

CITY OF CORAL GABLES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING  
VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE  
AUGUST 19, 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  
Margaret A. Rolando, Board Member  
Dona Spain, Board Member

Kara N. Kautz, Historic Preservation Officer  
ElizaBeth B. Guin, Historic Preservation Coordinator  
Gustavo Ceballos, Assistant City Attorney

1           MR. MENENDEZ: Good afternoon, and welcome to  
2           the regularly scheduled meeting of the City of  
3           Coral Gables Historic Preservation Board. We are  
4           residents of Coral Gables and are charged with the  
5           preservation and protection of historic or  
6           architecturally worthy buildings, structures,  
7           sites, neighborhoods, and artifacts which impart a  
8           distinct, 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  
11          city manager, and the ninth is selected by the  
12          Board and confirmed by the commission. Five  
13          members of the board constitute a quorum, and five  
14          affirmative votes are necessary for the adoption of  
15          any motion.

16          Any person who acts as a lobbyist pursuant to  
17          the City of Coral Gables Ordinance No. 2006-11 must  
18          register with the city clerk prior to engaging in  
19          lobbying activities or presentations before city  
20          staff, boards, committees, or city commission.

21          A copy of the ordinance is available in the  
22          office of the city clerk. Failure to register and  
23          provide proof of registration shall prohibit your  
24          ability to present to the Historic Preservation  
25          Board on applications under consideration this

1           afternoon.

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

20                   Presentations made to this board are subject  
21          to the City's False Claims Ordinance Chapter 39 of  
22          the City of Coral Gables city code.

23                   I now officially call the City of Coral Gables  
24          Historic Preservation Board meeting of August 19th,  
25          2020. The time is 4:05 p.m.

1           Presented today are, let me see who is  
2           present, Alicia Bache-Wiig, Dona Spain, Raul  
3           Rodriguez, Bruce Ehrenhaft, Cesar Garcia-Pons,  
4           Peggy Rolando, Xavier Durana and myself, Albert  
5           Menendez.

6           MR. FULLERTON: I'm here too.

7           MR. MENENDEZ: Oh, Mr. Fullerton. I forgot  
8           about Mr. Fullerton, John Fullerton.

9           Staff, Kara Kautz and ElizaBeth Guin.

10          MS. KAUTZ: And also Nancy Lyons from our  
11          department, which you guys can hear but not see is  
12          our administrative assistant that you have not seen  
13          in person before.

14          MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

15          So next is the approval of the minutes from  
16          the last meeting, which was July --

17          MS. LIONS: 15th.

18          MR. MENENDEZ: -- 15th.

19          Are there any changes or corrections?

20          Peggy? You have to unmute yourself.

21          MR. RODRIGUEZ: Hit the spacebar.

22          MS. ROLANDO: I would like to inquire whether  
23          it's possible to get actual minutes of the meeting,  
24          say three or four pages, rather than 100-page  
25          transcript of the proceedings.

1 MS. KAUTZ: We used to provide summary minutes  
2 to the Board, and then the secretarial service who  
3 was doing those for us is no longer in business,  
4 and we could not find another service to do that  
5 for us. So we just went ahead and followed the  
6 lead of the Planning and Zoning Board to do  
7 verbatim minutes so that if there is an appeal, if  
8 there's any item that goes to the commission, we  
9 already have those minutes in place.

10 MS. ROLANDO: Okay. It's just painful to  
11 review it twice.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Call for motion to approve.

14 MR. FULLERTON: So moved.

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Second?

16 MS. SPAIN: I'll second it.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Is there a second?

18 MS. SPAIN: I'll second it.

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Call for the role.

