



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 26, 2024

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

I. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 8:59 a.m.

II. **ROLL CALL**

Jeffrey W. Smith, Chairman	PRESENT
Richard F. Sammons, Vice Chairman	PRESENT
Betsy Shiverick, Member	PRESENT
Kenn Karakul, Member	PRESENT
Elizabeth Connaughton, Member	PRESENT
Katherine "KT" Catlin	PRESENT
Claudia Visconti, Member	PRESENT
Dan Floersheimer, Alternate Member	PRESENT
David Phoenix, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Maisie Grace, Alternate Member	PRESENT

Staff Members present were:

Friederike Mittner, Design and Preservation Manager
Sarah Pardue, Design & Preservation Planner
Bradley Falco, Design & Preservation Planner
Kelly Churney, Acting Town Clerk
Assistant Town Attorney Lainey Fransisco

III. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair Smith led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. Minutes of the Architectural Review Commission Meeting of May 29, 2024

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the minutes of the May 29, 2024, meeting as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

V. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Ms. Pardue indicated that the staff would like to remove item ARC-24-0014, 599 S. County Road, from the Consent Agenda and have the project heard under A. Items Pulled from the Consent Agenda.

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

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

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

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

No comments were heard at this time.

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

No one indicated a desire to speak at this time.

IX. **PROJECT REVIEW**

A. **CONSENT AGENDA**

1. **ARC-24-0014 599 S COUNTY RD.** The applicant, SAS Realty Enterprises, LLC (Greg Simonian, President), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications to the design of a previously approved new single-family residence.

Clerk's note: This item was pulled from consent and discussed under A. Items Pulled from the Consent Agenda

B. **DEMOLITIONS AND TIME EXTENSIONS**

1. **EXTPLAN-24-0001 [FKA ARC-22-216] (ZON-22-140) 248 COLONIAL LANE (COMBO)**. The applicant, 306 Livingston Street Holdings I, LLC (Matthew Mirones), has filed an application requesting a one-year extension of time for a previously issued Architectural Commission approval for the construction of a new two-story residence. (ORIGINALLY APPROVED AT THE MARCH 29, 2023, MEETING)

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Ms. Connaughton stated she was not in favor of granting the time extension.

Ms. Shiverick understood Ms. Connaughton's concerns. She asked the staff about the process if the extension was not approved. Ms. Pardue responded and explained the process if denied.

Mr. Smith inquired if the owner could demolish the home. Ms. Pardue stated that demolition required a building permit. Mr. Smith asked about the approval of the variances. Ms. Pardue stated that the approval for the variances would be lost if the extension was denied.

Ms. Catlin inquired if there was any legal reason to deny the project.

Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning James Murphy stated that the applicant should have outlined their request for the time extension and noted that they had not yet submitted a building permit. He stated the reason that expiration dates exist on approvals was due to many conditions that could change in a year.

Mr. Smith wondered if the construction drawings had been submitted. Mr. Murphy stated that he was unaware of any drawings. Mr. Smith asked about the new rule of limitations on time extensions. Ms. Pardue responded that applicants were allowed one (1) time extension since the recent decision by the Town Council.

Mr. Floersheimer questioned if it was in the purview of the Commission to deny the request.

Ms. Catlin stated that she could not view the plans and determine if they met the approval criteria. Ms. Pardue stated that the request was to approve the extension and pointed out that no changes had been made to the approved plans.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the reason for the delay.

Dinyar Wadia of Wadia Associates presented the request for a time extension.

Ms. Visconti asked about the Commission's precedent of granting time extensions. Ms. Pardue responded, spoke about the approval of past time extensions, and discussed the amount of time that would be granted with the time extension.

Ms. Grace asked about the criteria for the Commission to make the decision. She also questioned the amount of surrounding construction in the area and wondered if that should be considered in her decision.

Mr. Smith questioned the professional's ability to find another contractor to build the home for less than the initial bid. Mr. Wadia responded.

Ms. Catlin did not believe the cost would decrease over time.

