

1 1044 CORAL WAY

2 JANUARY 17, 2013

3 *****

4 MS. SPAIN: I'm sorry. I have a request to
5 take 1044 Coral Way in front of this next one.

6 MS. TACKETT: I think we should go back to the
7 regular order.

8 MR. LEEN: The reason is that 1044 Coral Way
9 is a special -- I'm sorry. 1044 Coral Way was
10 something that came before the city commission by
11 settlement, so they have everyone here now to
12 present to the historic preservation board. You'll
13 be recommending to the city commission. It's just
14 important that it be done today because then they
15 would get into the next -- if there's any
16 instructions or --

17 MS. TACKETT: I don't think there's a problem
18 getting to it. Do they have scheduling conflicts?

19 MR. LEEN: I don't know. Their Counsel --
20 Mr. Kuvin, do you have any issue with waiting? It
21 could be an hour or an hour and a half, depending
22 on how long -- this should be a long matter, this
23 next one, because Mr. Pinon has a fair amount of
24 evidence he wants to present.

25 MR. KUVIN: My clients are on their way. I

1 don't know why they're not here --

2 MR. LEEN: They were outside.

3 MS. THOMSON: My feeling on it, Madam
4 Chairman, is that the Minorca one is going to take
5 an inordinate amount of time from past experience
6 and I don't have any problem with Mr. Kuvin
7 presenting his case at this point.

8 MS. TACKETT: Is the applicant for Minorca
9 Avenue okay with this?

10 MS. THOMSON: It's up to you.

11 MR. LEEN: Are you okay with them going before
12 you?

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

14 MR. LEEN: Yes.

15 MS. TACKETT: Okay. Then we will take --
16 let's see, we are moving to the historic
17 preservation board review of the proposed residence
18 for the property located at 1044 Coral Way for a
19 recommendation to the Coral Gables City Commission.

20 MR. LEEN: And, Dona, if I may.

21 MS. SPAIN: Sure.

22 MR. LEEN: I just wanted to explain the legal
23 aspects of this issue because this is unique. This
24 hasn't happened before as far as I know. But
25 the -- what happened here is that the city

1 commission de-designated this property with
2 conditions.

3 One of the conditions being that the property
4 come back before the historic preservation board
5 for you to give recommendations to the commission
6 regarding the design of the building. It's already
7 gone to the board of architects who have
8 recommended approval with certain conditions,
9 slash, comments.

10 Now it's coming to you. Your comments will be
11 put together and provided to the city commission,
12 who will make the final decision regarding whether
13 to approve this design or not. It was done as a
14 settlement, and so -- and the commission approved
15 that by resolution, and I believe a draft of the
16 resolution was provided to you in your packets.

17 MS. SPAIN: Okay. This has been to the board
18 of architects and they are recommending approval
19 based on the following comments: The first one is
20 to coordinate the window openings and proportions.
21 The second one is to review the balcony bracket
22 size, proportion, spacing scale and consider adding
23 columns.

24 That is in this location here. Considering
25 adding brackets on the bottom and columns. The

1 entry columns to minimize grout joints or use butt
2 joints on the entry columns and to show the roof
3 pitches.

4 And the only thing that I would add to that
5 is if the architect is here now to explain -- if
6 you look at this elevation the dormer window --
7 there's a line on the roof, and the dormer window
8 comes right down to that line, and it stays with
9 the volume of the roof. If you look at that on the
10 side elevation, the bottom of the dormer is up from
11 that line, and the top of the dormer is above the
12 volume of the roof, so if he could just explain,
13 which he's going to do because they don't match.

14 And that, and I had a call from Venny Torre
15 about the wall. There is in fact a wall on the
16 site plans. There's no evaluation. There is a
17 note saying 36 high CMU wall with 24-inch high
18 ornamental aluminum fencing above. That wasn't
19 discussed at the board of architects. I'm not sure
20 about approving something that we don't have an
21 elevation for, you know, recommending approval to
22 the commission, but that's up to you. I'm going to
23 sit down and let Mr. Kuvin take over.

24 MS. TACKETT: Dona, wasn't there an existing
25 coral rock wall on the site?

1 MS. SPAIN: I don't think so. I don't believe
2 so.

3 MR. TORRE: No.

4 MS. TACKETT: Empty okay.

5 MS. SPAIN: I don't believe so. I think it's
6 a totally empty lot.

7 MR. LEEN: Dona, did you mention the historic
8 marker?

9 MS. SPAIN: There is a historic marker and I
10 have in your packet a recommended language. I'm
11 happy to go over that now or we can wait till after
12 you discuss the design.

13 MS. ROLANDO: I thought that we had had some
14 discussion too about incorporating the materials
15 that were left over as part of --

16 MS. SPAIN: No. That's not part of the
17 settlement.

18 MS. ROLANDO: Okay.

19 MR. KUVIN: The architect is here, so I'd like
20 to present him and you can ask him whatever
21 questions you have, and he is more intimate with
22 these drawings than I am.

23 MR. REARDON: Good afternoon. I could go
24 through the board of --

25 MS. TACKETT: Can you state your name and

1 address.

2 MR. REARDON: My name is Mark Reardon at 15790
3 Southwest 88th Avenue, Palmetto Bay, Florida.

4 And if you'd like, I can go through the board
5 of architect comments and point out exactly what
6 they meant with the comments, if that helps.

7 MR. SILVA: I'm pretty clear. But my question
8 is actually, Dona, I guess if you can clarify that.

9 MR. REARDON: This is a picture handout of the
10 dormer window of the house that was there.

11 THE CLERK: You need to speak into the
12 microphone, please.

13 MR. REARDON: This is a picture of the dormer
14 window of the house that was there that was
15 demolished. And this dormer that's designed is
16 very similar to this. If you like, I can pass it
17 out to the board.

18 MR. SILVA: No. No. So the intent is to
19 follow the front elevation, not the side?

20 MR. REARDON: Yes. Which you can see the
21 dormer window starts where the roof pitch changes
22 which is what that front elevation shows.

23 MS. SPAIN: Right. And actually what you're
24 looking at here is not this roof. You're looking
25 at it's a projection. It's projecting out, so you

1 don't see the roof tied into the wall.

2 MR. TORRE: Can I ask a question real quick to
3 clarify our instructions and our -- obviously,
4 we're not looking at a historical house. We're
5 looking at a -- I'll call it a new house that maybe
6 has some similarities. What are our instructions
7 as it relates to our review of this? Are we trying
8 to keep something that simulates the house? Does
9 it have some resemblance? Does it have some
10 historical -- what are we having here as the
11 instructions?

12 MS. SPAIN: There's no requirement to keep
13 anything of the original home that was there. This
14 is a new residence.

15 MR. TORRE: But is this like a second DOA of
16 sorts?

17 MS. SPAIN: Of sorts.

18 MR. LEEN: In a sense. There are other
19 historic properties on the street. You're looking
20 for, I wouldn't say consistency, but compatibility
21 with the other houses on the street. You're not
22 substituting for the board of architects, although
23 you could agree with their comments or not, but
24 that's your expertise.

