

**CORAL GABLES HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**April 16, 2009, 4:00 p.m.**  
**City Commission Chambers**  
**405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, Florida**

<b>MEMBERS:</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>J</b>	<b>J</b>	<b>J#</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>J</b>	<b>F#</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>APPOINTED BY:</b>
Dorothy Thomson	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Mayor Donald D. Slesnick, II
Margaret Rolando*									P	P	+	P	P	P	Vice Mayor William H. Kerdyk, Jr.
Ernesto Santos	P	P	P	P	P	P	E	P	P	P	A	E	P	P	Comm. Maria Anderson
Venny Torre*															Comm. Rafael "Ralph" Cabrera, Jr.
Dolly MacIntyre	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Comm. Wayne "Chip" Withers
Michael Beeman	P	P	P	P	P	P	E	P	P	P	P	^	^	^	Historic Preservation Board
Joyce Meyers	P	P	E	E	P	P	E	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	City Manager
Lisa Bennett	P	P	E	E	P	P	E	E	P	P	A	P	P	P	City Commission
Shirley Maroon	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	City Commission
														-	

+ Ms. Rolando recused herself from discussion.

- Ms. Maroon left the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

**A = Absent**

**P = Present**

**E = Excused**

**\* = New Member**

**^ = Resigned Member**

**# = Special Meeting**

**STAFF:**

Kara Kautz, Historic Preservation Officer

Betty Perez, Administrative Assistant

Rodney Carbonell, Historical Resources Department

**GUESTS:** City Manager Patrick Salerno, Laura Russo, Kendell Turner, Barbara Stein, David Arisco, City Architect Carlos Mindreau, Mohamed Fahmy, Burton Hirsch, Kelly and June Marcum, Margaret Davis, Leona Ferguson Cooper, Karla and Ana Quintana, Ari Miller, Jim Crum, Judith Weisel, Andrea Lopez, Joe Perillo, Rolando Hidalgo, Mary E. Burke, Ronald Mitas, Danny Impogno, Elizabeth Andrews, Bruce Fitzgerald, Leona Collins, Leona C. Baker, Louis Duncan, Sr., Isabella Smith

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Nancy C. Morgan, Coral Gables Services, Inc.

---

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

**DISCLOSURE STATEMENT and DISCLOSURE OF CONTEXT:**

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

**MINUTES: MEETING OF MARCH 19, 2009:**

**Ms. Thomson made a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 19, 2009. Mr. Torre seconded the motion, unanimously approved by voice vote.**

Coral Gables Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes

April 16, 2009

Continued

April 16, 2009

Continued

**DEFERRALS:**

None.

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

**LOCAL HISTORIC LANDMARK DESIGNATION:**

**CASE FILE LHD 2009-02:**

Consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 1243 Asturia Avenue, legally described as Lots 27, 28, and the East one-half of Lot 29, Block 5, Coral Gables Section "E", according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 8, Page 13, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

During a PowerPoint presentation wherein current and historic photographs and original drawings were displayed, Ms. Kautz reviewed the property's history, features, notable architectural characteristics, additions, replacements and ownership record. She concluded by stating that the property met the criteria for designation based on its cultural and architectural significance. After pointing out that the owner was present at the meeting, Ms. Kautz added that an e-mail indicating support was received from property neighbors David and Sandy Lysinger.

**Ms. Maroon made a motion to approve the LHD application for 1243 Asturia Avenue as proposed. Ms. Thomson seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Bennett, Ms. Maroon, Ms. Meyers, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.**

**STANDARD CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:**

**CASE FILE COA (ST) 2009-14 (continued):**

An application for the issuance of a Standard Certificate of Appropriateness for the property located at 2703 Alhambra Circle, a contributing property within the "Alhambra Circle Historic District," legally described as lots 17 and 18, Block 10, Coral Gables Section D, according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 25, Page 74, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant requested design approval for the installation of a new roof using clay "S" tiles.

Noting that minutes of the February 2009 meeting were in Board materials, Ms. Kautz relayed that the two motions made regarding this application in February did not receive a majority vote. Therefore, the inability of the Board to reach a decision was reviewed by the City Commission and remanded back for a full Board review.

