



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Minutes of the Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting Held on July 16, 2025

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 AM in the Town Council Chambers.

Members Present: Alexander Griswold, Julie Herzig Desnick, Jacqueline Albarran, Henry Ittleson, Catherine Brooker, Brittain Damgard, Jane Lindsay-Scott, Alexander Ives

Members Absent: Kim Coleman

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Damgard led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES

1. Minutes of the June 18, 2025, Landmark Preservation Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Albarran to approve the June 18, 2025, minutes as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Ms. Herzig-Desnick to approve the consent agenda as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

2. COA-25-0018 134 EL VEDADO RD. The applicant, Elizabeth and Jeffrey Leeds, have filed an application requesting Landmarks Preservation Commission review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for additions and alterations to an existing two-story Landmarked residence and accessory structures, including window, door and roof replacement, modifications to opening sizes, demolition of rear porch,

construction of an enclosed rear addition, addition of covered rear terrace, covered walkway and second floor addition to tennis house, and landscape and hardscape modifications. These plans were previously approved by LPC in 2023. Additionally, requesting the construction of a front wall with new vehicular driveway gates. Town Council previously granted zoning relief/approval as it pertains to the wall and gates.

3. HSB-25-0007 141 AUSTRALIAN AVE. The property owner, Gregory Pamel (SKA Architect & Planner, Design Representative), has filed an application requesting review and approval of exterior alterations, including new windows and doors and replacement of exterior vinyl siding with shake for both the primary and accessory structures that are designated HSBs, elevation of accessory structure and associated hardscape/landscape modifications.
4. ZON-25-0039 262 SUNSET AVE – FLOODPLAIN VARIANCE The applicant, James M. Crowley, Esq., has filed an application requesting a variance from the floodplain requirement from Chapter 50, Floods, to maintain the existing buildings at a finished floor elevation below current FEMA requirement, associated with the renovation of two (2) landmarked buildings (approved per COA-25-0004 (ZON-25-0006) at the May 21, 2025, LPC meeting).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH

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

COMMENTS

5. OFFICIALS

Ms. Damgard announced that Anne Fairfax had resigned from the commission effective immediately.

6. STAFF

6.1 Administrative Review Monthly Update

Ms. Mittner stated that there have been 22 administrative approvals over the past month.

7. PUBLIC - 3 MINUTE LIMIT

Town Clerk Churney called for public comment. No one indicated a desire to speak.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

8. COA-25-0009 (ZON-25-0026) 1200 S OCEAN BLVD (COMBO). The applicant, Dustin Mizell with Environment Design Group, has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of a new padel court, requiring a special exception, and associated exterior alterations, landscape, and hardscape modifications for the landmarked property. Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the updated landscape and hardscape plans for the proposed Padel court and site.

Ms. Albarran thought the presentation was helpful. She noticed it was between two non-landmarked structures, away from the landmarked structure and the road. She thought the court was well situated.

Mr. Ittleson thought the plans shown were a vast improvement. He believed it was still compacted on the site, and the position bothered him.

Ms. Brooker stated that while she did not love the design, it seems to be the least objectionable option for placing something the applicant strongly wants. She noted it does not impact any original features, is well-hidden, and reflects the owner's preference. Though torn, she indicated she would likely support the project despite its design flaws.

Mr. Griswold was supportive and thought the proposal was a natural location for the court. He noted that Padel courts were movable and temporary..

Mr. Ives reflected on prior concerns that the property had expanded far beyond its original landmark core, altering its scale, focus, and relationship to the site. He emphasized the need to caution both the applicant and future applicants about the implications of such growth. While he still holds those concerns, he acknowledged the proposed court is removable and expressed support for Option B on the west end of the property as a more acceptable solution.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick agreed with previous comments, expressing concern that the property appears dense and overbuilt. She acknowledged the structure's temporary nature as a mitigating factor and supported Option B, though she felt it was unfortunate that another element was being added. She ultimately preferred the placement near the pool, noting its invisibility from public view as the project's only redeeming quality.

A motion was made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Ms. Herzig-Desnick to approve the project as presented with Option A presented. The motion was carried 5-2, with Messrs. Ives and Ittleson dissenting.

