



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 2025

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

I. **CALL TO ORDER**

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

II. **ROLL CALL**

Jeffrey W. Smith, Chairman	PRESENT
Richard F. Sammons, Vice Chairman	PRESENT
Betsy Shiverick, Member	PRESENT
Kenn Karakul, Member	PRESENT
Elizabeth Connaughton, Member	PRESENT (Arrived at 9:02 a.m.)
Katherine "KT" Catlin	PRESENT
Claudia Visconti, Member	PRESENT
Dan Floersheimer, Alternate Member	PRESENT
David Phoenix, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Maisie Grace, Alternate Member	PRESENT

Staff Members present were:

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

III. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair Smith led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. Minutes of the Architectural Review Commission Meeting of December 20, 2024

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the minutes of the December 20, 2024, meeting as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

V. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

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

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

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

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

Mr. Floersheimer asked about The Breakers Tennis Center and said it was visible from any right-of-way. The Commission was told the landscaping would completely screen the shade structures. Ms. Mittner stated that the project had not yet been given its final ARCOM inspection, and the permit had not been closed out; she added that this issue would be addressed then. Mr. Floersheimer also expressed concern about the site triangle moving west on Seminole Avenue, turning onto Bradley Place, near the Meat Market. Ms. Mittner stated she would pass along those concerns.

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

Tom Parker, 215 Jamaica Lane, expressed concern that new construction projects would no longer be required to accept the transformer equipment. He has a pad on his property that may need to be adjusted when newer, bigger homes are built. He also expressed concern about the new construction on his street, which did not install the proper (and required) screening fences before the project began.

IX. **PROJECT REVIEW**

A. **CONSENT AGENDA**

1. **EXTPLAN-24-0011 129 CHILEAN AVE.** The applicant, Ch1129 LLC (George Mykoniatis), has filed an application requesting an Extension of Time for a previously issued Architectural Commission approval for construction of a new two-story single-family residence. (ORIGINALLY ARC-23-161 (ZON-24-006) AND APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 24, 2024, MEETING)

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

This item was pulled from the consent agenda and not included in the approval.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Visconti to approve the amended consent agenda. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

The Commission immediately heard ARC-24-0104 581 E WOODS RD., which was pulled from the consent agenda.

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

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Mses. Catlin and Grace disclosed ex-parte communications.

Ms. Connaughton expressed the addition of the window in the stairwell and did not favor the shutters. Mr. Smith agreed the window looked awkward.

The commissioners discussed the window.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the project with the conditions that the shutters be removed from the stairwell window on the north elevation, the window will be adjusted so that it is centered on the stair, and the staff would approve this feature in coordination with the Chair. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

B. MAJOR PROJECTS-OLD BUSINESS

1. **ARC-24-0085 (ZON-24-0044) 315 CHAPEL HILL RD (COMBO)** The applicant, Ocean Breezes 2 LLC (Francis Lynch, Attorney), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new, two-story, single-family residence of over 10,000 SF with a detached two-story accessory structure including final hardscape, landscape, and swimming pool improvements; requiring a special exception to redevelop a nonconforming parcel in the R-A zoning district and to provide reduced vehicle stacking; also one variance to encroach into the building height plane setback area. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Nelo Freijomel of Spina O'Rourke + Partners gave an architectural presentation. Keith Williams of Nievera Williams Design gave the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Mr. Karakul thought the project was good, and the heights were better. He thought the project had improved. He questioned the shutters on single windows; he thought they were odd and did not believe they worked. Mr. Freijomel stated he could modify the shutters.

Ms. Catlin thought the changes were well done. She thought the charm remained in the design.

Ms. Visconti was in favor of the changes. She questioned the limestone under the bay window on the lakeside elevation. She requested to see the final brick and limestone selections. She thought the morning porch wall was missing a detail, such as a treillage. She thought a vine on the gable end next to the motor court would be nice. She commented on the gates and thought the main gate should feel a bit different.

Ms. Connaughton thought the changes were an improvement. She provided a suggestion for the windows on the right hyphen, on the front elevation. She thought the large bay window on the lakeside elevation was too large and recommended studying the oriel window on the front elevation. She suggested studying the brick pattern on the gable end at the motor court.

Mr. Phoenix agreed with the recommendations on the gate changes. He liked the new hyphen designs and thought the house would be beautiful.

