



# TOWN OF PALM BEACH

## Minutes of the Architectural Commission Meeting Held on October 29, 2025

### CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 09:01 AM in the Town Council Chambers.

**Members Present:** Betsy Shiverick, Elizabeth Connaughton, Jeffery Smith, Claudia Visconti (arrived at 10:15 a.m.), Kenn Karakul, Richard Sammons, KT Catlin, David Phoenix, Sue Patterson, and Kathy Georgas

**Staff Present:** Friederike Mittner, Sarah Pardue, Bradley Falco, Kelly Churney, and Town Attorney Lainey Francisco

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Smith led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### MINUTES

#### 1. Minutes of the September 25, 2025, Architectural Commission Meeting

Ms. Catlin suggested a modification to Mr. Phoenix's comment in the Comments section. Ms. Churney asked Mr. Phoenix to explain the intent of his statement. Mr. Phoenix clarified his statement.

**A motion was made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Ms. Catlin to approve the minutes from September 25, 2025, to include the statement by Mr. Phoenix. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.**

### APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Catlin requested that ARCS-25-1009, 251 Dunbar Road, be removed from the consent agenda and discussed.

Ms. Connaughton requested that ARC-25-0044, 766 Hi Mount Road, be removed from the consent agenda and discussed.

**A motion was made by Mr. Phoenix and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to approve the consent agenda as amended, with the approval of ARCS-25-1257, specifically for 266 Southland Road. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.**

2. ARC-25-0044 (ZON-25-0045 ) 766 HI MOUNT RD. (COMBO) The applicant, Christina Baker, owner (Maura Ziska and SKA Architects, representatives), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for removal and new construction of a glass enclosure on the west side of the cabana, requiring a side yard setback. The Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Ms. Connaughton wondered if the proposed glass cabana could be more in keeping with the original home.

Mr. Karakul thought that some additional vegetation on the north elevation should be added to mitigate the impact of the four-panel window. Jackie Albarran of SKA Architect + Planner stated she would study that suggestion.

Ms. Connaughton suggested smaller columns.

Mr. Phoenix inquired about the west elevation and agreed with Mr. Karakul, suggesting that more vegetation could be added to mitigate the impact of the four-panel window. Ms. Albarran agreed to add more vegetation on the north elevation. Mr. Phoenix also stated he agreed with Ms. Connaughton about the glass cabana being subservient to the main structure. Ms. Albarran explained and advocated for the design.

Ms. Catlin stated she walked the area frequently and thought the change would be refreshing.

Mr. Sammons thought it was a big improvement over the store-bought cabana. He asked if the capitals on the structure could be lowered below the beam.

Ms. Georgas thought the proposal was a significant improvement and suggested adding landscaping below the window to soften it. Ms. Albarran stated she was open to the suggestion.

**A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Ms. Catlin to approve the project with the condition to lower the capitals to align with the tops of the windows and express the lintel as a beam under the corners. The motion was carried 6-1, with Ms. Connaughton dissenting.**

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

3. ARCS-25-1009 251 DUNBAR RD. The applicant, Alexandra Hersey Hamm Trustee

(Environment Design Group), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for installation of a fence.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Ms. Georgas disclosed ex parte communications.

Ms. Catlin requested to see the proposed fence.

Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the architectural plans for the fence and explained the request.

**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.**

4. ARCS-25-1257 266 SOUTHLAND RD. The applicant, William & Emma Roberts (Environment Design Group), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission approval for landscape and hardscape modifications.

## **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

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

## **ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH**

Town Clerk Churney swore in all those intending to speak and continued to do so throughout the meeting, as necessary.

## **COMMENTS**

### **5. OFFICIALS**

Ms. Catlin said that despite some landscaping improvements, the Breakers' tennis pavilions remain highly visible from Main Street and County Road, describing them as a "white sea" and suggesting additional screening is needed.

Mr. Smith said he inspected the Breakers' landscaping after the summer and felt it had greatly improved, noting that over 50 new trees had been added. Although he was previously a strong critic, he now finds the tennis pavilions mostly screened, except for a small opening near the steakhouse driveway. He mentioned one area where additional trees couldn't be planted due to utilities, concluding that the landscaping looks good and will continue to improve over time.

### **6. STAFF**

Ms. Pardue noted the updated meeting dates had been provided to the Commissioners. She noted that a correction had been made to the August 2026 meeting date.

