



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Planning, Zoning & Building Department

MINUTES

LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

9:00 a.m., FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1991

AT THE TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 360 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD, PALM BEACH

I. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m. by Lillian Jane Volk, Chairman.

II. Roll Call:

PRESENT: Lillian Jane Volk, Chairman
Elise P. Mackintosh, Vice Chairman
Sally Gingras, Secretary
William S. Gubelmann, Member
Anne G. Metzger, Member
Jacqueline Albarran de Mendoza, Member
Arthur Silverman, Alternate Member
Jane R. Grace, Alternate Member
John C. Randolph, Town Attorney
Robert L. Moore, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building
Timothy M. Frank, Planner/Projects Coordinator

ABSENT: Leslie Divoll, Member
Wilmer J. Thomas Jr., Alternate Member

RECORDING SECRETARY: Cynthia M. Delp

Let the record show that Mrs. Grace arrived at the meeting at 9:25 a.m.

III. A. Approval of the Minutes of the August 16, 1991 Meeting:

Let the record show that an amended copy of the August 16, 1991 Minutes was delivered to the Commissioners on September 19, 1991. As some of the Commissioners present had not been able to review the changes as yet, the approval of the Minutes was postponed to the October agenda.

MOTION BY MRS. MACKINTOSH TO APPROVE THE AUGUST MINUTES AS AMENDED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. Approval of the Minutes of the September 20, 1991 Meeting:

Please note the following correction to the September 20, 1991 Minutes of the Landmarks Preservation Commission, as noted by Mrs. Leslie Divoll, and distributed by Mrs. Delp.

On Page 11, the fifth paragraph...

"had been deferred pending action in the 91/91 Designation Season."

should read

"had been deferred pending action in the 91/92 Designation Season."

MOTION BY MR. SILVERMAN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS AMENDED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GUBELMANN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

IV. Public Hearings:

A. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 23-91, Doors, windows, awnings, guest rooms

Applicant/Owner: Mr. Wilson C. Lucom

Address: 260 North Ocean Boulevard

Architect: Smith Architectural Group

Project Description: Request approval to provide awning at front entry; and a new awning at the east facade of the breakfast room.

(Please note that this item was deferred from the July 19, 1991 Meeting, the August 16, 1991 Meeting, and the September 20, 1991 Meeting.)

Mrs. Volk stated that she had been informed that the applicant wishes another deferral of this matter. However, no representatives from Smith Architectural Group were present at this point in the meeting. The Commission elected to postpone this matter to later in the agenda.

Let the record show that later in the meeting, when Mr. Jeff Smith of Smith Architectural Group was present, he requested removal of this item from the agenda, with the understanding that they will reapply at such time as they are ready to bring this item forward.

MOTION BY MRS. METZGER TO REMOVE THE AWNINGS PORTION OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #23-91 FROM THE AGENDA.
(The record shall note that other portions of CoA #23-91

were previously approved at the August 1991 meeting.)

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GUBELMANN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 33-91, Solarium

Applicant/Owner: Mrs. Tauni De Lesseps

Address: 452 Worth Avenue

Architect: Mr. Steven J. Bruh

Project Description: Request approval to add a new glass enclosed solarium on the south side of the building

(Please note that this item was deferred from the September 20, 1991 Meeting.)

Mr. Steve Bruh came forward to present a new design for Mrs. De Lessep's desired solarium. Previously, he had presented alternative designs, the first being a glass and aluminum enclosure which had been denied by the Commission, and a second option, which was a more detailed enclosure, picking up elements of the existing structure. The Commission did not, however, favor the second design, as they felt it was a more permanent, substantial structure. The Commission, at its September meeting, requested the Mr. Bruh return with a corrected set of drawings for Scheme #1 (glass and aluminum structure) which would include a full rendering of the south elevation, including colors, attachments, etc. Mr. Bruh complied with that request today.

