



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Minutes of the Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting Held on March 18, 2026

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Members Present: Julie Herzig Desnick, Henry Ittleson, Catherine Brooker, Brittain Damgard, Jane Lindsay-Scott, Kim Coleman, Alexander Ives, Patrick Segraves, Katherine Bryan, Kristin Kellogg

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Damgard led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Ms. Mittner called for nominations for the Chair position. One nomination was made for Brittain Damgard. After a final call for nominations, no further nominations were received.

A motion was made by Mr. Segraves and seconded by Ms. Herzig-Desnick to accept Brittain Damgard as Chair. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Mittner called for nominations for the Vice Chair position. One nomination was made for Kim Coleman. After a final call for nominations, no further nominations were received.

A motion was made by Ms. Brooker and seconded by Mr. Segraves to accept Kim Coleman as Vice Chair. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

MINUTES

1. Minutes of the February 18, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Herzig-Desnick to approve the minutes of

the February 18, 2026, meeting as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

2. ZON-26-0014 995 ADAM RD. The applicant, Christopher Messon with Renewal by Andersen LLC, has filed an application requesting a variance from the floodplain requirement from Chapter 50, Floods, to maintain the existing primary structure at a finished floor elevation below the current FEMA requirement for the property containing a Historic Significant Building.
3. ZON-26-0017 335 SEASPRAY AVE. The applicant, Scott Nelson with Blueline Construction Group, has filed an application requesting a variance from the floodplain requirement from Chapter 50, Floods, to maintain the existing primary structure at a finished floor elevation below the current FEMA requirement for the property containing a Historic Significant Building.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH

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

COMMENTS

4. OFFICIALS

Ms. Damgard welcomed Kristin Kellogg and Katherine Bryan to the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

Ms. Coleman indicated that the commission had requested a gate on South County in front of an alleyway, but it had not been installed. She inquired if the gate would eventually be installed. After receiving questions about the gate's location, she stated she would bring pictures of the location to the next meeting.

Attorney Francisco advised that the board should not discuss or express opinions on the alley issue outside a quasi-judicial hearing and suggested it may fall under Code Enforcement. Further discussion should wait until the item is formally heard.

5. STAFF

Ms. Mittner indicated that 14 administrative approvals have been completed over the last month.

5.1 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.

Ms. Mittner explained that the Town Council and the design boards are pursuing zoning updates, including a proposal to allow signage on awning valances, which has historical precedent in Palm Beach. Because the current code prohibits such signage, applicants must seek variances, which require a hardship and are not typically applicable to this type of request. The proposed amendment would instead allow valance signage, subject to review and approval by the Architectural Commission (ARCOM) or the Landmarks Preservation Commission. She emphasized that this would not increase allowable signage and would remain fully discretionary, with limits on size, placement, and frequency. She indicated that the staff was requesting feedback to report back to the Town Council.

Mr. Ives confirmed that no logos would be allowed on the awnings, and Ms. Mittner confirmed. He thought this feature, if allowed, should be limited to the first floor.

Ms. Coleman inquired about the process for approving the awning. Ms. Mittner responded.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick thought consideration should be given to the allowable percentage for awnings; she thought the lettering could potentially overwhelm a smaller awning.

Ms. Brooker wondered whether it would be within the commission's discretion to prohibit any signage on an awning, even if it is allowable by the code. Ms. Mittner confirmed that it would be the commission's purview to reduce the lettering or outright deny the request if they felt it was inappropriate.

Ms. Damgard expressed concern that signage on every awning could appear cluttered. Mr. Ives agreed and wondered if signage on awnings should even be permitted.

Ms. Mittner noted that the board appeared generally opposed to the proposal but asked whether members would at least support removing the variance requirement while still allowing the design boards to provide guidance on the overall concept. Ms. Damgard agreed that the proposal should not require a variance.

Mr. Segraves wondered whether a specific font style was required. Ms. Mittner stated that the staff did not dictate a specific font style that was to be used.

6. PUBLIC - 3 MINUTE LIMIT

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Rick Smith, 130 Sunrise Avenue, provided documents related to COA-23-003, 139 N. County

Road, argued that the request lacked the expert testimony required under the applicable landmark and zoning criteria, particularly regarding noise, rooftop equipment, and impacts on the historic structure's massing and skyline. He stated that without such evidence, a certificate of appropriateness or variance cannot lawfully stand and warned against creating precedent. Mr. Smith also noted that prior meeting records contain no expert testimony to support the findings. He urged the Commission to deny the variance or defer it until competent, substantial evidence is provided by the applicant.

