1	CITY Of CORAL GABLES HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
2	DECEMBER 21, 2022, CORAL GABLES CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
3	405 BILTMORE WAY, CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA
4	
5	
6	EXCERPT: 1258 OBISPO AVENUE
7	
8	
9	Board Members Present:
10	Albert Menendez, Chairperson
11	Cesar Garcia-Pons, Vice-Chairperson Alicia Bache-Wigg
12	Xavier F. Durana Bruce Ehrenhaft
13	John P. Fullerton Michael J. Maxwell
14	Margaret "Peggy" Rolando Dona Spain
15	
16	
17	City Staff:
18	Warren Adams, Director of Historical Resources
19	Alac Danticinating.
20	Also Participating: Bernadette M. Gomez, Esq.
21	Javier Avila
22	
23	
24	
25	

## 1 THEREUPON: 2 T

The following proceedings were had:

\* \* \* \*

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Next Case File,
Case File COA (SP) 2022-034: An
application for the issuance of a Special
Certificate of Appropriate for the property
at 1258 Obispo Avenue, a Contributing
Resource within the "Obispo Avenue Historic
District," legally described as Lots 1 and
2, Block 3, Coral Gables Section "E,"
according to the Plat thereof, as recorded
in Plat Book 8, at Page 13 of the Public
Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The
application requests design approval for
the demolition of the existing residence.

Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Okay. This property is a contributing property within the Obispo Avenue Historic District. The residence was permitted in 1945, designed by Architect William Merriam.

In 2014, a Special COA was approved for a large one story addition to the residence. This was never built and the

COA expired.

In 2019, a Special Certificate of
Appropriateness for additions and
alterations to the residence and sitework
was approved with multiple conditions by
the Historic Preservation Board. This
proposal was never built.

In July 2021, the Historic Preservation
Board reviewed the request for a revision
to the prior COA for the removal and
replacement of the roof and floor framing
due to the poor condition. A replica of
the roof was to be built and the floor was
to be replaced with a lower concrete slab.

The Board made a motion to defer this request and suggested that a structural engineer, who is familiar with the residence, be present and participate in the discussion. The applicant did not return to the Board and the proposal did not proceed.

Staff met with the applicants, that's the current applicants, who are the new owners, prior to the purchase of the property and explained the prior Board

reviews and outcomes and what a contributing property was. So that was all discussed.

So the application that has been submitted by the new owners, who I believe purchased the property in March of this year, requests design approval for the demolition of the existing residence. And for clarification, the applicants went to the Board of Architects with the proposed design of the new house. The Board of Architects did not want to review that design, until we had whether the demolition was being approved or not.

So you have copies of the plans for the proposed house there. They are not under review. They're purely to show you that the applicant does have plans for a new property.

In support of the request, the applicant has stated the existing conditions are completely uninhabitable and beyond repair. The intent is to remove and rebuild the property, with its original shape, while adding square footage that

will complement the City.

Although not before the Board for review, the proposed plans for the new structure indicate the original exterior shape will not be retained and the entrance to the new house will be on Madrid Street rather than Obispo. So, again, that's not under review. It's only for information.

The applicant did submit two structural evaluations in support of the existing conditions. The first evaluation was done in 2020, which I believe was possibly prepared by the prior owner, to meet the Board requirement to have a structural engineer go there, and there was notification with decay, terminate damage, damage to structural members, water damage, subfloor framing damage, and that there have been some repair work.

A second report from December 2021 states that the general structure shell of the house is in poor condition, water was observed, infested by termites, water intrusion, aging, stability and carrying capacity of some of the wood elements were

affected, wood joists repairs were done that didn't comply with Code, exterior windows in poor condition, metal frames rusted and concrete walls are not braced at ground floor level.

However, this engineer's report then made recommendations. The first recommendations were that the roofing system and tiles, the roof plywood sheathing, and around fifty percent of the roof wood joists, and ceiling woods must be removed and replaced, wood floor and subfloor replaced, exterior windows replaced.

And under the conclusions, it stated, it is our opinion that the costs of the necessary repair works in this property to restore the structural integrity of the house can be similar to the total cost of a new construction.

So the engineer's report says this house can be repaired. It's purely a matter of cost as to why demolition is being requested.

So, from the reports, it can be

determined that the applicants were aware of some of the issues prior to purchase, from the first structural report, and the second report indicates that repairs are possible.

So the Code states that, when considering a request to demolish a structure within a Historic District, the following sections of the Code applies regarding demolition. I've included that in the report for your review.

So, one of those requirements or one of the things that the Board can do is, if a demolition is granted, you can defer the date of demolition to allow another use or relocation of the property. So Staff would recommend that if that's the option you're taking, that the demolition is deferred.

And there's another option for the Board, if demolition is approved, that materials or architectural features from the house be salvaged and retained for reuse in other structures. So Staff would recommend that.

And, also, under this section, there

are a number of factors that the Board shall consider when determining whether a property should be demolished. So you must consider these criteria.

So Number 1 is, the degree to which the building, structure, improvement or site contributes to the historic and/or architectural significance of the district. And Staff's response to that is, the building is a contributing resource within the district. Its removal would irreversibly and negatively impact the historic and architectural significance.

The second one is whether the building, structure, improvement is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood. Well, this building is not one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood.

The third one is whether the loss of the building would adversely affect the historic or architectural integrity of the site or district. The loss of the building would adversely affect the historic and architectural integrity of the district and

would result in one less contributing structure.

Whether retention of the building would promote the general welfare of the City by providing an opportunity for the study of local history, architecture, as the building retains much of its integrity, it provides an opportunity for study of local history and architecture.

Whether architectural plans have been presented to the Board for the reuse of the property, well, they have.

Whether the structure, improvement, site poses imminent threat to the public health or safety, the building does not pose an imminent threat to public safety, as it is not been determined to be an unsafe structure.

Whether the applicant has demonstrated that retention of the building would create an unreasonable or undue economic hardship, the applicant has not submitted the required documentation for the consideration of undue economic hardship.

Or whether there's a compelling public

interest requiring the demolition, there is no compelling public interest, as demolition would negatively impact the historic district, and the second engineering report indicates repairs are possible.

So it's Staff's opinion that the building isn't dangerous. The applicants were aware of the condition before they bought it. The second structural report suggests it can be saved. Nothing's been submitted stating that there's any economic hardship, and most of those criteria regarding demolition support Staff's opinion that the building should be saved.

I've also included some information in the report about demolition by neglect. As you know, if a building is left to decay, then there is the opportunity to move ahead with demolition by neglect. That's not under your consideration. That has to be determined by the Building Official. All you're looking at, at the moment, is the request for the demolition.

So a lot of other information in here

was really just for your information.

So when the applicant submitted the proposed new house to the Board of Architects, they deferred it to you, because they wanted to see if the demolition would be approved. Staff's opinion is, the house is contributing. Demolition of any contributing resource will result in a negative and irreversible impact to the district.

The applicant submitted two structural reports. The Anton report was prepared prior to the purchase and indicated structural issues with the floor and roof. The Canelas report indicates similar issues, but indicates it can be repaired.

As noted above, it's the opinion of
Staff the request meets only two of the
eight criteria regarding demolition. And
as noted by Staff, it appears the structure
suffers from seven of the ten defects
regarding demolition by neglect.
Therefore, based on everything, Staff's
recommendation is to deny the request for
demolition.

MS. GOMEZ: Good afternoon, Board

Members. My name is Bernadette. I'm here
on behalf of the applicants, Jennifer and
Javi.

He already went through the brief history of the house, but I'd like to just summarize, once again. The house was permitted in 1945, and the owner lived there for approximately 70 years, until selling it in 2013.

