TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Planning, Zoning & Building Department

MINUTES
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2000 at 9:00 a.m.
AT THE TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 360 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD, PALM BEACH

I Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m. by Chairman Eugene Pandula.

II Roll Call:

PRESENT: Eugene Pandula, Chairman
Elizabeth Dowdle, Vice Chairman
Ann Blades, Secretary
Sari M. Wilkey, Member
Jacqueline Albarran de Mendoza, Member
Ann Vanneck, Member
Jack Pyms, Member
Judy Hoffman, Alternate Member
Lesley Hogan, Town Attorney representative
Robert L. Moore, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building
Timothy M. Frank, Planner/Projects Coordinator

ABSENT: Nikita Zukov, Alternate Member (Excused)
Laurel Baker, Alternate Member (Unexcused)

RECORDING SECRETARY: Cynthia M. Delp

III Approval of the Minutes of the September 20, 2000 Meeting:
MOTION BY MRS. WILKEY FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES AS MAILED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

IV Administration of the Oath to all persons who wish to testify:
Mrs. Delp administered the oath to all those who were present and wished to testify today.

Post Office Box 2029 • 360 South County Road • Palm Beach, Florida 33480 • (561) 838-5430

Public Hearings:

A. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness # 17-2000, (deferred from June & July & August & September)
Landscape, hardscape, fenestration changes
Owner/Applicant: Merrilyn Bardes
Address: 196 Banyan Road
Architect: Brower Architectural Associates
Project Description: Request approval of the following:
1. Removal of existing tennis court, gazebo, spa, pool & decking
2. New Swimming pool, fountain and deck
3. Fenestration changes on east elevation south wing
4. Landscape/hardscape
5. Any other associated changes as presented

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION

Please note the project was approved as presented, with the exception of the fenestration change which was deferred to the July meeting. Another deferral was granted to the August meeting and then again to the September meeting for the fenestration changes on the east elevation south wing only. Another deferral to the October meeting was granted.

Mr. Frank testified that as the owner is still undecided, the architect has requested removal of the fenestration change from this request.

MOTION BY MRS. BLADES FOR REMOVAL OF THE FENESTRATION CHANGE FROM THE PROJECT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VANNECK.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #20-2000, (deferred from June, July and September 2000)
Owner/Applicant: New Ventures of Palm Beach County LLC, Laura Andre
Address: Lot 11, Vita Serena, a/k/a Clarendon Ave., a/k/a 300 Lake Park Drive a/k/a 11 Lake Park Drive
Architect: Everett H. Jenner
Project Description: Request approval of the following:
1. Raise existing building up to meet FEMA minimum of 7.0 NGVD
2. Add 2nd master suite at second floor
3. Raise and re-shape pool and add pool pavilion
4. Raise garage building to adjust for road and site
5. Build new roof above open air cabana bath (existing)
6. Any other associated changes as presented

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION
Mr. Pandula stated that he had spoken to Maura Ziska, Attorney for the applicant.

There was a motion at the June meeting for deferral of the project to the July meeting with the applicant taking note of the concerns and recommendations expressed. At the July meeting, an additional deferral was requested to the September meeting. At the September meeting,

the project was deferred again to October.

AS NO REPRESENTATIVE WAS PRESENT FOR THIS PROJECT, MRS. DOWDLE MOVED TO DEFER THIS ITEM TO THE END OF THE AGENDA.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. WILKEY.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Let the record show that this matter was heard after the 11:05 a.m. to 11:20 a.m. break.

Mrs. Delp administered the oath to Attorney ~~Moira~~ Maura Ziska, Skip Jackman, and Architect Everett Jenner. Mrs. Day noted, for the record, **that this is a tax abatement project.** Mr. Jackman offered some corrections/changes to the project description on the application. Item 2: "Add second master suite at second floor" should read "Add second floor addition." Also, Items 3 and 5 are being removed from the request. The LPC had previously commented that there were problems with the positioning of the pool. Without the pool pavilion (now deleted), the pool can be re-oriented north/south, a position preferable to the LPC. There is a fountain at the north end of the pool and a spa to the east side of the pool. The balcony bath will be deleted. The second story addition has been pushed back 8' and reduced in scale. In consideration of the tax abatement, the public spaces interiorly will remain. The newly revised site plan actually increases green space.