NEW BUSINESS

7. ITEMS PULLED FROM CONSENT

8. COA-26-0002 (ZON-26-0006) 1100 SOUTH OCEAN BLVD – MAR-A-LAGO. The applicant, Mar-a-Lago Club, LLC. (Harvey E. Oyer, III, Authorized Representative), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness review and approval for a new generator building housing two new 400KW generators 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.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Roger Ramdeen of Shutts and Bowen provided an overview of the project and explained the zoning requests to the commission. Rick Gonzalez of REG Architects presented the architectural plans proposed for the new structure, and Dustin Mizell of Environment Design Group presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Ms. Damgard asked whether the generator exhaust from the building would damage the surrounding trees. Mr. Mizell stated that the National Trust and the Secret Service were working together to develop a plan to shield the building while maintaining visibility.

Ms. Coleman wondered how the commission could approve it without the National Trust's approval. Mr. Mizell stated they felt comfortable approving the current plan, knowing that they would work out the remaining details with the Secret Service. Ms. Coleman stated that security was not within the commission's purview, but she was more concerned with aesthetics.

Ms. Damgard questioned whether the final plans would return to the commission for approval. Mr. Gonzalez stated that in the past, they returned to the commission for final approval after they received approval from the National Trust.

Ms. Brooker thought the building was lushly screened. She agreed that approval should be given to the final landscape plan; however, she did not have a concern about moving the project forward.

Mr. Segraves questioned the need for the crest over the front door of the utilitarian building. He preferred the square windows on the east and west sides. Mr. Gonzalez stated he would support either square or rectangular windows.

Mr. Ittleson asked about the generator, its size, and its use. Mr. Gonzalez responded. Mr. Ittleson wondered what the generator would power, if it would be permanent, and how the sound would be attenuated. Mr. Gonzalez responded and described the proposed measures to address the sound.

Mr. Ives asked about the applicant and the roof material. Mr. Gonzalez responded. Mr. Ives wondered whether there was any other location on site where the crest is located and asked about its size. Mr. Gonzalez responded. Mr. Ives was reticent to approve the crest and agreed with Mr. Segraves about the square windows.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott thought the building's location was appropriate but should appear subordinate. She also did not believe the crest was appropriate. Mr. Gonzalez responded and stated that the crest could be removed.

Ms. Coleman asked for confirmation that the crest would be removed, and Mr. Gonzalez provided it.

Ms. Damgard was not in favor of the small windows or the long rectangular windows; she thought both felt out of proportion. She also did not favor the brown louvers. Mr. Gonzalez asked whether a white or off-white would be better. Ms. Damgard asked to see a picture with the louvers in a lighter color.

Ms. Kellogg asked whether an elevation view was available that shows the proposed tie beam height relative to nearby structures, including window and door heights, so the Commission could better understand how the project relates to adjacent buildings. Mr. Gonzalez did not have an elevation view but stated that the structure's height is the lowest possible for a generator to fit. She thought a visual of the adjacent buildings would be helpful.

Ms. Damgard asked to see other colors for the louvers as well as the louver design. Mr. Gonzalez stated that the louvers would be designed to look like shutters.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick agreed that the louvers should be a lighter color but wondered how dirty they would become over time. Mr. Gonzalez responded that the club does extensive cleaning during the summer months and did not believe it would be an issue.

Mr. Ramdeen confirmed the Commission's requests, stating that the applicant can return with a finalized landscape plan incorporating additional vegetation requested by the National Trust, remove the crest for later review, adjust the louver color to a lighter tone if that is the consensus, and redesign the louvers. He asked that the project be approved with these conditions, allowing the applicant to return for minor modifications before permit issuance and, if possible, to have those adjustments approved by the Chair rather than the full Commission.

Mr. Gonzalez provided suggestions for revising the windows. He confirmed the glass would be clear, not tinted.

Ms. Kellogg noted that the National Trust recommended fully simplifying the roofline, not just removing the crest, and supporting the use of a simple hip roof. She added that if the doors keep glazing, the light pattern should be square rather than rectangular. She also questioned the

windows in the nearby buildings and whether they were similar to the proposed ones. Mr. Gonzalez stated they were rectangular.

