



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 22, 2018

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ROLL CALL

Robert J. Vila, Chairman	PRESENT
Michael B. Small, Vice Chairman	PRESENT
Robert N. Garrison, Member	PRESENT
Alexander C. Ives, Member	PRESENT
Maisie Grace, Member	PRESENT (left at 4:10 p.m.)
John David Corey, Member	PRESENT
Nikita Zukov, Member	ABSENT (excused)
Betsy Shiverick, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Katherine Catlin, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Dan Floersheimer, Alternate Member	PRESENT

Staff Members present were:

John Lindgren, Planning Administrator
Josh Martin, Director of Planning, Zoning and Building
Paul Castro, Zoning Administrator
John Randolph, Town Attorney
Kelly Churney, Secretary to the Architectural Review Commission

Please note: Ms. Churney noted that Ms. Shiverick would be voting in the absence of Mr. Zukov.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Vila led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JULY 25, 2018 MEETING

Motion made by Mr. Small and seconded by Mr. Garrison to approve the minutes from the July 25, 2018 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

V. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Small requested to amend the agenda with the deferral of the following projects to the September 26, 2018 meeting: B-060-2018, 211 Ocean Terrace, B-083-2018, 210 Miraflores Dr., B-093-2018, 977 S. Ocean Blvd., A-019-2018, 208 Sandpiper Dr. and A-030-2018, 304 Indian Rd.

Mr. Small also requested to amend the agenda by moving the project B-096-2018, 250 Kawama Lane to the first spot on the agenda. Additionally, he requested to hear the project A-029-2018, 340 Seaview Avenue upon the architect's arrival.

Motion made by Mr. Small and seconded by Mr. Garrison to approve the agenda as amended. 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. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS REGARDING NON-AGENDA ITEMS (3 MINUTE LIMIT PLEASE)

Chairman Vila welcomed Josh Martin, the new Director of Planning, Zoning and Building.

VIII. PROJECT REVIEW

A. DEMOLITIONS AND TIME EXTENSIONS
NONE

B. MAJOR PROJECTS – OLD BUSINESS

B-096-2018 Modifications

ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE VARIANCE

Address: 250 Kawama Ln.

Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. Martin Meyers

Professional: MHK Architecture & Planning

Project Description: Interior remodel to existing regency style house. Addition of two windows on east elevation and modification of existing door. ****Due to insufficient notice, the architectural portion of the project will be heard informally. The Commission can make a recommendation on the variance.****

VARIANCE INFORMATION: The applicant is proposing to build out 686 square feet in the existing one-story garage which will convert a one-story residence into a two-story residence and which will require the following variance for lot coverage to be 30 % in lieu of the 25 % maximum allowed in the R-B Zoning District for a two story residence on a lot that is in excess of 20,000 square feet.

Maura Ziska, attorney for the owner, explained the zoning requests and advocated for a positive recommendation to the Town Council.

Caroline Forrest, MHK Architecture & Planning, presented the architectural plans for the project.

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

Mr. Ives asked for clarification on the zoning request. Ms. Forrest responded.

Ms. Grace asked if the neighbors had received proper notice for the project. Ms. Forrest replied and explained that the project would return at the next meeting for a formal vote.

Mr. Vila called for public comment. There were no comments heard at this time.

Motion made by Mr. Small and seconded by Mr. Ives that implementation of the proposed variance will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject property. Motion carried 6-1 with Ms. Grace opposed.

B-008-2018 Demolition/New Construction

Address: 232 Seabreeze Ave.

Applicant: Jim & Robin Carey

Professional: MP Design and Architecture

Project Description: Demolition of existing two story single-family dwelling, two story garage, storage shed and pool. New construction of a two story single-family contemporary home with concrete tile and standing seam zinc coated copper roof, new pool, site walls and landscaping.

Project History:

- January 2018 – Approved demolition & deferred project to March 2018 for a complete redesign.
- March 2018 – Presented and deferred to April 2018 based on Commissioners comments.
- April 2018 – Deferred to May 2018 at the request of architect.
- May 2018 – Approved modified landscape and hardscape plan. Deferred architectural portion to June 2018 at request of architect.
- June 2018 – Deferred to July 2018 at request of architect.
- July 2018 – ****Change in Architect**** Deferred to August 2018 based on Commissioners Comments. Amended landscape demolition to include the approval of site wall.

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

Mr. Vila called for public comment. There were no comments heard at this time.

Michael Perry, MP Design and Architecture, presented the proposed architectural modifications for the project. He presented alternate renderings on the overhead projector.

Mr. Floersheimer expressed concern for the proposed banding on the home and thought it was too high.

Ms. Grace thought the design was still too cold and did not think the changes brought any warmth into the design.

Mr. Corey thanked the architect for the cross section of the home. He was in favor of some of the changes. He thought the proposed height of the home was acceptable but thought the banding was too high. He added that the design was still cold but could accept the design.

Mr. Ives thought the design had progressed over several months. He felt the design still lacked an identity but stated he would support the project.

Ms. Shiverick suggested changing the color of the stone to add warmth to the design. She also questioned the proposed Bougainvillea on the rear of the home. Ms. Shiverick asked to see a sample of the stone.

Mr. Perry presented some proposed material samples.

Mr. Garrison discussed the different design styles that exist on the street and thought this design would fit in well. He agreed with Ms. Shiverick about the amount of Bougainvillea proposed for the rear of the home.

Mr. Corey asked about the material sample for the roof. Mr. Perry provided some explanation. Mr. Corey thought a different roof color would be more appropriate.

Ms. Grace added that she did not feel there were any details in the design that would stand out. Mr. Perry responded.

Ms. Catlin suggested adding warmth to the design by reevaluating the colors for the home. She indicated that the landscaping would be important in the design.

Mr. Small did not believe the Commission should not rely on the landscape to add warmth to the home.

Mr. Vila stated that the previous home was a nice Monterey-style home by Maurice Fatio. While the proposed design was acceptable, he did not believe the fabric of the street was improved by the newly proposed home. He thought the house would be better with some added color.

Motion made by Ms. Grace and seconded by Mr. Corey to defer the project for one month to the September 26, 2018 meeting.

Mr. Perry asked for clarification to determine whether the deferral was due to color choices.

Mr. Randolph asked if the professional was clear about the reason for the deferral and which direction he should take in his modifications.

A short discussion ensued about the possible motion.

Mr. Corey withdrew his second on the motion. Ms. Shiverick seconded the motion made by Ms. Grace. The motion carried 5-2 with Messrs. Garrison and Vila opposed.

B-034-2018 New Construction

ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S)

- Done 4/25/18

Address: 901 N. Ocean Blvd.

Applicant: PBB Island Properties, LLC

Professional: Roger Janssen/Dailey Janssen Architects

Project Description: Construction of a two-story residence, hardscape, landscape and pool.

Project History

- March 2018 – Presented and deferred to April 2018 based on Commissioners comments.
- April 2018 – Motion carried that implementation of the proposed variance will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject property. Deferred to May 2018 to restudy both main and guesthouse.
- May 2018 – Presented and deferred to June 2018 based on Commissioners comments.
- June 2018 – Deferred to July 2018 at the request of the architect.
- July 2018 – Deferred to August 2018 at the request of the architect.

