



HISTORICAL PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
Meeting Minutes of February 16, 2022, at 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

MEMBERS	D 15	J 19	F 16	APPOINTED BY
Albert Menendez (Chair)	P	P	P	Commission-As-A-Whole
Cesar Garcia Pons (Vice Chair)	E	P	P	City Manager Peter Iglesias
Alicia Bache-Wiig	P	P	P	Mayor Vince Lago
Margaret (Peggy) Rolando	P	P	P	Vice-Mayor Michael Mena
Dona Spain	P	P	P	Commissioner Rhonda Anderson
Xavier Durana	P	P	#	Commissioner Jorge L. Fors, Jr.
Michael J. Maxwell	P	P	P	Commissioner Kirk R. Menendez
Bruce Ehrenhaft	P	P	P	Commission-As-A-Whole
John P. Fullerton	P	P	P	Board-as-a-Whole

☎ 305-460-5093

✉ hist@coralgables.com

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

STAFF: Warren Adams, Historic Preservation Officer, 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.

The meeting was called to order at 4:09 pm by Chair Menendez and attendance was stated for the record. Mr. Durana was not yet present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Mr. Maxwell and seconded by Mr. Fullerton to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 19, 2022.

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

NOTICE REGARDING EX-PARTE COMMUNICATIONS.

Chair Menendez read a statement regarding Notice of Ex-Partee Communications. Board members who had ex-partee 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.

Mr. Adams stated that Mr. Durana was on his way.

DEFERRALS

1. The Historic Designation of 122 Menores Avenue.

Reason for Deferral: Mr. Adams had been in discussions with the property owner's representative. An engineering report was submitted that the building was structurally sound. The building would be tented for termites in the near future. There was a proposal to convert this building to a sales office for the proposed new development adjacent to it and then once the development was complete it would be converted it to a clubhouse for the development. The owner's representative was requesting a one-month deferral to allow them to go over the proposal with staff. Mr. Adams indicated that the owner's representative was in the audience.

Ms. Lauren Kahn introduced herself and said she did not have anything to add but would answer any questions the board might have.

A motion was made by Mr. Fullerton and seconded by Mr. Garcia-Pons to approve the deferral of 122 Menores Avenue for thirty (30) days.

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

SWEARING IN OF THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Ceballos administered the oath.

Mr. Durana joined the meeting.

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

LOCAL HISTORIC DESIGNATION:

CASE FILE LHD 2021-012: Consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 737 Minorca Avenue, legally described as Lots 24 & 25, Block 25, Coral Gables Section "B," according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 111 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

Mr. Adams gave some background on the property:

1. The property owner was a new owner.
2. They purchased the property only a few months ago.
3. They submitted for a historic significance determination which led to the preparation of the designation report.
4. They have requested two (2) deferrals and during that time he had tried several times to schedule a meeting with the property owners, as the owner had stressed the importance of moving this along quickly so they could start construction and they had also wanted another expert opinion.
5. Notices were sent out in the past for the prior meetings when it was brought to the board.
6. Staff had tried to contact the owners before the notices were sent out for this meeting to ask if they wanted a deferral or to move forward. They had left phone messages without a response and Mr. Adams called the property owner this morning and there was no answer.
7. The owners were not present
8. How the board wanted to proceed?

Mr. Ceballos said if the item was properly noticed then there was no issue with the owners not being present.

Ms. Spain asked if the property owners had been sent and received a designation report. Mr. Adams responded affirmatively, and said he was sure that it would be appealed if it was designated. Ms. Rolando said she knew the neighbors received the notice because she had got one.

Chair Menendez said that they should move ahead.

A presentation with a voice over from Ms. Guinn was shown on the screen which gave a history of the property located at 737 Minorca Avenue, its historical aspects and how it related to the history of Coral Gables and the reasons it was being considered for historic designation.

Mr. Adams indicated that he had received letters of support for the historic designation of this home from:

- a) Sandra L Skidmore – 100 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach.
- b) Zuilly Pardo – 49 Campina Court.
- c) Karelia Ann Carbonell – President of the Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables.
- d) Olga M. Ramudo – 625 Alhambra Circle.

Mr. Adams said he did not think the property owners had arrived and had not had any emails from them.

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

Ms. Spain said that it was important for board members and the public to understand that the opinions of the owners are not considered during the designation. The only thing that the board should consider is whether it fits the criteria.

Mr. Fullerton asked if anyone knew if this property was built at the same time as its next-door neighbor. He said they had designated the other one in a prior meeting. Mr. Adams referred to the newspaper report on page 8 of the designation

report which read: "Two attractive bungalows are being built by Captain Christopher Story on New York, 731 & 737 Minorca Avenue".

Chair Menendez said that staff had made a strong case for designation. Mr. Fullerton said he was hoping that with designation this one would take on a more important feeling in the neighborhood, as right now it feels a little decrepit. Ms. Spain said it was also important to recognize the importance of those buildings and residences that were built other than in the 1920's. Everyone thinks historic properties were built in the 1920's, but this is a really significant home built in the 1930's that shows the history of the City and how it progressed.

A motion was made by Ms. Spain and seconded by Ms. Rolando to approve the local historic designation of the property at 737 Minorca Avenue, legally described as Lots 24 & 25, Block 25, Coral Gables Section "B" based on the **three (3) significance criteria:**

Historical, Cultural significance

4. Exemplifies the historical, cultural, political, economic, or social trends of the community

Architectural significance

1. Portrays the environment in an era of history characterized by one or more distinctive architectural style
2. Embodies those distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or method of construction as evidenced by staff's presentation and the staff report (this amendment was added by Mr. Garcia Pons).

The motion passed (Ayes: 9; Nays: 0)

Ms. Rolando said that even though this home was designed to meet the FHA criteria, it had two bathrooms which was considered a luxury for modest homes at the time. This was a very large lot, and this home is very well positioned on the lot to be renovated and added onto, and it is a lovely home. She said the board had designated other homes on that street and this home is in keeping with the nice fabric of the street. It is a great location and a very consistent neighborhood streetscape.

Ms. Bache-Wiig commended the staff for trying to reach out to the owner so many times and attempting to get them involved. She thought it showed the spirit of the department and their willingness to work with homeowners. Ms. Spain said that if it becomes a historically designated property staff will also work very well with the property owners.

Mr. Fullerton said to Mr. Adams that the pictures appear to show the house had a white roof at the beginning of its construction and that the City had a pretty strict program on files, so he hoped that when he looked at the restoration plans, he would look at those pictures. Mr. Adams answered affirmatively and said that he did mention the opportunity to adapt the house and apply for the ad valorem, but it did seem like the intent was to take most of it down.

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

SPECIAL CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2022-002: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at **2802 Columbus Boulevard**, a Local Historic Landmark, legally described as Lot 13, Block 8, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part One, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 8, at Page 108 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The application requests design approval for the installation of an S-tile roof.