Mr. Ives agreed with Ms. Kellogg's recommendation to look at the other utilitarian buildings to the west of the proposed building. He thought the commission was missing context by failing to take into account those other buildings.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that, since the south entrance was becoming more active, they would be studying the entryway and the small buildings and would return to the commission at a later date. Mr. Ives requested an elevation from the south side entrance, facing north, with all surrounding buildings, to obtain a clear view of the landscape.

Ms. Coleman asked for photographs or a video of the area in question, rather than renderings.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny, Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, suggested re-evaluating the west elevation design, noting that if the crest is removed, the pop-up roof segment may no longer be necessary. She recommended simplifying the roof by extending it downward and integrating the overhang, a traditional Mediterranean detail. She also advised strengthening the thin-looking brackets to better support the roof and enhance the building's utilitarian character.

Ms. Coleman thought it would be helpful to have photos of the Mar-a-Lago entrance and how the generator fits into the area.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick thought it would be helpful to see photographs of the utilitarian buildings to the west of the proposed building.

Mr. Ittleison thought the commission should also consider the number of buildings on the property and cautioned that more could be allowed in the future.

Mr. Segraves asked whether Mr. Gonzalez could share the thought process behind the building's location.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Mr. Segraves to defer the project to the April 22, 2026, meeting, specifically to address the following items: window design, the removal of the crest with a roof redesign, the louvers, a reduction of windows on the doors, and to bring photographs that show the view from the south to the north, so the commissioners can see the surrounding buildings and elevation changes. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

9. COA-26-0003 14 GOLFVIEW RD. The applicant, Jonathan Vergin with Sandbar Builders, LLC, has filed an application requesting Landmarks Preservation Commission review and approval to enclose an existing opening at the Landmarked property.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Shawn Rich of Sandbar Builders provided an overview of the project and presented the

architectural plans for the proposed modifications.

Ms. Damgard wondered whether consideration was given to fixing the leak on the inside and installing a recessed opening. Mr. Rich stated that they would consider that suggestion. Ms. Damgard asked whether consideration was given to replacing the railing shown in the original drawing. Mr. Rich did not believe there would be a request or need for one since the area would not be accessible. He added that they would recess the area in question with shutters.

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

Mr. Segraves agreed that a recessed space with a shutter would be a good solution.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick did not believe it was necessary to replace the railing, as it was mainly decorative.

A motion was made by Mr. Segraves and seconded by Ms. Coleman to approve the project, with the condition that the opening be replaced with a recessed space with a shutter over the opening. The motion was carried 6-1, with Mr. Ives dissenting.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

10. 151 ROOT TRAIL - REQUEST TO BE PLACED UNDER CONSIDERATION

Janet Murphy of MurphyStillings, LLC, presented photographs of 151 Root Trail along with some basic information on the property. She asked the commission if they would like to place the property under consideration for landmark designation.

Ms. Mittner stated that the owner requested that this property be considered for Landmark Designation.

Ms. Brooker clarified that although the owner voluntarily submitted the letter, the offer was conditioned upon approval of an addition, which she felt was important for the Commission to note. Ms. Mittner thanked Ms. Brooker for the clarification and explained that the intent is to combine the landmark review and the proposed addition into a single coordinated hearing. She noted that the current step is simply to study the property's eligibility. Attorney Francisco clarified that placing the property under consideration does not constitute approval of any conditions proposed by the owner in the submitted letter.

Mr. Segraves asked how the process would work if the Commission placed the property under consideration, reviewed and approved the proposed addition, and later decided not to designate the property as a landmark. Ms. Mittner explained that the addition and the landmark review would return together because the owners intend to seek adjustments under the Landmarks Incentives program, which applies only if the property is moving through the landmarking process.

Mr. Ives asked how many properties on Root Trail were landmarked. Ms. Murphy responded. Mr. Ives wondered whether the north end of Root Trail should be considered a historic district, or whether the commission should discuss the possibility.

Ms. Brooker suggested separating the homeowner's voluntary landmark consideration from discussions about a more complicated and potentially controversial matter on the street. She felt it would be unfair to delay her project and noted that once the property is under consideration, her plans must be reviewed by Landmarks rather than ARCOM, allowing her application to move forward without being held up.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Kellogg to place 151 Root Trail under consideration for Landmark Designation. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

11. 1127 N LAKE WAY DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: Virginia S. Burke

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified about the architecture and history of the British Colonial-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 1127 N. Lake Way part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Damgard asked about the design changes to the home. Ms. Murphy responded and explained the changes that had occurred.

