



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Building and Zoning Department
MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1990

TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 360 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD, PALM BEACH

I. Call to Order

The October 24, 1990 Architectural Commission meeting was called to order at 12:35 p.m. by Chairman Jeffery W. Smith.

II. Roll Call

PRESENT: Jeffery W. Smith, Chairman
Lesly Smith, Member
John Schuler, Member
Jane R. Grace, Member
Marie Hope, Member
Joanna Frost-Golino, Member
Leighton Rosenthal, Alternate Member
Laurel Baker, Alternate Member
Jesse Newman, Alternate Member

John C. Randolph, Town Attorney
Pamela McNierney, representing the Town Attorney
Robert L. Moore, Director of Planning, Zoning &
Building
Timothy M. Frank, Planner/Projects Coordinator

ABSENT: Jorge Sanchez, Member

RECORDING SECRETARY: Mary A. Pollitt

III. Approval of Minutes of September 26, 1990 Meeting.

MOTION MADE BY MR. NEWMAN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

(Mr. Rosenthal arrived at the meeting. Mr. Newman no longer voting.)

Mr. Randolph requested to speak to the Commission for approximately five minutes to review the duties and responsibilities of the Commission.

Mr. Randolph's remarks:

Sometimes it is helpful to review not only with this board but with all the boards of the Town their duties and responsibilities. The duties and responsibilities relating to the Architectural Commission are particularly difficult because of the nature of such a board. It is a board akin to a community appearance board where it is difficult to have specific criteria at least as specific as you may have in a zoning ordinance. Such a commission obviously serves a very useful purpose and has served a very useful purpose in this Town and other towns.

I am in the process with one community of a debate over whether to establish such a board because they are going through the throes of having, what they consider, some architectural nightmares coming up, and they want to have such a board. But the dispute that is taking place in that community is, "How can you establish a board such as that? Doesn't that involve the exercise of discretion and people imposing their own personal tastes on others?"

I think the answer is that it is not necessarily the case. I think that, particularly with the Town ordinance, there are criteria which are set forth in the ordinance which deal with the manner in which each and every application will be reviewed.

I think the matter of whether or not one person is imposing his taste on another person can be resolved simply by keeping foremost in the minds of the commissioners the criteria that are involved in the ordinance.

Again, it's very difficult in an ordinance such as this to draw specific criteria nor is it easy in a zoning ordinance to have height restrictions, set-back restrictions, lot coverage restrictions, etc. When we get into the type of criteria which are included within our ordinance, it necessarily involves some judgment, some use of discretion in determining whether or not the criteria are being met.

As you know, the criteria that are set forth in this ordinance are basically as follows:

First, the project is in good taste, good design and contributing to the image of Palm Beach. That is a little bit vague--that particular criteria--but there are others more objective that deal with whether or not a project is excessively similar to other projects in the general area; whether the project is excessively dissimilar; whether it is appropriate in relation to the neighborhood and that sort of thing.

I think when reviewing the applications, as long as a board such as yours keeps its criteria in mind, it could not go afoul of the purpose of the code, and it would avoid criticism from people saying, "Well, you're simply imposing your personal standards on us."

So, I think everyone, applicant and board alike, must realize there is, indeed, because of the nature of a board such as this, some discretion that has to be involved, unfortunately. But, without that, you could not have a board such as this, and you would perhaps be realizing, within the Town, some projects which no one would want to see.

I think in looking at the functions of an Architectural Review Board or a Community Appearance Board, I always like to use the example of--and this is an extreme example, I grant you--but for someone who is attempting to build, for instance, a dome shaped house on a street of rectangular shaped houses or where someone is attempting to build an ultra-modern project on a street that's full of Mizner type of construction. Again, those are extremes, but I think that is the basic type of thing that an Architectural Review Commission has to look at. Is this project particularly in harmony with the neighborhood? Is it too dissimilar, or is it too similar?

I think the other thing that needs to be kept in mind is that the zoning ordinance dictates what a person can put on a particular piece of property. It dictates height, dictates the number of stories, set-backs, lot coverage, etc.