#### **6.1 Presentation on R-B Front/Rear Setbacks**

Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning James Murphy explained that the Town Council has directed staff to take the lead on code reform, with a particular focus on the R-B single-family zoning district, which has been amended 27 times since 1972 and remains problematic. He said staff have been working with local architects to identify provisions that affect architectural quality, including one section that allows homes to be built up to five feet closer to the street in exchange for greater rear-yard setbacks. He reviewed the background of this rule, adopted in 2009 to provide flexibility, noting that changes to FEMA elevation requirements (in 2017 and 2024) may have impacted how these encroachments affect neighborhood streetscapes. Staff analyzed 12–15 examples across the North End and found mixed results: in some cases, the rule fit well, but in others, it disrupted streetscape uniformity, increased paving, and reduced front-yard landscaping. Mr. Murphy said both the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Town Council supported the staff's recommendation to remove this automatic "as-of-right" allowance and instead require review by the Architectural Commission (ARCOM) as a design waiver. This would enable a case-by-case evaluation based on criteria such as compatibility with the street, view corridors, and the neighborhood's character. He asked the Commission to begin considering the criteria that should guide such waivers, emphasizing that this shift toward context-based zoning would make future reviews more transparent, notify neighbors in advance, and create a clear public record of approvals. Mr. Murphy answered questions from the Commissioners and urged them to email the staff with any ideas on the criteria for the "waiver."

## 7. PUBLIC - 3 MINUTE LIMIT

For those unable to attend in person:

[Submit a written comment](#)

[Register to comment virtually](#)

John Corey, 426 Australian Avenue, stated that when he was on the Architectural Commission, he believed the decision was that the tents for The Breakers would be green. Mr. Smith stated that the Commission changed them to white. Mr. Corey stated that there are concerns that new homes appear too large on narrow streets and suggested creating an "angle of height" ratio, from the road crown to the roof ridge, to help the Commission better assess how houses fit within the streetscape without altering the zoning code.

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS

8. ARC-24-0090 (ZON-24 -0046) 2720 - 2730 S OCEAN BLVD- EDGEWATER/ AMBASSADOR SITE (COMBO) The applicant, Palm Beach Edgewater Fee Borrower LLC and Palm Beach Ambassador Fee Borrower LLC, has filed an application for Architectural Commission review and approval of a new multifamily, multibuilding residential development on the east and west sides of S Ocean Boulevard with a new multi-story residential building with five residential levels and a subterranean parking level and rooftop penthouse mechanical equipment to replace two existing five- and eight- story buildings on the east side of S Ocean Boulevard and to replace an existing three-story building on the west side of S Ocean Boulevard, to be demolished. This project includes multiple variances related to building height, building setbacks, building length, lot coverage, maximum amount of fill, rooftop generators, and rooftop mechanical equipment. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by

Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/ approval.

Mr. Murphy provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Attorney Harvey Oyer, representing the OKO Group, said the Ambassador Edgewater redevelopment is a landmark project that will set the standard for future South End redevelopment. He recapped a three-year process of collaboration with staff, Town boards, and neighbors, emphasizing that the design evolved through extensive feedback and now has unanimous support from neighbors. The proposal replaces aging hotel buildings with three five-story residential structures, reducing density from 135 to 41 units and eliminating transient hotel use. Mr. Oyer noted that most of the 20 variances stem from outdated RD-2 zoning and modern FEMA requirements, stressing that the project is lower in height and length than nearby buildings and fully meets the code's standards for harmony, balance, and contextual design.

Yusef Dennis of OMA presented the modifications to the architectural plans for the proposed buildings. He discussed the design intent and reviewed the proposed materials.

Mr. Sammons inquired about the building's height above ground and whether the measurements had taken into account the underground garage. He also inquired whether the professional had considered alternative arrangements for the five- and six-building complexes that had been shown. Mr. Dennis stated that the measurement was taken from the FEMA height established, which was the new ground level of the building. Mr. Dennis also discussed the building arrangement and the considerations made. Mr. Sammons wondered if the building adjacent to the beach would encroach upon the dune. Keith Williams of Nievera Williams Design stated that they would re-nourish the dune.

Mr. Smith offered an alternative suggestion for arranging the six buildings. Mr. Dennis responded and explained the reasons it was arranged in the configuration shown. Mr. Smith asked about the justification for the increased lot coverage that was proposed. Mr. Dennis said the project's design reduces elevation, steps back upper floors, and creates more open space and amenities at ground level. He explained that the requested lot coverage relief would provide flexibility to increase setbacks, add canopies, and enhance the site's character without significantly reducing the developable area. Mr. Smith argued that an architect should first look at the allowable footprint to determine the restrictions.

Mr. Oyer explained that while the project balances many factors: neighbor concerns, luxury design standards, and environmental goals, the larger floor plates and sustainability systems require slightly more lot coverage. He noted that the design intentionally reduces massing by carving out areas on the fifth floor, sacrificing valuable space to improve the building's appearance. Mr. Smith questioned how the additional coverage was justified, and Mr. Oyer responded that the request is consistent with other South End projects, such as Bellaria, which have similar or greater lot coverage and height approved under the same zoning code. Mr. Smith discussed the variances and the necessity of a hardship to approve them. Mr. Oyer explained that zoning changes have reduced the site's buildable area. To address neighbor concerns about blocked views, the design was modified and shifted farther from adjacent properties. He said meeting the strict lot coverage limit would actually create a bulkier, less attractive structure, while the current design offered a better result for both neighbors and the community. Mr.



Smith disagreed.

