



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Office of The Town Clerk

MINUTES FROM THE JOINT MEETING OF THE MAYOR AND THE TOWN COUNCIL AND THE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION HELD ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2002

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President William J. Brooks called the joint meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. in the Town Council chambers.

On roll call the following Elected Officials were found to be in attendance: Mayor Lesly S. Smith, President Brooks, President Pro-Tem Norman P. Goldblum, and Councilman Sam C. McLendon. Councilmen Jack McDonald and Allen S. Wyett were absent from the meeting.

The following members of the Landmarks Preservation Commission were present: Chairman Eugene Pandula, Vice-Chairman Elizabeth Dowdle, Sari M. Wilkey, Ann Vanneck, Judy Wells Hoffman, Wendy Victor, Pat Segraves, and Mario Nievera.

Also attending for all or part of the meeting were: Town Manager Peter B. Elwell; Town Attorney John C. Randolph; Recreation Director Russell Bitzer; Director of Planning, Zoning & Building Robert Moore; Assistant Director of Planning, Zoning & Building Veronica Close; Zoning Administrator Paul Castro; Planning Administrator Tim Frank; and Town Clerk Mary A. Pollitt.

II. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The invocation was given by Town Clerk Mary Pollitt. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by President Brooks.

III. REVIEW OF ALTERNATIVE SITE PLANS FOR THE PLANNED MODERNIZATION OF PALM BEACH PUBLIC SCHOOL

Kris Garrison outlined the competing objectives between the School Board and the Town as discussed in the previous joint meeting held on September 17th, digressing briefly to explain the function of the former Palm Beach Middle School located on the west side of Cocoanut Row that has been used recently to augment the elementary school. She continued that a decision was made to not include that campus as part of the new

**Minutes from the Special Joint Meeting – Town Council and Landmarks Preservation
Commission Held on September 23, 2002**

elementary school plan requiring a crossing guard and the use of the west campus has State requirements plus financial implications.

Ms. Garrison said that the Landmark Commission's desire to preserve the façade on the north side of the building had not been previously known. Additionally, from the Recreation Advisory Commission's meetings, the desire was to not only retain the ball field as it exists but to locate it in such a manner that playability on both fields is possible. She continued that two earlier objectives included maximizing the parking and improve the traffic circulation. Ms. Garrison said, based on the input from those meetings and from one-on-one meetings with individual Town Council members, a series of boards were being presented at this meeting showing the evolution of the thought process resulting from the meetings and the requirements of the School Board.

Ms. Garrison cited the 'givens' the School Board had to work with: 2.4 acres for the site; ground floor square footage requirements (47,000 sq. ft. of the footprint); 67,000 sq. ft. total requirement to meet the needs of the school; and compliance with current adopted School Board specifications that are consistent with State Requirements for Educational Facilities.

Young Song, Architect for the project, explained the boards and charts that were presented at the meeting, starting with the existing building on the campus with some modifications identified as Scheme 1 with an additional \$3 million cost attached to it. Scheme 2 had some parking modifications with a two story addition above the multi-purpose dining area with 45,800 sq. ft. on the first floor; 20,500 sq. ft. on the second floor; 29,000 sq. ft. open space or 27.6% with an additional \$3 million cost factor. Ms. Song said Scheme 2 was not an excellent solution for the educational adequacy.

Ms. Song described Scheme 3 as being similar to no. 2 scheme with a three story solution. She continued that scheme 4 involved relocating the cafeteria/kitchen area with a two story structure near the east end of the property noting the potential delivery problems related to the kitchen area plus an additional \$3 million cost.

Ms. Song said scheme 5 included some compromises: saving half of the building on the northwest; moving the outdoor stage farther north; providing 36 parking spaces at an increased cost that would be in the range of \$750,000 to \$1 million; it could overcome educational adequacy; and be a better solution than the others for security and safety.

Ms. Song explained Scheme 6 did not save any architectural element on the north end of the building. Additionally, she provided information on the rest of the charts presented at the meeting.