Mr. Karakul thought the design was attractive; he did not believe the approval of the time extension was a bad decision.

A discussion ensued on whether the Commission should grant the extension.

Town Attorney Francisco discussed the criteria to consider on whether to grant the time extension.

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the time extension as requested.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

David Kelso, 255 Monterey Road, spoke against the time extension request and advocated for the Commission to deny the request.

Ms. Catlin asked about the length of time it would take to grant a building permit. Mr. Murphy responded.

A discussion ensued.

The motion was carried 5-2, with Mr. Smith and Ms. Connaughton dissenting.

A. ITEMS PULLED FROM CONSENT AGENDA, IF NEEDED

1. **ARC-24-0014 599 S COUNTY RD.** The applicant, SAS Realty Enterprises, LLC (Greg Simonian, President), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications to the design of a previously approved new single-family residence.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Rafael Portuondo of Portuondo Perotti made the architectural presentation.

Clerk's note: Mr. Smith exited the room at 9:35 a.m. He returned at 9:42 a.m.

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

Ms. Grace inquired about the change in the fenestration sizes. Mr. Portuondo explained the error in the drawings. Ms. Grace preferred the shingle roof and the currently proposed front entrance.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the change in the front door and the bay window. Mr. Portuondo explained the design. Ms. Shiverick asked about the front gate and the material. Mr. Portuondo responded and stated the gate was proposed metal.

Mr. Floersheimer reviewed the changes. He also asked about the change to the pedestrian gate. Mr. Portuondo responded.

Ms. Connaughton wondered if the professional would consider a pedestal on the columns on the loggia bay window. Mr. Portuondo responded.

Mr. Sammons commented on the gate design and thought it needed restudied. He thought the previous front door was too tall and thin. If the design was to have an arched opening, he thought the arch should be wider. Mr. Sammons asked about the roof on the front elevation. Mr. Portuondo discussed the roof pitch.

Greg Simonian, the homeowner, advocated for the current proposed front entrance. He indicated that his wife preferred that elevation.

Mr. Karakul made a motion, seconded by Ms. Visconti, to approve the project on the condition that the front door be widened. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

B. MAJOR PROJECTS-OLD BUSINESS

1. **ARC-24-035 (ZON-24-043) 620 N LAKE WAY (COMBO)** The applicant, Ocean Front Avenue 2, LLC, a VA limited liability company (Don & Donna Whitaker), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new two-story single-family residence with final hardscape landscape and swimming pool, with variances for building height and cubic content ratio. This is a combo application that shall be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Roger Janssen of Dailey Janssen Architects made the architectural presentation. Tyler Nielsen of Nielsen Landscape Architecture made the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the variance for cubic content, to which Mr. Janssen responded. She did not believe the home would fit into the neighborhood and Palm Beach.

Mr. Sammons agreed with Ms. Connaughton. He thought the design had been approved but questioned whether it fit into Palm Beach.

Ms. Catlin liked the home and its style. She thought surrounding homes related to the proposed home and the plan had improved. Mr. Janssen responded.

Mr. Karakul thought the home was well-designed and liked the variety of styles on the island. He thought it was healthy to have variety. He thought the refinements in the design were nice. He cautioned that the scale of the landscaping, especially the front landscaping, be appropriate.

Ms. Visconti agreed with Mr. Karakul. She thought this home would tie some of the architectural styles in the area. She questioned the Cocoplum and how it was proposed to be showcased in the front of the property; she recommended using Jamaican Caper. Mr. Nielsen agreed. She also questioned Crabwood and wondered if that proposed height would be hard to find. Mr. Nielsen responded.

Ms. Grace inquired about the homes marked on the map. She thought the changes were nice but questioned whether the home fit into the neighborhood or Palm Beach. If the home moved forward, she hoped the materials would be high-quality.

Ms. Shiverick thought the home had a place in Palm Beach but sympathized with the neighbors' concerns. She wondered if the changes exaggerated the modernism of the style. She suggested lightening the windows to a lighter bronze and adding vertical muntins to the windows. Mr. Janssen showed the Commission an alternate view of the muntins, which the Commission preferred. She recommended using more of the English Chestnut wood material in the design.