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

Mr. Segraves commented that the property's ownership history is unique and, combined with its architectural significance as a Gustav Maass design, contributes to its historic importance for landmark consideration.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Coleman to recommend 1127 N. Lake Way 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 supports the designation. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

12. 409 SEABREEZE AVENUE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: William E. Betts, III and Nicole K. Betts

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified about the architecture and history of the Mediterranean 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.

Ms. Mittner provided confirmation of proof of publication.

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and was seconded by Mr. Ives to make the designation report for 409 Seabreeze Avenue part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Attorney M. Timothy Hanlon, representing the owner, entered his March 12 letter into the record and formally objected to the proposed landmark designation under House Bill 423 and Florida Statute 553.79(25). He stated that, while the home is well-maintained and attractive, it lacks the historical or cultural significance required for designation. He noted that the builder was a speculative contractor who constructed many similar homes elsewhere and is not a notable architect or designer. He concluded by reiterating the owners' opposition to the designation.

Aimee Sunny, Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, stated that the property is an excellent example of Mediterranean Revival architecture, citing its decorative features, including the barrel tile roof, stucco finish, tower with cornice detailing, arched windows, balcony design, asymmetrical massing, and chimneys. She concluded that, in her professional opinion, the home is a strong representation of the style.

Mr. Ives noted the differing arguments presented, observing that the opposition focused on the architect and builder, while the Preservation Foundation supported designation under criteria 1 and 3. He stated that the home clearly exhibits the defining features of Mediterranean Revival architecture and is strongly tied to the 1920s. He dismissed the relevance of it being a spec house and expressed full support for landmarking, emphasizing the property's remarkable preservation over more than a century and its importance to the community.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott wondered if there had been any substantive changes. She noted that there did not seem to be any external changes. Ms. Murphy stated that, based on the permits, there were no changes to the main facade.

Ms. Kellogg agreed with Mr. Ives and added that the consultants' findings under criterion 1 were relevant. She noted that the home reflects the pattern of development on the Sea streets during that era, representing an important cultural and historical shift in the Town's growth.

A motion was made by Mr. Segraves and was seconded by Ms. Coleman to recommend 409 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 opposed the designation. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

13. 113 CLARKE AVE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: Edwin Lin and Vivian Chiu

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified about the architecture and history of the Prairie-style residence. Ms. Stillings 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.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Mr. Segraves to make the designation report for 113 Clarke Avenue part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Damgard commented that the house is a wonderful example of its style and noted that, although larger in scale, it represents the cottage style architecture of which few examples remain in the town. Ms. Stillings stated it would have been part of the cottage colony, but with more stylistic features.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny, Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, stated that the house clearly meets criteria 1 and 3, emphasizing its distinctive character. She highlighted features such as deep roof overhangs and their projection over the bay windows, noting that this interpretation of the style is unusually unique in Palm Beach. She expressed surprise that the property is not already landmarked and concluded that it is an excellent and valuable example of its architectural style and period.

Mr. Segraves added that he was surprised the house had not been considered earlier, noting that its size and high-quality detailing set it apart from many homes of its era. He suggested that the workmanship reflects a level of skill beyond that of a typical builder.

Mr. Kellogg added that a similar house, once located at 177 Clarke, sharing comparable massing and stylistic features, including a bay window beside the entry, has since been lost. She noted that this makes the current example even more valuable in its setting and reiterated that it is an excellent representation of the architectural style.

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and was seconded by Mr. Segraves to recommend 113

Clarke 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 unanimously, 7-0.

14. 321 BARTON AVE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: Samuel A. Ramirez and Diane M. Ramirez

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Ms. Mittner provided confirmation of proof of publication.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified about the architecture and history of the Mediterranean Revival style residence. Ms. Stillings 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 321 Barton Avenue part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Diane Ramirez, owner, stated that they were honored that their property was to be landmarked.

Ms. Damgard asked about other homes designed by the same architect that had been designated landmarks. Ms. Stillings responded.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach agreed that the property meets the criteria in the designation report and noted that its design initially resembled that of Volk, who used similar L-shaped plans with angled entries. Further research showed the house predates Volk's arrival in Palm Beach, suggesting the design may even have influenced his later work.

