



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Minutes of the Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting Held on August 20, 2025

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

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

Members Unexcused: Alexander Griswold

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 Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting on July 16, 2025

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

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

2. OFFICIALS

Ms. Damgard stated that staff had provided the proposed 2026 meeting dates. She reaffirmed the Roberts Rules of Order that the commission would follow in the meeting.

3. STAFF

3.1 Administrative Review Monthly Update

Ms. Mittner indicated that 28 administrative approvals had been made over the last month, in coordination with the Chair.

4. PUBLIC - 3 MINUTE LIMIT

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach introduced the new Director, Danielle Del Sol. Ms. Del Sol introduced herself and stated she was happy to be in Palm Beach and looked forward to meeting everyone.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5. 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.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Pat Segraves of SKA Architect + Planner provided the architectural plans for the proposed carport structure.

Mr. Ives wondered if an organic structure, grown over time, could be used in lieu of the carport structure. Mr. Segraves stated his client would prefer something similar to what he proposed.

Ms. Brooker wondered about the original garage for the home. Mr. Segraves stated there had been a garage, but it had been used as a bedroom since it opened to the back pool area. He spoke of the changes made to the home, including the elimination of a curb cut. He said his client was not initially going to use a garage, but as he lived in the home, he wanted a place to park his car undercover.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick wondered if the structure could be painted green so it would not appear as prominent. Mr. Segraves stated he would consider the suggestion. Ms. Herzig-Desnick thought it would be less intrusive.

Mr. Segraves stated the proposed structure would likely be aluminum or galvanized steel with

painted aluminum poles.

Ms. Coleman expressed concern that the driveway was being narrowed and trees were added to conceal the unattractive feature. She did not favor the yellow and white color scheme. Mr. Segraves clarified that the landscaping proposal was intended to minimize street visibility, and the hedge could remain as is if preferred.

Ms. Albarran preferred option B because it appeared like a pergola; she suggested adding vines. She preferred the narrower opening with the hedges. Mr. Segraves placed a picture on the overhead projector of an entrance with a tree canopy, similar to what he would propose for this home's entrance.

Ms. Damgard asked if the house was for sale and why the changes were proposed if the home was for sale. Mr. Segraves stated that the project was not contingent on the sale but added that the home had been sold.

Ms. Coleman asked if the new owner knew about the proposed project, to which Mr. Segraves confirmed that he did.

Ms. Albarran thought that option B would be easier to maintain.

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

Ms. Damgard stated that while the design was acceptable, she opposed its location in front of a landmarked house, citing a lack of forethought, an undesirable precedent, and the inappropriateness of considering future buyers.

Ms. Brooker agreed and commented that while the design was much improved, she remained concerned about its placement at the front of the house. She noted that while additional landscaping might help, the need for extensive measures to disguise the structure suggested it may not be appropriate in that location.

Ms. Coleman agreed and believed the structure did not belong in the proposed location.

Ms. Damgard wondered if there was another location for the structure other than the front yard. Due to site constraints and limited side yard space, Mr. Segraves explained that the front motor court was the only feasible parking location. He noted that neighboring property owners had provided letters of support and that placing the structure behind the hedge would minimize visibility.

Ms. Albarran suggested relocating the structure to the east side along Coconut Row to avoid placement in front of the historic façade. However, this would require removing trees and adding hardscape. After discussion, it was acknowledged that such a location might still leave the structure visible from the street. In contrast, the proposed placement behind the hedge would minimize visibility without additional hardscape.

Mr. Ives stated that the proposal did not damage the property's historic integrity but raised concerns about its architectural and aesthetic impact. While ultimately able to support the

project, Mr. Ives cautioned that approving it could set an undesirable precedent for similar structures in town.

Mr. Ittleson stated that the proposed structure would detract from the historic character and presence of the landmarked property, set a poor precedent, and could not support the project.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Albarran to approve the project as presented, with option B. The motion failed 2-5, with Mses. Coleman, Herzig-Desnick, Brooker, Lindsay-Scott, and Damgard dissenting.