That second owner, in 2013, applied for an addition to the house, but the addition was never made.

The house is thereafter sold, in 2017, to a third owner. The third owner, again, applied for additions and renovations to the home, but these were never made.

Our applicants now purchased this house in 2021. So it's the fourth time that this home has changed hands.

All of these former owners were allowed to make renovations and additions to the home, but they never did. I probably shouldn't speculate as to why, but my guess is, probably because the cost benefit

analysis didn't make sense.

When they purchased the home in 2021, although they purchased plans, as well, they didn't come into this report from 2020 until after they purchased it. So, even if they knew before-hand that it was an older home that maybe needed some repairs, they didn't really know the gravity of the home.

To summarize the report again just briefly, there's significant termite infestation, water intrusion damage and significant aging that's caused significant disrepair to the roof and the floors.

Additionally, this deterioration is significant on numerous wood members, to the point where the integrity, stability and load carrying ability is compromised.

So, although, in theory, perhaps, the house can be renovated, how can you renovate a house that the walls can't even bear the weight of the roof?

Additionally, the repair cost to restore is not economically feasible, according to this first report, that they did not even come into until after they

purchased the home. The repair cost will exceed fifty percent of the cost to replace both, the roof and the flooring framing.

After receiving this, they got their own engineer to do a second report, in 2021, after they purchased the home. The findings of this report are very similar, significant water intrusion, significant termite damage. It seems that some previous repairs were done, without even complying to the minimum Code requirements.

The recommendations of the second report are that the roofing system and the tiles and around fifty percent of the roof must be removed and replaced, keeping in mind that the load-bearing walls, according to the first report, are not sound. The wood floors and part of the floors also need to be repaired, and all of the exterior windows and doors must be replaced. I'm not sure which, but one of the reports even said that a significant wind event or hurricane could possibly be damaging to this house.

So, with that in mind, it's difficult

to think how they can do significant renovations, that this house requires, with such structurally unsound foundation.

So, like I said, they purchased this house in 2021. They are not investigators. They don't want to flip this home. They're a couple, who wants to raise their family in this home. They have an idea of what they want to do to the home, and like he said, although not approved, this is the new construction proposal. So, as you can see, it maintains the original outline, the same footprint, of the home that exists. It just adds on to it.

They don't want to come in and ruin the neighborhood. It is a Historic District.

They want to keep it in line with the homes that exist there. You can see they have arched windows, arched doorways. I believe there is a color one here.

So this structure here is the original home. Again, it hasn't been submitted to the Board of Architects, but they want to keep arched windows that all in line with traditional Coral Gables homes; arched

windows, arched doors, the iron that you see in other Coral Gables homes.

Additionally, although, yes, it is in a Historic District, the house, as it stands, is not a traditionally Coral Gables-y home. It's not a stucco structure. It doesn't have arched windows. It doesn't have any iron. It doesn't have anything that you look at it and you say, "Wow, that's such a Coral Gables home." It's a home, for all intents and purposes, that although in a Historic District, really could belong in any other neighborhood in Miami.

So, for that reason, they are applying to demolish the home and create something in a very beautiful neighborhood, in a nice, big half acre corner lot, that for a long time has sat in disrepair, but hopefully, with the Board's approval, can be demolished and turned into something very beautiful.

Thank you for your time.

MR. MENENDEZ: I have a question for you. When did the owners purchase the home?

1	MS. GOMEZ: 2021.
2	MR. MENENDEZ: And have they done
3	anything to secure the home
4	MS. SPAIN: That's what my question is.
5	MR. MENENDEZ: since it was in bad
6	condition?
7	MS. GOMEZ: They don't live in the home
8	right now.
9	MR. MENENDEZ: It doesn't matter. They
10	own the home, correct?
11	MS. GOMEZ: Yes.
12	MR. MENENDEZ: Have they done anything
13	to you know, any repairs, have they done
14	anything to secure the home, the water
15	intrusion, anything?
16	MS. GOMEZ: There were a few broken
17	windows and they've repaired the windows to
18	fix the glass that was the water that
19	was coming in, because there was active
20	water intrusion, as well.
21	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. But they haven't
22	fixed the roof?
23	MS. GOMEZ: Well, they didn't want to
24	put money into a home that they were hoping
25	to demolish if it wasn't structurally

1 sound. MR. MENENDEZ: They purchased the home 2 to live in the home. 3 MS. GOMEZ: Right, but they didn't know 5 the state of disrepair and the dilapidation that the home had when they bought it, 6 until they came into the first engineering report, after they had already purchased 8 it. 9 MR. MENENDEZ: Yeah. From what I read, 10 11 the second engineering report says that the house, you know, can be repaired. 12 MS. GOMEZ: Well, it can be repaired, 13 but the structural soundness is not there. 14 MR. MENENDEZ: Well --15 MS. GOMEZ: If there's a wind event or 16 if there's a hurricane that could hurt the 17 home, then how much repair can you do? How 18 19 can you realistically repair a whole roof that a hurricane could knock down? 20 MS. SPAIN: Okay. That's done all of 21 the time. That's a roof repair. 22 MR. MENENDEZ: Yeah. 23 MS. SPAIN: And they bought a 24 historically designated home. I can't 25

```
imagine they bought that house and decided
1
          they could demolish it. I just can't
2
          imagine that was a their thought when they
 3
 4
          purchased the home.
 5
              MS. GOMEZ: Well --
              MR. MENENDEZ: And they knew the
 6
          condition of the home when they bought it,
7
          correct?
8
              MS. GOMEZ: Well, they knew it was an
9
          older home that needed repair, but they
10
11
          didn't have the engineering report with the
          specifics, and they're not engineers.
12
              MR. MENENDEZ: So there was no
13
          inspection --
14
              MR. AVILA: Excuse me. I'm the
15
16
         homeowner, okay.
17
              MR. MAXWELL: State your name.
              MR. AVILA: My wife and I bought the
18
19
         property.
20
              MR. MENENDEZ: Excuse me, what's your
21
          name?
              MR. AVILA: Javier Avila.
22
23
              MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
              MR. AVILA: Okay. So when we bought
24
          the home, we were informed by the seller
25
```

that there were plans that were approved to remodel and add square footage to the home.

He provided us with those plans.

I met with Warren Adams. We went over them. We talked about making some changes to the plans, on the back of the house, where we didn't want French doors. We were going to put sliding glass doors. He was okay, because it didn't face the street.

And we did all -- well, we talked about changing the Colonial grids, which is what you see there. So we did all of that.

That was before I found out that the house had severe problems.

I wound up finding that out after. Did
I know that the house looked in bad shape?
Yeah, 100 percent. I looked at the house
before I bought it. Was I properly
informed of the -- you know, the trusses
and the floor joists and the walls
cracking? I was not. Did I do an
inspection? No, because we were remodeling
the house. So there was no -- to me, I was
okay with taking it as is, because we're
remodeling the house. We bought the house

with plans.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It was later on that we -- we started seeing, hey, this is a little bit worse than what we thought. So I reached out to the seller and was, hey, look, I got a report from this so and so. He got the report. I said, let me do my own report. I got my own report, which is the report that's been presented to you guys.

On a separate note, I met with multiple GCs. I don't know if you guys know, but we're -- my wife and I are in the window business. We do a lot of work here in the City and we do a lot of work with Warren and Kara, so we know the process. And I met with multiple GCs, that I've worked with in the past, and I've brought them like the home that my wife and I want to build, that we want to live -- this is where I'm going to have, hopefully, my first child and raise my child -- and they're all telling me the exact same thing, "Javi, we can try to preserve those three walls that were originally approved in the plans, but there is no guarantee

that we're going to be able to preserve them." So it's going to cost more money and there's no guarantee. That just doesn't work for me. So that's where I'm at right now.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SPAIN: So it's really about the money, because it's going to cost you so much money to make it livable?