Eugene Pandula, Chairman of the Landmarks Commission, clarified that Scheme 6 presented at this meeting was basically Scheme 1 that was presented at the September 17th meeting. Mr. Pandula said he thought the Landmarks Commission expressed a very strong desire to retain the north corner building and work around that with the balance of the buildings being expendable in one form or another. He continued that the

**Minutes from the Special Joint Meeting – Town Council and Landmarks Preservation
Commission Held on September 23, 2002**

Commission was not advocating the demolition of the current media center; however, it appeared the (architects, etc.) were backed into a corner, and the result was another hodge-podge of connected buildings.

Mr. Pandula commented that all the presented schemes reflected the mandate to maintain the media center and the proposed addition on the northwest corner which is driving the site plan to the point of ruination. He said the Commission was being forced into accepting a rather mediocre solution on the south end of the site because of the two buildings on the northend that have been mandated to be saved. He suggested working on that and once that was accomplished, a more meaningful conversation regarding aesthetics could take place.

Ms. Garrison responded she failed to state the two buildings, under the Castaldi analysis, must remain; although she was successful in having a third building removed from the list and that building does not have to be retained. She said she is completely pessimistic that this finding could be changed. Responding to Mr. Panudula's questions, Ms. Garrison said the Castaldi analysis is based on the replacement value of the building compared to the remodeling of the existing building to meet current educational standards. Ms. Garrison continued that in order for the school to not follow the State requirements, the entire school reconstruction would have to have private funding.

Ms. Garrison said the School Board has not designated the school site as historic as the Town has landmarked the building on the northwest corner, but this may not carry enough weight to override the Castaldi analysis. She said the situation exists in Palm Beach where the Castaldi analysis would allow demolition of the building on the site that the Town has landmarked but would require retention of the other two buildings on the site.

Alternate Landmark Commissioner Wendy Victor said she had contacted the National Trust and the Bureau of Historic Preservation in Tallahassee regarding the State Statutes outlining the process to be followed in these cases.

Ms. Garrison responded she thought the School Board had followed this process.

Town Consultant, Jane Day, said the site is on the Florida Master Site File Form, and that was done originally done when the Preservation Foundation conducted the first survey of the Town and was updated in 1997 by her firm. She continued that the State issues a number and the site is a State designated site. She said the local designation provides local protection to the site for aesthetic considerations.

Mrs. Day explained the National Register of Historic Places is an honorary process, and only local legislations or municipalities can save, protect, and keep buildings from being too altered. She added that part of that process is the Florida Master Site File which the Town's Comprehensive Plan requires be updated every five years. Ms. Day said, since this School site is listed on the Florida Master Site File, this listing should have the Department of Education checking the records when a project is planned such as this.

**Minutes from the Special Joint Meeting – Town Council and Landmarks Preservation
Commission Held on September 23, 2002**

Ms. Garrison replied that the Castaldi analysis was conducted by the State Department of Education.

Planning, Zoning & Building Director Robert Moore asked Ms. Garrison and Ms. Song if it would be possible under the School Board's jurisdiction and given the State's insistence that the media center cannot be demolished, to relocate the media center on the site to a more convenient location and to then design around the building on the north side that the Town would like to see retained?

Ms. Song replied she was sure the building could be relocated, but it was a funding issue. She said she could check further on that with the State.

Polly Earl, Preservation Foundation, reminded the Town Council that, previously, DOT has had to stop a design project and check with the State Bureau of Preservation to determine if the plans impacted various local landmarks. She suggested the School Board situation was analogous to this.

Mayor Smith suggested, while all the parties were present at this meeting, the Landmarks Commission members should provide additional input on other aspects of the project to include the ultimate project design if money were no object; what buildings should be saved; the fate of the media building; and the parking configuration on Seaview which might preserve the baseball and soccer fields.

Landmarks Chairman Pandula stated that from a Town architectural prospective, in addition to keeping the landmarked 1921 building on the corner, the site meets the residential district of the Town which truly is a cottage environment. He said the stepping down of the scale from the larger mass on Royal Palm Way which includes taller buildings and moving the media center to the north end of the property, frees up areas for enlarging the larger building, if need be, in a location that does not hurt the Town. Mr. Pandula said what makes architecture in the Town 'special' is the level of detail, and the second scheme begins to articulate the buildings with all of their parts and pieces, a base, a middle, and a top. He added that it is the smaller scale elements that work in the Town of Palm Beach; the texture of a barrel tile roof; the shadow line resulting from a one foot overhang; the brackets—it is scale, rhythm, proportion.

