TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Planning, Zoning & Building Department

MINUTES
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 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 (arrived 9:11 a.m.)
Sari M. Wilkey, Member
Jacqueline Albarran de Mendoza, Member (arrived 9:05 a.m.)
Ann Vanneck, Member
Jack Pyms, Member
Nikita Zukov, Alternate Member
Judy Hoffman, Alternate Member
Laurel Baker, Alternate Member
John C. Randolph, Town Attorney
Robert L. Moore, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building
Timothy M. Frank, Planner/Projects Coordinator

ABSENT: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Cynthia M. Delp

III Approval of the Minutes of the June 21, 2000 Meeting:
MOTION BY MRS. WILKEY FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES AS MAILED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. DOWDLE.
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

V Public Hearings:

A. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness # 17-2000, (deferred from June)
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: None declared

Please note the project was approved as presented, with the exception of the fenestration change which was deferred to the July meeting. Another deferral is requested to the August meeting.

MOTION BY MRS. DOWDLE FOR DEFERRAL TO THE AUGUST MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VANNECK.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness # 18-2000, (deferred from June)
Addition, restoration, landscape/hardscape
Owner/Applicant: Matthew and Helene Lorentzen
Address: 250 Sanford Avenue
Architect: Brower Architectural Associates
Project Description: Request approval of the following:

1. Partial restoration of first and second floors
2. Covered balcony addition to second floor
3. Addition to existing cabana
4. New swimming pool and deck
5. General reconfiguration of landscape and hardscape, including reconfiguration of the driveway
6. Any other associated changes as presented

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION: None declared

Please note that there was a motion for approval at the June meeting to approve the project, but to return with landscape, pool, driveway, hardscape and materials. Approval was given with the proviso that shutters are added to the unshuttered openings.

Please note the architect is requesting deferral of the landscape, pool details, driveway, hardscape and materials to the August meeting.

Mr. Raphael Saladrigas, Architect, of Brower Architectural Associates returned to the LPC today for approval of the shutters which have been added according to last month's approval. Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza commented, however, that although it was her suggestion that the shutters be added, in viewing the new plans with staff prior to this meeting, she would recommend that no shutters be placed on the south elevation at the first and second floors due to a lack of space between the openings.

MOTION BY MRS. DOWDLE FOR APPROVAL OF THE SOUTH ELEVATION WITHOUT THE SHUTTERS. (To clarify, shutters are still approved for other previously unshuttered openings.)

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. WILKEY.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

and

MOTION BY MRS. DOWDLE FOR DEFERRAL OF THE LANDSCAPING, POOL, DRIVEWAY, HARDSCAPE AND MATERIALS TO THE AUGUST MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VANNECK.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #20-2000, (deferred from June)
Raise buildings, addition, site work
Existing owner: Orator Woodward
Contract Purchaser: Laura Andre
Address: Lot 11, Vita Serena, a/k/a 181 Clarendon Avenue,
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

Please note that 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.

Please note the architect is requesting deferral to the September meeting.

MOTION BY MRS. DOWDLE FOR DEFERRAL TO THE SEPTEMBER MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VANNECK.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

D. <u>Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #21-00, (deferred from June)</u>
<u>Addition, fenestration changes, pool, site changes</u>
Owner/Applicant: Irving W. Bailey II
Address: 15 Golf Road
Architect: Botkin, Parssi & Associates Inc.

<u>Please note that there was a motion at the June meeting for deferral to the July meeting, with the request that Mr. Botkin or a licensed architect presents this project.</u>

<u>CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION</u>: As follows...
Mrs. Wilkey: Met with the design team on location
Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza: Met with the design team at her office and spoke to Ames Bennett
Mr. Pyms: Met with the design team at the project
Mrs. Vanneck: Met with the design team at the project and conferred with Mario Nievera
Mr. Hoffman: Met with the design team
Mr. Zukov: Met with the design team
Mr. Pandula: Spoke with Mr. Bennett by telephone
Mrs. Blades: (Just arriving) Met with the attorney and the architect

Mr. Ames Bennett identified himself as the successor architect on this project and delivered the presentation in conjunction with Virginia Dominicis of Scott Snyder & Associates and Mario Nievera, Landscape Architect. Presentation details are shown below, item by item.

Project Description: Request approval of the following:

1. Relocation of garden wall and gate to the front property line north of the Sidewalk along Golf Road. New garden wall and gate to be same color, size and proportion, and same materials.

