



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Planning, Zoning & Building Department

MINUTES

LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

9:00 a.m., FRIDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1990

AT TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 360 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD, PALM BEACH

I. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Donald W. Curl, Acting Chairman at 9:01 a.m.

II. Roll Call:

PRESENT: Donald W. Curl, Vice Chairman and Acting Chairman
Elise P. Mackintosh, Secretary
Jane Volk, Member
William Gubelmann, Member
Sally Gingras, Member
Anne G. Metzger, Member
Jacqueline Albarran de Mendoza, Member
Arthur Silverman, Alternate Member
John C. Randolph, Town Attorney
Robert L. Moore, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building
Timothy M. Frank, Planner/Projects Coordinator

ABSENT: Wilmer J. Thomas Jr., Alternate Member

RECORDING SECRETARY: Cynthia M. Delp

Let the record show that Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza arrived at 9:04 a.m. and Mrs. Metzger arrived at 9:08 a.m.

At this point, Mr. Moore stated regarding Item #1 of the Designation Hearings, 255 South County Road, that the property owner is requesting a deferral of this hearing to the January meeting, and waives the right to require the Commission to act within 30 days.

MOTION BY MR. GUBELMANN TO DEFER THE DESIGNATION HEARING FOR 255 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD TO THE JANUARY MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SILVERMAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

III. Approval of the Minutes of the November 16, 1990 Meeting

MOTION BY MRS. VOLK TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS MAILED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

IV. Public Hearings:

A. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 53-90, Garage Doors

Applicant: Orator Woodward

Owner: Orator Woodward

Address: 300 Lake Park Drive

Architect: Smith Architectural Group

Project Description: Replace existing deteriorated garage doors

Mr. Orator Woodward, property owner, addressed the Commission in his request to replace the existing deteriorated heavy sliding barn type garage doors with automatic garage doors with a natural pecky cypress face.

MOTION BY MRS. VOLK TO APPROVE THE GARAGE DOORS AS SUBMITTED PER THE BROCHURE SUBMITTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. MACKINTOSH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Let the record show that Mrs. Metzger arrived at this point at 9:08 a.m., and consequently, Mr. Silverman will not vote on the subsequent issues.

B. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 54-90, Addition, pool pavilion and garage

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Clive Oatley

Owner: Mr. and Mrs. Clive Oatley

Address: 131 Barton Avenue

Architect: The Pandula Architects, Inc.

Project Description: Request approval for one story solarium addition at the west facade of the existing residence. (Style, colors, textures, materials and fenestration to match existing residence & balance with previous one story addition at the east elevation.)

One story free standing pool pavilion and automobile garage. (Style, materials and detailing to be consistent with main structure. Site location on axis with existing pool & living room with automobile access from Flagler Drive.)

Mr. Gene Pandula presented this two-fold project:

1. Construct a 250 square foot solarium addition to the dining room on the west facade.

This will be a one story addition will be similar to the east porch enclosure. It will extend out by a distance of 9.5 feet, as far as can be done while still maintaining proper setbacks. On the front and west elevations, they have duplicated the arched fanlight window at the front door. The addition will have a stucco finish and will be painted to match the rest of the building.

2. Construct a 450 square foot free standing building which will dually function as a one-car garage and pool cabana.

The attempt will be made to center the pool pavilion or cabana and its trellis on the existing swimming pool which works off the living room on the east side of the house. The garage will be accessed from Flagler Drive, and will provide a garage for this home which previously had none. The structure will be 22'x 20'. An exterior trellis will extend from the front of the pavilion back toward the house.

MOTION BY MR. GUBELMANN TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. METZGER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 55-90, Signage

Owner: Bustani Building Ltd.

Applicant: Bustani Building Ltd.

Address: 350 South County Road

Project Description: Request approval for identification signage for deli to read "Safari Deli"

Mr. Joe Bustani presented this signage request for eight inch anodized letters bolted to the wall reading "SAFARI DELI". The style of lettering will be as shown on the submitted drawing.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA TO APPROVE THE SIGNAGE AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

D. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 56-90, Planter

Owner: Norido II c/o Celio Soares

Applicant: Norido II c/o Celio Soares

Address: 150 South Ocean Boulevard

Architect: D. William Beebe

Project Description: Request approval for construction of a planter behind the existing front wall

This planter is to be constructed to remedy an ongoing problem area on the site, the stair which leads to the beach tunnel. Mr. Beebe, architect for the project, stated that people are gaining access to the tunnel and are not only using the tunnel, but are loitering there, which could potentially be dangerous to the owners.

The planter will be concrete with a stucco finish and will be painted to match the color of the house. It will be planted with dense and/or thorny foliage at a height of approximately four feet.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

E. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 57-90, Miscellaneous Changes

Owner: Mr. and Mrs. Louis D. Root

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Louis D. Root

Address: 61 Middle Road

Designer: S.D.A. Management, Inc.

Project Description: East elevation - Add balcony with french doors on the second floor. (Railing of balcony to be wrought iron or similar material.) Add shutters also. North elevation - Balcony railing matching east elevation North property line - Add stucco retaining wall along pool deck. South Line of pool deck - Add a stucco retaining wall. Garage-East elevation - Spiral stair under loggia going to second floor. Pool - tiling and decking and other miscellaneous changes

Michelle Ackerman of S.D.A. Management presented further modifications to this site as follows:

East Elevation The request is to add shutters to some of the windows on this elevation. The shutters will match the shutters on the north elevation in style. They will have aesthetic value, but will also serve as hurricane protection. Two existing windows will be changed to french doors with a small two foot balcony with wrought iron railing. The railing on the other existing balcony will be changed to match the new railing.

Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza suggested that the second floor windows (unshuttered) above the entranceway would perhaps be improved if they were arched casements. Mrs. Ackerman stated that she would mention this to her client.

MOTION BY MR. GUBELMANN TO APPROVE THE EAST ELEVATION AS DETAILED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. MACKINTOSH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

North Elevation The existing balcony railing will be changed to the new style railing.