Ms. Shiverick thought the project was very strong with the changes that had been made. She questioned the scale of the gables over the kitchen and master bedroom and asked for an explanation of the variance request. Mr. Freijomel explained the variance.

Mr. Floersheimer thought the house would be a nice addition to the neighborhood. He thought further changes could be made. He thought the hyphens could be more subservient to the wings. He was concerned about the depth of the wings. He was glad the north garage was removed. Mr. Floersheimer asked about the variance and what it would need to come into compliance. Mr. Freijomel responded.

Mr. Sammons thought the details of the design were overscaled. He thought the home had too much mass and fat. He questioned the design of the parapet and the limestone around the front door. He commented on the details on the back portico.

Ms. Grace thought the changes were good and responsive. She supported the variance request. She agreed with Ms. Connaughton's comments. She thought the home was still a large mass and more work was needed to differentiate each section.

Ms. Visconti asked about the gray tabby, to which Mr. Williams responded that it would be off-white or beige.

Ms. Connaughton recommended not mitering the limestone around the front door. She requested a study on the fenestration since there were many different types.

Mr. Karakul thought the previous portico was more interesting and wondered if others shared his opinion. Mr. Freijomel discussed why he had redesigned the element.

Mr. Smith thought the presentation was nice. He understood the variance request and thought it was due to the shape of the property. He supported the request.

Mr. Freijomel wondered if there would be a path forward that would allow the project to move to the Town Council. The commission discussed whether the variance affected the architecture.

Mr. Falco discussed how the project could move forward.

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

A motion was made by Ms. Connaughton and seconded by Mr. Sammons to defer the project to the meeting on February 26, 2025, given the Commissioners' comments. The motion failed 3-4, with Messrs. Karakul, Smith, Mses. Catlin and Visconti dissenting.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the project with the following items to be staff-approved in coordination with the Chair: the shutters, the limestone under the bay window, the scale of the bay window, the brick and limestone color selections, the differentiation of the center gate, the addition of treillage to the morning porch. The motion failed 2-5, with Messrs. Sammons, Smith, Mses. Shiverick, Connaughton, and Visconti dissenting.

Discussion ensued about a new motion.

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Ms. Visconti to approve the project with the following items to be deferred to the meeting on February 26, 2025: the shutters, the limestone under the bay window, the scale of the bay window, the brick and limestone color selections, the differentiation of the center gate, the addition of treillage to the morning porch, the rear porch, the parapets, the general proportions of the fenestration, the front entry and the detailing on the two oriel windows. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

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

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

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

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

Attorney Francisco stated that the guest house was the only element the Commission would be reviewing as all other project elements had been approved.

Mr. Karakul did not believe the guest house met the commissioners' comments. He thought the scale was not appropriate, especially for a folly element.

Ms. Shiverick thought the belvedere was too wide. She provided recommendations on this element, including changing the railings to match the main house. She also thought the element needed to be closed up and appear more like a folly, and she agreed that the scale was off.

Ms. Catlin appreciated that the professional tried to open the rear of the house. However, she thought the building presented bigger. She thought the wings and overall building should be reduced.

Ms. Grace thought the element was still too large and looked like a main home. She did not believe the item appeared like a folly. She questioned the grotto as well. She wished the landscape was more integrated with the grotto.

Mr. Phoenix agreed with Mr. Karakul; he thought the element appeared as an extension of the main home. He thought there was an opportunity to design something special. He thought the proposal was too big.

Mr. Sammons thought the carriage house element had nice portions but thought the main house was completely out of scale.

Ms. Visconti supported the roof material. She suggested changing the element from the rectangular shape and studying Volk's folly designs. She thought Ms. Grace had a good point about the pool shape and suggested restudying that feature. Mr. Correll stated that it was hard to design a guest house as a folly.

Ms. Connaughton thought the east elevation was charming, but the west elevation was too large. She suggested studying the roof and possibly considering a different design. She also thought the guest house was too tall and questioned the fenestration on the west side.

Ms. Grace wondered if the element could be a single story.

Mr. Smith called for public comment and said he would only receive comments on the guest house.

John Eubanks, attorney for Leslie Wyrzes at 444 Seabreeze Avenue, argued that with the change in the plans that included the driveway, he should be able to raise his objections to the pedestrian gate that opens onto the Wyrzes' western driveway.

