

CORAL GABLES HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, February 18, 2010, 4:00 p.m.
City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, Florida

MEMBERS:	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	APPOINTED BY:
Dorothy Thomson	P	P	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Mayor Donald D. Slesnick, II
Margaret Rolando*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	E	P+	P	E		Vice Mayor William H. Kerdyk, Jr.
Ernesto Santos	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P-	P-	P	P	P	Comm. Maria Anderson
Venny Torre*	P	P	P	P	E	P	P	P	P	P-	P	P	Comm. Rafael "Ralph" Cabrera, Jr.
Dolly MacIntyre	P	P	P	P	P	P-	P	P	P	P	P	P	Comm. Wayne "Chip" Withers
Richard Heisenbottle*						P	P	P	P	P	P	E	Historic Preservation Board
Joyce Meyers	P	P	P	P	P	P-	E	P	P	A	P	P	City Manager
Gay Bondurant*						P	P	P	P	P	P	P	City Commission
Sharon Langer*						P	E	P	P	P	E	P	City Commission

+ Ms. Rolando recused herself from discussion of one application at the special February meeting, and two applications at the December meeting.

- Ms. MacIntyre arrived at 6:53 p.m. and Ms. Meyers departed at 6:54 p.m. (August); Mr. Santos arrived at 4:50 p.m. (November); Mr. Torre arrived at 5:40 p.m.; Mr. Santos and Ms. Bondurant departed at approximately 6:00 p.m. (December).

STAFF:

Kara Kautz, Historic Resources Officer
Ricardo Herran, Historical Resources Assistant

A = Absent

P = Present

E = Excused

*** = New Member**

^ = Resigned Member

= Special Meeting

GUESTS: Juan C. David, David Maseda, Todd M. Traskos, Rafael Portuondo, Janet Gavarrete, Betty Fleming, Arva Parks, Jeff Bass, Jorge Hernandez, Robert Brown, Maria Gralia, Carol Horvitz, City Architect Carlos Mindreau

RECORDING SECRETARY/PREPARATION OF MINUTES: Nancy C. Morgan, Coral Gables Services, Inc.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Dolly MacIntyre at 4:05 p.m. A quorum was present.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT and DISCLOSURE OF CONTEXT:

Ms. MacIntyre read for the record the statement regarding lobbyist registration and disclosure. She then stated that if any members of the board had any ex parte communication or contact regarding any cases being heard, it was necessary to disclose such communication or contact. Board members did not indicate that any such communication occurred.

MINUTES: MEETING OF JANUARY 21, 2010:

Ms. Meyers made a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 21, 2010 as written. Ms. Bondurant seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by voice vote.

Thursday, February 18, 2010

Continued

DEFERRALS: Case File LHD 2003-18 Revised, 1044 Coral Way, deferred to the March 2010 meeting.

PUBLIC SWEARING IN: Nancy Morgan swore in audience members who planned to testify during the meeting.

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

Ms. Langer made a motion to excuse the meeting absence of Mr. Heisenbottle and Ms. Rolando. Ms. Bondurant seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by voice vote.

SPECIAL CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2009-28 (Continued):

An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 547 Aragon Avenue, a local historic landmark, legally described as Lots 23 and 24, Block 10, Coral Gables Section "B," according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 5, Page 111, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant requested design approval for interior alterations, and the installation of windows and doors. This application is a result of a violation. This application was heard at the November 19, 2009 and January 21, 2010 meetings of the Historic Preservation Board.

Ms. Kautz displayed images of the property additional to those shown at previous meetings, and advised that Board packets contained four window options and available types provided by the homeowner at the request of the Board.

Architect Juan David detailed the applicant's research and available options and types, noting their preferred solution, stating that the window company that could provide Board-acceptable windows would charge nearly \$85,000.

Homeowner Todd Traskos, Mr. David, Mr. Maseda (Project Coordinator), Board members and Ms. Kautz discussed and debated at length numerous details of the window design, thickness, color, comparisons of available styles of various window companies, problems with the transom, doors and window center style.