Ms. Kautz reviewed the initial presentation, stating that the owner wished to replace the roof using S tile (versus barrel), and that staff recommended barrel tile. She pointed out that the applicant submitted materials for review, which would be explained by the applicant after staff's presentation. City Architect Carlos Mindreau was available for information. Ms. Kautz added that if the Board decided to approve S tile, she would request that such approval be case-specific with the condition that the next time this applicant or a subsequent owner replaced the roof, barrel tile would be required.

Mr. Mindreau stated that only U.S. Tile manufactured a Spanish S tile suitable for a "barrel tile starter course," adding that the Santa Fe tile proposed by the applicant could not do that or do it well. He thoroughly explained the issue and applications, and concluded that if Spanish S tile were approved by the Board, then the tile should be manufactured by U.S. Tile, which has the initial appearance of barrel tile at the edge of a roof. He added that the perfect choice for the application was barrel tile, with a second choice being U.S. Tile Spanish S. A Florida Rooftec representative added that U.S. Tile Spanish S was proposed.

Homeowner Kelly Marcum informed the Board that the current proposal was to use a combination of U.S. Tile Spanish S and barrel tile, and mentioned the price differential of the applications. Lengthy discussion continued, after which Ms.

April 16, 2009

Continued

MacIntyre invited additional public comment. Hearing no requests to speak, she closed the public hearing portion of the application. Discussion of all aspects of the issue continued, with Board members indicating their opinion leanings and debating issues related to tile types and uses.

Ms. Kautz stated that, in the past, when historic homes were brought before the Board in this condition, the Board requested that barrel tile replace the roof. If a designated house already had S tile, owners were not forced to use barrel tile. In this case, she advised, there was a good chance that if S tile was used on this roof, barrel tile would not likely be forced in the future since those conclusions had been reached by previous boards.

**Ms. Maroon made a motion to approve the application of the U.S. Tile Spanish S tile with a barrel tile starter course. Ms. Thomson seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Maroon, Ms. Meyers, Ms. Thomson, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: Ms. Bennett, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando. The motion did not pass.**

Ms. Kautz suggested Board consideration of conditioning the installation of U.S. Tile Spanish S tile on using true barrel tile as a starter course and on a requirement that the homeowner use barrel tile in the next roof replacement. Mr. Mindreau added doubts that the Board of Architects would approve mixing roof applications on the same building because a roof is integral to architecture, especially in a historic structure. Board debate continued.

**Ms. Maroon made a motion to approve the application of the U.S. Tile Spanish S tile with the barrel tile starter on the roof with the condition that this be a one-time approval, case specific to this owner and Certificate of Appropriateness, and in the future the application for the re-roofing of this property must be true barrel tile. Ms. Thomson seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Maroon, Ms. Meyers, Ms. Thomson, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: Ms. Bennett, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando. The motion did not pass.**

Ms. Kautz said she would forward the issue to the City Commission for a decision. Mr. Torre requested that if the City Commission decided to approve the application, that the applicant be required to use red cement on the ridge or edges to make the roof appearance more authentic.

#### **SPECIAL CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:**

**CASE FILE COA (SP) 2008-23 (continued)** An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 214 Florida Avenue, a contributing structure within the MacFarlane Homestead Subdivision Historic District, legally described as Lot 28, Block 1-B, MacFarlane Homestead and St. Albans PK Comb and Supplem., as recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 81, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant requested design approval for the demolition of the structure. This item was deferred from the Historic Preservation Board meeting of February 19, 2009

Ms. Kautz recalled that the application was heard in February and March, after which she displayed photographs of the property that showed its current condition. She indicated that several people were present to speak to both sides of the issue.

Ms. Russo, representing homeowner Margaret Davis, stated that she listened to the recording of the February 19 Board meeting and read the staff report. To establish a record, Ms. Russo questioned Ms. Kautz, who affirmed the following:

- There was no change in the staff report from the December 2008 report;
- In 1993, 214 Florida Avenue was included as one of seven residences identified as meeting the requirements of a rehabilitation loan program. In January 2004, the MacFarlane Homestead Historic District was amended to add

property and, as part of that report, four houses mentioned as part of the 1993 program did not include 214 Florida Avenue.