Ms. Connaughton asked if the variance for the lot coverage included the garage space. Mr. Dennis responded. Ms. Connaughton inquired about the view corridors and wanted to know if they had been studied; she did not believe there would be a view corridor for the neighbors. Mr. Dennis spoke about the study of the vantage points in 3D from photographs taken of the corridor with the neighbors.

Mr. Sammons believed the large, unshaded glass did not contribute to the project's sustainability. Mr. Dennis emphasized that efficiency and sustainability are central to the project, noting it is designed to meet a high LEED standard. He highlighted features such as deeper canopies, recessed windows, shaded loggias, and high-performance triple-glazed glass to reduce energy use and enhance comfort, describing the project as a modern, environmentally responsible development.

Ms. Visconti asked if they studied alternative materials, specifically for the glass railings. Mr. Dennis stated the design group was happy with the glass railings and believed they were less busy.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the requested variances for the rooftop area. Mr. Dennis discussed the smaller setbacks in the roof designs that they had designed and how they had tried to mitigate the impact of the equipment.

Mr. Murphy explained that the Town's code currently limits rooftop mechanical equipment to 10% of the roof area, an outdated standard that has proven unworkable for modern projects. A recent code amendment increased the allowance to 30%, but the Ambassador Edgewater proposal still exceeds that limit. He said the applicant would still need several variances even under the new rule, noting staff have worked with them to consolidate the rooftop equipment as much as possible.

Mr. Phoenix asked about the material on the rooftop screening. Mr. Dennis discussed the material and showed a rendering of the proposed area. He stated the material would be white, to which Mr. Phoenix wondered if the color would be too stark. Mr. Phoenix wondered if other materials would be considered for the handrail. Mr. Dennis responded and discussed the proposed marine-grade hardwood. Mr. Phoenix discussed the east and west buildings, noting that they would look directly into the adjacent buildings.

Ms. Visconti wondered if they would be willing to work on the materials, specifically the handrails and terrazzo flooring. Mr. Dennis discussed the tone and color that they preferred, but added that they were happy to continue to study the materials. Ms. Visconti asked about the upcoming changes to the zoning code and wondered how many variances would be removed. Mr. Murphy responded.

Mr. Sammons asked if the applicant had provided the required streetscape. Mr. Murphy responded.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

The following individuals spoke in favor of the project and advocated for approval:

Fred Kamel, 3400 S. Ocean Blvd.,  
Attorney Megan Wegerif, on behalf of Clay Liflander at 2770 S. Ocean Blvd.,  
Skip Aldridge, 2295 S. Ocean Blvd.,  
Tony Ursillo, 3400 S. Ocean Blvd.,  
Jonae Barnes, 3400 S. Ocean Blvd.,  
Ruth Fattori, 2660 S. Ocean Blvd.,  
Guy Clark, 44 Cocoanut Row,  
Glori Carchi, 2660 S Ocean Blvd.,  
Rick Salvatore, 3300 S. Ocean Blvd.,  
Thomas Mandat, 110 Wells Road,  
Ronald Matzner, 3120 S. Ocean Blvd.,  
Alan Buchholtz, 2760 S. Ocean Blvd.,  
Marvin Baum, 2760 S. Ocean Blvd.

*\*Note: A short break was taken at 11:25 a.m. and the meeting resumed at 11:38 a.m.*

Mr. Karakul praised the development and design teams for collaborating closely with neighbors and earning their support, calling it a strong example of community engagement. He complimented the architectural progress, especially the wood details and terraced design, and emphasized the importance of maintaining or enhancing the landscaping as presented. He questioned the need for gates, noting that they are uncommon in that area, and suggested that the team revisit that detail with the neighbors. Mr. Dennis agreed to review it, and Mr. Karakul concluded by expressing full support for the project.

Ms. Shiverick praised the project's design and professional team, saying the updated architecture, especially the tapered cypress canopies and T-shaped columns, greatly improved the building's appearance and harmony with nearby structures. She commended the extensive neighbor outreach and collaboration with the commission, noting the result is a far better project that sets a high standard for future development. She also acknowledged that many of the needed variances stem from outdated zoning codes and expressed strong support for the project.

Ms. Catlin praised the design team for their perseverance and thoughtful placement of the buildings, noting that the massing and articulation were well-executed. She supported the three-building layout, the softer design elements, and the under-building garage, which she said made practical sense. She also encouraged staff to consider incorporating some of the requested variances, such as those related to modern standards, into future zoning updates. Overall, she commended the team's progress and expressed full support for the project.

Ms. Visconti thanked the team for their extensive community collaboration and noted that it was impressive how they effectively incorporated neighborhood feedback. She supported the revised building forms but reiterated her concerns about the glass railings, citing maintenance and overly modern appearance, as well as her dislike of the T-shaped columns. She said these details could be refined later and expressed openness to moving the project forward despite minor design reservations.

Ms. Patterson praised the project's refined design and color palette, saying it had become much more beautiful through the collaborative process with the commission. She commended the team's responsiveness and noted that the project sets a high standard for future developments, expressing strong support for its approval.

