



**MINUTES  
CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH  
HISTORIC RESOURCES PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING  
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER  
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2026 -- 6:00 PM**

**Motion:** L. Devlin moves to nominate/appoint E. LeBlanc as temporary Chair; E. Deveaux 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

**ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES:** Present were: Elaine DeRiso, Laura Devlin, Edmond LeBlanc, Ken Gross, Michelle Huffman, Edmund Deveaux. Absent: Robert D'Arinzo.

Also present: Anne Hamilton, Senior Preservation Planner; Yeneneh Terefe, Preservation Planner; Lauren Pruss, Principal Planner; Elizabeth Lenihan, Board Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

**ADDITIONS / DELETIONS / REORDERING AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** None

**CASES:**

**SWEARING IN OF STAFF AND APPLICANTS** Board Secretary administered oath to those wishing to give testimony.

**PROOF OF PUBLICATION**

- 1) 338 Cornell Dr – Provided in the meeting packet.

**WITHDRAWALS / POSTPONEMENTS** None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**BOARD DISCLOSURE:** Ken Gross did some research on New Business Item A with staff during the week and believes it will not bear upon his decision making abilities. Elaine DeRiso, received a courtesy notice for the same property. She owns the property at 314 Cornell, but resides elsewhere.

**Board Attorney:** E. DeRiso is significantly closer than other Board members and will be abstaining.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. HRPB Project Number 26-01500001:** A variance request for an eight (8) foot fence along the side alley property line at 338 Cornell Drive. The subject property is a contributing resource within the College Park Historic District and is located in the Single Family

Residential (SFR) zoning district. The future land use designation is the Single Family Residential (SFR).

**Staff:** A. Hamilton provides a brief overview of the request. The applicant applied for and received a permit for a six (6) foot fence; upon inspection to close the permit, it was observed that an eight (8) foot fence had been constructed. The applicant then requested a variance to allow the eight (8) foot fence. This address previously received approval by HRPB for re-construction of the house (22-00100384). This request involves approximately eighty (80) linear feet of fence along the west alley side of the parcel. As a variance request, the four variance criteria must be met. Staff review of the criteria reveals none of the criteria can be met. It is a self-imposed hardship.

**Applicant Agent:** Robert Gleichenhaus Realtor for corporate owner – The fence was constructed for safety issues related to vagrant on the property. A higher fence will be more beneficial to a new owner. His belief is that it is more a safety issue related to vagrancies rather than proximity to the liquor store.

**Board:** E. Deveaux asks if the applicant is open to other ideas? **Response:** It would not be his decision but would be interested to hear a suggestion. E. LeBlanc asks if the fence is eight (8) foot all around? **Response:** Yes. Would it need to be cut to six (6) foot? **Response:** Yes. K. Gross believes it is a unique property as it is the rear alley for the businesses and not many parcels in the City are similarly situated. The applicant asked for and received approval for a six (6) foot fence. What if the fence needs to be rebuilt in the future? E. Deveaux states that the criteria must be met. **Staff:** Applications and approvals for a fence or wall must follow the City regulations. Findings for variances must meet the criteria, criteria #1 is that the parcel is uniquely situated.

**Board:** L. Devlin requested an explanation of why an eight (8) foot fence is safer than a six (6) foot fence. **Applicant Response:** It is a better deterrent, the gate (leading to the pool equipment) is sometimes locked. He always calls ahead to the commercial property owner to have the vagrants removed from before he arrives on site. **Board:** L. Devlin asks whether as a Realtor the property easier to sell with an eight foot fence, is that a reason for the request? **Applicant Response:** No, it is better for the homeowner, it is a selling point. **Board:** E. LeBlanc states a four (4) foot fence would be allowed in the front setback and there is no fence at all. A four (4) foot fence in the front setback might discourage vagrancy in the front yard. E. Deveaux asks if there is a height restriction on the hedges and suggests a hedge in combination with a six (6) foot fence. It could have been a hardship before installation, now it's a violation. **Response:** There is no height restriction on hedge height, however the site would be required to have a safe sight triangle at the intersection.