Mr. Pandula commented that on the west elevation at the new addition, five openings are preferable to the seven shown, and also asked that the second floor windows be shortened a bit, all as shown in Design Alternate 002. Mr. Jackman stated that they will modify Alternate 2 adding the horizontal banding to continue it across.

Mr. Jackman noted that the pool deck finish is in coral stone, while the pool finish is white marcite only with no tile work.

Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza acknowledged that this house has experienced severe water problems over the years. She commented that there is no choice but to raise the house; the addition is fine as presented since it was lowered and set back; and the pool has finally been centered.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED WITH THE PROVISO THAT BANDING IS ADDED ON THE WEST ELEVATION BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND FLOORS; AND THAT ALTERNATE 002 IS THE APPROVED DESIGN FOR THE WEST ELEVATION, WITH THE THREE WINDOWS ON THE SECOND STORY AND TWO FRENCH DOORS ON THE FIRST FLOOR; AND THAT THE INTERIOR (PUBLIC SPACES) REMAINS AS ORIGINAL, WITHOUT THE COLONNADE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. PYMS.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #27-2000,
New Garage/guest house
Owner/Applicant: Robert E. Deziel
Address: 311 Brazilian Avenue
Architect: Smith Architectural Group
Project Description: Request approval of construction of a two story garage/guest house at rear of property, and other associated changes as presented

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION: None declared

Mr. Robert Deziel, owner, was present. Mrs. Delp administered the oath to Jeffery W. Smith and Associate Nevin Bauman. He presented a photo board of the property showing its post-restoration condition. There had been a two car garage and guest house in the rear which was in poor condition. Thus, it was demolished two to three years ago. The proposal is to replace this structure with a new two story garage/guest house at the rear of the property. It was noted that a variance had been obtained for this project. Mr. Smith stated that the configuration of the new structure is basically the same as the old. The garage doors are located on the east elevation. He presented a site plan, floor plan and elevations. There were no windows shown on the north and west elevations. This was done as a courtesy to the neighbor to the west, and since there is a parking garage on the neighboring property to the north. All materials on the garage/guest house match those on the main house.

The LPC felt that some openings should be inserted on the blank facades, and some discussion was heard on this subject.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA FOR APPROVAL WITH THE PROVISO THAT ON THE GABLE ELEVATION, ONE OR TWO WINDOWS SHALL BE ADDED; THAT SHUTTERS MAY BE PLACED ON THE OPENINGS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE OWNER AND ARCHITECT; AND THAT ON THE WEST ELEVATION, TWO DORMERS SHALL BE ADDED TO MATCH THE OTHER DORMERS ON THE EAST SIDE, AND ONE OR TWO WINDOWS SHALL BE ADDED ON THE FIRST FLOOR EAST ELEVATION.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. DOWDLE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

D. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #28-2000
Renovation, addition, demolition
Owner/Applicant: 455 North County Road Inc.
Address: 455 North County Road
Architect: In-Architecture, Inc., Anthony Tzamtzis
Project Description: Request approval of the following:

1. Demolition of newer additions on existing building, detached two story garage, staff quarters, carport, pool cabana, and pool
2. Total renovation, restoration of existing main residence
3. Addition to existing main residence
4. Restoration of existing beach cabana
5. Other associated changes as presented

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION:

Mrs. Wilkey: Met with the owner on October 3, 2000 at the site
Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza: Met with the owner at Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza's office
Mrs. Dowdle: Visited the site twice
Mr. Pandula: Met on the site with the owner and architect
Mrs. Blades: Met on site with Mr. Elias
Mrs. Vanneck: Visited the site

Mr. Bill Elias, Property Owner, and Attorney Wade Byrd presented the project. Mrs. Delp administered the oath to these gentlemen. Mr. Elias stated that this is a Mizner home completed in the beginning of the 1920's which was under one family ownership until July of this year. The project will strive to make the house habitable for today. He introduced the architect, Mr. Tzamtzis. **For the record, the applicant stated that they do intend to apply for the tax abatement relative to this project.**