MOTION BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA TO APPROVE THE BALCONY RAILING AS DETAILED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VOLK.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Site Plan Along the north property line, a retaining wall needs to be created because the elevation is low in comparison to the neighboring property. The wall is necessary to prevent run-off of water and debris, thereby keeping the pool and pool deck clean. Also, a retaining wall needs to be constructed down the center of the property. This wall will replace one which had been there originally, and had been removed during the demolition. Simulated coquina steps will come down from the wall to the pool deck. Tiered landscaping will be installed to mask both proposed retaining walls.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO APPROVE THE RETAINING WALLS AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VOLK.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Pool Details Mrs. Ackerman presented a sample of the coping selected. Tiling will be done in 3" white tiles. The decking will be in 1'x1' white simulated coquina.

MOTION BY MR. GUBELMANN TO APPROVE THE POOL DETAILS AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. MACKINTOSH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Garage East Elevation They propose to add a wrought iron spiral stair leading from the ground level to the second floor and will place it exteriorly underneath the second floor loggia. Previously, a stairway to the second floor had been inside the garage, but it utilized too much space.

MOTION BY MRS. MACKINTOSH TO APPROVE THE STAIR AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VOLK.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Bath house There is an existing deteriorated frame "shack" in the corner of the property which they will attempt to re-use as a bath house. It will house a bathroom and clothes dryer, and will be made more decorative to match the house, with the addition of shutters and a french door. A retaining wall will be added next to the building because of the low elevation.

The room will function as a dressing room only.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE BATH HOUSE/DRESSING ROOM BY MRS. VOLK.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GUBELMANN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Pool Cabana The size of the pool cabana, which is actually an open loggia, has been reduced in size from 14'x32' to 12'x24'. The design will remain very plain and simple to allow the landscaping and furnishings to predominate. There will be a solid wall in the back of the cabana, with the rest being open. Materials being used are stucco, wooden columns with minimal decoration, and barrel tile.

MOTION BY MR. GUBELMANN TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE POOL CABANA.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VOLK.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

F. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 58-90, Signage

Applicant: Leta Austin Foster

Owner: National Financial Realty Trust

Address: 205 Phipps Plaza

Project Description: Request approval for white Roman lettering on clear glass sign to match sign of Smith Architectural Group; door lettering (green with white outline); white window lettering on Seaview Avenue.

Leta Austin Foster presented the signage as is listed above, with no additions or corrections.

MOTION BY MRS. VOLK TO APPROVE THE SIGNAGE AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

(Please note that the record of Item G. will follow the "Other Business" items.)

V. Designation Hearings

Please note that lengthy legal descriptions are available within the Designation Reports for the following properties.

Item 1: 255 South County Road

OWNER: First National Bank in Palm Beach

(Please note that this item has been deferred from the November 16, 1990 Meeting.)

As stated earlier in these minutes, a motion carried to defer this hearing to the January 18, 1991 meeting.

Item 2: 452 Worth Avenue
OWNER: Tauni De Lesseps

Dr. Curl: The first item has already been deferred without prejudice, so we are moving on to Item 2. I take it that we will take Item 2, 3, 4, and 5 all separately.

Mr. Moore: They are separate property owners, so, yes, we will take them separately.

Dr. Curl: Do we have verification of proof of publication and proper legal service?

Mr. Frank: Yes, we do.

Mrs. Mackintosh: And the first one (the bank) has been deferred for how long?

Mr. Moore: 30 days.

Mrs. Mackintosh: Thank you.

Dr. Curl: At this point, we need to ask the secretary to swear in all witnesses who will be talking about these various properties.

Mrs. Delp: Do you swear or affirm that the testimony which you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

(Let the record indicate that Mr. Moore, Mr. Frank, and Mr. Sved were sworn.)

Dr. Curl: At this point, we need to request the Staff's recommendation.

Mr. Gubelmann: May I interject for one second. Is it possible for us, rather than have Mr. Sved repeat this four different times, to make one presentation?

Mr. Frank: Excuse me. When we consider each one separately, and we will need four separate motions.

Mr. Gubelmann: Four separate motions.

Mr. Frank: This is 452-460 Worth Avenue. As quickly as I can, I will defer to Mr. Sved.

Mr. Moore: Before Mr. Frank starts on that, or Mr. Sved, I think we ought to look at the deferrals. Do you have any requests for deferrals in this group? I think we do have one. Dr. Curl, I do recall a letter coming in on one of these.

Mr. Jeff Smith (audience): My client asked to be removed from the

agenda, not for a deferral.

Mrs. Delp: You should have all of the letters in front of you.

Mrs. Volk: Mrs. De Lesseps has asked for a postponement. The third letter in.

Mr. Moore: 452 Worth Avenue. The letter, I'll read it for Mr. Frank since his voice is not doing too well. It is dated December 19, 1990.

"Mr. Moore, Dear Mr. Moore: Would you please postpone the Landmark's Designation hearing for my property located at 452 Worth Avenue, from the December 21, 1990 agenda. I am currently processing a variance request through the Town and would prefer to have it resolved, prior to my property being considered for landmarking."

I assume that means a thirty day deferral.

Mr. Gubelmann: Do we then consider deferring the whole property?

Mr. Moore: I don't...I would ask Mr. Randolph's comment. I am not sure...

Mr. Randolph: Each one of these items, as far as I'm concerned, ought to be taken as an individual property. None of them can be considered as a whole. So, I think you should take each one of them individually.

Dr. Curl: O.K. Do I hear a motion to defer consideration of 452 Worth Avenue till next month?

Mrs. Volk: SO MOVED.

Mr. Gubelmann: One quick question before we vote on this motion. That is would our deferral meaning that it has been not landmarked have any bearing on the variance.

Mr. Moore: In my opinion, it does not have any bearing whatsoever, but it is the request of the client, and they do have a right to ask for a deferral, and we have generally considered those deferrals in a positive manner in the past. I concur with Mr. Randolph, though. Each property should stand on its own merits. Mr. Smith has a letter here too, representing...or someone, Mrs. McFarlane. I don't know if it was Mr. Smith. I believe it was Mr. Smith who actually wrote us. That's in this same package, representing 460. Mr. Smith may wish to address that matter now as to whether or not this matter should be on the agenda.

