



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Planning, Zoning & Building Department

**MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION MEETING
FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1998 AT 9:00 A.M.
TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 360 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD, PALM BEACH**

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL

PRESENT:

John H. Schuler, Chairman
Sally Gingras, Vice-Chairman
Laurel Baker, Member
Ethel Kinsella, Member
Lowry M. Bell, Jr., Member
Robert Deziel, Member
Joanna Frost-Golino, Member (arrived at 9:05 a.m.)
Floyd Wideman, Alternate Member
Marvin Rosenberg, Alternate Member
Eric Adams, Alternate Member
John C. Randolph, Town Attorney
Robert L. Moore, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building
Timothy M. Frank, Planner/Projects Coordinator
Gretchen Dayton, Recording Secretary

Mr. Schuler asked that in the interest of time to limit the audience comments to three minutes and limit the presentations to ten minutes.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE NOVEMBER 20, 1998 MEETING.

MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO APPROVE THE MINUTES.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WIDEMAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

IV. SWEARING IN OF PERSONS TESTIFYING

Persons testifying were sworn in at this time and periodically throughout the meeting.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

There were no consent agenda items to be heard.

VI. PROJECT REVIEW

A. DEFERRALS AND CONTINUATIONS - MAJOR PROJECTS

B82-98 New Residence

Applicant: Ocean Bay Holdings
Address: 140 Clarendon Avenue
Architect: Ralph Cantin
Project Description: New residence

This project was deferred from the October and November meetings and the applicant has requested deferral to the January meeting.

MOTION BY MR. WIDEMAN TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE JANUARY MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B83-98 New Residence

Applicant: Nikita and Paula Zukov
Address: 1226 North Lake Way
Architect: Nikita Zukov and Consulting Architect Jackie Albarran
Project Description: New two story single family Mediterranean style residence.

This project was deferred from the October and November meetings.

Mr. Deziel declared a previous Conflict of Interest and left the dias during the presentation. Mr. Schuler and Mr. Bell said they received a telephone call from Architect Steven Yeckes. All of the Commission members said they received a letter from Mrs. Bruno.

Mr. Frank said staff recommends that the project be deferred as no updated plans have been

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

received from the architect. He said the ARCOM application requires that projects which are deferred from month to month be received by the building department two weeks prior the ARCOM meeting so that staff may review for code compliance, and so that the plans are available for the Commission Members to review.

Mr. Bell said that if the architect has been working with the Commission, then the project should be heard.

Chairman Schuler ruled that project number B83-98 would be heard at this time.

Architect Jackie Albarran presented revised elevation drawings. She said the second story, facing the north, was reduced in size.

Mrs. Gingras felt the applicant has come a long way toward cooperating with the neighbor and the project was a big improvement.

Mr. Randolph suggested hearing the public comments before continuing with the Commission's comments.

Attorney Thomas Baird spoke on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Bruno. He said the applicant contacted his clients in the afternoon of December 17th and the revised plans were delivered after 9:00 p.m. The Bruno's had no opportunity to communicate with Mr. Yeckes and review the plans before the meeting.

Mrs. Albarran said that Mr. Yeckes received the plans at 4:00 p.m. on December 17th.

Architect Steven Yeckes said that Mrs. Albarran was correct, but he did not have time to review the plans and meet with the applicants.

Mr. Randolph said it is up to the Commission to decide whether or not they wish to determine if a project can go forward based upon changes that are made during the process. The fact that the parties did not meet at the Commission's suggestion to discuss the project, would not be a violation of due process.

Mr. Baird felt the plans should have been available for review in advance of this meeting. Therefore, they were not able to comment on the revised plans.

Mr. Randolph suggested that Mr. Baird and Mr. Yeckes take a few hours to review the plans.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO DEFER THE PROJECT UNTIL 11:30 A.M. SO THAT MR. YECKES MAY REVIEW THE REVISED PLANS.

**MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

This project was called again after project #B86-98.

Mr. Deziel declared a previous Conflict of Interest and left the meeting during the presentation of this project.

Architect Jackie Albarran presented a site plan showing the area of the building that had been removed.

Attorney Ron Kolins spoke in favor of the applicant and said all of the interested parties met and discussed the project.

Architect Steven Yeckes said that Mr. and Mrs. Bruno would like to look at two compromises, one would be to lower the two side wings 6", and the other would be to remove or relocate one room on the north elevation. Ms. Albarran said she thought that they decided to do one or the other. Mr. Yeckes said they would like to see both changes made to the project.

Ms. Albarran said they would have no problem lowering the height of the wings 6" which would meet the zoning code.

Mr. Kolins said that only one concession was acceptable to his client. He said that the Town Council granted 6" in a variance and they are not here giving it up unless the Bruno's would be willing to join with them. (To drop their law suit against the town).

Marie Bruno addressed the Commission and asked that a 10' portion of the second story, on the north side of the house, be relocated, possibly to the south side.

Ms. Albarran said they would be willing to lower the wings, but not remove 10' from the second floor.

Dr. Rosenberg left the meeting at 11:45 a.m. His absence was excused in compliance with Ordinance #11-95.

MOTION BY MR. WIDEMAN TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE PROVISION TO REMOVE 6" FROM THE TOP OF THE BEAM ON THE TWO WINGS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.

Mr. Kolins said there is no basis for the roof to be reduced other than as a concession to the Bruno's as a quid-pro-quo for putting an end to the litigation and the protests. He strongly objected to the Commission and said the roof is already 3' lower than by code what it could be. He said that everything that has been done concords with the variance they have been granted and is at or under the code. He said to give the Bruno's something more that they want, without their willingness to give anything in return, would be grossly unfair to his client. He said that if the Bruno's are unwilling to drop their lawsuit, then his clients absolutely do not want to lower the roof 6".

Mr. Wideman felt it was not a purview of this Commission to say whether they will drop their lawsuit or not. He said he was under the impression that the applicant was willing to drop the roof line, they now say they are not, except to attach conditions which the Commission has no purview to talk about.

AMENDED MOTION BY MR. WIDEMAN TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.

Mr. Bell said he felt they are reaching very dangerous grounds on the issue of neighbors coming in with architects complaining about someone's house and it's very dangerous when another architect comes in and criticize the presenter's plans. He said the Commission should proceed on their own basis and determine whether they like a project or not, no matter what the neighbors say.

Mrs. Frost-Golino said she understood what Mr. Bell said, but felt that the neighbor's input is extremely valuable because sometimes the Commission doesn't get a chance to look at the neighborhood and they may bring up issues they are not aware of.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B84-98 New Residence

Applicant:	A.R. Building Company
Address:	218 Jamaica Lane
Architect:	The Pandula Architects
Project Description:	New Two story residence

This project was deferred from the October and November meetings.

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

Mr. Bell and Mr. Deziel said they met with the architect. All of the Commission Members said they received a letter from a neighbor to this project.

Mr. Frank said staff recommends that the project be deferred as no updated plans have been received from the architect.

Mr. Bell said this project has been revised and it should be reviewed.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO REVIEW PROJECT #B84-98.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Architect Eugene Pandula said there were three directives given to him at the last meeting, two of which required specific action and one request was to restudy the living room windows. He said after reviewing the windows, they preferred not to change them as the verticality of the suggested change would compete with the horizontal elements on the building. He said they added some head panels above the ground floor windows and added a water table at the first floor level. He said they moved a section of the building on the second floor. He presented an overlay drawing showing the areas where the mass of the building had been removed. He said the CCR remains at 3.83, but to accommodate the changes 64 square feet were added which increased the FAR from 3.85 to 3.91. He said the green space was increased from 46% to 54% by deleting the curved driveway and replacing it with a straight driveway.

Mr. Frank said he received ten or eleven letters in opposition to this project and one letter in support of this project after the start of the meeting. He read these letters into the record at this time.

David Barton who resides at 216 Jamaica Lane addressed the Commission at this time. He discussed the zoning in the town and said they are way behind the curve. He said the residents are uninformed and ignorant of the problems facing them because of inadequate town communication. There are no councilmanic representation to turn to and ARCOM becomes a people's court. He said speculators have little regard for neighbors or the town, its pitting neighbor against neighbor. He gave technical reasons for project deferral or denial as stated in the ARCOM application. He said that when project compliance is not adhered to (as stated in the ARCOM application), citizens' unrest will follow.

J. William Weeks who resides at 210 Jamaica Lane addressed the Commission and commented on the size of the proposed project. He said this house is one and one-half times larger than the average house in the neighborhood. He said that several large spec houses have been built, but have not sold.

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

Sam Bokin who resides at 285 Jamaica Lane addressed the Commission and spoke in favor of the project. He said that some people who live on the west end of Jamaica Lane feel this project is in pretty good shape as presented. He felt that ARCOM and the Town Council does a good job enforcing the laws and we don't need the acrimony that goes on here.

The following is a verbatim transcript of the executive session that took place:

Chairman Schuler: I would like to take the comments of the commissioner's as we go around so that we can orderly get through this project.