MR. AVILA: No. It wasn't -- it's not just about it. It's about that there's no guarantee that they're going be able to disassemble the trusses -- and I know that one report says fifty percent, but I recently took -- a couple of months back, I took a roofer, Atlas Roofing, out to the house to take a look at it, and they said, "Look, my suggestion is, we redo everything, because there's patches and" --I'm not a roofer, but there's patches and connections and weird things going on in the attic, that he's like, "I'll be honest with you, I don't even want to touch it. The only way that I suggest you guys deal with this is, rip the whole roof off and do it again from scratch."

Parts of the house, around the kitchen 1 area, if you're walking, you better pray, 2 because you might fall right through, 3 because the house is in -- it's just really 5 bad. It's really bad. And it's not just -- yes, money is 100 percent, it's 6 part of my calculation, but the main part 7 is, I'm going to make an additional 8 investment, because it costs more to try to 9 preserve, with no guarantee that I'm going 10 11 to preserve it. So my GC starts --12 MS. SPAIN: I'm asking, because there's 13 an application for economic hardship that 14 would come before this Board, but you're 15 not here about that? So that's not under 16 consideration, the money --17 MR. AVILA: I don't know even know what 18 19 20 (Simultaneous speaking.) MS. SPAIN: I'm just saying --21 MR. AVILA: Yeah, I don't know about 22 23 that. I'm just --MR. FULLERTON: Excuse me, did you know 24 that this was a historically significant 25

residence?

MR. AVILA: I did, but I was okay with the plans that were presented to me, that had already been, right, somewhat approved or --

MR. ADAMS: I did see plans for an amended addition. I did see that.

MR. FULLERTON: If that house that we see to the left, the portion of the house, is -- includes walls from the original house, couldn't you demolish parts of it to relieve -- you know, keep significant portions of the exterior of the house which face the streets?

MR. AVILA: So that's what we're talking about, is that -- let's just say, the part that we're going to be keeping would be like -- from like, let's say, the first -- second window that way back -- uh?

No. No. No. The part that we're talking about, on the original plans that were approved to remodel and add square footage to the house was, to maintain from the second window, that way, the back wall, and then a portion of the return wall. So

1 it's basically like a little "L." That's
2 all that we're holding.

That's what I'm trying to explain, is that my -- the multiple GCs, everybody that I've taken there, they've all given me the same disclaimer, no guarantee -- it's going to cost more money to do and no guarantee that we're going to be able to preserve it.

And, then, when I come to think about it, what am I preserving? The windows are gone. The trusses are gone. The roof is gone. The joists are gone. Everything's gone. What am I holding? Three walls --

MR. FULLERTON: Preserving your right to do the project.

MR. AVILA: Right -- no -- what do you mean, I'm preserving my right to do the project?

MR. FULLERTON: Well, if you're not allowed to demolish the entire house, I believe, and it's been done before, that significant portions of the house -- preserving the exterior walls, significant portions of the exterior walls, allows you to proceed with an addition and with

1 redoing the house. MR. AVILA: And I was okay with that 2 when I purchased the house, is what I'm 3 trying to explain to the Board. 5 MR. FULLERTON: Well --MR. AVILA: I was 100 percent okay with 6 that. It was later, with our findings, 7 that we realized that the house had --8 MR. FULLERTON: But they're concrete 9 block walls and that's presumably --10 11 MR AVILA: Where's the thing? How do I -- how do I go back? 12 Okay. So the windows are all gone. 13 Electrical -- I want to show you something. 14 So these are part of the exterior 15 16 walls, that this -- this exterior wall, on 17 its own, it's starting to explode from the inside out. 18 MR. FULLERTON: It's all repairable. 19 MR. AVILA: The floor joists -- I mean, 20 the house is -- the house has really bad 21 damage, really bad damage, and to raise the 22 walls or fill the walls or whatever it is 23 that they're saying, is going to cost a lot 24 25 of money, with no guarantee.

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Ms. Rolando.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FULLERTON: Concrete block walls, on a concrete floor foundation, that is pretty sound construction. Now, your wood has to be removed, yeah, but you would have to put a new roof on it anyway, and -- I mean, you're fighting a battle which doesn't need to be fought. You preserve the exterior walls, a significant portion of them, and then you build the interior of the house, which you would have to do anyway -- you're going to build a new house there -- including the area where this house resides. You're going to have to build it over again. So why not just preserve the outside walls? And then go ahead with a roof that matches the old roof and stucco it and -- seems really not so complicated.

MR. AVILA: I get what you're saying, okay, to preserve three walls.

MR. MENENDEZ: Ms. Rolando.

MS. ROLANDO: You are coming to us asking to demolish a home because it needs to be re-roofed, its electrical system is

antiquated, and it needs new windows and doors. We get applications for approvals every single month that -- where the renovations include those items, re-roofing, new windows and doors and a new electrical system. That's not justification for demolishing a home.

You're saying that there's termite damage. I totally believe you. But if the termites have been marching through that home for ten years and nothing has been done, that doesn't necessarily make the home worthy of demolition.

get situations here regularly where there's been significant water intrusion, because of issues with the windows and doors, the stucco failing, whatever. This is a 75-year-old home, and it's been neglected. But I -- you haven't convinced me that it's worthy of demolition. Does it need a lot of work? Totally. And I think anybody who buys a home in this condition and doesn't do an inspection to quantify the scope of the issues, before you close, you're trying

to make that failure a reason for
demolition.

So I'm not prepared to say that this home -- and we've seen plenty of homes come through here with a lot worse water intrusion that this situation.

MR. AVILA: So my request is -- yes, the electrical is part of it, windows is part of it, 100 percent, but it's the structural component that is my reasoning for wanting to demolish the home. In the reports, it says that it does have structural issues, something about bracing. I'm not a structural guy. The -- the --

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS.}}$  ROLANDO: No, we have homes where they have to brace the walls.

MR. AVILA: The engineer that I spoke to told me himself, the last one that I hired, he said, "Look, my advice is, is knock it and do it from scratch." The GCs have all said the same thing, it's going to cost more money to try to preserve it with no guarantee.

So and just -- you've got to look at it from my standpoint for a second, okay.

So -- and I'm going to repeat it again,
what am I preserving? All of the roof has
to go, the flooring has to go, the windows
got to go, everything's got to go. What am
I preserving? Three walls. Risk
preserving three walls, that I'm going to
spend more money, with no guarantee.

And, then, I'm going to be honest here, I don't -- I want to live in a house that I'm going to feel safe. I've lived in this City for over twenty years, I've lived in the same place for twelve, waiting for my dream home to be built, so that I can, you know, hopefully have my first child. So I want to live in a home that I'm going to feel safe. Does that house make me feel safe? Absolutely not. Zero.

So that's where I'm coming to you guys.

I mean, put yourselves in my shoes for a second. What am I preserving, three walls, with no guarantee? There's no windows that I'm preserving. There's nothing there that could be preserved.

