TOWN OF PALM BEACH

PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 2017.

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 9:31 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL

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

Staff Members present were:
John S. Page, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building
John Lindgren, Planning Administrator
Kelly Churney, Secretary to the Landmarks Preservation Commission

Chairman Cooney noted that Ms. Drake would be voting in the absence of Ms. Fairfax.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Cooney led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 16, 2017 MEETING

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Silvin to approve the minutes of the March 16, 2017 meeting. Motion carried with all in favor.

V. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Chairman Cooney stated that the architect for COA-003-2017, 101 El Brillo had requested a one-month deferral, to the May 17, 2017 meeting.

Motion made by Mr. Silvin and seconded by Ms. Albarran to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried with all in favor.

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)

Ms. Hufty expressed concern with the staff approval of newly installed landscaping at 330 Island Rd and thought the Landmarks Preservation Commission should have seen the plans before approval. Mr. Lindgren stated he, the Chairman and preservation consultants discussed the proposed landscaping before the staff approval was given. Mr. Lindgren stated that the landscaping did not adversely affect the historic structure and all aspects of the Code were followed.

Ms. Drake asked for an explanation on why the Landmarks Preservation Commission looks at landscaping. Mr. Page discussed the reasons landscaping was important and talked about staff approvals.

Mr. Page stated that Ms. Albarran declared a continuing conflict for this project, 365 N. County Rd., at the March 16, 2017 meeting and had correctly completed the 8B form in accordance with State Law.

Mr. Page stated that Ms. Fairfax declared a continuing conflict for this project, 9 Golfview Rd., at the March 16, 2017 meeting and had correctly completed the 8B form in accordance with State Law.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #003-2017

LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S) - Done 1/18/17
Address: 101 El Brillo Way
Owner/Applicant: The Palm Trust, c/o Maura Ziska Trustee
Architect: Jose Luis Gonzalez-Perotti/Portuondo Perotti Architects, Inc.
Landscape Architect: Fernando Wong/Fernando Wong Outdoor Living Design
Project Description: Proposed improvements include demolition of existing two-story kitchen, staff and laundry portion of residence. This area will be replaced with proposed two-story kitchen, family room and guest wing as well as basement storage. The existing residence will also be remodeled in interiors. Landscape improvements are also proposed. Other associated changes as proposed.
Please note: this is a tax abatement project

VARIANCE INFORMATION: The applicant is renovating a Landmarked residence which includes a proposal to add a 7,873 square foot, two story addition with a basement to the west side of the residence for a new kitchen and guest wing and a 252 square foot two story addition to the east side of the residence to enlarge the existing office/den. The following variances are being requested: 1) a rear yard setback of 8.25 feet in lieu of the 15 foot minimum required for the guest

wing addition on the west side of the residence (268 square feet is encroaching in the setback); 2) a rear yard setback of 10.33 in lieu of the 15 foot minimum required for the office/den addition to the east side of the residence (70 square feet is encroaching in the setback).

At the January meeting, a motion carried that the implementation of the proposed variance would not cause negative architectural impact to the subject landmarked property. At the February meeting, a motion carried to defer the project for one month to the March 16, 2017 meeting. At the March meeting, a motion carried to approve the project as presented with the caveat for the architect to bring back details for the gates and fountains.

This project was deferred to the May 17, 2017 meeting at the approval of the agenda, Item V.

B. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #011-2017
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EXCEPTION WITH SITE PLAN - Done 3/16/17
Address: 340 Royal Poinciana Way, Suite 304
Owner/Applicant: RPP Palm Beach Property, LP, A DE Limited Partnership
Architect: Keith Spina/Glidden Spina + Partners
Project Description: Proposed Landmark Preservation Commission approval for outdoor dining at Sant Ambroeus in The Royal Poinciana Plaza. Outdoor dining is a part of The Royal Poinciana Plaza's history, as generations of Palm Beach residents visited the courtyards, they were met with colorful umbrellas and inviting furniture. John Volk's courtyards were designed with the intent that guests would visit and linger and that is exactly what Sant Ambroeus wishes to accomplish by re-introducing outdoor dining. The restaurant will relocate 20 seats from within their dining room to the fountain patio in an effort to restore an activity to the Plaza that has been missing for many years. Sant Ambroeus looks forward to serving their delicious food, in beautiful weather, among magnificent gardens and the wonderful company of friends.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION INFORMATION: The applicant is requesting a special exception with site plan approval to allow twenty (20) seats to be shifted from inside Sant Ambroeus and relocated around the fountain for outdoor dining when weather permits. The proposed restaurant is located in the northeast corner of the Plaza and the outdoor dining will be adjacent to the restaurant on the newly created patio around the east fountain. The outdoor dining will share the same hours as the restaurant: Sunday through Thursday – Breakfast, Lunch and Dinner – 8 a.m. to 10 p.m., Friday and Saturday – Breakfast, Lunch and Dinner – 8 a.m. to 11 p.m.

At the March meeting, a motion carried that the implementation of the proposed special exception with site plan review would not cause negative architectural impact to the subject landmarked property.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by Mses. Coleman and Patterson.

Mr. Spina stated he received approval from the Town Council at the April meeting for outdoor seating. He reviewed his request and showed the Commissioners pictures of the proposed furniture.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Segraves to approve the project as presented. Motion carried with all in favor.

C. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #014-2017
Address: 200 N. Ocean Blvd.
Owner/Applicant: 200 N. Ocean Blvd. Association, Inc./Marcia Kay, Board President
Engineer: Bijan Parssi/Botkin, Parssi & Associates, Inc.
Project Description: Install a replacement cornice section located at the North elevation of the subject property.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by Ms. Albarran.

Mr. Parssi provided a history of the building and of the project. He showed the Commissioners photos of the project site, the cracked cornices, proposed sections of the cornice removal, the areas to be replaced and new cornices. He described the method in which they are asking for approval to replace the cornices.

Mr. Segraves asked about the color of the proposed cornices compared to the existing cornices. Mr. Parssi showed the Commissioners a sample of the original cornice and a sample of the proposed cornice. Mr. Segraves expressed concern about seeing the old and new cornices throughout the building after the project is completed.

Some discussion ensued about the color of the cornice.

Mr. Segraves cautioned that the new cornices needed to match the ones removed. Ms. Albarran suggested using a surface coating. They both were in favor of the texture.

Ms. Hufty was not in favor of the color and did not think the ogee edge matched the original cornice. Ms. Coleman agreed that the ogee edge did not match.

Mr. Lindgren suggested a conditional approval that Mr. Parssi return on May 17, 2017 with a new sample.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Segraves to conditionally approve the project with the caveat that a sample of the new mold is brought to the May 17, 2017 meeting.

Mr. Silvin asked what percentage of the cornice would be replaced. Mr. Parssi responded with an explanation of the removal method of the cornices. Mr. Silvin asked if the owner would eventually be replacing all of the cornices. Mr. Parssi

stated that the owner is currently replacing the cracking cornices, which is about 25-30% of the total cornices.

Ms. Coleman restated that the sample molding did not match the original and expressed concern about the new pieces matching the existing pieces.

Motion carried with all in favor.

D. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #015-2017
Address: 151 Grace Trail #3
Owner/Applicant: Windi Grimes
Architect: Caroline Forrest/MP Design & Architecture
Landscape Architect: Keith Williams/Nievera Williams Design
Project Description: Replace existing doors and windows with new hurricane impact to match type and color. Modify existing hardscape and existing landscape. Proposed removable canopy/awning.

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

Ms. Forrest presented a history of the home and provided an overview of the project. She showed the Commissioners floor plans, elevations, existing photos and reviewed the materials to be used.

Mr. Williams presented the proposed landscape and hardscape design for the project. He showed the Commissioners a proposed site plan, elevations, details of materials to be used and showed samples.

