



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

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015, 09:00 a.m.

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 or may obtain an audiog recording of the meeting by contacting Cindy Delp, Secretary to the Architectural Commission at (561) 227-6408.

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Vila called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL:

Robert J. Vila, Chairman	PRESENT
Ann L. Vanneck, Vice Chairman	PRESENT
Kenn Karakul, Member	PRESENT
Richard Sammons, Member	PRESENT
Peter I. C. Knowles II, Member	PRESENT
Martin D. Gruss, Member	PRESENT
Robert N. Garrison, Member	PRESENT
Alexander C. Ives, Alternate Member	PRESENT (arrived at 9:14 a.m.)
Michael B. Small, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Maisie Grace, Alternate Member	PRESENT

Staff members present: John S. Page, Director of Planning, Zoning and Building, John Lindgren, Planning Administrator, John C. Randolph, Town Attorney (for part of meeting), and Cynthia Delp, Secretary to the Architectural Commission.

Let the record show that a court reporter, Dawn McConnell, was present for the item regarding 475 North County Road.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 28, 2015 MEETING:

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KARAKUL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

V. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK FOR APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KARAKUL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

Mrs. Delp administered the oath at this time and throughout the meeting as necessary.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS: None

VIII. PROJECT REVIEW:

A. MAJOR PROJECTS-OLD BUSINESS:

B - 108 - 2014 New Mixed Use Condominium/Commercial

ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S)

Address: 221 & 231 Royal Poinciana Way, Sunset Avenue, 214 Sunset Avenue, 216 Sunset Avenue

Applicant: T3 Family Investments, LLC

Project Description: Construction of a 120,525 square foot, two (2) story mixed use condominium structure with 100 underground parking spaces, 26,204 square feet of commercial space on the first floor and six (6) residential units on the second floor totaling 36,179 square feet (34,618 square feet under air). Building Color-Off White; Roof-Terra Cotta Clay Barrel tile; Trim-Terra Cotta

At the September meeting, after review of the project, a motion carried for deferral to the October meeting. At the October meeting, after review of the project, a motion carried for deferral to the November meeting. At the November meeting, after review of the project, a motion carried for deferral of the architecture and a second motion carried for deferral of the landscaping. At the December meeting, a motion carried that implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impacts to the subject property. A second motion carried "to send this to the Town Council approving the schematic plan of this project and that it is deferred for the final architecture to February so that in February the applicant can come back with all of the requirements shown from the variances that were granted or not granted and the details and materials presentation of each building, and then in February, that we take this up."

Please be advised that staff recommends deferral to the March meeting due to the deferral at the Town Council level.

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK TO DEFER TO THE MARCH MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KARAKUL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B - 125 - 2014 New Residence

Applicant: Mark Pulte, Mark Timothy Luxury Homes

Architect: Affiniti Architects, Benjamin Schreier

Address: 1330 S. Ocean Boulevard (formerly known as 1300 S. Ocean Blvd. Lot 2 Casa Apava)

Project Description: ~~Two-story West Indies influenced home totaling 15,240 sq. ft., swimming pool and associated landscaping. Building and Trim Color White; Roof Brown Concrete Roof Tiles; Shutter Color Blue~~ New two-story single family residence with "Italianate/Mediterranean" style. House is 13,510 sq. ft. plus 2,739 sq. ft. in outdoor covered space. Revised landscape plans and details.

At the November meeting, after hearing the project, a motion carried to defer the project to the December meeting for re-study. At the December meeting, after review of the project, a motion carried to defer to January for re-study. At the January meeting, a motion carried to approve the architecture of the house, subject to returning with the detail from the front door, studying the front door, studying the use of stone on the front entrance, and studying the balcony on the northwest side of the second floor, and the landscape must come back (deferred to February) and be presented. It was clarified that the applicant is to return with the re-study of the named issues as well as with the landscaping.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: No disclosures

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Daniel Menard, LaBerge and Menard

(It should be noted that Mr. Schreier was not present.)

LANDSCAPE PRESENTATION BY: Joe Peterson

Mr. Menard presented revised plans in response to the Commission's comments at the last meeting. Changes include: Clarifying the location of the front door by placing urns on pedestals in the arches on both sides of the front door; changed the style of fountains to be more correct with the period; changed style of front door to be more ornamental; regarding adding stone elements, the preference is to retain as much stucco as possible, but perhaps to do the capitals and bases in stone; two design options for rear elevation, especially at northwest corner; north elevation: columns and base changed to arch with two smaller flanking arches. Mr. Menard later noted that the stucco will have little to no texture, and the windows will be espresso aluminum windows.

Commission Comments: Without scale figures, it is hard to judge this; it is gigantic in scale; the simpler corner option is preferable; looking at the loggias in plan, there is no dimension to the thickness of these walls...flimsy for the scale of the building; walls are paper thin; a disconnect between the imagery and the substance of the building; the building is flimsy given the scale; issue with lights hanging all over the place...lose as many as possible and do some uplighting; it will look like a hotel with dual fountains; it should be more subtle; the lights do not contribute to the architecture; detail is vague regarding front door; generally improved, but scale is gigantic; agree about thickness of walls; not sold on stucco arches; not enough differentiation at front door; proportions and scale of building are off; need details regarding front doors; in the rear, there are no pilasters or a base at the corner...flimsy; detail on outlookers needed; and, like the simpler version of the corner.

Mr. Peterson continued with the revised landscape/hardscape plan. Design elements include: Formal design; at roadway: 6 ft. high site wall with pedestrian access in middle; several types hedging along the roadway; canopy Oak trees at 24 ft. height inside the wall; formal garden

leading to front door with Magnolia trees on either side; south side: relocated Royals, and several existing trees; Coconut Palms in very formal pattern in rear; mangrove areas across the back; north side: keep Strangler Fig by reducing driveway area; keep 35 Cabbage Palms along property line; and 12 ft. Seagrapes and Coconuts to block off the existing beach from the adjacent property.

Commission Comments: Any consideration given to shading the west elevation?; and, overall, an improvement; question the need for a pedestrian gate since it will hardly ever be used.

At this point, Mr. Menard ran the movie of the proposed project, as re-designed.

Commission Comments (continued): The scale of the Magnolias is not very strong; the scale of the architecture is off, especially in the northwest corner; too many lanterns...do professional uplighting; question the all metal windows for Palm Beach; windows must have proper profile; need material samples; we don't have enough information to judge this – no scale figures; the eaves could project more; the garage doors are like mc mansion garage doors; there's a lot of disconnect between what you're trying to do and the imagery, particularly in plan; enormous spans without structure; the house begs to be symmetrical, except for the appendage on the north side; not enough details; a giant house on an important site; and, agree it should be deferred.

