

**MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
AT THE PRESERVATION FOUNDATION, 311 PERUVIAN AVENUE, PALM BEACH**

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 2009, 9:30 a.m.

Please be advised that in keeping with a recent directive from the Town Council, the minutes of all Town Boards and Commissions will be “abbreviated” in style. Persons interested in listening to the meeting, after the fact, may access the audio of that item via the Town’s website at www.townofpalmbeach.com or may obtain an audio recording (tape or CD) of the meeting by contacting Cindy Delp, Secretary to the Landmarks Preservation Commission at (561) 227-6408. As a point of reference, you will find the approximate recording times listed on these minutes at the beginning of each item.

I. CALL TO ORDER: (9:30:08 a.m.)

Chairman Pandula called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL: (9:30:28 a.m.)

All regular members and all alternate members were present for this meeting. Let the record show that Mr. Moore arrived just after Roll Call.

Staff members present were Attorney John Randolph, John Page, Director of Planning Zoning & Building, John Lindgren, Planning Administrator, and Cindy Delp, Recording Secretary.

Let the record show that a Court Report, Jamie Reynolds Bentley, was present for the Designation Hearing for 958 North Lake Way on behalf of the property owner.

It should be noted that in this first offsite meeting location, the Town's audio equipment failed to produce an audible record of the meeting. The Court Reporter also recorded the meeting and has supplied the Town with a copy of her recording.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 18, 2009 MEETING: (9:30:54 a.m.)

**MOTION BY MR. EIGELBERGER FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. HANLEY.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

IV. ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH TO PERSONS WHO WISH TO TESTIFY:
By Mrs. Delp. (9:31:23 a.m.)

V. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: (Please limit comments to 3 minutes) (9:32:10 a.m.)

Mr. Pandula asked that comments from the Commission members also be heard at this time.

Lory Volk, Vice President of the John L. Volk Foundation, referred to the Town Council meeting yesterday. She noted her disappointment with the Royal Poinciana Plaza project which had also been reviewed informally at the February LPC meeting. She felt this project was being handled in an "arbitrary and capricious" manner, and that correct process is not being followed. Quite emotionally, she urged the LPC not to let this happen to "our Town."

Mr. Pandula noted that the LPC reviewed the matter only informally because the commission felt that there were procedural issues beyond the scope of the LPC. He noted that Mr. Cooley had raised the question about whether "demolition by neglect" is applicable to the Plaza, and Mr. Pandula has asked staff to look into this.

Mr. Cooley referred to a statement that was in the newspaper regarding the LPC "lauding" the Sterling Group's proposal for the Royal Poinciana Plaza. He countered that the LPC did not "laud" the plan, but did extend courtesy to the applicant in hearing the proposal. Mr. Roberts responded that the LPC noted both the good and the bad aspects of the plan, and acknowledged that there are many issues yet unresolved, and many approvals yet unattained.

At this point, Mr. Hanley apologized to the commission and the public for making the motion to hear the Royal Poinciana Plaza project on an informal basis. He stated that he did this in an effort to help move the process along. In retrospect, Mr. Hanley would have preferred to have made a motion not to hear the matter at all since it was a "seriously flawed application." Mr. Hanley stated that now the Sterling Group has elected to bypass the LPC, and take up their cause directly with the Town Council. "We have been undermined." Regarding the playhouse, Mr. Hanley felt that if it had been maintained, as required under the 1979 agreement, others may have come forward with a viable plan for its use. The theatre's landmark status may alleviate certain code requirements. "We (the LPC) have acted with good will, and it's been abused to the extent that I have been hearing for a month how Landmarks has endorsed this plan." Mr. Hanley expressed great concern that a dangerous precedent has been set here "shredding" the Town's zoning code, land use code, and density, and that this will have implications to future development projects such as Testas and the Breakers. "This is not a legacy that I want to see left to our children and to this Town. It will completely change the quality of life in this Town that we have enjoyed. And I am pro development. I am pro change, but the implications of what we're talking about here are too important to be summarily

dismissed." Once again, Mr. Hanley apologized for making the aforementioned motion.