- The January 2004 report included a photograph of 214 Florida showed a hole in the front elevation of the residence.
- The staff report stated that the City's Building Official and Structural Engineer opined that the property was unsafe and posed a hazard to the surrounding neighborhood.
- The property was "red tagged" by the City.
- The property was secured with a chain link fence by the Code Enforcement Division.
- This item was deferred at the February 19 meeting because a task force was researching various funding sources to assist this property and others in the neighborhood. The County Historic Preservation Officer indicated there was approximately \$40,000 in Office of Community Economic Development (OCED) money available for this property for restoration. There are a few other granting agencies in the federal stimulus package that might be also considered. OCED money is immediately available. There has been discussion regarding a group called "Rebuilding Together" that is interested in working in this neighborhood.
- No cost estimates were obtained for the restoration of this property. When a demolition request is made to the Historical Resources Department or the Historic Preservation Board, the responsibility of the financial burden is on the applicant.

Architect Burton Hirsch, identified as an expert in preserving commercial and residential historic structures, addressed the Board. He visited 214 Florida Avenue and found the following conditions:

- The structure is in failure.
- Nothing that remains of the property is salvageable; no structural member can be saved.
- The property could be replicated; however, a set of drawings would cost approximately \$30,000.

As Mr. Hirsch reviewed recent photographs, he showed that the chain link fencing installed by the City was destroyed by vandalism, stated that Miami-Dade County assessed the property at \$260,000, and gave an estimate of costs to replicate the building as approximately \$120 per square foot. He said there was no feasible possibility of restoring the structure. Ms. Russo recommended, with the 2009 hurricane season nearly at hand, that the Board grant property demolition and place conditions deemed advisable on future plans to replicate the building.

Ms. MacIntyre invited audience members to speak.

Attorney Ari Miller, representing Equicredit Corporation of America, the property's mortgage holder, stated that the mortgage was in default, the mortgage holder initiated foreclosure proceedings, and it was likely that the mortgage holder would take title to the property. On behalf of Equicredit, he recommended denial of the application to demolish the property, and to retain it as a historic landmark for future restoration. He pointed out that only one item in the criteria for demolition was met, and updated the Board on the current status of the foreclosure.

Ms. Russo advised that the foreclosure file revealed a counterclaim to the foreclosure proceedings and affirmative defenses that perhaps the mortgage was a forgery. She reviewed facts and said there were allegations that the owner at the time the mortgage was executed did not sign the note. Ms. Rolando recalled that the applicant inherited the property from her parents, and Ms. Russo reviewed the family's history with the property, concluding that Mrs. Davis is the sole property owner.

In response to Board questions, Ms. Russo said she was not representing the owner in the mortgage foreclosure; however, the counterclaim to the foreclosure included a lawsuit against the mortgage company alleging that the mortgage was fraudulent. Mr. Miller said Equicredit believed it was in their best interest to retain the property as a historic landmark, which would enable it to maintain its value. Board questioning continued.

Ms. Kautz confirmed that the property would continue to be a subject of review by the Board, even though it was no longer a contributing structure within the historic district, and any new structure could never be a contributing one in the

April 16, 2009

Continued

district. Ms. Kautz responded to inquiries about OCED grant monies and their criteria, to Mr. Santos regarding the property's land and building value and size, advising that \$40,000 in grant funding would not be near funding required to restore the property. She also responded to Mr. Torre's requests for clarification of details.

Ms. Cooper stated to the Board that the community was unique because of its residences. She described the history of the neighborhood, how the houses were built, and how space was added to them to accommodate growing family needs. She voiced concern that the Board was researching funding to restore a house when it did not do so in the case of a former application by Andy Parrish, whose structure contained more architectural vernacular. She affirmed that she was strongly in favor of preserving the remaining wood frame houses in the district; however, she said that this particular house could not be saved. Ms. Cooper pointed out that the house should not have been permitted to deteriorate to its current condition, and said it would not have happened if it was located on Biltmore Way.

There followed discussion pertaining to the condition of the property, the liabilities that existed because of its condition and the effects of the property on the community.

Mrs. Davis stated that the house was her home, and its previous condition was entirely different from its current state. She said restoration grants did not come through for the house, the City would not do anything with the property and would also not allow her to do anything with her property.

Carla Quintana, 105 Florida Avenue, urged the Board to allow demolition, stating that homeless people and others used the house for drug dealing and sleeping, putting the neighborhood in a very uncomfortable situation.

There being no further requests for public comment, Ms. MacIntyre closed the public hearing.