NEW BUSINESS

9. COA-25-0013 (ZON-25-0034) 215 EL BRAVO WAY (COMBO) The property owner, 215 El Bravo Trust (Maura Ziska, Trustee), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of exterior alterations, selective demolition, and additions including window and door replacement, roof replacement, reconstruction and extension of the two-story west wing, second-floor addition to the existing one-story garage, one-story additions, installation of a pergola, as well as new landscape and hardscape improvements including a new pool, requiring a variance from the floodplain requirement from Chapter 50, Floods, to maintain the existing buildings at a finished floor elevation below the current FEMA requirement, and requiring variances to reduce the rear (north) yard setback, reduce the side (west) yard setback, and exceed the maximum lot coverage permitted 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.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Jaime Torres-Cruz of Fairfax and Sammons presented the architectural plans proposed for the renovation of the landmarked home.

Ms. Damgard acknowledged the house's beauty and presentation but emphasized the importance of maintaining its architectural integrity, noting its significance as a quintessential Howard Major design. She expressed concern about setting a precedent by approving numerous variances and significant changes, especially to the front and the roof, which had previously raised issues with the town.

Mr. Ittleson praised the design, noting that the architect had addressed the concerns about the setbacks. He appreciated the removal of a hazardous step.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott complimented the overall plan and found many proposed modifications logical, especially given the home's prior alterations. She noted that the variety of existing flooring suggests room for restoration to the original intent. While she felt the proposed roof was aesthetically pleasing, she was concerned about the precedent it could set. Given its proximity to the property line, she questioned the potential impact of adding a second story to the garage.

Mr. Ives supported the proposed roof change, arguing that roof materials and colors should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and that this property's landmark designation did not hinge on a white roof. He noted the aesthetic improvement and found no harm to the historic integrity, framing the project as an example of responsible stewardship and evolution in the town. He supported the application as presented.

Echoing Mr. Ives, Ms. Brooker praised the project's beauty and cohesive color scheme, pointing out the inconsistency in how aesthetic elements like paint color and roofing are often scrutinized. She felt the proposed updates were tasteful, distinct, and in keeping with the house's character, ultimately supporting the application.

Ms. Mittner clarified that from a preservation standpoint, materials with inherent color, such as terracotta barrel tiles, are reviewed differently than paint colors, which are more subjective and easily changeable. She offered this distinction in response to Ms. Brooker's earlier comments.

Mr. Griswold acknowledged the sensitivity surrounding the roof but expressed appreciation that the front facade is being preserved and saw the rear alterations as a major improvement to the property. His main concern was the ceiling height of the second floor of the guest house and how it would appear to neighbors on Island Road, emphasizing the importance of proper screening to avoid resident complaints.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick raised a design concern regarding the two skinny columns above the loggia, noting they align directly with the keystones of the arches below, which she felt was structurally and visually problematic. In response, Mr. Torres-Cruz explained that the columns were intentionally lightweight and proportionally necessary to visually support the roof and maintain architectural balance. He emphasized that removing them would result in poor proportions and potential structural issues, though Ms. Herzig-Desnick ultimately disagreed with his assessment.

Ms. Damgard asked if side lights would be proposed on both sides of the front door. Mr. Torres-Cruz clarified the door's design.

Ms. Albarran thought many items on the rear of the project were being cleaned up.

Chair Damgard called for public comment. No one indicated a desire to speak.

Mario Nievera of Nievera Williams Design presented the landscape and hardscape plan for the site.

Mr. Ittleson asked about the Gumbo Limbo and if the applicant had permission from the Everglades Club to plant the material. Mr. Nievera stated that while he does not have written permission, staff would require it.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. 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, 7-0.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Albarran that the implementation of the proposed work and flood plain variance will not preclude the building's continued designation as a historic building. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

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

10. COA-25-0014 322 CLARKE AVE. The property owner, 322 CLARKE AVENUE LLC (Smith and Moore Architects, Design Representative), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations, including demolition of a non-original portico entry and construction of a new covered entry feature for the landmarked property.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Harold Smith of Smith and Moore Architects and Architect Yong Pak from Atlanta, Georgia, presented the architectural plans for modifying the landmarked structure.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick commented on the proposed entrance designs, favoring option 3, which she felt more closely replicated the original door's molding and appeared cleaner. She expressed concern that overly elaborate moldings could be visually disruptive due to the flatness of the building's façade. She found the third option less intrusive than the first one, where the molding was placed in the middle of the entablature. Mr. Yong discussed the entryway proportions and thought finials could be added to option 1 or 3.

Ms. Damgard asked about option B with the Palladian arch; she felt it felt grander in scale. Mr. Pak responded.

Mr. Ittleston understood the request for cover, but the second option with the Palladian arch felt much heavier.

