TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Planning, Zoning & Building Department

MINUTES
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
9:00 a.m., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 1996
AT THE TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 360 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD, PALM BEACH

I. CALL TO ORDER

The June 19, 1996 meeting of the Town of Palm Beach Landmarks Preservation Commission was called to order at 9:00 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 360 South County Road, Palm Beach, Florida by Chairman Jeffery W. Smith.

II. ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Jeffery W. Smith, Chairman
Eugene Pandula, Secretary
Jacqueline Albarran de Mendoza, Member
Arthur Silverman, Member
Harrison M. Robertson Jr., Member
Lindley M.F. Hoffman, Member
Jane R. Grace, Alternate Member
Elizabeth Shields, Alternate Member
Sari M. Wilkey, Alternate Member
Timothy M. Frank, Planner/Projects Coordinator
Robert L. Moore, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building

ABSENT: Joanna Frost-Golino, Vice Chairman
John C. Randolph, Town Attorney

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gretchen Dayton
TRANSCRIBED BY: Tammy Fairchild
EDITED BY: Cynthia M. Delp

Mr. Frank referenced a letter from Mrs. Robert M. Grace written to Cindy Delp and dated May 27, 1996. Mr. Frank read the letter into the record stating that she would be missing the July and August meetings as she would be out of town. It was requested that staff pass this letter on to the Town Manager's Office. These absences are unexcused.

Mr. Frank referenced another letter from Joanna Frost-Golino to Mr. Robert Doney with the subject matter as "Excused Absence from Landmark Commission meeting of June 19, 1996. Mr. Frank read the letter into the record, which stated that she would be unable to attend the meeting due to a death in the family. This absence is excused.

Post Office Box 2029 • 360 South County Road • Palm Beach, Florida 33480 • (407) 838-5430

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 1996 MEETING:

MOTION BY MR. HOFFMAN TO APPROVE THE MAY 15, 1996 MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION.

Mr. Robertson stated that on page 11 of the minutes it was stated that there was an agreement that verbiage be added to the LPC application that a presenter before this Commission be an individual under the direct supervision of an architect or an individual employed or compensated by an architect. Mr. Robertson did not recall any agreement and felt that there was some discussion regarding a dollar amount that might trigger the necessity of an architect.

It was pointed out that there was a dollar amount specified in the ordinance. Mr. Moore stated that nothing precluded an owner from coming to any of the Commission meetings, however, the question related more to the requirements of an architect to prepare the drawings.

Mr. Robertson questioned what would happen if a general contractor or a builder did the drawings. Mr. Moore stated that if it was required to have an architect to prepare the plans then the Commission would want the architect to make the presentation. The owner could make a presentation, depending on their level of skill, however, they risk a deferral if a question is asked by the Commission that cannot be answered by the owner. Mr. Robertson stated that he agreed that it should be an architect that would present plans, but felt it should be open to the owner if they had the necessary expertise. Mr. Moore pointed out that it was very rare to find a general contractor that had the skills or the seal. Mr. Moore stated that the rules that are made have to apply to all and could not make exceptions for some general contractors.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SILVERMAN.
MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF 6-1-0, WITH MR. ROBERTSON CASTING THE NAY VOTE AS HE DID NOT AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT IN THE MINUTES.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. 16-96, RENOVATIONS TO RESIDENCE.

Owner/Applicant: Mr. C. C. Wang
Address: 640 South Ocean Boulevard
Architect: Smith Architectural Group
Project Description: Request approval of the following:

1. Approval of revisions to all facades
2. Two minor two story additions
3. New spa
4. Revise landscaping and site walls
5. Exterior color change
6. Other associated changes as presented

Chairman Smith had previously declared a Conflict of Interest with respect to this matter. It was reported that there was a request from the Architect for removal of the landscaping and site walls from the agenda today. These items will be submitted for review in the future.. This matter was deferred from the March, April, and May meetings. The motion made at the April meeting was as follows: "Motion by Mr. Hoffman to approve the project with the condition that the south elevation garage addition and infill be re-studied and re-submitted in 1/4" scale, that the fourth window above the garages, on the north elevation, is deleted, and also deferring the landscaping and the site walls to the May meeting."

The motion made at the May meeting was as follows: "Motion by Mr. Pandula for approval of the plans as revised, with the exception that the three window grouping is restored to the plan at the sleeping porch area. Also, motion by Mr. Pandula to defer the landscaping and site walls."

MOTION BY MR. PANDULA TO REMOVE THE REQUEST FOR LANDSCAPING AND SITE WALLS FROM THE AGENDA.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. HOFFMAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. <u>APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. 25-96, MISCELLANEOUS CHANGES</u>.

Owner/Applicant: Paramount Partners
Address: 139 North County Road
Architect: David R. Miller, AIA
Project Description: Request approval of the following:

1. Cast stone at grade level planters
2. Cast stone at main entry
3. Exterior door replacement - courtyard
4. Railing replacement
5. Deck/roof-reroof and cast stone installation
6. Planter replacement at roof deck
7. Courtyard common area furnishings
8. Other associated changes as presented

Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza had previously declared a Conflict of Interest with respect to this matter.

This matter was deferred from the May meeting with the following motion: "Motion by Mrs. Frost-Golino approving the project as presented, excepting the metal railing details which are to be brought back to the LPC for review (drawing and mock up), and excepting the cast stone at the main entry of the auditorium until such time as the anticipated signage is ready for review."

Mr. Frank stated that the architect for this project has requested a deferral to the next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

MOTION BY MR. HOFFMAN TO DEFER THIS ITEM TO THE JULY MEETING.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SILVERMAN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #28-96, SHUTTERS.
Owner/Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Michael Fawcett
Address: 196 Banyan Road
Architect: Brower Architectural Associates
Project Description: Request approval of new wood shutters with raised panels to function as decorative hurricane shutters, and other associated changes as presented.

