



# **TOWN OF PALM BEACH**

## **PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

### **MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2020**

Please be advised that in keeping with a recent directive from the Town Council, the minutes of all Town Boards and Commissions will be "abbreviated" in style. Persons interested in listening to the meeting, after the fact, may access the audio of that item via the Town's website at [www.townofpalmbeach.com](http://www.townofpalmbeach.com).

#### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Small called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. All members participated via Zoom Webinar due to the COVID-19 situation.

#### **II. ROLL CALL**

Michael B. Small, Chairman	PRESENT
Robert N. Garrison, Vice Chairman	PRESENT
Alexander C. Ives, Member	PRESENT
Maisie Grace, Member	PRESENT
John David Corey, Member	PRESENT
Betsy Shiverick, Member	PRESENT
Jeffrey Smith, Interim Member	PRESENT
Katherine Catlin, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Dan Floersheimer, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Edward A. Cooney, Alternate Member	PRESENT

Staff Members present were:

Wayne Bergman, Director of Planning, Zoning and Building

Paul Castro, Zoning Manager

Laura Groves van Onna, Historic Preservation Planner

Kelly Churney, Secretary to the Architectural Review Commission

Bradley Falco, Zoning Technician

John Randolph, Town Attorney

#### **III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chairman Small led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. **RULES OF ORDER AND PROCEDURE**

Mr. Small congratulated Mr. Smith on his recent appointment to the Commission. He also thanked the Town Council and staff for allowing the Commission to meet virtually.

Mr. Small reviewed the administrative procedures for the meeting.

Mr. Small stated that the topic of demolition would be on the December 9, 2020 Town Council agenda.

V. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 28, 2020 MEETING**

**Motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Mr. Corey to approve the minutes from the October 28, 2020 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.**

VI. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Mr. Small announced the following changes to the agenda:

*Deferral of B-043-2020, 1045 S. Ocean Blvd. to the December 18, 2020 Meeting*

*Deferral of B-063-2020, 160 Royal Palm Way to the December 18, 2020 Meeting*

*Deferral of A-040-2020 130 Sunrise Ave., PH 1 to the December 18, 2020 Meeting*

**Motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Mr. Smith to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Bergman stated that staff would like to recommend the deferral of B-074-2019, 125 Worth Avenue to the December meeting as an informal project at a time certain.

Mr. Garrison agreed with Mr. Bergman's request.

Mr. Corey was troubled that the project had lingered for so long and had not been presented to the Commission. He requested that the project be presented. He thought that the online forum was successful and the Commission should hear the project.

Mr. Ives agreed with Mr. Corey. He thought the current meeting process worked and the project had been lingering over a year. He thought discussions should be heard.

Ms. Catlin agreed with Messrs. Ives and Corey. She thought that the virtual platform allowed for more participants.

Ms. Grace agreed with Mr. Garrison and thought that while many can access the virtual meeting, it did not work for everyone. She thought the project should be presented in person so that more citizens could participate.

Mr. Cooney thought the Zoom platform was successful and allowed for better participation.

Ms. Shiverick thought a discussion of the project was a good idea.

Town Attorney Randolph understood that both parties were requesting the project to be deferred to the December 18, 2020 meeting. He also understood that the applicants were requesting an informal meeting so that comments could be heard. Mr. Randolph recommended that the Commission defer the project to the December meeting.

Robert Frisbie, applicant, provided a history of the project and stated that the design team was ready to present or would be happy to defer to the December meeting.

Mr. Small inquired if the applicant had any objections to being deferred to at the December meeting at a time certain. Mr. Frisbie stated he would be happy to move forward at the wishes of the Commission.

Jamie Crowley, attorney for the applicant, stated his recommendation would be to hear the project informally at the December 18, 2020 meeting.

**Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Garrison to defer project B-074-2019, 125 Worth Avenue to the December meeting as an informal project at a time certain on the agenda. Motion carried 5-2, with Mr. Ives and Ms. Shiverick opposed.**

## VII. PROJECT REVIEW

### A. CONSENT AGENDA OF MINOR PROJECTS

#### 1. A-042-2020 Shutters

Address: 246 Tangier Ave.

Applicant: Robert S. Honeyman, Jr.

Professional: Jeffrey Tollison/All American Shutters

Project Description: Installation (1) manual roll up, (1) Impact Colonial and (1) Accordion.

*Please note: This item was pulled from the consent agenda.*

#### 2. A-054-2020 Landscape/Hardscape

Address: 238 Plantation Rd.

Applicant: Francesca Murray

Professional: Steve West/Parker Yannette Design Group

Project Description: Landscape and hardscape renovation plan.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication.

#### 3. A-055-2020 Modifications

Address: 210 Wells Road

Applicant: 341 Garden Road OPCO LLC (Gregory Borchardt, Member)

Professional: LaBerge & Menard Inc.

Project Description: Remove and replace windows with new impact rated.

Modifications to East, South and West elevations. Removal of South Loggia roof,

replace with open trellis. Partially enclose courtyard loggia for new breakfast room. Add to breezeway and enclose with a covered entrance.

4. A-059-2020 Modifications

Address: 402 Primavera Way

Applicant: Tom and Lillian O'Malley

Professional: LaBerge & Menard Inc.

Project Description: Add gate and decorative fountain at the entry courtyard.

5. A-061-2020 Modifications

Address: 105 Casa Bendita

Applicant: Atherton Property Trust (Robert Finnegan, Trustee)

Professional: Keith Williams/Nievera Williams Design

Project Description: New pool, generator, and rear hardscape. Replacement of rear site wall. New planting throughout.

6. A-065-2020 Awning

Address: 227 Angler Ave.

Applicant: Mary and Byron Thomas

Professional: Keith Williams/Nievera Williams Design

Project Description: Replace awning with pergola at rear of the property. Not visible from the right-of-way.

7. A-067-2020 Modifications

Address: 240 West Indies Dr.

Applicant: G240 West Indies LLC (Jordana Getreu)

Professional: MHK Architecture & Planning

Project Description: Street facing windows to be replaced with matching windows. Minor modifications and replacement of existing doors and windows along sides and rear elevation. Partial enclosure of an existing loggia of approx. 250'. No modifications are visible from the street. No additions or modifications to existing building envelope.