Ms. Coleman asked about the size of the courtyard. Ms. Forrest responded.

Motion made by Mr. Silvin and seconded by Mr. Gannon to approve the project as presented. Motion carried with all in favor.

E. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #016-2017
Address: 312 Worth Ave.
Owner/Applicant: Martin List (Property Manager)
Architect: Jason P. Drobot/Brasseur & Drobot Architects, P.A.
Project Description: The project consists of enhancing an existing entrance and fenestration for the southwestern unit located on the first floor, east elevation, south of the Maus and Hoffman southeastern arched entrance located within Via Mario. The project also consists of window replacement at the first and second floor of the same unit and removal of existing HVAC window units. Window units to be replaced with a mini-split system.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by Mses. Albarran and Hufty.

Mr. Drobot presented the proposed modifications for the project. He showed the Commissioners existing and proposed elevations, a site plan, floor plans, exterior photos of the existing building and discussed materials to be used.

Ms. Hufty asked about the proposed lanterns. Mr. Drobot stated that the lanterns would be a Mediterranean style and similar to the drawings.

Ms. Albarran was in favor of the project but questioned the planter boxes proposed.

Mr. Segraves suggested a stucco sill for the windows because he thought they looked too plain. Mr. Segraves expressed concern about the stucco band proposed on top of the column. He thought the planter boxes were fine as proposed. There was some discussion about the width of the stucco bands.

Ms. Coleman, Ms. Albarran and Ms. Hufty were in favor of adding sills on all of the windows. Mr. Drobot agreed.

Ms. Hufty expressed concern about the planter boxes.

Mr. Drobot and the Commissioners reviewed each existing elevation and discussed the windows.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, asked Mr. Drobot about the cushion capitals on the north elevation. Mr. Drobot explained his design. Ms. Stillings expressed concern about the number of added features that were not original. Mr. Drobot provided a further explained the design.

Ms. Hufty asked about the original architect. Mr. Drobot responded.

Ms. Albarran suggested plain pilasters, the addition of window sills and no planter boxes.

Ms. Patterson was in favor of the planters and suggested a constant water feed.

Ms. Drake was in favor of the pilasters. She did not have a strong option on the planter boxes.

Ms. Hufty referenced the distinctness of the Wells Fargo building design. She added that the proposed design reminded her of that building and thought the differentiation and whimsy in this design was wonderful.

Mr. Silvin questioned the intent of the design. Mr. Drobot stated the intent was to have separate units with their own identity.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Ms. Hufty to approve the project as presented with the added sills on the second floor, simplifying the

capital so it does not surpass the added band and the removal of the planter boxes. Motion carried with all in favor.

F. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #018-2017
Address: 105 Clarendon Ave.
Owner/Applicant: Charles Schumacher
Architect: Keith Williams/Nievera Williams Design
Project Description: Proposed gates for pedestrian access on Clarendon Avenue. Proposed generator enclosure gate.

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

Mr. Williams presented the proposed gates for the residence. He showed the Commissioners a site plan, drawings of the originally proposed gates and the currently proposed gates. He also presented a redesigned gate on the overhead projector.

Ms. Albarran was not in favor of the aluminum gate and preferred a wood gate. Ms. Hufty agreed.

Mr. Cooney and Mr. Segraves stated they would be in favor of the gate in front of the generator to be in aluminum but stated the main gate should be wood.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Gannon to approve the project as presented with the caveat that the front two gates are 4 foot in width, of wood material and the generator gate to be aluminum. Motion carried with all in favor.

G. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #019-2017
Address: 212 Sunset Ave.
Owner/Applicant: MSPB, LLC/Frances Frisbie
Architect: Jacqueline Albarran/SKA Architect + Planner, Inc.
Project Description: Demolition of a non-Landmarked one-story structure. Replace footprint with ¾" aggregate gravel (washed rock) 6" deep. Demolition will not start until the commencement of any new construction.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: There was no disclosure at this time.