You are not concerned with the zoning aspects of a particular piece of property except to the extent that if someone wants to put a second story on a house, and you think, "Well, most of the houses on that street are single story houses and we don't think you should be able to put a second story on them." I don't think that's within your province to rule on. If the zoning ordinance allows a second story, I think they're entitled to have a second story. However, I think you can look at the massiveness of that project and how it conforms to the rest of the neighborhood and do what you can in your role, as an Architectural Commission, in dealing with the architectural design so as to do your best in seeing that project conforms to the general area. So, I think, to that extent, you can consider those types of things.

That's basically it. I think all of us recognize and have recognized for sometime this is a very difficult board to sit on because the criteria are as well defined as we can make them. Sometimes they're not as particular as people would like to see them; but that's the way it is, and I think that's what we have to deal with and would just mention again in looking at these applications as long as you stick to the criteria, I don't think you can be criticized by an applicant for imposing your personal taste on others.

In response to Mr. Smith's request for questions, the Commission members had none.

Mr. Randolph thanked the Commission for the time allotted for his remarks.

(Mr. Randolph left the meeting at 12:50 p.m.)

IV. Project Review

A. Deferrals and Continuations: Major and Minor Projects

B28-90A Revisions

Applicant: The Wells Road Land Company
Address: 133 Wells Road
Architect: Ames Bennett
Project Description: Revisions to a previously approved project

The driveway materials and paint colors were deferred from the August meeting.

The architect requests deferral from the October meeting.

MOTION MADE BY MR. SCHULER TO DEFER THE PROJECT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ROSENTHAL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B66-90 New Residence

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Claude Clement Mimun
Address: 1150 North Ocean Boulevard
Architect: NEO Design; Earl Wolfe
Project Description: New two story residence

The project was approved at the September meeting with the conditions samples of the driveway materials, house colors, tile and glass samples and a landscape plan be submitted at a later meeting. Additionally, the balustrades were to be re-studied.

Dennis Michaud presented a light bronze tinted glass sample and a window frame representing the casement windows predominately used through out the house.

One large window on the front facade was changed to two smaller windows. A revised drawing was presented to show the change.

A sample of the cast stone window treatment was shown to the Commission. This cast stone will also be used on other details of the house, i.e. the columns and balustrades.

Mr. Smith noticed the cast stone molded window treatment does not show on the plans. These should be added.

Samples of the Italian clay roof tile which is a reddish-terra cotta color were presented to the Commission.

A discussion followed on the elevation drawing shown to the Commission. A maximum of 12 inches of fill may be used over the existing grade. The new elevation drawing reflects that requirement.

The driveway materials will be submitted with the landscape plan.

Samples of the color, "whitewash white", to be used on the stucco were presented.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. SMITH TO APPROVE THE SAMPLES AND CHANGES WITH THE CONDITION A LANDSCAPE PLAN (INCLUDING DRIVEWAY MATERIALS) BE SUBMITTED AT A LATER DATE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. HOPE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B16-90 Revisions/Additions

Applicant: Michael J. Civitella
Address: 272 Country Club Road
Architect: Lawrence Browning
Project Description: Revisions to approved project

The project was approved at the April, 1990, meeting and deferred from the August meeting.

Mr. Frank explained the project had been red-tagged by the Building Department after field inspectors ascertained the work was not being performed as indicated in the approved job site drawings.

The kitchen addition was to have a flat roof over the addition. The actual roof was constructed with a pitch to allow for the installation of roof tile. Mr. Michael Civitella contended the Building Department had required the pitch roof.

Mrs. Smith requested the name of the contractor for the project. Mr. Civitella replied he did not have that information.

Mr. Civitella presented photographs of the structure as it presently exists.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. SMITH TO DEFER THE PROJECT UNTIL THE END OF THE MEETING TO ALLOW MR. CIVITELLA TIME TO PRODUCE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Civitella returned at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Moore requested that Mr. Harry Ackerman, Chief Building Inspector, from the Building Department explain the series of events that occurred with the construction of this addition.

Mr. Ackerman reported an owner-builder permit was issued to Michael Civitella's father. No contractor applied for a permit. Mr. Ackerman had answered a question as to what pitch of roof was required for tile application.

