



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 2019.

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Cooney called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Edward Austin Cooney, Chairman	PRESENT
Richard Rene Silvin, Vice Chairman	PRESENT
Jacqueline Albarran, Member	PRESENT
Page Lee Hufty, Member	ABSENT
Patrick Segraves, Member	PRESENT
John T. Gannon, Member	PRESENT
Kim Coleman, Member	PRESENT
Jacqueline Weld Drake, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Sue Patterson, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Anne Metzger, Alternate Member	PRESENT

Staff Members present were:

John Lindgren, Planning Administrator
Josh Martin, Director of Planning, Zoning and Building
Kelly Churney, Secretary to the Landmarks Preservation Commission
Emily Stillings, Preservation Consultant for the Town of Palm Beach
Janet Murphy, Preservation Consultant for the Town of Palm Beach

Please note: Mr. Cooney noted that Ms. Drake would be voting in the absence of Ms. Hufty.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Cooney led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2019 MEETING

Motion made by Mr. Silvin and seconded by Ms. Albarran to approve the minutes of the February 20, 2019 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

V. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Silvin to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

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

Ms. Churney administered the oath at this time and throughout the meeting as necessary.

VII. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC AND COMMISSION MEMBERS: (Please limit comments to 3 minutes):

None.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #010-2019

Address: 822 S. County Rd.

Owner/Applicant: John D. Idol

Professional: Stephen Roy/Roy & Posey Architects

Project Description: Selective removal of landscaping, hardscape, pool spa, small pool, non-contributing structures, south addition and loggia on guest house and entry driveway pillars; replacement and selective modifications of existing windows and doors; modification to an existing main house lower roof; reduction of columns under the main house loggia; new hardscape and landscape; new entry pillars and driveway gate; relocation of mechanical equipment.

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

Jane Day, consultant for the project, advocated for the changes proposed for the existing residence.

Shawn Leonard, architect for the project, presented the proposed architectural modifications for the existing residence.

Ms. Metzger asked for clarification on the columns proposed for the front elevation, east façade. Mr. Leonard responded and stated he added another elevation to show the proposed columns more slender in shape.

Ms. Albarran was happy that many of the changes were taking the home back to the original design. She asked the architect to consider pairs of columns on the rear of the home to match the front entrance, rather than single columns proposed.

Mr. Segraves asked the architect about the type of glass he planned to use for the windows and inquired if he was planning to use a low energy glass. Mr. Segraves stated that if the architect was planning to use a low energy glass for the windows, he requested that the glass be as clear as possible. Mr. Segraves

suggested that the architect consider adding an overhang over the door on the south elevation on the guesthouse. Mr. Leonard responded. Mr. Cooney made a suggestion for the overhang. Mr. Leonard stated he would look for clear, low energy glass.

Mr. Cooney stated he was very happy to see that the new owner was replacing the windows with a wood product.

Mr. Silvin agreed with Mr. Cooney was happy to see the windows returning to a wood. He added that he was happy with all of the changes.

Mr. Cooney inquired how the new driveway pillars would be finished. Mr. Leonard stated the new driveway pillars would be brick and painted white. Mr. Cooney asked about if the shutters. Mr. Leonard responded.

Ms. Metzger stated she thought the changes were well done.

Mr. Roy presented the modifications proposed to the landscape and hardscape.

Mr. Cooney inquired about the height of the proposed Banyan trees. Mr. Roy responded. Dale Posey, Roy & Posey Architects, stated they are looking for good-sized Banyan trees now.

Mr. Cooney expressed concern that the guesthouse may be exposed after the removal of some of the landscape. Mr. Roy responded and discussed the long-term landscape plans and goals for the property. Mr. Cooney asked about the streetscape façade. Mr. Roy responded.

Ms. Albarran thanked the professionals for removing the Ficus Benjamina but expressed concern for the removal of the Gumbo Limbo. Mr. Roy responded and stated he was looking to relocate the one tree in good condition.

Ms. Coleman expressed concern for the lack of landscaping proposed for the front of the guesthouse and the rear of the property. Mr. Roy stated that the owner would like to remove the landscaping and replant in stages.

Ms. Patterson was in favor of the architectural changes. She thought the landscape was overgrown but expressed concern for the removal of the Gumbo Limbo.

Ms. Stillings inquired about the material proposed for the columns. Mr. Leonard stated the columns were proposed to be fiberglass. Ms. Stillings asked if the owner would consider using wood for the columns. Mr. Leonard stated he found a company that made columns that looked like a wood product and stated the reasons he would prefer to use the fiberglass columns proposed.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Silvin to approve the project as presented with the following conditions: change the columns on the rear of the home to a pair of columns rather than the single proposed and add more landscape buffering in front of the guesthouse. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #011-2019

LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EXCEPTION WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW

Address: 288 S. County Rd. (aka 290 S. County Rd.)

