

**MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION MEETING
WEDNESDAY JANUARY 27, 1999 AT 9:00 A.M.
TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 360 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD, PALM BEACH**

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ROLL CALL

PRESENT:

John H. Schuler, Chairman
Sally Gingras, Vice-Chairman
Laurel Baker, Member
Ethel Kinsella, Member
Lowry M. Bell, Jr., Member
Robert Deziel, Member (arrived at 9:05 a.m.)
Joanna Frost-Golino, Member (arrived at 9:10 a.m.)
Floyd Wideman, Alternate Member
Marvin Rosenberg, Alternate Member
Eric Adams, Alternate Member
Clay Brooker, Town Attorney (arrived at 9:05 a.m.)
Robert L. Moore, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building
Timothy M. Frank, Planner/Projects Coordinator
Gretchen Dayton, Recording Secretary

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 18, 1998 MEETING.

Note: The December meeting minutes had a section of verbatim transcript inserted at the request of the Town Attorney.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

IV. SWEARING IN OF PERSONS TESTIFYING

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

V. CONSENT AGENDA

There were not consent agenda items to be heard.

VI. PROJECT REVIEW

A. DEFERRALS AND CONTINUATIONS - MAJOR PROJECTS

B82-98 New Residence

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

This project was deferred from the October, November and December meetings.

Note: Mr. Wideman was a voting member for the review of this project.

Architect Ralph Cantin and Designer Joe Brennan presented the project. Mr. Cantin said the footprint is 7,000 square feet and project now has a 60% landscape area.

Mr. Brennan said they changed the shape of the windows on the rear elevation and added pre cast details around the three arched windows. The entrance was reduced by 6' so that the *entablature* is below the roof line. The roof line was changed on the two end buildings. The drive in garage on one side of the property and the staff quarters building on the other side, will be 35' away from the street, and the main house will be 60' away from the street. Mr. Bell asked Mr. Brennan if he felt that there were sufficient differences between the architecture of the other buildings on the street that they have designed. Mr. Brennan said he felt there was a difference in the style and that unfortunately with a computer the details are not brought out very well.

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

B87-98 Addition

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

This project was deferred from the November and December meetings.

Mr. Frank said he last had a conversation with the architect about a month ago and the client was discouraged by ARCOM's request to reduce the mass and to consider a one story building. He said they may not be back with this the project.

MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO MOVE THE PROJECT TO THE END OF THE MEETING AND IF NO ONE IS PRESENT AT THAT TIME, THE PROJECT WILL BE REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. FROST-GOLINO.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Note: No one was present at the end of the meeting to represent this project. Therefore this project was removed from the agenda.

B95-98 New Residence

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

Ex-parte communication disclosures

This project was deferred from the December meeting.

Attorney Ron Kolins said the architect was not present at this time.

MOTION BY MR. DEZIEL TO DEFER THE PROJECT UNTIL THE ARCHITECT IS PRESENT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

This item was called after project #B93-98.

Mr. Bell said he met with the owners and reviewed the plans.

Attorney Ron Kolins said his clients choose to work with ARCOM rather than pursue a project denial and carry it further.

Mr. Garvy said they met with several Commission Members during this process. He felt they have improved the design of the house through the interaction of the architect and the Commission. He said there are several houses surrounding them that are boarded up, two of the houses have window air-conditioners, some with flat roofs, some are abandoned homes that have no architectural, cultural or historical value to the area. He asked the Commission to consider this application as a positive move forward for Esplanade Way.

Architect Thomas Kirshhoff said they took 1' out the width of a portion of the house and the roof pitch was lowered to a 6/12 allowing for 10' ceilings on the first floor and 9' ceilings on the second floor. The square footage was reduced from 6,408 to 6,334 square feet and the cubic content is 3.83. The windows will be aluminum clad wood with true divided lites.

Some of the Commission felt it was an excellent job done on the house, the Monterey style diminished the appearance of mass and is more accommodating to the neighborhood. Other Commissioners felt the house was still large for the street. It was suggested to curve the driveway to the south to hide the garage doors facing the street. Mr. Kirchhoff said they plan to plant trees and landscape to screen out the garage doors. He said if the driveway were moved it would create a worse problem in relation to the neighbors driveways.

