TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Planning, Zoning & Building Department

MINUTES
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JULY 18, 2007 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 9:03 a.m. by Acting Chairman Hanley.

II **ROLL CALL:**

PRESENT: William Lee Hanley, Vice Chairman & Acting Chairman
Patrick Segraves, Secretary
Robert Eigelberger, Member
Eileen Bresnan, Member
Hazel Rubin, Member
Charles S. Roberts, Member
Dudley L. Moore, Jr., Alternate Member (Voting Member today)
Wallace Rogers, Alternate Member
John C. Randolph, Town Attorney
Veronica B. Close, Director of Planning Zoning & Building
Timothy M. Frank, Planning Administrator
Jane S. Day, Staff Preservation Consultant
Cynthia M. Delp, Recording Secretary

ABSENT: Eugene Pandula, Chairman (Unexcused)
D. Imogene Willis, Alternate Member (Unexcused)

III **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 20, 2007 MEETING:**
MOTION BY MR. MOORE FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SEGRAVES.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

V **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:**
MOTION BY MR. EIGELBERGER TO APPROVE THE AGENDA.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BRESNAN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Post Office Box 2029 • 360 South County Road • Palm Beach, Florida 33480
Telephone: (561) 838-5430 • Facsimile (561) 835-4621
E-Mail: pzb@townofpalmbeach.com • Website: www.townofpalmbeach.com

Recycled Paper

VI **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**: None

VII **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

At this point Mr. Hanley mentioned that Item B has been withdrawn at the applicant's request. As such, action was taken regarding Item B, out of order on the agenda.

B. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #18-2007(deferred from June)
Driveway relocation
Owner/Applicant; Mr. and Mrs. David Koch
Address: 150 South Ocean Boulevard
Architect: Thomas M. Kirchhoff, AIA, P.A.
Project Description: Request approval of landscape/hardscape and driveway relocation which is further described as: Relocate driveway from alley to Clarke Avenue. Relocated driveway will simplify access to gated service court. Other associated changes as presented.

At the June meeting, this matter was deferred to the July meeting at the request of the architect.

MOTION BY MR. EIGELBERGER TO REMOVE ITEM B FROM THE AGENDA AS IT HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN AT THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SEGRAVES.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #10-2007 (deferred from April, May & June)
Owner/Applicant: Royal Poinciana Chapel
Address: 58 and 60 Cocoanut Row
Architect: SKA Architect & Planner, Ms. Jacqueline Albarran
Project Description: Request approval for restoration, addition to historic structure, and landscape/hardscape which is further described as: A two-story addition to the Seagull Cottage to match existing in detailing and style. Addition of new turret reminiscent of the original removed turret. The Cottage also needs to be raised by one foot to correct drainage problems. A one story covered walkway connecting the Cottage to the Chapel is also proposed. The existing wood siding will be replaced by "Hardi" planks simulating the existing. The wood shingle roof will be replaced with high profile asphalt shingles to match existing. Existing wood windows and doors will be replaced with custom made hurricane impact wood windows and doors to match existing. An addition to the existing columbarium located near the South property line. The addition will match the existing columbarium architecture. The applicant is also seeking approval of a new garden area West of the Chapel and South of the Cottage. Other associated changes as presented.

Please note that at the April meeting there was a motion to defer the project for 30 days to allow time to work with the Chapel; to visit the site; and to allow time for the applicant to do a mock up of the project with the shingles clearly shown.

At the May meeting, there was a motion to approve CoA#10-2007 with the Hardi-board and the

shingles as submitted, given the new policy of the LPC with regard to use of non-original materials; and that the applicant is to return with paint color, windows, and a roof sample at the next meeting; and that the building will be raised one foot prior to commencement of reconstruction; and, that the Seagull Cottage will be landmarked in perpetuity. It is noted that the motion does not include approval of the windows at this time. It is further noted that the roof material approved is wood shingles, as presented, rather than the asphalt shingles originally requested. It was also noted that the columbarium was not included in the approval.

Please note that at the June meeting, this matter was deferred to the July meeting at the architect's request.