Mr. Sammons acknowledged the project's progress but strongly criticized its overall scale, energy use, and architectural approach. He said the buildings appear oversized and overly glazed, calling them inefficient "greenhouses in the tropics" and urging more solid wall surfaces and articulation. He objected to the thin, veneer-like materials as "disingenuous" and warned that approving such a design could set an undesirable precedent south of Sloane's Curve. He also faulted the repetitive, uniform floor heights and lack of variation, saying the project feels more like a mass-produced office complex than a distinctive, contextually responsive building in Palm Beach.

Mr. Phoenix said the project has improved significantly and praised the team's collaboration with the neighborhood. He supported the overall design but suggested reducing the lot coverage from 28% closer to 22% to avoid that variance. He shared concerns about the glass railings and the unresolved design of the rooftop mechanical units, but said the project will likely be world-class.

Ms. Connaughton said that while she agrees with many of the positive comments about the project and recognizes the design team's skill, she believes it is a missed opportunity not to break the large structure into multiple smaller buildings. She argued that doing so would create better views, more natural light, and improved exterior spaces for both neighbors and the developer. She said the current 95-foot-deep design feels too massive and not aligned with future development principles, though she concluded by acknowledging the team's strong effort and the project's many positive aspects.

Ms. Georgas praised the project's significant improvements and overall design, saying the building looks beautiful. Her only concern was the visibility of the rooftop mechanical equipment, suggesting the screening should be improved.

Mr. Smith said the project's design has greatly improved, but expressed serious concerns about the durability of materials near the ocean. He warned that the thin stone veneer, wood railings, and wood ceilings would deteriorate quickly in the salt air and require constant maintenance, suggesting the team reconsider those finishes. He praised the improved presentation and structural detailing but emphasized that the exterior materials still need further refinement for longevity.

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

**A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to approve the project with the following five items to be returned to the February 25, 2026, ARCOM meeting for further refinement and detailing: increased landscaping, detailing of stone attachment, the railing design, the mechanical penthouse level, and the gates. The motion was carried 5-2, with Ms. Connaughton and Mr. Sammons dissenting.**

**A motion was made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Ms. Connaughton that the**



implementation of variances #1 and #10 (lot coverage) for the above-ground structures would cause a negative architectural impact on the subject property. The motion was carried 5-2, with Mr. Karakul and Ms. Catlin dissenting.

A motion was made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Mr. Karakul that the implementation of the proposed variances #2-#9 and #11-#20 will not cause a negative architectural impact on the subject property. The motion was carried 4-3, with Ms. Connaughton and Messrs. Sammons and Smith dissenting.

9. ARC-25-0043 250 INDIAN RD. The applicant, Frances Sweeney (Dailey Janssen Architects), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a two-story addition to an existing residence, new detached garage with sitewide landscape and hardscape modifications.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Patrick Mayfield of Dailey Janssen Architects presented the architectural modifications for the proposed project, and Mario Nievera of Nievera Williams Design presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

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

Ms. Connaughton asked if the design had maximized the lot coverage and cubic content. Mr. Mayfield stated they had not reached the maximum.

Mr. Sammons asked if the reveal of windows in the masonry was at least four inches. Mr. Mayfield stated that all the fenestration would be replaced and confirmed that they would be properly set.

**A motion was made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the project as presented. The motion was carried 6-1, with Ms. Connaughton dissenting.**

10. ARC-25-0055 100 CASA BENDITA The applicant, Villa Bendita LLC (Environment Design Group), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for installation of vehicular and pedestrian gates with sitewide landscape and hardscape modifications.

Mr. Karakul disclosed ex parte communications.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Dustin Mizell of the Environment Design Group presented the proposed modifications for the gate designs.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the vehicular gate and whether there was a previous gate. Mr. Mizell responded and, while initially thinking there had been a gate in that location in the past, learned that this would be a new gate. Ms. Shiverick asked about the inspiration for the vehicular gate.

Mr. Mizell discussed the pedestrian gate, from which the design inspiration was taken.

Ms. Visconti inquired about the height of the vehicular gate in relation to the columns and the site wall. Mr. Mizell reviewed the heights. Ms. Visconti acknowledged that the gate was internal to the property and asked about the view from the street. Mr. Mizell responded. Ms. Visconti stated she could support the gate but suggested framing it with landscape to mitigate the height of the site wall next to the smaller gate.

Mr. Sammons asked if the vehicular gate design could be changed; he provided a suggestion for the design. Mr. Mizell stated that the priority of his client was to separate the public from the private portion of the site.

Mr. Karakul was grateful that there were no gates at the front of the property. He supported the request.

Mr. Phoenix thought the vehicular gate was too much for the small motor court. He did not believe the pedestrian gate enhanced the architecture and doubted that the aluminum would withstand the proposed design.

Ms. Catlin agreed with Ms. Visconti on the relationship of the gate with the wall; however, she was not opposed to the gate. She wondered if the applicant could consider a smaller and less ornate gate.

