TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Planning, Zoning & Building Department

MINUTES
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2005 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 9:02 a.m. by Chairman Pandula.

II **Roll Call:**

PRESENT:
Eugene Pandula, Chairman
Ann Blades, Vice Chairman
Wendy Victor, Secretary
Ann Vanneck, Member
Jack Pyms, Member
Judy Hoffman, Member
Patrick Segraves, Member
William Lee Hanley Jr., Alternate Member
Robert T. Eigelberger, Alternate Member (arrived 9:04 a.m.)
Eileen L. Morris, Alternate Member
John C. Randolph, Town Attorney
Robert L. Moore, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building
Timothy M. Frank, Planning Administrator
Jane Day, Staff Preservation Consultant

ABSENT: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Cynthia M. Delp

III **Approval of the Minutes of the December 15, 2004 Meeting**:
MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BLADES.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

IV **Administration of the Oath to all persons who wish to testify**: By Mrs. Delp

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

V **Public Hearings:**

A. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness # 22-2004, Reconstruction (deferred from October, November & December 2004)

Owner/Applicant: Robert Echele & Robert Gease

Address: 143 Clarendon Avenue

Architect: Lee Kvarnberg

Project Description: Request approval of the following:

This is a reconstruction of an "as built" landmarked accessory structure, garage, using the same building materials with respect to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation and reconstruction. The owners are using the same footprint. Other associated changes as presented.

Please note this matter was discussed informally at the August meeting. At the October meeting, there was a motion to defer this project to the November meeting, with the request for a peer review of the structural engineer's report, with the understanding that the cost for such a review is to be paid by the applicant. At the November meeting, there was a motion for deferral for re-study with the suggestion to take back to the client that the architect reconstruct the original Fatio plans, and if an addition is desired, it must be appropriate. At the December meeting, there was a motion to defer the application to the January meeting with the understanding that the owner would have a complete set of construction drawings, (based on the Fatio design as closely as possible and meeting today's building codes), presented to the Building Department prior to the January LPC meeting; and, that the LPC would approve the demolition and reconstruction upon satisfactory review of those plans.

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION

Mrs. Victor met with the architect. Mrs. Hoffman met with the architect. Mrs. Vanneck drove by and looked at the property. Mr. Segraves had a telephone conversation with the architect. Mrs. Morris spoke with the architect by phone. Mr. Pandula spoke with the architect by phone.

There was no one present on behalf of this project. Mr. Frank read a letter into the record from the architect, Mr. Lee Kvarnberg, wherein he states that his client "has directed me to not present at the 1-19-05 meeting and to withdraw this project." Mr. Frank stated that staff recommends for deferral rather than removal due to the code issues concerning this project. A deferral would offer additional time to confer with the architect and property owner.

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK TO DEFER TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING. MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BLADES.

Mrs. Victor asked that the plans be available at the Building Department at least two weeks prior to the meeting to give ample review time. Mr. Frank stated that generally the Town has plans on file two weeks prior to the meeting, but it has also been the practice of staff to allow acceptance of revised plans up to the date of the meeting, because quite often architects meet with commission members and make suggested changes as a result of those meetings. Staff must then be sure that the correct drawings are presented at the meeting, and are on file.

Mr. Frank stated that the architect had submitted three different architectural concepts prior to this meeting. Mr. Pandula added that the plans submitted do not respond to the LPC's request made in the December motion. As such, he questioned whether a letter should be written to the owner. Mr. Frank felt that was a good idea and asked for a motion to direct staff to write the letter.

At this point, there was a very lengthy discussion about whether to defer the project, deny the project, or withdraw the project. Mr. Randolph wondered whether a denial would be more appropriate than a deferral. Mr. Pandula responded that with this building, they have proceeded beyond demolition by neglect and have actually done constructive demolition to accommodate the engineering reports. The owner is afraid of liability issues concerning the building, yet his drawings are still a potpourri of various ideas. On the surface it would appear that the owner is simply requesting to withdraw the project, yet he has taken measures which worsens the condition of the original building.

Mrs. Vanneck defended her motion for deferral stating that it would provide the owner additional time to reflect on the subject, and allow for continued conversation to see what might happen at the next meeting. Mr. Eigelberger advocating removing the item from the agenda.

MOTION WITHDRAWN BY MRS. VANNECK.

