TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Planning, Zoning & Building Department

MINUTES
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2006 AT 9:00 A.M.
AT THE TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 360 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD, PALM BEACH

I **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Pandula called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

II **ROLL CALL:**

PRESENT: Eugene Pandula, Chairman
William Lee Hanley, Vice Chairman
Wendy Victor, Secretary
Judy Wells Hoffman, Member
Patrick Segraves, Member
Robert T. Eigelberger, Member
Eileen L. Bresnan, Member
Gail L. Coniglio, Alternate Member
Hazel Rubin, Alternate Member
D. Imogene Willis, Alternate Member
John C. Randolph, Town Attorney
Veronica B. Close, Director of Planning Zoning & Building
Timothy M. Frank, Planning Administrator
Jane S. Day, Staff Preservation Consultant
Cynthia M. Delp, Recording Secretary

ABSENT: None

III **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 15, 2006 MEETING:**
MOTION BY MRS. VICTOR FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. EIGELBERGER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

IV **ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH TO PERSONS WHO WISH TO TESTIFY:**
By Mrs. Delp

V **PLEASE NOTE THAT THE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION WILL HAVE AN INFORMAL DISCUSSION RELATIVE TO THE PROPOSED TOWN HALL RENOVATION AT 9:00 A.M. OR AS SOON THEREAFTER AS POSSIBLE.**

Mr. Peter Elwell, Town Manager, addressed the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC).

Please note that Paul Brazil, Director of Public Works, and Eric Brown, Assistant Director of Public Works, were present as well, and were available for comment as necessary. Mr. Elwell stated that he would provide some historical information relative to the Town Hall first, and then ask the LPC to provide some advice to the Town Council relative to the proposed addition to the north end of the Town Hall. He explained that over seven years ago, the Town began to examine space needs within the Town Hall. This led to the construction of the new Central Fire Station to provide a more modern and spacious area for the Fire Department, and the reallocation of the former Fire Dept. space (within the Town Hall) to other Town departments. He noted that the Planning, Zoning & Building Department (PZ&B), particularly, was in serious need of additional space. That PZ&B need for space prompted a study of the customer base of PZ&B along with a study of the traffic generated by visitors to the PZ&B Department. More recently, however, residents and others have expressed a need to have the PZ&B staff at ready access within the Town Hall Building. Also, with a growing reliance on improved technology, the traffic impact once experienced as a result of PZ&B customers, is projected to decrease. For those reasons, at the most recent Town Council meeting, the Town Council asked staff to examine "two alternatives on parallel tracks." The first option is to consult with the LPC regarding the potential of constructing a 25 ft. extension of the Town Hall, on the north side, which would provide additional office space so that all Town staff, currently functioning in Town Hall, could continue serving the public from the Town Hall location. The other alternative is to examine a potential relocation of some personnel out of the Town Hall, noting that it would most likely be a different group of personnel, other than the PZ&B staff. The Town Council will consider this matter further at its January 9, 2007 meeting.

Mr. Elwell reiterated that the Town Council has requested the advice of the LPC relative to the potential addition to the Town Hall. He was quite clear in informing the LPC that the north facade of the Town Hall will inevitably change, regardless of the path that is chosen. He recalled that two years ago, the LPC had approved a modification to the north facade of the Town Hall, but those changes were never realized due to conflicting budget constraints and high construction estimates. Mr. Elwell anticipated that if the addition to the Town Hall is not ultimately approved, and the building footprint remains the same, the LPC will most likely see a new design for the north end of the Town Hall in the future, different than the one approved two years ago. Of course, if the addition is approved, the matter will return to the LPC for design approval.

Mr. Elwell referred to the model, on display on the dias, to which Mr. Frank had added a "to scale" mock up of a proposed addition to Town Hall. The model had been originally produced to assist with the design of the new Central Fire Station within the landmarked Town Hall Square Historic District. Mr. Elwell noted that there was no architect present today to discuss any particular design, and that today's discussion was purely conceptual. He asked the LPC to state a preference to add on to the building, or not. He added that the Town Council has the prerogative to go ahead with an addition to Town Hall, even if the LPC objects to an addition, and in that case, the Town Council would want the advice of the LPC to insure that the best possible design is chosen for the addition.

