



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Minutes of the Local Planning Agency Meeting Held on March 4, 2026

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Members Present: Bridget Moran, Ted Cooney, Lewis Crampton, Bobbie Lindsay, Danielle Moore, Julie Araskog

Staff Present: Wayne Bergman, James Murphy, Kelly Churney, and Town Attorney Joanne O'Connor

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Council President Lindsay led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Director Wayne Bergman stated that Ordinance 8-2026 would be brought before the Town Council at a later date. He stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission discussed the item and wanted to further discuss it before making a recommendation.

A motion was made by Council Member Araskog and seconded by Council President Pro Tem Crampton to approve the agenda as amended. The motion was carried unanimously, 5-0.

COMMENTS

1. MAYOR AND TOWN COUNCIL MEMBERS

Council Member Araskog thanked Mayor Moore for the lovely lunch in celebration of Council President Lindsay. She thanked Council President Lindsay for her leadership.

Council President Lindsay also thanked Mayor Moore for the wonderful luncheon. She stated that the Mayor has always demonstrated natural leadership, consistently taking initiative and thinking of others before herself, which she described as an admirable quality.

2. PUBLIC - 3 MINUTE LIMIT

Council President Lindsay called for public comment. No one indicated a desire to speak.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ORDINANCES

Director Wayne Bergman stated that four ordinances from the previously presented group of zoning amendments, relating to awning signage, parking exemptions for landmarked commercial buildings, pedestrian access stairs and ramps on beach parcels, and seawalls, had been reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission with recommendations for adoption and would be presented to the Town Council later in the meeting for first reading.

A motion was made by Council Member Araskog and seconded by Council President Pro Tem Crampton to recommend Ordinance Nos. 6-2026, 7-2026, 9-2026, and 10-2026 to the Town Council for approval. The motion was carried unanimously, 5-0.

Council President Lindsay called for public comment.

Anita Seltzer, 44 Cocoanut Row, stated that she wished to place comments on the record regarding the principle of equivalency for landmarked commercial buildings. She expressed concern that recent interpretations of the Town's Comprehensive Plan may allow approval of projects that are not fully consistent with the plan's goals, objectives, and policies. She noted that the 2024 Comprehensive Plan, like the 2017 plan, contains 12 elements supported by data and analysis, along with a map series, and emphasized that the maps are intended to supplement, not replace, the plan's governing policies. She stated that these policies form the basis for land-use decisions and cautioned that departures from them could negatively affect the Town's quality of life.

A motion was made by Council Member Araskog and seconded by Council President Pro Tem Crampton to reconsider the motion to recommend Ordinance Nos. 6-2026, 7-2026, 9-2026, and 10-2026 to the Town Council for approval. The motion was carried unanimously, 5-0.

Council Member Araskog asked about the changes related to the Principle of Equivalency.

Assistant Director James Murphy explained that the proposed ordinance would remove the existing exemption for landmarked commercial buildings that currently allows interior improvements to increase occupancy or use without requiring additional off-street parking. He noted that this exemption presently applies to approximately 50 landmarked commercial buildings in the Town.

A motion was made by Council Member Araskog and seconded by Council President Pro Tem Crampton to recommend Ordinance 7-2026 to the Town Council. The motion was carried unanimously, 5-0.

Mr. Murphy stated the next item was Ordinance 6-2026, which was related to signage.

Council Member Cooney stated that he would prefer additional study before moving forward,

noting that while recent examples of awning signage at Glazer Hall and Elephante appeared attractive, those locations are more isolated. He expressed concern about the potential visual impact if similar signage were installed along areas where businesses are closer together, such as Worth Avenue, and suggested taking a slower approach to better evaluate how multiple awning signs might appear in those settings.

Mayor Moore confirmed that the signage would need to be approved by one of the design commissions. Confirmation was given.