Mr. Pandula asked Mr. Page for an update regarding this matter. Mr. Page responded that the Town Council met yesterday for approximately 3 hours, hearing many speakers on this subject. No final decisions were made. The Town Council seems to be willing and open to consider demolition of the theatre if the parties cannot come together regarding re-use of the theater. Regarding the issue of deterioration by neglect, Mr. Page reported that after several visits to the theater, the Town's Building Official has determined that deterioration by neglect does not apply to the theater.

Mr. Cooley felt that the entire Plaza should be evaluated for deterioration by neglect, rather than just the theater. As such, Chairman Pandula requested that this matter be placed on the May LPC agenda. Mr. Page noted that Code Enforcement has visited this site previously and has indicated several maintenance issues needing attention, and the Sterling Group has complied thus far. Staff will look into this further for the next meeting. It was mentioned that perhaps a member of the LPC might accompany Code Enforcement to the site.

Mr. Page reiterated that the Town Council took no action at yesterday's meeting. They did, however, encourage the stakeholders to come together to arrive at a mutually agreeable solution by the end of another 3 weeks. It was mentioned that a follow up meeting will be held on Friday, May 8, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. to discuss this matter again.

Mrs. Jere Zenko, 232 Tangier Avenue, agreed that the LPC did not "laud" the project at their February meeting. She felt that this project presents quality of life issues; that this issue produces a lot of anger and is a source of frustration; and, that the Town has paid for studies related to this project which should have been paid for by the applicant. Mrs. Zenko complimented those members on the commission who supported the informal review which occurred at the February meeting. She insisted on a full presentation regarding this site, not just "hearts and flowers."

John Ripley, Preservation Foundation, welcomed everyone to the Preservation Foundation. He offered the support of the Preservation Foundation for all 3 designation hearings today, and encouraged discussion about the new north bridge (later on the agenda). Regarding yesterday's Town Council meeting about the Royal Poinciana Plaza, Mr. Ripley was troubled about the Town Council making aesthetic judgments. He stated that this type of judgment should be referred to the LPC. He encouraged the LPC to separate the issues of use of the buildings from the buildings themselves, and to keep the best practices of historic preservation in mind.

VI. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:(10:01:56 a.m.)

**MOTION BY MR. HANLEY FOR APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.
MOTION SECONDED BY MR. EIGELBERGER.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS:(10:02:06 a.m.)

A. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness #4-09,
Site wall
Modification

Owner: David H. Koch, Trustee of the David H. Koch 2003 Trust u/a/d 1/24/03

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. David Koch

Address: 150 South Ocean Boulevard

Architect: Thomas M. Kirchhoff, AIA, P.A.

Project Description: Request approval to increase height of existing site wall which is further described as: Increase a 67 ft. - 10 in. length of the existing alley site wall, located at the southwest corner of the property, from 5 ft. - 10 in. to 9 ft. - 0 in. tall, for additional screening and privacy on the alley side of the residence. Other associated changes as presented.

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION

Mr. Hanley stated that he had spoken with Mr. Kirchhoff and the property owner. Mr. Roberts stated that he had spoken with Mr. Kirchhoff and the owner over the past several months.

This matter had been presented informally last month, and the LPC had made a positive recommendation for the requested variance at that time. Since then, the project has received approval of the variance.

MOTION BY MR. EIGELBERGER FOR APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

**MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTS.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

VIII. DESIGNATION HEARINGS:(10:03:32 a.m.)

1. 150 Chilean Avenue (deferred from March)

Owner: John Tonelli

Mr. Lindgren stated that proof of publication and proper legal service were achieved with regard to this designation hearing. Mrs. Day testified to the architecture and history relative to this property as outlined in the Designation Report. She testified that this property, a rare example of Moorish Revival architecture, meets 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 for the study of a period, style, method of construction or use of indigenous materials or craftsmen.

