

CORAL GABLES HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, September 16, 2010, 4:00 p.m.
City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, Florida

MEMBERS:	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	APPOINTED BY:
Dorothy Thomson	P	P	P	P	P	P	E	P	P	P	P	P	Mayor Donald D. Slesnick, II
Margaret Rolando	P	E	P	P	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Vice Mayor William H. Kerdyk, Jr.
Ernesto Santos	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Comm. Maria Anderson
Venny Torre	P	P	P	P	P	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	Comm. Rafael "Ralph" Cabrera, Jr.
Dolly MacIntyre	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Comm. Wayne "Chip" Withers
Richard Heisenbottle	P	P	P	P	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Historic Preservation Board
Deborah Tackett*						P	P	P	P	P	P	P	City Manager
Gay Bondurant	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	E	P	E	E	City Commission
Judy Pruitt*									P	E	P		City Commission

STAFF:

Kara Kautz, Historic Resources Officer
 Simone Chin, Historic Preservation Administrator
 Betty Perez, Administrative Assistant

A = Absent
P = Present
E = Excused
*** = New Member**
^ = Resigned Member

RECORDING SECRETARY/PREPARATION OF MINUTES: Nancy C. Morgan, Coral Gables Services, Inc.

GUESTS: Dona Spain, Maria C. Rodriguez, Dyanne Feinberg Henkel, William Gonzalez, Irma M. Abella, Andrea Askowitz, Ana Paula Ibarra, Barbara Stein, Ivan Rodriguez, Marisol Olivero, Rafael B. Gomez, B.J. Batchelder, Arva Parks, Carie Penabad, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, Jorge Hernandez, Alex Hernandez, Janet Gavarrete

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

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT and DISCLOSURE OF CONTEXT:

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

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

Mr. Santos made a motion to excuse the meeting absence of Ms. Bondurant. Mr. Heisenbottle seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by voice vote.

MINUTES: MEETING OF AUGUST 19, 2010:

Mr. Heisenbottle made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 19, 2010 meeting. Mr. Santos seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by voice vote.

DEFERRALS: None.

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

SPECIAL CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2010-11: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at **508 Caligula Avenue**, a contributing structure within the “French Country Village Historic District,” legally described as Lot 9 and 10, Block 125, Coral Gables Riviera Section Part Ten, as recorded in Plat Book 31, Page 1, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant is requesting design approval for the construction of an addition and alterations.

Ms. Kautz displayed property photographs and reviewed history, additions, alterations and the current application.

Homeowner Andrea Askowitz and Architect Ana Paula Ibarra explained application details, how the addition and alterations would accommodate their needs, and about proposed elements that differed from the original.

Ms. Kautz discussed the proposed garage window design (the architect assured they would be casement), adding that two issues would be addressed by Zoning: raising the garage floor height and removing a door between the kitchen and a service area as the wall is exterior. Errors need correction and an unspecified stainless steel and copper water feature would require a separate COA. She added that the proposed garage windows placed too much emphasis on the garage and appeared as living space. Ms. Ibarra said windows were designed that way to match the windows in proportion and size that would face the inside of the driveway court.

Ms. MacIntyre invited audience members to comment. Hearing no requests, she closed the public hearing.

Board/Staff comments/Applicant responses:

- Board/Staff: Simplify proposed garage windows; consider grouping small windows side by side instead of the proposed design to add the homeowner-desired interior light. A garage of this era would not have had living room-type windows and the proposed windows would not be a correct type for this house.
- Applicant: Accepted grouping of three side-by-side windows in the garage to move application forward.

Mr. Torre made a motion to approve the proposed design for 508 Caligula Avenue using three “Type D,” side-by-side windows on the garage wall and complying with all other staff recommendations as presented in the staff report. Ms. Rolando seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Heisenbottle, Ms. Pruitt, Ms. Tackett, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2010-13: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at **700 Alhambra Circle**, a contributing property within the “Alhambra Circle Historic District,” legally described as Lots 16, 17, and 18, Block 23, Coral Gables Section “B,” as recorded in Plat Book 5, Page 111, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant is requesting design approval for the construction of an addition and alterations to the existing structure.