Ms. Brooker stated that the house is beautiful and that its distinctive L-shaped plan with entrance is easily recognizable around town. She found the note about its design similarity to other homes interesting and said that if an architect like Volk later adopted comparable features, it would reinforce the significance of this earlier design. She agreed with the designation report and the three criteria supporting landmark status.

Mr. Segraves agreed with the prior comments and said he, too, learned something new about the L-shaped house type. He noted that this example may be the earliest of its kind in Palm Beach and that several similar homes, typically on smaller 50-foot lots, exist around town. He emphasized that this house's larger scale and unique design further support its significance.

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and was seconded by Mr. Ives to recommend 321 Barton

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

15. 250 PENDLETON AVE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: David J. Wermuth and Jennifer Kroman

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.

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 250 Pendleton Avenue part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

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

Mr. Ives praised the presentation and stated the property clearly meets criteria 1, 3, and 4. He emphasized that the house is an excellent example of the post-Depression, 1930s Georgian style, which had a major influence across the town, comparable to the Mediterranean Revival in the 1920s. He noted that Gustav Maass is a well-recognized architect, further supporting the designation. Mr. Ives added that it is encouraging to see a Pendleton property considered for landmarking, given the contentious history surrounding past preservation efforts on that street.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick asked if the portico was original. Ms. Murphy stated that it was, and that it was more beautiful in person. Ms. Herzig-Desnick thought the portico was beautiful and was a prominent feature of the home.

Ms. Brooker expressed appreciation for the inclusion of a 1936 newspaper quote in the report, noting that it effectively counters the frequent public assertion that the Pendleton and Sea Street houses were merely "spec homes" without significance. She stated that the quote clearly illustrates how these homes represent an important historic shift in the town and felt it perfectly captures the designation criterion. She added that she hopes the quote will be included in future designation reports for similar properties.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott stated that the property was an excellent example and expressed her appreciation for having it before the Commission. She noted that when she first visited the site, she assumed the structure was a wooden house because its exterior treatment made it appear

so. She remarked that scoring the concrete in this manner was unusual for the period in which it was built and felt that this distinctive treatment added a dimension of interest to the designation.

Ms. Damgard agreed and stated she visited the home, thinking that it was made of wood, but realized it was scored concrete.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Coleman to recommend 250 Pendleton 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.

16. 750 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD DESIGNATION HEARING
Owner: 750 S COUNTY LLC

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Ms. Mittner provided confirmation of proof of publication.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified about the architecture and history of the Georgian Revival-style residence. Ms. Stillings 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 750 S. County Road part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Attorney James Green, representing the owners, asked historic preservation expert and planner Wes Blackman to make a presentation.

Wes Blackman of CWB Associates explained that his presentation followed the handbook he had prepared and stated that, in his view, the nomination for 750 South County Road did not meet the standards required for landmark designation. He argued that while the structure was once associated with the El Solano estate, it has long been separated and no longer reflects that context. He also stated that the property lacks the exceptional architectural qualities required under Criterion 3, noting the absence of comparative analysis and describing the building as a simple, secondary structure with minimal Georgian Revival characteristics. Mr. Blackman further commented that later modifications and site changes have altered the property's original configuration and that the work is not a notable example of architect Belford Shoumate's extensive portfolio. Concluding that the designation report failed to meet the burden of proof under Criteria 1, 3, and 4, he respectfully requested that the Commission deny the landmark

designation.

Ms. Mittner said that, while Mr. Blackman stated that the home is simple in design, its beauty lies in that simplicity. She noted that although it may have served as a guest house, it was never architecturally connected to the primary structure and has always addressed County Road, meaning it did not function as a traditionally subordinate accessory building. She explained that the home's uniqueness is reflected in how it responds to the site's topography and local conditions, including the use of rafter tails, which are appropriate adaptations to the South Florida climate and vernacular. She offered this perspective as an example of the property's architectural merit.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach supported Ms. Mittner's remarks and noted that archival drawings show the guest house reflects the economic challenges of the 1930s, when the owners sought ways to maintain the El Solano estate. She explained that the structure was intentionally designed in a different style from the main house and incorporated forward-thinking features, including an early solar water-heating system. She added that the building's design responds thoughtfully to the site's topography and provides important historical context for the property.

Attorney Green formally opposed the designation.

