



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Planning, Zoning & Building Department

MINUTES

LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

9:00 a.m., FRIDAY, JANUARY 17, 1992

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

- I. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Lillian Jane Volk, Chairman, at 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Heeke addressed the Commissioners on behalf of the Town Council, and presented each one with a token of appreciation in reward for their dedicated service with the Landmarks Preservation Commission and the Town.

II. Roll Call:

PRESENT: Lillian Jane Volk, Chairman
Elise P. Mackintosh, Vice Chairman
Sally Gingras, Secretary
William S. Gubelmann, Member
Leslie Divoll, Member
Arthur Silverman, Member
Wilmer J. Thomas Jr., Member
Pamela McNierney, Attorney for the Town
Robert L. Moore, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building
Timothy M. Frank, Planner/Projects Coordinator
James Edward Sved, Staff Consultant

ABSENT: Anne G. Metzger, Member
Jacqueline Albarran de Mendoza, Member
Jane R. Grace, Alternate Member

RECORDING SECRETARY: Cynthia M. Delp

Let the record show that Mrs. Divoll arrived at 9:03 a.m.

III. Approval of the Minutes of the December 20, 1991 Meeting:

MOTION BY MR. SILVERMAN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS MAILED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. GUBELMANN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

IV. Public Hearings:

- A. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 47-91,
Courtyard, fountain, landscaping
Owner/Applicant: Mr. Franklin Frank
Address: 365 South County Road
Architect: Smith Architectural Group
Project Description: Request approval of courtyard layout,
fountain details, and landscaping

(Please note that the courtyard layout and fountain details were approved last month. Review of the landscaping plan will take place today.)

Mr. Frank stated that there has been a request by the architect for deferral to February...

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS FOR DEFERRAL TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. THOMAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- B. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 1-92,
Identification Signage
Applicant: Thomas Morrissey Salon
Owner: Via Mizner Associates Limited Partnership by
Via Mizner of Worth Avenue, Inc.
Address: 36/38 Via Mizner
Project Description: Request approval of identification signage consisting of one 12" x 33" sign installed on the stairwell (white lettering on a dark green sign to match existing Via directory signs; white door lettering on one of the upstairs doors; the name and "Service Entrance" on the downstairs service entrance in white letters; and one additional sign located beneath the second floor railing on the wall.

(Please note that this application received conceptual approval in December, pending legal advertisement for this meeting.)

As no objections from the public have been heard or received regarding this project, and as conceptual approval was granted last month...

MOTION BY MRS. MACKINTOSH TO APPROVE COA #1-92.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SILVERMAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- C. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 2-92,
Identification Signage
Applicant: Rudi's c/o Robert Sanders
Owner: Via Mizner Associates Limited Partnership by
Via Mizner of Worth Avenue, Inc.
Address: 337 Worth Avenue

Project Description: Request approval of three 4" signs, each with the word "Rudi's" in gold, one on the front door and one on the back door, and the third on the Worth Avenue window in the lower left corner.

(Please note that this application received approval in December, pending legal advertisement for this meeting.)

As no objections from the public have been heard or received regarding this project, and as conceptual approval was granted last month...

MOTION BY MRS. MACKINTOSH TO APPROVE COA #2-92.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SILVERMAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

D. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 3-92, Identification Signage

Applicant: Naturalis c/o Gareth Whitehead

Address: 256 Worth Avenue

Project Description: Request approval of identification signage consisting of two signs to rest on the sills of the arched openings, one in the east window and one in the Worth Avenue window. The signs will be made of plaster simulating carved stone, size: 31" high, 69.5" wide, 3.5" deep

(Please note that this application received conceptual approval in December, pending legal advertisement for this meeting.)

As no objections from the public have been heard or received regarding this project, and as conceptual approval was granted last month...

MOTION BY MR. SILVERMAN TO APPROVE COA #3-92.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. DIVOLL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

E. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 4-92, Identification Signage

Applicant: Countess Alexander

Owner: Via Mizner Associates Limited Partnership by
Via Mizner of Worth Avenue, Inc.

Address: 335 Worth Avenue

Project Description: Request approval of identification signage consisting of two signs on the window in gold lettering reading "Countess Alexander".

Mr. Ronald Alexander, representing his parents, addressed the Commission in pursuit of approval for the "Countess

Alexander" signage, as it exists. The name appears in gold lettering, however, a crown appears above the name. Mr. Frank stated that he had conferred with Mr. Zimmerman, Assistant Building Official, regarding the crown. They determined that the crown constitutes a logo, and as such, is not permissible. Additionally, this signage was erected without benefit of a building permit or LPC approval. Mr. Alexander stated that signage employing a crown has appeared on Worth Avenue for the past ten years, and his parents were unaware that it required LPC approval. Mr. Moore suggested that the applicant may want to consider using the signage without the crown, and seek a variance for the crown from the Town Council. The Commission acknowledged that although they may have no objection to this particular crown, their "hands were tied" by the Town's Sign Ordinance.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO APPROVE THE SIGNAGE WITHOUT THE CROWN LOGO, AS REQUIRED BY CODE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. THOMAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

F. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 5-92, Facade change, and Signage

Applicant/Owner: Via Mizner Associates Limited Partnership
by Via Mizner of Worth Avenue, Inc.

Address: 333-345 Worth Avenue

Project Description: (1) Request approval of facade renovation of easternmost portion of Worth Avenue facade of Via Mizner to include new columns, medallions and terra cotta balconies. All modifications will conform to the existing appearance. (2) Request approval of acceptable standard for Via Mizner identification signage in dark green and white (3) Request approval to reduce the size of the lettering on the existing directory signage to facilitate listing of all tenants.

Mr. Kirk Henckels with Via Mizner Ltd. Partnership presented this request as follows:

Facade Modifications: He presented photos of this easternmost portion of Via Mizner as it exists. This section of the building is not original with its white facade, and blue awning and solid railing at the second floor level. The request is to remove the awning, extend the trellis work matching the existing trellis to the west, continue the unusual barrel tile railings, add cast stone columns, add cast stone medallions to the facade, and paint treat the concrete to look like stone. All this is done in an effort to architecturally coordinate the detailing of this east building with the detailing of the western buildings.