In response to Ms. Langer's request for staff concerns and the Board's obligation regarding homeowners' project expenses, Ms. Kautz advised that issues related to project expenses was a decision of the Board. She cited the Zoning Code's economic hardship clause and the homeowner's right to apply for such consideration. Regarding the proposed window design, the applicant was asked to present alternatives to the Board. Ms. Kautz reviewed options, pointing out that Palm Beach windows were inappropriate; and the CMS windows were appropriate, but cost \$85,000 for 11 windows. Discussion continued on possible solutions to reduce window expense.

City Architect Mindreau stated the following:

- He had not seen the applicant's latest proposal before this meeting.
- Regarding the cost issue, the applicant created his problem by removing windows.
- The three doors at the rear of the property, critical to the architecture of the house, could be manufactured by the company that could replicate them with impact glass.
- The PGT window proposal with the single, one-leaf casement, regardless of muntin application, would appear awkward when the windows were open.

Discussion continued. Mr. Santos asked to see the profile of the proposed windows. Ms. Meyers suggested non-impact glass in the three rear doors and protecting against breakage with shutters. Mr. Traskos reiterated that he couldn't spend \$40,000 to over \$80,000 for 11 windows/doors. Both Ms. Thomson and Ms. MacIntyre suggested considering a compromise as a clear solution did not seem possible. At the Board's request, with the caveat that compromise was not ideal or preferred, Ms. Kautz made the following suggestion:

- Regarding the eight windows (eliminating door possibilities), considering the lack of affordable solutions, an incarnation of the original PGT design, whether a thicker muntin in the center or paired to read as double casements, would be acceptable.
- The doors in the rear could be considered as non-impact glass with shutters or as a fixed window with a faux door in front.

Thursday, February 18, 2010

Continued

Ms. MacIntyre invited members of the audience to comment. Hearing no requests, she closed the public hearing portion of the application.

Ms. Langer made a motion to approve the PGT windows as presented, including the rear door as proposed by the applicant. Ms. Thomson seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Bondurant, Ms. Langer, Ms. Meyers, Mr. Torre, Ms. Thomson, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: Mr. Santos.

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2010-01:

An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at **4203 Monserrate Street**, a contributing structure within the “Italian Village Historic District,” legally described as Lots 1 and 2, and beg. NE corner of Lot 12, SWLY 14 ft., NWLY 38.83 ft., E 33.1 ft. to POB, Block 9, Coral Gables Riviera Section Part 1, as recorded in Plat Book 28, at Page 31 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant requested design approval for the construction of an addition and alterations to the property. Variances are requested from the Coral Gables Zoning Code for minimum setbacks and to allow an auxiliary structure nearer to the property line than the primary structure.

During Ms. Kautz’ display of photographs, she described the history of the home and the designated City Village, stating that the house was a contributing structure. Design alterations and additions were detailed, and Ms. Kautz added that both design and variances were presented for Board approval. Stating that the Board of Architects granted preliminary approval of the design in November 2009, she said that the Project Architect would present the specifics of the case.

Mr. Portuondo reviewed the existing structure, garage, the design goals and the needed setbacks. He displayed a series of perspectives, explained architectural decisions and described an analysis for street visibility as it pertained to the application.

Ms. MacIntyre invited members of the audience to comment on the application.

Mr. Brown, 4200 Monserrate, stated his support for the application.

Ms. Kautz reviewed a letter received by staff from the neighbor immediately behind the applicant, who asked that the Board address the pool and air conditioning equipment and their visibility issues. Mr. Portuondo advised that the equipment had already been relocated to an area next to the carport, thus negating the issue.

Ms. Langer made a motion to approve the Special Certificate of Appropriateness, including the relocated equipment, as discussed and presented. Mr. Torre seconded the motion.