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK TO DEFER TO THE MARCH MEETING, AS THE RECORD SHOWS THE ENUMERATED CRITICISMS (above and below)...AND THERE IS A NEED FOR SAMPLES, DETAILS, FIGURES, AND, IMPROVE THE SCALE OF THE LANDSCAPING.

Under discussion, Mr. Menard questioned the comment about symmetry, as that would require total re-design. Members advised him to handle this through landscaping.

Commission Comments (continued): Still opposed to total stucco house of this size; the pedestrian gate is worthless...re-study; these are not the best landscape choices for this style of house; the north end of the house is sufficiently set back and hidden by the Strangler Fig; we are depending on a tree to hide the northeast corner of the house; the fountains have no historic basis...re-study; rear elevation: improvement on one side could be dropped, issue with bays...a duality, wing coming forward has two square openings calling attention because they are square in proportion and have same detailing with pilasters as the main group; the big chimneys are not a Mediterranean element...overscaled; the eaves could be broader to address tropical climate; eaves could be lower; biggest issue is disconnect between scale and substance of building...seems flimsy for what it's trying to be...when you look at the plan, it is obvious; thicken the walls and bring it down in scale; and, need details of driveway gates.

Mr. Menard was asked to show the video again.

**MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GRUSS.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

B - 122 - 2014 Alterations and Landscape/Hardscape

ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S)

Address: 208 Sandpiper Drive

Applicant: Mr. Stephen Livaditis

Architect: Roger P. Janssen

Project Description: 1. Alterations to existing entry portico. 2. Replace existing doors and windows. 3. New hardscape and landscape (1,2,& 3 relate to 208 Sandpiper Drive) Review of the existing landscaped open space which will be non-compliant with the Code if split from the Vacant Lot 24 on Sandpiper Drive.

At the December meeting a motion carried that implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impacts to the subject property. A second motion carried to defer the architecture to the January meeting. A third motion carried to defer the landscape to the January meeting. At the January meeting, a motion carried to approve the architectural changes as presented, and defer the landscape to February.

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

LANDSCAPE PRESENTATION BY: Andre Paradelo, Paradelo and Fleck Landscape Architecture

Mr. Paradelo presented the revised plans in response to comments made at previous meetings. He presented simple changes to the landscape and back pool area: Back pool area and pool reduced in size, thereby reducing the impervious area; Front yard: two front trees replaced with White Geiger trees, which are spread apart to reveal the access to the front door; underplanted Date Palms at street and front door with White Begonias; underplanted Ficus with White Begonias; and, added White Bridal Bouquet vines to corners of garage and several other areas.

Commission Comments: Overall, an improvement, but still reduce the amount of cast stone surround at the pool to make it more open and inviting.

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SAMMONS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

At this point, 9:50 a.m., there was a short recess to address technical issues. When the meeting was called back to order at 10:00 a.m., Mr. Sammons, Mr. Karakul and Mr. Ives were not present. Mr. Sammons and Mr. Karakul did, however, return prior to the actual start of the next presentation. Mr. Ives returned at 10:08 a.m. during the next presentation.

B - 002 - 2015 Demolition and New Residence

Address: 257 Sandpiper Drive

Applicant: G.W. Purucker Homes J.V.

Architect: Roger Janssen, Dailey Janssen Architects

Project Description: Demolition of an existing one story residence, hardscape, landscape and pool. Construction of new two-story residence including new hardscape, landscape and pool. Building Color - Off-white; Roof - White cement tile; Trim - White; Shutters - Blue/Green

At the January meeting, a motion carried for approval of the demolition with the typical caveats for sodding and irrigating. A second motion carried to defer the architecture for further study (to

February) so the building is more harmonious to the surrounding neighborhood in the areas of its architectural design, its massing, scale, rhythm, and the way it greets the street.

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

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Roger Janssen, Dailey Janssen Architects

Mr. Janssen presented revised plans in response to the Commission's comments last month. He explained that since the property owner would still like to have a two-story element in the middle of his home, he attempted to further mitigate the two-story volume in the middle of the house by taking 1 ft. each out of the first and second floors, by taking 1 ft. from the one-story wings, by reducing the roof pitch, and reducing the overall height of the building.

Commission Comments: Appreciate trying to reduce the height; porch is still too wide and still some other scale issues; not sure if you needed to drop the roof pitch, but if you did, you need projecting eaves for less scale; project not detailed correctly at portico, upper fascia of Tuscan order, at rear elevation, tall piers holding up nothing above, and, need broader eaves to reflect tropical climate; second story above garage is not usable...too hot; project does not meet Section 18-205 of the code, specifically (a) (4), (a) (5) c., (a) (6) a, e, and g; the north end is special...Sandpiper is still in its pristine state of being a one-story street...we need to preserve that enclave for the owners on the street and for the Town...I cannot support this application.

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK, CITING THOSE CRITERIA THAT I CITED, TO DENY THE PROJECT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON.

Commission Comments (continued): "Not in harmony with" is very subjective and hard for the architect to determine the objection; I visited the site and there are two houses directly across the street which are two story houses; there are 52 houses in the Dodge Estates and only 8 have objected; if we set a precedent and only allow one-story houses in the Dodge Estates, we are taking away a tremendous amount of real estate value from the owners; look at the architecture and not worry so much about the harmonious design of the house; we are talking about Sandpiper, not the rest of the houses in the Dodge Estates; on this block, people believe it should be one-story...cannot support something that is not in harmony with the rest of the neighborhood; we have an obligation to this street and these neighbors; we can't disregard the criteria relative to harmony; the street has a very nice feel; this house appears a lot more massive and not in harmony; I drove the entirety of the block and Eden Road...two-story homes back up to this, and 250 and 264 are partly two-story, and the west end is a two-story...there are other two-story houses on Sandpiper; don't want to deny an application just because it has a second story...work toward a deferral for a more harmonious application; agree that there is a way to design a house that could incorporate those pieces and would be harmonious...needs re-study; would agree to deferral for re-study; and, we have always objected to pop-ups...the project is not going in the right direction.