MR. FULLERTON: You're taking all of the windows out anyway. You're putting in

```
1
          new windows every place, every place,
          but --
2
              MR. AVILA: Correct, but what -- guys,
 3
          think about it, electrical is gone. I've
 5
          got to yank out all of the windows. I've
          got to yank out the roof. I've got to redo
 6
          the trusses. I've got to redo the
7
          joists -- the floor joists.
8
              MR. FULLERTON: This happens all of the
9
          time. It happens on --
10
11
              MR. MENENDEZ: Like it's done every
12
          day.
13
              MR. FULLERTON: -- on two-story houses.
              MR. AVILA: And then -- and then we've
14
15
          got --
16
              MR. FULLERTON: They preserve the
          exterior walls, on a two-story house,
17
          sections of houses, and they're not so
18
          worried, because it's -- the construction
19
          down here, starting in the '20s, was
20
          concrete block and -- concrete, with steel
21
          reinforcement. Those walls have to be
22
23
         pushed down. They just don't fall down.
          So I think you're overcomplicating your
24
          effort.
25
```

What I don't understand 1 MR. MENENDEZ: is that you bought a home and you spent 2 hundreds of thousands of dollars on that 3 home and you haven't done anything to 5 protect it, to preserve it, to fix it? MR. AVILA: That's just -- I'm sorry. 6 MR. MENENDEZ: You know, for me, that's 7 a big investment and --8 MR. AVILA: But that doesn't make --9 why am I going to try to put money into 10 11 saving something that I'm going to completely remodel? So why would I spend 12 any money on redoing a roof or fixing a 13 window or doing something -- I mean, I can 14 tell we're disagreeing, we're not agreeing, 15 but that just doesn't make any financial 16 17 sense whatsoever. I'm going to redo the roof anyway, so 18 why am I going to spend any money to patch 19 20 up a roof that I'm going to redo completely when I get the plans done? 21 MR. MENENDEZ: Well, then you bought 22 23 the home to demo it. MR. AVILA: No. I bought the home to 24 25 do the plans that were approved. We've

already agreed that there were plans that

were approved for the home, when I

purchased the home. That was my intention.

I met with Warren -- right, Warren, didn't

I meet with you prior -- I met with Warren

prior to purchasing the home.

I told the seller, "Give me a week.

Let me sit with the City." I met with him,

my wife and I. And we went through

everything. So there was no intention of

knocking down the house or anything. That

came after. Warren and I sat, we went

through the plans, and that was the

intention.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

MR. ADAMS: There were -- we did sit down and review plans for an addition.

That was done. So, my understanding was, there was an addition being built and one had been approved not long before that. It was very similar. We made a few amendments. But then we received the application for demolition.

MR. MENENDEZ: For demolition, okay.

MR. AVILA: And one more thing, the

CMUs -- sorry, the CMUs are hollow, so that's another reason why -- and it showed it in one of the pictures.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak in favor or opposition of this case? Okay.

MR. ADAMS: I would say, Chair, we have a letter from Karelia Carbonell, Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables. You have copies of it, recommend to work with Staff and the applicant for a plan to avoid demolition of 1258 Obispo Avenue. We cannot support the total demolition of a contributing structure in a historic district.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Well, I'm entertaining motions.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: I have -- just, sorry

-- one question for Staff, and I'm sure the
answer is, yes, but have you discussed with
the owner the process of a COA and how a
lot of this could be reviewed as part of a
future project that comes in, taking
consideration of what needs to be re-done,
as opposed to demolish and start from

scratch?

MR. ADAMS: Yeah. That was sort of discussed at the time we were discussing the addition, about what the process was, what should be kept. And I should point out that, the prior application to the Board was sort of left unresolved by the previous owner. The previous owner wanted to -- sink the floor level inside the house, take the roof off and replace it. The Board had no issue with lowering the floor level in the house, but they wanted an engineer to come along to explain just how bad the roof was. So that's where it was left. And that never went forward, and then it was purchased.