A motion was made by Ms. Brooker and seconded by Ms. Coleman to deny project COA-25-0021, located at 360 Seaspray Avenue, finding that the overall design of the project does not meet criteria c and d in Sections 54-122. The motion was carried 6-1, with Mr. Ives dissenting.

NEW BUSINESS

6. HSB-25-0008 249 SANDPIPER DR. The applicant, Dustin Mizell with Environment Design Group, has filed an application requesting review and approval of fence and landscape modifications for the property containing a Historically Significant Building.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the proposed project and provided a material sample for the commissioners to view.

Ms. Coleman asked if the color would fade. Mr. Mizell explained that while the wood material will fade over time, it will be kept natural without a clear coat to avoid a contemporary appearance. He noted the darker color was chosen for sustainability and durability in Palm Beach's climate, to align with the home's interior aesthetic, and because it would provide a simple fence solution without adding bulk or impacting neighboring properties.

Mr. Ittleson thought the material worked well with the property. Ms. Lindsay-Scott agreed.

Ms. Damgard asked if the material was wood with chemicals added to it. Mr. Mizell clarified that the proposed material was real wood, harvested sustainably. While the wood was blackened through a burning process for durability against salt and weather, Mr. Mizell noted they would be willing to adjust the color on the neighbor-facing side if objections arose.

Ms. 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.

7. HSB-25-0009 10 TARPON ISLE. The applicant, Christian Bolliger with Cooper Robertson, has filed an application requesting review and approval of demolition of the existing bridge and reconstruction, and exterior alterations, including roof replacement,

partial door replacement, and the installation of a new pergola for the property containing a Historically Significant Building.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Kristi Munilla, licensed interior designer and project manager, spoke on behalf of the property owner and emphasized that the home will be the family's primary residence. She highlighted the team's expertise in historic preservation, commitment to restoring the house with integrity, and willingness to incorporate Commission feedback. Ms. Munilla noted the significant structural issues inherited from prior work, explained that corrections will align with original drawings, and stressed the owner's investment in preserving the home's historic character while making it a livable residence for his family.

Sabrina Iorio of Rafael de Cardenas presented the architectural plans for the proposed home modifications. Michael Perry of MP Design & Architecture explained that the original white roof tile used on the house was no longer manufactured and required replacement with a comparable flat clay tile since the existing roof was failing. He provided material samples of what was being proposed.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick asked about the medallion on the fence and wondered about its orientation. Ms. Iorio stated it would face out. Ms. Herzig-Desnick asked about the front door design and thought it felt heavy for the style. Ms. Iorio explained that the new front door is based on the original design but simplified, meant to feel warm and inviting. Ms. Herzig-Desnick thought the door seemed Mediterranean and not in the style of the home. Ms. Iorio stated it was not the intent, and they would be happy to study the item.

Ms. Coleman expressed strong concern with the new front door, describing it as overly imposing and uninviting, and suggested the addition of sidelights or a transom to soften its appearance.

Considering its many evolutions, Mr. Ives asked what the home's style was. Ms. Iorio did not believe the home had a specific style but added that they were committed to working with the home as it existed. Mr. Ives asked about the historic railings, to which Ms. Iorio showed a photo of what she believed were the historic railings. Mr. Ives asked about the condition of the current roof tiles and wondered if it was a maintenance issue. Mr. Perry confirmed that the roof replacement was a maintenance issue.

Ms. Coleman asked about a different railing she saw at the property and showed the commissioners a photograph. Ms. Iorio stated the railings in question were on the south side balconies and did not match other railings. Mr. Perry confirmed that the railings shown by Ms. Coleman were not original. Ms. Coleman asked about the railings with the added mesh; Ms. Iorio responded and stated how the railings could be designed without the mesh.