Mr. Lindgren read several e-mails and letters of objection into the record:

1. E-mail dated February 20, 2015 from Michael Abtahi, 240 Sandpiper Dr.
2. E-mail dated February 22, 2015 from Shelton and Lynda Clyatt, 217 Sandpiper Dr.
3. E-mail dated February 23, 2015 from Williams and Maureen Shenkman, 248 Sandpiper Dr.
4. Letter dated February 22, 2015 from Peter Schneiderman, 272 Sandpiper Dr.

5. Letter dated February 23, 2015 from Kurt Hasenhuttl, M.D., 280 Sandpiper Dr.
6. E-mail dated February 24, 2015 from Vincent and Cathy Young, 225 Sandpiper Dr.
7. Letter dated February 23, 2015 from Attorney James Wearn for Mrs. Richter at 250 Sandpiper Dr.
8. Letter dated February 24, 2015 from Greg and Michele Weisman, 264 Sandpiper Dr.

It should be noted that Chairman Vila asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak relative to this project, but no person came forward.

Mrs. Vanneck was asked if she would re-consider her motion to deny the project. She would not change it to a motion for deferral since she felt that last month, ARCOM made it clear that the harmony of the street was not to be changed. Mr. Janssen requested a deferral to save the applicant from having to re-apply.

**MR. GARRISON WITHDREW HIS SECOND TO THE MOTION.
MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.**

Mr. Randolph advised that ARCOM cannot deny the house based on the fact that it is a two-story home. Instead, the criteria must be followed, and that is how Mrs. Vanneck explained her motion. That motion failed, so another motion was required.

**MOTION BY MR. SAMMONS TO DEFER (TO MARCH) BECAUSE THERE DOESN'T SEEM TO HAVE BEEN A LOT OF CARE GIVEN TO THE DESIGN...I'M VERY SKEPTICAL THAT THIS IS GOING TO BE SOMETHING THAT WE WANT. COME BACK WITH BETTER DETAILS, A LITTLE MORE STUDY...PLEASE THINK ABOUT THE NEIGHBORS...THEY WANT ONE-STORY HOUSES. YOU CAN GET THE PROGRAM INTO A ONE-STORY HOUSE.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KNOWLES.**

Under discussion, Mr. Garrison asked that the motion is clear that it encompasses all of the things that were negatively said by Mrs. Vanneck, so that when he does come back, the plan for the building is in conformity with good taste and design, with all of those things in Section 18-205, so it is clear that it is to be in conformance with the neighborhood and it meets the criteria of 18-205.

MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH MRS. VANNECK OPPOSED.

B - 007 - 2015 Demolition and New Residence

ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S)

Address: 275 N. County Road

Applicant: Franklyn DeMarco

Architect: SKA Architect + Planner, Patrick W. Segraves

Project Description: Demolition of existing two-story Bermuda style home. Construction of new two-story Classical style home to be approximately 5,500 square feet including a two-car garage with guest suite above. Final landscaping will also be included. Building Color - White; Trim - Stucco; Roof - Slate Grey concrete tile

At the January meeting, a motion carried to approve the demolition with the typical caveats for sodding and irrigating. A second motion carried that implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impacts to the subject property. A third motion carried to

defer the project to the February meeting for re-study of the elevations and landscaping based on the comments made.

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

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Patrick W. Segraves, SKA Architect + Planner
LANDSCAPE PRESENTATION BY: Don Skowron

Mr. Segraves reported that the Town Council approved the variances requested for this project. He presented revised plans pursuant to the comments at the last meeting. Changes include: Reduced height of chimneys; lowered, re-proportioned, and re-spaced windows throughout the house; changed some doors to French windows; changed railing detail and iron detail at front door; added quoins to corners and removed pilasters; and, added two 12 ft. sliding gates (4 ft. tall) at front of house in a design similar to the ironwork of the front door.

Commission Comments: Question regarding the intention of the project; almost has a bit of charm because it is so simple; the Chippendale rail above the porch is out at the edge of the cornice and should be brought in to line up with the column below; issue with moulding at bottom of fascia; chimneys seem to be bigger than necessary; the loggia (clarified to be an awning) in the rear has an incredibly long span and would benefit from more structure; eave details missing in plans (but shown on Elmo projector); the eave details do not respond to any recognizable traditional eave detail; quoins are a bit heavy; eave detail needs to be stronger; balcony looks precarious off the master bedroom and perhaps would benefit from columns; awning looks like a structure...needs more detailing; a vast improvement from last month; changes are very attractive and make a big difference; charming...fits where it will be; relocating the house to face Dunbar is a plus; in harmony with the street; west elevation: the long one-story section seems like an orphan...perhaps another window is needed.

Mr. Skowron continued with the revised landscape and hardscape in response to ARCOM's comments last month, primarily to beef up the landscaping. Changes include: Added eleven (11) more Coconut Palms; added Adonidia Palm(s); added Podocarpus in the corners; increased the size of the pool from 20 ft. x 8 ft. to 28 ft. x 8 ft.; and, added other landscape material and some flowering plants as presented. The driveway will be done in tabby.

Commission Comments: The front elevation is the weakest one...perhaps add pots; the 12 ft. gates are too ornate; are gates necessary at all?; do not like the gates; why do we need two entrances?...one of the openings is too close to the corner; OK with the two curb cuts; simplify the gates...too fussy; for the gates, use the design of the balcony railing instead of the ironwork of the front door; too much gate area across the front of the house; lintels over openings should project more; and, lots of little things that could be improved.

MOTION BY MR. SAMMONS TO APPROVE, SUBJECT TO MAKING CHANGES TO THE FOLLOWING: THE RAILING ABOVE THE PORTICO, THE LACK OF AN ARCHITRAVE AT THE PORTICO, THE LINTELS NEED TO BE BELIEVABLE, THE GATES CAN BE SIMPLIFIED, THE CORNICE (WE NEED TO SEE SOMETHING THERE), AND, THE AWNING NEEDS SOME STRUCTURE, NEEDS 4 COLUMNS, NOT 2.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON.

Mr. Randolph interrupted stating that the project either needs to be deferred or needs to be more specific. Some of the verbiage is too vague.

MOTION OF MR. SAMMONS RE-STATED BY MR. VILA TO APPROVE, WITH THE PROVISIO THAT YOU COME BACK NEXT MONTH WITH REVISED BALCONY PLACEMENT, EAVE DETAIL, LINTEL DETAIL, A SIMPLIFICATION OF THE GATE DESIGN, AND PORTICO, AND AWNING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B - 009 - 2015 New Residence

Address: 530 S. Ocean Boulevard

Applicant: Mr. Ken Parker/530 South Ocean Boulevard, LLC c/o Gregory Young

Architect: Smith and Moore Architects, Inc., Harold Smith

Project Description: New two-story residence with partial basement and pool. Final hardscape and landscape. Building and Trim Color - Cream; Roof - Grey

At the January meeting, a motion carried to defer the architecture for re-study and defer the landscaping, both to the February meeting.

