 321 BARTON AVE (COMBO)** The applicant, Timothy Hanlon, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for site improvements to the hardscape and landscape plans, including a new motor court, garage parking removal, and relocating a freestanding landscape wall, including variances to reduce the open space requirements and to eliminate the garage requirement. The variance review portion of the application shall be reviewed by Town Council.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

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

M. Timothy Hanlon, attorney for the applicant, explained the zoning requests and advocated for a positive recommendation to the Town Council.

Dustin Mizell, Environment Design Group, presented the landscape and hardscape modifications proposed for the site.

Diane Ramirez, owner, discussed the issues of the existing driveway.

Samuel Ramirez, owner, also discussed the issues of their current driveway.

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

Mr. Corey thought the project was very nice. He confirmed the motor court was sufficient for a turning radius, to which Mr. Mizell responded yes. Mr. Corey also suggested removing the sidelights from the newly proposed French doors.

Mr. Floersheimer inquired about the proposed stepping-stones. He suggested removing the stepping-stones to gain more greenspace. Mr. Mizell responded.

Ms. Grace recommended trying to grow sod in the joints in the motor court.

Ms. Shiverick had experienced the tightness of the driveway and empathized with the homeowner. She agreed with Ms. Grace and wondered if sod could be added to the motor court.

Motion made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to approve the project as presented with the following conditions: sod joints shall be added to the motor court and the sidelights shall be eliminated from the French doors. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Shiverick that implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative

architectural impact to the subject property. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

5. **ARC-22-140 248 VIA MARILA** The applicant, 248 Via Marila Trust dated September 13, 2021 (Guy Rabideau), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the demolition of an existing two-story single-family residence, one-story guesthouse, pool and hardscape, and the construction of a new two-story single-family residence with related hardscape and landscape improvements.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

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

Stephen Roy, Roy & Posey, presented the architectural plans for the proposed new residence.

Cory Meyer, Nievera Williams Design, presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

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

Ms. Grace thought the house was sited nicely. She stated she preferred a more traditional window and requested more uniformity in the fenestration.

Mr. Sammons questioned the proposed shutters with the casement windows. He suggested reducing the front door size as well as the size of the home.

Ms. Shiverick thought the project was very nice and would fit nicely on the street. She was in favor of the landscaping plans. She recommended changing the windows to double hung windows. She was in favor of the lighting choices.

Mr. Karakul thought the design was very nice and innovative. He thought the house was attractive.

Mr. Kirchhoff thought the plan was well conceived. He also preferred double hung windows.

Mr. Smith provided a suggestion for the columns on the street side.

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Grace to defer the project to the August 24, 2022 meeting. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

6. **ARC-22-141 218 MERRAIN RD.** The applicant, Robert and Kate Keith, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for demolition of an existing 4,287 square foot residence and construction of a new contemporary two-story residence with associated landscape and hardscape.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

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

Benjamin Schreier, Affiniti Architects, presented the architectural plans for the proposed new residence.

Cory Meter, Nievera Williams Design, presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Cindy Anderson, 226 Merrain Road, expressed her concerns for the proposed project.

Peter McKelvy, 1295 N. Lake Way, expressed his concerns for the proposed project.

Andrew Stewart, 210 Merrain Road, expressed his concerns for the proposed project.

Ms. Shiverick was not in favor of the style of the home and thought it was too dissimilar for the area. She also questioned the amount of fill proposed for the home.

Mr. Sammons thought the style of the home was too dissimilar to the surrounding homes. He did not find the home charming and thought it lacked quality materials.

Mr. Corey agreed with Ms. Shiverick and Mr. Sammons and thought the home clashed with the surrounding homes.

Ms. Grace agreed with her fellow Commissioners.

Mr. Kirchhoff did not believe the home was appropriate for the area.

Mr. Karakul agreed and did not believe the materials were appropriate for the site.

Motion made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Mr. Corey to deny the project based on Section 18-205a (5), (6c). Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

Please note: The Commission took a short break at 4:59 p.m. The meeting resumed at 5:09 p.m. Mr. Karakul returned at 5:13 p.m. Mr. Sammons did not return to the meeting.

7. **ARC-22-143 (ZON-22-093) 1356 N OCEAN BLVD. (COMBO)** The applicant, Pippasbeachclub LLC (Gary and Kelly Pohrer), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a new

beach cabana structure, requiring special exception and site plan review, and variances for (1) height, (2 + 3) setbacks, and (4) pool equipment location. Town Council will review the special exception with site plan review and variances portion of the application.

Mr. Hodges provided staff comments on the project.

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

Maura Ziska, attorney for the applicant, explained the zoning requests and advocated for a positive recommendation to the Town Council.

