

**MINUTES
TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND
IMPACT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
THURSDAY, MAY 2, 2024**

TIME: Thursday, May 2, 2024 – 9:00 AM
PLACE: Town Hall Island Room – 2 Bridge Rd., Hobe Sound, FL
PRESENT: Present in person were Chair Bonnie Schiralli, Vice Chair Judy Holden, Members Val McNeely, Eleanor Seaman, Jennifer Madden, and Alternate Member Marshall Field V. Also present were Building Department Director Catherine Harding, Senior Planner Ruben Cruz, Town Clerk Kimberly Kogos, and Town Attorney Thomas Baird.

Chair Holden called the meeting to order at 9:01 AM.

1. Minutes of the April 4, 2024 Impact Review Committee Meeting

MOTION: *Holden/Seaman moved to approve the minutes of the April 4, 2024, IRC meeting, as presented.*

ACTION: *Motion passed 5-0.*

2. 103 North Beach

This is the application of AGTC JI Properties, LLC, represented by Jared Gaylord of Marc R. Gaylord, P.A., requesting the following:

The proposed demolition of the existing residence and the construction of a new, two-story residence with a basement consisting of garage and storage space, a mechanical equipment room, and hobby room along with a laundry room. Also proposed is a new pool and spa with pool patio, open terraces, circular driveway and motor court, and associated landscape and hardscape. There will be a new septic system and exfiltration trench system.

-

Ex-Parte Communication

- *Member McNeely stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Vice Chair Holden stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Member Seaman stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Chair Schiralli stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
Member Field, V stated that he visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.

Mr. Cruz introduced the application and provided background information. He explained the staff approval process and provided recommended conditions including:

- Silt screen shall be installed and maintained along the front, side, and rear yard area facing the ocean.
- Construction Buffer and fence/mesh screening shall be installed prior to commencement of construction and maintained during construction.
- Dumpster and portable toilet shall be screened from public view.

- Connection fees due to South Martin Regional Utility shall be satisfied prior to Building Permit issuance.
- Applicant will adhere to Public Safety Review comments (see attached memorandum).
- Please note additional comments from the Town or SMRU may follow anytime during the review process (i.e., Building Permit, etc.).
- Please note additional requirements may be requested prior to issuance of Building Permit (i.e. DEP permit, Connection Fees, etc.).

Attorney Jared Gaylord, representing property owners, the Curran family, greeted the committee and introduced the project team. He began his presentation by showing aerial views of the property, as well as the survey, site plan, and proposed floor plans and elevations. He reviewed the site data and displayed streetscape photographs of the current property and neighboring properties. Mr. Chuck Yanette, landscape architect for the project, presented and reviewed the proposed landscape plans. He explained that the primary need is thicker mid-level buffering. He reviewed the planting plans followed by views of the existing and proposed buffers for comparison purposes. Mr. Yanette reviewed the construction staging plans and explained the buffering for the construction stage.

Member Seaman referred to the adjacent right-of-way (ROW) and asked about any impacts on that area. Attorney Gaylord explained that there are no impacts proposed for the ROW.

Chair Schiralli asked about the existing fence and if the fence would be removed. Mr. Yanette confirmed the fence would be removed.

Vice Chair Holden referred to the port-o-john and expressed concern regarding the view of the toilet. Mr. Yanette stated that the space would be screened.

Chair Schiralli referred to the front buffer and opined that the area in question is thin. She also referenced the fencing and confirmed it would be 8' tall. She expressed interest in a denser front buffer during construction. She also explained that the construction area needs to be watered down during demolition.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

MOTION: *Holden/Field V moved to approve the application with the seven (7) recommended conditions as well as the request to improve the front buffer, based on the testimony presented, the plans submitted, and the fact that the application meets the standards of Article X, Division 2, Section 2.03 for impact review.*

ACTION: *Motion passed 5-0.*

3. 400 South Beach

This is the application of Mr. & Mrs. Peter Smith, represented by Jared Gaylord, Esq. of Marc R. Gaylord, P.A., requesting the following:

The proposed demolition of the existing non-conforming residence, detached garage, orchid house, pool, pool patio and driveway and the construction of a new, one & two-story residence with garage, new pool, terraces, mechanical enclosures, driveways, motor court and associated landscape and hardscape. Also proposed is a new septic system and exfiltration trench system.