Mr. Ives stated that he has long considered Belford Shoumate an important Palm Beach architect and appreciated seeing one of his early works brought forward. He noted that even the opposition did not dispute Shoumate's significance. He emphasized that the house was built in 1941, early in Shoumate's career, and that its design reflects architectural approaches that predate the post-World War II trends referenced by the opposition. Mr. Ives highlighted the distinctive Porte cochère and second-story entrance as features that were likely uncommon in Shoumate's earlier projects and later appeared elsewhere in town. He also agreed with previous speakers that the structure's design thoughtfully responds to the site's natural topography, a characteristic seen in other areas of Palm Beach.

Mr. Ittleson did not understand why an owner would not be honored to have a designated property in the Town. He wondered whether there was an underlying reason and whether an owner considered HB 423. Attorney Francisco clarified for the record that the Commission's discussion should focus solely on the landmark designation criteria. She noted that any statutes that may or may not apply to the property are not relevant to the Commission's consideration at this stage and should not influence the designation decision.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick remarked that the structure is certainly unique, but she has difficulty seeing the intended Georgian Revival character in its design. She also expressed uncertainty about the changes to the first floor, noting that it appears the original garage doors were removed and converted into a Porte cochère. Ms. Stillings explained that the original garage doors were removed during a later renovation, during which the Porte cochère was narrowed, and windows were added to the first floor. She noted that modifications over time, such as changes to the Porte cochère's size, were likely made to accommodate evolving homeowner needs, including the need for larger vehicles. She added that such alterations are common among many of the town's designated landmarks as they adapt over the years.

Ms. Damgard thought the home's beauty lay in its simplicity and uniqueness in Palm Beach. She thought the home met the criteria outlined by the consultant.

Ms. Kellogg stated that she believes the property meets the designation criteria outlined by the consultants, noting that even the owner's rebuttal helps confirm Criterion 1 regarding the town's broader cultural and economic history. She observed that while the structure has undergone modifications, its character-defining features, such as the overall massing, front gable, and window proportions, remain intact. She added that alterations over time do not detract from its integrity and instead reflect how landmark properties naturally evolve. Ms. Kellogg also commented that while the field guide offers a helpful framework for architectural styles, Palm Beach's vernacular adaptations must also be considered. She noted that the later entry feature could be removed without affecting the building's historic character, and that the shift in style was similar to that seen in the Bermuda-influenced styles elsewhere in town.

Ms. Coleman grew up in a house similar to the one designed by Mr. Shoumate. She stated that the home no longer exists and that she did not know of a similarly designed home in the town.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Coleman to recommend 750 S. County 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, and with the acknowledgment that the owner opposed the designation. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

17. 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

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified about the architecture and history of the Monterey-style residence. Ms. Stillings 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 209 Banyan Road part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Attorney James Green, representing the owner, Jack McAtee, requested that Mr. McAtee

present testimony. Mr. McAtee stated that he has lived at 209 Banyan Road for 23 years. Responding to Mr. Green's questions and an older photograph of the house, he explained that the original west-side screened porch and the second-floor railing/balcony were enclosed in brick; the ground-floor porch was bricked in with a window added, and the upper-left section was converted to an enclosed storage area with no openings. He noted that the far-right (eastern) bay was also bricked in, enclosing roughly half of the original balcony. Additional changes include a rear expansion and stucco work, an east-side laundry-room addition, and the bricking-in of the west breezeway.

Wes Blackman of CWB Associates stated that he was asked to evaluate the potential landmark designation of 209 Banyan Road and concluded that the property does not meet the required criteria. He noted that the defining Monterey-style feature, the second-floor projecting porch, has been significantly altered, with major portions enclosed in brick, diminishing the original lightness and character of the design. He also argued that the brief period of ownership by the original family does not rise to the level of historical significance under Criterion 1. Under Criterion 3, he stated that the extensive enclosure of the porch and other changes have permanently compromised the building's architectural integrity. Regarding Criterion 4, Mr. Blackman acknowledged architect Maurice Fatio's prominence but described this house as neither exceptional nor a strong representative of his work. Concluding that the structure has lost its primary character-defining features and lacks sufficient historic and architectural integrity, he recommended against designation.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach said she would speak on behalf of the Preservation Foundation's Vice President, Katie Jacobs. Ms. Sunny explained that the property at 209 Banyan Road is currently featured in an exhibit at the Preservation Foundation and was selected before it was known it would come before the Commission this season. She stated that the exhibit highlights the transitional design period of the 1930s and that archival drawings reveal the house as a unique example, situated between late Mediterranean Revival and early Monterey styles. She noted that the owners at the time sought a design that was less ostentatious than those of the 1920s while still incorporating quality architectural elements. Ms. Sunny added that the Foundation rarely features non-landmarked buildings, underscoring their view of the property's architectural significance. Regarding alterations, she commented that the partial enclosure of the front balcony still allows the original form to be fully read, as the railing and columns remain visible, and she does not believe that the modification alone obscures the overall Monterey and Mediterranean character.

