TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Planning, Zoning & Building Department

MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION MEETING
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1996
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: Leighton A. Rosenthal, Chairman
Laurel Baker, Vice Chairman
Ethel Kinsella, Member
Sally Gingras, Member
John H. Schuler, Member (arrived at 9:04 a.m.)
Lowry M. Bell Jr., Member
Robert E. Deziel, Member (arrived at 9:04 a.m.)
Floyd Wideman, Alternate Member
Marvin Rosenberg, Alternate Member
Eric Adams, Alternate Member
Timothy M. Frank, Planner/Projects Coordinator
Robert L. Moore, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building

ABSENT: John C. Randolph, Town Attorney

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 28, 1996 MEETING.

MOTION BY MR. WIDEMAN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS.BAKER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

IV. PROJECT REVIEW

Architect Ken Brower requested an informal review of a new single family home at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Rosenthal felt informal reviews were inappropriate unless unusual circumstances are present. After discussion it was decided to hear Mr. Brower's presentation under Other Business but, it was agreed not to make it a policy for architects to request informal reviews after a meeting has commenced.

MOTION BY MR. BELL NOT TO ADOPT A POLICY TO HEAR PRELIMINARY PROJECTS THAT WILL BE PRESENTED TO ARCOM LATER.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A. DEFERRALS AND CONTINUATIONS - MAJOR PROJECTS

B51-96 New Residence

Applicant:	Jan Kemper
Address:	Lot B, Boca Ratone Company's Inlet Sub Division
Architects:	Kunik & Associates
Project Description:	New single family residence

This project was deferred from the June, July and August meetings.

Mrs. Baker, Mrs. Kinsella, Mr. Bell and Mr. Wideman declared ex-parte communications.

Architect Aaron Ware stated the total square footage of the house is 6,973 feet. A 6' high privacy wall at the master bathroom was added on the front elevation. Mr. Ware stated the windows were kept at 5' wide, but they are willing to make them 4' wide. The windows on both side elevations have been made larger and proportioned relative to the walls according to the Commission's comments. Mr. Ware stated that the plans have stayed much the same as last month's presentation. The windows on the south elevation are 9' tall with a ceiling height of 10'. After discussion it was decided to take the arched heads off the windows on the south elevation making them 6' casement windows with 2' sills.

MOTION BY MR. SCHULER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE PROVISION TO USE FLAT HEAD WINDOWS ON THE SOUTH ELEVATION.

Further discussion took place and Mr. Deziel stated he felt the failing element of this project is the eastern elevation.

AMENDED MOTION BY MR. SCHULER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH FOUR FOOT WIDE WINDOWS, TO USE FLAT HEAD WINDOWS ON THE SOUTH ELEVATION AND TO USE THE SAME WINDOW SILLS ON THE REAR ELEVATION AS THE FRONT ELEVATION.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. BELL.

The architect was asked to present the project materials and if there were plans to wall in this property. Ms. Simmons said they were still working on the landscape and hardscape plans. Ms. Simmons said they would like a three-color blend of barrel concrete tile on the roof but, are willing to use three tones of clay barrel tile roofing material.

ROLL CALL:

MR. SCHULER	**YES**
MR. BELL	**YES**
MRS. BAKER	**YES**
MRS. KINSELLA	**YES**
MRS. GINGRAS	**NO**
MR. DEZIEL	**NO**
MR. ROSENTHAL	**YES**

MOTION CARRIES 5-2.

Discussion took place regarding ex-parte communications. Mr. Moore said that when commission members have ex-parte communication, that discussion can be brought up at the meeting, and the public has the right to question what took place at the meeting. This board is quasi-judicial and the members are to act fair and impartial. The decision making process is to be done at the public hearing and members should not indicate to the applicant which way they will vote. The Applicants' choices after a motion for deferral has been made are; approval, approval with conditions or denial. Mr. Moore referred to the ordinance for clarification of this ruling.

Dr. Rosenberg stated he felt the Commission should give judgements on taste and architectural design but, actually to attempt to impose individual views on some projects should be questioned.

Mr. Deziel stated the commission is here to do the best job possible as laymen and try to get these jobs on track based on the experiences as town residents.

Mr. Schuler stated the commission is here to comment on the architectural aspects of a project and if the commission feels it is not appropriate, they should, and must make comments to better the project.

Mr. Bell felt if a project comes before the Commission that is bad, they should not tear it apart but, ask the architect to redesign the project.

Mrs. Gingras said although a project has "come a long way" and they have made an effort to improve the project, the Commission should insist on better architecture.

B57-96 New Two-Story Duplex

Applicant:	Euro-Homes, Inc.
Address:	242/246 Everglade Ave.
Architect:	Randall Stofft
Project Description:	New two-story duplex

This project was deferred from the July meeting.

Mrs. Baker and Mr. Deziel disclosed ex-parte communications.

Attorney Dean Vegosen addressed the Commission and stated the conditions of the variance are for the height of the building, one garage is to be side loading and they will request no other variances. He said both garages were now side loading but, the driveways have to be more expansive for a turnaround.

Architect Randall Stofft said the project was changed to a formal classical style with each of the entry setbacks about 25'. He had alternate drawings for the cast concrete element above the garages as some Commission members wanted him to rework this element. Mr. Stofft presented a drawing showing french style windows with sills on the side and rear elevations which were different from the plans previously submitted.

Landscape Architect Connie Fisher said there will be a low property wall with repeating columns. The focus of the front car court is a large date palm with under plantings. Seagrapes, white birds of paradise and silver button woods will be planted in the front of the duplex.