Ex-Parte Communication

- *Member McNeely stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Vice Chair Holden stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Member Seaman stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Chair Schiralli stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Member Field, V stated that he visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*

Mr. Cruz introduced the application and provided background information along with seven (7) recommended conditions to consider if the application is approved.

Attorney Jared Gaylord, representing property owners Mr. and Mrs. Smith, introduced the project team and provided a presentation beginning with aerial views of the property. He displayed the property site plan, proposed floor plans and elevations. He reviewed the site data and provided 3D renderings of the proposed structure. He also provided streetscape photographs of the current property.

Vice Chair Holden referred to the second floor sitting area and asked about the balustrade materials. It was confirmed the material is glass.

Chair Schiralli referred to an adjacent easement. Attorney Gaylord confirmed the three properties that have use of the easement.

Mr. Bert Krebs, landscape architect, reviewed the landscape plans beginning with the demolitions/existing vegetation removal/relocation plan. He reviewed the buffer and construction staging plans followed by the proposed landscape plan. He displayed the landscape elevations.

Vice Chair Holden stated that she would like to add the condition in a motion that the neighboring property access is not blocked at any time during or after construction.

Chair Schiralli referenced an old trash bin that should be removed. It was confirmed that the bin belongs to the neighbor, although it is not visible to the property owner.

Chair Schiralli opined that the south side buffer is particularly weak. Mr. Krebs confirmed the space would be bolstered and explained additional plantings on the east side.

Chair Schiralli asked about fencing height. Mr. Krebs pointed out that there was 8-foot fencing on the north side, while on the east side, there was only tree protection fencing.

Chair Schiralli also noted that the construction area needs to be watered down during demolition.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

MOTION: Holden/Field moved to approve the application with the seven (7) recommended conditions as well as the condition that the neighbors always have access to the easement, based on the testimony presented, the plans submitted, and the fact that the application meets the standards of Article X, Division 2, Section 2.02 and 2.03 for impact review.

ACTION: Motion passed 5-0.

4. 77 South Beach

This is the application of Mr. & Mrs. William Laverack, Jr., represented by Jared Gaylord, Esq. of Marc R. Gaylord, P.A., requesting the following:

The proposed construction of a new addition with a covered loggia that connects to the existing north guest suite, along with modifications to the hardscape and landscaping.

Ex-Parte Communication

- *Member McNeely stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Vice Chair Holden stated that she stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Member Seaman stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Chair Schiralli stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Member Field, V stated that he visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*

Mr. Cruz introduced the application and provided background information and noted seven (7) recommended conditions to consider if the application is approved.

Attorney Jared Gaylord, representing property owners Mr. and Mrs. Laverack, Jr., introduced the project team and provided a presentation of the proposed project. He displayed aerial views of the property along with the floor plans, elevations and site data information.

Mr. Richard Rutledge, landscape architect, displayed photographs of the current streetscape and explained the location of the proposed addition and buffering plants. He provided renderings that include the addition and proposed landscaping. He displayed the existing vegetation removal/relocation plan, the construction staging/buffer plan, and the proposed landscape plan.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

MOTION: Holden/McNeely moved to approve the application with the seven (7) recommended conditions, based on the testimony presented, the plans submitted, and the fact that the application meets the standards of Article X, Division 2, Section 2.02 for impact review.