He presented a design for a glass solarium enclosure with green framework to be placed under an existing white awning on the south elevation. The awning will project approximately 3.5 feet from the edge of the solarium, and thus, will shade the solarium. The green color of the frame will match the existing trim on the house. The glass will be tinted a light grey to match existing windows. The structure will include sliding glass doors and operable single hung windows on each of its three sides. These doors and windows will provide necessary ventilation into the solarium. The structure, Mr. Bruh stated, will be transparent and will not encumber or detract from the existing building.

Mrs. Volk stated the owner's position on this issue, that being that she needs an enclosure, the solarium, so that she can effectively enjoy the lake side of her home and property, and yet be protected from sun, wind and insects.

MOTION BY MR. GUBELMANN TO APPROVE THE SOLARIUM AS PRESENTED, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT SAME BE CONSTRUCTED

IN SUCH A MANNER AS IT IS EASILY REMOVABLE IN THE FUTURE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SILVERMAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 35-91,
Addition

Applicant/Owner: Royal Poinciana Chapel

Address: 60 Cocoanut Row

Architect: Nichols Ltd. Inc., Robert Nichols

Project Description: Request approval for demolition of 1,100 square feet of the existing western portion of the building (existing sanctuary to remain), and addition of 11,000 square feet for Fellowship Hall, kitchen and offices.

(Please note that this project was discussed at the September 20, 1991 Meeting, and was given conceptual approval at that time, pending legal advertisement.)

Mr. Nichols returned to the Commission and gave a repeat presentation to the Commission for the benefit of those Commissioners who were absent last month. To reiterate, the proposal is to demolish the existing 1,100 square feet western portion of the building which is currently office and storage space, and to add both a one story and two story addition. The first story will provide a foyer, a Fellowship Hall, a multi-purpose room, a kitchen, toilet facilities, elevator and stairs. The existing sanctuary and existing parking will remain as is. The addition has been designed sympathetic in character and massing to the existing structure, maintaining roof lines and window treatments. On the west elevation, a portico and loggia will overlook the lake. Every effort has been made to minimize the effect of the addition so that it does not overpower the existing Chapel.

Mrs. Mackintosh raised a concern over the blank wall on the south elevation, suggesting that some sort of design or architectural feature be added to this wall, so that it is more in keeping with the rest of the structure. This blank facade occurs where the storage area/mechanical equipment occurs on the interior. Mr. Nichols noted, however, that this blank facade cannot be seen by the public, nor very easily by neighboring properties. Mrs. Mackintosh, however, stated that over time, things could change, and this blank facade might be seen in the future. It was suggested that perhaps windows, relief designs, or recesses be added to the facade as ornamentation. Mr. Nichols stated that the blank wall is an advantage in that it promotes security of the storage area and mechanical equipment, and interiorly, optimizes available wall space.

Mr. Nichols stated, in response to Mrs. Mackintosh's concerns regarding the blank facade, that recesses in the molding and stucco are possible, and would be in keeping with the structure as they would repeat the rhythm. Additionally, recesses would not hamper security for the structure. In anticipation of Mrs. Mackintosh's concern, Mr. Nichols displayed a modified south facade, now showing three rectangular recesses and trim, shaped similar to the window at the kitchen.

Regarding the west elevation, Mr. Nichols responded to some concerns expressed last month regarding the elevation treatment in the west portico. A raised half-round stucco surround will now be added to the west portico, as a backdrop for the hanging lamp.

Mrs. Mackintosh brought up the subject of trees which will need to be removed to allow the construction. Mr. Nichols stated that a total of eight trees are involved, only three of which have been identified by a landscape architect as worthy of saving. These three (date palm, sapodilla, and reclinata) will be removed from their current location and will be replanted elsewhere on the site, probably along the south property line. The other five (three mangos, a schefflera, and a banyan) have been deemed unworthy of saving.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO APPROVE THE DEMOLITION OF THE WEST 1,100 SQUARE FEET OFFICE SPACE PORTION.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GUBELMANN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA TO APPROVE THE ADDITION OF THE 11,000 SQUARE FEET ADDITION FOR FELLOWSHIP HALL, KITCHEN, AND OFFICES AS PRESENTED, WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE WORTHY THREE TREES BE RELOCATED ELSEWHERE ON THE PROPERTY.