Ms. Kautz reviewed the property’s history during a photographic presentation, stating that the Board of Architects (BOA) reviewed the proposal on July 2, 2010. No variances were requested.

General Contractor Rafael Gomez introduced himself, architect George Peon’s associate, Marisol Olivero, and homeowner BJ Batchelder. Referencing staff observations regarding various elements of the design, Mr. Gomez and Ms. Olivero proposed revisions to address staff comments.

Ms. Kautz stated that vegetation and landscaping did not preclude good design and said the new addition needed to be subservient to the existing house, pointing out that the addition could be moved back without disturbing other property areas. Mr. Gomez disputed staff issues, and disagreed with moving the addition back.

Ms. MacIntyre invited other audience members to speak to the issue. Hearing no requests, she closed the public hearing.

Board comments:

- West elevation windows are disproportionately small and fenestration appears “off” for the size of the proposed addition. Window design is taller than appropriate.
- The addition is too heavy handed and out of scale with the main house, and should be lowered.
- Based on the lot size, the addition is not overly large, but the issue is massing.
- The flat roof and height of the addition results in a cube-like design and does not blend with the house.

Debate of issues continued. Deferral was discussed as an opportunity for the architect to create an alternative design to address the discussed design and features.

Ms. Rolando made a motion to defer the application for design approval for an addition to the residence at 700 Alhambra Circle to the next Board meeting to give the architect an opportunity to create an alternative design. Ms. Tackett seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Pruitt, Ms. Tackett, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Mr. Heisenbottle, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2010-14: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the properties at **620 Alhambra Circle**, a non-contributing property within the “Alhambra Circle Historic District,” legally described as Lot 1, Block 21, Coral Gables Section “B,” as recorded in Plat Book 5, Page 111, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant is requesting design approval for the installation of an in-ground hot tub adjacent to an existing swimming pool. A variance has also been requested to allow a swimming pool / spa closer to the front or side street than the primary structure.

Ms. Kautz reviewed the history of the house and application, displayed photographs, said the variance request was the basis for the application and concluded that staff recommended approval of the variance because of the peculiar site design.

Homeowner Dyanne Feinberg Henkel spoke briefly, after which the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Tackett made a motion to approve the design as proposed for the in-ground hot tub adjacent to the existing swimming pool located at 620 Alhambra Circle. Mr. Santos seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Pruitt, Ms. Tackett, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Mr. Heisenbottle, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

Ms. Tackett made a motion to approve the variance to allow a swimming pool / spa closer to the front or side street than the primary structure. Mr. Santos seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Tackett, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Mr. Heisenbottle, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2010-15: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the **Miracle Theater**, located at **280 Miracle Mile** (also known as 280 Coral Way), a local historic landmark. A lengthy legal

description is on file in the Historic Preservation Office. The applicant is requesting design approval for the replacement of a terrazzo band and the installation of stainless steel lettering.

Ms. Kautz reviewed the application to replace the outermost terrazzo band at the entry of the theater as it shows significant deterioration where the band meets the concrete sidewalk/tile, and to install steel lettering within the band. Staff agreed with the need to replace the entire outer band because of the inability to exactly match the existing color; however, Ms. Kautz said the replacement band needed to closely match existing terrazzo in both color and aggregate. A sample was required for approval by staff and the City Architect prior to installation. Additionally, Ms. Kautz said the word "local" should replace "designated" in signage, so lettering would read: "1995 City of Coral Gables Local Historic Landmark." With these conditions, staff recommended approval of the issuance of the COA.

Actors' Playhouse Executive Director Barbara Stein also requested that the words "Miracle Theater" be included in the theater's signage as it did in the original drawings, with modern signage reading "Wometco Enterprises Movie Palace – Miracle Theater". She said that all work should be completed prior to the season opening on October 4, 2010.

Ms. MacIntyre invited others to speak. Hearing no requests, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Thomson stated her membership without remuneration on the board of directors of the Theater, adding that this service would not affect her opinion about the application. There followed a brief discussion about color and the importance of matching the color as closely as possible to the original.