<u>Presentation</u>: To offer more front yard and green space. Remove existing pool and replace with pool in new location. The fountain will likewise be relocated. Another gate will be added for access from the front. An existing wooden gate will be moved out to the front.

2. Circular clear story window with conical roof to be inserted over the rotunda stairway

<u>Presentation</u>: This new dome will be located behind the main structure and will be classified as an observation tower. This new element cannot be seen from the street, but can partially be seen from the west. Windows will be inserted in the tower to provide light. Interior details include exposed rafters and beams, and pecky cypress. Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza commented that it appears that the tower could be lowered a bit to improve the front elevation. The LPC commented that the tower shown today is greatly improved over what was shown on last month's plans.

Mr. Frank commented that staff believes the tower does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards because it, an addition, is not of a different architectural style. Staff felt that the owner could not apply for tax abatement on this portion of the project. He stated that a low profile skylight would serve the same purpose of providing light, and would meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Bennett responded that light is not the only consideration, but interiorly, a beautiful view is desired with a lovely chandelier and the height provided by the tower.

3. New entrance added to the south elevation from the loggia extension into the kitchen. The doorway will match the existing south elevation entrance from the loggia extension into the dining room

<u>Presentation</u>: New matching door pointed out on the plans.

4. The height of the existing entrance to dining room on west side of the house will be raised to the same height/level as the existing windows along the north side of the home (in the dining room)

Presentation: Entrance height will be raised from 7' to 11'. It will have leaded glass around the outside and bottom to provide light into the interior spaces.

5. An existing window on the west side of the home (in kitchen) will be replaced by a doorway/entrance

Presentation: The door will be 3' in width. .

6. Interior renovation on second floor

Presentation: Mr. Frank stated that although the LPC typically does not consider interiors, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards need to be adhered to interiorly as well, if the applicant desires a tax exemption. The applicant does not need LPC approval of the interior, but does need LPC review of same. Interiorly, instead of having two bedrooms in the front, there will be one large bedroom with a sitting room. A new bathroom is planned, but requires a variance due to height. Mr. Bennett noted, for the record, that the project incorporates and continues the same structural system....wood frame with terracotta tile veneer.

Staff noted that the plans presented today have not previously been submitted to the Town, and as such, the Town has no file set of these plans. The applicant will provide a set of presentation plans after this meeting.

7. Bathroom added to second floor along the north (rear) side of home

Presentation: Requires a variance, per Mr. Bennett.

8. Removal of south elevation arched mirrors and coquina stone ledge table

Presentation: These items were added by a previous owner and will be removed.

9. Change color on window trim

Presentation: The existing light blue will be changed to a darker blue

10. Change style of front walkway from herringbone brick to natural coquina (to match existing hardscape currently located throughout the property)

Presentation: BY MARIO NIEVERA, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT. Mr. Nievera stated that the new pool will be surrounded by pre-cast coquina in a random rectangular pattern. When questioned, Mr. Nievera responded that natural coquina could not be used in that application as it is too sharp for use by children. Natural coquina will be used, however, on the front walkway, as stated above. Mr. Nievera was asked to return to the LPC with a sample of the pre-cast coquina. All natural coquina salvaged from the site will be used elsewhere on site.

A coquina path, replacing chatahoochee embedded in concrete, will lead to the west garden and pool area. The garden wall, as stated earlier, is moving forward to allow for more yard. Plantings near the wall will be re-planted at the new location. An existing ficus tree will remain in the front of the property. An existing areca palm hedge, separating the properties, will be removed and replaced with ficus hedge. Some front paving material will be removed and replaced with grass and plantings. The pool, in its new east/west orientation, aligns with the first garden door in the foyer. It will be completely tiled in blue and white tiles, with a patterned bottom. It was noted, for the record, that the existing pool has a north/south orientation and will be removed. The new pool is approximately 18' x 40'. The fountain will be moved to an antique courtyard. Areas for seating will occur on the west side of the pool and the north end. There will be a small terrace outside french doors. The project includes a new retaining wall, approximately 22" in height. Outside the dining room french door, there will be tile and brick with shallow steps leading up to the existing grade. A fountain will be centered on the dining room view.

11. Change a portion of the walkway along the east side to straighten the walkway and relocate the low retaining wall to align it with the new walkway

Presentation: Items 10 & 11 discussed by Mario Nievera, as stated above.