A model of the proposed design was presented. Mr. Tzamtzis commented that this is a unique property for its architecture, size and natural setting. The property has 300 feet of oceanfront and is about 3 acres in size. The design intent attempts to utilize the size. Mr. Tzamtzis stated that much historical research has been done in concert with the design project. He felt that the house has some peculiarities as it is difficult to determine the front from the back. Historically, there was a road running parallel to the ocean, making the ocean side the front of the house. There was a deliberate effort to create a side entrance, as the owner's brother lived in the house next door. When one enters the side entrance, however, there is only a passage to the upstairs foyer. Over time, the house has had several incompatible additions. A portico had been added in the 50s blocking the view to the ocean. Others were a bar addition, an elevator addition and a garage/shed roof addition. These poor additions need to be removed as part of the project. The house shows much disrepair and offers "an atmosphere for abandonment."

The project shows the development of an entrance facade, an enhancement of the tower room, a new driveway on the side, and an addition (in the same footprint as on Mizner's original drawings.), together with the demolition of the inappropriate additions. The interior, public and private rooms, will be changed as well. The house originally had 22 staff rooms. That number will not be duplicated. The existing library will now be converted to the arrival foyer by making it into a two story space. Stairs will be re-located to separate staff areas from the family areas, and other stairs will be moved as well. The existing main entertainment areas of the house have no view of the ocean; therefore, the interior will be modified. Floor plans of the basement, first and second floor, and tower room were reviewed, existing vs. proposed. The enclosed loggia will be converted to open space. Some fireplaces will be relocated, and some tiles, mantles and fireplaces will be able to be saved. The kitchen area will be changed to include a kitchen, butler's service pantry, a breakfast room and child's playroom. A new balcony will be created off the kitchen for a view to the ocean. The living room will be moved forward about eight feet. In the tower room, the stair and bath have been relocated to allow for a larger open area. Many of the floors are buckled and extremely deteriorated, and will need to be replaced. If any worthy materials can be saved, that will be done. Windows will be replaced using impact resistant glass.

Existing and proposed elevations were reviewed. On the east (ocean) elevation, the loggia will be opened up. A balcony will be added. At the balcony, there are windows instead of doors, and Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza asked that doors be placed there. The living room has been pushed out by eight feet. The west elevation holds the new main entrance. West elevation second floor windows have been re-centered. There was a significant amount of discussion relative to the garage addition windows. As for the north elevation, the shed roof garage has been removed. The windows inserted in the open arches were removed. A balcony for the kitchen is planned. A sheltered arrival for the service garage is proposed. The south elevation evidences the new two story garage addition.

Mr. Pandula complimented the applicant and architect on a fine presentation, and called for comments from Mrs. Day relative to the tax abatement. Mrs. Day stated that it is very important to look at the Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) when reviewing this project if the owner is going to go for tax abatement. She commented that Mr. Elias introduced this project as a "reconstruction." Reconstruction is not allowed under the tax abatement program. Restorations, Renovations and/or Rehabilitations are the permitted types of projects for tax abatement. She stated that the house was built in 1919 as a companion piece to the house next door for the Munn brothers. This house was built very early in Mizner's career and is one of his introductory works which brought Mediterranean Revival architecture to Palm Beach. She showed slides of the property as it exists today. The existing side entrance on the property is very important to the history of the home, and changing it is not, in her opinion, abiding by the SIS. Upon her visit to the house, Mrs. Day reports much deterioration in the entire house. Though repair and restoration/rehabilitation are necessary at this house, the interior changes include significant changes to the interior formal spaces. Changing the floor plan of the formal spaces is not permitted under the SIS. She urged the LPC to consider the SIS when considering any approvals of this project, or the applicant may want to re-think whether or not he wishes to go ahead with the abatement. She acknowledged the importance of saving this structure, but is it a rehabilitation or a reconstruction? While it might be an excellent reconstruction, it would not be appropriate for tax abatement. Mr Elias "is changing a lot. He is adding a lot of additions to the house. He is doing infill and he is changing interior spaces that define the way Mizner originally meant the house to be. He is also changing a lot of windows, and windows are important with the Department's Standards because they are one of the few features that are both and interior and exterior features of a room." She added, "Part of the process is if this goes forward and is approved here, he can then use those Certificates of Appropriateness to file with the town and the county, but I've got to take this to the Town Council and recommend whether he meets the Dept. of the Interior's Standards or not, and in good faith with this plan, I cannot do that."