Mr. Floersheimer liked Ms. Shiverick's suggestion to bring back warm elements in the design. He asked about the height of the home and wondered if the home could be lowered. He made suggestions to lower the height by lowering the finished floor. Mr. Janssen responded and explained the proposed height design.

Maura Ziska, the owner's attorney, stated that the request was to have the finished floor at grade.

Mr. Phoenix thought the changes would make the home warmer and raise the bar in the neighborhood. He added that he agreed with Ms. Shiverick's suggestions to add vertical muntins, lighten the window color, and add more chestnut wood to the design.

Ms. Sammons thought the home had improved, but added ornamentation could enhance the home.

Ms. Catlin thought the zoning code was broken. She thought the Commission should stop penalizing properties with unique lots; she thought there was value in owners embracing the uniqueness of the lot when deciding where to site their homes. She spoke in favor of the way the professional cited the home.

Ms. Grace recalled a home on the Seaview where the lot was excavated to lower the home.

Ms. Smith did not believe it was fair for the Commission to state that the home did not fit into the neighborhood. He thought some of the changes were good, and some were not. He asked about changing the breeze block to resemble louvers. Mr. Janssen discussed the design. A short discussion ensued about using stone for the breeze block; the Commissioners thought it should be wood.

Ms. Shiverick wondered if the chestnut wood could be used for the breeze block. Mr. Janssen agreed.

Ms. Connaughton suggested using a different material for the breeze block.

A motion was made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Mr. Karakul to defer the project to the meeting on July 24, 2024, to allow a restudy of the following elements: the vertical mullions, adding more Chestnut wood into the design, the breeze block, the gate, some elements in the landscaping and adding ornamentation in the design.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Jorge Sanchez, 239 Southland Road, thought more vegetation was needed on the road to shield the home.

The motion was carried 6-1, with Ms. Connaughton dissenting.

Clerk's note: The Commission took a short break at 10:29 a.m. The meeting resumed at 10:42 a.m. Mr. Karakul returned at 10:46 a.m.

2. **ARC-24-051 1330 N OCEAN BLVD.** The applicant, 1330 N Ocean Trust (James M. Crowley, Authorized Representative), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new two-story single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape, swimming pool, and beach parcel improvements.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Greg Tankersley of McAlpine made the architectural presentation. Keith Williams of Nievera Williams Design made the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Scott Schuster, 101 Ocean Terrace, spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Sammons asked about the height of the windows, the front door, and the eaves design. Mr. Tankersley responded. Mr. Sammons thought the light fixtures were oversized; he suggested reducing their size.

Ms. Shiverick liked the home but thought it was too big for the island's north end. She also thought the neighbor's home was too large for the space. She agreed that the lanterns were too large and did not like the placement of the lanterns on the east side.

Ms. Catlin liked the home but thought it needed to be reduced in size. She thought it took up too much of the building footprint, especially in the proposed area.

Mr. Karakul thought the home was attractive and well-planned. He liked how the guest wings were reduced. He did believe the detailing around the front door could be more balanced and suggested additional landscaping on the north side.

Ms. Connaughton thanked the professional for making the changes; she thought it helped the home and the owners would appreciate the additional light. She agreed with the comments on the lanterns and the front door. She discussed the height differences on the south wing and questioned the elevator shaft expressed through the roof.

Mr. Floersheimer liked the courtyard-style home. He agreed with the comments on the lanterns but supported the front door change. He expressed concern about the fenestration, especially in the courtyard elevations. He also recommended adding vines to the wall next to the pool.

Ms. Grace thought the reduction was nice; however, she thought the home was still massive and questioned the amount of fenestration proposed. She wondered if some more changes could be made to make it fit into the north end; she provided some suggestions.

Mr. Smith liked the reduction to the guest wing. He did not favor the elevator roof design and questioned the roof over the children's wing on the south elevation.