Mrs. Divoll suggested that the applicant consider using

different details on this east building, so it is apparent that this is a separate building. Using the same detailing, in her opinion, would break down the distinction of one building to another. She suggested that perhaps they might use different medallions and a different barrel tile pattern for the railings on the east building. Mr. Henckels agreed, in concept, with Mrs. Divoll's comments, but was reluctant to alter the proposed design.

Mr. Henckels, in compliance with the Commission's desire to be made aware of a comprehensive plan showing all contemplated changes for a structure, mentioned other facade changes which are proposed for discussion at the next meeting. These include the addition of small round medallions on the Worth Avenue facades of the western buildings, and using the two flagpole stanchions for new Via Mizner flags, which have not yet been designed. Mr. Moore informed Mr. Henckels that he would "run into a problem" with the flag. Further, Mrs. Volk commented that placing medallions on the west facade is like "gilding a lily".

With reference to today's request, however,

MOTION BY MR. GUBELMANN TO APPROVE THE FACADE CHANGES FOR THE EAST BUILDING AS PRESENTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SILVERMAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Standard Identification Sign: Mr. Henckels presented a sample sign showing the colors requested for the standard identification signage for tenants in Via Mizner. The signage will be either dark green (British green) with white lettering or white with dark green lettering. (It is noted that sign size and letter style was not discussed at this meeting, and same will be re-visited at the February meeting.)

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO APPROVE THE SIGNAGE AS REQUESTED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. THOMAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Reduction of size of lettering on existing directory signage: This is being requested to attempt to alleviate the ongoing problem of patrons being unable to locate businesses in the Via. They plan to rearrange the directory signage categorizing the tenants geographically, and to reduce the size of the lettering on the signage so that all tenants can be listed on the directory.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS TO APPROVE SMALLER LETTERING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. DIVOLL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

There was then a discussion regarding the sliding glass doors on the second floor level of the east building (discussed earlier). They are in four sections each and are in white aluminum. After the facade renovation is done, these doors may or may not become more visible. Mr. Henckels reminded the Commission that bougainvillea will grow over the trellis work on the second floor, making the doors less noticeable. Budgetary concerns of the applicant prevent the doors from being changed at this time. If the doors become an eyesore, Mr. Henckels pledged they would take action toward replacement of same.

V. Designation Hearings

(Please note that the following is a transcript of these hearings which is partially verbatim and partially paraphrase. Those portions which are verbatim are identified by the speaker's name.)

ITEM 1: 850 SOUTH OCEAN BOULEVARD

OWNER: Mr. Lawrence A. Moens

(Please note that this item has been deferred from the March 15, 1991 meeting, the November 15, 1991 meeting, and the December 20, 1991 meeting.)

Mrs. Volk verified with Mr. Frank that we had proof of publication and proper legal service. Mr. Moore, Mr. Frank, and Mr. James Sved, Staff Consultant, stood to be sworn in by Mrs. Delp.

FRANK: Thank you, Madame Chairman. The subject property located at 850 South Ocean Boulevard meets the following criteria for designation in the opinion of Staff:

(a) It exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, economic, or social history of the nation, state, county, or town.

also meeting criterion (c) It 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.

I'd like Mr. Sved to continue the presentation please.

SVED: Thank you, very much. 850 South Ocean Boulevard was designed circa 1927 in the Mediterranean Revival style, and it was designed by architect Julius Jacobs. Julius Jacobs did not do a lot of houses in Palm Beach, however, all of the houses that he did do are excellent designs and they are all in excellent condition. You might note in both of these slides which are virtually the same that the building behind 850 South Ocean Boulevard, 860, is one that you landmarked last year, and they do have very similar distinguishing features. They are

very distinct buildings, and they are both very beautiful buildings. Virtually, the only changes made to 850 South Ocean Boulevard, and the only notable changes were done in 1955. At that time, a number of out buildings and areas behind the house were changed, and remodeled and moved around, and a couple of out buildings were added at that time, as well. Basically, except for periodic maintenance and upkeep...small things that have been changed throughout the years, basically, this house is unchanged from its 1927 appearance. It is a very worthy design for your consideration today, as it is a notable and distinguished house designed by Julius Jacobs.

MOTION BY MR. GUBELMANN TO MAKE THE DESIGNATION REPORT A PART OF THE RECORD.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

GUBELMANN: Mr. Sved, I have one question. You say that it hasn't been changed. Have there been changes made to it to allow it to be centrally air conditioned?

SVED: There have been numerous upgrades and improvements to this building throughout time, as every other building in Palm Beach, but visually, especially from the road, the exterior appearance of this building hasn't been changed very much at all.

GUBELMANN: It looks excellent.

ATTORNEY A. PAUL PROSPERI: Good morning. I'm Paul Prosperi, and I'm representing the property owner, Mr. Lawrence Moens, who is objecting to the designation of this property. 850 South County Road, Mr. Moens acquired several months ago. (The Commission complained they could not hear Mr. Prosperi.) I'm so seldom described as being soft spoken, I'm taken back. My name is Paul Prosperi and I represent the property owner, Lawrence Moens, who acquired this property about four months ago. 850 South County Road...Mr. Moens is objecting to the designation of this property for the reasons that in the first place, we do not believe that it meets the criteria set forth in the Ordinance for designation. I would like to, if I might, just call your attention to certain points in the Designation Report dated March 15, 1991. By the way, the deferrals in this, came largely from Staff. The previous owner had died. The property went into an estate, and Mr. Moens didn't acquire this property until October.

GUBELMANN: When Mr. Moens acquired the property, he was aware of the fact that it was under consideration for landmark designation, was he not?