Maura Ziska requested a third deferral for the project for one month to the September 26, 2018 meeting to allow the architect to prepare for the presentation.

John Dotterer, attorney for Mr. & Mrs. Goodman, stated he understood that the Commission only allows three deferrals and asked that this would be the last deferral that the Commission approves. Mr. Lindgren responded and corrected the deferral process.

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

Ms. Grace stated she was sympathetic to the deferral request.

Motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Mr. Small to defer the project to the September 26, 2018 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

B-057-2018 Demolition/New Construction

Address: 251 Dunbar Rd.

Applicant: 251 Dunbar, LLC

Professional: Pat Segraves/SKA Architect + Planner

Project Description: Demolition of existing one story house. New construction of two story classical style home to be approximately 6,000 sq. ft. Final landscape and hardscape to be included.

A motion carried at the June meeting to approve the demolition request. A second motion carried to defer the project to the July 25, 2018 meeting for restudy. A motion carried at the July meeting to defer the project to the August 22, 2018 meeting for a restudy based on the comments from the Commissioners.

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

Mr. Vila called for public comment. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Segraves introduced Daniel Clavijo to present the project. Mr. Clavijo presented the proposed architectural modifications for the project. Mr. Clavijo showed some material samples proposed for the project.

Ms. Grace was in favor of the changes.

Mr. Corey thought the proposed roof sample was darker than what the rendered elevation presented. He thought the design fit on the street. He thought the arches on the pergola seemed to tall and skinny.

Mr. Vila agreed with Mr. Corey's pergola assessment.

Ms. Shiverick suggested using a lighter shade of gray on the roof material. Mr. Segraves stated he would use a lighter gray if he could find one.

Steve West, Parker Yannette Design Group, presented the proposed modifications for the landscape and hardscape.

Mr. Corey was in favor of the landscape plan but was not in favor of the proposed pavers in the hardscape design.

Mr. Garrison agreed with Mr. Corey and was not in favor of the proposed pavers. Mr. Garrison suggested removing the quoins on the home as well. Mr. West asked about Mr. Garrison's objections. Mr. Garrison stated he was not in favor of the color of the pavers. Mr. Vila agreed.

Mr. Ives discussed the design for the proposed quoins and explained he requested a differentiation between the one and two story portions.

Mr. Vila agreed that the quoins were problematic.

Mr. Corey suggested using a shadow line in the design for the one story portion of the home.

Mr. Clavijo presented an alternate design on the overhead projector and explained the design. Mr. Corey suggested keeping the quoins on the front of the home, removing them from the rest of the home and moving the one story portion over to create a shadow line.

Ms. Shiverick suggested removing the quoins altogether. Mr. Garrison agreed.

Mr. Segraves lobbied to keep the quoins on the front of the home.

Mr. Vila was in favor of keeping the quoins on the front and removing the quoins from the rest of the home. He thought the one story portion of the home would had looked better if it had been differentiated from the two-story portion.

Motion made by Ms. Grace and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve the project as presented with the caveat that the changes suggested by Mr. Corey are implemented.

Mr. Small asked that Ms. Grace consider some amendments to her motion, such as lowering the arches in the loggia and that the landscape architect to return to the Commission with a different option for the pavers. Ms. Grace agreed.

Motion amended by Ms. Grace and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve the project as presented with the caveat that the changes suggested by Mr. Corey are implemented (keeping the quoins on the front of the home, removing them from the rest of the home, moving the one story portion over to create a shadow line), lowering the arches in the loggia and that the landscape architect returns to the Commission at the September 26, 2018 meeting with a different option for the pavers. Motion carried unanimously.

B-059-2018 Modifications

Address: 3100 S. Ocean Blvd.

Applicant: Palm Beach Hampton Condominium Association

Professional: Jerome Baumohl/Jerome Baumohl Architect

Project Description: Renovation to existing Guardhouse incorporating new roof design, waterfall feature, rework/update perimeter site lighting fixtures and square two existing columns at porte cochère to match existing including landscaping.

A motion carried at the June meeting to defer the project to the July 25, 2018 meeting for restudy. A motion carried at the July meeting to defer the project to the August 22, 2018 meeting at the request of the architect.

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

Mr. Vila called for public comment. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Baumoehl presented the proposed architectural modifications for the existing guardhouse.

Mr. Corey was in favor of the proposed changes and supported the project. Mr. Corey suggested removing the angled column in the rear of the guardhouse. Mr. Baumoehl agreed.

Ms. Grace was in favor of the changes.

Mr. Vila thought the new design was a disservice to the original architecture.

Don Skowron presented the proposed modifications for the landscape and hardscape plans.

Mr. Vila asked if the proposal was to move the two Sea Grapes. Mr. Skowron responded and further explained his proposal.

Mr. Corey thought the proposed landscape was underwhelming. He thought the landscape was too thin and short. He added that the landscaping should be more robust.

Mr. Small agreed with Mr. Corey and thought the landscape was too sparse.

Mr. Skowron stated that the proposed changes were for the guardhouse only and that they were trying to get the changes done by October.

Mr. Vila agreed with Messrs. Small and Corey and stated that since the proposed light fixtures were north and south from the guardhouse, the whole property was considered. Mr. Vila inquired whether the details from the fenestration had been removed. Mr. Baumoehl confirmed it had been previously approved and removed.

Mr. Ives disagreed somewhat and did not believe the landscape needed to be doubled or tripled. Mr. Ives supported the changes for the guardhouse.

Ms. Catlin thought the changes were more in line with the look that has resulted since the change in the windows occurred.

Ms. Shiverick was in favor of keeping the Canary Date palms and was in favor of the proposed plans.

Motion made by Ms. Grace and seconded by Mr. Garrison to approve the project as presented. Motion carried 5-2 with Messrs. Corey and Small opposed.

Please note: A short break was taken at 10:18 a.m. The meeting resumed at 10:28 a.m.

B-060-2018 New Construction

Address: 211 Ocean Terrace

Applicant: 1963 Trust 211 Ocean Terrace LLC

Professional: Harold Smith/Smith and Moore Architects, Inc.

Project Description: Construction of a two-story single family residence. Final hardscape and landscape.

A motion carried at the June meeting to defer the project to the July 2018 meeting for restudy. A motion carried at the July meeting to defer the project to the August 22, 2018 meeting at the request of the architect.

Please note: This item was deferred to the September 26, 2018 meeting with the Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

B-061-2018 New Construction

Address: 261 Nightingale Trail

Applicant: Jeffrey A. Cole Trust

Professional: Ralph Cantin Architect, Inc.

Project Description: New one story home, landscape and hardscape.

A motion carried at the June meeting to defer the project to the July 25, 2018 meeting for restudy. A motion carried at the July meeting to approve the architecture as presented and to defer the landscape to the August 22, 2018 meeting based on the comments from the Commission.

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

John Lang, Lang Design Group, presented the proposed landscape modifications.

Mr. Corey was in favor of the changes.

Motion made by Ms. Grace and seconded by Mr. Small to approve the project as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

B-063-2018 Demolition/New Construction

ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EXCEPTION WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW AND VARIANCE(S)

Address: 1178 N. Ocean Blvd.