Mr. Smith: Would you like me to address this now?

Mr. Randolph: There is a motion on the floor.

Mr. Moore: I'm sorry.

Mrs. Gingras: I SECOND THE MOTION.

Dr. Curl: ALL THOSE IN FAVOR OF DEFERRAL OF 452 WORTH AVENUE WITHOUT

PREJUDICE UNTIL NEXT MONTH, SAY AYE.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY FOR DEFERRAL.

Dr. Curl: I guess it's at your pleasure.

Mr. Randolph: I would recommend that you listen to any requests for deferrals on any of these items first, and then proceed down the list.

Dr. Curl: Jeff.

Mr. Jeff Smith: I'm really here to speak on Item 5, 460 Worth Avenue, but we are not requesting a deferral. We are requesting that it be removed from the agenda. I'll present my findings. If you want to hear that item now or if you want to start back at Item #3 now.

Mr. Moore: So, he's a formal objection. I would think it inappropriate for him to speak at this time.

Dr. Curl: Shall we go on?

Mr. Moore: Yes. You would then proceed with Item #3.

Item 3: 456 Worth Avenue
OWNER: Cathleen C. McFarlane

Dr. Curl: 456 Worth Avenue.

Mrs. McFarlane: I'm Mrs. McFarlane. 456 Worth Avenue.

Dr. Curl: There is a procedure which we have to follow, and we will call on you.

Mr. Frank: Concerning 452-460 Worth Avenue, staff believes that it meets the following criteria for designation.

- (a) Exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, economic or social history of the nation, state, county or town; and
- (b) Is identified with historic personages or with important events in national, state or local history; and
- (c) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or is a specimen inherently valuable for the study of a period, style, method of construction or use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship; and
- (d) Is representative of the notable works of one or more master builders, designers or architects whose individual ability has been recognized to have influenced their age.

In this case, the Addison Mizner and Marion Sims Wyeth biographies are attached. Mr. Sved.

Mr. Sved: Thank you very much. The property at 452-460 Worth Avenue was designed and built in 1922 by the architectural firm of Addison Mizner. It was built as the Mayor Barclay Warburton Estate. At the

first slide here, you can see 452. This is 456 which was very nicely renovated by Mrs. McFarlane, I believe with Mr. Smith's assistance. 458, and we don't have a photograph of 460. There was nothing to photograph. The entire property is bordered on one side by Casa Leone which is already a landmark of the Town of Palm Beach, also designed by Addison Mizner; and bordered on the other side by the Town Docks. In 1957, substantial alterations were made to this structure by the architectural firm of Wyeth, King and Johnson. And it was in that same year that the Whitmores began the conversion process of the Warburton Estate, the ultimate result of which is four separate properties, instead of one property. This was researched over the summer by our student interns and they researched this as one building, and considered it as one building since it was built as one entire estate. Being as it is the work of Addison Mizner, and more specifically, it was designed by Lester Geisler of Addison Mizner's office. However, this is the work of Addison Mizner's office, the most widely known and well-respected architect of Palm Beach. It was one of the large grand estates of Palm Beach, and is very worthy of your consideration today. Each section...I can say the same thing about each one of them. This was, as I said, designed as one structure. It was designed as one estate, and it was considered by the summer intern staff as one estate. Therefore, the recommendation for one portion of this, stands true for all four sections. Thank you.

Dr. Curl: We are considering at this point, 456 Worth Avenue, Mrs. McFarlane's. At this point, it is necessary for a Commissioner to move that the Designation Report be made a part of the record.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS THAT THE DESIGNATION REPORT BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD FOR 456 WORTH AVENUE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GUBELMANN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Dr. Curl: Now, we will call on Mrs. McFarlane, but I think she needs to be sworn in.

Mr. Randolph: Yes.

Dr. Curl: You're going to have to be sworn in by the secretary.

Mrs. Delp swore in Mrs. McFarlane using the same verbiage as was earlier stated.

Mrs. McFarlane: I don't have any objection to my house being landmarked. In fact, I would be honored to have it landmarked. I do, however, feel that the houses on either side of me are desperately in need of some repair and improvements before they should be considered. Mrs. Whitmore's house on the west and Mrs. De Lesseps house on the east. That's all. I do have photographs of my house if anyone would like to see them.

Mrs. Mackintosh: Thank you. I think it's very nice to have someone that's so agreeable to landmarking. It's most appreciated.

Dr. Curl: Thank you very much. Are there any other witnesses? Are there any comments from the Commission.

Mrs. Volk: I've seen Mrs. McFarlane's house, and I congratulate her on a job well done, and Jeff Smith, the architect.

Dr. Curl: Do I hear a motion?

MOTION BY MRS. MACKINTOSH THAT 456 WORTH AVENUE BE RECOMMENDED TO TOWN COUNCIL FOR DESIGNATION AS A LANDMARK OF THE TOWN OF PALM BEACH, AND THAT THE CRITERIA, AS PRESENTED, BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GUBELMANN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Dr. Curl: We will recommend the landmarking.

Item 4: 458 Worth Avenue
OWNER: Susan H. Whitmore

Dr. Curl: This brings us to 458 Worth Avenue. Owner - Susan H. Whitmore. I think Mr. Frank, did you want to say something?

Mr. Frank: In addition to my earlier comments, we have a letter sent to Dr. Donald Curl, Chairman, Landmarks Commission, regarding the residence at 458 Worth Avenue.

"Dear Dr. Curl: In reference to your request to place 458 Worth Avenue on the list of landmarked properties, it has been carefully read and much consideration given. At the present time, I am not in favor of having my property designated as a landmark site. I therefore request that my residence at 458 Worth Avenue be removed from consideration and also be removed from your meeting agenda for December 21, 1990. Sincerely, Susan H. Whitmore."