12. Any other associated changes as presented

Mr. Pandula brought up the second floor bath addition, Item #7. Mr. Bennett stated that it does require a variance for height. Attorney Greg Young, Edwards & Angell, stated that a variance has been applied for review at the August Town Council meeting, but the landmarking does not apply to the north elevation at this particular site. Mr. Frank confirmed that Mr. Young was correct in his statement that the north elevation is not landmarked.

MOTION BY MRS. WILKEY TO ACCEPT THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED, WITH THE PROVISO THAT THE APPLICANT RETURNS WITH MATERIALS FOR THE POOL SURROUND AND WALKWAY.*

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

*It was noted that the bathroom addition was not included in this approval as it requires a variance which has not yet been approved, and it is on the north elevation, which is exempted from the landmarking. Attorney Greg Young commented that when they return with the materials, as requested, they will return with the tax abatement package as well.

E. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #25-99 (deferred from Oct., Nov.,& December, 1999 and May, 2000)
Owner/Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. William Meyer
Address: 334 E. Vedado Road
Architect: Jeff Blakely, Landscape Architect
Project Description: Request approval of landscape and hardscape, to include driveway, dock and seawall, and other associated changes as presented

There was a motion at the October, 1999 meeting for approval of the project as presented, with the proviso that the applicant returns with an elevation of the front gates, and with the proviso that the piers are removed, and that the path leading to the driveway is done in cast stone. Motions at the November, 1999, December, 1999, and May, 2000 meetings for deferral. The last deferral was to the July, 2000 meeting.

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION: None declared

Mr. Frank stated that the gates in question require a variance. Mr. Frank had spoken to the Zoning Administrator who told him that a variance had been previously applied for and approved for the original gates, and the Zoning Administrator is willing to accept that variance approval for this new gate as long as it is no closer to the road than the original gates.

Denise Meyer and William Meyer, owners, presented the request subsequent to a series of deferrals as listed above. Mrs. Meyer stated that the new gates will not be closer to the street than the present ones. As for gate design, she brought a sample of a quatrefoil design with spears on top and smaller spears on bottom. It will have a black powder coat (no gloss) with wrinkle finish to appear old. The gates will be 6'.5 in height with 1" and 3/4" pickets, and are situated between 6' gate posts with lights on top. They are sliding gates which slide to the center.

Mrs. Meyer presented a revised site/landscape/hardscape plan. The plan increases the landscaped area from 25% to 43%. The project includes a 6' high property wall with continuous bullnose cap separating this property from the neighboring property. The driveway will be done in "tabby" material which is composed of seashells embedded into concrete. This tabby material will be accented by coquina. Coquina is also the material of choice for the front steps and front path. All original coquina will be re-used on site. Part of the front grass area will actually be stabilized lawn to allow for more parking. Grass will grow on top of the stabilizing material making it appear like regular lawn area. A field stone wall is running across the front yard, approximately midway between the road and the house. Landscape lights are an assortment of surface mounted uplights, downlights, pagoda lights, and lights in steps.

Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza commented that the original house was so formal and this landscape plan is very informal. Mrs. Vanneck stated that she does not think that the landscape plan presented today improves the house. It was noted by the LPC and acknowledged by Mrs. Meyer that the original landscape plan was very different from today's presentation. The original presentation was more formal with straight lines and corners, while today's presentation offers softened and curved steps and wall configuration. Mrs. Meyer responded that she liked both plans and would proceed with whichever the LPC approved.

In the rear of the house, a spa is positioned 18" above grade. Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza commented that a spa, if above ground, must look like an old fountain. She asked to see an elevation of the fountain, but that was not available today.

Mrs. Vanneck inquired about the driveway lights as to design. Mrs. Meyer stated she has not yet shopped for the lights, but is looking for Colonial style black carriage lights. The lights will need to return to the LPC for review. Mrs. Vanneck also commented that she prefers the more formal wall rather than the fieldstone wall presented to run across the front of the property.

Mr. Frank stated, relative to site lighting, that ARCOM now has made a policy that any light on the site cannot exceed ½ foot candle and the light must be shielded. He wanted to introduce this concept to the LPC.

Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza and Mr. Pandula felt that the front gate design is so plain for its approximate 15' in length. They asked Mrs. Meyer to look for a more beautiful design.

Mrs. Meyer showed a sample of the railing at the garage balcony. She explained that a side yard gate will be 5' high with the same pickets as shown in the front entry gates. On the house, at the veranda, pickets will be 36" in height and Colonial in design.