Ms. Patterson agreed with Ms. Catlin. She thought that the design of the interior gate had too much detail.

Mr. Mizell provided suggestions on how the gates could be modified. He said he would be happy to make changes.

Mr. Smith thought the vehicular gate was excessive; he did not see the need for a gate in that location.

**A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Visconti to approve the pedestrian gate, with the condition that the vehicular gate and the landscaping, as discussed, be restudied and returned to the November 21, 2025, meeting. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.**

*\*Note: The meeting was recessed for lunch at 12:45 p.m. and resumed at 1:48 p.m.*

11. ARC-24-0146 258 WELLS RD. The applicant, Bear 258 LLC (Lang Design Group), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for two (2) swinging vehicular gates anchored by new piers and one (1) pedestrian gate with an arched landscape trellis above, located near the front property line along Wells Road. ***This item has been deferred to the November 21, 2025, meeting.***

***\*Note: This item was deferred to November 21, 2025, at the approval of the agenda.***

12. ARC-25-0026 310 POLMER PARK The applicant, Oscannlain Sean J Trust (Environment Design Group), has filed an application requesting Architectural

Commission review and approval for installation of entry columns, rear yard trellis and landscape and hardscape modifications. ***This item has been deferred to the November 21, 2025, meeting.***

***\*Note: This item was deferred to November 21, 2025, at the approval of the agenda.***

13. ARC-25-0060 259 WORTH AVE. The applicant, 259 Worth Avenue LLC (Riccardo Grazia), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for exterior modifications to an existing storefront including new signage, entry door and awnings. ***This item has been deferred to the November 21, 2025, meeting.***

***\*Note: This item was deferred to November 21, 2025, at the approval of the agenda.***

## **NEW BUSINESS**

14. ARC-24-0122 239 WELLS RD. The applicant, 239 WELLS ROAD, LLC (Michael Perry, Representative), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new, two-story residence with final hardscape, landscape and swimming pool improvements.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Michael Perry of MP Design & Architecture presented the architectural plans for the proposed project, and Cory Meyer of Nievera Williams Design presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Ms. Visconti asked if the Bougainvillea would surround the front door; Mr. Meyer confirmed it would. Ms. Visconti asked about the lights at the front door; Mr. Perry stated that the lights would be bronze.

Mr. Phoenix asked about the window color and the functionality of the wooden doors at the front entrance. Mr. Perry responded. Mr. Phoenix inquired about the strip of landscaping adjacent to the kitchen and wondered if grass could grow in that location. Mr. Meyer thought the growth would be successful in that location. Mr. Phoenix inquired about the possibility of adding awnings next to the pool, given the large number of arches. Mr. Perry provided an alternate rendering of the arches adjacent to the pool.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the lack of hardship around the pool. Mr. Meyer responded.

Mr. Karakul asked about the triple downspouts; Mr. Perry stated they were vents.

Ms. Connaughton asked if a two-story section had been considered in the rear of the property. Mr. Perry stated they studied it, but it did not work with the owner's program.

Mr. Smith asked about the glass next to the kitchen sink and its functionality. Mr. Perry responded and explained the design.

Mr. Sammons said the design feels overly busy and inconsistent, with mismatched arch styles, uneven rooflines, and too many façade projections that create a “frenetic” appearance. He suggested simplifying the front elevation by reducing the number of bump-outs, aligning window sizes, and using consistent sill details. He also noted that the pool area and main floor plan feel cramped, with disproportionate room sizes, and advised making the overall composition calmer, more balanced, and architecturally consistent.

Ms. Catlin thought the home had curb appeal and was different. She thought the detailing was good and simple. She thought it was a refreshing change from the designs that the Commission had seen. She appreciated the garage located in the rear of the home and thought the suggestions from Mr. Sammons could be implemented without compromising the home's charm.

Ms. Connaughton agreed and liked the garage in the rear of the home. She thought the massing was jumbled and unbalanced. She suggested placing the two-story mass in the rear of the home. She commented on the large entryway and thought it needed more study.

Mr. Phoenix said the design has strong curb appeal and many positive details. Still, he noted several concerns, including a pool area that feels too tight, excessive use of arches, and impractical interior flow. He praised the front doors and color palette but suggested simplifying the arches, refining exterior details such as the fireplace and railings, and improving the interior layout proportions.

Ms. Visconti said the pool is too large and cramped, suggesting it be resized, rotated, or reshaped to allow more garden space and a better connection between the main and guest houses. She also recommended using rectangular windows instead of arches in the master bedroom and keeping the solid wood front door rather than a glass one.

Mr. Karakul liked the home. He agreed that the pool element should be restudied. He recommended adding height to the four trees in the front to mitigate the height, and windows.

Ms. Patterson suggested rotating the pool and moving the spa to the end. She was in favor of the colors but thought the front facade could be studied.