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

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Moore wanted to commend the Garvy's, Mr. Kirchhoff and Mr. Kolins for working with the Commission rather than requesting an appeal, they listened to what the Commission said last month. He said that in his opinion that is the way the system should work. He thanked everyone that participated in...

B93-98 New Residence

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

This project was deferred from the December meeting.

Mr. Wideman, Mr. Bell, Mrs. Baker and Mrs. Gingras said they met with the architect. Mr. Adams said he met with the owner.

Architect Harold Smith presented revised project calculation as follows:

The lot coverage was reduced from 28% to 27.5%, the landscaped/open space was increased from 55.1% to 55.6%, the FAR was reduced from 40% to 39%, CCR was reduced from 3.9 to 3.76, the floor area was 5,890 and is now 5,749 square feet and the building height was reduced from 20'6" to 20'.

Mr. Smith said the bay windows were removed and replaced with two windows with shutters. A Stucco band was introduced at the second floor line to break up the height of the building. A solid plaster element replaced the aluminum railing above the entry. And the building color was changed from a salmon to a light beige.

The bay windows on the original drawing were liked better than the two windows on the first floor. It was suggested to remove the shutters and to replace the 2 to 1 window panes with 3 to 1 panes in the bay windows. It was felt that the massing was an improvement from the original presentation.

MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH BAY WINDOWS WITHOUT THE SHUTTERS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. BELL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. NEW BUSINESS - MAJOR PROJECTS

B1-99 Demolition

Applicant: W.W. Windle Company
Address: 249 Sea Breeze Avenue
Architect: None
Project Description: Demolition of existing single family home.

Rene Alonso represented the project and said the replacement house was approved at last month's meeting and they neglected to apply for the demolition of the existing house. He said the house was built in 1968 and he felt it had no historical value.

MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO APPROVE THE DEMOLITION WITH THE PROVISION TO SOD OR SEED AND IRRIGATE OR COMMENCE WITH THE CONSTRUCTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B2-99 New Residence

Applicant: Addison Construction
Address: 244 Via Las Brisas
Architect: Phoenix Architects
Project Description: New two-story residence.

Architect Lynn McColl said the project is a Country French Chateau style with some stone on the front facade and green flat cement tile on the roof and some copper roof sections. Laminated glass will be used in the windows. She said the project FAR is 43.8%, the CCR is 4.2 and the square footage is 8,991 square feet.

Ms. McColl was asked what element of this house makes it Country French Chateau style. She said the arched windows, dental moldings, the copper roof sections and the use of stone on the house. She was asked to present photographs of the Country French style architecture that looks something like this presentation.

It was felt that the size was blown up to the edge on everything, the set-backs are minimal, the beam height is maximum, the CCR and FAR. Mr. Deziel said this subdivision has been on the larger size relative to other neighborhoods, but he felt they exceeded the thresholds that were established there. He said the average floor area ratio for the is around 40%, CCR around 4.0 in that neighborhood. He asked Ms. McColl to focus on the architecture and tone the size down.

Mrs. Frost-Golino was concerned with using three separate garage doors and asked to have the garage facing away from North Lake Way and Via Las Brisas.

Mrs. Gingras said the side elevation on North Lake Way is too massive to be 30' from the street and it should be sensitive to that street. The entry feature has nothing to do with French Country Chateau.

Mr. Adams felt the lot deserves a house that is more interesting architecturally.

Dr. Rosenberg felt the size of the house was reasonable for the size of the lot and a three car garage should not be a problem. He agreed that the architecture needs to be re-addressed.

Mrs. Kinsella said there was too much hardscape in the project

MOTION BY MR. DEZIEL TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING AND TO INCORPORATE THE COMMISSION COMMENTS.

Mr. Frank read a letter objecting to a two story house, from Julia A. Amory who lives at 250 Kawama Lane.

Mr. Bell stated for the record that the total square footage of the house is 10,959 not 8,900. The square footage previously stated left out the three car garage, the loggia and the second floor covered balcony. The actual site is not 26,000 square feet, as stated, but 24,970.