Mr. Randolph did not feel removal from the agenda was appropriate as this is normally an option when someone has not gone forward with their plans. In this case, however, the applicant has been before the LPC and is in the middle of his application. While he understood Mrs. Vanneck's reason for having made the motion for deferral, he told the LPC that they were within their rights to deny the project as the applicant has not provided the plans which were requested the previous month, and because the applicant has elected not to be present at this meeting for a further presentation. Mr. Randolph recommended denial or deferral. Mr. Moore agreed with Mr. Randolph for denial of the project.

Ms. Maia Farish of the Preservation Foundation supported the option for denial as the applicant had not supplied the requested drawings at last month's meeting either.

Mr. Pandula recommended that the LPC protect themselves by corresponding with the owner to the effect that the building needs to be stabilized until he owner decides what he wants to do. Mr. Pandula was amenable to either denial, deferral or removal.

Mr. Moore noted that the Town's contracted engineer states that the building needs work. He urged the LPC to take action on the architect's last statement in the letter, and that was to "withdraw" the project, or deny or defer.

MOTION BY MRS. HOFFMAN TO ACCEPT THE OWNER'S REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL AND TO DIRECT STAFF TO WRITE A LETTER TO THE OWNER.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VICTOR.
MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH MRS. VANNECK VOTING AGAINST.

B. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #23-2004, Landscape/Hardscape (deferred from October, November and December 2004)
Owner/Applicant; Power-Love Associates
Address: 256 Worth Avenue
Landscape Design: Greencare Landscape
Project Description: Request approval to construct a waterfall, water gardens, bridge, and landscaping in the Gucci courtyard, and other associated changes as presented.

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION

At the applicant's request, this matter was deferred from the October meeting to the November meeting, and deferred again to the December meeting. At the December meeting, there was a motion for deferral to the January meeting, with the understanding that if no one is present at the January meeting, with suitable drawings, the application will be removed from the agenda.

Mr. Frank reported that the drawings submitted for this project were not satisfactory for presentation. He had a meeting with the landscape professionals, and showed them an example of what the drawings should look like. Since that time, no new drawings were submitted. Just yesterday, Mr. Frank had received a telephone call from the landscaper to set up another meeting so the project could move forward. Mr. Frank felt this has been on the agenda long enough and recommended removal from the agenda.

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK TO REMOVE THIS PROJECT FROM THE AGENDA FOR LACK OF PROPER DRAWINGS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BLADES.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #25-2004, Landscape/Hardscape & Modifications to previous approval (deferred from Oct. and November 2004
Owner/Applicant: Avram and Jill Glazer
Address: 5 Middle Road
Architect: Thomas M. Kirchhoff, AIA, P.A.
Morgan Wheelock, Landscape Architect
Project Description: Request approval of the following:

1. New Landscape Plan: The landscape design will remove existing, overgrown, out of character plant material, relocate quality material in conflict with new construction or hardscape design, and preserve existing material complementary to the overall design.
2. New Hardscape Plan: Includes a new swimming pool, spa and fountain; new terrace area, service drive and front drive materials
3. The second (existing) curb cut on Middle Road will be reopened to re-establish the loop drive previously closed. Both driveways on Middle

Road will have operable metal gates.

4. Changes to the description of improvements which received a Certificate of Appropriateness at the May 19, 2004 LPC Meeting, specifically changes to the four bay garage, changes to the east wing addition, and changes to the existing gambrel roof housing staff bedrooms and bath.
5. Other associated changes as presented

<u>CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION.</u>: None declared

The application indicates that this is a tax abatement project.

At the October meeting, there was a motion for approval of the landscape and hardscape, as presented, without raising the walls, and with bringing the west Ficus hedge down (in height), and with keeping the driveway gates on the same plane, and having the applicant return with lighting, gates, and fountain details. The architectural changes presented were approved. <u>At the December meeting, and at the architect's request, there was a motion for deferral to the January meeting.</u>

Mr. Don Skowron of Morgan Wheelock and Architect Tom Kirchhoff presented this request.

Mr. Skowron stated that he would present the gates and fountains today, but would have to come back for the lighting. He described the fountain on the south side of the office which is a combination of a wall fountain, a 22 ft. runnel and a basin, together with two water systems. The fountain will be 18" deep with dirty water (water lilies and papyrus) in the basin and chlorinated water in the wall fountain. Other dimensions are 16' wide x 10'2". Water will flow from the wall fountain down the runnel to the large basin. Coquina (3/4" thick) will be used for the veneer and the coping. Black glass tiles will line the inside of the fountain.