8. A-069-2020 Landscape/Hardscape

Address: 1055 North Ocean Blvd.

Applicant: William Rickman, Jr.

Professional: Mario Nievera/Nievera Williams Design

Project Description: Landscape as built plans and related hardscape adjustments.

***Please note: This item was pulled from the consent agenda.***

9. A-070-2020 Modifications

Address: 870 S. Ocean Blvd.

Applicant: Invest Komfort, LLC

Professional: Pat Segraves/SKA Architect + Planner

Project Description: Revising two facades to previously existing windows and doors neither changed nor replaced from ARCOM approval in 2016.

*Please note: This item was pulled from the consent agenda.*

**Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Garrison to approve the consent agenda as amended. Motion carried unanimously.**

**B. ITEMS PULLED FROM CONSENT AGENDA**

A-042-2020 Shutters

Address: 246 Tangier Ave.

Applicant: Robert S. Honeyman, Jr.

Professional: Jeffrey Tollison/All American Shutters

Project Description: Installation (1) manual roll up, (1) Impact Colonial and (1) Accordion.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Ralph Alparone, professional for the applicant, presented the proposed project.

Mr. Small called for public comments. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Small called for staff comments. Ms. Van Onna provided staff comments.

Mr. Cooney inquired about the roll up shutter at the front entrance to the home. Mr. Alparone responded.

Mr. Corey inquired if staff was aware that the shutters were installed prior to the Commission's approval. Ms. Van Onna responded. Mr. Corey expressed concern that there may be a loop hole to circumvent Commission approval.

Mr. Catlin expressed concern for the roll up shutter over the front door and questioned its appropriateness.

**Motion made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Garrison to approve the project as presented. Motion carried unanimously.**

A-069-2020 Landscape/Hardscape

Address: 1055 North Ocean Blvd.

Applicant: William Rickman, Jr.

Professional: Mario Nievera/Nievera Williams Design

Project Description: Landscape as built plans and related hardscape adjustments.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Keith Williams, Nievera Williams Design, presented the landscape and hardscape modifications proposed for the site.

Mr. Rickman, owner, described the conditions of his site and discussed the reasons for his request.

Pat Segraves, architect for the project, stated he discussed the project with Mr. Castro and Ms. Van Onna.

Mr. Rickman stated he has improved the amount of the impervious surface from the site prior to his renovation.

Ms. Van Onna and Mr. Castro provided staff comments.

Mr. Corey expressed concern that the proposed plans were an as built plan. Mr. Corey requested renderings for the proposed and as built plans. Mr. Williams showed the Commission the renderings and further explained the plans. Mr. Corey did not believe he had enough information to make a decision on the project. He also expressed concern for the synthetic turf proposed.

Ms. Shiverick agreed with Mr. Corey on the synthetic turf issue and thought native plants could be used.

Mr. Smith also expressed a concern for the synthetic turf and stated it would not count into the green space. Mr. Williams responded.

Mr. Rickman addressed the seawall and the reasons for the synthetic turf. He also discussed the reason the Palm trees were moved from the south side of the property.

Ms. Catlin requested different material other than synthetic turf.

Mr. Floersheimer thought there could be a different solution other than synthetic turf.

Mr. Small shared Mr. Corey's concerns and stated he had an issue with items that are installed without approval.

Mr. Small called for public comments. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Rickman stated he would install pavers and discussed all of previously planted material that had been lost to date. He discussed, what he believed, were his two options.

**Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to defer the project to the December 18, 2020 meeting with the caveat that full approved and proposed renderings and correct plans are submitted and that the native calculations are provided. Motion carried unanimously.**

A-070-2020 Modifications

Address: 870 S. Ocean Blvd.

Applicant: Invest Komfort, LLC

Professional: Pat Segraves/SKA Architect + Planner

Project Description: Revising two facades to previously existing windows and doors neither changed nor replaced from ARCOM approval in 2016.

Mr. Bergman stated that the Town had received a request from the owner for a one month deferral for the project. Mr. Segraves confirmed the request.

**Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Ives to defer the project to the December 18, 2020 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.**

**C. DEMOLITIONS AND TIME EXTENSIONS**

NONE

**D. MAJOR PROJECTS – OLD BUSINESS**

1. B-074-2019 Additions & Modifications

\*ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EXCEPTION WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW AND VARIANCE(S)\*

Address: 125 Worth Avenue

Applicant: 125 Worth Partners LLC

Professional: Jose Luis Gonzalez Perotti/Portuondo Perotti Architects

Project Description: The project consists of the façade renovation and addition to an existing four-story 1970's building. The fourth-floor structure will be removed and replaced with four new luxury residential apartments, and trellis gardens. The façade will be renovated with new architectural screens, white brick veneer and exposed concrete accents that will enhance the aesthetic of the building for its users and pedestrians alike. The addition component consists of a new one-story commercial structure with a roof top trellised courtyard and a two-story elevator tower.

ZONING INFORMATION: A request for Site Plan Review modification approval for revitalization, renovation and expansion of the 45-year-old nonconforming commercial building located at 125 Worth Avenue in the C-WA zoning district. The building will be completely renovated architecturally using design themes found in the Worth Avenue Design Guidelines. In addition, a two-story addition is being proposed on the east end of the property. To make this project financially feasible, the owners are requesting to demolish and rebuild the existing fourth story and expand its footprint to add four residential units. In addition to the Site Plan Review proposed modifications, the applicant is requesting the following Special Exceptions and Variances required to complete the project: 1. Per Section 134-1163(8)b., a special exception for a two-story and fourth-story addition. The existing building is four stories but it is being expanded. 2. Per Section 134-2182(b), a special exception for on-site shared parking, subject to a professional shared