Architect Raphael Saladrigas of Brower Architectural Associates addressed the Commission and stated that originally the house did not have shutters, however, wooden shutters were appropriate for houses of this era. The focus would be primarily on the windows which would allow the shutters to be placed easily. The windows, where the decorative stonework occurs, would not receive shutters.

Mr. Saladrigas presented photographs of the existing house, but had no drawings showing shutters on the house. Mr. Saladrigas stated that he was told by staff that drawings showing the shutters would not be necessary.

Ms. Albarran de Mendoza stated she saw a problem with not having drawings since some windows would not have shutters, however the one next to it would have a shutter. Ms. Albarran de Mendoza stated her concern that the house was not designed for shutters and felt that a lot of the windows would not be able to have shutters.

Mr. Smith stated that he agreed and felt that the architect should present elevations of the house with shutters compared to the house without shutters. Mr. Smith stated he questioned the style of shutters, and felt that the whole elevation of the house should be studied.

Ms. Albarran de Mendoza stated that usually houses with shutters are very formalized where all the windows are in line, however, this typical Spanish house has the windows all at different heights and it would be important to see how the facade is affected by shutters.

Mr. Saladrigas agreed, however, pointed out that houses in this era had shutters. Mr. Smith stated that this is a major change to a landmark house and felt that it was important for the Commission to see drawings in order to make a decision.

Members of the Commission felt that there would be very few windows that would be suitable for shutters. Mr. Saladrigas stated that the shutters were being considered for hurricane protection and that there are approximately 72 windows and doors in this house. Half of these windows would require shutters.

Mr. Frank stated that staff did mention to Mr. Saladrigas that he could return with a representative of one of the windows with the shutters. Staff understood that the owner needed hurricane protection and did not want to hold this effort up.

Mr. Smith stated that the owner could always put removable shutters up for hurricane protection and the Commission was not delaying that effort. The Commission is merely delaying the change in the design of the house. Mr. Smith stated that the petitioner has not demonstrated to him what the house is going to look like once the shutters are installed.

Ms. Shields questioned how the windows not shuttered would be treated for hurricane protection. Mr. Saladrigas stated that some of the windows would be protected from inside the house and the rest of the windows would have cutouts similar to the shutters seen.

It was the consensus of the Commission that the architect present elevation drawings of each facade showing the proposed shutters.

MOTION BY MR. PANDULA TO DEFER THE PROJECT TO THE JULY MEETING WITH THE PROVISION THAT THE ARCHITECT PRESENT ELEVATION DRAWINGS OF EACH FACADE INDICATING EACH WINDOW OPENING AND ITS PARTICULAR SHUTTER CONFIGURATION, AND THAT THE OWNER MAY PURCHASE REMOVABLE SHUTTERS FOR HURRICANE PROTECTION WHICH WOULD NOT NEED THE LANDMARK COMMISSION'S APPROVAL.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

D. APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #29-96, MISCELLANEOUS CHANGES.

Owner/Applicant: Via Parigi Properties c/o The Everglades Club
Address: 347 Worth Avenue
Architect: Brower Architectural Associates
Project Description: Request approval of the following:

1. Add barrel tile roof over existing third floor balcony, with wood columns and wrought aluminum railing.
2. Add balcony on second floor with french doors
3. Other associated changes as presented.

Architect Raphael Saladrigas of Bower Architectural Associates addressed the Commission and stated that they are proposing to change the facade by adding french doors, a balcony and adding columns and a tile roof over the third floor balcony. Mr.

Saladrigas stated that this balcony and doors were taken from a pre-existing parts on the other side and the windows would remain as they were with removal of the shutters.

Mr. Saladrigas stated that the ground floor is still retail and the second and third floor are still apartments. The Everglades Club felt that they wanted to embellish the property a little more to make it more rentable, feeling that the other elements of the Via Parigi Properties were more charming. They were having difficulty renting the space and felt these changes would assist in their efforts.

Ms. Albarran de Mendoza stated that on the third floor she noted three french doors in the drawings and was told they were not existing. Mr. Saladrigas stated they were using the sample of the balcony as an example to recreate at the other end.

There was a discussion of the drawings that were presented and Mr. Saladrigas detailed proposed changes so the Commission understood the exact changes that were to be made. There was discussion regarding the height and pitch of the new roof line and Mr. Saladrigas stated that the proposed change would not be higher than the present height.

Mr. Smith asked if any members of the Commission had been contacted by the owner/architect. Mr. Smith stated that he was contacted by Architect Raphael Saladrigas, and filed an exparte communication declaration form. Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza also disclosed exparte communication and filed the appropriate form.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA TO APPROVE THE REQUEST AS PRESENTED WITH THE PROVISO THAT THE PETITIONER COME BACK AND SHOW THE DETAILS OF THE SECTION OF THE ROOF SUCH THAT IT WORKS AS SPECIFIED, STARTING AT THE EXISTING EAVE LINE AND GOING NO LOWER THAN 3 AND 12 PITCH BECAUSE IF NOT, BARREL TILE WOULD NOT WORK; AND THAT THE DETAILS BE PRESENTED ALONG WITH DETAILS OF THE RAILINGS AND THE COLUMNS AND THE COLOR CHIP OF THE BUILDING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. HOFFMAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

E. <u>APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #30-96, AWNINGS</u>.
Owner/Applicant: E.R. Bradley's
Address: 280 Sunset Avenue
Contractor: American Awning Company
Project Description: Request approval of the following

1. Recover existing awnings on west windows
2. Enlarge north patio awning - 1'9" to west, 2' to east and 2' to north (Columns to remain in same position/colors to match existing)
3. Other associated changes as presented

Mr. Smith stated that he did speak to Gail Coniglio regarding the project. Mrs. Wilkey stated she also spoke to Gail Coniglio. The appropriate exparte communication disclosure forms are on file.

