



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Minutes of the Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting Held on May 21, 2025

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 09:29 AM in the Town Council Chambers.

Members Present: Alexander Griswold, Jacqueline Albarran, Catherine Brooker, Brittain Damgard, Kim Coleman, Alexander Ives, Jane Lindsay-Scott, and Anne Fairfax (9:31 am)

Members Absent: Julie Herzig Desnick, Henry Ittleson

Staff Present: Friederike Mittner, Abraham Fogel, Kelly Churney, and Town Attorney Lainey Francisco

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Damgard led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES

1. Minutes of the April 16, 2025, Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Commissioner Ives and seconded by Commissioner Coleman to approve the minutes of the April 16, 2025, meeting as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Mittner noted that HSB-24-0005, 854 South County Road, was withdrawn from the agenda.

A motion was made by Commissioner Coleman and seconded by Commissioner Ives to approve the agenda as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH

Ms. Churney swore in those intending to speak and continued to do so throughout the meeting, as necessary.

COMMENTS

2. OFFICIALS

There were no comments heard at this time.

3. STAFF

Administrative Review Monthly Update

Ms. Mittner indicated that 22 administrative staff reviews had been conducted in coordination with Chair Damgard.

She also noted that to align with the Town Council's meeting proceedings, staff requested to initiate Robert's Rules of Order for quasi-judicial meetings. She outlined the proposed meeting procedures. When asked if limitations could be set on presentations, Ms. Mittner stated that it was the Chair's prerogative and could be altered if necessary. Town Attorney Francisco concurred as long as the applicant had a reasonable amount of time to make their presentation.

4. PUBLIC - 3 MINUTE LIMIT

There were no comments heard at this time.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5. COA-25-0004 (ZON-25-0006) 262 SUNSET AVE (COMBO). The applicant, James M. Crowley, Esq., has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of exterior alterations including a new front porch, new front door, roof replacement, exterior color change as well as landscape and hardscape modifications including a new pool for the property under consideration to be landmarked. The project will change the use of the property, requiring site plan review and additional parking for which a variance is being requested. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Fogel introduced the project and provided staff comments.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Matt MacEachern from Emeritus provided the architectural presentation for the proposed railings.

Ms. Albarran asked about the code for the railing and wondered if they needed a railing that someone could not fall through. Director Wayne Bergman stated that only a handrail was required.

Ms. Fairfax thought a traditional and more generous landing would be nicer than the proposed one. Mr. MacEachern said they could increase the size of the landing. Ms. Fairfax did not favor the landscaping around the steps on the side. Mr. MacEachern stated he could eliminate the waterfall steps on the side and provide a more generous landing.

Mr. Ives stated that the applicant listened to the comments and responded. He asked which the owner preferred. Mr. MacEachern stated that option one was the owner's preferred railing.

Ms. Coleman asked if the door opened outward or inward, to which Mr. MacEachern stated it would swing outward. Ms. Coleman did not think the situation was ideal and expressed concern about the design.

Mr. Griswold agreed with Mr. Ives and thought the applicant responded to the comments. He recommended a simpler step and a wider and deeper landing.

Ms. Albarran suggested a railing at the top of the landing to prevent anyone from falling. She recommended a wider landing with a step at the door, reducing one riser.

Ms. Fairfax agreed and recommended reducing one riser, which would allow the handrail to terminate in the building. She also recommended removing the waterfall steps on the sides.

A motion was made by Commissioner Fairfax and seconded by Commissioner Griswold to approve the project with Option A, a larger and deeper landing, forward-facing steps, removing one riser, removing the waterfall side steps with the handrail terminating at the building, and all changes to be reviewed by the staff in coordination with the Chair. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

6. HSB-24-0005 (ZON-24-0035) 854 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD (COMBO). The applicant, Dustin Mizell with Environmental Design Group on behalf of 854 SO COUNTY RD LLC, has filed an application requesting review and approval of a guest house, gazebo, driveway, as well as hardscape and landscape modifications, including a variance to allow an additional guest house. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval. *This project received a partial approval at the August 21, 2024, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting. The applicant has withdrawn the remainder of the scope of work related to the guest house and gazebo.*