Suggestions were made to improve the driveways for an easier turnaround. It was also felt that landscaping should not hide bad elements of architecture and that this project looks likes a duplex with or without landscaping.

Mr. Stofft stated the last plan reviewed was asymmetrical and the new plan is symmetrical. He felt symmetry should not be an issue and then presented a photograph of an approved project on

Seminole Avenue that he felt was very symmetrical. Mr. Stofft asked for project approval at this time.

The commission felt the presentation of a mirror image duplex was not acceptable and asked for something different. Mr. Stofft said that the massing of this project was different from others he has presented in the past. Mr. Stofft further stated that with two side loading garages there is less yard space remaining. The Commission then asked the architect to make the project smaller and make one side different from the other.

MOTION BY MR. SCHULER TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE OCTOBER MEETING FOR FURTHER STUDY MAKING THE DESIGN ASYMMETRICAL.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. BELL.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Rosenthal read letters objecting to the project into the record.

B60-96 New Single Family Residence

Applicant:	Mrs. Arnold Miller
Address:	1415 South Ocean Blvd.
Architect:	John B. Gosman
Project Description:	New two-story single family residence

This project was deferred from the July meeting

Staff recommends deferral until the project meets code.

MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE OCTOBER MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. NEW BUSINESS - MAJOR PROJECT

B70-96 Front Entry & Driveway

Applicant:	Anita Gilberd
Address:	265 Sandpiper Drive
Designer:	K.C. Hubbard
Project Description:	Remodel front entry and circular drive

There were no ex-parte communication disclosures.

Designer K.C. Hubbard presented the project and stated the new owner felt the existing front entry is very dark and hard to see when entering the house. The front doors are recessed 10' from the front of the house. The proposed entry roof will be raised 3' which will let more light in. The awning type windows will be replaced with casement windows and shutters will be added. The existing grass circular driveway needs to be paved. The proposed driveway material will be sand color locking pavers. Mr. Hubbard did not have sample materials for the presentation.

MOTION BY MR. DEZIEL TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE RESIDENCE AS PRESENTED AND HAVE THE STAFF APPROVE THE DRIVEWAY MATERIAL.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SCHULER.

Some of the Commission members felt the front entry was too high and did not match the existing house. It was also felt the front doors could be moved forward rather than leaving them recessed 10'.

ROLL CALL:

MR. DEZIEL	**YES**
MRS. SCHULER	**YES**
MRS. BAKER	**NO**
MRS. KINSELLA	**NO**
MRS. GINGRAS	**NO**
MR. BELL	**NO**
MR. ROSENTHAL	**YES**

MOTION DEFEATED BY A VOTE OF 4-3.

MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO DEFER THE ENTIRE PROJECT TO THE OCTOBER MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B71-96 Demolition

Applicant:	Mr. and Mrs. Denis Coleman
Address:	662 Island Drive
Architect:	Smith Architectural Group
Project Description:	Demolition of existing structure

Mrs. Baker and Mrs. Kinsella reported ex-parte communications.

Mr. Deziel declared a conflict of interest regarding this project and left the meeting during the presentation.

Architect Jeff Smith stated the red brick colonial home was designed by Gustave Maas in the 1940's and that the house was on the market for more than five years. The existing house is approximately 6,900 square feet and the proposed house will be a one story Bermuda style, approximately 8,500 square feet. The property owners wanted the house off of the tax roll until the plans for the replacement house are complete.

MOTION BY MR. SCHULER TO APPROVE DEMOLITION WITH THE PROVISION TO SOD OR SEED AND IRRIGATE THE VACANT LOT WITHIN 90 DAYS. MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.

Mr. Moore stated before the owner can tear down a house they have to come to ARCOM and ARCOM has the right to know the history of the house and what will replace it.

Mr. Smith stated this house has no architectural merit and his client has the right to tear down the house. He said they will come back with a house that ARCOM would be pleased with and one that will enhance Everglades Island.

ROLL CALL:

MR. SCHULER	**YES**
MRS. BAKER	**NO**
MRS. KINSELLA	**NO**
MRS. GINGRAS	**NO**
MR. BELL	**NO**
MR. WIDEMAN	**YES**
MR. ROSENTHAL	**NO**

MOTION FAILED 2-5.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE OCTOBER MEETING FOR REVIEW OF THE PRELIMINARY PLANS OF THE REPLACEMENT HOUSE.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.

ROLL CALL:

MR. BELL	**YES**
MRS. KINSELLA	**YES**
MRS. BAKER	**YES**
MRS. GINGRAS	**YES**
MR. SCHULER	**NO**
MR. WIDEMAN	**NO**
MR. ROSENTHAL	**YES**

MOTION CARRIED 5-2.

MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO REFER THIS HOUSE TO THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION FOR LANDMARK CONSIDERATION.
MOTION DIED FOR THE LACK OF A SECOND.

Mr. Smith asked the Commission to deny this project.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO DENY THE REQUEST FOR DEMOLITION IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 5.384 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.

ROLL CALL:

MR. BELL	**YES**
MRS. KINSELLA	**YES**
MRS. BAKER	**YES**
MRS. GINGRAS	**YES**
MR. SCHULER	**NO**
MR. WIDEMAN	**NO**
MR. ROSENTHAL	**YES**

MOTION CARRIED 5-2.

This item was recalled later in the meeting under Other Business.

B72-96 Demolition and New Residence

Applicant:	Jonathan Deitcher
Address:	175 Via Palma
Designer:	J.F. Brennan Design/Build
Project Description:	Demolish existing house and build a new two story home.