20 MS. LYONS: Okay. Alicia Bache-Wiig?

21 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

22 MS. LYONS: Albert Menendez?

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

24 MS. LYONS: Peggy Rolando?

25 MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

1 MS. LYONS: Cesar Garcia-Pons?  
2 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.  
3 MS. LYONS: Bruce Ehrenhaft?  
4 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.  
5 MS. LIONS: Raul Rodriguez?  
6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.  
7 MS. LYONS: Dona Spain?  
8 MS. SPAIN: Yes.  
9 MS. LYONS: John Fullerton?  
10 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.  
11 MS. LYONS: Xavier Durana?  
12 MR. DURANA: Yes.  
13 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Notice regarding ex  
14 parte communications; please be advised that this  
15 board is a quasi-judicial board and the items on  
16 the agenda are quasi-judicial in nature which  
17 requires board members to disclose all ex parte  
18 communications. An ex parte communication is  
19 defined as any contact, communication,  
20 conversation, correspondence, memorandum or other  
21 written or verbal communications that takes place  
22 outside a public hearing between a member of the  
23 public and a member of a quasi-judicial board  
24 regarding matters to the heard by the  
25 quasi-judicial board.

1           If anyone has made any contact with a board  
2 member, when the issue comes before the Board the  
3 member must state on the record the existence of  
4 the ex parte communication, the party who  
5 originated the communication, and whether the  
6 communication will affect the board member's  
7 ability to impartially consider the evidence to be  
8 presented regarding the matter.

9           Deferrals; do we have any deferrals today,  
10 Kara?

11           MS. KAUTZ: We do not.

12           MR. MENENDEZ: Swearing in; if any persons in  
13 the audience will be testifying today, they need to  
14 be sworn in. So who's going to do that?

15           MS. KAUTZ: The court reporter will be doing  
16 that.

17           MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

18           THE COURT REPORTER: Am I doing that as I did  
19 last time as each person comes up, or am I doing it  
20 as a group?

21           You're muted, Kara.

22           MS. KAUTZ: Yeah. Sorry.

23           MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Kara --

24           MS. KAUTZ: I'm sorry. Gus, are you here?

25           Yes. We were always -- staff was always sworn in

1 along with the general public. Do we need to be  
2 sworn in as staff?

3 MR. CEBALLOS: They can just swear everyone in  
4 at the same time. Just as each item gets called  
5 up, those individual parties need to be sworn in.  
6 If you want to swear in all staff in one shot,  
7 that's fine.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Kara, should we take care of  
9 case number three first and just get that out of  
10 the way?

11 I can't hear you.

12 MS. KAUTZ: Let me see. I'm looking to see  
13 who's on.

14 We can do that if you prefer. I was trying to  
15 see if there was city staff on that we could get  
16 that out of the way or -- I don't see anyone from  
17 city staff on.

18 Daphne, is it just you?

19 MS. GURRI: Hi. Good afternoon.

20 Yes. I see Brandon DeCaro. I see Sherry and  
21 Jose Oliveros.

22 MS. KAUTZ: I'm not looking in the right  
23 place, obviously.

24 MS. GURRI: And Jose Matute.

25 MS. KAUTZ: Yeah, there's a whole other window



1           that I'm not even looking at right now.

2           Yeah, so because there is city staff on I  
3           would like to take the third item first if that's  
4           possible.

5           MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So Case File COA (SP)  
6           2020-009, an application for the issuance of a  
7           special certificate of appropriateness for the  
8           Granada Golf Course located at 2001 Granada  
9           Boulevard, a contributing resource within the  
10          Country Club of Coral Gables Historic District. A  
11          lengthy legal description is on file with the City  
12          of Coral Gables Historical Resources and Cultural  
13          Arts Department.

14          The application requests design approval for  
15          the construction of new golf course rain shelters.

16          MS. SPAIN: So I think before we get started I  
17          need to recuse myself because when I was a  
18          preservation officer I gave approval for a concept  
19          sketch of this.

20          Right, Gus?

21          I'm pretty sure I have to recuse myself, so  
22          I'm going to, and then I'm going to mute myself and  
23          come back on at some point.

24          MS. KAUTZ: We'll call you back.

25          Rayza, can you make her go away briefly?

1 MS. COLLAZO: Dona?

2 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

3 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Is the staff going to  
4 make a presentation first?

5 MS. KAUTZ: Yeah, I'll do a short intro.

6 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

7 MS. COLLAZO: I put Dona in the waiting room.

8 MS. KAUTZ: Huh?

9 MS. COLLAZO: I put Dona in the waiting room.

10 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.