Owner/Applicant: La Goulue Palm Beach LLC (Thomas Campaniello)

Professional: F. Michael Steffens/F. Michael Steffens, Architect

Project Description: The applicant is proposing to change Chez L'Epicier restaurant with La Goulue restaurant, and proposes the following exterior changes: The current restaurant façade consists of protruding planters in front of a knee wall inserted within the window bays on the east, three window bays on the north and the chamfered facade at the corner of the restaurant location. Above the knee walls are contemporary wood windows. The entrance to the space is located in one of the large window bays on the east side of the building. From the aspect, the types of materials, the construction, and the condition of the planter, the knee walls and the windows, it appears that they are all construction subsequent to the original building. It also appears that the entrance was relocated from what probably and logically was the original location at the corner of the building. The proposal is to remove the planters, the knee walls and the contemporary windows and replace them with pairs of wood French doors with transoms. There will be new infill wood façade panels between the door bay locations and a new continuous wood fascia/sign box above the window bays with a continuous awning built into the fascia. All the doors, the wood infill panels and the wood fascia/sign box would be painted faux oak. The proposed façade revision would look very similar to those in the photographs submitted with the application. The project also includes the restoration of the door to its original location on the northeast façade. The fascia will be designed in a manner that would preserve all the original architectural detail that currently exists. The fascia and woodwork connections to the wall would be minimal in nature and easily repaired if and when the decorative aspects of the fascia and façade were removed.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW INFORMATION: This application requests Special Exception approval to authorize a proposed restaurant, which exceeds 3,000 square feet of gross leasable area at the space currently occupied by Chez L'Epicier. The most recent restaurant approval for this location took place in October, 2014, and was modified in 2016. That restaurant, Chez L'Epicier, was approved for 4,454 square feet and 138 seats, and included valet parking. Approved hours of operation were: Dinner Wednesday through Sunday, 3:00 pm to midnight; Brunch and dinner Saturday and Sunday 10:30 am to midnight; Occasional special events weekdays or Monday and Tuesday night, not past midnight. In 2016, the hours of operation were modified to add dinner on Monday and Tuesday. This restaurant, La Goulue, requests the same square footage (4,454), number of seats (138), valet operation, and hours of operation as past approvals except that the request includes modifying the Declaration of Use Agreement to allow lunch on weekdays. A special exception

is also requested for 12 outdoor seats, to be located on the north side of the building. The applicant also requests site plan modification to modify the awnings and restore the main restaurant entrance to its historic location on the northeast facade of the building.

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

Jamie Crowley, attorney for the project, introduced and provided an overview of the project to the Commission.

Gene Pandula, architect for the project, presented the proposed modifications for the existing landmark commercial space. He presented additional historical photos of the commercial building on the overhead projector.

Jean Denoyer, owner of La Goulue, advocated for the proposed changes.

Many of the Commissioners offered their praise for the restaurant and welcomed the La Goulue to the town.

Mr. Martin spoke on behalf of staff and highly advocated for the project.

Mr. Segraves asked if the storefront to be used would be the salvaged storefront or a replica storefront. Mr. Pandula replied and stated it was a replication of the New York storefront.

Mr. Crowley stated that Mr. Denoyer and La Goulue would incur all of the expenses for the renovation.

Mr. Gannon stated he loved all aspects of the project.

Mr. Silvin thought it was important to revitalize that area of Town.

Ms. Drake agreed and added that she believed the vitality of the Town was part of the Commission's mission.

Ms. Patterson was in favor of the proposed restaurant and was in favor of having someone maintain the building.

Ms. Albarran stated she would be happy to see the green awnings removed.

Mr. Cooney stated that while he thought the restaurant was needed, he thought the architectural proposal was heavy handed for the corner. He discussed his concerns with the Commission and added that his main concern was the proposal to cover the pilasters.

Ms. Albarran asked if the professionals would be willing to compromise to retain the original pilasters.

Ms. Coleman was in favor of the proposed La Goulue entrance but expressed concern for extending the storefront the entire building.

Mr. Segraves stated he would be willing to give the professionals more latitude because the building would not be destroyed and the proposal was to wrap the columns.

Mr. Silvin asked the owner if he would compromise his design. Mr. Denoyer responded by saying a compromise would be taking the soul out of the bistro.

Mr. Gannon recommended giving the professional as much latitude as they needed so the result was not a watered down version of the restaurant.

Mr. Crowley stated the professionals researched methods on ways to leave the pilasters exposed while integrating the storefront. He added that they were unsuccessful in finding a successful result.

A discussion ensued among the Commissioners about the possibilities of the restaurant frontage.

Mr. Segraves recommended that the professionals return to the Commission with more details on the design if deferred.

Mr. Crowley asked the Commission if they would approve the project with the exception of the details of the pilasters.

More discussion ensued on the restaurant frontage as well as a possible motion.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Ms. Coleman to defer the project for one month to the April 17, 2019 meeting for a restudy of the design based on the comments of the Commissioners.

Mr. Denoyer expressed concern that he may not be able to open the restaurant by next season if the project was deferred.

More discussion ensued about the possible timeline of the construction schedule.

Mr. Crowley presented an alternate design sketch of the storefront that showed the pilasters exposed and painted.

Motion amended by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Segraves to approve the project as presented in the alternate design sketch shown on the overhead projector. Motion carried 5-2, with Mr. Cooney and Ms. Coleman opposed.