Applicant: 1178 Ocean LLC

Professional: Marvin Herman/Marvin Herman & Associates
Project Description: Demolition and reconstruction of existing one-story Beach Cabana, on existing footprint. New spa, final landscape and hardscape.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW AND VARIANCE INFORMATION: The Applicant seeks to reconstruct an existing beach house east of Ocean Boulevard adjacent to the east of property owned by the Applicant on the existing footprint in the existing location. Due to changes in the zoning code since the beach house was originally built, the variances indicated below are required, since greater than 50% of the existing structure, determined by cubic footage, is being demolished (per Code Section 134-417). To permit construction of a beach house with a square footage of 519 square feet, existing and proposed, in lieu of 350 square feet allowed by Special Exception. To permit the construction of a beach house with a depth dimension of 24' 8-1/2", existing and proposed, in lieu of 20' maximum dimension allowed by Special Exception. To permit the construction of a beach house with a width dimension of 21', existing and proposed, in lieu of 20' maximum dimension allowed by Special Exception. To permit the construction of a beach house with a setback of 5'-3-1/2", existing and proposed, in lieu of a minimum setback of 10' permitted by code. To permit a maximum hedge height/wall height existing and proposed to remain at +/- 6'-0"; in lieu of 4'-0" permitted by code. To permit a minimum ocean vista, existing and proposed, 0% of lot width, in lieu of 50% of lot width permitted by code.

A motion carried at the June meeting to approve the demolition request. A second motion carried to defer the project to the July 25, 2018. A motion carried at the July meeting to defer the project to the August 22, 2018 meeting at the request of the architect.

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

Frank Lynch, attorney for the owner, explained the zoning requests and advocated for a positive recommendation to the Town Council.

Peter Papadopoulos presented the proposed architectural changes for the beach cabana.

Claudia Visconti, SMI Landscape Architecture, presented the proposed landscape and hardscape changes.

Mr. Lynch stated that two variances had been eliminated from their request with a change in the plans.

Ms. Grace asked about the proposed height of the cabana. Mr. Papadopoulos responded.

Ms. Shiverick was in favor of the changes. Mr. Garrison agreed.

Motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to approve the plans as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

A second motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Ms. Shiverick that implementation of the proposed special exception with site plan review and

**variance will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject property.
Motion carried unanimously.**

B-071-2018 New Construction

Address: 624 Island Dr.

Applicant: Five Girls Rule, LLC

Professional: Harold Smith/Smith and Moore Architects, Inc.

Project Description: Construction of a new two-story residence with pool. Final landscape and hardscape.

A motion carried at the July meeting to approve the project as presented with the caveat that the architect return to the August meeting with an alternate design of the front gate.

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

Angie Janesheski, Smith and Moore Architects, Inc., presented the modified gate design for the new residence.

Mr. Garrison thought the design was excessively dissimilar for the area and stated he could not support the project.

Mr. Ives thought the previously proposed wood gate was a softer design. He thought the tile design was too busy.

Mr. Vila asked the professional if the tile was being sourced from Morocco. Ms. Janesheski stated that the tile had not been sourced to date.

Ms. Janesheski explained the tile design. Mr. Ives thought a softer transition would be better.

Ms. Catlin thought the front entrance was a bit lighter than the previous design.

Ms. Grace was in favor of the tile but thought the gates were too heavy. She suggested creating an arch in the stucco above the gate as well as lowering the sides of the front wall next to the gate.

Mr. Corey thought the gate design was too heavy and imposing. Mr. Corey suggested using the gate as a transition from the street to the house.

Ms. Shiverick thought the gate design had too much tile and suggested eliminating some of the tile. She was in favor of the tile choice.

Mr. Floorsheimer liked the transparent metal gate. He stated he agreed with Ms. Shiverick about the amount of tile proposed for the gate. He also stated he was not in favor tile. He questioned the proportions of the lanterns.

Mr. Corey asked about the height of gate above the street. Ms. Janesheski responded.

Mr. Vila stated the metal gate was good for transparency. He suggested eliminating some of the tile. Mr. Vila thought that the criticisms from the previous meeting had been addressed.

Mr. Small suggested removing the gate and some of the tile.

Motion made by Ms. Grace and seconded by Mr. Corey to defer the project for one month to the September 26, 2018 meeting to address the comments of the Commission.

Ms. Grace asked the professional to address the heaviness of the gate.

Motion carried 4-3 with Messrs. Ives, Small and Vila opposed.

B-073-2018 Demolition/New Construction

Address: 1556 N. Ocean Blvd.

Applicant: Pearls of the Palm Beaches, LLC

Professional: Pat Segraves/SKA Architect + Planner

Project Description: Demolition and new construction of two-story island style home to be approximately 4,700 square feet. Final landscape and hardscape to be included.

A motion carried at the July meeting to approve the demolition as requested. A second motion carried to approve the architectural portion of the project as presented with the landscaping portion to return to the August meeting for a restudy of the curb cut on N. Ocean Blvd.

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

Don Skowron presented the proposed modifications for the landscape and hardscape plans.

Motion made by Ms. Grace and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve the project as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

B-082-2018 Demolition/New Construction

***ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE TO SITE PLAN REVIEW WITH VARIANCE(S)* - Done 7/25/18**

Address: 456 S. Ocean Blvd.

Applicant: 456 S. Ocean LLC

Professional: Roger Janssen/Dailey Janssen Architects

Project Description: Demolition of existing restaurant with construction of Townhomes, landscape, hardscape and pools.

A motion carried at the July meeting to approve the demolition as requested. A second motion carried that implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject property. A third motion carried to defer the project to the August meeting for a restudy of the project based on the comments from the Commission.

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

Mr. Janssen presented the proposed modifications for the architectural plans. He presented material samples to the Commission.

Mr. Vila asked about the proposed roof material. Mr. Janssen responded.

Mr. Janssen presented alternate renderings on the overhead projector.

Ms. Grace thought the new design was an improvement from the previous design. She thought the windows were better in the inspirational photographs and thought more variation in the fenestration would be better.

Ms. Catlin was in favor of the transitions from unit to unit. She was not in favor of the chimney on the end of the unit.

Mr. Corey appreciated most of the details. He provided comments on each of the units with unit 1 being the most northern unit.

Unit 1 – least successful, too much glazing, possibly make center bay the feature of the unit, taper glazing on the sides with more masonry.

Unit 2 – works well mirrors center line, arched doors have too much glazing.

Unit 3 – most successful, good hierarchy but suggested adding muntins on two lower arched windows.

Unit 4 – was in favor of the corner chimney, recommended jog in wall with a pyramid hip roof on corner.

Ms. Shiverick was in favor of the design style and materials. She agreed with Mr. Corey about the addition of masonry around the windows on unit one and would like to see a rendering of the corner on unit 4. She asked if the gates would each have their own color. Mr. Janssen stated confirmed the gates would each be a different color. Ms. Shiverick suggested using a white or cypress for all of the gates and garage doors.

