



CORAL GABLES HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
Wednesday, March 15, 2023, Meeting, 4:00 p.m.
Coral Gables City Hall, City Commission Chamber
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, Florida 33134

Historical Resources &
 Cultural Arts

2327 SALZEDO STREET
 CORAL GABLES
 FLORIDA 33134

☎ 305-460-5093
 ✉ hist@coralgables.com

MEMBERS	A 22	M 22	J 22	J 22	A 22	S 22	O 22	N 22	D 22	J 23	F 23	M 23	APPOINTED BY
Albert Menendez (Chair)	E	P	P	E	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Commission-As-A-Whole
Cesar Garcia-Pons (Vice-Chair)	P	E	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	City Manager Peter Iglesias
Alicia Bache-Wiig	E	P	P	E	P	E	P	#	P	P	E	P	Mayor Vince Lago
Margaret (Peggy) Rolando	P	#	P	E	P	P	E	#	P	P	P	E	Vice-Mayor Michael Mena
Dona Spain	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Commissioner Rhonda Anderson
Xavier Durana	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	#	#	#	Commissioner Jorge L. Fors, Jr.
Michael J. Maxwell	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Commissioner Kirk R. Menendez
Bruce Ehrenhaft	P	P	P	P	P	P	E	P	P	P	E	P	Commission-As-A-Whole
John P. Fullerton	P	P	P	P	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Board-as-a-Whole

LEGEND: A = Absent; P = Present; E = Excused; * = New Member; ^ = Resigned Member; - = No Meeting;
 # = Late meeting arrival

STAFF: Warren Adams, Historic Preservation Officer, Gus Ceballos, Assistant City Attorney, Kara Kautz,
 Assistant Historic Preservation Officer

RECORDING SECRETARY/PREPARATION OF MINUTES: Nancy Kay Lyons, Administrative Assistant

OPENING STATEMENT

Chair Menendez read for the record the statement regarding the purpose of the board and lobbyist registration and disclosure.

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 pm by Chair Menendez and attendance was stated for the record.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the minutes from the February 15, 2023, Historic Preservation Board Meeting.

The motion passed (Ayes: 8, Nays: 0).

In answer to Ms. Bache-Wiig's comment that she was not present at the prior meeting Deputy City Attorney Throckmorton said that it would not preclude her from voting on administrative matters.

NOTICE REGARDING EX-PARTE COMMUNICATIONS.

Chair Menendez read a statement regarding Notice of Ex-Parte Communications. Board members who had ex-parte communication of contact regarding cases being heard were instructed to disclose such communication or contact. Board members did not indicate that any such communication occurred.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Ehrenhaft to excuse the absence of Ms. Rolando from this meeting.

The motion passed (Ayes: 8, Nays: 0).

ANNOUNCEMENT OF DEFERRAL OF AN AGENDA ITEM:

1. Request for Deferral:

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2023-009: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables City Hall. The application requests design approval for the replacement of windows.

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA:

1013 Castile Avenue: This would be first on the agenda in response to a request from Mr. Fullerton to address a concern that construction had been going on for approximately nine years and neighbors wanted an update.

SWEARING IN OF THE PUBLIC:

The court reporter administered the oath.

Mr. Palenzuela the City's outside counsel that works with the Code Enforcement Board made the following comments regarding 1013 Castile Avenue:

- a) The first round of permits was approved earlier this month.
- b) Work has stopped because they had a revision permit in to reorient the pool & other changes.
- c) Today the City approved the permit for the second round of revisions that were submitted, and work can commence.
- d) He will notify the owners that the permit was approved.
- e) The case went to the Code Enforcement Board, a Receiver has been appointed.
- f) The case has been stayed in court pending compliance by the owners who have been working towards this.
- g) The owners have been getting extensions.
- h) They reoriented the pool and had to make certain changes.

The following questions were asked by the Board. Responses from Mr. Palenzuela and staff are in italics.

1. Has there been any type of running fines or anything on this property?
Not yet. Originally the injunction action was filed against the former owners and the mortgagee. There was a foreclosure filed after the City commenced their injunction action. The decision was made by the court appointed Receiver to hold off doing any work himself until the foreclosure had run its course, because the liens on the property were such that you couldn't put any receiver liens on top of that and hope to sell the property. The property was sold at auction, the mortgagee ended up being the owner. They brought in a partner and now there are two joint co-owners of the property. They came in to correct the violations. The City was initially aggressive in the litigation, but once they obtained the order against the two buyers the City has been working with them to expedite the reviews and they have been working on the property.
2. When did the change in ownership happen?
The change in ownership and the injunction were in April of 2021. There was some time between the purchase and the sale of the property to the two current owners which the City had initially opposed.
3. That was two years ago, why the delay?
Since then, they have applied for their permits. The head of Development Services met with them on site to identify the things that they could do without the permits and what needed to wait. Originally the owners wanted to change the permits around and they were saying that they could not work without them. This was the third set of revisions that they had made. They reoriented the pool and made other changes, some of which were inside, others were to correct work that had not been done properly. The issue did not come up again that there was work that should be done but could not be done until the permits were issued, now that they have been issued the expectation is that they will continue to work.

4. Did the revisions come to the board for review or were they interior and could be handled by staff?
Mr. Palenzuela was not involved at the time, but the Board approved the original plans, and nothing had to come back to the Board as it has all been done administratively.
5. What year was that?
The original permit applications were in 2016 and 2017 before the injunctions.

Ms. Kautz said the COA was from 2014.

6. When and how was the auction sale advertised?
It went through the foreclosure process, a Notice of Sale gets published, and then the auction takes place. The other sale was not advertised, it was something that was arranged by the Mortgagee.

Comments from the Public, Staff and Board members:

Dawn Bowen: (husband Miguel Caridad 1012 Castile Avenue) expressed her concern over how long the work was taking and pleaded with the board to move the project along.

Additional Comments by the Board, Deputy City Attorney Throckmorton, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Palenzuela:

1. There is a fence on the front and east sides of the house and no fence on the west side and the house is open allowing anyone to enter.
2. Mr. Adams had thought that a fence or tarp had been put up.
3. Mr. Palenzuela received the complaint on March 13th regarding the fence, a Code Enforcement Officer went out today to take photographs and assess the issue regarding the fence and notify the owners that it has to be addressed. The two or three times since they started construction that they have been getting monthly extensions there were code enforcement issues, because the job site has to be maintained as a condition of getting another extension. Each time issues came up such as the “no trespassing” sign was missing, and twice the weeds started to grow, the owners were cited or warned, and they took care of it promptly. He expects that they will take care of the fence issue.
4. Mr. Adams and Mr. Palenzuela attend all the code enforcement meetings and the process is being followed and they are staying on top of them. It is a code enforcement issue.
5. Deputy City Attorney Throckmorton will see if there are any updates that need to be given to the Code Enforcement Board. There is a case pending with the receiver, and anyone that needs to be updated will receive them in a timely manner.
6. The City has done everything that it can legally do. They have an injunction, there is a receiver on the case, the owners are working towards compliance. If they stop complying, then Code Enforcement fines can start to run, and the injunction case would be reopened, and the receiver would then take over to finish the work. There was a delay in construction, they had to wait for the permit, but they can now legally resume.
7. They go every month as part of the extension request process. The city makes sure that there are no recent complaints and no new violations. They have to address anything new that comes up. They had to fix the mesh on the fence, the receiver fixed the gate initially before they took over construction. They have had two warnings that did not amount to fines for overgrown weeds which they took care of promptly. If anyone lets the City know that something is going on they will address the problem, and the owners should address it promptly.

Chair Menendez read a description of the first case as follows:

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2022-038: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at Balboa Plaza, a Local Historic Landmark, located at the intersections of Coral Way (a Local and State Designated Highway and a contributing resource within the “Coral Way Historic District”), De Soto Boulevard, South Greenway Drive, and Anderson Road. The application requests design approval for the alteration of the historic street grid and the introduction of a vehicular roundabout.

Deputy City Attorney Throckmorton stated that any person on ZOOM that wanted to testify needed to appear on video and be sworn in.

Mr. Adams made a presentation accompanying the on-screen Presentation. He read excerpts from the staff report and also made the following comments (comments are in italics, and references to the sections of the report are in regular font).

1. Proposal (page 1).
2. Site characteristics (page 1.)
3. *This came before the Board at the last meeting, and they had requested additional information.*
4. Background/Existing Conditions (page 1).
5. Proposed Alterations (Page 2. Proposal – 2nd to 4th paragraph).
6. *The Board is making a recommendation to the City Commission who will issue the final COA if they approve.*
7. *Mr. Adams passed out pages for the designation report for the board and the City Attorney to review. At the last meeting, the Board asked if a separate application is required as the entrances and plazas are designated. It appears that this will not be required. If the Board feels that this is required, it will be brought back at a later date.*
8. Letters of in opposition that were received and passed to the Board:
 - a) Bruce Fitzgerald - Coral Gables resident since 2000.
 - b) Jaime and Zully Pardo.
 - c) Ellen M. Dyer.
 - d) Dolly MacIntyre - Former 8-year member of the HEPB.
 - e) Maria Cerda - 1216 Asturia Avenue.
 - f) The Vidal Family - 301 Alesio Avenue.