PROSPERI: Actually, I don't believe he was because...I think prior to this, he became aware of sometime before the closing, after he entered into contract. Julius Jacobs, apparently, designed this building and the building to the south of it, which is the more remarkable of the two buildings. The building was built in 1927 by and for someone called John Segar, who I cannot think is a historical figure,

① nation...national historical figure or a Town historical figure. In 1955, there were extensive changes to the property which aren't seen in this particular photograph, but there are a large series of flat roofed 1950's buildings, including garage buildings, a pool house, servants' areas, and guest house which are flat roofed and gravel roofed. They have windows with jalousies. There is a pool which is not at all Spanish or Mediterranean Revival in style. It's a turquoise tiled pool with flat decking. In the property, it is not particularly in good condition, at that. The property appears in the book, Palm Beach Houses. Other than this front elevation, the only characteristic of the property which is reproduced in the book is the dining room ceiling, which I understand fell in on Mr. Moens the second night he owned the house. I am happy to report that he actually found a gentlemen who, fifty five years ago, worked in the company in Brooklyn, New York, who fabricated the ceiling. He was actually going to have it re-fabricated. That's an interior fixture, but...the house is in deceptively bad condition. There are changes in the windows. They are aluminum 1950's awning windows. The decorative tile, which you see, that surrounds the third floor tower, has been eaten away, and there are glazings gone, and there are large cracks and holes in the tiles. There is no central air conditioning in the house. There are window units or wall units through the house. The window and door jambs that have not been replaced are being eaten away. The stone columns in the front, the two of them in the entrance portico that you can see, are severely chipped away, and will likely have to be, and cracked, the metal reinforcing rods inside them are oxidized, and will likely have to be replaced. So, we would contest that the building is in good or original condition, particularly in the rear area and the out buildings in the back, including the guest house, the pool house, and the pool. In addition, the element starting on Page 9 of the Designation Report, which describes how the building differentiates itself "through its decorative tile work, unusually shaped tower with false Roman arch windows, and curvilinear east elevation roof line." Really, the curvilinear east roof line, I must say, seems to be referring to the building to the south, the larger building, designed by the same architect. And the one distinctive feature, which is the tile around the third floor windows is now so deteriorated that it's likely to have to be replaced. It's really just a blue and beige tile done in a checkerboard pattern around the window and under the surround. Again, we don't believe that the property meets either of the criteria for designation. We would point out that there were substantial modifications to the rear of the property which date from 1955, which is a rather simple plane, typical of 1955, and not at all in continuum with the rest of the house. I must say that, speaking for the property owner, the concern that he has is that he is someone of not unlimited means who has bought this house because he obviously fell in love with the house, and now has to marshal his assets in terms of modernizing and ...

(TAPE CHANGE)

① ...I was in the house yesterday, and it wasn't a particularly pleasant experience, unless you sat on a space heater. It's very cold in the house, and drafty around the windows because of termite damage to the sills, and a problem faced by a property owner is that dealing with a

house like this, one reaches several unexpected expenses, like the dining room ceiling, which is probably the most major feature of the house, at least in the judgement of the editors of Palm Beach Life. Mr. Moens is trying now to restore this portion, and did find the man who actually worked for the original fabricator. The exterior of the house is really quite simple, quite deteriorated, and changed in many ways. I think he's approaching the house with some sensitivity and care, but he's really a little leery at the moment proceeding with a voluntary designation, particularly because there's so much work, especially concerning the out buildings and the rear of the house, that he's not really ready to commit to a renovation/restoration plan.

GUBELMANN: We've been making some comments about this at the table. Maybe we ought to think about revising our landmark designation to include the original part of the house only, and not the later building, and possibly we might want to do a facade only, so he doesn't have to keep coming to us every time he wants to re-do a ceiling inside or something.

VOLK: Well, we don't have any jurisdiction over the inside of the building whatsoever, so you save on that score.

GINGRAS: Also, Jane, if he wants to, for example, just replace the tile, say the decorative tile is deteriorating and he wants to replace it with same, he doesn't have to come before us, does he?

VOLK: No.

GINGRAS: So, as long as he's not planning any changes, if what he wants to do is restore it, he doesn't have to keep coming back to us.

PROSPERI: May I make an additional comment? One thing, in discussing with Mr. Moens, it's a chastening experience when one buys into the notion of landmark. It's a chastening experience to read, as a property owner, or to try to read through a property owner's mind, the Landmark statute or Ordinance, having in mind, let's say, an experience for this fellow now is like replacing a dining room ceiling, which is costing him many thousands of dollars to try to restore this ceiling, which apparently there is (indiscernible) mixed into some plaster amalgam, which is what the ceiling is made out of. When you talk about the tile...the tile appears in just like four by four squares, sort of a sienna beige and navy blue checkerboard tile...but when you look at it clearly, it would be a very expensive tile to replace that tile exactly. The whole process of replacing it becomes rather expensive because now it's leaking where the glaze is gone, and creating water damage inside the house. The problem is that in your Ordinance, the use of the word "and/or"...you must meet the requirement that in the judgement of the Landmarks Coordinator and a designated member of the Commission, that it's a similar change and not a significant change and it cannot cost more than \$ 2,000.00. Alas, I fear that there's nothing that doesn't cost more than \$ 2,000.00. So really, the way the Ordinance is worded, technically, virtually nothing would escape coming before you and then having to go through the hearing process.

SILVERMAN: How long do you think the restoration will take place?

PROSPERI: When do I think...well, they're working on it now, but his problem is that he would like to do it almost like in phases. It's really a budgetary problem. He wants to do certain things, and then go back and do the more expensive things as he is able to do them. But some of the work that really needs to be done is work that one can't start without finishing to this level again, but maybe the work needs to be done in order to prevent augmenting water damage. For instance, with the tile, with the tile cracking and the glazing gone, water penetrates into that tower and then shows up in different places in the house, as it and travels down the walls and creates problems. It is an immediate maintenance problem, which has a certain dollar cost associated to it, but that might require temporary patching.

VOLK: Well, how is that going to upset the works if he has to come to us to guide him? He'd have to go to the ARCOM Commission if it weren't a landmark, and it was over \$ 2,000.00. I just don't understand the difference in your thinking.

PROSPERI: In the ARCOM Ordinance, it is much less comprehensive in what it covers, only the facade that is visible from the street, whereas the Landmarks Ordinance covers any exterior surface. So, that's where the problem is.

THOMAS: I would like to say that I bought 5 Middle Road five years ago. I was not before this Commission. And I restored it over a period of three years, and I don't think I spent ten cents more than if I had been before the Commission, and all I did was bring it back to the state I thought Marion Wyeth would have liked if he were around right now, and I think your fear is unwarranted, because having been through it beforehand, and having sat here now for several years, I don't think anything would have changed.

PROSPERI: I understand that. I do understand that. We've talked about that. I had talked about that with Mr. Moens, but there's a certain leeriness that comes based upon reading the cold words of that Ordinance in someone who's sitting there just having had sort of a bad experience so far with the house, and he's leery of what he sees as making a commitment to restore this house to a certain standard, which frankly, it hasn't been maintained to. He has a lot of deferred maintenance that he needs to catch up on.