Mr. Garrison agreed with Ms. Shiverick about using a washed cypress for the gates. He stated he agreed with Mr. Corey on unit 1 on making the center a feature in the unit. Mr. Garrison suggested changing the windows over two arched windows in unit 3.

Mr. Ives thought townhouses were not a great opportunity for negative and positive spaces. He thought the design was in a good place. He still felt like the design was a missed opportunity for a different style.

Mr. Small stated he was pleased with changes. He expressed concerns with unit 1 and asked that the professional consider Messrs. Corey and Garrison's suggestions.

Mr. Corey asked for 3-D renderings in the next presentation.

Mr. Vila agreed with the suggestions for unit one. He wondered if it was possible to vary roof heights. His other suggestions included:

Unit 2 - scale down the balcony

Unit 3 - scale of decorative balcony needs to be reduced

Unit 4 - the chimney is too big, questioned the shed roof over the arched doors.

Mr. Vila stated that he was in favor of the material choices.

Motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Mr. Small to defer the project for one month to the September 26, 2018 meeting based on the comments from the Commissioners relating to unit 1, 3, the corner of unit 4 and the color for the gates and garage doors. Motion carried unanimously.

Chuck Yannette, Parker Yannette Design Group, presented the proposed landscape and hardscape plans for the project.

Mr. Corey asked about the landscaping proposed for the buffer on the Gulfstream side of the property. Mr. Yannette responded. Mr. Corey expressed concern that there were not any shade trees for a one-acre property.

Ms. Grace suggested adding some variation to the front of the wall in the front of the property.

Mr. Garrison asked about the proposed driveway design. Mr. Yannette responded. Mr. Garrison suggested setting the pavers in sand rather than using mortar. Mr. Garrison also suggested asking for a larger variance to provide a few feet to plant some permanent separation for the new residence on Gulfstream Road.

Mr. Vila thought that since this is a premium location, he thought different, mature specimen trees would be nice.

B-083-2018 New Construction

****This project has to be approved in its entirety before it can be heard at by the Town Council to address the Site Plan Review application****

Address: 210 Miraflores Dr.

Applicant: 210 Miraflores Drive, LLC

Professional: Pat Segraves/SKA Architect + Planner

Project Description: New construction of two-story island style home to be approximately 4,400 square feet. Final landscape and hardscape to be included.

SITE PLAN REVIEW INFORMATION: Special Exception and Site Plan Review to allow the construction of a 4,381 square foot, two-story, single family house on a non-conforming lot, comprised of a portion of a platted lot, which is 90 feet in width in lieu of the 100 foot depth required in the R-B Zoning District.

A motion carried at the July meeting to defer the project for one month to the August meeting for a complete restudy.

Please note: This item was deferred to the September 26, 2018 meeting with the Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

Motion made by Mr. Small and seconded by Mr. Ives to hear the project B-090-2018, 101 Gulfstream Rd. at this time in the meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Lindgren stated that the Town's architect had arrived and requested to allow the project at 340 Seaview Avenue be heard before the project at 101 Gulfstream Road.

Motion amended by Mr. Small and seconded by Mr. Ives to hear the project A-029-2018, 340 Seaview Ave. and then the project B-090-2018, 101 Gulfstream Rd. at this time in the meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

C. MAJOR PROJECTS – NEW BUSINESS

A-029-2018 Modifications

Address: 340 Seaview Ave.

Applicant: Town of Palm Beach

Professional: Stephen Boruff Architects + Planners, Inc.

Project Description: Request to modify previously approved application including: stucco in lieu of cast stone at Main Building and Tennis Pavilion, hardscape material revision.

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

Mr. Castro explained that the project was more expensive than what had been budgeted and that the Town Council removed certain elements to meet budget constraints. Mr. Castro stated that they were hoping to bring some of the eliminated items back in the second phase of the project, should an additional donor step forward.

Mr. Garrison asked what decisions could be made by the Commission. Mr. Castro responded and explained the recommendations needed from the Commission.

Ms. Grace asked about the items being removed from the project. Mr. Castro stated that the Council had removed some of the items due to budget constraints but would like the flexibility to keep the items approved should someone make a donation.

A discussion ensued about the items being removed from the project. Mr. Lindgren stated that the items removed would need a staff approval to be built, should the Town receive the money to fund the items. Therefore, he thought that the Commission should offer their opinion on the items in question.

A discussion ensued about the items being removed from the project.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the budget shortfall. Mr. Freijomel stated that the removal of the three accessory structures would save \$326,000 and the cast stone changes would save \$347,000. The total savings would be \$673,000.

Nelo Freijomel, Stephen Boruff Architects + Planners, Inc., presented the architectural modifications to the previously approved plans. He showed the Commission the three accessory structures to be eliminated as well as the locations where the cast stone would be eliminated. Mr. Freijomel presented material samples to the Commission.

Ms. Grace stated she thought the cast stone was important for the quality and the look of the design. She was never in favor of the entry arch therefore she was in favor of its permanent elimination. She thought the playground pavilion was unnecessary as well.

Mr. Garrison stated he was opposed to removing cast stone. He stated he could not support removing the cast stone from the building, which was only 1% of the total cost of the project.

Mr. Ives agreed with Mr. Garrison's opinion of the cast stone. Mr. Ives thought the Town should be meeting the highest standard in design rather than the lowest standard. Mr. Ives stated he was disappointed that the Town could not find the money for a building that could potentially be standing for many decades.

Mr. Small agreed with Messrs. Ives and Garrison. Mr. Small expressed disappointment that the Town charged the Commission to uphold the beauty and charm of Palm Beach while they were not meeting these standards. He stated that he was opposed to removing the cast stone and hoped that the other items proposed for removal would be returned.

Ms. Catlin stated that the cast stone was a finish that should not be sacrificed. She stated she agreed with Ms. Grace and could accept the removal of the shade structures.

Mr. Corey thought the cast stone extremely important. He also was in favor of the entry gate and thought it should remain. He stated he would accept moving the shade structures for the playground into the second phase of the project.

Ms. Grace recommended eliminating the gymnasium or moving it to a second phase in order to obtain a higher quality product.

Mr. Vila agreed with Mr. Small's comments and opinions on Town buildings. He believed that eliminating the features was a negative action and he recommended opposing the proposal.

Motion by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to oppose the removal of cast stone on all building structures, that it was acceptable to modify the hardscape and that the other items proposed for removal would still carry an approval with the hope that they are returned to the project if the money was donated.

Mr. Vila called for public comment. There were no comments heard at this time.

Motion carried unanimously.

Please note: A lunch break was taken at 12:23 p.m. The meeting resumed at 1:30 p.m. Mr. Floersheimer returned at 1:35 p.m.

B-090-2018 New Construction

Address: 101 Gulfstream Rd.

Applicant: 456 S. Ocean, LLC

Professional: Roger Janssen/Dailey Janssen Architects

Project Description: Construction of a new two-story residence, landscape, hardscape, pool and spa.

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

Mr. Janssen presented the proposed architectural plans for the new residence. He presented an alternate entry design on the overhead projector.

Ms. Catlin asked about a proposed fenestration change on the second floor, east elevation. Mr. Janssen responded. She was in favor of the proposed stone on the front entrance.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the materials proposed for the new residence. Mr. Janssen presented material samples to the Commission. She was in favor of the proposed stone on the front entrance.