Ms. Yamilet Senespleda (Chief of Traffic Engineering Division) and Ms. Yanek Fernandez (Highway Division) from the Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works made a presentation following the on-screen Presentation:

1. The Board requested that additional data be presented regarding the request for these improvements.
2. A presentation has been prepared based on previous requests and evaluations.
3. A diagram and picture of what was presented at the last meeting was shown,
4. The project scope is to improve the intersection from a two-way stop control to a roundabout circle.
5. Information and data (mainly crash data) was provided for the Board's review which reflected the safety issues that this intersection has been presenting for 20 years.
6. The request from the City to the County was in 2003.
7. Right-angle crashes are the type of crashes seen at this intersection. Vehicles coming east and westbound hit cars driving north and south. Vehicles driving on Anderson Avenue and South Greenway Drive have not yielded to vehicles driving on Coral Way. This is an issue that is not getting any better.
8. Crash Data:
 - a) Data is from 2011 to 2022.
 - b) Data was shown for angle crashes at that location for 2015, 2016 & 2017.
 - c) Previous evaluations have been done and always the preferred alternative is a roundabout as it is a physical barrier at the intersection that prevents this type of crash from happening.
 - d) Recent data was shown from 2017 to 2022. There were 6 to 7 crashes per year, most of the crashes were angle crashes and left turn crashes. Vehicles traveling along Coral Way make a left turn on Anderson Avenue and they do not see each other, and an accident occurs.
9. Volume Data:
 - a) The FDOT Station shows the average number of vehicles along Coral Way exceeds 19,000 per day.
 - b) The County Road Station shows the number to be 17,000.
 - c) The stations are located more than one block away from each other.
 - d) The City consultant was working on another project along South Greenway Drive and they collated the data.
10. Previous Evaluations:
 - a) There are records back to 2003 when the City of Coral Gables requested the County to perform an analysis at this location.

- b) The first request was to evaluate installing a traffic signal. The warrants required to install a traffic signal were not met, and it was recommended that the best solution was a roundabout.
- c) In 2009 the County received another request and responded to the requestor saying that the best option was a roundabout.
- d) In 2009 the City requested the County to have this intersection included into the TIP (Transportation Improvement Program) for construction of the roundabout.

Comments by the County and Public Works.

- 1. The average number of crashes throughout the year is more than 10.
- 2. The number of accidents is higher, but the ones that can be mitigated with this type of treatment are the angle and the left turn crashes.
- 3. Compared to other intersections in the City the number is higher than average.
- 4. 5 accidents per year is the number for an intersection to qualify for traffic calming.
- 5. It is not known if this intersection has the highest incidence of crashes in the City of Coral Gables.
- 6. 19,000 cars travel on this road daily.
- 7. Coral Way is a County road and is wholly within the County's jurisdiction.
- 8. The City of Coral Gables Public Works Staff all agree that from a technical perspective a traffic circle is the best solution for pedestrian connectivity, traffic calming and the problems that exist at that intersection.
- 9. The funding that the City is using for this intersection will not be used for a traffic signal.
- 10. Putting in a traffic signal is expensive, the signal at the Public Safety building was \$400,000.
- 11. To make South Greenway Drive and Anderson Avenue right turn only and blocking off the access for someone to cross Coral Way will require a physical barrier. While it might be less impactful to the historical surroundings any modifications to the side street will impact the operations of the intersection and there is also an issue with pedestrian accessibility, and that type of improvement does not apply for this type of funding.
- 12. Granada has a light and Segovia has a traffic circle and while there are other places to cross it is a long run to get to these two places.
- 13. Because of the nature of traffic circles, while there still might be accidents but the severity of those accidents is reduced significantly. Side accidents become fender benders. There is a significant increase in safety.
- 14. The money allocated does not include traffic lights.
- 15. A traffic circle costs approximately \$800,000 including lighting. The price varies according to lighting.
- 16. The Venetian Pool has something that is on the ground that indicates where to stop at the crosswalk.
- 17. The cost to put in traffic signals with the current County contract is \$600,000 depending on the structure installed.
- 18. The roundabouts at Segovia and Biltmore and Segovia and Coral Way have similar volumes of traffic. Initially there was controversy that the sculptures would cause more accidents, but the reports were less after the sculpture and roundabout were installed.
- 19. The severity of the crashes is reduced with a roundabout as it limits the movements through the intersection.
- 20. Crash reports at the Balboa Plaza intersection show accidents that have hit the curbs, stop signs and backflow preventors. There has been a rollover accident and several accidents with injuries. While you are looking at a number you have to look at the severity of the crashes and the safety improvement. The roundabout is much safer.
- 21. A physical barrier limits movement, if you have a sign instead, unless you have a police car sitting at that intersection, people might try to make the movement and then there will be accidents.
- 22. If it is blocked and requires a right turn only and the traffic is veered that way, cost is not the only consideration, the consequence of those types of improvements is that after making a right turn they will then make a U-turn. This solves part of the issue and creates another one.
- 23. Traffic signals include mast arms, cabinets, and all sorts of other items. Above grade things that will have an impact. The cost of the closure will be relatively minimal. While it might reduce volume, it does not address the issue of connectivity. In addition, a controller panel, and service disconnects will have to be installed, and they could block the monuments.

24. There is a bus stop on the northeast corner that does not have accessibility right now. With this roundabout, accessibility to that bus stop will be increased because there would be a connection to it.
25. The solutions explored by the County were a traffic signal and the roundabout.
26. The public purpose of this roundabout is safety and pedestrian connectivity and maintaining the traffic flow which is a problem.
27. The County is paying for this project not the City.

Comments by Board Members:

1. The roundabout is a big project for a historic corner.
2. The roundabout will not alleviate the problem and will cost a lot of money and affect the character of a historic designated intersection.
3. The City and the County need to talk to each other since you do not want to impede the major flow on Coral Way.
4. A few cars want to go south from Greenway Drive and north from Anderson Avenue, a stop light could be installed that does not give huge amounts of time impeding the flow on Coral Way.
5. Sensors can be installed going north and south on Anderson and Greenway, which will change a light and give them 30 seconds to a minute to cross.
6. There are ways to measure how much traffic is backed up at an intersection and how many cars to let pass through.
7. The City and the County are looking at this intersection because it is difficult to approach it in a vehicle and nearly impossible to cross as a pedestrian.
8. The Historic Preservation Board is not going to argue with Public Works on the efficacy of the roundabout versus straight.
9. This intersection is historically designated as part of the City of Coral Gables. There are other alternatives that need to be explored that could mitigate the impact of the Historic Plan.
10. There are some very simple solutions that were overlooked and should be explored prior to the installation of a traffic circle.
11. The City needs to explore other solutions and then come back and tell the Board why they are not better.
12. The City can save a lot of money and get a better design that is more in compliance with the historic nature of the grid and serves the purposes of vehicles and pedestrian safety.
13. This intersection already has a right turn flow so it would be very easy to close the straight through from Anderson to the north and get some sort of effect to reduce the number of angle crashes.
14. The cost is irrelevant, the Board is looking at the plan of the City and the public purpose.
15. The report said that a vehicular roundabout was proposed at this location, in approximately 2,005 which was prior to the designation of the Coral Gables Historic city plan in 2,018 but the intersection itself was designated in 1988. If there had been funding in 2005 it should have come to the Board.
16. The City should consider the best scenario for honoring the historically designated aspect of the intersection. They have included improved and well-designed ADA crosswalks for safety, but without lights they will be meaningless for anybody trying to cross the street.
17. They had the following questions:
 - a) Statistics: They have been provided today.
 - b) What other solutions were explored and why were they discarded.
 - c) Who made the decision?
 - d) Was the Historic Preservation Department and/or an urban designer included and what were their opinions?
 - f) Will someone other than an engineer look at the flow of the traffic and determine that the roundabout is more efficient?

Comments by Mr. Adams:

1. The City street plan that designated the actual streets is the part of the historic plan that would have a problem.
2. Any sort of substantial alteration to the historic street plan by the code has to come to the Board.
3. When the Board is looking at the City plan you have to take into consideration the historic integrity of the City Plan and the effect of the proposed amendment on historic integrity, development and the public purpose being served.

4. Historic staff are not traffic engineers.
5. My suggestion would be stop signs, traffic signals, or a roundabout, or maybe even a right-hand turn only.
6. Traffic signals are going to have a bigger impact on the intersection than the traffic circle would. There are stop signs there at the moment.

Chair Menendez asked if there was anyone in the audience who would like to speak in favor or opposition of this case?

Deputy City Attorney Throckmorton stated that anyone on Zoom needed to have their camera on so that the court reporter could swear them in.

The Court Reporter swore in each speaker prior to their testimony with the exception of Ms. Carbonell who did not appear on camera and therefore her comments could not be considered testimony.

Sheryl Gold – 721 Biltmore Way made the following comments.