There were no ex-parte communications.

Mr. Frank stated there was no demolition report submitted by the architect.

MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE OCTOBER MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B73-96 Facade Renovation

Applicant:	Palm V Associates/Spa Thira
Address:	230 Worth Avenue
Architect:	The Pandula Architects, Inc.
Project Description:	Facade Renovation

There were no ex-parte communications.

Architect Eugene Pandula stated the facade renovation is for a new cosmetic boutique. The green false stone facade work and mill finish aluminum panels will be removed. The new storefront will have a textured stucco finish with a textured stucco banding, a limestone water table and clear plate glass in a mahogany frame. The building colors will be light beige, slightly darker cornice color and a natural mahogany finish. The storefront glazing is inset off of the sidewalk in an elliptical shape to accommodate a free standing fountain.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE PROVISION THE WORDING "FOR BEAUTIFUL SKIN" BE TAKEN OUT OF THE SIGNAGE.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B74-96 Additions

Applicant:	Joseph J. Bianco
Address:	180 Barton Avenue
Architects:	The Pandula Architects, Inc./Warren Bohn
Project Description:	Addition of a new second story to existing one story residence; expansion of the ground floor; new minor exterior facade details.

There were no exparte communications.

Architect Warren Bohn said this project was presented to ARCOM in January as a Mediterranean style, now the owners have decided to match the existing Bermuda style. One of the additions will extend the existing second floor. One addition is off of the master bedroom and another addition will add two guest bedrooms to the existing pool house.
Neighbors objected to windows on the east elevation at the January presentation. Therefore the number of windows on the east elevation have been reduced and they are 5'6" off of the finished floor level in a hallway.

MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. DEZIEL.
MR. BELL OPPOSED.
MOTION CARRIED 6-1.

C. DEFERRALS AND CONTINUATIONS - MINOR PROJECTS

A57-96 New Exterior Fixtures

Applicant:	Stephen Myers
Address:	460 Worth Avenue
Project Description:	New exterior fixtures

This project was deferred from the July and August meetings.

There were no ex-parte communication disclosures.

Architect Don Kino of Smith Architectural Group presented the project. Mr. Kino stated that an electrician brought a light fixture to show the Commission but, he had no photographs to present. Mr. Kino presented photographs showing the light fixtures installed on the building.

MOTION BY MR. DEZIEL TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SCHULER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Frank stated letters have been received from licensed engineers or licensed architects stating the unlicensed architect presenting a project is working under their supervision. The policy of unlicensed architects presenting projects is stated in the application package, the Commission reserves the right to defer a project and ask a licensed architect to explain the project to the Commission the following month.

It was felt that architects should design the projects and that the problem projects are usually designed by non licensed architects. Mr. Moore stated the Florida Statutes allows a draftsman to draw residential plans. This commission asks for a letter from a licensed architect or engineer stating the project has been done under their supervision. Mr. Frank stated it is difficult for staff to enforce licensed architects to prepare plans and present projects when the whole profession and the State are not. Mr. Moore stated the Commission has the right to demand that the licensed architect come to the meeting and present the project if the draftsman's presentation is not acceptable.

A61-96 Pergola

Applicant:	Mr. and Mrs. James Cleary
Address:	369 South Lake Drive
Architect:	Sanchez and Maddux
Project Description:	Replace awnings with pergola

This project was deferred from the July and August meetings.

There were no ex-parte communication disclosures.

Landscape Architect Jorge Sanchez stated the project consists of two pergolas, one on the west side and one on the east side of the roof top patio. A trellis will be used for screening of the apartment next door and to buffer the bedroom windows which open onto the service corridor. A retractable awning will be added on the west side.

MOTION BY MR. SCHULER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A71-96 Decorative Building Paint

Applicant:	Peabey Associates
Address:	249/251 Royal Palm Way
Architect:	Gordon Mock
Project Description:	Repaint building with a keystone effect

No one was present when the project was called.

MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE END OF THE MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SCHULER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

This item was heard after item #A84-96.

This project was deferred from the August meeting.

There were no ex-parte communications.

Architect Gordon Mock stated the owner of the building surveyed of some of the tenants in the building and most of them were opposed to changes to the building. Mr. Mock gave a summary of the project and stated the owners are not sure if they want to change the building after all. It was the consensus of the Commission the proposed change was not for the better. Mr. Mock asked for a denial of the project for closure.

MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO DENY THE PROJECT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CRITERIA SET FORTH IN ARTICLE IX, ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND PROCEDURE, SECTION 5-387, A. THE PLAN FOR THE PROPOSED BUILDING OR STRUCTURE IS NOT IN CONFORMITY WITH GOOD TASTE, GOOD DESIGN, AND IN GENERAL, DOES NOT CONTRIBUTE TO THE IMAGE OF PALM BEACH AS A PLACE OF BEAUTY, SPACIOUSNESS, BALANCE, TASTE, FITNESS, CHARM AND HIGH QUALITY, C. THE PROPOSED BUILDING OR STRUCTURE IS, IN ITS EXTERIOR DESIGN AND APPEARANCE, INFERIOR IN QUALITY SUCH AS TO CAUSE THE NATURE OF THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT TO MATERIALLY DEPRECIATE IN APPEARANCE AND VALUE AND C. THE PROPOSED BUILDING OR STRUCTURE IS, IN ITS EXTERIOR DESIGN AND APPEARANCE, INFERIOR IN QUALITY SUCH AS TO CAUSE THE NATURE OF THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT TO MATERIALLY DEPRECIATE IN APPEARANCE AND VALUE.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SCHULER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A72-96 Fenestration and Roof Changes

Applicant:	Mr. and Mrs. Satter
Address:	140 Seagate Road
Architect:	Gordon Mock
Project Description:	Fenestration changes and roof change from shingle to clay barrel tile

No one was present when the project was called.

MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE END OF THE MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SCHULER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

This item was heard after item #A71-96.

There were no ex-parte communications.

This project was deferred from the August meeting.

Architect Gordon Mock stated the owner wanted to add a chimney, change the building to a bone color and change the grey shingles on the roof to a clay barrel tile. New windows and new doors will be installed. The front porch will be made to center on the front door. Pre cast vent covers will be added at the gable ends of the roof.

Mr. Bell objected to a clay barrel tile on a one story building.

Mrs. Satter addressed the Commission and spoke in favor of the project. Architect Jeff Smith also addressed the Commission and said he remembers this house with flat cement tile on the roof and that there are two other one story houses with clay barrel tile roofs in the neighborhood.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.

ROLL CALL:

MRS. GINGRAS	**YES**
MRS. KINSELLA	**YES**
MRS. BAKER	**YES**
MR. SCHULER	**YES**
MR. BELL	**NO**
MR. DEZIEL	**YES**
MR. ROSENTHAL	**YES**

MOTION CARRIED 6-1.

D. NEW BUSINESS - MINOR PROJECTS

A76-96 Landscape

Applicant:	DBF of Palm Beach, Inc.
Address:	320 Barton Avenue
Architect:	Steven Dauben/Life Force Nurseries
Project Description:	Landscape

Mrs. Kinsella disclosed ex-parte communication.

Landscape Architect Steve Dauber presented the project. Mr. Dauber said there are existing banyan trees and some existing palm trees which will remain. An existing 6' ficus hedge will remain and a taller evergreen hedge will be planted behind it. The back yard will be mostly open with ground cover added to the rear of the property. Mr. Dauber stated he will conform to the irrigation and xeriscape regulations.

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

A77-96 Landscape

Applicant:	54 Clarke Limited Company
Address:	219 Clarke Avenue
Architect:	Dave Bodker
Project Description:	Landscape

Mrs. Kinsella declared ex-parte communication

Landscape Architect Dave Bodker stated royal palms will be planted on either side of the house and canary date palms will be planted at the center portion of the house. Two existing banyan trees will remain on the west property line. The project will have 86% planting area and 16% lawn area.

Mrs. Kinsella asked to have the existing trees protected with netting until the project is complete.

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

A78-96 Changes to Windows

Applicant:	375 South County Associates
Address:	375 South County Road
Architect/Contractor:	Nichols-Schwab/Batten Construction
Project Description:	Window change and new handrail on the west elevation, and addition of a window on the northeast elevation.

There were no ex-parte communications.

Architect Mindy Schwab stated the owners wanted to make the building more continuous with the restaurant which is French. French windows will replace the pane windows on the west elevation. A decorative handrail will be placed on the existing low wall which wraps around the building.

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

A79-96 Hardscape

Applicant:	Marvin Rosenberg
Address:	101 Nightingale Trail
Architect:	John Lang
Project Description:	Driveways, pool and patios

Mrs. Kinsella declared ex-parte communication.

Dr. Rosenberg declared a Conflict of Interest and left the dais during the presentation.

Mr. Frank stated the driveway has three curb cuts and would have to be approved by Public Works.

Landscape Architect John Lang stated he was directed not to have three curb cuts on the same street. The driveway has one curb cut on North Ocean Boulevard and two on Nightingale Trail. He said there is a steep grade which causes a problem with the driveway layout. The Commission felt that one crescent shape driveway on Nightingale Trail would be better and create less paving. He said he is trying to maintain a flat area for planting at the facade of the house and totally separate the garage area at a lower level.

It was agreed to continue the project review for the pool and patios only and come back next month for the driveway and an optional gate off of North Ocean Boulevard.

Mr. Lang stated the pool has a disappearing horizon edge at the end and is centered off of the living room. Six fox tail palms will be in planters along the edges of the pool.

MOTION BY MR. SCHULER TO APPROVE THE POOL AND PATIO AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A80-96 Shutters

Applicant:	Mr. and Mrs. Lewis Rudin
Address:	7 La Costa Way
Architect:	Denis LaBerge
Project Description:	Install roll down shutters on six locations per elevation with stucco surrounds to give a built-in look

There were no ex-parte communications.

President of Worth Builders Jim Martindale and Architect Mike Johnson presented the project.

Mr. Martindale stated in order to hide the shutter boxes a decorative flat stucco band which will protrude approximately 14" from the building will be used. The tracks will be painted to match the building. There will be five shutter boxes on the west elevation and one on the north elevation. The other boxes were built in or staff approved.

MOTION BY MR. SCHULER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Architect Mike Johnson received permission from the Chairman to hear an informal request for demolition at the end of the agenda.

A81-96 Change Roof Tile

Applicant:	Addison Development
Address:	215 Via Tortuga
Architect:	Carlos Martin
Project Description:	Change in roof tiles from flat concrete to clay "S" tile for previously approved project

No one was present to present the project.

MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE END OF THE AGENDA.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

This project was heard after item #A72-96.

There were no ex-parte communications.

Architect Carlos Martin presented the project. Mr. Martin stated the project was approved with flat concrete tile and now they would like a Spanish "S" clay tile. Mr. Martin said this type of roofing material is in keeping with the character of what is being built in the Phipps Estates. He presented two different tile samples.