Mr. Moore explained to Ms. McColl that the Phipps's house, directly to the north of this project, needs to be part of the neighborhood comparisons. He said the house exceeded the angle of vision from North Lake Way and some of the mass on that elevation should not be there. Mr. Moore said the Phipps Estates subdivision has a freeze on the zoning until April, 2000. Therefore the zoning in progress does not affect this project.

ALTERNATE MOTION BY MR. BELL TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING AND TO COMPLETELY RETHINK THE ENTIRE ARCHITECTURE.

MR. DEZIEL WITHDREW HIS MOTION AND SECONDED THE ALTERNATE MOTION.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B3-99 Demolition and New Residence

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Robert Krakoff
Address: 200 Emerald Lane
Architect: SGA Architects
Project Description: Demolition and new two-story residence

Architect Spencer Golliger introduced Contractor Jim Martindale of Worth Builders. Mr. Golliger said the house was built in 1949 and designed by John Volk.

Mr. Frank said the plans submitted for staff review did not have all of the dimensions and Mr. Ackerman could not determine the square footage of the house. He said the demolition letter received was rather brief and he was unable to determine the historical value of the house.

Mr. Deziel said he was familiar with the house.

MOTION BY MR. DEZIEL TO APPROVE THE DEMOLITION.

Chairman Schuler said that some of the other Commissioner's wanted to review the proposed house before approving the demolition.

MR. DEZIEL WITHDREW HIS MOTION.

Mr. Golliger said the proposed house is a 6,262 square foot, two-story, Bermuda style and that it is higher than the average FAR for the neighborhood at 36.7% and a CCR of 3.23.

It was felt that the style was not consistent all of the way around the house. The columns seem out of scale. It was stated that the architecture was undistinguished and uninteresting. If the style is Bermuda/Georgian then it should be symmetrical. The roof plan has a variety of different roof elements that are not typical in a two-story Bermuda/Georgian style. The garage door should be moved from the corner of the lot to one side or the other as the corner will be the most important part of the house. The element above the garage appears to be quite high for a garage. The pediment over the front entry needs to be improved. There is too much diversity between the size of the windows on the first floor and the second floor.

A suggestion of another curb cut was made and Mr. Moore said that would be the decision of the Director of Public Works Department.

Mr. Moore said that Mr. Peter Townsend of 210 Emerald Lane, sent a letter concerning drainage issue which would be addressed at the building permit stage. Mr. Moore said he will forward Mr. Townsend's letter to the Public Works Department.

It was stated that this proposed architectural style needs to be reworked.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING FOR RESTUDY OF THE ENTIRE ARCHITECTURAL CONCEPT OF THIS HOUSE TAKING SOME OF THE SUGGESTIONS ABOUT THE GARAGE LOCATION. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. DEZIEL WITH THE COMMENT THAT THE SIZE OF THE HOME IS ACCEPTABLE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO APPROVE THE DEMOLITION WITH THE PROVISION TO SOD OR SEED AND IRRIGATE THE LOT WITHIN 30 DAYS. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. DEZIEL. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B4-99 New Residence

Applicant: Malasky Homes
Address: 530 South Ocean Blvd.
Architect: Steven Bruh
Project Description: New two-story residence.

Mr. Moore said this project is an atypical situation. It went to the Town Council for a variance in height of the tie beam of the front entry. It was denied and the revised plans that were submitted reflect the changes to conform to the code. There is another variance that was first denied and

then reconsidered and is currently before Mr. Randolph for his final opinion. As to an honest disagreement on an area for a retaining wall that would be on the north side of the property this would allow for will be shown an entry way to a basement garage. The wall is at 9' rather than the permitted 7' and is within 3' of the property line and there is an honest disagreement of the interpretation of our code regarding what a garden wall or a retaining wall if it qualifies if their both treated the same. Mr. Randolph has given some preliminary review to this matter and Mr. Kolins has offered a letter of argument to him. Mr. Randolph has tentatively said that he believes that the Zoning Administrator, Mr. Castro will be correct in this matter, but has not issued a final opinion. He said that what is for review should be the corrected front entry, the issue of the retaining wall as far as it protrudes 2' above ground on the north side of the house will either be the subject of a variance request, or they may not need the variance. He said if the variance is not approved, they may have to raise the basement floor 1' and lower the overall tie beam 1' which would lessen the impact. He said the neighbor to the north has raised objections to this application and staff has his letter on file.