Mr. Adams made a presentation for the agenda item following a presentation on screen.

1. Permitted on October 30, 1925.
2. The residence was designed in the Mediterranean Revival Style by architect Leon H. Weisfeld.
3. It was one of three residences designed by Weisfeld for builder H.J. Hoodwin.
4. The house was located on the corner of Columbus Boulevard, and the other two are located at 1210 Sevilla Avenue and 2806 Columbus Boulevard.
5. This was the last of the three to be built.
6. It was designated as a local historic landmark in 2007.
7. The applicant is requesting approval for the replacement of the existing "S" tile roof with a Vera Spanish "S" tile roof, red in color.

8. In December 2021 a permit application was submitted to replace the existing tile at the residence with an “S” tile.
9. Before proceeding to the Board of Architects for review the Historical Resources and Cultural Arts Department staff did not approve the choice of tile, noting that the tile must be a two-piece true barrel tile.
10. The owner wishes to install an “S” tile.
11. The proposal was reviewed and disapproved administratively by the Board of Architects staff in January 2022 with the following comments: “Proposed tile Vera Spanish “S” clay, color red must receive okay for BOA review from the Historic Department, comply with Historic requirements, and resubmit.”
12. The work proposed in this application detracts from the integrity of the historic building and is inconsistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for rehabilitation.
13. The residence was built in 1925 in the Mediterranean Revival Style with the roofing materials considered one of the defining characters of the style.
14. The home originally had a two-piece barrel tile roof which is the appropriate roofing material for a local historic landmark.
15. Staff’s recommendation is for a motion to deny.

Mr. Adams stated that he thought the property owner was present with a presentation.

Mr. Eric Milton stepped up to the podium with a sample tile which was passed around to the board. He stated that he was the new owner of the property located at 2802 Columbus Boulevard. He stated that he had acquired the house and read all about the history of the house through the plethora of documents given to him as well as requesting film from Ms. Wilma Yhuit. He then went on to go through the presentation on screen:

1. He filed in December to upgrade the roof that was approved in 1999 and installed in the early 2000’s with the same tile that it has currently which is the existing “S” tile that is being passed around.
2. The existing roof is ready to be replaced and is currently Spanish Tile, “S” tile.
3. The property was designated as a local historic landmark in December 2007 with the “S” tile already in place.
4. The application is to replace the existing “S” tile roof with Veree Spanish “S” tile, red color.

He showed a picture of another house with “S” tile from the Veree website.

5. This tile is durable, sustainable, and a natural insulator, this Spanish Tile roof will match the Mediterranean Revival Style of the house.

He said he had two different points to his argument which he would go through today. He showed a picture from his four-point inspection done in July or August of 2021 showing the state of the current roof as it is.

6. The roof was installed in 2000 therefore it is about 22 years old.
7. Argument A: Existing Structure.
 - a) The existing roof is Spanish “S” tile.
 - b) The property did originally have a true barrel tile roof when it was built in 1925, but as of 1999 the Spanish “S” tile was installed.
 - c) The house was designated as a local historic landmark in 2007 which was after the modification was already made.
 - d) Both of the other houses designed by Leon H Weisfeld (1210 Sevilla Avenue and 2806 Columbus Boulevard) follow the same Mediterranean Revival architecture style, with one having “S” tile (slightly different in color than his house) and the other with true barrel tile.

He showed a copy of a document showing that the one piece “S” tile currently on the house was approved on December 16, 1999. He also said he had found other documents that he had not put in the presentation that showed that a leak was repaired in 2007 using the “S” tile, as well as other documents with pictures of the “S” tile that had been chosen which appeared very similar to the tile that he had chosen. He then showed a picture of a Barrel Tile vs Spanish “S” tile and went on to say.

8. Barrel tile consists of the pan piece which is the bottom structure, and the top piece called the arc in so it ends up being a set of different pieces interlocking. The main difference between the barrel tile and the Spanish “S” tile is the “S” tile is one piece that does the full wave of sequence, so it is interlocking, kind of the same style as the interlocking on the barrel tile, but it is a continuous piece.
9. Argument B: Other Historical Landmark Houses.
 - a) Other existing landmark houses have Spanish “S” tile. – He said he looked at the list of designated houses on the website, and either visited the houses or used Google maps and found that 1215 Alhambra Circle and 1243 Asturia Avenue have barrel tile, 2817 Columbus Boulevard (one of his neighbors) and 2709 Columbus Boulevard both have “S” tiles.
 - b) From street view, these tiles appear identical to the untrained eye and very similar to those looking for the difference.

10. Closing Statement:

- a) 2802 Columbus Boulevard has an existing Spanish "S" tile roof and therefore he should be permitted to replace this roof with a similar Spanish "S" tile roof.
- b) Having to pay an extra 15% for tile that is different from what is already in place is a hardship for him.
- c) As a young professional who chose to live in Coral Gables and extended himself financially to be able to purchase this home which he loves, he was not expecting this capital investment at this time.
- d) When he bought the home and did a four-point inspection, and he was told that the roof would last another 4-5 years. After the recent rainstorms in the first week after moving in he had to fix leaks which did damage to the paint job and interior walls which he had also had to fix. When he investigated where the leak was coming from, he found would have to replace the roof sooner than later.
- e) The rainy season is approaching, and he hoped to get approval so he could move forward with the roof replacement.

Mr. Milton concluded his presentation and thanked the board for allowing him to present.

Mr. Adams stated that he had a letter from Karelia Martinez Carbonell, president of the Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables recommending denial.

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

Ms. Kautz stepped up to the podium and brought to the board's attention that she had written the wrong date and the house was actually designated in 2001 before she got to the City. Ms. Spain asked for clarification of the date, to which Ms. Kautz said 2001. Mr. Fullerton asked if it was designated with the "S" tile?

Chair Menendez asked Mr. Adams what was the City's policy regarding the roof tiles? Mr. Adams replied that during the year he had been with the City all previous requests for installation of "S" tiles had been denied by the board and the staff's recommendation was denial. He believed that this has been the standard practice for long before he came to the City. Ms. Spain said it had been that way for quite a while. When staff was presented with an application for a new roof, they could administratively approve the barrel tile if it was a Mediterranean style home, but the board had directed staff that requests for "S" tile regardless of what was currently on the house, must come to the board as a Special Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff is very particular on window replacements, the windows had to be exactly the correct number of lights and raised mullions and yet if there was an "S" tile roof they were able to keep it an "S" tile. True barrel tile made such a huge difference on the integrity of Mediterranean homes. This roof in question was a prominent roof.

Ms. Rolando stated that during her time on the board they had been very consistent in their insistence of the use of barrel tile as it was authentic and was consistent with the original architectural intent of the property. She felt Mr. Milton would be doing the home and himself a disservice if he settled for anything less than true barrel tile. She said it was not that big of a difference in price, and she understood being house poor and looking at the checkbook and thinking "one more expense", but it would make a huge difference using the true barrel tile. For a significant period after hurricane Andrew in 1992 true barrel tiles were not available, they did not have the testing that ultimately became required for product certification. This may be the reason the "S" tile was permitted for such an important house.