1. Lives right around the corner from the intersection of Anderson and Coral Way and is a lifelong advocate of historic preservation.
2. She walks/drives through the intersection regularly and it is dangerous.
3. It is not safe to walk on North Greenway, get across to walk on Greenway, or drive safely when accessing Coral Way and heading west.
4. It has been said the simple solution is to make it a right turn and put a barricade but to go west on Coral Way when heading north on Anderson you would have to take a right turn and then how do you go west.
5. The City says public safety is the number one priority, if so, this must translate into more than lip service.
6. The Public Works staff is rightfully supporting the roundabout, as the only option to ensure safety for pedestrians and drivers.
7. This issue was originally brought to the County by residents, and the City 20 years ago, in the interim, traffic and conditions have only become worse.
8. Now the County is proposing a solution in coordination with our City's Transportation Department and the Historic Resources Officer is opposing the project to protect the historic "integrity."
9. Lives and safety are the priority. They trump whatever historic structure, or the historic grid that's always existed long before we've had this volume of traffic.
10. Everyone is interested in aesthetics, access, and historic integrity. Nobody cared about the access to Balboa Plaza, they removed the grass and installed a giant sofa, a mosaic carpet and lamp posts that shine into people's apartments.
11. No one has spoken to the residents that are impacted by this unsafe condition daily.
12. This roundabout will save lives and that should trump the historic integrity of the grid.

Mr. Adams: There was no recommendation in the report, as Staff had not received the facts and figures from the County at the time the report was written. It was never stated in the report that staff oppose this because a determination could not be made until they this information. This is why it was left open for the Board to hear the information and make their decision.

Marisa Chisena – 701 Biltmore Way (for 20 years).

1. Vehicular traffic in this area has increased exponentially and will get worse due to the influx of people moving to the Gables and the large new developments.
2. The intersection has become increasingly dangerous for pedestrians and cars.
3. She had to cross Coral Way to get to the Granada Golf Course and the Anderson Road intersection, and they do not want to have to go all the way to Segovia Circle or the Granada traffic light just to cross.
4. The proposed vehicular roundabout and pedestrian crossing will avoid the speeding of cars and potential accidents and benefit the residents that safely wish to cross Coral Way at that intersection.
5. She appreciates the beauty and historical value of this landmark but was sure Denman Fink did not envision this kind of traffic.
6. Other plazas in Coral Gables have changed their regional look with the addition of roundabouts and traffic lights. This will not be the only plaza that would go to a change.

7. Driver and pedestrian safety should be a priority.
8. A historical marker plaque with the history of this landmark should be created for future reference.
9. A right turn only from Coral Way will force a driver who wants to go West to go to the Segovia roundabout, up on North Greenway, down to Granada to find Coral Way. This is not an option as it will create additional traffic.
10. Roundabouts are fairly new in America and have been shown to reduce the severity of accidents, once drivers are educated, they will get used to it.
11. The two roundabouts on Biltmore Way and Coral Way that cross Segovia have been successfully decreasing the number and severity of accidents and have definitely helped pedestrian crossings.
12. The City is not maintaining flashing lights so they will serve no purpose.

Maritza, Jacobson 2401 Anderson Road (for 20 years)

1. Her apartment building is on the corner of Coral Way and Anderson and faces Coral Way.
2. She has witnessed hundreds of accidents in the last 20 years, it is a dangerous intersection for both drivers and pedestrians and is a safety issue.
3. The rock columns on Coral Way prevent drivers from seeing oncoming traffic so she goes the roundabout way to Valencia to Granada to make a left-hand turn.
4. The roundabout is a good solution and urged the board to consider it.

Jessica Keller – member of the community for 10 years.

1. She drives, walk, and bikes through this intersection on a regular basis and supports the roundabout.
2. In 2,018, and as part of the city's comprehensive multimodal transportation planning project the City adopted resolution, 2018-80 The City of Coral Gables Sustainable, Complete Streets Policy. At the time that it was passed the policy was recognized as one of the strongest and most comprehensive that truly reflected who we are as a community. What makes this policy a standout is its commitment to sustainability, resiliency, historic preservation, stormwater management, accessibility, and attention to aesthetics.
3. ***The resolution is available at: <https://portal.laserfiche.com/Portal/DocView.aspx?id=67874&repo=r-0e28d9ac&searchid=1596aa43-7670-4987-8425-69c91796463e>***
4. She read the following:
Section one. Vision users and modes.
The City of Coral Gables strives to develop a safe, reliable, efficient, integrated, connected, and livable multimodal transportation system that enables access, mobility, economic development, aesthetics, health, and well-being for people of all ages and abilities...
The complete section is as follows:
The City of Coral Gables strives to develop a safe, reliable, efficient, integrated, connected, and livable multimodal transportation system that enables access, mobility, economic development, aesthetics, health, and well-being for people of all ages and abilities, and supports enhancement and sustainability of the environment.

When there are conflicting needs among users and modes, the following prioritization will apply 1) above all, safety is paramount...

The complete section is as follows:

*C) When there are conflicting needs among users and modes, the following prioritization will apply:
1) above all, safety is paramount, (2) followed by mobility; (3) among modes, vulnerable uses shall come first; and finally, (4) seek balance among all modes involved. It is recognized that all modes cannot receive the same type of accommodation and space one every street, but the overall goal is that everyone – young, old, and of varying ability – can safely, comfortably, and conveniently travel across the network using all modes.*

Section 6 Context Sensitivity

(A) The application of this policy will be flexible, so as to encourage context-sensitive designs. Context sensitivity to the community's overall surroundings, its current and planned buildings and land uses, and current and unexpected transportation needs of all users will ensure that projects are appropriate

within the context of the neighborhood, sensitive to community values, and balance social, economic, and environmental objectives.

(E) Historic elements will be integrated and preserved into the design of its streets.

6. As it relates to safety, roundabouts have been proven as significantly safer than traditional intersections.
7. The County pointed out they have reduced speeds, conflict points, and, most importantly, the severity of crashes.
8. There is nothing attractive about large signal mast arms.
9. What the County is proposing aligns with their vision zero plan to end traffic fatalities and serious injuries by 2040.
10. If the County initiated a community engagement process, we could develop a beautiful intersection that is safe and preserves the historic character of the area.
11. She encouraged the Board to ask the County and the City to work together, to initiate a community engagement process.

Ms. Karelia Carbonell – on behalf of the Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables.

1. There can be conversations with all the parties, and specifically with the Historic Preservation Staff, and of course making them one of the stakeholders.
2. This is not an extreme. Safety is important, but we also live in a historic city.
3. The City Plan is a historic landmark that is under a zoning ordinance, which is why it is being discussed.
4. The issue is to come up with a solution that not only respects the integrity of the historic site, but also the safety of the residents.
5. This is a very one-sided discussion about doing something that will affect the historical integrity of that area. Once one entrance goes, then, which one is next and that is important.
6. It should be mandatory to read the City Plan that was adopted in 2018, because very clearly does it say that this is part of the historic grid?
7. Traffic has obviously increased, but if you make a right turn on Coral Way just a minute down the road is a roundabout that takes you back on Coral Way, and you can then go west. How many roundabouts are we going to have in that stretch?
8. I am all for the pedestrian crosswalk, they are obviously very important.
9. Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons said there should be discussions as to how to incorporate holistically and harmoniously everything that is needed.
13. We are in opposition of any alteration and introduction of a vehicular roundabout if it is not going to take into consideration the historic integrity of that area.
14. The Balboa Plaza was one of the first plazas erected, they were part of the vision of the City Beautiful. If we can follow Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons' recommendation I think there could be solutions to everyone's issues and I agree safety is very important, but we don't live in a place where history is not a part of what we have to consider. We are a historic City our City Plan is historic.
15. Roundabouts are not the end all for traffic mitigation. At the Commission meeting yesterday, it was said that roundabouts and traffic calming are sometimes actually hindrances, and people actually speed over them and do not stop. There could be other solutions, safety solutions, even for cyclists. It is really important that we consider our City Plan, our historic grid, our historic entrances.
16. I urge you to follow Vice-Chair Garcia Pons and motion that way.

Chair Menendez asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Mr. Adams asked if the Chair wanted him to read the names of the letters of support. Chair Menendez responded no.

Additional Comments:

1. There are no scheduled additional meetings other than potentially going to the Commission next.
2. The first and next public meeting has not been determined.
3. This is just a recommendation to the City Commission.
4. Mr. Fullerton stated that there was no better alternative than a roundabout.

5. Mr. Ehrenhaft asked for further input to be given to show the impact on historic aspects. He did not think that that the crossing would be improved by anything other than a stoplight.
6. Deputy City Attorney Throckmorton did not believe that the Historic Plan was designated at the time the other circles were approved.
7. Ms. Kautz stated that the designation was of the Historic City Plan and not later interventions. The overall grid of streets, the overall City Plan is designated not the circle at Segovia. The circle at Segovia and Coral Way did come to the Board because that is Segovia Plaza in which it is located.

A motion was made by Mr. Fullerton to make a recommendation to approve the request for design approval for the alteration of the historic street grid and the introduction of a vehicular roundabout.

No one seconded the motion. The motion failed.

A motion was made by Ms. Spain and seconded by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons to make a recommendation to deny the proposed request for design approval for the alteration of the historic street grid and the introduction of a vehicular roundabout.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7, Nays: 1).

Chair Menendez read a description of the next case as follows:

CASE FILE LHD 2022-011: Consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 831 Capri Street, legally described as Lot 8, Block 84, Amended Plat Coral Gables Granada Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 15, at Page 7, of the Public Records of Dade County, Florida.

A Power Point echoing the Designation Report was played onscreen.

Mr. Adams made the following comments:

1. Letters of Support were received from the Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables.
2. The designation was requested by the owners.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor or opposition of the case.

Mr. Garcia-Pons commended staff on the presentation and the report.

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the local historic designation of the property at 831 Capri Street, legally described as Lot 8, Block 84, Amended Plat Coral Gables Granada Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 15, at Page 7, of the Public Records of Dade County, Florida based on its historical, cultural and architectural significance as evidenced in the staff presentation and report.