Jacqueline Albarran, Architect, returned to the LPC today with the roof, window, and color samples. The roof shingles will be thick wood shingles made of pressure treated cedar. The roof material is projected to have a life of 30-50 years. Mrs. Albarran noted that the entire roof will be replaced with this material.

Mr. Eigelberger recalled that pressure treated materials had typically been treated with arsenic which would have a negative effect on landscaping surrounding the cottage. He wondered if arsenic was still being used. Mr. Frank did not believe that the use of arsenic in the pressure treating process was still ongoing. Mrs. Albarran will check on this.

Mr. Segraves stated that the original roof was more of a dimensional shingle than a shake shingle. Mrs. Albarran responded that while this may be true, they are doing an in kind replacement. She commented that dimensional shingles are typically thinner. Mrs. Day supported the in kind replacement of the roof material.

Regarding the windows, Mrs. Albarran reminded the LPC that she had originally requested metal clad windows. The applicant, however, would like approval for solid mahogany or mahogany windows with aluminum cladding. She had brought samples of both types of windows, which appeared very similar. The windows will be impact windows and will be white, regardless of the material. All doors will be solid mahogany.

Several members expressed a preference for all wood windows. Mrs. Day registered her preference for all wood as well, but noted that other historic projects, both in town and elsewhere, have used aluminum clad windows. Mr. Moore felt that if both window types are essentially the same in appearance, the applicant should be give the option to use either type.

MOTION BY MR. MOORE FOR APPROVAL OF EITHER SOLID MAHOGANY WINDOWS OR MAHOGANY WINDOWS WITH METAL CLADDING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTS.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Regarding exterior color of the cottage, Mrs. Albarran stated that the congregation has voted to approve a color. Color choices brought to the congregation were taupe, grey, yellow, and a soft green. The soft green was the overwhelming choice of the church body. The green is from the Benjamin Moore historic palette. Mr. Frank remarked that Benjamin Moore was in business in the time that the cottage was constructed, and as such, their historic palette is authentic for this structure.

Mrs. Bresnan commented that the green looks like a northern color. Mrs. Albarran reminded the LPC that the cottage is a Victorian house brought from the North. Mr. Eigelberger added that the

green color was used prevalently in the Addison Mizner era. Mr. Segraves and Mr. Eigelberger felt the soft green was a beautiful color.

Historically, Mrs. Albarran stated that the cottage has been blue grey, white, and Flagler yellow. Mr. Moore felt that the change to the green is too significant a change. Mr. Roberts favored one of the previous historic, traditional colors, especially since the LPC has acquiesced to allow Hardiboard and aluminum clad windows on the cottage.

Mrs. Albarran replied that the color has already changed at least three times, and the green, which will fade to an even softer green, was the overwhelming choice of the congregation. Mr. Eigelberger recalled that when the Royal Poinciana Plaza was once painted taupe, it looked terrible. He likewise felt that the green will fade quickly and it is a natural color.

MOTION BY MR. EIGELBERGER TO APPROVE THE SOFT GREEN.
MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

Mrs. Bresnan commented that the green will make the cottage look too "new." Mr. Roberts re-stated his opposition to the green color. Mrs. Rubin asked Mrs. Albarran if she could "grey the green" a bit more. Mrs. Albarran indicated that she would like to return to the LPC with a greyer green.

Mr. Brian La Rue, a member of the Board of Directors of the Royal Poinciana Chapel, stated that the Chapel needs to move forward with the painting. He asked that the matter not be deferred.

MOTION BY MR. ROBERTS TO APPROVE TAUPE OR ONE OF THE HISTORICAL COLORS FROM THE COTTAGE'S PAST.

Mr. Segraves suggested that the Cottage be painted a different tone of the same color to further distinguish the historic Seagull Cottage from the Chapel building. Mr. La Rue reversed his earlier statement by requesting a deferral for one month.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BRESNAN.

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT THE COMMISSION WAS SPLIT ON THIS MOTION. A ROLL CALL VOTE SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE, BUT WAS NOT REQUESTED AS THERE WAS AN IMMEDIATE SUBSEQUENT MOTION FOR DEFERRAL OF THE COLOR.