Mr. Sved: The property at 458 Worth Avenue is the residence of Susan Whitmore. It is the Whitmores who purchased the property, the entire property, the entire Warburton Estate, from the heirs or from the estate in 1957. They are, to the best of our knowledge or research, the second owners of this property, after the Warburtons. And I might remind you all that Mayor Warburton was a mayor of this Town for a considerable amount of time. The property at 458, as I said, was the property...is the residence and has been the residence of the Whitmore family. It is the Whitmores who initiated the conversion project to break this down into several different properties, and as I said of the last property, the entire estate is worthy of landmarking and, as I said also, all four items in front of you today are worthy based on the same criteria, being that they were part of one estate. Thank you.

Dr. Curl: At this point, it is necessary to move that the Designation Report be part of the record.

MOTION BY MR. GUBELMANN THAT THE DESIGNATION REPORT BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Dr. Curl: Are there any other witnesses who wish to testify? At this point, then, are there comments from any of the Commissioners.

Mrs. Volk: Mrs. McFarlane speaks of this as being in deteriorated condition or in need of repair. Has anyone seen that?

Mrs. McFarlane: May I add, the house has had a lot of things taken away from the original quality. For instance, it has jalousie windows and exposed air conditioning, and a lot of things that are very bad...roofs added that are just sort of plywood, and if you took a careful look at the house, you would not want it landmarked in that condition. I would like nothing better than to buy it myself and restore it, and then have it landmarked. It really is quite derelict at the moment.

Mr. Jeff Smith: I must agree with Mrs. McFarlane. The house is in very bad shape, and not just architecturally. If it were to be stripped back down, there have been so many unauthorized additions to the house...lean to(s), screen enclosures, sliding glass. That picture (referring to Mr. Sved's slide) is the best picture you will ever find of the house. And I think if anyone decides that's what it looks like from that little driveway opening, it's in horrible condition, and I don't think it's beneficial to Mrs. McFarlane to have it landmarked in the shape that it's in now or to my client, on the other side at 460 Worth Avenue.

Dr. Curl: I think you have not been sworn.

Mrs. Delp swore in Mr. Smith using the same verbiage as was earlier stated.

Mrs. Mackintosh: Can we landmark a part of it or all of it?

Mr. Randolph: You can landmark whatever portion of it you feel is justified. She is just indicating that she did not feel, and Mr. Smith does not feel that it is worthy of landmark designation.

Mrs. Mackintosh: Well, I'm just so afraid that someone might destroy it.

Mr. Randolph: Well, that's not really the consideration, whether or not it's going to be destroyed. The consideration is whether or not it is a landmark.

Dr. Curl: Well, I think one of the things we're missing is that just because a property isn't in great shape, doesn't mean it doesn't meet the criteria of architect, historical worth, association with people known in the Town. I mean it could be in terrible shape. We aren't necessarily only landmarking those properties that are great as far as repair. I'd like to just mention one other thing. This particular property is also essentially a Howard Major. He did an addition to it for the Warburtons very shortly after the original house was up, and Lester Geisler, an associate of Mizner, when he worked on the house,

he was his own man and his own firm. But I mean Lester Geisler is the architect of Hialeah Race Course, so I think you can put him in a category of fairly well known Florida architects. Howard Major is obviously a "major" architect, as well.

Mrs. Volk: I think we have to think too, that despite the condition of this individual building, and despite the fact that we are dealing with it building by building because each property is owned individually, what we have to do is to try to keep the character of that important area of Palm Beach...it's right at the foot of Worth Avenue and across from the landmarked Everglades Club, and this keeps the feeling that we treasure and are here to preserve. Part of that building, the Susan Whitmore house, must be some of the original walls and they should, by all means, be maintained to keep this overall feeling. That, to me, is what we are all after here, and if it's in a derelict condition, or falling in that, I think that it should not be allowed to deteriorate to the point of demolition. What is worth saving should not be allowed to deteriorate. I mean let's take down the little sheds and the little lean to(s), the roofs, and get this thing back in the shape of a landmark that we would love to have at this important corner.

Mr. Gubelmann: I'd like to speak. My family have been long time friends with Mrs. Whitmore and her husband, before her, and I think that she's a lady who maybe does not mean intentionally to let this house deteriorate in any way. I think if we brought to her attention the fact that these things were not the way a building of this character should be presented to the world...I don't find her an unreasonable person at all, and I think if we landmark the property and then say - you now live in a landmark, and these discrepancies do not in enhance it in any way, sort of, she might be very reasonable.

Mrs. Mackintosh: Yes, I do think she's approachable.

Mr. Gubelmann: Yes.

Mrs. McFarlane: I just wanted to say that the house has been occupied not by Mrs. Whitmore, but by her daughter, husband and their children. So, Mrs. Whitmore has just moved into it within the last year, and she is a most agreeable lady.

Mr. Gubelmann: I think we certainly want to keep this property as a landmark of the Town of Palm Beach.

Dr. Curl: Are we ready for a motion?

MOTION THAT THE PROPERTY AT 458 WORTH AVENUE BE RECOMMENDED TO TOWN COUNCIL FOR DESIGNATION AS A LANDMARK OF THE TOWN OF PALM BEACH, AND THAT THE CRITERIA, AS PRESENTED, BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Item 5: 460 Worth Avenue

OWNER: Worth Avenue Inc. c/o Koeppel Et Al

Mr. Frank: Mr. Chairman, I have two letters.

Mr. Moore: Let me read those letters. Mr. Chairman, we have two letters. One is addressed to you. The first one, December 14th, regarding 460 Worth Avenue...

"Dear Dr. Curl: Please be advised that we are the architects for the above referenced project. Our client has notified us that the house is under consideration to be landmarked. 460 Worth Avenue is not a "Mediterranean Revival" house originally built by Addison Mizner as pointed out on Page 12. Upon review of the plans in your archives we were able to ascertain that Addison Mizner did not build or design 460 Worth Avenue. This part of the Warburton estate, in fact, does not have any significant architectural or historical background as it was the detached garage for the estate, and housed several members of the staff. Due to severe muck conditions on the site we had to change the plans for the house to accommodate a new foundation. On July 12, 1990, the Town Council granted a variance to demolish and reconstruct more than fifty percent (50%) of the structure, and on July 25, the Architectural Commission approved plans to modify the residence in accordance with the plans on file. In addition, while drilling piles for the new foundation, an abandoned seawall was discovered which required removal and additional demolition to the house. Since the house will be virtually all new construction, we see no reason for it to be landmarked. We, therefore, request that the residence at 460 Worth Avenue be removed from consideration and that it also be removed from your meeting agenda, scheduled December 21, 1990. Please let us know of your decision in this regard. Sincerely, Smith Architectural Group, Inc., Jeffrey W. Smith, AIA."

