TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Minutes of the Architectural Commission Meeting
Held on December 19, 2025

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 09:00 AM in the Town Council Chambers.

Members Present: Betsy Shiverick, Elizabeth Connaughton, Jeffery Smith, Kenn Karakul, Kathy Georgas, Sue Patterson, David Phoenix, Richard Sammons, KT Catlin

Members Absent: Claudia Visconti

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Smith led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES

1. Minutes of the November 21, 2025, Architectural Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the minutes of the November 21, 2025, meeting as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

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

2. EXTPLAN-25-0009 315 COCOANUT ROW The applicant, Virginia C. Knott (Environment Design Group), has filed an application requesting an Extension of Time for a previously issued Architectural Commission approval for a new vehicular driveway configuration with landscape and hardscape modifications. (ORIGINALLY ARCS-24-0105 AND APPROVED AT THE DECEMBER 20, 2024 MEETING)

3. ARC-25-0086 (ZON-25-0080) 328 CHILEAN AVE. (COMBO) The applicant, Cathy B Graham Trust (SKA Architect + Planner), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for window and door replacements, first floor addition to an existing accessory structure with landscape and hardscape with a variance request for deficient landscape open space. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Karakul 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

4. OFFICIALS

No one indicated a desire to speak.

5. STAFF

Assistant Director James Murphy provided an update on the R-B zoning regulation that currently allows a five-foot reduction to the front yard setback as a matter of right in exchange for an increased rear yard. He explained that, following field reviews, consultation with architects, and discussions with the Planning and Zoning Commission, Landmarks Commission, and Town Council, staff found that North End streets vary significantly and that a uniform allowance may adversely impact neighborhood character and view corridors. Rather than eliminating the provision, staff recommended converting the allowance to a design waiver subject to review by the Architectural or Landmarks Preservation Commission, with established criteria, required documentation, neighbor notification, and a separate approval motion.

Ms. Shiverick wondered if there were any streets that may have an issue with the allowance. Mr. Murphy did not specify any details but stated that there were streets where this could be an issue.

Mr. Sammons wondered if there were some streets that could utilize a greater setback or more flexibility. Mr. Murphy stated he would relay the suggestion to the Town Council.

Ms. Connaughton agreed with Mr. Sammons and stated that, in addition to reviewing newer examples, she believed it would be helpful to study older, pre–zoning code examples where similar conditions may exist. She acknowledged the impact of rising floor elevations but requested that staff provide specific property addresses used as examples, so Commissioners could visit the sites and better evaluate conditions that may be of concern. Mr. Murphy stated he would provide the materials to the Commissioners.

6. PUBLIC - 3 MINUTE LIMIT

No one indicated a desire to speak.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

7. 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.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Michael Perry of MP Design and Architecture presented the proposed architectural modifications for the new residence. Mario Nievera of Nievera Williams Design presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Mr. Sammons thought the design was fantastic. He said that the windows had the same proportions and the design was more harmonious. He liked the arcade pergola but did not believe the wood beam was important and thought it would be nice if the three arches centered on the pool. He said the front door and surround were oversized and recommended replacing it with a standard door. He thought the two-accent windows adjacent to the front door could be reduced in size.

Ms. Connaughton thought the plans were a huge improvement from the last presentation but wished the two-story mass on the back of the home could be rethought. She thought the proportions of the front elevation were a bit tall. She also thought the glazing on the east and west façades was over-scaled. She agreed that the front door should be reduced in size.

Mr. Phoenix wondered if consideration was given to the arches in the rear. Mr. Perry stated that he had and mentioned that a vertical muntin had been added to change the light pattern. He agreed that the accent windows could be smaller or in a different shape. Mr. Perry agreed that the windows could be scaled down. Mr. Phoenix asked if the bay window detail was made of stone. Mr. Perry stated it was Pecky Cypress.

Ms. Shiverick wondered if regular windows would be considered instead of a bay window and a different roof, other than a shed roof. Mr. Perry discussed how the elements were studied. Ms. Shiverick thought the string course was a bit high and touched the windows, and the front door was over-scaled.