Ms. Spain concurred that the barrel tile was not available after Hurricane Andrew and so the City approved the "S" tile on historic homes, and now these roofs were coming up to 20 years and would be up for replacement. The Board of Architects had required true barrel tile in the past for Mediterranean homes that were not designated, and the Historic Board will require true barrel tile. She understood the cost aspect but felt that the true barrel tile would make a difference.

Ms. Rolando referred to the presentation where Mr. Milton had said that the untrained eye could not tell the difference, she said that it is clear to the trained eye and to the eye that had a little aesthetic sensor training. She said that when Mr. Vinnie Torre was president of the Historic Preservation Board he had said "the "S" tile roof was like a polyester tuxedo, it just didn't look right", she hoped he would make the right choice.

Mr. Ehrenhaft said from his experience on the board the only exceptions that he had seen where "S" tiles were permitted to go back on the structure was if there was a full roof of "S" tiles and they needed to do a temporary repair. When they have come before the board they have consistently stated the caveat that when the full roof needed to be redone it had to be true two piece barrel tile.

A motion was made by Ms. Rolando and seconded by Mr. Ehrenhaft to deny the design approval for the installation of an “S”-tile roof on the property at 2802 Columbus Boulevard.
The motion passed (Ayes: 9; Nays: 0).

Mr. Milton thanked the board for their explanation and said he would probably be reapplying to have his roof fixed in the next couple of weeks.

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

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2022-003: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 1043 North Greenway Drive, a Non-contributing Resource within the Country Club of Coral Gables Historic District, legally described as Lots 20 and 21, Block 4, Coral Gables Section “C,” according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 8, at Page 26 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The application requests design approval for an addition and alterations to the residence and sitework.

Ms. Spain disclosed that she had talked to Mr. Silva the owner of the property not specifically about the Special Certificate of Appropriateness, but he had called when he first purchased the property to try and figure out how to make it a contributing property. To do that he needed to do the alterations first and get the ad valorem. They were trying to figure out how he could get it designated.

Mr. Fullerton said he was having a hard time understanding why it was not contributing. Ms. Kautz said she would explain. The owner was a past chair of the Historic Preservation Board and was in the audience and would make his presentation.

Ms. Kautz made a presentation for the agenda item following a presentation on screen.
She showed a location map of the property.

1. The property was located just west of the Country Club on North Greenway Drive.
2. The district was designated in 1989 for the first time and was exceptionally expanded over the years.
3. The property (shown in the photograph) was a two-story coral rock residence designed by H. George Fink in 1923.
4. As shown in the first photo the second floor is stucco and the rest of the ground floor and features are all coral rock.
5. (Photo from 1926). There was a permit issued to architect H.B. Bush that included what is called the bar building to the right, which is essentially another two-story house that is connected to the first house by a covered walkway shown in the center.
6. In 1963 a small addition was made in the northwest corner of the original house and in 1954 a small one-story addition was added to the rear of the bar building.
7. In the 1940’s photo taken from the corner shows the coral rock wall shows the bar building and the second floor, all the structures are stucco.
8. There was a current picture in the packets that the board had, but not in the presentation.
9. At some point everything coral on the property was covered with stucco which is the most substantial alteration to what was essentially a coral rock cottage on the property.
10. Because of the substantial alterations to the property, the changing of the windows and the enclosure of the porch it was deemed to be non-contributing.
11. It was discussed at length how to treat this because they felt that they did not want the property to be demolished. As a non-contributing property any buyer could come in and demolish the property and build an estate. While they did not want to see it gone, they did not feel that it could be made contributing at this point.
12. Luckily Mr. Silva and his wife purchased the property and they have been able to talk them into keeping the footprint of both structures on the property.
13. As part of their alterations, they were proposing to bring back some of the restorative features to both buildings including trying to bring back the coral on the front porch opening, reopening the front porch, bringing back the original wood low wall, but they were asking to remove the second story, of the building shown in the photograph.
14. As part of that as was seen in the report, there was a twin building, identical to this house on Columbus that is owned by an architect across from Salvadore Park. The house is still coral, and retains its complete integrity, but it has no second story. The details were the same and is what Mr. Silva is using to do his restoration work.

Ms. Kautz said she was turning it over to the owner and architect to walk them through what he was proposing. He is removing square footage and doing a small addition.

Mr. Fullerton said they should welcome Mr. Silva back to the board as a former member of the board.

Mr. Silva introduced himself and said it was good to be back and thanked the board for welcoming him. He stated he now resided at 1043 North Greenway Drive.

Mr. Silva made a presentation for the agenda item following a presentation on screen.

1. Photo of original 1923 house.
2. Photo of house in 1926.
3. Photo of house today.
4. He said when they saw the house come on the market, they fell in love with it and saw that it had great potential, but it was in bad shape.
5. He said that Ms. Kautz had gone through all the reasons it was non-contributing, unsympathetic additions, inappropriate windows, things enclosed and lack of maintenance.
6. Mr. Silva showed a picture from the interior courtyard where they had cleared brush.
7. He showed a picture of the second floor and said that part of the second floor on the bungalow building was original.
8. After they purchased the property, the city had no as-builts, so they went and measured everything and created a decent set of as-builts.
9. He went on to show pictures of the damage to the house. The bar building and the roof were in terrible shape.
10. As soon as they closed in November they applied for and got a roofing permit and an exploratory demo permit so that they could see what the damage was.
11. They had done quite a bit of work, the bar building has been re-roofed, most of the sheeting on the roof deck was replaced because it was rotted away. It is now weather tight.
12. The other building is not yet weather tight because of the second floor.

Mr. Silva went through a series of drawings including:

- a) Demolition site plan and proposed site plan, proposed front wall elevation.
- b) Proposed demolition floor plan showing the 1964 addition and a 1963 addition which they were proposing to remove. A breezeway which they were proposing to remove as these were two stand-alone houses and they would link the two houses together.
- c) Second floor demolition plan. – showed the 1964 addition (single story), the original breezeway, a bathroom (unknown date), the 1963 addition and the original second floor.
- d) Proposed ground floor plan – they were proposing restoration work to restore the original porch on the rear and on the front (opening it up again) and a kitchen addition linking the two buildings which was very similar in massing and size to the breezeway, but wider.
- e) Proposed second floor which would be just restoration work.
- f) Demolition

Mr. Silva showed the following drawings/pictures:

1. Greenway Elevation: (South front elevation existing demolition and proposed demolition).
 - a) They were opening the front porch again.
 - b) Replacing all the windows and replacing with historically appropriate muntins.