Ms. Kautz advised that the City zoning code prohibited wood frame construction and if the Board were to recommend demolition, the house could not be replicated in wood frame. Ms. Russo added that the wood frame prohibition was a Coral Gables zoning prohibition, but not a prohibition by the State of Florida.

Ms. Kautz asked for clarification of the owner's intent for the property, and pointed out how intentions for a number of the community's properties could affect the future of the historic district. She also stated that an application similar to this one would be heard by the Board in June. Ms. Russo clarified the owner's intentions.

Discussion continued, during which time Ms. MacIntyre termed this application a "wake-up call" indicating a need to educate owners of historic houses, and added that one of the Board's purposes was to help homeowners maintain their homes in appropriate ways. She recommended that the Board address training and workshops designed to help homeowners.

**Ms. Bennett made a motion to grant the application for demolition of 214 Florida Avenue, with the caveat that any new structure on the property be consistent with the architectural fabric of the historic MacFarlane Homestead District. Mr. Santos seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Bennett, Ms. Maroon, Ms. Meyers, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.**

Ms. Thomson asked if the Board should make a recommendation to the Code Enforcement Board regarding violations and assessed fines that accumulated. Ms. Kautz said the Code Enforcement Board was informed that the Historic Preservation Board recommended in favor of removal of fines; however, the demolition had not been discussed or determined at that time. There is no mitigation until compliance with violations occurs, and the homeowner did not contact Code Enforcement. She said fines were no longer running; however, there is a lien on the property in the approximate amount of \$12,000, there is demolition by neglect and fees were imposed for City expenses.

April 16, 2009

Continued

**CASES CONSIDERED TOGETHER BY THE BOARD:**

Ms. Kautz explained that, although there were separate applications for Certificates of Appropriateness for the subsequent four properties, there was one applicant, one architect and one developer.

**CASE FILE COA (SP) 2009-03; CASE FILE COA (SP) 2009-04; CASE FILE COA (SP) 2009-05; CASE FILE COA (SP) 2009-06:**

**2009-03:** An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 111 Florida Avenue, an empty parcel of land within the “Mac Farlane Homestead Subdivision Historic District,” legally described as Lot 3, Block 2-A, MacFarlane Homestead, as recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 81, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant requested design approval for the construction of a new residence.

**2009-04:** An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 114 Frow Avenue, an empty parcel of land within the “Mac Farlane Homestead Subdivision Historic District,” legally described as Lot 22, Block 2-A, MacFarlane Homestead, as recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 81, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant requested design approval for the construction of a new residence.

**2009-05:** An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 116 Frow Avenue, an empty parcel of land within the “Mac Farlane Homestead Subdivision Historic District,” legally described as Lot 21, Block 2-A, MacFarlane Homestead, as recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 81, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant requested design approval for the construction of a new residence.

**2009-06:** An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 114 Oak Avenue, an empty parcel of land within the “Mac Farlane Homestead Subdivision Historic District,” legally described as Lot 21, Block 3-A, MacFarlane Homestead, as recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 81, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant requested design approval for the construction of a new residence.

Ms. Kautz displayed a map of the district, pointing out the location of vacant land parcels representing the four properties, stating they were considered non-contributing to the historic district. However, the Board has jurisdiction regarding construction on these vacant properties to mitigate their impact on the historic district. She reviewed district styles and each property, the outline of proposed floor plans, elevations, minor design differences and photographs.

Ms. Russo stated she represented LBW Homeowners Foundation, Inc., whose sole purpose was to build affordable housing units, and described the process for securing grants, waiving fees, permitting and the timeline of the project. The plans were approved by the Building and Zoning Department and permits were ready to be issued. She said the Lola B. Walker Homeowners Association approved the elevations, and that construction financing was in place.

Mr. Hirsch, project architect, explained that the design intention was not to replicate the bungalow or shotgun house styles, but to be sympathetic to the underlying architecture of the district. He described design elements, and differences between them. Stating that staff recommended additional design detailing, he described features added to comply with staff suggestions. He asked the Board to approve the submission and permit them to work out the remainder of the details with staff based on new elevations.

At the same time Mr. Santos praised Mr. Hirsch for his design concept and expressed understanding of budget limitations, he expressed concern about the designs’ lack of harmony with the typology of the district, and pointed out specific areas where he recommended changes to maintain a consistent architectural language in the neighborhood. Thereafter, Mr. Santos discussed specific features with Mr. Hirsch, including roofline treatments, columns, railings and other aesthetics. Mr. Hirsch concurred with some of the suggestions and agreed to work on details with staff.