parking analysis. 3. Per Section 134-419, a variance to allow an expansion of an existing nonconforming building by increasing the height from 53 feet in lieu of the 49 feet 2 inches existing and the 25-foot maximum allowed by code. 4. Section 134-419, a variance to allow an expansion of an existing nonconforming building by increasing the overall building height to 63 feet 4 inches in lieu of the 53 feet 8 inches existing and the 35-foot maximum allowed by current code. 5. Per Section 134-419, a variance to allow an expansion of an existing nonconforming building by increasing the existing air-conditioned floor area of the fourth story to 13,212.9 square-feet from 3,448.75 square-feet existing. An open fourth story trellis of 5,433 square-feet is also proposed in this application and included in the calculation of lot coverage, below. There is an existing exterior fourth floor covered area of approximately 3,290 square-feet in addition to the existing air-conditioned floor area on the fourth story of the building. 6. Per Section 134-1163(5), variance to allow a minimum front yard setback of 1-foot 1 inch for portions of the building in lieu of the 5 feet existing and the 5 feet minimum required on the private property. The sidewalk is required to be a minimum of 10 feet wide and this proposal is a minimum of 8 feet 2 inches in the area where the sidewalk is only 1 foot 1 inch wide on private property. 7. Per Section 134-1163(9)b., variance for lot coverage of 71% on the first floor in lieu of the 57% existing and the 35% maximum allowable. 8. Per Section 134-1163(9)b., variance for lot coverage of 66% on the second floor in lieu of the 57% existing and the 35% maximum allowed for second story. 9. Per Section 134-1163(9)b., variance for lot coverage of 54% on the fourth floor in lieu of the 20% existing and the 35% maximum allowable by code.

**Project history:**

December 2020 – Deferred to February 26, 2020 at request of applicant.  
 February 2020 – Deferred to March 25, 2020 at request of attorney & (neighbors).  
 March 2020 – Deferred to April 29, 2020 due to COVID-19  
 April 2020 – Deferred to May 27, 2020 due to COVID-19  
 May 2020 – Deferred to June 24, 2020 at request of attorney (neighbors request).  
 June 2020 – Deferred to July 29, 2020 at request of attorney (neighbors request).  
 July 2020 – Deferred to November 20, 2020 at request of attorney.

***Please note: This item was deferred to the December 18, 2020 meeting after the Approval of the Agenda, Item VI.***

2. **B-043-2020 Addition**

Address: 1045 S. Ocean Blvd.  
 Applicant: Kerry Vickar (Lionel Kerrin Vickar)  
 Professional: Roger Janssen/Dailey Janssen Architects  
 Project Description: New construction of a two story addition with basement.  
 New pool and pool deck. New hardscape and landscape, including civil/storm water management.

A motion carried at the October meeting to approve the project as presented with the caveat that the existing front doors would return to the November 20, 2020 meeting.

***Please note: This item was deferred to the December 18, 2020 meeting at the Approval of the Agenda, Item VI.***

3. **B-048-2020 New Construction**

Address: 257 Sanford Ave.



Applicant: Mary Bryant McCourt  
Professional: Patrick Ryan O'Connell/Patrick Ryan O'Connell Architect, LLC  
Project Description: Construction of a new two-story single family residence, landscape, hardscape and pool.

A motion carried at the August meeting to defer the project to the October 28, 2020 meeting in accordance of the comments from the Commissioners, which included concerns for scale and the way the sections related to each other, the fenestration, details needed restudied, too busy for the street, not in harmony with the rest of the homes. A motion carried at the October meeting to defer the project to the November 20, 2020 meeting with Commissioners questioning the portico, whether the style was in line with other homes on the street, the vertically of the home and whether it was charming enough for the street.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Mr. Small asked if the owner did voluntarily agree to dedicate a utility easement supporting the undergrounding project subject to the satisfaction of the Town. Mr. O'Connell agreed to the easement.

Mr. O'Connell discussed the overall changes that had been made to the design.

Rafael Portuondo, Portuondo Perotti Architects, presented the architectural modifications proposed for the new residence.

Mr. O'Connell showed the Commission paint samples.

Mr. Small called for public comments. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Small called for staff comments. Ms. Van Onna provided staff comments.

Mr. Garrison was in favor of the improvements.

Mr. Ives still had concerns but thought the changes helped the home fit in the area.

Ms. Grace requested a few fenestration changes.

Mr. Smith inquired about the timeline of the proposed demolition. Mr. O'Connell responded. Mr. Smith requested the maintenance of the pool and any white fly issues until demolition.

Mr. Floersheimer was in favor of the changes and of Ms. Grace's recommendations for the fenestration changes.

Mr. Castro provided staff comments relating to zoning issues.

**Motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Mr. Smith to approve the project as presented with the caveat that the cubic content ratio is resolved and that the project has met the criteria for approval listed in section 18-205 of the Town's code of ordinances. Motion carried unanimously. This application was approved with the condition that prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall either dedicate and record a utility easement, or enter into an agreement ensuring said easement, if necessary to facilitate utility undergrounding in the area.**

*Please note: A short break was taken at 10:26 a.m. The meeting resumed at 10:40 a.m.*

4. B-056-2020 New Construction

\*ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE TO VARIANCE(S)\*

Address: 756 Hi Mount Road

Applicant: Hi Mount LLC (Maura Ziska)

Professional: Ken Tate/Ken Tate Architect

Project Description: New one and two story plus sub-basement Mediterranean Revival Style single family residence with raised rear landscape terrace and fountain.

A motion carried at the September meeting to defer the project to the October 28, 2020 meeting in accordance with the comments from the Commissioners, which included how massive the home appeared from the Lake Trail, questioned the tower element, and a restudy of the gable on the northwest portion. A motion carried at the October meeting to defer the project to the November 20, 2020 meeting at the request of the professional.

ZONING INFORMATION: The applicant is proposing a new 8,327 square foot, two story residence on the subject property that will require the following variances: 1) Section 134-895(1): A chimney with a height of 13.56 feet in lieu of the 8.8 foot maximum allowed; 2) Section 134-8893(11): A lot coverage of 33% in lieu of the 30% maximum allowed for a two story residence in the R-B Zoning District; 3) Section 134-1: The proposed sub-basement is under the confines of the building above it and also below the lowest grade of the public street (Hi Mount Road) in front of the lot, however, it is not completely underground. A variance is being requested to allow a proposed sub-basement where a portion is not completely underground as there is a substantial change of grade from Hi Mount Road to Lake Trail. 4) Section 134-1670(c): A height of the retaining wall along the north property line to be 11.03 at its maximum height in lieu of the 7 foot maximum allowed. 5) Section 134-1670(c): A retaining wall at the northwest corner of the house, in the side yard within 10 feet of the property line that is at 14 feet in height in lieu of the 10 foot maximum from adjacent grade.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Mr. Small asked if the owner did voluntarily agree to dedicate a utility easement supporting the undergrounding project subject to the satisfaction of the Town. Ms. Ziska agreed to the easement.