NEW BUSINESS

7. COA-25-0008 (ZON-25-0014) 1047 S OCEAN BLVD (COMBO). The applicant, Maura Ziska, Trustee of 1047 South Ocean Boulevard Trust, has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of two (2) second-floor additions over existing one-story portions on the north and south sides of the residence, staircase reconstruction on the south side of the residence, removal of two (2) rear cantilevered balconies and reconstruction of the original John Volk designed second-floor curvilinear balcony on the east side of the residence, requiring side yard and lot coverage variances for the Landmarked property. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Fogel introduced the project and provided staff comments.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Attorney Maura Ziska introduced the project, provided an overview, explained the zoning request, and advocated for a positive recommendation to the Town Council. Roger Janssen of Dailey Janssen Architects presented the architectural plans for the new residence.

Ms. Damgard thought the proposal would look like it was initially designed that way, and she thought the additions were appropriate for the home.

Mr. Ives expressed a concern that the addition of the second story changed the asymmetry of the property. He was not on the commission when the residence was initially approved, but if he were, he stated he would have expressed a concern at that time. He thought that properties should be able to evolve. However, he thought the additions removed the uniqueness of the property.

A motion was made by Commissioner Griswold and seconded by Commissioner Coleman to approve the project as presented. The motion was carried 6-1, with Commissioner Ives dissenting.

A motion was made by Commissioner Griswold and seconded by Commissioner Brooker that the implementation of the proposed variances will not cause a negative architectural impact on the subject landmarked property. The motion was carried unanimously, 6-1, with Commissioner Ives dissenting.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

8. Discussion of Properties to Consider for Landmarking

- 105 North County Road
- 250 Pendleton Avenue
- 306 Pendleton Lane
- 315 Pendleton Lane
- 322 Pendleton Lane

- 333 Pendleton Lane
- 225 Barton Avenue
- 321 Barton Avenue
- 113 Clarke Avenue
- 306 Seabreeze Avenue
- 345 Seabreeze Avenue
- 409 Seabreeze Avenue
- 410 Seabreeze Avenue
- 230 Seaspray Avenue
- 400 Seaspray Avenue
- 425 Seaspray Avenue
- 140 Seaview Avenue
- 130 Cocoanut Row
- 141 Chilean Avenue
- 230 Chilean Avenue
- 234 Chilean Avenue
- 209 Banyan Road

Ms. Mittner reminded the Commission that May is Historic Preservation Month and added that Mayor Moore issued a proclamation for the Town of Palm Beach. Ms. Mitter then reviewed the goals for historic preservation that were outlined in the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Coleman asked if Seabreeze Avenue had ever been considered a historic district. Ms. Murphy reminded the Commission that Mr. Cooney tried to place the Sea Streets under consideration as a historic district. Emily Stillings of MurphyStillings reviewed the actions of the Landmarks Commission and the Town Council after Mr. Cooney's recommendation.

Attorney Lainey Francisco stated that she would need to review the previous minutes and actions to see if any action could be reconsidered.

Janet Murphy of MurphyStillings presented the following properties to be placed under consideration for landmark status: 105 North County Road, 250 Pendleton Avenue, 306 Pendleton Lane, 315 Pendleton Lane, 322 Pendleton Lane, 333 Pendleton Lane, 225 Barton Avenue, 321 Barton Avenue, 113 Clarke Avenue, 306 Seabreeze Avenue, 345 Seabreeze Avenue, 409 Seabreeze Avenue, 410 Seabreeze Avenue, 230 Seaspray Avenue, 400 Seaspray Avenue, 425 Seaspray Avenue, 140 Seaview Avenue, 130 Cocoanut Row, 141 Chilean Avenue, 230 Chilean Avenue, 234 Chilean Avenue, and 209 Banyan Road.

Ms. Brooker thought it would be interesting to see all the landmarked homes on a map with an overlay of the proposed homes. She thought that would help in the discussion of landmarked districts. She wondered how many homes on Pendleton were not landmarked; Ms. Murphy responded.