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Ms. Catlin to defer the project to the meeting on February 26, 2025. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

3. **ARC-24-0106 (ZON-24-0063) 260 COLONIAL LN (COMBO)** The applicants, Thomas & Meredith Hunt, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the construction of a new, one-story, single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape and swimming pool; requiring a special exception with site plan review to permit the redevelopment of the existing nonconforming parcel. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval. *This item has been deferred to the February 26, 2025, meeting.*

Clerk's note: This item was deferred to the meeting on February 26, 2025, at Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

4. **ARC-24-0040 1285 N OCEAN BLVD.** The applicant, M2B Properties LLC, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new, two-story single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape, and swimming pool. *This item has been deferred to the February 26, 2025, meeting.*

Clerk's note: This item was deferred to the meeting on February 26, 2025, at Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

5. **ARC-24-0071 224 VIA MARILA** The applicant, Adrian Tauro, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a new, two-story single-family residence and attached accessory structure with final hardscape, landscape and swimming pool. *This item has been deferred to the February 26, 2025, meeting.*

Clerk's note: This item was deferred to the meeting on February 26, 2025, at Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

C. MAJOR PROJECTS-NEW BUSINESS

1. **ARC-24-0108 (ZON-24-0066) 1519 N OCEAN WAY (COMBO)** The applicant, 1519 N Ocean Way #1 LLC & 1519 N Ocean Way #2 LLC (Maura Ziska, Attorney), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a new two-story single-family residence of over 10,000 sq ft and detached guest house with final hardscape, landscape and swimming pool improvements. A special exception with site plan review is required to redevelop the existing nonconforming parcel and zoning variances are required to exceed maximum building height, maximum overall building height, and to permit improvements within the ocean bulkhead setback. The Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning

relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Daniel Clavijo of Wadia Associates gave an architectural presentation.

Ms. Connaughton understood the site's issues; however, she did not believe the proposal was contextual for the tropical climate. She thought the architecture looked confused and questioned the fenestration. Mr. Clavijo explained the further design. Ms. Connaughton understood the comments but did not believe the home was appropriate.

Ms. Grace agreed with Ms. Connaughton and thought the square box design did not fit the site. She commented on the roof line and did not believe it contributed to the design. She thought the home was not appropriate for the beachfront lot. She also did not favor the two arches next to the pool and questioned the height that required a variance. She also thought the fenestration should be restudied.

Mr. Floersheimer agreed with Ms. Connaughton's comments. He thought the site plan for the proposed home was inappropriate and did not support the project.

Mr. Phoenix thought the proposal looked like an office building and that the mass of the home was completely wrong. He thought the design was a missed opportunity, and he did not support the project.

Ms. Visconti asked about the arrival at the home of the homeowner and the guest. Jaqueline Bayliss, Fernando Wong Outdoor Living Design, explained the arrival plan. Ms. Visconti asked for further clarification on the axis of the property. She did not believe the design was successful. Ms. Visconti asked about the visibility of the pool; Ms. Bayliss stated that the element was heavily landscaped. Ms. Visconti thought a courtyard home would work well on the site.

Ms. Catlin thought the design missed the mark and must be completely restudied. She thought the home's design should work with the slope of the property.

Mr. Karakul agreed with the other commissioners. He thought the scale of the home was inappropriate in the context of the surrounding homes.

Ms. Shiverick thought the architecture was in bad taste and recommended a complete restudy of the project.

Mr. Smith agreed with the other Commissioners.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Jennifer Stephan Beqaj, 1520 N Ocean Way, thought the proposed home

was too large, especially next to the surrounding homes. She questioned whether the lot was large enough for the guest house.

Mr. Clavijo responded to the Commissioners' comments.

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Ms. Catlin to defer the project to the meeting on March 26, 2025. The motion was carried 4-3, with Ms. Connaughton, Messrs. Sammons and Smith dissenting.

2. **ARC-24-0114 (ZON-24-0092) 1010 N LAKE WAY (COMBO)** The applicant, 1010 North Lake Trust LLC, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for elevation, shifting and renovation of a two-story house, addition of a loggia, new pool, hardscape and landscape requiring variances for lot coverage, setbacks and screening. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Peter Papadopoulos of Smith and Moore Architecture provided an overview of the project and its site plans. Timothy Haynes of Haynes-Roberts Inc. reviewed the façade elevations. Mr. Papadopoulos explained the variances. Keith Williams of Nievera Williams Design gave the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Mr. Sammons asked for technical information on how the home will be moved. Mr. Papadopoulos responded. Mr. Sammons was glad about the roof change. He questioned the replication of the existing details and thought they should be removed. Mr. Sammons asked about the details at the rear of the home, including the pavilions. He recommended eliminating the balustrades from the end bays. He recommended improving the cornice details on the front elevation.

