

XI. DESIGNATION HEARINGS

3. ITEM 3: 216 MONTEREY ROAD

Owner: Henry Jamison IV & Leslie Jamison

Several members disclosed ex-parte communications.

Janet Murphy, MurphyStillings, LLC, testified to the architecture and history of the Monterey-style residence. Ms. Murphy pointed out the design features of the residence. Ms. Murphy testified that the residence 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 Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Albarran to make the designation report for 216 Monterey Road part of the record. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Patterson called for public comment.

Attorney Guy Rabideau, representing the homeowners at 216 Monterey Road, read the homeowners' letter of objection into the record. He argued that the architect did not specialize in Monterey-style homes, that the home was not a superb representation, and that it lacked uniqueness. He added that the owners opposed the designation.

Ms. Murphy stated that while she did not know the total number of Monterey-style homes, Maurice Fatio designed more than one.

Aimee Sunny of the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach agreed that the home met the three criteria outlined by MurphyStillings. She

reviewed the criteria and explained why she believed it met them.

Ms. Patterson asked Ms. Sunny to list some of the benefits of landmarking. Ms. Sunny outlined some of the benefits.

Mr. Ives acknowledged that the commission was more forgiving on renovations than the Architectural Commission. He discussed Fatio's designs and argued that new homes should look to his designs as precedence. He also noted the two homes from Fatio that Mr. Fogel had previously shown, which had been demolished. Mr. Ives reviewed the criteria outlined by the consultants and thought the home was a superior example of a Monterey-style home.

Ms. Brooker spoke of her landmarked home and the many variances needed to complete the renovations. She thought her example demonstrated how the Town was willing to work with owners of landmarked homes that needed renovations.

Ms. Fairfax spoke about a Florida Statute that protected homeowners' rights to demolish their homes in a flood zone, regardless of whether the property is landmarked. Ms. Mittner stated there was a caveat: the home's finished floor elevation needed to be at or below the base flood elevation.

Ms. Patterson thought this was one of the most beautiful and charming homes in Palm Beach.

Attorney Franciso noted the code section to consider when landmarking was 54-161.

Ms. Patterson also stated the home had room for growth.

A motion was made by Mr. Ives and was seconded by Ms. Fairfax to recommend 216 Monterey Road 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 the owners of the home opposed the designation. The motion was carried unanimously, 7-0.