

CITY OF CORAL GABLES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE
OCTOBER 21, 2020

PARTICIPANTS:

Albert Menendez, Chairperson
Cesar Garcia-Pons, Vice Chairperson
John P. Fullerton, Board Member
Bruce Ehrenhaft, Board Member
Alicia Bache-Wiig, Board Member
Xavier Durana, Board Member
Raul R. Rodriguez, Board Member
Dona Spain, Board Member
Margaret A. "Peggy" Rolando, Board Member (From Page 15)

Kara N. Kautz, Historic Preservation Officer
EizaBeth B. Guin, Historic Preservation Coordinator
Gustavo Ceballos, Esq., Assistant City Attorney
Nancy Lyons, Administrative Assistant

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Good afternoon. Welcome to
2 the regularly-scheduled meeting of the City of Coral
3 Gables Historic Preservation Board.

4 We are residents of Coral Gables and are
5 charged with the preservation and protection of historic
6 or architecturally-worthy buildings, structures, sites,
7 neighborhoods, artifacts which impart a distinct
8 historical heritage of the city.

9 The board is comprised of nine members, seven
10 of whom are appointed by the commission, one by the city
11 manager, and the ninth selected by the board and confirmed
12 by the commission. Five members of the board constitute a
13 quorum and five affirmative votes are necessary for the
14 adoption of any motion.

15 Lobbyist registration and disclosure. Any
16 person who acts as a lobbyist pursuant to the City of
17 Coral Gables Ordinance Number 2006-11 must register with
18 the city clerk prior to engaging in lobbying activities or
19 presentations before city staff, boards, committees,
20 and/or city commission. A copy of the ordinance is
21 available in the office of the city clerk.

22 Failure to register and provide proof of
23 registration shall prohibit your ability to present to the
24 historic preservation board on applications under
25 consideration this afternoon.

1 A lobbyist is defined as an individual,
2 corporation, partnership or other legal entity employed or
3 retained, whether paid or not, by a principal who seeks to
4 encourage the approval, disapproval, adoption, repeal,
5 passage, defeat, or modifications of any ordinance,
6 resolution, action or decision of any city commissioner,
7 any action, decision, recommendation of the city manager
8 and any board or committee, including, but not limited to,
9 quasi-judicial advisory board, trust, authority or
10 council, any action, decision or recommendation of city
11 personnel during the time period of the entire
12 decision-making process on the action, decision or
13 recommendation which foreseeably will be heard or reviewed
14 by the city commission or a city board or committee,
15 including, but not limited to, quasi-judicial advisory
16 board, trust, authority or council.

17 Presentations made to this board are subject
18 to the city's false claims ordinance, Chapter 39 of the
19 City of Coral Gables City Code.

20 I now officially call the City of Coral
21 Gables Historic Preservation Board of October 21st, 2020
22 to order. The time is 4:05.

23 Present today are Alicia Bache-Wiig, Bruce
24 Eherenhaft, Dona Spain, John Fullerton, Raul Rodriguez,
25 Xavier Durana, Vice Chair Cesar Pons, Cesar Garcia-Pons,

1 and myself, Albert Menendez, the chair.

2 Staff, Kara Kautz, historic preservation
3 officer; ElizaBeth B. Guin, historic preservation
4 coordinator; and Gus Ceballos, assistant city attorney.

5 The next is approval of the minutes. Has
6 everybody reviewed the minutes?

7 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes. I'll move approval.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Do we have a second?

9 MR. EHRENHAFT: Second.

10 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. We have a second.

11 MR. FULLERTON: I have a correction.

12 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Who
13 seconded? I'm sorry, I didn't see that.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: Who seconded the motion?
15 Bruce Ehrenhaft.

16 MR. FULLERTON: I have a correction.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: What's the correction.

18 MR. FULLERTON: On Page 39, Line 12, there's
19 a reference to a word about the location of the driveway
20 in that application, and it was put down as "access," and
21 it should be "axis."

22 MS. KAUTZ: Okay.

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

24 MR. FULLERTON: A small detail. I'm just
25 showing off because I read the minutes, that's all. No,

1 it's actually what I said, and I wanted to just make sure
2 I wasn't misquoted.

3 MS. KAUTZ: So noted.

4 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Notice regarding ex
5 parte communications. Please be advised --

6 MS. KAUTZ: You need to vote.

7 MS. KAUTZ: Oh, we need to vote.

8 MS. KAUTZ: All in favor?

9 THE BOARD MEMBERS: Aye (collectively).

10 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Now, notice regarding
11 ex parte communications. Please be advised that this
12 board is a quasi-judicial board and the items on the
13 agenda are quasi-judicial in nature which requires board
14 members to disclose all ex parte communications.

15 An ex parte communication is defined as any
16 contact, communication, conversation, correspondence,
17 memorandum or other written or verbal communication that
18 takes place outside a public hearing between a member of
19 the public and a member of a quasi-judicial board
20 regarding matters to be heard by the quasi-judicial board.

21 If anyone has made any contact with a board
22 member, when the issue comes before the board, the member
23 must state on the record the existence of the ex parte
24 communication, the party who originated the communication,
25 and whether the communication will affect the board

1 member's ability to impartially consider the evidence to
2 be presented regarding the matter.

3 Next item is deferrals. Do we have any
4 deferrals today?

5 MS. KAUTZ: No, sir, none.

6 MR. MENENDEZ: None, okay. Swearing in,
7 that's the next item. Can everybody be sworn in at once,
8 or does it have to be on a case-by-case basis?

9 MS. KAUTZ: We've done it in the past, we've
10 done it per item. Right, Doreen?

11 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, that's right. I
12 think it's more, in my opinion, more accurate for the
13 record.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Let's go then to the
15 first item, and that is the historical significance
16 designation, 649 Palmarito Court, legally described as
17 Lots 18 and 19, Block 139, Coral Gables, Coral Gables
18 Country Club Section Part Six, according to the plat
19 thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 20 at Page One of the
20 public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. Okay, Kara.

21 MS. KAUTZ: So this is a historical
22 significance request that we've received from the owner of
23 this property. Their intent as stated in the letter of
24 intent was to demolish the property, demolish the
25 residence.

1 The city ordinance passed around 2003 that
2 requires a historic significance determination for any
3 structure in Coral Gables to be issued before a
4 determination -- I'm sorry, before a demolition permit can
5 be issued.

6 So this was an act that potentially,
7 protected potentially historic properties that are
8 currently undesignated.

9 This is the location of the property for
10 Palmarito Court and Palmarito Street, just to give you
11 some clue.

12 If, as that ordinance was written, if the
13 historic preservation officer finds that the property is
14 historically significant, generally further research is
15 conducted and a designation report is prepared and that
16 matter is brought to the board to consider designation as
17 a local historic landmark.

18 In this case, staff believes the property is
19 potentially historically significant. It was permitted in
20 the 1940s, and this is an early photograph of the house
21 soon after construction.

22 It was designed by architect William
23 Shanklin, Junior. It is largely unaltered.

24 But we wanted guidance from the board, and
25 your consideration today would not be to designate the

1 property, but only to determine if you wanted staff to
2 bring back a designation report after doing more research
3 on the property for a subsequent meeting, not at this
4 meeting.

5 Again, this is only for you all to discuss
6 the historic significance of the property and whether or
7 not you think it warrants a full staff report.

8 So this is, like I said, a 1940s photo.

9 This is how the house looks today via Google
10 Images.

11 These are the plans, original plans for the
12 property as Permit 6225, again, William Shanklin.

13 Don't adjust your screen or anything. They
14 are warped. They have vinegar syndromes taking over on
15 these plans, so this is the best images that we could.

16 But you can see the basic outline of the
17 first and second floors.

18 This is the front facade which is largely
19 unchanged.

20 These are remaining facades of the property.

21 This is the tax card the city has on file,
22 the original tax card. It just says the outline of the
23 building and the permit number and the permit date it was
24 issued, and I put this in here so that you could see from
25 the survey submitted by the owner that it has not had any

1 additions made to it over the years.

2 These are photos submitted by the applicant.
3 This is the front facade; a view from the corner, sort of
4 walking around. This is from Google. This is the west
5 facade; the rear submitted by the the applicant.

6 And that's my presentation, and again, we
7 would like your, your initial thoughts on what you'd like
8 us to do.

9 MR. CEBALLOS: And if I may interject,
10 Assistant City Attorney Gus Ceballos.

11 Just for some clarification, I think Kara has
12 already explained that this is simply basically staff
13 asking for direction from the board.

14 At this point public input is not relevant,
15 so any e-mails we've received in relation to this property
16 should not be considered. Those all, e-mails will be
17 considered if this property went to the next step and went
18 for historic designation, but currently where it stands,
19 it's just a request by staff looking for direction. It is
20 not a designation. If you have any questions, please let
21 me know.

22 MR. FULLERTON: When was it built?

23 MS. KAUTZ: It was built in 1940.

24 MR. CEBALLOS: Pardon my interruption again.
25 Kara, procedurally, did you want -- typically we wouldn't

1 allow the public or even the resident to speak on a
2 request from staff, but in this particular case, the
3 homeowner was instructed that he could make a quick
4 presentation, and he's also available to answer questions.

5 Procedurally, Kara, would you like to do that
6 now? Or I suggest we probably do before any actual
7 deliberation after.

8 MS. KAUTZ: Sure. In the past we've allowed
9 that, we've allowed the owners to speak as long as, and I
10 have directed the owner of this too, as long as it's
11 germane to the topic, not about what's going to be, you
12 know, planned for the property, so it should be specific
13 to the request at hand.

14 MR. SAHAREWICZ: Okay. Thank you very much.
15 I would like to speak for a couple minutes.

16 MS. KAUTZ: You need to be, actually we need
17 to swear you in.

18 MR. SAHAREWICZ: Okay.

19 MS. KAUTZ: And I believe staff needs to be
20 sworn in as well.

21 MR. SAHAREWICZ: That's fine.

22 THE COURT REPORTER: I would like the person
23 I'm swearing in to state their name, and I will swear
24 staff also.

25 (Thereupon, the Mr. Saharewicz, Ms. Kautz and Ms. Guin

1 were duly remotely sworn on oath.)

2 MR. SAHAREWICZ: Ed Saharewicz, I do, just to
3 get the name on the record.

4 MS. KAUTZ: The floor is yours.

5 MR. SAHAREWICZ: Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you
6 very much.

7 All right. Well, my understanding is this
8 type of meeting for direction at a public meeting is a bit
9 unusual and I had some concerns about that which I
10 communicated by e-mail to Kara, and so I'm happy to have
11 that put in the record, if germane, and I don't want to go
12 over it because I think it probably raises concerns that
13 other residents in the past have probably raised.

14 I guess the one point I would make in that
15 connection is that I think every average citizen of Coral
16 Gables who wishes to improve their property, demolishing
17 what is there, is taken by great surprise to find out that
18 if they don't get their permit for demolition, they end up
19 with a historical designation and all of the burdens
20 associated with that, and I know there's pros and cons and
21 philosophy in that regard, and I don't want to get into
22 that.

23 But my basic concern is that just strikes me
24 as fundamentally unfair. It's one thing I think to deny
25 the permit because you deem the building to be eligible

1 for designation. It seems entirely a different matter to,
2 from that, conclude that it should be and actually do a
3 designation.

4 I would only point out, I understand what
5 your process is. I don't think it's supported by the
6 code, and I don't want to argue it, but I just recommend
7 for your consideration a change in your process. I think
8 it's enough to deny, if you go there, I don't think we
9 need to go there on this property, but if you do deny the
10 permit, right, because that's what actually is being asked
11 for.

12 When you go as far as designation, that
13 imposes a burden on the property owner, of course, who is
14 unwilling for that designation because they're seeking
15 exactly the opposite, so I would suggest just for
16 consideration, not now, but put the idea in your head for
17 future things. It's one thing to have a willing owner and
18 the city agree on a historical designation, everybody is
19 happy.

20 Where that is not the case, I would suggest
21 that designation, even if you reject the demolition
22 permit, should only proceed if the community as a whole
23 wants to designate the district as historical. That way
24 everybody shares in the burdens and benefits of that
25 designation.

1 As to the particular property at hand, I
2 don't want to go into why I don't think the criteria are
3 met here. I don't think any of them are. Nothing I've
4 seen in the supporting materials presented for this
5 meeting nor in the submissions by e-mail that I've seen so
6 far on this changes my mind.

7 For example, I mean, I think William Shanklin
8 is a notable architect but far from a significant person
9 of the community. There's no -- you Google his name and
10 he doesn't show up at all in any Coral Gables website that
11 I could find, so I think that's indicative that that's not
12 a major person, but I don't want to go point by point.

13 Another one of my concerns here is that if a
14 designation -- if a determination is made that this
15 property is eligible for designation, I think at that, at
16 that point it would be -- I think at that point I should
17 have, as the property owner, what the basis for that
18 determination is. I should not have to wait to see the
19 report, whatever that report is, for designation for the
20 reasons I mentioned earlier.

21 This way we can argue the points on what the
22 criteria are and make the determination at the eligibility
23 level and go no further than that. That seems fair to me.

24 What seems unfair is if you lose that
25 argument, you have to go all the way to designation, and

1 the poor property owner is left with his dreams
2 unfulfilled, but also with the burdens, as I said, of the
3 historic designation. I know other people don't believe
4 that as a burden, but I think it clearly is when you look
5 at it.

6 So if something like that is going to be
7 made, it should be made either voluntarily by the owner,
8 or as a community project as I believe was done in the
9 Alhambra Circle Historical District resolution of this
10 board from 2015.

11 Anyway, so that's it. I'm available to
12 answer any questions you may have about the property. I
13 think what Kara said is generally true.

14 It's unchanged. We haven't -- when we got
15 the property, it was in a state of disrepair. I think
16 part of that reason was it's not a home conducive to
17 modern living.

18 I think the board should also consider that
19 this area, as I understand it, the houses were all on very
20 large lots at the time they were constructed and that
21 these were all subdivided since, which I think has changed
22 the historical character of the neighborhood in general
23 and should play a significant factor in its consideration.
24 I don't think you can take that away and then designate a
25 part of it historical.

1 Again, I don't think any of the criteria are
2 met here. I can offer as evidence of that that within
3 only a few blocks of my house, three corner houses within
4 recent times have received letters of significance which I
5 understand means not significant. Those are 730 Escobar
6 Avenue, 740 Escobar Avenue, 37 -- 637 Aledo Avenue, and
7 then on top of that, there's also 731 Escobar.

8 I know for a fact because I was familiar with
9 the property that I believe it's 730 Escobar was a very
10 unique structure, and so if that was not historically
11 significant, I fail to see how my property could possibly
12 be historically significant.

13 In any event, anyway, so those are kind of my
14 main points at this point. I appreciate the opportunity
15 to speak to you, make myself available to any questions
16 you have in regards to the property, and look forward to
17 this process going forward.

18 (Thereupon, Ms. Rolando remotely joined the meeting.)

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Let the record show that Miss
20 Rolando is now on line with us. Any comments from the
21 board?

22 I feel, I feel that if, if the department has
23 come and said that it's potentially historic, that we
24 should take a look at it and get more information.

25 MS. KAUTZ: Dona has her hand raised.

1 MS. SPAIN: I'm trying to be polite and raise
2 my hand. Yeah, I would like to see a designation report
3 so we can have a clear view of this property.