MOTION BY MR. ROBERTS TO DEFER THE COLOR FOR ONE MONTH.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. MOORE.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY MR. SEGRAVES TO APPROVE THE ROOF MATERIAL AS PRESENTED, (THICK WOOD SHINGLES MADE OF NON-POISONOUS, PRESSURE TREATED CEDAR), TO BE USED ON THE ENTIRE COTTAGE BUILDING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BRESNAN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. La Rue asked if the Chapel decides to go with solid mahogany windows, could they have the latitude to either stain the wood or paint it white. Mr. Eigelberger discouraged the use of stain

since staining will greatly increase the maintenance issues related to the windows.

Mr. Frank reported that he had spoken with Jorge Sanchez relative to the landscaping and columbarium. As design changes are not yet completed, a deferral was in order.

MOTION BY MR. SEGRAVES TO DEFER THE LANDSCAPE AND COLUMBARIUM.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. EIGELBERGER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #20-2007
Restoration
Owner/Applicant: RD of Palm Beach Inc.
Leslie Robert Evans, Esq.
Address: 204 Brazilian Avenue
Architect: David Miller and Associates, P.A.
Project Description: Request approval for restoration, sign, awning, windows, doors, lighting, and exterior color change, which is further described as full renovation of the exterior including new clay barrel tile roof, exterior stucco repair and repainting, replacement of existing windows, doors and storefront, new awnings, new signage, new exterior lighting, and other associated changes as presented

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION:
Mrs. Rubin spoke with the owner by phone. Mr. Roberts met with Les Evans at the building. Mr. Rogers visited the site.

Architect David Miller presented this project for exterior modifications to the Daily News Building. He displayed photos of the building from the 1930s. He noted that the building has been painted with different colors numerous times over the years.

As part of the renovation, the roof will be changed to clay barrel tile, which is an in kind replacement. The exterior will be re-painted from the existing cream stucco with peach trim to a mustard color (Benjamin Moore) with white/cream trim. The trim items include all outriggers, window sills, and cast stone treatments. There will be widespread storefront changes at the first floor level. At the corner of South County Road and Brazilian Avenue, the existing window will be changed to a pair of French doors, taking this entrance opening back to the original. The new doors will actually be aluminum, wide French doors which are in contrast to the original wood French doors. Other existing French doors on the building, now deteriorated, will be replaced with new aluminum French doors as well. All metals on the building will be white. Awnings will be dark green canvas Sunbrella shed-style awnings on rigid frames. They will occur on the first floor only. At the front entry, carriage lamps will be introduced, similar to the lamps on the original building. These lamps will also be placed on the north facade and at the garage. On the garage, which is currently used for storage, the existing garage door will be removed and replaced with a storefront. Lighting, positioned adjacent to the soffits, will be introduced to shine light down on the face of the building. These soffit fixtures are small unobtrusive fixtures, 4" in diameter and 8" tall. They will be finished either in natural copper or will be painted to match the facade of the building.

Mr. Frank noted that there is a pre-approved signage style for this building. Mr. Miller explained that the same approach will be used for the signage, but the colors will be adjusted to a green background with cream letters.

Mr. Eigelberger pointed out that the small downlights (20 watt max.) will not provide very much light and will be difficult to change since they are up so high. He was not in favor of painting the outlookers, rafters, and the overhang, feeling that they should be left natural. Mr. Miller replied that this is a renovation, not a restoration. .

Mr. Frank stated that staff has some concerns about the down lighting of the building. As such, staff would like a deferral of the lighting to allow for more research. Mrs. Day agreed. She saw no need for the down lights. She also noted that outriggers were never painted historically, and should be allowed to age naturally. Mrs. Day was in favor of restoring the original corner entrance. She had some concerns about aluminum windows on the second floor. She noted that the Preservation Foundation has a facade easement on this property.

Mr. John Ripley of the Preservation Foundation stated that he had met with the owner and his design team. While he was in favor of most of the project, he found the use of aluminum windows questionable. While it might be acceptable on the first floor windows, he wanted to see wood windows on the second floor level.

Mr. Miller clarified that the three French doors on the second level are the only openings which will be changed. The second floor white windows, now aluminum, will remain. Mr. Eigelberger noted, however, that the new French doors are proposed to have single lites in comparison to the original doors which had divided lites.

