



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Planning, Zoning & Building Department

MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 25, 2006

TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 360 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD, PALM BEACH

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Wideman called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL:

Floyd L. Wideman, Jr., Chairman
Morgan Dix Wheelock, Vice-Chairman
Marvin Rosenberg, Member
Leslie A. Shaw, Member
Nikita Zukov, Member
William P. Feldkamp, Member
William J. Strawbridge Jr., Member
Leslie C. Diver, Alternate Member
Thomas M. Youchak, Alternate Member
Jeffery Smith, Alternate Member
Stirling E. Clarke, Attorney
Veronica Close, Director Planning, Zoning & Building
Timothy M. Frank, Planning Administrator
Gretchen Dayton, Secretary

ABSENT:

None

III PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The pledge of allegiance was led by Chairman Wideman.

IV APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 16, 2005 MEETING.

IV APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 16, 2005 MEETING.

MOTION BY MR. WHELOCK TO APPROVE THE MINUTES.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SHAW.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

V SWEARING IN PERSONS TESTIFYING.

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

VI PROJECT DEFERRALS/REMOVALS

B85-05 Addition

Address: 245 Worth Avenue
Applicant: Jane B. Holzer
Architect: The Lawrence Group
Project Description: Addition of partial second floor of approximately 1,700 s.f. over a first floor of approximately 1,258 s.f. Materials, height and colors are compatible with the existing building. Retail use is unchanged.

This project was deferred from the September, October, November and December meetings at the architect's request. The architect requests deferral to the February Meeting.

B102-05 New Residence

Address: 251 Kenlyn Road
Applicant: Jerry Wheeler
Architect: Mesa Architecture
Project Description: Construction of a new two story Mediterranean style home.

This project was deferred from the October meeting and November meetings. Demolition was approved at the December meeting and the new construction was deferred for restudy. The architect requests deferral to the February meeting.

B109-05/V1-06 Additions & New Building

Address: 9 Lagomar Road and 12 Lagomar Road
Applicant: Roberto A. deGuardiola & Joanne M. deGuardiola
Architect: Thomas M. Kirchhoff
Project Description: Additions and renovations to existing three-story residence including:
1. A new one story pool pavilion and garage (basement)
2. A new two-story building consisting of entry gallery, office, and guest rooms.
3. Interior renovations to the existing structure.
4. New pool, hardscape, and preliminary landscape.

This project was deferred from the December meeting. The architect requests deferral to the February meeting.

MOTION BY MR. SHAW TO DEFER THE PROJECTS B85-05, B102-05 AND B109-05 TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WHELOCK.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VII TOWN COUNCIL PROJECTS - VARIANCE REQUESTS

Formal action may or may not be taken relative to these projects.

B88-05/V6-06 Addition

Address: 434 Seaspray Avenue
Applicant: Christopher and Andrea Kaufmann
Architect: James C. Paine, Jr.
Project Description: Second floor master bedroom suite addition over the existing garage and over loggia expansion of a ground floor, south of the garage. The roof height to match existing second floor roof. The materials and finishes to matching the existing.

This project was deferred from the September meeting at the architect's request. The October meeting was canceled due to Hurricane Wilma. The project was deferred from the November meeting as no one was present and it deferred from the December meeting for restudy.

There were no ex parte communications disclosed regarding this project.

Architect Jim Paine made changes to the project by rearranging windows, adding cast stone and lowering the height of the chimney. He decided not to move the second floor addition away from the street as it was requested last month, because the Town Council had no objection to it.

**MOTION BY MR. ZUKOV TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY DR. ROSENBERG.**

ROLL CALL:

MR. ZUKOV	YES
DR. ROSENBERG	YES
MR. WHELOCK	YES
MR. SHAW	NO
MR. FELDKAMP	NO
MR. STRAWBRIDGE	YES
MR. WIDEMAN	YES

MOTION CARRIED 5-2.

B95-05/SE20-05 New Residence

Address:	447 Primavera Avenue
Applicant:	Randall and Barbara Smith
Architect:	Smith and Moore Architects
Project Description:	Demolition of an existing two-story residence and construction of a new two-story residence with pool, hardscape, and landscaping.