4 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Durana, what do you think?

5 MR. DURANA: I'd also like to see a
6 designation report before we, you know, we make any
7 decision on this.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Bache-Wiig?

9 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I agree. I believe that if
10 staff feels that we should look further into it and get a
11 full report, then we should do that, absolutely, so I
12 would vote for yes.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Rolando?

14 MS. ROLANDO: I too concur with that.

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Garcia-Pons?

16 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I agree.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Fullerton?

18 MR. FULLERTON: Yes, I think so. I think
19 Mr. Saharewicz's comments about what he could expect are
20 already in the code.

21 I mean, you can decide and see what we're
22 going to look at and join in the process so you can see
23 what is happening during the evolution of this report, so
24 I don't see -- you're not losing anything. Anyway, yes,
25 I'll agree.

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Rodriguez?

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm agnostic.

3 MR. MENENDEZ: There's one in every bunch.

4 All right. Do I have a motion?

5 MR. SAHAREWICZ: May I ask a question before
6 you take the vote on that just so I'm clear?

7 As I understand what was said, the motion is
8 to go forward in the research. Does that mean you are, or
9 does that mean the historic preservation officer is going
10 to or has made her determination as to eligibility?

11 MR. MENENDEZ: No, sir.

12 MR. SAHAREWICZ: Or is the decision pending
13 the report?

14 MR. MENENDEZ: That means that we need more
15 information in order to make a decision so --

16 MR. SAHAREWICZ: Okay.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: -- a report will be generated.

18 MR. SAHAREWICZ: Just so I'm clear, so that
19 report will be generated, and at that point, the officer,
20 the historic preservation officer will make her
21 determination putting me on notice that the determination
22 has been made under, I guess it's Code Section 3-1107,
23 Subparagraph G. Is that a fair statement?

24 MR. FULLERTON: It still has to come back to
25 the board --

1 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

2 MR. FULLERTON: -- for confirmation.

3 MR. MENENDEZ: For review and a vote.

4 MR. SAHAREWICZ: No, I understand that, but
5 the difference between the items is that at the point of
6 designation I will have clear articulation from the staff
7 and the officer of their criteria, for their belief for
8 believing it meets the criteria, whereas the other process
9 is I won't have that view until near the time the meeting
10 is held for the determination of designation, which as I
11 mentioned before, I think is a difficult and problematic
12 process for me in my view of how the code is written.

13 MS. KAUTZ: We are required to bring --
14 they're directing staff to bring a designation report to
15 them, so we are going to do the research. We will be able
16 to articulate to you the reasons why or why not we feel
17 that it qualifies.

18 So right now as we feel it's potentially
19 significant, we'll know once we do the research whether or
20 not it meets the criteria or not, and like I said, when we
21 have that report prepared for the board, it is a
22 designation report, and it will go to the board and they
23 have the ultimate decision. They can decide whether or
24 not it meets the criteria based on the information that
25 we've presented.

1 MR. SAHAREWICZ: Okay. So at that point when
2 the report is done, it sounds like you will issue your
3 formal determination of your conclusion as to whether or
4 not it is eligible, and then from there, the 60-day period
5 for the hearing begins, correct?

6 MS. KAUTZ: Not usually, no, and I can ask
7 Gus, I can clarify this with him sort of after this is
8 done, but typically it's the board, we will bring the
9 report back to them within 60 days, and now it's up to
10 them. They determine that it's potentially significant
11 and they want to see more, so that 60 days window is for
12 us to prepare that report and bring it back to them.

13 MR. SAHAREWICZ: Okay. Well --

14 MS. KAUTZ: Our window, our window starts
15 now.

16 MR. SAHAREWICZ: Okay. I don't want to argue
17 the point. It just seems to me the way I read the code is
18 that from the point of the determination, which you're
19 saying has not been made and will not be made until you
20 have done the report, then the 60-day period begins.

21 MS. KAUTZ: I see what you're saying. That
22 60 days is put in there as, it's to protect the homeowner
23 so that we don't drag this out for, you know, six months.
24 It's put in there so that you will have a finite
25 determination within 60 days and not leave you waiting.

1 MR. SAHAREWICZ: Okay, all right. Very well.

2 Thank you. Sorry for holding up the deliberations.

3 MR. EHRENHAFT: Mr. Chair, excuse me. I
4 tried to raise my hand before. I need to add my comment
5 for the record that I also concur with --

6 MS. KAUTZ: Okay.

7 MR. EHRENHAFT: -- to get a staff report.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: So noted, Mr. Ehrenhaft.
9 Would you like, would you like to enter the motion then?

10 MR. EHRENHAFT: Certainly. So I move that
11 staff proceed to --

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible) someone
13 has their hand up.

14 MS. KAUTZ: Correct, but we're not taking
15 public input on this at this point. Go ahead, Bruce.

16 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. So I move that staff
17 be directed to proceed to prepare a historical
18 significance report to determine whether in their view --

19 MS. KAUTZ: It's a historic -- it's a
20 designation report.

21 MS. SPAIN: It's a designation report.

22 MS. KAUTZ: I'm sorry.

23 MS. SPAIN: It's a designation report. It's
24 been a long day.

25 MR. EHRENHAFT: Designation report to give

1 their recommendation to the board within 60 days of
2 whether or not they believe that the property merits
3 historic designation and addresses (inaudible).

4 (Reporter clarification.).

5 MR. EHRENHAFT: 649 Palmarito Court.

6 MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have a second?

7 MS. SPAIN: I'll second it. This is Dona.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, and then we need the
9 vote.

10 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

11 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

12 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Spain?

13 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

14 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Fullerton?

15 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

16 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Rolando?

17 Hello, Miss Rolando?

18 MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

19 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Rodriguez?

20 MR RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

21 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Menendez?

22 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

23 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr.

24 Garcia-Pons?

25 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.

1 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss

2 Bache-Wiig?

3 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

4 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: And I did get
5 Miss Spain, right?

6 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

7 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Okay, okay.
8 That's everybody.

9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Durana.

10 MR. MENENDEZ: Oh, Mr. Durana.

11 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Oh, I thought
12 I did call you. I said Mr. Durana. I'm sorry.
13 Mr. Durana?

14 MR. DURANA: Yes.

15 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Okay.

16 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Everybody accounted
17 for?

18 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Yes, sir.

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
20 Mr. Saharewicz.

21 MR. SAHAREWICZ: Thank you to the board.
22 Thank you very much.

23 MR. MENENDEZ: The next item on the agenda is
24 a special certificate of appropriateness, Case File COA
25 (SP) 2020-007, application for the issuance of a special

1 certificate of appropriateness for the property at 603
2 Minorca Avenue, a local historic landmark legally
3 described as Lots 14 and 15, Block 18, Coral Gables
4 Section B, according to the plat thereof as recorded in
5 Plat Book Five at Page 111 of the public records of
6 Miami-Dade County, Florida.

7 This application requests design approval for
8 relocation of the residence, an addition and site work.

9 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. Can you all see my
10 screen, I hope?

11 MR. MENENDEZ: No.

12 MS. ROLANDO: No.

13 MS. KAUTZ: Really? Well, I did that wrong
14 now, didn't I? Hang on one second. Okay, all right.
15 Here we go.

16 So again, this property, 603 Minorca Avenue,
17 Segovia and Minorca on the corner. It's coming back to
18 you for a second time. This is the Power Point that we
19 had before. We don't have a new one prepared, just wanted
20 to refresh your memory on the property which I'm sure you
21 all remember.

22 The circa 1923 photo, that's some -- we'll
23 get to that. So this, at the last meeting, you guys had
24 requested that the owner come back to you with a study
25 prepared by an expert. They retained Douglas Wood and

1 Associates to prepare the feasibility assessment that was
2 delivered to you all in your packets.

3 Just so you all know, the second item, the
4 second COA item has been deferred off of this agenda.
5 They are two separate items. They should not be
6 considered together, so it is not on this agenda. This is
7 one is only about the relocation of the existing
8 structure.

9 So the owner is here, the architect is here,
10 and I believe they have people with them as well.

11 THE COURT REPORTER: Would you like me to
12 swear them now, Miss Kautz?

13 MS. KAUTZ: Yes, please.

14 (Thereupon, Mr. Gibb was duly remotely sworn on oath.)

15 MR. WOOD: This is Douglas Wood. I'm not
16 registered as a lobbyist. Does that prevent me from
17 speaking?

18 MR. MENENDEZ: No, not at all.

19 MR. CEBALLOS: No.

20 (Thereupon, Mr. Wood, Ms. Bondurant, Ms. Brannigan,
21 Mr. Berman, and Ms. Martinez Carbonell were duly remotely
22 sworn on oath.)

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. We're going to hear now
24 from the owner and his architects and consultants, so you
25 can go ahead.

1 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Hi. My name is Greg
2 Goldstein and I am the owner of 603 Minorca Avenue.
3 (Thereupon, Mr. Goldstein was duly remotely sworn on
4 oath.)

5 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes. Hi. My name is Greg
6 Goldstein. I'm the owner of 603 Minorca Avenue. As I
7 mentioned in the last hearing, I live in Coral Gables in a
8 historic 1924 home on Asturia Avenue.

9 My home on Asturia was designated as historic
10 under my ownership, and my wife and I completed a
11 second-story addition while maintaining the original
12 elevation and footprint of the home, so I have experience
13 working with the historical department and completing
14 projects in Coral Gables.

15 I also have a vested interest in maintaining
16 and preserving the historical homes in the city.

17 Regarding 603 Minorca, I purchased the
18 property in 2018. It's a unique frame home with many
19 architecturally significant characteristics.

20 The 2005 report on the historic designation
21 of this home states that this is a Coral Gables cottage
22 and defines a Coral Gables cottage as a smaller, more
23 modestly-sized residence which was designed to provide the
24 same quality of construction and detail at a more
25 affordable level.

1 I am here today seeking approval from the
2 historical board to move the historical structure at 603
3 Minorca Avenue 20 feet to the east so it will sit
4 completely on Lot 14, allowing me to build a small,
5 historically-sensitive, one story addition to the back of
6 the property. Moving the home would allow me to preserve
7 the historical property as a one-story, more
8 modestly-sized residence, and completely maintain the
9 front elevation of the home and the east elevation of the
10 home facing Segovia, all of which are top priorities of
11 the historical department.

12 Section 3-1109 of the Coral Gables zoning
13 code allows for the moving of existing improvements. The
14 code states that the historic preservation board may grant
15 a special certificate of appropriateness if it finds that,
16 number one, no reasonable alternative is available for
17 preserving the improvement on its original site; and
18 number two, that the proposed relocation site is
19 compatible with the historic and architectural integrity
20 of the improvement.

21 So I would like to further detail both
22 requirements of the code section and explain why we meet
23 both requirements.

24 Number one, no reasonable alternative is
25 available for preserving the improvement on its original

1 site. As I mentioned in the previous hearing, my original
2 intent was to build a historically-sensitive addition to
3 the existing home. My architect and I went back and forth
4 with the historical department for about a year with
5 various development ideas. However, ultimately the
6 location of the home in the center of the lot made a
7 historically-sensitive addition to the original home an
8 impossibility.

9 Many properties with additions to historic
10 homes have clear advantages, making historically-sensitive
11 additions feasible.

12 For instance, 603 Minorca's sister or twin
13 home on Alcazar was built on the side of the lot, allowing
14 for a one-story site addition on the other side of the
15 home, and that home has five-foot setbacks on each side,
16 allowing more of the lot to be utilized for building
17 space.

18 My house is built in the center of the lot
19 and has a 15-foot side setback, making the location of the
20 home at the center of the lot even more limiting. It was
21 pointed out in the last hearing there have been several
22 overwhelming additions that have been approved and built
23 in North Gables that completely obscure the original
24 historical structure. I do not want to do that to this
25 home.

1 The reason this home was designated in the
2 first place was its small size and unique features.
3 Building a large two-story concrete structure to surround
4 this small frame home on all sides will not preserve the
5 historical significance and integrity of the home. It
6 will erase it.

7 I want to emphasize that it took over a year
8 of trying to plan a historically-sensitive addition to the
9 home and failing over and over again to conclude that
10 moving the structure was the best alternative. I know the
11 way we are set up here, the board doesn't have a full year
12 to go through the process I went through, my architect,
13 Callum Gibb, went through, and the historical department
14 went through.

15 But I encourage the board to look carefully
16 at the size of the lot, the location of the home, the
17 setbacks of the property, the history of the home and
18 other homes on Minorca Avenue, and I believe you will see
19 the best way to preserve the original structure and
20 historical integrity of the home and neighborhood will be
21 to approve moving the home.

22 The second requirement of Code Section 3-1109
23 is that the proposed relocation site is compatible with
24 the historical and architectural integrity of the
25 improvement.

1 Moving the structure 20 feet to the east on
2 the same lot will not affect the historical character of
3 the neighborhood or the historical character of the house.
4 I would argue there isn't a more compatible site for the
5 house relocation than on the same site 20 feet over.

6 Additionally, Coral Gables code follows the
7 Secretary of Interior's language on moving a structure at
8 67.4 H which states when a building is moved, every effort
9 should be made to reestablish its historical orientation,
10 immediate settings, and general environment. This is
11 exactly what we would be doing here.

12 So I believe it is clear we meet both
13 requirements of Section 3-1109 of Coral Gables zoning code
14 for the historic preservation board to grant a special
15 certificate of appropriateness to move the existing
16 improvement, and I would appreciate your approval, I would
17 appreciate your approval allowing me to move this
18 structure.

19 Also, I would like to mention there is a
20 petition going around collecting signatures against moving
21 the structure, and I can appreciate an opposing view, but
22 I want to make sure the board is aware of the petition and
23 the way the petition is being marketed and what people are
24 actually signing.

25 The petition states that approving the

1 staff's recommendation will negate the city's historic
2 designation as per the Secretary of Interior standards and
3 guidelines. This is not true.

4 The petition states that we are moving the
5 historical home to a far corner of the property. This is
6 also not true.

7 The petition cuts and pastes together
8 separate sentences from the 2005 historic designation,
9 claiming the size of the lot was an important factor in
10 its 2005 designation.

11 However, if you read the 2005 designation in
12 its entirety, it's clear that the house is classified as a
13 cottage home and is significant for its small size, style,
14 and unique characteristics, not the size of the lot.

15 Additionally, the petition asks individuals
16 to sign the petition as a statement of concern against the
17 troubling trend of inappropriate alterations and
18 demolitions, none of which we are doing here.

19 So I want to be clear to the board and all
20 the individuals that signed the petition, I am here today
21 seeking approval from the board to move the existing home
22 20 feet to the east as the best alternative to maintain a
23 Coral Gables cottage home and the best option to preserve
24 the historical integrity of the original structure.

25 That's all I have, and I just want to also

1 say I have Doug Wood here speaking on the existing
2 structure, and Jamison Brownie is registered as a
3 lobbyist. He's a structural mover, and I have him here
4 today to answer any questions you may have regarding
5 moving the structure. I thought that would help. Thank
6 you.

7 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Anyone else going to speak
9 from your team?

10 MS. KAUTZ: Greg, do you want them there to
11 answer questions, or would you like --

12 MR. GOLDSTEIN: That's okay. They're really
13 there to answer questions.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Do we have, do we have
15 anyone in the audience who would like to speak in favor of
16 this project? Anyone else would like to speak against
17 this project?

