



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Minutes of the Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting Held on May 20, 2026

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 09:29 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.

MINUTES

1. Minutes of the April 22, 2026, Landmarks Preservation Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Brooker to approve the minutes of the April 22, 2026, meeting as presented. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH

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

COMMENTS

2. OFFICIALS

Ms. Damgard noted that the Florida Commission on Ethics provided a small booklet on the dais for the commissioners.

3. STAFF

Ms. Mittner announced that May was Historic Preservation Month and stated that the mayor read a proclamation at the May Town Council Meeting. She announced that 20 homes had been landmarked within the last season. She indicated that 21 administrative approvals have been completed over the last month.

Ms. Churney announced that Mr. Segraves declared a conflict of interest for HSB-26-0003, 125 Brazilian Avenue, at the April 22, 2026, meeting, and had correctly completed the 8B form in accordance with State Law.

4. PUBLIC - 3 MINUTE LIMIT

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

GENERAL BUSINESS

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5. COA-26-0004 (ZON-26-0015) 151 ROOT TRAIL (COMBO) The applicant, Julie Phillips (Brian Brady with Brady Design, Representative), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of a new second-story addition to the existing one-story residence, requiring a landmark adjustment to maintain existing nonconforming setbacks (front, side, and rear yards) and lot coverage of the one-story residence, requiring a landmark adjustment to decrease the rear yard setback for the second-story addition, and requiring variances to reduce the side yard setbacks of the second-story addition for the property under consideration to be landmarked. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Julie Phillips, owner of 151 Root Trail, provided an overview of her home and the reason for the proposed addition.

Brian Brady of Brady Design presented the architectural plans for the proposed addition to the landmarked home.

Ms. Damgard asked about the second-floor ceiling height and the siding. Mr. Brady responded.

Mr. Segraves asked to see the existing and proposed home on the same sheet.

Mr. Ives asked questions regarding the application of the landmark adjustment standards and whether alternative design approaches had been considered to accommodate the proposed second-story addition. Ms. Mittner explained that the landmark adjustment process offers an alternative to a variance application, providing procedural efficiencies while allowing qualifying properties to seek relief through the adjustment review process. Mr. Ives sought clarification regarding the application of the landmark adjustment criteria. He noted that the proposed second-story addition appeared to be a reasonable approach given the site's constraints and the limited relief requested.

Ms. Brooker asked questions regarding the property's location within the floodplain and whether that status would affect the ability to demolish the landmark structure. Mr. Brady responded.

Ms. Damgard asked about the window replacement and stated she preferred casements. Mr. Brady responded and explained the reason for the sash windows.

Ms. Coleman expressed support for the proposal, stating that it fit well within the neighborhood and commented favorably on casement windows.

Mr. Ittleson expressed support for the proposal, complimenting the design and the owner's commitment to preserving and improving a landmark property.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott expressed support for the proposal, stating that the addition was subtle, respectful of the home's original character, and successful in restoring elements of its historic design.

Mr. Ives expressed support for the proposal, stating that it balances preservation with modernization and would help ensure the landmark property's long-term viability, while noting minor concerns about the addition's overall height.

Ms. Brooker, speaking as a neighboring resident, expressed support for the proposal, stating that the design was thoughtful, compatible with the street's character, responsive to neighborhood concerns, and generally supported by nearby residents.

Ms. Damgard agreed with Ms. Brooker and stated that the house felt very appropriate for the street.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Attorney Lisa Reves of Becker & Poliakoff, representing Bienestar Condominium Association, argued that the proposed addition and requested landmark adjustments and variances would intensify existing nonconformities, increase the massing of the historic structure, and set an undesirable precedent. She requested denial of the requested relief or a substantially reduced redesign.

Stephen Haymes, 146 Seminole Avenue, expressed concerns that the proposed second-story addition could negatively impact the privacy of neighboring properties, particularly with respect to views into adjacent outdoor living and pool areas, and questioned whether the proposed

landscaping would adequately mitigate those impacts.

James Lansing, 150 Seminole Avenue, expressed concerns that the proposed second-story addition could negatively impact neighboring properties by affecting views, breezes, and overall compatibility, and urged the Commission to consider the purpose of the setback requirements when evaluating the requested relief.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach expressed support for the proposal and recommended refinements to the siding, window trim, dormer detailing, and other architectural elements to better reflect the structure's historic character, noting that such revisions could be addressed as conditions of approval.

