

IX. DESIGNATION HEARINGS

7. 686 ISLAND DRIVE Owner: Robert Greenhill

James Green, Attorney for the owner, indicated that his client objected to the offer to only designate the front façade. After discussion, it was decided that the consultants would present the designation report a second time, since the last presentation was over one year ago.

Call for disclosure of ex parte communication: Disclosure by Mses. Metzger, Moran, and Coleman.

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history for this Neo-Classical Revival style home. Ms. Murphy pointed out the design features of this building. 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;

Sec. 54-161 (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.

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

Motion made by Ms. Coleman and seconded by Ms. Fairfax to make the designation report for 686 Island Drive part of the record. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0

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

Mr. Green recounted some of the expert testimony that was offered at the last meeting when the property was presented. He indicated that his client was opposed to designation. He asked to have the expert testimony incorporated into the record from the November 17, 2021, meeting.

Aimee Sunny, Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, thought the home was a spectacular example of the home. She also thought the home met criteria 1, 3, and 4.

Ms. Patterson discussed some of the elements that she believed to be original when she lived in the home.

Mr. Green objected to the statements made by Ms. Patterson; he objected to her offering evidence and thought her statements should be stricken from the record. Mr. Green thought Ms. Patterson should recuse herself. Town Attorney Randolph thought her statements were a part of her ex parte communication. Mr. Randolph cautioned the Commissioners to make their decisions based on the evidence presented at the hearing.

Mr. Green discussed some of the elements on the home that had be altered.

Ms. Albarran asked about which part of the front façade the consultants felt should be designated. Ms. Murphy responded.

Mr. Wong asked about the reasons the owner was objecting to the designation of the home. Mr. Green responded.

Motion made by Ms. Fairfax and seconded by Ms. Moran to recommend the front façade, including the colonnade, balconies, terraces, front wall, including the fenestration and the front wall of 686 Island Drive 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. Motion carried 6-1, with Mr. Segraves dissenting.

Mr. Segraves indicated that he voted no because he believed the entire home should be landmarked.

Many of the Commissioners indicated they would have supported a motion to landmark the entire home.

Town Attorney Randolph cautioned the Commission that they would need to open the motion, in order to hold any further discussions.

Motion made by Ms. Albarran and seconded by Ms. Coleman to open the motion for reconsideration of the previous motion. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Coleman wondered how a front façade could be maintained while rebuilding the remainder of the home. Ms. Fairfax confirmed it is possible.

Mr. Segraves advocated to designate the entire home, not only the front façade. He stated that the Commission looked at the entire home when any changes were proposed and therefore, he thought the entire home should be landmarked.

Ms. Fairfax stated she would support Mr. Segraves' motion of landmarking the entire home if he were to make one.

Town Attorney Randolph asked Ms. Murphy if the presentation supported designating the entire home, or only the front façade. Ms. Murphy stated her recommendation was to landmark the front façade, as a compromise to the owner.

Ms. Murphy stated that the front façade designation was a compromise with the homeowner. She indicated that the first presentation's intent was to designate the entire home; however, a compromise was made to designate the front façade only in which she would support. Mr. Randolph asked if the original recommendation was to designate the entire home. Ms. Murphy responded yes, but the recommendation changed to the front façade only as a compromise with the owner.

Ms. Moran pointed out that the home had two public facing views, one from the street and the other from the water.

Ms. Murphy pointed out that even if the front façade was landmarked, the Commission would have the purview of the entire home.

Ms. Herzig-Desnick did not understand the purpose of only landmarking the front façade of the home. Ms. Herzig-Desnick thought the entire home should be landmarked if it was the Commission's purview.

Ms. Murphy thought some owners felt more comfortable if they know only a portion is landmarked.

A discussion ensued about the Commission's purview when only a portion of a piece of property was landmarked.

Motion made by Mr. Segraves and seconded by Ms. Coleman to recommend 686 Island Drive 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 the owners' objections. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.