Mrs. Mackintosh again brought up the other five trees, asking whether any attempts would be made to save these trees. Mr. Nichols stated that he could not commit to saving these trees at this time. At this point, Mr. Moore interjected that the Town has a Tree Bank Program, and perhaps Mr. Ugi, if contacted, could claim these trees and re-plant them somewhere else in Town. Mr. Frank added that he has already contacted Mr. Ugi regarding this matter.

MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA AMENDED HER MOTION TO INCLUDE THAT MR. UGI, OF THE TOWN, BE CONTACTED TO SEE WHAT HE CAN DO WITH THE OTHER FIVE TREES.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- D. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 36-91,
New Urns and Pilaster Modification
Applicant/Owner: Mr. John Pickett
Address: 1768 South Ocean Boulevard
Architect: Lindley Hoffman
Project Description: Request approval for four new urns on
top of entry pilasters

Mr. Tom Kirchhoff presented this project for modification of the entry pilasters, and new urns for same. There are currently four pilasters, two out at the street, and two further in toward the property. The pilasters will be modified to a more Classical design. The two pilasters at the street are now topped with lights. The project includes the removal of those lights. All four urns will now be topped with new custom made cast stone urns with Greek fretwork at their top and fruit and vines on the bowl. Lettering reading "FOUR WINDS" will be incised into the stucco.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO APPROVE THE PILASTERS AND URNS AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- E. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 37-91,
Coquina headers and sills
Applicant/Owner: Via Mizner Associates Ltd. Partnership
c/o Aston Development
Tenant: Renato's Lounge
Address: 92/94 Via Mizner
Contractor: David Palmer
Project Description: Request approval to add coquina
headers to two windows and one door; and add coquina sills
to four windows

Mr. Kirk Henckels, representing Aston Development, presented this project for coquina headers and sills at Renato's Lounge. He stated that the facade in question is very flat. The addition of the coquina will add some depth and architectural detail to the facade. Mr. Henckels stated that there is precedent for the use of coquina in the Via...one door uses coquina around it, and the large arches have coquina around them.

Mr. Frank added that he had approved the paned windows on

this facade, as they represent an upgrade from what were 50's vintage aluminum windows.

Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza questioned, regarding the windows, how far along in production they were. She was concerned about the mullions of the windows, and stated that perhaps there should be less verticals, so that the panes would not be so small. Mr. Henckels agreed that this would be a better treatment for the windows. He stated that he would attempt to interject this change to the windows, if they were not too far into production.

MOTION BY MR. GUBELMANN TO APPROVE THE COQUINA SILLS AND HEADERS AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. MACKINTOSH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Frank addressed the Commission regarding Via Mizner as a whole. Approximately one year ago, there was a point in time that there was a development company in charge of maintaining the building. At that time, some elements were introduced, like pecky cypress over one of the arcades, and some details in Gothic arches that were actually broken off, as well as other changes. Staff objected to these changes. With the change of ownership to Mr. Ian Keane, Mr. Keane promised to remedy these matters. In a recent meeting with Mr. Keane, he agreed to work with the Town to return all of those details to either the original or a more appropriate material use. In essence, all of the violations from a year ago will be corrected. The Commission was very pleased to hear this and complimented the owner on his care of Via Mizner.

F. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 38-91, Trellis

Applicant/Owner: Via Mizner Associates Ltd. Partnership
c/o Aston Development

Tenant: Renato's Restaurant

Address: 87 Via Mizner

Architect: The Lawrence Group

Project Description: Request approval for installation of decorative trellis to conceal air conditioning equipment

Mr. Gene Lawrence presented this project for Renato's Restaurant. Currently, the restaurant requires an additional air conditioning unit because present capacity is insufficient. The existing compressors are scattered all over the roof, and are visible from certain points in the Via. The proposal is to take all of the miscellaneous compressors, refrigeration equipment and air conditioning

equipment, (5 total), put them in one place, and properly screen them. Initially, decorative trellis was considered, but this plan has since been abandoned. The proposal is for screening to occur on the courtyard side of Renato's Restaurant above the existing corinthian columns. In this location, the existing wood rafters and roofing will be lifted, and new wooden beams will be introduced directly above the existing corinthian columns. New removable access louvers will be placed between the wood beams. The roofing for this equipment enclosure will be left partially open to allow for proper ventilation of the units. The north and south sides of the enclosure will be stucco. The equipment enclosure will be painted white to match the existing walls of the structure.