The windows added to the kitchen in the area of the roof slope were not on the approved plans. Additionally, a paladian window was installed, not the flat top window shown on the plans. The plans for the kitchen addition showed a flat roof with a sky light. A 5' x 6' casement window was shown over the sink in the kitchen. The addition was to be stuccoed to match the existing residence.

MOTION MADE BY MR. SCHULER TO DEFER THE PROJECT UNTIL FAMILY MEMBERS COULD DISCUSS THE PROJECT FURTHER.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. SMITH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B77-90 New Residence

Property Owner:	Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Levin
Address:	446 North Lake Way
Architect:	Milton Klein
Project Description:	Construct two story residence with tennis court, swimming pool and cabana

The project was conceptually approved at the September meeting with the conditions detailed, working drawings, material samples and a landscape plan be presented at a later meeting.

The architect requests deferral from the October meeting.

MOTION MADE BY MR. SCHULER TO DEFER THE PROJECT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. HOPE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

(Mrs. Grace arrived at the meeting at 1:10 p.m.)

B82-90 New Residence

Applicant:	Richard Doan
Address:	218 Miraflores Drive
Architect:	Grierson Associates
Project Description:	New one-story residence with swimming pool

The project was approved at the August meeting with the condition a landscape plan, color samples and driveway materials be submitted at a later meeting.

The project was deferred from the September meeting.

MOTION MADE BY MR. ROSENTHAL TO DEFER THE PROJECT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B91-90 Addition

Applicant: Seymour and Rhoda Cole
Address: 233 List Road
Architect: Steven Bruh
Project Description: Second floor addition

The project was approved at the September meeting with the condition samples of the house (color), trim and roof be submitted at later meeting.

The architect requests deferral from the October meeting.

MOTION MADE BY MR. SCHULER TO DEFER THE PROJECT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. HOPE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B27-90 Color samples and Landscape Plan

Applicant: John Raimondi
Address: 1420 North Ocean Boulevard
Architect: Gene Pandula
Jungles Landscape Architects
Project Description: Color samples and Landscape Plan

The project was deferred from the September meeting.

Gene Pandula presented samples of the paint color for the exterior of the house and the color of the window banding. The flat roof tile is terra cotta.

Raymond Jungles presented details of the landscape plan for the west boundary of the property and the front hedge. Mr. Jungles explained he has attempted to use native vegetation as presently occurs on the ocean side of North Ocean Boulevard.

Mrs. Smith reminded Mr. Jungles a hedge along North Ocean Boulevard was agreed to for the purpose of site screening. The palmetto shrubs shown on the plan do not serve the same purpose as a site-screening hedge.

A discussion followed on the site screening of the pool. Mr. Moore pointed out this was a requirement of the variance Mr. Raimondi received from the Town Council and was to be in place

when the pool was completed. Currently, a "chicken wire" fence is in place. This fence was a temporary fence during the construction phase to meet the Town ordinance for screening pools.. Mr. Moore stated this is a Code Enforcement issue and will be handled by the Building Department.

Mr. Doyle Rogers, representing Mr. Jackson, the owner of the property to the immediate west of Mr. Raimondi, presented pictures to the Commission showing the present state of the landscaping materials planted this summer. His client requests no large trees be planted on the west edge of the property that would interfere with the view or breeze from the Ocean.

Mr. Smith suggested the removal of two large trees (live oak) shown on the landscape plan so the landscape plan presented could be considered.

MOTION MADE BY MR. SCHULER TO DEFER THE LANDSCAPE PLAN WITH THE CONDITION THE PLAN SHOW THE IDENTIFIED PLANTS RELATIVE TO THE PROPOSAL INCLUDING THE WEST PROPERTY LINE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. SMITH.

A discussion followed after the motion was made. Mrs. Frost-Golino suggested enough detailed information was available on the plan to allow the Commission to make a decision at this time.

Mr. Jungles suggested substituting sea grape for the hedge materials along North Ocean Boulevard and a seagrape on the west property line. Mr. Rogers requested a height limitation on the property line of 8 feet. Mr. Jungles also suggested using 2 - 14 to 16 feet shade trees.