This project was deferred from the September and December meetings at the architect's request. The October meeting was canceled due to Hurricane Wilma. Demolition was approved at the November meeting and the new construction was deferred for restudy.

Mr. Feldkamp, Mr. Wideman and Mr. Strawbridge said they met with the architect and reviewed the plans. Mr. Wheelock and Mr. Zukov said they met with the architect and visited the site.

Attorney Ray Royce, representing the applicant, said they met with the neighbors and discussed the plans. He noted that this property is in the RA zoning district, because it is adjacent to the lake, and the others on the street are in the RB zoning district. The new house will have less of an impact than the existing home because it will be set back farther from the street and will be lower in height.

Architect Harold Smith introduced Project Designer Steve Barlow. Mr. Smith explained that the variance requests are for modification to an existing site plan approval and a modification to a building height plane variance.

Zoning Administrator Paul Castro explained that this project would require a site plan approval because the lot is non-conforming. Also, it does not meet the angle of vision and the building height plane. He believed the plans had been revised and they are here today to get favorable consideration to bring back to the Town Council. He also pointed out that the front facade is

wider which will put more building closer to the street. They are asking for more of a variance for building height as well.

Mr. Wideman stated that this proposal impacted the street more than the existing house, but it is a beautiful house and it fits the neighborhood. As well, the new house would have less of an impact because it is lower than the existing building and architecturally it has a better facade.

Mr. Wheelock noticed that the previous landscape plan had a silver buttonwood hedge and green island ficus running across the facade. As such, he requested incorporating these hedges into the new plans.

Mr. Strawbridge commented on the style of architecture, which was described as a Palladian villa. He thought the building materials and colors were not in keeping with the neighborhood. And, if the house were pushed back nine feet, it would not require a height plane variance.

Architect Smith presented drawings of other options which would not require variances. The first option had two-stories with a flat front elevation. The second option had a stepping front elevation. He remarked that these options do not work for the client.

Mr. Smith asked the architect to restudy the stone cornice piece and the column spacing.

Mr. Frank read the Public Work's report which stated that a retaining wall is necessary east of the east driveway. In addition, the drainage plan did not agree with the site plan.

Dr. Rosenberg commented that any project can be designed to the code. However, based upon other considerations, one of which is the desire of the homeowner, there may be a better architectural presentation and development which would require a variance. The Commission's role is not to suggest that the architect absolutely conform to the existing code, but to come up with an alternative that given a variance would enhance the architecture.

MOTION BY DR. ROSENBERG TO CONVEY TO THE TOWN COUNCIL AN APPROVAL OF THE VARIANCE BECAUSE THE ARCHITECTURE WARRANTS IT. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WHEELOCK.

ROLL CALL:

DR. ROSENBERG	YES
MR. WHEELOCK	YES
MR. SHAW	NO
MR. ZUKOV	YES
MR. FELDKAMP	NO
MR. STRAWBRIDGE	YES
MR. WIDEMAN	YES

MOTION CARRIED 5-2.

B6-06 V2-2006 Renovations

Address: 230 Royal Palm Way
Applicant: FJK Properties, Inc.
Architect: Ed Oliver
Project Description: Renovations to an existing four-story building including the building of a mansard style parapet roof, addition of two tower features, facade modifications, interior reconfiguration and enclosing of a staircase on the rear of the building. The use of intensity of the project, as well as the circulation and parking will all remain the same.

Mr. Wideman said he met with the architect and reviewed the plans. Mr. Wheelock and Mr. Zukov said they met with the architect, the attorney and the owner. Dr. Rosenberg said he met with the architect and the attorney. Mr. Shaw said he met with the owner and the architect.

Architect Ed Oliver presented photographs of the Seminole Building and other commercial buildings on Royal Palm Way. He stated that they are not changing the overall building height, they are not increasing the square footage and they are building on the same footprint. He remarked that it is important to do this for a variety of reasons, primarily to satisfy current zoning.

Property Owner Mr. Keitel pointed out that the rendering did not reflect the actual building color.