Mr. Ives was in favor of the fenestration changes suggested by other Commission members. He stated he preferred the entrance in the original design as opposed to the alternate design with stone.

Ms. Grace agreed with Mr. Ives and preferred the simpler front entrance without the stone. She recommended extending the front entrance away from the home. She asked about the proposed ceiling heights. Mr. Janssen responded. Ms. Grace requested to reduce the ceiling and roof heights. Mr. Janssen responded.

Mr. Small was in favor of the proposed stone around the entrance.

Mr. Corey thought the proposed height was appropriate for the home. He was in favor of the proposed stone for the front door. Mr. Corey inquired about a thermal window on the east elevation. Mr. Janssen responded and stated the window was to allow light into the basement.

Mr. Vila inquired why the thermal window was proposed for grade level. Mr. Janssen responded and stated the window was to allow light into the basement. Mr. Vila was in favor of the east façade and of using the stone around the front entrance. Mr. Vila suggested restudying the broken pediment around the front entrance as well as the arched door. Mr. Vila asked about the colors in the roof blend.

Mr. Garrison was in favor of the blended roof colors. He was in favor of the design but thought the front door could be restudied. He was in favor of using the stone for the front door.

Chuck Yannette, Parker Yannette Design Group, presented the proposed landscape and hardscape plans for the new residence.

Ms. Grace expressed concern for the proposed Bougainvillea design on the front façade.

Mr. Corey suggested adding more variety in the large plant species proposed for the landscape. He also suggested adding shade trees to the landscape.

Mr. Vila agreed with Mr. Corey and thought shade trees should be included in the proposal. He expressed concern about using artificial turf as well as the landscaping proposed for the eastern border. He also suggested changing the landscape to a more informal design.

Motion made by Mr. Garrison second by Mr. Ives to approve the architectural plans as presented with the caveat to include the pilasters at the front door, a restudy of the front door and to include the window changes discussed while deferring the landscape and hardscape design for restudy, including the elimination of artificial turf. Motion carried unanimously.

B-084-2018 New Construction

Address: 119 Reef Rd

Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. Monty Falb

Professional: Pat Segraves/SKA Architect + Planner

Project Description: New construction of a two-story island style home to be approximately 4,500 square feet. Final landscape and hardscape to be included.

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

Mr. Segraves introduced Daniel Clavijo to present the project. Mr. Clavijo presented the proposed architectural modifications for the project.

Ms. Grace questioned whether the design fit on the street and thought the home needed some identity and flair.

Mr. Corey thought the home was not well suited for the street. He thought the house was too tall and aggressive. He thought the roof pitch was too steep, had fenestration issues and questioned the dormer over the garage as well as the columns on the pergola. He stated the presentation was missing a details page.

Mr. Ives agreed with Mr. Corey's assessment of the design. He questioned the pilasters, the dormer windows and the front entrance design. He recommended working on execution of overall house.

Ms. Shiverick agreed with her fellow Commissioners' assessments. She thought the roof pitch was too steep and the design lacked charm. She asked about the proposed shutter design. Mr. Clavijo presented a photo of the proposed shutters on a different home on the overhead projector. Ms. Shiverick asked about proposed color for the shutter. Mr. Clavijo showed the Commission a color sample.

Mr. Segraves stated that the proposed home is almost at grade and added he believed the ceiling heights were reasonable.

Mr. Garrison stated that the front door and front elevation needed to be restudied as it lacked charm and character.

Mr. Small stated that the current streetscape was evolving and thought the proposed home could use more charm.

Ms. Grace recommended designing something less formal with more character and quirkiness.

Mr. Corey stated that the fenestration was incorrectly proportioned in the inspirational photograph.

Ms. Catlin stated that the home in the inspirational photograph had quirkiness.

Mr. Vila suggested to lower the main roof and stated he believed that the design lacked charm.

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Small to defer the project for one month to the September 26, 2018 for a restudy. Motion carried unanimously.

B-086-2018 New Construction

Address: 95 Middle Rd.

Applicant: Adrian Tauro

Professional: Jose Luis Gonzalez-Perotti/Portuondo Perotti Architects

Project Description: New construction of a two-story residence, approximately 5,300 square feet and related landscape, hardscape and pool.

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

Rafael Portuondo, Portuondo Perotti Architects, presented the proposed plans for the new residence.

Ms. Grace asked about the amount of space between the two wings. Mr. Portuondo responded. Ms. Grace asked about the windows at the end of the two wings. Mr. Portuondo responded. Ms. Grace suggested using the arched window as in the inspiration photos. Mr. Portuondo responded.

Ms. Shiverick thought the house fit in well on the street. She clarified the size of the home. Mr. Portuondo responded. Ms. Shiverick asked about the garden room. Mr. Portuondo explained the design. Ms. Shiverick asked if the shutters proposed would be operable. Mr. Portuondo confirmed they would be operable. Ms. Shiverick asked about the large metal structure. Mr. Portuondo responded and further explained the design.

Mr. Corey was in favor of the home design. He thought 3-D perspectives would be helpful in evaluating the design. He asked about the window material. Mr. Portuondo stated the windows would be painted wood. Mr. Corey suggested adding a fireplace in the family room. Mr. Corey was not in favor of the slate roof proposed.

Mr. Ives thought the house fit in nicely in the area. He thought the design was elegant and graceful.

Ms. Catlin agreed with Mr. Ives and thought the home was beautiful and proportional.

Mr. Garrison agreed with Ms. Catlin and thought the house was well designed and fit nicely on the lot.

Mr. Small thought the design exuded charm and beauty.

Mr. Vila asked about the thickness of the proposed walls. Mr. Portuondo responded.

Keith Williams, Nievera Williams Design, presented the proposed landscape and hardscape plans for the new residence.

Mr. Vila asked about the vine species proposed. Mr. Williams responded.

Ms. Grace asked about the plant list. Mr. Williams stated they did not submit a plant list.

Mr. Floersheimer asked about the floor proposed for the garden room. Mr. Williams responded.

Mr. Grace asked about the size of the proposed trees for the garden room. Mr. Williams responded.

Ms. Shiverick was in favor of the proposed jasmine vines and pleached trees in rear. Ms. Shiverick questioned the pleached trees proposed for the front entrance. Mr. Williams responded.

Mr. Vila asked about the sample for the hardscape. Mr. Williams showed the Commission material samples. Mr. Vila suggested adding a scent garden.

Motion made by Mr. Small and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve the project as presented with the caveat that the professional submit a plant list to the Town staff. Motion carried unanimously.

B-087-2018 Demolition/New Construction

Address: 255 Emerald Ln.

Applicant: Prescott & Forbes, LLC

Professional: Kevin Asbacher/Asbacher Architecture

Project Description: Demolition of existing two-story residence. Construct a new two-story Island Colonial residence and swimming pool with final landscape and hardscape.

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

Mr. Asbacher presented the proposed demolition of the existing residence.

Mr. Ives asked if the owner considered a renovation rather than a demolition. Mr. Asbacher stated the owner's intent with the project.

Motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Mr. Corey to approve the demolition plans as presented with the caveats to remove all exotic and invasive plant species and to sod and irrigate the property within 30 days. Motion carried 4-3 with Ms. Grace and Messrs. Small and Ives.

Mr. Asbacher presented the proposed plans for the new residence.

Mr. Ives asked about the proposed color of the home. Mr. Asbacher responded. Mr. Ives suggested that the home height was too tall and suggested lowering the roof.

Ms. Catlin thought the home design was standard and basic. She asked the architect to bring charm to the design since the home he was replacing was a charming home.

Mr. Corey agreed with Ms. Catlin and thought the house was standard and generic. Mr. Corey thought the house was too tall, too massive and lacked character.

Ms. Grace suggested that there was too much repetition in the windows.

Mr. Garrison thought the roof pitch was too tall and thought the house belonged in the north rather than in Palm Beach.

Mr. Ives suggested using David Adler for an inspiration.

Ms. Shiverick thought the design did fit in the streetscape and stated that the Commission had received four letters of support from the neighbors. She did agree that the roof was too steep.

Ms. Grace suggested that the home was too similar for the street.

Mr. Vila suggested that the project needed a restudy of the roof and a way to bring light into the home. Mr. Vila suggested the possibility of a U design for the home.

Keith Williams, Nievera Williams Design, presented the proposed landscape and hardscape plans for the home.

Mr. Vila asked about the proposed height of the Royal palms. Mr. Williams responded.

Ms. Grace suggested continuing the vines around the corners of the home rather than the proposed design.

Mr. Corey asked about the proposed hardscape materials. Mr. Williams responded and further explained the design.

Motion made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Small to defer the project for one month to the September 26, 2018 meeting for a restudy based upon the comments from the Commissioners. Motion carried unanimously.

B-091-2018 New Construction

****This project has to be approved in its entirety before it can be heard at by the Town Council to address the Site Plan Review application****

Address: 232 Cherry Ln.

Applicant: Cherry Lane LLC

Professional: LaBerge & Ménard Inc.

Project Description: New 4,600 sq. ft. two story house, landscaping and hardscape.

SITE PLAN REVIEW INFORMATION: A request for Site Plan Review to build a 4,620 square foot two-story home on an existing 10,000 square foot platted lot with a depth of 80.0' in lieu of 100' required.

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

Daniel Ménard, LaBerge & Ménard Inc., presented the proposed plans for the new residence.

Mr. Ives thought the dormers were too fancy for the street. He questioned the front door design.

Harriet Golding, 222 Cherry Lane, expressed her objections to the proposed home.

Robin Weeks, 210 Jamaica Lane, showed the Commission photos of a large, two-story home next to her home. Due to the sizeable home next to hers, she stated she was empathic to Ms. Golding.

Greg Kino, attorney for the owners on 6 Windsor Court, expressed objections to the proposed home.

Frank Lynch, attorney for the owner at 232 Cherry Lane, asked about the deed restriction for single story homes. Mr. Lindgren stated there is a deed restriction on West Indies.

Gene Pandula, architect and testifying on behalf of the owners at 6 Windsor Court, spoke about the character and homes on Cherry Lane.

Mr. Lynch advocated for the proposed home.

Ms. Grace appreciated the design but she indicated the style did not belong on the small street and that the design was too dissimilar.

Ms. Catlin questioned whether the design fit into the area. She thought the mansard roof made the home appear heavy and suggested a home with a lighter feel due to its location in the middle of the street.

Mr. Corey thought the house was well sited and was designed sensitively. He thought some of the details should be streamlined.

Ms. Shiverick agreed with Ms. Grace and thought the style was more befitting for a large estate. She agreed with Ms. Catlin that the mansard roof was too domineering. She questioned whether the home fit in the middle of the block and thought it looked too grandiose for the area.

Mr. Vila thought this home was too dissimilar and did not fit within the spirit of the street.

Motion made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Small to defer the project for one month to the September 26, 2018 meeting for restudy. Motion carried unanimously.

B-092-2018 Additions/Modifications

ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE TO SITE PLAN REVIEW WITH VARIANCE(S)

Address: 130 Sunrise Ave. PH7

Applicant: BFT 3 Palm Beach LLC

Professional: David Lawrence/David Lawrence Architecture Inc.

Project Description: Install five retractable awnings on the seventh floor of the southeast side of 130 Sunrise Ave. The awnings will be installed off of penthouse 7.

SITE PLAN REVIEW AND VARIANCE INFORMATION: 1. A site plan modification with variances to allow five (5) retractable awnings totaling 873 square feet over the terrace on the seventh floor of a seven-story condominium building. 2. A variance request to allow the awning at a height of 60.83 feet in lieu of the 23 1/2 foot maximum height allowed in the R-C Zoning District. 3. A variance request to allow the awnings on the existing seventh floor penthouse of a seven-story building in lieu of the two story building maximum allowed in the R-C Zoning District. 4. A variance to allow the awnings at an overall height of 62.67 feet in lieu of the 26 1/2 foot maximum allowed in the R-C Zoning District for a flat roof. 5. A front yard setback of 29.83 feet to Sunset Avenue in lieu of the 122.11 foot minimum required.

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

Mr. Lawrence presented the architectural plans for the proposed awnings.

Mr. Ives asked for confirmation that the Commission had previously approved similar awnings. Mr. Lawrence confirmed that they had.

Motion made by Mr. Garrison to approve the project as presented.

Mr. Small stated he could not see any awnings on any of the units when he visited the property. Mr. Lawrence responded and showed the Commission some of the units that currently had awnings installed.

Mr. Corey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

A second motion made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Garrison that implementation of the proposed site plan review and variances will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject property. Motion carried unanimously.

B-093-2018 Demolition/New Construction

ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EXCEPTION WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW AND VARIANCE(S)

Address: 977 S. Ocean Blvd.

Applicant: 195 Phesten Associates Palm Beach LLC/Contract Purchaser

Professional: Studio SR Architecture, Inc.

Project Description: Demolition of existing single story residence; proposed new two story modern residence in white stucco, natural veneer with associated landscape and hardscape.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW AND VARIANCE INFORMATION: 1) Special Exception with Site Plan Review to allow the construction of a 9,685 square foot two-story, single family residence on a non-conforming lot that is 77 feet in depth in lieu of the 150 foot minimum required in the R-A Zoning District and 13,662 square feet in area in lieu of the 20,000 square foot minimum area required in the R-A Zoning District. 2) A request for a variance to allow the proposed swimming pool to have a 5-foot rear yard setback in lieu of the 10-foot minimum required and a 30-foot front yard setback in lieu of the 35-foot minimum required in the R-A Zoning District. 3) A request for a variance to allow a building height plane setback to be 35 feet in lieu of the 50-foot minimum setback required.

Please note: This item was deferred to the September 26, 2018 meeting with the Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

B-094-2018 Demolition/New Construction

****This project has to be approved in its entirety before it can be heard at by the Town Council to address the Site Plan Review application****

Address: 113 E. Inlet Dr.

Applicant: 113 E. Inlet, LLC

Professional: Roger Janssen/Dailey Janssen Architects

Project Description: Demolition of existing residence, hardscape, landscape and pool. Construction of a new two-story residence, landscape, hardscape and pool.