The second letter dated December 17, 1990 to Tim Frank regarding the landmarking of 460.

"Dear Mr. Frank: Upon review of the landmark informational materials sent to me by your office on November 16, 1990, I would like to point out the following factual error contained in the designation report. The last sentence on Page 14 identifies 460 Worth Avenue as being in good condition. The fact of the matter is that at the time I purchased 460 Worth Avenue, it had not been lived in for several years and dilapidated to the point of being uninhabitable. Numerous canvas and glass structures had been added to the property throughout the previous years. These additions were partly built without permits from the Building Department and would not even come close to meeting building codes or a minimum standard of living. Due to muck conditions, the house had shown severe settlement in and outside, and was actually splitting apart through a two-inch crack running through the entire house. These findings were confirmed to me by two independent engineering firms at the time of purchase. As a consequence of further, more in-depth soil borings by Ardaman Engineers, we discovered that muck conditions prevailed throughout the entire site. Due to the fact that muck compresses over time, the existing house had settled greatly, particularly in the southern part. Upon review with my architect and structural engineer, we came to the conclusion that the severe muck conditions made a superficial rehabilitation of the property impossible, as all foundations needed

to be secured by piling systems to assure stability and safety for my house. Aside from the unforeseen sizable cost increase of a foundation system completely suspended on piles, we were faced with a necessity of taking down more of the house than originally planned. On July 12, 1990, the Town Council approved the plans and variances for my house, and on July 25, 1990, the ARCOM ratified the design. By the time we will complete the house, most all of it will be brand new construction. Currently the site is virtually cleared and there is almost no house to landmark. The old house was in terrible condition, it did not belong to the main house of Mayor Barclay Warburton, and it was not designed by Addison Mizner. This newly-built house should not be landmarked as it is, first of all, not yet built, and secondly I prefer my home to be without a landmark designation. Therefore I request for you to withdraw by house from your list of proposed landmarks. I would kindly request to be informed should you nevertheless decide to proceed with the landmarking of my property, so that I can take all necessary steps to be properly represented by legal counsel in the December 21, 1990 meeting. Best regards, Ralf Gschwend."

I'd like to make some remarks regarding this. Mr. Smith's letter and the property owner's letter are factual as to the condition of the house that it was in prior to its current state. I personally visited the site with the architect, and did notice the severe deterioration in the house. However, there are some mitigating circumstances which I believe you should be made aware of. In an effort to preserve the rights of the property owner, Mrs. Whitmore, of the previously mentioned house, the Town permitted, as referred to, a zoning variance to be created to reconstruct 460. However, another zoning variance, which is not mentioned in either document, was granted by the Town which allowed a split of the property. This property was part and parcel of Mrs. Whitmore's property. The Town, in the application by two attorneys representing Mrs. Whitmore and the prospective purchaser, was presented with the proposition that they wished to have variances to allow the property split. One of the main reasons listed to the Town Staff and the Council was that Mrs. Whitmore was in need of divesting herself of 460, the proceeds of which she would be able to fund restoration on her property. Several of the illegal structures that Mr. Smith referred to, and I hope he's not referring to a carport that may be on that property, because that one, I believe we gave a variance to...several of the illegal structures were removed. It is...there is no question that Mr. Smith and the contractor have had to demolish the existing house at 460. That is absolutely factual due to the deteriorated condition of the building. The further they went into it, the further the deterioration was found to be. It will be a new building, for all practical purposes. I would point out that we have a landmark structure at 702 North County, in fact, looking for a C.O. today, and maybe I can get there this afternoon, that had to be completely rebuilt because of deteriorated conditions. One exception. One distinction between this property and the 702 North County, the distinction being that Mr. Smith has had to re-design the house. 702 North County is a complete re-build of virtually the original design by Mr. Fatio. This would not fall into that same category, though I would caution you that in your thoughts toward landmarking of this property, be advised that it is being completely re-built in a different fashion than it existed when the property first went under consideration. Those are my comments from

Staff.

① Mrs. Metzger: Mr. Moore, even though the house, the new house, has already been approved by ARCOM, is it appropriate to ask that from this point forward, that since Mrs. McFarlane's house has been landmarked, and hopefully maybe, we can...I'm sorry. We suggested it.

Mr. Gubelmann: Mrs. Whitmore's

Mrs. Metzger: No. Mrs. McFarlane just volunteered hers. What I'm saying is if we are lucky and can consider the whole thing as a unit, even though it has these individual owners, and this property already has been approved by ARCOM, can we request that we look at the plans, or is that...I mean, in other words, move it from ARCOM to Landmarks and consider the whole thing together, because don't we care that the plan that has just been approved by ARCOM are in keeping with the rest of the landmark structures that we hope will come our way.

① Mr. Moore: One comment from a lay Staff position. Mr. Smith's plans are excellent plans, and they do complement the other three houses in the area. I would not want to mislead you when I say a new house. He has certainly taken into consideration the Architectural Commission requirement of "not too similar and not too dissimilar" as to the design factor being incorporated in his plans, and the Architectural Commission did find that his plans were in keeping with the other three houses that were in the area. So, as far as that jurisdiction is concerned, I would not recommend, from a Staff level, that if you were going to landmark it, that's one thing. If you're not going to landmark it, I would certainly not recommend that you try to retain jurisdiction on a brand new house in any way, shape or form.

Mrs. Volk: I agree. I think that it's a new building, and there is not any reason to landmark it except protection to those around who will be, if they are, landmarked by the Town Council, that future owners will not do something alarming that would absolutely refute the landmarking of those buildings in consideration this morning.

Mrs. Mackintosh: It would have to be something compatible with what is there.

Mrs. Volk: It's been already approved.

Mr. Gubelmann: I have a question.

Mr. Moore: It's been designed, approved and being constructed.