Peter Papadopoulos, Smith and Moore Architects, presented the architectural plans for the newly proposed beach cabana.

Dustin Mizell, Environment Design Group, presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Mr. Smith objected to the beach cabana, particularly the parapet roof and the siting of the cabana. He thought the cabana was over the top in its design. He thought it should be moved out of the view of Seagate Road.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

James McKelvy, 1295 N. Lake Way, expressed his objections to the proposed project.

Mr. Karakul questioned the hip roof and thought the parapet should be reduced in scale.

Ms. Shiverick inquired about the variance for the height. Mr. Papadopoulos responded. She also inquired about the remaining variances requested. Mr. Papadopoulos responded.

Ms. Connaughton thought the cabana was overdesigned. She thought the most successful cabanas were more simplified.

Gary Pohrer, owner, discussed the design of the beach cabana.

Mr. Corey agreed with Mr. Smith's assessment of the cabana. He also expressed concerns for items proposed for the dune. He thought the project should return with a very sensitive design.

Ms. Grace agreed with Mr. Corey regarding the hardscape proposed and the number of items around the cabana. She supported the actual cabana.

Mr. Kirchhoff thought the design of the proposed cabana was too heavy.

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to defer the project to the September 28, 2022 meeting. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

8. **ARC-22-142 232 MOCKINGBIRD TRAIL** The applicant, The Beach House Trust, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the demolition of an existing 3,371 square foot residence. Construction of a new two-story 4,629 square foot residence with associated landscape and hardscape.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

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

Benjamin Schreier, Affiniti Architects, presented the architectural plans for the proposed new residence.

Selene Basile, Fernando Wong Outdoor Living Design, presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

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

Ms. Grace questioned the design style for the north end of the island. She thought the style was too formal and rigid. She was in favor of the native plantings.

Ms. Connaughton thought the front façade was interesting; however, she agreed with Ms. Grace and wondered if the design fit into the north end. She thought the design might be better in another location.

Mr. Corey thought the design was nice but agreed with Ms. Connaughton. He did not believe it fit into the north end of the island. He was in favor of the landscaping plan. He thought the home was well proportioned and well scaled.

Mr. Kirchhoff agreed with Mr. Corey. He was in favor of the house but did not believe it would fit into the proposed location.

Mr. Schreier touched on the possibility of bringing conceptual drawings to the Architectural Review Commission to save both time and money for the residents.

Motion made by Ms. Grace and seconded by Mr. Corey to defer the project to the September 28, 2022 meeting with the direction to consider different architectural styles appropriate for the area. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

9. **ARC-22-148 (ZON-22-105) 150 SEMINOLE AVE. (COMBO)** The applicant, James Lansing and Haviva D. Langenauer, as Trustee of the Haviva

D. Langenauer Trust u/a/d/8/10/92, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a demolition and redesign of the southern portion of the existing two-story residence, a redesign of all facades, the construction of an approximately 680 SF addition to the second story, and new pool, and new hardscape and landscape, requiring variances to maintain existing nonconforming setbacks with more than 50% demolition of a nonconforming structure as part of a renovation. Town Council will review the variance portion of the application.

Please note: This item was deferred to the August 24, 2022 meeting at Item V., Approval of the Agenda.

10. **ARC-22-153 243 SEASPRAY AVE.** The applicant, 243 Seaspray LLC, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the demolition of an existing two-story residence and the construction of a new single-family residence in the Island Transitional Style.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

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

Ms. Grace raised the issue of the notice to the neighbors. Ms. Pardue responded.

Gregory Bonner, B1 Architect, presented the architectural plans for the proposed new residence.

Grace Walton, Environment Design Group, presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

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

Ms. Shiverick thought the proposed home did not pay homage to the existing home. She could not support the home and stated she would support a denial.

Ms. Grace was sad to see the existing home demolished. She agreed with Ms. Shiverick.

Mr. Corey thought the home was too large for the site. He provided some suggestions for the design moving forward.

Ms. Connaughton thought there was too much going on with the front façade design. She also thought the home was too large for the street. Ms. Connaughton thought the home was too dissimilar to the surrounding homes in the area.

Mr. Martin thought the house was not appropriate for the area. He thought a denial was appropriate.

Mr. Kirchhoff questioned the proposed cubic content for this house. He thought the number exceeded the allowable CCR.

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Floersheimer to defer the project to the September 28, 2022 meeting for a complete restudy of the project. Motion carried 5-2, with Mses. Grace and Shiverick dissenting.