Mr. Floersheimer appreciated that the homeowner was trying to save the home. He agreed with Mr. Sammons that small details could be fixed. He liked the project. His biggest concern was the glazing on the west side of the home; he recommended reducing this element. He asked if a gate would be added for access to the dock. Mr. Williams stated he would add a gate.

Mr. Phoenix appreciated trying to save the home. He supported the fenestration and the variance request. He thought the lanterns were underscaled; he recommended gas lighting. Mr. Haynes discussed what they had discussed for the lighting. Mr. Phoenix questioned the color of the front door.

Ms. Catlin liked the changes overall. She wondered if the hardscape on the front could be further reduced. She thought the addition over the garage and the garage doors appeared tall. She recommended reducing those elements. She favored the fenestration on the west but wondered if they

could be reduced. She wondered if the bulkhead wall on the trail could be raised to help with the flooding. Mr. Williams stated he would study that issue. Ms. Catlin wondered if the truck logistics plan could be changed to utilize N. County Road.

Ms. Shiverick wondered if the homeowner would consider demolishing and rebuilding the home. She thought it could eliminate the variances. She was not in favor of the transoms over the rear doors. She agreed with Mr. Sammons' comments on the balustrades.

Ms. Visconti was glad that the home was being saved. She agreed with Mr. Sammons on his comments on the balustrades. She recommended looking at the transoms and eliminating the steps around the pool.

Ms. Grace was glad that the home was being saved and that the materials would be elevated. She asked about the fenestration on the west side and thought it looked better. She agreed with Mr. Sammons' comments on the balustrades.

Mr. Floersheimer stated that he generally did not support variances but felt they were justified in this instance. He thought the western fenestration could be slightly reduced. Mr. Haynes explained his design further.

Mr. Phoenix wondered if two specimen trees could be added near the pool. Mr. Williams stated he could study that and explained the steps around the pool.

Ms. Connaughton liked the fenestration on the west elevation. She agreed with Mr. Sammons' comments on the balustrades. She requested that the owner not use low-e glass material on the west fenestration and thought two trees could mitigate the heat.

Mr. Smith agreed that it was a huge undertaking to save a house that was not worth saving. He thought the variances could be eliminated, and the project would be much better.

A motion was made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Ms. Connaughton to defer the project to the meeting on February 26, 2025, to specifically restudy the rear elevation, detailing, and the possible addition of shade or awnings on the west elevation. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

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

Clerk's note: A short break was taken at 11:40 a.m.; the meeting resumed at noon.

Ms. Visconti inquired if she could make a motion to reconsider the previous motion to extend the deferral.

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Ms. Connaughton to reconsider the motion for project ARC-24-0114, 1010 N. Lake Way. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Ms. Connaughton to defer project ARC-24-0114, 1010 N. Lake Way, to the meeting on March 26, 2025. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

3. **ARC-24-0117 980 S OCEAN BLVD.** The applicant, 980 S Ocean (Emma) LLC, 980 S Ocean (Ian) LLC, and 980 S Ocean (Jane) LLC (Jane Holzer, Manager), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications to the previously approved design of a new, two-story single-family residence including new additions and complete redesign of landscape and hardscape across the site, resulting from the acquisition of additional lot area subsequent to the original approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Roger Janssen of Dailey Janssen Architecture gave an architectural presentation, and Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group gave the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Ms. Grace was in favor of the landscaping. She thought the addition did not measure up to the main house; she thought it should be more diminutive, and the hierarchy of the addition and main house should be restudied.

Mr. Sammons thought the front door needed more attention to signify the main entrance. He questioned its width and thought it was lost among the other doors. He also questioned the proportion of the plate glass window next to the main door.

Mr. Phoenix liked the landscape plans. He agreed with Mr. Sammon's comments on the front door. He also asked about the proposed lanterns. Mr. Janssen responded and stated they were still searching for a lantern.

Ms. Visconti asked about the landscaping around the niches. Mr. Mizell responded and explained the design. She recommended greening up the addition on the south elevation with a green vine, such as confederate jasmine.

Mr. Karakul thought the addition was successful. He wondered about the lanterns proposed across the front; he suggested adding only one at the entrance. Mr. Janssen agreed.