① Mr. Gubelmann: If we had landmarked the entire Warburton Estate, as an estate, before it was split up, then, as it was split and alterations were made to those parts of the property, i.e., with 460, they would have had to come not only to the Town Council for variances, but they would have had to come to us for plans to rebuild. But since they came to ARCOM with plans to rebuild, it's been approved. Knowing Mr. Smith's work, I'm sure it's a lovely house, but can we not retain jurisdiction over the property, not so much in any changes that are made in the future. That's what I would like to propose.

Mr. Moore: You may certainly...what's before you is the property and the structures that sit on the property. The one problem, from a Staff point of view that I want to point out, the report is dealing with an existing house, one that does not exist any longer.

Mr. Gubelmann: And if that house doesn't exist any more, it's as if we allowed some out building to be torn down that's on a landmark property. I think we then have to sort of say, can we not designate the property so that we have control over any future additions or changes. I don't want to get involved in even critiquing Mr. Smith's current design.

Mr. Moore: I believe that what is before you would entitle you to landmark the property and the structures that sit on it. The criteria...

Mr. Gubelmann: Even though the structure doesn't meet the requirements of being 50 years old.

Mr. Moore: Excuse me. Yes. However, the criteria that would permit you to landmark it, and I meant to finish it, Mr. Gubelmann. I'm sorry. The criteria is based on the actual structure. The criteria for the landmarking is not listed as the land and the importance of the land. The land is secondary to the historical structure that is no longer existing. So, even from a purely technical point of view, you could probably recommend landmarking, it would be a very weak case to landmark it purely because it happened to be just a piece of land, and envision no house on the land, it would be a very difficult, in my opinion, item to sustain if the property owner wanted nothing to do with the aspect of being landmarked.

Mrs. Volk: I think we should be grateful that Mr. Smith has replaced or is replacing what was torn away with an accepted...

Mr. Moore: One other item I might point out...that this type of dual jurisdiction exists currently on Worth Avenue. Side by side buildings, one landmarked, one not landmarked. The Architectural Commission has proven itself to be very sensitive in most cases to the landmark structures in the immediate area when they are looking at plans for renovating non-landmarked structures. So, it's not a question that they haven't had this experience. They have had it and have done quite well with it.

Dr. Curl: I might say that what we are really discussing now is whether or not this item should stay on the agenda.

Mr. Smith: O.K. Well, then we are not going to discuss the report or anything, because I do have...I have a video here of the existing conditions at the site. I think everyone is in agreement that there is very little structure left at all, and I think that the Landmark Ordinance addresses itself strictly to buildings, not property, so this is virtually a new building, I'm happy that someone would like to landmark my work, although I don't think it's appropriate.

Mr. Moore: Well, not to become argumentative with Mr. Smith, but the Town does have the ability to landmark property, i.e., the Cut on the north end, and it has considered landmarking vistas before the County

Club Cut. I do want to point out, and I think I have pointed out...unless...Dr. Curl is exactly correct. If you do not wish to consider this, and you wish to have it eliminated, I think you have the ability to do that, and recommend that it not even be considered. As to whether or not the land could be landmarked, I do believe you have the ability to do it, but it is a weak ability based on the fact that this Designation Report deals with the structure that sits on that land, and the land is secondary to the construction. So, unless there was some compelling reason to have land and land alone, I do not believe it should be considered.

Mrs. Mackintosh: But you can build a house and (indiscernible), so, it goes both ways.

Mr. Moore: Yes, and I don't mean to be argumentative about that. However, you must find something of historic value of the land in order to landmark the land. Your Designation Report...I will draw you back to it...does refer to the structure that no longer exists.

Dr. Curl: At this point, I think what we really need is a motion to take it from the agenda or go on.

Mr. Frank: You would need no motion to leave it on the agenda.

Mr. Gubelmann: I would like to make a MOTION THAT SINCE THE BUILDING WHICH HAS BEEN RECOMMENDED FOR LANDMARKING NO LONGER EXISTS, THAT WE REMOVE THIS PROPERTY FROM THE AGENDA, NOT PREJUDICING THE FACT THAT AT SOME FUTURE DATE WE MAY WANT TO CONSIDER IT AS PART OF A HISTORICAL DISTRICT OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT. SO, THERE WOULD BE NO QUESTION OF RES JUDICATA HAVING TO BE INVOLVED.

Mr. Moore: I would ask Mr. Randolph to speak to that motion...(tape change)

Mr. Randolph: I'm not sure that the motion really needs addressing. I think that the motion is an appropriate one. The...I guess the request is to remove this from the agenda today, and if that's the effect of the motion. Pardon? I think that the matter is just being asked to be removed, and are you, would you indicate that having been removed, you would waive any notice requirements that are in the Ordinance saying that we have to move forward once we've given our notice.

Mr. Gschwend: My name is Ralf Gschwend. I'm the owner of the property. At this point in time, my request to remove it is based on the fact that your Designation Report focuses on a house that was there, and due to the reasons that we went over, it is no longer there. So, I think that the basis of designation or even us discussing it here is gone. At a future date and time, if we should be successful to build a house that merits your consideration, then I think we will speak about it. I do not want to waive anything at this point. I just want to say the house that you were talking about was already, at the time, approved by ARCOM and Town Council to be demolished, so I think there is no basis for further discussion on a piece of land.

Mr. Randolph: The effect of the motion then, to remove this from the

agenda, would basically be that you're not recommending it for designation. So, as far as res judicata, it would, indeed, apply as to this specific item. If there is a new owner or a new structure in the future that you wish to consider some years hence, then res judicata won't apply because conditions will be different. If you decide to consider it as part of a historic district, res judicata won't apply because you'd be dealing with a historic district, not an individual house. So, I think you can either remove this from the agenda, or you can just recommend, on the basis of the testimony, that it not be considered for designation at this time.

Mrs. Volk: THE MOTION SAID TO REMOVE IT FROM THE AGENDA, AND I SECOND THAT.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Item 6: 102 Flagler Drive
OWNER: Heather Van Ekris

(Please note that the following also represents discussion of Item 7, which follows.)