Mr. Oliver described the building as having a cast stone base, rusticated stucco on the first floor, and cast stone at the corbels, cornice lines, arches above the doors and windows. The central tower element, on the front facade, provides an identity element for the building. The ½ tower element on the rear facade provides screening for the mechanical equipment and accommodates the elevator shaft. The stair tower in the south east corner of the building is an open metal stair which will be enclosed. The interior of the building will be demolished and brought up to code. He proposed clay barrel tile for the roofing material, bronze glass and black railings. The upper two floors will be painted yellow and a soft beige color painted on the first two floors. The tower features will be painted a lighter yellow color than the building.

Attorney Ron Kolins presented a board showing the break down of the variance requests into three categories. He said that the first category has three variances which are existing conditions and must be granted. The second category has to do with the tower features. The last category includes miscellaneous variances, such as, enclosure of the exterior staircase and the height of the mansard roof along the front of the building.

Mr. Feldkamp was not in favor of this building having a cornice height above the surrounding buildings. He questioned the hierarchy of the windows and asked what style of architecture they were trying to match. One style of architecture would have the balconies and the largest openings on the second floor with a reduction of height as the building goes up. He did not see any reason

for variances for the entry feature and the mansard roof.

Mr. Keitel defended the tower entry feature and stated that every good-looking building on the street has some kind of tower entrance.

Mr. Shaw commented that the project was pointing in the right direction, but the way the four floors are being portrayed is out of balance. He thought the mansard roof feature could be modified that would not require the added height.

Ms. Diver thought that the tower feature was appropriate with Royal Palm Way. However, the two-story elements on the second and third floors were out of balance.

Mr. Youchak asked that they take in consideration the screening of the cooling tower because it will be above the building and will be very visible from the bridge.

Mr. Smith said "bravo" for taking an ugly building and doing something with it. He suggested lowering the band at the top of the entry feature. In addition, if stone elements are being used on the building, the first floor rustication should be stone.

Mr. Wheelock thought that the variance requests should be supported by this Commission. Architecturally this is an esthetic enhancement to Royal Palm Way. He suggested creating an acoustical system to cut down on the noise of the cooling tower.

Mr. Oliver, responding to Mr. Smith's observation that the west elevation had recessed on the forth floor, replied that the building code does not allow windows on a common property line. He thought that staff may approve windows at a later date.

MOTION BY MR. WHEELOCK TO RECOMMEND TO TOWN COUNCIL THAT THIS PROJECT ARCHITECTURALLY MERITS THE VARIANCE APPLICATION. MOTION SECONDED BY DR. ROSENBERG.

Ms. Close asked the commission if any of the design suggestions that were made should be part of the motion?

Mr. Kolins thought it would be premature to restrict them on height of the tower because they have the flexibility to come back to ARCOM for their architectural review.

**MR. FELDKAMP OPPOSED.
MOTION CARRIED 6-1.**

B7-06/V9-06 Enclose Carport

Address: 1290 North Ocean Blvd.
Applicant: Herbert C. Pohlmann
Architect: SKA Architect + Planner/ Jacqueline Albarran
Project Description: Raise existing top of beam two-feet at center (one-story portion) and east terrace. Raise door headers in this area from six-feet, eight-inches to eight-feet high. Enclose an existing carport. Match the existing roof and all details.

Mr. Zukov stated that he had ex-parte communications.

Architect Jackie Albarran presented drawings showing how much the property elevation drops. According to the code, the point of measurement would have to start at the highest level of the land. She proposed raising the header height of the one-story section by two-feet. The project also includes enclosure of the carport which will be a great improvement and does not require a variance.

Mr. Feldkamp said this is a perfect example of a hardship due to a land issue. This is the whole concept of a variance and should not be done at an architect's whim.

**MOTION BY DR. ROSENBERG THAT THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION
RECOMMENDS THE VARIANCES BASED UPON THE ENHANCED
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN THAT WAS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WHEELOCK.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A. DEFERRALS AND CONTINUATIONS - MAJOR PROJECTS

B94-05 New Residence

Address: 110 Angler Avenue
Applicant: Stephen Macari
Architect: Smith and Moore Architects
Project Description: Demolition of an existing one-story residence and two-story garage/guest house and construction of a new two-story residence with pool.