SITE PLAN REVIEW INFORMATION: Site Plan Review to allow the construction of a 3,589 square foot, two-story, single-family house on a non-conforming lot which is 96 feet in width in lieu of the 100-foot depth required in the R-B Zoning District.

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

Mr. Janssen presented the proposed demolition of the existing residence.

Keith Williams, Nievera Williams Design, presented the proposed demolition plans for the landscape and hardscape.

Motion made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Corey to approve the demolition plans as presented with the caveats to remove all exotic and invasive plant species and to sod and irrigate the property within 30 days. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Janssen presented the proposed architectural plans for the new residence.

Mr. Vila asked if there were supports for the front entrance. Mr. Janssen explained the front entrance design.

Mr. Williams presented the proposed landscape and hardscape plan for the new residence.

Mr. Ives was in favor of the project.

Mr. Corey was in favor of the siting of the home. Mr. Corey questioned the height of the roof for the one story portion of the home. Mr. Janssen responded. Mr. Corey suggested possibly restudying the one story roof and front entrance design. He was in favor of the proposed landscape plan.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the proposed colors. Mr. Janssen showed the Commission a paint sample.

Ms. Catlin was in favor of the project and thought the proposed home had charm. She suggested breaking the shutters across the front elevation. Mr. Janssen responded.

Mr. Vila asked about the proposed roof material. Mr. Janssen responded. Mr. Vila clarified the roof design on the front entrance.

Motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve the project as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Please note: Ms. Grace left at 4:10 p.m. Ms. Catlin voted in the absence of Ms. Grace.

B-095-2018 Additions/Modifications

ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE VARIANCE(S)

Address: 207 Pendleton Ave.

Applicant: Betsy Sorrel/Contract Purchaser

Professional: MP Design & Architecture

Project Description: Demolition of interior. New windows in existing openings. Demolition of existing flat roof area to be replaced with new hip roof section. Erection of a new loggia and the extension of the existing one story kitchen.

VARIANCE INFORMATION: The Applicant is requesting the following variances to construct a 112 square foot addition to the kitchen and replace an existing awning with a 354 square foot loggia on the rear of the residence with an open balcony above: 1) a west side yard setback of 12.83 feet in lieu of the 15 foot minimum required in the R-B Zoning District for the loggia addition with open balcony above; 2) a cubic content ratio ("CCR") of 5.08 in lieu of the 4.97 existing and the 4.12 maximum allowed in the R-B Zoning District for the kitchen addition; and 3) a lot coverage of 37.25 % in lieu of the 38.5 % existing and the 30% maximum allowed in the R-B Zoning District for the kitchen addition.

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

Michael Perry, MP Design & Architecture, explained the zoning requests and presented the architectural modifications to the existing residence.

Mr. Vila asked about the entrance canopy support. Mr. Perry responded.

Mr. Ives complimented the architect on the restoration. Ms. Catlin agreed.

Matt Jackman, Nievera Williams Design, presented the landscape and hardscape modifications for the existing residence.

Mr. Ives asked about the proposed Pigeon Plums for the front façade and stated he thought the trees hid the home from the street. Mr. Jackman responded and offered to eliminate two trees. Mr. Vila suggested using Hibiscus rather than the Pigeon Plums for the front façade.

Mr. Lindgren stated that the one rendering showed two Calophyllum trees against the home while another rendering showed four.

Mr. Corey was in favor of the architectural plans. He was not in favor of the proposed Royal palms as well as the Pigeon Plums. He offered some suggestions for the front façade. Mr. Jackman responded.

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Ives that implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject property. Motion carried unanimously.

A second motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve the architectural plans as presented and to defer the landscape plans for one month to the September 26, 2018 meeting for restudy based on the comments from the Commission. Motion carried unanimously.

D. MINOR PROJECTS – OLD BUSINESS
A-019-2018 Modifications

Address: 208 Sandpiper Dr.
Applicant: 208 Sandpiper LLC
Professional: Andres Paradelo/Paradelo Burgess Design Studio, LLC
Project Description: Revisions to the previously approved hardscape/landscape plans, addition of decorative driveway columns, a decorative gate in the front yard/along Sandpiper Drive and a generator wall enclosure/gates.

A motion carried at the June meeting to defer the project to the July 25, 2018 meeting to allow the architect to bring more information to the Commission. A motion carried at the July meeting to defer the project to the August 22, 2018 meeting at the request of the architect.

Please note: This item was deferred to the September 26, 2018 meeting with the Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

E. MINOR PROJECTS – NEW BUSINESS

A-027-2018 Modifications

Address: 720 N. County Rd.
Applicant: Stephanie LaNasa
Professional: Nievera Williams Design
Project Description: Demolition and replacement of front site wall; front drive revision; associated landscape refresh/revisions.

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

Keith Williams, Nievera Williams Design, presented the proposed landscape and hardscape modifications for the site.

Mr. Floersheimer asked if there would be any sight line issues with the relocation of the wall. Mr. Williams responded.

Mr. Corey thought the project was acceptable but suggested more landscaping on the corner to create more privacy.

Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve the project as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

A-030-2018 Modifications

Address: 304 Indian Rd.
Applicant: Anna and Sean Miller
Professional: Thomas M. Kirchhoff, AIA/Kirchhoff & Associates Architects
Project Description: Add new site wall in front yard and relocate existing plantings to accommodate new wall. Relocate existing generator.

Please note: This item was deferred to the September 26, 2018 meeting with the Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

A-032-2018 Additions/Modifications

Address: 202 Onondaga Ave.

Applicant: 202 Onondaga LLC

Professional: Richard Sammons/Fairfax, Sammons & Partners, LLC.

Project Description: A new open pergola to be located in the rear yard of the property.

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

Matt Jackman, Nievera Williams Design, presented the plans for the proposed pergola.

Mr. Vila asked if the pergola would be seen from the street. Mr. Jackman showed the Commission the landscape renderings and indicated the portion that may be seen from the street.

Motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve the project as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

A-033-2018 Landscape/Hardscape

Address: 110 Indian Rd.

Applicant: 110 Indian Road, LLC

Professional: Harold Smith/Smith and Moore Architects, Inc.

Project Description: Addition of curb cut along North Ocean Boulevard.

Associated landscape/hardscape changes.

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

Mr. Smith presented the proposed plans for a second curb cut on North Ocean Boulevard. Mr. Smith stated he did seek approval from the Public Works Department and the Zoning Department.

Mr. Ives was not in favor of the additional curb cut.

Mr. Small explained the history of the project and the reasons he opposed the project.

Ms. Shiverick suggested that the owner use the existing backup space to assist his entry onto North Ocean Blvd.

Mr. Garrison made a suggestion to eliminate the existing curb cut and replace it with the proposed curb cut.

Michael Perry, professional for the original project, provided an explanation for the existing driveway design.

Ms. Catlin was not in favor of the additional curb cut.

Mr. Ives stated he was not in favor of allowing the property to have four curb cuts.