Mr. Sammons recommended moving the children's wing towards the garage and elevator shaft to provide more room in the courtyard. He thought the large openings in the living room and dining room were too dark, especially as black windows; he recommended adding vertical mullions. He also recommended changing the front door.

A motion made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the project with the following conditions: the lanterns shall be removed on the east elevation and modified on the front entry, the front door shall be changed to be more symmetrical, the children's wing shall

be moved to the south, vertical mullions shall be added to the living and dining room windows, the elevator shaft and the heights between the one and two-story buildings shall be modified. The motion was carried 5-2, with Mses. Shiverick and Catlin dissenting.

Mr. Falco indicated that the professional would need to submit a staff application for the changes suggested by the Commission, which would be reviewed and approved in coordination with Chair Smith.

C. MAJOR PROJECTS-NEW BUSINESS

1. **ARC-24-0004 (ZON-24-0005) 260 COLONIAL LN (COMBO)** The applicant, Maura Ziska (attorney) in conjunction with SKA Architect + Planner, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new one-story single-family residence with final hardscape landscape and swimming pool, requiring Special Exception with Site Plan Review approval to develop a nonconforming parcel and a variance to reduce the rear yard setback for the swimming pool. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications. *During the discussion, Ms. Visconti declared a conflict of interest and left the dais.*

Meredith Hunt, owner of the home, discussed her proposed home and advocated for a positive decision.

Jacqueline Albarran of SKA Architect + Planner made the architectural presentation. Jorge Sanchez of SMI Landscape Architecture made the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

David Kelso, 255 Monterey Road, spoke against the proposed project.

Maura Ziska, the applicant's attorney, explained the zoning requests that were being requested.

Ms. Albarran discussed the neighbor that supported the project.

Mr. Sammons thought the roof plan was overly complicated. He discussed the front elevation design and pointed out areas of improvement. He thought the proportions needed to be restudied.

Ms. Connaughton agreed with Mr. Sammons's assessment of the roof. She inquired about the window sizes, to which Ms. Albarran responded. Ms. Connaughton thought the proportions and type of windows needed restudy. She supported the variance requests. She also suggested including a

chimney for the ventless fireplace as well as looking at Bermudian precedent pictures when restudying the design.

Ms. Catlin agreed with Mr. Sammons and thought the floor plan was driving the design. She acknowledged that the lot was undersized but thought the home should fit on the lot. She thought the pool should be designed without the need for a variance.

Mr. Karakul thought the home could be more charming. He applauded the homeowner for building a one-story home. He supported the variance for the pool.

Ms. Shiverick supported the simplistic one-story design and the variance for the pool. She agreed with Ms. Connaughton's assessment of the windows. She thought the entrance could be more charming and gracious, possibly with Bermudian welcoming arms and a staircase. She recommended using double-hung windows and asked to see color samples.

Mr. Floersheimer agreed with many of the previous comments. He asked about the two curb cuts and the large amount of hardscape proposed at the front of the property. He questioned the Sylvester Palm proposed near the pool.

Ms. Grace was in favor of the one-story home. She thought there was too much hardscape and questioned the cluster of Coconut palms; she requested a shade tree in the front yard. She recommended eliminating the variance for the pool.

Mr. Smith thought the roof peak was too tall. He also thought the pool should be relocated so it did not require a variance.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Floersheimer to defer the project to the meeting on July 24, 2024. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

2. **ARC-24-0011 (ZON-24-0006) 1741 S OCEAN BLVD (COMBO)** The applicant, Maura Ziska (attorney), in conjunction with SKA Architect + Planner, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for partial second-floor demolition, construction of an expanded second floor on a single-family residence including variances from setbacks, open space requirements, and lot coverage. Additional components of the request include a new covered terrace area, interior renovation, and replacement of the swimming pool with a smaller version. This is a combination project that shall be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications. *During the discussion, Ms. Visconti declared a conflict of interest and left the dais.*

Jacqueline Albarran of SKA Architect + Planner made the architectural presentation. Jorge Sanchez of SMI Landscape Architecture made the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Mr. Sammons asked to see the building sections. He questioned the change of fenestration, the change in the garage doors and the entablature. He thought the proposed design lacked study and needed much more work.