MOTION BY MR. PYMS TO APPROVE THE PROJECT,
AND
OTHER MEMBERS ADDED CONDITIONS TO THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS: WITH CHANGING THE WALL DESIGN FROM FIELDSTONE TO THE MORE FORMAL STUCCO WALL, AND CHANGING THE SIDEWALK CONFIGURATION TO THE PREVIOUS FORMAL DESIGN, AND RETURNING WITH THE SPA CHANGES, THE LIGHTING FIXTURES AT THE GATE, AND EMBELLISHMENT OF THE GATE DESIGN.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA.

NO VOTE TOOK PLACE.

Then, it was suggested that a deferral might be the appropriate course of action, so...

MOTION BY MR. PYMS FOR DEFERRAL TO THE NEXT MEETING
AND
MRS. BLADES ADDED, WITH ALL PREVIOUSLY STATED POINTS TO BE ADDRESSED.
MOTION FOR DEFERRAL SECONDED BY MRS. VANNECK.

NO VOTE TOOK PLACE.

Mr. Randolph interrupted stating that the motion on the floor was the first motion for approval with specified conditions. He asked Mr. Pyms if that was his intent. Mr. Pyms replied that his intent was for approval with the specified conditions.

ROLL CALL VOTE:	**Mr. Pyms:**	**Yes**
	Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza:	**Yes**
	Mrs. Dowdle:	**Yes**
	Mrs. Wilkey:	**Yes**
	Mrs. Vanneck:	**No**
	Mrs. Blades:	**Yes**
	Mr. Pandula:	**No**

MOTION CARRIES 5-2-0.

In summary, the motion was for approval of the project, with the proviso that the applicant returns with a revised drawing implementing all of the changes discussed today, i.e., the more formal design scheme for landscape/hardscape, the more formal stucco wall instead of the fieldstone wall, spa details (either with the spa raised or placed in ground, with sufficient supporting plans and materials,) details relative to the entry light fixtures, and submission of an alternative gate design for consideration.

F. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #22-2000,
Extension of previous approval
Owner/Applicant: The Mar-a-Lago Club
Address: 1100 South Ocean Boulevard
Architect: REG Architects
Project Description: Request approval of extension of previous approval to relocate existing pump house, and other associated changes as presented

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION: None declared

Mr. Wes Blackman, Director of Projects, and Mr. Rick Gonzalez of REG Architects addressed the LPC relative to this request. The Certificate of Appropriateness for this work had been issued October 21, 1998 and was extended again on October 20, 1999 for the time period ending October 21, 2000. As that date is approaching, Mr. Blackman stated that when the Town Council reviewed the pavilion building, they tied the construction to the completion of the middle bridge. So, construction on the pavilion building could not be begun until the middle bridge is completed, most probably in 2003. The relocation of the pump house, the subject of this CoA, is related to the pavilion building construction. Instead of returning each year, Mr. Blackman requested extension to that time, 2003.

Mr. Frank recommended that the extension be granted only for one more year, due to the possibility of code changes within the span of several years.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA FOR A ONE YEAR EXTENSION.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BLADES.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

G. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #23-2000, Elimination of retractable windows
Owner/Applicant: James H. Clark, James H. Clark & Nancy Rutter Clark Revocable Living Trust
Address: 1500 South Ocean Boulevard
Architect: Bridges, Marsh & Carmo, Inc.
Project Description: Request approval of replacement of retractable windows in the north loggia with french doors, and other associated changes as presented

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION: None declared

Architect Mark Marsh of Bridges, Marsh & Carmo presented this project in furtherance of the ongoing construction at 1500 South Ocean Boulevard. He explained that on the south side of the north cloister, a/k/a the northernmost face of the interior courtyard, there are currently four retractable doors which disappear into the basement area. The project would replace those retractable doors with french doors with transom arches above. The french doors will match other french doors in that courtyard. Retractables already exist and will be maintained on the southernmost face of the interior courtyard. The LPC was concerned that if the french doors are permitted, the old retractable system would be eliminated. Mr. Marsh stated that the doors and the mechanical system for the doors can and will be retained. Mrs. Vanneck commented that the beauty of the house is the large expanses of plate glass, rather than french doors.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA FOR APPROVAL OF THE CHANGE, WITH THE PROVISO THAT THE DOORS, THE TRACKS, AND THE MECHANISM FOR THE DOORS ARE LEFT IN PLACE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. DOWDLE.