ACTION: *Motion passed 5-0.*

5. 512 South Beach

This is the application of Mr. & Mrs. Ryan Simovitch, represented by Jared Gaylord, Esq. of Marc R. Gaylord, P.A., requesting the following:

The proposed construction of a new, two-story residence with two 2-car garages, new pool, spa and pool deck, loggias, a balcony, driveway and motor court, and a new entry gate, along with associated landscape and hardscape. Also proposed is a new septic system and exfiltration trench system.

Chair Schiralli recused herself from this application as she is an abutting neighbor. She passed the gavel to Vice Chair Holden.

This is the application of Mr. & Mrs. Ryan Simovitch, represented by Jared Gaylord, Esq. of Marc R. Gaylord, P.A., requesting the following:

The proposed construction of a new, two-story residence with two 2-car garages, new pool, spa and pool deck, loggias, a balcony, driveway and motor court, and a new entry gate, along with associated landscape and hardscape. Also proposed is a new septic system and exfiltration trench system.

Ex-Parte Communication

- *Member McNeely stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Vice Chair Holden stated that she stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Member Seaman stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Member Field, V stated that he visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*

Mr. Cruz introduced the application and provided background information. He noted seven (7) conditions to be considered if the application is approved.

Attorney Jared Gaylord, representing the Simovitch family, introduced the project team. He provided aerial photographs of the property and explained that the previous structure had been demolished. He displayed the site and floor plans, elevations, and renderings of the proposed structure. He provided photographs of the current site conditions and streetscape.

Member Seaman asked Attorney Gaylord to review the proposed gate. Attorney Gaylord provided an explanation of the gate and associated materials.

Mr. Chuck Yanette, landscape architect, presented the landscape plan and explained the buffer plantings. He provided elevations of current and proposed buffers for comparison purposes. He explained the existing retaining wall and the proposed gate.

Member McNeely asked about the retaining wall and Mr. Yanette provided additional details for

clarification.

Vice Chair Holden asked about the vegetation removal/relocation plan referring to existing sabal palms. Mr. Yanette provided clarification.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

MOTION: Field V/McNeely moved to approve the application with the seven (7) recommended conditions, based on the testimony presented, the plans submitted, and the fact that the application meets the standards of Article X, Division 2, Section 2.02 for impact review.

ACTION: Motion passed 5-0.

Chair Schiralli rejoined the committee as Chair.

The committee recessed at 10:41 a.m.

The committee reconvened at 10:53 a.m.

6. 87 Links

This is the application of Mr. & Mrs. Charles Haldeman, represented by Adam Davis of J. Graham Goldsmith, Architect, requesting the following:

The proposed demolition of the existing residence, pool, and pool patio and the construction of a new, one & two-story residence with garage, new pool, spa, terraces, driveway, along with hardscape and revisions and additions to the landscaping. Also proposed is a new septic system and exfiltration trench system.

Ex-Parte Communication

- *Member McNeely stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Vice Chair Holden stated that she stated that she visited the property alone, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Member Seaman stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Chair Schiralli stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Member Field, V stated that he visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*

Mr. Cruz introduced the application and provided background information and noted seven (7) conditions to be considered if the application is approved. He explained two typos in the staff memo and clarified the applicant agent as well as the setback area of the property.

Mr. Graham Goldsmith noted that the proposed structure is located directly next to the Jupiter Island

Club, thus the architecture is similar to that of the Club. He noted the design is old Florida with gabled roofs, rectangular windows, and dormers.

Mr. Adam Davis, representing the Haldeman family, provided a presentation of the proposed dwelling beginning with aerial views, the site plan, and photographs of the existing structure. He displayed floor plans and elevations followed by the site data.

Mr. Bert Krebs, landscape architect, reviewed the demolition plan and construction buffering. He reviewed the proposed buffers and planting materials.

Member Seaman asked about impacts, if any, to the cottage on the south side of the property. Mr. Davis explained how there would be no impacts on the neighboring property.