Mrs. Victor inquired whether there was any historic precedent for this type of fountain at a house of this era. Mr. Skowron was not aware of any, but he felt it responds to the house in its shape and form. Mr. Eigelberger commented that there is no need for two separate water systems as the plants in the basin will provide enough of a biological filter to keep the water clean.

As for landscaping changes, Mr. Skowron noted that they have brought the height of the very tall front hedge down to the bottom of the roof line, as was requested in a previous motion. He added that they plan to remove two black olives with their staining leaves, and one Seagrape which was damaged in the hurricane. Instead they propose six triple Alexander Palms with 12 ft. of clear trunk. Mrs. Vanneck and Mrs. Hoffman did not feel that Alexander Palms were the appropriate choice., and suggested that the trees being removed be replaced with the same plant species. Mr. Eigelberger suggested saving the existing Seagrape and adding to it as he has seen these trees become magnificent see-through trees. Mr. Skowron stated that his client wants to open up views to the house and as such, wants a palm alley, and he pledged to look for another palm species to set off the front facade. Mrs. Vanneck commented that this is a formal house, not a tropical house, and palms are not correct here. Mr. Pandula advised Mr. Skowron that it is apparent that the LPC does not approve of palms at this site, and asked him to re-think the landscape.

Mr. Kirchhoff discussed various aspects of the front walls and hardscape. He stated that when the LPC had met in October, part of the motion was to **not** raise the height of the side walls at the motorcourt. In fact, they would be backed by a hedge with a chainlink fence buried inside to provide protection for the pool. New 4' tall self-closing gates will be placed in those walls. Along Middle Road, there will be a new pedestrian gate between piers. The plan includes raising the walls on either side of the front gate/piers to a height of 5'6", an increase of 18 inches.

Mr. Segraves asked whether the project had received variance approval for raising the front wall. Mr. Kirchhoff responded that he was not aware that he needed a variance, but the owner wanted more privacy and security for the front of the property, and thus, wants the wall raised. Mr. Segraves repeated that he believes that if the applicant is requesting to raise a wall over 4' tall which is not back 3 ft. from the property line, a variance is required.

Mrs. Vanneck commented that she does not like the proposal as she feels it is losing its formality. Mrs. Blades felt the driveway gates will be a detriment if they are kept closed all the time.

Mrs. Day reported that she has confirmed with the Preservation Foundation, who possess the Wyeth collection, that there are no Wyeth landscape plans for this house. There is no historical precedence for what the architect has planned for the site. Mrs. Vanneck noted that the major trees on the site were all of specimen size, and this proposal removes many of them.

MOTION BY MRS. VANNECK TO DEFER THE LANDSCAPING TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BLADES.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Frank reiterated that the applicant would need a variance to raise the height of the wall, and the Town Council would be interested in the LPC's feedback relative to that variance request. It was the expressed consensus of the LPC that the front walls should be kept low, thus eliminating the need for a variance.

Mr. Kirchhoff reviewed that the house previously had a chatahoochee driveway and swing gates. At the front door, there were brick piers and two small walls, and Mr. Kirchhoff felt that they took away from the beauty of the front door area. The new proposal brings a new driveway configuration and materials which were approved in October 2004, and the new front step/railing configuration which would be changed by removing the brick piers and side walls. The landscaping beds on either side of the front steps will be decreased in width by 2 feet. Mr. Kirchhoff mentioned that the two driveway entry gates must be at least 18 ft. back from the property line, but they are still shown to be on different planes, (contrary to the motion at the October meeting.)

Mrs. Vanneck felt the proposal is totally changing the front of the house. Mrs. Day reminded the LPC that this is a tax abatement project, so if the original materials are still there at the front entrance, they should probably be retained. Mr. Kirchhoff acknowledged that the brick piers at the front door are original, but he felt they were inappropriate as they do not relate to the steps and the element. Mrs. Day stated that she did not anticipate this many changes to the project today, as Mr. Kirchhoff had indicated by phone that he was presenting a change in the roof tiles today. She offered to search for photos from the 30s or 40s to substantiate the original look of the front facade before any approvals are given.