Todd Moran of American Awning Company presented drawings of the proposed changes to the Commission and stated that Bradley's wanted to create an overhang for rain protection. The proposal is to come out 1'9" to the west additional and 2' to the north and 2' to the east. Mr. Moran stated that the columns all remain the same, as well as the glass and colors and the only change is the creation of the overhang.

Mr. Frank stated that the petitioner did not need a variance as long as the columns remain in the same location, however, he tried to get in touch with Mr. Moran as the drawings submitted did not meet the code as it showed the columns in a different location than they are presently located. Mr. Frank stated that the drawings would have to be brought into conformance with the code. Mr. Frank stated that he has not seen the drawing that Mr. Moran is now presenting and added that the cantilever that goes two feet or less into the setback is legitimate and would not need a variance.

Mr. Frank stated that normally this would be a staff approval, however, he felt that this should come to the Commission because the owner is expanding.

Mr. Moran presented photographs and a color swatch for the Commission's review. Mr. Moran stated that the existing awnings have been on the building for 10 years and it is time to replace them and the owner felt that at this time he would like to create the overhang for rain protection at the same time.

MOTION BY MR. HOFFMAN TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

F. <u>APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #31-96, MISCELLANEOUS CHANGES</u>.
Owner/Applicant: Ms. Leta Austin Foster
Address: 64 Via Mizner
Architect: Joseph Dixon
Project Description: Request approval of the following:
(Changes in conjunction with remodeling of third floor apartment)

1. Install residential elevator on northwest corner of building
2. Enlarge windows on east elevation
3. Install new metal fire escape to replace existing
4. New awnings on east facade windows-awnings to be french blue/white stripe
5. New door on ground floor to access elevator to third floor
6. New french doors with sidelites-third floor north elevation
7. New exit door-second floor north elevation
8. Other associated changes as presented

Sari Wilkey reported ex parte communication with the architect and filed the appropriate form. .

Architect Joe Dixon addressed the Commission and stated that the generating reason behind the request is that the owners wanted to take the third floor, which at present is not used, and turn it into an apartment for occupancy by the owners themselves. Currently the ground floor is retail space, the second floor is the owners' interior design office and the third floor would be the apartment. They propose to take the north facade and add an elevator on the northwest corner of the building that would go to the third floor and would negate a fire door in two locations. The owners propose to redesign the fire escape and add the french doors, which would also bring light into the north facing room that would be the living room of the new apartment. These french doors would serve as the secondary fire exit for the third floor. Plans also include the replacement and restoration of the windows that presently exist and the replacement of the windows in the overhanging bay as it is thought that these windows were not part of the original building, but were added in the 1950's.

The owners want to restore the existing windows and replace those that cannot be restored, exactly the same way, and are therefore asking for awnings on the north and east side for sun and rain protection. The awnings currently on the first floor would be replaced with the same as proposed on the third floor, french blue & white striped..

Mr. Dixon stated that the fire marshal has been out for inspection and there is a question as to whether or not they need a new fire exit on the second floor. Staff and the fire marshal disagree, and the fire marshal did not think it was needed. Mr. Dixon stated there is an internal stairway which gives the owners the second fire exit in addition to the fire stair at the south end of the building. If the new fire door is not needed, they would not change the second floor facade at all.

Mr. Dixon presented photographs of the existing building. Mr. Dixon stated they plan to put central air on all three floors which would enable them to get rid of all the window air conditioners, as well as all the drain pipes that are going down the face of the building.

Mrs. Leta Foster stated that they would like to have the same signs as before. Mr. Frank stated there were two alternatives on the signage. There is a pre-approved sign for Via Mizner and they could install that or they could come back with what they had in Phipps Plaza and do a short presentation to the Commission. It was decided that the petitioner would come back with the presentation for signage. Mrs. Foster stated that she would like to go to a soft blue for the windows.

Members of the Commission were pleased with the proposed changes to the building. Mrs. Foster stated that she would like to come back to the Commission for approval for a new design for the existing fire escape. Mr. Dixon stated that they are using a residential elevator that did not require a house.

MOTION BY MR. ROBERTSON FOR APPROVAL OF THE PETITION AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SILVERMAN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY..

There was a discussion regarding the seating for the Commission and it was pointed out that the architects making presentations be informed if all Commission members could not see plans being presented.

G. APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #32-96, MISCELLANEOUS CHANGES.

Owner/Applicant: Dr. and Mrs. Raymond Tronzo
Address: 255 Clarke Avenue
Architect: Popper & Associates
Project Description: Request approval of the following:

1. Remove old outside wall a/c units from front and east facades, and replace with new wall units. New wall units will sit on the ground.
2. Remove and replace trees at east side front door. New trees to be palms to match those on west side of front door
3. Remove one new doorway-west side of house and re-open original doorway to recreation room. New door to be french door similar to doors in via.
4. Remove sliding glass doors on west side of house at recreation room, and create smaller single hung aluminum window with muntin bars. Replace existing awning window (south of sliding glass doors) with single hung aluminum window with muntin bars
5. Replace damaged door on north side of recreation room with new fixed french door. Create new opening in north wall for new french door to match other doors
6. Replace plastic window in recreation room with enlarged aluminum picture window painted white
7. Create sunken, grassed courtyard north of main house in existing area which is now concrete. Courtyard to have Spanish/Moorish design elements with tiles to match pool & cabana tile
8. Remove insensitive addition enclosing the via on the southwest corner of the house to restore it to its original condition. Restore french doors leading to it from the dining room to glass instead of mirror
9. Other associated changes as presented.

It was pointed out that upon review of the drawings, some of the proposed changes did require a variance, mainly the covered walkway that goes from one building to an accessory structure. The Commission could hear all of the requested changes, except for the portion that required a variance.