THOMAS: I'm empathetic and sympathetic.

MACKINTOSH: Buying a house like that and falling in love with it, as he did, he should have pride in all the work. I can't believe he wouldn't want to do it. It might have to be slowly, but you don't have to be extravagant to repair a house if you do it carefully and use the proper materials. I don't understand what you're trying to say to us.

VOLK: The house was built of tile, wasn't it?

PROSPERI: It's hollow tile, with parts of frame stucco.

① VOLK: Which is really the finest kind of building, which had to be discontinued in 1963 because it was no longer possible to afford. So, all the tile people closed down. But that house was built to stay. What is wrong with it are some superficial things, and of course, in an old building, I know well, some serious things too, and expensive, but that is according to our criteria, that it exemplifies the social history of our Town and the kind of building is no longer being done. It is a part of history. I think you should think about these houses you have to not just see them, but you have to think about them on the street, and in the city, and what they mean there, as well. That, to me, is a part of South Ocean Boulevard that it would look strange without.

DIVOLL: If we can address the new construction, we'll call it new construction, say from roughly the 50's, we have another set of issues here. Perhaps, things have been done to this property, which we might not have permitted had it been a landmark. This owner...we have no idea what he wants to do with those newer portions of the work, and also, the record doesn't reflect what they are. We don't have photographs or any site plan that shows where those additions might be, how big they are, what the changes are, and as a result, I'm reluctant to say they should be in or they should be out of any landmark consideration. I think we need some more information, physical information about this property to exclude, possibly exclude some portions of it from landmark consideration.

① MACKINTOSH: We need a more detailed report.

FRANK: I think that we can ask Mr. Sved for another level of detail. If I remember, I listened to his report, he did refer to these structures, and he did note that they were there, and I think he even noted the time period.

DIVOLL: That's quite right.

GINGRAS: But it doesn't appear on the site plan.

PROSPERI: If I might say this, I'm sure the property owner would be happy to cooperate with Mr. Sved and come back next month with photographs of the 1955 structures, and maybe some details, and you might be able to allay his fears. Certainly, I would draw the distinction...Mr. Moens is very respectful of the house, and obviously likes the house quite a lot, and he has purchased the house with a commitment (indiscernible) in excess of what he would otherwise do, and that creates, in part, the leeriness, considering now what he's facing, in terms of expense and the kind of work he is doing. So, perhaps, we could compromise that way.

VOLK: Chat with him, and tell Mr. Moens that we might be able to work something out.

① SILVERMAN: Can you do it by the next meeting?

PROSPERI: Yes. We would be happy to do that.

VOLK: That would be fine. Can we have a motion to defer this?

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS THAT LANDMARKING CONSIDERATION OF 850 SOUTH OCEAN BOULEVARD BE DEFERRED TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING, WITH THE PROVISIO THAT THE OWNER RECOGNIZES HE IS WAIVING HIS RIGHT BY ORDINANCE REQUIRING THE COMMISSION TO ACT WITHIN 30 DAYS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. THOMAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

(Please note that Mr. Gubelmann left the meeting at this point, 9:58 a.m.)

ITEM 2: 115 FLAGLER DRIVE

OWNER: Mrs. Joseph Lauder

(Please note that this item has been deferred from the April 19, 1991 meeting, and the November 15, 1991 meeting.)

(See Item 3 below)

ITEM 3: 126 SOUTH OCEAN BOULEVARD

OWNER: Estate of Mr. J.H. Lauder & Mrs. Estee J. Lauder

(Please note that this item has been deferred from the April 19, 1991 meeting, and the November 15, 1991 meeting.)

Mr. Frank addressed the Commission regarding Items 2 & 3, as listed above. There is a letter on file requesting deferral of Item 2 to February, and deferral of Item 3 to November of this year. In the interim, they will have Mr. Ames Bennett, Architect, prepare another report regarding the structures. Staff agrees that they be allowed the additional time to research the properties, and submit their report.

Regarding 115 Flagler Drive, Staff had earlier been informed by an attorney that the condition of the structure was very deteriorated, and thus, not worthy of landmarking. Staff, upon gaining access to the structure, has inspected the structure, both interiorly and exteriorly. Staff has found that although some deterioration exists, the house is yet sound. Thus, Staff does not concur with attorney's assessment of the property. Staff has, however, been in contact with Mr. Bennett. They have asked that, subject to his investigation of the property, he might identify any problems which might cause Staff to change their point of view. Mr. Bennett has agreed to do this within the next month.

MOTION BY MR. SILVERMAN THAT LANDMARKING CONSIDERATION OF 115 FLAGLER DRIVE BE DEFERRED TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING, WITH THE PROVISIO THAT THE OWNER RECOGNIZES SHE IS WAIVING HER RIGHT BY ORDINANCE REQUIRING THE COMMISSION TO ACT WITHIN 30 DAYS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Attorney Greg Kino, representing Mrs. Lauder, acknowledged that Mr. Bennett will commence with his study of the properties, and that Mrs. Lauder does, in fact, waive her right, as above. Regarding 126 South Ocean Boulevard, the Commission asked Mr. Kino why a deferral to November was necessary. He responded that they would like to deal with one property at a time in light of the additional research which must be done, and the random availability of the property owner. Mr. Frank did comment that the letter requesting deferral clearly indicates that the owner has a definitive plan of action, and Staff concurs with the deferral request.

MOTION BY MR. THOMAS THAT LANDMARKING CONSIDERATION OF 126 SOUTH OCEAN BOULEVARD BE DEFERRED TO THE NOVEMBER MEETING, WITH THE PROVISIO THAT THE OWNER RECOGNIZES SHE IS WAIVING HER RIGHT BY ORDINANCE REQUIRING THE COMMISSION TO ACT WITHIN 30 DAYS.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SILVERMAN.

ROLL CALL VOTE AS FOLLOWS: MR. THOMAS: YES
MR. SILVERMAN: YES
MRS. MACKINTOSH: NO
MRS. GINGRAS: YES
MRS. DIVOLL: YES
MRS. VOLK: YES

MOTION CARRIED 5-1, WITH MRS. MACKINTOSH CASTING THE NEGATIVE VOTE.