Maura Ziska, attorney for the owner, provided an overview of the project, explained the changes in the zoning requests and advocated for a positive recommendation to the Town Council.

Mr. Tate presented the architectural revisions proposed for the new residence.

Jorge Sanchez, SMI Landscape Architecture, presented the landscape and hardscape revisions proposed for the new residence.

Mr. Small called for public comments.

Jamie Crowley, attorney for Robert and Christina Baker, thanked the design team for making the modifications. He stated that based on the representation from Maura Ziska, who indicated that the many of the items would not be seen from his client's side of the property, his clients do not have any objections with the proposed plans. Mr. Crowley stated that he requested that the proposed generator would be moved away from his client's property, to which Ms. Ziska agreed. He also encouraged the allowance of extended construction hours during the summer months so that the contractor would meet the 18 month timeline.

Ms. Ziska stated she could not commit to the relocation of the generator. Mr. Sanchez stated he would need to discuss the possibility with his clients.

Mr. Crowley stated he would need to see the proposed plans for the generator.

Mr. Small called for staff comments. Ms. Van Onna provided staff comments.

Mr. Castro provided staff comments relating to zoning issues.

Mr. Garrison thought the project fit into the community with the changes.

Mr. Ives supported the project and thought it was in keeping with the area.

Ms. Grace was in favor of the changes and thought the project was successful. Her only concern was that people would not be able to view the home from the Lake Trail because it was so heavily landscaped.

Mr. Corey thought the changes were an improvement to the design. Mr. Corey inquired about the tower feature and questioned if the area was unresolved. Mr. Corey thought some taller landscape should be planted on the western side of the property for shade purposes.

Ms. Shiverick was very happy with the changes and stated she would support the project.

Mr. Floersheimer still questioned the tower feature and the size of the proposed basement. He questioned if the generator could be located in the basement. Mr. Tate stated he would have to investigate the recommendation.

Many of the Commissioners were supportive of the project.

**Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Shiverick that implementation of the proposed variance will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject property. Motion carried unanimously.**

**A second motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Ms. Grace to approve the project as presented and that the project has met the criteria for approval listed in section 18-205 of the Town's code of ordinances. Motion carried unanimously. This application was approved with the condition that prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall either dedicate and record a utility easement, or enter into an agreement ensuring said easement, if necessary to facilitate utility undergrounding in the area.**

5. B-059-2020 New Construction

Address: 125 El Bravo Way

Applicant: 125 El Bravo Way LLC (Braden Smith, Manager)

Professional: MP Design and Architecture Inc.

Project Description: New two-story residence with three car garage on a vacant lot. New landscape, hardscape and pool.

A motion carried at the September meeting to defer the project to the October 28, 2020 meeting due to concerns such as the front entrance was too massive, the fenestration, the house was too bulky, lack of charm, the garages on the front of the home, not in harmony with the neighborhood. A motion carried at the October meeting to defer the project to the November 20, 2020 meeting at the request of the professional.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Mr. Small asked if the owner did voluntarily agree to dedicate a utility easement supporting the undergrounding project subject to the satisfaction of the Town. Mr. Perry agreed to the easement.

Michael Perry, MP Design and Architecture, Inc., presented the architectural revisions proposed for the new residence.

Keith Williams, Nievera Williams Design, presented the landscape and hardscape revisions proposed for the new residence.

Mr. Small called for public comments. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Small called for staff comments. Ms. Van Onna provided staff comments.

Mr. Garrison was in favor of the changes and thought they were an improvement. Mr. Garrison spoke highly of the proposed landscape plan.

Mr. Ives agreed with Mr. Garrison on the landscape plan. Mr. Ives was thought the architectural changes were good. He questioned the pediment but otherwise was supportive of the project.

Ms. Grace thought the previous design of the home was charming but thought the new design was statelier and fit more into the neighborhood.

Mr. Corey was in favor of the landscape plan but questioned the fountain against the property line. Mr. Williams responded. Mr. Corey thought the new design was cleaner than the previous whimsical design. He still questioned the mass from the street and the front pediment. He thought some improvement could be made to the front of the front. He also was concerned with the way the garage protruded into the front of the lot. He suggested a change to the roof over the pergola. Mr. Corey thought these items needed to be deferred.

Ms. Shiverick thought the previous design had more charm than the newly, proposed design. She agreed with many of Mr. Corey's suggestions, including the front entrance pediment. She also liked Mr. Corey's suggestion to the change in the garage design. Ms. Shiverick was in favor of the landscape design.

Mr. Smith liked the proposed style of the home but thought a cement tile was a better choice over the wood shake. He made a suggestion for the front pediment. Mr. Smith was in favor of the landscape design.

Ms. Catlin liked the home but agreed with the comments on the front pediment. She thought the home would be a great addition to the street.

Mr. Cooney thought the proposed style was more in keeping with the street. He agreed with the comments on the pediment and garage design.

Mr. Small agreed with the other Commissioners and thought the design was more in line with the neighborhood. He thought a change in the front pediment and the garage design would be appropriate. Mr. Small was in favor of the landscape design.

Mr. Corey questioned the transoms on the first floor and suggested changes to the fenestration. Ms. Shiverick agreed.

Mr. Perry addressed some of the comments of the Commissioners.

**Motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Mr. Smith to approve the project as presented with the caveat that the following items are restudied and will return to the December 18, 2020 meeting: front entrance pediment, the windows and a change in the roof material to a flat, white concrete tile and that the project has met the criteria for approval listed in section 18-205 of the Town's code of ordinances. Motion failed 3-4, with Mses. Grace, Shiverick and Messrs. Corey and Small opposed.**

**Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to defer the project for one month, to the December 18, 2020 meeting for a restudy of the front entrance pediment, the windows, the roof material, the garage design and the roof over the pergola. Motion carried 6-1, with Mr. Garrison opposed.**

6. B-061-2020 New Construction

Address: 165 Seaspray Ave.

Applicant: M2B Properties LLC (Gregory L. Palmer, Agent)

Professional: Gregory L. Palmer/Harrison Design

Project Description: New Construction of a single family residence on an open lot.