Mr. Smith thought the front facade was a big issue. He did not believe the home was suitable for Wells Road; he thought it should be more dignified.

**A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Mr. Sammons to defer the project to the November 21, 2025, meeting with the direction to restudy the front facade, arches, and pool element. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.**

15. ARC-25-0041 (ZON-25-0044) 337 BRAZILIAN AVE. (COMBO) The applicant, FRIESE FAMILY TRUST (Paul Friese, Trustee) has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new, two-story residence and detached accessory structure with final hardscape, landscape and swimming pool with variances requested related to redevelopment of the existing nonconforming parcel configuration and for additional grade fill within setback areas. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Rafael Portuondo of Portuondo Perotti Architects presented the architectural plans for the new residence.

Ms. Georgas wondered if the second roof could be seen; Mr. Portuondo stated that it would not be visible. She asked about the brick; Mr. Portuondo stated it would be coral stone.

Mr. Phoenix asked about the materials and color for the windows. Mr. Portuondo responded and explained the intention of the design.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the design of the windows. Mr. Portuondo responded and explained the intention of the design.

Ms. Visconti wondered if a deeper shade of gray could be used for the windows. Mr. Portuondo stated he would study the suggestion.

Ms. Catlin liked portions of the project but did not favor the end product. She was not in favor of the trellis and the additional fill. She liked the look of the home from the street, the garage, and the guest quarters. She thought portions of the home felt very heavy. She thought the design was too heavy for the lot.

Ms. Visconti thought this home was a good version of what the town should be doing and should encourage. Ms. Catlin asked Ms. Visconti about the fill for the home next to the proposed. Mr. Falco explained that unfinished garage and storage areas can legally be built below FEMA elevation and are unrelated to the fill variance. He noted that older neighboring homes were built under different rules, requiring finished grades close to floor level. However, under the current code, fill is limited in setback areas to half the height difference between the finished floor and the road crown.

Ms. Patterson commended the design team for working creatively with a narrow lot. Still, she expressed deep concern that the project would demolish a 100-year-old Mediterranean Revival home she believes should have been landmarked. She said the house represents an important part of Palm Beach's historic fabric and suggested exploring a joint review between ARCOM and the Landmarks Commission. While she acknowledged the owners' rights, she said it is heartbreaking to see such a historically significant home potentially torn down.

Ms. Shiverick said the project's Mediterranean Deco concept is interesting but feels overly detailed. She suggested simplifying the design, particularly removing the coral stone accents around the windows, and using the nearby yellow house on Brazilian Avenue as a model for a cleaner, more refined approach that better captures the intended style.

Ms. Connaughton agreed with Ms. Visconti and thought the proposed home was a good example of how the home would engage with the street. She thought the home was interesting and asked to see more examples of stone coursing. She thought the front facade needed work. She agreed with Ms. Patterson and also lamented the loss of the historic home.



Mr. Sammons said he regretted seeing the existing house demolished, calling it lovely and worth preserving. He offered design feedback on the new proposal, suggesting the decorative stone “shutters” and second-story lintel details be removed or simplified, favoring real shutters and stronger masonry corners instead. He said the front elevation might feel too small, the spacing between houses too tight, and suggested adding steps in the rear to reduce fill. Overall, he found the design to be creative and well-executed, but encouraged a few refinements to achieve balance and authenticity.

Mr. Phoenix said he liked the project’s details and overall curb appeal but suggested simplifying the front façade by replacing a section of scalloped coral stone with stucco for better symmetry and consistency. He agreed that a few decorative elements could be reduced, but praised the design as thoughtful and well-landscaped.

Mr. Karakul said he liked the overall plan and concept but found the front façade awkward, particularly the spacing and alignment between the curved lower windows and those above. He suggested adjusting the proportions or simplifying the design for more charm. He also praised the spa structure’s playful “folly” feel but recommended relocating or removing a window on the cabana wall to create a cleaner, more cohesive look.

Mr. Smith said he liked the overall concept and how the site was divided, but was concerned about the large retaining wall along the neighbor’s property, warning that it could cause drainage and maintenance problems. He suggested stepping down the grade and simplifying the front façade by removing the brick “shutters” and other heavy details, favoring a cleaner, more traditional Palm Beach look. He praised the plan’s balance and columns but urged restraint in materials and detailing for a more elegant appearance.

**A motion was made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Ms. Connaughton to defer the project to the meeting on November 21, 2025, in accordance with the comments of the Commissioners.**

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

**The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.**

16. ARC-25-0059 (ZON-25-0053) 124 SEABREEZE AVE. (COMBO) The applicants, Matthew & Kristin Lipton, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for partial demolition and reconstruction of an existing nonconforming accessory structure requiring a structure separation variance, renovations and additions to an existing nonconforming residence requiring cubic content and setback variances, with full hardscape and landscape renovations including a new swimming pool requiring setback variances; on an existing nonconforming “Sea Street” parcel. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Mr. Karakul and Ms. Georgas disclosed ex parte communications.