Ms. Brooker asked about the windows in the rear of the home and their sill heights. Mr. Brady responded that the windows Ms. Brooker inquired about could be raised.

Mr. Segraves expressed support for the overall proposal but recommended additional consideration of several design details. He stated a preference for wood siding and windows, noting that these materials would be more consistent with the home's historic character. He also recommended further review of the proposed front door and roofing materials to ensure they are compatible with the structure's period. Additionally, Mr. Segraves expressed concern regarding potential privacy impacts on neighboring properties. He suggested that a landscape plan be provided to address screening, preserve existing landscape features, and mitigate views from the proposed second-story addition.

Mr. Segraves asked whether the Town Council would approve the item or whether the commission was the final body to hear it. Ms. Mittner explained that the Commission has final authority over the landmark adjustment request, while the requested side setback variances will be reviewed separately by the Town Council because the proposed setbacks are less than five feet from the property lines.

A motion was made by Ms. Brooker and seconded by Mr. Ives to approve the project with the following conditions: the window at the rear on the second floor be restudied to address the rear neighbor's privacy concern, that the use of Hardy board material be reconsidered for a composite material as suggested by the Preservation Foundation and/or the use of wood products on the siding and windows with these items to be reviewed by the staff in coordination with the chair, and that the applicant return with a more detailed landscape plan that addresses the concerns raised by the commissioners.

Mr. Segraves recommended bringing the entire project to the commission so they could see the materials.

Ms. Brooker revised her motion as follows:

The motion was revised by Ms. Brooker and seconded by Ms. Coleman to defer the project to the June 17, 2026, meeting, with the following items to be reconsidered: the second-floor rear window, a full landscape plan, and samples of exterior materials, including the roof and siding, and the historic trim detailing. The motion was carried 6-1, with Mr. Ives dissenting.

6. HSB-26-0003 125 BRAZILIAN AVE. The applicants, Joseph R. Bagby and Martha G. Bagby, Trustees of the Joseph R. Bagby Revocable Trust (Pat Segraves with SKA Architect + Planner, Representative), have filed an application requesting review and approval of exterior alterations, a second-story addition, selective demolition of features, as well as landscape and hardscape improvements for the property containing a Historically Significant Building.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications. **Note: Mr. Segraves declared a conflict of interest for the project and left the dais during the discussion.*

Ms. Mittner provided staff comments on the project.

Eric Broberg of SKA Architect + Planner presented the architectural plans for the proposed modifications.

Mr. Ives asked about the front pergola. Mr. Broberg responded.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach expressed support for the application and commended the applicant and design team for incorporating the Commission's previous comments. She noted that the residence retains numerous original architectural features and praised the efforts to preserve historic elements, including original doors, columns, window openings, and decorative details. Ms. Sunny further stated that the proposed modifications, including the revised gate design, window improvements, and second-story addition, were compatible with the home's historic character. She concluded by expressing her belief that the project represented a thoughtful and successful preservation effort.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick asked about the window changes over the garage doors. Mr. Broberg responded.

Ms. Kellogg expressed support for the proposal, stating that the revisions enhanced the design, honored the home's historic character, and were consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

Ms. Brooker agreed with Ms. Kellogg. She expressed support for the proposal, noting that restoring original architectural details enhanced the home's historic character and overall appearance.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott expressed support for the proposal, noting that the applicant had been responsive to the Commission's comments and had successfully restored original architectural elements, resulting in a highly successful design.

Ms. Damgard agreed with her fellow members. She thought the architect did a good job of addressing the commission's comments. She stated that it was a beautiful project.

A motion was made by Ms. Kellogg and seconded by Ms. Coleman to approve the project as presented, finding that the overall design meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation and the criteria set forth in Sections 18-206, 54-122, and 54-123. The motion

was carried unanimously, 7-0.

7. COA-26-0005 (ZON-26-0016) 1047 S OCEAN BLVD. (COMBO) The applicant, Maura Ziska (Trustee of 1047 South Ocean Boulevard Trust), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of a two-story addition on the east side (rear) of the residence as well as landscape improvements, requiring a landmark adjustment to decrease the side yard (south) and rear yard (east) setbacks, and a variance to increase lot coverage for the landmarked property. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Jason Skinner of Dailey Janssen Architects presented the architectural plans for the proposed modifications.