Mr. Ives asked what option the owner most preferred, to which Mr. Pak stated the second option with the Palladian arch. Mr. Ives compared the three proposed entry options to the existing architecture. He felt Option 1 appeared overly busy, Option 2 didn't align well with the home's style, and he supported Option 3 as the most fitting due to its Corinthian columns, which match the existing pilasters. Acknowledging that any new design would appear as an addition, he viewed Option 3 as the most modest and compatible with the property's overall character.

Mr. Griswold confirmed that the original molding around the front door is intact and acknowledged the appeal of Option 3 for its clean appearance and compatibility with adjacent windows. However, he ultimately preferred Option 1, believing it best honors the original façade and front door by maintaining a design closer to the home's original appearance.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott agreed that option 3 was clean and aligned well with the existing architecture, but preferred option 1. She felt it better complemented the original molding and respected the historical character of the front façade. She wondered if the Corinthian elements in option three could be incorporated into option one. Mr. Pak responded.

Ms. Damgard confirmed that the Corinthian columns from option 3 could be used in the option 1 design.

Ms. Albarran thought the second option overwhelmed the architecture. She thought the columns in the third option were too small and underwhelming. She stated that the more she looked at option one, the more she liked it. Mr. Pak responded. Ms. Albarran thought option one was the best proportioned for the space.

Mr. Ives felt that the commission's consensus seemed to like option one, with the Corinthian columns, with or without the finials.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick liked the Doric columns on the first option and the entablature on the third option.

Chair Damgard called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach urged the Commission to support either Option 1 or a modified version of Option 3 for the front entry, emphasizing that the Palladian option was inappropriate. She noted that Option 1 draws directly from a historic image in the Foundation's collection and reflects the original door surround, elements of which still exist on the property. She emphasized the importance of preserving the architectural integrity of the front elevation and recommended maintaining the original Doric column motif, which is historically accurate for the entry.

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

11. COA-25-0015 140 SEASPRAY AVE. The property owner, KPNC Trust (Karen Kiehl, Trustee), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations including window and door replacement, installation of a new pergola, as well as landscape and hardscape improvements including a new pool for the landmarked property containing a main residence and pool house.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Mark Marsh and Gui Vasquez of Bridges Marsh presented the architectural plans to modify the landmarked structure.

Ms. Damgard asked about the doors being removed from the loggia arcade. Mr. Vasquez further explained the change.

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

Chair Damgard called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach thanked the architect for allowing a tour of the property, which provided helpful insight into the proposed changes. She appreciated the thoughtful and sympathetic design approach, noting that the modifications are compatible and draw inspiration from the original drawings and existing architectural features.

A motion was made by Ms. Herzig-Desnick and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve the project as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

12. COA-25-0017 (ZON-25-0035) 1221 N LAKE WAY (COMBO) The property owner, 1221 NLW LLC (Maura Ziska, Authorized Representative), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the existing pool on west side

of the property, demolish an existing fountain on the south side of the property, and construct a new pool on the south side of the property, requiring variances to reduce the south (side) yard setback, and increase the distance between the pool water's edge and the pool equipment. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Mario Nievera of Nievera Williams Design presented the landscape and hardscape modifications to the site.

Mr. Ives thought it was a lovely project.

Mr. Griswold and Ms. Damgard agreed.

Chair Damgard called for public comment. No one indicated a desire to speak.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Albarran to approve the project as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Albarran that the implementation of the proposed variances will not cause a negative architectural impact on the subject property. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

13. COA-25-0021 (ZON-25-0038) 360 SEASPRAY AVE (COMBO) The applicant, Erik Broberg with SKA Architect + Planner, has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of a new detached aluminum carport requiring variances for setbacks, angle of vision, lot coverage, and cubic content ratio (CCR) 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.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Patrick Segraves of SKA Architect + Planner presented the architectural plans for the proposed carport.

Mr. Ittleston referenced the letters received against the project and wondered if the area would be visible to anyone. Mr. Segraves explained that while the garage may be partially visible at an angle through an opening, it is generally discreet due to the hedge in front. He noted that the client had limited placement options for the garage. He emphasized that nearby neighbors, including those directly across the street and to the east, have submitted letters of support.

Ms. Brooker asked about the awning at Phipps Plaza. Mr. Segraves noted that the proposed awning is the same size as one previously approved by the Commission. He explained that the awning is not screened from the street and sits approximately two to three feet from the

sidewalk, adjacent to the Wyeth structure.

Ms. Mittner stated that the staff believed the awning was a different situation from the one proposed.