Mr. Deziel said if a project is subject to a deferral on a variance, that element automatically removes the project from the ARCOM or Landmark Commission's agenda. He said this would have the potential to be presented to the Town Council with the statement that this project has already been approved by ARCOM, we just want the variance now catch up to it. He said the Town Council frowns heavily on that kind of situation. He said projects should be ready to go to the building department after ARCOM and not go for a variance with a flag on it that it has been approved.

Attorney Clay Brooker, representing the town, suggested letting the applicant's attorney, Mr. Kolins, address the issue before the Commission makes the final decision to hear the project or to defer it.

Attorney Ron Kolins said he agreed with the normal procedure of having variances resolved before it comes to ARCOM, but this is an unusual situation. He felt that a wall that is not visible, 100% below grade, is subject to the provisions of the town code relating to garden walls. He said there are other solutions to the retaining wall problem which have little or no bearing on the architecture of this home.

**felt it was not necessary for a variance as there are no provisions for retaining walls in the town code. He said if they have to build a 7' retaining wall, there are other ways to provide the extra 2' needed to retain the earth for the below grade driveway into a below grade garage.

Mr. Bruh said the plans reflected a conforming tie beam height.

Mr. Moore said that if they did have to redesign to conform to the code, the worse case scenario

would be that the basement floor would have to be raised 1' and drop the overall height down 1'. He said that rather than have an increase in height it would be a reduction in height.

Dr. Roseneberg stated that if they fail to receive a variance and they have alternative means of earth retention on the north side, then there still would be no effect on the appearance of the house.

Mr. Schuler said he felt that if 1' were taken out of the house it could effect the appearance of the house and effect the propotions of the house.

Mr. Deziel said the entire house will vary based on wether or not the retaing wall will be approved.

Mr. Wideman said that this project may not be able to be build and felt the Commission should not consider it at all.

Mr. Adams said he has heard applicant say to the Town Council that they have obtained approval of ARCOM and use this as a wedge to drive in favor of their own position.

Joanna Frost-Golino had the reservation of not getting into the position of the Town Council approving a variance before ARCOM has seen the project and they are locked in to accepting a retaingin wall which will provide for a three story mass.

Mr. Moore stated that Mr. Kolins has advised the staff that the applicant has withdrawn the variance request.

Mr. Kolins said the retaing wall can be kept at 7' and the extra two feet required for the earth retentntion could be delt with by landscape terracing work. He said that if the Commission is not comfortable with this offer, then they will not withdraw the variance request.

After further discussion, Mr. Kolins asked to have the project deferred and said that they are not withdrawing the variance request.

MOTION BY MR. DEZIEL TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING AS THIS PROJECT SHOULD NOT BE ON THE AGENDA DUE TO THE ZONING ISSUE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Moore said that it was his decision to leave the project on the agenda.

B5-99 Addition

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Thomas P. Turchan
Address: 211 Eden Road
Architect: SKA Architect
Project Description: Addition on first and second floors

The architect requests deferral to the February meeting.

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

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B6-99 New Residence

Applicant: Harry J. Brown
Address: 130 Peruvian
Architect: SKA Architect
Project Description: New two-story residence.

The staff recommended deferral of this project.

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

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B7-99 Demolition and New Residence

Applicant: Mr. Hamlin Beattie
Address: 252 Kenlyn Lane
Architect: Robert Bell
Project Description: Demolition and new two-story residence.

Mrs. Baker, Mr. Schuler, Mrs. Gingras and Mr. Adams declared ex-parte communications.

Architect Robert Bell introduced the Property Owner, Hamlin Beattie. Mr. Bell said the existing house was constructed in 1950 for Mr. and Mrs. Waltz and designed by Lester Geiser. The house is a single story, 2,236 square feet which includes a florida room addition in 1966. The condition is poor to average for a structure of this age and a number of structural and cosmetic repairs are required. He said the existing house has an FAR of .172 and a CCR of 1.36.