Mr. Elias commented that this project is a rehabilitation that requires reconstruction. Ceilings are crumbling at this house. You can poke your fingers through the walls. It is in pathetic condition. This house needs to be totally brought up to habitable standards. Mr. Elias made the point that he did not seek demolition and subdivision of this property, as many other purchasers of this property might have. Any new buyer will want the house to relate to the ocean. As it stands now, the house has very little relationship to the ocean, thus, the need for change.

Mrs. Wilkey commented that if Mr. Elias were not asking for tax abatement, only the exterior changes would be reviewed, and she felt they would probably be approved, perhaps with slight modifications. Since review of the interiors also comes into play when an applicant seeks tax abatement, the approvals are in question. Mr. Tzamtzis responded that, in his opinion, the interior changes maintain the relationship of the rooms.

Mr. Moore commented that both Mr. Elias and his attorney visited the offices of PZ&B prior to preparing the presentation. He acknowledged that others interested in the property had likewise met with him, Tim Frank, and Paul Castro. All interested persons agree the property is in great disrepair, but all others, other than Mr. Elias, opted for demolition. So Mr. Moore applauded Mr. Elias' efforts. On the other hand, however, Mr. Moore stated that he agrees 100% with Mrs. Day's point of view, as this project involves a huge amount of money to the Town and Palm Beach County. He called for the applicant to make a decision as to whether they wish to pursue the tax abatement or not.

Mr. Elias responded that if he were standing before the Town Council, he might get a different ruling as to whether the tax abatement is appropriate, since he is going to extra effort to save the house. He explained that he must move forward with the project, and needs some sort of approval.

Mr. Moore stated that the tax abatement issue is not appealable to the Town Council. It is only appealable to the State of Florida. This appeal process is an option for Mr. Elias to pursue should he choose to. Mr. Moore also stated that the LPC would not be bound by the State's decision. Only the LPC recommends whether the project is suitable for tax abatement.

Mr. Pandula stated that he spent three days last week at a workshop in St. Augustine dedicated to tax abatement. The interiors presented today are "not even close." The exteriors, with some minor adjustments, probably are close.

Mr. Moore offered a suggestion in the spirit of cooperation in not wanting to see the house demolished. If the applicant does want to appeal to the State and preserve his right to come back to the LPC, the Town would be in a position to allow him to go forward with a pending appeal on the tax abatement. Mrs. Blades and Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza felt it was the duty of the LPC to do whatever they could to save this house.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA FOR APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED WITH TAX ABATEMENT ONLY FOR THE EXTERIOR CHANGES, WITH THE PROVISO TO ADD A DOOR WHERE THE WINDOW IS NOW ON THE OCEAN SIDE ON THE NORTHEAST SIDE; AND THAT THE LITTLE BALCONY SHED ROOF HAS OPEN FENESTRATION INSTEAD OF THE CLOSED WALL (THE CLOSET AREA); AND THAT THE SMALL WALL WHERE THE SECONDARY GARAGE IS CLOSED ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE NORTH FACADE SHOULD BE A SOLID WALL.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BLADES.

Under discussion, Mr. Moore stated that the reference to tax abatement on exterior changes should be deleted from the motion, and let the state make the determination.

MOTION AMENDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA TO SAY ALL THE DETAILS PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED, BUT DELETING THE TAX ABATEMENT FOR EXTERIOR CHANGES VERBIAGE, AND JUST GIVING A STANDARD CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BLADES.

Prior to the vote, Mr. Pandula asked the applicant to re-think the breakfast balcony design, and to return in the future with details of handrails, trim details and balustrades. He also asked the applicant to consider altering the roof line on the south side, where the new addition is located, to indicate clearly where the addition begins. Also, on the west side, the entry is acceptable, but still a bit heavy, so the applicant was asked to re-consider the scale and formality. Mr. Elias responded in agreement to drop the roof to establish a break at the new addition. These items will return to the LPC when the applicant returns with the landscape and hardscape, etc.