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

**MOTION SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTS.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

MOTION BY MR. EIGELBERGER THAT THE PROPERTY AT 150 CHILEAN AVENUE BE RECOMMENDED TO THE TOWN COUNCIL AS A LANDMARK OF THE TOWN OF PALM BEACH, AND THAT THE CRITERIA, AS PRESENTED, BE MADE PART OF THE RECORD.

**MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GOLINO.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

2. 323 Chilean Avenue

Owner: David P. Kane

Mr. Lindgren stated that the notice of hearing was properly mailed, but not claimed by the owner. Mr. Lindgren hand delivered the notice of hearing to the owner just yesterday. The owner signed for the notice, writing a letter in support of the designation, and waiving the 30 day notification requirement. Mr. Lindgren read the letter dated April 14, 2009 into the record. Mrs. Day testified to the architecture and the history relative to this property as outlined in the Designation Report. She testified that this property meets 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 for the study of a period, style, method of construction or use of indigenous materials or craftsmen.

Mrs. Day noted that this house has been changed quite a bit over time, and at one time was divided into 6 apartments.

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

**MOTION SECONDED BY MR. HANLEY.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Since the property has experienced quite a bit of change, the commission discussed whether it should be landmarked. Mr. Eigelberger felt that the home should be under the LPC's jurisdiction, rather than ARCOM, since it contributes to the character of the neighborhood, and since the owner supports the landmarking. Mrs. Rubin did not feel it should be landmarked due to the changes done. Mrs. Day noted that other properties in this neighborhood have been landmarked with even more changes than this property, and she gave Polly Earl's house as an example. She thought that by landmarking it, the LPC could control future changes which might take the building back closer to the original design.

MOTION BY MR. ROBERTS THAT THE PROPERTY AT 323 CHILEAN AVENUE BE RECOMMENDED TO THE TOWN COUNCIL FOR DESIGNATION AS A LANDMARK OF THE TOWN OF PALM BEACH, AND THAT THE CRITERIA, AS PRESENTED, BE MADE PART OF THE RECORD.

**MOTION SECONDED BY MR. EIGELBERGER.
MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH MRS. RUBIN OPPOSING.**

3. [958 North Lake Way \(deferred from March\)](#)

Owner: Sondra and David S. Mack

Mr. Lindgren verified that proof of publication and proper legal service were achieved with regard to this designation hearing. He noted that the following letters were received: Letter dated June 30, 2008 from the property owner objecting to the designation; Letter dated January 14, 2009 from the architect, Richard Meier, stating his opposition to landmark designation of private residences; and, Letter dated April 10, 2009 from the property owner wherein he once again stated opposition to the landmark designation. Mr. Lindgren read all three letters into the record.

Mrs. Day thanked Mr. Mack for meeting with her to discuss this issue. She noted that she also had four meetings with Robert Deziel, Attorney, who represents the Macks in this matter. Mrs. Day attested to her resume, which was submitted for the record, and also attested to her experience working for the Town of Palm Beach, working in other parts of Florida, and elsewhere. Mrs. Day testified to the architecture, history, and architect for 958 North Lake Way as outlined in the Designation Report. She testified that this property meets the following criteria for designation as a landmark:

Sec. 54-161 (3) 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 craftsmen; and,

(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.

Mrs. Day's full testimony can be heard on the audio recording of this meeting. Within that testimony she noted the concerns regarding this designation as presented to her by the property owner's attorney, Robert Deziel. Mr. Deziel questioned if any other properties were landmarked while the architect was still living; whether the architectural style of 958 North Lake Way is representative of the Palm Beach style; and whether 958 North Lake Way should be landmarked at only 32 years of age. Mrs. Day provided testimony addressing these concerns. Mrs. Day stressed the fact that the Landmarks Ordinance does not speak to age of a structure and/or does not require owner consent for landmarking. She spoke at length regarding the architect, his body of work, the awards he received, and his general importance in the world of architecture.