11. **ARC-22-126 (ZON-22-088) 240 OLEANDER AVE. (COMBO)** The applicant, PTMJM Florida Investment Properties, LLC (Patricia Lambrecht), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the demolition of an existing two-story apartment building and the construction of a new two-story single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape and pool, requiring variances due to deficient lot area and to exceed maximum lot coverage. Town Council will review the variance portion of the application.

Please note: This item was deferred to the August 24, 2022 meeting at Item V., Approval of the Agenda.

E. MINOR PROJECTS – OLD BUSINESS

1. **ARC-22-097 142 PERUVIAN AVE.** The applicant, Susan & Robert Taylor, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the replacement of two pedestrian courtyard gates on a two-story condominium building.

Mr. Hodges provided staff comments on the project.

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

Steve Mittman, board president for the condominium at 142 Peruvian Avenue, presented the architectural plans proposed for the new pedestrian gates.

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

Ms. Shiverick inquired if a wood material door would be considered. Mr. Mittman responded. Ms. Shiverick thought that a wood door would be much more appealing.

Ms. Grace asked how often the doors have been replaced. Mr. Mittman responded.

Mr. Martin wondered if it possible to replicate the existing doors. Mr. Karakul agreed.

Mr. Karakul thought the cross rail spoiled the design in the proposed door.

Mr. Corey agreed and thought a wood door would be most appropriate.

Ms. Grace agreed.

Ms. Connaughton strongly encouraged the replication of the existing door in a wood material.

There was a discussion about a possible motion.

Mr. Smith passed the gavel.

Motion made by Mr. Smith to approve the PVC door with the detailing of option number two, shown in plan. Motion failed for lack of a second.

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Grace to defer the project to the August 24, 2022 meeting. Motion carried 6-1, with Mr. Smith opposed.

2. **ARC-22-101 249 WORTH AVE.** The applicant, Holbrook Real Estate, LLC. (Jane Holzer), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for storefront alterations to an existing commercial space.

Mr. Hodges provided staff comments on the project.

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

Mary Langan, Architect for David Yurman, presented the proposed material for the modifications to the existing commercial space.

Mr. Floersheimer and Ms. Shiverick preferred the travertine material.

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

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the project with the limestone-finished material. Motion carried 5-2, with Mr. Floersheimer and Ms. Grace dissenting.

F. MINOR PROJECTS – NEW BUSINESS

1. **ARC-22-133 482 ISLAND DR.** The applicant, 482 Island Drive Trust (William W. Atterbury III), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for exterior modifications to an existing seawall and dock.

Please note: This item was withdrawn at Item V., Approval of the Agenda.

2. **ARC-22-152 375 S COUNTY RD.** The applicant, Three Seventy Five South County Assoc/ Gedney Station, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the installation of two (2) wall mounted pieces of artwork in the courtyard of an existing one-story building.

Mr. Hodges provided staff comments on the project.

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

Nelo Freijomel, Spina O'Rourke, presented the proposed artwork for the commercial space.

Ms. Grace thought the artwork was acceptable if the lighting were changed.

Mr. Floersheimer was not in favor of the proposed artwork.

Mr. Corey inquired about the material of the artwork. Mr. Freijomel responded. Mr. Corey thought there were many details were missing and could not support the request.

Mr. Karakul wondered if other architectural features were considered, rather than the artwork proposed. Mr. Freijomel responded.

Ms. Connaughton was not in favor of the art in front of the windows.

Mr. Smith thought that artwork on canvas, installed outdoors, would be odd. He suggested placing art on tiles.

Motion made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Mr. Corey to defer the project to the August 24, 2022 meeting with the consideration of different architectural features in the space or art placed on tiles. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

IX. UNSCHEDULED ITEMS (3 MINUTE LIMIT PLEASE)

1. Public

There were no comments heard at this time.

2. Staff

Ms. Churney stated that Joshua Martin declared a continuing conflict for a project at 143 Reef Road at the June 29, 2022 meeting and had correctly completed the 8B form in accordance with State Law.

Ms. Churney stated that Richard Sammons declared a continuing conflict for a project at 249 Worth Avenue at the June 29, 2022 meeting and had correctly completed the 8B form in accordance with State Law.

3. Commission

Mr. Floersheimer discussed a previous project on Oleander Avenue, which had a glass railing. He recalled that the Commission directed the professional to remove the glass railing and indicated that it had not been removed.

Ms. Grace recommended reducing the time for presentations to less than 15 minutes. A consensus of the Commission was to reduce the presentation time unless the square

footage of the proposed home was greater than 10,000 square feet.

Mr. Kirchhoff raised the issue of the three projects that had incorrect CCR calculations.
Mr. Hodges responded.