Mr. Phoenix wondered if Mr. Perry considered a metal roof structure for the bay with decorative wainscoting under the window. Mr. Perry favored the cypress detail and thought stone would be too heavy.

Mr. Smith questioned the changes that were seen versus the plans that were submitted. He believed the front door and bay window were out of scale. He expressed concern about the setbacks. He noted the pergola in the rear and thought the element should be centered on the pool.

Mr. Sammons questioned whether the shutters would be operable; Mr. Perry confirmed they would be.

Ms. Catlin agreed with Mr. Sammons. She agreed that the front door could be reduced as well as the windows.

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

Mr. Phoenix favored the arched door and was opposed to the shed roof. He thought it would be nice to align the backyard elements. He thought the windows at the front should be restudied.

Ms. Connaughton had trouble with the massing of the home, particularly the second floor.

Mr. Sammons stated that while the overall design was generally acceptable, he had concerns with proportions and massing. He commented that the bay window detailing appeared too informal for the front façade and that the overall size should be reduced. He noted that the center portion of the house was too narrow, creating proportional imbalances that affected other elements, and suggested modest dimensional adjustments to widen the center and slightly reduce the wings. He also recommended narrowing certain windows and doors to improve proportions and vertical emphasis. He concluded that with additional refinement and minor adjustments, the design could be improved.

Ms. Shiverick thought the rear design worked well. She thought the front still needed work, possibly less fenestration.

A motion was made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Mr. Sammons to defer the project to the January 28, 2026, meeting for a restudy in accordance with the Commissioners' comments. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

8. 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.

Yanni Varnava of Varnava Design Studio presented the architectural plans proposed for the new residence. He pointed out the changes to the landscape plans for the site.

Mr. Sammons asked if the middle bay of the home got wider. Mr. Varnava stated that it had not widened and reviewed the plans.

Ms. Georgas asked about the awning windows. Mr. Varnava responded and pointed out the windows in the design.

Ms. Catlin asked about the size of the home. Mr. Varnava responded.

Mr. Karakul stated that he did not support the proposed house in its current design, expressing concerns that it lacked sensitivity to the scale of the street and the size of the lot. He commented that the proposal was not sufficiently creative in responding to the constraints of an undersized lot and concluded that the design required further refinement.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Attorney John Eubanks, on behalf of the neighbors at 217 and 225 West Indies Road, stated that the surrounding streetscape on Cherry Avenue and West Indies Drive is characterized by one-story, moderately sized homes that are compatible with the scale of their lots, which attracted residents to the neighborhood. He expressed concern that the proposed two-story house is substantially larger than surrounding homes and would appear out of scale on the small lot, potentially altering the character of both streets. He noted that the massing, height, and frontage coverage could set a precedent, leading to similar development and a "domino effect" in the area. He added that the proposal would create disharmony between the existing neighborhoods on both streets and requested that the design be revised or denied in favor of a proposal more compatible with the surrounding community.

Ms. Catlin thought the changes that were made were too minimal. She thought the home seemed too large and thought it should be reduced. She did not think the design fit in with, or was special enough for, the street; she thought it was just average. She thought the architect needed to rethink the design and explore a more creative design.

Ms. Connaughton stated that the house appeared oversized and out of place within the context of the street. She also expressed concern with the front façade, noting that the composition and balance of its elements felt unresolved and that the overall design could benefit from further refinement to improve proportional balance.

Mr. Phoenix asked about the existing square footage of the home; Mr. Varnava responded.

Mr. Smith expressed concern that the house was positioned as close as possible to the rear yard setback, placing nearly the entire structure at the minimum distance and pushing the two-story portion close to adjacent properties. He stated that this configuration would result in neighboring properties facing a large wall of the house. He also commented that, from an aesthetic standpoint, the design resembled a typical spec house and that while minor improvements had been made, the overall design had not changed significantly.