Mr. Heisenbottle made a motion to approve the application, subject to staff recommendations, for the replacement of the terrazzo band, the installation of the lettering, and the modification of signage. Ms. Pruitt seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Tackett, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Mr. Heisenbottle, Ms. Pruitt, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

LOCAL HISTORIC DESIGNATION:

CASE FILE LHD 2010-04: Consideration of the local historic designation of the buildings currently on the University of Miami Main Campus (5665 Ponce de Leon Boulevard) referred to as **Architecture Building #48** located at **1217 Dickinson Drive**, and **Architecture Building #49** located at **1223 Dickinson Drive**, legally described as all of the "Architecture South" building and all of the "Architecture North" building as now existing, laid out and in use, the same being a portion of Tract 1 of Amended Plat Portion of Main Campus University of Miami, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 46 at Page 81 of the Public Records of Dade County (now Miami-Dade County), Florida.

Mr. Heisenbottle recused himself from consideration of this application as his firm consulted to the owner on this subject.

Ms. Kautz advised that the proposed designation of University of Miami campus buildings #48 and #49 would be considered first, after which significance requests for other campus buildings would be heard. She reported that the second request for significance determination of ten additional buildings was amended by the university to consider designating buildings #48 and #49 at this meeting, consider designating two of the other ten structures at a later meeting, and consider the significance of the remaining eight buildings at this meeting.

Ms. Kautz described the history of buildings #48 and #49, displayed photographs and drawings and relayed information about the architecture and architects. She stated staff's recommendation to approve designation of the two buildings.

Janet Gavarrete, U.M. Associate Vice President of Planning, advised that from the time of the designation application's submittal, buildings #34 and #35 were added. As the entire group of buildings would be discussed, she pointed out experts present to address issues, including Arva Parks, Carie Penabad, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, Jorge Hernandez and Ivan Rodriguez.

Ms. MacIntyre invited other audience members to speak to the application. Hearing no requests to speak at this time, Ms. MacIntyre closed the public hearing.

Ms. Tackett expressed appreciation to staff for the comprehensive report and to the applicant for bringing the application forward.

Ms. Tackett made a motion to approve the local historic designation of the University of Miami's architecture buildings #48 and #49. Ms. Thomson seconded the motion.

Ms. Pruitt recommended that plaques describing the importance of the buildings be installed.

Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Pruitt, Ms. Tackett, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE DETERMINATIONS:

Ms. Kautz explained that the remaining buildings were submitted for further determination of historic significance, meaning that the buildings met minimum criteria for designation. The University was requesting to, over time, demolish these buildings as appropriate. She advised the Board that they should either find the buildings significant, not significant or not sufficiently significant to warrant preserving them.

Thereafter, Ms. Kautz relayed that ten buildings on the U.M. campus were considered part of the initial request for consideration:

- the Hughes/Guidance Center Building #21, 5600 Merrick Drive;
- the Brunstetter Building #22, 5616 Merrick Drive;
- the Grosvenor Building #23, 5638 Merrick Drive;
- the Pentland Building #34B, 1238 Dickinson Drive;
- the La Gorce Building #35, 1228 Dickenson Drive;
- the Foster Building #36, 1216 Dickinson Drive;
- the Rhodes Building #37, 1204 Dickinson Drive;
- the Railey Building #41, 1203 Walsh Avenue;
- the Smith Building #42, 1213 Walsh Avenue;
- the Allen Building #43, 1221 Walsh Avenue.

Of the ten structures named above (those that remain of the original 27 apartment buildings), the Pentland Building #34B and the La Gorce Building #35 were being submitted for designation as local historic landmarks rather than determination of significance, and would be considered at another meeting. The remaining eight buildings were to be addressed at this meeting. Photographs of each of the buildings were shown as each individual building's typologies, uses and history were relayed.

