



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2024

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 once it has concluded may access the audio of that item via the Town's website at www.townofpalmbeach.com.

I. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

II. **ROLL CALL**

Jeffrey W. Smith, Chairman	PRESENT
Richard F. Sammons, Vice Chairman	ABSENT (Unexcused)
Betsy Shiverick, Member	ABSENT (Unexcused)
Kenn Karakul, Member	PRESENT
Elizabeth Connaughton, Member	PRESENT (Arrived at 9:22 a.m.)
Katherine "KT" Catlin	PRESENT
Claudia Visconti, Member	PRESENT
Dan Floersheimer, Alternate Member	PRESENT
David Phoenix, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Maisie Grace, Alternate Member	PRESENT (Left at 1:00 p.m.)

Staff Members present were:

Friederike Mittner, Design and Preservation Manager
Sarah Pardue, Design & Preservation Planner
Bradley Falco, Design & Preservation Planner
Kelly Churney, Acting Town Clerk
Assistant Town Attorney Lainey Fransisco

III. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair Smith led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. Minutes of the Architectural Review Commission Meeting of November 22, 2024

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Ms. Catlin to approve the minutes of the November 22, 2024, meeting as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

V. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Ms. Pardue requested the following projects be moved to the beginning of the agenda: ARC-24-0103 (ZON-24-0061) 1247 S Ocean Blvd., ARC-24-0070 2308 Ibis Isle Rd., and ARC-24-0027 203 S Lake Trail. Additionally, she mentioned that ARC-24-0104, 581 E. Woods Road requested a deferral for the January 29, 2025, meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Mr. Floersheimer to approve the amended agenda. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

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

Ms. Churney administered the oath and continued to do so throughout the meeting, as necessary.

VII. **COMMENTS FROM THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Mr. Floersheimer stated that residents on Miraflores complained about the landscape trucks on their street. These trucks were servicing large estates that can hold the parking on-site. He asked the staff to investigate the issue. Ms. Pardue stated that the residents should call Code Enforcement, who can address the issue. Assistant Director of Planning, Zoning, and Building James Murphy discussed the ongoing traffic discussions at the Town Council meetings, which would discuss all traffic-related issues. He also stated that the Town Manager's office established an email for residents to send their traffic concerns.

VIII. **COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS REGARDING NON-AGENDA ITEMS (3 MINUTE LIMIT PLEASE)**

No comments were heard at this time.

IX. **PROJECT REVIEW**

As noted in the agenda's approval, the following projects were moved to this location on the agenda.

1. **ARC-24-0103 (ZON-24-0061) 1247 S OCEAN BLVD (COMBO)** The applicant, Providencia Partners LLC (Maura Ziska, Authorized Signatory), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications to a previously approved new residential estate which includes the incorporation of a pickleball court and modifications to front yard site walls which will require a variance to exceed maximum wall height permitted; with landscape and hardscape adjustments related to the scope of work. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Mses. Visconti and Grace disclosed ex-parte communications.

Daniel Kahan of Smith and Moore Architects presented the plans for the proposed modifications.

Ms. Catlin thought the estate was beautiful. However, she felt the home was beginning to resemble a boutique executive retreat, and that was a line that should not be crossed.

Ms. Grace did not believe the new courts would present a challenge.

Mr. Karakul thought the changes were well planned and there was enough land to accommodate the changes.

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

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

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

2. **ARC-24-0070 2308 IBIS ISLE RD.** The applicants, Michael Berman & Victoria Hagan, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new, two-story, single-family residence and detached accessory structure with final hardscape, landscape, and swimming pool.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Peter Papadopoulos of Smith and Moore Architects presented the architectural plans, and Mario Nievera of Nievera Williams Design presented the site's landscape and hardscape plans.

Mr. Floersheimer thought the plans were nice. He expressed concern for the owner to the north and wondered if the new construction would block their view. Mr. Papadopoulos responded. Mr. Floersheimer was concerned about the amount of glass on the western elevation. Mr. Papadopoulos responded.

Mr. Phoenix liked the project and felt it would fit into the area. He supported the landscaping as well. He wondered if there was any decorative lighting on the gates. Mr. Papadopoulos responded.

Ms. Catlin thought the home was beautifully designed. She supported the glass and landscaping.

Ms. Visconti thought the project was well-designed. She supported the glass on the western side. She suggested a little more study for the pedestrian gates.

Ms. Grace thought this would be the most attractive house on the island. She complimented that the home was reduced in size from the existing home.

Mr. Karakul complimented the project.

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul to approve the project as presented.