The motion passed (Ayes: 8, Nays: 0).

Chair Menendez read a description of the next case as follows:

CASE FILE LHD 2022-013: Consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 517 Aragon Avenue, legally described as the West 36.4 Feet of Lot 16 and all of Lot 17, Block 10, Coral Gables Section "B," according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 111, of the Public Records of Dade County, Florida.

A Power Point echoing the Designation Report was played onscreen.

Mr. Edward Matos – 2800 Ponce de Leon Boulevard (representing the property owners) made a presentation following the on-screen Presentation. He made the following comments:

1. He gave some history on the property owners.
2. They bought the property at 5178 Aragon Avenue and applied for a demolition permit.
3. What Does the Code Say: Section 8-103 of the Code was shown onscreen with certain lines underlined:
 - a) ...if they possess integrity... (1st paragraph).
 - b) In order to qualify for designation...must have significant character... (2nd paragraph).
 - c) The third paragraph does not apply here, it is for multiple properties.
 - d) The fourth paragraph goes into the criteria staff emphasized in their staff report.
 - i) Exemplifies the historical, cultural, political, economic, or social trends of the community (Code Section 8-103(A)(4)).
 - ii) Portrays the environment in an era of history characterized by one (1) or more distinctive architectural styles (Code Section 8-103(B)(1)).
 - iii) Embodies those distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or method of construction (Code Section 8-103(B)(2)).
4. In layman terms:
 - a) Possess integrity – It hasn't lost its original style.
 - b) Have significance character, interest, or value,
 - c) Meet one of the Criteria:
 - i) Exemplify a trend – it has to be a prime example of a particular trend.
 - ii) Portray and era of history – It brings us back to that particular era.
 - iii) Embodies distinguishing characteristics. It captures what makes this particular architectural style special.
5. When first hearing the term “Minimal Traditional” design, he did research. Based on the staff report it is:
 - a) A response to economic hardship and new FHA loan requirements.
 - b) A cost-effective approach to popular, better defined architectural styles.
 - c) No hard and fast set of guidelines.
 - d) The Staff Report acknowledges that such homes came from Modernist and Mediterranean Revival Styles (especially in Coral Gables) but also Colonial Revival, Arts and Crafts, and Tudor Styles. The “Minimal Traditions style was flexible.” (See Staff Report page 6).
6. The County’s Historic Preservation Design Guidelines say something similar. It is a catch all term because at that time (tough times) means you have to improvise, and you have to be flexible on your architectural style.
7. He showed pictures of examples from Coral Gables.
8. He showed pictures of examples from the County.
9. This presents a real challenge because you have a duty to find that a building embodies certain characteristics and particular features of an architectural style, but here you have a style that is a chameleon, it has everything.
10. He showed pictures of 501 Aragon Avenue which were mentioned in the staff report. The left picture looks a lot like the right.
11. He referred to the staff reports for different properties:
 - a) 501 Aragon Avenue (LHD 2016-18) which stated that “No structural additions have been made to the residence and alterations have been minimal as well”.
 - b) 737 Minorca Avenue (LHD 2021-12) – pictures present almost the same idea. Staff report said, “it is determined that the property at 737 Minorca Avenue has retained its historic integrity for over eight decades”, the alterations were made in 1939 by the same person who built the house.
 - c) While it has been modified many of the modifications were made by the original builder. He showed a plan of the modifications taken from the staff report saying that the modifications were minimal, not much had changed.
 - d) 1700 Cortez Street (LHD 2007-14)
Pretty much only the awnings have changed. The staff report says: There have been few substantive changes to the structure at 1700 Cortez Street over the past 67 years other than what would be considered routine maintenance (painting, re-roofing, roof repairs, etc.).
12. He compared the staff report for 517 Aragon Avenue to the staff reports of the other houses as follows:
 - a) Staff report describes additions/alterations over four pages, see staff report pages 13-16.

- b) Significant addition in 1961. Including an additional garage, enclosure of the original carport, changing windows.
 - c) Metal Window Grates were installed in 1978.
 - d) Significant Changes in 1994 including the window and door changes to the north and west facades.
 - e) 2006 Roof replacement: Marked change from barrel tile to s-tiles.
13. He restated the legal criteria:
- a) Possess integrity – this property has gone through three redesigns.
 - b) Be significant – does this stand out all the great historic properties in Coral Gables?
 - c) Exemplify a style –
 - d) Portray an era of history.
 - e) Embodies a characteristic.

Jose Cardona – Principal Architect for Design Space Architecture located at 9990 SW 77th Avenue, Penthouse 15, Miami, Florida 33156.

1. Introduced himself and his team and their experience.
2. Presentation Overview – He gave an overview of the items he would cover.
3. Minimal traditional architecture, its core values stem from a retraction of ornamentality, lavishness, and complexity.
4. An elevation of the original architecture of the property was shown (top of page).
 - a) On the right side of the house, is a porch with poured concrete semicircular entryways and the porch also has exposed rafters with decorative rafter tails (a design that lends itself to ornamentation).
 - b) Gable transitions on each end of the home, an extensive front window and what was meant to be a decorative chimney stack.
 - c) All components listed here hint at an opulent touch by the architect dealing with the presumed budgetary restraints during those times.
 - d) The most modest gesture in the home appears to be the carport for a single vehicle situated on the far left of this elevation drawing. This carport once provided a literal transparency and sense of lightness to the house.
 - e) The upcoming slides will show how that feature has since been altered.
5. Examples of Minimal Traditional Style: He showed examples of Minimal Traditional styles – they read as modest simple designs with front facing gables, minimal gable transitions and a lack of ornamentality. The house at 517 Aragon Avenue at one point had glimpses of minimal traditionalism, however throughout its life several extensive renovations and additions have obscured any hints of its intended style.
6. Building Massing Study: (A colored diagram was shown) The diagram that juxtaposes the original massing of the house on the left, and the current massing of the house to the right.
 - a) On the left you the house attempts to establish some horizontality with the front facade while being flush with the original carport.
 - b) On the current massing to the right is the construction of a 2-car garage, situated about 18 inches, proud of the original front wall of the building.
 - c) The volume inserted for the double garage introduces a segmented rhythm along the front facade that creates a push pull effect unlike what one would expect from a modest architectural style like Minimal Traditionalism.
 - d) On the original massing, there are facade alterations behind the carport, where a small single-leaf door once existed. The previous owners constructed oversized double doors and decorative steps leading to it.
 - e) The original covered terrace was enclosed on the rear side of the house.
 - f) The semicircular opening to the porch has since been sealed with custom doors with a custom door side light assembly which had to be custom to fit the artful opening.
7. Building Plan Study – (A drawing was shown with purple-colored areas).
 - a) A plan study on the original plan of the house to identify the areas of alteration was provided.
 - b) These areas were indicated in purple on the drawing.

- c) Approximately 50% of the floor plan has been altered in a way that retracts from its association with minimal traditional architecture.
 - d) A two-car garage was built, the rear terrace was enclosed, the front porch was enclosed, various interior alterations were done, and numerous window and door openings were altered.
8. Building Then and Now: South Elevation: (Two renderings were shown)
- a) The front elevation drawings of the house were shown.
 - b) The original house is on the top side of the page, and below a front elevation produced for the current front elevation.
 - c) The most significant change is the construction of the 2-car garage in lieu of the small carport original to the home.
 - d) The carport once gave a sense of transparency to the house. Now the two-car garage creates a closed-off, heavy, and opaque field.
 - e) Even simply adding one garage door to the carport would have adversely affected the feel of the front facade.
 - f) In this, in this case, two garage doors have been added.
 - g) The frontage aesthetic is now a segmented language instead of a seamless horizontal transition.
 - h) The semi-circular porch, entry, threshold has been sealed with a window/door assembly, and custom iron work was installed in front of the windows, and the doors.
9. If the house was previously designated as historic, many of these items would not be allowed nor considered appropriate, as they drastically changed the ethos of the home.
10. Building Then and Now: North Elevation (Two renderings were shown)
- a) The back elevation shows the enclosed porch of the rear house between the 2 gable end roofs.
 - b) The wraparound window on the far left of the drawing that was sealed and turned into a large window for a bedroom.
 - c) The chimney appears to have been designed to have a touch of decorativeness, but at some point, it was essentially humbled down and now it is just a simple chimney.
 - d) The bulky opaqueness instilled at the right side of the house after the double car extension was built.
11. Building Then and Now: West Elevation (Two renderings were shown)
- a) The left elevation, facing west was completely altered during a 1988 kitchen renovation.
 - b) In the original elevation (on the top of the page) the house had 2 slim doors and a small window in the kitchen.
 - c) During the kitchen renovation all openings were sealed, and one large double door was installed with decorative steps leading up to it, and a large window installed adjacent to the double door.
 - d) The original car had 2 openings on the side which were sealed after the 2-car garage was constructed. The bulky and opaque nature of that car garage edition.
12. Building Then and Now: East Elevation (Two renderings were shown)
- a) Nearly all openings on the right elevation facing east have been modified.
 - b) The window to the right was sealed and split into 2 windows.
 - c) The window in the bathroom was reduced in size and glass blocks were installed.
 - d) The wraparound window on the corner was removed and turned into a single punctured window, another elaborate semicircle on the side of what used to be the front porch.
 - e) Custom windows were installed, and custom ironwork was installed superimposed over those windows.
13. Alterations Analysis: Garage Front (a colored photo of the two garage doors was shown)
- a) The house has undergone several modifications throughout its history that have unfortunately removed its inclusion to the group of historic homes that exemplify the story of minimal traditional homes built in the 1930s.
 - b) These homes were meant to be an architectural response to the strenuous economic times.
 - c) One feature of this house was the carport fashioned on the west side of the residence.
 - d) When Frank Lloyd Wright coined the term carport, in his Usonian Homes the intent was to move away from the fully built garages and provide an economic solution to store vehicles.
 - e) The minimal traditional style of this home was aligned with that notion.