Mrs. Victor asked Mr. Elwell if a traffic study has been done in relation to the Digby Bridges, Marsh & Associates *Oppidium Silhouette Plan Proposal* (December, 2001). He responded that not all that was suggested in the *Oppidium* will be able to be effected due to DOT and budget constraints. However, certain DOT improvements are scheduled to be made to the Town Hall Square Historic District area. Mrs. Victor also asked Mr. Elwell's opinion about all departments remaining under the Town Hall roof. He responded with a reminder that the Town Council, as the governing body, makes the decisions regarding space allocations, department locations, etc. Mr. Elwell stated that originally, his opinion was to locate additional office space for PZ&B, while retaining the existing footprint of Town Hall. Within the past six months, however, the Town Council has given consideration to the expansion of Town Hall, and very recently, has endorsed that concept by a 3-2 vote. Ideally, per Mr. Elwell, it would be best to keep all existing Town Hall departments in the Town Hall to facilitate better staff communication and better service to the public. This is not to say that Town staff cannot function without being located in Town Hall, as is evidenced by the Recreation Department, Public Works Department, and the Police and Fire Departments. However, the advantages of keeping the staff within the Town Hall prompted serious consideration of the north extension to the building. At this juncture, the Town Council needs the input of the LPC to determine the impact of an addition to the Town Hall and to the Town Hall Square Historic District.

Mr. Hanley remarked that the building intrudes way out into the cross street on Australian. He felt the building would destroy the sight line down to the ocean and interfere with the light from the ocean. Mr. Hanley suggested that only extending the building by 12.5 feet would help to alleviate his concerns, though that may not be practical.

Mrs. Hoffman inquired as to how the DOT would view a plan to reduce South County Road to one lane each way. Mr. Elwell responded that the DOT has not said no to such an idea, but the Town Council has chosen to keep two lanes each way, and allow other improvements to the streetscape. Mrs. Hoffman asked whether it is really necessary, due to electronic communications, that all existing Town Hall departments remain in the Town Hall. Mr. Elwell answered that it is better for existing Town Hall departments to remain in the Town Hall, but it is possible to function apart. Mrs. Hoffman questioned how much of the PZ&B traffic is generated by visits from residents. Mr. Elwell responded that this has already been studied, but the Town Council has decided that PZ&B should remain in the Town Hall. Mrs. Hoffman asked how long the addition would provide sufficient extra space before it, too, is outgrown. Mr. Elwell answered that staff has grown over the last two decades, but we are currently in a "strict, no growth" policy. He felt that the proposed addition would suit the Town's needs for the foreseeable future.

Mrs. Bresnan commented that the LPC is being asked for input, but has no design to review at this time. Mr. Elwell answered that this is first a massing and scale issue, not a design issue. He re-stated that today's review is purely conceptual. Mrs. Bresnan asked whether code requirements for the interior will affect the exterior. Mr. Elwell repeated that the north facade will have to be modified in some way, as the interior space at the north end of the building is no longer used as a garage. He added that although the previous Digby Bridges approved plans for changes to the north facade included an entrance, any new design may not necessarily contain an entrance.

Mr. Segraves commented that the existing Town Hall building massing is certainly preferable to the massing which would result if an extension was constructed. He noted that in the Digby Bridges design for changes to the north end of Town Hall, which received LPC approval a few years ago, at least some amount of green space was integral to the project.

Mr. Eigelberger stated that most people are anti-expansion. He was adamant that the Town Hall is a National Historic Landmark located within the Town Hall Square Historic District, and it would be inappropriate for the Town's Landmarks Preservation Commission to approve an extension to this building. His opinion was that approving the extension would set a very bad precedent, and set a poor example of the Town's Landmarks Preservation Commission. Mr. Eigelberger stated that there is no question that this Landmarks Preservation Commission is against an addition to the Town Hall, and that this building should stay exactly as it is.