Additionally, they have recently found a photograph of an awning that had been located in this area. Mr. Lawrence noted that Renato's Restaurant has wanted an awning in this location for a long time. Mr. Lawrence acknowledged the fact that the Commission could not act on this matter today as it had not been advertised, but he brought it to the attention of the Commission because it affects today's proposal. Currently, there is one awning along the building, and tables with umbrellas. Originally, there was just one large, single awning. Renato's would like to go back to that concept, thus eliminating the umbrellas. Some Commissioners commented that if the awning is installed, the air conditioning enclosure will hardly be noticeable.

Mr. Frank stated, for the record, that there may be a zoning problem with the concept of the one large awning, especially if it is determined that the awning adds to the square footage of the Restaurant. He commented that, according to his knowledge, the awning has not been presented to or reviewed by Mr. Zimmerman with respect to zoning.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO APPROVE THE EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE AS PRESENTED WITH STUCCO ON THE NORTH AND SOUTH ENDS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. MACKINTOSH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- G. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 39-91,
Various modifications to existing residence
Applicant/Owner: Mr. and Mrs. Ralph McDonald
Address: 300 El Brillo Way
Architect: Smith Architectural Group, Ken Brower
Project Description: To follow in this record

Mr. Jeff Smith and Mr. Raphael Saladrigas of the Smith Architectural Group presented this project. Mr. Smith presented

the project item by item, as is listed on the agenda.

1. Add a door to the east two story wing, downstairs at the courtyard side: This wing was previously staff quarters. The owners would like to change the use to family use. Currently, there is a window in this location. The project includes changing the window to a door, to match the other door on the same wing.
2. Add a door on the courtyard side of the garage to allow access to garage: Previously, this was a blank wall with one window. The project includes changing the window to a door, to allow the children to use this area as a cabana.
3. Change existing fiberglass garage doors to wood paneled doors as originally designed: The new doors will be painted white.
4. Landscape screening for seven (7) air-conditioning units: The house was never air-conditioned before. The specific locations of the units will be site screened with landscaping.
5. Pedestrian service gate in new north wall for access to service area: This gate will be one of three new gates.
6. Two new automobile gates into the motorcourt - one off El Brillo and one off Travers Way. (As shown on the drawing) They will match the picket motif found along the edge of the property.
7. Service drive at southwest end of property off Travers Way. The drive will be 10' wide and will have gates with 6' high pilasters: The drive will actually come in off El Brillo Way. These gates will have the similar arched design of the motorcourt gates, but they will, in contrast, be solid gates.
8. White picket and red brick wall (to match existing) along portion of south and east edge of property: Currently, the house has brick piers with white pickets. This motif is to be implemented around additional sections of the property to close it off. This is being done as a security measure to prevent persons from entering the property and seating themselves under existing landmarked trees. The picket motif will provide security, but will maintain the feeling of openness.
9. Two pedestrian gates adjacent to new north wall: These are the remaining two of three new pedestrian gates.
10. Garbage enclosure on north elevation: This will be a plywood enclosure, painted green, to hide the garbage cans.
11. Block up window on east elevation on the ground floor of east wing: This will occur in the wing previously used as staff quarters. One small window in the hall will be deleted.

Mr. Gubelmann questioned the arch of the motorcourt gates, thinking that a straight edge might be more in keeping with the

white pickets. Other Commissioners commented that the garage doors are arched, so there is precedent for the arch. Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza stated that it would be preferable, in her opinion, to line up the horizontal of the motor gates with the top edge of the pickets. Mr. Smith agreed.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. METZGER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

V. Other Business

A. Informal Review - 350 South County Road, Helander Gallery
Requests conceptual approval of identification signage pending legal advertisement for the November Meeting.