Dr. Tronzo presented slides of the existing building and detailed explanations of what was being shown. Dr. Tronzo stated that the new a/c units being proposed are the new smaller units that are the size of an overhead luggage compartment. On the east side of the house, the a/c unit has also been replaced by the new unit described above.

Dr. Tronzo pointed out that the dead tree is being replaced with palm trees to match with the other side of the house. On the west side of the house, inside a via, the door will be removed and replaced with a wall and restored to original design. The slider to the window would be removed and restored to the original design.

Dr. Tronzo stated that the plastic window inside the house would be replaced with an enlarged window. Dr. Tronzo discussed the false wall around the west side of the house and presented the original drawings. Dr. Tronzo stated that they wanted to restore this area so the door would open onto the via.

Dr. Tronzo stated that the plans also call for the removal of the round top windows with french doors that are not covered with mirror.

Dr. Tronzo stated that the biggest problem with the house is the backyard as when water falls into an area with stone blocks, water comes into the loggia. Last year, a foot of water entered the loggia.

Landscape Architect David Keir of Seminole Bay Landscape Company presented landscape plans of the sunken courtyard which would act as a retention pond. The elevation difference between the courtyard and the loggia is approximately 1-1/2 inches, which causes a problem with water back flowing into the house. There are historical elements in the house that will continue to be damaged if this problem is not corrected. Mr. Keir proposed a sunken courtyard in the center of the area, using a classical form, sunken approximately 18" to form a retention pond. The drainage would be funneled into this area from all sides and there would be resurfacing on the areas next to the loggia, the pool and the barbecue cabana. The water would be funneled into the sunken courtyard where it will be picked up by a drainage system. Mr. Keir stated that there would be percolation field under the grass to the center of the sunken courtyard that would be surrounded by trench drains that would feed west between the house and the garage into an existing sunk pit with a pump that would feed out into the storm drainage system of Palm Beach.

Mr. Keir stated that new system would allow the property to hold a large volume of water in the sunken area in the case of a major storm event and could handle the water secondly with a sump pump. Additionally, Mr. Keir presented a sample of the tile that would be used on the riser steps on three sides of the courtyard. Each of the three sides leads to a use area - the pool, the barbecue and the loggia. On the east side of the house there is an existing 6 foot high concrete wall that has aged and requires no changes. The existing outdoor lighting and irrigation systems will remain intact. The historical features of the patio, such as the well and some of the minor concrete details around the edge, will be preserved in place.

In response to a member of the Commission, Mr. Tronzo stated that the windows in the house are all aluminum, except in the front of the house. Mr. Tronzo stated he did not have an objection to installing wood windows throughout, as was advocated by Mr. Pandula..

MOTION BY MR. PANDULA TO APPROVE THIS APPLICATION AS PRESENTED, EXCEPT FOR THE PORTION THAT WOULD REQUIRE A VARIANCE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SILVERMAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

H. <u>APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #33-96, MISCELLANEOUS CHANGES TO RETAIL AREAS.</u>
Owner/Applicant: Breakers Palm Beach, Inc.
Address: 1 South County Road
Architect: Peacock & Lewis Architects and Planners, Inc.
Project Description: Request approval for upgrade and new storefronts including aluminum frames, plaster and paint to both the existing north and south retail areas, and other associated changes as presented.

Mr. Steve Pollio, Architect with Peacock & Lewis Architects and Planners, Inc., addressed the Commission and stated they are requesting amendments to the west elevation on two particular areas of the south portion, south of the porte cochere. The outer exterior is not being changed. The interior portion of the building, the loggia, in response to a sensitive vocabulary with regard to the Italian Renaissance, presents the responsibility to this high profile building, of maintaining aesthetics as much as possible. In trying to achieve this, this particular elevation contains an existing arched window facade. They propose to maintain the existing arch, repair existing moldings as they exist and introduce the anodized framed windows. Mr. Polium stated that 90% of the hotel has been changed to the anodized framed window system.

In response to the further elevation which is in direct relationship to that arch, they maintain the existing vertical column and have researched the original 1925 drawings as to the original railing in place at that point. The metal railing on the balcony was removed somewhere during renovations and they propose to bring the metal railing back, mimicking exactly what the 1925 drawings showed as to railing details..

Mr. Polium explained that arches could not be used in all areas because of the elevations of the building. Mr. Polium stated that the gourmet shop will no longer be there and the clothing shop on the other corner would be affected.

Mr. Jerry Wygant, Vice President of Flagler Systems, addressed the Commission and stated that the stores that are impacted are the drug store, what was a coffee shop, the floral studio that will all come back in renovated fashion. Mr. Wygant stated that a gourmet coffee shop will be brought back for guests. A swimwear store would be brought in to replace an existing swimwear store.

Mr. Moore stated that the Flagler System currently has a Planned Unit Development for all of the property with the Town of Palm Beach. It was initiated and agreed upon in 1974/1976. This has been an ongoing process with the Flagler System and they have been in for modifications to this Planned Unit Development which involves the commercial space which is the subject of this request in front of the Town Council. The Town Council has previously approved the existence of this space and the building of the new space. The Landmarks Preservation Commission's jurisdiction, by agreement with the Flagler System under the Planned Unit Development Agreement, is the west facade of the structure known as the Breakers Hotel. That is the only area that is landmarked at the Breakers Hotel by agreement with the Town. The Commission's comments regarding areas to the north and south will be taken into consideration by the Flagler System, but their jurisdiction only involves the west facade.

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

Mr. Moore pointed out that Mr. Wygant was the benefactor through Mr. Keenan for the Town's Preservation Celebration yesterday and thanked them for their generosity.

I. <u>APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #34-96, MODIFY WINDOWS AND DOOR</u>

Owner: Bustani Building, Ltd.
Applicant: Galaxy Grill, Limited
Address: 350 South County Road
Architect: The Lawrence Group Architects
Project Description: Request approval to modify windows by removing mullions, and to remove door at north elevation and replace with new french door, and other associated changes as presented.

