



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Minutes of the Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting Held on November 19, 2025

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 09:31 AM in the Town Council Chambers.

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Damgard led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES

1. Minutes of the October 22, 2025, Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Coleman to approve the Landmark Preservation Commission meeting minutes of October 22, 2025. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Mittner noted the deferral of COA-23-003, 139 N. County Road, to the December 17, 2025, meeting.

A motion was made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve the agenda as amended. 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. Brooker thanked the staff for their promotion of the landmark incentives, as well as the Town Council for their receptiveness to hearing about them.

3. STAFF

Ms. Mittner stated that the landmark incentives had been passed on first reading at the Town Council and would be presented at the December meeting for adoption. She also noted that within the last month, the staff had conducted 15 administrative approvals in coordination with the chair.

4. PUBLIC - 3 MINUTE LIMIT

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

GENERAL BUSINESS

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5. COA-25-0003 (ZON-25-0009) 303 PENDLETON LN (COMBO). The applicant, M. Timothy Hanlon, has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of a new carport addition requiring a side yard (west) setback variance for the property under consideration to be Landmarked. 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.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Attorney M. Timothy Hanlon, on behalf of the applicant, provided an overview of the application, explained the variance requested, and advocated for a positive recommendation to the Town Council. Jennifer Lamy of Northworks Architects presented the architectural plans for the proposed carport, and Claudia Visconti of SMI Landscape Architecture presented the landscape and hardscape changes for the site.

Mr. Segraves asked about the garage door and the site coverage numbers. Ms. Lamy stated that the garage door would not be changed; it would be a solid door. Ms. Lamy stated that their site coverage was below the allowable amount.

Mr. Ives inquired about the width of the existing garage door and its intended use. Tom Hunt, the owner, stated that the garage does not contain cars and explained why he was unable to park in the garage. Mr. Hunt stated they currently park in the same location, which is in front of the garage. Mr. Ives asked about the width of the carport. Ms. Lamy responded. Mr. Ives

questioned why the carport was extended forward to cover the side entry rather than kept flush with the building, suggesting that alternative options could avoid creating an awkward protrusion. He noted that similar design approaches had been discouraged in past projects. Mr. Hanlon stated that the owners do not have a covered entry to their home, and therefore get wet when it rains.

Mr. Griswold thought the plan was tasteful and supported the request.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott noted that she did not see any other carports on the street. However, she thought the plan was tasteful but worried about setting a precedent. Mr. Hunt discussed one additional carport and one fabric awning over a driveway near his home. Ms. Lindsay-Scott thought the solution was viable.

Ms. Albarran stated that the design is attractive and more charming than exposing the garage door, and she supports covering the entry door with the proposed structure. She preferred the selected brackets as historically appropriate and confirmed she had no concerns with the two-foot setback, noting it covers the area gracefully.

Ms. Brooker noted that while covered parking on landmark properties will continue to be requested, this particular design is appropriate because it is consistent with the house, integrated with the existing garage location, and well-landscaped so it blends into the property. She felt that it provided suitable covered parking for a home that lacks it and that setting such a precedent would not be problematic.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick liked the simplicity of the design and thought it would blend into the home. She inquired about the proposed vines and how they would be attached to the structure. Ms. Visconti described how the vines would be attached.

Ms. Coleman thought the approval should be conditioned on the plantings being added. She asked if the carport would be opened to the top. Ms. Lamy stated it would be solid.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach explained that the homeowners were initially surprised by the landmark proposal but mainly concerned about their lack of parking. She said the proposed covered parking is a sensible, minimal, and fully removable solution that does not damage the historic structure or remove character-defining features. She emphasized that it is compatible with the home, preserves the existing garage, and meets the owners' practical needs without compromising preservation goals.

A motion was made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Ms. Coleman to approve the architectural and landscape plans as presented. The motion was carried 6-1, with Mr. Ives dissenting.

A motion was made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Ms. Herzig-Desnick that the implementation of the proposed variance will not cause a negative architectural impact on the subject property. The motion was carried 6-1, with Mr. Ives dissenting.

6. 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. *The demolition and reconstruction of the existing bridge and the north entry front door replacement have been removed from the scope of work; therefore, the remainder of this application is withdrawn.*

***Note: This item was withdrawn from the agenda during the approval of the agenda.**

NEW BUSINESS

7. COA-25-0030 (ZON-25-0067) 801 S COUNTY RD (COMBO). The applicant, LaBerge & Menard Inc., has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of modifications to the existing garage to add a second-story guest house, as well as landscape and hardscape modifications, including a variance to allow an additional guest house 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.

Daniel Menard of LaBerge & Menard presented the proposed architectural plans, and Grace Walton of Green Concepts presented the landscape and hardscape changes for the site.