ITEM 4: 120 EL BRILLO WAY

OWNER: Mr. John D. Jr. and Mrs. Chandler Mashek

FRANK: Thank you, Madame Chairman. The subject property at 120 El Brillo Way, under "Criteria for Designation" in the report, in the opinion of Staff, it meets the following criteria...

(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.

Staff also believes it meets criterion (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, it is Marion Sims Wyeth. The biography is attached. Would you continue with the presentation, Mr. Sved?

SVED: Thank you. As Mr. Frank stated, this was designed by Marion Sims Wyeth. Virtually, all the block here on El Brillo Way is designed by Marion Sims Wyeth. This one, in particular, was designed in 1928. It is a very large house on a very small street. As such, it's very difficult to get a good photograph of it. What it does lend to the street facade though is a rather unassuming front, and the

building seems to go on endlessly behind it. The building is in excellent condition. It's got some very beautiful cast stone ornamentation and some very beautiful ironwork. As you can see at the slide at right, the most distinguishing feature of this Mediterranean Revival house is the aedicular entrance which has somewhat of a Mephistophelean character who looks down and, I guess, keeps the bad people out of the house. This is very typical of a Marion Sims Wyeth Mediterranean Revival home. What sets it apart from the other Mediterranean Revival houses that Mr. Wyeth did in Town and on this block, is its cast stone ornamentation, and it is very worthy of your consideration today.

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

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GINGRAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VOLK: I'd like to say at this point, at this time, that Mr. Mashek and Mrs. Mashek have volunteered the designation of this house excepting the pool and pool pavilion which was done at a much later date, and they felt was not up to the rest of the house. It should be changed at a later time.

MOTION BY MR. THOMAS THAT 120 EL BRILLO WAY BE RECOMMENDED TO TOWN COUNCIL FOR DESIGNATION AS A LANDMARK OF THE TOWN OF PALM BEACH, EXCEPTING THE POOL AND THE POOL PAVILION, AND THAT THE CRITERIA, AS PRESENTED, BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD.

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. DIVOLL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ITEM 5: 241 EL VEDADO ROAD
OWNER: Mr. Steven M. Varsano

FRANK: Thank you, Madame Chairman. The subject property located at 241 El Vedado Road...in Staff's opinion, it meets the following criteria for designation:

(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,

Staff further believes that it meets criterion (d) Is representative of the notable works of one or more master builders, designers or architects whose individual ability has been recognized or who influenced his age.

Also, I'd like to comment that I talked with the owner whose listed address is London, England, and I talked to him on the phone yesterday, and he returned the call from somewhere in Germany. Apparently, he travels a lot. However, he has submitted a letter for

the record, and he asked that I read it into the record. So, I think I should do that for him at this point, and then, I'll further comment on some of the things that he said in the discussion. The letter is dated December 18th to Timothy M. Frank, AICP, and the subject is the hearing for landmark designation for 241 El Vedado Road...

"Dear Mr. Frank, We are in receipt of your letter dated December 13 notifying us of the public hearing to be held on January 17 to consider the above property as a landmark. It is impossible to be present on this date for this hearing. However, we absolutely want to make our position known that we do not have any desire to see this property designated as a landmark. The property has been for sale for over two years. The present economy notwithstanding, the most significant negative response received by prospective purchasers is the fact that the front door is located on the side of the house, versus on the street side, which takes away from the grandness and practicality of a normal home. The designated report included in your package states the criteria for designation. We believe this criteria, as specified in the letter, could be applied in general terms to almost any home in the world. It states that: *The building is not a purely neoclassical structure. This should not make it more special than something which is. *There are central chimneys. Please show me a house that has a chimney which is not central. *The home is "built into human scale". What does this exactly mean? *The structure is a departure from the usual array of architectural styles of Mr. Volk's works. This may prove versatility in his design, but it certainly does not mean that it is correct and accepted by the people who live in those homes or drive by and look at them. It could have been an unsuccessful test model. As a person who has done both, I do not believe the architectural symmetry with the front door on the side of the house is a positive or aesthetically pleasing feature. Any guest I ever had in this home, while I lived in it, would always comment on how unusual and how inconvenient this design is. Basically, it is a polite way of people showing their displeasure for this design. The designation finally notes that this structure shows "unusual foresight", as several design elements of this design would be comfortable in today's Post Modern Architectural Environment". If, in fact, you are looking to landmark properties of pure architectural styles or notable works of local architects, I don't believe eclectic designed homes fit into this category. Henceforth, I would like the decision to consider the above described property as a landmark to be negative in order that the future owner of the house can do as they deem fit. I am not completely understanding of my rights under section 16-43 (i) of the Town of Palm Beach Code of Ordinances and would appreciate further explanation of same. Please send all correspondence to the Mountleigh office address as outlined on this letterhead. Sincerely, Steven M. Varsano"

In my discussions with him, he did point out that the property is now in corporate ownership, and he is an officer of that corporation. He said that it is for sale, and he feels that landmarking would make it difficult for him to sell the home. I explained to him his rights under the section in the Ordinance. He does not chose or wish this matter to be deferred. He would like it to be heard today, and will reserve his rights for when the Town Council hears this as to whether he would like to object further. But he felt that by reading the letter, he would make his objections known, and ask that you do rule on it today. I guess I should ask at this point for Mr. Sved to continue the presentation further.

SVED: This building was built and designed, as Mr. Frank stated, by John Volk in 1936, and as it does state in the report, this building does show a lot of historical reference. I mean you can obviously see the little portico and the proportion and what's described in here as "proportioned to the human scale". It is intended to explain the fact that this house is not overbearing. This house does not have 35' grand entranceways. It is built to the proportion of the human body which is a Renaissance idea. This building is also very forward thinking, forward looking...as the report dictates, there are a lot of elements of this house that may have seemed outlandish or a little bit roguish or renegadish back in 1936. However, they are all ideas and designs and architectural discoveries that have become part of the mainstream since that time. Another very interesting and nice feature of this house is the symmetrical design, and you can see at the slide at left that it is perfectly symmetrical and it does not lend itself to any additions and actually, there have been no additions to this house...as Mediterranean Revival houses we usually see have these

large rambling additions tacked on to them periodically. This house is very pure in its form and pure in its design and pure in its historical reference. It is very worthy of consideration as a differentiation from the normal kind of architecture that we've seen Mr. Volk design, especially from this period.