- f) The core value has unfortunately been tarnished by the inclusion of a double car garage on the main frontage of this building.
14. Alterations Analysis: Garage Rear (a colored photo of the rear side of the garage with a garage door and overhang was shown)
- a) The image of the rear side of the garage showing that opaqueness was displayed on the screen.
 - b) A decorative water feature was also added, and the side extension becomes this segmented wing of the house, instead of a continuation, as it was originally designed.
15. Alterations Analysis: Interior Garage (colored photos of the interior of the garage were shown)
- a) Image of the interior of the garage addition was shown.
 - b) The garage was built around the carport.
 - c) The structure of the new garage was tied into the existing concrete of the carport, mending them in a way that would require extensive repairs and reinforcement if the garage was to be removed.
16. Alterations Analysis: Enclosed Porches (colored photos of interior of the porches were shown)
- a) The interior of the front porch that was enclosed was shown.
 - b) Central air conditioning was introduced.
 - c) If this space were unenclosed, the HVAC system for the house would have to be redesigned.
17. Alterations Analysis: Enclosed Porches (more colored photos of interior of the porches were shown)
- a) Another image of one of those enclosures was shown.
 - b) This is for the rear terrace.
 - c) This was permitted during a 1961 renovation.
 - d) Just like the enclosed porch both structures have exposed rafters, and presumably no insulation.
18. Alterations Analysis: Entry Arch & Rafters (a colored photo of a portion of the entryway along with the rafters was shown).
- a) The inclusion of exposed rafters on the eve of the front porch entry was pointed out.
 - b) The rafters have a decorative rafter tail design, which was a clear move to insert touches of ornamentality to the home.
 - c) These decorative gestures create an overtone similar to that of which is often experienced in a detailed, intricate, and picturesque architectural style, like in Spanish Colonial, or Mediterranean Revival, both of which are a far cry from the modest and unassuming, Minimal, Traditionalist style.
 - d) The expressive semi-circular entry to what used to be the porch was shown. This would have called for skilled laborers to create a formwork that can be considered above average in complexity.
 - e) The custom windows and ironwork were shown.
19. Alterations Analysis: Openings on all sides (colored photos of the window openings were shown).
- a) Image of some of the window openings, the current state of them after being modified by previous owners was shown.
20. Alterations Analysis: Openings on all sides (a colored photo of the doors, steps and a garage door on the back side were shown).
- a) Not only were windows modified, the slim and simple doors were converted to considerably wide windows doors, even in today's standards.
21. Existing Structural Conditions: (a layout of the home was shown).
- a) They performed an extensive inspection on the residence, during which they visually inspected the crawl space, performed drone inspections on the roof and scanned the exterior walls using radar technology.
 - b) The results of the inspection have been documented and memorialized in a report submitted to the board.
 - c) The main observations dealt with the location and quantity of the steel reinforcement bars or rebar in the existing residence, or lack thereof.
 - d) A floorplan with red dots on locations where rebar was discovered was shown.
 - e) While minimal rebar was found, the most concerning thing was the size of the rebar in the existing house. Current building codes require a number 5- or 5/8-inch diameter rebars on the corner of the house. The house when it was scanned has 1/2 diameter rebar, and just on one corner.
 - f) This house will have to be extensively reinforced in order to be considered a safe dwelling unit.

- g) Several spots in the crawl space appear to have deteriorated wood floor joists, some of which were poorly repaired and are showing signs of failure already.
- 22. Building Reversibility or Restoration: (two color photos of the garage doors and windows and door of the house were shown).
 - a) The alterations this house has experienced over time have pushed it further and further away from what could have been considered a humbly designed home in an era where the cost of construction, was a major driver in architectural design.
- 23. He urged the Historic Preservation Board to move away from designating this property as local history.
- 24. Coral Gables has a plethora of beautifully significant local gems, including this home as part of that group would dilute the esteem of being labeled Historic Home in Coral Gables.
- 25. A newly designed home on this lot would be adding to the beautification of this marvelous City, and the meticulously appointed Coral Gables Board of Architects will undoubtedly aid in approving a design that adds to the embellishment of the City Beautiful.

Property Owner Shaan Patel made the following comments:

- 1. He thanked the board for listening on behalf of himself and his wife.
- 2. He gave some history of his life, his desire to become an architect, his desire to build his dream home and how he came to acquire the property.
- 3. Historic designation would severely limit their dreams for the property.

Edward Matos made closing comments:

- 1. Designation is not warranted and the reasons for that are:
 - a) The building has lost its integrity, which is one of the key criteria you must find.
 - b) Over time the architect has shown how all the changes have taken away the distinctive look of a minimal traditional building.
 - c) It's not significant. It doesn't stand out among the in the historic fabric of Coral Gables.
 - d) It does not exemplify a style.
 - e) Because of all the changes that have occurred it does not portray a trend in time.
 - f) When you look at this building, you don't say to yourself immediately that you are back in the 1920s or 1930s.
 - g) It does not embody any one particular characteristic that you would call minimal traditional. It is quite ornate, as our architect testified.
 - h) Important, too, because we always think, there is a possibility for rehab or restoration, or maybe even addition, within the framework of a historic home, but here you found that you can see that it's not really viable for the structural reasons that the architect has pointed out. There are problems with this building involving the rebar, also extending to the flooring and roofing.
- 2. Ask yourself if this is a minimal building? If we're going to add, restore, modernize the building is it still minimal? That is why integrity is important.
- 3. Historic preservation/designation does not mean you can't do anything with the property. That's very true, but that's not to say that there aren't certain losses, and one of the losses I want to emphasize here and why I think significance is important is that the City as a whole, is losing something.
- 4. The majority of your history is in front of you it is not behind you, and you have to leave some room for the new architects like the new owners to come in to design within the character of Coral Gables, not to go outside the character of Coral Gables, but to build new, to add something new, to contribute to the history and so that is something that would be lost.
- 5. It does affect property values, and we have to keep that in mind.

Mr. Matos handed the materials discussed to the board and to the clerk if they wanted to reference them.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor or opposition of the case.

Mr. Adams said there was a letter of support from the Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables.

Ms. Carbonell wanted to speak on ZOOM, Chair Menendez said they already had a letter from her and could not consider her comments as testimony unless she appeared on video.

Ms. Carbonell said she could not appear on video as she was driving. She made the following comments:

1. You have our letter in support of the staff's report.
2. She heard all the presentations.
3. Only one criterion is needed.
4. The staff really put together a strong case for designation.
5. We only have a few homes that Mr. Merriam designed.
6. History is not in front of us, it is behind us also and we do live in a historic city.
7. It's always a wonderful thing where we can continue to preserve what has made us the reason people move here.

Mr. Matos requested to rebut, but Chair Menendez said the public portion was now closed.

Staff made the following comments:

1. Minimal Traditional:
The presentation/discussion on Minimal Traditional was very generalized and not focusing on Coral Gables. We would not use a Neo-Classical style from Washington to try and justify a Neo-Classical style here we would look at the local examples.
Minimal traditional buildings will differ slightly from place to place, and, as you know, Coral Gables has its own unique style of architecture dating from the 1920's, and on page 6, it is clearly explained:
Excerpt from the Staff Report:
"By the mid-1930s in Coral Gables, there was a departure from the ornamented and picturesque Mediterranean Revival style that dominated the City's landscape. Minimal Traditional houses in Coral Gables most often reflected this precursor style as well as the dominant regional Modernistic styles of Art Deco and Art Moderne. Specifically, Minimal Traditional style homes in Coral Gables tended to reflect Mediterranean Revival style influences with features such as barrel tile roofs, grouped vents, arched openings, and prominent chimneys. The Modernistic aesthetic included smooth stucco, a horizontal emphasis, fenestration without sills or lintels, curved and geometric forms, simplified roof types, eyebrows, corner windows, and floral motifs."
2. The question of integrity:
How much has the building been altered? It was actually a definition of historic integrity in the definition sections of the Code.
Excerpt from the Code:
"Historic integrity is the authenticity of a property's historic identity evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the properties prehistoric or historic period. Historic integrity enables a property to illustrate significant aspects of its past not only must the property resemble its historic appearance, but it must also retain physical materials design features and aspects of construction dating from the period when attained significance. These features are listed in Appendix "C"."
It further goes on to say:
"All six qualities (integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, or association) do not need to be present for eligibility as long as the overall sense of past time and place is evident."
3. 737 Minorca Avenue was referenced by the applicant as being minimally altered and that is why it was designated. This property actually does have an addition to the side of property much like what is in front of the Board today.
4. The final comment, historic designation, affects property values. Without any proof of this it is a bit of a generalization to make. I think you would be hard pushed to argue that historic designation in Coral Gables significantly affects property values, possibly up, but we have no figures to qualify that.
5. 1700 Cortez Street that was mentioned in the Staff Report. Its porch that has the similar arched circular feature has also been enclosed and was enclosed at the time of designation and that was cited as being minimally altered. We have done that in the past.