Mr. Ives asked if the consultants would have additional resources to study other properties brought forward if the Commission were to study all proposed properties. Ms. Murphy responded and stated it would be possible to look at additional ones. Mr. Ives emphasized the importance of identifying which buildings on Sea Streets were already landmarked, historically

significant, or currently under consideration. He noted about 15% of the area had been redeveloped in the past 10–15 years, reflecting broader changes in the community. To better understand and communicate this evolution, he suggested documenting past demolitions and major alterations alongside current preservation efforts.

Ms. Damgard thought that while there were numerous homes to consider, the history of some of the homes on the same streets would be the same.

Ms. Fairfax thought the commission, along with the Preservation Foundation, had a great opportunity to educate owners on the history of their street and the landmarks program.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach stated that they were always willing to support advocacy efforts of the Landmarks Commission and preservation in the Town. She stated that the 2020 survey identified over 1,000 properties in town that were potentially eligible to be landmarked, and she was happy to see the numerous properties proposed to be placed under consideration.

Ms. Brooker thought that if they were considering the nodes for landmarking, it would be great to revisit the incentives to landmark a home. She also stated that it would be nice to eliminate the requirement for a variance if the landmarked home's footprint does not change.

Mr. Ives thought that with the upcoming zoning reform, the need for variances may change. Mr. Ives thought the north end should be revisited for nodes worth saving, especially with the amount of redevelopment occurring in that area.

Ms. Mittner stated that the incentives for landmarking were being considered during the code modification. She also added that the Historically Significant Building (HSB) program has been quite successful in the north end of the island.

Mr. Griswold thought that insuring historic homes was an issue, especially in Florida. He added that owners cannot afford the rising costs, and they could be resisting due to the extra insurance costs. He recommended advocating at the appropriate governmental level for subsidies in this area, because he thought that incentives would be attractive.

Ms. Fairfax thought the facade easement program would be an incentive to consider it; she explained its benefits.

Ms. Coleman asked if there were any updates from the Senate bill that affected landmarked homes. Attorney Francisco said she made a presentation on the legislation and would send her the information.

Ms. Damgard asked which governmental level would decide on the insurance premiums and the facade easement program. Attorney Francisco stated she would research the issue and provide an update.

Mr. Griswold thought it would be nice if real estate taxes could be reduced on historic homes. Ms. Fairfax said that historic homes in Honolulu were handled in that manner.

A motion was made by Commissioner Fairfax and seconded by Commissioner Albarran to place the following properties under consideration for landmark status: 105 North County Road, 250 Pendleton Avenue, 306 Pendleton Lane, 315 Pendleton Lane, 322 Pendleton Lane, 333 Pendleton Lane, 225 Barton Avenue, 321 Barton Avenue, 113 Clarke Avenue, 306 Seabreeze Avenue, 345 Seabreeze Avenue, 409 Seabreeze Avenue, 410 Seabreeze Avenue, 230 Seaspray Avenue, 400 Seaspray Avenue, 425 Seaspray Avenue, 140 Seaview Avenue, 130 Cocoanut Row, 141 Chilean Avenue, 230 Chilean Avenue, 234 Chilean Avenue, and 209 Banyan Road. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

MEETING SCHEDULE

9. NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, June 18, 2025

Mr. Ives asked about Senate Bill 1730, the Live Local Act, and asked if it would affect Palm Beach. Town Attorney Francisco stated that her office was evaluating the bill and would provide an update in the future.

Ms. Brooker asked if there was a timeline to provide a list of recommendations or incentives. Ms. Mittner said that there would be no timeline.

Council President Pro Tem Crampton thought that the discussion was good and added that the Town Council should discuss these items as well. He thought Mr. Ives made a good point about the redevelopment in the north end. He asked that the discussion be elevated to the Town Council once more information was learned.

Ms. Damgard asked that the discussion on incentives be placed on the July meeting agenda and asked the Commissioners to send any of their recommendations to staff prior to that meeting.

Ms. Fairfax thought that while controversial, owners should know that they can still demolish their homes if they are landmarked under the new law. She thought it preserved their property rights.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Ives and seconded by Commissioner Griswold to adjourn the meeting at 10:34 AM. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Respectfully Submitted,


Brittain Damgard, Chair