Architect Eugene Lawrence, representing Galaxy Grill, addressed the Commission and presented photographs of the area from the County Road and north side of the existing building. Mr. Lawrence also presented photographs of the existing mullions and stated that they want to take out the mahogany mullions on the ground floor. Mr. Lawrence stated that they would also like to change the awnings on the building and pointed out that the awnings are very bulbous and inconsistent with what the owner is proposing to do inside the building. The owner would like an awning that is a simple shed awning with a lip that would go up inside the arch at the windows.

Mr. Lawrence stated that there are two square arches at either end and the arches in the center are round. The owner felt that using the simple shed awning complimented both configurations and ties the building together. The color of the awnings would be navy blue.

Mr. Lawrence stated the existing north door would change to a french door to match the two front doors on the east elevation.

It was pointed out by Staff that this building was in a historic district, but the building is a non-contributing building. Therefore, the Commission had some additional latitude in its review process.

In response to a member of the Commission regarding parking problems, Mr. Lawrence stated that the owner has obtained leases for additional parking one street over from this location.

MOTION BY MR. HOFFMAN FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED, WITH THE PROVISO THAT THE AWNINGS BE SQUARE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Informal Review: 345 South County Road
Replace step treads from poured concrete to cast concrete

No representative was in attendance to present this to the Commission. Mr. Smith stated that if this was conceptual it could be handled at next month's meeting. Mr. Smith stated that when he reviewed the file it was not much of a visual change and could be handled by a staff approval.

B. Discussion relative to historic districts

Jane Day addressed the Commission and stated she had two items. One was correspondence with Michelle Clarke Royal who would like to put her house under consideration. The address for this house was 277 Pendleton. Ms. Day stated that she had been to the property which was designed by John Volk in 1930 and felt that it met the criteria as far as architecture and as a representation of John Volk's work, however, there is a need for this to be studied. Ms. Day stated that she was asking the Commission to approve a study over the summer so it could be placed on a fall agenda for landmarking.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA THAT STAFF SHALL STUDY 277 PENDLETON AVENUE FOR LANDMARKING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SILVERMAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

(THIS MOTION PLACES THIS PROPERTY "UNDER CONSIDERATION" FOR LANDMARK DESIGNATION.)

Ms. Day stated there has been some interest on Pendleton Avenue to make a historic district on Pendleton. Because the Town received a grant from the State of Florida last November to study the developmental history of the Town, staff has been waiting to have that study started and completed before they see exactly where it would be appropriate to put historic districts in Town.

The process of the State government is slow in working. Ms. Day stated that staff has received the contract back from the State and it has been signed as far as the Town of Palm Beach is concerned and has been sent back to Tallahassee. Ms. Day reported staff is now waiting for George Percy, Director of Historical Resources, to execute the contract. At that time staff can proceed with the study.

Ms. Day stated that she has done a little preliminary work and there are 164 plats within the Town of Palm Beach from 1900 to 1996 and they will be looked at in chronological order. Staff will be looking at the developmental history, beginning with the 1900 Root subdivision. When staff gets to Pendleton they will know exactly what was happening with the architects, the developers, the people that were building there and why it came about. Staff will be better able to attribute that district to the criteria in the ordinance. Ms. Day felt once the study is done the Commission will be better educated to proceed with where the districts should be, how many contributing resources there are in each particular district and how they want to go about the landmarking process.

Ms. Day stated that her research on Pendleton Avenue revealed most of the well known architects in Palm Beach from the 1930's have built there. Ms. Day stated that it is a very interesting street, but before the Commission decides to proceed with the district, she felt they needed to have all the necessary information in order to make the correct decision.

Ms. Day felt that landmarking should not be shoved down people's throats and felt that the district studies should be as in detail as individual studies because the burden in the future will be for the Landmarks commissioners to approve Certificates of Appropriateness. Therefore, the Town will have to know where these properties fit in, and to have the architecture documented so it is known where to go in the future for any renovations that may come to the Commission.

Ms. Day stated that over the summer if the Commission members hear from residents that they are interested in landmarking they can talk to either members of the Commission, Mr. Frank or herself. The agenda is getting full for the 1996/1997 season because staff is proceeding with the Golf view houses one at a time and a number of carry overs from the Town Council that were deferred until the Fall.

Mr. Frank stated that in addition to what Ms. Day stated there is another grant in process where the Town's Preservation Plan that was approved by this Commission within the last two years will be rewritten under a state grant and incorporated into the Town's Comprehensive Plan. Staff believed this would make the Town's LPC Ordinance the strongest ordinance in the State.

Ms. Day stated that the Preservation Foundation has been very active in educating the residents on Pendleton Avenue regarding the values of landmarking, however, Ms. Day felt that staff needed to see the study first to see exactly what was there and what's not. Ms. Day stated that she would hate to propose a district that had too little representation and felt that there needed to be a commonality within the district. Otherwise, Ms. Day felt it would be better to go for landmarking on an individual property basis right now. At a recent Certified Local Government meeting in Orlando, Ms. Day stated it was obvious to her that the difference with Palm Beach and other places in the State of Florida is that they do not have an Architectural Review Commission. Other cities are using districting to do what ARCOM does for Palm Beach and Ms. Day felt that Palm Beach was in a little better position than other cities.

Ms. Day stated that Palm Beach is the only municipality in the State to win a Preservation Award for its program and thought it was because everything is well documented and it proceeds the way it does.

Mr. Moore stated that it is with great regret that Jane Grace will not be here in July and August, and pointed out that the ordinance states that is an automatic removal. Mr. Moore stated that Mrs. Grace served the Town well for many years and he will personally miss her and her history of the Town, as well as this Landmarks Commission and the residents of the Town not to have that expertise available. Mr. Moore thanked Mrs. Grace for her services.

