

**C.     MAJOR PROJECTS – OLD BUSINESS**

1.     B-065-2021 7 OCEAN LN.

Applicant: 7 Ocean Lane, LLC (Nedim Soylemez, Manager)

Professional: Portuondo Perotti Architects, Inc.

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

A motion carried at the June meeting to defer the project to the July 28, 2021 meeting for a restudy in accordance with the comments of the Commissioners. At the July 28, 2021 meeting, a motion was made to deny the proposed new home as presented but failed for lack of a second. Another motion was made to defer the project, for two months to the September 29, 2021 meeting, for a restudy with a potential change in style, moving the house to the west, reducing the size of the house, reducing the east fenestration and reducing the garage size or relocating it to the basement as well as all of the direction provided. A motion carried at the September meeting to defer the project to the November 19, 2021 meeting for a restudy with particular attention to the front façade screening and the glazing on the rear façade.

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. Portuondo agreed to the easement.

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

Dustin Mizell, Environment Design Group, presented the landscape and hardscape plans proposed for the site.

Mr. Small called for public comments.

Rick Gonzalez, representing neighbor Elizabeth Ailes, stated his client was very happy with the new changes, particularly with the garage sunken to the basement level. He stated that Ms. Ailes fully supported the application.

Elizabeth Ailes, 6 Ocean Lane, expressed her appreciation for the owners and design professionals who listened to her concerns in the new re-design of the home. She offered her full support for the project.

Attorney John Eubanks, representing neighbor Elizabeth Ailes, appreciated the professionals that listened to Ms. Ailes' concerns for the new home.

Mr. Small called for staff comment. Ms. Pardue and Mr. Murphy provided staff comments.

Ms. Catlin thought the design was refreshing and exciting. She was in favor of the gardens and happy to see the garage location in the basement.

Mr. Floersheimer agreed with Ms. Catlin. He appreciated the new siting of the home further back from the ocean. He questioned the site lines shown in the presentation. Mr. Floersheimer was happy to see the garage location in the lower level. He was unsure about the brick rather than the previously proposed vertical slats. He thought the mechanical equipment should be located on the ground rather than the roof. He questioned the amount of glass on the east elevation and thought this side should be restudied.

Mr. Kirchhoff asked for further clarification of the brick screening. He questioned the egress from the second floor windows with the brick screening proposed. He asked for the details on the aluminum levers proposed.

Mr. Ives questioned whether the proposed home was better than the last presentation. He was excited by the professional's approach and material choices; however, he added that the home felt static and boxy.

Mr. Corey thought the landscape plan was well done and thought the material choices were environmentally smart. Mr. Corey expressed concern that while the lot was one of the smallest in the neighborhood, the proposed home was designed setback to setback and bigger than the neighboring homes. He thought the home was too big on the site. He also thought the pool was too large and too close to the ocean. He was not in favor of the mechanical equipment's location on the roof.

Ms. Grace agreed with the comments of the other Commissioners. She agreed with Mr. Corey's comments that the home's size was pushing the limits. She still questioned the east façade fenestration and thought it should be reduced. She was in favor of the plantings on the west façade. She wondered if a deed restriction would be placed on the plantings. She was not in favor of the mechanical equipment's location on the roof. Ms. Grace was in favor of the material choices but wondered if the home would appear dense and lack movement. She recommended a slight increase in the east side plantings.

Ms. Shiverick agreed and thought the home was dense and static. She was unsure which brick screen pattern was proposed and wondered if it appeared too dense. She also questioned why all of the designs for this lot had been big and boxy; she suggested a lighter and open home with porches for this lot. She liked the native plant materials and the garage location proposed.

Mr. Sammons thought this home was static and lacked movement. He thought the home design was too deep and fat. He also questioned the lack of individuality in the design. He thought the home was just another home that would erode the character in Palm Beach.

Mr. Smith was in favor of the new garage location and stepping the home back from the beach. He agreed with Mr. Kirchhoff's concern about the egress from the second floor. He thought eliminating the roof on the balcony, east façade, would help to ameliorate the design's size and rectangular like appearance.

Mr. Small agreed with the other Commissioners. However, he complimented the professional for working successfully with the neighbors. He also thought the home was too big and boxy. He questioned the design style but added he thought it was acceptable in its location. With that said, he thought the home needed some restudy.

Mr. Portuondo further explained the design of the new home and addressed some of the concerns of the Commissioners. Mr. Portuondo stated he would revisit the location of the mechanical equipment.

Caren Marden, 1 Ocean Lane, expressed concern for the location of the driveway next to the pedestrian beach access.

Mr. Floersheimer pointed out an inaccuracy on the plans for the overall building height.

Ms. Grace requested the professional to bring comparisons of the previously proposed home at the next meeting.

Mr. Corey indicated that the Commission had reviewed various versions of the design. However, he still felt the home was too large for the site; it did not respect the ocean, the design was a problem with privacy concerns and added the house would look odd and not contextual in its proposed location.

**Motion made by Mr. Corey and seconded by Ms. Shiverick to deny the project at 7 Ocean Lane as presented, based on the failure to comply with Section 18-205 of the Code, paragraph a (1), (6c) and**

**(6d). Motion carried 4-3, with Messrs. Smith, Kirchhoff and Small opposed.**