THE MOTION FAILED 5/2 WITH A ROLL CALL VOTE AS FOLLOWS:

YEA: JOHN SCHULER
LESLY SMITH

NAY: MARIE HOPE
JOANNA FROST-GOLINO
LEIGHTON ROSENTHAL
LAUREL BAKER
JEFFERY SMITH

(Mrs. Grace abstained from voting on this issue because she had not been present at previous meetings when the project was discussed in depth.)

A discussion followed by the Commission members on the possibility of amending the submitted landscape plan.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO TO APPROVE THE CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN AS SUBMITTED WITH THE HEDGE IN FRONT AS DISCUSSED, AND ON THE WEST PROPERTY LINE, SUBSTITUTE ONE SEAGRAPE TREE FOR THE 2 SHADE TREES AND THE HEDGE TO BE NO HIGHER THAN 8 FEET. THE HEDGING MATERIAL SHOULD BE SEAGRAPE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. HOPE.

MOTION CARRIED 5/2 WITH A ROLL CALL VOTE AS FOLLOWS:

YEA: JOANNA FROST-GOLINO
MARIE HOPE
LEIGHTON ROSENTHAL
LAUREL BAKER
JEFFERY SMITH

NAY: LESLY SMITH
JOHN SCHULER

Mr. Pandula requested the Commission render a decision on the submitted paint samples.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. HOPE TO APPROVE THE COLOR SAMPLES.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SCHULER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

(The Commission recessed from 2:00 p.m. to 2:20 p.m.)

B86-90 New Residence

Property Owner: Peter Stanley
Address: 1332 North Ocean Boulevard
Architect: James P. Drago
Project Description: Construct new two story residence

The project was deferred from the September meeting.

Ms. McNierney stated Ms. Baker would continue voting on this project in place of Mrs. Grace who had not been present at previous meetings when this project was discussed.

Mr. Frank read a letter into the record from the Doctors Lerner who reside at 201 Ocean Terrace. The Lerner's object to the height of the structure and stated "the house is.....not in keeping with the character of the existing neighborhood."

Jim Drago, Architect for the project, requested comments from the neighbors (in attendance in the audience) be heard prior to his presentation so he could react to any objections or questions.

Mr. Smith replied Mr. Drago's verbal presentation should be presented first to allow any questions arising from the presentation to be clarified.

Mr. Drago presented a map of the North Ocean Boulevard area identified with letters representing neighboring properties. The letter "A" represents the Stanley property at 1332 North Ocean Boulevard. The present house on the lot is 34 feet above mean sea level (as measured by a surveyor). "B" represents the property owned by Dr. Lilja to the south and is 33 feet above mean sea level.

Mr. Martino's house to the west is "C" and measures 38 feet above

sea level. "D", the property north on Ocean Boulevard measures 43.5 feet.

Mr. Martino responded to questions from Mr. Drago and the Commission. He stated he did not wish to look at the back of Mr. Stanley's house which is 49 feet above mean sea level, nor would he like Mr. Stanley looking into his back yard from an elevated height.

Mr. Moore defined "neighborhood" as required by the ordinance for notification of property owners. Two hundred (200) feet is measured from the edges of the subject property.

Mr. Drago presented his changes to the drawings compared to the drawings presented at the previous meeting. The driveway cut on Ocean Terrace has been eliminated. Entry to the garage area is from the North Ocean Boulevard side only. The house has been dropped (lowered) as far as the code allows.

Cut through elevations showed the relationship between the north and south properties and the east and west properties.

The garage level (basement) is below the crown of the road (North Ocean Boulevard) and the first floor elevation is 18 inches above the crown. The garage doors are not visible from Dr. Lilja's property. The existing seagrape/Australian pine hedge is 11-13 feet.

Responding to questions from the Commission, Mr. Drago reported of 12 houses in the area, 6 are one-story residences, 4 are one and one-half stories and 2 are two-story residences.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Drago how the cubical content of Mr. Stanley's proposed residence would compare to other houses in the neighborhood. Mr. Drago responded he could not answer that question without entering the homes in question.

Mrs. Hope questioned the drainage of water from the property given the location of the garage area. Mr. Drago replied the water would be contained on the property and mentioned the use of a dry well and an engineering solution to the potential problem. The storm sewer line is located to the west of the property.

The Commission asked Mr. Martino if he had further comments concerning the project. Mr. Martino replied Mr. Drago promised him that he would not be able to see the Stanleys' house. Mr. Drago responded, " If we promise to do something, we have to do it."

