

Minutes  
Architectural Review Board  
April 28, 2025 at 6:30 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Wellington Architectural Review Board was held on April 28, 2025 in Village Hall at 12300 Forest Hill Boulevard.

**I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Stacy Somers called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

Board Members Present: Stacy Somers, Maria Wolfe, John Greene, and Luis Rodriguez

Board Members Absent (Excused): Maria Raspanti and Sal Van Casteren

Staff Present: Kelly Ferraiolo, Senior Planner, and Jonathan Sandoval, Planner

**II. REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN**

None

**III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**ARB-348 Approval of the March 26, 2025 Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes**

A motion was made by John Greene, seconded by Luis Rodriguez, to approve the March 26, 2025 Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes. The motion passed unanimously (4-0). Sal Van Casteren and Maria Raspanti had excused absences.

**I. ADDITIONS & DELETIONS**

Petition No. 2025-0003-ARB Lotis Wellington 1 Signs (Building 3, 4, 6, and 7) was postponed to the May 28, 2025 ARB meeting at the request of the applicant.

**II. SWEARING IN OF WITNESSES**

Kelly Ferraiolo swore in all speakers that were providing testimony.

**III. NEW BUSINESS**

**Petition 2025-0002-ARB 4210 Siena Circle Pergola**

Ms. Ferraiolo made a presentation on the request for an alternative design for a pergola located at 4210 Siena Circle. She informed the Board that the dimensions of the pergola have changed, however, as long as the pergola was not larger in square feet and is located directly behind the house, then staff had no issues with the size modification.

A motion was made by John Greene, seconded by Luis Rodriguez, to approve Petition 2025-0002-ARB 4210 Siena Circle Pergola as presented by staff. The motion passed unanimously (4-0). Sal Van Casteren and Maria Raspanti had excused absences.

**Petition No. 2025-0004-ARB 13680 Paddock Drive Alternative Fence Design**

Jonathan Sandoval made a presentation on the request for an alternative fence design for 13680 Paddock Drive.

Ricardo Garcia, owner, stated they built the pool and the pool company was supposed to remove the fence to bring the equipment back and apply for the permit to replace the fence. They had many inspections and there was no mention of the fence. Years later, they pulled permits for the screen enclosure and had inspections with no mention of the fence. They received code violations in the past and were never cited on the fence. He mentioned the section of the code that allows for metal fences that simulate wood shall be considered wood which he believed that he was.

Mr. Greene asked when Mr. Garcia purchased the house if there was a fence, and he stated there was a wooden fence in the front which was removed by the pool company. Mr. Greene asked about the functional pool barrier that the pool company signed off on during permitting. Ms. Ferraiolo stated if the pool had a baby gate, then that would have sufficed the requirement for a pool barrier. Mr. Garcia confirmed there was a baby gate. Mr. Greene stated he drove by and he didn't have an issue with the metal simulating the wood. Ms. Ferraiolo stated the intent of that section of the code Mr. Garcia reference was for fences types that are already permitted as there are so many variations of fences that are offered.

Mr. Garcia stated he wasn't sure who the interior side fence belonged to. Ms. Ferraiolo stated the way it is installed shows that the fence is the neighbors, however, the neighbor is insisting that it is not their fence. It most likely was installed on by the previous owner through Palm Beach County.

Mr. Greene asked about the screening requirement for the fence. Ms. Ferraiolo stated that the requirement is for portions of the fence that is not moveable so he would only be required to install one or two plants. She mentioned that the fence would have to meet the five (5) foot setback from the front corner as there is no window or AC unit that interferes. Mr. Garcia stated they installed the fence in the exact location of where it was previously. Ms. Ferraiolo stated ARB does not grant variance for setbacks, they are only approving the material and design. The Planning and Zoning Manager is authorized to reduce the setback. She stated you will need to pull a permit for the replacement of the side fence and they will require you to set the fence back five (5) feet from the front corner. There have been no complaints by neighbors.

A motion was made by Luis Rodriguez, seconded by Maria Wolfe, to approve Petition 2025-0004-ARB 13680 Paddock Drive Alternative Fence Design as presented by staff. The motion passed unanimously (4-0). Sal Van Casteren and Maria Raspanti had excused absences.

#### **IV. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

None

#### **V. COMMENTS FROM THE STAFF**

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for May 28, 2025 at 6:30 pm.

#### **VI. COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

None

#### **ADJOURN**

**Meeting adjourned at 7:07 pm.**

---

**Stacy Somers, Chairman**

**Date**