6. The architect said that the Historic Preservation Board would not allow the front porch to be closed, as it is now. A couple of meetings ago the Board allowed someone to enclose their porch so that is not actually a true statement.
7. The rafters that were noted as an alteration of the porch with the decorative rafters, are not an alteration, they are original to the house, and indicative of this style.
8. On the east elevation the windows that were noted to be altered were not. Page 13 of your Staff Report states they were changed during construction, as was the practice at the time.

Mr. Matos responded as follows:

1. The actual Code provision clearly states you have to have integrity, be significant and then one of those 3 criteria that's Staff pointed out. It is all of the above. It is 1, 2, and then one of the remaining. It is not just one of all these criteria. It's the first 2 integrity and significance, and then one of a long list, staff has only called out 3 from that long list.
2. At no point in my presentation did I say there were zero alterations in the other buildings, what I said was that they were minimal. I pulled words exactly from Staff's own reports. There was no attempt to mischaracterize anything.
3. With respect to costs, in the packet that you've been provided by our architect, there's actually a breakdown of additional costs and expenses that would be related to our renovation or restoration.

Chair Menendez said the Board does not consider costs in their deliberation.

Chair Menendez asked if there were any questions or comments.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Has the applicant requested or provided any reasons for economic hardship on this application?

Mr. Adams: There has been no request and that normally accompanies a Certificate of Appropriateness application. We don't know exactly what repairs or alterations are being proposed.

Deputy City Attorney Throckmorton reminded the board that Mrs. Carbonell's testimony was not sworn, and they should not rely on it and any motions made should be based on the record that was provided to them.

A motion was made by Mr. Maxwell and seconded by Ms. Spain to approve the local historic designation of the property at 517 Aragon Avenue, legally described as the West 36.4 Feet of Lot 16 and all of Lot 17, Block 10, Coral Gables Section "B," according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 111, of the Public Records of Dade County, Florida on the basis of local historical, cultural, and architectural significance as per the information provided in the staff report.

The motion passed (Ayes: 8, Nays: 0).

The board took a 10-minute recess.

Chair Menendez read a description of the next case as follows:

CASE FILE LHD 2022-015: Consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 1710 Hernando Street, legally described as Lots 13 & 14, Block 4, Coral Groves Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 15, at Page 72 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

A Power Point echoing the Designation Report was played onscreen.

Mr. Carlos Yanes, the property owner, stated that they do not oppose the designation.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor or opposition of the case. When no one did he closed the public portion of the hearing and opened it up to the board for comments.

Ms. Spain asked if this house was on the Garden Club House Tour. The owner confirmed that it was.

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the local historic designation of the property at 1710 Hernando Street, legally described as Lots 13 & 14, Block 4, Coral Groves Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 15, at Page 72 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida based on its historical, cultural and architectural significance as evidenced in the staff report.

The motion passed (Ayes: 8, Nays: 0).

Chair Menendez read a description of the next case as follows:

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2023-008: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 1710 Hernando Street, a Local Historic Landmark, legally described as Lots 13 & 14, Block 4, Coral Groves Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 15, at Page 72 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The application requests design approval for the demolition of the carport, an addition, and alterations to the residence and sitework.

Mr. Adams made a presentation following the on-screen Presentation. He read excerpts of the following from the staff report and also made the following comments (comments are in italics, references to the sections of the report are in regular font).

1. Proposal
2. Staff Observations
 - a) Demolition
 - b) Addition
 - c) East (front) Elevation
 - d) South Elevation
 - e) West (Rear) Elevation
 - f) North Elevation
 - g) Siteworks
3. Variances – None
4. Board of Architects – comments are in the staff report.
5. Staff Conclusion:
 - a) Staff still need details of the garage doors, windows and other things which can be submitted.
 - b) Staff have no issue with the sitework and the rear addition.
 - c) Staff have concerns over the demolition of the original car for the new 2 car garage.
 - d) Staff is recommending approval with the conditions stated in the staff report.

Mr. Norman Blandon – Architect – N25 Architecture made a presentation following the on-screen Presentation.

1. They agree with the staff conditions except for the carport.
2. A survey was shown.
3. Existing photos were shown.
4. Plans delineating the area of work.
5. Demolition Plan:
 - a) Proposed demolition of the 2013 addition. (shown in purple).
 - b) Reworking steps (shown in purple).
 - c) The carport in question. (shown in purple).
6. Second Floor Plan:
 - a) Planning to do interior alterations to add bedrooms.
 - b) Carport and addition below (shown in purple).
7. Proposed floorplan (showed the following):
 - a) Living space and guestroom addition in the back.
 - b) Pool area and deck accessible from previous access and new doors on the new addition.
 - c) Proposed garage.
8. This proposal came about after they went to the Board of Architect who had some suggestions.

- a) The original proposal just extended the existing carport and it looked awkward to them with a flat roof and it was not cohesive with the house, so they suggested adding a parapet which is what they have done in this proposal.
9. Second Story:
 - a) The front elevation with the proposed new garage was shown.
 - b) Part of The second garage door has been stepped back so that it won't be a continuous façade.
10. South Side:
 - a) Showed the existing and the proposed.
 - b) A drawing showing the existing and proposed 2-story addition was shown.
 - c) It keeps the same character of the house.
11. Rear Elevation:
 - a) Before and after were shown.
 - b) The demolition areas were marked in purple.
 - c) The garage extension from the back was shown.
12. North Elevation:
 - a) Before and after were shown.
 - b) The proposed demolition was shown in purple.
 - c) The garage addition where the carport is right now was shown.
 - d) A door and windows for the new bedroom would be added.
13. Rendering of the existing and Proposed Addition:
 - a) It showed the removal of the existing carport.
 - b) The proposed two-car garage was shown.
14. Rendering of the rear of the house:
 - a) Proposed west view showing the 2-story bedroom addition and garage and bedroom addition with the pool and pool deck.
15. Rendering of the Southwest view of the house:
 - a) Shows the existing and proposed.
16. Neighborhood photos that were required by the Board of Architects were shown.
17. Photo of original house:
 - a) The carport is not visible.
18. Photo of the carport from the inside of the house:
 - a) The year of the photo is not known, but the carport is not original because there is a window from the inside of the house looking out to the carport. It was an addition at some point (a picture was shown).
19. Pictures of the carport were shown.
20. Zoning code requires the carport/garage to have a minimum of 12 feet. In this case when a car is inside the doors can barely be opened. Making it wider will allow better access to the car.
21. Comparison between the historical photo and the drone photo which they had taken:
 - a) The drone photo shows the carport, but it is not shown in the historical photo.
22. Original rendering submitted to the Board of Architects:
 - a) They had planned to extend the carport with the same roof.
 - b) There were aesthetic problems for the board.
 - c) That is why they are proposing to demolish the carport and do the two-car addition in the front.

Questions and Comments from the Board. Mr. Blandon's answers are in italics.

1. The comparison old historic photo shows a structure (carport) with a driveway leading up to it.
2. Are there two separate roofs on the garage?
No, they are the same roof, one is set back from the other with a parapet.
3. Is it sloped slightly?
Behind the parapet it will have a slope for drainage.
4. Is the parapet level?
Yes.
5. Is the garage door that is closest to the house a little bit smaller than the outside one?
No that might be an optical illusion, it is the same.

6. You have made them both standard widths, right?
Yes, the same width as required by zoning.
7. And you raised it up a little bit too?
Yes
8. You have side by side, but have you stepped the second carport back just a little bit.
Yes
9. Will the proposed new double new carport be open down the middle or do you have two separate bays?
The intent is to have it open down the middle.
10. How much extra space do you get with the new carport?
1 foot, 8 inches.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor or opposition of the case. When no one did he closed the public portion of the hearing and opened it up to the board for comments.

Chair Menendez asked Mr. Blandon if he had issues with staff condition #7, Mr. Blandon said yes.

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the design proposal for the demolition of the carport, an addition, and alterations to the residence and sitework and approve the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at **1710 Hernando Street**, a Local Historic Landmark, legally described as Lots 13 & 14, Block 4, Coral Groves Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 15, at Page 72 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida with the six conditions, not including #7 as stated in the staff report.

The motion passed (Ayes: 8, Nays: 0).

Conditions are as follows:

1. *The stucco on the addition shall be differentiated from the historic stucco.*
2. *The new roof tiles shall match the existing roof tiles.*
3. *A schedule providing details and specifications of the proposed new windows and doors is submitted to Staff for review.*
4. *Windows shall have clear glass and high profile muntins.*
5. *The new windows shall not have sills to differentiate the addition from the historic structure.*
6. *Details of the proposed pavers, rear terrace surfacing, swimming pool, and garage doors are submitted to Staff for review.*

Chair Menendez read a description of the next case as follows:

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2023-005: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at **1104 Malaga Avenue**, a Local Historic Landmark, legally described as Lots 5-11 Inclusive, Block 12, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part One, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 8, at Page 106 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant is requesting design approval for a Master Site Plan for future improvements.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons asked the Chair to have them explain the meaning of the design approval for a Master Site Plan for future improvements.