Patrick Segraves of SKA Architect + Planner presented the architectural plans proposed for the accessory structure, and Cory Meyer of Nievera Williams Design presented the landscape and

hardscape plans for the site.

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

Ms. Connaughton inquired whether the existing columns would be utilized for the porte cochère. Mr. Segraves responded.

Mr. Sammons inquired about the pitch of the porte cochère's roof. Mr. Segraves stated it would be the same.

Ms. Shiverick inquired about the requested variances. Mr. Segraves reviewed two of the variances required: one for a reduced side setback of five feet instead of twelve and a half, which the affected neighbor fully supports, and another for a slight site coverage increase from 35.7% to 36.7% (about 80 square feet). He noted that a third technical variance was triggered because a neighboring house is only three feet from its property line, even though his project meets its own setback.

Mr. Sammons asked if the setbacks could be grandfathered in. Mr. Falco explained that the zoning code allows special exceptions for narrow Sea Street lots, permitting reconstruction on roughly the same footprint as long as minimum setbacks and separation distances are met. He clarified that since the building is being demolished and rebuilt, it must comply with a five-foot side setback. Shifting it a few feet north would achieve the required ten-foot separation from the neighboring structure.

Mr. Sammons thought it was an improvement and supported the proposal.

Mr. Phoenix asked if the element counted as garage parking. Mr. Falco stated it was not required.

Ms. Connaughton thought the front of the porte cochère could be slightly reduced in height. Mr. Segraves agreed to look at the suggestion. She wondered if there was a different window in the rear that could be used rather than the bay window. Mr. Segraves agreed to look at the suggestion as well.

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

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

17. ARC-25-0062 (ZON-25-0059) 222 CHERRY LN. (COMBO) The applicant, Nancy Clifford, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new, two-story, single-family residence with final landscape, hardscape, and swimming pool improvements on an existing nonconforming parcel of land, requiring site plan review for redevelopment. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Yianni Varnava of Varnava Design Studio presented the architectural plans proposed for the accessory structure.

Mr. Sammons asked about the materials for the columns. Mr. Varnava responded.

Mr. Smith was concerned that the home looked massive on the street compared to the other homes. He also expressed concern about the siting of the home, with the second story overlooking the homes on West Indies.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the flat portion of the roof and wondered if the overall height was too tall. Mr. Varnava explained the reason for the design. She asked about the roof pitch. Mr. Varnava responded.

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

Mr. Sammons offered detailed design critiques, suggesting the front roofline should have a continuous eave for a cleaner look and that window widths should be made consistent to create rhythm in the Georgian-style façade. He noted structural inconsistencies, such as misaligned posts, thin rear columns, and a roof that doesn't convincingly sit on the masonry walls. He also recommended simplifying the front bay, adjusting window proportions, and improving column alignment to create a more balanced and structurally coherent design.

Ms. Catlin said that while the house is attractive, it feels average and out of scale for Cherry Lane's narrow lots and smaller homes. She emphasized that the proposed two-story design would overpower the street and disrupt its established character, setting a poor precedent for future development. She urged greater sensitivity to the neighborhood context and alignment with surrounding one-story homes.

Ms. Connaughton said the design has potential but needs refinement, especially on the front façade, where the four uneven sections disrupt the rhythm of what should be a balanced Georgian style. She also criticized the awkward rear massing with a floating two-story section over a one-story base and suggested reducing the house's depth to improve proportions and meet height limits. She emphasized that architectural details, columns, and structural alignments should be cohesive and consistent.

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

**A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Sammons to defer the project to the meeting on November 21, 2025, in accordance with the comments of the Commissioners. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.**

18. ARC-25-0063 (ZON-25-0057) 226 OLEANDER AVE. VACANT (LOT 6 OF THE PLAT OF THE JEANETTE COURT ADDITION TO PALM BEACH) (COMBO) The applicant, Beach Gal LLC (Melissa Schorr, Manager), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new, two-story,

single family residence with final landscape and hardscape; variances are requested and required to develop the nonconforming parcel of land in the R-C zoning district and for town council to review the COMBO application prior to ARCOM review and approval. Review of the COMBO application is contingent on the applicant's appeal of administrative determination being upheld by the Town Council regarding the current configuration of the parcel. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Mr. Sammons disclosed ex parte communications.

Richard Leja of ACI Architectural Group presented the architectural plans for the newly proposed residence, and Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the style of the home. Mr. Leja responded.

Ms. Georgas asked about the window mullions and confirmed it was only one mullion. Mr. Leja responded.

Mr. Phoenix asked if the professional considered different patterns for the windows. Mr. Leja responded. Mr. Phoenix asked about the stucco detail above the front door. Mr. Leja responded.

Ms. Visconti asked for further explanation of the hardscape and the gates. Mr. Leja responded.

Mr. Sammons asked about the reveal of the windows. Mr. Leja stated they would be set back a few inches. Mr. Sammons asked about the shutters; Mr. Leja stated that they were decorative. Mr. Sammons asked about the depth of the front porch. Mr. Leja stated it was 5 feet.