Mr. Frank stated that this is the Bustani Building, and to the best of his recollection, a continuity of awning color and style has been established for the building, but none has been established for signage. He noted that a Special Exception has been granted for this second location for the Helander Gallery, with their other location being on Worth Avenue. The two locations will exist until May of 1992, at which time the South County Road location will be the only location for Helander Gallery.

Ms. Susan Hall and Ms. Jo Mett, of Helander Gallery, presented their request for signage. They would like the South County Road signage to mirror the Worth Avenue signage. They showed an example of one of the letters which are eleven (11") inches high and are made of Corian, a material similar to granite. Additionally, they requested a small sign reading HELANDER GALLERY on the first line and Palm Beach on the second line, done in white stick-on letters on the inside of the right window.

Mr. Frank commented that although there are at least three different styles and sizes of signage on the building now, a sign of this size is not preceded on this particular building. He believed that the largest signage on the building, that of A.T. Carroll, is approximately nine (9") inch lettering in a black anodized aluminum with an antique. Concerns were expressed regarding the size and contemporary style lettering of the proposed sign.

The Helander representatives stated that the South County Road storefront is 25' 9", as opposed to the Worth Avenue storefront which is 19'. The signage, itself, is 11.5' long. Therefore, the signage will run only half the length of the South County Road frontage.

Mr. Frank then received updated information, as researched by Staff's Mr. Sved, that A.T. Carroll's approved signage was black anodized aluminum with an antique finish, and that no definitive decision was made with respect to future signage on the building, but it was the wish of the Commission to continue either the style or the materials

throughout the building.

MOTION BY MR. GUBELMANN FOR CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL OF THE WINDOW SIGNAGE; AND CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL OF THE FACADE SIGNAGE AS PRESENTED WITH RESPECT TO MATERIAL SELECTION AND COLOR, WITH THE CONDITION THAT IT CONFORMS IN SIZE TO THE EXISTING A.T. CARROLL SIGNAGE; WITH ALL CONCEPTUAL APPROVALS PENDING LEGAL ADVERTISEMENT FOR THE NOVEMBER MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. Informal Review - 351 Worth Avenue - Mary Mahoney

Requests conceptual approval of exterior color change pending legal advertisement for the November Meeting.

Mr. Jeff Smith presented this request for a color change of this building in Via Parigi. The existing color is white, and the proposed new color is a light terracotta. Additionally, he discussed the addition of emerald green awnings with a white scalloped edge to cover all of the windows on the second and third floors. Historically, awnings did cover these windows. He added that the building has been sandblasted, and they would like to proceed with the exterior prior to the season. Pecky cypress elements will be left natural, and stone elements will be brought back to natural stone color.

MOTION BY MR. GUBELMANN FOR CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL OF THE COLOR CHANGE AS PRESENTED, PENDING LEGAL ADVERTISEMENT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. METZGER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. Status Report - Memorial Fountain

Mr. James Sved addressed the Commission regarding the progress of the Memorial Fountain restoration. He stated that nearly all of the work included in the Fountain Grant has been completed. He reported that there had been some difficulty in matching the paint color of the reflecting pool to the tile, but this has been resolved. He anticipated that water would be put back into the pool next week.

Regarding the landscaping, he will be working closely with Mr. Ugi of the Town and the Garden Club. The landscape plan, when completed, will be brought to the Town Council for final approval, as they are the property owner.

D. 91/92 Designation Season - Comments by Staff

Mr. Frank stated that the Commissioners had, before them, copies of the Designation Reports concerning the properties which will be heard for Designation in November. He maintained that every effort will be

made to provide the Designation Reports to the Commission one month in advance of the hearing date, or as early as possible.

Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza brought up the subject of public and real estate professionals' lingering misconceptions of landmarking. Mrs. Volk replied that she has spoken before the Palm Beach Board of Realtors in the past, but unfortunately, only those in attendance had the benefit of correct information. Public relations/education remains a continuing concern.