18 MS. MARTINEZ CARBONELL: I would like to
19 speak. This is Karelia. I would like to speak as well.

20 MR. MENENDEZ: You can speak. You have your
21 hand up.

22 MS. BONDURANT: Okay. Interestingly enough
23 -- can you hear me?

24 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

25 THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, excuse me. I

1 need the name, I need the name of the person speaking

2 MS. KAUTZ: Name and address, please, Gay.

3 MS. BONDURANT: I'm sorry. Can you hear me

4 now?

5 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. State your name and

6 address, please.

7 MS. BONDURANT: Yes. My name is Gay, G-A-Y,

8 Bondurant, B-O-N-D-U-R-A-N-T, and I live at 446 Alcazar in

9 the Alcazar Historic District.

10 Interestingly enough, I was on that, on your

11 board in 2005 when Mr. Perez, the former owner, came and

12 brought that house for designation.

13 The owner has made, Mr. Goldstein, has made a

14 compelling argument.

15 However, a couple things, and I think that

16 one of my concerns is precedent, that if we allow one

17 historic house to be moved, then there's the next one and

18 the next one and the next one, and those people may not be

19 as sensitive to the preservation issues as Mr. Goldstein

20 is.

21 Also, it's ironic that the previous

22 discussion on the previous issue, the gentleman referred

23 to the size of the lots now surrounding his building on

24 Palmarito Court, and he indicated and felt that the

25 splitting of the lots had denigrated the neighborhood.

1 I feel for Mr. Goldstein, but let me ask this
2 just as a point of interest: What are, what are you
3 planning to build that is so large that the setbacks are
4 right up against the house?

5 MS. KAUTZ: Gay, what -- this is not, this
6 case is not about splitting the lot --

7 MS. BONDURANT: I know, yeah.

8 MS. KAUTZ: -- or anything else. If he moves
9 it, he can build a pool over it.

10 Ms. BONDURANT: Right.

11 MS. KAUTZ: It's not about that, so.

12 MS. BONDURANT: No. I just wondered if there
13 had been a consideration of the setbacks being suggested,
14 but I just, I feel like it's a matter of precedent, and
15 maybe there's, I shouldn't say this, but maybe there's a
16 bigger lot somewhere else in Coral Gables, and I'm against
17 the move and -- but he does make a compelling argument,
18 but according to code, from my vision is our first choice
19 is not move it.

20 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.

21 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

22 MS. MARTINEZ CARBONELL: Hello. This is
23 Karelia.

24 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

25 MS. MARTINEZ CARBONELL: Okay. This is

1 Karelia Martinez Carbonell.

2 I would like to first speak on just the
3 report as far as the actual motion, the actual motion, I'm
4 going to read it. On August -- the meeting, the August
5 meeting, right?

6 Said, you know, and I'm going to read it, "A
7 motion to defer consideration of the special certificate
8 of appropriateness for 603 Minorca Avenue pending receipt
9 of a report from a consultant selected by city staff
10 advising on the feasibility of moving the structure to the
11 proposed location."

12 The report that was submitted was submitted
13 and it was per the owner, so to state on record it was a
14 general feasibility report, that was not from an objective
15 perspective.

16 MS. KAUTZ: Karelia, I was staff, city staff
17 was the one who made Mr. Goldstein hire Doug Wood, so that
18 is an incorrect statement.

19 MS. MARTINEZ CARBONELL: Well, what I heard
20 was that the report, you know, the report shows that it
21 was the owner who hired the report -- the -- what's his
22 name? I forget now his name. Wood, right, Wood?

23 MS. KAUTZ: Douglas Wood, Douglas Wood.

24 MS. MARTINEZ CARBONELL: Right. That was not
25 clear, so, but with that said, it doesn't, it doesn't

1 prove anything as far as it being that the cottage would
2 be protected if it was moved. There was nothing in the
3 report making that statement.

4 It was actually saying, "We really haven't
5 even looked." They weren't, they weren't even on the
6 property. It was really more of, you know, the owner, I
7 believe the way I read it, it was, you know, sort of what
8 I just got from the owner, what he has done.

9 MS. KAUTZ: That's not true either. Doug
10 Wood is on the phone, but I'll let you finish, but that's
11 not correct.

12 MS. MARTINEZ CARBONELL: Well, this is just
13 -- again, please allow me to make my point.

14 You know, again, according to how, not just
15 myself, but I have actually several people that read the
16 report, have got -- you know, send me notes, you know,
17 send me their feedback.

18 Again, the report does not 100 percent or
19 even 50 percent give credence to that this historic
20 landmark will, will, will, will, will be -- will keep its
21 integrity. I mean, I didn't read that in the report.

22 Now, the other thing is that the report goes
23 on to say that the coral rock foundation is going to be
24 chopped up and somehow re-put together, which is
25 absolutely -- you know, I mean, as a preservationist, you

1 don't want to read anything like that in a report.

2 So you know, again, those are the things
3 that, you know, the report really does not really make a
4 compelling argument to move this cottage. It's a
5 historical cottage. It's a landmark.

6 The 2005 designation report does state, yes,
7 it does state that the lot, the size of the lot, it's on
8 Page Two of the report, it does state that it is part of
9 the uniqueness of the property, so if somebody wants to
10 deny that, then that's their prerogative, but it is
11 written, and I'm going to quote it.

12 "The uniqueness of this home is characterized
13 by the size of the property, and it is one of the few
14 homes of this type to still exist on such a large parcel
15 of land while maintaining its integrity."

16 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Can I provide the actual
17 quote, please? Because this is the second time that she's
18 not giving the accurate quote of what's in the report.

19 MS. MARTINEZ CARBONELL: That is the accurate
20 quote.

21 MR. GOLDSTEIN: No. You're not --

22 MS. MARTINEZ CARBONELL: That's a quote on
23 Page Two of the designation report.

24 MR. CEBALLOS: Pardon my interruption, but I
25 don't think that a back-and-forth between the public

1 commenter and anyone -- you'll be given an opportunity,
2 Mr. Goldstein --

3 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Okay.

4 MR. CEBALLOS: -- as long as you want to
5 address any public comments after the fact.

6 MR. GOLDSTEIN: It's just not an accurate
7 quote.

8 MS. MARTINEZ CARBONELL: Okay. Well, you
9 show me if it's not and I will take a look at it, but I am
10 quoting exactly from Page Two of the designation report.

11 MR. MENENDEZ: Miss Carbonell, Miss
12 Carbonell, is there anything else?

13 MS. MARTINEZ CARBONELL: Yes.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: Because there are other people
15 who need to speak.

16 MS. MARTINEZ CARBONELL: Well, the other, the
17 third point, okay, which was brought up about the
18 Secretary of Interior's guidelines of moving a property,
19 and, you know, it's absolutely not an acceptable solution.

20 And there's really only two -- and these have
21 had legal challenges, so it's not like I'm speaking, you
22 know, you know, from the field. I mean, these have had
23 legal challenges, and the only accepted reason for
24 justifying the move are that the building has been moved
25 in the past or that the only means of saving the building

1 from certain loss is a relocation, and this does not fit
2 what the homeowner is asking. So thank you for the time.

3 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Brannigan?

4 MS. BRANNIGAN: Thank you. I appreciate a
5 moment, I'd like to address the board.

6 My name is Martha Brannigan. I live at 609
7 Minorca Avenue. My house shares a 113-foot boundary with
8 this property, 603 Minorca. I've owned my home for 34
9 years, and I intend to stay here. I believe I'll be the
10 most heavily impacted by any development of the property.

11 So basically the proposal to move the house
12 is a terrible idea. I realize that they went round and
13 round with a couple different ideas of how to redevelop
14 the property, and perhaps maybe their expectations of just
15 how much floor area ratio can be extracted from the lot is
16 not realistic given that the house is sitting in the
17 center of the lot.

18 That's where it is. That's where it's been
19 for almost a hundred years, and that's where it should
20 stay.

21 There is no historic preservation reason for
22 moving the house. A historic property shouldn't be moved
23 except in the most extraordinary of circumstances, perhaps
24 if a property were in imminent danger such as if it's
25 discovered that it was sitting on a sinkhole or maybe if

1 it was threatened by a sea level rise or some sort of
2 compelling reason that the property was at risk of being
3 lost, but no such reason exists here.

4 The only reason is to shove it over to one
5 lot so that a big new house can be shoe-horned on the
6 second lot next to it. That's the only, that's the only
7 reason.

8 And the expert's report is kind of telling.
9 It's full of caveats and limitations. It's hardly a
10 ringing endorsement of the idea to move the house. It's
11 -- and at any rate, it shouldn't be the centerpiece of any
12 decision by this esteemed board.

13 It's just a feasibility report. It doesn't
14 speak to the advisability of moving the house.

15 And I assure you, I'm a journalist, I've
16 spent 40 years, I've seen courthouse cases where expert
17 witnesses -- I'm not impugning the integrity of what this
18 witness is saying.

19 I'm just simply saying it would not be hard
20 to go out and find a witness to say precisely the
21 opposite, and the report -- and the expert does not say
22 that it would be, that -- it says it's feasible but it's
23 rather difficult.

24 As for this double lot, it's key to the
25 integrity of this property, and let's remember, it is

1 just, it's only a double lot. It's not this huge expanse
2 of green space that needs to be developed and -- it's 100
3 feet wide. It's just a double lot.

4 It looks bigger perhaps because it's on a
5 corner and enjoys the benefit of a green swale on the two
6 sides. It's on the corner of Minorca and Segovia, and it
7 looks like it has a lot of green space, but it's just a
8 100-foot lot.

9 So this is a spec development. It's just,
10 this isn't somebody who is looking to build a home that
11 they're going to live in like the neighbors who have
12 written to you whose messages have been minimized and
13 disparaged perhaps because they don't have all the expert
14 skills to articulate it. It's just a double lot.

15 So I believe the historic preservation board
16 can do better than this to reach some reasonable agreement
17 with the developer that protects the integrity of the
18 property, which is your mission, and allows a reasonable
19 development consistent with the city's objective.

20 And it shouldn't, certainly it shouldn't be
21 more than one story.

22 And my understanding is that, that someone
23 who has a historic designation that's an easement on the
24 property and the expectation is you can have this enormous
25 expansion on the property is simply not right.

1 It's historically designated. Therefore
2 you're entitled to a reasonable beneficial use of the
3 property, but not, you know, wall-to-wall concrete, you're
4 just not, so to raise the idea that the alternative to
5 this is like this horrifying structure that will destroy
6 the appearance of the house is just not the case.

7 The developer made a rather compelling case
8 for why that should not be done, and I think you keep that
9 in mind for any future ideas.

10 If it is impossible to protect, to project --
11 for the project to reach the biggest house with a maximum
12 floor area ratio, then you just have to settle for
13 something that's more reasonable and that protects and
14 respects the historic nature of the site. Its character,
15 the design, the scale and the massing should be in line
16 with the property and the surrounding areas. This is only
17 reasonable. This is being a good neighbor.

18 So I'd also like to mention that there were
19 more letters written by residents that the staff has not
20 bothered to make part of the record. Perhaps they
21 dismissed them as cumulative or repetitive, or I don't
22 know what the reason, but they didn't bother to mention in
23 the record.

24 When the project is done, the developer will
25 move on and sell it, but we'll still be here. This is our

1 home, so please give some consideration to that. Thank
2 you.

3 MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you. Is there anyone
4 else who would like to speak in opposition to this case?

5 MR. BERMAN: Yes, there is. My name is
6 Howard Berman. I live at 501 Alcazar Avenue, and I just
7 want to express some of the shared concerns that have been
8 voiced regarding the structural integrity of the house in
9 the case of a potential move.

10 There seems to be obviously a variety of
11 questions that need to be clarified and answered, and many
12 of us feel we would be more comfortable with greater
13 assurances that the house would not be damaged.

14 But there is also the other question of the
15 historical integrity of the house in its original location
16 as envisioned by the architect, H. George Fink, one of the
17 first generation of architects of the Merrick era when the
18 community was founded, and I think this bears on the issue
19 of double, the double lot that we were just talking about.

20 It seems to be implied that as a modest
21 cottage, this house is not as significant as others and
22 perhaps its move is not as seriously impacting the
23 historical integrity of the neighborhood.

24 I think it's really important to remember
25 that George Merrick's vision was that modestly-priced

1 smaller homes were as essential to what he envisioned
2 Coral Gables to be as the largest, most lavish mansions,
3 and he envisioned that every street would have a mix of
4 smaller and larger homes of different sizes and different
5 price points so that there would be a richly diverse
6 community, and I think this cottage is very much a symbol
7 of that vision.

8 The fact that it is a smaller house on a
9 larger lot is exactly what Merrick was getting at, that
10 you didn't have to be a wealthy mansion owner to be able
11 to have a house that contributed to the look and feel and
12 integrity of the broader neighborhood, and I just feel
13 that these are important points to be entered into the
14 record and they're part of many of our concerns about this
15 proposal. Thank you.

16 MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

17 THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. Mr. Berman,
18 were you sworn in, in the beginning?

19 MR. BERMAN: I did say --

20 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you, thank you.

21 MR. BERMAN: -- I would swear to tell the
22 truth.

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Anyone else who would
24 like to speak in favor or in opposition?

25 Okay. I'll open it up then for board

1 discussion.

2 MS. KAUTZ: Albert, I would like to bring the
3 board's attention to additional letters that were received
4 that were all distributed to you all today to be part of
5 the record.

6 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

7 MS. KAUTZ: I was waiting for the public
8 hearing to be ended before I did that.

9 There are letters received, you all received
10 from Claudia Kaufman, Joyce Nelson, Brett Gillis, Karelia
11 Carbonell, and those are the additional ones that were
12 received after the last meeting. Those will be part of
13 the record. They're all in opposition.

14 Can I make two points regarding the public
15 input, or would you all like to discuss it amongst
16 yourself first?

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

18 MS. KAUTZ: Okay. My only -- the two
19 comments I wanted to make is that this property, the only
20 reason why staff felt compelled to bring this forward was
21 that this is an incredibly unique scenario in that this is
22 a wood frame structure. It is not a CBS structure like 99
23 percent of the houses that are on the historic register.

24 It was actually a surprise to us that this
25 one was wood framed because its sister house, its twin

1 house is actually concrete block and looks the exact from
2 the exterior.

3 So setting a precedent by allowing the
4 structure to be moved is not, is not something that we
5 think is going to be an issue. There just aren't others
6 like it out there.

7 And the other point I wanted to bring up was
8 that the designation report, there's been discussion in
9 social media about moving the structure and negating the
10 designation report, and that again is simply not true.

11 The reasons why this property was designated
12 as historic have to do with its architectural
13 significance. Both criteria were architectural. There
14 are in the code aesthetic considerations that can be
15 given, aesthetic significance that have to do with siting
16 and sort of landscape, and none of those were cited.

17 The reason the discussion about the size of
18 this lot wasn't the size, it wasn't, it wasn't designated
19 because of that. It wasn't, it wasn't designated as the
20 size of the lot as a criteria.

21 It was actually noted that it was a cottage,
22 and those are typically on smaller lots. That's the
23 reason why that portion of the code -- of the designation
24 report reads as, discusses the lot, because it was an
25 anomaly.