Mr. Pandula: Thank you I'm complete Mr. Schuler, I'll just answer questions.

Chairman Schuler: Fine, now Mrs. Gingras would you like to comment on the project?

Mrs. Gingras: Well, I definitely appreciate what you have done by taking off that second story portion, I'm sort of sorry that you've loaded it onto the back. The problem that I have, you know when you look at these figures, I'm still struggling with the fact that you are significantly larger than everything else around you. Can I just make one other comment? I know that the same client of yours . . . you brought in a couple of months ago a terrific one-story project that was at I believe 4,400 square feet that we all loved. Is there any possible, I mean, I would guess that if you came in with something similar to that, on this lot, that these neighbors would be a lot happier.

Mr. Pandula: Well it was a different size lot, the foot print was a little larger and it allowed us to stay on a one floor footprint.

Mrs. Gingras: I didn't say to reproduce it, but in the spirit of that.

Chairman Schuler: Ok, any other comment?

Mrs. Gingras: No.

Chairman Schuler: All right, Mr. Bell.

Mr. Bell: I would like to ask a question. What is the size of the house that exists there now?

Mr. Pandula: I would have to research that, I've got it somewhere Lowry, I don't recall, I think it's about 2,000 square feet, I believe.

Chairman Schuler: 2,300, somewhere in that neighborhood.

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

Mr. Bell: I have, of course, tremendous mixed emotions about this. I think he's tried to comply with everything we asked for and yet there is an outcry from the people that surround it. I'm not sure how much we should listen to that, because on the other hand I've been to every zoning meeting that took place last month. I've been to two or three Town Council meetings and I think that at each of them they've told us to stay out of the zoning issues and stick to mass and the architectural end of it, and yet we keep trying to enforce them to reduce the size, so were in mixed blessings, were criticized in both directions.

Mrs. Kinsella: Lowry, in the minutes it says . . .

Chairman Schuler: Let him finish, Ms. Kinsella.

Mr. Bell: And if you're referring to the minutes, last time I asked for him to, to make it a one story portion at the front and not, I did not address the size of it. Simply because I'd been to so many Town Council meetings where they criticized us for trying to fight the size. So I'm not sure what to say, I know that at the west end of the block it's larger buildings there. I've asked for this to be reduced in the past, I think they reduced it by six hundred when I asked for 1,000, but I'm not sure. Is that how much you reduced it?

Mr. Pandula: That's correct.

Mr. Bell: All right.

Chairman Schuler: What's your answer to that Mr. Pandula.

Mr. Pandula: That's correct, we took out off about 650 from the original presentation.

Chairman Schuler: O. K. go ahead Mr. Bell.

Mr. Bell: So, again, I've a terrible dilemma facing us, uh I know we like to listen to the neighbors and try to make it fit into the neighborhood and yet you've got two neighbors here that are saying the opposite thing. Some of them are saying "don't affect my property values by lowering the standards that we can build there" and others are saying "don't destroy my property by letting him build bigger."

(From the audience) Mr. Barton: That's 11 to 1, not 1 to 1.

Chairman Schuler: Sir, let him . . . we're having this discussion and if you don't mind we will proceed.

Mr. Bell: So, under those circumstances it's hard for us to fight against an applicant who keeps

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

willing to change things and yet I'm not sure how we proceed at this point I'm not willing to state my position on this so I'll yield to someone else.

Chairman Schuler: Mrs. Frost-Golino.

Mrs. Frost-Golino: Thank-you, I think that we are all conflicted on this one, because we appreciate the architecture and yet don't appreciate the size. And that's it in a nut shell. I understand that you have reduced it in the past, but I believe from the last application you increased it, isn't that correct?

Mr. Pandula: Yes, by about 60 square feet.

Mrs. Frost-Golino: Yea, and you put that in the back. Again, though, mitigated by the architecture, I believe you moved it off the side where it would have more impact on the neighbors and moved it into the center of the property. Is that correct?

Mr. Pandula: Essentially, yes.

Mrs. Frost-Golino: Center-back. As I'm looking at the . . . if you show the difference on the site plan, I think you can illustrate

Mr. Pandula: It's gone from right here, this "L" shape piece to about a 10 foot wide strip in the back.

Mrs. Frost-Golino: Right . . . which backs up against . . . is that . . . backs up against Tradewind?

Mr. Pandula: Yes.

Mrs. Frost-Golino: O.K., and your streetscape that you've shown here, is that dotted line showing the relationship of the houses to the neighborhood.

Mr. Pandula: The dotted line is the form of the house that's on the property now.

Mrs. Frost-Golino: O.K., but that other darker line is not reflective of this particular streetscape.

Mr. Pandula: No, this was the original . . .

Mrs. Frost-Golino: So, it's a little bit unfair to your own argument because I think that your present house, streetscape would look better on a street than what you've shown there. Isn't that correct?

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

Mr. Pandula: Significantly, but that's accomplished on this overlay I believe.

Mrs. Frost-Golino: Yea, it's just that . . . that since we're . . . I think what we're doing Gene, is focusing in on how this relates to the houses in the neighborhood from a mass standpoint. So, you're not helping yourself on a streetscape by not showing how you are relating, I think in a superior way to your . . .

Mr. Pandula: I understand, but we've been through that, I think, you know the tie beam is still at 19'6". Uh, I've got a 17'5" foot side yard set back on one side.

Mrs. Frost-Golino: except that you've reduced the mass on the street because you've put it to the rear of the property. So you've actually helped, the streetscape is actually better than what your showing. I think that we have to hold you to the same standards we hold other applicants in that, I'm not sure which one you've referred to, but your own structure shows that you, there's only one house in the whole neighborhood that's larger than you are and that actually is on Tradewind on a 13,000 square foot lot and your on a 11,200. Just look at the houses on Jamaica, the next house that approaches you is 225 at 3,173, everything else is in the 2,000's. And your FAR which, you know we're not strictly looking at in our code is quite different. And your CCR is unfortunately still substantially different. It's again with all of the houses in the neighborhood, you're the second one, there's one on Tradewind, the same one, which is quite large.

(From the audience) Mr. Weeks: It doesn't back up to Tradewind, it backs up to Bahama.

Chairman Schuler: Sir, Mr. Weeks, let us finish this, we understand that and were gonna make that announcement.

Mr. Weeks: It's incorrect John,

Chairman Schuler: Well, I understand it, but we're gonna advise Mr. Pandula that was the case.

Mr. Pandula: O.K., than I apologize.

Mrs. Frost-Golino: O.K., thank you

Chairman Schuler: I want to finish with each Commissioner, if you don't mind making their comments, because we've given you an opportunity to make yours and I think it's their opportunity to . . .

Mr. Weeks: I realize that, but I think it should be accurate, John.

Chairman Schuler: I believe that and we will, we were knowledgeable about the fact that it did

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

back up to Bahama and I was gonna make that comment at the completion of Ms. Frost-Golino's comments.

Mr. Weeks: I Apologize.

Chairman Schuler: But I didn't want to interrupt her. Go ahead Ms. Frost-Golino.

Mrs. Frost-Golino: Thank-you. Basically, just going on what has been presented to me by the architect. The point is, I guess, that the case is actually being made in terms of size as if, even if you look at these numbers, which may or may not reflect the exact 200 feet of the neighborhood. I again, once again, I just say that I am very conflicted about this project. I believe very strongly that since I'm the person who's guidelines, I drafted the guidelines that you're reading and it was passed by all of us at ARCOM previously. It is suggested, although not required, by the guidelines, that you are in compliance with the size issues in the street. It is required by the ordinance that you not be too dissimilar. And the problem that we're having is the ordinance says not *visibly* excessively dissimilar. This is a two-story house, and you can't make a one story house out of a two-story house, but I still think that there might be, as you were driving along imagining this house on the street, it would be *visibly* excessively dissimilar. Despite Gene's very best efforts to move it off the street. Again, I think if you, one last point, Mr. Chairman, if you were to look at this area in ten years the way things are going, and with additions and changes, this house might be a beautiful addition to a street which is growing. I don't think we want to restrict growth. It's just that we have to allow for controlled growth, incremental growth and unfortunately this is a leap up and I think all the neighbors are perceiving it that way. Thank-you.

Chairman Schuler: Thank-you Ms. Frost-Golino. Ms. Kinsella, you had a comment, I believe.

Mrs. Kinsella: I just want to say that the minutes say and I quote "Mr. Pandula agreed to meet with the neighbors and discuss this project with them." As one of the conditions and I don't think he's done that, and I think it's a waste of time . . . too dissimilar to the neighborhood.

Chairman Schuler: Well, I want to refer you back to our original comments when we were discussing having Mr. Randolph . . . It can be suggested that be done, but that is not an absolute requirement, if they don't do that, it would be nice if they did.

Mrs. Kinsella: He agreed to it, so that says . . .

Chairman Schuler: Any other comments? Do you have any comments on the project Ms. Kinsella?