Mr. Segraves stated he was inclined to approve the use of aluminum windows and doors, but he wanted to see a sample of the door. He, like Mr. Eigelberger, preferred doors with divided lites. He noted that the rafters, soffit, and fascia should not be painted, and recommended a stain instead. Mr. Miller replied that it would have to be a natural opaque stain. As for the lites in the doors, Mr. Miller stated that a single lite door is already in place on the building, and invited the members to go see it at their convenience. Mrs. Rubin also recommended that the upper level French doors should have lites. Mr. Miller responded that if the doors must have lites, he would want them to have a raised muntin profile.

Mr. Hanley felt that the use of wood (natural mahogany) on the upper level would greatly enhance the building. While Mr. Miller agreed that wood is preferable, the inherent maintenance issues are the problem. Mr. Segraves commented that aluminum would be fine with a nice muntin pattern.

Mr. Frank re-stated staff's recommendation for a deferral of the lights. He thanked the property owner for giving this building the attention it deserves. Mr. Frank stated that all approvals are subject to the approval of the Preservation Foundation, in light of the Preservation Foundation's facade easement.

MOTION BY MR. EIGELBERGER TO APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH THE EXCEPTION AND DEFERRAL OF THE FOLLOWING: THE LIGHTING, THE FRENCH DOORS (SAMPLE TO BE BROUGHT TO LPC-ALUMINUM WITH DIVIDED LITES), AWNING DESIGN ,AND COLOR SAMPLE OF OUTLOOKERS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. RUBIN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

D. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #21-2007
Rooftop wireless antenna facility
Owner/Applicant: Breakers Palm Beach, Inc.
Verizon Wireless
Address: 1 South County Road
Architect/Engineer: Kimley-Horn and Associates
Project Description: Request approval for stealth rooftop wireless antenna facility which is further described as: The application is a request by Verizon Wireless to install a total six (6) exterior stealth panel antennas at the Breakers Hotel. Antennas to be placed as follows: Two (2) antennas to be situated facing north on the north tower, two (2) antennas to be situated facing south on the south tower and two (2) antennas to be situated facing east on the south tower. Antennas measure 70.9 inches in length, 3.9 inches in width and 2 inches in depth. The antennas and cables are to be painted to match the exterior color of the existing building. In addition the request seeks approval for the placement radio cabinet equipment to be situated within a two hundred square foot area located in the interior attic space of the hotel. Equipment associated with the installation will not be visible to the general public and is confined to the interior of the building. Other associated changes as presented.

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION: None declared

This project was presented by Jason Laskey, Project Manager, and he was attended by Mark Fairchild, Engineer. Ms. Jospehine Condi from Verizon was also present.

Mr. Laskey noted a correction to the description. The (2) antennas situated facing east on the south tower will really be on the north tower. Mr. Laskey explained that the antennas, since they will be painted to match the building, will not be noticeable to the general public. The antennas will serve to improve cellular service on the island. Mr. Laskey noted that the antennas have received approval from the State of Florida Division of Historical Resources (SHPO).

Mr. Eigelberger questioned the need for the antennas on the Breakers, suggesting that perhaps a higher Singer Island location would be better. Mr. Laskey responded that the Breakers site is essential for adequate coverage on the island.

Mrs. Day stated she had met with Mr. Alex Gilmurray at the Breakers to review this project, and she had also spoken with a representative from the State of Florida, SHPO office relative to the project. She reminded the LPC that the Breakers was placed on the National Register in 1973, and that status is what triggered review by the State. Mrs. Day noted that while the State approved the project, they did place certain conditions on that approval. She read those conditions into the record, as outlined in the letter from the State. Mrs. Day gave her opinion that the project was a good installation which will benefit cellular phone use in the Town.

Mr. Eigelberger expressed his preference that a variety of cell phone companies be able to operate cooperatively using the same equipment. Mr. Frank explained that cell phone equipment, though reported to be able to function together with the equipment of another carrier, has been problematic in our experience. It was noted that another cell phone carrier will appear before the LPC next month to place their antennas on the Breakers as well.