1 So I just wanted to -- it will not negate the
2 designation report by moving the structure, and that's
3 what I wanted to say. Dona has her hand up, so.

4 MR. MENENDEZ: Who's got their hand up?

5 MS. KAUTZ: Dona.

6 MS. SPAIN: No, I was going to say basically
7 word for word what Kara just said. It's like we're on the
8 same wavelength.

9 The designation report talks about
10 architectural significance, and that's why it's
11 designated.

12 The fact that it's a tiny little cottage on
13 the lot was noted in the report only because typically
14 cottages, in order to actually qualify to be on a 65-foot
15 lot, so that's the only reason. (Inaudible) concern about
16 it --

17 MS. KAUTZ: We're losing you, Dona.

18 MS. SPAIN: -- questions, and by the way,
19 minor -- oh, sorry. It's my WiFi. It's been going in and
20 out all day. Can you hear me now?

21 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. You might want to turn off
22 your video. It might be -- sometimes it helps if you turn
23 off the video.

24 MS. SPAIN: Okay.

25 MS. KAUTZ: Okay. Try that.

1 MS. SPAIN: Does that help?

2 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

3 MS. SPAIN: Does that help?

4 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

5 MS. SPAIN: Okay, perfect. I'd much rather
6 do it without a video.

7 My concern about, about keeping it where it
8 is, is that because the criteria for significance that it
9 was designated on is architectural and its significant
10 characteristics of this house that they do an addition.

11 So I'm less concerned about moving it. I
12 don't think it -- as long as it stays the same location,
13 only 20 feet over, I think that makes a lot of sense
14 because then the facades on both streets will be visible,
15 and I think it's important for this house to be seen that
16 way, and I know it would be difficult otherwise.

17 And I also just want to say that there isn't
18 a better structural engineer than Doug Wood, so I'm really
19 happy that he was hired.

20 And could someone speak to the whole idea
21 about the coral rock and how that would work with moving
22 it?

23 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I can start, I can start.
24 There are options --

25 THE COURT REPORTER: State your name, please.

1 MR. GOLDSTEIN: This is Greg Goldstein. I
2 spoke previously.

3 So there are options, different ways to move
4 the home, and really I'm here looking for guidance from
5 the board on what's going to make you feel comfortable
6 allowing this to move forward.

7 We learned from Darius in the building
8 department that when the home gets moved, we are going to
9 need to build a new foundation under the home and then
10 reinforce and upgrade the coral stem wall.

11 There is different possibilities. We could
12 utilize the existing coral boulders and rebuild with the
13 existing, rebuild at the new location.

14 We could build a concrete stem wall to put
15 the frame home on and create veneers from the existing
16 coral to put on the new stem wall.

17 But it's really, there's different options,
18 and I can't really make a decision on which way to go
19 until the board tells me what they want to see or where
20 they're going to be comfortable.

21 As far as moving the structure, I have
22 Jamison Brownie if anyone has a question, I think he's
23 here, to discuss the possibilities of moving the
24 structure.

25 MS. SPAIN: And just one final thing -- can

1 you hear me?

2 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.

3 MS. SPAIN: Okay. One final thing, and I
4 want verification from Kara. If the board were to approve
5 moving this the 20 feet, we're not approving a lot
6 separation or even an addition. It's just the moving of
7 the house. We could agree to move the house and deny the
8 lot separation and whatever addition comes before us.

9 MS. KAUTZ: Correct. They had applied to the
10 moving of the structure which entailed removing a rear, a
11 rear garage addition and another addition that's part of
12 the -- you can see it on the photograph. It's like a
13 step-down at the rear. It was a later addition.

14 So they're proposing to remove that portion,
15 move the house over, and then construct another small
16 addition to the rear which I believe is a master suite or
17 a master bathroom or something, and a small garage that
18 faces the side street. So there is a small --

19 MS. SPAIN: So that's all part of this
20 application?

21 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

22 MS. SPAIN: Okay.

23 MS. KAUTZ: But any other, any other proposal
24 beyond what you've seen in the previous August meeting, if
25 there's, if that changes, then that comes back to you all

1 for anything.

2 MS. SPAIN: Okay.

3 MR. MENENDEZ: Miss Rolando?

4 MS. ROLANDO: Kara, could you also advise
5 whether, if we approved moving the structure, would this
6 board have any comments, an opportunity to comment on the
7 structure that would be proposed for the adjacent lot?

8 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. That's, it's part of the
9 process. It would be a separate certificate of
10 appropriateness with a recommendation for new
11 construction. The entire property remains designated, so
12 it's under your purview.

13 MS. ROLANDO: Okay.

14 MS. KAUTZ: Again, and this is only to move.
15 It's a separate process that he needs to go through,
16 Mr. Goldstein needs to go through.

17 This, even if, for example, if he wanted to
18 move it over to do a better one story addition to the
19 existing house that keeps, you know, 90 percent of the
20 facade intact, that again would come back to you later.
21 This is just to move it and a small addition that was
22 initially proposed.

23 MS. ROLANDO: Understood. Thank you for the
24 clarification.

25 MS. KAUTZ: You're welcome.

1 MS. SPAIN: I have one more thing, and I
2 apologize.

3 Just about the requirement for historic
4 properties to be one story additions, that doesn't exist.
5 The properties have the ability to do a two-story
6 addition, and that's something the city has never told a
7 property that they can only do a one story addition, so
8 that's all. That's all I have.

9
10 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Garcia-Pons?

11 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes. I have a follow-up to
12 Miss Rolando's question, and I understand what we're doing
13 today is specifically about moving the house within the
14 existing lot.

15 Kara, you mentioned that if there's another
16 -- if there's something else coming afterwards, it would
17 be a separate review from this board. Would a lot split
18 also come to this board, or would that happen elsewhere?

19 MS. KAUTZ: It's a process that happens
20 elsewhere. It goes through the planning and zoning board
21 and city commission, but because it's historic, you all
22 would give a recommendation.

23 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So it cannot be split --
24 oh, it's a recommendation.

25 MS. KAUTZ: It's a recommendation only.

1 MR. GARCIA-PONS: And then it would go to --

2 MS. KAUTZ: Correct.

3 MR. GARCIA-PONS: -- the commission for final
4 approval?

5 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. It's a planning and zoning
6 process. It's a building site determination eventually.

7 MR. GARCIA-PONS: And then as a follow-up for
8 the chair, if that does happen, and I understand what we
9 are doing today, if that does happen and the parcel is
10 split, would the review of a separate parcel of land come
11 before the historic preservation board?

12 MS. KAUTZ: A review for a new structure?

13 MR. GARCIA-PONS: A new structure.

14 MS. KAUTZ: Absolutely. The lot is still
15 designated.

16 MR. GARCIA-PONS: The entire lot, even if
17 it's split into two parcels?

18 MS. KAUTZ: Both lots are still historic
19 parcels, yes.

20 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Okay, and I do have a
21 couple other questions, but I'll pause, Albert, if
22 somebody else wants to ask.

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Fullerton.

24 MR. FULLERTON: Well, excuse me. I'm very
25 much against moving this building. I have great respect

1 for a friend, my friend, Doug Wood. We've done a lot of
2 work together over the last 40 or 50 years. I don't know
3 how old you are, Doug, but I've been here 50 years, and
4 I've read the feasibility assessment. Well done, nicely
5 put together.

6 However, there's so many places where you
7 really don't know what's going to happen when it starts
8 getting moved, and the fact that that frame structure is
9 sitting on top of the rock wall complicates the matter
10 even further.

11 If it was, if the frame structure went all
12 the way down to a foundation and could be moved
13 separately, then you could work out how to carefully move
14 this, the stem wall. That might be a different story.

15 But I think, I think the intrinsic activity
16 of or movement of a very, very immovable structure, a
17 wood-framed structure with stucco on the outside, is, it's
18 impossible. It is not going to happen with any degree of
19 assurance that what you end up with is not a re-stuccoed
20 building which will take away a lot of its character, and
21 then rebuilding of that stone wall which is difficult, to
22 say the least, because the craftsmanship that built that
23 wall doesn't exist anymore, I don't think.

24 There may be some old-time stone masons that
25 could possibly put it together, but it wouldn't have the

1 same character, in my view.

2 Secondly, I think there's no reason to move
3 it to make a feasible and viable project out of it, that
4 is you've got a 35-foot building space behind it for a
5 very, very reasonable addition to this building without
6 putting another house on that lot next to Mrs. Brannigan.

7 I think that's one of the worst things
8 that could happen over this whole project, of this whole
9 process, is to move it over, take away the historic
10 context in which it has been for so long, and then put
11 another house behind it, potentially two stories. I
12 think, I think that's really, really the main problem.

13 If we let it move and then it goes to some
14 other board, the zoning board to determine whether it can
15 be lot split, they could, with all respect to the owners
16 -- and you know, I'd probably do the same thing. I would
17 fight if the zoning board said no because I wouldn't have
18 any reason to -- the house wouldn't be a reason why I
19 couldn't split it because then we've allowed this to
20 happen.

21 So there would definitely be a lot split
22 asked for at some point in the future, and if not, then
23 why not just do the, build the addition so you could have
24 a more expensive home to sell or to make a project from?

25 I just, I can't see any plus for the

1 neighborhood in changing this house location and the
2 potential ramifications therefrom, thereof, so that's my
3 two cents.

4 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. I've got a question for
5 Mr. Gibb.

6 MR. GIBB: Yes.

7 MR. MENENDEZ: My question is what is
8 limiting you right now in completing the project the way
9 that the building sits today on the property?

10 MR. GIBB: You're asking why can't we just do
11 the master bedroom and garage addition in its current
12 location?

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Correct.

14 MR. GIBB: The feasibility of a return, I
15 guess.

16 I mean, you certainly could build a one
17 bedroom and a garage addition to the house, but it would,
18 in our view, underutilize the potential of the property,
19 so that's why we always looked at a way of creating a rear
20 yard to the property.

21 We always wanted to give some additional
22 thought to using the empty space in the rear and east of
23 the property.

24 Plus also the house is designed to be a small
25 house. You walk in one room, you go to the living room,

1 you go to the dining room, and then the bedrooms follow
2 on, so the idea of being able to sort of develop into a
3 house which had additional larger spaces kind of meant we
4 had to sort of encompass the property, so we always looked
5 at doing additions sort of to the middle and sides, and
6 really that's where we sort of came up against this
7 feeling that the elevation to Segovia shouldn't be reduced
8 in any way.

9 But the answer to the question is obviously
10 if the addition sits on one lot, it also sits on two, but
11 it's a question then of, I think someone was mentioning
12 about how it would not be beneficial to the neighborhood.
13 I'm not 100 percent sure that's correct.

14 I think that if you, if you manage to move
15 the property, develop the property, and in a certain
16 extent it would be beneficial because it would add
17 something to the property, to the neighborhood. I don't
18 think moving it would be detrimental. I don't think
19 adding a structure is detrimental. It's in keeping with.

20 So we're always looking for a way to use the
21 potential of the area architecturally and in an area, so
22 that's why we didn't choose just to do a one-room addition
23 to the property.

24 MR. MENENDEZ: So the setbacks are not an
25 impediment to you to complete this project?

1 MR. GIBB: The current setbacks, or the
2 zoning setbacks?

3

4 MR. MENENDEZ: The zoning setbacks we have
5 today.

6 MR. GIBB: All right. So the zoning setback
7 is 15 feet from Segovia, so we could -- so as soon as you
8 build two of the setbacks, then you're starting impeding
9 on or enclosing the property or enclosing the feel of the
10 house.

11 So, but certainly we could, by code, what we
12 -- you know, there are lots of things you are limited in
13 doing. There was also minimums that you would have to do,
14 so developing the property would have to include a garage
15 of some description, and we looked at various options on
16 where that would be located.

17 But currently the required zoning setbacks do
18 not stop us from doing a small addition. It's a question
19 of whether that makes a reasonable use of the potential of
20 the property.

21 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Kara, as a board, can
22 we issue a variance on setbacks? I didn't hear that.

23 MS. KAUTZ: Yes, yes.

24 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So Mr. Gibb, if you
25 needed some space and we could give you a variance on the

1 setback, for instance, would that help you and your client
2 in --

3 MR. GIBB: Well, sorry. I should say that
4 the, currently the rear setback of the property is ten
5 feet, so the proposal we have which locates the garage in
6 the rear with the mechanical equipment also in the rear,
7 that would need a rear setback adjustment.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

9 MR. GIBB: So yes, so that --

10 MR. MENENDEZ: Which would come to us and we
11 would --

12 MR. GIBB: Right, and that sort of goes hand
13 -- in the past, a project I've been involved with, we
14 proposed the addition and everybody, and the board is
15 limited to grant the addition and the variation at the
16 same time.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Exactly, so that would help
18 you if you had it, if you were able to get a variance.

19 MR. GIBB: Yes. The current addition as
20 drawn requires a rear setback.

21 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, okay.

22 MR. GIBB: Unless, unless it's actually a
23 cottage. If it is a cottage, then it doesn't need a
24 variance. If it isn't a cottage, then it does.

25 MR. MENENDEZ: Understood. Okay. Thank you.

1 Mr. Rodriguez, what do you have to say?

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I was on mute. I have read
3 this report, the feasibility study, and I'm not going to
4 go through it line by line.

5 I'm just very concerned with the fact that it
6 doesn't really conclude that this can be done, nor does it
7 conclude that the structure would remain intact.

8 In fact, there is language that's all, it's
9 all cast in passive voice: "It may be determined that,"
10 "If it is determined to be continue using," "It may be
11 possible to," "It will likely be."

12 None of that gives me a lot of comfort that
13 when this is -- that the project will be moved and that
14 the house will be intact, it will be, it will be
15 historically accurate by the time it is moved.

16 But putting aside this issue of the
17 feasibility of moving it, I would echo everything that
18 John Fullerton has said. He's very articulate and he's an
19 architect, and I'm not going to try to speak any further
20 to the issues that he addressed. I endorse him
21 completely.

22 I would like, however, to read into the
23 record, for the record, if this goes before the
24 commission, I want this to be on the record. This is a
25 letter that was dated August the 18th, 2020, from the

1 Florida Trust for Historic Preservation of Housing.

2 And it reads in the second paragraph that,
3 "The lot itself is a significant characteristic of the
4 historic resource. Any relocation (inaudible) with the
5 city's 2005 historic designation of the property,
6 negatively impact the historic integrity, and create a
7 precedent that will be detrimental to preserving historic
8 resources in the future."

9 I agree with that statement and I would like
10 to make sure it is in the record.

11 And one final point, there's been a lot of
12 talk about preserving the historical integrity of the
13 structure, and I believe that the best way to preserve the
14 historical integrity is not to move it, and I will not
15 support a move, a motion to endorse the moving of the
16 house.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Ehrenhaft?

18 MR. GIBB: Albert, can I ask a question?

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes. Go Ahead.

20 MR. GIBB: Kara, the report that's been
21 cited, the 2005 designation, was that done in conjunction
22 with a previous design addition?

23 MS. KAUTZ: It was taken with an accelerated
24 certificate of appropriateness, yes.

25 MR. GIBB: So the report was done because

1 they came forward with the addition?

2 MS. KAUTZ: It was done at the same time. I
3 don't know if it was, if they were designating it because
4 they were doing an addition and needed something. They
5 were taken at the same time. I can't answer the reason
6 why, sorry.