Mrs. Kinsella: Not that hasn't been already said.

Chairman Schuler: O.K. Mr. Wideman?

Mr. Wideman: Nothing at this time.

Chairman Schuler: Mr. Deziel?

Mr. Deziel: First of all I just want to say that I appreciate the efforts that Mr. Barton has put into this. He's just somebody that lives on the street and I think he's doing this for his street and the town and he's just trying to help out. He said two things that I think are extremely important. Number one, he said a lot of things, but the two that I remember are the facts that we need some town planing and that there could be some citizens' unrest. I personally would like to see both. There's no doubt about it, everybody on the commission has experience that, we have a view of how we'd like to see things fit in, and we try and give people like Gene, and Gene you've done a, I think architecturally you've done a remarkable job here, I mean your work looks great. So then we give comments and other professionals that work for applicants have not been nearly as accommodating as Gene has. I mean I think he's been here at least three or four times, I don't even want to count, but he keeps coming back to us as opposed to appealing and every time he comes back I think he comes back in a mood of cooperation as opposed to confrontation. So, unfortunately I'm not saying this project doesn't get approved today, but the long term answer isn't here today. Every time we give some input and try to give some direction, the Town Council slams the thing back to us and they make up their own independent minds and come up with an easy solution that just says ARCOM go pick out some windows and doors you want and build the thing. So, and I'm giving my experience watching the Town Council review the exact same projects we review and I'm trying to give deference to Mr. Barton's efforts and his other neighbors and at the same time deal with Gene's request. I'm looking at the numbers on the street, the numbers on the street are awfully small, but I certainly don't think that we can ask Gene to come in with a house that's twenty-five, twenty-eight or even thirty-two hundred square feet because I'm not even talking economics, I'm just talking being realistic. The home warrants a larger size and I wish that we could establish a policy right here at a size that we would feel comfortable proceeding on this street, because that's the only solution that I see happening here and if we could pass that size onto Gene and I'm not saying it's not the size he's proposing today, but if we can give Gene an objective criteria to work with, I'm sure that he can fill that bag of square feet with something that is extremely attractive, that the neighbors are going to like architecturally. I think at the end of the day without a doubt its going to be larger than what there looking for, but somehow I think we have to find a compromise between what Gene would like to put there and what the neighbors find acceptable because ultimately if they don't push this project that way, I think we are going to end up in a worse situation because the Town Council has consistently, every time, taken the easy way out of approving a large project that doesn't work and told us to go pick some windows and doors. And I think when we have somebody as cooperative as Gene has expressed himself to be I'd like to extend the fig leaf back to Gene and say let's work with him and come up with a solution, and let's move him and his client down the road with an

answer. I know I've been long winded, but I think this is one . . . I personally think this is one of the toughest projects I've dealt with on this commission. I mean it, we've had so much more resistance in this and we've had such worse projects that have gotten approved, but what's tough for me is, the cooperation that's been extended not only by the architect, but I'll say by the neighbors and by cooperation, I mean the effort that they've expended to show us how . . . their side of the story. So there's a lot of work going on both sides here. And maybe the answer isn't . . . one or the other or the Town Council's cop out position of some subjective response that makes no sense to the request. I'd like to see us make a policy decision right now where we can give the architect an answer that he can deal with as owner and move on. I'll start off with that and I personally think that we have to give Gene some objective numbers to work with whether it is a cubical content number, or a floor area ratio number that we feel fits in with this street all be it I think at the beginning it's going to violate Joanna's comment that it's not going to fit in with the neighborhood, but I think over time it will establish a precedent for the neighborhood that we now looking forward think was a good decision for the neighborhood. I've even talked about this with Gene and I have no idea whether it's acceptable to him, but I'd like to give him some numbers that he can work with, with that design, and see if he'll go with it, and move this thing along.

Chairman Schuler: Thank-you Mr. Deziel. Did you complete your comments?

Mr. Deziel: I'll save any comments in the event that this Commission decides they want to take up a discussion on what those objective criteria are.

Chairman Schuler: Mr. Pandula do you have any comments to that? I've got two other commissioners that have not made comments and I want to get theirs.

Mr. Pandula: No. Well thank-you to Robert for thinking highly of our efforts here. I think, and this is a philosophical decision that we're all struggling with at a much bigger picture, but it's only a number. CCR and FAR are numbers and it doesn't matter what the number is. Bulk, mass is an architectural unit that can be related to, it's there, its physical and my philosophical position is, it doesn't matter what the number is as long as it looks appropriate. And what your potentially saying by coming in with a number that is whatever you deem appropriate relative to the average of the neighborhood, it means that the tricks of the trade of architecture scale, proportion, detail, tucking masses around, are invalid, it is not a tool that we can use to get a larger or required program accomplished if the number doesn't work. And I just simply suggest to you, to not get hooked into the number, but to look at architecture, look at the bigger picture, look at devices that have been used thousands of years to design buildings and apply them. If this is an ugly building, just tell me it's ugly and I'll go back and work on it, but I don't think I should be . . . and I'm well within the code, I mean at a 19'6" tie beam, the floor areas are down, the set backs are humongous. In the face of all that, you would think that would be applauded as opposed to just going back and saying well that's really nice, but the numbers still don't work. And I submit that the numbers are insignificant relative to the bigger picture. End of sermon.

Chairman Schuler: Thank-you sir, that's a . . . I'm gonna get to you in just a second. You have a follow up question?

Mr. Deziel: I just wanted to clarify one thing for Gene. Gene I refer to the numbers really only as a benefit and as a . . . to your project, because, without thinking it further, your numbers are so far out of line relative to what's there. And when I say that I would give this project a number, the mitigating factors that you've thrown at this job, I think are tremendous. You've got the lower tie beam, you've got the larger set back, its exemplary architecture and your side of the columns the list goes very long. And that's the reason why I'm willing to say that the number that I would like to see applied to you, would be much greater than anything in the neighborhood.

Chairman Schuler: Thank-you Mr. Deziel. Mr. Adams.

Mr. Adams: As I recall the Town Council has expressed itself to some extent and I don't know if we're actually thinking too much about that, but we do have mass as something that is an architectural element, it's been defined that way we'll accept it as that. And the mass is what Gene has addressed himself to. And that is the thing which I, and I don't like the numbers, I don't . . . I've seen in the hands of good architects numbers matter not at all because they address themselves to the architectural issues and they managed to bury additional numbers in ways that Gene has done for the most part here. I do think it's a bit big and there are some properties there that are much, much smaller. I doubt those properties ever would be built again and I think . . . I feel that we're charged with making the transition acceptable to everybody in ways that we can. But I again, Gene has done an excellent job in attempting to deal with this mass which is apparently what the Council has asked us to deal with rather than the numbers. So I think he's made a great start. I also wonder about something, I think that the neighbors are not charged with choosing materials and approving designs, I think they are charged with coming and expressing themselves on impositions to their, either their legal situation or the property rights. This is not a forum within which neighbors come and by a democratic process approve a design. So, I would like to remind us about that. If this house needs to be reduced slightly perhaps that is true. I would like to see that the emphasis be in the mass rather than any emphasis on numbers here, CCR, FAR or otherwise. Because Gene . . . we're boxing him in, he's attempted to make more green space in response to what we've asked him to do. And then if we asked him . . . were going to be put in a position of asking him the opposite . . . there's not much, you know, we've got to leave him room withing which to work as an architect. And however we resolve this, I would like . . . I would approve this house . . . 4,300 square feet to me is not a very large currently built house. So I don't know which of us can live in anything much, much smaller than that.

Chairman Schuler: Thank-you sir. Dr. Rosenberg?

Dr. Rosenberg: John, and respect to your opening comments, I really couldn't add very much

more to the discussion than what's already been expressed.

Chairman Schuler: All right. Thank-you sir. Do you have a question Ms. Gingras?

Mrs. Gingras: Well I guess in the spirit of what Robert was saying I might ask if Gene would be willing to . . . you have a 21% lot coverage now, and 30 is allowed, two story, if you would be willing to decrease the amount of second story space and perhaps decrease the square footage a bit, and decrease the square footage that's on the second floor and load it onto the first floor. I'm getting the sense from the neighbors that it's the two story, the amount of two story structure that is on this property that, is the objection. Did that make any sense? In other words a larger footprint . . .

Mr. Pandula: Yea, I don't know if I would characterize their opinions that way, but that's fair game. I understand what you're saying and I think it would be easy for me to take the third guest bedroom that is above the garage here and make it a single story unit and begin to enclose the pool court yard. That's a swap of square footage, and I'm not quite . . . how I would get there and all that. But that's all doable. It's doable, but it doesn't change the appearance from the street, so yes, I can do it, where does it get us, I don't know, but . . .

Mrs. Gingras: You know, throw out a suggestion . . . is there something you can do that would reduce the appearance of the mass from the street.