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

The motion was seconded by Ms. Catlin. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

3. **ARC-24-0027 (ZON-24-0034) 203 S LAKE TRL (COMBO)** The applicants, Darlene & Gerald Jordan has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a new two-story single-family residence with a one-story pool house and Padel court, with final hardscape, landscape, and swimming pool improvements; with (2) special exceptions required as it pertains to the proposed Padel court and the location of a vehicular gate. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Randy Correll of RAMSA gave an architectural presentation, and Mario Nievera of Nievera Williams Design gave the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Ms. Connaughton thought the added details were an improvement; she thought they could be pushed further on the family room element. She asked about the front entry roof. Mr. Correll responded. Ms. Connaughton thought the entry element was very high and suggested a restudy of the pool house.

Ms. Grace appreciated the changes made to the project but thought more restudy was needed as it was too large and needed some reduction. Mr. Correll stated that the home was smaller than the existing home and thought the open space elements had improved. Ms. Grace recommended more single-story elements.

Attorney Maura Ziska reiterated her conversations with an adjacent neighbor, who had concerns.

Ms. Catlin thought the changes improved the design and the scale was better.

Mr. Karakul agreed with Ms. Catlin and thought the design had been refined. He thought the home would be a handsome addition to the area.

Mr. Phoenix thought the landscaping was superb. He supported the home but added that the pool house should feel like a folly.

Ms. Visconti thought the study of the changes was helpful. She also thought the pool house needed more whimsy. She liked the changes and thought many were improvements. She recommended that a warmer stone be used in construction.

Ms. Connaughton agreed with Ms. Visconti.

Mr. Floersheimer agreed with the other comments. He asked if there was a revised landscape plan to show the changes he discussed. Mr. Nievera showed the revised

plans.

Mr. Smith agreed with the other comments and thought the pool house was a missed opportunity. He provided suggestions for an alternate design and thought the scale was appropriate. He expressed a concern for the copper roof over the entry and recommended a white or flat roof.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Nicole Betts, 409 Seabreeze Avenue, did not believe the home would fit into the neighborhood. She objected to the scale and the pedestrian gate.

Leslie Wyrzes, 444 Seabreeze Avenue, asked about the generator building, to which Mr. Correll stated it would be removed. She thanked the professional for removing the additional curb cut. She asked about the pedestrian gate and wondered if it would open on her driveway. Mr. Nievera showed the gate entry.

Mr. Floersheimer wondered about garbage collection. Mr. Nievera responded.

Anne Pepper, 333 Seaspray Avenue, appreciated the changes to the Chinese garden but thought the building resembled a hotel in its design. She thought the guest house lacked appeal and should be reduced in height.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the size of the home compared to the existing one. Mr. Correll responded and discussed the size reduction.

Ms. Visconti wondered if the applicant would be willing to have a sign at the pedestrian gate directing any deliveries or services to the correct location.

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the project as presented with the following conditions: a sign will be added at the pedestrian gate that provides directions for deliveries or services and to restudy the stone on the home and the pool house, which will return to the meeting on January 29, 2025. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

Clerk's note: A short break was taken at 10:33 a.m. and resumed at 10:46 a.m.

B. MAJOR PROJECTS-OLD BUSINESS

1. **ARC-24-0032 (ZON-24-0028) 272 VIA MARILA (COMBO)** The applicant, Melissa Wight, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a new vehicular gate which requires one (1) variance to reduce the minimum driveway area in front of the vehicular gate. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval. *(Item has been remanded back to ARCOM for reconsideration by the Town Council on November 13, 2024)*

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Messrs. Karakul and Floersheimer disclosed ex-parte communications.

Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the plans for a proposed vehicular gate.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the height of the gate and understood the need. She supported the request.

Ms. Grace recommended a white gate as she felt it would fit better in the neighborhood.

Mr. Phoenix wondered if the property was fenced. Mr. Mizell responded. Mr. Phoenix thought that option four was the most attractive of the gates proposed.

Ms. Visconti supported the gate and agreed that sconces were needed. She favored the darker gate but thought a more decorative gate should be considered.

Ms. Catlin recommended embedding a fence around the property to help with security. She agreed that a deed restriction on the fence should be added to the motion.

Mr. Floersheimer wondered if the commission had to approve a gate. Town Attorney Lainey Francisco stated that she believes the intent of the Town Council was for a gate to be approved; however, the design of the gate was up to the Commission. Mr. Floersheimer recommended changing the entrance to the property so that the home was less visible. Mr. Mizell agreed to the suggestion on the fence and added that he studied moving the driveway entrance.

Mr. Phoenix recommended a louvered design with a more Palm Beach feel.

Mr. Karakul thought that narrowing the driveway helped the design. He was not in favor of adding sconces and added he supported the fourth design choice.

Ms. Grace thought a front and rear fence should be considered. She agreed that a deed restriction on the fence should be added to the motion. She thought an arched gate might fit into the neighborhood.

Ms. Catlin thought an arched gate would not be compatible with the home's architectural style.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Mr. Floersheimer to approve vehicular gate option four with the hedging around the gate to be closed, to suggest that the owner embed a fence around the property and to place a deed restriction on the gate so that it shall be removed if the home is sold. The motion carried 6-1, with Ms. Visconti dissenting.