Ms. Kautz showed the Board a PowerPoint presentation and noted the following: the property is located across from the Biltmore Hotel and spans between Malaga Avenue and Anastasia Avenue; a 1920's photo of the house was shown; the property was designated in 1978 and designed by H. George Fink; the property has not had any substantive additions and very few alterations; and has only had six owners in its' almost 100 year old existence.

Chair Menendez said he had worked on the home and recused himself, passing the gavel to Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons.

Ms. Kautz continued:

1. A 1940's photo of the house was shown with the Biltmore Hotel in the background.
2. The house is under new ownership as of last year and there are code enforcement issues based on work done by the previous owner. To get the improvements done to close the code enforcement case, they were going to start work in a piecemeal sort of fashion. i.e., do the windows first and then start addressing certain things at a time.
3. She was taken on a tour of the property by the homeowner and advised them to apply for an ad-valorem tax abatement application, requesting that they prepare a master plan to get COA approval for future work. Then they can turn in the application for the abatement based on this work and as they are ready to do the individual projects, they can submit either a special or standard COA to be reviewed by staff or the board. All items can be encapsulated into one abatement application that is the most robust application that they can get.
4. The board is not approving per se the addition shown, that will come back to the board. Similarly, they are not approving the guest house which may or may not happen in a future phase.

Questions and comments by the Board: Ms. Kautz's responses are in italics.

1. If they have many things to do, does everything that is in the ad-valorem application have to be done and included in just one request or can they do the lion's share and have some things that will be submitted in another phase?
The way it is worded is that the application for tax relief has to be submitted prior to the onset of construction. Before they start, we have to have the application for the whole project. It does not make sense to put in one application for the windows, pay the money, do the application, come back, and do another for the addition then come back again. This way it gets them all, but all of the separate certificates are covered under that Ad-Valorem application.
2. You get everything approved for the overall plan, but does everything have to be completed for every phase of that for every item?
Before they apply for Part Two at substantial completion, anything that is included in the request has to be reflected in Part Two. If they decide that they do not want to do something later on, we exclude that from the scope of work, and they move forward with a Part Two that reflects exactly what they did. The architect is here. This is a spectacular property that will only benefit from the work that they are proposing, which is not a lot given the size of the property. It is a really important house in the City's history.
3. Have we as the City done a master plan approval like this before?
Similarly, there were two that were done before. One was for the Zinnmaster Estate (the Coral Rock Village). They came in with a big scope of work and then they phased out each cottage and then the house individually. The Board also approved a concept site plan for Java Head. Then the landscape plans came back to the Board in two parts, as did the proposed pool house and additions to the property.
4. What exactly are we reviewing for approval today?
You are reviewing the package so that you are comfortable with it, and you know you are going to see this again later. You are giving them approval in theory to move forward with what is here.
5. If they come back for the full house, all the applications will come back to us?
Yes, the windows, which they are probably going to do rather soon, will come to staff administratively. The pool will depend on when they do it. Pools usually just come to staff, but if it is something else it will come to the Board. The addition and the perimeter wall will definitely come to the Board.
6. The specifics in this application may change a bit here or there in the next application.
I think they want to move forward with the work on the house first and then that small addition to the rear as the first phase and then progress from there.
7. Was this the house that had the labels on the windows for years?
Yes.

Mr. Nelson DeLeon – Locus Architecture, Inc. made the following comments:

1. My client is traveling overseas, they really wanted to be here.
2. The gist of what my clients want to do is to restore the home as accurately as possible to its original design.

3. What you will see as far as elevations of the existing house that is all in keeping with what we have been able to glean off of this photo in particular (1940s' photo). It actually zooms in perfectly well to where I can actually see how many spindles, and how many knuckles there are on the spindles. All the way to the original drawings of Fink. Some elements I think were probably not built into the original home, but in all cases what we couldn't see in photos, we used the Fink plans as a guide as to what that intent was. The photos being our primary inspiration for understanding how the house was and this first picture here you will see the elements from the 20's that disappeared in the 40's.
4. Some of the shutters, the decorative cutouts on the walls disappeared. As the house progressed some of the decorative wing walls were shaved off and the house became a bit more angular in nature. Some of those very decorative swirls and wall movements disappeared. We are trying to bring that back.
5. The original plans were shown:
 - a) The house is actually pretty close to the original plans. A few changes occurred over the years, but for the most part the floor plan has stayed intact.
 - b) We relied heavily on the original photos for the original intent on the window grids, sizing and spacing. And the same thing with the doors.
6. More pictures of the existing home were shown:
 - a) Two views from Cordova Street.
 - b) Main entrance view.
 - c) Existing terrace view (three photos).
7. A lot of what was there originally has been stripped off and you will see in my comparative elevations clearly what we are trying to bring back.
8. The only addition that is planned on the main home is visible on the right image here (existing terrace view) it will be tucked in between the garage and what is the current laundry and kitchen area. The other three facades of the home are staying intact.
9. An overall view of the master plan was shown:
 - a) With the main house there is a shaded area in the back, this is where the proposed 2-story addition will be. It adds a family room and a master suite to the back.
 - b) The family room is to take advantage of the rear, it is a very large property and there is currently no real visual engagement or access to that back yard.
 - c) The idea is that this first phase would provide the access to the potential future master plan of adding the pool or the guest house for the pool house.
10. Demolition Plan:
 - a) The demolition plan is pretty extensive and accurate.
 - b) Everything you read on here are add-on elements that are being removed to restore the house and the plan back to its original state.
11. Proposed Floor Plan:
 - a) The only places where we have deviated from that is the connection point to the new family room on the ground floor and the connection point to the new master suite on the second floor.
 - b) The foyer, the living room, the dining room, the den, the kitchen with the exception of the transition to the family room, are all being brought back to the original.
 - c) The loggia area (the 45-degree cut-out) was the original entrance to the home, but once you entered the loggia there are 4 sets of doors with no hierarchy. In reviewing this with the client the idea is to bring the entrance to the actual main foyer which is a beautiful space. And you will see in the elevations what we are proposing to do.
 - d) The bedroom arrangement is in essence on the main house theme.
 - e) We took what used to be the sleeping porch in the back that had been converted to a bedroom and used that piece as the transition element to get to the new master suite.
12. Proposed Roof Plan:
 - a) The one thing we are adding is the big "X" in the middle.
 - b) That is a double height stair with a beautiful overlook.
 - c) An oversized skylight to illuminate the center of the house will be installed.
13. Proposed and Demolition Front Elevation North / Proposed Front Elevation North:
 - a) When we studied the photos, we realized that the shaded areas were cutouts.

- b) Particularly in the front, this one here (he pointed on the drawing), and there are three of them. They were cutouts with spindles and decorative tiles around the border and we are going to bring that back.
- c) The client is very excited about bringing all of this back.
- d) Reintroducing the 45-degree cutout to the loggia, the decorative side opening and the center of the foyer which always had an arch which has been converted to a square now. We are bringing that arch back.
- e) On the side of these openings, we are reintroducing these decorative walls that added a lot of movement.

Questions and comments from the Board. Mr. Deleon's answers and comments are in italics.

1. You are going back to the 20's not the 40's right.
We are going back to the 20's. In the 20's some things started to disappear. These shutters here (he pointed to on the drawing Proposed front elevation north), if you look at the photos from the 20's they had started to disappear. This element, which is a window now, in the 20's was a decorative cut-out that probably had a screen behind it, so we are going to bring that back and keep the window behind that.
2. Usually, they had a window back there and people hated them because you couldn't clean the outside.
It is not an easy detail to figure out. The original Fink drawings had a second stair at the back of the garage. We would like to reintroduce that stair to the back but eliminate the stair that is on the side. Part of the reason is that it was almost inverted with the run rise. The run is about 8 inches, and the rise is about 12 inches, it is a steep, dangerous, and awkward stair arrangement.

Master Suite: This is the piece that we would like to propose to add. This is the master suite, a step back element to the master bath and then the reason for the asymmetry on the large side of the family windows, and then the smaller is the spot we intend to in the future create a covered connector with double doors that would then link to the guest house on the other portions of the property.
3. Did you get rid of the fountain?
Yes, but not the spigot. We are going to reuse that in another part of the house.
Garage: This is the back of the garage or the side of the garage and then this is the part that we are introducing which projects forward and a 1-story element that projects forward to the family is a screened enclosure. This is all part of the original architecture.
4. The plans pretty clearly show that on that 45-degree front door there was a hood mold over it and a decorative molding on it. It is shown in the photographs as well. Are you going to restore that? It goes right above the door, and it comes up like that and there are rope columns right there on the side. You can see it in the photographs.
That will be added back in.
5. There is another one over the bay over the oriole window and I can't see it, I haven't seen a photograph of it, at construction or right close to that where that is visible but there would be one over the bay in the middle as well. Which is also shown in the plans.
I am not sure it got built because it was shown as a planter in the plans and when I studied that bay window I couldn't tell if there was ever enough width to have the planter and the octagon shape. I don't think that there are any photos that clearly show that part of the house. The Fink drawings do show an element above. When you are at the site it does not appear that the width for that element ever to have been put in, but it is possible that it could have been.
4. If you could clean it and get down and look at the stucco, you could probably tell that was the case.
Once some of the work on the exterior occurs some of those tell-tale signs will become visible.
Just as a recap:
 - a) *The first part of this is to stop the house from continuing to degrade.*
 - b) *Restore it as accurately as possible and add the 2-story addition to the back.*

Ms. Kautz stated that the back raised terrace where the fountain is located was added at a later date.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor or opposition of the case. When no one did he closed the public portion of the hearing and opened it up to the board for comments.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons asked Ms. Kautz if the two-story main house addition would be a separate application to the board. Ms. Kautz responded affirmatively.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons asked the board if everyone understood and was comfortable approving a master plan. Board members answered affirmatively.

