

I. DESIGNATION HEARINGS

ITEM 4: 357 Crescent Drive

Owner: Juliette De Marcellus

Please note: The item was continued from the 01/19/22 LPC meeting.

Mr. Silvin asked for confirmation on proof of publication. Ms. Churney provided confirmation.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by several members.

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history for this Neo-Classical Revival style home. Ms. Murphy testified that the building met the following criteria for designation as a landmark: Sec. 54-161 (1) Exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, economic or social history of the nation, state, county or town; and, Sec. 54-161 (3) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or is a specimen inherently valuable of the study of a period, style, method of construction or use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.

Mr. Silvin called for any public comment on the designation.

Juliette De Marcellus, owner, discussed the reasons she objected to the proposed designation. She recommended that her home be designated as a historically significant building rather than a landmark.

Aimee Sunny, Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, agreed that the home did meet the criteria for designation. She encouraged the Commission to designate the home.

Mr. Segraves inquired about the procedure to demolish the home if it were designated historically significant. Ms. Murphy responded.

Mr. Murphy provided a clarification on the historically significant building program and process.

Ms. Fairfax argued that a historically significant building could be held to a tighter standard than a landmark, particularly since the changes to a historically significant building needed to meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Ms. De Marcellus again requested that the Commission not landmark the home as she had no plans to renovate the home. She discussed the fact that the land was worth much more than the actual home.

Ms. Metzger inquired if a historically significant building could eventually become a landmark, to which Mr. Murphy confirmed it could.

Ms. Patterson empathized with the owner. However, she stated that if she removed the personal component of her decision, she thought the home should be landmarked.

Ms. Moran stated that she did not believe the value of the land was a consideration of the Commission; She also thought this home should be a landmarked.

Ms. Albarran thought the decision was difficult. She reviewed her tour of the home and the issues with the home. However, she discussed her love of the home and thought the issues with the home could be fixed.

Mr. Segraves asked which landmarked criteria the home met. Ms. Murphy restated the two criteria in which she believed the home met to become a landmark.

Mr. Silvin stated that while he understood the homeowner's concern, the Commission took an oath to protect the architectural fabric of the Town. He indicated to the owner that she would have an opportunity to speak to the Town Council about this decision.

Ms. De Marcellus discussed the flooding issues with the home and added that she was unsure whether the water had caused any structural damage to the home. She stated her objection to the designation as she did not want her heirs to have to deal with the designation.

Motion made by Ms. Damgard and seconded by Ms. Patterson to 357 Crescent Drive to the Town Council for designation as a Landmark of the Town of Palm Beach based on criteria 1 and 3 in Section 54-161. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.