Mr. Griswold expressed concern about the precedent of allowing aluminum awning structures so close to the public right-of-way, especially in a driveway. He noted that the property's original garage was removed to create air-conditioned space. He stated that, while the decision should be based on architectural merit, this request was not straightforward and could be problematic for neighbors.

Mr. Ives expressed reservations about the proposed awning structure, but ultimately viewed the impact as minimal. While not enthusiastic, he thought the proposal was de minimis and acceptable. However, he cautioned against setting a precedent for similar temporary-looking structures becoming common, which he felt would diminish architectural integrity.

Ms. Brooker did not believe the Phipps Plaza awning was a true comparison to the proposal. While she acknowledged the property owner's desire for covered parking, she struggled with the idea of a tent-like, semi-permanent structure at the front of the property. She did not believe the proposal was appropriate for the site.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick confirmed that the hardscape would not increase with the proposal. Mr. Segraves responded.

Mr. Ittleton agreed with Ms. Brooker's comments. He did not believe the structure was appropriate for a historic property.

Ms. Damgard did not believe having an awning in the front yard looked appropriate.

Ms. Lindsay Scott wondered if there was a way to disguise the material, perhaps by wrapping the structure. Mr. Segraves responded. Ms. Damgard wondered if the structure could be hedged in, to which Mr. Segraves stated it could.

Ms. Albarran stated that awnings were typical in Palm Beach. She also suggested adding a hedged entrance and landscaping to buffer the structure. Mr. Segraves thought that was possible, and her comment was a positive suggestion.

Chair Damgard called for public comment. No one indicated a desire to speak.

Mr. Griswold expressed concern about placing a basic aluminum awning three feet from a charming neighborhood's sidewalk. He suggested that if a structure is allowed, it should be better designed to complement the architecture. He also noted the potential visual impact of removing or replacing the hedge. Mr. Segraves discussed his thoughts on a possible solution.

Mr. Ives noted that, unlike similar awnings seen in commercial or mixed-use areas, this proposed structure is in a residential setting and risks appearing out of place. He suggested exploring more residential, integrated solutions, such as landscaping or adding a large shade tree, to avoid the structure feeling overly commercial or temporary.

A motion was made by Mr. Griswold and seconded by Ms. Albarran to defer the project to the August 20, 2025, meeting for a restudy of the carport. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

14. HSB-25-0006 (ZON-25-0040) 259 QUEENS LANE (COMBO) The property owner, Lisa and Simon Van Den Born (Smith Kellogg, Design Professional), has filed an application requesting review and approval of exterior alterations including one-story additions, window and door replacement, installation of new trellis, as well as landscape and hardscape improvements, requiring a variance from the floodplain requirement from Chapter 50, Floods, to maintain the existing building at a finished floor elevation below the current FEMA requirement, and requiring a Special Exception with Site Plan Review due to the significant renovation (demolition of more than 50% of the building) to re-vest development on the non-conforming lots, for this historically significant building. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Kristen Kellogg of Smith Kellogg Architecture, Inc., presented the architectural plans to modify the landmarked home. Brian Vertesch of Brian Vertesch Landscape Architecture presented the landscape and hardscape plans proposed for the site.

Ms. Damgard wondered if the owner would consider doing the repairs to the brick and keeping the color. Ms. Kellogg said that the change in paint color was non-negotiable for the owner, and added that the builder also encouraged it due to the amount of deterioration. Ms. Kellogg stated that the brick was very soft and not in good condition. Ms. Damgard asked about the material for the roof replacement. Ms. Kellogg noted that they were limited in their ability due to the weight that could be placed on the structure and discussed why they suggested the Cedar shake.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick agreed that it was sad that the brick was to be painted and wondered if another treatment could be used. Ms. Kellogg stated that the owner had been adamant about her desire to paint the brick.

Mr. Griswold asked if the addition to the east would step down from the main home; Ms. Kellogg confirmed it would. Mr. Griswold compared the additions and wondered if there was a way to make the east and west additions similar in scale to the landmarked home. Ms. Kellogg reviewed the additions and explained the design. Mr. Griswold still felt the additions were two different scales, but were easily solvable. He advocated changing the brick color due to the damage, but suggested a wash rather than full paint. He also wondered if the pool equipment would be seen from the library. Ms. Kellogg stated that they proposed lowering it below eye level.

Mr. Ittleson agreed with the comments on the paint color.