Demolition was approved at the September meeting and the new construction was deferred for restudy. It was carried over from the October meeting and deferred from the November and December meetings at the architect's request.

Mr. Feldkamp, Mr. Wideman and Mr. Zukov said they met with the architect and discussed the

plans.

Architect Harold Smith revised the project to reflect the Commissioner's comments by lowering the brackets under the balcony, reducing the number of wall lanterns and changing the color of the shutters to a lighter blue.

Mr. Smith was asked to restudy the front door and the flanking columns to bring them more in scale.

Mr. Frank read a letter from Amy and Berry Loring asking that the air-conditioning units be moved from the west side to the east side of the house.

Mr. Smith said the air-conditioning and pool equipment are located on the south side of the house behind a wall.

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

MOTION SECONDED BY DR. ROSENBERG.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B108-05 Addition

Address:	1690 South Ocean Boulevard
Applicant:	Blond-O-Stab, NV
Architect:	Grassi Design Group
Project Description:	One and two-story addition to an existing Regency style residence with matching detailing and trim. A new motorcourt at the east yard and new terraces, loggias and swimming pool at the west yard.

This project was deferred from the November and December meetings for restudy

There were no ex parte communications disclosed regarding this project. Mr. Wheelock announced that he had a previously declared a conflict of interest and left the dais during the presentation.

Architect Eugene Pandula introduced Guy Grassi of Boston who is the project architect. Mr. Pandula noted that Mr. Grassi has done several schemes studying the pediments at the entry. As a result, they decided to make the portico rectangular rather than oval.

Architect Guy Grassi added, they felt that the original proposal was best suited for the building.

**MOTION BY MR. ZUKOV TO APPROVE THE ORIGINAL PROJECT DESIGN.
MOTION SECONDED BY DR. ROSENBERG.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

B110-05 Demolition & New Residence

Address: 202 Plantation Road
Applicant: Peter Plotkin and Diane McNeel
Architect: SKA Architect + Planner
Project Description: Demolition of existing one story home. Construction of a new two-story Italian style home to be approximately 6,100 square feet

This project was deferred from the December meeting at the attorney's request.

Ms. Diver, Mr. Feldkamp, Mr. Wideman, Mr. Strawbridge Mr. Zukov and Dr. Rosenberg said they met with the architect and reviewed the plans. Mr. Wheelock said he met with the architect, visited the site and spoke with a neighbor to the north.

Architect Pat Seagraves read the demolition report stating that the house was built in 1954 for Chester A. Bolles. The architect of record was Maurice Nolley.

Mr. Seagraves acknowledged that the existing hedge on the property will remain through construction.

**MOTION BY MR. SHAW TO APPROVE DEMOLITION WITH THE PROVISION TO
SOD OR SEED AND IRRIGATE THE LOT WITHIN 15 DAYS.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. FELDKAMP.**

Mr. Frank relayed the town engineer's report, which stated that there was an obstruction of the site triangle and a retention wall is required on the south side of the easement.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Seagraves said they redesigned the house from an Italian style to an island style. He noted that there were no other two-story homes surrounding this project.

It was the consensus of the commission that this house was much too massive for the neighborhood. And, that it is the gateway into a single-story, beautiful neighborhood. It was suggested making the house a partial two-story rather than a full two-story building.

Attorney and Land Planner Tod Messinger, representing Mr. and Mrs. Lehman, submitted a statement in opposition to the application. The document included an analysis of the

neighborhood and cited the town's code in section 18, criteria for issuance of a building permit.

Attorney Maura Ziska explained the property is fronted by three streets with the front setbacks. The owners wanted space to plant a garden. That is the reason for a two-story house.

Lindley Hoffman, 211 Bermuda Lane, thought the house was very massive. The house is very tall looming over the one-story houses all around it. The floor level starts at 9 feet above sea level and the town code only requires 7.5 feet.

Judy Wells Hoffman, 211 Bermuda Lane, remarked that this project is as massive to this site as the public school is to its site. In addition, this proposal spoils the entrance to this sub division.

Gay Lehman, 201 Plantation Road, spoke against the project and stated that it was not in keeping with the area.

Mrs. de Bragancia, 596 North County Road, objected to a two-story house that will take up the entire lot.