A motion carried at the October meeting to defer the project to the November 20, 2020 in accordance with the comments from the Commissioners, which questioned the lack of character, charm and identity of the design and whether the rear of the home could be separated into its own cottage.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Mr. Small asked if the owner did voluntarily agree to dedicate a utility easement supporting the undergrounding project subject to the satisfaction of the Town. Mr. Palmer agreed to the easement.

Mr. Palmer presented the architectural revisions proposed for the new residence.

Steve West, Parker Yannette Design Group Inc., presented the landscape and hardscape revisions proposed for the new residence.

Mr. Small called for public comments. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Small called for staff comments. Ms. Van Onna provided staff comments.

Mr. Garrison was in favor of the changes to the front of the home. He questioned the landscaping in the rear of the home. Mr. West responded. A short discussion ensued about the rear landscaping.

Mr. Ives stated that with the changes, he still felt that the home had an unresolved identity. He questioned if the design was a missed opportunity for the street.

Ms. Grace was in favor of the changes that had been made. However, she thought there was a lack of compatibility between the small structures and the main house. She wished the windows on the front were more vertical in their approach.

Mr. Corey thought the house was charming and fit into the area. He also was in favor of the landscape plan.

Ms. Shiverick agreed with Mr. Ives and thought an opportunity was being missed in the design. She questioned the clapboard versus the stucco. She questioned the dark grey for the driveway. She also requested to see the blue color for the shutters. She thought the design would be more fitting in the cottage style.

Mr. Smith did not have any issues with the design.

Ms. Catlin did not have any issues and thought the home worked fine for the area. Mr. Floersheimer agreed.

Mr. Small thought the project was improved and fit on the street.

**Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Smith to approve the project as presented and that the project has met the criteria for approval listed in section 18-205 of the Town's code of ordinances. Motion carried 4-3, with Ms. Shiverick, Grace and Mr. Ives opposed. This application was approved with the condition that prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall either dedicate and record a utility easement, or enter into an agreement ensuring said easement, if necessary to facilitate utility undergrounding in the area.**

7. B-063-2020 Modifications

\*ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EXCEPTION WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW AND VARIANCE(S)\* - DONE  
10/28

Address: 160 Royal Palm Way

Applicant: LR Palm House LLC (Maura Ziska)

Professional: Michael Sean McLendon/Cooper Carry

Project Description: The existing Palm House hotel is located at 160 Royal Palm Way. It is currently vacant and construction is partially completed. The structure is three stories with a partially enclosed basement containing parking and back-of-house functions. The proposed new work for the hotel includes completion and conversion of guest rooms for a total of 79 keys. A new pool deck will be constructed adjacent to the existing Function Room. Other exterior improvements will include re-painting, new exterior floor finishes, trellises and a covered

walkway leading to the existing Function Room. Fenestration requiring replacement will be replaced with similar windows and doors.

A motion carried at the September meeting to defer the project to the October 28, 2020 meeting in accordance with the comments of the Commissioners, which included concern for the gazebo-typed dome structure in the courtyard, the structure for existing the lobby on the interior south elevation, the curtains on the front of the structure, the crowding of elements in the courtyard, the trash location needed resolution, and improvements needed in the porte cochère element. A motion carried at the October meeting that implementation of the proposed variances will not cause negative architectural impact to the subject property. A second meeting carried to approve the project as presented with the caveat that the landscape, service gate and paint colors would return to the November 20, 2020 meeting in accordance with the comments from the Commissioners.

*Please note: This item was deferred to the December 18, 2020 meeting at the Approval of the Agenda, Item VI.*

**E. MAJOR PROJECTS – NEW BUSINESS**

**1. B-064-2020 Additions/Modifications**

Address: 260 Nightingale Trail

Applicant: David Canepari

Professional: Keith Spina/Spina O'Rourke

Project Description: The renovation of the existing 3,274 sf one-story residence to include new exterior building color, shutter color, roof material, garage door and detail trim work. The addition of 120 sf one-story kitchen addition on the north side of Nightingale Trail. Associated landscape.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Mr. Small asked if the owner did voluntarily agree to dedicate a utility easement supporting the undergrounding project subject to the satisfaction of the Town. Mr. Freijomel agreed to the easement.

Nelo Freijomel, Spina O'Rourke, presented the architectural modifications proposed for the existing residence.

Keith Williams, Nievera Williams Design, presented the landscape and hardscape revisions proposed for the new residence.

Mr. Small called for public comments. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Small called for staff comments. Ms. Van Onna provided staff comments.



Mr. Garrison was in favor of the changes but questioned the proposed garage door and the darkness of the proposed slate roof. Mr. Ives agreed.

Ms. Grace was in favor of the project.

Mr. Corey was in favor of the project but would rather see a white roof.

Ms. Shiverick was in favor of the project. She suggested using a more gray material rather than the black roof material proposed.

Mr. Smith supported the project.

Many of the Commissioners were in favor of the project.

**Motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Ms. Grace to approve the project as presented and that the project has met the criteria for approval listed in section 18-205 of the Town's code of ordinances. Motion carried unanimously. This application was approved with the condition that prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall either dedicate and record a utility easement, or enter into an agreement ensuring said easement, if necessary to facilitate utility undergrounding in the area.**

*Please note: A lunch break was taken at 12:34 p.m. The meeting resumed at 1:00 p.m. Upon roll call, all were in attendance with the exception of Messrs. Corey, Ives and Ms. Grace. Messrs. Corey and Ives returned at 1:02 p.m. Ms. Grace returned at 1:03 p.m.*

2. B-065-2020 Modifications

Address: 223 Monterey Road

Applicant: Michael Peacock

Professional: Roger Hansrote/ACI

Project Description: Remove and replace all exterior windows and doors with impact rated assemblies. Add new windows at front entry and add doors at various locations. Add a new entry with new roof. New generator located to the northeast and replace existing cement tile roof with cedar shingle roof. Newly proposed hardscape and landscape improvements.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Mr. Small asked if the owner did voluntarily agree to dedicate a utility easement supporting the undergrounding project subject to the satisfaction of the Town. Mr. Hansrote agreed to the easement.

Roger Hansrote, Architectural Consultants Inc., presented the architectural modifications proposed for the existing residence.