Mr. Elwell responded that the issue is much more complicated for the Town Council. Mr. Eigelberger countered that the expansion was approved by the Town Council on a 3/2 vote, so it was not unanimous. He stated that the "footprint should stay where it is. It is bound on all sides." Mr. Eigelberger felt that any staff which can be moved out of Town Hall should be moved for less employee parking, and less customer traffic. "Our charge is strictly the integrity of this building. If you want to change the interior, change the interior, but I say that the footprint sits the way it is...(referring to the Town Council) they have given us a charge to protect the integrity of the landmarks of this town. This is a national landmark. This is like putting a bump on the Flagler Museum, or putting a bump on the Warden House...it's such a simple matter, if you're out of space, go build something, but don't mess with a national landmark."

Mr. Pandula stated that the answer to the question of whether the Town Hall could have an extension is yes, but "it would take a world class solution to do it appropriately, and I think the site is really not the empty pad that was the entrance to the fire bays. The site, in that case, if you wish to consider this concept, is the entire district...whatever you consider would have to be done in that context, and truly, it would have to be a world class piece of architecture, whether, with all due respect, staff space is deserving of that." Secondly, he felt that the Town Hall is an architectural icon in the town. Mr. Pandula remarked that the credibility of the LPC is on the line, and the commission should lead by example. He felt it would be a shame to damage the fine reputation which has been established by the Town's Landmarks Preservation Commissions over the years, especially since the Town's landmark program is highly regarded both on the state and national levels. "Our stature in the community as to how we respond to other people's projects is going to be measured by how we respond to this one. So I think we need to be very careful about how we treat this."

Mrs. Hoffman commented that the addition would cut off the public space and air space, and will negatively impact the design of the Memorial Fountain and the Town Hall. She felt it would be "tragic" to bump out the building.

Mr. Eigelberger recalled that about 25 years ago, when he was Chairman of the Landmarks Preservation Commission, the Town of Palm Beach wanted to tear down the North Fire Station. Mr. Eigelberger stated that he hired Phil Steele, Architect, to draw plans to renovate the structure, and signatures were obtained from residents to prevent the tear down. He likened this situation to that one, and stated that every foundation and club in the town is against the Town Hall extension. He urged Mr. Elwell to look for space elsewhere.

MOTION BY MR. EIGELBERGER "THAT THE LANDMARK COMMISSION IS NOT IN FAVOR OF ANY EXPANSION OF TOWN HALL, AT ALL, IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM, DUE TO THE FACT THAT IT IS A NATIONAL REGISTERED MONUMENT; IT'S A NATIONAL LANDMARK; IT'S IN THE MIDDLE OF A HISTORIC DISTRICT; AND, EVERYONE IS VERY HAPPY WITH THE WAY IT SITS RIGHT NOW."

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. HOFFMAN.

Mrs. Bresnan asked that the Town take another look at the *Oppidium Silhouette* Plan.

Mrs. Rubin commented that in today's world, with technology so prominent, and in fact, eliminating jobs, the need to house more staff should be diminished or eliminated. As such, she questioned the need for more space, i.e., the addition. Mr. Elwell responded that while Town staff has increased over the years, the space for those staff members has not. In the last 20 years, staff within the Town Hall has increased from 34 to 59, without any increase in space. The extension would provide a solution to the space needs for existing staff.

Mrs. Coniglio felt that approval of the extension would step outside the boundaries of landmark guidelines, and would be like "destroying a photograph album" for our children. Mrs. Coniglio stated she is totally against it.

Mrs. Victor was concerned that the Town Council be given the tools to work with the motion made. She felt that the LPC should provide a list of several reasons to explain why the LPC has voted against the Town Hall extension, and thought that Mrs. Day could compile the list. Mr. Eigelberger felt that he had given sufficient reasons within his motion, and Mrs. Delp re-stated the motion. Mr. Elwell stated that the Town Council will have the benefit of the Draft Minutes of this meeting, and he would have significant Sunshine Law concerns about supplementing the motion, (post-meeting), with reasons for making the motion.

Mrs. Willis stated that about a week ago, she and John Mashek toured the space which has been vacated by the Fire Department. She questioned why 40 employees could not fit into the 6,000 square feet available, and why more space is needed at all. Mr. Elwell responded that it is up to the Town Council to decide the space allocations for staff. He corrected the amount of available square footage, however, from 6,000 to 4,400 square feet. Mr. Elwell noted that if the Town Council's policy decision required maintaining existing staff within the existing footprint, it could be done, but there would still be considerable cost to renovate the building without meeting the space needs of staff as they serve the community.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Hanley acknowledged the members of the Town Council who were present for this discussion, and thanked them for attending.