Mr. Smith asked if the Town Council could review Mrs. Grace's record. Mr. Moore stated that it was considered an automatic removal once you miss two meetings in a row. In response to Mr. Smith, Mr. Moore stated she could be reappointed at a subsequent date.

IV. <u>PUBLIC HEARINGS: (CONTINUED)</u>

It was decided that Mr. Raphael Saladrigas could come back with his petition for review of decorative shutters.

MOTION BY MR. ROBERTSON TO RECONSIDER HEARING ITEM COA #28-96.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SILVERMAN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Saladrigas stated that he now had elevations of the proposed shutters and pointed out that the majority of windows on the front elevation are decorative arched. The front door, the small one-foot eight doors over the entrance and the window towers would not receive shutters. The only windows receiving shutters are those that are felt to be able to accept them readily.

Ms. Albarran de Mendoza questioned the windows on the left and the fact that they could only hold one shutter because they were so small. Ms. Albarran de Mendoza did not feel that visually one shutter would work.

Mr. Smith stated that he questioned any shutters on this facade and felt that it totally altered the frontispiece over the front door. Mr. Smith felt the proportions were wrong. Mr. Hoffman agreed with Mr. Smith's opinion. Mr. Smith felt that the shutters were making the house look like a farm house rather than a grand Palm Beach estate.

Mr. Saladrigas stated that the owner of the house was the owner of a polo team and he likes the Argentina look and felt that he has seen these shutters on a number of occasions and that it was appropriate on Mediterranean houses.

Mr. Saladrigas presented elevations showing shutters on the other sides of the house. Mr. Smith stated that the elevations showed a lack of proportion. Mr. Smith felt that a house is either designed to have shutters or not to have shutters.

Mr. Saladrigas stated that the owner wants the shutters and felt they were needed for hurricane protection. Mr. Moore stated that the owner was not being precluded from having hurricane protection and could have removable shutters.

Mr. Hoffman felt that from the point of view of the ease of working with the shutters, when you consider the owner would have to get up on a ladder to put up the colonial shutters it would not be much harder to put up removable shutters from the garage. Ms. Albarran de Mendoza felt that it would be a lot less expensive to get the other shutters than it would be to get the permanent shutters.

Ms. Albarran de Mendoza stated that some buildings are originally designed for shutters and it makes sense to have them. However, she felt that this was one of the cases where shutters did not make sense because every window has a different look.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA THAT THIS APPLICATION NOT BE ACCEPTED FOR WOODEN SHUTTERS AND THAT THE OWNER WOULD BE ALLOWED TO HAVE HURRICANE SHUTTERS USING REMOVABLE PIECES LIKE MOST OF THE LANDMARKED HOMES AT THE MOMENT.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. HOFFMAN.

Mr. Robertson felt that the owner needed hurricane protection, however, the Commission was here to preserve the landmark much the way it was in the beginning.

Mr. Pandula stated that the shutters alter completely the character of the architecture of the front facade of the house and felt the only logical location for shutters was on the west side of the house above the garage.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The reconfiguration of the seating was discussed and it was decided that the seating would stay as it has been.

Mr. Frank stated that Wes Blackman was in attendance earlier and he wants to be heard for the tennis pavilion at the Mar-a-Lago Club. Mr. Frank stated that he had a short discussion with him and asked if the Commission remembered the yin yang detail that was wrapped all the way around the building. Apparently it is becoming cost prohibitive to produce that much of it and he wanted that detail to be removed on two sides. Mr. Blackman asked if he could be heard today and Mr. Frank informed him that he would have to request being heard from the Chairman. Obviously for some reason Mr. Blackman had to leave the meeting. Mr. Frank felt it was major because it was the ornamentation of the structure all the way around and they were asking for it to be removed on 2 of the 4 elevations. Mr. Frank felt that the Commission should see a presentation before discussing the issue.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MR. ROBERTSON TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:50 A.M.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SILVERMAN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be held at 9:00 a.m. on **Wednesday, July 17, 1996** in the Town Council Chambers, Town Hall, 360 South County Road, Palm Beach, FL.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene Pandula, Secretary
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

gd/tf/cmd

TOWN OF PALM BEACH

ATTENDANCE RECORD (1996)
With New Members

MEMBERS	1/96	2/96	3/96	4/96	5/96	6/96	7/96	8/96	9/96	10/96	11/96	12/96
Jeffery W. Smith	P	P	P	P	P	P						
Joanna Frost-Golino	P	P	P	P	P	E						
Eugène Pandula	P	P	P	P	P	P						
J.Albarran de Mendoza	P	P	P	P	P	P						
Arthur Silverman	P	P	P	P	P	P						
Lindley Hoffman	n/a	n/a	P	P	P	P						
Harrison Robertson	n/a	n/a	P	U	P	P						

ALTERNATES	1/96	2/96	3/96	4/96	5/96	6/96	7/96	8/96	9/96	10/96	11/96	12/96
Jane R. Grace	E	P	P	P	P	P						
Elizabeth Shields	U	P	P	P	P	P						
Sari M. Wilkey	ñ/a	n/a	P	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 (1996)
With new members

MEMBERS	1/96	2/96	3/96	4/96	5/96	6/96	7/96	8/96	9/96	10/96	11/96	12/96
Jeffery W. Smith	V3	VPD1 V2	VPD4	VPD3	VPD4	VPD1						
Joanna Frost-Golino												
Eugene Pandula	V1	VPD1	VPD1	VPD1	VPD1							
J. Albarran de Mendoza		V1	VPD1		V1	VPD1						
Arthur Silverman												
Lindley Hoffman												
Harrison Robertson												

ALTERNATES	1/96	2/96	3/96	4/96	5/96	6/96	7/96	8/96	9/96	10/96	11/96	12/96
Jane R. Grace		V1										
Elizabeth Shields												
Sari M. Wilkey												