Ms. Albarran declared a conflict of interest, as she is the architect of record for the project.

Ms. Albarran reviewed the proposed plans for the project. She provided a history of the buildings, provided a demolition report, showed an aerial photo, original drawings, existing photos, exterior and interior site plan, discussed the timing of the project and the material to be used on the site after the demolition.

Mr. Silvin asked how the neighbors would be protected during the demolition. Ms. Albarran responded.

Mr. Segraves asked why the project is not being presented to the Architectural Commission since it is not a landmarked building. Mr. Lindgren stated that the building was a non-contributing structure on a landmarked site. Mr. Segraves asked about the demolition requirements. Mr. Cooney responded.

Mr. Page indicated that Ms. Coleman would be voting in the absence of Ms. Albarran.

Ms. Coleman asked about the proposed use of the lot once the building is demolished. Ms. Albarran responded.

Mr. Segraves asked if the Landmarks Commission would see any newly proposed buildings for the site. Mr. Lindgren stated that they would.

Motion made by Ms. Drake and seconded by Ms. Hufty to approve the project as presented.

Mr. Cooney asked for public comment. There was none.

Motion carried with all in favor.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Informal Review – Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #017-2017
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EXCEPTION WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW
Address: 1 S. County Rd.
Owner/Applicant: The Breakers Palm Beach, Inc.
Architect: Steve Pollio/Peacock and Lewis, AIA
Project Description: Construction of a 404 sq. ft. new retail shop in the Palm Court. It will be named Mary Lily's and will sell ice cream and candy. The location is currently a breezeway connecting the Palm Court and the Porte Cochère at the main hotel entrance. This space falls within our overall commercial square footage approved in 1990 for the Palm Court. We believe it will be a valuable addition to our hotel.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION INFORMATION: The applicant is requesting a special exception with site plan approval for the construction of a new retail shop in The Palm Court. The shop, called Mary Lily's, will sell primarily ice cream and candy. It will total 404 square feet, and will be constructed in the breezeway connecting The Palm Court and the porte-cochere at the main hotel entrance. The square footage for this business will bring the total overall commercial square footage in The Palm Court area to 10,062 and the total retail square footage to 7,565, and so will not cause the 10,700 overall commercial square footage or the 8,200 retail square footage approved in 1990 for The Palm Court area by Resolution No. 17-90 to be exceeded. This application also requests special exception approval to expand the existing seafood restaurant and bar. Internal hotel space was reconfigured to allow an additional 1,781 square feet of space and 37 additional seats, for a total of 6,111 square feet and 177 seats.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by Messrs. Silvin and Cooney.

Mr. Pollio presented the proposed plans for the project. He showed the Commissioners a site plan, elevations and photos of the site.

Mr. Silvin asked about the current use of space. Mr. Pollio responded.

Ms. Albarran asked about the proposed muntins on the windows. Mr. Pollio explained that what appeared as muntins are actually score lines on stucco.

Ms. Drake expressed concern about the future circulation once built.

Motion made by Mr. Segraves and seconded by Mr. Gannon that the implementation of the proposed special exception and site plan review will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject landmark property. Motion carried with all in favor.

B. Informal Review – Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #020-2017
LPC TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION RELATIVE TO VARIANCE
Address: 139 N. County Rd.
Owner/Applicant: Harvey E. Oyer, III, Esq. (Agent)
Architect: Gene Pandula/The Pandula Architects, Inc.
Project Description: A request by the Paramount Church, Inc. ("Paramount") for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing Paramount sign with an identical business sign of the same size, height, number of bulbs, color, appearance and location.

VARIANCE INFORMATION: The applicant is requesting the approval of a sign variance to replace the existing Paramount sign with an identical business sign of the same size, height, number of bulbs, color, appearance and location. The following variance is requested: To increase the maximum gross surface area for a business sign for the Paramount Theatre to 156.20 square feet in lieu of the 20 square feet maximum as required by code. A requested variance of 136.20 square feet.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: There was no disclosure at this time.