ROLL CALL VOTE:	MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA:	YES
	MRS. DOWDLE:	YES
	MRS. WILKEY:	YES
	MR. PYMS:	YES
	MRS. VANNECK:	NO
	MRS. BLADES:	NO
	MR. PANDULA:	YES

MOTION CARRIED 5-2-0.

H. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #24-00.
Statue
Owner/Applicant: Town of Palm Beach
Address: 360 S. County Road, Memorial Fountain
Project Description: Request approval to place Henry Morrison Flagler statue on the north end of the Memorial Fountain, and other associated changes as presented

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION

The Town requests deferral of this Certificate of Appropriateness request to the August meeting.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA FOR DEFERRAL TO AUGUST.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. WILKEY.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

***Please see "Other Business for more on this subject."**

***

At this point, there was a recess from 10:48 a.m. to 10:57 a.m. at which point the meeting was re-convened.

***

Let the record show that Ms. Veronica Close, Assistant Director of Planning, Zoning & Building, was seated as Mr. Moore had to leave the meeting.

I. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #16-2000, (deferred from May)
Owner/Applicant: State of Florida Dept. of Transportation
Address: Royal Park Bridge
Architect/ Engineer: Florida Dept. of Transportation
E.C. Driver & Associates. Inc.
Project Description: Request approval for replacement of Royal Park Bridge, and other associated changes as presented

There was a motion at the May meeting for deferral to the July meeting.

Mr. Pandula stated that when we left this matter at the May meeting, the LPC requested a cohesive presentation knitting together the suggestions and changes made to the plans, thereby producing one complete set of plans showing all the features of the project updated.

Mr. Joe Borello introduced himself as the Project Manager for the DOT. He was accompanied by Mr. Mario Echagarrua, Consulting Engineer with E.C. Driver, and Mr. Thomas Piotrowski, H2L2

Architects and Planners, and Bill Waddell with Urban Resource Group. Mr. Borello stated that the drawings have been updated as requested by the LPC. He asked Mr. Echagarrua to start from the beginning with the presentation.

Mr. Echagarrua explained that they are attempting to fulfill a promise made to the Town Council that the new bridge would be ready in four years. The temporary bridge is in place. The old bridge is in the process of being demolished. The last part of the project is, of course, construction of the new bridge. The meeting today will serve to provide an update of the project and the drawings.

The bridge is approximately 1100 feet long and 100 feet wide. It is 23 feet up from the water level as opposed to 15 feet with the former bridge. He explained that the Town Council has already approved the vertical and horizontal structure of the bridge. From the West Palm Beach entrance to the bridge, there are 3 spans, the bascule, and then five spans leading over to Palm Beach. The existing light fixtures on the existing bridge will be re-used on the new bridge and more of them will be added. He briefly reviewed the bridge tender's house. Bridge entrance features will be constructed at the West Palm Beach and Palm Beach ends of the bridge. These entrance features will attempt to replicate the 1929 bridge entrance features, but will be slightly wider and taller with lights on top. He showed an aerial view of the existing bridge with certain details noted.

Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza stated that the aerial plan is insufficient. The LPC needs a floor plan of the bridge from the West Palm Beach side to the Palm Beach side, with all traffic lanes, medians, details and grass areas noted. There was some misunderstanding on the part of the applicant as to what information had been requested by the LPC at the previous meeting. Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza stated that the LPC does not need construction or engineering drawings, but needs a floor plan of the entire bridge so the aesthetics are clear and visible.

Mr. Tom Piotrowski discussed the architectural portion of the bridge. It is a taller and wider bridge than the previous bridge, with similar, yet slightly revised entry feature abutments. Look out areas occur at each bridge pier. The look outs are of varying sizes, but all have the same railing features. The bridge will be done in poured concrete and some pre-cast, with textured paint unifying the entire bridge. There was much discussion regarding the barrier wall. It began as a Jersey barrier, but a more preferable barrier was chosen...the Minnesota barrier, which is a 2' high single face barrier wall. Above the 2' of concrete is 8" of space and then a steel railing. The LPC commented that they do not like either the Jersey or Minnesota barriers, and asked whether a Palm Beach barrier can be created. Mr. Echagarrua stated that there is no time to do that. Development of a new barrier could take as long as ten years. Time is of the essence as the bridge has been promised in four years. Mr. Borello stated that the face of the barrier can have different finishes, colorings, etc. in an effort to make it more acceptable. Mr. Piotrowski stated that there is a Columbus barrier being used on a bridge there, which is a lower barrier. The LPC was very interested in investigating this Columbus barrier or any other barrier being used on a bridge.