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

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. THOMAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VOLK: Were there any comments from the Commissioners? First of all, I'd like to say that for obvious reasons, I can't make any comment, except architecturally speaking, the houses with so-called entrances on the side are very, very frequent in Palm Beach, and it's very charming. Obviously, driving up to the front door is not always the best solution. I think anyone who has lived here knows that that's not a valid criticism. From then on, I'll say nothing, but ask for comments.

THOMAS: I would like to say that since he has put himself on the line in the letter, we really have very little room to move, and we either act or don't act, and it would be my suggestion that we act, and then let him seek his redress at another board or commission...before the Council, excuse me.

Mr. Moore confirmed that it is the prerogative of the Commission as to whether they wish to take action on this matter or not, however, the owner has made it clear that he will not accept any delays in this matter on the LPC level. Mr. Frank noted that when he spoke to the owner by phone, he did explain the portion of the Ordinance which the owner did not understand.

MOTION BY MR. THOMAS THAT 241 EL VEDADO ROAD 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 MRS. DIVOLL.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ITEM 6: 294 HIBISCUS AVENUE
OWNER: Ms. Carol Hall

VOLK: What is the Staff recommendation?

FRANK: Thank you, Madame Chairman. The subject property, 294 Hibiscus Avenue...Staff has found that this commercial structure meets the following criteria for designation:

(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.

Also meeting criterion (d) is representative of the notable works of one or more master builders, designers or architects whose individual ability has been recognized or who influenced their age.

In this case, the architect is Maurice Fatio, and the biography has been attached. Mr. Sved, could you continue with the presentation please?

SVED: Thank you. 294 Hibiscus Avenue was designed in 1929 for Wiley Reynolds by the architectural firm of Treanor and Fatio. The diminutive size of this building in no way detracts from its architectural history or from its worthiness in front of you today. It is a simply beautiful and beautifully designed well proportioned building. As you can see, it's a Mediterranean Revival building with a three bay construction on the front facade. I might add that the architectural element on the front of the building are carved out of coquina, a beautiful material. There is a very nice balance of symmetry to this facade as well. It has what I believe is its original barrel clay tile roof still attached to it. This is one storefront downstairs and three small apartments upstairs. In between the two, and you can almost make out the spacial differentiation, except that that large tree got in the way...in between the front two apartments and the rear apartments, there is a large courtyard which is accessed only by the first floor. It's very nicely designed and very well executed. This house is in excellent condition. I know that some of the windows have been changed, and that there have been some minor modifications to this house, however, I find that this house is very true to its original design and is one of the finest architectural components ever put forth by the architectural firm of Treanor and Fatio.

SILVERMAN: Is the store occupied?

GINGRAS: Yes.

SILVERMAN: By what...what kind of a business?

SVED: An interior designer.

MOTION BY MRS. GINGRAS THAT THE DESIGNATION REPORT BECOME PART OF THE RECORD.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. THOMAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VOLK: Mr. Prosperi, here you are again.

PROSPERI: I'm back. I'm Paul Prosperi representing the property owner Howard Talkis and Carol Hall, who are objecting to this designation. I have here Mr. Fatio's original drawing for the

structure, which I'd like to pass to you. It shows you...(indiscernible). There originally was, as you can see right here on this drawing, an archway...it was nicely ornamented, which came over the stair, which is gone. There's been added this awning over here. This drive was originally cut coquina, and apparently, the property also included this land here which is now the Crippled Childrens' parking lot. The windows have been changed. The detail of the over window, the arched over window has been changed. The photographs here would show some of the modernization which has taken place. The structure apparently was originally built for mixed use, has three quite small efficiency apartments on the second floor "one rooms". And it was organized as an office, with two rooms and a little service corridor connecting. It is currently used by an interior design firm as an office storefront. A problem is that this Crippled Children Society building butts up on the right to it, and there's a ... beyond this hedge is a parking lot. Across the street is...well, actually Christopher Reynolds security..I think it's either Paine Webber or something now, at least three level, stories, a three level block building. (Referring back to 294 Hibiscus)-It's a rather small structure which is quite simple. Really, its only indigenous architectural elements are the cornices, and these two columns here, which remain of the coquina, which I think if you see the detailed photographs, are in deteriorated condition. And although it may be a charming building, certainly there are a number of Fatio houses and structures which have already been landmarked which are representative of his work. This one is quite small, perhaps 1,000 square feet or 1,200 square feet on the first floor and literally, three rooms on the second floor, which I think you will see that the deletion of the archway lost really the obvious characteristic of what was intended for an elevation by the architect. We object to the designation and point out that there is a quite significant change in the front elevation. I mean for as long as I remember this building, which is sixteen or seventeen years, it hasn't been there. And the changing environment of the building because of these rather overbearing buildings built on Royal Palm Way. This building does not merit landmarking.

THOMAS: I'd like to ask you if this were totally demolished, what could you put in its place on the present lot.

PROSPERI: Virtually nothing.

THOMAS: So what is the problem?

PROSPERI: I don't quite understand.

THOMAS: Unless you aggregated with the adjacent property, you couldn't do anything with it anyway.

PROSPERI: That's true, but I don't know that that is a criteria for landmarking.

THOMAS: On the other side of the fence though, what can you do with it?

PROSPERI: I may be obtuse, but I understand that the size of the property...one of the difficulties with the property, certainly, is that it was on a larger parcel and was sold off. And then the difficulty with the property in terms of its use because it is surrounded by a parking lot on two sides and a rather tall building that obscures light and air on the second side. So, I agree with all that. I would say, in terms of the criteria for landmarking, that the elevation of the building, because of the deletion of the arch and the removal of some of the architectural characteristics and components intended by the architect, although it may be a charming little building, it isn't really representative of the architect's work, as he intended it to be, in accordance with the other criteria for designation. I do think that you're right on the other point. The building is under zoning where there is no other use under the existing code. You couldn't replace much there.

GINGRAS: Paul, we're trying to find out what the owner's real objection is. Very often in these cases, as you know, people anticipate tearing a building down. If that's not the case here, what is the objection for our own clarification?