25 MR. TORRE: Thank you.

1 MS. TACKETT: Okay. Is there anyone else in
2 the audience that wishes to speak on this item?

3 Okay. If not, we will close the public
4 hearing and open it up to board comments.

5 MS. MACINTYRE: I'd like to make a comment.

6 MS. TACKETT: Yes.

7 MS. MACINTYRE: Yes, we are looking for a
8 compatible addition to Coral Way, which is one of
9 the most beautiful streets in the United States of
10 America. I feel like this has been a long exercise
11 in futility. The fact that this property went
12 through this whole process of being de-designated,
13 the end result is no different than if the
14 designation had been left in place, because as I
15 recall, we had approved plans or would approve
16 plans of a compatible structure on the site with
17 this historic designation for the property, and
18 unless I'm misunderstanding the past, it seems to
19 me like there's been an awful lot of wasted effort
20 to get to the same place.

21 MS. TACKETT: Thank you.

22 Any other board comments?

23 MS. THOMSON: Where is the historic marker
24 going to be being placed? I think that was a very
25 important part of at least we have something to

1 designate that it was historic --

2 MR. LEEN: And, Ms. Thomson, that was your
3 suggestion very many years ago, I think.

4 MS. THOMSON: Yes. Thank you.

5 MS. SPAIN: My view on that is that it should
6 be in the swale. I believe, and you all can
7 disagree, but I think that any historic marker
8 should be in the swale because if the City's
9 maintaining these markers, it needs to be on City
10 property, and we can't enter on to someone's
11 property to maintain it, so for me the most
12 sensible place is to be in the swale. That's my
13 recommendation.

14 MS. THOMSON: Well, there's already a
15 precedent of course as we know on private property,
16 with the of the owners of the property, right?

17 MS. SPAIN: Yes. And actually I wanted that
18 to be moved out to the swale, so that didn't
19 happen. Because, again, we haven't been able to
20 maintain that marker. That's on Alhambra, I
21 believe, the Roxy Bolton house.

22 MR. LEEN: If I may, I would -- if you decide
23 to put it or the commission decides with your
24 recommendation to put it on a private property as a
25 condition I would recommend that there be an

1 easement of some sort provided to the City.

2 MS. SPAIN: We can do that so we can enter the
3 property to maintain it. I just need to have it
4 maintained.

5 MS. THOMSON: How difficult is it to establish
6 an easement? And that's a whole new other process,
7 isn't it?

8 MR. LEEN: No. I think as long as they're
9 agreeable to it, it's not hard at all. We can just
10 draft it. If they don't agree, then the commission
11 would have to decide and I would have to look at
12 whether that's an appropriate condition or not.

13 MS. ROLANDO: What's the problem with putting
14 it on the swale?

15 MR. LEEN: No problem at all. I'm just saying
16 that if you did put it on private property.

17 MS. THOMSON: Well, one problem may be that it
18 has something of the swale area and it's the City's
19 responsibility if a car goes smashing into it on
20 Coral Way.

21 MS. SPAIN: You also need to recommend on the
22 wording of the plaque, but why don't you take the
23 design first and then we can discuss the plaque.

24 MR. TORRE: One question for the architect or
25 maybe a few.

1 MR. REARDON: Yes.

2 MR. TORRE: Your elevations show one facade
3 with smooth stucco and then I see another facade
4 with the textured stucco.

5 MR. REARDON: It's textured stucco. Textured
6 stucco.

7 MR. TORRE: My couple comments are, the roof,
8 barrel tile roof? What are we looking for? What
9 are you proposing?

10 MR. REARDON: It is a barrel tile roof;
11 cement, not clay.

12 MR. TORRE: Okay. I'm going to tell you my
13 opinion just to have a real barrel tile clay on
14 this roof, that's No. 1.

15 The windows seem to be a little simplistic and
16 maybe at some point could look a little modern
17 because they're so plain. There's no muntins on
18 them when you get to elevation -- on the east side.
19 They become quite large and pretty expansive. Same
20 thing with the south elevation. Is there a reason
21 for not putting muntins?

22 MR. REARDON: That's what the owner likes, so
23 we went through that with the board back and forth,
24 but in the end we had the muntins on the doors and
25 not the windows.

1 MR. TORRE: Okay. Again, I'm just one person
2 here, but my opinion would be to put some kind of
3 detail muntins design on those windows to try to
4 take away some of the modernity of this house away.
5 Those are my first initial comments. I would like
6 to hear what else the board has to say. Do you
7 have anything else?

8 MS. TACKETT: I'll comment. I'm actually -- I
9 don't know. This is a difficult issue when you're
10 kind of being so literal in almost reconstructing a
11 historic property. I would have rather have seen
12 just a new house, because the -- with scale and
13 massing maybe that was similar to the historic home
14 that was demolished, you know, but since they are
15 so literally recalling it, I agree with Venny that
16 at least on the portion that's recalling the
17 historic house that those windows should be
18 detailed more historically accurate. The two-story
19 structure behind it, you know, I'm not really happy
20 with the design direction overall, so I don't want
21 to start from scratch here.

22 My only comment at this point, because I'm
23 probably in the minority, but I'm not that excited
24 about the overall development of the architecture
25 at all. But my only comment I guess would be to

1 get a more historically accurate window type on the
2 bungalow portion of the project and then leave the
3 two-story more simple, simple and modern in terms
4 of the window types so that there's some sort of
5 differentiation. And that's my only comment.

6 Any other board members' comments?

7 MR. TORRE: Debby, the issue that you're
8 saying that the front should be resembling
9 something that was there as opposed to not --

10 MS. TACKETT: Well, I mean, it is already. I
11 mean, they've designed it already very much
12 resembling what was there before, so I think if
13 they're going to be so literal, then they should go
14 even a little bit further and have the muntin grids
15 and the -- that would have been more historically
16 accurate.

17 MR. SILVA: I would agree normally, Debby, but
18 I would be concerned that we're just confusing the
19 issue even more.

20 MS. TACKETT: It's already a confusing site
21 because they're trying to recreate something that's
22 gone, and you're never going to get it --

23 MR. TORRE: The way I look at it, it's a big
24 house. If you keep this house really large,
25 simplistic, meaning modern concrete roof tile and

1 you keep the windows modern, it's going to look
2 like this big ranch house from someplace else. So
3 if you keep it some form -- keep it more quaint,
4 something to bring it down to earth, again, texture
5 stucco to a high degree, not just a light texture,
6 somewhat of a heavy, the barrel tile. Once it
7 starts to age it could look like a little bit more
8 of a sympathetic house in my eyes, including the
9 muntins.

10 MS. ROLANDO: Again, I'm just one voice. I
11 agree with Venny Torre's comments on the barrel
12 tile roof. I don't have as many problems with the
13 massing as some of the other members do, but I
14 think the windows are a mess. All -- you know,
15 just the fenestration is so confused. It's in all
16 different directions. I think that the approach
17 needs to be more traditional, and I would do it --
18 maintain a consistency with appearance with the
19 fenestration throughout the perimeter of the home.

20 I -- you know, that's my thoughts on it, and
21 that's the direction that I would propose that this
22 board move in.

23 MR. TORRE: I second that.

24 MS. THOMSON: What are you all saying now?
25 You think it should be restructured now?

1 MS. ROLANDO: That the plans should be
2 modified such that they -- roof tiles would be true
3 barrel roof tiles, that the windows have muntins
4 and be consistent throughout the exterior.