Mr. Kirchhoff also mentioned that the owner would like to replace the existing front door with a wood/glass door to bring more light into the foyer and allow the owner to look out. Mrs. Victor commented that the suggested door does not go with the house. Other members agreed. Also, Mr. Kirchhoff added that they have just arrived at a new design for the driveway entry gates, one with palm trees. Hearing this, Mrs. Vanneck suggested a deferral of the entire front of the house.

Moving on, Mr. Kirchhoff stated that the roof is now done in Ludowici tiles, but the original roof material is unknown. The proposal is to replace the existing roof with new, one color, Ludowici tiles which have an irregular raked surface. (Sample shown.)

MOTION BY MRS. BLADES FOR APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED LUDOWICI ROOF TILES.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VANNECK.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Moving back to the fountain, Mr. Eigelberger commented that he likes the fountain, but again stated there is no need for two water systems within the fountain. Mrs. Vanneck agreed that for continuity, only one filter system is best. Mr. Pandula asked for an update at the February meeting relative to the engineering.

MOTION BY MR. SEGRAVES FOR APPROVAL OF THE FOUNTAIN AS PRESENTED, WITH AN UPDATE TO COME AT THE FEBRUARY MEETING RELATIVE TO THE ENGINEERING, AND FOR APPROVAL TO REMOVE THE TWO BLACK OLIVE TREES.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. PYMS.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

AND

MOTION TO DEFER THE BALANCE OF THE PROJECT TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING, TO INCLUDE THE GATES, WALLS, THE PALMS, THE FRONT ENTRANCE, THE FRONT DOOR, I.E., THE WHOLE FRONT OF THE RESIDENCE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. BLADES.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

While Mr. Wheelock and Mr. Skowron were still present, Mrs. Vanneck noted that many months ago, the LPC was pushed to get the Four Arts Garden renovation approved, and since that time, virtually no progress has been made. Mr. Wheelock noted that the plans are in the Building Dept. for permit approval and may be released today. Since the project was heard by the LPC, construction drawings were developed and submitted for review; certain code issues had to be further addressed; and, the permit issuance is now imminent. Mrs. Vanneck noted further that it is her understanding that the "formal demonstration gardens" will be reviewed by Mr. Wheelock's firm. She reminded Mr. Wheelock that the LPC needs to approve any changes to those gardens. He acknowledged that he was aware that LPC approval was necessary.

D. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #28-2004, Courtyard modifications (deferred from November and December 2004)
Owner/Applicant: New Bradley House Ltd.
Address: 280 Sunset Avenue
Architect: Brower Architectural Associates Inc.
Project Description: Request approval of the following:
1. New landscape and hardscape in courtyard and united adjacent spaces
2. Re-alignment of existing fountain on axis
3. Re-define courtyard space by relocation of front wall, planters and material patterns
4. New materials include: Chicago brick, key stone, bronze deck drain and various landscape materials
5. Other associated changes as presented

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION: None declared

Please note that at the November meeting, there was a motion for deferral to the December meeting. At the December meeting, there was a motion for deferral to the January meeting, together with the request that staff makes it very plain that the owner of the Bradley House, or his representative, Attorney Ron Kolins, attend the January meeting, or it will be removed from the agenda.

Architect Ken Brower stated that Attorney Ron Kolins could not be present today and asked him to attend the meeting and request an additional deferral to allow additional time to confer with the owner.

Mrs. Hoffman noted that the landscaping at the north entrance to this courtyard is not symmetrical (Seagrapes on one side and flowers on the other side). Mr. Brower agreed that it should be symmetrical and unified with the courtyard.. At this time, he has done no planting schemes and has not been asked to do so. Mrs. Blades noted her dissatisfaction with the existing fountain. Mr. Pandula asked whether anyone is working on landscape/hardscape plans. Mr. Brower responded that Doug Winter is working on preliminary drainage plans. Drainage issues birthed this project initially, which caused Mr. Brower to file plans several months ago. Several deferrals have followed and Mr. Brower is unaware of the outcome of subsequent discussions with the property owner and/or tenants. As such, he does not know how to proceed.

Mr. Frank explained that it had become apparent during these past few months, that there was a plan for Coco's to use the courtyard for outdoor seating. The Town has not authorized outdoor seating at this location. Mr. Brower is waiting for direction from the client as to how to proceed.

Mr. Eigelberger, relative to the landscaping, advocated following the original 1979 landscape plan for the site which used two Royal Palms, Cocoa Plums, ground cover, terra cotta pots, etc. He suggested that the Town records be searched for that original landscape plan.