Mrs. Frost-Golino asked Mr. Drago if they had considered lowering the front entrance to a one story area to be compatible with the neighborhood. Mr. Stanley replied he would look at changing the roof line over the entry area.

Mrs. Frost-Golino objects to the mass of the building. Mr.

Schuler commented the building is "quite massive and very busy". Mrs. Hope commented that "less is more". Mrs. Smith has a problem with the amount of glass on the house and the bay windows and balconies that were added on the second floor.

Mr. Drago presented a closing statement requesting approval for the project.

Mr. Martino would like to see a definite site plan showing the proposed trees and a commitment from Mr. Drago and Mr. Stanley as previously mentioned.

Dr. Lilja commented on the lowering of the garage area which is better. The new project is 16 feet higher than the existing structure on the lot. He objects to the height and massiveness of the house and the dissimilarity of the design to other houses in the neighborhood. Dr. Lilja also requests the site screening be maintained.

Ann Lilja, 110 Ocean Terrace, questioned the relationship of the scale of the house and the integrity of the design as it relates to Palm Beach. She commented the design is "out of Builder's World".

MOTION MADE BY MR. SCHULER TO DEFER THE PROJECT FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THE MASSIVENESS OF THE RESIDENCE AND [SECTION (f)] AS FOLLOWS:

"THE PROPOSED BUILDING OR STRUCTURE IS NOT VISIBLY EXCESSIVELY DISSIMILAR IN RELATION TO ANY OTHER STRUCTURES EXISTING OR FOR WHICH A PERMIT HAS BEEN ISSUED OR TO ANY OTHER STRUCTURES INCLUDED IN THE SAME PERMIT APPLICATION, FACING UPON THE SAME OR INTERSECTING PUBLIC OR PRIVATE WAY (ALLEYS NOT INCLUDED) AND WITHIN TWO HUNDRED (200) FEET OF THE PROPOSED SITE IN RESPECT TO ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING FEATURES:

- (1) CUBICAL CONTENTS,
- (2) GROSS FLOOR AREA,
- (3) HEIGHT OF BUILDING OR HEIGHT OF ROOF,
- (4) NOT INCLUDED WITH THIS MOTION

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. SMITH.

The Commission, Mr. Drago and Mr. Stanley discussed the issues in the motion before the vote was taken.

Mr. Stanley said he was not prepared to scale the house down and he does not want a deferral.

Mrs. Frost-Golino asked Mr. Stanley if he would consider design changes in an attempt to make the roof design less.

Mr. Stanley replied he would consider changing the roof line but not the facade.

Mrs. Smith asked Mr. Stanley if he would consider changing any of the windows, reduce the massiveness or dealing with the dissimilarity to the neighboring properties?

Mr. Stanley replied he did not know what windows could be removed and didn't "necessarily want to change" anything else.

Ms. McNierney advised the Commission if they would decide for a denial and not a deferral, the ordinance requirements should be delineated on a denial form.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 7/0 WITH A ROLL CALL VOTE.

YEA: JOHN SCHULER
LESLY SMITH
MARIE HOPE
JOANNA FROST-GOLINO
LEIGHTON ROSENTHAL
LAUREL BAKER
JEFFERY SMITH

(Mr. Newman left the meeting at 3:25 p.m.)

B96-90 Remodel commercial space

Applicant: B. Handelsman
Address: 238 Worth Avenue
Architect: The Lawrence Group
Project Description: Divide present space in half; new entrance and storefront to face Via.

The project was deferred from the September meeting.

Donna Beinstein presented elevation drawings of the proposed changes.

The present retail space would be divided with a new door opening into the via at the edge of the courtyard.

The Commission requested photographs of the building in question. Ms. Beinstein did not have the photographs but offered to return at the end of the meeting with them.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO TO DEFER THE PROJECT UNTIL THE END OF THE MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. SMITH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Ms. Beinstein returned at the end of the meeting with photographs

of the building.