Adam Mills, Environment Design Group, presented the landscape and hardscape revisions proposed for the existing residence.

Mr. Small called for public comments. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Small called for staff comments. Ms. Van Onna provided staff comments.

Ms. Grace was happy to see the renovation of the small home on the north end. She was in favor of the proposed landscape plan.

Several of the Commissioners were in favor of the renovations.

Ms. Shiverick recommended keeping the shutters on the home, possibly in a green color. She was supportive of the project.

Mr. Smith did not see an improvement to the home but was in favor of the landscape plan. Ms. Catlin and Mr. Floersheimer agreed.

Mr. Cooney agreed that the shutters should remain on the home and was in favor of the landscape plan.

Mr. Small thought the existing home had more charm rather than the proposed improvements.

Ms. Grace inquired if the change had already been made to the roof. Mr. Hansrote responded.

Mr. Cooney stated that he believed the new windows were already installed. Mr. Hansrote confirmed that this was the case.

A discussion ensued about a possible motion.

**Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Garrison to defer the project for one month, to the December 18, 2020 meeting to respond to the comments made by the Commissioners and with the direction that no further work is to be done to the property. Motion carried unanimously.**

3. B-070-2020 Additions/Modifications

Address: 109 El Mirasol

Applicant: 109 El Mirasol Drum Set Trust (Maura Ziska, Trustee)

Professional: MP Design and Architecture, Inc.

Project Description: Additions and renovations to the existing two-story residence. New hardscape, landscape and pool.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Mr. Small asked if the owner did voluntarily agree to dedicate a utility easement supporting the undergrounding project subject to the satisfaction of the Town. Mr. Perry agreed to the easement.

Michael Perry, MP Design and Architecture, Inc., presented the architectural modifications proposed for the existing residence.

Mario Nievera, Nievera Williams Design, presented the landscape and hardscape revisions proposed for the existing residence.

Mr. Small called for public comments. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Small called for staff comments. Ms. Van Onna provided staff comments.

Mr. Garrison supported the project.

Mr. Ives was in favor of the landscape plan. Mr. Ives questioned the fountain feature in relationship to the renovated home and stated he could not support the project.

Ms. Grace thought the renovation was positive. She stated she would prefer white windows and doors rather than the bronze proposed. She questioned the fenestration on the north and south elevation.

Mr. Corey questioned if a window or a balcony was proposed on the rear façade. Mr. Perry stated that French doors and a Juliet balcony was requested. Mr. Corey thought the landscape plan was fine but questioned the six Coconut Palms on the street.

Ms. Shiverick thought the architectural changes were an improvement. She was in favor of the landscape plans as well.

Mr. Smith thought the renovation was a vast improvement to the existing home.

Ms. Catlin was supportive of the project.

Mr. Small thought the front door was understated but was supportive of the remainder of the project.

**Motion made by Ms. Grace and seconded by Mr. Garrison to approve the project as presented with the condition that the north and south windows are changed from horizontal to vertical panes and that the project has met the criteria for approval listed in section 18-205 of the Town's code of ordinances. Motion carried 5-2, with Messrs. Ives and Small opposed. This application**

**was approved with the condition that prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall either dedicate and record a utility easement, or enter into an agreement ensuring said easement, if necessary to facilitate utility undergrounding in the area.**

4. B-071-2020 New Construction

Address: 1332 N. Ocean Blvd.

Applicant: 1332 Ocean Trust (Guy Rabideau, Trustee)

Professional: Peter Papadopoulos/Smith and Moore Architects, Inc.

Project Description: New two-story residence. New swimming pool. Final landscape and hardscape.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Mr. Small asked if the owner did voluntarily agree to dedicate a utility easement supporting the undergrounding project subject to the satisfaction of the Town. Mr. Papadopoulos agreed to the easement.

Peter Papadopoulos, Smith and Moore Architects, Inc., presented the architectural modifications proposed for the existing residence.

Jorge Sanchez, SMI Landscape Architecture, presented the landscape and hardscape revisions proposed for the existing residence. Claudia Visconti, SMI Landscape Architecture, added further explanation of the plans.

Mr. Small called for public comments. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Small called for staff comments. Mr. Castro responded to the comment regarding the screening of street side parking. Ms. Van Onna provided further staff comments.

Mr. Garrison thought the home took advantage of the site and the landscaping enhanced the site. He was very supportive of the project.

Mr. Ives stated the entire project was delightful. Mr. Ives was sympathetic to Mr. Sanchez's comments regarding street side parking.

Ms. Grace thought the home stood out for the area but was very attractive, stately and had nice detailing. She questioned the pergola design and was sympathetic to Mr. Sanchez's comments. She questioned whether a variance should be sought to open up the landscaping. She also questioned the black balconies but was supportive of the project.

Mr. Corey thought the design of the home was exceptional and beautiful. He was very supportive of the project. He was supportive of the landscape plan but

questioned the low plantings on the north side of the home. Ms. Visconti responded.

Ms. Shiverick agreed with Mr. Corey. She requested higher plantings on the east side of the home outside of the family room. Mr. Sanchez responded.

Ms. Shiverick inquired about the Code provision to screen parking from the street. Mr. Castro responded.

Mr. Smith and Ms. Catlin were in favor of the home.

Mr. Floersheimer inquired about the inspiration for the home. Mr. Papadopoulos responded.

Messrs. Small and Cooney were both supportive of the project.

**Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve the project as presented and that the project has met the criteria for approval listed in section 18-205 of the Town's code of ordinances. Motion carried unanimously. This application was approved with the condition that prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall either dedicate and record a utility easement, or enter into an agreement ensuring said easement, if necessary to facilitate utility undergrounding in the area.**

**F. MINOR PROJECTS – OLD BUSINESS**

1. A-024-2020 Solar Panels

Address: 159 Seaspray Ave.

Applicant: Eric Leiner

Professional: Manuel Siques/Go Solar Power

Project Description: Solar PV System Roof Mount and Interconnection.

A motion carried at the August meeting to defer the project to the October 28, 2020 meeting due to lack of detailed plans and no notice to the neighbors. A motion carried at the October meeting to defer the project to the November 20, 2020 meeting as no presentation and mini-set were received.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Jackson McInerney, Go Solar Power, presented the proposed solar panels proposed for the existing residence.