PROSPERI: (Indiscernible) This is a building which was obviously intended to fit into a different fabric of buildings and uses on this side street. It's a commercial building on a 25' lot or a 40' lot that has no parking associated with it, where a large part of the original parcel has been sold off. It is cheeked by a rather unattractive side of a taller building that cuts off light and use. You have three very small, I would say in the neighborhood of say 150 square feet efficiency units, literally bedrooms with some (indiscernible) and first floor space, which has very limited use because it hasn't had very much visibility to any commercial street. It's not suitable for office use because of its configuration, and lacking of parking, which is a negative for any kind of commercial use. So, I think that the property owner would say that time has not been kind to this property in terms of its utility, and that maybe the landmarking of it would be one more burden, which is maybe not justified, given the criteria in that statute or your Ordinance. Once again, there are a lot of nooks and crannies on the inside and the courtyard of this building, perhaps could be ...

(TAPE CHANGE)

PROSPERI: (Continued) This is not contemplated, but let me give you an example. There is...the building is in essence, C shaped, a squared off C, with the courtyard in the center. That courtyard has, its interior has some architectural ornaments, but it doesn't fit, because you see it's inside, it's sort of like between a showroom and a storeroom, and the way the building is organized, it doesn't really the or create an architectural amenity or an element with an emphasis on the first floor. That is something that would...regulation of the use of that courtyard is something that would fall within the Landmarks Ordinance, but yet not fall within the Architectural Commission.

VOLK: May I hear some comments from the Commission?

MACKINTOSH: May I say that the fact that it doesn't fit is quite wrong. I think the buildings around it don't fit.

PROSPERI: Perhaps you could arrange to have the other ones torn down.

MACKINTOSH: But I think it represents what Palm Beach was. It proves something. You go to Europe or anyplace, any city in America, and you find something like that. It represents something that we used to have. To me, this is very important. It stands out against the modern.

SILVERMAN: Does Staff recommend that this be landmarked?

FRANK: Yes.

THOMAS: Economically, you have the largest cube on the smallest piece of property you could possibly get. So, you are not economically deprived.

GINGRAS: Would zoning allow an enclosure of that courtyard in any event, whether it was landmarked or not, if that's what you're contemplating?

PROSPERI: No. I mean I was just giving you an example of one of them. I not sure if it is contemplated, and I could just say that would think it would be rather a difficult and familiar job of finding parking that would dry the enclosure of additional space. Again, absent...this is a building which has sort of been impacted by time, and I think the owner would tell you that it is a very difficult building to rent...(Then addressing someone else, Mr. Prosperi asked how long was it took to rent the first floor. The response was three years.) It's just a question of sort of layering on an additional difficulty on this building. I might say that, with respect to commercial buildings, at some point, the Commission might want to consider some incentives that would encourage a commercial owner faced with this kind of problem...lack of parking with the neighborhood sort of moved away from the building. I couldn't agree with Mrs. Mackintosh more about that this building is infinitely preferable to most of the commercial buildings in the neighborhood, but I would again remind you of the criteria in your Ordinance for designation, and suggest that, because, as that drawing will show, the front elevation has been changed considerably, I think, quite remarkably from what was intended. Certain of the architectural components which were intended by the architect have been removed, and with the lack of any other designation criteria which applies to the building, it's not suitable for designation.

MOORE: Madame Chairman, I don't disagree with Mr. Prosperi's points. One issue that keeps surfacing, and we never do answer it. So, I'd like to endeavor to answer, at this point, is what will the zoning permit on this property. The building is in an enclave. It is next to the Crippled Childrens' Society. By Special Exception, if the building were not there, supplemental parking could be applied for through the Town Council for use by the Crippled Childrens' Society building. That is a use that conceivably could be applied for if the

⊙ Crippled Childrens' Society were in need of the additional parking. So, I did want to point out, this is in the C-OPI zoning district. it is and would be a use that the property could be put to if the building were not there.

VOLK: Thank you. Any other comments? I'm not sure what I'm hearing?

MACKINTOSH: Well, I feel it's most important to hang on to that building. It proves how Palm Beach was. It had beauty, had dignity.

VOLK: We have to face the fact of life that there are many people who really have no regard for the historical aspects. I can't see that this would change things at all for the owner, to make him...and I would like to say, and this may be a little too previous, but in a meeting that I was, not a Town meeting, but a preservation meeting, that there is, on the state level, prospects for some changes in the tax assessment to landmarked houses. It may not come soon because of the bad condition of the state, but they are there in some sort of form. Previously, for commercial buildings, there was a tax break until the tax changes in 1986, but I think that there's a big movement in the preservation area to press along with this so that there's some tax relief or some trade off. So, there's always that to look forward to.

⊙ SILVERMAN: BASED ON THE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION, I WOULD THINK WE SHOULD, AT LEAST I WOULD AGREE TO DESIGNATE THIS PROPERTY AS A LANDMARK.

THOMAS: I agree.

VOLK: Is there a second?

THOMAS: SECOND.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The Commission also mentioned to Mr. Prosperi that signage was erected on the building, and a change to the door was made without Commission approval. The door change is only with respect to color, and Mr. Frank felt that change would have been permitted as the building was under ARCOM jurisdiction at that time. The signage, however, does require approval. So, the owner will be notified to request approval of the signage.

VI. Other Business

Town Hall Doors

⊙ Mr. Frank brought up the subject of two Town Hall doors, one on the east side of the building and one on the west side, both of which are solid doors. As there is no window in either door, there was some concern that the doors may present a possible safety problem...swinging out into the path of pedestrians. This had been investigated by Mr. Elwell of the Manager's Office

and the Risk Manager. They determined that the doors do not represent a significant risk. To alleviate the situation, caution signs have been placed on the inside of the doors, warning them to open the doors slowly.

Mary Mahoney Sign Revision

Mr. Frank reported that some of the signage which was approved last month was changed in the field. Last month, the Commission approved either black or white lettering. Instead, they have used, with Mr. Frank's permission, gold leaf lettering trimmed in green. At the main entrance, a sign was to be located above the door. Instead, they would like to place the street address above the door and use two smaller signs showing the store name, one in each of the sidelights of the door. Mr. Frank stated that the two new signs are smaller than the one approved last month, so there is no zoning violation.