Ms. Connaughton thought the second story was appropriate but also requested to see the section drawings. She thought the square proportions on the windows worked best and thought that the same design should be carried to the rear of the home.

Ms. Shiverick agreed with the comments of Mr. Sammons and Mr. Connaughton. She recommended using an awning rather than a pergola.

Mr. Floersheimer thought the project was interesting. He thought the existing home was in disrepair. He supported the addition of a second story. He expressed caution for using too much fenestration, especially on the west elevation.

Mr. Karakul thought the design was heading in the right direction. He wondered if the professional considered a terrace on the second floor at the rear.

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

Mr. Sanchez discussed the amount of green that is proposed for the design.

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

3. **ARC-24-0013 216 VIA MARILA** The applicant, 216 VM LLC (Jason Green, Agent), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a new two-story single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape, and swimming pool.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Roger Janssen of Dailey Janssen Architects made the architectural presentation. Steve West with Parker Yanette Design Group made the landscape and hardscape presentation.

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

Mr. Sammons thought the front elevation's symmetry was problematic, so he suggested a design change. He also provided recommendations for the fenestration on the second floor, the bay windows on the front elevation, and the design on the south elevation. Overall, he thought the home was nice.

Mr. Phoenix liked the home and the materials proposed.

Ms. Catlin expressed concern about how the home presented itself on the street. She thought it would loom over the street and wondered if it could be pulled back. Mr. Janssen responded.

Ms. Grace thought the home would seem too massive on the street.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the lintel and sill detail materials and wondered if that could be carried to the second floor. Mr. Janssen responded. She also wondered if the design had too much going on. Mr. Janssen responded. She recommended changing some of the details to be more consistent.

Ms. Shiverick agreed with Ms. Connaughton about the front elevation; she thought there may be too much going on. She recommended changing the front balcony to include pickets to simplify the detail. She suggested creating a gallery off the front entrance.

Mr. Karakul liked the home. He thought the layering of the landscaping would be important. He suggested pushing the library wing back from the street.

Ms. Visconti agreed the front entrance was busy; she recommended removing the brick lintels. She asked about the palms proposed by the street on the north elevation; she recommended carrying them across the entire front of the property and installing them at 12 feet.

Mr. Smith asked if the study could be moved so that the roof's peak was between the two upper windows. Mr. Janssen responded.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to defer the project to the meeting on July 24, 2024, to restudy the fenestration and proportions. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

4. **ARC-24-0019 1214 N OCEAN BLVD.** The applicant, Michael Perry, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and

approval for an addition to primary structure, construction of a new guest house, new pool, landscape and hardscape to expand into recently combined property to the west.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Michael Perry of MP Design & Architecture made the architectural presentation. Cory Meyer of Nievera Williams Design made the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Ms. Connaughton found it difficult to consider the presentation with the different styles proposed. She liked the courtyard design and thought the site was respected. She did not favor the roof on the guest house; she thought that portion of the design needed restudy.

Ms. Visconti wondered if the professional considered a parapet roof rather than a gable roof. Mr. Perry responded. She thought the design looked like three separate buildings and commented on the different roof materials. She thought more consistency was needed among the roof materials and pitches. She asked about the blue pergola proposed. Mr. Perry responded. Ms. Visconti recommended using a white pergola.

Ms. Grace thought the design worked since it was quirky and had a scale similar to the neighborhood. She thought the roof material on the guest house could be changed to match the main house. She recommended adding a specimen tree on the northwest corner. Mr. Meyer stated that he proposed a Pigeon Plum tree.

Ms. Shiverick agreed with Ms. Grace that the roof material should be consistent with the existing home. She was in favor of the folly design.

Mr. Floersheimer liked the gallery. He wondered if the roof peaks were too tall. He recommended looking at the amount of fenestration in the gallery. He agreed the guest house should have roof material to match the existing home. He asked about the trees being root pruned; he wondered if they would be reused. Mr. Meyer responded. Mr. Floersheimer wondered if steps would be added between the buildings. Mr. Perry responded and described the design.