Mrs. Vanneck stated that this owner has had ample time to file the appropriate drawings and to come before the LPC as was requested, yet there are still no revised drawings filed, and the owner and/or his representative have not appeared at the LPC meeting. As such, she recommended removal from the agenda. Mr. Brower again requested deferral to allow additional time for the remaining issues to be resolved.

MOTION BY MR. SEGRAVES TO DEFER FOR TWO MONTHS TO THE MARCH MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. HOFFMAN.
UPON A ROLL CALL VOTE, THE MOTION FAILED 3-4, WITH MRS. VANNECK, MRS. BLADES, MRS. VICTOR AND MR. PANDULA VOTING AGAINST THE MOTION.

MOTION BY MRS. BLADES FOR REMOVAL FROM THE AGENDA.
MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VANNECK.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Staff will research the old records to try to find the original landscape/courtyard/fountain plans.

*****

Please note that the architect for Item E has requested to be placed last on the agenda due to a scheduling conflict.

VI **Other Business**:

A. Designation Hearing: Everglades Island Gates
Owners: Town of Palm Beach and Everglades Club
(Deferred from April 21, 2004, November 17, 2004, and December 15, 2004)

Mr. Frank stated that there is another request for deferral from the Everglades Club. There is an area directly adjacent to these gates which was in need of maintenance by the Town of Palm Beach. When the maintenance issues are resolved, the designation hearing will take place for the gates. Mr. Frank reported that a contractor has been secured by the Town for the maintenance. The Everglades Club will maintain the Everglades Island Gates in the future, and supports the landmarking.

MOTION BY MR. PYMS FOR DEFERRAL TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING TOGETHER WITH THE EVERGLADES CLUB WAIVING THEIR RIGHT TO REQUIRE THE LPC TO ACT WITHIN 30 DAYS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VICTOR.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

At this point, Mrs. Delp administered the oath to all those who were not previously sworn.

B. Revised landscaping, Royal Park Bridge

Mr. Jorge Sanchez, part of the committee to beautify the new bridge, addressed the LPC. He explained that the DOT had agreed to frame the east end of the bridge with two, very large trees. Ultimately, two very large, over 30 ft. tall, matching Green Buttonwoods were selected as the trees of choice. Unfortunately, these have been nearly impossible to find.

As a substitute, a pair of Ceiba Kapok trees have been suggested, and the Town Council is in favor of this option. Mr. Sanchez stated that they will frame the bridge beautifully; they are available; and they are hearty specimens. The DOT will be purchasing the trees, and the trees will be planted in May or June, with proper tie downs.

Mrs. Vanneck asked whether the Kapoks have invasive roots which could cause damage to pipes, etc. Mr. Sanchez replied that this species does not have invasive root problems. The Ceiba Kapok has a blossom, though an insignificant one. These blossoms were used, due to their buoyant qualities, in WW II to make Mae West jackets. Mr. Sanchez noted that the tree will defoliate for about one month of the year, but it is very structural when it defoliates.

Mr. Moore noted that this item was on the agenda for informational purposes only. He recalled that the original trees chosen to flank the bridge were specimen Live Oaks; then Green Buttonwood; and now, Ceiba Kapoks.

Let the record show that at this point, 10:55 a.m., there was a short recess and the meeting reconvened at 11:06 a.m.

C. <u>HISTORIC SITES SURVEY PRESENTATION: MRS JANE DAY</u>

Mr. Frank stated that a State grant had been received to allow Mrs. Day, our preservation consultant, to update the Town's Historic Sites Survey. Copies of the new 2004 Historic Sites Survey were distributed to the members.

Mrs. Day stated that a historic sites survey is "a systematic and detailed recording of historic resources." The first Palm Beach survey was done in 1981, and was conducted by the Landmarks Planning, Inc. group from Pittsburgh, and went no further north than the Palm Beach Country Club. In 1988, the Historic Palm Beach County Preservation Board updated the original survey, and also did not go any further north than the Palm Beach Country Club. In 1997, Research Atlantic did a second update to the survey, and the boundaries were extended to the

Lake Worth Inlet, but only as far south as Sloan's Curve. The only structure south of Sloan's Curve which is listed is the Little Red School House.