Ms. Damgard asked why the design did not include the original Chippendale railings. Ms. Iorio believed the current Chippendale railing style conflicted with the home's softer, more organic features such as the Dutch gables, curved entrances, and railings. While it fit the original Howard Major design, she felt the newer proposed design would better harmonize with the house as it exists today.

Chair Damgard called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny of Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach emphasized the historical significance of the 1939 Howard Major design, noting Major's advocacy for white roofs and British Colonial/West Indies influences. She provided background on Major's architectural philosophy and the property's evolution, stressing that the original white tile roof and Chippendale railings are defining features that should be preserved. Ms. Sunny urged the Commission to require retention or in-kind replacement of these elements under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, as they represent the property's true period of significance rather than later alterations.

Ms. Herzig Desnick asked Ms. Sunny about the original front door. Ms. Sunny confirmed that the existing front door was original to the house and shown in the historic drawings. She noted that the proposal is to recreate it in the same design and style, and clarified that the new door under discussion pertains only to the new construction, not the historic portion.

Mr. Perry explained that while the Chippendale railings could legally remain under historical exemption, the owners prefer to meet the modern code for safety due to their young children. Regarding the new front door, he noted that a transom like the original is impractical with the current Dutch Colonial design. Still, he offered to explore alternative panel and side light options. He added that the original white roof tiles were no longer available, the roof must be replaced, and historically, the house carried a red clay tile roof from the late 1970s through 2019.

Ms. Damgard confirmed that a new Chippendale railing could be made to comply with the existing code; Mr. Perry agreed.

Ms. Coleman asked about the shutters that appeared longer than the windows. Ms. Iorio stated they would be maintained but refinished in a new color. She added that there was a panel below the windows.

Ms. Albarran stated that while a wooden door would be acceptable since the original was wood, she disliked the proposed panel design, describing the panels as too long and narrow compared to the wider proportions of the original. She suggested revising the layout to better reflect the original door's design. Ms. Iorio stated that the client preferred the proposed door, but they would be open to restudying the feature.

Mr. Ives observed that the property had undergone significant changes over its 86-year history, raising questions about its architectural integrity and whether it ever merited Historically Significant Building (HSB) designation. He noted conflicts between the original 1939 design and later alterations, particularly the Dutch gables, which he felt most damaged the historical character. He added that he would ultimately support the application but lamented the loss of the original 1939 house.

Ms. Brooker acknowledged the difficulty in identifying the original house within the current structure. Still, she stressed the importance of preserving elements of the original architect's intent now that it is designated as an HSB. She supported maintaining the Chippendale railings and white roof, noting similar examples in town, while also praising the design team's proposed

changes, such as softened shutters, a wood front door, cypress balconies, and the pergola, for improving the building's overall appearance.

Ms. Albarran emphasized the importance of maintaining the white roof and replicating the Chippendale railings in a code-compliant manner. She also supported the use of a wood front door with slight alterations.

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and seconded by Ms. Albarran to approve HSB-25-009 located at 10 Tarpon Isle, finding the overall design of the project meets Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the criteria set forth in Sections 18-306, 54-122 and 54-123, subject to the following conditions: the roof tile material shall be white, the railings shall be in the Chippendale style, and the front door and bridge designs shall be deferred to the September 17, 2025, meeting. The motion was carried 6-1, with Mr. Ives dissenting.

8. LPCS-25-0303 335 COCOANUT ROW. The applicant, 335 Cocoanut Row Trust, has filed an application requesting the review and approval of a new 60KW generator for the property containing two (2) Historically Significant Buildings. *[This item has been deferred to the September 17, 2025, Landmark Preservation Commission meeting.]*

**Note: This item was deferred to the meeting on September 17, 2025, at the Approval of the Agenda.*

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Mittner stated that the staff was continuing to work on landmark incentives, which would be presented to the commissioners later.

MEETING SCHEDULE

9. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 17, 2025.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Albarran to adjourn the meeting at 11:31 AM. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Respectfully Submitted,


Brittain Damgard, Chair