A letter from former Board member Joyce Meyers was distributed to the Board, containing Ms. Meyers thoughts on the issue that the "proposal to designate and permanently preserve four of the Marian Manley buildings is a reasonable compromise to interpret that piece of history," and her recommendation that the Board "adopt a motion similar to the one . . . approved for the wood frame buildings on the north side of the campus" to "designate the four buildings recommended by the University and to deem the remaining buildings in the collection to be significant, but not so significant as to require designation."

Ivan Rodriguez, representing the University as an architecture and historic services consultant, described the presentation as part of the University's work to develop a strategy to identify and preserve significant historical resources throughout the campus. He described buildings #21, 22, 23, 36, 37, 41, 42 and 43 and presented them for a recommended

determination of no historical significance, stating that these eight buildings repeated the three architectural typologies, required considerable maintenance and repair and some were not occupied any longer. The determination of no significance, he continued, would allow the university to remove these buildings in their need to grow the campus and implement the master plan.

There followed supportive commentary from Ms. Gavarrete, Ms. Parks, Ms. Plater-Zyberk, Carie Penabad and Jorge Hernandez. There being no further requests for public comment, Ms. MacIntyre closed the public hearing.

Lengthy Board discussion examined all issues related to the buildings, the university's plans and the fact that all the buildings in the original group were well represented by preservation of buildings #48, #49, #34B and #35.

The **University of Miami "Hughes/Guidance Center Building #21,"** located at **5600 Merrick Drive**, legally described as all of the "Guidance Center Building 21" as now existing, laid out and in use, the same being a portion of Tract 6 of Amended Plat Portion of Main Campus University of Miami, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 46 at Page 81 of the Public Records of Dade County (now Miami-Dade County), Florida.

Ms. Tackett made a motion recognizing the importance of the assembly of the four preserved buildings (Architecture Building #48, Architecture Building #49, Pentland Building #34B and La Gorce Building #35). The Hughes/Guidance Center Building #21 is not individually significant as it is represented within the assembly of preserved buildings; therefore, demolition by the University of Miami, at its discretion, of this individual building will be allowed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Santos.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Pruitt, Ms. Tackett, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

The **University of Miami "Brunstetter Building #22,"** located at **5616 Merrick Drive**, legally described as all of the "Apartment Building 22 (Brunstetter)" as now existing, laid out and in use, the same being a portion of Tract 6 of Amended Plat Portion of Main Campus University of Miami, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 46 at Page 81 of the Public Records of Dade County (now Miami-Dade County), Florida.

Mr. Torre made a motion recognizing the importance of the assembly of the four preserved buildings (Architecture Building #48, Architecture Building #49, Pentland Building #34B and La Gorce Building #35). The Brunstetter Building #22 is not individually significant as it is represented within the assembly of preserved buildings; therefore, demolition by the University of Miami, at its discretion, of this individual building will be allowed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Thomson.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Thomson, Ms. Pruitt, Ms. Tackett, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

The **University of Miami "Grosvenor Building #23,"** located at **5638 Merrick Drive**, legally described as all of the "Apartment Building 23 (Grosvenor)" as now existing, laid out and in use, the same being a portion of Tract 6 of Amended Plat Portion of Main Campus University of Miami, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 46 at Page 81 of the Public Records of Dade County (now Miami-Dade County), Florida.

Ms. Rolando made a motion recognizing the importance of the assembly of the four preserved buildings (Architecture Building #48, Architecture Building #49, Pentland Building #34B and La Gorce Building #35). The Grosvenor Building #23 is not individually significant as it is represented within the assembly of preserved buildings; therefore, demolition by the University of Miami, at its discretion, of this individual building will be allowed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Santos.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Pruitt, Ms. Tackett, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

The University of Miami “**Foster Building #36,**” located at **1216 Dickinson Drive**, legally described as all of the “Apartment Building 36 (Foster)” as now existing, laid out and in use, the same being a portion of Tract 5 of Amended Plat Portion of Main Campus University of Miami, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 46 at Page 81 of the Public Records of Dade County (now Miami–Dade County), Florida.