So that last application was left sort of hanging.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: One last comment. I think it's important to understand the willingness of Staff to work with all conditions of all properties, inclusive of redoing the floors and roof. So it doesn't have to be demo or re-build. It could be a COA of an existing building, with major

```
renovation. So I wouldn't fear the next
1
          process, if it comes to a denial today.
2
              MR. MENENDEZ: A motion?
 3
              MR. MAXWELL: You want me to make a
 4
5
         motion?
              MR. MENENDEZ: I'm open to motions
 6
          right now.
7
              MS. SPAIN: I'll make a motion.
8
              MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.
9
              MS. SPAIN: I'd like to make a motion
10
11
          to deny the design proposal for the
          demolition of the existing residence for
12
          the property at 1258 Obispo Avenue.
13
              MR. MENENDEZ: Do I have a second?
14
              MR. MAXWELL: Second.
15
              MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Maxwell seconds it.
16
              THE SECRETARY: Ms. Rolando?
17
18
              MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
              THE SECRETARY: Mr. Garcia-Pons?
19
              MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
20
21
              THE SECRETARY: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
              MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
22
              THE SECRETARY: Mr. Maxwell?
23
              MR. MAXWELL: Yes.
24
              THE SECRETARY: Ms. Spain?
25
```

```
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
1
             THE SECRETARY: Mr. Fullerton?
2
             MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
3
             THE SECRETARY: Mr. Durana?
4
5
             MR. DURANA: Yes.
             THE SECRETARY; Ms. Bache-Wiig?
6
             MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
7
             THE SECRETARY: Mr. Menendez?
8
             MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
9
             THE SECRETARY: Motion passes.
10
             MR. AVILA: Thank you.
11
             MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.
12
              * * * *
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE
STATE OF FLORIDA:
SS.
COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:
I, NIEVES SANCHEZ, Court Reporter, and a
Notary Public for the State of Florida at Large, do
hereby certify that I was authorized to and did
transcribe the foregoing audio proceedings and that
the transcript is a true and complete record, to the
best of my ability.
DATED this 6th day of February, 2023.
min Dan
NIEVES SANCHEZ

				Page 1
	<b>Anton</b> 11:12	<b>Association</b> 34:9	better 23:2	13:17
<u>A</u>	anybody 28:22	Association 54.9 Atlas 22:15	beyond 4:23	case 2:4,5 34:6
<b>ability</b> 13:17	anybody 28.22 anyway 27:6,12	attic 22:21	big 16:17 32:8	caused 13:12
38:14	30:25 32:18	audience 34:5	BILTMORE	ceiling 6:11
<b>able</b> 22:1,11	appears 11:20	audio 38:12	1:3	Certificate 2:7
25:8	applicant 3:19	authorized	<b>bit</b> 21:3	3:2
Absolutely	4:18,21 5:9	38:11	block 2:11 26:10	certify 38:11
30:17	9:19,22 11:2	<b>Avenue</b> 1:6 2:8	27:2 31:21	Cesar 1:10
acre 16:17	11:11 34:11	2:9,20 34:12	<b>Board</b> 1:1,9 3:6	Chair 34:7
active 17:19	applicants 3:22	36:13	3:9,15,20,25	Chairperson
Adams 1:18	3:23 4:9 7:1	Avila 1:20 19:15	4:10,11 5:2,14	1:10
2:17,18 20:4	10:8 12:3,18	19:18,22,22,24	7:13,20 8:1	CHAMBERS
24:6 33:16	application 2:6	22:9 23:18,22	9:11 11:3 12:1	1:2
34:7 35:2	2:15 4:4 23:14	24:2,15 25:16	15:23 23:15	changed 12:20
add 20:2 24:22	33:23 35:6,17	26:2,6,11,20	26:4 35:7,11	changes 20:5
adding 4:25		, , ,	,	_
addition 2:24	applications 28:2	27:20 29:7,17 31:3,14 32:6,9	<b>Board's</b> 16:19 <b>Book</b> 2:13	<b>changing</b> 20:11 <b>child</b> 21:21,21
12:12,12 24:7		31:3,14 32:6,9		30:14
25:25 33:17,19	applied 12:11,16	37:11	bought 10:10	
35:4	applies 7:9		18:6,24 19:1,7	City 1:1,2,17 5:1
additional 23:8	applying 16:14	avoid 34:12	19:18,24 20:18	9:4 21:14
Additionally	Appropriate 2:7	<b>aware</b> 7:1 10:9	20:25 32:2,22	30:11 33:8
13:14,22 16:3	Appropriaten	B	32:24	clarification 4:9
additions 3:3	3:3	Bache-Wigg	<b>brace</b> 29:16	close 28:25
12:16,22	approval 2:15	1:11	braced 6:4	CMUs 34:1,1
adds 15:14	4:7 16:19	Bache-Wiig	<b>bracing</b> 29:13	COA 2:5,23 3:1
adversely 8:21	approvals 28:2	37:6,7	<b>brief</b> 12:5	3:10 34:21
8:24	approved 2:23	back 20:6 22:14	<b>briefly</b> 13:10	35:25
<b>advice</b> 29:19	3:5 4:14 7:20	24:19,24 26:12	<b>broken</b> 17:16	Code 6:2 7:6,9
<b>affect</b> 8:21,24	11:6 15:10	bad 17:5 20:16	<b>brought</b> 21:17	14:11
afternoon 12:1	20:1 21:24	23:5,5 26:21	Bruce 1:12	<b>Colonial</b> 20:11
<b>aging</b> 5:24 13:12	24:4,22 32:25	26:22 35:14	<b>build</b> 21:19	<b>color</b> 15:20
agreed 33:1	33:2,20	based 11:23	27:10,12,15	come 13:4,25
agreeing 32:15	approximately	basically 25:1	<b>building</b> 8:6,10	15:15 23:15
<b>ahead</b> 10:19	12:9	battle 27:7	8:14,17,21,23	25:9 29:4
27:17 36:9	arched 15:19,19	bear 13:20	9:3,7,15,20	35:13
Albert 1:10	15:24,25 16:1	beautiful 16:16	10:8,15,18,22	comes 34:23
Alicia 1:11	16:7	16:21	35:25	36:2
<b>allow</b> 7:15	Architect 2:22	before-hand	built 2:25 3:7,13	coming 17:19
allowed 12:21	Architects 4:10	13:6	30:13 33:19	27:23 30:18
25:20	4:12 11:4	<b>behalf</b> 12:3	<b>business</b> 21:13	comment 35:19
<b>allows</b> 25:24	15:23	believe 4:5 5:12	buys 28:23	COMMISSION
alterations 3:4	architectural	15:19 25:21		1:2
amended 24:7	7:21 8:8,13,22	28:9	$\overline{\mathbf{C}}$ 38:1,1	compelling 9:25
amendments	8:25 9:10		calculation 23:7	10:2
33:22	architecture 9:6	belong 16:12 benefit 12:25	Canculation 23:7	complement 5:1
analysis 13:1	9:9			complete 38:13