A discussion ensued about whether a recommendation on the variances was needed from the Commission.

A motion was made by Mr. Floersheimer and seconded by Mr. Karakul that the implementation of the proposed variances will not cause a negative

architectural impact on the subject property. The motion carried 6-1, with Ms. Connaughton dissenting.

2. **ARC-24-0068 2291 IBIS ISLE RD.** The applicant, 2291 Ibis Isle Road East LLC (Environment Design Group), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for sitewide landscape and hardscape modification and the installation of a pergola and terrace. *(Item has been remanded back to ARCOM for reconsideration by the Town Council on November 13, 2024)*

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Mses. Grace disclosed ex-parte communications.

Attorney Maura Ziska provided the details of the request. Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the plans for a proposed vehicular gate.

Ms. Visconti supported the gate but asked if the width could be reduced.

Ms. Connaughton agreed with Ms. Visconti and thought the gate should be reduced in width and a stone should be added to the pillars.

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

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Floersheimer to approve the vehicular gate with the condition that the driveway opening at the vehicular gate be reduced to 12 feet and that the column cap material is limestone. The motion carried 6-1, with Ms. Connaughton dissenting.

3. **ARC-24-0071 224 VIA MARILA** The applicant, Adrian Tauro, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new, two-story single-family residence and attached accessory structure with final hardscape, landscape and swimming pool.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Messrs. Karakul and Floersheimer disclosed ex-parte communications.

Jason Cutajar of Jason Cutajar Architectural Design presented the architectural plans, and Keith Williams of Nievera Williams Design presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Ms. Connaughton liked the front façade and the site plan. She recommended possibly changing the style to a Mediterranean design. She questioned the roof plan on the south side over the living room. She recommended adding some large trees to the front lawn.

Ms. Grace questioned whether the details of the proposed home would fit into the neighborhood. She questioned the window proportions, the height of the home, and the long ridge line. She thought the proposed home was out of proportion to the surrounding homes.

Ms. Visconti wondered if the front of the home could be more interesting, similar to the courtyard. She questioned the railings for the balconies. She did not favor the garage sconces. She recommended a change to the fountain adjacent to the pool.

Mr. Phoenix felt the materials and the white color needed restudy. He did not favor the sconces and recommended adding color to the garage doors. He did not favor the glass sliding doors and recommended adding color to the fountain adjacent to the pool.

Ms. Catlin thought the changes had improved the design but needed more restudy. She thought the materials were boring and the design needed more interest. She favored the landscape design.

Mr. Karakul liked the home but provided some suggestions for the entryway.

Ms. Grace recommended studying the windows on the front elevation.

Ms. Connaughton questioned the second-floor design and thought it affected the mass of the roof.

Ms. Visconti agreed with Mr. Phoenix's comments on the glass sliders and recommended looking at cedar material. Mr. Floersheimer agreed.

Mr. Smith questioned the pitches of the roof, especially the one over the loggia.

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

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Visconti to defer the project to the meeting on February 26, 2025, for study in accordance with the comments from the Commissioners. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

4. **ARC-24-0074 117 DOLPHIN RD.** The applicant, Marla Wiegman Fusz 2021 Family Trust (Marla Fusz, Trustee), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new, two-story, single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape and swimming pool.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Roger Janssen of Dailey Janssen Architects presented the architectural plans.

Ms. Visconti favored the brick and the colored door. She did not favor the Bahama shutters on the side of the entry.

Ms. Catlin liked the gable end for the entry and the white stucco.

Ms. Connaughton liked the brick on the first floor. She thought the opening was

too wide.

Mr. Phoenix liked the brick and green shutters. He liked the straight front door opening. He agreed that the side shutters were not necessary.

Ms. Grace liked the brick extended on both sides of the front door. She thought it would distinguish the house from the others on the street.

Mr. Karakul thought the window proportions looked better. Mr. Floersheimer agreed with Mr. Phoenix.

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

Andre Paradelo of Paradelo Burgess Design Studio presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Ms. Visconti thought the entry path should be made of broken coral stone but favored the new driveway.

Ms. Grace liked the wings with the vines. She questioned the palms added to the front of the home and suggested a different tree species.

Mr. Phoenix liked the vines proposed. He agreed with Ms. Visconti that a lot was happening with the hardscape material.

Ms. Grace inquired about the new hardscape area.

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Mr. Floersheimer to approve the project with the following conditions: the front façade shall be approved as submitted and the hardscape shall be all coral stone, except for the driveway, which shall be approved as presented. The motion was carried 6-1, with Ms. Catlin dissenting.