Mr. Pandula stated the need for the sign to be replaced. He explained the reason for the requested variance, showed an aerial map, a historic site plan, existing photos, historic drawings and historic photos.

Mr. Cooney was happy that the owner was replacing the sign.

Ms. Hufty asked about historic murals that were in the building years ago.

Dwight Stevens, Owner, responded with a history of the murals.

Mr. Gannon stated that the sign was a part of Palm Beach.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Silvin that the implementation of the proposed variance will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject landmark property. Motion carried with all in favor.

A short break was taken at 11:30 a.m. The meeting resumed at 11:40 a.m.

X. DESIGNATION HEARINGS

Item 1: 228 Seaspray Ave.
Owner: Shipley, Gergana K. and Zachary

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

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history for this 1926 City Builders' Mediterranean Revival style home. Ms. Murphy pointed out the design features, which included an ornate stone door surround with Corinthian pilasters, arched multi-light French doors with full height shutters, decorative metal work, an exterior chimney and mixed fenestration of double hung windows. She also spoke about the history of the owners over the years. Ms. Murphy testified that the building meets 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 of use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.

Mr. Page informed the Commission that Jamie Gavigan would be standing in for Town Attorney Skip Randolph, should they have any legal questions.

Mr. Page asked Mr. Segraves if he thought he had a conflict of interest with this hearing. Mr. Segraves stated he did not think he had a conflict.

Mr. Silvin asked if the owners were in agreement with the recommendation for landmarking their home.

Mr. Cooney asked for confirmation that the Town had proof of publication and notice with regard to this landmark designation hearing. Ms. Churney provided confirmation.

Motion made by Mr. Silvin and seconded by Mr. Gannon that the designation report be made part of the record. Motion carried with all in favor.

Chairman Cooney stated that Ms. Coleman would be voting in the absence of Ms. Hufty.

Mr. Shipley, owner, discussed the renovations that were recently completed at his home and stated that they were flattered that their home was considered to be landmarked and did not see this as an impairment.

A second motion was made by Mr. Silvin and seconded by Mr. Gannon that 228 Seaspray Avenue be recommended 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 with all in favor.

Item 2: 335 Seabreeze Ave.
Owner: Meaney, Barbaree P.; Barbaree Meaney Trust

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

Mr. Cooney asked for confirmation that the Town had proof of publication and notice with regard to this landmark designation hearing. Ms. Churney provided confirmation.

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history for this 1925 William Eckler Mediterranean Revival style home. Ms. Murphy pointed out the design features, which included a Romanesque-style compound arch entryway, a curved parapet with Cape Dutch effect, a round stair tower and carved wooden brackets under the roof eaves. She also spoke about the history of the owners over the years. She reviewed the alterations to the property as well. Ms. Murphy testified that the building meets 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 of use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.
Sec. 54-161 (4) Is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer or architect whose individual ability has been recognized or who influenced his age.

Motion made by Mr. Silvin and seconded by Mr. Gannon that the designation report be made part of the record. Motion carried with all in favor.

Barbaree Meaney, owner, expressed several reasons why her home should not landmarked. She also read letters from architects Jeffrey Smith and Nikita Zukov, who were both concluded that her home was not worthy of landmarking.

Mr. Silvin stated that looking at the front façade only could be misleading, especially when three other façades had been altered. He did not feel that the home was worthy of landmarking, other than the front façade, which he discussed with Ms. Meaney. Ms. Meaney was opposed to landmarking the façade of her home.

Ms. Drake stated that she felt so much of the building had been changed and did not feel that it was worth of landmarking.

Ms. Albarran asked if this property could ever be considered again in the future. Mr. Lindgren stated that a future consideration would not be likely. Ms. Murphy stated an owner could ask for consideration in the future.

Mr. Segraves liked the front façade of the home but agreed with his fellow Commissioners.

Ms. Meaney stated that the grandson of a previous owner has spoken with her about the possibility of purchasing the home in the future.