Ms. Connaughton suggested looking at the scale of the home's elements when restudying the design.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Karakul to deny the project based on Section 18-205 (a) 3 of the Town Code. The motion failed 2-5, with Mses. Shiverick, Connaughton, and Messrs. Sammons, Smith, Phoenix dissenting.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to defer the project to the meeting on February 26, 2026, for a major restudy. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

9. ARC-25-0053 228 VIA LAS BRISAS The applicant, VIA LAS BRISAS LLC (Catherine R. Clifton, Authorized Representative), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new, two-story, single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape, and swimming pool.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

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

Ms. Shiverick wondered if an awning was considered for the rear of the home rather than a roof over the loggia; she thought there was too much roof. Mr. Roy responded that it had not been considered and discussed the design's limited color palette and their intent for continuity on all four sides.

Mr. Phoenix wondered if a pergola was considered rather than a roof over the pergola. Mr. Roy stated that a pergola was considered and discussed his client's need for shade.

Ms. Connaughton wondered if consideration had been given to a different location for the stairs or expressing it in a different way. Mr. Roy explained the reasons for the location of the stairs and the design.

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

Mr. Phoenix liked the facade, color palette, and thought it was a nice approach to a new home. He thought the home was beautiful.

Ms. Catlin commended the architect for listening to the commissioners' comments.

Ms. Patterson was in favor of the project; she thought it was beautiful.

Mr. Karakul thought the home was stylish and handsome. He agreed that the architect had addressed the commissioners' comments.

Mr. Sammons recommended minor refinements to improve proportions, including narrowing a side pilaster, widening the front door opening, and adjusting the entry surround. He also suggested modifying the roof form at the corner to enhance its appearance and stated that the design would be sound with these adjustments.

Ms. Connaughton stated that the project was attractive overall but suggested refinements, including adjustments to the rear roof form, widening the front door, and providing greater visual separation between the garage and the main house to improve the façade composition.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the project as

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

10. ARC-25-0073 3140 S OCEAN BLVD. The applicant, Carton Place Condominium Association, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for site improvements including a new guardhouse with lift arms, installation of a fountain, new entry covering, and landscape and hardscape modifications.

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

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Architect Jerome Baumoehl presented architectural modifications proposed for the commercial building.

Ms. Shiverick requested clarification regarding the lighting in the portico area, specifically whether the lights were string lights or a new addition. Mr. Baumoehl explained that the lighting consists of recessed fixtures concealed within channels in the concrete columns, producing a subtle glow rather than visible fixtures, and noted that the lighting had been part of the design. Ms. Shiverick indicated some hesitation about the feature and stated she would consider it further.

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

Sean Twomey of Environment Design Group presented the changes to the proposed fountain.

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

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 January 28, 2026 meeting.*

Note: This item was deferred to January 28, 2026, at the approval of the agenda.

12. 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. *This item has been deferred to the January 28, 2026 meeting.*

Note: This item was deferred to January 28, 2026, 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 February 25, 2026 meeting.*

Note: This item was deferred to February 25, 2026, at the approval of the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS

14. ARC-25-0076 (ZON-25-0066) 3031 S OCEAN BLVD. (COMBO) The applicant, PB3031 LLC, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the demolition of an existing two-story building and the construction of a new five-story, 12-unit residential building requiring multiple variances from the regulations in the R-D-(1) zoning district. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications. *Note: Mr. Sammons declared a conflict of interest and left the dais during the discussion.*

**Note: A short break was taken at 10:43 a.m., and the meeting resumed at 10:58 a.m.*

Assistant Director James Murphy provided staff comments on the project. He answered questions from the commissioners.

Attorney Maura Ziska, on behalf of the applicant, presented an overview of the project and zoning requests, advocating for a positive recommendation to the Town Council.

Anne Fairfax of Fairfax and Sammons presented the architectural plans proposed for the project.