MOTION BY MRS. BRESNAN FOR APPROVAL, WITH CONDITIONS, AS SPECIFIED IN THE LETTER FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA (SHPO). MOTION SECONDED BY MR. EIGELBERGER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VIII **OTHER BUSINESS:**

A. Informal Review: In association with Variance #24-2007
270 Queens Lane

Request approval for new one-story cabana/garage, new pool, hardscape and landscape

Michael Perry returned to the LPC today because the applicant is now seeking a variance for setback. Mr. Perry noted that the LPC had approved the project for the main house and the cabana several months ago without the variance. When the Building Department discovered that the variance was needed for the project as drawn, the matter returned to the LPC with a different design, avoiding the need for a variance. The LPC ultimately suggested that the applicant might seek the variance for a better project, which brings the matter to today's informal review.

MOTION BY MR. SEGRAVES TO RECOMMEND TO THE TOWN COUNCIL THAT THE PROJECT DESIGN WHICH INCLUDES THE VARIANCE REQUEST IS THE BEST SOLUTION FOR THE SITE.

Prior to a vote, Mr. Frank asked Mr. Perry if the neighbor's concerns have been resolved. Mr. Perry's response is as follows: "That was resolved. There is no problem with the driveway as proposed...in the meeting I think Bob had stated to talk to Public Works and they have no problem with the driveway whatsoever."

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. EIGELBERGER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. Informal Review: In association with Variance #26-2007
4 Golf Road

Request approval of new pool with landscape and hardscape to replace existing pool, landscape and hardscape

Mario Nievera, Landscape Architect, presented this informal review. He explained that the existing pool, already located in the setback, is actually walled off from the living room, and persons do not approach the house properly with the existing layout. The proposal is to remove the existing pool and replace it with a long, linear lap pool (40 ft. x 12 ft.), with two sets of steps. The pool will be centered on the dining room's pair of French doors. With the new configuration, the owners will have a prettier view of the pool/garden area, and the landscaped area will increase from 39% to 45%.

Mr. Frank and Mrs. Day did not feel that enough of a hardship exists to merit the variance, but aesthetically speaking, the project has no negative impact to the landmarked house. Mr. Randolph reminded the commission that the Town Council evaluates hardship issues, and the LPC's responsibility is to provide an opinion to the Town Council regarding the aesthetics of the variance and its impact to the landmark.

While most members agreed that the proposal would enhance the property, Mr. Eigelberger thought the pool was too big for the house; that he would like to see the pool parallel to Golf Road, along with creation of a courtyard; and, that he would like to see another alternative with a

more narrow pool and increased green space around the entry to the house. Mr. Moore clarified that the pool will only be 12 feet wide, not 20 feet wide as some of the commissioners were saying. After further discussion, the following motion was made:

MOTION BY MR. MOORE RECOMMENDING TO THE TOWN COUNCIL THAT THE PROJECT DOES NOT NEGATIVELY IMPACT THE LANDMARK.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTS.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. Confirmation of November LPC Meeting Date

It was confirmed that the November meeting of the Landmarks Commission will be held on November 28, 2007, one week later than normal, due to the Thanksgiving holiday.

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

Mr. Eigelberger mentioned that the Slat House has been painted a different color without LPC approval. Mr. Frank responded that it is "under consideration" for landmarking, and would need LPC approval, but staff is looking forward to resolving this issue with the property owner, along with all of the other issues relative to the Royal Poinciana Plaza.

****

Ms. Close reported that the Royal Poinciana Area Planning Study was approved by the Town Council to include the Royal Poinciana Plaza and a few adjacent streets. The focus of the study is to determine ways to revitalize and/or enhance the area. The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council will serve as consultants for the project. More updates will follow.

*****

Ms. Close reported that the Town has prevailed in the Royal Poinciana Plaza lawsuit.

*****

Ms. Close mentioned that the LPC had asked staff to look at member absences and how to deal with them. She requested additional time to research this further, and suggested that the LPC might want to consider formalizing a deferral policy. Mr. Frank noted that ARCOM has a "three strikes and you're out" policy, whereby on the third deferral, there would have to be a really good reason to substantiate the deferral. Absent that good reason, the matter could be removed from the agenda, and the applicant would have to re-apply.