MOTION BY MR. DEZIEL TO DENY THE REQUEST FOR ROOFING MATERIAL CHANGE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CRITERIA SET FORTH IN ARTICLE IX, ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND PROCEDURE, SECTION 5-387, A. THE PLAN FOR THE PROPOSED BUILDING OR STRUCTURE IS NOT IN CONFORMITY WITH GOOD TASTE, GOOD DESIGN, AND IN GENERAL, DOES NOT CONTRIBUTE TO THE IMAGE OF PALM BEACH AS A PLACE OF BEAUTY, SPACIOUSNESS, BALANCE, TASTE, FITNESS, CHARM AND HIGH QUALITY AND C. THE PROPOSED BUILDING OR STRUCTURE IS, IN ITS EXTERIOR DESIGN AND APPEARANCE, INFERIOR IN QUALITY SUCH AS TO CAUSE THE NATURE OF THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT TO MATERIALLY DEPRECIATE IN APPEARANCE AND VALUE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MRS. BAKER OPPOSED.

MOTION CARRIED 6-1.

A82-96 Revisions to Previously Approved Plans

Applicant:	Mr. and Mrs. Russell Balasco
Address:	136 Woodbridge Road
Architect:	James Ashley
Project Description:	Changes from last ARCOM meeting: 1. Minor changes in window size, location & muntins 2. Minor change in second floor overhangs 3. Addition of Chimneys

Architect James Ashley stated changes to the front elevation include the addition of french doors with a balcony, a window was made smaller and chimneys were added. Mr. Ashley presented photographs of the house under construction. Mr. Moore stated the house has changed dramatically from what was originally approved. Mr. Wideman said he thought the original approval was to separate the two large windows more than just 4". He said muntins are not in all of the windows. Mr. Ashley said the original approval was to lower the windows from the roof line and add a barrel tile roof.

Cidalina Balasco addressed the Commission and said the original presentation showed windows the Commission felt were too high and too wide. Therefore, the windows were lowered and made smaller. She said the muntins have not been applied to all of the windows yet.

The Commission questioned using stick on muntins and asked to see a sample. It was felt there was much confusion as to what was approved and what Mr. Ashley wanted approved. The Commission asked for detailed drawings of the changes to the project and sample materials.

Mrs. Balasco asked for approval of the windows and chimneys and said the house originally had a chimney which was much larger than the new ones. Mrs. Balasco said there was no chimney shown on the plans that ARCOM approved but, since there was an existing fire place, they decided to keep it.

Mr. Ashley stated the changes to the original project are as follows:

1. A chimney was added.
2. A french door with a balcony was added, which was staff approved.
3. A window was reduced in size by 1' and made rectangular in shape.

It was felt there were inconsistencies with the original plans and it was again stated the project should be deferred and detail drawings to be presented at next month's meeting.

Mr. Ashley stated there were changes in the field and there were changes in the drawings. The fireplaces were approved and staff told him to come to ARCOM to get the chimneys approved.

Mr. Frank stated there was one request for a window change to a french door that was staff approved. The field inspector found the exterior did not match the approved ARCOM drawings and brought it to his attention. Mr. Frank said the changes he noticed were the large windows without the large division between them, the outrigger arrangement was modified, the medallion was relocated, the window on the north west elevation was a different size and location, the balcony and french doors were different from what staff approved and chimneys were added. Mr. Frank suggested following through with the stucco band from the balcony to break up the two story windows.

Mr. Moore stated for Mr. Ashley what the Commission wants to see at the next meeting:
1. Detail drawing of how to separate the two story windows.
2. Detail drawing of the two chimneys.
3. A comparison of the old drawing showing all of the changes.

Mr. Moore asked the architect to submit the drawing one week before the meeting.

MOTION BY MR. SCHULER TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE OCTOBER MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A82-96 Continued

THE FOLLOWING ARE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 1994 AND THE DECEMBER 1994 MEETINGS REGARDING THIS ITEM:

C89-94 Addition

Applicant:	*Cidalina Henriques-Balasco*
Address:	*136 Woodbridge Drive*
Architect:	*James E. Ashley*
Project Description:	*Variance #55-94 approved construction of an addition to the second floor at 10' setback in lieu of 15' and two-story addition providing 33.5' front yard setback in lieu of 35' required*

Mr. James Ashley presented elevation drawings and photographs of the project. The plans showed a second story addition of three bedrooms, a living room and a study/exercise room. The roof is changed from a flat roof to Spanish barrel tile with the same 6'-12' pitch and exterior stucco finish. It also showed a new front entrance with the stairs to the second floor inside the house instead of the existing outside stairway. Mrs. Frost-Golino thought the 6'-12' was quite high for a barrel tile roof and suggested using two windows on the front elevation instead of the two story window shown. She liked the new mini-tower front entrance and thought some additional landscaping in the driveway would screen the garage door. Mr. Wyett questioned the air-conditioning units and garage door and how they will be screened from view. He suggested replacing the two driveway curb cuts with a center cut so the garage door would be screened much better.
Mr. Balasco, the owner of the property, stated he would like to improve the appearance of the home and thought the center driveway was a good idea.

MRS. BAKER MOTIONED TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE DECEMBER MEETING TO RESTUDY THE WINDOWS; CENTER GARAGE ENTRANCE AND CURB CUTS.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. BELL.
MOTION CARRIED 6/1 WITH MR. WYETT VOTING NEGATIVELY.