This most recent survey was accomplished after a year of driving and walking the streets of the Town. Town records, Palm Beach County Property Appraiser records, and the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps were also researched to produce the survey. An updated historic sites survey can always be updated and improved, and becomes a planning tool for the Landmarks Preservation Commission and staff. Listing a property in the survey does not protect it, or landmark it. It merely establishes an inventory of historic resources and those which have been severely altered or demolished since the last survey. The Town's Comprehensive Plan now requests that the historic sites survey be updated every five years.

Last December, Mr. Frank and Mrs. Day had requested a grant for the Town of Palm Beach to update the survey. The grant was issued for $ 11,000 and the Town added $ 4,000 for a total of $ 15,000 cash plus in kind services.

Next, she explained a sample Florida Master Site File form, distributing a sample copy to each of the members. Since the last survey, the form has increased from two pages to four pages. It is now computerized and is available on the State's web site. The updated Master Site File forms are available in notebooks at the Planning, Zoning & Building Department. In this most recent survey, buildings constructed up through 1954 (back 50 years) were included. As such, the buildings constructed from 1947 through 1954 were added to the previous survey information to create the new survey.

Mrs. Day continued with her review of the distributed 2004 Historic Sites Survey. She called attention to Page 32, Specific Recommendations for the Town of Palm Beach, and explained that 1238 Historic Sites (built before 1955) were reviewed for the new survey. Of those, 109 were removed from the inventory due to demolition and/or alteration, leaving a total of 1129 historic sites remaining. Page 33 lists the Town of Palm Beach properties on the National Register. Page 35 lists the landmark properties which are taking advantage of ad valorem tax relief, and lists the amount of monies involved in that relief. She noted that while the abated amount may appear large, she verified with the Town's Finance Department that the Town is temporarily losing only $ 211,139.00 per year in Town property taxes as a result of the tax relief benefit. Mrs. Day called attention to Page 42, Immediate Action Plan, and read the seven items listed there into the record. Next, she called attention to Page 48 where there begins a street by street listing of the Florida master Site File Numbers. Mrs. Day showed some slides of some examples of the new entries to the survey, and she noted that many of these are more modest homes from the 1950s.

In conclusion, Mrs. Day stated that this is the Palm Beach inventory, and we must all do the best we can with the resources we have.

Maia Farish of the Preservation Foundation thanked Mrs. Day for an extraordinary amount of work to produce the survey. She encouraged the LPC members to use the Preservation Foundation resources as well to gain further information about Town properties.

D. Architectural Presentation - Mr. Tim Frank

Mr. Frank supplied the members with several informational sheets relative to different styles of columns (Doric Order Plain, Doric Order Fluted, Ionic Order, Corinthian Order), and certain architectural terms. and discussed the various column design styles with the LPC. More of these educational presentations will be offered in the future.

*****

Mr. Pandula asked Mrs. Day if anything in particular was noteworthy during her survey process. Mrs. Day responded that the north end is really very low scale with modest structures. Neighborhood patterns are evident, like the Sea streets. There have also been some major losses. On the whole, however, architecture in the Town of Palm Beach is very stable.

Mr. Pandula suggested that the survey be done for every building in the town, regardless of its age, so that eventually a form is completed as soon as a building is built. This would create an exceptional data base to see what is actually here in the town.

Mrs. Blades suggested that the other commissions and the Town Council be given the benefit of the presentation that Mrs. Day gave today.

Mr. Eigelberger asked Mrs. Day if she could establish a list of the next twenty buildings which should be landmarked, and to check if there have been attempts to landmark these structures before. Mrs. Day responded that she will be able to do this, and asked the members for any suggestions to add to the list.

Let the record show that Mrs. Vanneck left the meeting at this time.

V **Public Hearings (continued)**

E. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #1-2005, Addition, new accessory structure & site work
Owner/Applicant: Mr. Dwight Schar
Address: 1300 South Ocean Boulevard
Architect: Bridges, Marsh & Carmo
Project Description: Request approval as follows:
Proposal is to enclose an existing ground floor open balcony on the East side of building to create an interior gallery linking two existing spaces immediately off the breakfast area. The existing fenestration will be re-used in the addition along with roof and building materials matching the existing structure.

Also a new, separate, four car garage and bedroom is proposed on the South end of the existing residence. The architectural elements will be similar to the existing.

The existing single driveway entry will be modified and a new entry proposed in the northwest corner of the site connecting to the existing arrival motorcourt adjacent to the entrance to the residence.