Mr. Moore commented that if people know that two (2) deferrals are automatic, they will work according to that schedule. He did not necessarily agree with the ARCOM policy. He also felt that if the applicant was not present to request even the first deferral, the item should be removed from the agenda.

Mr. Frank clarified that deferrals are not granted by staff, and always need a motion for deferral. Ms. Close stated that with the Town Council, requests for deferral which are received at least one week in advance are always approved. For deferral requests received less than a week in advance, the applicant is advised to be present at the Town Council meeting.

Mr. Hanley felt that one deferral request was reasonable, but on the second deferral request, the applicant should know that he will have to make his case for deferral at the LPC meeting. Applicants should know that a third deferral will most likely not be granted. It was also clarified that applicants should be present at the LPC meetings to request any and all deferrals, and that failure to appear will result in the item being removed from the agenda.

In summary, the members agreed that applicants need to be present to request deferrals; that the first deferral would most likely be granted; that a request for a second deferral requires justification; and, that a third deferral will likely not be granted.

*****

Mrs. Bresnan noted that it was mentioned earlier that ARCOM uses a lighting consultant to advise them on lighting issues. She questioned whether this could apply to the LPC as well. Ms. Close replied that staff is assembling a policy for ARCOM relative to lighting. When it is developed, staff can present it to the LPC as well.

X **ADJOURNMENT:**

MOTION BY MR. EIGELBERGER TO ADJOURN AT 11:08 A.M.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. MOORE.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be held on Wednesday, August 15, 2007 at 9:00 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, second floor, 360 South County Road, Palm Beach, Florida.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Segraves, Secretary
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

cmd

TOWN OF PALM BEACH **ATTENDANCE RECORD 2007**
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

MEMBERS	1/07	2/07	3/07	4/07	5/07	6/07	7/07	8/07	9/07	10/07	11//07	12/07
Eugene Pandula	_P__	_P__	_E__	_P__	_P__	_P_	_U_	____	____	____	____	____
Judy Hoffman	_P__	_P__	_(no longer a member)___					____	____	____	____	____
Patrick Segraves	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	____	____	____	____	____
Wendy Victor	_P__	_P__	_(no longer a member)___					____	____	____	____	____
William Lee Hanley Jr.	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	____	____	____	____	____
Robert Eigelberger	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	_E__	_P_	____	____	____	____	____
Eileen Bresnan	_U__	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	____	____	____	____	____
Hazel Rubin			_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	____	____	____	____	____
Charles S. Roberts			_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	____	____	____	____	____

ALTERNATE MEMBERS	1/07	2/07	3/07	4/07	5/07	6/07	7/07	8/07	9/07	10/07	11//07	12/07
Gail L. Coniglio	__P_	(Elected to the Town Council)										
Hazel Rubin	__P_	__P_	(Promoted to regular member)									
D. Imogene Willis	__P_	__P_	_P__	__P_	__P_	__P_	_U_	____	____	____	____	____
Dudley L. Moore			_P__	_U_	__P_	__P	__P_	____	____	____	____	____
Wallace Rogers			_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	_P__	____	____	____	____	____

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

TOWN OF PALM BEACH **RECORD OF VOTING CONFLICTS 2007**
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

MEMBERS	1/07	2/07	3/07	4/07	5/07	6/07	7/07	8/07	9/07	10/07	11//07	12/07
Eugene Pandula	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Judy Hoffman	___	___	(No longer a member)									
Patrick Segraves	___	_V__	VPD1	VPD1	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Wendy Victor	___	___	(No longer a member)									
William Lee Hanley Jr.	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Robert Eigelberger	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Eileen Bresnan	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Hazel Rubin			___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Charles S. Roberts			___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

ALTERNATE MEMBERS	1/07	2/07	3/07	4/07	5/07	6/07	7/07	8/07	9/07	10/07	11/07	12/07
Gail L. Coniglio	___	(Elected to the Town Council)										
Hazel Rubin	___	___	(Promoted to regular member)									
D. Imogene Willis	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Dudley L. Moore	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Wallace Rogers	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

LEGEND:

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