Ms. Coleman expressed concern about the lot coverage and asked about the request. Mr. Fogel explained that the setback relief qualified as a landmark adjustment, while the proposed lot coverage exceeded the allowable adjustment limits and therefore required a separate variance. Mr. Skinner reviewed the existing and proposed lot coverage.

Mr. Ittleson expressed concern that the property was already heavily developed and questioned the impact of adding additional square footage. Ms. Mittner clarified that the Commission could evaluate the architectural impacts of the addition but should not base its determination solely on the increase in lot coverage. She indicated that the Town Council would weigh in on the variances.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott asked whether the ocean-side second-floor addition was stepped back and sought clarification on its visual massing and appearance from the ocean side of the property. Mr. Skinner clarified that the second floor is aligned with the new first-floor addition and is not stepped back, although it is set back from the existing one-story wing on the north side of the residence.

Mr. Ives asked for clarification on the additional square footage proposed, noting his understanding that the project would increase the residence from approximately 5,500 to approximately 6,000 square feet. Mr. Skinner confirmed. Ms. Mittner clarified that the square footage would increase from 7,317 square feet to 7,785 square feet.

Mr. Segraves asked to see the existing and proposed rendering of the addition on the east elevation. Mr. Skinner further explained the addition. Mr. Segraves expressed support for the revised rear balcony design, stating that it better complements the home's architecture and improves the overall massing of the addition.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick asked about the measurement of the new addition to the pool; she thought it looked very crowded. Mr. Skinner thought it was about 3 feet. Ms. Herzig-Desnick reiterated that the space looked crowded.

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

Ms. Kellogg noted that, although the revised balcony design was an improvement, she remained concerned that the addition altered the original asymmetrical massing of the rear façade and referenced the criterion requiring retention of the existing rhythm of building masses and spaces.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott expressed concern regarding the increased massing and altered appearance of the east elevation. She requested additional renderings to better assess the visual depth and impact of the proposed addition.

A motion was made by Mr. Segraves and seconded by Ms. Coleman to defer the project to the June 17, 2026, meeting to restudy the addition on the southeast corner to be less imposing to the rear of the property, as well as the house's mass. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

NEW BUSINESS

8. COA-26-0009 4 GOLFPVIEW RD. The applicants, Sandeep Alva and Tina Anna Rading (Rafael A. Rodriguez with Studio SR Architecture + Design, Representative), have filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of a new one-story addition to the existing three-story residence, requiring a landmark adjustment to increase lot coverage for the landmarked property.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Raphael Rodriguez of Studio SR presented the architectural plans for the proposed modifications, and Don Skowron presented the landscape and hardscape plans for the site.

Ms. Brooker asked about the size of the addition in relation to the existing patio. Mr. Rodriguez responded. Ms. Brooker asked about the increase in lot coverage. Mr. Rodriguez further explained the intended use.

Mr. Ives asked how much space would be expanded beyond the garage and about the landscaping covering the chimney. Mr. Rodriguez answered the questions.

Mr. Segraves stated he supported the project. He asked about the valley in the roof and the proposed roofing material, which Mr. Rodriguez stated would be barrel tile. Mr. Segraves asked whether the landscaping would be increased, and Mr. Skowron confirmed that it would.

Ms. Coleman asked about the use of Ficus. Mr. Skowron discussed the type of Ficus to be used and stated it was not susceptible to disease.

Ms. Brooker asked about the proposed house color. Mr. Rodriguez responded.

Ms. Damgard called for public comment.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach expressed support for the

application, stating that it represented an appropriate use of the landmark adjustment program and that the proposed addition was modest in scale, compatible with the existing structure, and respectful of the property's historic character.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott expressed support for the proposal, noting that converting hardscape to landscaped open space was a positive aspect of the project.

Ms. Brooker expressed support for the proposal, stating that the rear addition was compatible with the existing home and would preserve the streetscape's character.

Ms. Damgard thought the addition looked as if it had always been there.

