



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Minutes of the Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting Held on January 21, 2026

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 09:30 AM in the Town Council Chambers.

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

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 December 17, 2025, Landmarks Preservation Commission

A motion was made by Mr. Griswold and seconded by Ms. Coleman to approve the minutes of the December 17, 2025, meeting as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Mittner requested that the Landmark Designations be reordered so that they would be heard as follows: 234 Chilean Avenue, 230 Chilean Avenue, 345 Seabreeze Avenue, and 410 Seabreeze Avenue. She indicated that the designation hearing for 2780 S. Ocean Blvd. would be deferred to April 22, 2026.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Segraves 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

No comments were heard at this time.

3. STAFF

Ms. Mittner indicated that 15 administrative approvals had been completed over the last year.

4. PUBLIC - 3 MINUTE LIMIT

No comments were heard at this time.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5. 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.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project. Attorney Francisco clarified that the full renovation project was properly noticed on the agenda and that the Board may consider all aspects outlined in the staff memo and presentation. She advised members to disclose any materials received from the public during ex parte communications and reminded the Board that its review is limited to the exterior modification criteria in Town Code Sections 54-122 and 54-123, not the proposed use, which is under the Town Council's jurisdiction.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Jamie Crowley, Attorney on behalf of WEG Paramount LLC, stated that comments regarding the proposed additional vestibule were recently raised by the Town Council and that the applicant had received initial staff feedback but needs additional time to review and coordinate an appropriate response. He indicated that the applicant would work with staff to determine the proper review process and return with a proposal addressing any exterior modifications related to the vestibule.

Lester Woerner, owner, stated that the Paramount Theater project is focused on preservation and adaptive reuse rather than development, guided by extensive historical research. He thanked

the Town Council and expressed his commitment to working collaboratively with the Board and staff to restore the building's historic character and ensure its long-term viability.

Rick Gonzalez of REG Architects presented the architectural plans proposed for the commercial building.

Mr. Ives asked whether the dome would be removed and reinstalled during restoration. Mr. Gonzalez explained that a prior dome restoration conducted in place approximately twenty years earlier did not require removal and stated he did not anticipate removal would be necessary. Mr. Ives confirmed there were no changes to the box planters since the last presentation, which Mr. Gonzalez confirmed. Mr. Ives requested clarification of "back of the house," and Mr. Gonzalez explained that it referred to the east and south walls and the front side of the second floor. Mr. Ives asked about window changes, which Mr. Gonzalez addressed. Mr. Ives also asked about the increase in rooftop mechanical space, and Mr. Gonzalez noted that the existing walled mechanical area would be expanded by approximately 25 percent to accommodate a generator, with no change to the 10-foot height. Mr. Ives requested an estimated increase in square footage rather than a percentage.

Ms. Coleman asked about the proposed gates on the west side and the two doors on the south side. She wanted to know why the doors weren't similar, and Mr. Gonzalez said the gates are the same on both the south and east sides. He said the doors could be altered for consistency. Ms. Coleman felt that all railings needed to be reviewed by the commission to ensure they matched the existing design. Mr. Gonzalez noted that no new design for the gates was being proposed.

Mr. Ittleson asked about the expected durability of the wood if the commission were to insist on wood. Mr. Gonzalez stated 10-20 years, dependent upon the installation and workmanship. He thought aluminum would last 20-30 years.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick asked about adding awnings on the south side of the building, where they might be more functional. Mr. Gonzalez explained that the south entrance awning was at the club entryway and that the courtyard gates did not have awnings because patrons accessed the courtyard through the tunnel. He added that the remaining openings were secondary windows and that the east side did not have awnings. Ms. Herzig-Desnick stated that those areas could benefit from awnings.

Mr. Griswold wondered whether the window profiles could be matched between wood and aluminum, and Mr. Gonzalez said they would be identical. Mr. Griswold requested landscape renderings of the planter around the parking lot. Cory Meyer of Nievera Williams stated there would be a significant amount of additional landscaping. Mr. Griswold agreed with the staff that the screening around mechanical areas with one-third stucco and two-thirds tile would be more attractive. He supported the inverted gate and stated that the owner's willingness to go the extra mile on restoration would benefit the town.