Mr. Segraves thought the house was interesting. He expressed concern about the visibility and design of the proposed garage, stating that the wide elliptical arch was not suitable and would be better suited as a rectangular opening. He suggested exploring an alternate motor court entrance to avoid emphasizing the garage and encouraged creating more variation in the rooflines and elevations to add visual interest. Overall, he felt the current design overly highlights the garage in an unattractive way.

Mr. Ives shared Mr. Segraves' conceptual concerns. He felt the design appeared heavy and could benefit from more variation in roof heights and stronger positive-negative space to create visual interest. While he appreciated the effort to remain modest and consistent with the main house, he encouraged exploring more ornamentation and design refinement. He also emphasized considering key street-view perspectives, particularly the southwest view shown in the renderings, since that is how the public will experience the building. He also recommended being more modest with the hardscape.

Mr. Ittleson expressed concern that the second floor over the garage would be overwhelming on the street. Mr. Menard stated that the addition would be pushed back off the street by 58 feet.

Mr. Griswold agreed with Mr. Segraves' comments. He felt the overall height of the addition is reasonable, but agreed the center garage door appears too wide. He suggested exploring an alternate driveway entrance to reduce the visual impact of the garage and recommended varying roof heights to break up the massing. He also noted the existing pedestrian gate now feels oversized relative to the new guest house and could be redesigned to reduce scale.

Ms. Coleman commented that the proposed porch and its overhang resemble a screened-in porch and do not match the more gracious architectural character of the existing house, making the design feel out of place.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick said the design was a good first attempt, but it felt somewhat static, and it was difficult to evaluate without seeing the main house. She noted that although elements were said to reference the main structure, the massing, detailing, or roofline may not yet reflect that character. She recommended articulating the massing of the structure.

Ms. Damgard appreciated how Mr. Menard designed the structure to be sensitive to the neighbors.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny of The Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach agreed with prior comments about the need to break up the massing and vary rooflines to better reflect the character of the main Mediterranean Revival house. She appreciated the effort to protect the main structure and neighbor views, but recommended providing a clearer rendering of how the addition will appear from Ocean Boulevard, noting its size and proximity to the road may surprise the public. She said a street-level perspective would help the Commission fully understand the impacts of visibility and landscaping.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Griswold to defer the project to the December 17, 2025, meeting. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

8. COA-23-003 (ZON-23-020) 139 N COUNTY RD—THE PARAMOUNT THEATER (COMBO). The applicant, WEG Paramount LLC, has refiled an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of the renovation, including window and door replacement, roof replacement, installation of awnings, railing replacement, selective demolition, reconstruction of original features, as well as landscape and hardscape improvements, and adaptive re-use of an existing Landmarked theater structure. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval. The consideration of which is part of a facilitated resolution by the magistrate under Florida's Land Use and Environmental Dispute Resolution Act. **This item has been deferred to the December 17, 2025, Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting.**

**Note: This item was deferred to December 17, 2025, during the approval of the agenda.*

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

9. 1127 NORTH LAKE WAY - REQUEST TO BE PLACED UNDER CONSIDERATION
Owner: Virginia Burke

Janet Murphy of MurphyStillings presented a brief overview of the British Colonial-style residence at 1127 N. Lake Way. She requested that the residence be placed under consideration for landmark status.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Segraves to place 1127 North Lake Way under consideration for landmark status. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

10. 303 PENDLETON LANE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: Thomas Hunt and Linda Hunt

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history of the Monterey-style residence. Ms. Murphy pointed out the design features of the residence. Ms. Murphy testified that the residence met the following criteria for designation as a landmark:

Sec. 54-161 (1) Exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, economic, or social history of the nation, state, county, or town; and,

Sec. 54-161 (3) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or is a specimen inherently valuable of the study of a period, style, method of construction, or use of Indigenous materials or craftsmanship,

Sect. 54-161 (4) Is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual ability has been recognized or who influenced his age.

Ms. Damgard requested confirmation of proof of publication. Ms. Mittner provided confirmation.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Coleman to make the designation report for 303 Pendleton Lane part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick inquired about the other homes on the street that had been designated, specifically the number of Monterey-style homes. Ms. Murphy responded. Ms. Herzig-Desnick asked if it was the predominant style on the street, to which Ms. Murphy stated yes, as well as the Colonial Revival style.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Attorney M. Timothy Hanlon, on behalf of the owners, explained that the Hunts were initially surprised by the landmark designation and had considered objecting, but with guidance from Ms. Sunny and Ms. Mittner, they came to support the process and worked collaboratively to address their property concerns. He noted the Hunts are now eager to move forward and consent to the designation, contingent on receiving the remaining approvals and permits for the project. He thanked the Commission for its assistance.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach believed that the property clearly meets Landmark Criteria 1, 3, and 4 in the designation report and qualifies for landmark status. She thanked the Hunts and Mr. Hanlon for their openness and support despite the unexpected nature of the designation and noted the owners' strong care for the home's historic details. She encouraged the Commission to recommend the property for designation to the Town Council.