11 So as you just read, this is the location map.  
12 You're all familiar with the Granada Golf Course.

13 It was designated in 1989 as a contributing  
14 resource along with North and South Greenway. The  
15 residences in North and South Greenway Drive are  
16 part of the Country Club of Coral Gables Historic  
17 District.

18 The proposal here is for the construction of  
19 six new golf rain course shelters that are on the  
20 property. The architect will go over their design,  
21 but essentially it's one prototypical design that  
22 will be placed in six locations on the golf course  
23 and rotated in various areas to accommodate the  
24 site.

25 There were no variances along with this

1 application. This is what's being replaced. They  
2 were not original to the golf course and are  
3 failing. Most of them have already been removed.

4 We dated them, I believe, the late '40s, if I  
5 remember correctly.

6 The Board of Architects reviewed and was  
7 administratively approved by the Board of  
8 Architects on June 3rd with no comments.

9 We do recommend approval. As Dona mentioned,  
10 she approved a concept sketch back in 2018, and  
11 it's finally come to fruition, this project.

12 They are new construction within the district  
13 and should be evaluated from their impact on the  
14 district as a whole not on their individual sort of  
15 architect.

16 We found that they are clearly distinguishable  
17 as new interventions on the golf course, don't  
18 impact any historic integrity of the course itself,  
19 and comply with Secretary of Interior's Standards  
20 No. 9 and 10.

21 So let me unshare my screen and turn it over  
22 to the architect.

23 All right. You have the floor.

24 MS. GURRI: I guess I'll share my screen. I  
25 just -- I'm new to this, so I just have to -- I'll

1 give it a shot. Let me know if you can see.

2 Can everyone see my screen?

3 MR. FULLERTON: No.

4 MS. GURRI: How do I do the screen share?

5 MS. COLLAZO: Down at the bottom there's like  
6 a green -- a little green thing that says share  
7 screen.

8 MS. GURRI: Okay. All right. That would  
9 help, right? Let me try that. Okay. Give me one  
10 second.

11 How about now? Can you see it now?

12 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

13 MS. GURRI: You can see it? All right.

14 MS. KAUTZ: If you hit from the beginning, it  
15 will start the slides there for you.

16 MS. GURRI: Okay. So everybody can see the  
17 cover which is a rendering? Everybody can see  
18 that?

19 MS. KAUTZ: Yep.

20 MS. GURRI: All right. Thank you very much.

21 My name is Daphne Gurri, and I'm one of the  
22 two principals this afternoon. I'm here with my  
23 partner Jose Matute, although we're in different  
24 cities, we're both here to present this project.  
25 We are the architects of this project for the City

1 of Coral Gables. So the client is the City of  
2 Coral Gables, and Gurri Matute, PA, is the  
3 architect of record.

4 So as Kara mentioned, the scope of the project  
5 is to replace six rain shelters. There are more  
6 than six, I believe there's like nine rain  
7 shelters, but at this time the proposal is to  
8 replace six. And the location of where we're  
9 replacing them is shown here on the screen. So  
10 north is up. The yellow button, the little yellow  
11 dot is Burger Bobs and the pro golf shop, and then  
12 the locations of the six shelters are shown on the  
13 diagram with the red dots.

14 So I'm going to show at the beginning some  
15 historic context. So as Kara mentioned, the golf  
16 course opened in 1923 and it's also part of the  
17 Country Club of Coral Gables Historic District.  
18 The period of significance is from 1922 to 1939.

19 And what you're looking at here are some views  
20 from pictures that we found in the state archives  
21 of Florida back in the 1920s when the park opened  
22 up. And as Kara mentioned, the rain shelters were  
23 not part of the early construction in the 1920s.

24 The existing conditions as they are right now,  
25 this is a typical rain shelter of the ones that

1 still remain. Many of them have already been  
2 demolished because they were in high disrepair and  
3 they were failing.

4 So these are not contributing to the golf  
5 course shelter. They are historically considered  
6 to be a resource in this environment. They have  
7 exceeded their useful life.

8 They're small. They're about 99 square feet,  
9 just under a hundred one square feet, and their  
10 footprints, it's an octagon shape, but basically  
11 it's like 11 feet by 11 feet in overall dimension,  
12 wood frame structure.