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

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Harold Smith and Angela Janesheski, Smith and Moore Architects

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PRESENT: Keith Williams, Nievera Williams Design

Ms. Janesheski presented revised plans in response to the comments made at the last meeting. She stated that with the revisions, the design is even better. Changes include: No major changes to site plan except for updates due to floor plan changes; reduced overall height due to decrease in roof pitch; staff powder room relocated due to massing changes driven by exterior; east loggia revised to match new design; massing on north side at kitchen area and the exterior footprint of the stair hall revised to eliminate flat spots in roof; masses of family room pavilion moved west toward garage to help alleviate the pinched feeling of hyphen connecting the family room to the main house; roof plan updated; raised height of east crickets; still proposing light green/grey slate roof tile, but other clay samples brought today; most design changes to east elevation; changed the order of the south bay from Doric to Ionic; revision to ornamentation detailing of central loggia for a more Classical arcade look; reduced width of loggia; re-studied window style, size and proportion; height of upper level of garage reduced; and, other changes as presented. Materials proposed: Green/grey slate roof, grey limestone, light colored stucco. Ms. Janesheski presented roof samples of the natural slate and an alternative, the Ludowici Ludo slate (clay).

Commission Comments: What is point of all the ironwork above the hyphen?; big improvement; a light grey roof will look better than a green roof; green roof detracts from structure; detailing improved; on stair tower elevation, fenestration does not do it justice...re-study; front elevation: center loggia improved with quoined pilasters; the intercolumniation of the arches sets the meter for the building, and the meter is ignored on the sides where the architraves of the porticos are impossibly long to be in stone...so they look phony...they are not in keeping with scale established in the middle of the building...they are too wide; cornice detail not really well done; modillions are scattered, no drip, fascia missing; gutter detail; in general, detailing is not thought through; the building is not studied enough to be responsive to this scale of building; the design

adapts well to a cold Northern European climate, so they don't necessarily translate well to a tropical climate; very little shade...windows aren't shaded; the eaves are not broad; pitch of the roof is very steep; a myriad of things are wrong with it architecturally; great improvement on east loggia, but it's still very overdone...the dormers are over-detailed, the scale over the front door and the amount of layering is not working yet; not restrained enough and not correct in scale; simplicity and subtlety are needed; simplify; it's too heavy...light and air are needed; "frou frou" is not working; lighten the roof color; hyphen between family room and garage with railing for no purpose and a blank wall...re-study.

Mr. Williams continued with the revised landscape/hardscape with design elements to include: Retain existing Coconut Palms and re-use; re-use existing dune plantings; remove Sabal Palms, Schefflera, and Gumbo Limbo; single curb cut into property; large motor court with large Seagrape; site wall along east property line terminating in two piers flanking the entrance; Green Island Ficus and Sea Plum espaliered to front wall facing east; Coconut Palms and Green Island Ficus in interior gardens; raised terrace on south side with shallow lawn steps under canopy of trees; perimeter hedging 12-14 ft. in height; driveway leading to back parking area; courtyard feeling at family room with fountain on wall; and, rear: lawn framed with stone, added citrus trees and Bougainvillea, and tucked pool in southwest corner with heavy landscaping. No driveway gates are included in the project at this time, but they are planned for the future.

Only positive comments were heard relative to the landscaping. Mr. Smith requested some sort of approval at least as to massing and footprint, understanding that there is work to be done on the detailing.

MOTION BY MR. GARRISON FOR APPROVAL OF THE FOOTPRINT AND LANDSCAPING, BUT THE DETAILING IS TO RETURN IN MARCH, ESPECIALLY ON THE EAST ELEVATION.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VANNECK.

MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH MR. SAMMONS OPPOSED.

B. MAJOR PROJECTS-NEW BUSINESS: (11:50:01 a.m.)

B - 010 - 2015 Gate

Address: 475 N. County Road

Applicant: Christopher and Vicki Kellogg

Architect: Ralph Cantin, AIA

Project Description: New black anodized aluminum gate on service driveway

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

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Ralph Cantin

ATTORNEY PRESENT: Paul Rampell for Ms. Noble at 473 N. County Road

ATTORNEY PRESENT: Frank Lynch for 123 LLC at 455 N. County Road

ATTORNEY PRESENT: Roy Fitzgerald for the Kelloggs

Mr. Randolph stated that Mr. Rampell had contacted him in regard to a recorded easement suggesting that this application not be entertained unless Mr. Rampell's client joined in the application, because his client has a property interest in this matter. Mr. Randolph opined that ARCOM was only to apply the criteria of the Code as it relates to the placement of the gate and

not to make a legal determination as to who owns what part of the property. Routinely, when staff receives an application, no title search is performed to reveal any recorded agreements or easements. Mr. Randolph advised Mr. Rampell that the role of ARCOM in this matter is just to consider the design of the gate under the criteria of the Code.

Mr. Cantin presented the gate in accordance with the submitted plans for the proposed gate, to be placed 50 feet back from County Road.

Let the record show that Mr. Sammons declared a voting conflict with regard to this project as he has a client with an interest in this property. Mr. Ives will vote on this project.

**MOTION BY MR. GARRISON FOR APPROVAL OF THE GATE, AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KARAKUL, BUT THERE SHOULD BE SOME
VEGETATION AROUND EACH OF THE GATE POSTS.
MR. GARRISON ACCEPTED THE CONDITION STATED BY MR. KARAKUL.**

Mrs. Vanneck agreed that the gate needs to be anchored by landscaping.

Attorney Frank Lynch, representing 123, LLC, the property immediately to the south, stated that his client's concern is that this gate represents a barrier across an easement. His client was not opposed to the gate, but to what that gate represents. If the gate is allowed to be closed, and there is no automatic opener to that gate, the possibility exists that service personnel will be re-directed onto an easement that exists on the property owned by 123, LLC, overburdening that easement. If there were an automatic opener to the gate, so that service vehicles approaching could have access, that concern would go away.

