

X. LANDMARK DESIGNATION HEARING

1. ITEM 1: 249 PERUVIAN AVE

Owner: S & S Peruvian LLC

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

Ms. Mittner read a letter of objection by James Gavigan with Shutts and Bowen, who wrote on behalf of Rhonda Nasser, one of the owners of the buildings.

Emily Stillings, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history of the Mid-Century Modern style buildings. Ms. Stillings pointed out the design features of the buildings. Ms. Stillings testified that the buildings 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,
- Sect. 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. Mittner provided confirmation.

A motion was made by Ms. Damgard and was seconded by Ms. Moran to make the designation report for 249 Peruvian Avenue part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0

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

Mr. Randolph recommended that the Commission act on the request for deferral before considering the application. Mr. Randolph also discussed the hearing requirements listed in the Town’s Code.

Patrick Segraves, one of the owners of 249 Peruvian Avenue, stated that the item had been deferred twice, and he advocated for the Commission to hear the application and to landmark the buildings.

Ms. Mittner stated that the letter of objection on behalf of Dr. Nasser indicated

that she owned many buildings, but the Property Appraiser's office listed only one building under her name.

Amanda Skier, Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, spoke about the significance of the building. She advocated that the building be landmarked and for the building to be preserved.

The Commission discussed whether the item should be deferred at Dr. Nasser's request. The consensus of the Commission was that Dr. Nasser had ample opportunities to state her objections.

A motion was made by Ms. Damgard and was seconded by Ms. Albarran to deny the request for deferral. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Damgard thought the property was iconic. It looked good on the street and was well-kept. She thought it looked like old Palm Beach. She thought it represented Stetson well and would like to have one of his buildings landmarked.

Ms. Moran thought the building was an excellent example of John Stetson's work. She was happy that Mr. Segraves was an excellent steward of the property.

Mr. Ives agreed Mr. Segraves was an excellent steward of the property. He also concurred that John Stetson's work was important. He questioned the uniqueness of the screen block on the building but did believe the cantilevered features were special. He was torn about whether the building should be landmarked but leaned toward not landmarking it.

Ms. Albarran felt that some of the points Mr. Ives raised were why she believed the buildings should be landmarked. She also thought the property was special since Stetson designed it, and it was his residence. She felt the building was architecturally beautiful and historically significant.

Ms. Fairfax agreed with Mr. Ives and had some reluctance in landmarking the building. She thought the building was modest and wondered if it was the highest and best design to help define the street. She questioned whether having every style represented was necessary and did not love the building.

Ms. Patterson stated she was a fan of the Mid-Century Modern style. She worried about the evolution of Palm Beach; she feared the fabric of Palm Beach could slip away. She acknowledged that while the building was not the most spectacular representation of the style, she thought the building was great. She advocated for the building to be landmarked and protected.

Ms. Damgard agreed with Ms. Patterson.

A motion was made by Ms. Albarran and was seconded by Ms. Damgard to recommend 249 Peruvian Avenue 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 acknowledgment that there are several owners of the buildings, one owner opposed while most supported the designation. The motion was carried 6-1, with Ms. Fairfax dissenting.