K. Gross- believes the site is unique however other members mention the need to meet all four criteria.

**Board Attorney:** This could be a discussion item in a joint workshop with Planning & Zoning to discuss a possible code change pertaining to alleyway fences.

**Applicant:** How many community complaints from neighbors were received? **Board and Staff:** None, however the request does not meeting the criteria. **Board:** M. Huffman, drove by the site, and believes this has to do with safety rather than the rules/criteria. L. Devlin states a site visit results in non-parity with other board members; knowing or having more information than other Board members.

**Board Attorney:** Reminds the Board member that all site visits should be disclosed. If the intent is to inspect the site prior to coming up for Board review all Board members should be on an

equal basis of having the same information. The disclosure must be made. Quasi-judicial hearings are based upon all members hearing and receiving the same information at the same time. Any research, including google street views, should be disclosed.

K. Gross drove by as well and requests that staff provide larger photos. **Staff:** The photos are provided to staff by the applicant and is what is presented to the Board. Board Attorney offers that Google street views can be reviewed during this meeting.

**Motion:** K. Gross moves to approve HRPB 26-01500001 with conditions, as the project meets the variance criteria as stated below:

1. Special conditions exist. A side alley is rare. Most side alleys are abutting other residential lots.
2. The applicant will be deprived of all reasonable use of the land - For the same reason it was decided an eight (8) foot high fence in the rear is suitable.
3. Putting a hedge will not help.
4. Not detrimental to anyone.

M. Huffman-2<sup>nd</sup>. K. Gross the portion adjoining the house to the eight (8) foot alleyway fence shall be cut to six (6) feet. The variance shall run with the property, no time limit.

**Vote:** 2 ayes, 3 nays. Dissenting E. LeBlanc; E. Deveaux; L. Devlin. **Motion fails.**

Board members suggest a Joint meeting for code changes. E. LeBlanc would support code changes requiring a fence on a public roadway be limited to a four (4) foot fence irrespective of location.

E. Deveaux believes this is a cut and dried situation and self-inflicted.

**Motion:** E. Deveaux moves to disapprove HRPB 26-01500001 as the applicant does not meet the variance criteria based upon the data and analysis in the staff report; L. Devlin 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** 3 ayes; 2 nays K. Gross and M. Huffman dissenting. **Motion passes.**

- B.** Ordinance 2026-02: Consideration of an ordinance establishing a new section within the Land Development Regulations to allow murals and sculptures to be attached to structures.

**Staff:** L. Pruss provides details of the new Ordinance. Much of the Ordinance is related to moving it out of sign code.

**Board:** L. Devlin asks about enforcement. **Responses:** Enforcement is available under other sections of the Land Development Regulations. The approvals would fall under the Development Order requirements. E. Deveaux- has concerns about the distance between murals and sculptures. Question as to what is a mural? **Board Attorney:** Is the neighborhood becoming overwhelmed? Is it in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. The Major Thoroughfare Design Guidelines are in effect as well as the Historic Preservation Guidelines.

**Staff:** The Ordinance provides enough constraints.

The Commission would like to understand the reasons for recommended denial. The objection seems to be for regulation of sculptures and murals in on residential property. It is more likely that a sculpture, rather than a mural, could extend beyond the height of the structure.

**Staff:** Y. Terefe-Preservation Planner. Fences are not structures, this is why they are allowed on the property line. The only regulated 'paint' is for chain link fences to be black coated.

Currently murals are allowed in Commercial and Industrial zoning districts. Murals, as this Ordinance is written, would be allowed in all zoning districts

**Motion:** K. Gross moves to recommend denial of the Ordinance 2026-02 to the City Commission; L. Devlin 2<sup>nd</sup> . The reasons for the recommendation are the Board would like:

- a better definition of mural
- no regulation for single-family homes
- consideration of visibility from Right-of-Ways.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

**PLANNING ISSUES:** The Board election is due however Board would like to table until all Board members, the chair, are present.

Availability for the City garage meeting. March 25 or April 8 or April 15. Please hold the dates.

E. LeBlanc believes he will not be able to participate due to his proximity to the project. He will be able to speak as an individual, not as a Board member.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** (3 minute limit)

**DEPARTMENT REPORTS:** None

**BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:** None

**ADJOURNMENT: 7:51 PM**