Landmarks Commission Member Sari Wilkey supported Chairman Pandula's comments adding a short history of the structure. She said the parking was not quite as important as preserving the history.

Landmarks Commission Member Pat Segraves, Architect, said the northeast corner of Royal Palm Way is the entrance to the Town and is very important. He agreed with the other comments by the Landmarks Commission Members.

**Minutes from the Special Joint Meeting – Town Council and Landmarks Preservation
Commission Held on September 23, 2002**

Alternate Recreation Advisory Commission Member Ken Fishman, 330 Cocoanut Row, questioned whether the concerns of the Recreation Group were addressed in Scheme 6?

Ms. Garrison responded Scheme 6 was presented at the September 17th joint meeting, and it only addresses the parking and the traffic circulation which were the objectives given at earlier meetings. She said multiple changes were reflected in each of the six options presented at this meeting.

Mr. Fishman said, in his opinion, the Town requires the entire ball field as it is presently for the children. He added that children can play volley ball, soccer, and other games on the site, and any compromise of that is wrong for the children. Mr. Fishman stated the field has to be kept intact, and modifications to that, in his opinion, were unacceptable. Mr. Fishman suggested using the west campus enabling the Town to maintain the entire recreation program as is.

Ms. Garrison said the issue of selling the west campus property would be considered by the School Board at its October 16th meeting. She continued that if the building were to be kept, a large amount of money would be needed to meet the current educational standards to renovate the building. She said the School Board had approval from the Castaldi analysis to demolish that building, but because of local priorities, the School Board did not want to go in that direction.

Ms. Garrison commented that when the School Board modernizes schools, the effort is to bring the school up to current educational specifications, and having a crossing guard is not desirable for the safety of the school or desirable for the residents who live across the street who complained about the traffic concept. She said that fitting the campus on one side of the street will result in a more productive and successful program than splitting a campus in two, run by one administrator.

Responding to the question of the Town's control over the site, Attorney Randolph replied he had stated at the last meeting that the Town can impose reasonable development standards, but the Town cannot deny the application. He continued that the balancing of interests is the issue, and strong opinions have been voiced by residents, members of the various boards, the Town Council, and the School Board. He said he understood this meeting was beyond the point of hearing those opinions, and the purpose of this meeting was, that in light of the various opinions that were previously stated, to try to balance the interests of the School Board and the Town. He said he had refrained from comment regarding the jurisdiction of the State concerning landmarks because that was not the issue; although many legal issues could be addressed. Mr. Randolph said he thought the first issue to be determined was whether or not some sort of compromise could be agreed upon between the parties that will satisfy them, and if those compromises cannot be met, then, perhaps, it is the School Attorney versus the Town Attorney, and he was hoping to avoid that.

Mr. Randolph reiterated the Town can impose reasonable development standards, but those reasonable development standards cannot deny the facility's ability to functionally

**Minutes from the Special Joint Meeting – Town Council and Landmarks Preservation
Commission Held on September 23, 2002**

operate. He continued that the Town had to rely on the School Board, at least initially, in determining what they need to functionally operate the school, and if they are saying they cannot functionally operate the school and still accommodate all of the Town's interests, then to deny their ability to go forward with the plans, which allows them to be functionally operational, will be a denial, and that is something the Town cannot do under the Statutes.

Jane Baker, 235 Cocoanut Row, said she has lived at her present address for seventeen years, directly across the street from the 1921 school façade. She said she would not like to see that section demolished, and questioned the reason for having a two story structure with a cafeteria in that location and the delivery trucks in that area. Ms. Baker suggested that north elevation, across the street from her, should be left as low density to fit into the residential neighborhood. Ms. Baker added that any proceeds from the sale of the school on the west side of Cocoanut Row should be used for the project on the east side of the street.