Ms. Kautz stated that the amount of restoration work that they are doing is the type of project that the ad-valorem tax abatement program is made for. Therefore, it did not make sense to not let them take advantage of it.

A motion was made by Ms. Spain and seconded by Mr. Fullerton to approve the design proposal for a Master Site Plan for future improvements on the property at **1104 Malaga Avenue**, a Local Historic Landmark, legally described as Lots 5-11 Inclusive, Block 12, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part One, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 8, at Page 106 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida, as stated in the staff report and the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness

The motion passed (Ayes: 7, Nays: 0).

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons passed the gavel back to Chair Menendez.

Chair Menendez read a description of the next case as follows:

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2023-007: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at **1209 Algardi Avenue**, a Non-Contributing Resource within the Santa Maria Street Historic District, legally described as Lots 21 & 22 Less the West 51 Feet of Lot 22, Block 95, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part Five, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 23, at Page 55 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The application requests design approval for a second-story addition and alterations to the residence and sitework.

Ms. Kautz made a presentation accompanying the on-screen PowerPoint Presentation. She read excerpts of the following from the staff report and also made the following comments (comments are in italics, references to the sections of the report are in regular font).

1. A location map of the property was shown.
2. Background
3. Proposal
4. Board of Architects
5. Staff Conclusion

Eduardo Llano – Architect of Record made the following comments:

1. They have been through the review process and now we are just trying to get the permit.
2. It is a 1-story addition.
3. It is a larger property and the client wanted to get more bang for his buck for the property and does not want to move.
4. They came up with the idea to do a two-story addition.
5. They keep the same footprint, and do not take any yard space away, and keep the existing septic tank.
6. They are not maxed out in terms of overall size; they wanted to keep a one-story portion and do the second story in the middle.
7. He has done this before somewhere in Malaga and it works well.
8. 4017 Santa Maria that faces the golf course kind of has the same parti where they have a 1-story portion with the middle portion being 2-story.

9. When he met with the client it was a reference and they basically followed that idea.
10. Site Plan:
 - a) The middle portion which is like an L-shape, is the 2-story portion.
 - b) The rest stays 1-story.
 - c) It is setback especially from the Santa Maria side and it is a step back also from the side neighbor.
11. Second Floor:
 - a) The second floor will be a master suite with a living space and then a 2-story foyer.
 - b) It does have a new entrance piece to the front.
 - c) In a ranch house everyone fights with where the entrance is, so they have incorporated that also.
12. Elevation for the Permit:
 - a) The house with the new 2-story addition was shown.
 - b) The new entry and the new 2-story piece were shown.
 - c) The bottom drawing showed that they were extending an existing gate to bring it across the front of the whole property.
14. Existing and Proposed South Elevation – Proposed South Elevation Fence:
 - a) Showed a comparison of what the house looks like now, the whole ranch element (a low house) and the piece that gives the contrast.
 - b) The comparison between the existing and the new on this elevation was shown.
15. Proposed West and East Elevation:
 - a) Elevations on the side were shown.
16. Proposed east elevation:
 - a) The 1-story looking east towards Santa Maria with the 2-story addition was shown.
18. Existing and Proposed West Elevation:
 - a) The side towards the side neighbor (the garage side) was shown.
18. Proposed North Elevation:
 - a) The rear façade was shown.
 - b) The pool is off this side of the house so that is really your outdoor living area.
19. Proposed and Existing North Elevation:
 - a) A comparison of the existing versus the 2-story portion was shown.

A motion was made by Mr. Fullerton and seconded by Mr. Durana to approve the design proposal for second-story addition and alterations to the residence and sitework on the property at **1209 Algardi Avenue**, a Non-Contributing Resource within the Santa Maria Street Historic District, legally described as Lots 21 & 22 Less the West 51 Feet of Lot 22, Block 95, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part Five, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 23, at Page 55 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida and the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness

The motion passed (Ayes: 8, Nays: 0).

BOARD ITEMS / CITY COMMISSION / CITY PROJECTS UPDATE: None

ITEMS FROM THE SECRETARY:

1. **Appeals of the board's decisions:**
 - a) COA(SP)2022-008 - 1258 Obispo – Application for Demolition
 - b) LHD2022-014 – 110 Phoenetia Avenue “The Garden of Our Lord” – Application for designation.

Outcome: Both were appealed to the City Commission and the appeals were denied.

2. **Two-piece barrel tile roof:**

Recommended Wording: “Staff can only approve the original roof covering or window design on the house. Anything further requires board review and approval. “S” tiles are not supported in replacement of barrel tiles.”

1. Wording will not prevent someone from submitting an application to the Board.
2. The City cannot prevent someone from bringing an item to the Board.
3. Suggestions:

- a) The wording be put on the application not to preclude the applicant from submitting to the Board, but to make them aware and eliminate the need to refer to another document.
 - b) A clause be included that referred to windows going back to the original configuration. Which would make the applicant aware before hiring the window company.
 - c) A clause which the applicant signs affirming that what was approved by the Board is what must be installed. This puts the onus on the applicant to accept liability if the incorrect items are installed.
4. The Deputy City Attorney will work with staff and return with a document for the Board's final review at the next meeting.

3. 2023 State Legislative Session:

- a) Board members were provided with a copy of the bill as well as the email from Daniel Ciraldo, Executive Director of the Miami Design Preservation League regarding lobbying the state.
- b) The bill was introduced by Senators Brian Avila (Miami Gardens) and Spenser Roach (Fort Myers).

Comments by Deputy City Attorney Throckmorton:

- a) HB1317 – Proposed this year in the State Legislature in the House and there is a companion bill.
- b) It is going to the regulatory reform and economic development subcommittee this week.
- c) Last session there was a bill regarding coastal historic homes, and while there was protection built in for those homes already designated as of the date of that bill.
- d) This new bill is a little bit different in that it provides that no local ordinances can restrict demolition of homes if they are in coastal hazard zones which are defined in FEMA flood maps. They are zones V, V 1 through 30 and VE.
- e) Many of the City's historic homes are not in those zones, but parts of the City are. Whether or not they contain historic homes, there is no exception made for homes that were designated prior to the bill and there is a requirement that local governments cannot require reconstruction/ rebuilding of the similar home. The City cannot impede the new construction once the home has been demolished.
- f) The City is working with its lobbyists. They are following this bill and tracking it carefully and the City Attorney's Office will keep Historic Preservation Staff abreast of any changes that may happen and how it goes in the committee.
- g) The hurricane in Sarasota may have contributed to the introduction of this bill. It is related to the bill proposed last year, while that one had some exceptions, this one goes a bit further.
- h) This is one of the City's bills or interest, they are following and tracking it very closely and working with their lobbying team in Tallahassee. This bill would be covered by the legislative priorities that were adopted by the City Commission.
- i) I think it falls under sort of the preemption language that the city always tries to do battle every year up in Tallahassee. Obviously, any time the City's hands are tied by a bill like this we get concerned. It is covered by our legislative priorities. We don't have a particular proposed amendment at this point, but we are certainly tracking and following and working with our lobbyists to see what if any wiggle room there is in this bill.
- j) Because of this preemption the City is not for this bill.
- k) I don't want to state the City's exact position on a bill to the extent that there were amendments raised. Anytime a bill like this has preemptive language like this the City gets concerned and wants to look very closely at its effect. Obviously, there are coastal communities that would be even more affected than the City of Coral Gables.
- l) The City is tracking it closely to see what if any amendments are made.
- m) The Board can certainly pass a motion opposing the bill as it is currently proposed and that will certainly go to the City Commission.
- n) She has email about other City's having certain representatives. Palm Beach was at the Committee hearing. She is in contact with the City's lobbyists to see what if any other municipalities are doing at the subcommittee level or others.

- o) She did not believe that the Florida League of Cities has taken a position on the bill.
- p) The bill was filed on March 1st, 2023.

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Maxwell from the Historic Preservation Board to the City Commission to oppose HB1317 as currently written and strongly encourage the City to protect its existing historic fabric.

The motion passed (Ayes: 8, Nays: 0).

4. Historic Preservation Plans:

- a) Mr. Maxwell suggested forming a sub-committee to create a format/guideline for the preparation of historic preservation plans to assist the city and future applicants.
- b) The subcommittee would be an ad hoc subcommittee for a period of time and would be subject to the Sunshine Law and meetings would be publicly noticed.
- c) Members would be decided, volunteers would be accepted.
- d) Mr. Maxwell will head the sub-committee, other members will be Mr. Ehrenhaft, Mr. Menendez, and Mr. Fullerton.

A motion was made by Mr. Maxwell and seconded by Mr. Fullerton to form a subcommittee to assist the Historic Preservation Staff in creating a format for historic preservation plans for Transferable Development Rights (TDRs)

The motion passed (Ayes: 8, Nays: 0).

ADJOURNMENT:

A motion was made by Chair Menendez and seconded by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed with a collective aye.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:34 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Kara Kautz
Acting Historic Preservation Officer