5 MS. TACKETT: Consistent in what way? Size?

6 MS. ROLANDO: The size of the muntins and that
7 there be muntins. Because without any muntins at
8 all it comes across as --

9 MS. TACKETT: Suburban tract home.

10 MR. TORRE: Modern house --

11 MS. ROLANDO: Modern house, yeah. So it seems
12 to me to pick up on the concept of some
13 consistency, some -- excuse me -- compatibility
14 with the street scape of the, -- you know, the
15 other homes that we need to have more sympathetic
16 windows.

17 I think you did a good job on the doors. I
18 like the doors.

19 And to me what's particularly jarring about
20 the plans is that you have these very contemporary
21 windows and window sizing and massing, and yet
22 these traditional and quite complementary doors.

23 MS. TACKETT: That's a good point.

24 MS. THOMSON: All in all it looks like to me
25 they've done a marvelous job. I'm not an architect

1 so I would have to defer to your comments. But the
2 fact of the matter having that structure, my eye
3 goes to that main structure as reminiscent to me of
4 the original structure, the original home, and I
5 think they did a very good job.

6 And given all the problems we had with it, I
7 don't know how much better -- and agree, Peggy,
8 about your comments about the windows and muntins
9 and so forth, to me would probably be simply
10 rectified. But overall the architectural rendering
11 here is wonderful. You've done a wonderful job in
12 my humble explanation.

13 MR. KUVIN: I'd just like to point out that
14 some of the houses surrounding this particular one,
15 if you compare it to the house directly next door,
16 I would agree with what Ms. Rolando says 100
17 percent.

18 However, it's not a historical property
19 anymore, and it's not a historical building. We
20 always have to take into account that the Toyos
21 have a very large family. They have, what is it,
22 four children living in the home? They have five
23 children, so I think we also have to take that into
24 account as to the size of the structure. They do
25 own the property. I think that across the

1 street -- and think that Ms. MacIntyre pointed this
2 out on numerous occasions, that she didn't want to
3 see another McMansion in the neighborhood. Across
4 the street we have two McMansions right there on
5 Coral Way. The house --

6 MS. MACINTYRE: I've looked for those
7 McMansions and they don't stand out to me at least.
8 I'll say that.

9 MS. TACKETT: Because they're in scale.

10 MR. KUVIN: I would agree with you. I think
11 the way that they're built though with very limited
12 amount of foliage in the front, trees, the open
13 driveways, that type of thing. With a big house
14 that kind of just stands right there. And they are
15 very modern. They were built probably at least in
16 my summation in the last 20 years.

17 Next door to the house we also have a
18 contemporary house, a one-story with a circular
19 driveway in front of it, reminiscent of the 1950s
20 type, 1960s type of architecture in South Florida
21 without a barrel roof whatsoever.

22 MR. TORRE: The problem is this house has been
23 designed by start using a guideline of a house from
24 the 1920s. That is the style we're going with, so
25 I think to try to get anything else but that style

1 in here is contradictory to what should be done.
2 So if we start with that nucleus for that first
3 structure the rest should be in context, and the
4 windows to me are just what ties it all together.

5 MR. KUVIN: I'm not trying to disagree with
6 everybody, because obviously it's all subjective.
7 However, what I am just trying to point out is that
8 there are other houses in the neighborhood and I
9 think this strikes a very -- I mean, my own
10 personal opinion, I think it strikes a very
11 moderate view and fits into the neighborhood. It's
12 not all the way in one direction. It's not all the
13 way in another direction and it kind of fits what
14 my client needs, is a larger house.

15 MS. TACKETT: But then I think that's where
16 the confusion is. It's not all the way, like just
17 what you said. I think that's where the board --
18 you're losing the board. You know, pick one or the
19 other or else you end up with kind of a
20 watered-down confusion a little bit.

21 So, you know, if the board is in the direction
22 that these windows should be broken down with a
23 muntin grid more consistent with a historic window
24 from this time period of the house that was
25 demolished, then I think that's a good suggestion

1 to lessen the confusion.

2 MR. KUVIN: And, Ms. Tackett, what I would
3 suggest is that if we could come up with some very
4 specific changes that you wanted that perhaps my
5 client might adopt some of those. Maybe even
6 something that --

7 MS. TACKETT: I don't know what the rest of
8 the board -- not everyone has spoken --

9 MR. KUVIN: We have the architect here today
10 who might have said, you know what, we've actually
11 thought about going in that direction and we
12 thought maybe we just wanted to stay more towards
13 the middle. I'm not really sure. I can't promise
14 that my client will make any changes --

15 MS. TACKETT: Well, ours is just a
16 recommendation. We're just making a recommendation
17 to the commission.

18 MS. SPAIN: I think the key here is to make
19 specific recommendations to the city commission so
20 they can go to the next step.

21 MS. TACKETT: So we have two on the table
22 right now, the barrel tile and the windows.

23 MS. MACINTYRE: Can I just ask a question? It
24 looks to me like we have awnings -- or, I mean,
25 shutters, excuse me, on two sides and not on the

1 other two sides?

2 MS. TACKETT: Yeah.

3 MS. MACINTYRE: The east and south elevation
4 don't have shutters. The other two do.

5 MS. ROLANDO: What's your intention there?

6 MR. REARDON: The shutters are on the two
7 street sides, not on the interior property side.

8 MS. MACINTYRE: If the other two side had
9 shutters it would make quite a difference to me in
10 the impact of the windows. I don't know.

11 MS. ROLANDO: They're decorative shutters or
12 are they -- are they functional or decorative?

13 MR. REARDON: No, they're not functional.
14 They're painted wood shutters, fixed, but they are
15 proportionate to a real shutter.

16 MS. ROLANDO: Okay.

17 MR. TORRE: I'll be more specific. I'll try
18 to be specific. On the east and south elevations
19 the ones on page No. 2, page A6 specifically, the
20 windows are too large on the second floor for what
21 I believe should be the true size of the windows
22 proportionally speaking for the time period that
23 we're talking about. I think that's the first
24 thing that glares at me.

25 And then if you take -- bring those down, the

1 rest may be in the right proportion. They need to
2 have the split that is proportionate and that means
3 two over six or whatever that muntin grid should be
4 that makes sense for this period.

5 MR. REARDON: Well, the windows were smaller
6 and going through the board of architects; we made
7 them larger per their requests.

8 MR. TORRE: Right, and that's what strikes me
9 as out of context.

10 MR. REARDON: Right. So -- yeah, we had them
11 one foot smaller to begin with.

12 MS. SPAIN: They were square, weren't they?
13 They were -- I think the issue the board of
14 architects had, I believe, is that they were
15 square.

16 MR. TORRE: I understand this is not going
17 back for second review. The commission has to take
18 what we're saying and read into it and then they
19 have to accept or not accept. I don't know how to
20 be more specific, but maybe someone can help on
21 this. I think those are the ones that strike the
22 most as wrong. The other ones maybe just need the
23 muntins.

24 But, Dona, can you make a recommendation from
25 staff side or are you not allowed to do that?

1 MS. SPAIN: I'm allowed to. I just planned
2 not to.

3 MR. TORRE: Because I know you work with the
4 homeowners before it gets to us.

5 MS. SPAIN: I would agree with the board of
6 architects comments. I certainly agree about the
7 barrel tile.

8 MR. KUVIN: I'd just like to point out, this
9 is the house directly next door. These are the
10 windows in the front.

11 MS. TACKETT: Right, but that's a totally
12 different --

13 MR. KUVIN: This is directly next door. This
14 is directly I guess west across the street there.

15 MS. THOMSON: What is the difference between
16 cement barrel tile or is it? It says cement.

17 MS. ROLANDO: It's not clay. It's not a clay
18 fired --

19 MS. THOMSON: It's just a cement barrel?

20 MS. SPAIN: It's made out of cement. I mean,
21 I honestly don't think it was the intent of the
22 owners or the architect to recreate the period or
23 the building. I think they just took elements of
24 that building that they like.