Mr. Phoenix asked about the bridge and whether it was being proposed. Ms. Fairfax stated that they would like it, but knew it would cause more variances. Mr. Phoenix asked about generators for the units. Ms. Fairfax stated they would be individual. He said the architecture was beautiful. Mr. Phoenix asked about the possibility of different colors for the building. Ms. Fairfax stated that they would study this suggestion and agreed it would help make it feel less monolithic. Mr. Phoenix asked if a tree could be added to the center of the main courtyard. Ms. Fairfax indicated that the landscape architect could address the question. However, she did speak about the limitations of the size of the tree due to the marine environment.

Ms. Shiverick thought the architecture was splendid. She asked about the gate and whether it was needed. She wondered if it would detract from the aura. Ms. Fairfax thought bollards would be a better option, and she felt there were more effective gate designs.

Ms. Georgas asked about the parking garage and how residents would get to their units. Ms. Fairfax responded and explained the functionality; she added that parking would not be utilized on the main street.

Ms. Catlin wondered if safety features would be added where the garage was pinched. Ms. Fairfax did not believe that the garage would be unsafe. Ms. Catlin asked about the number of floors at the PalmBeacher Apartments. Ms. Fairfax responded. Ms. Catlin wondered what the man-made island was made of. Ms. Fairfax was unsure, but heard it was from the old Lake Worth Bridge.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the reason for the gate; she liked the bollard suggestion. She asked about the space between the garage level and the first main floor. Nick Spinelli of Copperline Partners reviewed the plan that showed the garage and first-floor heights. Mr. Murphy discussed the proposed heights of the garage as well as the first floor. Ms. Connaughton asked what would be in the mechanical equipment; Mr. Spinelli responded.

Ms. Patterson favored the architecture. She understood the need for a gate after first installing bollards at her home, but then changed to a gate. Ms. Fairfax stated there may be a guard.

Mr. Phoenix understood the need for the gate or security because of the deliveries and photo opportunities.

Mr. Karakul thought the project was exceptional and would be exciting. He thought the challenge would be delivering the quality that would make the project so special and added that he would not want to see the quality compromised. He supported the variances. He thought the landscaping was underdeveloped.

Mr. Smith thought the design was beautiful and romantic. However, he questioned the size, the density, and the height. He thought the design was very aggressive. Ms. Fairfax acknowledged that the project contains a high level of density and stated that the intent was to create a more urban architectural form rather than a suburban one, referencing historic Palm Beach precedents. She explained that from a development perspective, the project's size and amenities were necessary to support the significant capital investment. She noted that the design resulted from a balance between architectural goals and development realities and looked to the Board for guidance in refining the proposal.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Jeff Miller, 3000 S. Ocean Blvd., expressed concern that the proposal would overshadow his building and block the view from many angles. He did not object to the redevelopment or the architecture, but thought the building was too big, especially in terms of height.

Attorney Megan Wegerif, on behalf of the Bellaria at 3000 S. Ocean Blvd., stated that she had been working with the applicant on behalf of the residents, but they were not yet in a position to support the project.

Ms. Connaughton believed the buildings felt tall and wondered if they could be reduced. She agreed with Mr. Smith about the intensity and wondered if there could be more variety in the scale of the different units. She suggested differentiating the two buildings at the end. She inquired about the front entrance to each unit and wondered if they would be used; Ms. Fairfax responded and discussed how she envisioned them being used. Mr. Spinelli stated that the Fire Department did not want any parking in the drive aisle.

Steve West of Parker Yannette Design Group stated that there were a few spaces where shortterm parking could be possible in the piazza area. He spoke about his intent with the future landscaping plans.

Ms. Catlin requested that any ambiance not be lost in future changes. She thought that the variances would be required regardless of when the site was redeveloped. She expressed strong support for the concept, describing it as village-like, innovative, and precedent-setting for the South End, and praised the varied façades, use of color, greenery, and articulation to avoid flat massing. She also commended efforts to mitigate construction impacts and suggested exploring a more open gate design.

Ms. Georgas believed the owners would fill up all allowable parking spots allotted for each unit.

Ms. Fairfax requested some formal guidance from the Commission.