and/or 8:7	area 23:2 27:13	Bernadette 1:20 12:2	capacity 5:25 Carbonell 34:8	completely 4:22
<b>answer</b> 34:20	asking 23:13			32:12,20
antiquated 28:1	27:24	<b>best</b> 38:14	carrying 5:24	complicated

	Ī	I	İ	I
27:19	38:5	11:25 28:13,21	<b>due</b> 3:12	4:21 5:10
comply 6:2	couple 15:7	29:2 33:23,24	Durana 1:11	35:25 36:12
complying 14:11	22:14	34:12,13 36:12	37:4,5	<b>exists</b> 15:13
component	<b>Court</b> 38:9	demonstrated		expired 3:1
29:10	cracking 20:21	9:19	<b>E</b>	explain 25:3
compromised	create 9:20	denial 36:2	<b>E</b> 2:11 38:1,1	26:4 35:13
13:17	16:15	deny 11:24	economic 9:21	explained 3:25
conclusions 6:15	criteria 8:4	36:11	9:24 10:12	explode 26:17
concrete 3:14	10:13 11:19	described 2:10	23:14	exterior 5:4 6:2
6:4 26:9 27:2,3	current 3:23	design 2:15 4:7	economically	6:13 14:20
31:21,21		4:11,13 36:11	13:23	24:13 25:23,24
condition 3:12	D	designated	<b>effort</b> 31:25	26:15,16 27:9
5:22 6:3 10:9	<b>damage</b> 5:16,17	18:25	Ehrenhaft 1:12	31:17
17:6 19:7	5:17,18 13:11	designed 2:21	36:21,22	
28:23	14:9 26:22,22	deterioration	<b>eight</b> 11:19	<b>F</b>
conditions 3:5	28:9	13:14	electrical 26:14	<b>F</b> 1:11 38:1
4:22 5:11	damaging 14:24	determined 7:1	27:25 28:6	<b>face</b> 20:9 24:14
35:22	dangerous 10:8	9:17 10:22	29:8 31:4	factors 8:1
connections	<b>date</b> 7:15	determining 8:2	elements 5:25	failing 28:18
22:20	<b>DATED</b> 38:17	difficult 14:25	engineer 3:17	failure 29:1
consider 8:2,4	day 31:12 38:17	dilapidation	5:15 14:5	<b>fall</b> 23:3 31:23
consideration	deal 22:23	18:5	29:17 35:13	familiar 3:17
9:24 10:21	decay 5:16	Director 1:18	engineer's 6:6	family 15:7
23:17 34:24	10:18	disagreeing	6:21	<b>favor</b> 34:6
considering 7:7	December 1:2	32:15	engineering	<b>fear</b> 36:1
construction	5:20	disassemble	10:5 18:7,11	feasible 13:23
6:20 15:11	decided 19:1	22:12	19:11	features 7:21
27:4 31:19	defects 11:21	disclaimer 25:6	engineers 19:12	February 38:17
contributes 8:7	<b>defer</b> 3:15 7:14	discussed 4:3	entertaining	<b>feel</b> 30:10,16,16
contributing 2:8	deferred 7:18	34:20 35:3	34:17	<b>fifty</b> 6:10 14:2
2:19 4:2 8:10	11:4	discussing 35:3	entire 25:20	14:14 22:13
9:1 11:7,8	degree 8:5	discussion 3:19	entrance 5:5	fighting 27:7
34:14	<b>demo</b> 32:23	disrepair 13:13	<b>Esq</b> 1:20	<b>File</b> 2:4,5
convinced 28:20	35:24	16:18 18:5	evaluation 5:11	<b>fill</b> 26:23
copies 4:15	demolish 7:7	<b>district</b> 2:10,20	evaluations 5:10	financial 32:16
34:10	16:15 17:25	7:8 8:8,11,23	<b>event</b> 14:23	<b>finding</b> 20:15
<b>Coral</b> 1:1,2,3	19:2 24:11	8:25 10:4	18:16	findings 14:7
2:11 15:25	25:20 27:24	11:10 15:16	everybody 25:4	26:7
16:2,5,10 34:9	29:11 34:25	16:4,12 34:15	everything's	<b>first</b> 5:11 6:7 7:3
<b>corner</b> 16:17	demolished 8:3	documentation	25:12 30:4	13:24 14:17
correct 17:10	16:20	9:23	exact 21:22	18:7 21:21
19:8 31:3	demolishing	<b>doing</b> 32:14	examples 8:16	24:19 30:14
<b>cost</b> 6:19,23	28:7	dollars 32:3	8:18	<b>fix</b> 17:18 32:5
12:25 13:22	demolition 2:16	<b>Dona</b> 1:14	exceed 14:2	<b>fixed</b> 17:22
14:1,2 22:2,7	4:8,13 6:23	<b>doors</b> 14:20 16:1	EXCERPT 1:6	<b>fixing</b> 32:13
25:7 26:24	7:10,14,15,18	20:7,8 28:2,5	<b>Excuse</b> 19:15,20	<b>flip</b> 15:6
29:22	7:20 10:1,3,14	28:17	23:24	<b>floor</b> 3:11,13 6:5
costs 6:16 23:9	10:17,20,24	doorways 15:19	exist 15:18	6:12 11:14
County 2:14	11:6,8,19,22	<b>dream</b> 30:13	<b>existing</b> 2:16 4:8	20:20 26:20

				5
27:3 31:8 35:9	30:4 36:9	<b>history</b> 9:6,9	18:17,20	investment 23:9
35:12	going 20:8 21:20	12:6	hurt 18:17	32:8
flooring 14:3	22:1,2,7,11,20	<b>holding</b> 25:2,13		<b>iron</b> 16:1,8
30:3	23:8,10 24:17	<b>hollow</b> 34:1	I	irreversible 11:9
<b>floors</b> 13:13	25:6,8 26:24	home 12:17,20	idea 15:8	irreversibly 8:12
14:18,18 35:23	27:12,14 29:21	12:23 13:2,7,8	<b>imagine</b> 19:1,3	issuance 2:6
Florida 1:3 2:14	30:1,6,8,10,15	14:1,6 15:6,8,9	imminent 9:14	issue 35:11
38:3,10	32:10,11,18,19	15:13,22 16:5	9:16	issues 7:2 11:14
<b>following</b> 2:2 7:9	32:20	16:10,10,15,25	impact 8:12	11:16 28:17,25
footage 4:25	<b>Gomez</b> 1:20	17:3,7,10,14	10:3 11:10	29:13
20:2 24:23	12:1 17:1,7,11	17:24 18:2,3,6	important 35:20	items 28:4
footprint 15:13	17:16,23 18:4	18:18,25 19:4	improvement	
foregoing 38:12	18:13,16 19:5	19:7,10,25	8:6,15 9:13	J
<b>former</b> 12:21	19:9	20:2 21:18	include 28:4	<b>J</b> 1:13
forward 35:15	Good 12:1	27:24 28:7,11	included 7:10	<b>Javi</b> 12:4 21:23
fought 27:8	granted 7:14	28:13,19,23	10:16	Javier 1:20
<b>found</b> 20:13	gravity 13:8	29:4,11 30:13	includes 24:10	19:22
<b>foundation</b> 15:3	grids 20:11	30:15 32:2,4	including 27:13	Jennifer 12:3
27:3	ground 6:5	32:23,24 33:2	inclusive 35:22	<b>John</b> 1:12
<b>fourth</b> 12:19	guarantee 21:25	33:3,6	indicate 5:4	<b>joists</b> 6:1,11
frames 6:3	22:3,11 23:10	homeowner	indicated 11:13	20:20 25:12
framing 3:11	25:6,7 26:25	19:16	indicates 7:4	26:20 31:8,8
5:18 14:3	29:23 30:7,21	homes 15:17,25	10:5 11:15,16	<b>July</b> 3:8
French 20:7	guess 12:24	16:2 29:4,15	infestation	justification
Fullerton 1:12	<b>guy</b> 29:14	honest 22:21	13:11	28:7
23:24 24:8	guys 21:9,11	30:8	infested 5:23	<u>K</u>
25:14,19 26:5	22:23 30:18	hopefully 16:19	information 5:8	
26:9,19 27:2	31:3	21:20 30:14	10:16,25 11:1	<b>Kara</b> 21:15 <b>Karelia</b> 34:8
30:24 31:9,13		hoping 17:24	informed 19:25	keep 15:17,24
31:16 37:2,3	<u>H</u>	house 4:11,16	20:19	24:12
<b>future</b> 34:23	half 16:17	5:6,22 6:19,22	inside 26:18	keeping 14:15
<b>G</b>	hands 12:20	7:22 11:3,7	35:9	24:17
	hanging 35:18	12:6,7,12,14	<b>inspection</b> 19:14	kept 35:5
Gables 1:1,2,3	happens 31:9,10	12:18 13:18,20	20:22 28:24	<b>kind</b> 8:16,19
2:11 15:25	hardship 9:21	14:24 15:2,5	integrity 6:18	<b>kitchen</b> 23:1
16:2,10 34:9	9:24 10:13	16:4 18:12	8:22,25 9:7 13:16	knew 13:6 19:6
Gables-y 16:5 Garcia-Pons	23:14 health 0:15	19:1 20:6,13	intent 4:23	19:9
1:10 34:18	health 9:15 hey 21:3,5	20:16,17,23,25	intent 4.23	knock 18:20