X. **NEXT MEETING DATE:** Wednesday, August 24, 2022

XI. **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to adjourn the meeting at 6:48 p.m. The meeting was adjourned without the benefit of a roll call.

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 24, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 S. County Road.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Jeffrey W. Smith", written over the printed name and title.

Jeffrey W. Smith, Chairman
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

kmc

CERTIFICATION OF ACTION BY THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION

The Architectural Review Commission has denied the following request as it is not in accordance with the criteria set forth in Article III. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND PROCEDURE, Section 18-205 Criteria.

Application Number and Title: ARC-22-141, 218 Merrain Road

Address: 218 Merrain Road

Applicant: Robert and Kate Keith

Architect: Benjamin Schreier / Affiniti Architects

Project Description: Demolition of an existing 4,287 sq. ft. residence and construction of a new contemporary two-story residence with assoc. landscape and hardscape
The above request has been denied by the Architectural Review Commission for the following reasons:

- ___ (1) The plan for the proposed building or structure is not in conformity with good taste and design and in general does not contribute to the image of the town as a place of beauty, spaciousness, balance, taste, fitness, charm and high quality.
- ___ (2) The plan for the proposed building or structure does not indicate the manner in which the structures are reasonably protected against external and internal noise, vibrations, and other factors that may tend to make the environment more desirable.
- ___ (3) The proposed building or structure is, in its exterior design and appearance, of inferior quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.
- ___ (4) The proposed building or structure is not in harmony with the proposed developments on land in the general area, with the comprehensive plan for the town, and with any precise plans adopted pursuant to the Comprehensive Plan.
- ✓ (5) The proposed building or structure is excessively similar to any other structure existing or for which a permit has been issued or to any other structure included in the same permit application within 200 feet of the proposed site in respect to one or more of the following

features of exterior design and appearance:

- a. Apparently visibly identical front or side elevations;
- b. Substantially identical size and arrangement of either doors, windows, porticos or other openings or breaks in the elevation facing the street, including reverse arrangement; or
- c. Other significant identical features of design such as, but not limited to, material, roof line and height of other design elements.

✓ (6)

The proposed building or structure is excessively dissimilar in relation to any other structure existing or for which a permit has been issued or to any other structure included in the same permit application within 200 feet of the proposed site in respect to one or more of the following features:

- a. Height of building or height of roof.
- b. Other significant design features including, but not limited to, materials or quality of architectural design.
- c. Architectural compatibility.
- d. Arrangement of the components of the structure.
- e. Appearance of mass from the street or from any perspective visible to the public or adjoining property owners.
- f. Diversity of design that is complimentary with size and massing of adjacent properties.
- g. Design features that will avoid the appearance of mass through improper proportions.
- h. Design elements that protect the privacy of neighboring property.

— (7)

The proposed building or structure is not appropriate in relation to the established character of other structures in the immediate area or neighboring areas in respect to significant design features such as material or quality or architectural design as viewed from any

public or private way (except alleys).


- ___ (8) The proposed development is not in conformity with the standards of this Code and other applicable ordinances insofar as the location and appearance of the buildings and structures are involved.
- ___ (9) The project's location and design does not adequately protect unique site characteristics such as those related to scenic views, rock outcroppings, natural vistas, waterways, and similar features.

The applicant is advised that appeals must be filed with the Town Clerk within 10 days in accordance with Article III. Section 18-177 of the Town Code of Ordinances.

CERTIFICATION:

The above denial was issued by the Architectural Review Commission at their meeting on 7/27/22

TOWN OF PALM BEACH



Chairman, Architectural Commission

CERTIFICATION OF ACTION BY THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION

The Architectural Review Commission has denied the following request as it is not in accordance with the criteria set forth in Article III. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND PROCEDURE, Section 18-205 Criteria.

Application Number and Title: ARC-22-072 (ZON-22-083) 965 N. Ocean Blvd.

Address: 965 N. Ocean Blvd

Applicant: 965 North Ocean Boulevard, LLC (Matthew Sellick)

Architect: Roger Janssen

Project Description: Construction of a new two-story residence w/ a basement exceeding 10,000 sq ft w/ assoc. landscape and hardscape improvements. SPR for a 150 KW generator will be performed by Town Council.