**Motion made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Small to deny the project A-033-2018 based upon the failure to comply with the criteria in Section 18-205 of the Code, particularly paragraphs a(3), a(4), a(6), a(6(c)) and a(6(h)).
Motion carried 6-1 with Mr. Corey opposed.**

Please note: Mr. Vila noted that Ms. Catlin voted in the absence of Ms. Grace.

A-034-2018 Modifications

Address: 1050 N. Ocean Blvd.

Applicant: Edmund H. Beebe

Professional: Roger Janssen/Dailey Janssen Architects

Project Description: Modifications to site walls, doors and windows to previously approved residence that is currently under construction.

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

Mr. Janssen presented the architectural modifications to the previously approved plans.

Mr. Garrison was in favor of the project. He asked for clarification on the proposed garage door design and material. Mr. Janssen responded.

Motion made by Mr. Garrison to approve the project as presented.

Mr. Corey was in favor of the project with the exception of the garage doors.

Mr. Ives was in favor of the project but expressed concerns about the future changes.

Mr. Small seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

A-035-2018 Modifications

Address: 236 Fairview Rd.

Applicant: Todd & Frances Peter

Professional: NB Construction Group LLC

Project Description: Apply smooth sand float stucco finish over the existing painted brick veneer. Paint new stucco Benjamin Moore "Simply White."

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

Keith Spina, Glidden Spina, presented the proposed modification for the finish on the home.

Motion made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Small to approve the project as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

A-036-2018 Modifications

Address: 201 Everglade Ave., Apt 105

Applicant: Suzanne Stoll

Professional: None

Project Description: Short divider 4'8"h x 6'8"w between units 105 and 106 back patios extending from exterior wall to hedge in back of the building behind tall hedge facing back parking lot. White PVC not visible from the street.

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

Ms. Stoll presented the request for a white PVC divider in the rear of the property.

Mr. Small confirmed with the owner that she had approval from the condominium board for the PVC fence. Ms. Stoll confirmed that she did have approval.

Ms. Shiverick asked the owner why she chose to use a PVC material opposed to another material. Ms. Stoll responded.

Mr. Lindgren explained to the Commission how he discovered the fence.

Ms. Catlin expressed concern that the PVC material used was too shiny and white. Ms. Stoll responded.

Motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Mr. Small to approve the project as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Small stated that as a member of the prevailing side, he was prepared to make a motion for reconsideration for the project at 905 N. Ocean Blvd.

Frank Lynch, attorney for the owner at 905 N. Ocean Blvd., stated the owner is prepared to submit plans with much lower lot coverage than previously presented.

Greg Kino, attorney for Mr. and Mrs. Goodman, stated his clients had no objections to the new plans.

Mr. Ives clarified the resubmittal process.

Motion made by Mr. Small and seconded by Mr. Corey to reconsider the project at 905 N. Ocean Blvd. at the September 26, 2018 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Lindgren stated that the project would need to be re-noticed for the September 26, 2018 meeting.

Michael Perry, professional for the project at B-008-2018, 232 Seabreeze Ave., asked if he could present new color samples for the new residence at 232 Seabreeze Avenue.

Ms. Shiverick provided her concerns for the newly proposed colors.

Motion made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to reconsider the project at this point in the meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

A short discussion ensued about the proposed colors, the motion to reconsider and the deferral given to the project earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Floersheimer expressed concern about the location of the banding around the home and thought that other Commissioners were not in favor of the design.

Motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to approve the architectural plans as submitted for B-008-2018, 232 Seabreeze Ave. with the caveat that the colors for the home will be reconsidered at the September 26, 2018 meeting. Motion carried 5-2 with Messrs. Corey and Ives opposed.


X. ADDITION COMMUNICATION FROM CITIZENS (3 MINUTE LIMIT PLEASE)
There were no comments heard at this time.

XI. COMMENTS OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION AND DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT
There were no comments heard at this time.

XII. ADJOURNMENT
Motion made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Corey to adjourn the meeting at 5:36 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 26, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 S County Rd.

Respectfully Submitted,


Robert J. Vila, Chairman
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION
kmc

CERTIFICATION OF ACTION BY THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION

The Architectural Review Commission has denied the following request as it is not in accordance with the criteria set forth in Article III. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND PROCEDURE, Section 18-205 Criteria.

Application Number and Title: A-033- 2018 110 Indian Rd

Address: 110 Indian Rd

Applicant: 110 Indian Road, LLC

Architect: Harold Smith

Project Description: Addition of curb cut along North Ocean Blvd. Associated landscape / hardscape changes.

The above request has been denied by the Architectural Review Commission for the following reasons:

- ☐ (1) The plan for the proposed building or structure is not in conformity with good taste and design and in general does not contribute to the image of the town as a place of beauty, spaciousness, balance, taste, fitness, charm and high quality.
- ☐ (2) The plan for the proposed building or structure does not indicate the manner in which the structures are reasonably protected against external and internal noise, vibrations, and other factors that may tend to make the environment more desirable.
- ☒ (3) The proposed building or structure is, in its exterior design and appearance, of inferior quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.
- ☒ (4) The proposed building or structure is not in harmony with the proposed developments on land in the general area, with the comprehensive plan for the town, and with any precise plans adopted pursuant to the Comprehensive Plan.
- ☐ (5) The proposed building or structure is excessively similar to any other structure existing or for which a permit has been issued or to any other structure included in the same permit application within 200 feet of the proposed site in respect to one or more of the following

features of exterior design and appearance:

- a. Apparently visibly identical front or side elevations;
- b. Substantially identical size and arrangement of either doors, windows, porticos or other openings or breaks in the elevation facing the street, including reverse arrangement; or
- c. Other significant identical features of design such as, but not limited to, material, roof line and height of other design elements.

✓ (6)

The proposed building or structure is excessively dissimilar in relation to any other structure existing or for which a permit has been issued or to any other structure included in the same permit application within 200 feet of the proposed site in respect to one or more of the following features:

- a. Height of building or height of roof.
- b. Other significant design features including, but not limited to, materials or quality of architectural design.
- ☒ c. Architectural compatibility.
- d. Arrangement of the components of the structure.
- e. Appearance of mass from the street or from any perspective visible to the public or adjoining property owners.
- f. Diversity of design that is complimentary with size and massing of adjacent properties.
- g. Design features that will avoid the appearance of mass through improper proportions.
- ☒ h. Design elements that protect the privacy of neighboring property.

— (7)

The proposed building or structure is not appropriate in relation to the established character of other structures in the immediate area or neighboring areas in respect to significant design features such as material or quality or architectural design as viewed from any

public or private way (except alleys).

- ___ (8) The proposed development is not in conformity with the standards of this Code and other applicable ordinances insofar as the location and appearance of the buildings and structures are involved.
- ___ (9) The project's location and design does not adequately protect unique site characteristics such as those related to scenic views, rock outcroppings, natural vistas, waterways, and similar features.

The applicant is advised that appeals must be filed with the Town Clerk within 10 days in accordance with Article III. Section 18-177 of the Town Code of Ordinances.

CERTIFICATION:

The above denial was issued by the Architectural Review Commission at their meeting on August 22, 2018

TOWN OF PALM BEACH


Chairman, Architectural Commission