MOTION BY MR. THOMAS TO APPROVE THE AMENDED SIGNAGE.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SILVERMAN.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Taubman Awning - 1820 South Ocean Boulevard

Last month, a retractable arm awning was approved as to size, style, and location, pending an alternative color selection. The original request put forth by the applicant was for a red awning. The Commission did not feel that this color was appropriate for a landmarked home. Since that time, Mrs. Taubman has contacted Staff and various Commissioners regarding her intent for this awning, which, unfortunately, was not represented last month by the contractor. She agrees that the chosen red is not appropriate as it first appears. She pledges, however, to fade the awning either by direct sunlight, or bleach, if necessary. The faded color, then, will be similar to the awnings typically found on the Riviera.

MOTION BY MR. SILVERMAN TO APPROVE THE REQUESTED RED, PROVIDED IT BE FADED.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. THOMAS.

MOTION CARRIED 5-1, WITH MRS. MACKINTOSH CASTING THE NEGATIVE VOTE.

Discussion regarding the Carriage House - 790 S. County Road
Last month, a question was raised as to whether the construction which has occurred at 790 South County Road is in keeping with the previous landmark approval of same, particularly with respect to the vista from South County Road to the lake. Mr. Frank stated that Staff has researched this, and has determined that the new construction does abide by the LPC approval given.

① The vista yet remains via three glassed arches, instead of through open doors of the Carriage House. Mr. Frank did comment, however, that there is an additional problem at this site concerning the landscaping. Apparently, a landscaper hired to trim the landscape, instead denuded it. Mr. Frank will inquire as to the intentions of the owner with respect to re-landscaping.

Coke Machine - BP Station

Mr. Silverman commented that there is a Coke Machine at the BP Station, 340 South County Road. The problem with the machine is that it is brightly illuminated at night, and is not in keeping with the landmark district. Staff will research this matter.

News Racks

In the past, the Commission had discussed appropriate designs for news racks, particularly with respect to the Town Hall Square Historic District. Mr. Frank reported that a design has been selected, and the benefactor for the racks has authorized the Town to proceed. Mr. Randolph is presently researching the legalities involved with this issue.

VII. Adjournment

① MOTION BY MR. SILVERMAN TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 11:10 A.M.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. THOMAS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission will be heard on Friday, February 21, 1992 at 9:00 a.m. in the TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, TOWN HALL, 360 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD, PALM BEACH.

Respectfully submitted,



Sally Gingras, Secretary

cmd

294 Hibiscus Avenue

V. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Designed by one of Palm Beach's best architectural firms in 1929, 294 Hibiscus Avenue represents an excellent example of a Treanor and Fatio design for a mixed-use structure of Spanish design. The two story structure retains its original overall appearance, with virtually no modifications from the original plans. Original details, such as the cornice and Composite columns, were carved from true coquina, not cast in the traditional Palm Beach Building tradition.

The structure was built for Wiley R. Reynolds, past president of the First National Bank of Palm Beach, who also built La Solano on South Ocean Boulevard.

294 Hibiscus is an excellent example of a small, mixed use structure for Palm Beach. Nevertheless, this structure is rich in its design, its details, and especially in its proportion. This structure is fully worthy of the distinction it would be afforded as a Landmark of the Town of Palm Beach.

VI. CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

Section 16-38A of the Town of Palm Beach Landmarks 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:

(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"

294 Hibiscus Avenue embodies the distinguishing characteristics of Spanish architecture, as interpreted by the architectural firm of Treanor and Fatio. The structure is a unique example of a mixed use program, executed on a modest scale.

This structure retains its original, carved coquina details. During the Florida Land Boom of the 1920's, most decorative

architectural details were cast in a concrete conglomerate to imitate coquina.

(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."

294 Hibiscus Avenue is an excellent example of the work of the architectural firm of Treanor and Fatio in Palm Beach. Treanor and Fatio's signature is found throughout the island community, in structures built in the 1920's, 1930's and 1940's. With Addison Mizner and Marion Sims Wyeth, Treanor and Fatio helped to established the "Palm Beach Style" in residential and commercial design in the Town.

PLEASE SEE MAURICE FATIO BIOGRAPHY, AS ATTACHED.

120 El Brillo Way

V. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

120 El Brillo Way was designed by one of Palm Beach's most noted architects, Marion Sims Wyeth, during the Town's most prolific residential building period. This structure is an excellent example of a Mediterranean Revival villa on a small, ocean block side street. While Wyeth designed many of the homes in this area, this ocean block residence offers one of the neighborhood's best, most unique, and most well preserved streetfront appearances.

The aedicular main entrance, with its Mephistophelean guardian, engaged Composite columns and entablature, offers both a whimsical and a Renaissance touch to an otherwise well proportioned, well designed residence. Owners of this structure should be commended for upkeeping this residence, and maintaining its character and its appearance. 120 El Brillo Way is worthy of the distinction it would be afforded as a landmark of the Town of Palm Beach.

VI. CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

Section 16-38A of the Town of Palm Beach Landmarks 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:

(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"

120 El Brillo Way is an excellent example of a Mediterranean Revival villa in Palm Beach. The structure is designed to offer an engaging streetfront facade, while preserving its privacy for the south end of the property. The excellent architectural design is complemented by the structure's craftsmanship. A considerable amount of time and construction expertise went into its completion, including the aedicular entryway, roof brackets, and balcony railings.

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."

120 El Brillo Way was designed by architect Marion Sims Wyeth, one of the most revered designers Palm Beach has known. A prolific architect, Wyeth completed innumerable homes and business structures during his career. While this and other structures distinguish Wyeth's talents, he may best be known as the project architect for Joseph Urban's Mar-A-Lago.

PLEASE SEE MARION SIMS WYETH BIOGRAPHY, AS ATTACHED

241 El Vedado Road

VI. CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

Section 16-38A of the Town of Palm Beach Landmarks 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:

(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"

241 El Vedado Way is an excellent example of John Volk's interpretation of Neo Classical architecture for Palm Beach. While not a purely Neo Classical structure, Volk employs many traditional ideals in the tradition of Jefferson, Latrobe, and Ledoux, including the temple form, symmetrical massing, low pitched roofs with parapets, and central chimneys. Similarly, 241 El Vedado Way is a symmetrically massed structure, built in to human scale, a rich Renaissance tradition embraced by the traditional Neo Classical architects.

(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."

241 El Vedado Way is a notable work of local architect John L. Volk. While this type of Neo Classical structure is a departure from Volk's usual array of architectural styles, this structure proves Volk's versatility and knowledge of architecture. This structure also shows unusual foresight, as several design elements of this design would be comfortable in today's Post Modern architectural environment.