7 MR. GIBB: Well, it wasn't designated prior
8 to that?

9 MS. KAUTZ: No, it was not. The designation
10 report and the certificate of appropriateness came at the
11 same time, in 2005.

12 MR. GIBB: Right, and then the addition that
13 was proposed in 2005, that was done the same time, round
14 about same time?

15 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. It was approved at the same
16 meeting, yes.

17 MR. GIBB: Okay. So I think it should be
18 noted that that addition obscured almost everything about
19 the house except for the front section, the gable section.

20 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. We showed the board at the
21 last, at the August meeting this drawing. If they would
22 like to see them again, I'm happy to show them.

23 MR. GIBB: It was agreed in our meeting that
24 a similar-type addition would not be approved.

25 MS. KAUTZ: Correct.

1 MR. GIBB: That's one of the reasons why, in
2 answer to Albert's question, we were, you know, we had
3 seen what was done before and we were trying to do
4 something different.

5 MS. KAUTZ: Right.

6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman?

7 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Rodriguez.

8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: If I may respond to that,
9 we're here looking at the request to move the historic
10 property, the house. We're not here to review what was
11 done in the past or what will be done in the future should
12 the lot be split, so I'm not sure that what was just said
13 is really relevant to our consideration.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, so noted.
15 Mr. Ehrenhaft?

16 MR. EHRENHAFT: I too have reservations
17 about, having read the feasibility report, and I believe
18 the expert's comments on behalf of on the owner and even
19 Mr. Goldstein also, have indicated that the coral rock
20 wall itself may have to be dismantled.

21 It might -- and I don't know whether that
22 means that it's going to be block by block of coral rock
23 that happened to be in the original construction and it
24 becomes a pile of coral rock, or whether large sections of
25 the wall, the coral rock wall that sit below the floor,

1 the floor joists could be somehow cut out and left in
2 large sections and moved undisturbed.

3 But I have severe concerns that the base wall
4 which is a major part of the aesthetic of the building
5 will be destroyed and have to be reassembled and not have
6 the same, the same character.

7 And I am also concerned, as Mr. Fullerton
8 said, that if the plaster is damaged in moving, that there
9 may be difficulties in making a properly aesthetically
10 correct repair to it, because we never want the entire
11 facades of buildings re-stuccoed. Kara, if I may, may I
12 ask a question of you?

13 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

14 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. My understanding was
15 that there had been a proposal under a prior owner and
16 they were looking to do what was essentially a massive
17 two-story addition that was going to totally envelop and
18 essentially consume the cottage and that that did not go
19 forward, and that Mr. Goldstein with Mr. Gibb's assistance
20 were looking at doing a more sensitive one, one-story
21 addition behind the cottage. No?

22 MS. KAUTZ: No.

23 MR. EHRENHAFT: They were doing, they were
24 proposing --

25 MS. KAUTZ: It went through, it went through

1 several iterations. Portions of it, and Greg or Callum,
2 please correct me if I'm wrong, portions of it were one
3 and a half to two stories, if I'm not mistaken, but it was
4 substantial, and the addition that was proposed would have
5 compromised about 60 percent of the wood frame structure
6 by nature of sort of, by nature of sort of wrapping the
7 structure in order to utilize the property because of the
8 way it sits, which was a concern for us.

9 MR. EHRENHAFT: So it was going to make it
10 basically a U-shape and come forward on the side facades
11 and eat the back of the house?

12 MS. KAUTZ: Well, we were working with them
13 to avoid that because we wanted, what was really important
14 to staff also was that that corner view is important. We
15 felt that it was very important, that that Segovia facade
16 and the front facade were almost equally important because
17 of where it sits, how it sits.

18 And so part of the reason why we were
19 suggesting that if it were -- or not suggesting; we were
20 comfortable with it being moved towards Segovia is that is
21 maintained and it gives you the remainder of the lot to
22 work with. That was, there were numerous iterations, but
23 the way, the way you would have to attach to the framed
24 house was problematic for us.

25 MR. EHRENHAFT: But they were, they're not

1 interested in or not willing, from your understanding, to
2 do the very same addition that we saw that was the more
3 modest one story addition --

4 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

5 MR. EHRENHAFT: -- that we saw in the
6 drawings from August that would be attached to this
7 cottage?

8 MS. KAUTZ: Right. I can't speak -- I can't
9 answer that question for you. That's Mr. Goldstein.

10 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yeah. I understand what
11 you're saying. It's just hard for me to move forward with
12 a scenario that I could build on a 5,200-square-foot lot,
13 and then build that same exact house on an
14 11,250-square-foot lot.

15 It just doesn't make sense as far as
16 utilizing the property, and that's why we came up with
17 this solution.

18 But as far as just a little back story, when
19 I purchased the home, I did research and I pulled the
20 records of that plan that was approved by the previous
21 owner, so when Callum and I began, we moved in that
22 direction because I had seen that this plan was already
23 approved that really was just leaving that front gable
24 exposed but was wrapping the entire house, you know,
25 everywhere else.

1 And Kara and Dona, you know, going through
2 the process, they were the ones that kind of educated me
3 on, you know, what they wanted to see and what was
4 historically appropriate, and we tried several times.

5 But you know, I also wanted to get a certain
6 amount of bedrooms, I think it was four bedrooms on this
7 lot, and it was just very, very difficult to do that, and
8 that's how we ultimately moved in this direction.

9 And just one other thing about the setback.
10 It's not just the side setback that was an issue. It was
11 that we -- the historical department did not want us to
12 build anywhere on Segovia Street. We would have to start
13 building behind the existing structure, so it's not just
14 the zoning issue. It's also because of that actual
15 property that made it difficult for us to figure out where
16 this addition was even going to be situated.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Rodriguez?

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman, I have to
19 object again.

20 We were told at the very beginning of this
21 discussion that we could not discuss what would be done
22 with the other half of the parcel if it were split. We
23 had plans from the last meeting. We know what they were
24 going to suggest.

25 We were told that should be an irrelevant

1 discussion at this meeting. This is only whether the
2 cottage will be moved or not moved.

3 All this discussion of what could be done or
4 has not been done or could have been done is irrelevant to
5 this discussion of whether or not --

6 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I would like, I would like to
7 just state if the city attorney, if the city attorney
8 could just confirm that the Coral Gables code does require
9 you to consider the alternatives when making this decision
10 on whether to move the home. That's part of the code
11 section.

12 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Ceballos?

13 MR. CEBALLOS: I would have to defer to Kara.
14 I'm not aware of any code section that specifically speaks
15 to moving a home, but I will confirm with the board member
16 that what is up for discussion right now is not what
17 can or cannot be built in the future, but specifically the
18 COA is for the relocation of the home, and let me read it
19 directly, for the residence, the addition and all pending
20 site work.

21 Nothing else is supposed to be considered
22 with this particular item or this particular COA.

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

24 MS. KAUTZ: Right. The code section, just so
25 you all know, is 3-1109, Moving of Existing Improvements,

1 and I'll read it into the record so you all can hear it.

2 "The moving of significant improvements from
3 their original location shall be discouraged. However,
4 the historic preservation board may grant a special
5 certificate of appropriateness if it finds that no
6 reasonable alternative is available for preserving the
7 improvement on its original site and the proposed
8 relocation site is compatible with the historic and
9 architectural integrity of the improvement."

10 So in terms of talking about alternatives to
11 the move, I think that's what Mr. Goldstein was
12 addressing.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Bache-Wiig?

14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Wait. What we're discussing
15 here, there's been no discussion of whether or not this is
16 a reasonable or unreasonable relocation of this property
17 or the need for it. All that's been thrown out is if
18 we're going to allow the cottage to be moved 20 feet to
19 the east.

20 We have no discussion here about what are the
21 reasonable alternatives. The reasonable alternative is to
22 leave it where it is.

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Bache-Wiig?

24 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Hi. Sorry. I just want to
25 go back a little bit and just say, you know, I think I

1 appreciate, you know, staff's outside-of-the box thinking,
2 you know, towards this item and having the structure
3 moved, you know, as being an alternative.

4 I really do understand that the concerns are,
5 you know, that corner view from Segovia and maintaining
6 that existing siting, you know, if you will, that you get
7 from that perspective or maintaining that perspective you
8 get from the siting that's there right now.

9 And I do appreciate that we, you know,
10 decided to go to the feasibility report and that that
11 report came to us and we were able to look at it. You
12 know, it's very thorough, but I do have concerns about the
13 actual moving of the structure and the repercussions that
14 would come from physically moving that structure.

15 I believe that, you know, our board and staff
16 can come up with a reasonable solution to the site. I
17 have faith in the board like many -- we have an echo.

18 Okay. I just have faith that we can come up
19 with something that's reasonable like we have many times
20 before, and so in principle I would not be supporting the
21 item to move the structure.

22 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Durana?

23 MR. DURANA: I agree pretty much along with
24 what Alicia just said.

25 You know, while I do appreciate and I

1 understand the homeowner's, you know, dilemma, and I
2 appreciate that, you know, they thought a little bit
3 outside the box trying to think of a better way to salvage
4 the house than moving it. I just don't feel comfortable
5 moving that house without it potentially being damaged.

6 And I just don't know -- I also don't see a
7 real hardship for moving the house or any sort of imminent
8 danger to the house, you know, if the house -- in those
9 situations, I think I would lean towards moving the house
10 if there was some sort of potential damage that could
11 happen to the house. I think one of the previous people
12 mentioned like a sinkhole or something like that or water,
13 you know, you know, sea level rise or something.

14 But you know, to move it because we don't
15 love the way an addition is going to look, I don't think
16 that's the right precedent to set, you know, going
17 forward.

18 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Rolando, do you
19 have anything to add? No. Mr. Garcia-Pons?

20 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Thank you. So Kara, I just
21 want one point of clarification, and then a couple of, a
22 couple of comments.

23 This application, as Mr. Ceballos mentioned,
24 is for the relocation of the residence, the addition and
25 the site work, so this includes the garage additions that

1 would be moving over that includes that setback in the
2 rear, that eight and a half feet, so just to be -- it's
3 just not moving the house. It's the moving and the new
4 addition, right?

5 MS. KAUTZ: Correct, as proposed.

6 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Thank you. So I appreciate
7 city's staff's recommendation. I appreciate the intent by
8 which the applicant and city staff are proffering moving
9 of the residence in order to protect the structure, I
10 think as Miss Bache-Wiig had mentioned, protecting the
11 view from both of the streets which protects the building
12 and that corner, right, the entire both streets of the
13 corner.

14 I'm having a little bit of trouble with the
15 no reasonable alternative is available portion of that
16 section that you mentioned, Kara, and I know that I had
17 the same issue at the last meeting, and Miss Spain had
18 mentioned the idea that it also includes historic
19 preservation as a consideration, right, so that actually
20 helped me think about this in a slightly new way.

21 My concern of this is the impact on, what the
22 impact of the move and the addition would do if we
23 approved this certificate of appropriateness. It would
24 then preclude any other future certificates of
25 appropriateness that would be I think amenable to the

1 existing or the moved project, specifically access to the
2 site.

3 So right now I can see the site just off one
4 street. If somehow this project is moved over, there
5 would not be any access to the site other than through the
6 other street. I think that is a major issue with the lot
7 and the structure.

8 And unless this is seen more as a certificate
9 of appropriateness for the entire lot, I would probably be
10 against this move because if I don't see the imminent
11 reasonable alternative that may not be available, but I am
12 100 percent amenable to the idea, and I appreciate what
13 city staff is doing. I'm concerned that it has a negative
14 impact on the structure and the site going forward.

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Spain?

16 MS. SPAIN: Hi. I just wanted to clarify
17 that although I was in the department when this first came
18 forward with an addition, a large addition, I was not part
19 of conversations having to do with this application to
20 move it or to split a lot. I just need to have that on
21 the record because I was not part of this, these
22 applications at all.

23 And having said that, I was looking at these
24 plans, and I agree with Cesar. I wish it had come forward
25 to us with just the move and so then, then I would be

1 comfortable, more comfortable, although the coral rock
2 really bothers me. That whole situation with the wood
3 structure on top of it is concerning.

4 But the fact that they've done these
5 additions to make this actually a contained property,
6 having everything they want on a small little house and
7 then this empty lot next to it, it's a concern, because
8 then if, in fact, we were to recommend against the lot
9 separation, then they would have this empty lot. I guess
10 they could put a pool, but it's almost like they're
11 anticipating that being approved, and I have a problem
12 with it. Anyhow, that's all, that's all I have.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Any more comments from any of
14 the board members or any of the audience?

15 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Can I just say, Mr. Brownie
16 of Brownie Structural Movers --

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Miss Bondurant, please.

18 MS. BONDURANT: It concerns me a little bit
19 that the gentleman, Mr. Goldstein, clearly knew this was a
20 historic property when he bought it, did he not?

21 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Of course I did, yes.

22 MS. BONDURANT: Okay. That's just my point.
23 It's easier to ask forgiveness than it is to ask for
24 permission, and I just feel like going in, you knew it was
25 an "iffy" situation, I assume.

1 You're a very smart man, You've done your
2 homework, but it was a designated property when you bought
3 it, so.

4 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Anybody else have any
5 comments?

6 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I just want to say, I think
7 my, the lobbyist I have here, Jamison Brownie from Brownie
8 Structural is trying to speak but has been muted.

9 MR. MENENDEZ: He can go ahead and speak. He
10 needs to unmute himself.

11 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Okay.

12 MR. BROWNIE: Yes. This is Jamison Brownie
13 with Brownie Structural Movers. Can you hear me?

14 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, we can. Go ahead.

15 MR. BROWNIE: Yes. I keep hearing everybody
16 saying that the structure is, won't make the anticipated
17 move structurally. That is a completely false statement.

18 We have moved several structures. I am
19 actually a fourth-generation building mover. My family
20 has been moving structures since 1922, and relocating a
21 stucco wood frame home is completely feasible.

22 We've actually relocated a 950-ton hollow
23 clay tile structure on Star Island in Miami Beach with no
24 issues to it whatsoever.

25 And as far as the coral rock stem wall, that

1 can be, we can shore the entire structure, shore the house
2 up, and remove that coral rock piece by piece. It's laid
3 up in a pattern that is very easy to replicate with the
4 same stone.

5 So I know a lot of people had some
6 reservations about the structural integrity, so just to
7 put everybody's mind at ease, that structure is a very
8 easy and simple structure to relocate without any
9 structural issues arising from the relocation.

10 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank You. Anyone
11 else?

12 MR. FULLERTON: I think it would be, have
13 been a good thing if Mr. Wood had talked to you. In his
14 report, unfortunately he never said anything like it would
15 be easy to do, I mean, and I understand why. He's a smart
16 man. He's been around.

17 And moving something like that I think is
18 just basically -- I don't want to say anything against
19 your business, Mr. Jamison, but I don't see, I don't see
20 how it can't be an issue at some point, and for that
21 reason I would like to make the motion to deny the
22 application for moving this building.

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Do we have a second?
24 Miss Bche-Wiig seconds it. Unmute.

25 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I second the motion.

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Can we get a vote?

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: What is the motion?

3 MR. MENENDEZ: To deny.

4 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: A motion to
5 deny?