He was able to figure items from some historical photos and went back to the home on Columbus for measurements as it was identical, the same exact footprint.

2. Cordova Elevation: East side elevations (existing demolition) and east side elevation (proposed) also the carport elevation (existing demolition):
 - a) They were able to get the original dimensions of the altered masonry openings which they would restore.
 - b) They were restoring the ridge element to the rear which was squared off.
 - c) Restoring casement type windows on the bar building which were originally installed.
 - d) Installing single hung windows on the other building which was originally installed.
3. Model House:
 - a) Mr. Silva said he wished they still had the wood windows shown on the model house but would try and get the next best thing.
4. Interior Courtyard – East interior elevation – Existing Demolition and Proposed.
 - a) They would be removing the one-story addition.

West Side Elevation existing demolition and proposed.

- a) The bar building arch openings were enclosed.
5. Picture of the arched openings.

- a) They did exploratory demo and found that the previous owner had butchered the openings, they put a tie beam across the top so restoring the arches will be difficult, but they were at least going to restore them in the family room area.
- 6. West Interior Elevation – Existing demolition and proposed.
- 7. North Rear Elevation – Existing demolition and proposed
 - a) Removing unsympathetic additions and restoring the rear porch.
- 8. Drawing of front of home:

Reasons for removing the second floor are:

 - a) Architecturally the way it is built, it is built to leak. The pitch roof just hits it, it truncates there (as shown in the photograph). It is in bad condition. He showed a picture of the roof. The valley is leaking water.
 - b) They had started to open the walls and they were rotted.
 - c) The view from the second floor looked directly at the roof instead of the golf course.
 - d) The entire house on the ground floor is coral, the other house is masonry, and everything on the second floor is wood, supported by 2 x 6 rafters which were all rotted.

Mr. Silva thanked the board for their time, he said he really enjoyed working from his side and working with Mr. Adams and Ms. Kautz has been a pleasure and the project was better because of their input. He invited them to tour the house after he closed. He encouraged anyone listening or watching to do this and he felt that this is what the Historic Preservation Department did, and they were just trying to improve historic buildings and the state of buildings in the city.

Mr. Silva said there were three conditions on the report:

- 1) Raised muntins – they had no issue with this requirement.
- 2) Clear glass – they had no issue with this requirement. They were originally wanted to use a low “E”, but it was reflective, and Ms. Kautz was concerned with that, so they looked at their energy model since they were gutting the inside and increased the roof insulation from a R20 to a R22 that covered them for the energy code, and it saved money, so he thanked Ms. Kautz for bringing it up.
- 3) Paint – they requested to come back and work with staff or paint later as they were not ready to think about colors.

Ms. Kautz added that there were no variances requested and that the Board of Architects had approved this without comment.

Mr. Maxwell asked Mr. Silva how difficult it was to remove the stucco from the coral rock?

Mr. Silva said they had brought out a couple of contractors and they had told him it was impossible, that it was costly and difficult so he went out with his father-in-law and they went to the back to areas they were going to open up and they did some experimenting and found out that if you do 2 x 2 squares with a concrete saw the stucco will come off, however he did not know if it would be an acceptable finish at the end, it was something they needed to look at. They could not commit to doing it on the entire house as it would be too labor intensive, but they were going to try and do it on the porches. If they couldn't do it or it looked terrible, they would do a coral veneer to replicate what was there before.

Mr. Maxwell asked it was Portland cement?

Mr. Silva said it was done sometime in the 70's. Ms. Kautz said it was done before the district was designated in the 80's so she guessed it was done during the 70's. Mr. Silva went on to say that it was hard stuff, they were hoping to take a sledgehammer to it, and have it crack off, but it did not work. Mr. Maxwell concluded that it was Portland. Ms. Rolando said the house had been mistreated, and it needed a great architect to envision the renovation.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the Special Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions for design approval for an addition and alterations to the residence and sitework. on the property at 1043 North Greenway Drive with the following conditions:

- 1. *Window/door muntins are to be high-profile / dimensional.*
- 2. *Window/door glass to be clear.*
- 3. *Staff requests clarification on the proposed paint color.*
- 4. *The new pool will be handled administratively with a Standard Certificate of Appropriateness at the time of permitting.*

The motion passed (Ayes: 9; Nays: 0).

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

TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS (RECEIVING SITE):

The proposed development (receiving site) is located at 290 Valencia Avenue (also known as 2601 Salzedo Street), legally described as Lots 1 through 12 and Lots 35 through 46, Block 10, Coral Gables Crafts Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat book 10, Page 40 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida and Lots 1 through 4, inclusive, Block 15, Coral Gables Crafts Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat book 10, Page 40 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The following Local Historic Landmark properties are within five hundred (500) feet of the proposed development located at 100 Miracle Mile:

- 280 Miracle Mile (Miracle Theater), a lengthy legal description is on file with the Historical Resources and Cultural Arts Department.
- 2506 Ponce de Leon Boulevard (H. George Fink Studio), legally described as Lots 22 & 23, Block 7, Coral Gables Crafts Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 10, Page 40 of the Public Record of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

Therefore, per Section 14-204.6 of the Coral Gables Zoning Code, the Historic Preservation Board's review and approval of the proposed development is required to determine if the proposal adversely affects the historic, architectural, or aesthetic character of the historic property.

Mr. Adams made a presentation following a PowerPoint presentation on the screen.

1. This is a request to transfer development rights to a receiving site.
2. If a receiving site of TDR's is within five hundred feet of a local historic landmark section 14-204.6.8.3 of the zoning code requires the Historic Preservation Board's review and approval of the proposed development to determine if the proposal adversely affects the historic, architectural, or aesthetic character of the historic properties.
3. The two properties within 500 feet of this proposed development are at 280 Miracle Mile which is the Miracle Theater and 2506 Ponce de Leon Boulevard which is the H. George Fink Studio, both are local historic landmarks.
4. The proposed development received Board of Architect's preliminary approval on December 16, 2021, where it was determined that the project is entitled to Level 1 and Level 2 bonuses.
5. Level 1 bonus standards for all types of architectural design. Bonuses are available up to a maximum of .24 floor area ratio and up to a maximum of one-story for all types of architectural designs.
6. Level 2 bonuses are for Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural design and an additional bonus up to .3 floor area ratio and one-story or two stories shall be permitted if the Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural design is utilized.
7. This means that the proposed development needs to be a Mediterranean design building to qualify for this Level 2 bonus.
8. The site proposed for this development is currently a mix of low-rise commercial structures and surface parking lots, and it has been determined that none of the existing structures are historically significant.
9. The proposed new development is a mixed-use building of 329,197 square feet which includes 63,000 square feet of Transfer of Development Rights.
10. The eighteen-story structure is approximately 204 feet, 8 inches in height to roof level fronting Valencia Avenue, Salzedo Street and Almeria Avenue.
11. The required parking will be on-site on the second through the sixth levels.
12. The report does contain a listing of what the various floors will contain.
13. The Board of Architects determined the overall design of the building meets the requirements to qualify for Level 2 bonuses for Mediterranean architectural design.
14. This proposal will also require review by the Planning and Zoning Board and the City Commission.
15. The staff recommends the approval of the request of the Transfer of Development Rights to the site and the applicant is here.