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and was seconded by Mr. Ives to recommend 303 Pendleton Lane to the Town Council for designation as a Landmark of the Town of Palm Beach based on criteria 1, 3, and 4 in Section 54-161 and with the acknowledgment that the owners

of the home supported the designation. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

11. 201 WORTH AVENUE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: LENDAN INC

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Janet Murphy of MurphyStillings, LLC, testified about the architecture and history of the Mid-Century Modern style commercial building. Ms. Murphy pointed out the design features of the building. Ms. Murphy testified that the residence met the following criteria for designation as a landmark:

Sec. 54-161 (3) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or is a specimen inherently valuable of the study of a period, style, method of construction, or use of Indigenous materials or craftsmanship,

Sect. 54-161 (4) Is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual ability has been recognized or who influenced his age.

Ms. Damgard requested confirmation of proof of publication. Ms. Mittner provided confirmation and noted the recent work on the building, including new signage.

Mr. Ives was surprised that criterion 1 was not included. Ms. Murphy stated that they did consider criterion 1, but did not feel the evidence was sufficient.

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and was seconded by Mr. Segraves to make the designation report for 201 Worth Avenue part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick questioned the style, thinking it seemed more in the International style. Ms. Murphy responded and discussed the building's design style.

Mr. Griswold said it is unfortunate that the building's original windows were replaced, as they were an important architectural feature. He also offered a broader comment, noting that this three-story building has long-term leases and substantial square footage that could not be rebuilt under today's zoning, which already provides strong protection. He suggested the Commission prioritize landmarking properties that are not already safeguarded by restrictive zoning.

Ms. Albarran remarked that the 1955 black-and-white photograph of the building looked much more attractive than in its current condition, noting that the brick appeared softer and more appealing in the historic image. She expressed regret that the present appearance makes her less certain about supporting the designation.

Mr. Segraves said he agrees with many of the prior comments but emphasized that the building is an iconic part of Worth Avenue, and he cannot imagine the street without it. While he shares concerns about the windows, he believes they could be appropriately restored. Overall, he felt the structure was significant and difficult to envision being replaced with something newer; he supported the designation.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott thought the building had undergone substantial changes, particularly with the

windows.

Mr. Ives said that while he understands the concern about landmarking buildings that are already unlikely to be demolished, landmarking should not be based solely on the risk of demolition. Instead, it should recognize buildings that clearly meet the criteria and are worthy of designation. He noted that although he personally has never liked this building, it is a prominent three-story structure that has long been used as a reference point in town and fully meets the landmark criteria. He concluded that it deserves landmark status and should be recommended to the Town Council.

Ms. Coleman thought the recent changes had improved the building's appearance.

Mr. Ittleson believed the history of the building was an integral part of Palm Beach, and since it met the criteria, he supported the designation.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick thought the building disrupted the natural rhythm of the street and did not believe it met the criteria.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach said the building reflects an important mid-century era in Palm Beach, noting that similar architecture once surrounded Town Hall. She agreed it meets Landmark Criteria 3 and 4, and potentially 1, because it tells the story of changing times and of architect John Stetson's evolution after his military and international work. While not universally loved, she emphasized that it is historically significant and encouraged the Commission to recognize its merit.

Ms. Damgard emphasized that for commercial buildings, the Commission should carefully consider the points raised, noting that some properties that likely should have been landmarked were not, and could be lost if redevelopment occurs.

Town Attorney Francisco reminded the Commission that landmark decisions must be based strictly on the criteria in the code, not personal opinions about aesthetics or concerns about possible demolition. She emphasized that votes must rely on competent, substantial evidence supporting those criteria.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Coleman to recommend 201 Worth Avenue to the Town Council for designation as a Landmark of the Town of Palm Beach based on criteria 1, 3, and 4 in Section 54-161, with the notation that the ownership of the building did not believe it met the criteria for designation. The motion was carried 6-1, with Ms. Herzig-Desnick dissenting.

12. 220 EDEN ROAD DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: Clara Urbahn and Jason Briggs, Co-Trustees of 220 Eden Road Trust

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history of the Monterey-style residence. Ms. Stillings pointed out the design features of the residence. Ms. Stillings

testified that the residence met the following criteria for designation as a landmark:

Sec. 54-161 (1) Exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, economic, or social history of the nation, state, county, or town; and,

Sec. 54-161 (3) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or is a specimen inherently valuable of the study of a period, style, method of construction, or use of Indigenous materials or craftsmanship,

Sect. 54-161 (4) Is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual ability has been recognized or who influenced his age.