6 MR. FULLERTON: The application for moving
7 the structure.

8 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Okay.
9 Mr. Rodriguez?

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

11 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Rolando?

12 MS. ROLANDO: No.

13 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: You do want to
14 move it?

15 MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

16 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Okay. Miss
17 Spain?

18 MS. SPAIN: I'm going to vote no. Is this
19 just --

20 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Fullerton?

21 MS. SPAIN: I'm sorry. Is this just for the
22 move, or is this for the move and the addition?

23 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Yeah. This is
24 to, this is to not approve the move. The motion was not
25 to approve the move.

1 MR. CEBALLO: Pardon my interruption. Kara,
2 is it possible for the addition and the site work to be
3 done without the move?

4 MR. FULLERTON: Sure.

5 MS. KAUTZ: Yes, and they can also do the
6 move without the addition and site work.

7 MR. CEBALLOS: So do we know if the
8 applicant --

9 MS. SPAIN: I'm back to my question then. Is
10 this, is your motion, John, just about the move, or is it
11 about the whole application?

12 MR. FULLERTON: It's about the move. The
13 application -- I mean the addition, I have no problem
14 with.

15 MS. SPAIN: Okay. So I'm going to stick with
16 the "no."

17 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Okay. So if
18 you vote no, you agree to the move.

19 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

20 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: If you vote
21 yes, you do not agree to the move.

22 MS. SPAIN: No. I am agreeing to the move, I
23 am agreeing to the move because I am voting no.

24 MR. FULLERTON: Okay. That's confusing me.

25 MS. BACHE-WIIG: No. That's not what I --

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. The motion is not to
2 move the property. If you say yes, you agree that you do
3 not want to move the property. If you say no, you want to
4 move the property. Is everybody clear on that? Okay,
5 let's continue.

6 MR. EHRENHAFT: But it's not just the move.
7 It's also the entire --

8 MR. MENENDEZ: No. We're just talking about
9 the move here.

10 MR. EHRENHAFT: I thought it was --

11 MS. ROLANDO: It's just the move.

12 MR. MENENDEZ: We're just talking about the
13 move here.

14 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: It's just the
15 move. It's just --

16 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. I misunderstood
17 because I thought we were told that it included the
18 addition that had been provided.

19 MS. SPAIN: That's not what the motion is.
20 The motion is to not move.

21 MR. FULLERTON: The motion is to, my motion
22 is to deny the move of the house.

23 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

24 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I second Mr. Fullerton's
25 motion.

1 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Who is that,
2 Miss Bache-Wiig?

3 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

4 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Okay, all
5 right. Mr. Rodriguez voted yes --

6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Correct.

7 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: -- that he did
8 not want to move.

9 Miss Rolando voted no, that she agrees to the
10 move.

11 Miss Spain voted no, that she approved,
12 agrees to the move. Mr. Fullerton?

13 MR. FULLERTON: No -- I mean yes.

14 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Yes, you do
15 not approve the move. Okay? Miss Bache-Wiig?

16 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes, I do not approve the
17 move.

18 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Okay.
19 Mr. Durana?

20 MR. DURANA: Yes, I do not approve the move.

21 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr.
22 Garcia-Pons?

23 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes, I do not approve the
24 move.

25 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

1 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes, do not approve the move.

2 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Menendez?

3 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes. I do not approve the
4 move.

5 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Okay. So we
6 have seven yes's and two no's. The motion has passed.

7 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Mr. Chairperson?

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

9 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Does anybody wish to
10 make another motion? Because all we did was move to not
11 move the building, which it seems like a really odd motion
12 to have made.

13 So I don't know if anybody has another
14 thought as to a motion that we can pass, or perhaps
15 through the chair if the applicant wants to proffer
16 another option.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Well, right now, it's, we have
18 denied the move, and now we've got to vote on the
19 addition, correct?

20 MR. GARCIA-PONS: That's, I think the
21 question is we have a certificate of appropriateness that
22 we've cut into pieces, so I'm not sure --

23 MS. KAUTZ: We now leave the house exactly as
24 it is.

25 MR. GIBB: We have the option to come back

1 with an addition to the house in its existing location
2 then.

3 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

4 MR. CEBALLOS: The way that it currently
5 stands, the board has only decided in part about the
6 relocation. They've denied the relocation.

7 I would suggest that we ask the applicant if
8 the applicant would like for the board to consider the
9 addition and site work in its current location.

10 If he chooses yes, then the board can take
11 the item and basically vote on the COA in two separate
12 parts.

13 If the applicant wishes to withdraw, does not
14 want those items to be considered because it was all
15 conditional on the residence, that's his choice.

16 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Goldstein, what would you
17 like to do?

18 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well, the proposed addition,
19 the additional bedroom and garage in its current, in the
20 location we proposed, it would not make sense at this
21 point without moving the home, so we can withdraw that
22 part of the application.

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So you would like to
24 regroup and come back?

25 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I guess. That's all I can

1 do. Yes.

2 MR. MENENDEZ: All right.

3 MR. FULLERTON: I think, if I can make a
4 quick statement, I think you have a lot of opportunity to
5 do an addition to that home to the east -- to the west and
6 to the north, so I wouldn't -- I really think something
7 significant could be done with that house.

8 MR. GOLDSTEIN: That's what I thought, that's
9 what I thought when I bought the property, but I'm going
10 to regroup and figure out how to proceed. I appreciate
11 everyone's attention.

12 MR. FULLERTON: You've got 35 feet behind you
13 to the east-west. That's a pretty good size space.

14 MR. GOLDSTEIN: But it's a like a "T." I
15 didn't want to build a "T."

16 MR. FULLERTON: No, not a "T," not a "T".

17 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Okay.

18 MR. FULLERTON: But anyway, that's for you
19 and Mr. Gibb. Mr. Gibb is a very talented architect. I
20 know he can help you do this.

21 MR. MENENDEZ: All right, Mr. Goldstein,
22 thank you. We'll see you back soon.

23 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Great. Thank you.

24 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, okay. The next item up
25 is Case File COA (SP) 2020-013, an application for the

1 issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness in
2 accordance with Section 3-1104 (D)(2) of the City of Coral
3 Gables zoning code for the public right of way adjacent to
4 244, 250, 272 and 290 Valencia Avenue, and 247 and 297
5 Almeria Avenue legally described as the west 265 feet of
6 alley, Block Ten, Coral Gables Craft Section, according to
7 the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book Ten, Page 40, of
8 the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

9 The applicant is requesting recommendation of
10 approval for an amendment to the city plan for the
11 vacation of the alley. Kara?

12 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. This is the location
13 map of the alleyway in question. It is, like he said, the
14 west 265 feet of the public right of way bisecting Block
15 Ten between Salzedo and Ponce.

16 So this is the first amendment that we have
17 to the city plan that's being requested. I don't have
18 anything. Laura, Miss Russo, did not present a Power
19 Point. I'm going to take this down. I believe she'll be
20 walking you through your, what was provided to you in the
21 packets.

22 We did want to note that this, each
23 application for the amendment to the city plan will be on
24 a case-by-case basis, so I wanted you to know that any
25 approval that is given or consideration given to this item

1 does not set a precedent for future applications, just to
2 put that out there.

3 Laura, would you like to begin your
4 presentation?

5 MS. RUSSO: Yes, thank you.

6 MS. KAUTZ: And we'll discuss it after.

7 MS. RUSSO: Thank you very much, Kara. Good
8 evening, Mr. Chair, members of the board. For the record,
9 Laura Russo with offices at 2334 Ponce de Leon Boulevard.
10 I am here --

11 MS. KAUTZ: You need to be sworn in. I'm
12 sorry.

13 (Thereupon, Ms. Russo was duly remotely sworn on oath.)

14 MS. RUSSO: I am here this evening
15 representing Brockway, Limited, and Brockway Valencia,
16 Limited, who are the owners of Lots One through 12 and 35
17 through 46 that abut the alley in question. Block Ten is
18 bounded on the north by Valencia Avenue, on the west by
19 Salzedo, and on the south by Almeria Avenue.

20 For those of you very familiar with downtown
21 Coral Gables, the area in question is the site of the
22 Mercedes Benz parking lot. It currently holds some
23 inventory and two small buildings.

24 The owners of the property are requesting
25 that the alley from Salzedo eastward, 265 feet, be

1 vacated, and are offering a substitute access and utility
2 easement of 35 feet in width that will run south to
3 Almeria.

4 To give you a little background, we've been
5 working with Hermes Diaz at public works and Paul Rodas
6 and his department in submitting the substitute access
7 easement which will be perpetual. We are doing this
8 because we are in a contract with the City of Coral Gables
9 and with a Hudena (phonetic) entity that is looking to
10 substitute their acquisition of the old police station and
11 take over this site and Mercedes would move to the old
12 police station.

13 So this is in preparation for any development
14 that might occur at that time. There is no current
15 development that is being sought at this time, and the
16 proposed amendment that was worked on by Miriam Ramos,
17 city attorney, had conditions that would make the alley
18 vacation be effective upon the presentation and approval
19 of plans, site plan approval for development of the
20 property.

21 And so I am happy to answer any question that
22 I am able to answer, and you know, obviously this is done
23 as a precursor for development of this west end of the
24 block that is in the heart of the central business
25 district, and so I, you know, respectfully request your

1 approval of this, of the alley vacation.

2 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Are there anyone in the
3 audience who would like to speak in favor of this case?
4 Mr. Jimenez?

5 MR. JIMENEZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you
6 very much. Joe Jimenez with Gulino Partners, offices at
7 2020 Salzedo Street. As Miss Russo mentioned --

8 THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. Have you
9 been sworn, sir?

10 MR. JIMENEZ: No.
11 (Thereupon, Mr. Jimenez was duly remotely sworn on oath.

12 MR. JIMENEZ: So I was just here. I know
13 that there have been some questions about the fact that
14 there is no site plan. As a future developer of this
15 site, I'm here just to answer any questions. I just
16 wanted to introduce myself to the board, but obviously we
17 are in favor of the item.

18 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Anybody else who wants
19 to speak in favor? Anyone who would, who would like to
20 speak in opposition?

21 Okay. I'll open this up for discussion among
22 the board members. Mr. Garcia-Pons, what do you think?

23 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Are you calling me? I
24 don't have my hand raised, but when I do, you'll know.

25 MR. MENENDEZ: I wear glasses so I don't see

1 very well.

2 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I do have a comment, and I
3 think I understand, you know, the assemblage of the
4 property probably makes it a little bit easier to develop.

5 My concern on this is, you know, there is a
6 fabric inherent to the downtown area which includes the
7 alleys. Services exist on those alleys which take the
8 services away from the main streets.

9 By closing off this particular alley, we are
10 perhaps not moving services that would be taken care of in
11 the alleys to the main streets because it does say in the
12 document that those services would be moved to the new
13 property that they're going to give a perpetual easement
14 to.

15 I would prefer to see that any of the
16 services that would have happened in the alley actually be
17 internalized to the building versus to be relocated onto
18 the new perpetual easement.

19 But even larger than that, I have -- I'm
20 probably fundamentally opposed to closing alleys in
21 business districts. I think that changes, changes the
22 character of those districts by allowing for an assembled
23 property which thus allows for a larger building, but
24 again, that is a personal opinion. I'm just sharing it
25 with you.

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Rodriguez?

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, I'm trying to find the
3 mute button. I actually sat through the entire
4 hour-and-a-half presentation at the planning and zoning
5 board, and having heard what that discussion was, I have
6 no objections to the recommendations of the staff.

7 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Dona, what do you think

8 MS. SPAIN: I have no objections.

9 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

10 MS. SPAIN: And I also am fundametally
11 against closing alleys, just so you know, but I think that
12 in this case it makes sense.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Miss Rolando?

14 MS. ROLANDO: Yes. I have a question for
15 Laura. Are there any uses in Lots 15 through 19 of Block
16 Ten that utilize that lobby -- excuse me, that alleyway?

17 MS. RUSSO: Miss Rolando, it's my -- well,
18 it's not my understanding. We have confirmation that
19 there is a sewer line that runs through the alley, a Coral
20 Gables sewer line. There are utilities, so there is AT &
21 T, there is FPL, there is other utilities, all of which
22 have agreed to the relocation to the easement.

23 So the properties that you are talking about
24 would not be impacted because the utilities would be
25 moved. In fact, some of the utilities would, in fact, be

1 upgraded,

2 But instead of the utilities continuing west
3 throughout the alley, they would stop at the end of the
4 east ten feet of Lot 11, all right. Where the substitute
5 easement begins, the utilities would be cut off there and
6 proceed south through the proposed perpetual access and
7 utility easement.

8 MS. ROLANDO: Now, are there any of those
9 buildings that will remain that use that alley for access
10 to parking or loading at the rear of any of these
11 buildings?

12 MS. RUSSO: Well, the lots in question which
13 my client owns will not be impacted, and the balance of
14 the lots will not be impacted either because we are not --
15 we are leaving the alley.

16 So just to give you a little perspective,
17 that block, Block Ten, has an alley on the lot immediately
18 facing Ponce. At the end of the lots that face Ponce,
19 there is a north-south alley, so that bisects the block
20 from Valencia south to Almeria. Then there is an
21 east-west block.

22 So by providing the substitute easement -- so
23 we could not vacate and leave a dead end. We had to
24 provide a way for the utilities to continue south and to
25 provide both access and ingress and egress.

1 And so we had originally proposed 20 feet,
2 and in working with public works, they then went to 30
3 feet, or I think 28 feet, and then they went to 35 feet.
4 They wanted to be sure that any type of vehicle would have
5 the maneuverability, which is why we are providing,
6 unusual, but a much larger easement than the width of the
7 alley that's being vacated.

8 MS. ROLANDO: So you have a turning radius
9 then?

10 MS. RUSSO: Oh, more than, more than adequate
11 turning radius, absolutely. We worked very closely, our
12 engineers and public works, to come up with this, to come
13 up with this width of the proposed easement, yes.

14 MS. ROLANDO: And the alley is one way?

15 MS. RUSSO: The alley right now I think is
16 two ways --

17 MS. ROLANDO: Okay.

18 MS. RUSSO: -- both of them. I don't know
19 that they necessarily function that way because when you
20 try to go north-south, sometimes there are cars in the
21 north-south behind some of the restaurants, but alleys are
22 usually two ways unless labeled otherwise.

23 MS. ROLANDO: Okay. Thank you.

24 MS. RUSSO: You're welcome.

25 MS. KAUTZ: I don't think any of the city --

1 I could be wrong. I don't think any of the city alleys
2 are labeled one direction or another.

3 MR. FULLERTON: I have a couple. I noticed
4 on the planning and zoning board agenda or minutes --
5 maybe it's not minutes -- the planning board recommended
6 denial. Was that just because they didn't have a site
7 plan to see how it was going to impact the building?

8 MS. RUSSO: Yes, that is correct. The number
9 one consensus objection from the board members was that
10 they didn't have a site plan.

11 Although the proposed ordinance requires a
12 site plan before the alley vacation goes into effect and
13 still allows the planning and zoning board to review the
14 proposed project and go, and you know, provide input at
15 that time, it just didn't seem to register.

16 MR. FULLERTON: Is there a building on Lot 34
17 now which is where the turning radius would most likely
18 strike a building if a large truck was in there?