ARCOM MINUTES of December 21, 1994:

The project was deferred to the December meeting so that the applicant could restudy and resubmit drawings of the windows; garage entrance and curb cuts.
Mr. Ashley submitted revised drawings of the project.
The front two story windows were narrowed and the 10 foot driveway was moved closer to the side property line and landscaped screening is proposed in front of the garage door. Mrs. Baker felt the revised narrowed windows were too close to the roofline and thought the original design was more uniform.
Mr. Hoffman suggested lowering the windows to the height of the original plans and keep the windows narrow.

MOTION MADE BY MR. WYETT TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH CONDITIONS THE HEIGHT OF THE TWO STORY WINDOWS BE LOWERED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. HOFFMAN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A83-96 Front Entry

Applicant:	Homa Bahary
Address:	160 Kings Road
Architect:	Robert Bell
Project Description:	Remodel front entry with pre cast stone

No one was present to represent the project.

MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE END OF THE AGENDA.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

This project was heard after item #A81-96.
There were no ex-parte communications.

Architect Robert Bell presented elevation drawings and photographs of the existing house. Mr. Bell stated that the original house was built as three pods connected with internal patios. About ten years ago the house was added on to and all of the interior patios were enclosed. The owner wants to change the color of the building and add a new main entry. The proposed entrance has stone work with columns on either side of the front door.

The Commission felt the proposed entrance did not match the contemporary style of the house. It was suggested to make the banding much larger on the sides and the top of the entrance. It was also suggested to look at a house on South County Road with a glass and wrought iron doorway.

MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE OCTOBER MEETING FOR RESTUDY.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SCHULER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A84-96 Landscape

Applicant:	Rori & Dilow Estates
Address:	220 Banyan Road
Architect:	Lowry Bell
Project Description:	Landscape plan

The landscape architect was not present to represent the project and Mr. Bell suggested deferral to the October meeting.

MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE OCTOBER MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mrs. Baker left the meeting at this time.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Moore stated the Commission turned down a request for demolition earlier in the meeting for lack of the ability to know what was going on the property in place of the existing house and Mr. Smith has requested reconsideration of project #B71-96. Mr. Moore recommended the Commission hear Mr. Smith's application again.
Mr. Deziel has previously declared a Conflict of Interest regarding this project.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO RECONSIDER PROJECT #B71-96, DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOUSE AT 662 ISLAND DRIVE. *Mr. Rosenthal passed the gavel.*
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ROSENTHAL.

ROLL CALL:

MRS. GINGRAS	**YES**
MR. ROSENTHAL	**YES**
MRS. KINSELLA	**YES**
MR. BELL	**YES**
MR. SCHULER	**YES**
MR. WIDEMAN	**YES**
DR. ROSENBERG	**YES**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Smith stated in lieu of going to the Town Council and attempt to overturn the denial for demolition, he felt it was wise to return to this Commission. He stated the owner would like to landscape the property until it comes time to submit the plans for review of the new house. Mr. Smith stated the property is very well landscaped now and the vacant area will be sodded or seeded, irrigated and additional trees will be added if the Commission requests.

MOTION BY MR. SCHULER TO APPROVE DEMOLITION WITH THE PROVISION TO SOD OR SEED, IRRIGATE AND INSTALL ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPING TO THE VACANT AREA WITHIN 30 DAYS OF DEMOLITION.
MOTION SECONDED BY DR. ROSENBERG.

ROLL CALL:

MR. SCHULER	**YES**
DR. ROSENBERG	**YES**
MRS. KINSELLA	**NO**
MRS. GINGRAS	**NO**
MR. BELL	**NO**
MR. WIDEMAN	**YES**
MR. ROSENTHAL	**YES**

MOTION CARRIED 4-3.

INFORMAL REVIEW

Architect Mike Johnson stated the project is a renovation to the house known as the one with the blue tile roof at 901 North Ocean Boulevard. Demolition of a guest house and bridge will be requested at next month's meeting.

INFORMAL REVIEW

Architects Ken Brower and Raphael Saladrigas presented a Mediterranean style project for a vacant lot on Ibis Isle.
Suggestions were made regarding the project.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 3:40 P.M.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Leighton A. Rosenthal,
Chairman

gd

TOWN OF PALM BEACH **ATTENDANCE RECORD (19 96)**

MEMBERS	1/24	2/28	3/27	4/24	5/22	6/26	7/24	8/28	9/25	10/23	11/22 (Fri)	12/12 (Tue)
LEIGHTON ROSENTHAL	P	P	P	P	E	E	E	P	P			
LAUREL BAKER	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P			
LINDLEY HOFFMAN	P	P	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
BRUCE HELANDER	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	/	/	/	/	/
ETHEL KINSELLA	P	P	P	P	P	U	P	P	P			
SALLY GINGRAS	P	P	P	P	A	P	A	E	P			
JOHN SCHULER	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P			
LOWRY BELL	/	/	P	P	P	P	P	U	P			

ALTERNATES	1/24	2/28	3/27	4/24	5/22	6/26	7/24	8/28	9/25	10/23	11/22	12/12
LOWRY BELL	P	P	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
ROBERT DEZIEL	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P			
MARVIN ROSENBERG	/	/	P	P	P	P	P	A	P			
FLOYD WIDEMAN	/	/	P	P	P	P	P	P	P			
ERIC ADAMS	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	P			

/25 MEMBER-

LEGEND: P = Present
E = Excused Absence
U = Unexcused Absence
A = Absence Pending Classification as "Excused" or "Unexcused"

TOWN OF PALM BEACH

RECORD OF VOTING CONFLICTS (19 96)