Mr. Santos made a motion recognizing the importance of the assembly of the four preserved buildings (Architecture Building #48, Architecture Building #49, Pentland Building #34B and La Gorce Building #35). The Foster Building #36 is not individually significant as it is represented within the assembly of preserved buildings; therefore, demolition by the University of Miami, at its discretion, of this individual building will be allowed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Tackett.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Pruitt, Ms. Tackett, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

The University of Miami “**Rhodes Building #37,**” located at **1204 Dickinson Drive**, legally described as all of the “Rhodes House Building 37” as now existing, laid out and in use, the same being a portion of Tract 5 of Amended Plat Portion of Main Campus University of Miami, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 46 at Page 81 of the Public Records of Dade County (now Miami–Dade County), Florida.

Ms. Rolando made a motion recognizing the importance of the assembly of the four preserved buildings (Architecture Building #48, Architecture Building #49, Pentland Building #34B and La Gorce Building #35). The Rhodes Building #37 is not individually significant as it is represented within the assembly of preserved buildings; therefore, demolition by the University of Miami, at its discretion, of this individual building will be allowed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Pruitt.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Tackett, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Pruitt, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

The University of Miami “**Railey Building #41,**” located at **1203 Walsh Avenue**, legally described as all of the “Apartment Building 41 (Railey)” as now existing, laid out and in use, the same being a portion of Tract 5 of Amended Plat Portion of Main Campus University of Miami, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 46 at Page 81 of the Public Records of Dade County (now Miami–Dade County), Florida.

Mr. Torre made a motion recognizing the importance of the assembly of the four preserved buildings (Architecture Building #48, Architecture Building #49, Pentland Building #34B and La Gorce Building #35). The Railey Building #41 is not individually significant as it is represented within the assembly of preserved buildings; therefore, demolition by the University of Miami, at its discretion, of this individual building will be allowed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Thomson.

Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Pruitt, Ms. Tackett, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

The University of Miami “**Smith Building #42,**” located at **1213 Walsh Avenue**, legally described as all of the “Apartment Building 42 (Smith)” as now existing, laid out and in use, the same being a portion of Tract 5 of Amended Plat Portion of Main Campus University of Miami, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 46 at Page 81 of the Public Records of Dade County (now Miami–Dade County), Florida.

Ms. Thomson made a motion recognizing the importance of the assembly of the four preserved buildings (Architecture Building #48, Architecture Building #49, Pentland Building #34B and La Gorce Building #35). The Smith Building #42 is not individually significant as it is represented within the assembly of

preserved buildings; therefore, demolition by the University of Miami, at its discretion, of this individual building will be allowed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Tackett.

Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Santos, Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Pruitt, Ms. Tackett, Mr. Torre, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

The **University of Miami “Allen Building #43,”** located at **1221 Walsh Avenue**, legally described as all of the “Apartment Building 43 (Allen)” as now existing, laid out and in use, the same being a portion of Tract 5 of Amended Plat Portion of Main Campus University of Miami, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 46 at Page 81 of the Public Records of Dade County (now Miami–Dade County), Florida.

Ms. Tackett made a motion recognizing the importance of the assembly of the four preserved buildings (Architecture Building #48, Architecture Building #49, Pentland Building #34B and La Gorce Building #35). The Allen Building #43 is not individually significant as it is represented within the assembly of preserved buildings; therefore, demolition by the University of Miami, at its discretion, of this individual building will be allowed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Santos.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Rolando, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Pruitt, Ms. Tackett, Mr. Torre, Mr. Santos, Ms. MacIntyre. Nays: None.

BOARD ITEMS / CITY COMMISSION / CITY PROJECTS UPDATE:

1044 Coral Way: Ms. Kautz reported that the City Commission remanded matters pertaining to 1044 Coral Way back to the Board on a legal technicality. The City Attorney recommended that the item be dismissed for res judicata, so the Commission decided the appropriate place for dismissal of the case would be at the Board level. The City Attorney will provide a memorandum about the matter and will be asked attend the next Board meeting.

Next Board Meeting: Thursday, October 21, 2010, 4:00 p.m.: Ms. Thomson and Ms. MacIntyre will be out of town for the October meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kara N. Kautz
Historic Preservation Officer