VI **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

A. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #26-2006,(deferred from Nov.) Courtyard Tent/Umbrellas
Owner: New Bradley House, Ltd.
Applicant: Coco Palm Beach Restaurant
Address: 290 Sunset Avenue
Architect: Giacomelli Architecture Inc.
Project Description: Request approval for addition of temporary tent which is further described as: Addition of a 14 ft. x 33 ft. waterproofed canvas temporary tent* at west side of courtyard for outdoor dining. This tent will be installed during the season and it is totally detached from the building. Canvas will be striped in white and dark green. Other associated changes as presented.

It should be noted that the applicant has modified the associated application for Special Exception, eliminating the request for the tent, and substituting four (4) 8' x 8' umbrellas. Please note that this matter was deferred from the November meeting to the December meeting at the request of the attorney for the applicant.

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION

Mr. Segraves had a conversation with the attorney.
Mrs. Hoffman looked at the courtyard.
Mr. Eigelberger met with the applicant months ago.
Mrs. Coniglio spoke with the attorney at the last Town Council meeting.
Mrs. Rubin met with the architect and attorney a few months ago.
Mrs. Willis met with the architect and the attorney

Attorney Maura Ziska and Architect Dario Giacomelli presented this request. She stated this was originally proposed as a tent, but this plan was abandoned in favor of umbrellas. The change to umbrellas made the original request for a variance unnecessary. She noted that the Town Council has approved the request for Site Plan Review, with the four (4) umbrellas. The matter has returned to the LPC for aesthetic review today.

Mr. Giacomelli explained that the proposal is for four (4) 8'x8' canvas, free-standing umbrellas located on the west half of the courtyard. Each umbrella will accommodate six (6) seats. Each umbrella canvas will be square and will be dark green with white stripes. It was noted that the proposed square umbrellas will be larger than the existing octagon ones in the courtyard now.

Mrs. Coniglio questioned whether the increased size of the proposed umbrellas will negatively impact the landmarked courtyard. She recalled that Mr. Frank had suggested four (4) 8' round umbrellas at the last meeting. Mr. Frank agreed with Mrs. Coniglio stating that he would have staff approved the 8' round umbrellas.

Mrs. Willis objected to the fact that larger striped umbrellas are being proposed to replace smaller, beige umbrellas which blend in better. She felt they consume too much of the courtyard, and will make it difficult for those who are checking into the hotel to maneuver through the courtyard. Ms. Ziska responded that the umbrellas will be used for dinner only, and the umbrellas are temporary and removable. Mr. Segraves felt that the square umbrellas work better in the space, as long as they are moveable.

Ms. Close tried to clarify whether the umbrellas and tables would be removed from the site daily. Ms. Ziska stated that the tables will remain in the courtyard; that the umbrellas will only be opened at night; and, no one will use the courtyard tables during the day. Members of the LPC noted that the existing umbrellas are up during the day. Mrs. Willis stated that the existing umbrellas occupy more than one-half of the courtyard. She felt the green and white stripes will stand out too much, and the umbrellas will take away from the charm of the courtyard..

Mr. Giacomelli assured the LPC that the walkway in the middle of the courtyard will be clear. Mr. Eigelberger saw no problems with the umbrellas as they are typical of most restaurants in Europe.

MOTION BY MR. EIGELBERGER FOR APPROVAL OF THE UMBRELLAS AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. HANLEY AND MR. SEGRAVES SIMULTANEOUSLY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mrs. Ann Vanneck, resident and former LPC member, stated that the lack of maintenance at the Bradley House is creating an eyesore. She requested that the owner be made to comply. Mr. Pandula acknowledged that this has been an ongoing issue, and asked Mr. Frank to respond. Mr. Frank stated that the building has improved due to code enforcement action, but certainly more can be done. He admitted that progress has been slow at this site. Mrs. Hoffman asked Mr. Frank to check the condition of the stairs as she felt that the cracks in the steps may present a safety hazard.