Mr. Joe Jimenez executive vice president and general counsel for Codina Partners stepped up to the podium and thanked the board and introduced himself. He said he had a presentation and that he agreed with Mr. Adams. His presentation

would focus on the history and how they got to the property. Mr. Jimenez made a presentation to the board following a PowerPoint presentation on the screen.

1. This was not just one property because the history goes back to when Ms. Spain was with the city, it was originally supposed to be somewhere else.
2. This is a combination of a development of four different properties along Salzedo Street running from Navarre to Almeria.
3. Years ago, Codina Partners built The Sofia at 2000 Salzedo Street and their office at 2020 Salzedo Street.
4. Mr. Jimenez showed a map on the screen and said that at the time there was a municipal parking lot across the street, and they owned a piece that squared that off, and they had intended to build it out as a sister tower to The Sofia. They had started designing the project and almost submitted for permitting.
5. The City approached them to combine the two so that the City could build a new state of the art Public Safety building (he indicated the lot on the screen., located across the street from their headquarters).
6. It took a while to do and in the meantime the City stayed at its' previous Public Safety building located on Salzedo Street about seven or eight blocks south.
7. They were going to get that property and build something on that, but they did not know how long it was going to take so they decided to let the City build the new building and improve properties that they already had.
8. During the time that the City was building they were approached by Mercedes Benz who needed to improve their at-grade decades old used car lot.
9. It was a perfect solution for them as they now had a more developable lot and they did not have to demolish a building, and the view to the east was better. Mercedes Benz would get an existing building that they would refurbish that already had a 300 plus car garage which would get their cars off the street.
10. Mr. Jimenez showed pictures of the existing building and the proposed new Mercedes Benz building that would bring the Mercedes brand and preserve the structure and the garage. He felt Mercedes Benz was brave as the City had built the new building because the old building was about to fall down. The plans are going forward.
11. So once again they traded, and they ended up with the assemblage site between Valencia and Almeria along with a 10,000 square foot non-historic lot that has a non-historic 1200, or 1300, foot little structure on the corner (highlighted on the presentation).
12. He thought that since he was coming to the Historic Board he would give a history of what they saw as a culmination of years long effort that when all these entities work together now 5, 6, 7 years later, you have two at grade lots that weren't activating anything being replaced by a brand new municipal building that will hopefully be a luxury tower unlike anything seen in Miami Dade County and an older building in much need of repair that will bring a decades long corporate client into a new headquarters all along the same street.

He then went on to explain why they were at the Historic Board.

1. There are two historic buildings within 500 feet of the proposed building.
2. They had put into scale that the Mobility Hub is coming in there too.
3. They are starting to see growth in the area, and what is being replaced are old single story industrial and very small-scale retail, lots of 2500 feet. There is not a lot of room to do anything unless you assemble.
4. It is in the central business district which is what was conceived when the district was created.
5. Navarre is the last street on the north side of the central business district so it like doing bookends.
6. What they wanted to do was bring activity to this neighborhood, allow people to walk to the theater.
7. He was familiar with the Fink studio as Bugatti always has a wait.
8. Creating a residential use is what is missing from this area and everything that it brings with it.
9. This site plan is 1.74 acre cumulative; it is a mixed-use building as any residential has to be in the Central Business District.
10. There is fine dining, office space, retail, shared work office all along Salzedo Street.
11. Salzedo Street in between Valencia and Almeria and would be activated with pedestrian, commercial, and leisure use at all times of the day and night.
12. The building is proposed at 18 stories and is up to 174 units, but this building was at about 150.
13. Although they were using TDR's, the program for this building was unlike anything seen before. They were not going for density they were going for right sizing not downsizing.
14. The smallest unit in the building is about 1250 square feet.
15. The average size for market rate units like the Sofia is about 950 square feet.
16. The largest unit is close to 10,000 square feet.
17. They were going after a market that would keep people in Coral Gables that no longer need to be in their current homes.
18. Anywhere from the North Gables, Golden Triangle, Gables Estates, South Gables it doesn't matter there is something in this building for everyone because downtown is becoming a place where people are going to be

able to walk around and enjoy the historic properties, to enjoy Miracle Mile and to see continued growth in the area that complement it and focus where it is supposed to be focused, the Commercial Business District.

19. If anyone is familiar with Bachour in their current building this courtyard would be double the size.
20. There would be a 20,000 square foot courtyard plus covered loggias in the paved areas.
21. They were trying to find something equally as good as Bachour.
22. What makes this project unique is that they had struck a deal with the City where they would give the lot to the City as a Municipal Park.
23. A planned area development does require a public benefit, this park will qualify as a public benefit and will be entirely owned by the City and transferred to them upon completion of the project.
24. There is storage on the mezzanine level.
25. He showed a picture of the parking and said that they realized they it might need to be bigger even though the unit count would be smaller.
26. The amenity deck would be on top of the garage with a lap pool, a regular pool a fitness center and a clubhouse.
27. There would be two outcroppings of the two towers surrounding the courtyard where there will be exercise, Zen gardens, above ground vegetable gardens, barbecue areas and seating areas etc.
28. Mr. Jimenez went through several more slides showing elevations of the buildings.
 - a) The loggias along the north and south sides of Salzedo.
 - b) The paseo running along the east property line that would be the cut through from Valencia to Almeria.

Mr. Fullerton asked him to clarify the height of the building if it was 204 feet eight inches. Mr. Jimenez answered affirmatively. Mr. Fullerton said it was higher than most. Mr. Jimenez said the building itself was taller because of the architectural features. The city commission has already passed on the first reading, and they have transmitted to the state because it is a comp plan amendment. The maximum height currently in the city for habitable uses is 190.5. In the Central Business District, the density is unlimited. If you can park it and you can fit it in the floor area ratio you can build it. You can do a bunch of studios, one and two bedrooms. There are no one bedrooms in this building now, they are taking it to 174 because it entitled them to 100 to the acre because the new legislation passed by the city on the first reading gives you a height bonus in pad if you bring your density down from unlimited to 100 per acre. If they were to build a normal market rate building like the Sofia, he penciled it out at around 315 units, they were currently at 150. When you go to build, impact fees are based on doors. The city went with a policy decision that if you wanted a little bit extra. He said he intended to take advantage of the legislation and put a less abstract face on it, but it is a different product one that was not readily available. They were not getting any more units from taking advantage of the height, what they got was the ability to go higher floor to floor. When you do a 10,000 square unit you have to do 8 feet. The height was necessary for the integrity of the product not for any more floor area ratio. You also need a certain amount of leasable square feet to make the project financially feasible.