Mr. Pandula: Not off the top of my head. I mean we've held, you know, the mass of the two story block to a minimum. It's got one suite of rooms up above it. Without completely altering the building I don't know if that's the thing to do . . . how we would go about that.

Chairman Schuler: So are you saying that you would . . . that's what you'd like to do is move that . . . and I don't understand exactly whether you're saying in answer to her question that you would like to maybe move that or study that issue, the back issue or maybe the front. Do you want to do that?

Mr. Pandula: The front I don't particularly, no. I think that's a completely different building and I think there's going to be a two-story mass somewhere and I think if it's a two-story building it should read as a two-story building like every other one around it does. I think, focusing on what Sally has requested, could I take some of the second floor mass and put it on the ground floor. The answer to that is yes. I'll tell you yes I can do it and it will take me several sketches to get there, but that is a relatively easy solution. On the other hand I can't tell you now that by getting there its going to be a swap of square footage it will be identical either. But sure it could be done. My 50% green space will vaporize. And I not sure the leading square footage back here accomplishes anything for anyone, to be honest with you, but it that's a direction to go in, it's easy enough to do.

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

Mrs. Gingras: I'd rather see you take it off the front if there's a way to do that.

Chairman Schuler: And you're saying that you can't take it off the front. That's what you're saying?

Mr. Pandula: No, it would be a completely different house, John, and I think, I feel fairly strongly that this two-story house, its facade relates very well to the other two story houses and facades on the street. With porches, with railings, with balconies and such, so I'd rather not get a hybrid going.

Chairman Schuler: I think you've done a very job on the architecture of this house and I also agree with your comments relative to the fact that we ought to look at the architecture and that is an important aspect of this project and any project and we cannot be glued to figures as our determination of architecture because that does not apply. And I think that we need to do that. Now Mr. Bell you had a question?

Mr. Bell: Well I know that you and Mr. Deziel and myself attended the last Town Council meeting where we had quite a discussion about size and mass and everything else. And I know that Mr. Moore was there and I'd like to hear his comments as it pertained to that. I know he doesn't want to speak to it, but I think he should say exactly what the Town Council represented themselves.

Chairman Schuler: Mr. Moore would you like to make a comment on that request?

Mr. Moore: Yea, I would have several comments, but I would like to defer them because I haven't heard any kind of a motion yet and I don't want to try and influence your motion.

Chairman Schuler: All right, let . . . I think we should . . .

Mr. Moore: But if I could say something though, I think a lot of you all have reference some of the frustration that everyone experiences, including the Town Council because as you recall you are advisory to the Town Council and they are the ultimate authority if someone decides to appeal your actions to them . . . so, and then of course they're appealable to the Circuit Court. But having said that, I think that you need to come to some kind of conclusion as to how you believe that this particular application, massaged to the point that it is right now, fits into your criteria. Because I can't tell you whether you should approve it or shouldn't approve it.

Chairman Schuler: Well, I think that we have talked about this issue for several times on this commission. In order to get something started, I'm going to turn the gavel over to the Vice-Chairman and I'm gonna make the motion that we approve the project and then we'll get

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

something going here, one way or the other.

Vice-Chairman Gingras: Is there a second?

(There was no response.)

End of verbatim transcript.

Chairman Schuler passed the gavel to Vice-Chair Gingras.

**MOTION BY MR. SCHULER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.
MOTION DIED FOR THE LACK OF A SECOND.**

**MOTION BY MR. BELL TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO LATER IN THE
AFTERNOON AND PRESENT A STREETSCAPE DRAWING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.**

ROLL CALL:

MR. BELL YES

MRS. BAKER YES

MRS. GINGRAS YES

MRS. KINSELLA YES

MR. DEZIEL YES

MRS. FROST-GOLINO NO

MR. SCHULER YES

MOTION CARRIED 6-1.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY MR. DEZIEL TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE
PROVISION TO REDUCE THE CCR TO 3.75.
MOTION FAILED FOR A LACK OF A SECOND.**

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO
THE JANUARY MEETING AND REDUCE THE SQUARE FOOTAGE OF THE HOUSE
TO 3,920.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.**

ROLL CALL:

MRS. FROST-GOLINO YES

MRS. KINSELLA YES

MRS. GINGRAS YES

MRS. BAKER **NO**
MR. BELL **NO**
MR. DEZIEL **NO**
MR. SCHULER **NO**
MOTION FAILED 3-4.

This project was called again after project #B68-98.

Mrs. Frost-Golino was not in attendance at this time.

Architect Eugene Pandula presented a streetscape drawing and he presented freehand drawings and overlays. He said at the second floor level he took three feet off the perimeter of one of the rooms for a reduction of 144 square feet. He added 48 square feet of that back under a balcony so that there will be a net reduction of 96 square feet. He said that he cantilevered and reduced the depth of the balconies in the back corner. He put the chimney back on the front of the house as it was originally presented. He said there will be a 20'6" set back for the second floor mass and a lower roof that climbs on top of a bigger roof beyond. He said the proposal is a whole new scheme with an additional 100 square feet removed from the building.

It was stated for the record that the freehand drawings that Mr. Pandula presented were for architectural purposes only and not working drawings.

Mr. Barton thanked the Commission for their forbearance. However, he felt that the neighbors' views were ignored and that ARCOM ignored their own published guidelines in making their judgments and they failed to enforce compliance of the law. He said the next step is appeal to the Town Council.

Mr. Randolph was asked for his comments to Mr. Barton's statement. He said that it was Mr. Barton's interruptions to his message, and he didn't think that ARCOM read their actions as Mr. Barton stated.

The following is a verbatim transcript of the Commission's executive session:

Chairman Schuler: Mr. Deziel, we'll start with you.

Mr. Deziel: O.K. Gene your... the revised-revised now that you came back with this afternoon, are you happy with that architecturally? Do you feel good about it?

Mr. Pandula: Actually, I can make it work, it's close enough and again given that I've only

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

a half an hour to an hour to bring it up to this place. I can make it work. I think it's O.K.

Mr. Deziel: And where does that put the square...

Mr. Pandula: All right, subtract 96 from 4,384 so you're just under 4,300 square feet. You're 4,290, something like that, square footage. It's going to reduce cubic content by just under 950 square feet, so it's probably right at where you were going this morning at 3.75, probably a little bit below that.

Mr. Deziel: Based on Gene's answers to my comments, I would make a motion for approval of the project as presented this afternoon with the cut sheet there.

Chairman Schuler: All right, thank you sir. Is there a second to the motion?

Mrs. Gingras: I would second that if this can be kind of a conceptional . . . I mean, I don't think it a good precedent to say that we're gonna give approval to a, you know, a bum-wad overlay. I think he needs to come back with the final drawings, but we can send the message that it's in the right direction.

Mr. Deziel: O.K. Sally does this help you with the precedent issue . . . Gene has been here so many months and he's trying to really move on with this thing. I don't have any problem with . . . if he gives his bum-wad to Tim and that stands as the official record until he replaces it with a document that we would normally accept. If that's O.K. with you?

Mrs. Gingras: O.K.

Mr. Deziel: And only because these are extenuating circumstances because the time frame this project has taken.

Chairman Schuler: All right, any other comments? Ms. Gingras?

Mrs. Gingras: No, I guess I seconded that.

Chairman Schuler: Mr. Bell.

Mr. Bell: I concur that the changes are an improvement and I welcome any changes that will help reduce the scale of the front of the house in the neighborhood.

Chairman Schuler: Ms. Baker.

Mrs. Baker: I would hope since Mr. Weeks reminded me of the fact that I have talked

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

about in-your-face architecture that if you will go back and look at the history of the presentation of this particular site. There has been a tremendous effort as I see it in revisiting the neighborhood, looking at the lifestyle, the image of this particular street and efforts that have been made. It is larger, but it does not have the appearance of mass and the aesthetics have changed that soften it and blend it into this particular street. Unlike, I would remind you the in-your-face proposal that was originally brought to this commission. So while it is larger, and the neighbors will not be happy necessarily with the numbers, I think it's important for all of us to use the numbers as an exercise, but not be blind sighted by what those numbers are not telling us about the aesthetics of a house and the ability of a good architect to soften, reduce and eliminate the appearance of mass.

Chairman Schuler: Thank-you. Do we have any other comments? We have a motion and a second so we can move . . .

Mr. Adams: Yes, I would like to make one comment, John. I'm particularly pleased, Gene, with that one, slight one story element that you've gotten on the east side there, because that's the way it was to begin with. In the current structure as terrible as it is, and I'm intimately familiar with that particular house. The fact nevertheless is that on the east side it is relieved considerably by a one story element. You've made a great effort in that direction without compromising anything too much. I think the mass is better and I think for quick work, if you can call this quick work over four months, you've done a very good job.

Chairman Schuler: All right, thank-you Mr. Adams. Anybody else . . . Mr. Wideman? All right we have a motion and a second to approve the project with the changes that were presented this afternoon, so I'd like to indicate, everybody indicate, all in favor please signify by saying aye.