<u>CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPARTE COMMUNICATION;</u> Mrs. Victor visited the site with Mrs. Day. Mrs. Morris visited the site with Mrs. Day. Mr. Pandula visited the site and met with the architect.

Digby Bridges, Architect, stated that this is not a tax abatement project. He noted that only the house is landmarked in this case. Mr. Bridges explained that the balcony was added in 1995/96 (came to LPC in 1994) by Marc Ferguson, Architect, to connect the guest wing (former staff quarters) and the main house. The new owner would like to be able to get to the guest wing under cover, rather than via an open balcony. The proposal would retain the beautiful bridge window, but moves it out to enable the enclosure of the balcony, and adds two infills on either side. The proposal would affect the slope of the roof at the bridge area, however.

Because of the nature and number of questions from the members, Mr. Moore stated that he wanted to make sure that each and every commissioner understands what is being proposed here, even if a site visit has to be made. A deferral may be in order to allow for further understanding. Mr. Moore recalled that when the Ferguson changes were reviewed in 1994, which were major changes, there was a site visit to the property at which time minutes were taken and the public noticed, etc. The current LPC must understand this current proposal as well.

Mrs. Victor commented that she was stunned to learn that only she, Mr. Pandula, and Mrs. Morris have visited the site. She recalled that the Mayor has asked that the LPC members do their homework with regard to upcoming projects. Mrs. Victor felt that the proposal severely alters the rhythm of this very long facade, and she recommended deferral.

Architect Mark Marsh joined the presentation at this time. The issue, he explained, is to create a covered linkage between the main house and the guest wing by creating a simple parapet element to enclose the existing balcony and move the fenestration out 8 feet. He felt this was the best solution which does not fight the existing architecture. Mr. Bridges added that this change does not destroy the integrity of the house, and he felt you would not even notice it after completion.

Mr. Eigelberger questioned why the existing bridge, now used as a breakfast room, is not used as the covered passage. He commented that a breakfast room is utilized for an hour per day, and for that matter, a breakfast room could be relocated elsewhere in the house. The architect's response was that if the bridge was used as the passageway, one would have to go through the butler's pantry, and this was deemed to be undesirable to the owner.

Let the record show that Mr. Pyms left the meeting at 12:30 p.m.

Mr. Pandula offered a different solution...to leave the east window in place and build an outer glass wall to establish a see through covered link. Mr. Marsh acknowledged this as one option. Mr. Segraves supported Mr. Pandula's suggestion as it makes the bridge stay reading as a bridge.

Mrs. Victor asked when enough is enough, as this house experienced additions on two other occasions. She felt it was not a hardship to go 20 ft. outside. Mr. Marsh responded that this is such a small change and it does not hamper the beauty of the house. He asked for direction from the commission.

Mrs. Day offered some history relative to the house. She commented that the bridge and the three story tower are the most important elements of this house. She noted that the main entrance of the house used to be underneath the bridge originally. Mrs. Day does not like what the proposal does to the roof. She had no objection to the changes proposed for the garage.

Mr. Moore stated that this meeting could be adjourned to a date certain for a site visit, or members could go to the site individually. Mr. Marsh stated his preference for the group to visit the site together. *Mrs. Delp notes that there was no motion for deferral or a site visit, but it was clearly understood that this portion of the project was deferred to the February meeting, and that there would be a site visit during the February meeting.*

Garage

The proposed garage will be a free-standing structure on the south side of the house. It will be a three car garage with west facing garage doors and a storage loft on the second floor. Mrs. Day noted that the original garage faced west also. Mr. Moore noted, for the record, that the new garage building is within the landmarked box at the site. At this time, the house has no garage.

Let the record show that Mrs. Hoffman left the meeting at 12:55 p.m.

The garage will be built using the same materials, shutters, iron work, balcony details, roof tiles, and windows as the main house.

Mrs. Blades inquired whether the garage was large enough for a house this size. The architect responded that a three bay garage was the owner's request. Mr. Moore noted that there is a proposal before the Planning and Zoning Commission to increase the covered parking spaces on properties. He thought this project might be exempt from that provision, but he will check it.

MOTION BY MRS. VICTOR FOR APPROVAL OF THE GARAGE AS PRESENTED.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SEGRAVES.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
(It should be noted that all three Alternate Members voted on this motion, and those to follow, as three regular members had already left the meeting.)