Mr. Fullerton asked if they had gotten MED bonus?

Mr. Jimenez replied that they had got MED 1 and 2 and design approval from the Board of Architects.

Mr. Garcia Pons asked whether the Boards review would be about the impact of the development on the two historic structures that are within 500 feet? He said it would be difficult to determine the impact the development would have on those historic structures as their submittal had only 2 or 3 pages that showed the other properties in question.

Would the massing of the building infringe upon the aesthetic of the other buildings as you viewed them? He thought the Fink property was well insulated because of its distance and location in its context it would be the Miracle Theatre, and even then, it would be the view of the Miracle Theater with this building in the backdrop.

What would it look like if he was standing across the street looking at the marquee of the Miracle Theater with this building behind it? He could not tell as there was a nothing in the package to show him that and he had not gone out to the site to check it. The research he had done on the package, the TDR's numbered about 63,000 square feet, which looking at the section of the building it looks like it is 19% or 20% of the building and generally the top four floors from 14-18 yields about 50,000 square feet.

Without the benefit of the TDR growth square foot area of 60,000 square feet would that impact the height of the building, the 50,000 square feet of those top five floors, would that impact the development in height, and would that height have a significant impact on the view from the street of the theater looking back without those five floors? Mr. Garcia Pons said he did not know how he would answer that question without showing him.

Mr. Jimenez said that he could not show it, he had done the best he could. The reason he had put the new mobility hub to scale was because the mobility hub dwarfs the Miracle Theatre. Even if you stood across the street on Miracle Mile facing south the first thing to catch your eye would be the new mobility hub because its unique design would make it stand out. He could not show it to him today without everyone having to use their mind's eye to see an intervening building. Even though their building was taller it was more in line with the Mediterranean concept. If their building was built first, it would actually look smaller because it does step from the Miracle Mile which had the lowest height in the area. You would see the mobility hub and then his new building which would be two more blocks away. Because their building was different it would not have the impact architecturally because of the phasing, which is why he tried to address more than architectural impact. He said if you bring more people to a neighborhood and more people can walk to that theater and you make the district livelier, that should be part of the code required language of impact also. The Fink building would be less impacted because he had scaled down towards the building which was 500 feet from the eastern end of his property. Three or four years after these buildings were finished it would be different than what a massing would currently show.

Mr. Garcia Pons asked staff that when something like this came to the board it was imperative that the perspective of the impact be from the pedestrian level of the building with whatever building is on it. He said to Mr. Jimenez that this was a great package to highlight this building, but there is a model that was presented in the package, pages 2.8 and 2.9 and the slide on the screen that had the mobility hub in it, so that means the model was built. So even just a view of a pedestrian from across the street showing both buildings that they already had a model of would clearly describe what they were meant to review.

Mr. Jimenez said they had taken it from the city's presentation and tried to put it in their presentation as well as they could. Mr. Garcia Pons interjected that even if it was a box, a rectangle, or a ghost it would be clear what the massing of that building would do with relation to the massing of their particular building. He would encourage staff as he found it hard to determine what the potential impact would be based on the information provided. Not that he thought it was good or bad, he just didn't know.

Mr. Adams said that when he had used street view when he was looking at this and he did look at the building on page 2.8 which is to the right of the proposed building which is smaller. You could see that when you looked at the Miracle Theater and made an estimation. When you stood on Miracle mile you could technically see the building that above it with the orange barrel tile roof. When you stood on Miracle Mile you would be able to see the new building above the Miracle Theater. He said he was using the buildings that existed that can be viewed currently albeit this building would be taller and potentially closer. He also said that there will also be the mobility hub, so they would have to take all of that into consideration in trying to determine if this building was going to have more of an impact on the Miracle Theater than 1) what exists and 2) what is already proposed. He thought it was difficult to say that this building is going to have a significantly greater impact on the theater. If we had the Miracle Theater and nothing above five stories within six blocks of the theater it would be clear cut, but when you look at what is there and what is proposed you must weigh everything.

Mr. Adams said he had someone with their hand raised on ZOOM.

Mr. Garcia Pons closed his comment by saying that the board needs to look at substantial competent evidence, they can't say it is going to look like this or I think it is like that, so he said it was important for staff to help them so that they could make that determination.

Mr. Maxwell said that in the future when they had these types of items it would be good to have street level photographs for example from Miracle Mile looking back. They could ask the applicant to do that and scale that into the back. He thought that Mr. Garcia Pons comment was excellent as he had gone to Miracle Mile and looked back, and he couldn't see the Del Monte building too much even though it was at a much higher elevation. He hoped they had a chance to look at the mobility building as it would have a serious impact on the theater.

Mr. Adams said that in the past he had asked for the street views. Sometimes they were provided other times not, and sometimes you look at them and wonder if that is really what it was going to look like. He said they would do as Mr. Maxwell asked in the future.

Ms. Spain said this was the first time the board had seen TDR applications without the sending site, typically it all came as a complete package, after it had been to the zoning department who would verify that the package has the

appropriate number of square feet and the 63,000 square feet had been calculated and you had what it could actually receive as TDR's.

Mr. Jimenez said he was told to come to the board first before planning and zoning.

Ms. Spain said that she had had the same problem as Mr. Garcia Pons, and she needed to disclose that months ago Mr. Codina had called and wanted her and her husband to come to his office to talk about this building. It was more about the concept of the building and that when they retired this building could be an option for them. She had seen the very preliminary drawings. Ms. Spain said they would have to come back to this board when the sending site has been identified.

Mr. Jimenez said he had spoken to the city attorney and as he understood the code a sending site gets a certificate of TDR; they do their covenants and get approved by the board and everything else and that becomes a marketable instrument.

Ms. Spain said the sending site would have to come to the board. Mr. Jimenez said only they had to come to the board. Ms. Spain said it was an issue for the city attorney as they had been through this in the past. Typically, there was an identified receiving site, you had a number of TDRs, and it became a certificate for TDR's which is approved by this board based on a maintenance plan. She thought there was a city attorney determination that you could do that separate and apart from a receiving site, but she did not think they had ever done it in the past.

Ms. Rolando said they usually presented both to the board at the same time, and if there was more than one sending site an allocation of the TDR's that were being assigned from each.

Mr. Ceballos stated that typically they are brought forth together just because it is the more practical option but there was no requirement to do so. If the board was to approve this as a sending site, it would be the applicant's responsibility to find the TDRs wherever they are. If they had already been through the process or a property needed to go through the process it is on them. Simply approving them as a receiving site does not guarantee that they could get the TDRs they would still have to go through the process. There is no requirement that both parties come together, it is two separate reviews, two separate criteria, and they can be done independently.