35:19 36:19,20	hired 29:19	20:25 22:16	33:10,14	29:20
GC 23:12	historic 1:1 2:9	23:1,4 24:8,9	intents 16:11	knocking 33:11
GCs 21:11,16	2:20 3:6,8 7:8	24:11,13,23	interest 10:1,2	know 10:18 13:8
25:4 29:20	8:7,13,22,24	25:20,22 26:1	interest 10.1,2	17:13 18:4,12
general 5:21 9:4	10:4 15:16	26:3,8,21,21	intrusion 5:24	20:16,19 21:11
Give 33:7	16:4,12 34:8	27:11,12,14	13:11 14:8	21:11,15 22:12
given 25:5	34:14	30:9,16 31:17 33:11 35:10,12	17:15,20 28:14	23:18,18,22,24
glass 17:18 20:8	Historical 1:18	houses 31:13,18	28:16 29:6	24:12 30:14
go 5:15 26:12	historically	hundreds 32:3	investigators	32:7
27:16 30:3,3,4	18:25 23:25	hurricane 14:23	15:5	
		nullicane 14.23		L
	l	l	l	İ

L 25:1	19:17 36:4,15	N	26:2,6,13	22:13 23:6
large 2:24 38:10	36:16,23,24	name 12:2 19:17	27:21 29:25	26:6 29:9
<b>left</b> 10:18 24:9	mean 25:17	19:21	33:15,24 34:4	permitted 2:21
35:7,15,17	26:20 27:7		34:6,16	12:8
legally 2:10	30:19 32:14	necessarily 28:12	old 27:17	pictures 34:3
let's 24:16,18	meet 5:13 33:5		older 13:6 19:10	place 30:12 31:1
letter 34:8	meets 11:18	necessary 6:17 need 14:19 27:8	once 12:7	31:1
level 6:5 35:9,12	members 1:9		open 36:6	<b>plan</b> 34:11
line 15:17,24	5:17 12:2	28:21	opinion 6:16	plans 4:15,18
little 21:3 25:1	13:15	needed 13:7 19:10	10:7,15 11:7	5:3 9:10 13:3
livable 22:8	Menendez 1:10	needs 27:24 28:1	11:17	20:1,3,6 21:1
live 17:7 18:3	2:4 16:23 17:2	34:24	opportunity 9:5	21:25 24:3,6
21:19 30:9,15	17:5,9,12,21		9:8 10:19	24:21 32:21,25
lived 12:8 30:10	18:2,10,15,23	negative 11:9	opposed 34:25	33:1,13,17
30:11	19:6,13,20,23	negatively 8:12	opposition 34:6	Plat 2:12,13
load 13:17	27:1,22 31:11	10:3	<b>option</b> 7:17,19	plenty 29:4
load-bearing	32:1,7,22	neglect 10:17,20	original 4:24 5:4	plywood 6:9
14:16	33:15,24 34:4	11:22	15:12,21 24:10	point 13:16 35:5
local 9:6,8	34:16 36:3,6,9	neglected 28:19	24:21	poor 3:12 5:22
long 16:18 33:20	36:14,16 37:8	neighborhood	originally 21:24	6:3
look 16:9 21:5	37:9,12	8:17,19 15:16	outcomes 4:1	<b>portion</b> 24:9,25
22:16,17 29:19	Merriam 2:22	16:13,16	outline 15:12	27:9
29:24	met 3:22 20:4	never 2:25 3:7	outside 27:16	<b>portions</b> 24:13
looked 20:16,17	21:10,16 33:4	12:13,17,23	overcomplicat	25:22,24
looking 10:23	33:5,8	35:15	31:24	pose 9:16
loss 8:20,23	metal 6:3	new 3:23 4:5,11	owner 5:13 12:8	poses 9:14
lot 10:25 16:17	<b>Miami</b> 16:13	4:18 5:3,6 6:20	12:11,15,15	possible 7:5 10:6
21:13,14 26:24	Miami-Dade	11:3 15:11	34:21 35:8,8	possibly 5:12
28:21 29:5	2:14 38:5	27:6,12 28:1,5	owners 3:24 4:5	14:23
34:22	<b>Michael</b> 1:13	28:5 31:1 <b>nice</b> 16:17	12:21 16:24	pray 23:2
Lots 2:10	mind 14:16,25	NIEVES 38:9,22		prepared 5:13
lower 3:14	minimum 14:11	Notary 38:10	P	11:12 29:3
lowering 35:11	moment 10:23	note 21:10	<b>P</b> 1:12	present 1:9 3:18
	money 17:24	noted 11:17,20	<b>Page</b> 2:13	presented 9:11
M	22:2,7,8 23:6	Nothing's 10:11	part 14:18 23:7	21:9 24:3
<b>M</b> 1:20	23:17 25:7	notification 5:16	23:7 24:17,20	Preservation 1:1
Madrid 5:6	26:25 29:22	number 8:1,5	26:15 29:8,9	3:6,8 34:9
<b>main</b> 23:7	30:7 32:10,13	numerous 13:15	34:22	preserve 21:23
maintain 24:23	32:19	Humerous 13.13	participate 3:18	22:1 23:10,11
maintains 15:12	month 28:3	0	Participating	25:8 27:8,16
major 35:25	months 22:14	<b>Obispo</b> 1:6 2:8,9	1:19	27:21 29:22
making 20:5	<b>motion</b> 3:15	2:19 5:7 34:12	parts 23:1 24:11	31:16 32:5
March 4:6	36:3,5,8,10	36:13	<b>passes</b> 37:10	preserved 30:23
marching 28:10	37:10	observed 5:23	<b>patch</b> 32:19	preserving
Margaret 1:13	motions 34:17	Official 10:22	patches 22:18	25:10,14,17,23
matches 27:17	36:6	okay 2:4,18	22:19	30:2,5,6,20,22
materials 7:21	move 10:19	17:21 18:21	<b>Peggy</b> 1:13	presumably
matter 6:23 17:9	multiple 3:5	19:16,23,24	percent 6:10	26:10
Maxwell 1:13	21:10,16 25:4	20:9,24 24:2	14:2,14 20:17	pretty 27:4
		,		_ ,
1				

	•	•	i	i
previous 14:10	put 17:24 20:8	31:22	Reporter 38:9	27:1,22,23
35:8,8	27:6 30:19	relieve 24:12	reports 6:25	29:15 36:17,18
<b>prior</b> 3:10,24,25	32:10	relocation 7:16	11:12 14:22	<b>roof</b> 3:11,13 6:9
5:13 7:2 11:13	putting 30:25	remaining 8:16	29:12	6:11 11:14
33:5,6 35:6		8:18	request 3:9,16	13:13,21 14:3
probably 12:23	Q	remodel 20:2	4:20 7:7 10:24	14:14 17:22
12:25	quantify 28:24	24:22 32:12	11:18,24 29:7	18:19,22 22:24
problems 20:14	question 16:23	remodeling	requested 6:24	25:11 27:6,17
proceed 3:21	17:4 34:19	20:22,25	requests 2:15	27:17 30:2
25:25		removal 3:10	4:7	31:6 32:13,18
proceedings 2:2	R	8:11	required 9:23	32:20 35:10,14
38:12	<b>R</b> 38:1	remove 4:23	requirement	35:23
process 21:15	raise 15:7 21:21	removed 6:12	5:14	roofer 22:15,19
34:21 35:4	26:22	14:15 27:5	requirements	roofing 6:8
36:2	<b>re-build</b> 35:24	renovate 13:19	7:12 14:11	14:13 22:15
<b>project</b> 25:15,18	<b>re-done</b> 34:24	renovated 13:19	requires 15:2	ruin 15:15
34:23	re-roofed 27:25	renovation 36:1	requiring 10:1	rusted 6:4
<b>promote</b> 9:4	re-roofing 28:5	renovations	residence 2:16	Tusteu 0.4
properly 20:18	reached 21:4	12:16,22 15:2	2:20,25 3:4,18	S
properties 35:22	read 18:10	28:4	4:8 24:1 36:12	safe 30:10,16,17
	realistically	= :	resides 27:14	safety 9:15,16
<b>property</b> 2:7,18	18:19	repair 4:23 5:19 6:17 13:22		salvaged 7:22
2:19 3:25 4:2,6	realized 26:8		resource 2:9	SANCHEZ 38:9
4:19,24 6:17	really 11:1 13:8	14:1 18:18,19	8:10 11:8	38:22
7:16 8:3 9:12	16:12 22:6	18:22 19:10	Resources 1:18	sat 16:18 33:12
19:19 36:13	23:4,5 26:21	repairable 26:19	response 8:9	saved 10:11,15
proposal 3:7,20	26:22 27:18	repaired 6:22	restore 6:18	saving 32:11
15:11 36:11	reason 16:14	11:16 14:19	13:23	saving 32.11 saying 23:21
<b>proposed</b> 4:10	29:1 34:2	17:17 18:12,13	result 9:1 11:9	26:24 27:20
4:16 5:3 11:3	reasoning 29:10	repairs 6:1 7:4	retained 5:5	28:8
protect 32:5	rebuild 4:24	10:5 13:7	7:22	says 6:21 18:11
provided 20:3	received 33:22	14:10 17:13	retains 9:7	22:13 29:12
provides 9:8	receiving 14:4	repeat 30:1	retention 9:3,20	scope 28:24