25 MR. KUVIN: I'd just also like to point out

1 the tile roof right across the street from the
2 house as well. This is right across the street off
3 Coral Way. This is directly opposite. They've got
4 a lot of these ideas from the houses that are
5 surrounding them.

6 MR. TORRE: To me that is fine, except you put
7 that little triangular thing in the front, and that
8 to me becomes the leading element where I take all
9 my inspiration from in terms of design. I'm sorry,
10 but that's what was there. When I look at that I'm
11 looking for barrel tile and I'm looking for
12 proportions that match that style. If you take it
13 forward, then the rest of the house should be in
14 line with those styled elements and propositions.

15 MR. KUVIN: And I think what you're talking
16 about would definitely be an example of this, which
17 is the house right next door.

18 MR. TORRE: Proportionately speaking, that's
19 correct.

20 MR. KUVIN: This house is from the 1920s.

21 MR. TORRE: It's more -- and it's only because
22 you took off what was there. I mean, had you
23 designed something totally, I wouldn't be looking
24 for that, but that's what happened.

25 MR. KUVIN: And that's the house right across

1 the street also. That's a little bit catty corner,
2 has that quarter tile roof type thing.

3 I agree that this is what you would like. I'm
4 not really sure exactly why they used this,
5 probably and obviously less -- these types of tile
6 roofs, I mean, they're the ones that were rounded
7 on the bias and stuff, you just can't get those
8 anymore.

9 MR. SILVA: So how do we proceed? I mean,
10 going forward I mean, if we're not going to go back
11 to square one, which I don't think is the intent.
12 The intent is to comment on this.

13 MS. SPAIN: I don't think that's appropriate.

14 MR. SILVA: Then I think we have on the table
15 the barrel tile, and do we need to -- I guess we
16 need to have a motion --

17 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

18 MR. SILVA: -- that has a list of
19 recommendations.

20 MS. TACKETT: Yes. I think we have three on
21 the table right now, the barrel tile, the window
22 muntin configurations and the stucco texture.

23 MR. TORRE: Correct.

24 MS. TACKETT: I'm okay, and I think that would
25 go pretty far to improve the structure and it's

1 comparability with the neighborhood.

2 MS. THOMSON: The question is --

3 MS. TACKETT: You know, I don't think there's
4 a whole lot else we can --

5 MS. SPAIN: What about those comments for the
6 board of architects? Do you all agree with those
7 comments?

8 MR. TORRE: Can you repeat them, please. Can
9 you repeat them?

10 MS. SPAIN: Sure.

11 MS. ROLANDO: Okay. So coordinate window
12 openings and proportions, which is in keeping with
13 our recommendation, review balcony brackets, size,
14 proportion, spacing, scale and consider adding
15 columns.

16 MS. TACKETT: I agree with that.

17 MS. ROLANDO: Good. And entry --

18 MR. TORRE: Columns.

19 MS. ROLANDO: -- columns to minimize --

20 MR. TORRE: Grout.

21 MS. ROLANDO: -- grout points or use butt --

22 MS. TACKETT: Butt joints.

23 MS. ROLANDO: -- and then show roof pitches.

24 I'll --

25 MR. TORRE: I think what we're missing is

1 clarifying what the window situation should be, and
2 I think that's where it starts to --

3 MS. ROLANDO: Well, it seems to me that the
4 windows on the sides and rear elevation should be
5 compatible in size and proportion with those in the
6 front.

7 MS. TACKETT: Yeah.

8 MR. TORRE: Correct.

9 MS. ROLANDO: And we're recommending muntins
10 on the windows on the front elevation, and we would
11 be recommending the same thing on the other
12 elevations. Is that --

13 MR. SILVA: Are you including shutters in that
14 as well?

15 MS. ROLANDO: I think that's -- can we get --

16 MS. MACINTYRE: No. I just asked the
17 question.

18 MS. ROLANDO: Alejandro, what do you think
19 about the shutters?

20 MR. SILVA: I like the shutters. I think
21 they're expensive. It's a cost issue and they're
22 doing it on the street side, which I'm happy with.
23 I'd like to see it on the other side, but, you
24 know, it's not the end of the world.

25 MS. MACINTYRE: I'm okay with it as it is.

1 MS. ROLANDO: Okay. So I don't think we need
2 to include that then.

3 MS. TACKETT: I would agree.

4 MS. THOMSON: The board of architects didn't
5 recommend the barrel tile, right? They were going
6 with the cement barrel?

7 MR. REARDON: Right. That's correct.

8 MS. THOMSON: And how does the owners of the
9 property react to that? Because that's quite an
10 added expense, is it not? I'd like to know how --
11 I think it's important to know what their reaction
12 is to that recommendation as going to the
13 commission on the tile.

14 MR. REARDON: The reason was financial
15 reasons. It's about two-and-a-half times the cost
16 at a minimum.

17 MS. THOMSON: Uh-huh.

18 MR. REARDON: So that was the reason to
19 go with the concrete.

20 MR. TORRE: I disagree with that as
21 contractor. Thank you.

22 MR. REARDON: Okay. The owner's brother has a
23 roofing -- he's a roofing contractor, and he was
24 the one that knows the differences between a cement
25 roof and a clay tile roof.

1 MS. THOMSON: But here, here in this hearing
2 here, I don't hear any objection to that right now.
3 You have no objection to that, going to the barrel
4 tile as opposed to the cement barrel? I think it's
5 important for the commission to know that too.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It costs a lot of
7 money.

8 MR. REARDON: Yeah, there is an objection to
9 it.

10 MS. THOMSON: There is an objection?

11 MR. REARDON: Yes.

12 MS. THOMSON: Well, you should say so.

13 MR. KUVIN: I believe the objection -- I
14 believe there are recommendations of the board
15 made. I don't think we're here to debate whether
16 one is better than the other. If the board would
17 like to make that recommendation and pass it on to
18 the city commission, then that would be the
19 privilege of the board to do so.

20 MS. THOMSON: Okay.

21 MR. LEEN: If I may, Mayor Thomson, it -- so
22 ultimately though you would either recommend
23 approval or denial. If it's approval, it would
24 approval without conditions or comments. We're
25 calling them comments; it's a recommendation. Or

1 approval with comments, and you could accept or not
2 the board of architects and you can add your own.

3 MS. THOMSON: I just think from this
4 direction, just from history of myself, receiving
5 it at the commission table they're going to gloss
6 over that unless there's really a strong objection
7 to the recommendation that it is cement tile, as
8 opposed to what we're saying here today, and for me
9 I don't care one way or the other, but I'm just
10 thinking about what we're talking about if you're
11 being silent on that or really not raising the
12 issue. It's not going to rise to that level when
13 they're looking at, they being the commission. And
14 that's just my comment here.

15 Because I do know there's an added cost. Now,
16 Venny says it's not that two-and-a-half much, but I
17 don't know. And that's again not in our purview to
18 do that.