Attorney Maura Ziska pointed out that the tie beam height is at 19 feet and they are allowed to go up to 22 feet. The overall height of this proposal is about 10 feet taller than the existing roof height.

MOTION BY MR. WHELOCK TO DENY THE PROJECT AS SET FORTH IN ARTICLE III. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AD PROCEDURE, SECTION 18-205 (6). THE PROPOSED BUILDING OR STRUCTURE IS EXCESSIVELY DISSIMILAR IN RELATION TO ANY STRUCTURE EXISTING OR FOR WHICH A PERMIT HAS BEEN ISSUED OR TO ANY OTHER STRUCTURE INCLUDED IN THE SAME PERMIT APPLICATION WITHIN 200 FEET OF THE PROPOSED SITE IN RESPECT TO ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING FEATURES; A. HEIGHT OF BUILDING OR HEIGHT OF ROOF. C. ARCHITECTURALLY COMPATIBILITY. AND E. APPEARANCE OF MASS FROM THE STREET OR FROM ANY PERSPECTIVE VISIBLE TO THE PUBLIC OR ADJOINING PROPERTY OWNERS. MOTION SECONDED BY DR. ROSENBERG.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY MR. SHAW TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ZUKOV.

ROLL CALL:

MR. SHAW	YES
MR. ZUKOV	YES
MR. WHELOCK	NO

DR. ROSENBERG NO
MR. FELDKAMP YES
MR. STRAWBRIDGE NO
MR. WIDEMAN NO
MOTION FAILED 4-3.

ROLL CALL FOR THE FIRST MOTION:

MR. WHELOCK YES
DR. ROSENBERG YES
MR. SHAW NO
MR. ZUKOV NO
MR. FELDKAMP YES
MR. STRAWBRIDGE YES
MR. WIDEMAN YES
MOTION CARRIED 5-2

Mr. Frank reminded everyone that the same project cannot come back for one year. If they come back next month, they have to have a new design.

B111-05 Addition

Address: 695 North Lake Way
Applicant: James and Amelia Engel
Architect: SKA Architect + Planner
Project Description: Addition of a single-story loggia to the rear of the home and two-story addition to an existing single-story, Regency style home to be approximately 2,280 square feet.

This project was deferred from the December meeting for restudy.

Ms. Diver and Mr. Feldkamp said they met with the architect. Mr. Wheelock and Mr. Zukov said they met with the architect and visited the site.

Architect Pat Seagraves presented the revisions to the original presentation. He noted that the dormer windows were made smaller and some of the French doors were replaced with windows. He agreed to refurbish the existing hedge to screen the neighbors.

It was suggested to replace the mansard roof with a cornice element to match what already exists on the building. Other elements to restudy are the tall narrow two-story section of building and the existing double height entrance.

MOTION BY MR. FELDKAMP TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING AND COME BACK WITH A ONE STORY VERSION.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SHAW.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. NEW BUSINESS - MAJOR PROJECTS

B1-06 Addition

Address: 111 Seagate Road

Applicant: Scott Derrin

Architect: The Lawrence Group

Project Description: Application for the extension of the previously approved work of a second story addition and internal remodeling.

Property Owner Scott Derrin stated that a construction project across the street has continued for quite a while. He did not want to start construction until this project is completed because parking is an issue.

MOTION BY MR. WHEELOCK TO APPROVE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ZUKOV.

Mr. Smith mentioned that this house is advertised for sale with plans approved by the Architectural Commission.

MR. WHEELOCK WITHDREW HIS MOTION.

MR. ZUKOV WITHDREW HIS SECOND.

MOTION BY MR. FELDKAMP TO APPROVE A SIX MONTH EXTENSION TO THE PROJECT.

MOTION SECONDED BY WHEELOCK.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B2-06 Demolition & New Residence

Address: 264 Country Club Road
Applicant: Real Property Intellectuals, LLC
Architect: The Lawrence Group
Project Description: Application for an extension of the previously approved work for demolition of a one-story single family residence and construction of a two-story residence with clay barrel tile roofing.

Property Owner Scott Derrin stated that the town had a construction project on the street which made it impossible to get to the job site.