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

**MOTION SECONDED BY MRS GOLINO AND MR. EIGELBERGER SIMULTANEOUSLY.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Before any further testimony, Mrs. Delp administered the oath to additional persons who wished to testify and had not been previously sworn.

Let the record show that there was a short recess from 11:02 a.m. to 11:12 a.m.

Once again, Mrs. Delp administered the oath to those who had not been previously sworn.

CALL FOR DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION: Mr. Moore spoke with Mr. Deziel, but not much about this matter; Mrs. Golino spoke with Mr. Deziel on two occasions and she has been in the house; Mrs. Rubin met with Mr. Deziel and has visited the house and has met with the Macks and Mr. Deziel; Mr. Pandula had a meeting at the house with Mr. and Mrs. Mack and Mr. Deziel; Mr. Hanley met at the site with Mr. Deziel and the Macks; Mr. Cooley received two letters and spoke with Robert Moore about this subject.

Attorney Robert Deziel, representing David and Sondra Mack, introduced his team as Mr. Mack, the property owner, Mark Stumer, Architect, Robert Moore, former Building Official and Director of Planning Zoning & Building for the Town of Palm Beach, and Attorney James Green, also Attorney for the property owners. First, he thanked members of the commission and members of Town staff for meeting with him and/or providing information. Mr. Deziel stated that the Macks are long time residents of Palm Beach; they are very civic minded; and, they are not opposed to the concept of landmarking, but feel it is wrong in this particular situation. Mr. Deziel stated that the Macks oppose any landmarking of this property for 4 reasons: 1) The property is less than 50 years old and there is no owner consent to the landmarking; 2) The Town has a custom and policy to save truly historic period structures; 3) There is a lack of understanding regarding what the criteria (3) and (4) mean and how they are to be interpreted by the commission and the property owner; and, the Designation report is fatally flawed with omissions; and 4) the architect, Richard Meier is still alive and producing work.

Mr. Deziel entered approximately fifteen exhibits into the record consisting of several letters, a Certificate of Occupancy for 958 North Lake Way, the Designation Report for 958 North Lake Way, two boxes holding 259 Designation Reports for the Town's 259 landmarks, a Designation Report for 444 North Lake Way, the current list of landmarked properties, the Landmark manual, residential plans and permit for 958 North Lake Way, resumes of Mrs. Day and Mr. Stumer, and resumes and Applications for Service for the existing members of the Landmarks Preservation Commission. All exhibits are on file at the Planning, Zoning & Building Department.

Mr. Deziel's testimony, in its entirety can be heard on the audio recording of this meeting. Several of the points he made follow:

- * The previous owner, Mr. Taubman, contracted with Richard Meier to build this home and influenced the design of the home. Building materials were used which were very vulnerable to South Florida weather conditions. The home fell into disrepair, and it was sold at a discounted price because buyers were not interested in the maintenance required on a Richard Meier house.
- * The home is out of place in the architectural landscape of Palm Beach as it is unlike the other 259 existing landmarks as to architectural style.
- * A property owner deserves fair warning when property rights are going to be affected and potentially impaired.
- * Of the 259 existing landmarks, with minute exception, all are at least 50 years of age.
- * La Ronda, proposed for designation by the LPC, was turned down by

the Town Council because it was not yet 50 years of age.

- * 400 South Ocean Boulevard was not pursued for landmarking because the owners objected to the designation.

- * Lack of owner consent should be given great weight.

- * Designating this property would not be consistent with past practices of Mrs. Day, the LPC, and the Town Council.

- * What do the designation criteria mean and how do property owners interpret them?

- * The Designation Report is flawed with omissions.

At this point, Attorney Jim Green asked Mrs. Day a series of questions including, but not limited to, questions regarding the Landmark Manual, the Designation Report for 958 North Lake Way, and tax abatement. The questions and responses are available on the audio recording of this meeting. Let the record show that Mr. Deziel then asked some questions to Mrs. Day, and this was followed by an additional question from Mr. Green.

Let the record show that Mr. Eigelberger left the meeting at approximately 11:45 a.m.