Mr. Small inquired about the new location of the panels if some of the panels on the east roof were removed. Mr. McInerney responded.

Mr. Small called for public comments. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Small called for staff comments. Ms. Van Onna provided staff comments.

Mr. Garrison thought the Commission should be hesitant to allow panels on sloped roofs that face neighbors.

Mr. Ives thought maybe the Town should come up with more direction for solar panels. He also suggested that the Town Council come up with some guidance on solar panel applications. Since the panels were functional, he believed there was only so many aesthetic options for the them.

Ms. Grace believed it was not aesthetically pleasing to see solar panels so she was not supportive of the request.

Mr. Corey stated he was sympathetic to the neighbors but he did not believe they would be seen from the street and from the neighbors. He was torn.

Ms. Shiverick agreed with Ms. Grace and did not support the request.

Mr. Smith thought the panels were fine on flat roofs but were not appropriate for sloped roofs.

Ms. Catlin agreed with Mr. Smith. She also thought more information on the Tesla panels would be nice.

Mr. Floersheimer thought the Commission should balance climate change versus aesthetics. Mr. Floersheimer inquired about the functionality of the panels. Mr. McInerney responded.

Mr. Cooney shared the aesthetic concerns and requested to hear from the neighbor.

Mr. Small thought the panels were acceptable for the flat roof but not for the sloped roof.

David Williams, 145 Seaspray Avenue, expressed his objections to the panels on the sloped roof.

Mr. Small inquired about any flat spaces on the south side of the home. Mr. McInerney responded.

**Motion made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Corey to defer the project for one month, to the December 18, 2020 meeting, for a restudy of the solar panels to be placed only on the flat sections of the roof and that the panels are not visible from the street and/or neighbors regardless of landscaping. Motion carried unanimously.**

2. A-040-2020 Awnings

\*ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE TO SITE PLAN REVIEW AND VARIANCE(S)\*

Address: 130 Sunrise Ave., PH 1

Applicant: Elaine Hirsch

Professional: Jeffrey Brasseur/Brasseur & Drobot Architects

Project Description: Add a 30' x 12'-2" fixed awning to 7<sup>th</sup> floor, penthouse 1, Northwest side of 130 Sunrise Ave.

A motion carried at the October meeting to defer the project to the November 20, 2020 meeting at the request of the attorney.

ZONING INFORMATION: A site plan modification with variances to allow a 365 square foot fixed awning over the terrace on the seventh floor of a seven story condominium building. The following variances are being requested: 1. Section 134-948(8): To allow the awning at a height of 61.5 feet in lieu of the 23 1/2 foot maximum height allowed in the R-C Zoning District. Section 134-948(8): To allow the awning at an overall height of 63.66 feet in lieu of the 26 1/2 foot maximum height allowed in the R-C Zoning District. Section 134-948(8): To allow the awning on the existing seventh floor penthouse of a seven story building in lieu of the two story building maximum allowed in the R-C Zoning District. Section 134-948(6): To allow a west side yard setback of 50.1 feet in lieu of the 61.5 foot minimum allowed. Section 134-948(7): To allow a rear street yard setback of 106.5 feet in lieu of the 123.16 foot minimum allowed.

***Please note: This item was deferred to the December 18, 2020 meeting at the Approval of the Agenda, Item VI.***

**G. MINOR PROJECTS – NEW BUSINESS**

1. A-048-2020 Modifications

Address: 230 Atlantic Ave.

Applicant: Linda Saligman

Professional: Albert Jacob/Larch Designs Plus

Project Description: Interior remodel to include new kitchen, master bath and closet. New front staircase with new interior doors and trim throughout. New front façade to include double front door and single window above, along with new garage door to replace existing single car garage doors.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Mr. Jacob presented the architectural, landscape and hardscape modifications proposed for the existing residence.

Mr. Small called for public comments. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Small called for staff comments. Mr. Castro provided staff comments relating to zoning. Ms. Van Onna provided further staff comments.

Mr. Garrison stated he preferred the existing elevations rather the proposed. He suggested a deferral of the project so the professional could bring back all of the relevant information.

Mr. Ives was supportive of the landscape plan. He suggested beefing up the shaded area and questioned the size of the water wall. He suggested fulling committing to one style with the change in the front façade.

Ms. Grace was in favor of simplifying the front exterior but she was not in favor of the large arch proposed. She suggested using more design in the garage door.

Mr. Corey questioned whether the proposed arch worked with the rest of the home. He was in favor of the existing two, single car garage doors rather than the double proposed. He thought the professional needed to move forward with one design style.

Ms. Shiverick agreed with Mr. Corey. She inquired about the driveway wall and swirls proposed. Mr. Jacob responded.

Mr. Smith stated he preferred the existing façade and was not in favor of the front wall and piers.

Ms. Catlin was not in favor of the redesign of the front façade or the fenestration changes.

Mr. Floersheimer thought there should be consistency in the fenestration changes. He expressed concern for the amount of impervious surfaces and suggested reducing the water wall.

Mr. Cooney thought the existing home was better than the proposed. He expressed concern about the size of the water wall as well as the front wall and piers.

Mr. Small was not in favor of the redesign of the front façade.

**Motion made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Garrison to defer the project for one month, to the December 18, 2020 meeting, for a restudy in accordance of the comments from the Commissioners. Motion carried unanimously.**

2. A-058-2020 Dock

Address: 630 Island Dr.

Applicant: Island Drive Realty Trust (Mark Biondi, Trustee)

Professional: Coston Marine Services Inc.

Project Description: Install an “L” shaped dock measuring 22’ long x 8’ wide access pier to a 55” long x 8’ wide “L” shaped pier head. Install an 8 piling



aluminum boat lift on the outside of the “L” dock. Install small lights on piling, face down, to shine on the deck. Install power pedestal for boat.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Mr. Small asked about the reason that docks were now being reviewed by the Commission. Ms. Van Onna responded.

Michael Bryant, Coston Marine Services, Inc., presented the installation of the proposed dock.

Mr. Small inquired how the dock would look in relation to the other docks in the area. Mr. Bryant responded.

Mr. Bryant presented photographs of the existing site.

Mr. Small called for public comments. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Small called for staff comments. Ms. Van Onna provided staff comments.

Ms. Grace thought that the further the docks stuck out into the water, they are less attractive.