Informal discussion regarding Mar-a-lago

Mr. Moore reported that he had just received the court reporter's transcript of the Town Council motion upholding the denial of Certificate of Appropriateness #15-91 for the subdivision of Mar-a-Lago. This transcript will be copied and distributed to the Commissioners as soon as possible. Essentially, the Town Council upheld the denial of CoA #15-91, but told the applicant to return to the LPC with a different plan which would involve a form of preservation or a preservation plan. Mr. Moore did not anticipate this matter coming back to the Commission until December or January.

Mrs. Volk stated that she attended the Town Council meeting, but was confused as to the intent of the Council's action. She questioned whether the Town Council was telling the LPC that they had to approve a subdivision for the property. It was her understanding that they did not, in fact, say this. She concluded that the LPC may welcome another application for subdivision of the property, but the LPC is not obliged to approve same.

Mr. Moore stated that the applicant has also made a timely application for approval of a PUD-4, Planned Unit Development, a zoning matter, for the property. This PUD, will obviously however, have to take into consideration the preservation of the property, landscapes, vistas, and buildings. The applicant is currently then, proceeding down two roads. The Council has directed them that they may pursue an alternative subdivision plan with the LPC, and concurrently, the applicant has also applied for approval of a PUD from the Zoning Commission. At some point in the PUD process, the LPC will have an opportunity to review the PUD request. Mr. Moore stated that although an LPC review opportunity is not stipulated in the ordinance, he will administratively require that it must come to the LPC for review of the application with respect to historical resources. Mr. Moore stated that the Zoning Commission will meet on November 26 and possibly November 27, at which time this item will be heard.

Mr. Gubelmann commented that it is not up to the LPC to design a subdivision or PUD, but it is helpful to be able to exchange ideas and make constructive suggestions which might be more suitable.

The Clarion Group of consultants who reviewed the original subdivision request of CoA #15-91 are currently studying the PUD-4 request. The Town Council has approved funding for this. Mrs. Volk asked the status of the Federal grant which the Town can apply for to cover some of these costs, as was discussed at a previous meeting. Mr. Moore reported that the grant application is complete in its rough stage, but the final application has not been submitted, pending a closer determination of the costs which might be incurred. It was also mentioned that the Town can negotiate with the applicant, in a case such as this, to recoup some or all of the expended Town funds.

Mr. Moore stated that he will administratively require 30 days notice of when the applicant plans to return to the LPC, which would include submittal of plans. Per the Town Council, they will not be required to re-apply in the normal fashion or pay a filing fee for subdivision review.

Mrs. Metzger questioned why Mr. Trump does not declare his intent to pursue either a subdivision or a PUD. Mr. Randolph responded that the applicant took advantage of the allowable time period in which one can file for review of a PUD, and filed for same so that the matter could be reviewed during this zoning season. He maintained that we cannot anticipate what will happen with regard to a subdivision application, as there is none before the Commission. The route Mr. Trump decides to pursue is entirely up to him.

Mr. Gubelmann asked for more information regarding what a PUD actually allows. Mr. Moore responded to this question as follows: "It is a form of subdivision which allows for more negotiation to take place in a less rigid format than the subdivision ordinance." For example, lot lines could be drawn in a different configuration than the Town's Zoning Ordinance calls for. The "PUD-4" is specifically set up for historical structures and properties. Mr. Moore stated, "It is a special exception. It does have provision for use of single family residence, multi-family residence, and town houses, the latter two of which are not permitted under the subdivision ordinance. Additionally, the PUD-4 allows for the calculation of the entire property, as a whole, in determining the density of the property. The subdivision ordinance does not. Those are some basic differences between the subdivision ordinance which is more rigid in its standards, which must comply with the Zoning Ordinance, versus a PUD. A PUD, for all practical purposes, is a bargaining tool between the Town and the applicant." The PUD allows the applicant to present imaginative proposals to the Town for review, but the applicant must identify what type of zoning relief is being requested.

VI. Adjournment

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:55 a.m.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GUBELMANN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be heard on Friday, November 15, 1991 at 9:00 a.m. in the TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, TOWN HALL, 360 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD, PALM BEACH.

Respectfully submitted,


Sally Gingras
Secretary

cmd