5. **ARC-24-0023 (ZON-24-0010) 515 NORTH LAKE WAY (COMBO)** The applicant, JORDAN GRETCHEN S TRUST (Maura Ziska, Authorized Representative), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new one-story single-family residence with final hardscape and landscape, a special exception to develop the existing nonconforming lot, and one variance 1) to exceed the permitted angle of vision. This is a combination project that shall be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Roger Janssen of Dailey Janssen Architects presented the architectural plans, and Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group gave the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Mr. Floersheimer thought the professional responded to the comments of the Commissioners.

Mr. Phoenix thought the home was nice.

Ms. Grace asked about the color of the adjacent home. Mr. Janssen responded.

Ms. Connaughton stated she could not support the project.

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

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Floersheimer to approve the project as presented. The motion carried 5-2, with Mr. Smith and Ms. Connaughton dissenting.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Floersheimer that the implementation of the proposed variances will not cause a negative architectural impact on the subject property. The motion carried 6-1, with Mr. Smith dissenting.

7. **ARC-24-0080 (ZON-24-0042) 141 ATLANTIC AVE (COMBO)** The applicants, Sloane Family Trust (Brasseur & Drobot Architects, P.A.), have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a first-floor addition to an existing residence, a new pool and hardscape, new site wall and expansion of an existing curb cut. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Jason Drobot of Brasseur & Drobot Architects presented the architectural plans.

Mr. Phoenix thought the house was charming and liked the details; however, he did not support the proposed color. He thought the front door should be painted, and shutters should be added to the windows on the second floor.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the stucco and windows. She thought the stucco trim around the openings felt bulky, and shutters could help the design. She thought the railing should carry around the porch, and the transom windows could be removed.

Ms. Catlin liked the changes and that the details were simple. She also supported the widening of the driveway.

Ms. Grace liked the simpler color palate.

Ms. Visconti thought the changes were better. She suggested a light green for the color of the home. She liked the windows but was not in favor of the low wall.

Ms. Connaughton recommended making the column spacing equal on the front elevation. Mr. Drobot responded.

Mr. Phoenix asked if the owner would consider adding back the siding on the home. Mr. Drobot responded.

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

Mr. Floersheimer asked about the spacing of the column. Ms. Connaughton and Mr. Drobot responded.

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Ms. Catlin to approve the project with the following conditions: the window surrounds on the second floor shall be eliminated, green shutters shall be added, and the proposed side railing shall be an open railing with the elimination of the pony wall. The motion carried 5-2, with Mses. Connaughton and Visconti dissenting.

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

8. **ARC-24-0095 210 JAMAICA LN.** The applicant, J. Williams Weeks Estate (Robin Weeks), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new, two-story, single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape, and swimming pool improvements.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Roger Janssen of Dailey Janssen Architects presented the architectural plans, and Gabby Suarez of Nielsen Landscape Architects presented the site's landscape and hardscape plans.

Ms. Grace asked about the home's square footage and height and the garage's orientation. Mr. Janssen responded.

Ms. Connaughton thought the changes were an improvement. However, she thought the front entry element was too wide and questioned the window proportions on the first floor, north elevation. Mr. Janssen responded. She recommended adding a horizontal row of glass on the front three windows. She questioned the design of the garage and provided suggestions.

Ms. Catlin liked the changes and the dormer over the garage. She recommended using a quality garage door.

Mr. Floersheimer wondered if the applicant would dedicate an easement, to which Mr. Janssen stated that the easement for underground equipment had been secured. Mr. Falco further explained the easement requirements.

Ms. Visconti liked the dormer over the garage. She thought the front entry was a bit wide and asked if the columns could be reduced and made of wood. She asked that the element be revisited. She also made a recommendation for the columns on the loggia.

Mr. Floersheimer expressed concern about the dormers.

Ms. Connaughton wondered if the beams over the garage could be lowered. Mr. Janssen responded.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Ms. Catlin to approve the project with the following conditions: the dormer over the garage shall be added back to the plan, the dormer on the northwest wing of the home shall be eliminated, shutters shall be added to the proposed pergola and the front entry design shall be restudied and submitted for approval by the staff in coordination with the chair. The motion was carried 6-1, with Mr. Floersheimer dissenting.

9. **ARC-24-0040 1285 N OCEAN BLVD.** The applicant, M2B Properties LLC, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new, two-story single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape, and swimming pool. *[The applicant has requested a one-month deferral to the January 29, 2025, ARCOM meeting.]*
Clerk's note: This item was deferred to the meeting on January 29, 2025, at Item V. Approval of the Agenda.
10. **ARC-24-0085 (ZON-24-0044) 315 CHAPEL HILL RD (COMBO)** The applicant, Ocean Breezes 2 LLC (Francis Lynch, Attorney), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new, two-story, single-family residence of over 10,000 SF with a detached two-story accessory structure including final hardscape, landscape, and swimming pool improvements; requiring a special exception to redevelop a nonconforming parcel in the R-A zoning district and to provide reduced vehicle stacking; also one variance to encroach into the building height plane setback area. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval. *[The applicant has requested a one-month deferral to the January 29, 2025, ARCOM meeting.]*
Clerk's note: This item was deferred to the meeting on January 29, 2025, at Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

C. MAJOR PROJECTS-NEW BUSINESS

Clerk's note: A lunch break was taken at 1:00 p.m. The meeting resumed at 2:02 p.m. Ms. Connaughton returned at 2:09 p.m. Ms. Grace did not return to the meeting.