Ms. Coleman asked about the details on the front entry. Ms. Meaney responded.

A second motion made by Ms. Drake and seconded by Mr. Silvin that 335 Seabreeze Avenue not be recommended to the Town Council for designation as a landmark of the Town of Palm Beach because it does not meet the criteria and many alterations have been made to the home. Motion carried with all in favor.

Mr. Silvin commended the Preservation Consultants on a great job.

Item 3: 222 Everglade Ave.
Owner: O'Hara, Tierney E. and Timothy

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

Mr. Cooney asked for confirmation that the Town had proof of publication and notice with regard to this landmark designation hearing. Ms. Churney provided confirmation.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history for this 1927 Mediterranean Revival style home, most likely designed by Rudolph C. Warner. She also spoke about the history of the owners over the years. Ms. Stillings pointed out the design features, which included a tile covered roof with wide overhangs and exposed rafters, an elaborate entrance, arches, columns, balconies, entrance tower, ornate cast stone door surround, and tower parapet. Ms. Stillings reviewed the modifications made to the residence. Ms. Stillings testified that the building meets 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 of use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.

Motion made by Mr. Silvin and seconded by Mr. Gannon that the designation report be made part of the record. Motion carried with all in favor.

Timothy O'Hara, owner, expressed his objections to why his home should not landmarked.

Mr. Segraves inquired about the other three homes that were landmarked. Ms. Stillings responded.

Ms. Albarran expressed concern with designating the home because of the neighborhood where it is located. Mr. Cooney agreed and discussed some of the factors that play a part when designating a home. A short discussion ensued about the neighborhood's lack of historic character and identity.

Ms. Drake felt that the house did not fit in its neighborhood and was not in favor of the designation.

Mr. Gannon stated that there are parts of the home that are charming and compelling but they were not significant to landmark against the owner's wishes.

A second motion made by Ms. Drake and seconded by Ms. Coleman that 222 Everglade Avenue not be recommend to the Town Council for designation as a landmark of the Town of Palm Beach because of its location and lack of distinction. Motion carried with all in favor.

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

Mr. Page updated the Commission on the Town Council's decision to Landmark 210 Dunbar Rd. and 125 Australian Ave. at their meeting in April.

Ms. Stillings reminded the Commissioners that she would be looking at properties to Landmark next season. She asked Commissioners to send her or Janet any addresses that they should consider. Ms. Murphy stated that they have properties from last season to consider but would like suggestions from them as well.

Mr. Silvin expressed concern about hearing an update from the Four Arts regarding the mural restoration. Mr. Lindgren updated Mr. Silvin by stating that the Four Arts would be attending the May meeting to provide an update. Ms. Albarran reminded the Commissioners that they would be raising the floor, which was a concern.

Mr. Silvin also expressed concern for the pedestal from the basin on which Artemis stood, that was located in the fountain in Bradley Park. Mr. Silvin also expressed a concern that was brought to him by Anita Seltzer. Mr. Page stated he relay Mr. Silvin's concerns to Paul Brazil, Director of Public Works.

Ms. Drake expressed a concern about the lack of work happening at the north bridge. Ms. Coleman also stated some concerns for the area. Mr. Page stated he would relay her concerns to Paul Brazil as well.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Silvin to adjourn the meeting at 12:54 p.m. Motion carried with all in favor.

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be held on Wednesday, May 17, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 South County Rd. Palm Beach.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward A. Cooney, Chairman
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

kmc

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
Albarran, Jacqueline	Landmarks Preservation Commission
MAILING ADDRESS 324 Royal Palm Way #227	THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: ☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY Town
CITY Palm Beach COUNTY Palm Beach	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: Town of Palm Beach
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED 4/19/17	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, Jacqueline Albarran, hereby disclose that on April 19, 20 17:

(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:

Certificate of Appropriateness Hearing
019-2017
212 Sunset Avenue

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.

4/19/17
Date Filed

J. Albarran
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.