MEMBERS	1/ 24	2/ 28	3/27	4/ 24	5/ 22	6/ 26	7/ 24	8/ 28	9/ 25	10/23	Fri 11/22	Tue 12/ 12
LEIGHTON A. ROSENTHAL												
LAUREL BAKER												
LINDLEY HOFFMAN			/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
BRUCE HELANDER												
ETHEL												
SALLY GINGRAS						2V						
JOHN SCHULER					V							
LOWRY BELL			V	V2								

ALTERNATES	1/24	2/ 28	3/ 27	4/24	5/22	6/26	7/24	8/28	9/25	10/23	11/22	12/12
LOWRY BELL	V	VPD	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
ROBERT DEZIEL		* / V	V3	VPD	VPD/V	VPD	~~VPD~~ V		V			
MARVIN ROSENBERG	/	/	V	VPD	VPD	VPD			V			
FLOYD WIDEMAN	/	/										

* No Conflict was necessary at this time.

LEGEND: V = One Voting Conflict during a meeting
V2 = Two Voting Conflicts during a meeting
V3 = Three Voting Conflicts during a meeting
And so on...

VPD = Voting Conflict Previously Declared (This category to be used when a conflict has been declared at a previous meeting, and the changes being reviewed are part of an ongoing renovation project. ONLY COUNT ORIGIN DECLARED CONFLICT FOR ONGOING PROJECTS PER JOHN C. RANDOLPH, T ATTORNEY)

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME	NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE
DEVER, ROBERT E.	ARCOM
MAILING ADDRESS: P.O. Box 936	THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: ☒ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☐ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY
CITY: Palm Beach COUNTY: FL.	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: Palm Beach, Town of
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED: 9/25/96	MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ APPOINTIVE

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

This form is for use by any person serving at the county, city, or other local level of government on an appointed or elected board, council, commission, authority, or committee. It applies equally to members of advisory and non-advisory bodies who are presented with a voting conflict of interest under Section 112.3143, Florida Statutes.

Your responsibilities under the law when faced with voting on a measure in which you have a conflict of interest will vary greatly depending on whether you hold an elective or appointive position. For this reason, please pay close attention to the instructions on this form before completing the reverse side and filing the form.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

person holding elective or appointive county, municipal, or other local public office MUST ABSTAIN from voting on a measure ich inures to his or her special private gain or loss. Each elected or appointed local officer also is prohibited from knowingly voting on a measure which inures to the special gain or loss of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he or she is retained (including the parent organization or subsidiary of a corporate principal by which he or she is retained); to the special private gain or loss of a relative; or to the special private gain or loss of a business associate. Commissioners of community redevelopment agencies under Sec. 163.356 or 163.357, F.S., and officers of independent special tax districts elected on a one-acre, one-vote basis are not prohibited from voting in that capacity.

For purposes of this law, a "relative" includes only the officer's father, mother, son, daughter, husband, wife, brother, sister, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, and daughter-in-law. A "business associate" means any person or entity engaged in or carrying on a business enterprise with the officer as a partner, joint venturer, coowner of property, or corporate shareholder (where the shares of the corporation are not listed on any national or regional stock exchange).

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

ELECTED OFFICERS:

In addition to abstaining from voting in the situations described above, you must disclose the conflict:

PRIOR TO THE VOTE BEING TAKEN by publicly stating to the assembly the nature of your interest in the measure on which you are abstaining from voting; *and*

WITHIN 15 DAYS AFTER THE VOTE OCCURS by completing and filing this form with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

You must abstain from voting and disclose the conflict in the situations described above and in the manner described for elected officers. In order to participate in these matters, you must disclose the nature of the conflict before making any attempt to influence the decision, whether orally or in writing and whether made by you or at your direction.

IF YOU INTEND TO MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION PRIOR TO THE MEETING AT WHICH THE VOTE WILL BE TAKEN:

- You must complete and file this form (before making any attempt to influence the decision) with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who will incorporate the form in the minutes.
- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING:

- You must disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You must complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who must incorporate the form in the minutes. A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency, and the form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Robert Bowen, hereby disclose that on Sept 25, 19 96:

(a) A measure came or will come before my agency which (check one)

____ inured to my special private gain or loss;

____ inured to the special gain or loss of my business associate, _____;

____ inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____;

____ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, by whom I am retained; or

____ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

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

The vote will inure to the benefit of Denis and Anabelle Coleman who are my law clients.

9/25/96
Date Filed

Robert Bowen
Signature

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

DENIAL

CERTIFICATION OF ACTION BY ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

The Architectural Commission has denied the following request in accordance with the criteria set forth in Article IX, ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND PROCEDURE, Section 5-387 (Criteria)

Application Number and Title: B71-96

Applicant: M/M Denis Coleman

Address: 662 Orchard Drive

Architect: J. Irvin

Project Description: demolition

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

___ a. The plan for the proposed building or structure is not in conformity with good taste, good design, and in general, does not contribute to the image of Palm Beach as a place of beauty, spaciousness, balance, taste, fitness, charm and high quality.

___ b. The plan for the proposed building or structure does not indicate the manner in which the structures are reasonably protected against external and internal noise, vibrations, and other factors which may tend to make the environment more desirable.

___ c. The proposed building or structure is, in its exterior design and appearance, inferior in quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.

___ d. The proposed building or structure is not in harmony with the proposed developments on land in the general area, with the Comprehensive Plan for Palm Beach, or with any precise plans adopted pursuant to the Comprehensive Plan.