Ms. Meyers, expressing agreement with Mr. Santos’ comments, emphasized the basic shape of the houses and opined that the design was not truly compatible with the surrounding area. She made suggestions about the shape and elements of the buildings. Ms. MacIntyre commented that the design appeared more colonial than Bahamian, and Ms. Bennett

April 16, 2009

Continued

recommended changes as well. Ms. Meyers said the structures needed re-design to be more appropriate in the neighborhood, and said the current design was incompatible with infill.

Ms. Kautz relayed the timeline of the project which began when it was first brought to staff one and a half years ago, at which time the applicant was informed about City processes that had to be satisfied.

Ms. Bennett cautioned that care was needed to comply with standards and the ambience of the neighborhood. Ms. MacIntyre observed that there were several vacant lots in the neighborhood, and suggested the applicant bring new drawings to the Board.

Ms. Cooper spoke about important deadlines looming for funding, and explained circumstances that might affect loss of funding. Three people, she stated, were signed up for the houses and if the projects did not go forward, the applicants could lose their opportunities to own them.

Ms. Meyers suggested that the County might consider an extension if progress was ongoing. Ms. Cooper replied that they asked the County for an extension on another property and said her group was satisfied with the design and appearance of the houses. After additional discussion, Mr. Santos and Mr. Torre offered to work with Mr. Hirsch before April 30 to expedite the process so the Board could consider changes at its May 7 meeting.

**Ms. Bennett made a motion to defer the applications to give Mr. Santos and Mr. Torre an opportunity to work with Architect Burton Hirsch before further Board consideration at the May 7 meeting. Ms. Rolando seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Bennett, Ms. Maroon, Ms. Meyers, Mr. Torre, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.**

The meeting suspended proceedings for approximately 10 minutes and reconvened at 7:10 p.m. Ms. Maroon left the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

#### **SPECIAL CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:**

##### **CASE FILE COA (SP) 2008-06 (continued):**

An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the Miracle Theater located at 280 Miracle Mile, a local historic landmark, a lengthy legal description is on file in the Historic Preservation Office. The applicant is requesting design approval for the replacement of the marquee. Variances from Article 5, Division 19, of the Coral Gables "Zoning Code" are requested for the installation of "LED" signage. This was deferred from the Historic Preservation Board meetings of August 21, 2008 and October 16, 2008.

Ms. Kautz said staff's report and opinion remained the same as originally issued; however, for the benefit of newer board members, she relayed the history of the theater, its architectural style and 1995 designation as a local landmark. She reviewed proposal basics, stating that the letter of intent specified static signage, electrical work and structural repairs. The application required multiple variances, from the signage portion of the code because a new sign of this height, size, composition and placement was not allowed in the City. Based on the number of variances, this would be a single variance from the entire section of the code. Ms. Kautz said the marquee was an original character-defining feature of the building, was integral to the front façade and should not be removed and replaced. She said replacing the original marquee with LED would be a tragic error.

Ms. Stein reviewed the theater's relationship with the City and obligation to it. She reviewed the application in detail, explaining that current signage was antiquated and costly. She stated the theater's goal to replicate the current sign in grids and lettering as it now appears using LED, adding that the Board of Architects unanimously approved the proposal with the caveat that the sign be stationary. She said the signage would be reversible if it did not meet with Board standards.

Mr. Arisco said this presentation was the theater's third visit to the Board, adding that current signage was obsolete and becoming increasingly more difficult to replace with lettering, which is changed quite often and by hand. He said that LED lettering could be changed multiple times daily without difficulty, and described how it would appear.

Mr. Crum, a representative of LED sign manufacturer Daktronics, displayed LEDmodules and reviewed their components and qualities, along with governing software and its ability to manipulate marquee announcements and placement. He described signage opening, trim, grid, height, curvature and ability to make the marquee a complete message center. He responded to Board questions regarding a myriad of issues, which included the proposed signage's ability to withstand strong winds, to appear three dimensional and to match any color. Mr. Crum said his company would help the theater establish and learn the program, that the work was guaranteed and that local technicians were in the area to respond to service calls.

Ms. MacIntyre invited audience members to speak.

Ms. Weisel, a Miracle Mile property owner, spoke in favor of the application.