MOTION AMENDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA TO LEAVE THE ROOF BREAK UP TO THE APPLICANT'S DISCRETION, AND WHEN THE APPLICANT RETURNS WITH THE LANDSCAPE PLAN, HE SHOULD PRESENT THE STUDY OF THE RAILING AND THE ENTRANCE, IN CASE WHEN YOU DO THE LANDSCAPE PLAN, THAT MAY BE RE-VISITED TO MAYBE A SIMPLER DESIGN.

MOTION SECONDED EARLIER BY MRS. BLADES, AND AGAIN BY MRS. WILKEY.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

***

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA THAT THE DEMOLITION OF THE OUTBUILDINGS AND ANYTHING ON THE SITE, AS REQUESTED FOR DEMOLITION, IS APPROVED AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VANNECK.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

***

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA THAT THE CABANA, TENNIS PAVILION, TENNIS COURT, LANDSCAPE/HARDSCAPE, AND SWIMMING POOL BE DEFERRED TO A LATER DATE. (Since no date certain was specified, this will be deferred to the November meeting.)

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. WILKEY.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

***

At this time, there was a meeting recess from 11:05 a.m. to 11:20 a.m.

VI Other Business:

A. Distribution of copies of Designation Reports for November meeting

Mrs. Day distributed copies of the Designation Reports for 444 North Lake Way and 163 Seminole Avenue. Two additional handouts were distributed for La Ronda, at 444 North Lake Way as well. Both of these properties were deferred from last designation season.

VII **Workshop: Tax Abatement Program - by Jane Day and Tim Frank:**

Mrs. Day stated that this workshop is being done in an effort to clarify the confusion relative to tax abatements. She distributed a package to the members including the following:

1. Town of Palm Beach: Planning, Zoning & Building Department Tax Abatement Checklist
2. Town of Palm Beach, Florida Historic Preservation Tax Exemption Application - Part 1, Preconstruction Application
3. Town of Palm Beach, Florida Historic Preservation Tax Exemption Application - Part 2, Request for Review of Completed Work
4. Town of Palm Beach Code of Ordinances, Chapter 54, Historical Preservation
5. Appendix A, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, 1992
6. Business Card of Jane Day

Mrs. Day referenced the Town of Palm Beach Code of Ordinances, Section 54-196, Scope of Tax Exemptions and read a portion of that section into the record. It specifically allows "tax exemptions for the restoration, renovation or rehabilitation of historic properties. The exemption shall apply to 100 percent of the assessed value of all improvements to historic properties that result from restoration, renovation or rehabilitation made on or after the effective date of this section." The abatement is valid for a ten year period. Authorization for the abatements was given by an amendment to the State Constitution, with the proviso that the changes made abide by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The applicants must announce, prior to review of the projects, that they plan to seeK tax relief for the ten year period.

Mrs. Day referred to Appendix A, "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, 1992." She noted that although the standards recognize "reconstruction" as a means to replace non-existent portions of historic property for interpretive purposes, that term is not included in the Town's ordinance. Therefore, "reconstruction" does not qualify for the tax abatement. Mrs. Day read the definitions of "rehabilitation" and "restoration."

Mrs. Day called on the Landmarks Preservation Commission to hold the applicant to task in undertaking changes to the historic properties. The changes must abide by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards since the applicant may be entitled to major tax relief. Factors to be considered are: Is the building a national treasure? Did an important event happen there in a particular room or interior space? What is the physical condition of the property? Is the original form intact? Are any of the alterations done previously important to the history of the building? What is the proposed use? Will the building's character remain after it is brought up to code? Are the materials, which define the historic character of the building, to remain or will they be changed? Windows, porches, and entrances are very important to the historic character of a building. She emphasized that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards are flexible, and that they allow an owner to do all sorts of changes to make them liveable and saleable. Mrs. Day noted that tax abatement is salable with the house, so it is a valuable benefit to the property owner.