MOTION MADE BY MR. SCHULER TO APPROVE THE ALTERNATE PLAN.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. HOPE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B43-90 New Residence

Applicant:	Mr. and Mrs. Frazier Wellmeier
Address:	206 Queens Lane
Architect:	Robert F. Sonberg
Project Description:	Review of 3 elevations

This project was approved at the June 27, 1990 ARCOM meeting. In addition to window changes on two of the elevations, the south elevation was never presented to the Commission.

Frazier Wellmeier presented copies of the approved elevations to the Commission and revisions of those elevations.

MOTION MADE BY MR. SCHULER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. SMITH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A79-90 Revisions

Applicant:	Mr. and Mrs. Robert Whitacre
Address:	200 Emerald Lane
Designer:	Michelle J. Ackerman
Project Description:	Revisions to an approved project

This project was approved at the July 25, 1990, ARCOM meeting.

Cathy and Robert Whitacre presented photographs of the project. They wish to change the approved driveway cut for safety purposes.

The Commission discussed the configuration of the driveway. One side of the driveway can be reduced and additional planting provided in that area to site screen the garage door.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. SMITH TO APPROVE THE REVISION WITH THE CONDITIONS THE DRIVEWAY WIDTH BE REDUCED TO APPROXIMATELY TWELVE (12) FEET AND A LANDSCAPE PLAN BE SUBMITTED AT A LATER MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SCHULER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THE ABOVE CONDITIONS.

B. New Business - Major Projects

B100-90 New Residence

Applicant: Gordon Sinclair
Address: 324 El Bravo
Architect: Ronald J. Bercovitz
Project Description: New Residence (extension of previously approved submission)

This project was approved at the November, 1989 ARCOM meeting.

Mr. Mark Gustetter presented a review of the project. He stated Mr. Sinclair will not be building the residence but Mr. Gareau will be the new owner.

Mr. Gustetter stated no changes have been made in the plans.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. SMITH TO APPROVE THE PROJECT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B101-90 Renovations

Applicant: Albert Beriro
Address: 20 Middle Road
Designer: Trezise Design Associates, Inc.
Project Description: Renovations to front and rear facades

Steve Trezise presented a site plan for the project that provided details of the addition and renovations. The property extends from Middle Road to South County Road.

Photographs of the existing residence were presented.

A new entry "stoop" and door are planned. The garage door will be changed to a swinging, solid wood door. One window will be removed and two other windows will be switched.

The Commission members commented the proposed changes were an improvement.

MOTION MADE BY MR. SCHULER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. SMITH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B102-90 Renovations and New Auxiliary Structure

Applicant: Lawrence Gordon
Address: 1260 North Ocean Boulevard
Designer: Jamie Nassehi
Project Description: Renovate front facade; construct auxiliary

structure

Jamie Nassehi presented a site plan showing the proposed auxiliary building and the front facade renovation.

The existing front garage door will be removed and replaced with windows. New windows on the other side of the front entrance will be added to match. (These replace sliding glass doors.) The Commission noted the window heights are not the same. Mr. Nassehi explained one area is the dining room and the window height was planned to accommodate furnishings.

The rear (auxiliary building) has a three (3) car garage. The garage doors face a motor courtyard. An additional two rooms are between the garage area and the existing residence.

The Commission discussed the roof pitch and mass of the auxiliary building as compared to the residence. Steps lead down to the building from the main residence. Mr. Schuler suggested the ceiling height be increased in the auxiliary building to 9 feet.

Mr. Nassehi also requests the color change for the existing roof tile be changed to white. The tiles would be painted white.

The Commission discussed the details of the two structures.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. SMITH TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE CONDITIONS THE ROOF PITCH OF THE AUXILIARY BUILDING BE THE SAME AS THE EXISTING RESIDENCE; THE DETAILS ON THE NEW BUILDING TO BE THE SAME AS THE RESIDENCE AND A LANDSCAPE PLAN AND COLOR SAMPLES BE SUBMITTED AT A LATER MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. HOPE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B103-90 Demolition

Applicant:	Dr. Mary Tarzian
Address:	248 La Puerta
Contractor:	Keough-Forelli Contractors
Project Description:	Demolish existing residence

Mr. Frank explained the Code Enforcement Officer of the Town had initiated the demolition action on this structure as it is a potential health and safety problem.

A representative of the contractor presented photographs of the property.