Mr. Karakul stated that the discussion had identified several sensitive areas, including green space, unit layout, parking, and the project entrance. He encouraged further refinement to improve openness and suggested studying the use of color, as well as viewing the project from broader vantage points, such as across the bridge, to ensure it makes the desired visual statement.

Mr. Smith stated that the project remained overly massive and suggested that reducing the number of units would improve parking conditions. He commented that while the development had the appearance of a village, it lacked shared community amenities and therefore did not function as a true village.

Mr. Phoenix expressed general support for the project and agreed that parking and service access would require careful consideration. He stated that with additional refinement, those practical concerns could be addressed, and suggested exploring visual and physical cut-throughs within the site to enhance connectivity while maintaining the village character.

Mr. Murphy reminded the Board that many of the concerns raised, including building mass, height, village character, and common green space, are directly related to zoning code provisions and the variances being requested. He noted that elements such as recreation open space and building length are addressed within the zoning code and could help mitigate massing if applied differently. He encouraged Commissioners to view these issues in the context of the variance requests and invited continued dialogue with staff on zoning matters during future reviews.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Connaughton to defer the project to the meeting on February 25, 2026. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

15. ARC-25-0082 216-218 WORTH AVE. The applicant, Brunello Cucinelli Boutique (AND Studio/ Shutts & Bowen LLP Representatives), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for exterior façade alterations, including a new ground-floor storefront system and new signage.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Roger Ramdeem of Shutts and Bowen provided an overview of the request. Dakota Hendon of AND Studio Architecture and Design presented the architectural plans proposed for the commercial building.

Ms. Connaughton inquired about the existing travertine and requested a sample of the proposed material. Mr. Hendon responded and provided a sample.

Ms. Patterson questioned whether making both sides of the open-air corridor identical could result in a loss of character, despite the staff's conclusion that no historic materials would be lost due to prior alterations. Ms. Mittner responded that the proposed design would comply with Worth Avenue Design Guidelines, noting that the storefront widths remain within established standards. She added that many existing elements, including the concrete louvers, are not original and have been altered over time, which is why historical reference materials were provided.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the next tenants who wanted to have the buildings separated. Mr. Herndon stated the plan was to renovate the space and stay there for some time.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the corridor and wondered why it was not centered. Mr. Hendon responded and described the current layout.

Mr. Phoenix wondered how far the grill was set back from the front design. Mr. Hendon responded and showed the details in the plan. Mr. Phoenix asked about the area at the end of the Via. Mr. Herndon described the use of the space. Mr. Phoenix recommended adding a lantern to break up the façade.

Ms. Connaughton thought the work was beautiful, but preferred splitting up the shop fronts for a smaller scale.

Ms. Georgas favored adding a lantern between the two storefronts, a suggestion made by Mr. Phoenix.

A motion was made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Ms. Catlin to approve the project with the condition that a lantern be added above the center walkway and that the lantern be approved by the staff in coordination with the chair. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

16. ARC-25-0084 (ZON-25-0081) 150 WORTH AVE (COMBO). The applicant, Wilson 150 Worth LLC (Tim Hanlon Representative), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for exterior façade alterations, including new windows and doors, architectural enhancements such as pilasters, a frieze band, arches, tile, and awnings. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications. *Note: Mr. Sammons declared a conflict of interest and left the dais during the discussion.*

Attorney M. Timothy Hanlon, on behalf of the building's owner, provided an overview of the project. Anne Fairfax of Fairfax and Sammons presented the architectural plans proposed for the project.

Ms. Shiverick favored the improvements to the western side. She wondered if they considered changing something where the living wall is located. Ms. Fairfax explained the Palm Beach Garden Club's position on the green wall, since it was donated by them. Ms. Fairfax prepared a reduced version of the garden wall with windows on the side and showed alternate renderings. She stated that the ownership also proposed an additional living wall around the loading dock. She provided new renderings of this area as well.