*****

Mr. Pandula stated that Mr. Elwell wished to address the LPC relative to earlier questions regarding the *Oppidium Silhouette*. Mr. Elwell commented that the *Oppidium Silhouette* was drafted, along with the model of the Town Hall Square area, to address the LPC's concerns regarding building a three-story building (the new Central Fire Station) within the Town Hall Square District , and was integral, he thought, in the evolution of the design of that building. The *Oppidium Silhouette* was intended to be used as a tool for the future for new construction projects within the Town Hall Square District. Mr. Eigelberger suggested to Mr. Elwell that the model be covered with a plexiglass cover to preserve it for the future.

*****

B. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #27-2006,
Addition and rehabilitation
Owner/Applicant: Estate of Willem K. Wirtz
Address: 228 Phipps Plaza
Architect: RAR Architect Inc.
SKA Architect & Planner
Project Description: Request approval of rehabilitation of 1979 addition to make it architecturally compatible with the original Howard Major designed residence. This includes the addition of a sloped roof element on the 267 sq. ft. addition, making it compatible with the original structure. Replace existing plate glass windows and side service door with new windows and shutters to match original detailing. Replace existing asbestos roof with new asphalt shingles. Other associated changes as presented.

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION

Mrs. Hoffman visited the site yesterday, going all around it with one of the neighbors.

Attorney Barry Curtin, Jacqueline Albarran, Architect-Consultant, and Rafael Rodriquez, Architect of Record from RAR Architects, presented this request. Ms. Albarran stated that the Town Council granted the variance which had been requested by the applicant. She explained that due to the property being bound by easements, what could have been a 4,000 square foot home had to be reduced to approximately 1,200 square feet. Mrs. Albarran presented the proposed new elevations for the structure, contrasting those to the existing elevations. She explained that the existing structure has plate glass windows, a terrible flat roof, and a strange skylight. The new proposal removes a service door, changes the plate glass windows to the original windows with shutters, and changes the existing asbestos roof to a low peaked asphalt shingle roof.

MOTION BY MR. EIGELBERGER FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. HOFFMAN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #28-2006, Minor Modification
Owner/Applicant: Mr. Stephen A. Schwarzman
Address: 1768 South Ocean Boulevard
Architect: Ferguson & Shamamian Architects LLP
Project Description: Request approval of minor modifications to approved house design which is further described as: The structural design of the chimneys at the west loggia calls for additional lateral support that can not be provided by the chimneys themselves. We propose a single one inch diameter steel rod at each chimney, anchored to the adjacent roofs, to provide this support. Other associated changes as presented.

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE ATTORNEY FOR THE APPLICANT HAS REQUESTED DEFERRAL OF THIS MATTER TO THE JANUARY 2007 MEETING.

Mr. Frank read a letter into the record from Maura Ziska, Attorney for the applicant, in which she requested deferral of this matter.

MOTION BY MRS. VICTOR FOR DEFERRAL TO THE JANUARY MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. EIGELBERGER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VII **OTHER BUSINESS:**

VIII **COMMENTS OF THE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR:**

Mr. Eigelberger had some questions relative to the Mar-a-Lago flagpole. Ms. Close responded that if an application for the flagpole is submitted, it will go to the Town Council first, and she encouraged the LPC members to wait for their quasi-judicial hearing before forming any opinions.

Mrs. Day referred to an article in the *New York Times* on November 26, 2006 relative to the Landmarks Preservation Commission of New York City. Mrs. Day distributed a copy of the article to the LPC members at Mrs. Victor's request.

Mrs. Day reported to the LPC relative to the Australian Pines of Gulfstream, as had been requested by the LPC last month. She stated that Gulfstream received a special dispensation from the State to re-plant Australian pines because the road is designated as a State Scenic Highway. They take cuttings from the existing trees and grow them in a nursery, so that as needed, the trees on A1A can be replaced in kind. She noted that the trees are not being planted from seeds, but from cuttings, which renders the plants sterile. As such, there is no resulting problem with disbursement of the seeds. Mrs. Day stated that Wells Road is not designated as a State Scenic Highway, but she offered to pursue this matter with the State.