13 Some of them have water fountains, others do  
14 not. So the sketch that was presented was back --  
15 derived and conceived maybe two years ago from a  
16 different consultant. This was a sketch that was  
17 prepared by AECOM. It was presented to a few key  
18 stakeholders from the city, including the manager  
19 from the Granada Golf Course itself, Dona Spain  
20 from Historic Preservation, and facilities.

21 A couple things I wanted to point out about it  
22 is that this scale was much larger than what you're  
23 going to be seeing today. So in this drawing you  
24 can see that they had enough distance in between  
25 the bench to be able to drive through two golf

1 carts. Because of the limitation of the site  
2 constraints and limited budget, we scaled down the  
3 design of the project, but keeping, always  
4 preserving this concept that had been presented and  
5 seemed to be working for everyone.

6 We took from that sketch, we took as we  
7 developed it, it was a freehand sketch. We went  
8 and we looked for architectural elements that were  
9 relevant, so we looked at the Burger Bob's and pro  
10 golf shop, at the architectural elements that were  
11 here, like oolitic stone and the pipe column, and  
12 even the shape and configuration of the roof edge,  
13 and even the colors. So we took those things and  
14 incorporated that into when we developed the sketch  
15 into the final prototypical design.

16 So the overall size of the prototypical rain  
17 course shelter is roughly 12 feet by almost  
18 26 feet. So it does take up about twice the  
19 footprint, but that goes all the way to the edge of  
20 the concrete bench over here on this side. So from  
21 this concrete edge here all the way to the right  
22 side is the 26 feet, and then the other direction  
23 is 12 feet.

24 So we reduced it significantly so the golf  
25 carts cannot drive through it. It's designed --

1 the purpose for this is to replace the ones that  
2 have failed and to provide protection from the rain  
3 and inclement weather. That is the purpose of  
4 these rain shelters.

5 These are the drawings that we prepared to  
6 illustrate the height. It's basically -- we tried  
7 to go as small as possible. We didn't want to make  
8 the design to be too imposing, and we wanted to  
9 also keep it as transparent as possible. And from  
10 a safety point of view, it was encouraged by the  
11 City, the park department, the golf course manager,  
12 and the police all encouraged to maintain a  
13 transparency through the shelters. So we have the  
14 top of the height of the roof is eight-foot six,  
15 which is comparable to what you have now, and the  
16 underside of the ceiling on the inside is  
17 seven-foot ten.

18 And then putting all the materials together  
19 the next slide shows all the materials  
20 individually. So here's the asphalt drive as  
21 connected, where it needs to get connected. This  
22 is kind of the Coral Gables sidewalk pink that we  
23 want to do for the concrete to define the limits of  
24 the shelter itself. Then we have the oolitic stone  
25 for the back wall, and then on the backs of the



1 wall you have the water fountains, and then you  
2 have a wood bench that's cantilevered from the  
3 oolitic stone, and then you have a concrete bench  
4 which comes out into the grassy area. And then you  
5 have the pipe column, which is a steel pipe column,  
6 with kind of like a Venetian, a muted Venetian red  
7 color. And then we have the honeysuckle vines  
8 growing around the three -- the cluster of the  
9 three columns.

10 And then the materials for the roof, it's a  
11 precast system so all of the roofs will be uniform.  
12 They'll be very easy to construct off premises, and  
13 when you bring it to the site it's very clean and  
14 very fast.

15 Same thing goes with the wall in the back.

16 And here are the materials and the selection  
17 of the drinking fountains. So you have the  
18 honeysuckle vine which grows around the cluster of  
19 the three pipe columns, the drinking fountain, it's  
20 a prefab bench, gets cantilevered from the oolitic  
21 stone, the Coral Gables pink for the concrete with  
22 a rock salt finish, two colors of precast, one a  
23 darker one for the roof, so that it kind of holds  
24 better any dirt or accumulation of dirt. We took  
25 into consideration maintenance and not wanting to

1           have to repaint these. So it comes already  
2           integral with the color of the precast.