19 MS. RUSSO: There is currently a small one
20 story building on Lot 34, which is why the public works
21 department insisted that we not just give them 20 feet or
22 25 feet, but went to the full 35, because they wanted any
23 truck to be able to circumvent that building.

24 MR. FULLERTON: Okay.

25 MS. RUSSO: So that was taken into

1 consideration by the city public works staff and director.

2 MR. FULLERTON: Thanks, Laura.

3 MS. RUSSO: You're welcome.

4 MR. MENENDEZ: Any other discussion? Okay.
5 Would somebody like to make a motion?

6 MS. KAUTZ: I just want to clarify for the
7 board before you do that, that you are not, you are not
8 approving a certificate of appropriateness. You are
9 recommending to the city commission that they issue the
10 certificate of appropriateness. All amendments to the
11 city plan through a certificate of appropriateness will be
12 issued by the commission.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

14 MS. SPAIN: I'll move it.

15 MR. FULLERTON: I'll second.

16 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Fullerton seconds
17 it.

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Just for clarification, we're
19 approving the recommendation of the staff?

20 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay.

22 MS. SPAIN: Sorry, good call.

23 (Reporter clarification.)

24 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr.
25 Garcia-Pons? Hello?

1 MR. GARCIA-PONS: No.

2 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: My connection
3 went. Mr. Ehrenhaft?

4 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Bruce, you're muted.

6 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

7 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Spain?

8 MS. KAUTZ: Dona, that was you.

9 MS. SPAIN: Sorry. Yes.

10 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Rolando?

11 MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

12 MS. KAUTZ: You're muted, Nancy. Nancy,
13 you're muted. Let me finish. Hold on.

14 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: I lost
15 everybody again.

16 MS. KAUTZ: You're back.

17 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Rodriguez?

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. Did you call my name?

19 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Rodriguez?

20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. I support the motion.

21 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Okay.

22 Mr. Fullerton?

23 MR. FULLERTON: Yes, yes.

24 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Is that a yes?

25 MR. FULLERTON: Yes, yes.

1 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Fullerton?

2 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

3 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Okay.

4 Mr. Durana?

5 MR. DURANA: Yes.

6 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Durana?

7 MR. DURANA: Yes.

8 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Menendez?

9 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

10 MS. KAUTZ: Motion passes. Thank you.

11 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Okay.

12 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I'm sorry. I didn't hear my
13 name called, but I vote yes.

14 MS. KAUTZ: I wrote you down as yes. I think
15 it was called.

16 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Okay.

17 MS. RUSSO: Thank you all very much, much
18 appreciated.

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, okay. We have a
20 standard certificate of appropriateness, Case File COA
21 (SP) 2018-154, revised, an application for revision to a
22 previously issued standard of, standard certificate of
23 appropriateness for the building located within the
24 University of Miami main campus, Frost School of Music,
25 referred to as the Arnold Volpe Music Building located at

1 5489 San Amaro Drive, legally described as all of the
2 Arnold Volpe Music Building as now existing, laid out and
3 in use, the same being a portion of Tract One of the
4 amended plat portion of main campus, University of Miami,
5 according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 46
6 at Page 81 of the public records of Dade County, now
7 Miami-Dade County, Florida.

8 The application requested design approval for
9 window and door replacement. The revision requests design
10 approval for the as-built windows and doors.

11 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.

12 MS. SPAIN: Okay. Before we get started, I
13 think I need to recuse myself because I did the final
14 inspection on these windows and rejected it, so.

15 MS. KAUTZ: Okay.

16 MS. SPAIN: I don't know what to do about
17 that. I'm going to mute myself and --

18 MS. KAUTZ: I think as long as your camera is
19 off and you're muted, you're fine. Gus, is that all
20 right?

21 MR. CEBALLOS: That's fine.

22 MS. KAUTZ: Okay, perfect. So this is the
23 location map of the Volpe building on the university
24 campus, and these were photos, these were images that we
25 had from when this came to you in 2018. It was permitted

1 in 1954, architect is Robert M. Little. The University of
2 Miami owns it.

3 The top photo is shortly after construction.
4 The bottom photo was how it was previous to the window
5 replacement in 2018. Original permit drawings on the top
6 and the elevation below.

7 So this is what was approved. It was a
8 storefront, storefront system that was intended to mimic
9 the original which was wood frame. You can see that the
10 louvers installed here were being returned and either
11 restored or replicated, and then this is what's installed.

12 And so the reason why we're bringing this to
13 you and the reason why the inspection was rejected is
14 because the installation was intended to be an entire
15 assemblage. That's how it was presented to the board, and
16 what, in fact, exists now is a storefront unit of windows
17 and then a door assemblage which changes the bulk of the
18 assembly, so this is the reason why we're bringing it back
19 to you.

20 These are additional photos. I'm going to
21 stop my screen share and allow the architect -- the
22 university is on the line as is the architect.

23 Nancy, you need to make Chisholm Architects a
24 co-host so they can share their screen, and I'll turn it
25 over to the university.

1 MR. VALE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, esteemed
2 members of the board. Good afternoon, Robert Vale is my
3 name.

4 THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, excuse me.
5 Have you been sworn in, sir?

6 MR. MENENDEZ: I have not.
7 (Thereupon, Mr. Vale was duly remotely sworn on oath.)

8 MS. KAUTZ: There should be a few people
9 probably that are from --

10 MR. VALE: We also have Mr. Matthew Pollack
11 and Ricardo Herran present. They should be sworn in as
12 well.

13 Thereupon, Mr. Herran and Mr. Pollack were duly remotely
14 sworn on oath.)

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead, Mr. Vale.

16 MR. VALE: Thank you. Again, Robert Vale,
17 assistant general counsel for the university. 1320 South
18 Dixie Highway is my address. I'll make a brief
19 introduction and then turn this over to Mr. Matthew
20 Pollack, the engineer with Chisholm for the project will
21 make a presentation. As I mentioned, Ricardo Herran of
22 the university's planning department is also present.

23 As Mrs. Kautz mentioned, we're here today as
24 a continuation of our conversation with the board
25 regarding Arnold Volpe Music Building that we started with

1 the board back in 2018.

2 At that time we came before the board
3 voluntarily and as stewards of the university historically
4 significant resources on its campus to designate the
5 building as historic, and then since the historic
6 designation, we've been working with city staff to finish
7 out our ability to harden and fortify the window openings
8 of this building.

9 And in 2019, we received design approval and
10 a certificate of appropriateness was issued for the
11 replacement of the windows and doors along the
12 southwestern-facing storefront of the building, and this
13 project consists of two main components, the first being
14 the replacement of the hurricane-resistant windows and
15 doors, and the second part consisting of the exterior
16 louvers that are an important characteristic of the
17 original design.

18 At this time we've completed the first phase
19 of the installation of the windows and doors, and the
20 as-builts reflect a slight deviation from the approved
21 plans in the area of the window area above the doors
22 because of NOA specifications.

23 So therefore, we're here requesting approval
24 of the as-built windows and doors before we move to install
25 the louvers in accordance with the originally-issued

1 certificate of appropriateness.

2 I'm an attorney, not an architect. I'm going
3 to turn this over to Mr. Pollack who can make a more
4 detailed presentation on the technical details of the
5 project.

6 Thank you for your time, and we look forward
7 to your favorable vote.

8 MS. KAUTZ: You should have the ability to
9 share your screen.

10 MR. POLLACK: I will. Good evening. I'm
11 Matt Pollack. I'm the architect. I'm president of
12 Chisholm Architects. I just wanted to go through a brief
13 description of the project, just to kind of refresh your
14 memories of the board members that were present back in
15 2018 and for any new board members that weren't here.

16 Let me turn my screen on now, so if everyone
17 can see that. Let me just reduce my screen here. Okay.

18 As everyone remembers, we came back -- we
19 came in front of the board in 2018 to work with the board,
20 and as counsel had mentioned, we had done two, several
21 improvements to the exterior of the building.

22 The first, the first phase was on the
23 northeast side where we replaced the casement windows with
24 fixed windows and then mimicked the casement windows, and
25 then we came back later and did the northwest quadrant

1 which is what you see in the rendering now, and that was
2 in working with, working with that.

3 This again is just a site plan. I think
4 we're all aware of where the building is located. This
5 was the rendering that we had done as part of the
6 original, the original submission that basically showed
7 the original storefront system was actually made out of
8 wood with aluminum -- it had wood with aluminum, with
9 aluminum window, with aluminum window -- wood frames, I'm
10 sorry, and then it had wood jalousies and aluminum frames
11 with solid core wood doors.

12 Over the course of 40 or 50 years, the
13 jalousie louvers were eventually covered over with
14 exterior boards and the building lost all of its, all of
15 its character.

16 So as we prepared our drawings for permit,
17 the original intent was, as you see on the top of the
18 building, which pretty much we're sticking with the intent
19 that we had. As you recall when we were here in front of
20 the board two years ago, we changed the material from wood
21 to aluminum, and the reason we did that was, one, the NOA
22 for the aluminum window was available.

23 We were -- it was also, it provided a more
24 slender profile for the window frames, and it also allowed
25 us an opportunity to inset the louver system which we

1 presented to the board at that time as well.

2 So what -- here are some renderings that we
3 did to sort of show the intent of what, of what we were,
4 what we had in the beginning as far as the original louver
5 elevation, and then what we presented to the board at that
6 time, and as you can see, the slenderness of the vertical
7 and horizontal elements was maintained. We maintained the
8 curve.

9 We made a change in the storefront door. We
10 went with a French-style door in lieu of the solid panel
11 door, but it all kept the essence of the system.

12 Eventually this is what was built. At the
13 top is still what was approved.

14 And on the bottom what occurred is that
15 during the shop drawing process by the delegated engineer,
16 the NOA for the door and the window above the door did not
17 have an NOA approval in the configuration that we had
18 presented, that we had presented to the board, and because
19 of that, what occurred is that the frame of the window
20 which is not visible to the exterior of the building was
21 flipped, and it creates not only a slightly different
22 appearance in the window frame itself, but it's also
23 pushed forward an inch or two from the windows in the
24 back.

25 Again, this is an indication of that

1 condition there showing the wider window, the wider window
2 above the door.

3 We went ahead and just added in the detail,
4 and I don't know if you guys can see the little hand or
5 not on the screen, but what's occurring is that in this
6 section here above the window and door, we have the frame
7 and the thicker part of the frame is facing the exterior
8 of the building, whereas the typical details for the
9 balance of the storefront system, the thicker frame is
10 actually on the interior of the building.

11 By doing this detail, we were able to keep
12 the slenderness of the system, and be able to keep the
13 slenderness of the system, and also fit the louver system
14 in, in between the frame, the frame of the storefront
15 system, so it was very consistent with the original, the
16 original design intent.

17 These are just the overall floor plans. Most
18 of the spaces here are being used.

19 These are instructional space. It's a music
20 building so there's -- and some of the spaces, they're
21 using it as classrooms. Other spaces, it's used for
22 rehearsal and a combination of the two.

23 Again, these were photographs that Kara had
24 actually shared and some that Ricardo had shared with us
25 to get an idea of what the building looked like back in

1 1954, again, the pictures of prior to the renovation, and
2 then these are the updated photographs of the storefront
3 system.

4 And as you can see in this area here, because
5 of the flipping, the flipping of the system, we had an I
6 think somewhat noticeable change in thickness and scale
7 and in the framing of the storefront system. Part of this
8 is just a result of the engineering required in order to
9 meet the window requirements as well as the NOA
10 requirements or a combination of both of those items. So
11 with that, we're open to questions.

12 MR. MENENDEZ: Kara, has this been approved,
13 or not? This is not what we approved two years ago.

14 MS. KAUTZ: Sorry. What is installed is not
15 what you approved.

16 MR. MENENDEZ: Why wasn't it caught? I mean,
17 there's a shop, there's a shop drawing process and
18 approval process. It wasn't caught there?

19 MS. KAUTZ: From what I remember, the shop
20 drawings showed what was approved by you all. There was
21 no modification in the shop drawings that would have led
22 us to believe they were different than what you all
23 approved.

24 MR. MENENDEZ: So why are we here then? You
25 know, we approve something and now we're here to approve

1 something that we didn't, that we didn't approve.

2 MS. KAUTZ: Because we did the final
3 inspection and we didn't sign off on it because it didn't
4 match, so they are pending a final inspection from us.

5 MR. MENENDEZ: You know, I just don't get it
6 because if we approve something, it's got to be done the
7 way that, you know, we approved it. It was submitted that
8 way and it was approved that way, so why, why wasn't it
9 built that way?

10 MS. KAUTZ: That's not a question for me.

11 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Pollack?

12 MR. POLLACK: What I wanted to say is that
13 during, during the, during the process here, and I believe
14 the university can also step in on this, is that it went
15 through the shop drawing process, and I believe the shop
16 drawings were submitted to, to the city to go through the
17 routing through the city.

18 Simultaneous to that, the contractor was in
19 the process of construction. Because of the, you know,
20 window of opportunity that there's, they basically started
21 the first week of May and they had to be out by the second
22 week of August, so there was a fast track on that system.

23 I believe the shop drawings that were
24 submitted -- I don't know if those shop drawings were ever
25 approved -- did indicate the change in the storefront

1 system due to the NOA issue.

2 MS. KAUTZ: I can ask ElizaBeth to see if she
3 can log on to it. I'm on a different computer right now.
4 I can see if they were approved if you want to wait, you
5 want to hang on.

6 MR. POLLACK: Kara, I think -- I don't think
7 -- they may or may not have been approved, but I do know
8 that it got to you late in the process, if it got to you
9 at all, that's for sure.

10 MR. MENENDEZ: If they weren't approved, why
11 was it built that way? I mean, that's why we have an
12 approval process.

13 MR. POLLACK: Again, again, that sort of not
14 -- it puts me in a difficult situation, but the reality of
15 it is, is that because of the university time frames for
16 construction and the need to hurricane-harden the
17 building, they fast tracked, they fast tracked, they fast
18 tracked the construction and the fabrication and the
19 fabrication of that information, you know, of the shop
20 drawing information. They were working simultaneously at
21 the same time they were in the process of construction.

22 MR. MENENDEZ: No, I understand that. It's
23 really not an excuse though, and the way that, the way
24 that it was submitted and the way that we approved it is
25 much cleaner, as far as I'm concerned.

1 MR. POLLACK: We don't disagree, we don't
2 disagree with that assertion, and I don't -- it was not, I
3 don't think, the intent of anybody, certainly of our
4 office or the university or the contractor to not, to not
5 do that.

6 I think what it became an issue of is simply
7 being able to get an NOA that will meet the requirement.
8 One of the primary missions of the process was, moving
9 forward, was that the key element to this whole renovation
10 was to hurricane-harden the building, so that's I think
11 why we have this situation with the window and the door
12 frame, the reality, the reality of it being what it is.

13 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Albert, I believe
14 Mr. Herran has his hand raised.

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead, Mr. Herran.

16 MR. HERRAN: I was just going to say that the
17 shop drawings were indeed submitted with the change to the
18 window and the door. I think there was a slight issue in
19 terms of the routing and then there was delay in terms of
20 the approval, but the shop drawings did make it to the
21 city with the revision.

22 They were rejected based on the comment they
23 didn't match what was originally approved at the board
24 level.

25 As Matt was mentioning, the university did

1 have a very small window for installation. We only have
2 the opportunity to install when the students are out in
3 the summer, and that's why there was some, a bit of
4 miscommunication in terms of the installation and the
5 change.