Attorney Paul Rampell, representing Cristina Noble, owner of 473 North County, stated that Ms. Noble also owns an easement over Mr. Kellogg's property. There is ongoing litigation between Ms. Noble and Mr. Kellogg with many different issues disputed. He stated that he and his client object to the Town entertaining this application because his client is a co-owner of the property over which the gate is planned. His client has not joined in the application. He submitted a survey into the record. He maintained that he must be allowed to present the case of his client so that it is on the record and appealable to the Town Council.

Upon hearing the outcry from ARCOM members as to why they were being drawn into these issues that do not concern ARCOM, Mr. Randolph advised that Mr. Rampell has the right to present his case orally today.

Mr. Cantin stated that access through the gate will be by a code, and the code will be given to Ms. Noble.

Mrs. Vanneck suggested that both parties be instructed to resolve their issues with the other, and then return to ARCOM for approval.

MOTION WITHDRAWN BY MR. GARRISON.

**MOTION BY MR. GRUSS TO DEFER TO MARCH.
MOTION SECONDED SIMULTANEOUSLY BY MR. IVES AND MRS. VANNECK.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Roy Fitzgerald asked what was the basis, per the criteria, for the deferral. Mr. Vila and Mrs. Vanneck called for more design with planting, i.e., a presentation with landscape treatment.

B - 011 - 2015 Storefront

Address: 225 Worth Avenue, Suite "B"

Applicant: JMcLaughlin/Tenant; Burton Handelsman, Mgr. of Love is Next Door, LLC/Landlord

Architect: Stephen L. Griss, AIA

Project Description: The project includes the exterior storefront and facade renovation of the portion of the building in front of Suite "B" for the new tenant, JMcLaughlin, fine clothing retail store.

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

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Stephen Griss

Mr. Griss presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans for this storefront renovation which includes: relocating the entrance to the center with a double door and displays to the left and right; remove flattened arch and black awning; bronze metal; recessed entrance with entrance mat paving with terrazzo tile border; coral stone trim; signage on the building, the vitrine and on the storefront window in light bronze lettering; impact glass; off-white building color; green awning with 1" oyster stripe border; and green vitrine.

Commission Comments: The header over the window does not fit in terms of scale; issue with the angles on the vitrine; overall, I like it; entrance mat interferes with new paving of Worth Avenue; the entrance mat is inside the recess and beyond the facade of the building, so it's OK; angles of door are fine; the squaring of the opening is an improvement; the vitrine should be simplified; there is no sill on that vitrine; it's a commercial storefront and it is an improvement over what was there, and these are very transient; the color is nice; issues with the vitrine trim; not in favor of floor mat proposed...keep uniform with tabby of Worth Avenue.

Mr. Lindgren stated that one of the signs does not meet code, Sign detail on Sheet A: 4.1. Any motion for approval should be without that sign.

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED WITH THE CAVEAT THAT YOU CHANGE THE VITRINE SURROUND ACCORDING TO MR. SAMMONS' RECOMMENDATIONS AND PUT A SILL ON IT; (2) THAT THERE NOT BE A RECESSED MAT IN THE FRONT; AND (3) THAT THE SIGN THAT IS NOT MEETING CODE BE REMOVED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KNOWLES.

MOTIN CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B - 012 - 2015 New Residence

Address: 208 Angler Avenue

Applicant: Edward P. Grace III and Holly Grace

Architect: Jeffrey Gapster, Architectural Design Assoc.

Project Description: New single family home: One story, totaling 4471 sq. ft., with white stucco lap siding, white trim, grey shutters, grey cement tile roof. New pool, associated hardscape, landscape and landscape lighting.

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

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Jeffrey Gapster, Architectural Design Assoc.
LANDSCAPE PRESENTATION BY: Steve Parker, Parker Yannette

Mr. Gapster presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above for this new single family home with 3,200 sq. ft. under air. This is a single story, four bedroom, four bathroom home with stucco siding over concrete block, dormers, and Colonial and Bahama shutters. Material samples were shown.

Commission Comments: Thank you for the scale and size; question need for cupola over garage; looks like it's always been there as to style of house and window style; cupola way out of scale; dormers serve no purpose; this house does not have character or charm; garage doors need to be re-studied...they are not something that we want to look at from the street; the windows are all different widths; the shutters next to them don't correspond to the window openings; clapboard over concrete block is strange; no improvement over what may have been built in the 1950s; issue with shutters not working; problem with dormers...they should match front and back; windows look like awning windows; porch entry feature needs to be larger in scale; appreciate size and scale, but change the windows; like the scale...the operative word here is "vernacular"...not every house has to be a perfect example of a particular style; bring down the scale of the cupola and scale down the front dormers by 20% and minimize the trim.

Mr. Parker continued with the landscape/hardscape pursuant to the submitted plans. Design elements include: Circular drive with 12 ft. openings; driveway pavers; pool and patio in rear; lush landscape without a lot of color...just layers of green; thick perimeter planting; landscape material to include: Coconut Palms, Adonidia Palms, Ligustrum, Areca Palms, Macarthur Palms, Clusia hedge and other plant material as presented.

Commission Comments: Plant Clusia at 5-6 ft. in height rather than the 4-5 ft. proposed; add more palms on east side; nice job at front entry; has sense of old Florida; would benefit from native vegetation.

MOTION BY MR. SAMMONS TO DEFER TO MARCH FOR RE-STUDY OF THE FENESTRATION AND DORMER DETAILS AND AVOID THE FRONT LOADING GARAGE, AND NOTING THAT WE WANT TO SEE SOMETHING UNIQUE AND STUDIED TO THE PLACE.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS BY MR. SAMMONS DURING THE MOTION: IT IS TOO MUCH OF A "COOKIE CUTTER" TO SOMETHING ELSE AND IT IS NOT STUDIED WELL ENOUGH TO GEL YET; APPLAUD THE FACT THAT IT IS SMALL IN SCALE; WE WANT TO AVOID THE FRONT FACING GARAGE, AT LEAST NOT HAVING THE DIRECT SHOT FROM THE STREET TO THE GARAGE.

**MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON.
MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH MR. VILA OPPOSED.**

Let the record show that Mr. Vila called for a lunch recess at 12:42 p.m., with the meeting scheduled to resume at 1:45 p.m. The meeting actually resumed at 1:50 p.m.

B - 014 - 2015 Final Landscape and Hardscape

Address: 1290 N. Ocean Boulevard

Applicant: 1290 Investments

Architect: Environment Design Group/Dustin Mizell

Project Description: Final hardscape and landscape plan for the revised pool garden and motor court entry with an auto gate proposed. New fence applications and site wall are included. Landscaping will be revised accordingly. A new design for the beachfront property is also included in this application.