Mr. Bell said he included some houses outside of the 200' radius for the CCR comparison chart. He said that Mr. Beattie just built a house next door to this lot on North Lake Way. He said there will be a separate, single-story building in the back of the proposed two-story house which will have a garage, a cabana and a guest bathroom. There will be two open loggias, one off of the living room and one off of the one-story element. The garage will be at the rear of the property and will be side loading. He said the finished floor elevation will be at 8'.66" and the sunken living room will be at elevation 7'.5". The house will have Spanish barrel tile roofing material, mahogany casement windows with true divided lites. The front entry will have a balcony with a decorative iron railing above it and trimmed in stone. The building is 34' wide on the 100' wide lot. Mr. Bell said the plans that were submitted to the staff were revised to reflect a recalculated CCR which was done by dropping the tie beam of the main residence 8".

Mr. Beattie addressed the Commission and said they wanted to maximize the privacy for the existing house they now live and maximize the privacy for the adjoining property. It is their intention to move into the new house when it is completed. He said the only way to protect his house which is right behind this is to create a blank wall with shuttered false openings along the western exposure. He said that the houses on Kenlyn Lane are below sea level and as they are sold, they will be torn down and larger houses will be built.

Mr. Deziel felt that the proposed house was too large for the street and the house is off the chart from a size standpoint.

'The Commission felt

Mrs. Kinsella objected to the large along the front of the house.

Mrs. Gingras said that it would be nice to have a sunken living room, but from the exterior of the house, the house needs to be brought down to the 7'.5" elevation. She felt the house was big, but commended the architect for putting a 34' wide mass on a 100' wide lot.

Mrs. Frost-Golino felt that it was wrong if houses are being built so close together, and building such massive houses, that it is so hard to protect the pool area from being seen from the neighbors houses by building shuttered blank walls.

Mr. Bell said he they have reduced the appearance of mass from the street and soon they may be able to take in consideration that open loggias on the first floor would not be counted into the CCR. He said that he was not as upset about the size as some of the other members.

Mrs. Baker was in favor of the placement of the house on the lot and the placement of the single story, separate, and partially obscured building on back portion of the lot. Unfortunately, when the numbers are added up, it doesn't play in the applicant's favor. The hedge should be pushed back in front of the cabana building so that it looks like a smaller house on a big lot. She suggested a

Charlston style home rather than the proposed Spanish Eclectic style.

Mr. Wideman felt this proposed project and the house Mr. Beattie built on the corner of North Lake Way and Palma Way would be an example of what may be termed "block busting". He said now that the house is finished, he is surprised that it was approved because it loomes over everything else and it is much larger than expected.

Mr. Adams suggested a one story element at the front of the house.

Mr. Bell referred to the Zonning Commission's proposed sliding scale and said that a 13,000 square foot lot the maximum CCR would be 3.88. Which on a floor area with a 20' height of a building would be 4,800 square feet and a 22' high building, would be 4,400 square foot building. The proposed building is a 5,800 square feet which is 1,000 square feet more than the new recommendations.

Dr. Rosenberg felt that size should not matter as the mass of the project has been addressed as to the view from the street.

It was felt the Commission has to be consistant with size when approving new buildings and that the neighbors view other sides of the house and that should not be ignored.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING AND TO REDUCE THE CCR OF THE PROJECT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B8-99 Addition and Remodel

Applicant:	Patricia McGinty Gallagher
Address:	312 Cherry Lane
Architect:	Stephan Yeckes
Project Description:	Remodel residence to include extending kitchen and master bedrooms, remodel entry and enclose an existing carport.

Staff recommends deferral as the project requires a variance.

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

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B9-99 Additions and Alterations

Applicant: Ms. Helen Pecori
Address: 133 Dolphin Road
Architect: Glen Harris
Project Description: Additions and alterations to existing one-story structure, to provide new two-story residence.

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

Architect Glen Harris said that covered patio areas at the rear and a small covered patio area to the front of the house will be added on the ground floor. The two-story addition will be square to create a "pod" look which give an island feeling to the home. The existing driveway comes straight in to the garage. They will take out an awing covering a parking area on the west side of the house. The roof will be metal. He presented a street scape drawing and said there is a variety of homes sizes on Dolphin Road. He said the FAR is 39% and the CCR is 3.92 and the total square footage will be 4,268.