MOTION BY MR. SHAW TO APPROVE THE PROJECT FOR AN ADDITIONAL SIX MONTHS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. FELDKAMP.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B3-06 Demolition

Address: 125 Ocean View Road
Applicant: John F. & Heidi G. Niblack
Architect: Robert L. Bell
Project Description: Demolition of existing residence

Architect Robert Bell read the demolition report which stated that the house was designed by George Votaw in 1962. The condition of the house is poor. The new buyer of this property lives at 127 Ocean View. He bought this property to accommodate a new motorcourt, entry gates and landscaping. He assured the commission that there was a drainage plan for this project and that the plans will be presented at a later date.

MOTION BY MR. SHAW TO APPROVE DEMOLITION WITH THE PROVISION TO SOD OR SEED AND IRRIGATE THE LOT WITHIN 15 DAYS AND WITH THE SUBMISSION OF A DRAINAGE AND EROSION PLAN.

MOTION SECONDED BY

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B4-06 New Residence

Address: 252 Cherry Lane
Applicant: Sandra Brady
Architect: SKA Architect + Planner/Jacqueline Albarran
Project Description: New two-story Mediterranean style residence with barrel tile roof, stucco walls, exposed wood rafter tails, hurricane code French doors and casement windows.

The architect was not in attendance at this time.

**MOTION BY MR. SHAW TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE END MEETING.
MOTION WAS NOT SECONDED.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

In the audience was John Kaywell who asked to comment on a project that will be coming before the commission next month. After discussion, it was decided to wait until the project is before them so that the applicant has the opportunity to respond to his comments.

Ms. Albarran was in attendance at this time.

Mr. Feldkamp, Mr. Wideman, Mr. Wheelock, Mr. Zukov and Dr. Rosenberg said they spoke with the architect regarding the project.

Architect Jackie Albaran asked to present the demolition portion today. However, demolition was overlooked in the project description.

Mr. Frank suggested reviewing the new construction and advertise the demolition for next month's meeting.

Chairman Wideman allowed the review of the new construction.

Architect Jackie Albarran presented a one and two-story Mediterranean style home. The building walls will be a soft modulated, white, beige or peach stucco. In addition, the wood will have a natural stain and the roofing material will be barrel tile.

Mr. Wheelock informed the architect that the requirement for presentation is to bring building material samples. He questioned the back up area at the garage and recommended removing the center post or moving the house to make access to the garage easier. As well, the planting strip at the garage area will need to be at least 4 feet in width.

MOTION BY MR. WHELOCK TO APPROVE THE PROJECT SUBJECT TO MOVING THE HOUSE 3 FEET TO THE WEST, TO INCLUDE A 4 FOOT WIDE BUFFER PLANTING STRIP TO THE PROPERTY TO THE EAST, AND TO REMOVE THE CENTER COLUMN AT THE GARAGE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SHAW.

Richard Webber, 257 West Indies Drive, read a letter of objection to the project. This letter was signed by himself, Selma T. Slater, James and Dottie Alban and Robert and Mary Simses.

Architect Albarran read a letter from Mr. Cooley, 6 Windsor Court, in support of this project.

Mr. Yeager, 255 Cherry Lane, strongly supported this project.

Ms. Albarran proposed eureka palms along the property line to screen the neighbors.

MR. FELDKAMP OPPOSED.

MOTION CARRIED 6-1.

B5-06 New Cabana/Guest House & Pergola

Address:	515 South County Road
Applicant:	Gloria Daigh
Architect:	SKA Architect + Planner/Jacqueline Albarran
Project Description:	Replace an existing non-conforming awning structure with a one-story cabana guest house, and pergola to match existing structure, with recently approved sloped roof, and new hurricane code doors and windows.

Ms. Diver, Mr. Feldkamp, Mr. Wideman and Mr. Wheelock met with the architect and discussed the plans.

Architect Jackie Albarran stated that the roof change was previously approved by ARCOM which required a variance as it was slightly in the set back. Now, they would like to build a guest house where a non-conforming awning structure stands. Also, a barbecue area which will create a garden court yard with a fountain.