Ms. Albarran asked about the addition height, windows, and doors. Ms. Kellogg walked through that portion of the design. After a short discussion Ms. Albarran and Mr. Griswold felt the east addition should be raised 12 inches. Ms. Kellogg stated she would be happy to make that

change, but the additions would never be perceived as shown in the drawings due to how they were set back from the street and the proposed landscaping.

Chair Damgard called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach commended the project's respectful preservation of architect Henry Harding's original front façade details, including windows, shutters, and the second-floor balcony. She supported using cedar shake roofing as an appropriate alternative to the original asbestos shingles. While acknowledging the challenges of painting previously unpainted brick, she appreciated the justification provided due to the brick's poor condition and the careful selection of paint. Lastly, she supported maintaining the current height of the east sunroom addition to avoid interfering with existing second-story windows.

A motion was made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve the project as presented. The motion was carried 5-2, with Ms. Damgard and Mr. Ittleson dissenting.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Griswold that the implementation of the proposed work and flood plain variance will not preclude the building's continued designation as a historic building. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

15. LPCS-25-0301 2275 S OCEAN BLVD (THE REEF CONDOMINIUM) The applicant, Jose Ramirez with Nievera Williams Design, has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to resurface the existing drive aisles and parking lots with pavers for the landmarked property.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Mario Nievera of Nievera Williams Design presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Mr. Ittleson thought the white square designs in the hardscape were confusing.

Ms. Damgard stated she spoke with Mr. Nievera about installing concrete from the street to the garden wall that defined the gates and piers; Mr. Nievera confirmed this and stated he would make that change.

Chair Damgard called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach thanked the design team for their collaboration and emphasized the importance of preserving the original design of The Reef, a significant modernist property. She expressed concern about replacing the original front concrete rectangles with pavers, noting that the concrete pattern is part of the historic design and still intact today. While she supported removing deteriorating wood joints and repairing the concrete, she urged the Commission to carefully consider any changes that would alter the property's original character.

Scott Sanders, 2275 S. Ocean Blvd, 104, explained their thorough process in selecting new

paving materials for the driveways. The group, composed of experienced design professionals, aimed to choose a solution that would complement Gene Lawrence's iconic architecture while being functional and durable. After extensive research, site visits, and a review of historic plans and photos, they concluded that uniform gray pavers in a running bond pattern would best serve as a subtle, appropriate backdrop. He emphasized their commitment to honoring the building's landmark status and preserving its architectural integrity.

Peter Wilson, 2275 S. Ocean Blvd., explained that the property was undergoing a \$10 million restoration, including necessary underground work that requires removing deteriorated concrete driveways. He noted that the original architect, Gene Lawrence, included paver-like materials in his plans and that concrete had proven unsuitable due to cracking and elevation changes. He requested approval to install uniform pavers to complement the architecture and complete the restoration.

A motion was made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Griswold to approve the project with the condition that the entrances be installed in concrete from S. Ocean Blvd. to the front garden site wall. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

**Note: The meeting was recessed for lunch at 1:08 p.m. and resumed at 1:45 p.m.*

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

16. Incentives Discussion

Ms. Mittner discussed the existing incentives, which include the tax abatement program, the eligibility for the floodplain variance, exemptions from the Florida Building Code, bronze plaques, greater flexibility of the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) versus the Architectural Commission in the approval process, and the reduced review fees for the Landmarks Preservation Commission versus the Architectural Commission. She then spoke about incentives previously raised, such as federal tax credits, historic easements, and transfer of development rights (TDR). Lastly, she introduced five new proposed incentives, which included the following: no notice requirement for floodplain variances, a dedicated webpage for property owners, code reform to incorporate LPC-approved waivers, code reform to facilitate rehabilitation of non-conforming structures and properties, and exclusive events for property owners.

Note: Mr. Ittleton left the meeting at 2:17 p.m.

Chair Damgard called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach expressed appreciation for the in-depth discussion on landmark incentives, noting the Foundation's long-standing support for such efforts. She highlighted a Foundation-funded economic study by Donovan Rypkema that showed landmark properties in Palm Beach carry a 6-13% market premium over similar non-landmarked homes. Ms. Sunny also shared that the Foundation is updating its website to include resources for historic property owners and is planning renewed outreach to real estate agents. She emphasized the Foundation's commitment to supporting the Town and its preservation goals.

MEETING SCHEDULE

17. The next meeting is on Wednesday, August 20, 2025.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Albarran to adjourn the meeting at 2:28 PM. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Respectfully Submitted,


Brittain Damgard, Chair