Mr. Piotrowski showed a new rendering of the bridge tender's house with new details shown. The applicant will return with the roof tiles. Some members felt that the tender's house was too high. The existing bridge tender's house is at least 10' lower in height than the proposed tender's house. Mr. Echagarrua commented that standards for bridge tender's houses have changed over the course of time, and the height of the house is as such in an effort to maintain adequate sight lines of the bridge tender. Mr. Frank commented, in his opinion, that the tender's house could be designed to be shorter. The top windows are supposedly for ventilation, but Mr. Frank suggested that ventilation can come from other sources. Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza reviewed the architectural drawing and the colored rendering of the bridge tender's house, finding that the architectural drawing was so much more a true representation of how it will look.

Let the record show that Mrs. Hoffman left the meeting at this point, 11:30 a.m.

Mr. Pandula commented that today's presentation brings about the same comment as the presentation from last month. He stated that the applicant must "put the pieces together" and present the total bridge with all green areas shown...do a floor plan and pull off the details.

Mr. Bill Waddell of Urban Resource Group reviewed the landscape plan as revised. There is a median on the Palm Beach side of the bridge with a four foot strip on either side of cast stone Herpel type material, and a 5' median lawn area with three urns, cast stone also. As you arrive at the entry features, it would become a continuous full lawn median with annuals. Large live oak or green buttonwood trees will anchor the bridge. Existing Royal Palms will be relocated on the Four Arts property. A new wall will be constructed on the north side of the bridge along the back of the parking lot to help soften the condition and allow the grade to be brought up. No details of the wall were available. On the south side of the bridge, there will be the other anchor tree, sidewalk into the park, lots of trees screening the utility area, and four Royal Palms will be relocated along the water. Mr. Waddell stated that they have been working closely with the Town, with Jorge Sanchez and with the Garden Club relative to the landscaping.

Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza commented that the three planters are strange, and suggested that they be either carried to the end, or eliminated, or be reduced in number to just one. It was questioned whether the median could be done in just grass, thereby eliminating the urns and the cast stone. Mr. Echagarrua stated that there are weight concerns with all grass.

The applicant noted that there will be two urns on the West Palm Beach side, but not in a median.

The LPC reiterated its plea for a drawing that shows all of the details, updated as discussed, from the West Palm Beach side to the Palm Beach side. Mr. Piotrowski stated that he would like to have input from the commission prior to the next meeting so that they do not appear again without having what the commission is looking for. He understands the level of detail the LPC is requesting, and quite nicely stated that they will regard it as an honor to receive approval from the LPC.

Mrs. Polly Earl, Executive Director of the Preservation Foundation, expressed her frustration about what she has heard at this meeting. This is a critical project for the Town as it is a bridge that we will all be looking at for the next 100 years. The LPC must be able to review the details, despite previous Town Council approvals. She asked that the LPC look for mechanisms of communication with the applicant prior to the next meeting so that a professional presentation is ready for the August meeting. She recommended that the LPC contact Tallahassee relative to suggestions regarding the bridge.

Ms. Wendy Victor, resident and urban design professional, supports the concern over the width of the bridge. She proposed that the bridge be designed correctly, even if it takes two more years. She has information in her possession and is willing to share it as to instances where towns have challenged DOT regulations for specific locations. She also questioned the maintenance of the median planting areas.

Mr. Jorge Sanchez supported both Mrs. Earl's and Ms. Victor's remarks. He felt that the new bridge will be a runway into West Palm Beach and Palm Beach, and no one will drive 30-35 mph as has been suggested. He did not care for the urns. He liked the entry piers, but suggested a third pier in the middle. He was also in favor of lowering the bridge tender's house.

Mrs. Earl brought up the 15 parking spaces on the lakefront to the south of the bridge. She asked why they cannot be moved to the south edge of the parcel rather than along the lakefront. The applicant pointed out that the number and location of the spaces has already been approved by the Town Council. The LPC again asked for more landscape camouflage of the parking spaces. Nantucket was cited as a great example for camouflaging parking areas.