Dr. Curl: This brings us to Item 6, 102 Flagler Drive.

Mr. Frank: Since 6 & 7 indicate the same property, 102 Flagler Drive/131 Barton Avenue. They happen to be one building.

Mrs. Mackintosh: Where are we now?

Mr. Moore: 6 & 7.

Mr. Frank: The Staff's Statement of Significance: Though this property has some historical background and was modified by a master architect, staff recommends that it not be considered for designation. The original design of the building is unknown. Therefore, the extent of the of the 1930's changes are uncertain. Furthermore, the integrity of the building was destroyed when it was separated into two buildings in 1973. It is not an example of one style. It has elements from the Bermuda and Italianate styles, which do not blend harmoniously. Therefore, the buildings do not meet criteria for designation, and should not be designated. Mr. Sved.

Mr. Sved: Thank you. As Mr. Frank stated, the building was built...there were these two buildings, this and this...at left you see this one, 131 Barton Avenue, and on the right, you can see 102 Flagler Drive. These were originally built as one house in 1929, excuse me, 1924 by an unknown architect. The plans are not on file, so the original design is also not on file. In 1932, Marion Sims Wyeth extensively renovated this house into what a 1932 newspaper called, and I quote "modified Bermuda style". Originally, this was one large house connected by a breezeway. It's also sometimes considered a, called a loggia, and that breezeway connected right about where that driveway goes in right now. As I understand it, in talking to the property owner at 131 Barton Avenue, the way this was considered after the Wyeth addition was that 131 Barton Avenue was the main house, and the 102 Flagler Drive portion was considered a guest residence, in-laws, and what-not. Approximately in 1973, some other

work was done to this property by Kemp Caler, the architect. I believe it is at that time that the breezeway was removed and this became two separate properties. Since then, the properties have been dealt with separately as there were separate owners, separate...I imagine the lot was split too. However, the fact remains that the original 1924 design is unknown. The renovations to these houses are rather eclectic, and we feel, therefore, that it is not worthy of consideration today. That is for both Items 6 & 7.

Dr. Curl: At this point, we need the Designation Report to be made part of the record.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS THAT THE DESIGNATION REPORT BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. VOLK.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Dr. Curl: Are there any other expert witnesses who wish to testify? Comments?

Mrs. Volk: Well, I think in light of the recommendation by our historian, our architectural historian, I MOVE THAT WE WITHDRAW IT FROM RECOMMENDATION FOR DESIGNATION AS A LANDMARK.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA.

Dr. Curl: It's been moved and seconded that we...Now let me get this straight. We did only one at a time, since there are different property owners, so this would be 102 Flagler Drive only. It's been moved that we not recommend the designation of 102 Flagler Drive. All those in favor say aye. Opposed.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Dr. Curl: We will not recommend it. That brings us to 131 Barton Avenue.

Item 7: 131 Barton Avenue
OWNER: Brooke R. Oatley

(Continued from Item 6, as noted above.)

Dr. Curl: I take it that it is not necessary to approve the Designation Report because we've already had a motion.

Mr. Frank: Yes.

Mrs. Volk: I MOVE THAT 131 BARTON AVENUE NOT BE RECOMMENDED FOR DESIGNATION AS A LANDMARK.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. ALBARRAN DE MENDOZA.

Dr. Curl: All those in favor of not recommending 131 Barton Avenue say aye. Opposed.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Item 8: 91 Middle Road
OWNER: William L. Hanley

Dr. Curl: That leads us to Item 8, 91 Middle Road, and we have a request to hear for deferral until February. Mr. Hanley died yesterday, and I think that it is very advisable that we grant the deferral. Do we need a deferral motion?

Mr. Frank: Well, first of all, I want to mention that his letter, in the record, requesting this deferral...we'll enter that into the record. In addition, we just found out from their attorneys this morning, that Mr. Hanley had died, and he said that the estate of the trust that handled Mr. Hanley's affairs was very much in turmoil. They didn't know...as a matter of fact, they did know that there were going to be some changes. Apparently, there had been a trust in charge of his affairs, and they were asking for deferral, and were going to represent this, and it was the attorney's understanding that since his death, that is actually going to change. And so, I would say that a deferral, based on the comments from the attorney this morning is very much in order.

Mr. Randolph: Excuse me, when the deferral was initially requested, was a waiver given as to notice requirements and moving forward. Did you extract that from him when you spoke to the attorney?

Mr. Frank: No, I didn't.

Mr. Gubelmann: I also think that if the estate's in any sort of a turmoil, this is probably the one of these things that may need to be deferred more than one month. It takes a while.

Mr. Frank: Just for your knowledge, when we send deferral letters, that verbiage is always in there, but this letter did not have it.

Dr. Curl: Do I hear a motion?

Mrs. Volk: To what meeting should it be deferred?

Mr. Frank: February.

Mrs. Volk: I think that's soon though.

Mr. Gubelmann: Will they be ready to deal with it, or they'll let us know in February if they don't want to deal with it.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS THAT THE LANDMARKING CONSIDERATION OF 91 MIDDLE ROAD BE DEFERRED TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING WITH THE PROVISIO THAT THE OWNER RECOGNIZES THAT THE ESTATE IS WAIVING ITS RIGHT BY ORDINANCE REQUIRING THE COMMISSION TO ACT WITHIN 30 DAYS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GUBELMANN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Item 9: 15 South Lake Trail

OWNER: H. Loy Anderson

Dr. Curl: This leads us to Item 9, 15 South Lake Trail, H. Loy Anderson, and here the Staff requests deferral.

Mr. Frank: Yes. Apparently, there was...I'll try to simply state it. It's rather complicated. Apparently, there was some sort of computer error in the name of the person who was notified for the property. The correct person was not notified, so we had to go through that process again. Because of that, Staff is requesting a deferral. That is really simply stated, but essentially, we request Staff deferral so we can re-notify the owner of this property.

Dr. Curl: (Comments indiscernible.)

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS THAT LANDMARKING CONSIDERATION OF 15 SOUTH LAKE TRAIL BE DEFERRED TO THE JANUARY MEETING...

Mr. Gubelmann: February. Oh, January.