1. **ARC-24-0086 (ZON-24-0053) 240 EL DORADO LANE (COMBO)** The applicant, Henry and Laura McNamara (B1 Architect), have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a significant renovation (including greater than 50% demolition) and addition to a single-family house. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Gregory Bonner of B1 Architect presented the architectural plans, and Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Mr. Phoenix thought the changes were a big improvement. He suggested using a different light fixture.

Mr. Floersheimer liked the project and thought the changes would improve the property. He asked about the requested variances; Mr. Bonner explained.

Ms. Connaughton did not have an issue with the existing condition that needed a variance. She asked about the increase in the garage height. Mr. Bonner discussed the garage height and door dimensions. Ms. Connaughton thought the garage should be lower and given less importance.

Ms. Catlin thought the renovation was tasteful and respectful.

Ms. Visconti thought the changes were a nice improvement to the home. She asked about the height of the front door, to which Mr. Bonner responded. She recommended copper light fixtures and a colored shutter. She thought the chevron pattern was overdone and recommended a straight panel on the garage door. She also provided a recommendation on the hardscape, particularly the parking space.

Mr. Smith thought the project should be rethought and possibly started from scratch. He thought a new house could make a statement on the street, and he did not favor the proposed project.

Mr. Karakul understood Mr. Smith's comment, but he also understood the owner's needs. He thought the changes were sensitive.

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

Ms. Connaughton asked about the size of the garage. Mr. Bonner responded.

A motion was made by Ms. Connaughton and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the project as presented with the following conditions: the garage

element shall be revised and returned for approval by the staff in coordination with the chair; the sconces shall be changed; the brick in the parking space shall be removed; and Coral stepping stones shall be used as a pathway to the front entrance. The motion carried 5-2, with Messrs. Floersheimer and Smith dissenting.

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

2. **ARC-24-0098 301 POLMER PARK RD.** The applicant, Patrick Carney, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new, split-level, two-story, single-family residence of over 10,000 square feet; with final hardscape, landscape and swimming pool improvements.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Patrick O'Connell of Patrick Ryan O'Connell presented the architectural plans, and Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Ms. Visconti asked about the proposed lot coverage, to which Mr. O'Connell responded. She thought the proposed home looked like a massive block and needed a restudy.

Mr. Phoenix agreed with Ms. Visconti and thought the mass would tower over the neighbors. He did not favor the skylight on the top of the home and said he could not support the project.

Ms. Catlin believed that the proposed home did not respect the area. She thought it was too big and too massive and should be denied.

Mr. Floersheimer thought the home was excessive and did not fit into the area.

Ms. Connaughton thought the details in the home were nice. However, she understood the neighbors' concerns about the north side of the home and the excavation to accommodate the garage. She thought the skylight feature was beautiful.

Ms. Visconti asked about the pool design and did not believe it was cohesive with the design. She encouraged a three-car garage and smaller planters next to the garage.

Mr. Floersheimer reminded the commission that the existing home used to be on a lot, double the size of the existing lot.

Ms. Connaughton suggested a study of the window glazing.

Mr. Smith argued that the courtyard was unsymmetrical, that the pool needed more study, and that there was too much glass on the south elevation.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Darrell Ross, 300 Polmer Park Road, opposed the project. He discussed the construction on the street and requested all construction parking be held on the site.

Peter and Patty Garvey, 300 Cherry Lane, opposed the project, especially the height disparity between the two properties.

Attorney Frank Lynch, on behalf of the owner, spoke about the owner's right to develop the property with the different height difference of the lot.

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Ms. Connaughton to defer the project to the meeting on February 26, 2025, for a complete study in accordance with the Commissioners' comments. The motion carried 4-3, with Ms. Catlin, Messrs. Phoenix, and Floersheimer dissenting.

3. **ARC-24-0104 581 E WOODS RD.** The applicant, 581 E Woods Trust, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a second-floor rear addition with a new staircase and replacement of the front door.

Clerk's note: This item was deferred to the meeting on January 29, 2025, at Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

4. **ARC-24-0106 (ZON-24-0063) 260 COLONIAL LN (COMBO)** The applicants, Thomas and Meredith Hunt, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new, one-story, single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape, and swimming pool; requiring a special exception with site plan review to permit the redevelopment of the existing nonconforming parcel. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications. *Clerk's note: Ms. Visconti declared a conflict of interest and left the dais during the discussion.*

Attorney Maura Ziska, speaking on behalf of the owner, provided an overview of the project and introduced the owner, Meredith Hunt.