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

LANDSCAPE PRESENTATION BY: Dustin Mizell, Environment Design Group

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Mark Marsh, Bridges Marsh & Associates

Mr. Mizell presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above. He noted that this project had been before ARCOM approximately one year ago for architectural changes and some landscape/hardscape. The design goal is for an organic design which takes advantage of the ocean. Design elements include: Landscape transitions from more formal to natural on the ocean side; Good buffer on Merrain and North Ocean Boulevard; add Foxtails around pool; add Areca Palms; remove Seagrape and some other plant material along North Ocean Boulevard which is not in good condition; most of the current revisions concern the motor court and the pool garden; modified the motor court in the front yard to add to the pool garden in the back yard; new automated motor gate (perforated slat wall system); new small pedestrian gate; back yard is simple and clean with a modern feel; water wall and water trough; at the beach area, moved spa to south, added water wall, added built-in seating; and, small architectural changes to cabana, without any change to footprint (opened it up; added bar; added Nana window system; rearranged bath; and, fenestration changes).

Commission Comments: Had been pleased that the bump out was going to be screened (during initial review) by Seagrape, and now you are taking that tree out...it needs to be back in...it's important, visually, for the house; you will be able to see at least the top of the fountain wall from the street; waterfall feature...does it run all day?; how visible are the waterfall and "fire things" to the driver heading south; the "fire things" on the beach are a bad idea; no problem with the architecture; you might want to reduce the open space to allow for more landscape screening from the road; overall, nice and clean, but add more landscaping to green it up and mitigate it...and on the ocean side too (add Coconuts); and, the gate material should be wood rather than aluminum.

Mr. Mizell assured the Commission that the fire bowls on the ocean side will be eliminated from the plan.

MOTION BY MR. KARAKUL TO APPROVE AS PRESENTED, EXCEPT FOR THE FIRE PITS ON THE OCEAN SIDE, AND SAVE THE SEAGRAPE BY THE CARPORT AND ADD MORE LANDSCAPING AT THE GATE ENTRANCE AND ON THE OCEAN SIDE...ADD MORE COCONUTS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VANNECK.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B - 015 - 2015 Pool/Deck/Bar/Awning

Address: 755 N. County Road

Applicant: The Beach Club

Architect: Peacock & Lewis, Architects and Planners, LLC

Project Description: New pool and deck area to replace existing. Removal of southeast area of building to be replaced with new bar and supporting existing facilities. New planting and paving to replace existing. New covered awning structures to replace existing awning structures and associated changes as presented.

Please be advised that the architect has requested that this project be withdrawn.

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK TO WITHDRAW THIS PROJECT FROM THE AGENDA.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B - 016 - 2015 Demolition

Address: 156 Seagate Road

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Mark Saur

Architect: Roger P. Janssen/Dailey Janssen Architects

Project Description: Demolition of current residence, landscape and hardscape

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

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Roger P. Janssen/Dailey Janssen Architects

Mr. Janssen provided the demolition report for this one-story home built in 1950 by E. B. Walton Sr. and designed by John Stetson. The existing vegetation will remain as is until such time as construction will commence.

MOTION BY MR. KARAKUL FOR APPROVAL OF DEMOLITION WITH THE TYPICAL CAVEATS FOR IMMEDIATE SODDING AND IRRIGATING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VANNECK.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B - 017 - 2015 Roof Changes

Address: 139 Everglade Avenue

Applicant: Douglas Haddad

Architect: SKA Architect + Planner, Jacqueline Albarran, Architect, P.A.

Project Description: Raise existing top of beam by 24" to accommodate two new pergolas at front facade. Change the slope of the roof from 4 in 12 to 6 in 12. Revise existing copper roof at bay window to adjust to roof change. All detailing to match existing.

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

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Jacqueline Albarran, SKA Architect + Planner

Mrs. Albarran presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above to raise the top of the beam for higher interior ceiling heights and to allow for space for the front pergolas. The very flat copper roof will be changed to have more of a bell shape. She noted

that the rear patio is to remain for the time being, as opposed to the plans submitted. Pergola details were shown on the Elmo projector.

Commission Comments: Thank you to Mr. Haddad for doing something charming and in keeping.

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KARAKUL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B - 018 - 2015 Final Landscape/Hardscape

Address: 1695 N. Ocean Way

Applicant: 1695 NOW, LLC

Architect: Joe M. Peterson

Project Description: Final landscape and hardscape plan approval

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

LANDSCAPE PRESENTATION BY: Joe Peterson

Mr. Peterson presented the final landscape/hardscape in accordance with the submitted plans. Preliminary landscape had been approved approximately a year ago. During that preliminary review, the Commission asked for more salt tolerant plants on the north property line, more mystery at the front, and more screening of the guesthouse from the roadway. This final plan attempts to respond to those requests. Design elements include: Added large Date Palms at entryway to define that; added slightly curved wing walls with retractable gate; removed parking area in front of guest house to allow for more planting; secondary drive reduced in width from 14 ft. to 10 ft. to allow for more landscaping; added seven (7) additional Coconut Palms; more layering across the front; add Bougainvillea to trunks of Coconuts at the entry circle; re-install removed 20 ft. Seagrapes; Coconut Palms down main drive; at south side of motor court, 18 ft. Montgomery Palms at staggered heights; pool and pool deck on north side with Date Palms at corners; Coconut Palms and other plants around back of pool; and, other landscape material as presented.

Commission Comments: Concern with 14 ft. drop on north side; too many dune lights shown on plan...use down lights; questioning treatment of exterior sides of property walls; house is so massive with a huge flat roof...it needs to be hidden by landscaping...needs more massive planting; the gate is higher in the middle where there is the most weight...structurally irrational; losing an opportunity to create a lushly planted beach easement similar to the other three easements in this area...we should require that there be landscaping on the north side of the wall; and, go for a natural landscape look in the easement.

It should be noted that as a result of the comment for more massive planting to hide the architecture, Mr. Peterson agreed to add 4 ft. of height to the planned landscape material.

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED, WITH THE CAVEAT THAT WE "BEEF UP" THE SOUTH ELEVATION, THE WEST ELEVATION WITH AS MANY TIGHT SEAGRAPES AND TRY TO PUT SOME GUMBOS AND CABBAGE PALMS IN THE ACCESS TO THE BEACH; AND CHANGE THE GATE DESIGN TO A DIP IN THE MIDDLE.

**MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

C. **MINOR PROJECTS - OLD BUSINESS: (02:35:07 a.m.)**

A - 004 - 2015 Modifications to Previous Approval

Address: 710 S. County Road

Applicant: Joan Granlund

Architect: Bridges Marsh Architects, Mark Marsh

Project Description: Modifications to previously approved design to include a one-story addition on the northwest corner, changes to fenestration and miscellaneous finish changes.

At the January meeting, this project was not heard and was deferred to the February meeting at the request of the applicant/architect.

Please be advised that the architect requested deferral to the March meeting.

**MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK FOR DEFERRAL TO THE MARCH MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SAMMONS.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A - 007 - 2015 Chiller with Screening

Address: 1045 S. Ocean Boulevard

Applicant: Michelle Borislow

Architect: Brasseur & Drobot, Jeffrey D. Brasseur

Project Description: The project includes the addition of a 40 square foot, 25 ton air cooled chiller at the northwest corner of the residence and landscape screening.

At the January meeting, a motion carried for deferral (to Feb.) and that the approval of the chiller in this location is subject to a landscaping plan which includes landscaping in the driveway area, and landscaping and hardscape, including a wall around this chiller.

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

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Jeffrey D. Brasseur, Brasseur & Drobot

LANDSCAPE PRESENTATION BY: Andre Paradelo, Paradelo and Fleck, Landscape
Architecture

OTHERS WHO TESTIFIED: Shelly Borislow

Jeffrey Brasseur presented the revised plans pursuant to the motion made last month. Those plans provide for a new chiller in the northwest corner of the residence, a 7 ft. 4" tall site wall around the chiller, and new landscaping. He noted that the chiller and site wall were shifted back toward the water to allow for the site wall and keep it out of the setback. The shape of the front landscape island was reconfigured by rounding the corners, and tiered hedging of Silver Buttonwood and Green Island Ficus was added, per plans. Green Island Ficus, 7 to 8 ft. tall, will screen the site wall at the chiller. He noted that Mrs. Borislow would like to retain the ability to look through the front doors to the ocean.

Mr. Paradelo continued with additional information relative to the landscape/hardscape.

Commission Comments: Concern over number of vehicles parked there; suggestion to add two (2) beautiful standard (10-12 ft.) Silver Buttonwoods in the island to soften the area; suggestion to add some low greenery at front door; curb cuts are absurdly wide...looks commercial...add softscape to front of house; both cuts at 26 ft. in width ruin the house...decrease the curb cuts, and add more low hedge and a few trees...frame the view to the ocean; decreasing the curb cuts and adding more Buttonwoods would decrease the commercial feel; add more landscaping at front facade at the palms; and, the ability to see the ocean through the front door is a generous gesture, so framing that view with the two Buttonwoods could be very successful.

Mr. Vila offered the condolences of the Commission to Mrs. Borislow. Mrs. Borislow commented that the number of cars parked at the residence has already reduced. She supported the curb cuts, as they exist, as it can be hazardous moving in and out of the driveway.

MOTION BY MR. SAMMONS FOR APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED FOR THE CHILLER AND THE ENCLOSURE, AND SOFTEN THE FRONT WITH LARGER SHADE TREES, AND ADD LOW PLANTING AGAINST THE HOUSE FLANKING THE ENTRY.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A - 008 - 2015 Extend Garage

Address: 215 Onondaga Avenue

Applicant: Maria Drelich

Architect: H. John Griffin II, P.E.

Project Description: Extension of the undersized one-car garage

At the January meeting, this project was not heard and was deferred to the February meeting at the request of the applicant/architect.

Please be advised that the applicant has requested deferral to the March meeting.

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK FOR DEFERRAL TO THE MARCH MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

D. MINOR PROJECTS-NEW BUSINESS:(03:04:04 a.m.)

A - 010 - 2015 Awning

Address: 155 Hammon Avenue

Applicant: Colony Hotel

Architect: None

Project Description: Recover existing awning over Polo Room door with red awning fabric. Previously approved white.

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

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Karen Knier, Assistant General Manager

Ms. Knier presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans for a Jockey Red awning in Sunbrella fabric and a red frieze on the building above the awning. It should be noted that the changes are already in place, without approval, and are the subject of Code Enforcement action.

Mr. Lindgren stated that the Colony Hotel had obtained staff approval from him for a blue and white striped awning to match other awnings on site. That staff approval was not paid, and no building permit was obtained. The blue and white awning was installed, but subsequently it was replaced by the red awning, without any approval or permit.

Chairman Vila cautioned the applicant to follow proper Town procedures and requirements.

Commission Comments: Eliminate the red painted stripe; like the red frieze; and, the other awnings are all blue and white striped.

**MOTION BY MR. GARRISON FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SAMMONS.**

Commission Comments (continued): Problem with blue and white awnings and a red awning on the same building; the awnings are around the corner from each other and one cannot see them both at the same time; and, would prefer them all the same.

MOTION CARRIED 5-2, WITH MRS. VANNECK AND MR. KARAKUL OPPOSED.

A - 011 - 2015 Modifications

Address: 66 Middle Road

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Robert Bishop

Architect: Smith Architectural Group, Jeffery W. Smith

Project Description: Minor changes to the east facade which are further described as: Revision of the garage doors to closed louver design and eased arch top, stucco detailing added, revised design of pedestrian gate to courtyard, copper plume finials at entry roof and courtyard piers, change of exterior house color from yellow to Benjamin Moore "Perfect Peach" and other associated changes as presented

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

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

Mr. Smith presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described in detail above. In addition to the above: Cornice changed to projecting crown; moved window up higher; changed pedestrian gate from wrought iron to wood; changed the window to include into frontispiece of family door; and, balcony railing detailed to include rosettes.

**MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A - 012 - 2015 Doors/Windows/Shutters

Address: 357 North Lake Way

Applicant: Erik Waldin

Architect: MP Design & Architecture

Project Description: Replace entry door and adjacent windows with new wood door and windows. Shutters to be returned and placed in original locations.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: No disclosures

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Michael Perry, MP Design & Architecture

Mr. Perry presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above. In addition: Three (3) arched openings removed in favor of new recessed panel front door and French doors, along with the return of the shutters. The garage door will be simplified.