Mr. Frank: Mrs. Delp. Are we prepared to notify notices for January?

Mrs. Delp: They have already been noticed.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. METZGER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VI. Other Business

A. Discussion of Town Hall Exterior Lighting on South facade and Tower

Mr. Moore addressed the Commission on this subject. As the Town flies the American Flag during the evening hours, it is illuminated as is required. This lighting is provided by a very unobtrusive source on the north side of the street light. As a result of this, only a part of the building is illuminated, and appears somewhat out of scale during nighttime viewing hours. Today's discussion is to determine whether or not the Commission has any objection to the Town lighting the west side of the building in the same manner as the east side of the south entrance is lit. Also, some soft lighting is to be created in the bell tower, up from the floor, for evening illumination. Without any objection from the Commission, the Town will experiment with the new lighting.

Mrs. Polly Earl, who was in the audience, addressed the Commission regarding this subject. She suggested that in addition to the suggested lighting per Mr. Moore's remarks, that additional lighting might be considered on other areas of the building to enhance the beautiful restoration of Town Hall. She mentioned also that some of the lighting fixtures which were to be hung as part of the restoration have not yet been hung, apparently due to some problem between the contractor and the Town.

Mr. Moore spoke to this problem and explained that the fixtures are not yet hung because the fixtures are not "listed" by an approved testing laboratory. They are exterior lighting fixtures, and are subject to the weather, so this is very important. Someone must assume responsibility for the fixtures, and some technical problems must be resolved with the size of conduit required to run the wiring to these fixtures. These problems are "on the table" and the Town and contractor are attempting to reach a resolve to them.

B. January 8, 1991 Ratification Hearing

Mr. Frank reminded the Commissioners to offer their support at the January 8, 1991 Town Council meeting at such time as the November LPC designated properties will be scheduled for ratification hearing.

At this point, Dr. Curl addressed the Commission stating his desire to vacate his position as Acting Chairman. His second term with the LPC will expire in February of 1991, at which time he will leave the Commission. He stated that Mrs. Volk has agreed to fulfill the remainder of his term as Chairman.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO ELECT MRS. VOLK AS CHAIRMAN TO FULFILL DR. CURL'S TERM WHICH WILL EXPIRE IN FEBRUARY OF 1991.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. METZGER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Gubelmann, on behalf of the Commission, thanked Dr. Curl for his many years of expert service toward landmarking efforts within the Town.

(Let the record show that Mrs. Albarran de Mendoza and Mrs. Metzger left the meeting at this point, 11:03 a.m.)

G. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 59-90, Driveway

Applicant: Mr. Fred M. Brunner

Owner: Mr. Fred M. Brunner

Address: 134 El Vedado Road

Contractor: Thomas Adeimy

Project Description: Request approval for existing asphalt driveway with interlocking pavers.

Mr. Tom Adeimy, contractor for this project, stated that the existing asphalt driveway is to be changed to interlocking pavers. The coloring will be a red and tan combination field stone with a tan border.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO APPROVE THE DRIVEWAY REPLACEMENT AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. MACKINTOSH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:07 a.m. without a motion.

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be held on Friday, January 18, 1991 at 9:00 a.m. in the TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, TOWN HALL, 360 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD, PALM BEACH.

Respectfully submitted,

Elise P. Mackintosh
Elise P. Mackintosh
Secretary

cmd

452-460 Worth Avenue
456 & 458 Worth Avenue recommended
for designation

V. Statement of Significance

This building reveals a great deal about the history of Palm Beach. It was built in the 1920's during the height of the Palm Beach building boom, and is located on a place of local historical significance. It is an excellent example of the Mediterranean Revival style, and is situated prominently on the Lake end of Worth Ave. This residence was the work of Addison Mizner, and was also partially designed by Wyeth, King and Johnson. Though this building has been altered greatly, it has historical value and deserves designation.

VI. Criteria for Designation

Section 16-38A of the Town of Palm Beach Landmark Preservation Ordinance #2-84 outlines the criteria for designation of a landmark or landmark site and suggests that at least one criterion must be met to justify the designation. Listed below are criteria which relate to this property and justification for designation:

(a) "Exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, economic or social history of the nation, state, county or town"

This house was built during a period of economic affluence in Palm Beach. Its size and ornamentation of the structure indicates the economic strength of Barclay Warburton, the original owner. It has weathered times of economic hardship in Palm Beach, as well, with few periods of vacancy.

This property is important in that it is the site of the alligator wrestling matches of Alligator Joe early in Palm Beach's history. Also, this is a very distinctive property, in that it extends out over the lake and is an entity unto itself. It is an important terminus to Worth Ave.

Like many other Palm Beach houses, this building was first a vacation house, which the owners later made permanent. Warburton added many sections onto this building, and was very concerned about the development of the building and the property.

(b) "Is identified with historic personages or with important events in national, state or local history."

This building is closely identified with Palm Beach Mayor, Barclay Warburton. Warburton was very active in Palm Beach society, and did a great deal to improve the community.

As mentioned earlier, this building is also situated on the site of Alligator Joe's famous wrestling matches at his alligator farm.

(c) "Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or is a specimen inherently valuable for the study of a period, style, method of construction or use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship."

Mediterranean Revival style buildings were ubiquitous in Palm Beach during and after the 1920's. However, this building is one of the best, and most well preserved examples of Addison Mizner's interpretation of a Mediterranean Revival style "villa." It is characterized by its irregularity in shape and in window and door treatment. This house is designed in a way that balances these irregularities. The use of hollow clay tile in the structural system also distinguishes this building. Stucco walls and tile roofs are used very often in Palm Beach architecture, but this building is also covered with many mosaic tiles, plaques and cast stone arches.

Each of the separate buildings has distinguishing characteristics, but the essence of the entire building is very evident, making designation of this as one property appropriate.

(d) "Is representative of the notable works of one or more master builders, designers or architects whose individual ability has been recognized to have influenced their age."

See Attached Addison Mizner and Marion Sims Wyeth Biographies.

This building is also associated with well known Palm Beach builder, Cooper Lightbown, who built many Palm Beach residences and also served as Mayor.