The LPC members commented that it is very important that applicants know about and are familiar with the tax abatement issues. She reviewed the document entitled: Town of Palm Beach: Planning, Zoning & Building Department Tax Abatement Checklist, which outlines the abatement process. Mrs. Dowdle recommended some underlining and bolding of certain verbiage, and as such, Mrs. Day asked other members to review the document, and bring forth any recommendations at next month's meeting.

Mrs. Day showed slides of town properties which are now benefitting from the tax abatement, and provided information as to the dollars exempted from taxation. (It should be noted that only the local and county taxes are affected by the tax abatement, and not the school taxes.)

The Brazilian Court: The assessed value or taxed value was reduced by $ 3,400,000
(Mr. Frank noted that this translated to a savings of approximately $100,000
per year, or approximately $1,000,000 saved in taxes over the course of the ten years)
210 Via Del Mar: The assessed value or taxed value was reduced by $ 1,590,000
250 Jungle Road: The assessed value or taxed value was reduced by $ 506,049
260 Pendleton Avenue: The assessed value or taxed value was reduced by $232,000
241 Sanford Avenue: The assessed value or taxed value was reduced by $136,198
210 El Brillo Way: The assessed value or taxed value was reduced by $1,625,000
440 Brazilian Avenue: The assessed value or taxed value was reduced by $209,260
216 Pendleton Avenue: The assessed value or taxed value was reduced by $60,000

Mrs. Day pointed out that there are four properties in the tax abatement pipeline right now. Since 1997, however, a total of $7,759,259 in assessments has not been taxed by the Town of Palm Beach or Palm Beach County due to the granting of tax abatements for landmark properties. (School taxes are not affected.)

Mr. Pandula commented that preservation became popular in about 1966, and at that time, it was done by owners who had passion for preservation and restoration. One of the reasons for the tax abatement program was to encourage people to preserve and restore buildings, rather than demolish. Now, it has come full circle, in that applicants almost don't want to preserve and restore unless they get the tax abatement. Mrs. Day stated that this problem is so prevalent in Palm Beach because of the large dollars involved. Mrs. Day noted, however, that there is a 50% threshold on the changes made to be able to acquire the tax abatement. If more than 50% of the structure is changed, no abatement is available since too much of the original structure has been changed.

VIII Adjournment:

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK TO ADJOURN AT 12:40 P.M.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be held on **WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2000** in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 South County Road, Palm Beach at 9:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann Blades

Ann Blades, Secretary
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

cmd

TOWN OF PALM BEACH

ATTENDANCE RECORD (2000)

MEMBERS	1/00	2/00	3/00	4/00	5/00	6/00	7/00	8/00	9/00	10/00	11/00	12/00
Jeffery W. Smith	P	P	P	***Resigned***			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Eugene Pandula	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Elizabeth Dowdle	U	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P			
Sari M. Wilkey	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	U	U	P		
Jacqueline Albarran de Mendoza	P	P	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Ann Vanneck	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Ann Blades	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	E	P		
Jack Pyms	see below-----			P	P	U	P	P	P	P		

ALTERNATES	1/00	2/00	3/00	4/00	5/00	6/00	7/00	8/00	9/00	10/00	11/00	12/00
Nikita Zukov	P	P	P	P	E	P	P	U	P	E		
Judy Hoffman	P	P	P	P	E	P	P	P	P	P		
Jack Pyms	P	P	P	(appt. as regular member)						—		
Laurel Baker	n/a	n/a	n/a	E	P	P	P	P	P	U		

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

TOWN OF PALM BEACH

RECORD OF VOTING CONFLICTS (2000)

MEMBERS	1/00	2/00	3/00	4/00	5/00	6/00	7/00	8/00	9/00	10/00	11/00	12/00
Jeffery W. Smith		VPD2										
Eugene Pandula	V1			V1 VPD1								
Elizabeth Dowdle												
Sari M. Wilkey												
Jacqueline Albarran de Mendoza												
Ann Vanneck												
Ann Blades												

ALTERNATES	1/00	2/00	3/00	4/00	5/00	6/00	7/00	8/00	9/00	10/00	11/00	12/00
Nikita Zukov												
Judy Hoffman												
Jack Pyms												

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

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