Ms. Catlin agreed with Ms. Shiverick and Grace. She thought the addition was unique and worked with the land. She liked the open space. She agreed with the comments on the roof materials and thought they should be consistent.

Mr. Sammons agreed that the roof material should be consistent. He asked if the shutters could be removed from the main home.

Ms. Connaughton wondered if the addition could have nicer windows.

Mr. Smith did not object to the folly but did not support the proposed addition. He did not like the main home.

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Mr. Sammons to defer the project to the meeting on July 24, 2024, for a restudy. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Clerk's note: A short break was taken at 1:09 p.m. The meeting resumed at 1:22 p.m.

5. **ARC-24-0023 (ZON-24-0010) 515 NORTH LAKE WAY (COMBO)** The applicant, JORDAN GRETCHEN S TRUST (Maura Ziska, Authorized Representative), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new one-story single-family residence with final hardscape and landscape, a special exception to develop the existing nonconforming lot, and one variance 1) to exceed the permitted angle of vision. This is a combination project that shall be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Roger Janssen of Dailey Janssen Architects made the architectural presentation. Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group made the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Ms. Connaughton asked about removing the curb cut and wondered about the property's address change. She did not favor the entry next to the garage and recommended changing its orientation. Mr. Janssen explained how different options were studied. She recommended looking at the proportions on the entablature.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the proposed fenestration and the fenestration at the existing home. Mr. Janssen responded. She also asked about the proposed paving, to which Mr. Mizell responded.

Mr. Sammons thought the building's length needed to be shortened. He also thought the proposal was overreaching and unlivable as a single-family home.

Ms. Catlin recommended moving the front door to create more of a garden entry.

Mr. Karakul agreed with Ms. Catlin and thought the driveway material should be consistent with the main house.

Ms. Visconti agreed with Ms. Catlin and Mr. Karakul. She wondered if the garage could be shifted to the east so it could be sideloaded. She recommended using some of the hardscape material from the main home to tie into the guest home.

Ms. Grace wondered if there would be unity of title between the two properties. Mr. Janssen responded. She liked the previous suggestions for changing the garage but wished the design looked more traditional. She recommended vertical panes for the fenestration rather than horizontal.

Mr. Sammons wanted to see the garden of the neighboring home and how it related to the proposal.

Mr. Smith thought the west elevation was unattractive and needed restudy.

Ms. Connaughton thought the plan was strange. She was not in favor of the garage entrance on Tangier Avenue.

Mr. Floersheimer also questioned the look of the landscape plan for the main house. Mr. Mizell stated he would return with that plan.

Ms. Grace asked about the palms and thought they should be lower.

Ms. Visconti asked why the front of the home was not proposed for N. Lake Way. Mr. Janssen responded. She recommended changing the design of the guest home so it did not match the main home.

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

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Visconti to defer the project to the meeting on July 24, 2024, for a restudy of the project and a review of the requested variance. The motion was carried 4-3, with Messrs. Sammons, Smith, and Ms. Connaughton dissenting.

D. MINOR PROJECTS - OLD BUSINESS

1. **ARC-23-142 318 SEASPRAY AVE.** The applicants, Robert and Elizabeth Russell, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the design of a new two-story single-family residence with sitewide landscape and hardscape improvements.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Daniel Clavijo of Wadia Associates made the architectural presentation.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the material proposed. Mr. Clavijo responded and further explained the design.

Mr. Smith asked about the plan that was proposed for staff approval. Mr. Clavijo responded.

Mr. Sammons preferred the second option but questioned the tile between the windows and recommended changing the proportion of the small windows over the front door.

Ms. Visconti asked about the tile proposed at the front entrance and the stucco surround. Mr. Clavijo did not have a tile sample but stated the color pallet was light blue.

Ms. Connaughton agreed that the second option was better. However, on the first option, she recommended removing the rope detail. She recommended removing the two smaller windows on the front elevation above the front door. She also recommended attaching the keystone to the upper window on the second option. Mr. Clavijo expressed a concern about attaching the keystone to the windows.