19 But I would think that there should be a
20 notation at this point if there's any very serious
21 objection, and the owner is nodding his head. In
22 other words, it should be a point that's emphasized
23 when it rises to the commission level.

24 MR. TORRE: I'll make a point, a technicality.
25 The point is the cost difference is exactly in the

1 tile itself, not the installation, not what happens
2 underneath it. So you're only getting to the level
3 of tile, not the paper, not the labor. So once you
4 get to that point, you're talking about whether you
5 get to here. So proportionately speaking on the
6 roof, it's not two-and-a-half the cost of the roof.
7 It's two and a half, what they're saying of the
8 tile cost, but in reality that's not necessarily
9 true, and the reality the fraction of the entire
10 job is a much smaller piece.

11 And my point here is that in the list of what
12 we have described as recommendations, barrel tile
13 to me is a strong recommendation as far as I'm
14 concerned.

15 MS. THOMSON: I would disagree with that
16 myself then. I think there's a little bit of
17 disagreement only one on this level is disagreeing
18 with that, because I feel that overall assessment
19 of what's gone on with the history of this
20 particular property and reaching this point today
21 you have a board of architects that approved it,
22 the barrel -- the cement tile, and if we're going
23 to vote over -- we're going to recommend over the
24 board of architects, which really wasn't brought up
25 in their comments here at all -- and if --

1 MS. TACKETT: Right, but they are looking at
2 different things too.

3 MS. THOMSON: If it's important to the owner,
4 I think it should be emphasized so that they look
5 at that and discuss it at the commission level.
6 That's what I'm thinking.

7 MS. TACKETT: Okay. I think if we don't have
8 any more comments I think we should try to craft a
9 motion and move on from this.

10 MS. ROLANDO: Let me propose a motion. I
11 move -- could you just clarify we approve the plans
12 as modified by the board or adopting the board of
13 architects comments and making our own additional
14 recommendations.

15 MR. LEEN: Yeah, based on what you're saying,
16 I would recommend you move to approve the plans
17 with the design with the comments of the board of
18 architects and these additional ones that you just
19 mentioned.

20 MS. ROLANDO: Okay. Okay. I move that we
21 approve the plans as submitted with the -- and
22 adopt the comments of the board of architects and
23 include the following recommendations for
24 additional revisions to the plans.

25 One, that the windows on the elevations, other

1 than the front elevations, be compatible with -- or
2 be of the comparable size and proportion with
3 muntins to those on the front.

4 Well, first would be that the windows on the
5 front have muntins.

6 MS. THOMSON: Can we take these separately or
7 are you going to do one motion?

8 MS. ROLANDO: I'm trying to do one
9 comprehensive motion --

10 MS. THOMSON: Well, I would suggest that --

11 MS. ROLANDO: Dorothy, allow me to complete
12 the proposal -- or the proposed resolution and then
13 you can move to amend if you so choose to.

14 MS. THOMSON: Okay.

15 MS. ROLANDO: Secondly, that the windows on
16 the elevations other than the street facade be of
17 the same size and proportion as those on the front
18 elevation.

19 Three, that there be clay barrel tile roofs,
20 and that the stucco be textured stucco, not smooth,
21 not smooth, and that the stucco would be consistent
22 around all four facades, or all four elevations.

23 MR. KUVIN: I've just been told, Ms. Rolando,
24 from the architect that it's already textured so I
25 guess we can take that part if that's all right

1 with you.

2 MS. ROLANDO: Leave it in. If it's already
3 there, then it's already -- okay.

4 MS. TACKETT: So we have a motion. Is
5 everyone clear on the motion? No. Okay.

6 MS. ROLANDO: Okay. Do you want me to state
7 it again or --

8 MS. TACKETT: Let's -- okay. So, Judy, the
9 motion is, there's a few points that we're adding
10 to the board of architects comments, to approve
11 what the board of architects comments and to put
12 the muntin grid consistent with the historical
13 documentation of that time period on the front, to
14 put the muntin -- to -- on the other -- I guess it
15 was the south and east elevations --

16 MS. ROLANDO: And back.

17 MS. TACKETT: -- and rear to revise the window
18 size and proportions to match more closely with the
19 window size and proportions on the front, to
20 request that the applicant uses a true clay barrel
21 tile, and three to incorporate a textured stucco
22 throughout the house.

23 MS. ROLANDO: Exterior of the house.

24 MS. TACKETT: Exterior of the house.

25 So is everyone clear on the motion now?

1 Okay. So we have a motion. Do we have a
2 second?

3 MR. TORRE: I'll second.

4 THE CLERK: Was that Venny?

5 MR. TORRE: Yes.

6 MS. TACKETT: Okay.

7 MS. THOMSON: Madam Chair, I move to amend the
8 motion to separate the roofing material from the
9 overall motion.

10 MS. TACKETT: Okay. Does the maker of the
11 motion accept that revisions?

12 MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

13 MS. TACKETT: Okay.

14 MS. ROLANDO: So long as we vote on it
15 separately.

16 MS. TACKETT: Okay. So we have a motion, an
17 amended motion. Do we have a second to that
18 amended motion?

19 MR. LEEN: The maker of the motion has amended
20 her motion.

21 MS. TACKETT: Okay. So we have a motion and a
22 second.

23 Roll call.

24 MR. LEEN: Just to be clear, you're voting on
25 the motion as it was stated, minus the barrel roof

1 which would be voted separately.

2 MS. TACKETT: Minus the barrel roof, correct.

3 MS. ROLANDO: And we'll vote on that
4 separately?

5 MR. LEEN: Yes, that will be voted on
6 separately.

7 MS. TACKETT: Okay. Roll call.

8 THE CLERK: Okay. Mr. Torre?

9 MR. TORRE: Yes.

10 THE CLERK: Mr. Silva?

11 MR. SILVA: Yes.

12 THE CLERK: Ms. Rolando?

13 MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

14 THE CLERK: Mayor Thomson?

15 MS. THOMSON: Yeah. I appreciate you doing
16 this so I can vote yes on this portion of it.

17 Thank you.

18 THE CLERK: Ms. MacIntyre?

19 MS. MACINTYRE: Yes.

20 THE CLERK: Ms. Pruitt?

21 MS. PRUITT: Yes.

22 THE CLERK: Ms. Tackett?

23 MS. TACKETT: Yes.

24 Okay. Now we have a second motion.

25 MS. ROLANDO: Yes, and the second motion would

1 be to amend the previous motion to include clay
2 barrel tile.

3 MR. TORRE: To allow what's proposed already.

4 MS. ROLANDO: To recommend, yes.

5 MS. TACKETT: Okay. So we have a motion to --

6 MR. LEEN: If I may, that would be more like a
7 motion for reconsideration. I would just say that
8 you're moving to add another comment, you know, an
9 additional comment, which is the barrel.

10 MS. ROLANDO: Okay. I move to recommend an
11 additional recommendation.

12 MR. LEEN: Yes.

13 MS. ROLANDO: That our recommendations of this
14 board include that the roof material -- the roof
15 material would be clay barrel tile.