Ms. Hunt discussed her intent with the new home.

Austin Depree of Northworks presented the architectural plans, and Jorge Sanchez of SMI Landscape Architecture presented the site's landscape and hardscape plans.

Ms. Connaughton recommended changing the roof pitch over the front entry; she thought it was too wide. She also suggested changing the fenestration on the front elevation and raising some of the windows.

Mr. Phoenix loved the pink color of the home. He wondered if the owner would consider gas lanterns. He thought the trellis was too wide and open. He liked the symmetry on the front façade and the front door material. He wondered if another shade tree could be added to the front of the home. Mr. Sanchez responded. Mr. Phoenix asked about the size of the front door; Mr. Depree responded and stated he could restudy the door width and fenestration. Mr. Phoenix thought the front gate was too wide and recommended adding a pattern to the transom.

Ms. Catlin thought the landscaping and driveway were a bit bare. She recommended adding more landscaping around the garage. She agreed with many of Mr. Phoenix's comments. She liked the simplicity of the home. Mr. Sanchez responded and explained the design of the driveway.

Ms. Hunt discussed the need for a larger driveway.

Mr. Karakul thought the house was nice and the scale was good. He thought a study of the fenestration was needed, and he provided a suggestion for the driveway.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the head height of the windows. Mr. Depree responded. She believed the windows should be raised.

Mr. Smith discussed the different roof pitches and stated that the design would not work with the tile. Mr. Depree noted that all the pitches were either 7/12 or 12/12. He also commented on the pool and recommended moving it away from the home.

Mr. Floersheimer liked the color of the home.

Ms. Connaughton wondered if the pool could be larger. Mr. Depree responded.

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

Mr. Sanchez commented on the pool location.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Connaughton to defer the project to the meeting on January 29, 2025. The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

D. MINOR PROJECTS - OLD BUSINESS

1. **ARC-24-0093 1240 N OCEAN WAY** The applicant, Polly Daugherty, on behalf of Paradelo Burgess Design Studio, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the installation of solar panels on the roofs of an existing two-story residence.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Polly Daugherty of Paradelo Burgess Design Studio presented the application for the installation of solar panels.

Mr. Smith stated that it seemed that only six of the panels would be seen and added that the project would be successful without those six panels.

Mr. Floersheimer thanked the professional for the study. He wished the study had included S. Ocean Way because that is where he saw much of the roof. He asked about the location of the inverters. Contractor Scott Hart stated the inverters were under the panels.

Ms. Visconti thought the study was successful and appreciated the information.

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

Terry Collier, the owner of 1240 N. Ocean Way, understood the concern for visual pollution. He spoke about his request for solar panels.

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

2. **ARC-24-0060 910 S OCEAN BLVD.** The applicant, 910 S Ocean LLC (Portuondo Perotti Architects), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications to an interior courtyard and balcony railings.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Mr. Floersheimer disclosed ex-parte communications. *Clerk's note: Ms. Visconti declared a conflict of interest and left the dais during the discussion.*

Rafael Portuondo of Portuondo Perotti Architects presented the architectural plans.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Floersheimer and seconded by Ms. Catlin to approve the project as presented. The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

3. **ARC-24-0066 324 PLANTATION RD.** The applicant, Wendy Schriber Trust (Environment Design Group), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a pergola structure and site wall with associated landscape and hardscape.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Mr. Floersheimer disclosed ex-parte communications.

Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group gave the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Ms. Connaughton stated she would support a variance for the pergola's height. She thought the decorative pergola's design was charming.

Ms. Catlin liked the simplicity of the original pergola.

Mr. Floersheimer stated he would approve the originally proposed pergola.

Ms. Visconti liked the more decorative pergola and would support the variance.

Mr. Floersheimer asked about the owner's preference; Mr. Mizell stated that his owner did like the simpler pergola.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Floersheimer and seconded by Ms. Catlin to approve the project as presented, with option A for the pergola. The motion failed 3-4, with Mses. Visconti, Connaughton, and Messrs. Karakul and Smith dissenting.

A motion was made by Ms. Connaughton and seconded by Ms. Visconti to defer the project to the meeting on January 29, 2025. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

4. **ARC-24-0096 150 WORTH AVE—THE ESPLANADE** The applicant, Wilson 150 Worth LLC, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for updated paving, updated railings, removal of the main central staircase, and the addition of a water feature for the Esplanade.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Mr. Phoenix disclosed ex-parte communications.

Mark Gianquitti, Director of O'Connor Property Management, provided an overview of the project.

Lexi Barry from Gensler & Associates presented the architectural plans for the site renovation. Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group gave the landscape

and hardscape presentation.