Mr. Phoenix liked the newly proposed living wall. He suggested framing it with terracotta. He wondered if a Via was considered on the South County Road. Ms. Fairfax liked the idea, but the ownership was not in favor of the suggestion. Mr. Phoenix asked about the changes to the colonnade at the west entrance. Ms. Fairfax explained how it would be changed. Mr. Phoenix inquired about the lighting and planters, and recommended adding more finishing touches to the colonnade; Ms. Fairfax responded. Mr. Phoenix discussed phasing the construction with Ms. Fairfax.

Ms. Patterson preferred the alternate view of the living wall, with the two additional windows. She also agreed that more detailing could be added in the colonnade on the west side.

Ms. Georgas wondered if the new entrance to S. County Road would cause more traffic to stop for pedestrian drop off.

Ms. Catlin liked the idea of framing the living wall and suggested placing doors on either side of the wall. She favored the living wall over the loading dock. She did not oppose adding embellishments to the west end colonnade, but she liked the simplicity and brightness of the area.

Ms. Connaughton wondered if the loading dock would still be needed if the space were occupied by smaller stores. Ms. Fairfax responded and stated it was unknown at this time. Ms. Connaughton thought anything done to mitigate the loading dock would be nice.

Mr. Karakul thought the project was nice. He recommended taking the living wall higher if the reduced, alternative wall is built.

Mr. Smith supported the alternate design of the living wall but thought they should change it into windows rather than doors so that signage would not be added. He agreed with Mr. Karakul that the living wall should go up to the cornice. He questioned the size of the cornice but knew it was rendered it appear oversized.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Attorney Jamie Gavigan, on behalf of The Colony, stated that the hotel does not oppose the project or its architecture but raised several concerns. He emphasized the importance of ensuring that the owner and future tenants do not object to the Colony's continued use of the service alley for deliveries, noting its long-standing use and explaining that this concern contributed to the Town Council's requirement for a solid gate. He also requested consideration of a service alley management plan among the owner, the Colony, and neighboring properties to address future operational issues. Additionally, while acknowledging that rooftop use was not part of the current application, he stated for the record that the Colony would object to any future rooftop restaurant or active use due to potential impacts on the hotel.

Mr. Hanlon stated that the issues stated by Mr. Gavigan were not the purview of the Architectural Commission.

A motion was made by Mr. Phoenix and seconded by Ms. Patterson to approve the project with the following conditions: the commission preferred the reduced size of living wall (subject to the Garden Club's approval), terracotta framing, raised to cornice line, flanked by two windows on the west façade to return to Chair for details on the north entrance including gas lanterns, embellishment around windows, tile in arches, groin vaults, and the screening of the loading dock. The motion was carried 6-1, with Ms. Connaughton dissenting.

**Note: A short break was taken at 1:36 p.m., and the meeting resumed at 1:47 p.m.*

17. ARC-25-0080 (ZON-25-0071) 760 N OCEAN BLVD. (COMBO) The applicant, Palm Beach Country Club Inc (WRP DESIGN & Maura Ziska Representative), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a 640 SF addition to the golf cart storage building. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Bill Panasuik with WRP Design presented the architectural modifications proposed for the site.

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

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

18. ARC-25-0085 123 CHILEAN AVE. The applicants, Paul & Aline Griffin, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for design changes to a previously approved new, two-story, single-family residence and accessory structure.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Patrick Segraves of SKA Architect + Planner presented the architectural modifications proposed for the new residence. Steve West of Parker Yannette Design to present the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the tabby color proposed. Mr. West responded.

Ms. Georgas asked about the detailed scallop overhang on the front facade. Mr. Segraves explained the previous and current design.

Mr. Sammons requested a comparison between the current proposal and the previously submitted design and commented on window proportions, suggesting that wider, more consistently proportioned casement windows, similar to those on the side elevation, be used on the front façade and porch. He also suggested extending balcony widths and adjusting the window above the entry to improve balance and avoid overly narrow proportions. Mr. Segraves responded that the suggested adjustments could be accommodated and acknowledged the intent to refine the design to better reflect appropriate proportions and architectural style.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the ceiling height and wondered if it could be shortened in height. Mr. Segraves advocated for the proposed height. Ms. Connaughton agreed with the comment to widen the balcony on the front facade.