Mr. Phoenix stated that the windows are incorrect and that the shutters should either function or at least appear operable. He felt the upstairs balcony was too shallow, suggested adding sconces beside the front door, and recommended using a single front door with sidelights instead of double doors. He also disliked the green railing color and thought the stucco detailing above the entry looked too heavy.

Ms. Visconti said the stucco detailing above the front door feels too heavy and that a single door would improve the façade's proportions. She recommended restudying the gates and driveway materials, making the gates match the green shutters. While she liked the green railings and overall scale, she felt the elevation and materials needed revision for a more cohesive look.

Ms. Patterson thought the front door was too large for the scale of the house. She was not in favor of the windows or railing, or inoperable shutters. She thought the home had no identity.

Ms. Catlin thought the home was thought out for a small lot. She thought it felt stiff and angular and recommended that it be softened. She also recommended removing the columns on the balcony and the stucco detail over the front door, and recommended using a single front door. She thought the home should have a romantic cottage feel.

Mr. Karakul thought the front door was unsuccessful and thought the element should be restudied. He was not in favor of the mullions; he thought they should be true casement windows.

Mr. Sammons said the proposed house is too large and out of character for the small, cottage-style homes on Oleander Avenue. He criticized the 12-foot floor height and overall scale as excessive, saying it feels imported rather than fit the street's charm. He urged simplifying the structure, using more authentic masonry detailing, setting windows deeper into the walls, and improving proportions, so the design feels appropriate to the neighborhood's modest character.

Mr. Smith commented on the front entry.

**A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Visconti to defer the project to the December 19, 2025, meeting for a complete restudy. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.**

19. ARC-25-0064 230 BARTON AVE. The applicant, RPI Corporation (Environment Design Group), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for installation of a generator.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

There was no disclosure of ex parte communications.

Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the plans for the proposed generator.

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 approve the project as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.**

**A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Shiverick that the implementation of the proposed variances will not cause a negative architectural impact on the subject property. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.**

20. ARC-25-0066 127 REEF RD. The applicant, 127 Reef Road Land Trust (Environment Design Group), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a driveway replacement, installation of a terrace with sitewide landscape and hardscape modifications.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

There was no disclosure of ex parte communications.

Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the hardscape and landscape plans, as well as the newly proposed door color and awning.

Ms. Visconti asked about the existing driveway material and the proposed material. Mr. Mizell responded.

Mr. Smith inquired about the proposed installation of the driveway material. Mr. Mizell responded.

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

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

21. ARC-25-0067 (ZON-25-0061) 410 N LAKE WAY (COMBO) The applicant, North Lake Trust (Val Hawkins Architect, LLC), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modification to an existing rear pergola into covered loggia with second story deck, installation of exterior staircase, skylights and window and door modifications. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Mr. Karakul and Ms. Catlin disclosed ex parte communications.

Architect Val Hawkins presented the architectural plans proposed for the modifications to the existing home. Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group spoke about the changes to the landscape and hardscape.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the existing roof material and the new decking. Mr. Hawkins responded. Ms. Shiverick wondered if they would consider using vertical wood pickets instead of the metal proposed. Mr. Hawkins responded and expressed the owner's wishes. Ms. Shiverick asked if the house was visible from the Lake Trail, to which Mr. Hawkins replied that it was, but only minimally.

Ms. Catlin requested confirmation that it was in the same footprint as before, but now it was enclosed, except for the spiral staircase. Mr. Hawkins provided confirmation.

Mr. Sammons was unable to support the project.

**A motion was made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Mr. Karakul to defer the project to the November 21, 2025, meeting. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.**

Mr. Hawkins asked if the project could be approved with the change in material for the railing.

Town Attorney Lainey Francisco reminded the Commission that the motion had passed, so they would either need to reopen the motion or proceed to the next item.

Mr. Mizell questioned if the item could be approved with lpe railings.

**A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to reopen the item for further consideration. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.**

Mr. Hawkins discussed the items that could be modified to obtain Commission approval for the



project.

Ms. Connaughton asked if the columns would be wood. Mr. Hawkins discussed the material for the columns.

Mr. Smith discussed the evolution of the changes to the rear of the home with Mr. Hawkins. Mr. Smith stated that he did not object to the project if the railing material were changed. He accepted the stone deck and spiral staircase.

Ms. Connaughton asked Mr. Hawkins if the columns could be changed to resemble a wooden expression to match the front of the house. Mr. Hawkins stated that he could review the details. Ms. Connaughton stated she was opposed to skylights in Florida.

Mr. Hawkins stated that he was happy to make the requested revisions and return to the Commission for approval.

**A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Visconti to defer the project to the November 21, 2025, meeting. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.**

#### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business discussed at this time.

#### **MEETING SCHEDULE**

22. The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, November 21, 2025.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Mr. Karakul to adjourn the meeting at 5:09 PM. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.**

Respectfully Submitted,



---

Jeffery W. Smith, Chair