MOTION BY MR. EIGELBERGER TO PROCEED WITH GATHERING INFORMATION TO TAKE WHATEVER ACTIONS ARE NECESSARY WITH THE STATE TO ALLOW REPLANTING OF THE AUSTRALIAN PINES ON WELLS ROAD.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VICTOR AND MRS. BRESNAN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Eigelberger asked staff to check on the landscaping at the Mar-a-Lago Ballroom to see if it has been planted according to LPC approvals. Secondly, he asked staff to check on the back side and/or north side of the Bath and Tennis Club, which he stated is looking like a factory building, and needs more landscaping.

Mrs. Coniglio asked whether the flagpole issue should not come to the LPC first, rather than to the Town Council. Ms. Close responded that the current procedure is that any zoning request goes first to the Town Council, and then to each of the commissions. There are exceptions to that, but the flagpole does not fall into that category.

Mr. Eigelberger noted, relative to the flag issue, that there are American Flags in place at St. Edward's Church, at the U.S. Post Office at the east end of Royal Poinciana Way, at the Breakers, and in the Town Hall Square Historic District, all of which are landmarks. He felt that these flags should be used as a means of comparison when evaluating the Mar-a-Lago flag.

IX **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**:
None

X **ADJOURNMENT:**

MOTION BY MR. HANLEY TO ADJOURN AT 10:25 A.M.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VICTOR.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be held on **Wednesday, January 17, 2007** at 9:00 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 South County Road, Palm Beach.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Victor, Secretary

Wendy Victor, Secretary
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

cmd

TOWN OF PALM BEACH
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

ATTENDANCE RECORD 2006

MEMBERS	1/06	2/06	3/06	4/06	5/06	6/06	7/06	8/06	9/06	10/06	11//06	12/06
Eugene Pandula	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	U	P	P	P	P
Ann Blades	P	P	(Term maximum reached)									
Judy Hoffman	P	P	E	P	E	E	P	P	A	E	E	P
Patrick Segraves	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	E	P	P	P	P
Wendy Victor	P	P	P	P	P	U	P	P	P	P	P	P
William Lee Hanley Jr.	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	A	P
Robert Eigelberger	P	P	P	P	P	A	U	P	P	P	P	P
Eileen Bresnan			P	P	P	P	U	P	P	P	P	P

ALTERNATE MEMBERS	1/06	2/06	3/06	4/06	5/06	6/06	7/06	8/06	9/06	10/06	11//06	12/06
Eileen L. (Morris) Bresnan	P	P	(Promoted to regular member)									
Gail L. Coniglio	P	P	P	P	P	U	P	P	P	P	P	P
Hazel Rubin	P	P	P	P	P	P	U	P	P	P	E	P
D. Imogene Willis			P	P	P	P	P	U	P	P	P	P

LEGEND: P=Present. E=Excused, U=Unexcused,A=Absence Pending Classification as “excused” or “unexcused”

TOWN OF PALM BEACH **RECORD OF VOTING CONFLICTS 2006**

LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

MEMBERS	1/06	2/06	3/06	4/06	5/06	6/06	7/06	8/06	9/06	10/06	11/06	12/06
Eugene Pandula	V						V		V VPD1			
Ann Blades			(Term maximum reached)									
Judy Hoffman												
Patrick Segraves	V	VPD1					V					
Wendy Victor												
William Lee Hanley Jr.												
Robert T. Eigelberger												
Eileen Bresnan												

ALTERNATE MEMBERS	1/06	2/06	3/06	4/06	5/06	6/06	7/06	8/06	9/06	10/06	11/06	12/06
Robert T. Eigelberger				(promoted to regular member)								
Eileen L. (Morris) Bresnan			(Promoted to regular member)									
Gail L. Coniglio												
Hazel Rubin												
D. Imogene Willis												

LEGEND:

V	=	One Voting Conflict during a meeting
V2	=	Two Voting Conflicts during a meeting
V3	=	Three Voting Conflicts during a meeting
VPD	=	Voting Conflict Previously Declared (This category to be used when a conflict has Been declared at a previous meeting, and the Changes being reviewed are part of an ongoing project. ONLY COUNT ORIGINALDECLARED CONFLICT PER JCR, TOWN ATTORNEY)