The Commission felt the project was an outstanding job and it ties in with what they have been trying to accomplish in this town to create an outdoor living area and a Florida style home. The combination of the one story portions with the mass in the middle of the two story section having it broken up with the porches is outstanding work.

Mr. Schuler was concerned with the mixture of windows, as some of them have large plate glass sections. He felt they should relate to each other rather than having separate styles.

Mr. Harris said that he will use a repetitive casement type window rather than using the fixed center window.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO APPROVE THE PROJECT SUBJECT TO CHANGING THE WINDOWS TO ALL CASEMENT WINDOWS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. DEFERRALS AND CONTINUATIONS - MINOR PROJECTS

The meeting was reconvened at 1:35 p.m after a lunch break. Mr. Deziel and Mr. Brooker were not in attendance at this time.

A64-98 ATM

ARCOM Minutes 1/27/99

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

This project was deferred from the December meeting.

The architect requested to have the project deferred.

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

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A65-98 ATM

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

This project was deferred from the December meeting.

The architect requested to have the project deferred.

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

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BAKER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A55-98 Driveway and Gates

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

This project was deferred from the October, November and December meetings.

No one was present to represent this project.

MOTION BY MR. WIDEMAN TO REMOVE THE PROJECT FROM THE AGENDA.

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

Mr. Deziel and Mr. Brooker were in attendance at this time.

A60-98 Landscape

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

This project was deferred from the November and December meetings.

Landscape Architect Howard Ostrout presented a site plan showing the areas of hardscape removed from the project. The pavers in the driveway will be red, tan and charcoal colors, in different sizes, positioned in an "Old Town" pattern.

After his presentation, the north property line was discussed and he agreed to add three 14' tall fish tail palms to this area. It was suggested to remove one of the curb cuts on North Obean Boulevard and add more greenspace as it was felt there was not enough greenspace. It was suggested to use sepping stones instead of concrete walkways areas and widen the pedestrian gates and create a motor court.

Mr. Dom Caldarone of Boston Homes addressssed the Commission and stated that the original designer mis-calculated the greenspace.

**MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO APPROVE THE PLANS WITH THE PROVISION TO CLOSE THE NORTH CURB CUT ON NORTH OCEAN BOULEVARD AND FILL IN WITH MATCHING LANDSCAPING ALONG THE STREET, TO ADD THREE FOURTEEN FOOT FISHTAIL PALMS ALONG THE NORTH PROPERTY LINE, TO USE STEPPING STONES ON THE NORTH SIDE OF THE HOUSE AND TO HAVE STAFF REVIEW THE REVISED PLANS FOR FINAL APPROVAL.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. DEZIEL.**

ROLL CALL:

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

MRS. FROST-GOLINO YES
MR. SCHULER YES

MOTION CARRIED 6-1.

A51-98 Landscape

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

This project was deferred from the October, November and December meetings.

No one was presente to represent the project.

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

C. NEW BUSINESS - MINOR PROJECTS

A1-99 Landscape

Applicant: Wittmann Building Corp.
Address: 110 Clarendon Avenue
Architect: Lang Design
Project Description: Landscape plans

No one was present when this project was called.

MOTION BY MR. WIDEMAN TO DEFER THIS PROJECT TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. KINSELLA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Schuler called this project after item #A4-99 as Mr. Lang was in attendance at this time.

Landscape Architect John Lang said the landscaping will consist of salt tolerant plants and trees and hedging will be planted across the front of the property.

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

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

A2-99 Landscape

Applicant: Peter Knudsen
Address: 593 Island Drive
Architect: Steven Dauber
Project Description: Landscape plan

Landscape Architect Steven Dauber presented photographs of the houses on the street, a site plan and an elevation drawing of the proposed landscaping. He said there will be multi planting levels in certain areas, foxtail palms planted in the rear yard, and a salmon color bougainvillea accenting a balustrade.

**MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO APPROVE THE LANDSCAPE AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WIDEMAN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A3-99 Landscape

Applicant: Charles Henderson
Address: 321 Via Las Brisas
Architect: Steven Dauber
Project Description: Landscape plan

Landscape Architect Steven Dauber presented the project. He said the house is a one-story Mediterranean style and two large urns with calamondin citrus topary trees will be placed on either side of the front entrance and podocarpus and bougainvillea will frame the front windows.

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

A4-99 Facade Change

Applicant: PB Cavaliers, L.C.
Address: 179 Bradley Place
Architect: Sally Gingras
Project Description: Facade changes only, including removal of existing tiled mansard roofs. Addition of a hip roof over two story portion. Deletion of

showroom windows, addition of double hung windows with plantation shutters.

Vice-Chairman and Architect Sally Gingras first declared a Conflict of Interest and then presented the project. She said the building was constructed in the 1970's and it has a mansard cement barrel tile roof and big arched showroom windows with awnings over them. A pitched roof will be placed on the two-story section, the big arched windows will be closed in with double hung windows with plantation shutters. Quoins and stucco banding will be added to the building.

After discussion it was agreed to lower the stucco banding to the bottom of the second floor windows.

MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE PROVISION TO LOWER THE STUCCO BAND TO THE BOTTOM OF THE WINDOWS ON THE SECOND FLOOR .

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. DEZIEL.

ROLL CALL:

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

MOTION CARRIED 4-3.

A5-99 Awnings

Applicant:	Houston's Restruant, Inc.
Address:	336 Royal Poinciana Way
Project Description:	Awnings

Mr. Frank said the awning color was unusual and that is why this application is on the agenda.

Fred Hennighausen represented Houston's design department for the Palm Beach Grill and presented a swatch sample of the yellow awning proposed for the restraurant.

MOTION BY MRS. BAKER TO APPROVE THE AWNING COLOR AS

PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. BELL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

The Commission discussed a letter received from Leighton Rosenthal which strongly objected to the garage door that face North County Road for the new residence being constructed across the street from him. Mr. Moore said that he met with Mr. Rosenthal and told him that he will be notified when the landscaping plans are submitted for ARCOM review.

The awnings for the new post office were discussed and Mr. Frank said he gave them a staff approval as the Federal Government has the right to supersede our ordinance.

Mr. Bell wanted to discuss the pattern book that had been distributed to the Town Council and the Zoning Commission.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO HAVE A 8:00 A.M. WORKSHOP MEETING TO DISCUSS THE PATTERN BOOK.

Mr. Moore said that that book may change in the near future.

MOTION DIED FOR THE LACK OF A SECOND.

Chairman Schuler announced that next month will be Mrs. Baker's last meeting as she has served two full terms on ARCOM.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MRS. KINSELLA TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 3:20 P.M.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. DEZIEL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next Architectural Commission meeting will be held on February 24, 1999 at 9:00 a.m.

A4-99

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME GINGRAS, SALLY		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW	
MAILING ADDRESS REEF ROAD		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY PALM BEACH	COUNTY FL. PALM BEACH	☒ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☐ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED 11/27/99		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: COMMISSION MEMBER	
		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

A person holding elective or appointive county, municipal, or other local public office **MUST ABSTAIN** from voting on a measure which 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, SALLY GINGRAS, hereby disclose that on JAN 27, 1999:

(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 DAVID REESE, 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:

I AM THE ARCHITECT OF RECORD FOR THE
RENOVATION OF 179 BRADLEY PLACE
WHICH CAME BEFORE ARCOM FOR
APPROVAL OF FACADE CHANGES

2.24.99

Date Filed

Signature

Sally Gingras

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.

94-99

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE	
MAILING ADDRESS		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY	COUNTY	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☐ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION:	
		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

A person holding elective or appointive county, municipal, or other local public office **MUST ABSTAIN** from voting on a measure which 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.

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.

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, SALLY GINGRAS, hereby disclose that on JAN 27, 1999:

(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 DAVID REESE, 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:

I AM THE ARCHITECT OF RECORD FOR THE RENOVATION OF 179 BRADLEY PLACE WHICH CAME BEFORE ARCOM FOR APPROVAL OF FACADE CHANGES

Date Filed

2.24.99

Signature

Sally Gingras

1. CE: 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.