Ms. Visconti did not favor the chosen coral or the gray color. She recommended a classic Dominican Coral Stone. She suggested looking at Worth Avenue for material choices. She asked about the drains and wondered if they could be placed in the banding. Ms. Barry responded. Ms. Visconti stated she could not support the materials.

Mr. Smith recommended using bronze for the drains.

Mr. Phoenix asked about the railings and whether they would be retained. Ms. Barry stated that they would remain and return in the future. Ms. Barry restated the outline of the project. Mr. Phoenix provided different suggestions for stone patterning.

A discussion ensued about the site drainage and limitations due to this drainage.

Ms. Connaughton agreed with Messrs. Smith and Phoenix on the patterning. However, she did not support the gray color and did not believe it appropriate.

Ms. Catlin asked about the steps and tiles and if they were proposed to be changed. Ms. Barry responded. Ms. Catlin thought the colors needed to be similar to the existing tile, with added splashes of color.

Mr. Smith recommended looking at the circular pattern around the main staircase and possibly changing the pattern there.

Mr. Floersheimer did not favor the classic coral stone, the gray stone, or the wave drain.

Discussions ensued about the material, the patterning of the material, and the drains.

Mr. Karakul asked about the thresholds and how they would be changed. Ms. Barry responded. Mr. Karakul did not believe the patterning was necessary; he thought a simpler would be preferable.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Ms. Visconti to defer the project to the meeting on January 29, 2025. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

5. **ARC-24-0097 (ZON-24-0057) 334 CHILEAN AVE (COMBO)** The applicants, Overflow Pad Too LLC (Environment Design Group), have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications to an existing site wall, installation of two additional A/C units, and water feature with associated landscape and hardscape changes. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning

relief/approval.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Mr. Phoenix disclosed ex-parte communications.

On behalf of the applicant, Attorney Maura Ziska provided an overview of the project, explained the zoning requests, and advocated for a positive recommendation to the Town Council. Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the landscape and hardscape.

Mark Styslinger, the property owner, stated he met with the neighbors and offered to pay for the landscaping to be installed to mitigate the new equipment.

Mr. Floersheimer asked about removing the door into the mechanical yard. Mr. Smith stated that an exit from the garage was required.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Paul Dassenko, 328 Chilean Avenue, discussed the remediation offered. He stated that the suggestion would further darken his living room. He discussed the additional mechanical equipment being placed on his side of the home and felt he was bearing the burden of all the equipment.

Ms. Ziska showed the wall section higher than the code allowed. Mr. Mizell further explained the request.

A conversation ensued about the wall and how it could be mitigated for the neighbor.

Ms. Connaughton asked for clarification on the A/C units and the necessary clearance. Mr. Mizell responded. Mr. Falco weighed in on the code requirements.

Ms. Visconti recommended a solution for the north wall. She also thought there would be a clearance issue with the generator and the A/C equipment.

Further discussion ensued about the location of the equipment.

Ms. Catlin moved, seconded by Mr. Phoenix, to approve the wall without raising the two proposed sections shown, as it appears that the A/C equipment is sufficiently screened. The motion carried 6-1, with Ms. Connaughton dissenting.

6. **ARC-24-0099 250 VIA LINDA** The applicant, Subtrust Under Article Second of the MTDT 2009 Descendants Trust, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission approval for the installation of a generator. *[The applicant has requested a one-month deferral to the January 29, 2025, ARCOM meeting.]*

Clerk's note: This item was deferred to the meeting on January 29, 2025, at Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

E. MINOR PROJECTS-NEW BUSINESS

1. **ARC-24-0105 315 COCOANUT ROW** The applicant, Virginia C. Knott (Environment Design Group), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission approval for a new vehicular driveway configuration with landscape and hardscape modifications.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

There were no disclosures of ex-parte communications.

Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the landscape and hardscape.

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

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

2. **ARC-24-0110 (ZON-24-0068) 233 OLEANDER AVE (COMBO)** The applicants, Kimmi & David Smick of CWI233 LLC, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a new driveway, terrace, perimeter fence, garden gates and landscape plantings which will require variances for reduction in landscape open space and perimeter landscape open space requirements. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Mr. Floersheimer disclosed ex-parte communications.

Kimmi Smick, the property owner, presented the landscape and hardscape.

Mr. Floersheimer asked about the hedge on the west after a neighbor expressed their concern. Ms. Smick stated that they would maintain the hedge on their side of the property.

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

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

Clerk's note: Ms. Connaughton left the meeting at 5:49 p.m.

3. **ARC-24-0100 745 N LAKE WAY** The applicant, PB C-2022 TRUST (Madison Worth Architecture), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission approval for exterior modifications, driveway configuration and installation of a sitewall.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Gerard Beekman of Madison Worth Architecture presented the architectural plans, and Chris Simon of Nievera Williams Design presented the landscape and hardscape.