- The above request has been denied by the Architectural Review Commission for the following reasons:
- ☒ (1) The plan for the proposed building or structure is not in conformity with good taste and design and in general does not contribute to the image of the town as a place of beauty, spaciousness, balance, taste, fitness, charm and high quality.
 - ☐ (2) The plan for the proposed building or structure does not indicate the manner in which the structures are reasonably protected against external and internal noise, vibrations, and other factors that may tend to make the environment more desirable.
 - ☐ (3) The proposed building or structure is, in its exterior design and appearance, of inferior quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.
 - ☐ (4) The proposed building or structure is not in harmony with the proposed developments on land in the general area, with the comprehensive plan for the town, and with any precise plans adopted pursuant to the Comprehensive Plan.
 - ☐ (5) The proposed building or structure is excessively similar to any other structure existing or for which a permit has been issued or to any other structure included in the same permit application within 200 feet of the proposed site in respect to one or more of the following

features of exterior design and appearance:

- a. Apparently visibly identical front or side elevations;
- b. Substantially identical size and arrangement of either doors, windows, porticos or other openings or breaks in the elevation facing the street, including reverse arrangement; or
- c. Other significant identical features of design such as, but not limited to, material, roof line and height of other design elements.

✓
— (6)

The proposed building or structure is excessively dissimilar in relation to any other structure existing or for which a permit has been issued or to any other structure included in the same permit application within 200 feet of the proposed site in respect to one or more of the following features:

- a. Height of building or height of roof.
- b. Other significant design features including, but not limited to, materials or quality of architectural design.
- c. Architectural compatibility.
- d. Arrangement of the components of the structure.
- e. Appearance of mass from the street or from any perspective visible to the public or adjoining property owners.
- f. Diversity of design that is complimentary with size and massing of adjacent properties.
- g. Design features that will avoid the appearance of mass through improper proportions.
- h. Design elements that protect the privacy of neighboring property.

— (7)

The proposed building or structure is not appropriate in relation to the established character of other structures in the immediate area or neighboring areas in respect to significant design features such as material or quality or architectural design as viewed from any

public or private way (except alleys).

- ☐ (8) The proposed development is not in conformity with the standards of this Code and other applicable ordinances insofar as the location and appearance of the buildings and structures are involved.
- ☐ (9) The project's location and design does not adequately protect unique site characteristics such as those related to scenic views, rock outcroppings, natural vistas, waterways, and similar features.

The applicant is advised that appeals must be filed with the Town Clerk within 10 days in accordance with Article III. Section 18-177 of the Town Code of Ordinances.

CERTIFICATION:

The above denial was issued by the Architectural Review Commission at their meeting on July 27, 2022

TOWN OF PALM BEACH



Chairman, Architectural Commission

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME <i>Sammons, Richard</i>		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <i>Architectural Review Commission</i>	
MAILING ADDRESS <i>455 Worth Ave</i>		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY <i>Palm Beach</i>	COUNTY <i>Palm Beach</i>	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED <i>July 27, 2022</i>		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <i>Town of Palm Beach</i>	
		MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ APPOINTIVE	

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

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

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

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

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

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

* * * * *

ELECTED OFFICERS:

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

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

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

* * * * *

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

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

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

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

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

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

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

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

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Richard Sammons, hereby disclose that on July 27, 20 22.

(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 clients of McNe - Wilson 150, by Worth LLC, whom I am retained; or
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

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

ARC-22-119
150 Worth Avenue
Minor Project

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.

7.27.22
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 <i>Sammons, Richard</i>		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <i>Architectural Review Commission</i>	
MAILING ADDRESS <i>455 Worth Ave.</i>		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY <i>Palm Beach</i>	COUNTY <i>Palm Beach</i>	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED <i>July 27, 2022</i>		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <i>Town of Palm Beach</i>	
		MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ APPOINTIVE	

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

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

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

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

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

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

ELECTED OFFICERS:

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

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

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

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

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

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

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

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

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

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

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

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Richard Sammons, hereby disclose that on July 27, 20 22:

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


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

ARC-22-129
515 N. Lake Way
Major Project

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.

7.27.22

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 <i>Smith, Jeffrey</i>		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <i>Architectural Review Commission</i>	
MAILING ADDRESS <i>241 Sanford Ave</i>		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY <i>Palm Beach</i>	COUNTY <i>Palm Beach</i>	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED <i>July 27, 2022</i>		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <i>Town of Palm Beach</i>	
		MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ APPOINTIVE	

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

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

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

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

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

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

ELECTED OFFICERS:

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

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

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

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

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

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

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

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

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

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

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

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Jeffrey Smith, hereby disclose that on July 27, 20 22:

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

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


ARC-22-139
525 N. County Road
Minor Project

If disclosure of specific information would violate confidentiality or privilege pursuant to law or rules governing attorneys, a public officer, who is also an attorney, may comply with the disclosure requirements of this section by disclosing the nature of the interest in such a way as to provide the public with notice of the conflict.

Date Filed

7.27.22

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.