Ms. Albarran asked about the window materials and stated that they should be either all aluminum or all wood. She expressed concern about humidity becoming trapped between wood-clad materials. Mr. Gonzalez responded that clad window materials had improved. Ms. Albarran stated that she preferred the inverted gate.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott stated she was not in favor of the roll-up gate and preferred the wood inverted gate. She asked about the increase in rooftop space and whether the generator could be located in the parking lot. Mr. Gonzalez stated he did not believe there was sufficient space at ground level for the generator. Mr. Crowley added that the adjacent neighbor had requested that the generator not be located near his house.

Ms. Brooker referred to the size of the rooftop mechanical enclosure, comparing renderings from the northwest and south corners. She was surprised it was described as only a 25% increase, noting that the expansion appeared not to be toward the front, the northwest corner, or the south. She asked whether most of the growth was on the east side facing the Sun and Surf Condominium and requested confirmation. Regarding the windows, Ms. Brooker asked whether the two samples on display were sufficient to address concerns about whether the clad windows could closely match the wood windows, or whether they were merely generic samples that did not fully represent the final installed product. It was clarified that the samples were standard showroom examples from the manufacturers. She noted that the details would be verified and coordinated during preparation of the construction documents. Mr. Gonzalez also stated that the materials would be verified and that they would be working closely with town staff. Ms. Brooker preferred the inverted gate.

Mr. Segraves liked the inverted gate design and the friendliness of the gate. He expressed concern about the windows, noting that even though the windows had matching bars and muntins, differences in style and operation between the wood and clad double-hung or single-hung windows would remain due to manufacturing differences. He asked about the club entrance barrel awning, noting that it appeared to be metal in the rendering. It was clarified that the awning would be canvas fabric on a frame, consistent with the other awnings on the property, and that the entrance awning would use a solid color rather than the striped pattern used elsewhere. Regarding the screening of mechanical equipment, Mr. Segraves suggested that the mechanical area remain as it currently exists. He asked if that was a possibility of keeping it the same. Mr. Gonzalez noted that the mechanical equipment is visible, and the intent is to tie everything together and clean up the appearance.

Ms. Damgard suggested framing the mechanical equipment enclosure to make the element less visible. She also stated she noticed a difference between the wood and aluminum windows. In addition, she preferred clear glazing. She asked about the texture of the stucco, making it more like a picture frame with terracotta and a lowered base. There will still be columns, beams, and stucco to hold it altogether. Mr. Gonzalez stated it would match the original stucco. She liked the inverted wooden spindle gate.

Ms. Coleman asked that the wooden gates be designed to avoid a delicate appearance. She expressed concern about the view from Sunset Avenue and the large blank wall, as shown in the rendering, without palm trees. Mr. Meyer stated that substantial landscaping was proposed for that wall.

Ms. Albarran stated that some drawings showed the existing wall, and she said it was not aesthetically pleasing. She said the addition would be much better.

Ms. Herzig Desnick asked about soundproofing equipment. John Tuckus, REG Architects, stated

that kitchen exhaust fans would be equipped with silencers and that the cooling towers would be surrounded by a sound barrier. He also said the generator would be gasoline-powered and only operated during emergencies. Mr. Crowley added that the Town Council approved the generator's location as a variance, and they conditioned it on being gas-powered so it would be quieter.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Cindy Cirlin, 130 Sunset Avenue, spoke about the project. She raised concerns about the disproportionate mechanical infrastructure relative to the reduced club size, the visual and height impacts of rooftop equipment on a landmarked building, the need for variances that would alter the historic roofline, massing, and silhouette, and potential harm to the building's historic character.

Danielle Del Sol of The Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach stated she toured the site with Mr. Werner and was pleased that restoration work was expected to begin soon, noting portions of the building were failing and in need of attention before hurricane season. She expressed gratitude that Mr. Werner and his architects were working with the Town to restore one of the island's most iconic and publicly accessible buildings with a high level of historic quality. She reported staff's recommendation to use wood windows, stating that, despite the investment, properly maintained, high-quality wood windows had proven durable, and that the existing wood windows in the building could have been repaired after decades of neglect.