At the initiative of Ms. Meyers, the property’s accommodation for parking was discussed. Led by Mr. Santos, discussion of the breezeway connected to a blank wall was examined with Architect Portuondo. Mr. Santos also commented on the hip roof, advising that it appeared detached from the house, which Mr. Portuondo said was purposeful to avoid replicating an appearance of the original.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Bondurant, Ms. Langer, Ms. Meyers, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Thomson, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

Ms. Bondurant made a motion to approve the variance pertaining to the swimming pool and pool deck location in the area between the street and the main residential building or any part thereof. Ms. Langer seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Langer, Ms. Meyers, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Bondurant, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

Thursday, February 18, 2010

Continued

Ms. Bondurant made a motion to approve the variance pertaining to the property having an addition with a rear setback of five feet. Ms. Langer seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Meyers, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Bondurant, Ms. Langer, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

Ms. Bondurant made a motion to approve the variance pertaining to the property having an overall side setback of approximately fourteen feet one and three quarter inches. Ms. Langer seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Bondurant, Ms. Langer, Ms. Meyers, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE DETERMINATIONS:

Ms. Kautz advised that the properties would be addressed separately, although the structures are groups and commonly known as the art buildings. Board packets included two memos dated December 2006 by Historic staff to Planning regarding the UMCAD agreement. Historic staff input was to avoid demolishing the three buildings as they were significant to the history of the University as well as to the remaining architecture of the University.

As advised by Ms. Kautz, the Board was tasked with determining whether the buildings were significant enough to warrant preparation of staff designation reports or to allow the demolition of the buildings or a modified version of each. She informed the Board about its options.

While reviewing early photographs of the University campus that featured the three “art” buildings, Ms. Kautz described the history of each, concluding that these three original buildings are the only three that remain on the campus. She reiterated that staff considered them significant due to their architecture and history.

1290 Campo Sano Avenue: The University of Miami “L-1 Building,” legally described as a portion of Tract 2 of Amended Plat Portion of Main Campus University of Miami, according to the plat thereof as recorded in PB 46-81.

1300 Campo Sano Avenue: The University of Miami “Art Building,” legally described as a portion of Tract 2 of Amended Plat Portion of Main Campus University of Miami, according to the plat thereof as recorded in PB 46-81.

1310 Campo Sano Avenue: The University of Miami “L-1 Art Annex,” legally described as a portion of Tract 2 of Amended Plat Portion of Main Campus University of Miami, according to the plat thereof as recorded in PB 46-81.

Photographs of 1290 Campo Sano were shown and described. Known as the “art annex,” Ms. Kautz explained the building’s history.

Citing discussion of all three buildings, Ms. Gavarrete, Associate Vice President of Campus Planning and Development, introduced attorneys Jeff Bass and Maria Gralia, and Jorge Hernandez and Arva Parks as volunteer resources to the University. Ms. Gavarrete displayed drawings and described the buildings’ campus location. Her position was that the buildings should be considered as a group, rather than individually.

The buildings, Ms. Gavarrete continued, were only in temporary use for a long time and one is currently unsafe for use. While reviewing the history of the City’s review of the buildings, she cited a City ordinance that required their demolition. In 2001/2002, UM applied to demolish one of the buildings.

Ms. Gavarrete requested that two of the buildings be deemed not significant by the Board and a portion of one deemed significant, believing that this portion showcases the University’s history and the architectural quality of its beginnings.

Ms. Parks described the research and thorough examinations of these buildings by Mr. Hernandez, Ms. Gavarrete and herself over the past few years. She reviewed the history of the art/administration building in detail, concluding that the art/administration building met the criteria for history, significant people and architecture.

Thursday, February 18, 2010

Continued

Mr. Hernandez detailed architecture of the three buildings as a painting studio, graphic studio and the original administration building on the UM campus. The administration building is the only two-story building among the three, and the most historically and architecturally significant. This proposal, he continued, was to save a portion of the original administration building (unused for seven years and in poor condition) where the architectural history can be interpreted. The remaining sound pieces of original wood in the other two sections of the building could be used to repair the portion proposed to be retained.

Ms. Gavarrete said the historic and architectural story is conveyed with the original administration building, adding that the other two buildings do not relay the same story. Ms. Parks again described her careful review of each of the buildings and their history and said the three buildings are repetitive, stating that the story of the buildings and the University are best told by the administration building. She also said the historic criteria was not met by the other two buildings. For the record, Ms. Parks stated that neither she nor Mr. Hernandez were paid to testify, but provided this service as volunteers.