Mr. Murphy explained that the proposed ordinance includes additional regulations requiring review by the appropriate design commission and limiting each storefront to one business name on an awning valance, regardless of the number of bays or awnings. He added that the awning signage would count toward the total permitted signage area, meaning that wall signage would need to be reduced if awning signage is used.

Council Member Cooney clarified that the total permitted square footage of signage would not increase under the ordinance, but rather that a portion of the existing allowed signage area could be allocated to awning signage instead of wall signage. Mr. Murphy confirmed and added that the ordinance further limits awning signage by restricting lettering height to seven inches, allowing only the business name, not products, to be displayed, permitting signage on only one awning per storefront, and limiting the signage area to no more than 20 percent of the total awning valance, subject to review by a design commission.

Mr. Murphy further explained that the ordinance limits signage to the awning valance, the flap at the front of an awning, and allows only a single line of text identifying the business, not products or services. He noted that the Planning and Zoning Commission further reduced the permitted signage from 25 percent to 20 percent of the awning valance length, with lettering limited to 7 inches in height, and that the signage counted toward the overall allowable wall signage area. Mr. Murphy also stated that historic research of Worth Avenue indicated that awning signage was once common. He suggested that its omission from the 1974 code may have been a cautious regulatory approach rather than a direct prohibition.

Council Member Araskog thought that signage on the awning and the building was too much and looked cluttered. Mr. Murphy explained that the ordinance does not regulate the number of awnings on a building, noting that buildings with multiple commercial bays may have corresponding awnings as reviewed by the Architectural Commission (ARCOM) or the Landmarks Preservation Commission under existing code provisions. He stated that staff were directed to study the issue following approvals at the Royal Poinciana Playhouse, Glazer Hall, and Elephante, where awning signage had required variances, and that the purpose of the ordinance is to establish regulations so that limited business name lettering on the awning valance could be permitted without requiring a variance.

Council Member Araskog stated that she worried about unintended consequences. She did not support the Ordinance as presented and thought the Planning and Zoning Commission should further review signage on the awnings and buildings.

Mayor Moore stated that the proposed ordinance would make awning valance signage optional rather than mandatory for businesses. She noted that the overall permitted signage square

footage would remain the same whether the signage is placed on the building or the awning valance, and that any proposed signage would still be subject to review and approval by the appropriate board, such as the Landmarks Preservation Commission. Mr. Murphy confirmed this and stated that the valance signage would be approved by one of the design commissions and would not be approved administratively. Mayor Moore thought that a variance for signage was onerous. She also reminded the Council that the island had lacked retail businesses in recent years.

Council Member Moran expressed support for allowing signage on awning valances, noting that it reflects the Town's historic character and recalls the appearance of storefronts from decades ago. She stated that the signage would still be subject to review by the design commissions and expressed confidence that business owners would design signage appropriate for their storefronts. Ms. Moran added that she preferred allowing signage up to 25 percent of the awning valance rather than 20 percent, as originally discussed, noting that it could better accommodate longer business names and maintain appropriate proportions. She concluded that there was no need to send the ordinance back to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Council Member Araskog stated that she would like the proposal reviewed by ARCOM and the Landmarks Preservation Commission before making a decision, noting that those bodies have greater expertise in architectural and design matters than the Planning and Zoning Commission. She expressed concern about the potential visual impact of varying lettering sizes on awnings and suggested that additional study would be beneficial, particularly for areas such as Worth Avenue.

The Town Council reached consensus to send the proposed ordinance to the Landmarks Preservation and Architectural Commissions for their feedback.

Mr. Murphy explained that the proposed ordinances regarding beach access stairs and seawalls were drafted to align the Town's regulations with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) permitting requirements, including adjusting certain measurements from 12 inches to 18 inches. He noted that while the changes may reduce some routine variances, many requests would still come before the Council. Mr. Murphy also stated that, because the current code is largely silent on beach access stairs, staff recommended proactively establishing regulations to prevent unregulated construction following storms or other events.