After comments from some of the Landmark Commission members regarding Landmarks jurisdiction, Attorney Randolph said a letter was received from the Administrator of the Architectural Preservation Section of the Bureau of Historic Preservation, and in that letter the section of the Statutes related to State requirements for educational facilities which became effective January 5, 2000, states each board shall initiate measures to work with the Division of Historical Resources relating to demolition of any historic resource. He continued the letter defines any historical resource as any prehistoric site of historic district, site, building, object or other real or personal property of historical, architectural, or archeological value. He said he did not think that it was a given that the School Board is required to do what (Landmarks Commission Member Wendy Victor) has stated the requirement is. He added that it was a good point to be raised and if, in review, that they are required to do that, they will have to go back to the State; but that is a legal decision to be made, and it should not impede forward progress at this meeting.

Ms. Garrison recapped three of the schemes presented:

Scheme No. 6 was presented at the 9/17/2002 meeting – it does not preserve the building, only the north elevation, and it puts the ball field as far as possible toward the School Board property but completely on Town property;

Scheme No. 5 preserves two elevations of the building and uses it as part of the outdoor play area and stage, it keeps the ball field in the same position;

Scheme No. 2 moves the playing field but gives it some extra room allowing some of the recreational activities to occur; preserves the north elevation with wings.

Ms. Garrison explained the urgency of the schedule regarding the review process and construction deadlines which involves a one year academic window and a holding school on Benoist Farms Road. She continued that the holding school will not be available the following year.

**Minutes from the Special Joint Meeting – Town Council and Landmarks Preservation
Commission Held on September 23, 2002**

Town Manager Elwell said none of the six schemes presented at this meeting keep the playing field exactly where it is today, because the field encroaches 85 feet onto the School property. He noted that scheme 1 keeps most of the playing area, preserves the 1921 building but sacrifices in the process the parking lot fronting on Seaview.

Gail Coniglio, Chairman of the Recreation Advisory Board, said scheme no. 1 was her preference and urged retaining the recreation fields. Mrs. Coniglio added that her preference was to make the school aesthetically beautiful and allow the use to be as expansive as possible.

Gene Pandula, Chairman of the Landmarks Commission, said all of the conversations at this meeting have been predicated on the moving of the media center building and that is a given at this point or the result of this meeting is pointless. He continued that the massing diagram, shown in scheme no. 2, is the most appropriate one with the 'L' shape mass of the two story building on scheme no. 2 up against Royal Palm Way being the more appropriate way to go, particularly if it can be extended to the north, filling the void that the relocated media building filled.

President Pro-Tem Goldblum said he worked out an arrangement to use 50 parking spaces every day except for one Tuesday a month during five months of the year for the Forum, and the information Ms. Garrison had was correct.

Bud Tamarkin, resident, thanked everyone for their consideration and clarified that the Society of the Four Arts needed the parking for eight weeks but the events do not begin until 3:00 p.m. He said there will be no problem as long as the arrangement with the Four Arts is in place.

Ms. Garrison presented the project schedule showing that the School Board needed an approved footprint plan, elevations, etc. by the end of November in time to apply for a Water Management District permit.

Mayor Smith said she understood the School Board had its own inspector, and the requirement for raising the building could be waived. She suggested the Town of Palm Beach could possibly wave the requirement to raise the building.

Sandra Player, Senior Project Administrator, responded the School Board had its own inspectors; however, there is a State requirement from DOE that requires one foot above the flood elevation for the finished floor elevation. She added that the School Board had never received a waiver from that requirement.

Ms. Garrison said although the School Board has its own inspectors, they must follow the same rules as the Town's Building Department. She added that the Department of Education Rules are followed in addition to the School Board's. She stated she was concerned about asking for waivers, because they take many months to negotiate and to

**Minutes from the Special Joint Meeting – Town Council and Landmarks Preservation
Commission Held on September 23, 2002**

navigate through the bureaucracy. She added the need for waivers would severely damage the project schedule.

Ms. Song stated construction absolutely had to start in June 2003, and to be able to do that, two to three months will be required to secure all of the permits and hire the appropriate people, and the construction document has to be finished by the end of February. She continued that by the middle of November, architectural details, the site, and the question of moving the media center have to be resolved.

Mayor Smith questioned if the Council selected one of the schemes at this meeting and zeroed in on the condition the media center be demolished, would the School Board have a problem with the schedule then?