Chair Schiralli requested an 8' construction gate instead of a 6' gate. She also referred to the dumpster and requested a separate screening for the dumpster area. She referred to the trailer and toilet along the north property line and requested an enclosure of some sort to shield the area since it is slightly elevated. She commented on the buffering and suggested a denser plant material.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

MOTION: McNeely/Holden moved to approve the application with the seven (7) recommended conditions as well as the conditions recommended by committee members listed below, based on the testimony presented, the plans submitted, and the fact that the application meets the standards of Article X, Division 2, Section 2.02 and 2.03 for impact review.

- ***Fencing around construction trailer and port-o-let***
- ***Fencing at 8' not 6'***
- ***Rear buffer to be enhanced***

ACTION: Motion passed 5-0.

7. 488 South Beach

This is the application of M Southern Command LLC, represented by Jared Gaylord, Esq. of Marc R. Gaylord, P.A., requesting the following:

The proposed construction of 2 new vehicular gates at the driveways and slight modifications to the previously approved landscaping.

Ex-Parte Communication

- *Member McNeely stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Vice Chair Holden stated that she stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Member Seaman stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*

- *Chair Schiralli stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Member Field, V stated that he visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*

Mr. Cruz introduced the application and provided background information noted six (6) conditions to be considered if the application is approved.

Mr. Chuck Yanette, representing the property owner, provided a presentation of the proposed gates and modified landscaping. He provided site plans and elevations of the proposed gates. He reviewed the current and proposed buffering for comparison purposes.

Vice Chair Holden asked for confirmation of the gate setback. Mr. Yanette stated that the gate is 25' from the access drive. Vice Chair Holden expressed concern that the gates are not set back far enough for a construction truck and trailer to park if the gates are closed. Discussion ensued regarding the hedge along the access drive as well as the gate setback.

The written concerns submitted from Nancy Auth was referred to as well as those from public safety.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

MOTION: Field V/McNeely moved to approve the application subject to staff conditions as stated in the staff memorandum and as meeting the standards of Article X, Division II, Section 2.02 for impact review and based upon the testimony presented and the plans submitted.

ACTION: Motion passed 5-0.

8. 392 South Beach

This is the application of Mr. & Mrs. Peter Morse, represented by Adam Davis of J. Graham Goldsmith, Architects, requesting the following:

The proposed construction of a new service gate south of the primary driveway.

Ex-Parte Communication

- *Member McNeely stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Vice Chair Holden stated that she stated that she visited the property, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Member Seaman stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Chair Schiralli stated that she visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had no ex-parte communication.*
- *Member Field, V stated that he visited the property with Ruben Cruz, read all materials, and had*

no ex-parte communication.

Mr. Cruz introduced the application and provided background information, noting six (6) recommended conditions if the application is approved.

Mr. Adam Davis, representing property owner Mr. and Mrs. Morse, provided a presentation of the proposed service gate. He provided an aerial view of the property along with site plans and photographs of the current conditions. He reviewed the proposed gate material and noted the setback of 16'8".

Member McNeely asked if the new driveway and access would destroy the existing sidewalk. Mr. Davis explained that the access area had been used previously for heavy construction traffic and the sidewalk was not impacted at that time.

Chair Schiralli explained that sidewalk maintenance would need to be an added condition to the motion.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

MOTION: Field V/Holden moved to approve the application subject to staff conditions as stated in the staff memorandum and the condition that the property owners are responsible for sidewalk maintenance, and as meeting the standards of Article X, Division II, Section 2.02 for impact review and based upon the testimony presented and the plans submitted.

ACTION: Motion passed 5-0.

9. Other Items

a. Next Meeting - June 6, 2024

Vice Chair Holden stated that she requested meeting dates from staff as well as committee members' availability for the summer. She mentioned that two dates, one in July and one in January, needed to be rescheduled due to holidays.

b. Other Matters

The committee asked for a copy of the LDR that provides for the minimum width of the driveway and sidewalk maintenance.

Discussion ensued regarding remote participation and requested a copy of the resolution.

Chair Schiralli adjourned the meeting at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Kimberly Kogos, Town Clerk