Mr. Green called Mark Stumer of Mojo Stumer Architects to testify in this matter. First Mr. Stumer spoke regarding his own background and experience. He stated that he is a personal friend of Richard Meier and a big fan of his work. Mr. Stumer serves on the landmark commission of his hometown. Mr. Stumer felt that Richard Meier is a very popular architect and is on his way to being one of the masters of modern architecture, but he is not there yet. He noted that Meier's use of materials has been questioned; his designs typically require high maintenance; and, Meier's projects look the same too often. Mr. Stumer recalled an instance where he presented a new home to the Town's Architectural Commission, and it was turned down because its modern style did not fit into Palm Beach architecture. He questioned if the LPC was here to landmark the house or the architect. Mr. Stumer answered a line of questions posed by Mr. Green, as available on the audio recording.

Let the record show that Mr. Moore left the meeting at approximately 12:11 p.m.

Mr. Green called the property owner, Mr. Mack to testify and asked him a series of questions. Mr. Mack testified that prior to purchasing this property, he had researched the issue of the age of this home as it relates to possible landmarking, and had also researched the owner consent issue as it relates to landmarking. He asked the LPC not to change the flavor of the community, which he felt would happen as a result of landmarking this property.

Mr. Green called Robert L. Moore to testify. Mr. Moore provided his background and experience working for the Town of Palm Beach as the Director of Planning, Zoning & Building. Mr. Moore recalled that this house was the subject of litigation many years ago, and it was alleged and proven that materials used were inferior and detrimental to living in the house. He spoke to the 50 year rule, acknowledging that it was not a hard and fast rule, but a means to establish a way to proceed in landmarking. He noted that if an owner requests approval for demolition of a landmark, he will have to prove his case for demolition. He discussed property owner rights and the expectations of this property owner and other property owners to rely on the conditions, rules, regulations and practices that existed when they purchased their properties.

Mr. Hanley cited the example of 91 Middle Road, which was landmarked over owner objection. Three architects were involved in this property, and changes were made to the original structure. So, 958 North Lake Way is not unique as to owner objection and/or changes having been made to the original design.

Mrs. Golino commented that 958 North Lake Way is an amazing piece of architecture. She spoke to the extreme success of Richard Meier in the world of architecture. Mrs. Golino stressed that the LPC has to proceed according to the Landmarks Ordinance, which does not address the age of the property or owner consent. Referring to the ordinance, she noted that this house is a valid monument to the architectural history of Palm Beach, and its style is absolutely valid for the Town. Regarding Meier's use of materials, she stated that this does not make the house unworthy of landmarking. She also remarked that the tour boats that go by Palm Beach always mention the Richard Meier house, so if this is being said on a tour boat, she questioned how the LPC could not consider it an important landmark. Lastly, she questioned if the owner loves the house, as was testified, and he has no plans to tear it down, why is he not volunteering the property for landmarking.

Mr. Pandula stated that if one ventures onto Richard Meier's website, this house appears there and is well documented. Mrs. Golino had copies from the website and submitted them for the record.

Mr. Pandula questioned Mr. Stumer regarding whether he felt that this house is representative of Richard Meier's work and has "influenced his age." (Criterion 4) Mr. Stumer answered affirmatively. Mr. Pandula and Mr. Stumer entered into an exchange, architect to architect, about landmarking more modern properties under 50 years of age, even ones as early as 30 years of age; and about introducing a house of this modern style into the Palm Beach list of landmarks. Mr. Pandula felt that

the list should include an example of Meier's work. Mr. Stumer agreed, but asked that the house be revisited after it reaches an appropriate age.

Mr. Deziel commented that the Town should suddenly not chose to landmark a style of architecture which has to date been unappreciated in Palm Beach. He also stated that a property owner should not have to explain or defend why they do not want their home landmarked. The house might be landmarked in the future, but it is premature at this time.