___ e. The proposed building or structure is excessively similar to other structures existing or for which a permit has been issued or to 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 of exterior design and appearance:

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

___ f. The proposed building or structure is 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) Other significant design features such as materials or quality of architectural design.

___ g. The proposed building or structure is not appropriate in its relation to the established character of other structures in the immediate area or neighboring areas in respect to significant design features such as material or quality or architectural design as viewed from any public or private way (except alleys).

___ h. The proposed development is not in conformity with the standards of this Code and other applicable ordinances insofar as to the location and appearance of the building and structures which are involved.

___ i. The project's location and design does not adequately protect unique site characteristics such as those related to scenic views, rock outcroppings, natural vistas, waterways, and similar features.

The applicant is advised tha appeals must be filed with the Town Clerk within 10 days in acco ance with Article IX, Section 5-388 of the Town Code of Ordinances.

CERTIFICATION:

The above denial was issued b the Architectural Commission at their meeting on _____ _____.
(date)

TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Leighton A Rosenthal
Chairman, Architectural Commission

X j. No plans were submitted for the replacement house.

A71-96

DENIAL

CERTIFICATION OF ACTION BY ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

The Architectural Commission has denied the following request in accordance with the criteria set forth in Article IX, ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND PROCEDURE, Section 5-387 (Criteria)

Application Number and Title: A71-96 DECORATIVE BUILDING PAINT

Applicant: PEABEY ASSOCIATES

Address: 249/251 ROYAL PALM WAY

Architect: GORDON MOCK

Project Description: REPAINT BUILDING W/A KEYSTONE EFFECT.

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

X a. The plan for the proposed building or structure is not in conformity with good taste, good design, and in general, does not contribute to the image of Palm Beach as a place of beauty, spaciousness, balance, taste, fitness, charm and high quality.

___ b. The plan for the proposed building or structure does not indicate the manner in which the structures are reasonably protected against external and internal noise, vibrations, and other factors which may tend to make the environment more desirable.

X c. The proposed building or structure is, in its exterior design and appearance, inferior in quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.

___ d. The proposed building or structure is not in harmony with the proposed developments on land in the general area, with the Comprehensive Plan for Palm Beach, or with any precise plans adopted pursuant to the Comprehensive Plan.

___ e. The proposed building or structure is excessively similar to other structures existing or for which a permit has been issued or to 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 of exterior design and appearance:

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

___ f. The proposed building or structure is 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) Other significant design features such as materials or quality of architectural design.

___ g. The proposed building or structure is not appropriate in its relation to the established character of other structures in the immediate area or neighboring areas in respect to significant design features such as material or quality or architectural design as viewed from any public or private way (except alleys).

___ h. The proposed development is not in conformity with the standards of this Code and other applicable ordinances insofar as to the location and appearance of the building and structures which are involved.

___ i. The project's location and design does not adequately protect unique site characteristics such as those related to scenic views, rock outcroppings, natural vistas, waterways, and similar features.

The applicant is advised tha appeals must be filed with the Town Clerk within 10 days in acco ance with Article IX, Section 5-388 of the Town Code of Ordinances.

CERTIFICATION:

The above denial was issued by the Architectural Commission at their meeting on September 25, 1996.
(date)

TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Leighton A Rosenthal
Chairman, Architectural Commission

A81-96

DENIAL

CERTIFICATION OF ACTION BY ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

The Architectural Commission has denied the following request in accordance with the criteria set forth in Article IX, ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND PROCEDURE, Section 5-387 (Criteria)

Application Number and Title: A81-96 CHANGE ROOF TILE

Applicant: ADDISON DEVELOPMENT

Address: 215 VIA TORTUGA

Architect: CARLOS MARTIN

Project Description: CHANGE IN ROOF TILE FROM FLAT CONCRETE TO CLAY "S" TILE FOR PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PROJ.

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

✓ a. The plan for the proposed building or structure is not in conformity with good taste, good design, and in general, does not contribute to the image of Palm Beach as a place of beauty, spaciousness, balance, taste, fitness, charm and high quality.

___ b. The plan for the proposed building or structure does not indicate the manner in which the structures are reasonably protected against external and internal noise, vibrations, and other factors which may tend to make the environment more desirable.

✓ c. The proposed building or structure is, in its exterior design and appearance, inferior in quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.

___ d. The proposed building or structure is not in harmony with the proposed developments on land in the general area, with the Comprehensive Plan for Palm Beach, or with any precise plans adopted pursuant to the Comprehensive Plan.

___ e. The proposed building or structure is excessively similar to other structures existing or for which a permit has been issued or to 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 of exterior design and appearance:

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

___ f. The proposed building or structure is 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) Other significant design features such as materials or quality of architectural design.

___ g. The proposed building or structure is not appropriate in its relation to the established character of other structures in the immediate area or neighboring areas in respect to significant design features such as material or quality or architectural design as viewed from any public or private way (except alleys).

___ h. The proposed development is not in conformity with the standards of this Code and other applicable ordinances insofar as to the location and appearance of the building and structures which are involved.

___ i. The project's location and design does not adequately protect unique site characteristics such as those related to scenic views, rock outcroppings, natural vistas, waterways, and similar features.

The applicant is advised tha appeals must be filed with the Town Clerk within 10 days in acco ance with Article IX, Section 5-388 of the Town Code of Ordinances.

CERTIFICATION:

The above denial was issued b the Architectural Commission at their meeting on _____ _____.
(date)

TOWN OF PALM BEACH

_____
Chairman, Architectural Commission