3                     And then a lighter color gray for the bench  
4           itself, which is the one that comes outside into  
5           the grassy area. Oolitic stone, limestone, with a  
6           random pattern attached to the wall, so this is  
7           cladding the wall, the vertical wall, some  
8           ornamental river rocks at the base where the  
9           cluster of the columns are.

10                    And then these are the two colors that we  
11           have. We chose the Sherwin Williams Habanero Chile  
12           for the pipe column, which is kind of just like a  
13           little accent color, and then this color here, it's  
14           kind of like a muted brownish color. What we  
15           wanted to do is to kind of hide the colors that are  
16           inside of the pipe columns that are where the  
17           honeysuckle is. So this color is like the color of  
18           a tree bark.

19                    Now I'm going to show you where all of the  
20           shelters are going and how they rotate depending on  
21           the site. So starting with the first one, this is  
22           the one that's very close by to the pro golf shop  
23           and the Burger Bob's, so if you can look to see  
24           View D is in the photograph, you can see the  
25           proximity to where that first shelter is going to

1           be. And you can also see that standing from the  
2           perspective of the Burger Bob's looking back to  
3           View C.

4           So one of the things that I wanted to mention  
5           is that not all of the shelters are going to have  
6           water because the City has a limited budget. We  
7           are only putting water in the shelters that already  
8           had water or had it nearby. So in this case, this  
9           shelter is going to have water because it's already  
10          there, it's already nearby.

11          And again, the rotation of the area -- well,  
12          the drawing on the left is a demo, so since there  
13          is no shelter there's nothing to reflect because  
14          it's already gone. But the dashed line shows you  
15          the limits of the new asphalt that would have to be  
16          reconstructed to be able to smooth out and even out  
17          the slope and grade.

18          On the right side you can see the asphalt in a  
19          slightly darker gray area.

20          And the rotation of the shelter at every  
21          single site is depending on the orientation of  
22          where the nearest tee is and where the balls, the  
23          golf balls historically come to. But basically in  
24          every single site we try to keep the location of  
25          the rain course shelter in exactly the same place

1 unless there was a really good reason to move it  
2 because we already have utilities here. We have  
3 water and power. This one stays exactly where it  
4 is.

5 On the upper right-hand corner you can follow  
6 with the key plan, it shows where we're at on the  
7 site. So this is shelter four. This is one of the  
8 shelters where we are proposing to move it.

9 We had discussions with, again, the manager of  
10 the golf course and he thought that this site that  
11 we're choosing on the opposite side of the tree, of  
12 the big oak tree, was a better site simply because  
13 there's more space. That tree when it was back in  
14 the '20s, it's now 60 plus years old when this rain  
15 shelter was originally built, so it's not a very  
16 good place to put a structure that's going to last  
17 another 30, 40 years. So we're proposing to move  
18 this to the open area to the right. So if you look  
19 at View C that's where it is being located.

20 So the drawing on the left shows you the  
21 camera views of where we're taking those pictures,  
22 and you have the dash line of where the new  
23 location is going to be. The drawing on the right  
24 shows you the close-up view of what that's going to  
25 look like.

1           Shelter five is the next one. This one here  
2           we're actually going to be cutting back some of the  
3           asphalt, so in the drawing on the left you can see  
4           how much of the area of the asphalt is going to be  
5           cut back because we don't need it. We would  
6           actually come back and put some more grass area to  
7           fill that in. So you can see that this one is  
8           almost in exactly the same location of where it is  
9           now. And this one will have water.

10           The next one is Shelter number seven, and this  
11           one here is tucked away behind some existing  
12           hedges. These shelters will be removed -- I'm  
13           sorry -- the hedges are going to be removed. And  
14           we oriented the shelter, again, kind of like in the  
15           orientation to anticipating where the balls are  
16           coming. So the back part where the wall is, that  
17           kind of serves as a protection for the balls that  
18           are coming in from the right side.

19           And this one is one of the ones that has like  
20           more drainage issues because there's a steep  
21           incline from the Ting point, which is on the right  
22           side, so this one will have to be graded up a  
23           little bit. We'll be grading this one up and we'll  
24           also be sloping up the asphalt to meet the entrance  
25           to the shelter.