providing 9:5	recommend	replace 14:2	return 3:20	scope 28.24 scratch 22:25
<b>public</b> 2:13 9:14	7:17,24 34:10	35:10	24:25	29:20 35:1
9:16,25 10:2	recommendati	replaced 3:14	reuse 7:23 9:11	second 5:20 7:4
38:10	11:24	6:12,13,14	review 4:12,17	8:14 10:4,10
purchase 3:24	recommendati	14:15,21	5:3,8 7:11	12:11 14:5,12
7:2 11:13	6:7,8 14:12	replacement	33:17	18:11 24:19,24
16:24	record 38:13	3:11	reviewed 3:9	29:25 30:20
purchased 4:6	recorded 2:12	replica 3:12	34:22	36:14,15
12:18 13:2,3,5	Records 2:14	report 5:20 6:6	reviews 4:1	seconds 36:16
14:1,6 15:4	redo 22:17 31:6	6:21 7:3,4,11	revision 3:9	SECRETARY
18:2,8 19:4	31:7 32:18,20	10:5,10,17	right 17:8 18:4	36:17,19,21,23
26:3 33:3	redoing 26:1	11:12,15 13:4	22:5 23:3 24:4	36:25 37:2,4,6
35:16	32:13 35:23	13:9,24 14:5,7	25:14,16,17	
purchasing 33:6	regarding 7:10	14:13,17 18:8	33:4 36:7	37:8,10 section 2:11
<b>purely</b> 4:17 6:22	10:14 11:19,22	18:11 19:11	rip 22:24	7:25
purposes 16:11	regularly 28:15	21:6,7,7,8,8	<b>Risk</b> 30:5	7:25 <b>sections</b> 7:9
pushed 31:23	reinforcement	22:13	Rolando 1:13	Sections 7.9

21.10	10 1 07 4	20 10 12 14	4162.12	1.24.10
31:18	18:1 27:4	29:10,13,14	thereof 2:12	uh 24:19
secure 17:3,14	soundness 18:14	structurally	thing 21:23	understand 32:1
see 11:5 15:12	SP 2:5	15:3 17:25	26:11 28:14	35:20
15:18 16:2	<b>Spain</b> 1:14 17:4	structure 5:4,21	29:21 33:25	understanding
20:12 24:6,7,9	18:21,24 22:6	7:8 8:6,15 9:2	things 7:13	33:18
seeing 21:3	23:13,21 36:8	9:13,18 11:20	22:20	undue 9:21,24
seen 29:4	36:10,25 37:1	15:21 16:6	think 15:1 25:9	uninhabitable
seller 19:25 21:5	speak 34:5	34:14	28:22 31:4,24	4:22
33:7	speaking 23:20	structures 7:23	35:20	unreasonable
selling 12:10	Special 2:6,23	stucco 16:6	third 8:20 12:15	9:21
sense 13:1 32:17	3:2	27:18 28:18	12:15	unresolved 35:7
separate 21:10	specifics 19:12	<b>study</b> 9:5,8	thought 19:3	unsafe 9:18
seven 11:21	speculate 12:24	subfloor 5:18	21:4	unsound 15:3
<b>severe</b> 20:14	<b>spend</b> 30:7	6:13	thousands 32:3	use 7:15
<b>shape</b> 4:25 5:5	32:12,19	submit 5:9	<b>threat</b> 9:14,16	<b>▼</b> 7
20:16	spent 32:2	submitted 4:5	three 21:24	V
sheathing 6:10	<b>spoke</b> 29:17	9:22 10:12	25:13 27:21	Vice-Chairper
<b>shell</b> 5:21	<b>square</b> 4:25 20:2	11:2,11 15:22	30:5,6,20	1:10
<b>shoes</b> 30:19	24:22	suffers 11:21	<b>tiles</b> 6:9 14:14	$\mathbf{w}$
show 4:17 26:14	<b>SS</b> 38:4	suggest 22:23	time 12:19 16:18	
showed 34:2	stability 5:24	suggested 3:16	16:22 18:22	waiting 30:12
significance 8:8	13:16	suggestion 22:17	31:10 35:3	walking 23:2
8:13	<b>Staff</b> 1:17 3:22	suggests 10:11	today 36:2	wall 24:24,25
significant 13:10	7:16,23 11:18	summarize 12:7	told 29:18 33:7	26:16
13:12,12,15	11:20 34:11,19	13:9	<b>total</b> 6:19 34:13	walls 6:4 13:20
14:8,8,22 15:1	35:21	support 4:20	totally 28:9,22	14:16 20:20
23:25 24:12	<b>Staff's</b> 8:9 10:7	5:10 10:14	touch 22:22	21:24 24:10
25:22,23 27:9	10:14 11:6,23	34:13	traditional	25:13,23,24
28:16	standpoint	<b>sure</b> 14:21 34:19	15:25	26:10,16,23,23
similar 6:19	29:25	<b>system</b> 6:9 14:13	traditionally	27:2,9,16,21
11:15 14:7	stands 16:4	27:25 28:6	16:5	29:16 30:5,6
33:21	start 34:25		transcribe 38:12	30:20 31:17,22
Simultaneous	started 21:2	T	transcript 38:13	want 4:12 15:6,9
23:20	starting 26:17	<b>T</b> 38:1,1	true 38:13	15:15,17,23
single 28:3	31:20	take 22:16 35:10	trusses 20:19	17:23 20:7
sink 35:9	<b>starts</b> 23:12	taken 25:5	22:12 25:11	21:18,19 22:22
sit 33:8,16	state 18:5 19:17	<b>talked</b> 20:5,10	31:7	26:14 30:9,15
site 8:6,23 9:14	38:3,10	<b>talking</b> 24:16,21	try 21:23 23:9	36:4
sitework 3:4	stated 4:21 6:15	tell 32:15	29:22 32:10	wanted 11:5
situation 29:6	states 5:21 7:6	telling 21:22	trying 25:3 26:4	35:8,12
situations 28:15	stating 10:12	ten 11:21 28:11	28:25	wanting 29:11
<b>slab</b> 3:14	steel 31:21	terminate 5:16	turned 16:20	wants 15:7
sliding 20:8	story 2:24	termite 13:10	twelve 30:12	Warren 1:18
sold 12:14	street 5:6 20:9	14:9 28:8	twenty 30:11	20:4 21:14
somewhat 24:4	streets 24:14	termites 5:23	two 5:9 11:11,18	33:4,4,5,12
sorry 32:6 34:1	structural 3:16	28:10	two-story 31:13	wasn't 17:25
34:18	5:9,14,17 6:18	<b>Thank</b> 16:22	31:17	22:9
sort 35:2,7,17	7:3 10:10	37:11,12		water 5:17,22,23
sound 14:17	11:11,14 18:14	theory 13:18	U	13:11 14:8
1111	11.11,11.10.11			17:14,18,20
	I	I	I	I

				Page /
20 14 16 20 5	11.4061			
28:14,16 29:5	wouldn't 36:1	5		
way 1:3 22:23	wound 20:15			
24:19,24	<b>Wow</b> 16:9	6		
we're 20:24	X	<b>6th</b> 38:17		
21:12 22:1	Xavier 1:11	7		
24:15,17,20	Aavier 1:11			
25:2,8 32:15	<u> </u>	<b>70</b> 12:9		
32:15	yank 31:5,6	<b>75-year-old</b> 28:19		
we've 29:4 31:14	yeah 18:10,23	28:19		
32:25	20:17 23:22	8		
week 33:7	27:5 35:2	82:13		
weight 13:21	year 4:7	02.13		
weird 22:20	years 12:9 28:11			
welfare 9:4	30:11			
went 4:9 12:5				
20:4 33:9,12	$\overline{\mathbf{Z}}$			
35:15	<b>Zero</b> 30:17			
whatsoever				
32:17	0			
wife 19:18 21:12				
21:18 33:9	1			
William 2:22	<b>1</b> 2:10 8:5			
willingness	<b>100</b> 20:17 23:6			
35:21	26:6 29:9			
wind 14:23	<b>1258</b> 1:6 2:8			
18:16	34:12 36:13			
window 21:12	<b>13</b> 2:13			
24:19,24 32:14	<b>1945</b> 2:21 12:8			
windows 6:3,13	2			
14:20 15:19,24				
16:1,7 17:17	<b>2</b> 2:11			
17:17 25:10	<b>2013</b> 12:10,11			
26:13 28:1,5	<b>2014</b> 2:23			
28:17 29:8	<b>2017</b> 12:14			
30:3,21,25	<b>2019</b> 3:2 <b>2020</b> 5:12 13:4			
31:1,5	<b>2020</b> 5:12 15:4 <b>2021</b> 3:8 5:20			
wood 5:25 6:1	12:19 13:2			
6:11,12 13:15	12:19 13:2 14:6 15:5 17:1			
14:18 27:4	<b>2022</b> 1:2			
woods 6:11	<b>2022</b> 1:2 <b>2022-034</b> 2:5			
work 5:19 21:13	<b>2022-034</b> 2:3 <b>2023</b> 38:17			
21:14 22:4	<b>2023</b> 38:17 <b>20s</b> 31:20			
28:22 34:10	<b>208</b> 31:20 <b>21</b> 1:2			
35:21	<b>41</b> 1.4			
worked 21:16	3			
works 6:17	32:11			
worried 31:19				
worse 21:3 29:5	4			
worthy 28:13,21	<b>405</b> 1:3			
			<u> </u>	