Mr. Green stated that Ms. Sunny did not make it clear what was being exhibited at the Preservation Foundation. He wondered if it was a picture of the current or historic home. Ms. Sunny stated that the original architectural drawings were being featured.

Ms. Stillings expressed disagreement with the numbers presented by Mr. Blackman regarding the number of Monterey-style and Maurice Fatio homes landmarked. She stated they were incorrect. Mr. Ives asked for the numbers that Ms. Stillings believed were correct. Ms. Stillings provided those figures. Mr. Blackman stated where he obtained his numbers.

Ms. Brooker noted that, while the architectural guide referenced in the discussion describes Monterey houses as having full-width balconies, she recalled that the Commission has previously reviewed and landmarked several Monterey-style properties in which the balconies did not

extend the full length of the façade. She asked for confirmation that several landmarked Monterey examples in Town similarly deviate from the full-width definition. Ms. Stillings confirmed this statement and added that she does not believe the guide stated that the balcony must run the full width. Ms. Stillings added that the majority of the Monterey-style homes in Palm Beach do not have full-width balconies; many have partial-width cantilevered balconies. Ms. Brooker noted that, as Ms. Sunny mentioned, the original porch columns on the east side were retained when that portion of the porch was enclosed, which is consistent with the type of preservation guidance typically recommended for maintaining distinguishing features of historic properties. She also observed that when the west-side porch was removed, the resulting addition was designed to remain subservient to the main structure, an approach aligned with recommended practices for historic homes. She added that this type of alteration could likely be reversed in the future, allowing the porch to be restored if desired. Ms. Stillings agreed that the west-side addition reads as recessed and clearly subordinate to the main structure. She noted that when the house was originally built, the open, screened porch with a deck above reflected a period when air conditioning was limited. The 1995 addition, she explained, was a way to create more air-conditioned living space while still respecting the original design and ensuring that the new work remained visually subservient to the historic portion of the house.

Ms. Kellogg believes the property clearly meets the designation criteria. She described it as a strong example of the architectural transition in the 1930s from Mediterranean Revival to more restrained, Monterey-influenced designs, similar to other transitional properties in Palm Beach, such as Southwood. She emphasized that while the referenced field guide is useful, Palm Beach's architectural identity includes local adaptations, such as partial balconies and varied entry treatments, that differ from strict textbook definitions. She found the combination of styles at 209 Banyan to be a compelling illustration of Criterion 1, and under Criterion 3, she felt the design reflected distinctive characteristics of this transitional period. Regarding Criterion 4, she noted that works by a notable architect are significant, whether large estates or smaller, as each contributes to the broader architectural narrative of the town.

Ms. Damgard said the changes to the home were in keeping with its original style and architecture.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Herzig-Desnick to recommend 209 Banyan 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, and with the acknowledgment that the owner objects to the designation. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

18. 225 BARTON AVE DESIGNATION HEARING

Owner: Kim S. Fennebresque, Trustee of the Kim S. Fennebresque Revocable Trust
This item has been deferred to the November 18, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting.

Please note: This item was deferred to November 18, 2026, upon the approval of the agenda.

At this time, Ms. Coleman asked that 301-309 S. County Road be placed under consideration for study and that the Commission determine whether it was worthy of landmark designation.

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and seconded by Ms. Kellogg to place 301-309 S. County

Road under consideration for Landmark Designation.

Ms. Mittner stated that it was considered part of a district; however, that consideration was removed. The property has never been individually considered.

Discussion ensued on whether the property should be considered. The staff displayed the property on the overhead projector for the commission to see what was being proposed.

The motion was carried 5-2, with Mr. Ives and Ms. Brooker dissenting.

MEETING SCHEDULE

19. The next meeting is scheduled for April 22, 2026.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Coleman to adjourn the meeting at 01:25 PM. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Respectfully Submitted,


Brittain Damgard, Chair