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 ORIGI DECLARED CONFLICT FOR ONGOING PROJECT PER JOHN C. RANDOLPH, [illegible]WN ATTORNEY)

FORM 8B MEMORANDUM OF VOTING CONFLICT FOR COUNTY, MUNICIPAL, AND OTHER LOCAL PUBLIC OFFICERS

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME SMITH, JEFFERY	NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE LANDMARK PRES. Com
MAILING ADDRESS 241 SANFORD AVE	THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: X CITY [ ] COUNTY [ ] OTHER LOCAL AGENCY
CITY: PALM BEACH — COUNTY: FL, PB	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: Town of P.B
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED 6/19/96	MY POSITION IS: [ ] ELECTIVE X APPOINTIVE

MINUTES

Conflict Previously Declared

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

This form is for use by any person serving at the county, city, or other local level of government on an appointed or elected board, council, commission, authority, or committee. It applies equally to members of advisory and non-advisory bodies who are presented with a voting conflict of interest under Section 112.3143, Florida Statutes. The requirements of this law are mandatory; although the use of this particular form is not required by law, you are encouraged to use it in making the disclosure required by law.

Your responsibilities under the law when faced with a measure in which you have a conflict of interest will vary greatly depending on whether you hold an elective or appointive position. For this reason, please pay close attention to the instructions on this form before completing the reverse side and filing the form.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

ELECTED OFFICERS:

A person holding elective county, municipal, or other local public office MUST ABSTAIN from voting on a measure which inures to his special private gain. Each local officer also is prohibited from knowingly voting on a measure which inures to the special gain of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he is retained.

In either case, you should disclose the conflict:

PRIOR TO THE VOTE BEING TAKEN by publicly stating to the assembly the nature of your interest in the measure on which you are abstaining from voting; *and*

WITHIN 15 DAYS AFTER THE VOTE OCCURS by completing and filing this form with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

A person holding appointive county, municipal, or other local public office MUST ABSTAIN from voting on a measure which inures to his special private gain. Each local officer also is prohibited from knowingly voting on a measure which inures to the special gain of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he is retained.

A person holding an appointive local office otherwise may participate in a matter in which he has a conflict of interest, but must disclose the nature of the conflict before making any attempt to influence the decision by oral or written communication, whether made by the officer or at his direction.

IF YOU INTEND TO MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION PRIOR TO THE MEETING AT WHICH THE VOTE WILL BE TAKEN:

- You should complete and file this form (before making any attempt to influence the decision) with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who will incorporate the form in the minutes.
- A copy of the form should be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form should be read publicly at the meeting prior to consideration of the matter in which you have a conflict of interest.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION OR VOTE AT THE MEETING:

- You should disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You should complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

DISCLOSURE OF STATE OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Jeffery W. Smith, hereby disclose that on 6·19, 1996:

(a) A measure came or will come before my agency which (check one)

___ inured to my special private gain; or

✓ inured to the special gain of C. C. Wang, by whom I am retained.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my interest in the measure is as follows:

Voting Conflict Previously declared Re: CoA # 16-96
640 S. Ocean Blvd.

6·19·96

Date Filed

Signature

NOTICE: UNDER PROVISIONS OF FLORIDA STATUTES §112.317 (1985), A FAILURE TO MAKE ANY REQUIRED DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR AND MAY BE PUNISHED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION FROM OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT, DEMOTION, REDUCTION IN SALARY, REPRIMAND, OR A CIVIL PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED $5,000.

FORM 8B MEMORANDUM OF VOTING CONFLICT FOR
COUNTY, MUNICIPAL, AND OTHER LOCAL PUBLIC OFFICERS

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME de MENDOZA ULBARRAN, JACQUELINE	NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE Town of Palm Beach Landmarks Preservation Comm
MAILING ADDRESS 204 PHIPPS PLAZA	THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: [ ] CITY [ ] COUNTY [ ] OTHER LOCAL AGENCY Town
CITY COUNTY PALM BEACH, FL 33480	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: Town of Palm Beach
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED ~~5/15/96~~ 6/19/96	MY POSITION IS: [ ] ELECTIVE X APPOINTIVE

MINUTES ~~MEMBER~~

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

This form is for use by any person serving at the county, city, or other local level of government on an appointed or elected board, council, commission, authority, or committee. It applies equally to members of advisory and non-advisory bodies who are presented with a voting conflict of interest under Section 112.3143, Florida Statutes. The requirements of this law are mandatory; although the use of this particular form is not required by law, you are encouraged to use it in making the disclosure required by law.

Your responsibilities under the law when faced with a measure in which you have a conflict of interest will vary greatly depending on whether you hold an elective or appointive position. For this reason, please pay close attention to the instructions on this form before completing the reverse side and filing the form.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

ELECTED OFFICERS:

A person holding elective county, municipal, or other local public office MUST ABSTAIN from voting on a measure which inures to his special private gain. Each local officer also is prohibited from knowingly voting on a measure which inures to the special gain of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he is retained.

In either case, you should disclose the conflict:

PRIOR TO THE VOTE BEING TAKEN by publicly stating to the assembly the nature of your interest in the measure on which you are abstaining from voting; *and*

WITHIN 15 DAYS AFTER THE VOTE OCCURS by completing and filing this form with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

A person holding appointive county, municipal, or other local public office MUST ABSTAIN from voting on a measure which inures to his special private gain. Each local officer also is prohibited from knowingly voting on a measure which inures to the special gain of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he is retained.

A person holding an appointive local office otherwise may participate in a matter in which he has a conflict of interest, but must disclose the nature of the conflict before making any attempt to influence the decision by oral or written communication, whether made by the officer or at his direction.