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

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. WHELOCK.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. DEFERRALS AND CONTINUATIONS MINOR PROJECTS

A36-05 Roll Shutters

Address: 680 South Ocean Blvd.
Applicant: Alec Englestein
Contractor: Action Hurricane
Project Description: Install electric roll shutters east and south elevations. The boxes above windows and the tracks on the sides will be painted to match the house color.

This project was deferred from the December meeting as no one was present.

No one was present to represent the project.

MOTION BY MR. SHAW TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. FELDKAMP.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

D. NEW BUSINESS - MINOR PROJECTS

None

VIII OTHER BUSINESS

Dr. Rosenberg suggested that the code be changed to have ARCOM regulate building color changes of existing homes and restoration of landscaping. He asked that Ms. Close to come up with the appropriate language regarding building color changes for discussion next month.

Mr. Strawbridge reminded the commission that to make this change would require Town Council action.

Mr. Wheelock explained that there are two different kinds of landscaping. One is purely functional, i.e., to screen, and the rest is decorative. The wording of regulating landscaping should be directed to the functional aspects of screening.

IX ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MR. WHEELOCK TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 1:00 P.M.

MOTION SECONDED BY SHAW.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next meeting of the Architectural Commission will be held on February 22, 2006 at 9:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Floyd L. Wideman Jr., Chairman

CERTIFICATION OF ACTION BY THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION

The Architectural Review Commission has denied the following request as it is not in accordance with the criteria set forth in Article III. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW AND PROCEDURE, Section 18-205 Criteria.

Application Number and Title: B110-05 New Residence

Applicant: Peter Plotkin and Diane McNell

Address: 202 Plantation Road

Architect: SKA Architect ± Planner
Pat Seagraves

Project description: Demolition of existing one-story home.
(the demolition was approved January 25, 06

Construction of an new two-story Italian style home.
The above request has been denied by the Architectural Review Commission for the following reasons:

- ___ (1) The plan for the proposed building or structure is not in conformity with good taste and design and in general does not contribute to the image of the town as a place of beauty, spaciousness, balance, taste, fitness, charm and high quality.
- ___ (2) The plan for the proposed building or structure does not indicate the manner in which the structures are reasonably protected against external and internal noise, vibrations, and other factors that may tend to make the environment more desirable.
- ___ (3) The proposed building or structure is in its exterior design and appearance inferior quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.
- ___ (4) The proposed building or structure is not in harmony with the proposed developments on land in the general area, with the comprehensive plan for the town, and with any precise plans adopted pursuant to the Comprehensive Plan.

— (5) The proposed building or structure is excessively similar to any other structures existing or for which a permit has been issued or to any other structures included in the same permit application within 200 feet of the proposed site in respect to one or more of the following features of exterior design and appearance:

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

X (*)(6) The proposed building or structure is excessively dissimilar in relation to any structure existing or for which a permit has been issued or to any other structure included in the same permit application within 200 feet of the proposed site in respect to one or more of the following features:

- (*) a. Height of building or height of a roof.
- b. Other significant design features including, but not limited to, materials or quality of architectural design.
- (*) c. Architectural compatibility.
- d. Arrangement of the components of the structure.
- (*) e. Appearance of mass from the street or from any perspective visible to the public or adjoining property owners.
- f. Diversity of design that is complimentary with size and massing of adjacent properties.
- g. Design features that will avoid the appearance of mass through improper proportions.
- h. Design elements that protect the privacy of neighboring properties.

- ___ (7) The proposed building or structure is appropriate in relation to the established character of other structures in the immediate area or neighboring areas in respect to significant design features such as material or quality or architectural design as viewed from any public or private way (except alleys).
- ___ (8) The proposed development is not in conformity with the standards of this Code and other applicable ordinances insofar as the location and appearance of the buildings and structures are involved.
- ___ (9) The project's location and design does not adequately protect unique site characteristics such as those related to scenic views, rock outcroppings, natural vistas, waterways, and similar features.

The applicant is advised that appeals must be filed with the Town Clerk within 10 days in accordance with Article III. Section 18-177 of the Town Code of Ordinances.

CERTIFICATION:

The above denial was issued by the Architectural Review Commission at their meeting on ___

TOWN OF PALM BEACH


Chairman, Architectural Commission