A motion was made by Ms. Coleman and seconded by Mr. Segraves to approve as presented, finding that the overall design of the project meets the criteria set forth in Sections 54-122 and 54-123. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Coleman to approve the landmark adjustment for the property located at 4 Golfview Road, finding that the applicable sections of Sections 134-235(a) have been met. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

9. COA-26-0010 (ZON-26-0020) 241 SEAVIEW AVE. (COMBO) The applicant, Palm Beach Day School (Michael Murphy, Representative), has filed an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the review and approval of new rooftop air conditioning units and screening, requiring a variance to exceed the maximum permitted height for rooftop mechanical equipment and screening for the landmarked property. This is a combination project that shall also be reviewed by the Town Council as it pertains to zoning relief/approval.

Several members disclosed ex parte communications.

Mr. Fogel provided staff comments on the project.

Carl Conner of PGAL Architect presented the architectural plans for the proposed modifications.

Mr. Segraves asked questions about the height and clearance of the mechanical equipment screening, and Mr. Conner confirmed that the screen matched the equipment's height and provided the minimum required operational clearances.

Ms. Lindsay-Scott asked whether the HVAC units could be consolidated onto a single roof area. Mr. Conner explained that building layout and mechanical routing constraints required the equipment to be located in separate areas.

Mr. Ives asked about the location, visibility, and height of the proposed rooftop mechanical equipment. Mr. Conner stated that the units would be located approximately 53 feet from the roof edge and would not be readily visible from the street. He explained the applicant's rationale regarding the requested height relief.

Ms. Coleman asked about Phase 3 of the modifications. Mr. Conner responded.

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

Ms. Damgard expressed support for the project, stating that the proposed improvements were needed and that the mechanical equipment had been thoughtfully designed to minimize visibility.

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

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

10. Discussion of Properties to be Placed Under Consideration for Landmarking

- 211 Park Avenue
- 117 Wells Road
- 279 Queens Lane
- 211 Orange Grove Road
- 219 Orange Grove Road
- 216 Garden Road
- 135 Seaview Avenue
- 136 Seaview Avenue
- 445 Brazilian Avenue
- 120 Chilean Avenue
- 124 Chilean Avenue
- 145 Chilean Avenue
- 149 Chilean Avenue
- 141 Gulfstream Road
- 10 Middle Road

Janet Murphy of MurphyStillings presented 15 properties to the Landmarks Commission for consideration of landmark status.

Mr. Ives was excited to see Architect Agnes Ballard represented in the proposed list. He wondered if other Agnes Ballard homes could be considered. Ms. Stillings stated that they could look into other Ballard homes, but she did not believe any others were landmarked.

Ms. Brooker wondered whether there were other areas of the town not represented in the landmarks program. Ms. Murphy stated that ongoing preservation efforts seek to identify historic resources throughout the Town, with an emphasis on geographic diversity and on creating clusters of designated properties where appropriate.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach expressed support for the proposed landmark designations, highlighting the significance of Agnes Ballard and G. Sherman Childs, and commended staff and preservation advocates for their efforts to advance the Town's historic preservation goals and expand the inventory of recognized historic resources.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Coleman to place the following properties under consideration for landmark status: 211 Park Avenue, 117 Wells Road, 279 Queens Lane,

211 Orange Grove Road, 219 Orange Grove Road, 216 Garden Road, 135 Seaview Avenue, 136 Seaview Avenue, 445 Brazilian Avenue, 120 Chilean Avenue, 124 Chilean Avenue, 145 Chilean Avenue, 149 Chilean Avenue, 141 Gulfstream Road, and 10 Middle Road. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

MEETING SCHEDULE

11. The next meeting is scheduled for June 17, 2026

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and seconded by Ms. Coleman to adjourn the meeting at 11:59 AM. 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 Segraves Patrick		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE Landmarks Preservation Commission	
MAILING ADDRESS 2500 S. Ocean Blvd., Apt 2A1		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY Palm Beach	COUNTY Palm Beach	☐ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☒ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED May 20, 2026		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: Town of Palm Beach	
		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, Patrick Segraves, hereby disclose that on May 20, 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 Joseph and Martha Bagby, 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:

HSB-26-0003

125 Brazilian Avenue

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.

Date Filed

5/20/16

Signature

Patrick Segraves

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.