Ms. Shiverick asked where the stained-glass would be sourced. Mr. Segraves responded.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Mr. Phoenix to approve the project with the following conditions: lowering the proportions of the stained-glass windows, utilizing the same windows on the second floor, and widening the front arch with an iron grill on top to relieve the height. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

19. ARC-25-0087 (ZON-25-0079) 320 DUNBAR RD. (COMBO) The applicant, Peter May (Ferguson & Shamamian Architects), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a new rear loggia with variances to exceed allowable Cubic Content Ratio (CCR) and lot coverage. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Scott Sottile of Ferguson Shamamian presented the architectural plans for the new rear loggia.

Mr. Sammons provided suggestions for the size and width of the beam.

Ms. Connaughton thought it was pushed too far forward on the façade. She agreed with Mr. Sammons' comments.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the existing awning and if it had failed. Mr. Sottile spoke about the client's need for weather protection.

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

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

A motion was made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Ms. Catlin 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. ARCS-25-0937 (ZON-25-0082) 241 EL DORADO LN. (COMBO) The applicant, Desmond & Cristina Keogh (Paradelo Burgess Design Studio), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval of after the fact installation artificial turf requiring variances for open landscape and front yard open space. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Ms. Connaughton disclosed ex parte communications.

Desmond Keogh, owner of 241 El Dorado Lane, explained his request for artificial turf due to his medical condition.

Ms. Patterson could not support artificial turf because she felt it would set a precedent.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the area where the artificial turf was proposed. Andres Paradelo of Paradelo Burgess Design Studio showed where artificial turf would be installed on the site. Ms. Connaughton empathized with the owner but wondered if ground covering was considered. Mr. Keogh responded. Mr. Paradelo stated that no pesticides are used on the site.

Ms. Shiverick agreed with Ms. Connaughton that a compromise of ground covering with stepping stones would be a good solution, and turf only on the putting green.

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

Mr. Paradelo stated they would like to return with a different solution.

A motion was made by Ms. Shiverick and seconded by Ms. Catlin to defer the project to January 28, 2026. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Catlin stated that several professionals had requested that the commissioners acknowledge receipt of communications from them, even if they choose not to meet or respond. Their clients are not always happy to hear that they did not receive a response from the commissioners. Mr. Smith asked Town Attorney Francisco if that was required; he believed it would open the door to ex parte discussions. Ms. Francisco stated she would discuss this at the next meeting.

Ms. Connaughton wondered if the Town could prohibit artificial turf? Ms. Mittner stated that this would be a policy decision by the Town Council. Ms. Connaughton thought the commissioners should study the Worth Avenue Design Guidelines, as she felt the stores on Worth Avenue were being combined with second stories. She thought the commission and the Town Council should look at these projects with more discretion.

Ms. Connaughton recommended that the commissioners review the John Volk home and the columns in Phipps Plaza; she stated she did not understand how the garage feature was approved.

MEETING SCHEDULE

21. The next meeting is scheduled for January 28, 2026

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Ms. Catlin to adjourn the meeting at 02:43 PM. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

____

Jeffery W. Smith, Chair

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME	NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE
Sammons Richard	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
CITY: Palm Beach — COUNTY: Palm Beach	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: Town of Palm Beach
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED: 12/19/25	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 December 19, 20 25:

(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:

ARC-25-0084
150 Worth Ave
Continuing Conflict

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.

Dec 19 '25
Date Filed

[signature]
Signature

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

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

LAST 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
CITY Palm Beach COUNTY Palm Beach	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: Town of Palm Beach
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED December 19, 2025	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 Simmons, hereby disclose that on December 19, 20 25:

(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:

ARC-25-0076

3031 S. Ocean Blvd

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.

Dec 19, 25
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.