Mr. Corey thought more information was needed to make a decision.

Ms. Shiverick expressed concern at the size and how far the dock protruded into the canal.

Mr. Bryant showed the Commission a sample of the dock material and responded to Ms. Shiverick’s concerns.

Ms. Catlin agreed with Ms. Shiverick’s assessment.

Mr. Floersheimer thought the proposed dock was excessively dissimilar to other docks in the area.

Mr. Small agreed with Ms. Shiverick’s assessment.

Mr. Castro provided staff comments.

There was further discussion about the project and whether the project should be reviewed by the Commission.

**Motion made by Mr. Garrison and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve the project as presented and that the project has met the criteria for approval**

**listed in section 18-205 of the Town's code of ordinances. Motion failed 3-4, with Mses. Shiverick, Grace and Messrs. Corey and Small opposed.**

**Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to defer the project for one month, to the December 18, 2020 meeting with the request that the professional provide the dock in a broad context of where it is in the surrounding properties and the surrounding docks as well as provide renderings.**

A discussion ensued on whether it was appropriate for the Commission to review the project.

**Motion carried 4-3, with Messrs. Garrison, Ives and Smith opposed.**

3. A-060-2020 Awnings

Address: 240 Via Las Brisas

Applicant: Michael Rome

Professional: MP Design and Architecture, Inc.

Project Description: New front entry layout with simplified railing design.

Replacing barrel tile roof with flat cement roof tile. Simplified stucco sill details.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Michael Perry, MP Design and Architecture, Inc., presented the architectural modifications proposed for the existing residence.

Mr. Small called for public comments. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Small called for staff comments. Ms. Van Onna provided staff comments.

Many of the Commissioners were in favor of the changes.

Ms. Shiverick was in favor of the project and was in favor of the added casings to the windows. Ms. Catlin and Mr. Floersheimer agreed.

**Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to approve the project as presented with the window casings shown, and that the project has met the criteria for approval listed in section 18-205 of the Town's code of ordinances. Motion carried unanimously.**

4. A-062-2020 Signage

\*ARCOM TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EXCEPTION\*

Address: 227 Suite A and 223 Royal Poinciana Way

Applicant: Flagler Holdings North Carolina, Inc. (Alex Gilmurray, Executive VP)

Professional: RGE Associates

Project Description: Illuminated building signage and vinyl for tenant space in building 1 and building 2 at Via Flagler.

ZONING INFORMATION: Pursuant to Section 134-2373(13) of the Town Code, the applicant is requesting special exception approval to allow an internally illuminated, backlit business identification sign for Main Street by The Breakers, a new retail facility to be located at 223 Royal Poinciana Way. The applicant is also requesting an additional special exception to allow the same type of internally illuminated, backlit business identification sign for Shan, a retail clothing store to be located at 227 Royal Poinciana Way, Suite A. Both of these buildings are located at Via Flagler (221 Royal Poinciana Way) in the C-TS zoning district, and the signs will be consistent with the backlit business identification sign that was approved by ARCOM and the Town Council for Henry's. Other than the special exception for an illuminated sign, no other special exceptions or variances are requested or required.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Jamie Crowley, attorney for Flagler Holdings North Carolina, Inc., presented the zoning requests and the proposed backlit signage. He showed inspiration for the signage proposed.

Mr. Small called for public comments. There were no comments heard at this time.

Mr. Small called for staff comments. Ms. Van Onna provided staff comments. Mr. Castro provided further comments on the zoning requests.

Mr. Garrison was in favor of the proposed signage.

Mr. Ives thought the Main Street sign felt cramped and was also concerned that it stated Main Street. He thought the interior signs were acceptable.

Ms. Grace was unsure the building should have more backlit signage. She thought the placement on the outside of the buildings were distracting. She felt that the Shan sign was too large and should not be backlit.

Mr. Corey was not in favor of the Main St. signage and the placement. He also felt the signs were too large.

Ms. Shiverick agreed with Mr. Corey and thought the building should be unsigned. She also did not believe the hair salon signage should be backlit.

Mr. Smith suggested placing the Main Street signage above the door and spell out street. He also agreed that the hair salon signage should not be backlit.

Ms. Catlin thought the different signage would make the building look like a hodgepodge of signage.

Mr. Floersheimer was in favor of the stenciling on the doors but opposed to any backlit signage.

Mr. Cooney was troubled by the signage and the illumination of the signage. Michael Del Gigante, RGE Associates, responded. Mr. Cooney stated he could not support the project.

Mr. Crowley inquired if it was appropriate to bifurcate the motion to allow signage for the hair salon when the establishment opened.

**Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to approve the signage on the glazing but to defer the signage on the building for one month, to the December 18, 2020 meeting, in accordance of the comments of the Commissioners. Motion carried unanimously.**

VIII. **STAFF APPROVALS**

There were no staff approval questions at this time.

IX. **DISCUSSION**

1. Commission Size Discussion

Mr. Bergman provided a background on this discussion and stated the Town Manager's office wanted staff to review the makeup of the Commissions. Staff felt the Commission sizes were too large and recommended a reduction through attrition to a 5 member board with two alternates. Town Council requested that staff speak with all of the Commissions to gain their feedback on the size of the Commissions.

All of the Commissioners provided their feedback on the issue.

X. **UNSCHEDULED ITEMS (3 MINUTE LIMIT PLEASE)**

1. Public

There were no public comments at this time.

2. Staff

There were no public comments at this time.

3. Commission

Mr. Cooney inquired about the potential second day for the December meeting. It was announced that the second day would be December 21, 2020.

Mr. Cooney also asked if he could review the previous Designation Manual and the modified Designation Manual. Mr. Bergman stated he could send both items to Mr. Cooney.

Mr. Ives thought that the longer meetings could be attributed to the changes in the Designation Manual.

Ms. Grace inquired about the work that had been completed at the home on Monterey. Mr. Bergman stated he would need to research the issue.

Mr. Floersheimer was in favor of the new Consent Agenda.

XI. **ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion made by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Ives to adjourn the meeting at 5:09 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.**

The next meeting will be held on Friday, December 18, 2020 at 9:00 a.m. in the Town Council Chambers, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, Town Hall, 360 S. County Road.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael B. Small, Chairman  
ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

kmc