Ms. Grace favored the change but did not support attaching the keystone to the windows; she felt it would look too heavy.

A motion was made by Ms. Connaughton and seconded by Ms. Visconti to approve the project with option number two, with the conditions that the tile between the two upper windows and the two smaller windows on the north elevation shall be eliminated and the lanterns next to the front door shall be lowered and pulled in slightly. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

E. MINOR PROJECTS-NEW BUSINESS

1. **ARC-24-0001 640 ISLAND DR.** The applicant, 640 FLORIDA LAND TRUST BALLERANO HAMES A JR TR, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications to an existing vehicular and pedestrian gate design.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Cory Meyer of Nievera Williams Design presented the two gates as proposed.

Mr. Sammons questioned the need for the gates.

Mr. Floersheimer thought the gates were too foreboding and industrial.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the color proposed for the gate.

Ms. Catlin was not in favor of the proposal.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Karakul to defer the project to the meeting on July 24, 2024, for a redesign of the gates. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

2. **ARC-24-0016 (ZON-24-0007) 403 BRAZILIAN AVE (COMBO)** The applicant, BHJ Land Trust, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications to an existing pool and courtyard of an existing single-family residence with a variance for the placement of the pool equipment. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group made the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Ms. Visconti thought the proposal clearly showed a problem with the code. She supported the variances.

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

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

3. **ARC-24-0005 260 EL PUEBLO** The applicant, David Khoury, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for removal of an existing carport, a garage renovation and expansion to an existing residence.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Caroline Forrest of MHK Architecture made the architectural presentation.

Ms. Connaughton did not feel the proposal would change how the home was perceived from the street. She thought the addition should be lower than the main home to feel more secondary. She recommended splitting the garage doors.

Mr. Sammons thought the lower eave on the addition was nicer so the roof could blend with the main home. He recommended changing the window to a wall dormer and installing a shed roof in the rear of the addition.

Mr. Smith asked about the design of the garage doors. Ms. Forrest described the proposed doors.

Ms. Catlin thought the proposal worked and the plan was simple.

Mr. Floersheimer agreed with Ms. Catlin. He asked about the room over the garage. Ms. Forrest responded and described the existing and proposed changes.

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

X. **ANY OTHER MATTERS**

Mr. Smith spoke favorably about the iPads provided to the Commission by the staff.

Mr. Sammons raised the issue of the significantly different criteria in the Code, which were placed there to prevent tract housing from being built in the Town. A discussion ensued.

XI. **NEXT MEETING DATE:** July 24, 2024, at 9:00 AM

XII. **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Mr. Karakul to adjourn the meeting at 2:35 p.m. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 24, 2024, at 9:00 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 S. County Road.

Respectfully Submitted,



Jeffrey W. Smith, Chairman
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

kmc

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME Visconti, Claudia		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE Architectural Commission	
MAILING ADDRESS 310 Valette Way		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY West Palm Beach	COUNTY Palm Beach	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED June 26, 2024		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: Town of Palm Beach	
		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, Claudia Visconti, hereby disclose that on June 26, 20 24 :

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

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

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

ARC-24-0011

1741 S. Ocean Blvd (Combo)

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.

06/26/2024
Date Filed

CA
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 Visconti, Claudia		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE Architectural Commission	
MAILING ADDRESS 310 Valette Way		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY West Palm Beach	COUNTY Palm Beach	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED June 26, 2024		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: Town of Palm Beach	
		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, Claudia Visconti, hereby disclose that on June 26, 20 24 :

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

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

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

ARC-24-0004

260 Colonial Lane (Combo)

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.

06/26/2024
Date Filed

[Signature]
Signature

NOTICE: UNDER PROVISIONS OF FLORIDA STATUTES §112.317, A FAILURE TO MAKE ANY REQUIRED DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR AND MAY BE PUNISHED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION FROM OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT, DEMOTION, REDUCTION IN SALARY, REPRIMAND, OR A CIVIL PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000.