16 MS. TACKETT: Okay. We have a motion. Do we
17 have a second?

18 MR. TORRE: Second.

19 MS. TACKETT: Okay. Motion is --

20 THE CLERK: Who was the seconder, please?

21 MS. TACKETT: Mr. Torre.

22 THE CLERK: Thank you.

23 MS. THOMSON: Comment? Discussion?

24 MS. TACKETT: I don't know if we need -- we've
25 discussed this at length.

1 MS. THOMSON: This is a new motion and I need
2 to have notation of the discussion of any motion.

3 MS. TACKETT: Okay. We've got a lot of people
4 in the audience, so we'll give you a couple
5 minutes.

6 MS. THOMSON: I'm sure we have a lot of people
7 in the audience. It's a very important item to me
8 and I think to the owners of the property.

9 The -- my only comment under discussion of the
10 motion is that I think it is an unnecessary
11 hardship to place the necessity on an owner to
12 place the clay barrel as opposed to the cement
13 barrel which was originally recommended and
14 approved by the board of architects. And that --
15 and that inasmuch as, inasmuch as this is not a
16 replica, a replication of the original historic
17 home, and it is not a historic property.

18 MS. TACKETT: Okay. Thank you.

19 Roll call.

20 THE CLERK: Mr. Silva?

21 MR. SILVA: Yes.

22 THE CLERK: Ms. Rolando?

23 MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

24 THE CLERK: Mayor Thomson?

25 MS. THOMSON: No.

1 THE CLERK: Ms. MacIntyre?
2 MS. MACINTYRE: Yes.
3 THE CLERK: Ms. Pruitt?
4 MS. THOMSON: No.
5 THE CLERK: Mr. Torre?
6 MR. TORRE: Yes.
7 THE CLERK: Ms. Tackett?
8 MS. TACKETT: Yes.
9 Okay. Did we want to discuss the marker --
10 MS. SPAIN: Yes, we do.
11 MS. TACKETT: -- as well? Okay. Let's move
12 on to the marker. I think everyone has the sheet
13 that was delivered to us.
14 MS. SPAIN: Staff's recommendation on the text
15 is that on this site prior to 1924 one of the first
16 residences on Coral Gable -- on Coral Way was
17 constructed. The one-and-a-half-story vernacular
18 building was similar in design to the Coral Gables
19 Merrick house located at 907 Coral Way. The design
20 was based on the bungalow typology with a long
21 porch that wrapped around the building on the front
22 and sides. The home was built for Worth St. Clair
23 and his wife Emma Merrick, sister to Reverend
24 Solomon G. Merrick, the father of City Founder
25 George Merrick. It remained in the Merrick family

1 until 1956. The property was designated as a local
2 historic landmark on April 15, 2004. In May of
3 2006 the home collapsed and in December of 2006 the
4 Historic Preservation Board approved the demolition
5 of the structure. As a result of the collapse of
6 this pioneer home, the City of Coral Gables
7 Historic Preservation Ordinance, already one of the
8 toughest in the nation, was further strengthened by
9 the addition of a section of the Zoning Code
10 specifically concerning demolition by neglect.

11 And the marker will be one of those standard
12 Florida markers without obviously that emblem on
13 top. Typically we put the seal of Coral Gables in
14 that location.

15 MS. MACINTYRE: Might we add the word
16 reluctantly approved?

17 MS. SPAIN: No. No. That would not be my
18 recommendation.

19 MS. MACINTYRE: It just sounds like approval
20 is the course of the day, and --

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

22 MS. THOMSON: Can we ask the owner of the
23 property whether or not they --

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.) It's not
25 funny.

1 MS. TACKETT: Excuse me, sir. You're out of
2 order. Please leave.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's not funny to us.
4 We spent ten --

5 MS. TACKETT: Sir, you're out of order.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I will file a
7 lawsuit if that sign --

8 MS. TACKETT: Sir, you need to leave now.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, I'm not leaving.
10 That's an embarrassment to this city and the
11 citizens of this city. I will file a lawsuit if
12 that sign gets placed on the property. That's
13 embarrassing. I wouldn't do this to your children.
14 I wouldn't ask that your children be treated like
15 this.

16 MS. TACKETT: Sir, you need to leave or we
17 need to get someone to escort him out.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's an insult.
19 Laughing at my expense. That's great. That woman
20 right there, close to your granddaughter. You know
21 what I mean. You --

22 MS. TACKETT: Sir, leave now, please, or we
23 are going to get someone to escort you out.

24 MR. KUVIN: If I may speak for my client,
25 please.

1 MS. TACKETT: Sir, no. Let's move on. Staff
2 has -- are you finished with your --

3 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

4 MS. TACKETT: Okay. And we have comments from
5 board members at this point?

6 MS. THOMSON: Yes. I'd like to ask a
7 question. Of course, the owner's not here to
8 answer, but the attorney for the owner. Do you
9 have any idea whether or not the property owners
10 would allow an easement in their property for this
11 sign to be erected?

12 MR. KUVIN: I'm not sure. I haven't discussed
13 whether they would allow to have it on the property
14 itself, however, I'd like to speak to what's
15 written here, if I may.

16 MR. TORRE: Can I ask a question first?

17 Dona, was this permit number two for them?

18 MS. SPAIN: Pardon me?

19 MR. TORRE: What permit number was this?

20 MS. SPAIN: I don't know. I don't know the
21 answer. It was constructed before the City was
22 incorporated and then once the City was
23 incorporated it went back and permitted all those
24 existing structures. I'm not sure what the permit
25 number was, but it doesn't reflect --

1 MR. TORRE: Do you know what -- was this the
2 second home build on Coral Way as far as -- do we
3 know?

4 MS. SPAIN: I believe so, but I'm not really
5 sure. We'd have to go back to the designation
6 report.

7 MS. TACKETT: I think one of the first is --

8 MS. SPAIN: Well, that's what I said.

9 MS. TACKETT: Yeah, I think --

10 MS. SPAIN: I wanted to be accurate. I wasn't
11 sure about the --

12 MS. ROLANDO: The sequence.

13 MS. PRUITT: What about placing the marker on
14 the swale?

15 MS. SPAIN: That's my recommendation.

16 MS. PRUITT: Yes.

17 MS. TACKETT: Yeah, I would agree too.

18 MS. PRUITT: I would recommend that too.

19 MS. ROLANDO: Yeah, there's no reason to have
20 it on the property.

21 MS. MACINTYRE: You know, in light of his
22 response, I hadn't anticipated that, and I think we
23 need to rethink it and see why he's so upset.

24 Can the wording be changed in a way --

25 MS. TACKETT: I don't think we should give him

1 any more time than he deserves.

2 MS. MACINTYRE: Well --

3 If his counsel would like to comment on the
4 text of the marker, I would entertain your
5 comments.

6 MR. KUVIN: Thank you, Ms. Tackett.

7 My client does not object to having the marker
8 on the property. It was actually part of the
9 agreement with the city commission. However, he
10 does feel very strongly, as you can see, that the
11 house collapsed not by neglect, but by the fact
12 that it took a very long time for them to try to
13 get the plans passed and there were numerous
14 attempts to do it.

15 I think that everyone would agree that there
16 is no evidence whatsoever that my client in any
17 way, shape or form neglected the property. I mean,
18 They purchased it for good money. They spent tens
19 and tens of thousands of dollars to develop this
20 property, to draw up plans which incorporated the
21 house that was already there.