Carlos Colos, 130 Sunset Avenue, stated that he had submitted his comments to the staff. He expressed his concerns about the project, particularly with the mechanical equipment enclosure.

Eric Smith, 130 Sunset Avenue, agreed with Mr. Colos's comments. He discussed the screening proposal on the east side and whether it complied with the Certificate of Appropriateness, standards, preservation, and historic character.

Anita Seltzer, 44 Cocoanut Row, asked about the review process and whether staff had vetted the images presented by the applicant at the meeting. She noted that applicants had previously not been permitted to present new materials that were not available to the board or the public in advance, and raised concerns for all projects. She presented additional information and expressed her concerns about the project.

Mr. Ives stated that the board was not required to choose among the proposed gate options and could instead prohibit a gate entirely at the primary northwest entrance. He acknowledged the security concerns but characterized them as operational rather than architectural or historic preservation issues and stated that any gate at the main entrance would undermine the building's historic integrity. He emphasized that the property was one of only three significant urban properties in the Town, all of which are nationally or internationally important, and should therefore be held to the highest preservation standards. While acknowledging the applicant's efforts, he stated that Palm Beach's established preservation rules applied and had served the Town well for decades.

Mr. Ives stated that the December motion directed a restudy of the gate design, window materials and glazing, rooftop screening, and items identified in the staff report, but expressed

disappointment that little redesign was evident in the January submission. He noted that many staff report items remained unresolved and that the level of detail was insufficient for a property of this significance, making it difficult to evaluate compliance with Sections 54-122 and 54-123 regarding proportions, materials, textures, massing, and architectural relationships. He stated that the application lacked the detail necessary for a competent review and that the options were to defer for further study and detailing or to deny the application. He reiterated his opposition to the gate and concluded that, absent deferral, he would not support the proposed project.

Ms. Coleman stated that the materials presented consisted primarily of renderings and illustrative images and emphasized the importance of reviewing detailed architectural drawings to fully evaluate the project. She noted that architectural drawings would better address the specific details previously raised and that renderings represent an idealized depiction rather than definitive design documentation.

Mr. Griswold stated that the Pulse architectural plan set, which contained substantial detail, was included in the memo and constituted a public record. He noted that the applicant had provided additional details at the meeting, including window options, material, and color palettes. He said that if the Commission desired further detail, specific direction should be provided, as he believed the applicant had substantially addressed requests from the previous meeting.

Ms. Brooker agreed that substantial detail had been provided, but she noted that some issues remained unresolved. She stated that she would support a motion to defer to the next meeting, provided it included clear and specific direction on the items to be resolved, and she cited examples of such items. She felt that the way the expansion of the enclosure had been described as moving closer to the dome, as opposed to closer to the east side of the building, was helpful. While Ms. Brooker felt that the gate was a legitimate option, she was not opposed to a wood gate with the inverted opening because, to her, it did not feel as solid for the limited hours when it would be closed.

Mr. Ives noted that the staff report, on pages 11 and 12, identified items requiring further study and additional information that were nearly identical to those listed in December and had not yet been resolved. He stated that while the Commission must be fair to the applicant, it served as a review body rather than a design body, and it was not the Commission's role to resolve a large portion of design decisions. He expressed concern about applicants presenting multiple options without a clear proposal and emphasized that, given their experienced design team, it was the applicant's responsibility to present a specific, well-defined proposal supported by detailed documentation rather than numerous renderings that generated additional unanswered questions.

Ms. Damgard stated that the applicant had addressed several of the staff's prior questions and that decisions regarding aluminum-clad versus wood windows were now before the Commission. She noted that while specific light fixture images had not been provided, the renderings appeared appropriate. She stated that glazing, stucco texture, wood types for railings and windows, and gate design had been discussed, and that the applicant had revised the gate to better match the building. She expressed that the architect should be credited for responding to most prior comments, acknowledged that some additional details were needed, and stated that certain aspects of the project could potentially move forward if someone felt like making a motion.