Please note: A short break was taken at 11:15 a.m. The meeting resumed at 11:26 a.m.

IX. DESIGNATION HEARINGS

Item 1: 124 Clarke Avenue

Owner: Emily J. and Gerald M. Lemole

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

Mr. Silvin noted in his ex parte disclosure that he had several conversations with Doctor Lamole and members of his family about the dual mission of the Landmarks Commission. These included discussions describing the Commission's willingness to work with architecturally sensitive owners applying to update their properties. As a result, Doctor and Mrs. Lamole supported both the designation of their home and the Town's preservation efforts.

Mr. Cooney asked for confirmation on proof of publication. Ms. Churney provided confirmation.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history for this Mediterranean Revival style home. Ms. Stillings pointed out the design features of this building. Ms. Stillings testified that the building met the following criteria for designation as a landmark:

Sec. 54-161 (1) Exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, economic or social history of the nation, state, county or town; and,

Sec. 54-161 (3) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or is a specimen inherently valuable of the study of a period, style, method of construction or use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;

Ms. Stillings added that the owners of 124 Clarke Avenue sent a letter to the Town offering their support of the designation.

Motion made by Mr. Silvin and second by Ms. Albarran to make the designation report for 124 Clarke Avenue part of the record. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Silvin stated that the house, especially the interiors, are superior and well maintained.

Ms. Albarran spoke about the addition she designed for the home. She spoke about the wonderful interiors of the home.

Mr. Cooney called for any public comment on the designation.

Aimee Sunny, Director of Education of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, offered her support for the designation on behalf of the Foundation.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and second by Mr. Silvin to recommend 124 Clarke Ave to the Town Council for designation as a Landmark of the Town of Palm Beach based on criteria 1 and 3 in Section 54-161. Motion carried unanimously.

Item 2: 211 Dunbar Rd.
Owner: H E Rayfield

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

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history for this Mediterranean Revival style home. Ms. Murphy pointed out the design features of this building. Ms. Murphy testified that the building met the following criteria for designation as a landmark:

Sec. 54-161 (3) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or is a specimen inherently valuable of the study of a period, style, method of construction or use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and second by Mr. Silvin to make the designation report for 211 Dunbar Rd. part of the record. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Cooney asked for confirmation on proof of publication. Ms. Churney provided confirmation.

Paul Rampell, attorney representing Gene and Gayle Rayfield, asked Janet Murphy a number of questions about landmarking homes in the Town. Ms. Murphy answered all of Mr. Rampell's questions.

Mr. Rampell stated that the owners objected to the landmarking of their home and discuss the reasons for their opposition. Mr. Rampell offered several items as evidence to oppose the designation.

Mr. Rampell introduced Jeffrey Smith, Smith Architectural Group and architect. He asked Mr. Smith questions about his expertise in the area of landmarks. Mr. Smith spoke about his expertise in this area. He asked Mr. Smith to comment on whether 211 Dunbar Rd. was worthy of landmark designation.

Mr. Smith stated he did not believe the residence was worthy of a landmark designation. He presented historic photos of the home and explained why he thought the existing home had lost its integrity.

Mr. Cooney called for any public comment on the designation. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Silvin agreed with Mr. Smith's assessment of the home.

Mr. Cooney stated his objections to the arguments made by the owner's attorney; however, he added that the additions to the residence were not sensitive and therefore he would not support to designate the home.

Mr. Segraves discussed the process of bringing homes forward for consideration.

Motion made by Mr. Gannon and seconded by Mr. Silvin that 211 Dunbar Rd. is not recommended to the Town Council for designation as a landmark of the Town of Palm Beach due to the multiple changes that altered the architectural style of the home. Motion carried unanimously.

X. COMMENTS OF THE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING, ZONING & BUILDING DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR.

Mr. Cooney extended congratulations to Julie Araskog for her new term on the Town Council.

Mr. Silvin raised the issue of the possibility of demolition by neglect at 323 Chilean Avenue and discussed the letters that he had received about the issue. Mr. Cooney expressed his frustration as well and asked staff to look into the issue and provide an update to the Commission.

1. Informal Review of LPC Projects – Josh Martin

Mr. Martin discussed the informal review process at the Landmarks Preservation Commission. Mr. Martin stated that staff would like to amend this process in that projects would no longer have an informal review. He stated that in the spirit of process improvement, staff would like to try this new process for six months. Mr. Cooney was in favor of the idea.

Mr. Martin updated the Commission on two Ordinances that would be presented to the Town Council regarding construction screening and the retention of screening during construction, specifically on narrow streets. He asked the Commissioners to send any comments or concerns to him. A short discussion ensued among the Commissioners regarding this issue.

Mr. Lindgren stated that Mr. Segraves declared a conflict for the Certificate of Appropriateness for 3 Pelican Lane at the February 20, 2019 meeting and had correctly completed the 8B form in accordance with State Law.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

A motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Gannon to adjourn the meeting at 12:30 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be held on Wednesday, April 17, 2019 at 9:30 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 South County Rd. Palm Beach.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Edward A. Cooney". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Edward Cooney, Chairman

LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

kmc