

## **X. DESIGNATIONS**

### **1. ITEM 1: 205 Jamaica Lane** Owner: William K. Tomita

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history for this Mid-Century Modern style home. Ms. Stillings pointed out the design features of this building. Ms. Stillings 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;

Sec. 54-161 (4) Is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer or architect whose individual ability has been recognized or has influenced his age.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: There were no disclosures at this time.

Ms. Patterson asked for confirmation on proof of publication. Ms. Churney provided confirmation.

**Motion made by Ms. Moran and seconded by Ms. Albarran to make the designation report for 205 Jamaica Lane part of the record. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0**

Ms. Patterson called for any public comment on the designation.

Mr. Tomita, owner of the home, discussed his strong opposition to the designation. He provided several reasons for his opposition, which included the financial implications of owning a landmarked home, his inability to obtain homeowners insurance, the home's low elevation (which is below FEMA elevation), the flat roof and old plumbing. He reviewed all the maintenance review items that he had to address in the past year.

Aimee Sunny, Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, provided a suggestion to the homeowner that could assist him in providing homeowner's insurance. She spoke about the incentive of the tax abatement program. She also stated that the homeowner would have the option of demolition. She thought the home was an excellent example and should be landmarked.

Mr. Tomita discussed the reasons the tax abatement program would not financially help him.

Mr. Herzig-Desnick thought that landmarking a home did have benefits beyond

financial reasons.

Mr. Segraves asked if the home had been modified, such as additions. Ms. Stillings stated that there had been modifications, but she felt the home retained its integrity. Mr. Segraves thought the home would meet the criteria of landmarked status. Since the homeowner could demolish the home, he did not believe the landmarked status would harm the homeowner.

Mr. Wong could see that the windows had been changed on the home. He thought that if the home was landmarked, the next owner could make changes to the home under the benefits of the landmarks program.

Ms. Moran thought that the landmarked status would provide more benefits to the homeowner. She outlined the advantages of the landmarked program. She thought the style was one of the least represented in Town, as well as one of the least represented architects in the history of the Town. She was in full support of landmarking the proposed home.

Ms. Albarran stated she loved the vertical element of the home. She was in favor of landmarking the home, especially to have the architect represented in the Town. She reiterated that the home could be demolished under the new bill.

Mr. Tomita inquired if the new house bill was repealed, how would it affect his home if it was landmarked.

Town Attorney Randolph stated he believed the homes in the queue during the transition, the law would still apply.

Ms. Patterson thought the homeowner made a good choice in selecting his home. She was in favor of the home and agreed with many of the other Commissioners' comments. She stated that she did not believe the landmarked status would be a detriment to the homeowner. She thought the homeowner could be a good example for the neighborhood.

**Motion made by Ms. Damgard and second by Ms. Albarran to recommend 205 Jamaica Lane to the Town Council for designation as a Landmark of the Town of Palm Beach based on criteria 1, 3 and 4 in Section 54-161, and with the acknowledgement of owner opposition. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.**