IF YOU INTEND TO MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION PRIOR TO THE MEETING AT WHICH THE VOTE WILL BE TAKEN:

- You should complete and file this form (before making any attempt to influence the decision) with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who will incorporate the form in the minutes.
- A copy of the form should be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form should be read publicly at the meeting prior to consideration of the matter in which you have a conflict of interest.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION OR VOTE AT THE MEETING:

- You should disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You should complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

DISCLOSURE OF STATE OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, JACQUELINE ALBARRAN de MENDOZA, hereby disclose that on 5/15, 1996:

(a) A measure came or will come before my agency which (check one)

____ inured to my special private gain; or

____ inured to the special gain of ______________________, by whom I am retained.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my interest in the measure is as follows:

MY HUSBAND, MARIO G. de MENDOZA III IS THE ATTORNEY OF RECORD FOR PARAMOUNT PARTNERS (CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. 25-96)

Also for continuation of hearing related to this item 6/19/96.

5/15/96

Date Filed

Signature

NOTICE: UNDER PROVISIONS OF FLORIDA STATUTES §112.317 (1985), A FAILURE TO MAKE ANY REQUIRED DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR AND MAY BE PUNISHED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION FROM OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT, DEMOTION, REDUCTION IN SALARY, REPRIMAND, OR A CIVIL PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED $5,000.

DATE: 7-1-96

RE: CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. ______

STREET ADDRESS: Bradleys Restaurant

ITEM FOR LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING ON: 6/19/96

NOTE: This form is to record disclosures of the following information regarding authorized ex-parte communications in quasi-judicial matters relating to Town of Palm Beach Council, its Commissions and Boards, pursuant to Town Resolution No. 21-95, which was adopted by Town Council at its July 11, 1995 meeting:

1. Name of individual who has communicated with a Commission Member: ______

2. Name ~~of~~ person or group whom the individual represents: ______

3. Content of communication: When Gail Coniglio came to say hello - I stated that an overhang on patio awning would be great.

4. Circle one: Commission Member contacted individual
   Individual contacted Commission Member
   Not planned - conversation while having lunch

5. Site visit conducted on: Date of lunch 6/10/96

6. Other disclosure information: ______

NAME: Sara M. Wickey

TITLE: alternate - Landmark Preservation

DATE: 6·19·96

RE: CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. 29-96

STREET ADDRESS: 347 WORTH AVE

ITEM FOR LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING ON: 6·19·96

NOTE: This form is to record disclosures of the following information regarding authorized ex-parte communications in quasi-judicial matters relating to Town of Palm Beach Council, its Commissions and Boards, pursuant to Town Resolution No. 21-95, which was adopted by Town Council at its July 11, 1995 meeting:

1. Name of individual who has communicated with a Commission Member: KEN BROWER, RALF SALADREGIS

2. Name of person or group whom the individual represents: VIA PARIGI PROPERTIES

3. Content of communication: PREVIEW PLANS

4. Circle one: ~~Commission Member contacted Individual~~
   Individual contacted Commission Member

5. Site visit conducted on:

6. Other disclosure information:

NAME: JEFFREY W. SMITH

TITLE: CHAIRMAN

DATE: 6/19/96

RE: CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. 29-96

STREET ADDRESS: 347 WORTH AVENUE

ITEM FOR LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING ON: 6/19/96

NOTE: This form is to record disclosures of the following information regarding authorized ex-parte communications in quasi-judicial matters relating to Town of Palm Beach Council, its Commissions and Boards, pursuant to Town Resolution No. 21-95, which was adopted by Town Council at its July 11, 1995 meeting:

1. Name of individual who has communicated with a Commission Member: KEN BROWER

2. Name of person or group whom the individual represents: BROWER ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATES REPRESENTING VIA PARIGI PROPERTIES c/o EVERGLADES CLUB

3. Content of communication: PRESENTED ENTIRE PROJECT CHANGES

4. Circle one: Commission Member contacted individual
   Individual contacted Commission Member

5. Site visit conducted on: ± WEEK BEFORE MEETING

6. Other disclosure information: NONE

NAME: JACQUELINE ALBARRAN

TITLE: COMMISSION MEMBER

DATE: 6·19·96

RE: CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. 30-96

STREET ADDRESS: ~~295 [illegible]~~ 280 SUNSET

ITEM FOR LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING ON: 6·19·96

NOTE: This form is to record disclosures of the following information regarding authorized ex-parte communications in quasi-judicial matters relating to Town of Palm Beach Council, its Commissions and Boards, pursuant to Town Resolution No. 21-95, which was adopted by Town Council at its July 11, 1995 meeting:

1. Name of individual who has communicated with a

   Commission Member: GAIL CONIGLIO

2. Name of person or group whom the individual represents:

   E.R BRADLEYS

3. Content of communication: TO EXPLAIN· CHANGES

4. Circle one: Commission Member contacted individual

   ~~Individual contacted Commission Member~~

5. Site visit conducted on: 6·17·96

6. Other disclosure information:

NAME: JEFFERY W. SMITH

TITLE: CHAIRMAN

DATE: 6/19/96

RE: CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. 31-96

STREET ADDRESS: 64 Via Mizner

ITEM FOR LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING ON: ______

NOTE: This form is to record disclosures of the following information regarding authorized ex-parte communications in quasi-judicial matters relating to Town of Palm Beach Council, its Commissions and Boards, pursuant to Town Resolution No. 21-95, which was adopted by Town Council at its July 11, 1995 meeting:

1. Name of individual who has communicated with a Commission Member: Joseph Dixon

2. Name of person or group whom the individual represents: Mr. Leta Austin Foster

3. Content of communication: Walked around building & showed location of elevator & french doors

4. Circle one: Commission Member contacted individual

   Individual contacted Commission Member

   Chance meeting!

5. Site visit conducted on: 6/19/96

6. Other disclosure information: ______

NAME: Sam M. Wesley

TITLE: alternate