Ms. Song replied the problem was that the Castaldi analysis did not allow the building to be demolished, and that could only be done with private funds. She said if the building were demolished, the entire project cost of \$11 or \$12 million would have to be funded privately.

Ray Manning, Song & Associates, said he had a very similar problem and cited the Media Center at Jupiter Elementary that was slightly below the flood plain. He continued the School Board did have to raise the floor elevation at great expense, and the building was not torn down.

Landmarks Commission Member Elizabeth Dowdle said she did not think the Council and the Commission had answers for the School Board at this meeting; although assuming scheme no. 2 as articulated by Chairman Pandula, keeping the 1921 building, stepping down to cottage height on the northern side; going to a higher structure on the Royal Palm Way side, and keeping as much open space as possible could be developed by Ms. Song.

Mr. Pandula said that scheme no. 2 appears to be fine if Ms. Song could look at the school circulation plan and other solutions that were discussed; the media center could be left where it is and functions and connections could be reconsidered, and that conceptual layout could work.

Tom Johns, Director of Program Management for the School District, said he wanted to make sure that the concerns he had with scheme no. 2 were heard. He continued that the building would have to be raised two feet, and he was unsure of the effect on the 1921 building which would affect the construction schedule. Mr. Johns said a funding issue exists for scheme no. 2 that would require an additional \$3 million that the School Board does not have and procuring that private funding by a date certain would be a scheduling problem. Mr. Johns reiterated that the School Board is trying to do what is best for the children.

Mr. Johns noted that the educational adequacy for scheme no. 2 is poor, although the ball fields and building may be saved.

**Minutes from the Special Joint Meeting – Town Council and Landmarks Preservation
Commission Held on September 23, 2002**

Ms. Song said the three major items that compromise the Educational Adequacy issue are adjacency, security and safety plus the adequate size of the facility.

President Brooks said Palm Beach has a very safe and secure campus, and his feeling was the School Board was taking a template from other schools and dropping it on this site. He added that he had a serious problem with the ranking of the three major items in the Educational Adequacy issue.

Mayor Smith said the existing school has been there for eighty years, and the Town is attempting to find the best school for the children who go there, meanwhile preserving the Town's tradition and heritage that goes with the school. She continued that the Principal, Marilyn Brady, the teachers, and the volunteers who serve in the program are not going to be diminished by going to a brand new school on the east side of the campus.

Mr. Johns said scheme no. 2 was not the best option for those criteria that come up with academic adequacy.

President Pro-Tem Goldblum questioned why any proceeds from the sale of the School Board property on the west side of Cocoanut Row could not be used for the new construction on the east side of the street?

Mr. Johns replied he could not answer that question, and it was a matter of School Board policy.

President Pro-Tem Goldblum said this should be investigated and followed through.

After further discussion involving scheme no. 2, Ms. Song reiterated that the design had to have 47,000 square feet on the ground floor.

Principal Marilyn Brady stated the Palm Beach Public School is the number one school in the district on the remodeling list. She said the school has a "B" rating this year; however, the school has been at a loss to do all the things other modern schools have access to. Some of the educational programs that should be going on in the classrooms cannot because of space limitations.

Mr. Moore asked what on scheme no. 2 could not pass muster with the Department of Education?

Ms. Song responded that scheme no. 2 had the 47,000 sq. ft. on the ground floor but many of the details have not been worked out yet.

Mr. Moore asked if there was any impediment, such as the fact the media center could not be torn down, to raising the floor? He said he did not care what the re-design would be, but what technically in Tallahassee is blocking scheme no. 2?

**Minutes from the Special Joint Meeting – Town Council and Landmarks Preservation
Commission Held on September 23, 2002**

Ms. Garrison said Mrs. Brady would have the answers to those questions; however, Mr. Johns articulated two key concerns—schedule and cost. She said the \$3 million increase in cost is probably not adequate to raise the building two feet or to provide the level of architectural detail that the Town would like to see on the building. She added the current budget is \$8 million which is higher than spent in other communities, but additional costs were added to cover the fact that the site is small, to add fill to the site, and to cover higher construction costs in Palm Beach. Ms. Garrison said she estimated the changes discussed at this meeting would cost a minimum of an additional \$5 million plus the costs for the architectural details.