Mr. Segraves agreed with a lot of the comments and felt that there were still some areas of concern

A motion was made by Mr. Segraves and seconded by Ms. Coleman to approve the project as presented, with the following conditions: the rooftop mechanical and screening plan and the landscape plan with elevations will return to the February 18, 2026, meeting, all windows will be of wood material, all gates will be of wood spindle material, except for the south gate, and the north entrance wood spindle gate will be an inverted design as shown. The motion was carried 6-1, with Mr. Ives dissenting.

**Note: A short break was taken at 11:32 a.m., and the meeting resumed at 11:38 a.m.*

6. 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. *This item has been deferred to the February 18, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting.*

**Note: This project was deferred to February 18, 2026, with the approval of the agenda.*

NEW BUSINESS

7. COA-25-0034 (ZON-25-0083) 207 ROYAL POINCIANA WAY AND 208-10 SUNSET AVE (COMBO). The applicant, Flagler System Management Inc, has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of the exterior alterations including awning, window and door replacement, signage, as well as landscape and hardscape improvements for the landmarked (207 Royal Poinciana Way) building and for the non-landmarked (208-10 Sunset Ave) building, and variances from the Floodplain requirements from Chapter 50, Floods. The Town Council shall review the application as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Keith Spina of Spina O'Rourke + Partners presented the project's architectural plans. He noted that the exterior would remain the same, and generally, the majority of the interior would be removed and restored. He stated the business would operate as it has always, with an outdoor dining area under the awning.

Ms. Coleman asked for clarification on the design and connectivity to the two smaller retail spaces. Mr. Spina provided an explanation, stating that the buildings would be connected to create a collection of interconnected buildings.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott asked for clarification regarding the breezeway, noting that when the building was operating as Chuck and Harold's, patrons could walk through an open-air area toward Sunset

Avenue. It was clarified that the breezeway would remain on the east side, allowing continued pedestrian access through to Sunset, while former connections on the west side involved small shopping spaces and interior circulation through the market and kitchen areas. She asked whether staff could walk through the kitchen to access the restaurant, which was clarified as internal circulation only. She also asked for additional information about the new skylight system proposed over the former back dining room.

Mr. Ives asked about the proposed skylight in the former back dining room. Mr. Spina explained that the existing large opening, currently covered by a canvas awning, would be removed and infilled with a flat roof. He stated that the skylight would be centrally located, slightly reduced in size, framed with traditional structure, and visible only from within the dining room.

Ms. Coleman wondered if it was rainproof, and Mr. Spina said yes, rainproof but not hurricane-proof.

Mr. Segraves asked if the name on the awning was approved by the Town Council, to which Mr. Spina stated it had been.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott asked about what would be retained on the interior. Mr. Spina stated that most of the interior would be removed and further explained the plans.

Mr. Griswold asked about the column details on the front awning and wondered if wood could be mitered around the column. Mr. Spina clarified that while the elements appeared to be wood, the columns would remain aluminum. The existing 4 by 4, approximately 14-foot-tall aluminum columns would either be reused or replaced in kind, with a new canvas awning installed above. The columns would be painted to resemble wood. A wood trellis would be installed beneath the canvas awning, creating the appearance of a wood ceiling when viewed from below, while the canvas remained above it. Mr. Griswold thought the S-tile on the façade should be replaced.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick asked about the restaurant's theme. Mr. Spina stated that the theme would be Mediterranean, but that the menu would be unique compared to existing restaurants.

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

Mr. Segraves thought the roof should be barrel tile and wondered if it could be included in the motion. Town Attorney Francisco stated that the roof could not be part of the motion. Attorney Jamie Crowley, on behalf of The Breakers, stated that he would speak with his client about the recommendation.

Mr. Ives thought the changes were maintaining the historical integrity.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott thought the changes were positive and honoring the building's intention.

Mr. Griswold felt the awning was a vast improvement over the existing one.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Griswold and seconded by Ms. Coleman 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.

8. COA-25-0032 210 DUNBAR RD. The applicant, Caleb Laux, has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations, renovation, and additions, as well as landscape and hardscape improvements, including a landmark adjustment request to increase the maximum permitted cubic content ratio (CCR), and a variance from the floodplain requirement from Chapter 50, Floods, for the landmark property containing a main residence and accessory structure.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Architect Caleb Laux, on behalf of the owner, presented the architectural plans proposed for the landmarked residence. Landscape Architect Brian Vertesch presented the landscape and hardscape modifications for the site.