All of the Commission Members: Aye.

Chairman Schuler: The ayes have it and it's so ordered. Thank-you Mr. Pandula we appreciate your cooperation and your promptness in coming back to discuss the matter.

End of the verbatim transcript.

B86-98 New Townhouse

Applicant:	Earl Hollis
Address:	330 Brazilian Avenue
Architect:	The Pandula Architects
Project Description:	New two story townhouse

This project was deferred from the October and November meetings.

Mr. Deziel said he met with the architect. Mrs. Baker said she met with Mr. Hollis.

Mr. Frank said that the revised plans had not been received by staff prior to this meeting.

MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO HEAR PROJECT #B86-98.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. DEZIEL

ROLL CALL:

MRS. BAKER YES

MR. DEZIEL YES

MRS. GINGRAS YES

MRS. KINSELLA NO

MR. BELL YES

MRS. FROST-GOLINO YES

MR. SCHULER YES

MOTION CARRIED 6-1.

Architect Eugene Pandula said the square footage of the proposed project is 10,780, the FAR is 63% and the proposed project is about 13% higher than the average building size in the neighborhood. He said there are two property owners for this duplex building and this is not a speculation project. He said it is a stylized, two-story Mediterranean style building with a one-story garage element at the street. One of the front doors will be set back from the street 72' and the other will be 65' away from the street. The project will have cast stone around the windows and doors, true barrel tile roof and hurricane rated wood windows. The building will be white or light cream color with cream color cast stone trim.

The Commission liked the look of two different houses and the nice clean design. It was suggested to use single width garage doors for less of a commercial feeling. The fenestration on the front of the building and the entry feature were discussed. It was felt that three windows over two looked top heavy and it was suggested to proportion the glass on the first floor or use two windows on top. It was felt that the windows above the entry looked crowded by the entry feature. Mr. Pandula said there is a 3' wide terrace that the windows above the entry open onto. It was suggested to raise the windows on the garage or use an element rather than a window. Mr. Pandula said he could raise the windows as he had 12" to 18" to work with. It was felt the plate height of the roof could be changed to make the roof more distinctive.

MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE PROVISION TO RESTUDY THE WINDOWS ON THE SECOND FLOOR AND TO RAISE THE GARAGE WINDOWS, POSSIBLY RAISE THE PLATE HEIGHT OF THE ROOF ON THE RIGHT SIDE OF THE BUILDING TO BREAK UP THE ROOF LINE AND TO USE SINGLE WIDTH GARAGE DOORS.

**MOTION SECONDED BY MR. BELL.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

B87-98 Addition

Applicant: Bjorn Aaserod
Address: 242 Country Club Road
Architect: Blue Minges Architect
Project Description: Add new upper level. Raise up main level from 4.5 NGVD to 7.5 NGVD, two car garage and demolish non conforming structure.

This project was deferred from the November meeting. Staff recommended deferral as no revised plans were received from the architect.

**MOTION BY MR. DEZIEL TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE JANUARY MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

B89-98 New Residence

Applicant: 3 Island Partners Lakefront
Address: 1000 Indian Road
Architect: Thomas Kirchhoff
Project Description: New two story residence

This project was deferred from the November meeting.

Mr. Wideman, Mr. Bell, Mrs. Baker, Mr. Schuler and Mr. Adams said they met with the architect.

Architect Thomas Kirchhoff said he is representing Three Island Partners who are developing the house for this property. He said the property looks at Peanut Island and the Port of Palm Beach. The total square footage of the proposed house is 10,307 and the lot coverage will be 24.9%. He said the house will have an island flavor, somewhat Georgian in style with large overhangs, exposed rafter tails and half round gutters. There will be Colonial shutters that will provide hurricane protection and there will be cast stone columns and quoins at the corners. The house will be two stories with a large entry porch, a large porch extending across the back of the house and a cabana with open porches. Mr. Kirchhoff said the CCR is 4.4 and the FAR is 39%

The Commission felt the architecture was attractive, but the house is too big for the site. It was stated that this project is neighboring a different zoning district and there are smaller homes

around it which makes it difficult for the architect to blend his home in with the neighborhood. He needs to take that into consideration the mass and the roof height.

Mr. Kirchhoff said the house without the balconies and garage is 8,000 square feet. He said they would be willing to remove the cabana structure.

Mrs. Frost-Golino said the three garage doors will be very visible when coming around the curve and that the doors should be addressed with the landscaping.

**MOTION BY MR. BELL TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE PROVISION TO REDUCE THE HEIGHT OF THE ROOF.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.**

**AMENDED MOTION BY MR. BELL TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE PROVISION TO LOWER THE UPPER ROOF BY THREE FEET AND MAKE "KICKS" ON THE ONE-STORY PORTIONS, AND REMOVE THE CABANA STRUCTURE.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.**

ROLL CALL:

MR. BELL	YES
MRS. KINSELLA	YES
MRS. GINGRAS	NO
MRS. BAKER	YES
MR. DEZIEL	NO
MRS. FROST-GOLINO	NO
MR. SCHULER	YES

MOTION CARRIED 4-3.

The meeting was reconvened after lunch at 1:30 p.m.

Mrs. Frost-Golino left the meeting at this time and her absence was excused in compliance with Ordinance # 11-95.

B68-98 New Residence

Applicant:	Bayhill Development
Address:	321 Brazilian Avenue
Architect:	Smith and Moore Architects

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

Project Description: Construction of a new two-story residence with detached garage/staff quarters building.

Demolition was approved at the August meeting. This project was denied at the September meeting, placed on the October ARCOM agenda at the Town Council's directive, and then deferred by ARCOM from the October and November meetings.

Ex-parte communications with the property owner were declared by Mr. Schuler and Mr. Adams and ex-parte communication with the property owner and the architect was declared by Mr. Bell. Mrs. Baker declared a previous Conflict of Interest and left the dais during the presentation.

Mr. Schuler said he had a letter from Mr. Brindell in which he requested that the project be deferred until the afternoon. He said that a deferral was not necessary because the project did not come up in the morning session.

Attorney Jim Brindell representing the applicant addressed the Commission.

Mr. Schuler said he attended the last Town Council meeting and it was referred back to ARCOM to review the architectural aspects of the project.

Architect Harold Smith said that after the Town Council meeting and meeting with some of the ARCOM Members, one suggestion was made to add some one-story mass to the front of the building. That was done in the form of two octagonal shaped additions to the front which extend approximately eight feet from the face of the building toward the south and added 200 square feet to the building. He said the total floor area now is 5,816 square feet.

It was stated that Mr. DeMarco is the contract purchaser.

**MOTION BY MR. BELL TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ADAMS.**

Attorney Peter Broberg representing the neighbor to the east of this project addressed the Commission. He objected to the additional 200 square feet added to the project. He said he didn't care if it was architecturally more pleasing or not, the Town Council said they cannot do that, "you can't make it smaller so you can't make it bigger."

Mr. Moore said he believed the intent at the Town Council meeting was that there should be no reduction, but if something had to be added to address the mass issue for ARCOM, that it could be added and as long as there would be not creation of a variance.

Mr. Deziel said the pleasure of the Town Council was that this project be approved at this

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

meeting. He said he believed the discussion at the Town Council meeting was to redistribute the square footage to address the mass issue. He said he has never heard of additional square footage being added to diminish the mass. He has heard of taking mass from the second story and putting it on the first story to diminish the mass. He said they are here with more than what the Town Council asked for ARCOM to approve.

Mr. Bell felt that by adding something to the front elevation solved the problem and that the Commission would look foolish if they approved the elevation that has been turned down in the past.

Mr. Deziel said the elevation was turned down because the majority of the Commission felt that the elevation was too large in its mass. He said the Town Council wanted ARCOM to "talk about doors and windows" and not address the mass. He said he preferred not to go in the opposite direction than they have been working on for the last four months.

Mr. Schuler said the Town Council understood that the majority of the Commission Members did not think that the architectural appearance of the proposed design was adequate at that time.

Mrs. Gingras felt the additions improved the appearance of the front elevation, but on the other hand how can mass be reduced by adding square footage.

Mr. Moore said the Town Council did not preclude ARCOM from looking at an elevation drawing showing the front entry recessed 2'. Mr. Moore said he did not understand why the plain facade kept showing up and the elevation with the broken facade was not in the mix for review. Mr. Smith said he did not have that elevation drawing with him to show the Commission as the one story projection would not work with the step in the facade.

Mr. Wideman said he felt that ARCOM was going out on a limb to let them put more square footage in this house.

ROLL CALL:

MR. BELL	YES
MR. ADAMS	YES
MRS. GINGRAS	YES
MRS. KINSELLA	NO
MR. DEZIEL	NO
MR. WIDEMAN	NO
MR. SCHULER	YES

MOTION CARRIED 4-3.