6 We are -- we do want to ensure the city that
7 the university is making changes internally to make sure
8 that this does not happen again and that we are
9 instituting a process much like we have with the
10 university's architect's office where they have to stamp
11 any historic building before it goes to the board of
12 architects, so we're instituting a similar process to
13 ensure that that doesn't happen on our end again.

14 We want to make sure that there was, that you
15 understand there was no ill will on our part. It was just
16 a lack of timing and a bit of miscommunication.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Well, there are ways of
18 hardening a building temporarily while this thing is
19 getting straightened out. You know, I just feel that the
20 solution that you had, the original solution, the ones
21 that we approved was the correct one. It was much
22 cleaner.

23 And I just get frustrated in that this isn't
24 the first time, not with the university, but with other
25 projects, that a project will come back to us after we

1 have approved it to approve it after the fact because it
2 was built incorrectly.

3 So it's frustrating on our end when we take
4 all this time to review things, to study things, to
5 comment on things and vote on things, and then things
6 aren't done as we had accorded.

7 So does anybody else have any any comments on
8 this?

9 MS. KAUTZ: I wanted to say Ricardo was
10 correct. My memory, my memory was wrong. It wasn't the
11 final inspection that we rejected it. It was the shop
12 drawings that we rejected which caused us to go visit the
13 site to go see what was installed. He was absolutely
14 right. That was my bad, so.

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Rolando?

16 MR. FULLERTON: Just a question: The fact
17 that you changed it from what was proposed was because of
18 the NOA, a problem with the NOA on the transom, or
19 something else?

20 MR. POLLACK: What occurred is during the
21 shop, during the -- when the delegate engineer was
22 preparing the shop drawings for the subcontractor, he came
23 back and said that, that the system -- you know, the
24 reason we selected this system is because it allowed us to
25 flip the storefront system 180 degrees and still have the

1 NOA and still, and be able to put the louver into the
2 window.

3 And when they did the engineering on that,
4 they came back and said, "Well, we have a problem because
5 the door, the door doesn't have an NOA with that
6 configuration."

7 Now, I don't know, I don't know if they
8 tested it and they didn't pass it, they didn't do it, or
9 they never tested it.

10 My guess is that probably where they probably
11 have the issue is probably on the water intrusion side of
12 that at the threshold, and probably with, in the way we
13 had configured it, the door had to swing out for life
14 safety reasons, and the window had to be flipped the other
15 way, so I think that was one issue.

16 And I think probably the other issue is that
17 the vertical support between the storefront system and the
18 door itself is probably going to have to be beefed up no
19 matter what simply because of what you need in order to
20 meet the wind load on that, on that system.

21 So I think there was a combination of items
22 there. I think there's a question of, you know, of time,
23 and then a question of engineering, and then a question of
24 testing probably, all contributed to this, to the
25 situation we're in right now.

1 MR. FULLERTON: Well, when you turn the whole
2 glazing system around like that, obviously the door cannot
3 be turned around because it has to swing out because of
4 wind requirements and water intrusion, so you couldn't
5 change the door configuration or the framing of it, so
6 that's where you ran into problems and had to make a
7 change.

8 I think switching the light glazing
9 configuration around is not a problem because, well,
10 visually not a problem because you can recess the louvers
11 into the frame nicer in a better way. I agree with that,
12 I agree with that. I just, I don't understand how you
13 could have dropped the ball on the NOA part of it and not
14 come up with a solution that worked out.

15 MR. POLLACK: Because we weren't aware that
16 the window above, the manufacturer didn't make us aware
17 that the window above the door couldn't be flipped. That
18 had to be in the same, that had to be in flush with, with
19 the door, that the door swinging out because it hadn't
20 been tested in that configure -- everything else had been
21 tested in the configuration that we have except the window
22 over the door.

23 MR. FULLERTON: So the window and the door
24 are a single element?

25 MR. POLLACK: I suppose that that's probably

1 how that, how that was tested, but remember, that
2 storefront system doesn't necessarily always have to have
3 a door. The glazing system could be tested either way and
4 always passed, but the door with the transom above it, it
5 was either, it was either not tested in the configuration
6 that we thought it could be put in, which was door
7 swinging out, window flipped the other way, or it didn't
8 pass. That, I don't know.

9 MR. FULLERTON: Is the transom fixed glass
10 like the rest of it?

11 MR. POLLACK: Yes, yes.

12 MR. FULLERTON: I don't understand why the
13 transom --

14 MR. POLLACK: If you look at the picture,
15 there's a little lip on there.

16 MR. FULLERTON: Yeah. I don't understand why
17 the transom configuration would vary from the other
18 transom glass that's on the rest of the storefront, but
19 that's not for me to say. I just thought it's an odd, odd
20 situation, and I've put doors in storefront windows and
21 glazing before and never had a problem with the transom
22 glass.

23 MR. POLLACK: And I think it's just a
24 question of the test, of what was tested by NOA and what
25 didn't. That's, you know, my thoughts on that.

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Garcia-Pons?

2 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Thank you. I actually had
3 the same questions that Mr. Fuller had, so I'm probably
4 going to defer to the 2018 ruling, but is there a
5 possibility, maybe Mr. Pollack can think about a retrofit
6 of the existing structure, is there a possibility maybe,
7 Mr. Herran, of that transom window is the one that also is
8 the one that bothers me the most, if there could be a
9 retrofit of just that panel to make it more like the other
10 windows above, I think that the positioning of the door
11 with the positioning of the louvers will make it fine
12 because they're all going to be pressed up against the
13 front line, but that top window is the one that's going to
14 be out of place.

15 So you know, again, I'm going to vote in
16 deference to the 2018, but I would, I'd be very amenable
17 if the transom of that door panel could be moved, I'd be
18 happy to vote for that as well.

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Miss Rolando?

20 MS. ROLANDO: Yes. Can you tell me what's
21 going on with the louvers? Are you holding off on
22 installing them pending a decision here? I couldn't --
23 I'm not clear what you're doing with the louvers.

24 And by the way, to me what's installed looks
25 so clunky, I think it should have popped out pretty

1 quickly that there was an issue, especially when what was
2 designed was pretty elegant.

3 MR. POLLACK: I want to defer to Ricardo on
4 the status of the louver system. Where we had left it off
5 before the pandemic was that they were in the process of
6 working with someone that manufactured the louvers in the
7 material which would come from I believe --

8 MR. HERRAN: Germany.

9 MR. POLLACK: -- Germany, and I believe that
10 then with COVID-19 and everything, everything has sort of
11 been put on hold so we haven't really been too involved in
12 the louver situation.

13 I would say this, and you know, I think once
14 the louvers are put in, that will change the overall
15 appearance of the system and perhaps not be -- well, it
16 certainly won't have that heavy look, which I agree you
17 have that at the door and over the window. A part of that
18 is just a function of the engineering that is needed, and
19 then part of that is the function of the fact that we
20 couldn't flip that window.

21 So I don't know if it would make more sense,
22 and Ricardo, I defer to you, if we were to come back, you
23 know, defer and come back once we have a louver designed
24 that is acceptable to staff so we can take a look at that
25 to make the system look, to get the system to look as

1 close as it can to what was originally approved back in
2 2018.

3 I don't know if I'm frozen or if everyone
4 else is frozen.

5 MS. ROLANDO: Are the louvers being applied
6 to the exterior?

7 MR. POLLACK: What's happening is that the
8 louver system, what we're manufacturing is a, is, it's
9 going to be -- the louvers that were originally there were
10 operable jalousies.

11 MS. ROLANDO: Right.

12 MR. POLLACK: But instead of having them
13 glass, they had wood, and there was no glass behind those
14 jalousies. There was just a screen.

15 And so when we were at the board two years
16 ago, we designed a fixed louver with a wood -- actually
17 it's not a wood. It's like a, it's wood, but it's a
18 processed wood so that it is very durable, and they were
19 in the process of building mock-ups in order to --

20 MS. ROLANDO: Okay.

21 MR. POLLACK: -- insert that go inside glass
22 so it will really, it will mimic the original intent of
23 the building but have a hurricane, a piece of hurricane
24 glass, excuse me, behind it.

25 So that's what, that's what we were -- you

1 know, that's the next phase which would be like Phase Two
2 A of this or Two B of this project, is to get those, you
3 know, mock-ups made, hopefully get it approved, and then
4 get it fabricated and, fabricated and installed. The
5 installation of those is not something that is necessarily
6 has to wait until the summer simply because it's not
7 very --

8 MS. ROLANDO: It's not disruptive.

9 MR. POLLACK: It will be just decorative at
10 this point.

11 MR. HERRAN: Right, and this is Ricardo
12 again, everybody, and if I may, when we received the
13 approval for the certificate of appropriateness last year
14 in 2019, in January, the directive from the board was to
15 move forward but to work with city staff on the detailing
16 of the louvers, so that's currently where we are now, and
17 that's kind of been put on hold because we wanted to make
18 sure that we came back to you to review this change before
19 we move forward.

20 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Rodriguez?

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have no comment.

22 MR. DURANA: Mr. Durana?

23 MR. DURANA: I'm kind of the opinion that I'd
24 like to see the louvers before we make a decision.

25 I mean, you know, being a contractor, I

1 understand that, you know, these impact windows, there's
2 limited NOAs, you know, with the design.

3 I mean, you can't -- it's not like you can
4 get a craftsman to design this and build it and custom
5 make it the way you want. I mean, they have to have a
6 certain NOA to be approved.

7 So I understand kind of, you know, what
8 happened there above the door. It's unfortunate, but I
9 kind of understand, but I would like to see it with the
10 louvers, you know, to kind of see the overall, you know,
11 aesthetic and see how it compares, you know, to what the
12 proposed elevation was, you know, before we make a
13 decision.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: Miss Bache-Wiig?

15 MS. BACH-WIIG: I agree with Mr. Durana. I
16 would like to see a sample. I think it would be helpful
17 to inform, you know, the board.

18 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Ehrenhaft? You
19 need. You need to unmute yourself.

20 MR. EHRENHAFT: The discussion about the
21 louvers making the odd window somehow more acceptable
22 esthetically makes no sense to me. The louvers are all
23 below that and the transom windows all remain exposed,
24 irregardless.

25 I'd like to know, since they're not sure, how

1 the window configuration with the door was tested, I'd
2 like to know whether they can do a retrofit where the
3 window is either redesigned so that it has the same
4 profile as the remaining windows that are already
5 installed, or whether the one that was flipped can somehow
6 be put in the position that was originally contemplated.

7 So that's, that's all I've got to say, you
8 know, with respect to observations of the city.

9 MR. MENENDEZ. Okay. Any other comments?

10 MR. FULLERTON: I'd like to just say one more
11 comment real quickly.

12 The louvers to me are just an embellishment.
13 I think they're going to be, I think they'll be better
14 than the original submittal in that they will be sunken
15 back into the storefront between the, between the
16 outstanding aluminum verticals.

17 The only problem I have is that window above
18 the door, and like Bruce said, I think that's the only
19 thing I wouldn't -- I'd approve it if they can do
20 something with that transom.

21 And other than that, I think we might be
22 swatting at, you know, mosquitoes. I think it's not that
23 terrible. Anyway, I would say, if we could do it with --
24 they could do something about that transom window and just
25 look for an option to move it to the back side in line and

1 flush with the, with the transom window glass in that same
2 assembly.

3 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Does someone want to
4 put a motion out?

5 MR. VALE: May I make a comment?

6 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead, Mr. Vale.

7 MR. VALE: I think in light of the comments,
8 in light of the comments that we've been receiving, I
9 think that unfortunately I don't have the ability to
10 concur with my colleague, Ricardo, but I see -- okay.

11 I think what we'd like do at this point is to
12 defer this item and to come back. We appreciate your
13 comments very much, and we will look into alternatives
14 that will be acceptable.

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Kara?

16 MS. KAUTZ: That's fine with me. You all
17 need to make a motion to defer the item.

18 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

19 MR. FULLERTON: So moved.

20 MS. KAUTZ: Who was that?

21 MR. FULLERTON: Fullerton.

22 MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have a second?

23 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'll second it.

24 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Garcia-Pons
25 seconded it. Can we have a vote? And the vote is to, the

1 vote is to defer?
2 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Durana?
3 MR. DURANA: Yes.
4 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
5 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
6 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
7 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
8 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Menendez?
9 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
10 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Did somebody
11 answer? Mr. Rodriguez?
12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
13 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Rolando?
14 MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
15 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Fullerton?
16 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
17 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss
18 Bache-Wiig?
19 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
20 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr.
21 Garcia-Pons?
22 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
23 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Did you say
24 yes?
25 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.

1 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Okay, all
2 right, and Miss Spain was had recused herself.

3 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

4 MS. KAUTZ: Not sure. Let me text her and
5 tell her to come. Thank you. The motion is deferred --
6 the item is deferred.

7 MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Vale,
8 Mr. Pollack, Mr. Herran.

9 MR. VALE: Thank you.

10 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. She should be joining
11 in.

12 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Kara, any board items,
13 city commission, city project update?

14 MS. KAUTZ: Now that -- Cesar had requested
15 an update about the S tile versus the true barrel tile
16 discussion that you all had at the last meeting, and I
17 don't know if Gus has anything to update. He wasn't
18 there, but Christina has been --

19 MR. CEBALLOS: It was scheduled for November
20 4th, so we can provide an update on the next meeting.

21 MS. KAUTZ: Right. We're having a meeting
22 with the city attorney's office then.

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

24 MS. KAUTZ: Other than that, I don't have
25 anything for you all except for to let you know that the

1 week, next week, on the 28th, 29th and 30, the National
2 Historic Preservation conference that was intended to be
3 held here in Miami has been, has gone all on a virtual
4 platform, so you can sign up for specific days if you want
5 to join in and listen to any of the conference dates that
6 are there.

7 Their calendar or schedule of events is on
8 line. Just look up National Trust Conference 2020. They
9 have some really great speaker if you want to, if any of
10 you have a couple of hours you want to, you know, drop in.

11 MR. GARCIA-PONS: If you don't mind, can you
12 send us a link to that please?

13 MS. KAUTZ: Sure, I absolutely will,
14 appreciate it.

15 And then the other thing I think just
16 occurred to me, the Fink studio, the bid for the
17 contractor for the renovation and restoration of the Fink
18 studio was approved by the city commission at the last
19 meeting, so hopefully that would be that will be underway
20 by the end of this year, so that's exciting.

21 MS. SPAIN: Nice, really nice. I keep
22 driving by and looking at it.

23 MS. SPAIN: Yes. It will be great, really
24 excited. That's all I have.

25 MR. MENENDEZ: All right. Motion to adjourn?

1 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

2 MR. MENENDEZ: Second?

3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Second.

4 MR. MENENDEZ: All right. We're adjourned.

5 (Thereupon, the meeting was concluded at 6:55 p.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF FLORIDA)
COUNTY OF DADE)

I, DOREEN M. STRAUSS, do here by certify that
the foregoing pages, numbered from 1 to including 123,
represent a true and accurate transcription of the record
of the remote proceedings in the above-mentioned case.

WITNESS my hand in the City of Miami this 16th
day of November, 2020.

Doreen Strauss



Doreen M. Strauss