1           Shelter eight is another one that's going to  
2           be almost in the same location of where it's at  
3           right now, with the exception that we're going to  
4           be removing the hedges. So the footprint of the  
5           shelter is going to be where it is now, plus in the  
6           area of where those hedges are.

7           And shelter nine, which is the last one, is  
8           also very nearby to where it is. So where you have  
9           the hedges now, that's where the beginning of the  
10          new shelter will be. It will be off to the right,  
11          so you can see how it gets closer to the existing  
12          asphalt.

13          And that concludes the presentation. I can  
14          address any questions that anybody may have.

15          MS. KAUTZ: At the top of the screen, unless  
16          any of the Board wants to see any of the slides,  
17          you can unshare your screen at the top.

18          MS. GURRI: Okay. Thank you.

19          MR. MENENDEZ: Is there anyone in the audience  
20          who would like to speak in favor of this case?

21          Anybody --

22          MS. CARBONELL: Hello?

23          MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

24          MS. CARBONELL: Hi this is Karelia.

25          MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. You need to be sworn in.

1 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay.

2 MS. CARBONELL: Okay. I'm ready.

3 MS. KAUTZ: We also didn't swear in the  
4 architect and myself.

5 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. So do you want me  
6 just to backtrack and swear them both in at the  
7 same time then?

8 MS. KAUTZ: Please.

9 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. I know I can't see  
10 Ms. Carbonell, but could you raise your right hand  
11 please, Ms. Gurri? Thank you.

12 Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the  
13 whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

14 MS. GURRI: Yes, I do.

15 MS. CARBONELL: I do.

16 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Go ahead.

18 MS. CARBONELL: Okay. This is Karelia, and my  
19 question --

20 MS. KAUTZ: Karelia, you need to give your  
21 full name and address for the record.

22 MS. CARBONELL: This is Karelia Martinez  
23 Carbonell, 532 Altera Avenue, Coral Gables.

24 MS. KAUTZ: Go ahead.

25 MS. CARBONELL: Ready?

1 MS. KAUTZ: Uh-huh.

2 MR. MENENDEZ: Yeah, go ahead.

3 MS. CARBONELL: Okay. Just from a  
4 preservation sort of perspective, are any of these  
5 1940 shelters, or at least one, I guess maybe in  
6 the best shape, could one be preserved, you know,  
7 just so that -- you know, they do look like they  
8 should because of the fact that even though they  
9 were in the 1940's, I think it's always nice to at  
10 least keep one.

11 Again, I don't know if anybody else has any  
12 ideas, but they -- you know, I would prefer to keep  
13 one around. And I don't know if the department has  
14 been thinking about that, or are they all going to  
15 be destroyed?

16 MS. KAUTZ: A demolition permit was already  
17 issued for the remaining ones. I believe there  
18 were three remaining.

19 Daphne, I don't know if you can confirm that  
20 or not. I believe there were three still  
21 standing --

22 MS. GURRI: Yes.

23 MS. KAUTZ: -- and there was a demolition  
24 permit issued for those for the end of last year.

25 MS. CARBONELL: So there's already a



1 demolition permit?

2 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

3 MR. FULLERTON: Well, the question is can one  
4 of them be preserved?

5 MS. KAUTZ: I believe that they're already so  
6 far gone, and Brandan, who's on here from public  
7 works, can probably speak to that. But it was my  
8 understanding that they are -- they're so far gone,  
9 they're done.

10 MR. DECARO: I just unmuted myself --

11 MS. CARBONELL: It seems like number seven --

12 MS. KAUTZ: Go ahead, Brandan.

13 MR. DECARO: Do I need to be sworn in?

14 MS. KAUTZ: City staff, probably just to be on  
15 the safe side, and then also introduce yourself.

16 THE COURT REPORTER: Do you swear to tell the  
17 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

18 MR. DECARO: Yes, I do.

19 I'm Brandan Decaro, I'm the senior project  
20 manager here for the capital improvement division  
21 of public works.