Ms. Shiverick asked about the orchids and their proposed location. Mr. Mizell responded. Ms. Shiverick asked about the driveway material, to which Mr. Mizell stated it was coral stone.

Ms. Visconti provided a recommendation for the hedging.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Karakul and seconded by Ms. Catlin to approve the project with the following conditions: greenery is added to the lower south façade of the addition, the lanterns across the south elevation are eliminated, and a straight hedge, rather than a sculpted ball hedge, is installed along the front of the property. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

4. **ARC-24-0133 (ZON-24-0074) 410 SEABREEZE AVE (COMBO)** The applicant, Deborah Glass, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for a second story addition which requires variance(s). Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Kristen Kellogg of Smith Kellogg Architecture, Inc. gave an architectural presentation and explained the variance requests.

Ms. Grace thought it was a nice presentation. She supported the changes.

Ms. Catlin agreed with Ms. Grace. She thought the changes honored the existing home.

Ms. Shiverick agreed. She wondered if the owner could consider a Bahama shutter over the dressing room window.

Mr. Sammons agreed and thought the project was nice.

A motion was made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the project with the condition that a Bahama shutter or blinds are added to the windows on the addition. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

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

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

5. **ARC-24-0131 288 SANDPIPER DR.** The applicant, Mr. Kelly Williams, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for modifications and additions to the previously approved design of an existing one-story guest structure. *This item has been deferred to the February 26, 2025 meeting.*

Clerk's note: This item was deferred to the meeting on February 26, 2025, at Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

6. **ARC-24-0128 (ZON-24-0093) 203 VIA VIZCAYA (COMBO)** The applicant, PAUL Z. OKEAN (Trustee, under Trust Agreement dated 5/21/91 as the Paul Z. Okean Revocable Living Trust), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review for the design of a new, two-story, single-family residence with final hardscape, landscape and swimming pool improvements, with special exception approval required for redevelopment of a nonconforming parcel and a variance request for deficient landscape open space. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval. *This item has been deferred to the February 26, 2025 meeting.*

Clerk's note: This item was deferred to the meeting on February 26, 2025, at Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

D. MINOR PROJECTS - OLD BUSINESS

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

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications. *Richard Sammons declared a conflict of interest and left the dais during the discussion.*

Josh Lerner of O'Connor Capital Partners provided an overview of the project. Chris Mitchell of Gensler gave an architectural presentation, and Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group gave the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Ms. Grace asked about the existing railings, to which Mr. Mitchell stated they would not be touched at this time. She did not favor the botanical coral stone and themed drains; she thought the coral stone should be plain. She preferred a geometric pattern.

Ms. Connaughton thought the presentation was better than the previous one. She questioned the Arabesque tile chosen for the border. She recommended changing the pattern of the drains and wondered if the drains were needed where there was total enclosure. Mr. Mitchell responded.

Ms. Visconti thought the drains should be configured before setting the patterns. She preferred the bronze drains in a geometric pattern. She thought the coral stone should be Classic Dominican Coral, not Palladium. She liked the terracotta border but recommended a different shape other than the Arabesque. She recommended looking at the tile cuts at the thresholds. She recommended adding a threshold where the tile pattern changes. Mr. Mizell asked for clarification on the coral. Ms. Visconti

responded and preferred B or D for the blue tiles.

Mr. Phoenix questioned the Arabesque tile proposed. He liked the tiles selected for the stairs; he recommended reducing the grout line and using a bullnose finish for the steps. He liked the bronze geometric drains. He commented on the pattern of the tile and borders. He recommended creating something special for the thresholds and recommended a stone border.

Mr. Floersheimer commented on the riser tile.

Ms. Catlin liked the darker blue tiles and provided recommendations. She liked the diamond pattern and agreed that the drainage should be set before determining the pattern for the tile.

Ms. Shiverick thought the Dijon pattern was better than the Versailles pattern.

The commission weighed in on the pattern, suggesting increasing the tile size in the diamond pattern.

Ms. Shiverick liked the bronze botanical drains. She liked the suggestion for alternating the blue tiles on the risers.

Mr. Karakul commented on the Versailles pattern and provided a recommendation on the threshold. He recommended increasing the size of the tiles.

Ms. Visconti recommended using a coral border with a glazed tile cabochon or a coral border with a terracotta cabochon. She also recommended looking at the thresholds in Via Parigi.