Ms. MacIntyre invited audience members to speak.

Ms. Horvitz, 5931 S.W. 45th Street, stated she works for the University, but was not present as a member of University staff, but to express her interest in the balance of campus green space, particularly the arboretum area.

Hearing no further requests to speak, Ms. MacIntyre closed the public hearing.

Comments, suggestions, discussion between Board members, the University team and Ms. Kautz included the following:

- Staff deems the three buildings historically significant, and all should be retained and preserved.
- The space vacated by removal of the painting and graphic studios would be replaced with green space.
- The buildings do not meet current academic needs and the program needs to move to another campus location that also provides more academic space.
- UM is not currently asking to demolish the two smaller buildings, but seeking agreement with UM that they are not historic; also seeking Board agreement with designating a portion of the original administration building as historic, and to demolish the balance of the building that isn't used to restore the preserved portion.
- Two structural engineering reports deemed the administration building in its current condition as unsafe.
- Ms. Kautz: An entire building may be deemed significant with an understanding that the whole structure cannot be saved, and then do a COA for demolition of a portion of the building and restoration of the remainder. The University's proposal is asking for action that will ultimately lead to the demolition of the buildings. The buildings are a lasting historical record for the University.
- If all three are determined to be significant, that is not a historic designation.
- For the record, Ms. Bondurant raised a point of law (Laches), citing the City's Resolution No. 238880, signed in August 1982, interpreting laches to mean in this case that if the University did not demolish the buildings as allowed at the time it was allowed, the University would lose its right to do so. Attorney Jeff Bass disputed the interpretation. Ms. Bondurant reiterated that action that could have and should have taken place ten years ago did not occur.
- The buildings only need to meet one of the criteria for historic designation to be deemed historically significant, rather than all criteria.
- Ms. Meyers: Two of the three buildings (excluding administration building) are not so significant to warrant preservation.

Ms. Langer made a motion to approve determination of historic significance on all three buildings. Ms. Thomson seconded the motion.

Ms. MacIntyre said that each building would be voted on separately.

Ms. Langer made a motion to approve determination of historic significance for the entire original administration building (1300 Campo Sano). Ms. Bondurant seconded the motion.

Thursday, February 18, 2010

Continued

Discussion continued on the procedural meaning and significance of the motion. Ms. Gavarrete urged the Board to find that the painting and graphic buildings were not significant, that the administration building was significant, and to allow the University to return with a proposed designation of a portion of the building and a restoration plan. Regarding the motion on the floor, Ms. Meyers said a Certificate of Appropriateness would be needed for the remaining portion of the administration building.

Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Santos, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Bondurant, Ms. Langer, Ms. Meyers, Mr. Torre, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

Ms. Langer made a motion to declare 1290 Campo Sano historically significant. Ms. Thomson seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Bondurant, Ms. Langer. Nays: Ms. Thomson, Ms. Meyers, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. MacIntyre. The motion failed.

Ms. Langer made a motion to declare 1310 Campo Sano historically significant. Ms. Bondurant seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Bondurant, Ms. Langer. Nays: Ms. Thomson, Ms. Meyers, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. MacIntyre. The motion failed.

Ms. Langer made a motion to initiate the historic designation report for 1300 Campo Sano. Ms. Bondurant seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Bondurant, Ms. Langer, Ms. Meyers, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Thomson, Ms. MacIntire. Nays: None.

BOARD ITEMS / CITY COMMISSION / CITY PROJECTS UPDATE:

City Hall Windows: Ms. Kautz will follow up with Public Works on this issue as well as the deterioration of the coral rock walkway in front of City Hall (as a possible safety issue).

Historic District Signage: Pending

William Cooper Park: The City Commission voted to approve the renaming of Washington Park in the golden Gate area for William Cooper. A ceremony will be scheduled.

Request for 1044 Coral Way Application for the March Meeting: Ms. Meyers requested that Board packets include the relevant Code sections that apply to the issue of de-designation and demolition by neglect, in addition to the minutes related to this property (to be sent by e-mail).

ADJOURNMENT: 6:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kara N. Kautz
Historic Preservation Officer