Mr. Ives asked about the landmark adjustment request and requested more information from Mr. Laux, who responded that, from a zoning perspective, there were discussions about renovating some interior areas of the home. He spoke about adding amenities while focusing on not altering the historical spaces; he said the main objective was to preserve the historical interior areas.

Mr. Segraves noted that all sides of the façade are reviewed, and he thought this was a great project and wondered if the windows were to be matched to the past replacement. Mr. Laux is open to a better window product. Mr. Segraves thought the proposed window looked a little stark.

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

Ms. Damgard asked if the owner would consider replacing all the windows. Mr. Laux responded that there had been a discussion, and there are actual preservation issues that would have to be addressed in keeping with the front of the house. There is currently no proposal to change the front of the house. The owner is committed to preserving the structure's historic aesthetics.

Ms. Albarran felt the proposed changes were nicely detailed, and she could not imagine denying the project.

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 Mr. Segraves 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. Segraves for final determination of approval of the Landmark Adjustment for an increase in the allowable CCR shall be granted, that

all the criteria applicable to the application as set forth in Sec. 134-235(a), items a through c, and Sec. 134-237(2)(g), items 1 and 2 have been met. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

9. COA-25-0035 (ZON-25-0086) 860 S OCEAN BLVD (COMBO). The applicant, Janet S. Cafaro Trust (M. Timothy Hanlon, Representative), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of one-story beach cabana and swimming pool on the beach parcel and front yard modifications on the main parcel requiring a special exception to allow the construction of the beach cabana and a variance to exceed the maximum permitted retaining wall height on the beach parcel of the landmarked property. The 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. Ms. Albarran declared a conflict of interest for the project as the architect of record and left the dais during the discussion.

Attorney M. Timothy Hanlon, on behalf of the applicant, reviewed the zoning requests as part of the application and advocated for a positive recommendation to the Town Council. Jackie Albarran of SKA Architect + Planner presented the architectural plans proposed for the beach cabana. Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Mr. Segraves asked to see an elevation looking east from S. Ocean Blvd. and asked what would be seen once built. Mr. Mizell showed a drawing, noting that the wall on the west side of the house was not being changed. He confirmed that only the cabana wall would be modified and not the wall along the house. He also noted that the wall would be largely obscured by hedges, would be generally level at approximately 48 inches, and would be lowered to about 30 inches at the sides while remaining higher at the center due to grade changes. The finished cabana floor elevation was confirmed, and it was noted that the changes would improve the condition without increasing visual impact. Mr. Segraves concluded that the project appeared to work well, and he supported it.

Mr. Ives asked about the floor-to-ceiling height of the cabana and the roof slope. Ms. Albarran responded. Mr. Ives asked about the changes to the front garden of the main house. Mr. Mizell responded and discussed the new design.

Ms. Brooker asked for further clarification about the new all along the road where the cabana is located. Ms. Albarran explained that the wall had to be extended on the east side to serve as a retaining wall. Ms. Brooker confirmed that upon completion of the wall, it will be no higher at its highest point than it is currently.

Mr. Griswold asked if the tile had been selected for the area near the lanterns. Ms. Albarran stated the tile matched the existing tile on the home. Mr. Griswold did not favor the railings added to the lawn; he suggested no railings.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick asked about the elevation of the cabana and how it would be compared to the neighboring property. She wondered if the elevation was comparable to adjacent properties. Ms. Albarran responded that they would be at the seawall height, matching neighboring

properties. Ms. Herzig-Desnick asked if there were any regulations on the removal of the dunes. Ms. Albarran responded that the only regulation was that whatever soil was removed had to be replaced, and that has been done.

Ms. Coleman asked if both pools would be retained. Mr. Mizell said it was being restudied.

Ms. Damgard asked about the details of the front wall. Mr. Mizell showed a photo, and Ms. Damgard asked if the elements on the wall were original. Ms. Albarran responded that when A1A was raised, the whole front of the home was altered at some point.