The Commission requested the existing hedges on the road be maintained.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. SMITH TO APPROVE THE DEMOLITION WITH THE CONDITIONS THE HEDGES ALONG THE ROAD ARE TO STAY AND THE LOT BE SODDED-AND IRRIGATED WITHIN NINETY (90) DAYS IF NO CONSTRUCTION BEGINS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SCHULER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THE STATED CONDITIONS.

B104-90 Construct Columbarium

Applicant: Royal Poinciana Chapel
Address: 60 Cocoanut Row
Architect: Robert Nichols
Project Description: Construct 400 square foot columbarium
(memorial) structure

Mr. Frank mentioned the Royal Poinciana Chapel site is being considered for Landmark status since this project was initiated. A Special Exception was granted by the Town Council at the October meeting.

Bob Nichols presented a drawing of the structure which is compatible to the chapel. The columbarium is located to the south on the site plan. The inside of the "L" shaped structure contains niches and a bench.

Several Commission members commented detailing could be added to the structure to more closely match the chapel. Mr. Nichols replied due to the size of the building, details were kept at a minimum.

MOTION MADE BY MR. SCHULER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT (THE DETAILING MAY BE ADDED IF THE APPLICANT SO WISHES).

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. HOPE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. New Business - Minor Projects

A114-90 Sign

Applicant: Thrift, Inc.
Address: 231 S. County Road
Contractor: none
Project Description: Sign: Black letters on building

Theresa Fredericks, Manager of the Thrift Shop, presented pictures of the new location and of the old sign.

The existing black letters would be placed above the awning on

the new location. Mr. Moore pointed out this height would constitute a second floor sign, and that is not allowed by the Code.

Ms. Fredericks requested signage be placed on the awning. Mr. Moore replied the Code does not allow signage on awnings.

The Commission suggested signage on the glass windows.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. SMITH TO APPROVE SAME STYLE LETTERING (AS THE BLACK LETTERS SUBMITTED) PAINTED ON THE WINDOWS IN EITHER WHITE OR BLACK.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THE ABOVE CONDITIONS.

All15-90 Renovations

Applicant: Augusta D. Stephenson
Address: 210 Ocean Terrace
Architect: Robert L. Bell
Project Description: Change windows; convert kitchen area to covered entry

The architect requests this item be removed from the agenda.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. HOPE TO REMOVE THIS ITEM FROM THE AGENDA.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SCHULER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

All16-90 Granite floor

Applicant: Grosvenor International
Address: 205 Worth Avenue
Architect: The Lawrence Group
Project Description: Replace existing granite, first floor, southeast corner

Donna Beinstein presented a sample piece of granite to be used on the columns. The present granite would be replaced with a granite to match the previously approved lobby floor area.

Mr. Smith commented the granite was not an architectural enhancement to the building especially where it joined the material on the facade over the door area.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. SMITH TO DEFER THE PROJECT FOR RE-STUDY OF THE GRANITE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. HOPE.

THE MOTION CARRIED 6/1 WITH MRS. FROST-GOLINO VOTING NEGATIVE.

A117-90 Remodeling

Applicant: George Phillips
Address: 264 Dunbar Road
Architect: K.M.K. Architects
Project Description: New entry; change windows and enlarge driveway

The applicant requests this item be deferred from the agenda. Additional changes may be made before submission.

MOTION MADE BY MR. SCHULER TO DEFER THE PROJECT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. HOPE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A118-90 Awnings

Applicant: Richter's
Address: 224 Worth Avenue
Contractor: American Awning Company
Project Description: Install 2 window awnings

Joe Mattei presented a plan for a show case straight awning with a slight curve. The color of the awning would match the stone trim on the building and have coral trim.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. SMITH TO APPROVE A STRAIGHT AWNING WITH NO CURVE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A119-90 Awning (color)

Applicant: Pat Booth
Address: 1326 North Ocean Boulevard
Contractor: American Awning Company
Project Description: Request for peach trim on approved eggshell awning

The contractor requests removal from the agenda.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. SMITH TO REMOVE THE ITEM FROM THE AGENDA.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. HOPE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A121-90 Gates

Applicant: Conrad M. Black

Address: 150 Canterbury Lane
Contractor: S.E.A. Development, Inc.
Project Description: Install white, aluminum entrance gates

A site plan showing the subject gates twenty (20) feet from the road was presented.