After discussion of the State's involvement regarding the issue of the Landmarked north building, Attorney Randolph said the State's opinion would be very dependant upon the input they receive from the Town regarding the wishes of the Town, and from a scheduling standpoint, the schedule might be assisted if a scheme were chosen that would concur with the Landmarking. He said, otherwise, the Town might be looking at a long bureaucratic process with the State. He added that it might be beneficial to the School Board to have the Town set up another meeting subsequent to the School Board meeting on October 16th to inform the Town of the resolution of the problems discussed at this meeting.

Ms. Garrison said she and her colleagues, if they came back, would like to have a more thoughtful site plan that builds on the scenario discussed with more discussion concerning the budget at that point.

President Brooks asked Attorney Randolph if, legally, Landmarks Chairman Pandula, Mayor Smith, Town Manager Elwell, and Attorney Randolph could meet with Ms. Garrison, Mrs. Song, and their superiors to discuss the issues of maximizing green space, save as much of the ball field as possible, and address the concerns raised by citizens and Landmark Commission members at this meeting?

Attorney Randolph replied that legally that could be done as long as the Town Council appointed the group as a body to meet with the School Board in an attempt to work out any unanswered questions. He added the Town Council should not designate the group as a Board, otherwise, the Sunshine Law would apply.

Attorney Randolph recommended the Town Council and the Landmarks Commission give direction to the School Board at this meeting regarding the schemes presented. He said it would be preferable if the School Board would take the input received at this meeting and then inform the Town at another meeting, advising of where they can go and where they cannot. Attorney Randolph offered to have the aforementioned group work with the School Board during the interim time prior to a presentation at another meeting.

President Brooks said he thought the Town Council and the Landmarks Commission had provided information at this meeting that Ms. Garrison and Mrs. Song could act upon.

**Minutes from the Special Joint Meeting – Town Council and Landmarks Preservation
Commission Held on September 23, 2002**

President Pro-Tem Goldblum said he would like to make it clear that the Landmarked building could not be demolished, and the School Board has to pay to raise the floor in that building. He continued that the Town Council liked scheme no. 2, and with that, the School Board should come back with a plan on how it would be accomplished.

Mayor Smith left the meeting at 3:35 p.m.

Jane Baker, 235 Cocanut Row, said many residents have signed petitions requesting this issue be put to the voters.

President Brooks responded that would be a dereliction of the Town Council's duty, and the Council has an obligation to resolve the situation.

Landmarks Chairman Gene Pandula questioned the \$8 million budget at 67,000 square feet that would equal \$120 per square foot.

Ms. Garrison replied the School Board usually builds at \$100/square foot.

Mr. Pandula, addressing the \$5 million overrun, said if \$1 million were allotted to aesthetics, i.e. details etc., leaving \$4 million for the historic building which is \$1,000 per square foot. He questioned the \$4 million as being excessive.

Ms. Garrison responded that the media center would have to be converted to a different use, and that is an expense not needed under any scheme that is the School Board's typical approach to a new building.

Mrs. Song added that the project is just in the development stage, and all costs are preliminary at this point.

Pat Segraves, Architect and Alternate Landmarks Commission member, questioned lengthening the construction line as he did not see the project happening in the time frame as presented unless weekly meetings were held with the Town.

Attorney Randolph said he heard the schedule was not subject to change, and the Town was prepared to expedite its process to assist the School Board regarding the meeting concept. He continued that depending upon the results from this meeting and if a site plan were selected, the next step would be consideration by the Landmarks Commission for review and final adoption. He said he did not foresee a situation where a first, second, and third review would be done by the Landmarks Commission, because the Town did not have that kind of luxury. He added the Town's process would be expedited from the standpoint of going before the Council; it would be expedited as far as going before the Landmarks Commission; and if a solution were reached, a development order would be entered into that would incorporate the Town's conditions as well as the Landmarks Commission's conditions.

**Minutes from the Special Joint Meeting – Town Council and Landmarks Preservation
Commission Held on September 23, 2002**

Town Manager Elwell, adding to Attorney Randolph's comments, said the reason for the extraordinary process described, which may sound excessively expedited to some listeners, is due to the fact that the project is not under the Town's ordinances in this instance but under the State Statutes. He continued that the Statutes are very clear as to the limited role of the Town in reviewing the School Board's proposal.