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

Mr. Ives thought the design was nice and very good. He thought the beach cabanas in the area needed a bit of humility.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Segraves 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.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

16. 234 CHILEAN AVE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: Patrick J. Foy, Trustee of the Patrick J. Foy Revocable Trust dated February 2, 2023

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified about the architecture and history of the Prairie-style residence. Ms. Murphy pointed out the residence's design features and 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.

Ms. Mittner provided confirmation of proof of publication and noted there was a Scrivener's error on the third page of the report.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Mr. Segraves to make the designation report for 234 Chilean Avenue part of the record with the notation of the Scrivener's error. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Mittner stated that the owner supported the designation.

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

Mr. Ives stated that the designation report was well-supported and emphasized the importance of preserving landmark structures in the Royal Park area to maintain a buffer between commercial and residential areas and to protect the neighborhood's historic character and significance.

Ms. Brooker agreed with Mr. Ives. She thought the style was unique and worth preserving, particularly given how few there were in town.

Ms. Damgard thought that keeping the older homes in Palm Beach was important.

Mr. Ittleson thought this home was a perfect representation of Palm Beach.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Mr. Segraves to recommend 234 Chilean Avenue to the Town Council for designation as a Landmark of the Town of Palm Beach based on criteria 1 and 3 in Section 54-161, and with the acknowledgment that the owner supports the designation. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

15. 230 CHILEAN AVE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owners: Kevin R. Adell and Joelle Lukasiewicz-Adell

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified about the architecture and history of the Prairie-style residence. Ms. Murphy pointed out the residence's design features and 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.

Ms. Mittner provided confirmation of proof of publication and noted there was a Scrivener's error on the third page of the report.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Mr. Segraves to make the designation report for 230 Chilean Avenue part of the record with the notation of a Scrivener's error. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

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

Ms. Mittner stated that the Town previously received correspondence from the owner's attorney opposing the designation, and that she recently spoke with the owner regarding available LPC incentives. She noted that the owner indicated she and her attorney likely would not attend the meeting, but did not provide a definitive response on whether she supported or opposed the designation.

Ms. Brooker commented that the property remains a good example of historic integrity despite

past alterations and demonstrates that landmarked homes can accommodate modest changes over time while retaining their character, noting that landmark designation should not discourage homeowners from making appropriate adaptations.

Ms. Albarran remarked that the visible two-story rear garage and its placement near the property line are historically characteristic features of the Sea Streets neighborhood and contribute to the authenticity and fabric of the area.

Ms. Coleman agreed with Ms. Albarran.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick commented that while the house is appealing, it no longer retains the defining architectural features of the Prairie style, noting the absence of characteristic elements such as piers, an open porch, and a central entrance, as well as the replacement of original windows, and therefore does not represent a strong example of that style.

Mr. Segraves stated that he believes the property is worthy of landmark designation, noting that elements such as the roof pitch and overall form reflect Prairie style and American Foursquare characteristics. He acknowledged changes to features like the front porch but observed that such alterations are common among similar homes and that the house's plan and historic character remain largely intact.

Mr. Ives agreed with Mr. Segraves and Ms. Brooker. He commented that, consistent with prior remarks, landmark criteria should account for the evolution of buildings over time and recognize locally adapted interpretations of architectural styles. He stated that, while the property may not meet every national definition of Prairie style, it reflects the vernacular execution of that style in Palm Beach and therefore continues to meet the criteria for landmark designation.

Mr. Griswold commented that the proximity of the two homes reinforces their significance under the landmark criteria by illustrating an important economic and cultural period in the Town's history. He added that the homes remain relevant to the community's cultural identity and reflect the lived experience and historical character of Palm Beach.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Mr. Griswold to recommend 230 Chilean Avenue to the Town Council for designation as a Landmark of the Town of Palm Beach based on criteria 1 and 3 in Section 54-161. The motion was carried 6-1, with Ms. Herzig-Desnick dissenting.