Mr. Phoenix reminded the commission that terracotta cabochons were porous. He wondered if the blue tiles should be used as cabochons. He thought the stone could be ordered for summer construction, and the cabochons could be selected later.

Ms. Grace was sympathetic to their schedule, but she added she would like to see samples of the materials. Mr. Karakul recommended constructing a mockup of the tiles.

Mr. Mizell wondered if the coral stone could be ordered if Ms. Visconti approved it. He stated he could still create a mockup of the tiles.

Ms. Grace cautioned the commission to move forward before seeing the mockup.

Ms. Visconti did not favor the horizontal joints in the pattern; she thought they should be hidden. Ms. Connaughton recommended adding a straight transition in those areas.

Mr. Phoenix recommended studying a pattern where the decorative pieces

are in the center, and the stone is on the outside.

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to defer the project to the meeting on February 26, 2025, and that an onsite mockup be created for the Commissioners to view before the February 26, 2025, meeting. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

Attorney Francisco stated that any visits to the site should be done individually and disclosed in their ex parte.

2. **ARC-24-0066 324 PLANTATION RD.** The applicant, Wendy Schriber Trust (Environment Design Group), has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for construction of a pergola structure and site wall with associated landscape and hardscape. *This item has been deferred to the February 26, 2025 meeting.*

Clerk's note: This item was deferred to the meeting on February 26, 2025, at Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

3. **ARC-24-0099 250 VIA LINDA** The applicant, Subtrust Under Article Second of the MTDT 2009 Descendants Trust, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission approval for the installation of a generator. *This item has been deferred to the February 26, 2025 meeting.*

Clerk's note: This item was deferred to the meeting on February 26, 2025, at Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

Clerk's note: A lunch break was taken at 1:27 p.m. The meeting resumed at 2:07 p.m. Ms. Catlin returned at 2:12 p.m., Ms. Grace at 2:15 p.m., and Mr. Karakul at 2:19 p.m.

E. MINOR PROJECTS-NEW BUSINESS

1. **ARC-24-0134 (ZON-24-0076) 369 LAKE DR PH-A (COMBO)** The applicant, Hunter Trust, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for an approximately +/- 335 SF addition to an existing penthouse unit on an existing 6-story building, requiring a special exception with site plan review and variances for height and setback. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Mr. Phoenix, Mses. Connaughton, and Grace disclosed ex-parte communications.

Kyle Fant of Bartholemew + Partners gave an architectural presentation.

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Mr. Sammons to approve the project as presented.

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

The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

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

2. **ARC-24-0113 1600 S OCEAN BLVD.** The applicant, PB Pavilion Trust (Peter A. Flanagan, Robert G. Simes, & Michael Vineberg as Trustees), has submitted an application requesting Architectural Commission (ARCOM) review and approval for modifications to the existing landscape and hardscape and modifications to the driveway gates and pedestrian gate at an existing single-family residence with ARCOM approved renovations and additions underway.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Cory Meyer of Nievera Williams Design gave the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Ms. Visconti asked about the columns on the gate adjacent to the dock, commented on the plinth on the columns, and thought the way the gate related to the capital needed to be restudied.

Ms. Shiverick thought the gates were beautiful and asked about their material.

JP Molyneux of JP Molyneux Studio Ltd. discussed the gate and the material.

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

Mr. Sammons pointed out that he still did not favor the artificial turf being used on the property. He questioned whether the gate could be built as designed, specifically about the design of the side of the gate. He also asked further questions about the gate and questioned its viability. He provided recommendations for the pier design, including using bronze for the gate.

Ms. Visconti thought the gate should be bronze as well.

Mr. Phoenix agreed with Mr. Sammons on the ladder detail on the side of the gate. He recommended reducing the plinth and aligning the gate with the element. He asked to see the lighting for the piers and wondered about the caps for the balustrade and whether they matched

the caps on the piers. Mr. Meyer responded.

Ms. Connaughton agreed with Mr. Sammons and the other commissioners. She was not in favor of artificial turf. Mr. Meyer responded and stated he could change it into stone with planters.

A motion was made by Mr. Sammons and seconded by Ms. Visconti to defer the gate and pier detailing to the meeting on February 26, 2025, and to approve the landscaping plan without any artificial turf. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

3. **ARC-24-0115 249 W INDIES DR** The applicant, 239 Monterey Land Trust, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the installation of a swimming pool and generator with site-wide landscape and hardscape modifications.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Cory Meyer of Nievera Williams Design gave the landscape and hardscape presentation.