New Driveway

The owner would like to reconfigure the driveway creating a north arm with a new curb cut on South Ocean Boulevard, and a new gate to match the existing gate. This will make the traffic flow much more better on the site. Persons will enter the site via the south entrance, and exit via the north entrance. The driveway material will be concrete with a soda finish and a cast acid washed curbing.

Mr. Moore noted that Public Works and the DOT need to approve the new north curb cut.

Mr. Marsh noted that there is a landmarked Poinciana tree near the new north driveway which is not doing well. Joe Ugi has become involved in reviewing the health of the tree, which may have to be removed. If so, Mr. Ugi, the Town Manager's Office and the Garden Club will have to approve the removal of the tree. As for the other specimen trees on the site, Mr. Ugi has already come to the site and re-tagged all of the historic specimen trees.

MOTION BY MRS. BLADES FOR APPROVAL OF THE RECONFIGURATION OF THE DRIVEWAY SUBJECT TO PUBLIC WORKS AND DOT APPROVING THE DRIVEWAY CUT, AND TO DEFER THE NEW GATE TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING TO SEE THE DESIGN OF THE GATE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VICTOR.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Eigelberger expressed some concern about placing a concrete driveway amid all of those old trees. The commission will review the area during the site visit next month.

VI OTHER BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

Mr. Moore: Regarding the Public School

Mr. Moore re-stated that staff is sorry about how the Public School demolition happened so suddenly, that the School Board did not honor their agreement, and that the Town could not have saved the building through having jurisdiction. Mr. Moore called their attention to the various correspondence which has been generated by the Town noting the Town's displeasure, as well as various news articles. He stated that there had been an easement abandonment request on the Town Council's agenda, which was removed from the agenda this past month regarding the gas line at the site. Eventually, it will probably be granted, but not immediately.

Mrs. Day: Designation Report

Mrs. Day distributed a Designation Report for 421 Peruvian Avenue which will be heard at the February meeting.

Comments from Mrs. Blades

1. She called attention to the awful drains on the cupola at St. Edwards. Staff will go out to check on these.
2. She thanked Mrs. Victor for the information she forwarded to the members.
3. She announced that there will be a meeting relative to the Royal Poinciana Playhouse at the Flagler Lecture Room on January 27, 2005 at 2:30 p.m. which is open to the public. This is an effort to save the playhouse.
4. She announced that the Garden Club is sponsoring Arbor Day at Bradley Park on

Friday of this week at 11 a.m. The Day School and Rosarian will be involved and a tree will be planted in the Mayor's honor.

VII **Adjournment**:

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m. without benefit of a motion.

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be held on **Wednesday, February 16, 2005** at 9:00 a.m in the Town Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Town Hall, 360 South County Road, Palm Beach.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Victor, Secretary

Wendy Victor, Secretary
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

cmd

TOWN OF PALM BEACH
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

ATTENDANCE RECORD 2005

MEMBERS	1/05	2/05	3/05	4/05	5/05	6/05	7/05	8/05	9/05	10/05	11//05	12/05
Eugene Pandula	P											
Ann Vanneck	P											
Ann Blades	P											
Jack Pyms	P											
Judy Hoffman	P											
Patrick Segraves	P											
Wendy Victor	P											

ALTERNATE MEMBERS	1/05	2/05	3/05	4/05	5/54	6/05	7/05	8/05	9/05	10/05	11/05	12/05
William Lee Hanley Jr.	P											
Robert T. Eigelberger	P											
Eileen L. Morris	P											

LEGEND:

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

TOWN OF PALM BEACH
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

RECORD OF VOTING CONFLICTS 2005

MEMBERS	1/05	2/05	3/05	4/05	5/05	6/05	7/05	8/05	9/05	10/05	11/05	12/05
Eugene Pandula												
Ann Vanneck												
Ann Blades												
Jack Pyms												
Judy Hoffman												
Patrick Segraves												
Wendy Victor												

ALTERNATE MEMBERS	1/05	2/05	3/05	4/05	5/54	6/05	7/05	8/05	9/05	10/05	11/05	12/05
William Lee Hanley Jr.												
Robert T. Eigelberger												
Eileen L. Morris												

LEGEND:

V = One Voting Conflict during a meeting
V2 = Two Voting Conflicts during a meeting
V3 = Three Voting Conflicts 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)