Mr. Phoenix thought the presentation was thoughtful. He supported the color and light fixtures.

Ms. Catlin wondered if the covered walkway was part of the application. She requested that the construction trucks use County Road rather than N. Lake Way. She also asked about parking for construction vehicles. James Hall with Madison Worth Architecture outlined that parking would be onsite.

Mr. Karakul thought the project was great and asked about the shadow boxes on the front façade. Mr. Hall responded. Mr. Karakul stated he was not in favor of that feature.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Alexander Ives, 239 Jamaica Lane, advocated for the approval of the project.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Visconti to approve the project as presented with the conditions that the shadow boxes/panels be removed and the truck logistic plan be changed to reflect the use of County Road. The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

Ms. Mittner stated that the Commission neglected to make a motion regarding the variances for the project at 233 Oleander Avenue, ARC-24-0110 (ZON-24-0068).

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Karakul that the implementation of the proposed variances at 233 Oleander Avenue will not cause a negative architectural impact on the subject property. The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

4. **ARC-24-0112 224 S OCEAN BLVD.** The applicants, Armen & Claudia Manoogian, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications to a previously approved new driveway design.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Jose Gonzalez of Gonzalez Architects presented the landscape and hardscape.

Mr. Floersheimer asked about the trees near the driveway as well as the light fixtures. Mr. Gonzalez responded.

Ms. Catlin supported the coconut trees but wondered about the landscape open space calculations. Mr. Falco responded.

Ms. Visconti asked about the request in front of them. Mr. Gonzalez responded.

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

Ms. Catlin stated that the commission has made owners remove the synthetic turf and install grass. She thought this could set a precedent.

Armen Manoogian, the owner, discussed the intent and advocated for the proposal.

A discussion and debate ensued about whether the commission should approve the proposal. Mr. Falco stated that section 66-313 of the town code allowed for artificial turf as a driveway accent, subject to review by the commission.

A motion was made by Mr. Floersheimer and seconded by Ms. Catlin to approve the project as presented. The motion carried 4-2, with Messrs. Smith and Phoenix dissenting.

5. **ARCS-24-0341 1080 S OCEAN BLVD.** The applicant, Environment Design Group, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission approval for the installation of a perimeter site wall with landscape and hardscape improvements.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

There were no disclosures of ex-parte communications.

Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the landscape and hardscape.

Mr. Phoenix wondered why the pre-cast was not added to the wall.

Mr. Floersheimer asked about the height of the Buttonwood hedge. Mr. Mizell responded.

Ms. Visconti asked about the height of the wall. Mr. Mizell responded. Ms. Visconti provided suggestions for the wall and columns.

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

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Mr. Phoenix to approve the project with the condition that the columns be changed to Cast

stone without architectural detailing and the vegetation be changed from Silver Buttonwood to a Sea Plum espalier. The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

X. **UNSCHEDULED ITEMS**

Ms. Churney stated that Richard Sammons had declared a conflict of interest for 150 Worth Avenue at the November 22, 2024, meeting and correctly filled out the forms required by the State.


XI. **NEXT MEETING DATE:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025

XII. **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Visconti to adjourn the meeting at 6:37 p.m. The motion was carried unanimously, 6-0.

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, January 29, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 S. County Road.

Respectfully Submitted,



Jeffrey W. Smith, Chairman
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

kmc

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME <i>Visconti, Claudia</i>		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <i>Architectural Commission</i>	
MAILING ADDRESS <i>310 Valette Way</i>		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY <i>West Palm Beach</i>	COUNTY <i>Palm Beach</i>	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED <i>December 20, 2024</i>		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <i>Town of Palm Beach</i>	
		MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ APPOINTEE	

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, Claudia Visconti, hereby disclose that on December 20, 20 24:

(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, Jorge Sanchez SMI Landscape Architecture;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, by whom I am retained; or
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

ARC-24-0060
910 S. Ocean Blvd.
Continuing Conflict

If disclosure of specific information would violate confidentiality or privilege pursuant to law or rules governing attorneys, a public officer, who is also an attorney, may comply with the disclosure requirements of this section by disclosing the nature of the interest in such a way as to provide the public with notice of the conflict.

Date Filed

12/20/2024

Signature

[Signature]

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

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME <i>Visconti, Claudia</i>		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <i>Architectural Commission</i>	
MAILING ADDRESS <i>310 Valette Way</i>		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY <i>West Palm Beach</i>	COUNTY <i>Palm Beach</i>	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED <i>December 20, 2024</i>		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <i>Town of Palm Beach</i>	
		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, Claudia Visconti, hereby disclose that on December 20, 20 24:

(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, Jorge Sanchez, SMI Landscape Architecture;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, by whom I am retained; or
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

ARC-24-0106 (20N-24-0063)

260 Colonial Lane

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.

12/20/2024
Date Filed

CA
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.