Ms. Grace confirmed all turf was real grass, which Mr. Meyer confirmed.

Ms. Catlin asked about the walls next to the hedges. Mr. Meyer responded and confirmed that they would be covered with material.

Ms. Visconti was supportive of the project.

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

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

4. **ARC-24-0119 (ZON-24-0072) 136 REEF RD (COMBO)** The applicants, John and Bonnie Stepan, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the reconstruction of a rear terrace with one variance to reduce the side yard setback. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Andre Harris of Andre Gerald Harris Inc. gave an architectural presentation.

Ms. Grace was supportive of the project. Ms. Connaughton agreed.

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

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

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

5. **ARC-24-0120 224 ATLANTIC AVE.** The applicant, 224 Atlantic LLC, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the enclosure of the first-floor covered parking area to an enclosed garage and storage area with sitewide landscape and hardscape improvements.

Mr. Falco provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Richard Leja of ACI Architecture gave an architectural presentation.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the proposed square footage for the enclosure. Mr. Leja responded. Ms. Connaughton did not support the cladding material and did not feel it was appropriate for Palm Beach.

Mr. Phoenix disagreed and thought the material grounds the building. He was not in favor of the transom windows in the garage.

Ms. Shiverick suggested using a pecky Cypress with a wash for the garage and bottom floor cladding. Mr. Leja stated that the owner would agree to Cypress.

Ms. Visconti thought regular Cypress or stone might be better for the element. She asked about removing the Ficus Benjamina hedge. Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group responded and described the replacement. Ms. Visconti did not support the fenestration in the garage.

Mr. Floersheimer thought this addition completed the building. He acknowledged that the hedge would obscure the project.

Mr. Phoenix provided further recommendations, such as changing the garage door to a white door and using a coral stone rather than wood.

Todd Peter, 236 Fairview Road, a friend of the owners and their real

estate agent, stated the owners were trying to soften the home and remove the condominium feel.

Ms. Grace preferred a lighter wood for the cladding element.

Mr. Karakul was not in favor of the transom element. He liked the idea of a lighter wood.

Mr. Sammons recommended using a hedge for the bottom element.

Ms. Catlin was not a fan of the building and thought the windows were problematic. She recommended using wood in a lighter stain; she thought the wood gave the home a residential feel.

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

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Karakul to approve the project with the condition that the cladding material is made of Cypress wood with a lighter stain and the transom windows on the front are eliminated. The motion carried 4-3, with Mr. Smith, Mses. Connaughton and Visconti dissenting.

6. **ARC-24-0124 232 COLONIAL LANE** The applicants, George and Zvenka Kleinfield, have filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for the installation of a perimeter fence on the South property line.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

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

Ms. Grace asked for further clarification on the request. Mr. Mizell responded.

Ms. Visconti suggested adding a hedge along with the fence, to which Mr. Mizell responded. Ms. Visconti supported the project.

Ms. Connaughton asked about the location of the black aluminum fence, to which Mr. Mizell responded.

Mr. Floersheimer thought that since it was the owner's property, he should be able to add a fence. He supported the project.

Ms. Catlin asked about the space between the wall and the property line. Mr. Mizell responded.

Mr. Sammons supported the project.

Mr. Smith called for public comment.

Steven Wolf, 225 Monterey Road, a neighbor to the south, expressed concern for his visual of the two seven-foot walls. He suggested placing a cap on the fence.

Mr. Floersheimer did not see the issue. He recommended that Mr. Wolf place a hedge on his side of the property to disguise the fence.

Ms. Visconti clarified where the two seven-foot walls would be placed.

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

7. **ARC-24-0125 936 N LAKE WAY** The applicant, Pamela Cline, has filed an application requesting Architectural Commission review and approval for new garage door and pedestrian gate designs, driveway material changes, and landscape modifications.

Ms. Pardue provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Cory Meyer of Nievera Williams Design presented the garage door and entry gate changes, landscape, and hardscape.

Ms. Connaughton was not in favor of the changes. She thought the changes went too far.

Ms. Catlin was not in favor of the mirrors on the gate door. Mr. Meyer stated that they could leave the mirrored spaces open instead.

Mr. Meyer showed the Commission a sample for the garage door.

Ms. Connaughton thought that water would pool on the garage door.