Ms. Spain asked if when the sending site comes to them is there a different TDR number assigned to it because it had not been like that in the past. Mr. Adams said he thought so but would have to check. Ms. Spain said she had a case where a sending site assumed it was used because it was joined to a receiving site. Then the receiving site decided that they did not need those TDRs on that site and never paid for the TDRs from the sending site, but it was approved as part of the receiving site, and it had become a mess. She said Mr. Adams would have to work that out paperwork wise.

Mr. Jimenez said there was a property that they were in contract talks with that had a certificate of TDR had "X" amount and sold "Y" amount and they were now getting their delta, their balance, their "Z". They had already been approved, their maintenance plan and everything else. Maybe they did it at the same time as whoever they sold to the first time, but now they are sitting there with this balance which they were currently negotiating for. The logic was that they should go with their process, not tied to anyone else as if they change their mind on the price, and say that the price is higher, you are tied to them and will have to go back to the board. Where he got his TDRs was important, but he would answer that another day while these approvals go forward.

Mr. Adams said that before they brought the application to the board, they had checked with the city attorney to see if they could do it this way. He had also pointed out to the applicant that there was a requirement for receiver sites that they be reviewed subject to them being in conformance with any applicable conditions of approval pursuant to the certificate of TDRs. They have come for approval, and should they not get the TDRs then their development would suffer.

Ms. Spain said the main risk is that zoning would not approve the additional height.

Mr. Jimenez said that as the history showed they had been sitting on the property for six years that they were ready to develop. They had been through the deal with the city, the city finishing its building, then the pandemic and now a 20-25-30% price increase on materials. The hurry becomes more real given the economics and everything else,

so anything that he could run on a parallel track he would do. He said he was going as efficiently and transparently as possible, not cutting any corners, they had been waiting on the legislation and got it moving once it passed the first reading unanimously. If it did not pass again then they would have done everything for nothing, and he would have to redesign the building and make it smaller. Every risk had been calculated and at the right time. If he got approval from the board as a receiving site he could go and secure those TDRs from wherever they may be, and if his calculations were wrong and it was not 63, and planning told him it was 50, then he was already prepared for 63. It would not be more.

Ms. Spain asked if they were approving this as a receiving site, she thought they were just determining what was in the staff report? Mr. Adams stated that they were determining if it had a negative impact on buildings within 500 feet.

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

Ms. Karelia Carbonell president of the Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables spoke on Zoom.

1. She thought they had detoured from the item about the adverse effects and gone to an issue that lost the perspective of why this item had come to the board. It was really these two historic properties.
2. They had made a big deal about the Morris building on Ponce. This building would be as tall, and the view shed was going to be affected.
3. This building would be the tallest building in that area.
4. The Miracle Theater would be affected by the mobility hub, and their comments were public, the residents were not happy with that project, but this would be even taller.
5. She thought they needed to think about this. One building would become other buildings, and that Salzedo area was still quite quaint and had been enjoyed that way for many years. They needed to think if this building would fit in to the Salzedo area.
6. She commended and applauded Mercedes Benz for taking over the old public safety building and repurposing it.
7. She had heard laughter about what Mercedes Benz was getting into because the building was falling apart. She did not know the condition of the building structurally or engineering wise, but as far as the aesthetic and architectural components of the building, her and a few other preservationists had many meetings with the Mercedes Benz corporate, and they had heard them and understood the importance of the building. Unfortunately, even though they tried to meet with Codina, they never wanted to hear about it.
8. It really comes down to how important it is to keep the building and not just because of the preservation, but because of our planet. If the city is going to be serious about carbon neutrality at some point in the near future, demolishing buildings for new construction is actually detrimental to the environment. Just like the garage, which was being demolished for the mobility hub, was detrimental the environment you could add many demolitions to that. She closed by reading a quote from the National Trust for Historic Preservation. "Arguments that promote a practice of disposable real estate are unsustainable at best and at worst environmentally catastrophic. There is embodied carbon within existing structures and the fact that it can take up to 80 years to offset the carbon debt that is incurred when an existing structure is replaced, even if the new building is highly energy efficient. New buildings will never likely offset the carbon cost of their construction. We don't have time to simply build our way to a sustainable future." She asked everyone to keep that in mind. This was one of the platforms that preservationists are speaking out about. This was our environment and the more demolitions, and construction that would prevent us from getting anywhere near carbon neutrality. If we are serious about it, we had to start thinking about not just preserving the buildings, but actually preserving our environment.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone else wanted to comment. When no one answered he closed the public portion of the hearing.

Mr. Jimenez commented that he wanted to make sure that there was no misunderstanding, he had repeated the joke that Ms. Spain had said to Mr. Silva, it was a complement about Mercedes Benz, he felt they were brave for taking over the building. He said he remembered speaking with Ms. Carbonell and he did not think that the old fire station was significant, the city did not think so either, and he was in the development business, and they had a plan of what they wanted to do. He was happy that they could get the building into the hands of someone who would preserve it. He had a very close working relationship with Mercedes Benz, and he wanted it understood that he was not making fun of them.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone had any more questions.

Mr. Bache-Wiig asked what the height of the Plaza was?

Mr. Jimenez said the 190.5 was habitable space. The code allowed the architectural features to go much higher. They would not be the tallest building in Coral Gables the Plaza comes in at 190 and I think they go above 200. With their tower they would be the fourth tallest. The architectural features do not count to the 190.5. You would see different architectural features in the skylines on different buildings, but they are all capped at 190.5. 298.3 is the Plaza, and at their highest actual point his building would be at 230 or 235. The highest habitable floor is 205.

Chair Menendez asked how tall the Mercedes Benz building was?

Mr. Jimenez said it was four stories with roof top parking and he guessed it was 50 or so feet. There was a Publix catty cornered, a post office and now the new park. Mr. Kurdak owns the building to the east. It was one story along Almeria. Ms. Spain said the Publix will be redeveloped. Mr. Fullerton asked staff if they checked the impact on all historic structures in the area or only those that were subject to TDRs for a project like this. Mr. Adams said that the code said buildings within 500 feet. Mr. Fullerton said he understood, but the impact of this building obviously affected other historic structures in the area, whether they are giving us TDRs or not. Ms. Spain said it wasn't about whether they were giving up TDR's it was about whether they were designated historic and within 500 feet.

Ms. Bache-Wiig said that she thought they had to look at it in context because the centerpiece of the Plaza is the Arts Center Building, and it is a historic building, and it is two story, and it is surrounded by about a million square feet of buildings. Those buildings do not step, they are at that height, she thought that there were a couple of concessions that this building was doing.

1. They are stepping back.

2. They are giving an entire parcel to a park which deems that undevelopable in the future.

She thought there was context around this business district, there was precedence that there are historic structures of one and two stories that are surrounded by even taller buildings that do not step and are not providing an entire parcel as a park. She thought they needed to look at it as a whole as it was not even adjacent to a historic structure like the Plaza was. She understood that they did not have a sightline study which would have been helpful but thought that they could imagine. She thought they were well within the realm of approving this based on precedence.