B. NEW BUSINESS - MAJOR PROJECTS

B90-98 New Residence

Applicant: William Elias
Address: 305 Clarke Avenue
Architect: Smith and Moore
Project Description: New two-story Tuscan Neo-Classic Villa

Mrs. Baker and Mr. Wideman said they spoke with the architect and the owner.

Property owner Bill Elias presented the project and said the proposed project is a Tuscan Villa. He said the property is a corner lot and the building will be set back 40' from the street, 31' from the side and 23' from the rear yard. He presented a sample board showing the Tuscan style cast stone details. He said there is 6,800 square feet of air-conditioned space and that the loggia and garage are 1,500 square feet. Mr. Frank said the open spaces count in the CCR calculations. Mrs. Baker said it would not be easy to enclose all of the open space. Mr. Elias said there will be a wall around the pool area on the Central Avenue side and there will be a 16' hedge on the inside of the wall.

MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED WITH THE PROVISION THE LANDSCAPE AND HARDSCAPE COME BACK FOR APPROVAL.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WIDEMAN.

Mr. Deziel asked for the CCR and FAR figures. Architect Harold Smith said the FAR is 44%, the CCR is 4.4 and the greenspace is 43.7%. Mr. Deziel said this project is in the same proximity as Doyle Rogers new residence presented about a month ago. He said the Commission questioned the size and he thought the Mr. Roger's lot was bigger than this one. Mr. Roger's came back with a CCR of about 4.0. He said the roof plan is massive to accommodate a lot of square footage below it. He felt that 43% greenspace was meeting the bare minimum. He said the project was too big and not consistent with what was asked of another applicant to meet a month ago. He felt the cast stone details looked heavy and too animated.

Mr. Smith said the roofing material is a high profile clay barrel tile which will be variegated in color. The windows will be aluminum clad impact resistant windows with true divided lites. Mr. Elias said that cast stone material will be used for this project.

Mr. Bell said he also felt the house was quite large and the over the window and entry door treatments were too elaborate.

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

Mrs. Baker felt the project was a refreshing change and they need more imagination and a little bit of folly with houses. She agreed that it is a little over the edge, but the drama, the rhythm and harmony of the house gives credence to using a very odd lot in a big neighborhood and using it to good effect.

It was stated that the project is 8,350 total square feet.

Mr. Schuler said he felt the details and certain aspects of the fenestration should be reviewed and the house should relate to the size of the lot and the proportions, other than that the house has many charming effects to it.

ROLL CALL:

MRS. BAKER	YES
MR. WIDEMAN	YES
MRS. GINGRAS	YES
MRS. KINSELLA	YES
MR. BELL	NO
MR. DEZIEL	NO
MR. SCHULER	NO

MOTION CARRIED 4-3.

B91-98 Renovation

Applicant:	Robert Fessler
Address:	318 Arabian Road
Architect:	Smith and Moore
Project Description:	Renovation of existing two-story residence. A new carriage house at existing tennis court.

Mr. Bell, Mrs. Gingras and Mr. Adams said they met with the architect and reviewed the plans.

Architect Jon Moore presented the project and passed out mini plans and neighborhood statistics to the Commission. He said the house will be renovated within the existing footprint and a carriage house will be added to the east of the existing house. A second floor will be added which will surround an existing court yard and the style will be Spanish Colonial. He said the building will have rustone woodwork, textured stucco, shutters and barrel tile roof. He presented a color board and said the building will be a cranberry color which will be white washed.

Mr. Bell felt they did a wonderful job of transforming the present house into what is proposed. He commended the architects on their presentation form, which make it easy for the Commission to follow along and look at the project in more detail.

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

Mr. Deziel felt the tower, the balcony columns and the windows on the second floor, east elevation looked awkward.

Mr. Jon Moore said the windows on the second floor are existing and that they did not plan to change that elevation very much.

Mrs. Gingras commented that the 5/12 roof pitch was a little high for Mediterranean style, the tower is an overstatement and the building would be better served without it, the windows on the second story wing should be rethought and the proposed carriage house is a bit too grand.

Mr. Jon Moore spoke in the property owner's absence and said he believed the owner would agree to remove the tower if it is a major issue.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE PROVISION TO REMOVE THE TOWER.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WIDEMAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Frank said the proposed residence for 201 Via Bellaria was approved by ARCOM, but there is a landmarked specimen tree on the property which in the way of the house. The town forester Joe Ugi suggested to flip the floor plan and the tree would be avoided entirely by construction. Smith & Moore Architects reviewed and agreed that the plan could be flipped. Mr. Frank asked the Commission if they will direct staff to approve the revised floor plan for this project.

Mr. Jon Moore said the house is exactly the same with the exception of the floor plan.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO APPROVE THE REVISED FLOOR PLAN FOR 201 VIA BELLARIA.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B92-98 Demolition and New Residence

Applicant:	Paul Birmingham
Address:	300 Cherry Lane
Architect:	Smith and Moore
Project Description:	Demolition and new residence

Mrs. Gingras, Mr. Schuler and Mr. Adams said they met with the architect.

Architect Harold Smith presented a photograph of the existing house. He said the Bermuda style residence was constructed in 1951 and an addition was built at a later date.

MOTION BY MR. WIDEMAN TO APPROVE THE DEMOLITION WITH THE USUAL CONDITIONS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Architect Harold Smith said the site slopes from 8' at the south west corner to 17' at the west end of the property. He said the property is surrounded by homes that vary in size from 3,500 square feet to more than 10,000 square feet. He said there will be a two-story mass facing North Lake Way and a one-story mass that steps up the hill into the side of the two-story mass. The total square footage is 4,762 square feet which is 1,200 square feet larger than the existing home. The lot coverage is 28.5%, FAR is 39% and the CCR is 4.0. The roof will be a 5/12 pitch with flat white cement tile roofing material, the building will have a sand float stucco finish, operable wood shutters and true divided lite double-hung windows. Mr. Smith presented a color chip of pale yellow which is the proposed building color.

It was felt that the front entry may be "jammed" into the corner. It was suggested to carry the "Chippendale" railing around from the west facade and carry it over the front door and to make the surround flat at the top of the front door to making it less Mediterranean looking.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE PROVISION TO CONTINUE THE RAILING OVER THE FRONT ENTRANCE, CHANGE THE ENTRANCE DOOR AND TO EXAMINE THE BATHROOM WINDOW.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B94-98 Addition

Applicant:	Spencer and Patricia Levey
Address:	130 Reef Road
Architect:	SKA Architect
Project Description:	Addition of garage, front entry, box windows, roof, fascia, etc.

Note: The plans submitted for review did not meet the zoning code. Ms. Albarran said there was a box window in the set back that has been removed. Mr. Moore said if the Commission decides to discuss this project it would be with a condition that it has not had a final review for zoning. Ms. Albarran said she misunderstood the zoning code, it was a matter of removing two brackets and the window looks the same on the elevation drawings.

After discussion it was decided to hear project #B94-98. Chairman Schuler wanted to caution architects to follow procedure and properly submit their revised plans. He said if the plans don't come properly through the town, then we are not handling this exactly right. He said there have been several exceptions to that rule today.

Mr. Frank said that when plans do not comply, a letter is sent with a resubmitting deadline date. Note: The revised plans were handed to Tim Frank later in the meeting.

Architect Jackie Albarran said the project is a small house on a large lot. She said the existing garage will be made into a family room, the new garage will be relocated behind an existing wall and the garage door will be cut into the wall. The new entry will be enlarged and centered and a new loggia will be added to the rear of the house. Two jalousie windows will be replaced with a standard divided lite window and a box window.

Property Owner Patricia Levey addressed the Commission and said they plan to move the garage door over, add onto the driveway to form a semi circle and plant hedges at the street to block the garage doors from the street. She said the existing garage door will become a window and the existing garage door will be moved over to the existing wall. Ms. Albarran suggested coming back with a driveway plan for the Commission's review.

**MOTION BY MR. WIDEMAN TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE
STIPULATION TO COME BACK WITH A HEDGE PLAN FOR STAFF REVIEW.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

B95-98 New Residence

Applicant:	Robert A. Garvy
Address:	200 Esplanade Way
Architect:	Thomas Kirchhoff
Project Description:	New two-story residence

Mr. Wideman and Mr. Schuler said they met with the architect. Mr. Bell, Mrs. Baker and Mr. Adams said they met with the attorney and the architect.

Attorney Ron Kolins representing the applicant addressed the Commission. He said this project originally came before the Commission in August. He said it sits in a neighborhood with smaller, older homes and the Commission felt the project was a little too massive looking for the neighborhood. He said that rather than deferring it again, Mr. Kirchhoff totally redesigned the house.

Architect Thomas Kirchhoff presented the project. He said the house will face Esplanade Way and the garage will come in from Ocean Way. The style is now a Monterey with a cantilevered balcony on the second floor with a cantilevered roof at a lesser pitch than the main roof. The roof pitch will be at 7/12 with white concrete tile material. The stucco on the building will be white with a sand float finish and operable shutters. The house is about 6,100 square feet on a 16,125 square foot lot. The size of the main part of the house was reduced from the previous proposal,

but the CCR is about the same as the original presentation at 3.72. The first floor footprint was reduced and second floor area was increased because of the design style.