Mr. Roberts congratulated everyone for doing a great job in this designation hearing. He stated that he had been out of the room when ex parte communications were declared. As such, he stated that he had met with the Mack's attorney. He noted that he is heavily influenced by an owner's property rights and likewise with owner consent; that he favors adherence to the 50 year rule for landmarking; that he is influenced by the architect's letter regarding this property; and, that the LPC should be sure to landmark the house, and not the architect.

Mrs. Rubin was concerned with the rights of homeowners. She questioned whether conditions/Town policies should be grandfathered when a home is purchased. Since this house requires higher maintenance, from her real estate point of view, Mrs. Rubin commented that it would be a problem to sell this house.

Mr. Cooley commented that the Town is fortunate to have such an articulate, enthusiastic and passionate consultant in Mrs. Day. Likewise, Mr. Deziel did a great job. He stated that he was torn on this issue as both sides have presented good arguments, but stated he would vote against the landmarking because of age of the structure and lack of owner consent.

MOTION BY MRS. GOLINO THAT THE PROPERTY AT 958 NORTH LAKE WAY BE RECOMMENDED TO THE 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. HANLEY.

(Prior to the vote, it was clarified that Ms. Willis would be voting in Mr. Eigelberger's stead.)

UPON A ROLL CALL VOTE, THE MOTION CARRIED 4-3, WITH MRS. RUBIN, MR. ROBERTS AND MR. COOLEY VOTING AGAINST.

There was a short recess at this time. Let the record show that Mrs. Rubin left the meeting at 1:17 p.m.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. [Informal Presentation: Proposed Changes to Flagler Memorial Bridge](#)

Paul Cherry of Kimley Horne gave a presentation regarding the proposed new bridge to replace the existing Flagler Memorial Bridge. Unfortunately, the visual presentation which was intended was cancelled due to technical difficulties. Mr. Cherry noted that the existing Flagler Memorial Bridge was built in 1938 and was intended to last for 50 years. It is a reinforced concrete bridge which has deteriorated due to salt conditions. Replacement of the bridge is necessary. The new bridge will be 15 feet higher and 60 feet wider than the existing north bridge. Amy Streelman of Janice Research did a cultural resources assessment regarding the bridge and discussed her findings. Mr. Pandula stated that he, along with John Ripley and Ann Blades sit on a committee relative to the new bridge. He explained that three design options have been presented: an understated design with flat arches, one with a Key West scheme, and one which is bright white in color and would be the first "green" bridge in the state. The committee prefers the understated design with flat arches. Final decisions have not been made regarding the design at this point. Construction of the new bridge is scheduled to begin in July of 2010.

Mr. Cherry stated that his team would return to another LPC meeting with their visual presentation and additional information.

B. Staff update: Conditions at Publix Parking Lot

Due to the fact that the recording equipment and laptop were needed for a 2:00 p.m. meeting at Town Hall, this item was not discussed. It will be carried on the May LPC agenda.

C. Staff update: Conditions at West Palm Beach Pumping Station at Coral Cut

Due to the fact that the recording equipment and laptop were needed for a 2:00 p.m. meeting at Town Hall, this item was not discussed. It will be carried on the May LPC agenda.

X. COMMENTS OF THE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING ZONING & BUILDING DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR:

No additional comments were heard at this time as the meeting was about to adjourn.

XI. SITE VISIT: SEAGULL COTTAGE

Since the meeting had gone for so long and the members had been expected at Seagull Cottage in the late morning, the site visit was cancelled for today. Staff will reschedule this with the Chapel.

XII. ADJOURNMENT:(1:42:34 a.m.)

MOTION BY MR. HANLEY TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT APPROXIMATELY 1:45 P.M.

**MOTION SECONDED BY MR. COOLEY.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Just after the motion, Mr. Pandula thanked the Preservation Foundation for hosting the meeting, and welcomed Mrs. Golino and Mr. Cooley to service on the commission.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles S. Roberts, Secretary
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be held on Wednesday, May 20, 2009 at 9:30 a.m. at the City of West Palm Beach City Center, 401 Clematis Street, West Palm Beach.

cmd