Mr. Floersheimer asked about the inspiration for the design. He did not favor the mirrors in the gate and thought the gate should be made of metal. He questioned the garage door design.

Ms. Shiverick asked if the frosted glass could be kept in the garage. She also suggested designing the gate, as recommended by Mr. Floersheimer, as a metal gate without mirrors.

Mr. Phoenix did not mind the gate but was not supportive of the mirrors in it. He recommended raising the gate to the arch. He thought that if the gate was designed to be offset, the garage doors should remain in the frosted glass.

Ms. Grace thought the original design seemed simpler and that the new design did not fit the home's aesthetics.

Mr. Karakul agreed and did not believe the proposal was interesting. He also questioned the hardscape material.

Ms. Shiverick liked the Belgium Belgard cobble with a limestone border for the hardscape.

Ms. Visconti questioned the need for the pedestrian gate and wondered if a lower gate could be used if the arch above it was removed.

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

A motion was made by Ms. Visconti and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to keep the previously approved frosted glass garage doors, that Belgium Belgard cobble with a limestone border to be used for the hardscape and to defer the pedestrian gate to the meeting on February 26, 2025. The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

8. **ARC-24-0118 (ZON-24-0071) 239 WORTH AVE (COMBO)** The applicant, CSPB WORTH LLC, has filed an application required Architectural Commission review and approval for a one-story addition to the rear of an existing one-story commercial building, including variances from parking, landscape open space, and lot coverage in the C-WA district. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval. *(This application has been withdrawn.)*
Clerk's note: This item was withdrawn at Item V. Approval of the Agenda.

X. UNSCHEDULED ITEMS

Ms. Churney stated that Claudia Visconti had declared two conflicts of interest for 260 Colonial Lane and 910 S. Ocean Blvd. at the December 20, 2024, meeting and correctly filled out the forms required by the State.

Mr. Karakul stated there was an approved home on the corner of Clarke Avenue & County Road; he stated that the windows had no mullions on the windows. Ms. Visconti stated that she was working on the project and that it was being addressed. Mr. Karakul brought up another project, Ocean Towers on North Ocean Blvd., which was approved with equipment on the roof to be screened. He indicated that the equipment was visible and unattractive. Ms. Mittner stated that the staff would review the projects.

Mr. Sammons commented on modern designs and thought that scale was important in these designs. He also questioned the requirement for a logistics plan for a hedge replacement. Ms. Pardue discussed the logistics plan and the

lack of ability to enforce it. Ms. Catlin thought these issues should be included in the ongoing code review.

Ms. Visconti thought the project materials should be specific to the proposed plans.

Ms. Pardue stated that staff cannot call Code Enforcement on behalf of others; she asked everyone to call them if they see something that was not approved.

Town Attorney Francisco warned the commission against discussing specific projects, as they could be returned to the commission for review.


XI. **NEXT MEETING DATE:** Wednesday, February 26, 2025


XII. **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Ms. Catlin and seconded by Mr. Karakul to adjourn the meeting at 3:52 p.m. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, February 26, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 S. County Road.

Respectfully Submitted,


Jeffrey W. Smith, Chairman
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION


Richard Sammons, Vice Chair
for Jeffrey Smith

kmc

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME <i>Sammons, Richard</i>		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <i>Architectural Commission</i>	
MAILING ADDRESS <i>455 Worth Avenue</i>		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY <i>Palm Beach</i>	COUNTY <i>Palm Beach</i>	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED <i>January 29, 2025</i>		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <i>Town of Palm Beach</i>	
		MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ APPOINTIVE	

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

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

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

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

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

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

* * * * *

ELECTED OFFICERS:

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

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

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

* * * * *

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

Although you must abstain from voting in the situations described above, you are not prohibited by Section 112.3143 from otherwise participating in these matters. However, you must disclose the nature of the conflict before making any attempt to influence the decision, whether orally or in writing and whether made by you or at your direction.

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

- You must complete and file this form (before making any attempt to influence the decision) with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who will incorporate the form in the minutes. (Continued on page 2)

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

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

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

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Richard Sammons, hereby disclose that on January 29, 20 25:

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

- ☐ inured to my special private gain or loss;
- ☒ inured to the special gain or loss of my business associate, O'Connor Group;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, by whom I am retained; or
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

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

ARC-24-0096
150worth Ave

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

Jan, 29 2025
Date Filed

[Signature]
Signature

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