22 And then unbeknownst to everybody, the house
23 collapsed on its own. And some of the reasons that
24 were given for the collapse of the house was the
25 fact that the roof had changed from the original

1 design of the house and had been -- they put that
2 full barrel roof on, which the weight itself caused
3 the house to collapse.

4 I'm lucky enough and I'm probably one of the
5 few people here in the room that can say that I've
6 actually been inside that house numerous times
7 while it was up and it was a beautiful house. I
8 mean, I used to visit the lady that lived there.
9 She used to watch our dog when we were out of town.

10 But the house was old, and I knew it was old
11 even back in the '70s and the '80s when we used to
12 visit it. You could smell how old the wood was,
13 and that's what caused the house to collapse.

14 The fact that it's mentioned here on the
15 proposed marker upsets my client, as you can see.
16 I personally as well as my client believe that it
17 doesn't belong on there and because of the fact
18 what we're trying to do is celebrate the fact that
19 the house was there.

20 I'd like to see instead of the seal of Coral
21 Gables on the plaque, I'd like to see maybe perhaps
22 some type of rendition of the house on there to
23 give people an idea of what it looked like or
24 perhaps maybe one of the ones that I've seen in the
25 past where it shows the house, the rendition of the

1 house or the outline of the house in the background
2 along with the text in there.

3 But we should be celebrating this piece of
4 property and the house that was there that
5 collapsed unbeknownst to everybody. I think Ms.
6 MacIntyre will tell you too. It took a very long
7 time. Ms. Thomson, you were at many of those
8 meetings.

9 MS. THOMSON: Yes.

10 MR. KUVIN: And they tried on numerous
11 occasions, tried to get the house, and there were
12 opinions and everyone's entitled to their opinion.
13 And one day someone drove by and the house
14 collapsed.

15 That's my client's feeling on this.

16 MS. THOMSON: I can see. I would feel the
17 same way. If I'm going to live in the property and
18 then have a sign outside on the property saying the
19 thing was there before the house and the structure
20 was there before collapsed because of neglect,
21 that's --

22 MS. SPAIN: I -- this is my wording. I take
23 full responsibility.

24 MS. TACKETT: So, Dona, is this the one
25 incident that did propel this ordinance --

1 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

2 MS. TACKETT: So before this collapse there
3 was no talk of a demolition by a neglect ordinance?

4 MS. SPAIN: I think it was mentioned in the
5 ordinance, but this is now a separate section
6 because of the collapse this house.

7 And I need to point out that it doesn't say
8 that they neglected it. Because of the previous
9 owner, Elvera Davis, did nothing to maintain this
10 house. And honestly, she's the person that
11 neglected it. It collapsed when they owned it, but
12 the neglect was not by their hands necessarily.
13 They didn't do anything to --

14 MR. KUVIN: The house was almost 100 years
15 old.

16 MR. TORRE: But I don't think the last
17 sentence really ties to that, and I don't think
18 when I read it that --

19 MS. SPAIN: My view is the only good thing,
20 the only things that came out of this house
21 collapsing was toughening the preservation
22 ordinance. Because other than that, we lost this
23 beautiful historic significant structure in the
24 city.

25 MS. ROLANDO: I will say I do like your idea

1 of having --

2 MS. SPAIN: I do too.

3 MS. ROLANDO: -- a depiction of the house and
4 I think that's respectful and it actually clarifies
5 what --

6 MS. SPAIN: What was there.

7 MS. ROLANDO: -- was there. So I think that's
8 a great idea.

9 MS. SPAIN: It may be possible to have one of
10 those -- the way they do in cemeteries, they have
11 those markers that have the renderings or even
12 photographs on, or we have something similar to
13 that in back of the Merrick house at the grotto
14 that we did, and so we certainly can do some type
15 rendition of the house on that.

16 MS. THOMSON: You need a positive image, not a
17 negative.

18 MS. SPAIN: No, I know.

19 MS. THOMSON: The negativity comes through on
20 that.

21 MS. PRUITT: And what would the wording on the
22 plaque say?

23 MS. SPAIN: Pardon me?

24 MS. PRUITT: The wording on the plaque?

25 MS. SPAIN: You can change it in any way you

1 want.

2 MS. PRUITT: So now -- so we're not going to
3 make any decision on that now?

4 MS. SPAIN: No, you need to decide on what the
5 wording of the plaque should be, so that it can be
6 recommended to the city commission.

7 MR. KUVIN: My suggestion is everything past
8 where it says Merrick family until 1956, the next
9 sentence where it says the property was designated
10 as a local historic landmark, everything past that
11 point to me it doesn't really go to the house. It
12 just tells the past history of the house. I would
13 like to celebrate the first 100 years of the house,
14 not last two years.

15 MS. ROLANDO: Well, let me throw this out for
16 consideration, as a result -- you say here as a
17 result of the collapse of this pioneer house, what
18 it really is as a result of the prolonged neglect
19 of house over a period of years.

20 MS. SPAIN: Well, I think that's what the
21 owners object to.

22 MS. ROLANDO: The building collapsed. It
23 wasn't one -- and I don't -- and I agree. I don't
24 think we should by this say you're the cause
25 because we know that it -- that the home was

1 neglected, and we have this problem consistently,
2 or rather consistently in Coral Gables, that, you
3 know, some of the homes aren't maintained.

4 So if there's a lesson learned from this to me
5 it's the neglect is the problem over a long period.
6 If you neglect the home for a year or two, it's
7 probably -- that's not going to be the, you know,
8 stake in the heart of the home.

9 So I agree that we're not placing blame here.
10 What we need to do is alert -- use this as the
11 moment to inform people about the neglect.

12 MS. SPAIN: What if we do this? What if we
13 eliminate -- what if the last sentence says, as the
14 result of a collapse of this pioneer home the City
15 of Coral Gables Historic Preservation Board,
16 already one of the toughest in the nation, was
17 further strengthened, period.

18 MS. MACINTYRE: I think we should take that
19 out. I don't think it belongs there on a historic
20 marker.

21 MS. PRUITT: I don't think people are going to
22 stand there and read this whole thing. I think
23 they're just going -- if we just have the first two
24 sentences. I mean, that's all people are going to
25 read.

1 MS. SPAIN: So just stop it after George
2 Merrick?

3 MS. PRUITT: After similar to the Merrick
4 house located on 907 Coral Way, and stop.

5 MS. TACKETT: But I think -- you need to know
6 why it's not there anymore on some level, so I
7 think, you know, maybe in May of 2006 the home
8 collapsed and as a result the -- I don't know -- as
9 a result the City of Coral Gables Historic
10 Preservation Ordinance was strengthened.

11 MR. SILVA: Why don't we say that due to the
12 age and condition of the existing structure in
13 May 2006, I think that's kind of --

14 MS. PRUITT: Yeah, that's better.

15 MS. ROLANDO: And does it matter that we
16 approved the demolition of this structure? I think
17 that's excess verbiage.

18 MS. TACKETT: Yeah, I agree. I would remove
19 that.

20 MS. ROLANDO: And I think we can say, the
21 original home collapsed and was demolished.

22 MS. MACINTYRE: Yeah, I think we should say
23 the original home, but I think maybe we should add
24 the present home was constructed and such and such
25 so there's no confusion --

1 MS. ROLANDO: Right. Right.

2 MS. MACINTYRE: -- between the lost historic
3 home and what's there now.

4 MS. SPAIN: True, but we don't know when it's
5 going to be constructed.

6 MR. KUVIN: Ms. MacIntyre, if you wanted to do
7 that I was actually going to make suggestion that
8 perhaps you might put on there that a fine example
9 of this type of architecture can be seen right next
10 door, and put the -- because that is a fabulous
11 house. I mean, someone who was walking along there
12 that wanted to see what the house might have looked
13 like would be, you know, definitely to point that
14 house out. That is one of the premier houses in
15 Coral Gables.