MOTION MADE BY MR. SCHULER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. SMITH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

122-90 Renovations

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Peter Buswell
Address: 157 Everglade Avenue
Architect: Oliver & Glidden
SKA Architect + Planner
Project Description: Replace windows, enclose tower and second floor porch, enclose first floor porch and replace asphalt roofing with clay barrel tile

Jacquie Albarran presented a site plan for the project.

The tower and porch would be enclosed. The tower floor would be removed, thus providing a sky light effect for the room below.

Wood casement windows will be used to replace existing windows.

The loggia will be enclosed, and French doors will be used.

Clay barrel tile will replace the asphalt roofing on the garage.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. HOPE TO APPROVE THE PROJECT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. SMITH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A123-90 Renovations

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Berkow
Address: 16 Sloan's Curve
Architect: Stephen A. Yeckes
Project Description: Second story addition: renewing previously approved submission plus additional changes

This project was approved at the October 25, 1989 ARCOM meeting.

Stephen Yeckes presented a site plan showing the second story addition. Photographs of the property were also presented.

The size of the addition has been slightly enlarged. Window sizes and shapes have been changed. Stuccoing, shutters and color will match the existing building.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. HOPE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A124-90 Shutters

Applicant:	Mrs. Janson
Address:	114 Clarke Avenue
Contractor:	Folding Shutter Corporation
Project Description:	Install 2 aluminum roll-down shutters

Howard Hemstreet presented a site plan showing the location of the two shutters.

MOTION MADE BY MR. SCHULER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A125-90 Sign

Applicant:	Kassatly's
Address:	250 Worth Avenue
Contractor:	Phil Rowe Signs
Project Description:	Cut out gold leaf letters on building

Steve Rowe presented an elevation drawing showing the position of the gold leaf letters.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. SMITH TO APPROVE THE SIGN.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SCHULER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A126-90 Awning

Applicant:	Villa Plati
Address:	Bradley Place
Contractor:	Awnings By Jay
Project Description:	Awning over second floor balcony

The awning over the second floor balcony faces the Bike Trail.

The retractable awning would be an eggshell color.

Mr. Moore pointed out the Villa Plati complex will have a number of (fee simple) owners. No certificates of occupancy have been issued for any of the buildings at this time. In the absence of a Homeowners' Association, Mr. Plati will have to issue a letter that every awning on the building will be the same (eggshell) color and style.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. SMITH TO APPROVE THE EGGSHELL RETRACTABLE AWNING WITH THE CONDITION MR. PLATI ISSUE A LETTER THAT ALL AWNINGS TO BE USED ON THE BUILDINGS WILL BE THE SAME.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THE STATED CONDITION.

Al20-90 Shutters

Applicant:	Warren N. Ponvert
Address:	425 Seabreeze Avenue
Contractor:	Bernardo Shutter Corporation
Project Description:	Storm shutters

Leo Flannery presented a site plan showing the location of the accordion shutters. Bahama shutters currently exist on other windows on the house.

Photographs of the residence were also presented.

MOTION MADE BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO TO APPROVE THE SHUTTERS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. SMITH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Flannery requested the Commission to solve a shutter problem the Parc Regent Condominium building is having.

Mr. Frank reported Mr. Flannery had requested guidance on a shutter preference for the entire structure. Since no provisions for storm shutters were made at the time of construction, a box to hold the shutters would have to be installed on the exterior of the building or one could be installed on the inside of the reveal (this is visible from the inside of the room and blocks light and any view from the room). The outside box does cover some of the architectural detail on the window.

The Commission members discussed the differences between the two installations. Mrs. Smith suggested the outside box is preferable. If the box is viewed from inside, window treatments could be difficult unless valences were used.

Mr. Schuler suggested a white, outside box be mounted on the building. The white box would be similar to the white window trim. The entire building should be the same.

No motion was necessary.

Adjournment

MOTION MADE BY MRS. SMITH TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The October 24, 1990 Architectural Commission meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m. The next Architectural Commission meeting will be held November 28, 1990.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffery W. Smith, Chairman

JWS:mp