MOTION BY MR. KARAKUL FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VANNECK.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A - 013 - 2015 Windows/Doors/Exterior/Pool

Address: 417 Seaview Avenue

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Todd Carlson

Architect: MP Design & Architecture

Project Description: New windows and doors. Replacing existing siding with stucco finish. New pool.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: No disclosures

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Michael Perry, MP Design & Architecture

Mr. Perry presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above for this cottage which the clients intend to raise up to 7.5 ft. Design elements include: Remove vinyl siding in favor of stucco; change front door to solid chevron door; change bay windows to remove mullions in center section; change house and pool cabana fenestration; add pool on east side; and, remove driveway in favor of creating garden in front.

Commission Comments: Solid panes in center of bay windows is a little inconsistent; good to raise the house and save it; losing the original window for a plate glass window kills the cottage feel; and, add some landscape when they raise it.

MOTION BY MR. GARRISON FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.

**MOTION AMENDED BY MR. GARRISON FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED, BUT
KEEP THE MUNTINS IN THE CENTER OF THE BAY WINDOWS.**

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SAMMONS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A - 014 - 2015 Loggia/Pool/Door

Address: 210 Orange Grove Road

Applicant: Mrs. Alice Ruth and Mr. Ron Alvarez

Architect: MP Design & Architecture

Project Description: Enclosure of existing loggia and addition of new loggia. Replace existing pool with new pool. All finishes to match existing house. Replace existing front door with new door.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosures by Mrs. Vanneck and Mr. Small

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Michael Perry, MP Design & Architecture

Mr. Perry presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above. He reminded the Commission that this was the project where the original garage was enclosed illegally by the original owner. Mr. Perry had previously presented a design for this home, but that one was not approved. After reconsideration, new plans are proposed to include: Bringing the garage back into its original location, thereby replacing the existing family room; enclose the original loggia to become the new family room; add a new loggia to the east; change the pool; and, re-build balcony in front and add a segmented arched transom over the front door.

Commission Comments: Great solution; portico is a little spindly...beef it up.

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KARAKUL.

MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH MR. SAMMONS OPPOSED.

A - 015 - 2015 Landscape/Hardscape/Gate

Address: 589 N. County Road

Applicant: Christine & Robert Stiller

Architect: Keith Williams, Nievera Williams Design

Project Description: Proposed hardscape and landscape and entry gate.

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

LANDSCAPE PRESENTATION BY: Keith Williams, Nievera Williams Design

Mr. Williams presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above with design elements to include: Re-shape pool; re-layout the courtyard paving and incorporate large tree; add additional landscaping; in front, remove existing columns with walls and gate and place the gate inside the gate house; open up the front entrance to main house and add garden in front; add water feature on axis with breezeway; adjust grade at east end of pool, adding steps; re-align hedges; introduce more Date Palms; emphasize entrance to house and screen out the two wings; motorized gate (swinging into gate house) to be solid bronze and will be fabricated in France; and Epay solid wood service gate.

Commission Comments: Service gate is too heavy; putting the gate in the gate house is very special.

**MOTION BY MR. KARAKUL FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SAMMONS AND GARRISON SIMULTANEOUSLY.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A - 016 - 2015 Doors

Address: 167 Dunbar Road

Applicant: Laura Andrassy

Architect: Roger Janssen

Project Description: Modification to entry door and interior courtyard French doors

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

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Roger Janssen

Mr. Janssen presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above for modifications to the original approval for this house which is under construction. Proposed changes include: Replace approved square wood plank door with inswinging solid wood shutter panels fronted by a solid glass door, and have half-round arch head instead of square head; at living room, change square head divided lite doors to arch head French doors and fixed picture glass unit at center with same arch head.

Commission Comments: Issue with no mullions...it's an inconsistency of scale along the facade; arched opening on front door can be wider and taller.

**MOTION BY MR. SAMMONS FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED, WITH THE
MULLIONS RETURNED TO THE WINDOWS AND THE FRONT DOOR COULD BE
MADE TO FIT THE SURROUNDING BETTER...SMALLER
ARCHITRAVE...ARCHIVOLT AROUND THE FRONT DOOR.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VANNECK.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A - 019 - 2015 Modifications

Address: 1740 S. Ocean Boulevard

Applicant: 149 Brazilian, LLC

Architect: SKA Architect + Planner/Patrick W. Segraves, A.I.A.

Project Description: Remove existing doors and windows and replace with impact doors and windows, raise window and door head height to 8'-0" above finished floor, remove existing entry columns and entry roof and replace with new (east elevation)

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: No disclosures

ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION BY: Patrick W. Segraves, SKA Architect + Planner

Mr. Segraves presented the project in accordance with the submitted plans and as described above to replace all of the windows and doors, and change the front porch.

Commission Comments: Vast improvement

MOTION BY MR. SAMMONS FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED, BUT NOTING
THAT THE LINTELS ABOVE THE DOOR SHOULD GO PAST THE OPENINGS.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

IX. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS (3 MINUTE LIMIT PLEASE): (03:51:03 a.m.) None

X. COMMENTS OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION AND DIRECTOR OF PLANNING,
ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT: (03:51:06 a.m.)

Mr. Sammons noted that he has driven by several sites which have been previously approved by ARCOM, and it appears to him that the construction does not include that which ARCOM asked the applicant to do. Mr. Lindgren stressed the fact that unless conditions are placed within a motion, suggestions do not become mandated. Staff assured the Commission that if construction is not per the ARCOM plans, it will be caught prior to the end of the job. Mr. Sammons referenced a book entitled Building with Nantucket in Mind as a great guide to architecture. Other members thought that such a book might be helpful in Palm Beach. Mr. Garrison stated the importance of clarifying the type of stucco which will be used on a job. Mr. Sammons stressed the need for requiring scale figures in the drawings, and it was suggested that the ARCOM application be modified to make that a requirement.

XI. ADJOURNMENT: (03:52:01 a.m.)

MOTION BY MR. SAMMONS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 3:52 P.M., WHICH WAS
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The next meeting of the Architectural Commission will be held on Wednesday, March 25, 2015 at
9:00 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 S. County Road, Palm Beach.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert J. Vila, Chairman ✓
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

cmd

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

NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME SAMMONS RICHARD		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION	
MAILING ADDRESS 455 WORTH AVE.		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: ☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY TOWN	
CITY PALM BEACH	COUNTY PALM BEACH	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: TOWN OF PALM BEACH	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED 2/25/15		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 FEB. 25, 20 15:

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

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

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

B-010-0015 475 N. COUNTY RD.

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

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.