It was decided that Mr. Pandula would meet with the DOT representatives prior to the next meeting.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA TO DEFER TO THE NEXT MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. WILKEY.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VI Other Business:

A. Informal Consideration: Memorial Fountain Statue
Advisory to the Town Council relative to placement of a statue of Henry Morrison Flagler at the north end of the Memorial Fountain.

Mr. John Blades presented photographs of the proposed statue via digital photography. The photos showed the statue superimposed on the Memorial Fountain site at the north end.

Mrs. Wilkey commented that in her opinion, the Memorial Fountain is not the correct site for the fountain. She, like other commissioners, felt that the statue would more appropriately be placed in the median eastward of the Flagler Memorial Bridge, or conversely, on the grounds of the Flagler Museum. History would support the placement of the statue in the Royal Poinciana Way median as Flagler's railroad bridge once ended there.

Mr. Blades responded, however, that the Royal Poinciana Way location was contemplated at one time, but the response given to Mr. Blades at that time was that the statue should not intrude on the Bicentennial Eagle, already placed in the median.

Mr. Blades responded that the statue's donor is interested in placing the statue at a prominent location in the Town. He discussed the history of the Memorial Fountain, and commented that the statue seems to fit there.

Though discussion continued about alternative locations and plans for placement, Mr. Randolph reminded the LPC that the Town Council is seeking feedback from the Landmarks Preservation Commission relative to placement of the statue at the Memorial Fountain location only.

Ms. Wendy Victor addressed the LPC stating that her family was one of the six major contributors to the Memorial Fountain. Her opinion was that there was already "enough going on" at the Memorial Fountain location. She preferred the Royal Poinciana location.

After discussion, it was summarized that while the statue is acceptable, it should **not** be placed at the Memorial Fountain location.

Mr. Pyms left the meeting at 12:45 p.m.

B. Clarification relative to telecommunication towers on Town Hall

Representatives from AT&T and West Tower Communications were present, Mr. Ken Ballew and Mr. Mike Julian. Mr. Ballew stated that AT&T requires three antennae at the north end and two at the south end. The Certificate of Appropriateness #22-99, issued for the telecommunication towers, was read into the record by Mr. Frank and again by Mr. Randolph. It approved two towers on the north end of the roof and two towers on the south end, with specific details as to placement.

Mr. Frank stated that the construction drawings submitted for permit show the north antennae on the exterior of the parapet wall, rather than the interior, as was approved. In addition, a Town ordinance requires that other equipment must be able to be co-located with that placed by AT&T.

Mr. Mike Julian stated that if the drawings show the antennae mounted on the outside of the parapet, that is an error in the drawings and it will be revised. Other vendors can co-exist with AT&T, but not in the same location as AT&T's equipment. Any additional antennae, beyond the four already approved, requested by AT&T will have to return to the LPC for approval.

C. 162 Atlantic Avenue - Possible "Under Consideration" status

Mrs. Day did a preliminary review of this property, and it appears that the property is worthy for study for possible landmarking.

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK TO PLACE 162 ATLANTIC AVENUE "UNDER CONSIDERATION" FOR LANDMARK DESIGNATION.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

D. Comments by Polly Earl

Mrs. Earl offered copies of this year's program for the meeting of the National Trust to be held in Los Angeles on October 31-November 5, 2000. Any commission member interested in going can avail themselves of a slightly reduced rate available through the Preservation Foundation.

VII <u>Adjournment</u>:
MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA FOR ADJOURNMENT AT 1:15 P.M.
MOTION SECONDED BY VARIOUS MEMBERS.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be held **Wednesday, August 16, 2000** at 9:00 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, Second Floor, Town Hall, 360 South County Road, Palm Beach.

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					
Elizabeth Dowdle	U	P	P	P	P	P	P					
Sari M. Wilkey	P	P	P	P	P	P	P					
Jacqueline Albarran de Mendoza	P	P	E	P	P	P	P					
Ann Vanneck	P	P	P	P	P	P	P					
Ann Blades	P	P	P	P	P	P	P					
Jack Pyms	see below-----			P	P	U	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					
Judy Hoffman	P	P	P	P	E	P	P					
Jack Pyms	P	P	P	(appt. as regular member)								
Laurel Baker	n/a	n/a	n/a	E	P	P	P					

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 COUNT ORIGINA DECLARED CONFLICT FOR ONGOING PROJECTS PER JOHN C. RANDOLPH, TOWN ATTORNEY)