Ms. Damgard requested confirmation of proof of publication. Ms. Mittner provided confirmation.

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and was seconded by Ms. Herzig-Desnick to make the designation report for 220 Eden Road part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach stated the property clearly meets Landmark Criteria 1, 3, and 4, noting the building's elegant Monterey style enriched with Georgian Revival elements. She highlighted the architectural significance and agreed with the conclusions of the designation report.

Mr. Segraves noted the home is not only a good Monterey-style example but is also one of the earliest houses built on the North End north of the Palm Beach Country Club, making its location and early history uniquely significant.

Ms. Brooker noted that the house is an excellent example of how a property can retain its original character while being significantly expanded and adapted for modern living, demonstrating that preservation and updates can coexist successfully.

Mr. Ives agreed that the home is not only influential but also a path-breaking example in town, emphasizing the importance of architect Maurice Fatio to Palm Beach's architectural history. He noted that even today's architects look to Fatio's work when trying to resolve design challenges while maintaining the traditional Palm Beach style.

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and was seconded by Mr. Ives to recommend 220 Eden Road to the Town Council for designation as a Landmark of the Town of Palm Beach based on criteria 1, 3, and 4 in Section 54-161. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

13. 246 TANGIER AVENUE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: Robert Stewart Honeyman Jr.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history of the Monterey-style residence. Ms. Stillings pointed out the design features of the residence. Ms. Stillings testified that the residence met the following criteria for designation as a landmark:

Sec. 54-161 (1) Exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, economic, or social history of the nation, state, county, or town; and,

Sec. 54-161 (3) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or is a specimen inherently valuable of the study of a period, style, method of construction, or use of Indigenous materials or craftsmanship,

Sect. 54-161 (4) Is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual ability has been recognized or who influenced his age.

Ms. Damgard requested confirmation of proof of publication. Ms. Mittner provided confirmation.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Coleman to make the designation report for 246 Tangier Avenue part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Brooker requested clarification on whether the home still qualifies for landmark designation despite the alterations referenced in the owner's letter of opposition. She requested confirmation that the additions are subordinate to the original structure and that the main, historic portion of the house remains intact for the record. Ms. Stillings responded and outlined the modifications to the home.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott wondered if the elevation is considered when the property is evaluated for landmark designation. Ms. Stillings explained that the certificate referenced by the owner pertains to a state law that allows for the demolition of certain newly landmarked homes when the owner objects, not to the Town's own ordinance.

Mr. Griswold thought this was a great example of a Monterey-style home and a great work of Howard Major. He supported the designation.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Attorney M. Timothy Hanlon, representing the owners, submitted his July 9, 2025, objection letter into the record and stated that the owners do not consent to the landmark designation. He clarified that their objection is made specifically for purposes of House Bill 423 (2022) and Florida Statute 553.79(25).

Mr. Ives asks about a section of the letter sent by Mr. Hanlon regarding the 50% of the front facade that had been changed. Mr. Hanlon stated that his clients believe that the right half of the front elevation had been changed.

Ms. Damgard asked Ms. Stillings about the comment in the letter by Mr. Hanlon. Ms. Stillings did not agree with the objection and showed historic renderings of the home.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach stated that, based on the drawings and information provided, the primary front façade remains largely intact, and any past one-story additions appear subservient and consistent with the home's character. She stated that these changes do not preclude designation and agreed that the property meets Criteria 1, 3, and 4. She noted the house reflects architect Howard Major's design philosophy, seen in features such as

the full-width overhanging porch and board-and-batten siding. She concluded that it is a strong example of the Monterey style and should be recommended for landmark designation.

Mr. Ives said that, despite objections, the house clearly reflects the defining characteristics of the Monterey style and aligns with Howard Major's architectural principles as outlined in the designation report. He emphasized the significance of Major's contributions to Palm Beach, noting the historical context of his break from Mizner and the unique design philosophy that followed. He stressed that this home illustrates Major's distinctive approach and supports its designation.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Mr. Griswold to recommend 246 Tangier Avenue to the Town Council for designation as a Landmark of the Town of Palm Beach based on criteria 1, 3, and 4 in Section 54-161, and with the acknowledgment that the owners of the home opposed the designation. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

14. 750 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: 750 S COUNTY LLC

[This item has been deferred to the March 19, 2026, LPC meeting.]

****Note: This item was deferred to March 19, 2025, during the approval of the agenda.***

MEETING SCHEDULE

15. The next meeting is scheduled for December 17, 2025

Ms. Damgard announced the next meeting date in December.

Ms. Churney stated that Jacqueline Albarran had declared a conflict of interest for the project at 159 Australian Avenue, COA-25-0028, at the October 22, 2025, meeting and had correctly filled out the required forms by the State.

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully Submitted,


Brittain Damgard, Chair