A motion was made by Council Member Araskog and seconded by Council President Pro Tem Crampton to recommend Ordinance Nos. 9-2026 and 10-2026 to the Town Council and to recommend 6-2026 be presented to the Landmarks Preservation and Architectural Commissions for their feedback. The motion was carried unanimously, 5-0.

3. FIRST READING

- 3.1 6-2026** An Ordinance Of The Town Council Of The Town Of Palm Beach, Palm Beach County, Florida, Amending Chapter 134, Zoning, Article XI, Signs, Division 1, Generally, At Section 134-2373, General Regulations And Definitions Applicable To Permitted Signs, Related To The Prohibition Of Signage On Awnings To Allow Signage On The Valance Of Awnings Subject To Certain Conditions; Division 3, Commercial Districts, Adding Section 134-2451, Signs On

The Valance Of An Awning, Creating Standards For Signage On Awnings; Providing For Severability; Providing For The Repeal Of Ordinances In Conflict; Providing For Codification; And Providing An Effective Date.

- 3.2 7-2026** An Ordinance Of The Town Council Of The Town Of Palm Beach, Palm Beach County, Florida, Amending Chapter 134, Zoning At Article IX, Off-Street Parking And Loading, Division 2. Off-Street Parking, By Amending Section 134-2175 To Remove The Exemption Of Landmarked Commercially Zoned Buildings From Providing Additional Required Off-Street Parking If Increased Occupancy Or Use Is Created By Interior Building Improvements Which Create More Gross Leasable Area By Deleting In Its Entirety 134-2175(E); Providing For Severability; Providing For The Repeal Of Ordinances In Conflict; Providing For Codification; And Providing An Effective Date.
- 3.3 8-2026** An Ordinance Of The Town Council Of The Town Of Palm Beach, Palm Beach County, Florida, Amending Chapter 134, Zoning, By Amending Article IX, -- Off-Street Parking And Loading, Division 2, -- Off-Street Parking, By Creating A New Section To Provide Regulations For Tandem (Stacked) Parking In A Valet Operated And Maintained Parking Lot Or Parking Garage; Providing For Severability; Providing For The Repeal Of Ordinances In Conflict; Providing For Codification; And Providing An Effective Date.
- 3.4 9-2026** An Ordinance Of The Town Council Of The Town Of Palm Beach, Palm Beach County, Florida, Amending Chapter 134, Zoning, By Amending Article VIII, -- Supplementary District Regulations, Division 6, -- Structures, Subdivision I, -- In General At Section 134-1703, --Reserved, To Provide Regulations For Pedestrian Access Stairs And Ramps To The Oceanfront Beach; Providing For The Repeal Of Ordinances In Conflict; Providing For Codification; And Providing An Effective Date.
- 3.5 10-2026** An Ordinance Of The Town Council Of The Town Of Palm Beach, Palm Beach County, Florida, Amending Chapter 62, - Marine Structures, Article II, - Bulkheads, Seawalls And Groins On Atlantic Ocean At Section 62-37, - Bulkheads Groins To Accord With Plat; Variances., And Amending Chapter 134, Zoning, By Amending Article VIII, - Supplementary District Regulations, Division 6, - Structures, Subdivision I, - In General At Section 134-1701, - Structures East Of Ocean Bulkhead Line To Update The Permitted Location Of New And Reconstructed Ocean Seawalls; Providing For Severability; Providing For The Repeal Of Ordinances In Conflict; Providing For Codification; And Providing An Effective Date.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was discussed at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Council Member Moran and seconded by Council President Pro-Tem Crampton to adjourn the meeting at 10:04 AM. The motion was carried unanimously, 5-0.



APPROVED:

Kelly Churney
Kelly Churney, CMC, Town Clerk
Date: 4/14/26

APPROVED:

Bobbie D. Lindsay
Bobbie D. Lindsay, Town Council President