Ms. Stein read proposal-positive comments from Architect John Fullerton, who served as a donator of architectural and historic preservation services to the theater.

Board members, applicants and Mr. Crum discussed numerous proposal details. Photographs of other applications of signage were viewed and discussed.

With no further audience requests to speak, Ms. MacIntyre closed the public hearing portion of the application.

Ms. Kautz commented that Secretary of Interior Standards required that any improvements or alterations made to historic properties be reversible, and opined that this application did not appear reversible based on correspondence from Arcolite, who indicated that the components for this type of sign are no longer available. She said current signage letters were available for purchase. Stating that the cost to replace the marquee was approximately \$164,000, and the cost to restore the marquee was approximately \$71,000, Ms. Kautz said spending the greater amount did not seem fiscally-responsible for the City, particularly since so many other preservation issues need funding. She offered options as follows:

- LED could be incorporated elsewhere in the façade of the building;
- LED signage could be placed lower than the marquee;
- Several portions of the Secretary of Interior Standards specified that restoration was the preferred application rather than replacement;
- The criteria for the requested variances do not apply to prevent restoration of the marquee;
- Staff is sympathetic to changing needs of the theater and its occupants, but staff adamantly believes the marquee should be repaired and not replaced.

Debate of issues continued. Many Board members expressed conflict with the issues and an understanding of both sides of the argument. Ms. Meyers said she spoke with preservation architects who indicated agreement with staff's position. She also learned that manufactured letters were available for purchase. Ms. Stein and Mr. Crum spoke about theaters that shifted to technological LED signage with success. The merits of both sides of the issue were thoroughly reviewed.

Mr. Torre recommended that if the application were approved, restrictions should apply as follows: the stainless steel needs to retain current appearance; the faceted appearance should be mimicked so the only element that is different is the white color in the middle; the lettering should have the current tarnished, reddish appearance; there should be no flashing letters or signs at any time.

**Mr. Torre made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the signage maintain its historical character, including specific details as discussed (stainless steel, exact block lettering, red color and all other aspects of current signage appearance). Ms. Bennett seconded the motion.**

April 16, 2009

Continued

**Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Meyers, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Bennett, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: Ms. Rolando.**

**STANDARD CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:**

**CASE FILE COA (ST) 2009-03 (continued):**

An application for the issuance of a Standard Certificate of Appropriateness for the Douglas Entrance, a local historic landmark, located at 800 Douglas Road, legally described as Blocks 1, 2, 3, 4, and Lot K & that part Ponce de Leon Park Cir. & Galiano Ct. & Calabria Ct. closed per Ord. #992, Revised Plat of Douglas Section, according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 34, Page 32, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant requested design approval for the installation of impact-resistant doors and windows. This item was deferred from the Historic Preservation Board meeting of March 19, 2009.

Stating that the status of this case remained the same as the previous month, Ms. Kautz briefly reviewed facts.

Ronald Miles, a representative of the owner, said the team had been working for over a year on the window/door project, the windows were deteriorating from termite damage, and substantial funds were invested in the property and project over the past two years.

Dr. Mohamed Fahmy, project engineer for this project, reported that Board comments from the previous meeting were seriously addressed by the team. He reviewed each issue raised by the Board, described design responses in detail and dialogued with Board members along with Andrea Lopez, manager of the building. A debated discussion focused on operable versus inoperable windows and their appearance. Dr. Fahmy assured the Board that the windows would be painted white and muntins would be added to make them appear more residential. Mr. Perillo discussed paint color and factory-applied muntins.

Mr. Torre and Mr. Santos closely examined drawings and sought further clarification of issues. After discussion, Mr. Santos thanked the project team for their attention to Board requests, and indicated he recognized the drawings as proper shop drawings and said he was satisfied. Mr. Torre expressed a lack of confidence about how project elements would come together.

**Ms. Meyers made a motion to approve the project for windows and doors subject to Ms. Kautz' detailed, technical review, with the caveat that if there are any components with which Ms. Kautz is not satisfied, those issues will be brought back for further Board review at the next meeting. Mr. Santos seconded the motion.**

Ms. Kautz advised that the applicant could proceed with installation of small casements with Board approval. Discussion continued.

**Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Meyers, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Bennett, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business to be discussed, the meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kara N. Kautz  
Historic Preservation Officer