10. 345 SEABREEZE AVENUE DESIGNATION HEARING
Owner: Ramsey C. Speer

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified about the architecture and history of the Monterey-style residence. Ms. Murphy pointed out the residence's design features and 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,
Sec. 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. Mittner provided confirmation of proof of publication.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Coleman to make the designation report for 345 Seabreeze Avenue part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Katie Jacob of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach provided historical context for the two Seabreeze Avenue homes, explaining that they reflect a mid-1930s shift in Palm Beach architecture toward more restrained, proportionate, and enduring design following the 1920s boom and the Great Depression. She noted that the properties, designed in 1935 and 1937, exemplify this period's architectural values and, when viewed together, illustrate an important chapter in the Town's architectural evolution, supporting their consideration for landmark designation.

Ramsey Speer, owner, stated that while he was not advocating for landmark designation, he wished to clarify that the house was originally constructed with a red brick exterior, which was later stuccoed due to weather damage. He explained that he opposes landmark designation for practical reasons, noting that the property is located in a flood hazard area and that landmark status could limit future options related to required elevation standards. He further stated, for the record, that he does not consent to landmark designation under applicable state law, while emphasizing that he has no intention of harming the home's historic character.

Mr. Ives asked the staff to clarify the state law noted by the owner so he has a clear understanding. Ms. Mittner explained that if a property owner opposes landmark designation and the structure is below FEMA flood elevation, the owner would not be precluded from applying for a demolition permit in the future. She noted that while no flood elevation certificate has been filed, the owner appears aware of the property's elevation, which preserves that option moving forward.

Ms. Brooker asked if the staff knew about the original brick on the building. Ms. Murphy stated that she did not find evidence of that but trusted the owner's statement. Ms. Brooker asked for confirmation that whether the home was stucco or brick, it would still fit into the definition of the Monterey-style. Ms. Murphy provided confirmation.

Ms. Damgard questioned how the owner's opposition to designation, combined with state law allowing demolition of structures below FEMA guidelines, affects the Board's ability to designate the property as a landmark. Ms. Mittner replied that the Board has previously landmarked homes under similar circumstances and that landmark designation may still proceed if the criteria are met and approved by the Town Council. She noted, however, that the owner would retain the ability to apply for demolition in the future.

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and was seconded by Mr. Griswold to recommend 345

Seabreeze 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 owner verbalized his objection to the designation. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Murphy reminded the commission that any revisions to the home, if landmarked, would be reviewed by them unless the home was demolished. Mr. Ives also noted that the owner would be eligible for all the benefits of landmarked homes.

11. 410 SEABREEZE AVENUE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: Deborah E. Glass

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified about the architecture and history of the Georgian Revival-style residence. Ms. Murphy pointed out the residence's design features and 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,

Sec. 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.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Coleman to make the designation report for 410 Seabreeze Avenue part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Mittner provided confirmation of proof of publication.

Many commissioners thought the home was very attractive.

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

Mr. Ives commented that the Town has done well in recognizing Georgian Revival architecture and noted that the style has been receiving increased attention in the community. He stated that landmarking the property is particularly valuable as it provides a strong example of the style for future reference and reflects the Town's preservation priorities.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick asked for more explanation about the style. Ms. Murphy further explained why she believed the Georgian Revival style was represented in the design.

Mr. Segraves thought this was a good representation of Gustav Maass, who designed many Georgian-style homes.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Mr. Griswold to recommend 410 Seabreeze 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. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

12. 2780 S OCEAN BLVD (AMBASSADOR II) DESIGNATION HEARING
Multiple Owners: See Designation Report for Complete List of Owners

**Note: This project was deferred to April 22, 2026, with the approval of the agenda.*

13. 209 BANYAN RD DESIGNATION HEARING
Owners: John J. McAtee, Jr., Trustee of the John J. McAtee, Jr. 1996 Revocable Trust u/a/d September 10, 1996, and Roslynn Glenn McAtee, Trustee of the Roslynn Glenn McAtee Revocable Trust u/a/d October 24, 2002
This item has been deferred to the March 18, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting.

**Note: This project was deferred to March 18, 2026, with the approval of the agenda.*

14. 141 CHILEAN AVE DESIGNATION HEARING
Owner: CHANT (PALM BEACH) CORP
This item has been deferred to the April 22, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting.