Mr. Pandula recommended scheme no. 2 be adopted as reflecting the best interests of the Town.

President Pro-Tem Goldblum said he recommended scheme no. 2 also and have Ms. Garrison and Mrs. Song go forward to work out the details with the School Board and the State to expedite the project and get it on schedule.

Gail Coniglio, Recreation Advisory Chairman, requested that Ms. Garrison and Mrs. Song secure a site plan to determine the areas around the Recreation Center and how the activities of the Center will be affected.

Ms. Garrison responded she was unable to get a survey of the park and requested if the Town had one, that it be provided.

Recreation Director Russell Bitzer replied he did have a survey.

Mrs. Song questioned if the reason for choosing scheme no. 2 was saving the 20 feet for the recreation field and saving the 1921 building, was changing other layouts a concern for the Council?

President Brooks, responding for the Council, said the layouts were not a concern.

Town Manager Elwell mentioned that, as the drawings become refined, the Town should express some thoughts about the parking lot that fronts on Seaview Avenue and how critical that element is or how expendable it may be.

President Brooks said, speaking for himself, that he would not be overly concerned about that parking lot.

Ms. Garrison said Mrs. Song is going to have to work under the existing budget of \$8 million, and additional funds cannot be considered given the time frame for the project.

President Brooks responded that the Council did not put the State requirements in regarding landmarking, and the building was landmarked because of its historic significance. He said he thought it was incumbent upon the School Board, in its budgeting process, that it understand that. He continued that solutions to some of the problems discussed at this meeting are under the perusal of the State or the School Board.

Town Manager Elwell said, that in the context of unfinished business regarding the budget, the Town may want to make a formal request to the School Board to be

**Minutes from the Special Joint Meeting – Town Council and Landmarks Preservation
Commission Held on September 23, 2002**

considered at the October 16th School Board meeting to consider ear-marking the proceeds from the sale of the property on the west side of Cocoanut Row to further address the budget for this project.

President Pro-Tem Goldblum made a motion to request the School Board use proceeds from the sale of property on the west side of Cocoanut Row to subsidize the project on the east side of Cocoanut Row. The motion was seconded by Councilman McLendon and carried 3-0 on roll call. Councilmen Wyett and McDonald were absent from the meeting.

Ms. Garrison requested input regarding the architectural style for the project.

Mr. Pandula suggested embellishing along the lines of the 1921 building.

Consultant Jane Day said, having discussed the issue with several of the Landmarks members separately, the interest is in producing a new building in the Mediterranean Revival style that is the signature of the original 1921 building. She explained that the entire site was landmarked, because the Town does not landmark individual buildings on a site.

Mr. Moore requested Ms. Garrison provide meaningful information regarding the true, hard costs.

Town Manager Elwell said it was his understanding that based upon identifying scheme no. 2 as the preferred alternative at this meeting that between now and the next visit to the Town, the site plan and the budget will be refined. He continued that a visit to the Town Council will be necessary for final review in addition to review by the Landmarks Commission to go over the detailed architectural design of the buildings.

Ms. Garrison said she understood the compromise was to allow the ball field to be moved slightly off the School Board's property with the architecture style to be Mediterranean Revival which is not the style of the present buildings. She said she had thought until this meeting that it might be a collaborative project, financially, and that was not the case at this meeting. She continued that the finances and several other items mentioned were concerns to her.

Attorney Randolph questioned if the Town was waiting to hear from the School Board and how would the Town approach the School Board meeting?

President Brooks said Town Manager Elwell would represent the Town, and he would contact Ms. Garrison to set up a mutually convenient date for a meeting.

Town Manager Elwell confirmed that staff will continue to communicate, and his expectation was to have the School Board appear one more time before the Council and the Landmarks Commission.

**Minutes from the Special Joint Meeting – Town Council and Landmarks Preservation
Commission Held on September 23, 2002**

President Brooks thanked all who attended the meeting.

IV. ANY OTHER MATTERS

There were no other matters.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:01 p.m.



William J. Brooks
Town Council President



Mary A. Pollitt
Town Clerk