Ms. Rolando said her point was a good one. She also said that the buildings to the north of the Plaza on Sevilla were mostly two story, some historic, some not, and there were adjacent residential neighborhoods. Here there are none, and it is commercial all around, it is not adjacent to a historic site, and she thought it was a non-descript site. She said she was comfortable that this building would not have an adverse effect on the Fink Studio. This was more than a block away and was not interfering with the facade or that corner of the theater.

Mr. Fullerton said he thought the intermodal center was far more impactful to both of those buildings than this building.

Chair Menendez said if you walk around Coral Gables a lot of the historic buildings are within sight line with larger buildings behind them, it is part of progress. He did not think that it affected the two properties in question. He said some of the board members have made some good suggestions as far as the information they needed to make a good decision. He asked staff that in the future with TDRs they provide complete information such as sight lines, photographs, and elevations. Some members of the board wanted to see the sending site as well as the receiving site added to their packages.

Mr. Adams said they could do that, but he wanted to point out that some of the higher rise buildings that have been discussed weren't necessarily reviewed for TDRs because they were not within 500 feet of the structure, or TDRs weren't requested. There were other buildings there that are high, but they were not necessarily reviewed by the board for this issue. If the board had reviewed them then maybe changes would have been requested or they wouldn't have been approved. There were always a lot of discussions about sight lines and view sheds and what disturbs the view to and from historic sites and districts. You could always potentially stand in a historic district and see a new high rise building a mile and a half away, and they were correct that you had to take the context into consideration and decide whether it would adversely affect the historic, architectural, and aesthetic character of the historic properties. If this building was surrounded by one story buildings, then obviously you could say that it had a serious effect, but when there were other high-rise buildings over a block away a certain amount does come down to taking the context into consideration of this site, not necessarily other sites.

A motion was made by Mr. Fullerton and seconded by Mr. Rolando to approve Transfer of Development Rights (Receiving Site) that the proposed development does not adversely affect the historic, architectural, or aesthetic

character of the historic properties within five hundred (500) feet of the proposed development located at 100 Miracle Mile.

The motion passed (Ayes: 8; Nays: 1).

Mr. Jimenez said they had to come back to the board next month for the alley vacation. He said to Mr. Garcia Pons as a gesture they would do their best to come up with information that not only puts in the mobility hub as best as they could but would also give him the sight line from a couple different places.

ITEMS FROM THE SECRETARY: None.

DISCUSSION ITEM:

Mr. Adams said the Landmarks Advisory Board had their first meeting and it went well, and they have tasked him with looking into former signs that no longer exist and trying to identify what happened to them.

Ms. Rolando asked what signs?

Mr. Adams said there was a sign to the entrance of Coral Gables Country Club at the 3rd hole (green) before the road improvements that had disappeared. He was trying to find out what happened to it. It could be seen from a street view from 2007, but they could not make out what it said. He said he had questions like that to try and find out what happened to formerly existing signs.

Mr. Adams said that he had to point out that there was a clear distinction between that board's purview and the Historic Preservation Board. He had informed them that the joint meeting with the Historic Preservation Board would be around November as the board had suggested and they are fine with that. The code required that the Landmark Advisory Board meet once a quarter, but they could call special meetings. They have called a special meeting for March 22, prior to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Gondola Building – no updates
2. 1209 Asturia Avenue – Russel Pancoast Designed – had been demolished.
3. 4200 Granada Boulevard – the board had directed Mr. Adams that someone from the city should go out and inspect the elevator tower. Mr. Adams had reached out to Development Service and Public Works and the City did not have anyone to go out and inspect elevator towers. He ran the engineering drawings through the city architect who advised what the minimum height requirement was from the second-floor level to the top of the tower. Mr. Adams had offered to go out to the site and get photographs however the property owner was reluctant, as he did not know what Mr. Adams would see when he took the photos. The property owner offered to meet Mr. Adams out there with the elevator company that installed it, but Mr. Adams was reluctant to do this as they had given disputable information when the elevator was planned, and they did not come in to amend the application when it was clear that the increased height was required. He said he was still trying to get it resolved. He did receive a slightly amended drawing from his architect which appeared to show the roof flattened off at the top instead of coming to a point of the pyramid, this reduced the height slightly and there did appear to be some sort of stucco banding suggested around the tower. He said he was still trying to figure out how to move forward as it was difficult to follow the board's directions as he did not have anyone to inspect the elevator and he was not an expert in that field. Mr. Fullerton said it was not really inspecting, it was just looking at it to see what the conditions were. Mr. Adams said he had offered to do that. Mr. Fullerton asked who had said no to that? Mr. Adams answered that it was the property owner.
4. Landmark Advisory Board: Mr. Garcia Pons asked staff if they could send them the dates of the next Landmark Advisory Board meeting so he could watch. Mr. Adams asked if board requested, he would send the agenda. Chair Menendez said if it was going to affect them, they wanted to know what was happening. Mr. Adams said the plan was not to let that happen and to keep a distinction between the Historic Board's responsibilities and the Landmark Advisory Board. If anything came up that would affect the Historic Preservation Board he would

notify them. Ms. Rolando said that they were an advisory board while the Historic Preservation board was quasi-judicial. Mr. Garcia Pons said he was more interested in what was happening.

5. Applications: Mr. Garcia Pons asked if when an application came before the Historic Preservation Board that had a previous designation could they be provided with the previous designation report as part of the application as it would be helpful to know the background. Ms. Kautz said that all the properties that came before the board were designated so was there a distinction between all of them? Mr. Garcia Pons said that typically an application for a Special Certificate of Appropriateness had a package that described what was approved previously and what is being requested, but there are some applications that did not. He said he wanted information on what was approved for those applications. Mr. Adams said that they would provide it in the future.

Chair Menendez asked if there was anything else. Mr. Asrani walked up to the podium and Mr. Adams said he had checked with the city attorney, and it was up to the board if they wanted to hear Mr. Asrani. He had not realized that Mr. Asrani was present. Chair Menendez said that he was not on the agenda, and they did not have any of his items in front of them. He asked if the board wanted to hear from Mr. Asrani. Mr. Ceballos said it was up to the board, they did not have their packages and it was an item that was previously deferred. Mr. Adams said they were not able to amend any prior motions because it had not been advertised and it was not on the agenda, so they could hear the applicant, but could not take any action. Ms. Spain said they had no photographs of what was done, and it would be easier if they had the information. Mr. Asrani said they did not need photographs.

Chair Menendez said the board needed to decide if they wanted to hear him or not, and he was not on the agenda. Mr. Asrani said he was. Chair Menendez said a board member had asked a question about his property, but he was not on the agenda, and they had to follow the rules. Mr. Asrani left.

NEW BUSINESS: None

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Garcia Pons made a motion to adjourn and was seconded by Ms. Bache-Wiig.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:41 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Warren Adams
Historic Preservation Officer