16 MS. TACKETT: Well, she does -- Dona's
17 language says the Merrick house at 907 Coral Way,
18 so I'm okay with that.

19 MS. THOMSON: Just to take out the negative
20 words like neglect. It has a bad connotation.

21 MS. PRUITT: Right.

22 MS. TACKETT: So do we have a consensus?

23 MS. SPAIN: I don't have the wording, just so
24 you know. I don't know exactly what --

25 MS. TACKETT: I think we're good with

1 everything until where it says in May of 2006 the
2 home collapsed.

3 MS. SPAIN: Okay. And then --

4 MS. TACKETT: Or you can say the historic home
5 collapsed, and as a result the City of Coral Gables
6 Historic Preservation Ordinance was strengthened.

7 MS. SPAIN: That's fine.

8 MS. TACKETT: I don't know how the rest of the
9 board feels about that.

10 MS. ROLANDO: I would think to me what's
11 critical is getting across the idea that it
12 collapsed not spontaneously for no reason.

13 MS. TACKETT: You're right, and --

14 MS. ROLANDO: It collapsed because it was
15 neglected for years.

16 MS. THOMSON: No.

17 MS. TACKETT: But Alejandro had some language
18 that I didn't mention that I was thought good, due
19 to the age and condition of the home. So in
20 May 2006 the home collapsed due to its age and
21 condition.

22 MS. ROLANDO: Well, you can't say age because
23 there's homes that are 500 years old in Europe
24 or -- so it's not age. It's --

25 MS. PRUITT: Due to its condition?

1 MR. KUVIN: I'd just like to make --

2 MS. TACKETT: Due to its structural condition.

3 MR. KUVIN: I'd just like to make a
4 suggestion --

5 MS. THOMSON: That could be interpreted as a
6 flaw in the original building of it and so forth.
7 It put no blame on anyone, structural damage,
8 structural --

9 MR. KUVIN: You can understand my client's
10 position in that this has been going on for a long
11 time.

12 MS. TACKETT: I understand, sir. You've
13 stated that and we understand. We need to get
14 through the rest of meeting. We've got a few more
15 items to get through, I just want to get the board
16 happy with this last bit of language here.

17 MR. KUVIN: Can I make a suggestion we come
18 back and do this another time?

19 MS. TACKETT: I think we should just -- we're
20 almost --

21 MS. SPAIN: I just want it at the same time at
22 the city commission so it can be done.

23 MS. TACKETT: Yeah. I mean, or we could just
24 say in May of 2006 the home collapsed.

25 MS. SPAIN: And as a result the City of --

1 MS. TACKETT: And as a result --

2 MS. SPAIN: -- Coral Gables Historic
3 Preservation Ordinance was strengthened.

4 MS. THOMSON: That's right. It leaves it up
5 to anyone's interpretation.

6 MS. SPAIN: I think that's fine.

7 MS. TACKETT: Everybody cool with that?
8 Dolly? Judy? Peggy? Alejandro?

9 MR. TORRE: Yes.

10 MS. TACKETT: I'm happy with that as well.

11 MS. ROLANDO: And it will have the rendering
12 of the original.

13 MS. SPAIN: We'll try. I think that's a great
14 idea.

15 MS. THOMSON: I move the approval of the
16 wording --

17 MS. SPAIN: Did you vote?

18 MR. LEEN: A motion.

19 MS. TACKETT: Oh, do we need a motion? Okay.
20 Can I have a motion?

21 MS. THOMSON: I just started -- I move the
22 approval of the wording as stated.

23 MS. TACKETT: Is that clear enough?

24 MS. ROLANDO: Well, I think we would want Dona
25 to restate it.

1 MS. THOMSON: Restate it.

2 Dona, I've just made a motion to approve the
3 wording as stated. And would you like to state it?

4 MS. SPAIN: Okay. It's the same up until --

5 MS. ROLANDO: Just read it. Read it into the
6 record.

7 MS. SPAIN: Okay. On this site prior to 1924
8 one of the first residences on Coral Way was
9 constructed. The one-and-a-half story vernacular
10 building was similar in design to Coral Gables
11 Merrick house located at 907 Coral Way. The design
12 was based on the bungalow typology with a long
13 porch that wrapped around the building on the front
14 and side. The home was built for Worth St. Claire
15 and his wife, Emma Merrick, sister to Reverend
16 Solomon G. Merrick, the father of City Founder
17 George Merrick. It remained in the Merrick family
18 until 1956. The property was designated a local
19 historic landmark on April 15th, 2004. In May of
20 2006 the home collapsed and as a result the City of
21 Coral Gables Historic Preservation Ordinance was
22 strengthened.

23 MS. TACKETT: Okay. So that's the motion. Do
24 I have a second?

25 MS. THOMSON: Second -- oh, I made the motion.

1 MR. TORRE: Second.

2 MS. TACKETT: Okay. Mr. Torre seconded it.

3 Roll call.

4 THE CLERK: Ms. Rolando?

5 MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

6 THE CLERK: Mayor Thomson?

7 MS. THOMSON: Yes.

8 THE CLERK: Ms. MacIntyre?

9 MS. MACINTYRE: Yes.

10 THE CLERK: Ms. Pruitt?

11 MS. PRUITT: Yes.

12 THE CLERK: Mr. Torre?

13 MR. TORRE: Yes.

14 THE CLERK: Mr. Silva?

15 MR. SILVA: Yes.

16 THE CLERK: Ms. Tackett?

17 MS. TACKETT: Yes. Okay.

18 MS. SPAIN: Okay.

19 MS. TACKETT: That ends --

20 MR. LEEN: So if I may, Mr. Kuvin, so these

21 recommendations will be taken to the city

22 commission and be decided at that time.

23 MS. THOMSON: Will that be next week or --

24 MR. LEEN: And I'll make sure the commission

25 gets all of your recommendations and the board of

1 architects.

2 MS. THOMSON: Is that next week or February?

3 MR. LEEN: It will not be in the next -- Dona,
4 I was asked whether it would be at the next
5 commission meeting. I think it would be at the one
6 following that most likely, not the next one.

7 MS. SPAIN: The next one is already set.

8 MR. LEEN: Yeah, it's not the Tuesday one, so
9 probably the one after that.

10 MS. SPAIN: Which I believe is February -- I
11 want to say 5th, but I could be wrong.

12 MR. LEEN: Yes. Mr. Kuvin, would you be ready
13 to proceed then on the 5th or do you want
14 additional time?

15 MS. THOMSON: Is that the first Tuesday of the
16 month?

17 MR. KUVIN: On what?

18 MR. LEEN: Do you want this to go before the
19 commission on the 5th?

20 MR. KUVIN: I'll have to speak to my client.

21 MR. LEEN: Okay. Speak to your clients and
22 just let us know.

23 MS. SPAIN: Whenever you're ready.

24 MR. KUVIN: Thank you very much for your hard
25 work on this and your patience.