Mrs. Baker felt the project was a wonderful improvement over the original presentation.

Mr. Deziel asked for the numbers of this project and then compared them to the neighborhood. The neighborhood statistics charts were handed out the Commission Members.

Mr. Kolins said this house is larger than the others in the neighborhood given the age and type of neighborhood that it is and all of the lots, except one, are approximately 35% smaller than this lot. Mr. Kolins said they cannot provide their clients with a functional house for them at numbers that are different from this. What they thought was the main concern of most of the Commission, was to redesign the style of the house so that it is a little bit lower, reads less formal and it reads less massive. He said there is no way his clients will buy that property and build a 3,000 square foot house and have it adequate for their family needs.

Mr. Deziel said this is going to be a big house in that neighborhood when the vast majority is 2,000 and 3,000 square foot homes on lots close to the size. He said what Mr. Kolins' clients need for a residence size, is for the most part is irrelevant when considering the application of zoning ordinances and planning in a neighborhood.

Mr. Kolins said this project does meet all of the zoning requirements and does not need any variances, it has a roof height, due to the style, that is lower than would other wise would be and is on about 1/3 larger lot than the majority of the other lots in the area. He said the neighborhood is old and somewhat dilapidated and they are small and not functional for today's needs and families.

Mrs. Gingras felt the style was a big improvement. However, she felt the house is too large.

**MOTION BY MR. WIDEMAN TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.**

ROLL CALL:

MR. WIDEMAN	YES
MRS. KINSELLA	YES
MRS. GINGRAS	NO
MRS. BAKER	NO
MR. BELL	NO
MR. DEZIEL	NO
MR. SCHULER	YES

MOTION FAILED 3-4.

Mr. Kolins asked the Commission to deny the project because his client will not be able to make this house smaller and he said they will pursue it from that point.

**MOTION BY MR. BELL TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE JANUARY MEETING
AND TO REDUCE THE PROJECT BY 400 SQUARE FEET.
MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.**

Mr. Deziel said they should take the two houses out of the calculations that are on North Ocean Boulevard and come back in the neighborhood of size of about 40% larger than the average. He said that the proposal is 76% larger than the average house in the area. He said there is no problem with the architecture, except for the mass that is considered in the architecture, which will be too dissimilar in size with the neighborhood.

**MOTION BY MR. DEZIEL TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE JANUARY MEETING
BASED ON THE CRITERIA IN SECTION 5-387, G. THE PROPOSED BUILDING OR
STRUCTURE IS NOT APPROPRIATE IN ITS RELATION TO THE ESTABLISHED
CHARACTER OR OTHER STRUCTURES IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA OR
NEIGHBORING AREAS AND THE PROPOSAL SHOULD BE 5,500 SQUARE FEET
MAKING IT APPROXIMATELY 40% LARGER THAN THE AVERAGE IN THE
NEIGHBORHOOD.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.**

Mr. Kolins said he is sure his client will not want to bring this house back at 5,500 square feet and he again asked for a project denial.

ROLL CALL:

MR. DEZIEL	YES
MRS. GINGRAS	YES
MRS. BAKER	YES
MRS. KINSELLA	NO
MR. BELL	YES
MR. WIDEMAN	NO
MR. SCHULER	NO

MOTION CARRIED 4-3.

B96-98 Demolition

Applicant: 1320 N. Lakeway LLC

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

Address: 1320 North Lake Way
Contractor: Benno Janssen III
Project Description: Demolition of existing residence

Mr. Deziel said he spoke to the attorney regarding this project.

Contractor Benno Janssen presented a photo board of the existing house and said it was built in 1950 and designed by Caler and Plockelman. He said the main house is approximately 2,800 square feet and the garage is 450 square feet. He said there is no historical significance attached to this residence and at the present time there are no future plans for the lot.

Some of the Commission Members commented that the house was in terrible condition.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO APPROVE THE DEMOLITION WITH THE PROVISION TO SOD OR SEED AND IRRIGATE THE VACANT LOT WITHIN 30 DAYS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. DEZIEL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B97-98 New Residence

Applicant: W.W. Windle Co.
Address: 249 Seabreeze Avenue
Architect: Affiniti Architects
Project Description: New Two-story residence

Architect Benjamin Schrier presented the project. He said they will request demolition of an existing house. He said they did not do a demolition request, but would like the Commission to review it and formally apply for demolition next month.

Mr. Frank said that is not normal procedure and no demolition report was filed with the history of the property.

Chairman Schuler ruled to hear Mr. Schrier's presentation.

Mr. Schrier said the proposed replacement house will be 4,820 square feet, it will have an FAR of 39.4% CCR of 4.1, lot coverage of 29.9% and a greenspace of 49.2%. The garage will be located in the rear of the property and will come in off of the alleyway in the back of the property. Mr. Schrier said the finished floor slab will be at 8'6" NGVD with a tie beam height at 20'8". After

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

comments, Mr. Schrier agreed to lower the slab to the required 7'6" NGVD and that would bring the tie beam height down one foot. He said the roof will have barrel cement tile material and true divided lite, impact glass, metal clad windows. He said the areas of contact will have stone elements and the areas of no contact will be stucco.

The proportion of the windows and the window surrounds were discussed and it was suggested to submit the working drawings to Mr. Frank and let him look at them to see how they actually look.

MOTION BY MR. WIDEMAN TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE PROVISION THAT THE HEIGHT BE REDUCED DOWN TO 7'5" FOR THE SLAB.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B93-98 New Residence

Applicant:	Amigo Partnership
Address:	333 Eden Road
Architect:	Smith and Moore
Project Description:	New two-story residence

Mr. Bell, Mrs. Baker, Mrs. Gingras and Mr. Schuler said they spoke with the architect.

Architect Harold Smith said they represent Mr. Paul Whittmann who owns the property. He said that it consists of two vacant lots on the north side of the street. He said the smallest home on Eden Road is 3,739 square feet and the largest is 10,411 square feet. This project is the western most of the two lots. The house is two stories, 5,890 square feet, with a FAR of 40% and a 3.9 CCR. He said there is a one story mass in the rear with a three car garage coming off the alley. There will be a pool court yard with a detached guest house/cabana. The side yard set backs are 19' on the west and 17' on the east. He said the style is a classic Georgian with a broken pitch roof and a tie beam height of 20.6". The building will have a sand float, smooth textured stucco finish, true divided lite, double-hung windows and shutters. The roof will be a flat, medium warm grey concrete tile. And cast stone will be used for the quoins, steps and columns.

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

Mr. Deziel felt the quoins were too small and out of scale for the vertical height and the building was very simple in its symmetry.

Mr. Wideman felt that the project was uninspired and that the project was very large for the area and that they are "pushing the envelope."

Mrs. Baker felt that the house was nice, but the numbers are a little high compared to the rest of the neighborhood.

Mrs. Gingras suggested dressing up the house by possibly adding a water table at the base and add a horizontal band 2/3 of the way up the building. She felt the quoins were in scale, but felt the building, especially the wings were too vertical.

Mr. Paul Whittmann addressed the Commission and defended the architecture and size of the proposed project.

Mr. Moore said there was a two-story house on two lots and now there will be two houses on two lots that will definitely change the character neighborhood. He said that the other vacant lot has a landmarked sausage tree.

Mrs. Baker stated the street has evolved and this project will be the "crown" on the development of Eden Road. She felt that it is very important that the two houses they bring in, come in at the average, or not much over the average CCR and FAR for that street. It was stated that the average CCR is 3.1 and the FAR 31%.

**MOTION BY MR. DEZIEL TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE JANUARY MEETING
AND THE RESTUDY THE FRONT ELEVATION AND REDUCE THE SIZE
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WIDEMAN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

C. DEFERRALS AND CONTINUATIONS - MINOR PROJECTS

A43-98 Lighting

Applicant: CPS Properties
Address: 324 Royal Palm Way
Architect: Robert Bell
Project Description: Addition of lighting to illuminate building in the evening hours.

This project was deferred from the October and November meetings.

No one was present to represent the project.

**MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO REMOVE THE PROJECT FROM THE AGENDA.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WIDEMAN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A46 -98 Pavilion

Applicant: Mr. And Mrs. John Zenko
Address: 232 Tangier Avenue
Architect: The Pandula Architects
Project Description: Add one story, 80 s.f. entry pavilion.

This project was deferred from the October and November meetings.

No one was present to represent the project.

**MOTION BY MR. WIDEMAN TO REMOVE THE PROJECT FROM THE AGENDA.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A51-98 Landscape

Applicant: Euro-Homes
Address: 306 and 314 Chilian Avenue
Architect: Lang Design
Project Description: Hardscape and landscape plans

This project was deferred from the October and November meetings.

Mr. Bell said he spoke with the architect.