**Note: This project was deferred to April 22, 2026, with the approval of the agenda.*

MEETING SCHEDULE

17. The next meeting is scheduled for February 18, 2026

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and seconded by Mr. Ives to adjourn the meeting at 02:11 PM. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Respectfully Submitted,


Brittain Damgard, Chair

FORM 8B MEMORANDUM OF VOTING CONFLICT FOR COUNTY, MUNICIPAL, AND OTHER LOCAL PUBLIC OFFICERS

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME <i>Albarran Jacqueline</i>		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <i>Landmarks Preservation Commission</i>	
MAILING ADDRESS <i>324 Royal Palm Way #227</i>		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY <i>Palm Beach</i>	COUNTY <i>Palm Beach</i>	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED <i>1-21-26</i>		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <i>Town of Palm Beach</i>	
		MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ APPOINTIVE	

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

This form is for use by any person serving at the county, city, or other local level of government on an appointed or elected board, council, commission, authority, or committee. It applies to members of advisory and non-advisory bodies who are presented with a voting conflict of interest under Section 112.3143, Florida Statutes.

Your responsibilities under the law when faced with voting on a measure in which you have a conflict of interest will vary greatly depending on whether you hold an elective or appointive position. For this reason, please pay close attention to the instructions on this form before completing and filing the form.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

A person holding elective or appointive county, municipal, or other local public office **MUST ABSTAIN** from voting on a measure which would inure to his or her special private gain or loss. Each elected or appointed local officer also **MUST ABSTAIN** from knowingly voting on a measure which would inure to the special gain or loss of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he or she is retained (including the parent, subsidiary, or sibling organization of a principal by which he or she is retained); to the special private gain or loss of a relative; or to the special private gain or loss of a business associate. Commissioners of community redevelopment agencies (CRAs) under Sec. 163.356 or 163.357, F.S., and officers of independent special tax districts elected on a one-acre, one-vote basis are not prohibited from voting in that capacity.

For purposes of this law, a "relative" includes only the officer's father, mother, son, daughter, husband, wife, brother, sister, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, and daughter-in-law. A "business associate" means any person or entity engaged in or carrying on a business enterprise with the officer as a partner, joint venturer, coowner of property, or corporate shareholder (where the shares of the corporation are not listed on any national or regional stock exchange).

* * * * *

ELECTED OFFICERS:

In addition to abstaining from voting in the situations described above, you must disclose the conflict:

PRIOR TO THE VOTE BEING TAKEN by publicly stating to the assembly the nature of your interest in the measure on which you are abstaining from voting; *and*

WITHIN 15 DAYS AFTER THE VOTE OCCURS by completing and filing this form with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

* * * * *

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

Although you must abstain from voting in the situations described above, you are not prohibited by Section 112.3143 from otherwise participating in these matters. However, you must disclose the nature of the conflict before making any attempt to influence the decision, whether orally or in writing and whether made by you or at your direction.

IF YOU INTEND TO MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION PRIOR TO THE MEETING AT WHICH THE VOTE WILL BE TAKEN:

- You must complete and file this form (before making any attempt to influence the decision) with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who will incorporate the form in the minutes. (Continued on page 2)

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING:

- You must disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You must complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who must incorporate the form in the minutes. A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency, and the form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Jacqueline Albarran, hereby disclose that on January 21, 20 26:

(a) A measure came or will come before my agency which (check one or more)

- ☒ inured to my special private gain or loss;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my business associate, _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, by whom I am retained; or
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

COA-25-0035
860 S. Ocean Blvd.

If disclosure of specific information would violate confidentiality or privilege pursuant to law or rules governing attorneys, a public officer, who is also an attorney, may comply with the disclosure requirements of this section by disclosing the nature of the interest in such a way as to provide the public with notice of the conflict.

1-21-26
Date Filed

[Signature]
Signature

NOTICE: UNDER PROVISIONS OF FLORIDA STATUTES §112.317, A FAILURE TO MAKE ANY REQUIRED DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR AND MAY BE PUNISHED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION FROM OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT, DEMOTION, REDUCTION IN SALARY, REPRIMAND, OR A CIVIL PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000.