Mr. Frank said there has been no updated information received regarding the project since October 14, 1998.

MOTION BY MR. WIDEMAN TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE JANUARY MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.

ROLL CALL:

MR. WIDEMAN	YES
MRS. KINSELLA	YES
MRS. GINGRAS	YES
MRS. BAKER	NO
MR. BELL	NO
MR. DEZIEL	YES
MR. SCHULER	YES

MOTION CARRIED 5-2.

A55-98 Driveway and Gates

Applicant: Addison Construction
Address: 236 Via Las Brisas
Architect: Phoenix Architects
Project Description: New driveway and aluminum gates

This project was deferred from the October and November meetings.

No one was present to represent the project.

MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE JANUARY MEETING.

Mr. Frank said that no revised drawings have been received since October 13, 1998.

**MOTION BY MR. WIDEMAN TO REMOVE THE ITEM FROM THE AGENDA.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A58-98 Landscape

Applicant: Jack Flagg
Address: 249 La Puerta Way
Landscape Architect: Steven Dauber
Project Description: Landscape plan

This project was deferred from the November meeting.

Landscape Architect Steven Dauber presented an overlay drawing of the project. He said the rose apple trees are native, fast growing, and they will grow to the height of the eve line on the building. The 7' wood fence at the end of the driveway will be board on board and quite dense to buffer noise from the neighbors.

Lore Smith, who resides at 250 Nightingale Trail, said the wooden fence and hedge material planted at the end of the driveway would satisfy her concern for the noise.

Mr. Dauber said the solid ficus hedge installed along the fence will be 12 to 13 feet high. He said the hedge material around the base of the building is now 3' high portocarpus which will grow to the bottom of the windows.

**MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE
PROVISION TO CHANGE THE FLORIDA APPLE TO THE FICUS ALII.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. BELL.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A59-98 Landscape

Applicant: Samuel Foreman
Address: 1072 North Lake Way
Architect: William Jaskela
Project Description: Landscape plan

This project was deferred from the November meeting.

Steve Smith addressed the Commission and said the landscape architect has a family emergency

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

and had to leave, so he would be representing the project. Mr. Smith said that annuals will be planted in the front of the house and zoyza grass will be used for the lawn.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

The driveway was discussed and it was agreed to take out one parking space in front and grass-crete the rest of the driveway.

AMENDED MOTION BY MR. BELL TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE PROVISION TO REDUCE THE PARKING AREA IN FRONT AND USE GRASS IN THE PAVING AREA.

**MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A60-98 Landscape

Applicant:	Martin Atkins / Boston Homes
Address:	201 Monterey Road
Architect:	Howard Ostrout
Project Description:	Landscape plan

This project was deferred from the November meeting.

This project was called after item #B84-98.

Mr. Frank said he did not believe that the landscape and the hardscape were approved at a previous ARCOM meeting.

Landscape Architect Howard Ostrout presented an elevation drawings of the proposed project. He said cocoanut trees will be planted along North Ocean Boulevard which will curve inward away from the power lines and will curve inward along the driveway. Two 26' tall Egyptian date palm trees will be planted close to the house, Montgomery palms will be planted at the corners of the house and clusters of Washintonia palms will be planted as well as several color accent trees. A 5' silver buttonwood hedge will be planted in front of the 6' high privacy wall with variegated liriopie planted in front of the hedge.

Mr. Moore said it was the staff's opinion that the hardscape and site wall were up for discussion.

Mr. Ostrout said that Mr. Caldarone of Boston Homes met with Mr. Frank and Mr. Frank concluded that the site wall was approved as the footers and piers have been poured.

ARCOM Minutes 12/18/98

Mrs. Kinsella said she did not see any changes on the plans to the driveway, the curb cuts and increase of greenspace as were discussed at the last meeting.

Mr. Ostrout said that at a safety standpoint, the driveway as presented would prove a safety feature.

**MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO APPROVE THE LANDSCAPE PLAN AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WIDEMAN.**

Mrs. Kinsella ask for the greenspace percentage of the project. Mr. Ostrout said the green space is 39.2%. Mr. Moore said that figure must be incorrect. Mr. Ostrout said they are aware that 40% is the requirement and they will take off some areas to make it 40%. He was then asked to make the greenspace more than 40%.

Mr. Ostrout said the hardscape material is a Tuskin stone, concrete paver system. He said the border pavers will be 6" x 9" and the driveway area colors will be red, tan and charcoal.

Chariman Schuler said that if this plan does not meet the zoning code requirements, they will have to come back and present a plan that does. Mr. Moore said that 52% is the required landscaping for this site plan, that had been approved. He said the site plan and the hardscape were approved and he suggested that the architect coordinate both plans to meet the 52% requirement and follow the approved hardscape plan.

**MRS. BAKER WITHDREW HER MOTION.
MR. WIDEMAN WITHDREW HIS SECOND.**

**MOTION BY MR. DEZIEL TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE JANUARY MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

C. NEW BUSINESS - MINOR PROJECTS

A63-98 landscape

Applicant:	John Beard
Address:	410 Chilian Avenue
Architect:	Steven M. Dauber
Project Description:	Landscape plan

Landscape Architect Steven Dauber presented an elevation drawing of the proposed landscaping. He said the ficus hedge along the driveway and over the driveway cuts will be sculptured. There will be an entire array of queen palms, areca palms and washingtonia palms to add more scale to

the building heights.

It was suggested to move the driveway to the west to create more greenspace, but after discussion it was felt that to keep the driveway at its location and reduce the width of it would be the better solution.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO APPROVE THE LANDSCAPING WITH THE PROVISION TO REDUCE THE WIDTH OF DRIVEWAY TO 12'.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Schuler passed the gavel to Vice-Chair Gingras and was away from the meeting room during the next project.

A64-98 ATM

Applicant:	Suntrust Bank
Address:	300 Royal Poinciana Plaza
Architect:	Glen P. Harris
Project Description:	New ATM service

Architect Glen Harris said there was a previous request for an ATM machine at this location and since that presentation the lighting has been changed to a uniformed type of lighting arrangement. He said all of the lighting in front of the ATM unit is down lighting and on the ground level.

The Commission did not feel comfortable with the location of the ATM machine and the added lighting in this area.

Mr. Harris introduced Jack Craig Senior Vice-President of Suntrust Bank. Mr. Craig said the customers requested after hours banking at this location.

It was suggested to find another location or create an interior lobby for the ATM machine.

MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE JANUARY MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. DEZIEL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A65-98 ATM

Applicant: Fidelity Federal
Address: 245 Royal Poinciana Way
Architect: Glen P. Harris
Project Description: New ATM service

Vice-Chair Gingras passed the gavel back to Chairman Schuler at this time.

Mr. Schuler, Mrs. Baker and Mr. Bell said they discussed the project with Mr. Harris.

Architect Glen Harris presented the project.

The Commission felt that there would be significantly more lighting for the ATM machine and they were not in favor of commercial transactions taking place on the street. It was suggested to locate the machine in the back of the building or inside.

MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE JANUARY MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. DEZIEL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A66-98 Revisions

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Robert Lawrence
Address: 30 Middle Road
Architect: Mike Walski
Project Description: Add quoins of white painted stucco and louvered entry doors.

Building Contractor Jerry Sullivan presented the project. He asked for approval of double louvered entry doors and the addition of quoins to the house. It was felt that the same size hardware should be used on the entry doors. Mr. Sullivan said he was concerned that the two hardware fixtures may not clear each other when the doors are closed.

Mr. Deziel left the meeting at this time.

Mrs. Baker felt the house would look better if the garage door matched the louvered entry doors.

Mr. Sullivan said it hard to find attractive hurricane rated garage doors, but they will make an effort to find a replacement.

MR. BELL MADE THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED WITH THE STIPULATION TO COORDINATE THE FRONT DOORS AND TO APPLY FOR STAFF APPROVAL IF A MATCHITNG HURRICANE RATED GARAGE DOOR CAN BE FOUND.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ADAMS.

A67-98 Gates

Applicant: F. Eugene Dixon
Address: 220 El Vedado Road
Architect: Thomas Kirchhoff
Project Description: Driveway entry gates

Architect Thomas Kirchhoff presented the proposed entry gates to the Commission.

**MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A68-98 Landscaping

Applicant: F. Eugene Dixon
Address: 220 El Vedado Road
Architect: Innocenti & Webel
Project Description: Landscaping

Mrs. Kinsella said it was a beautiful plan, but they need to remove the plantings from the easement areas.

**MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED WITH THE PROVISION TO REMOVE THE PLANTINGS FROM THE EASEMENTS.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Note: Bert Kribbs of Innocenti & Webel was present, but did not address the Commission.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Discussion took place regarding project submission deadlines. It was decided to have the architect representing deferred projects submit their revised plans no later than the Monday, or two days, before the next scheduled ARCOM meeting. It was stated for the record that landscape plans should have a picture of the house part of the presentation.

III. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:00 P.M.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.