22 I believe that the demolition permit was  
23 issued quite some time ago because many of the  
24 shelters were in such bad shape after the last  
25 hurricane, after Hurricane Irma, that several of

1           them were taken down, any of them that were  
2           completely beyond repair. This is the first time  
3           that anyone's ever brought up the possibility of  
4           keeping any of the shelters.

5           Of course several of them -- because Daphne,  
6           the architect, is putting the new shelters almost  
7           in an identical location -- obviously have to be  
8           demolished. We would have to study which ones are  
9           left and whether they're repairable at all.

10          Any of the shelters that I've gone and looked  
11          at myself are way beyond repair. In other words,  
12          funding would have to be secured to actually repair  
13          the shelters, you know, so they would not be  
14          unsafe.

15          There's one thing that I would like to add  
16          that Daphne didn't bring up. These shelters are  
17          not only protecting people from rain,  
18          theoretically, they're also protecting golfers from  
19          lightning strikes. You know, there is lightning  
20          protection built into the designs, and I don't know  
21          that the old shelters had that kind of protection.

22          And many of them are so close to vegetation  
23          that the vegetation potentially, especially the  
24          large trees, could attract a lightning strike, you  
25          know, that somebody could be injured just sitting

1 in the shelter. So does that help answer your  
2 question?

3 MS. GURRI: Well, Brandan, I'd like to add  
4 something to piggyback onto what you're saying.  
5 Another difference is that the new shelters address  
6 ADA barrier removal. So some of the shelters, as I  
7 mentioned before, the slope doesn't meet the  
8 criteria, the approach for you to get to the  
9 shelter is not meeting the criteria.

10 So it's not only a matter of the useful life  
11 of the individual wood frame structure itself, but  
12 we're also bringing the City into compliance to  
13 remove any barrier removal.

14 MS. KAUTZ: I will say that when the permit  
15 was signed, it was signed back when Dona was still  
16 here, and one of the reasons why I believe, and  
17 this is just from a professional standpoint, that  
18 she was okay with the demolition permit is that  
19 because, as Daphne mentioned, the period  
20 significance for that district is limited to 1930,  
21 late 1930s, and these structures we believed to be  
22 built after that. We have no proof that they were  
23 there prior to. So they're outside of the period  
24 of significance of the district and failing so...

25 MS. CARBONELL: This is Karelia. They're

1 still over now 60 years old, and all I'm saying is,  
2 I'm not saying for them to even stay on the golf  
3 course, but for them -- I mean, there's so many  
4 parks that the City's working on. I mean, at least  
5 one, one, can be renovated, and the one with the  
6 best possibility. I don't know which one. It  
7 seems like number seven seems to be, you know, from  
8 the eye -- you know, I don't think it would take  
9 that much money. But I would hate to have them  
10 destroyed until maybe our -- you know, one of the  
11 preservation groups, you know, can come up with  
12 maybe funding.

13 But the City is -- you know, there's parks out  
14 there, a new park. It would be nice to even have  
15 that type of -- that in one of the parks.

16 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Kara, may I ask a question?  
17 To the caller's point, I mean, taking one of those  
18 structures, you know, the one that's in the best  
19 shape and refurbishing it and relocating it to  
20 either maybe like a central point, you know, within  
21 the golf -- not central in the course, but maybe  
22 something closer to Burger Bob's, you know, where  
23 it becomes -- it's displayed, and there's a plaque  
24 of some kind, and there's some, you know, write-up.

25 I don't know if there's any value to that, but

1 I can see that being attractive, and having  
2 additional historical, you know, references on the  
3 golf course.

4 MS. KAUTZ: You can certainly entertain that  
5 as part of the motion.

6 MR. FULLERTON: There's a nice little area  
7 near the chipping area along South Greenway over in  
8 the corner, which is kind of out of the way of any  
9 golfer, but kind of useful for groups that are out  
10 there, children and so forth, to not get caught in  
11 the rain, and that might be a nice place to have a  
12 little shelter.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Well, and also, I think the Boy  
14 Scouts they have a --

15 MR. FULLERTON: Yeah.

16 MR. MENENDEZ: -- troop building on the golf  
17 course, that might be an area where that can be  
18 moved to. It could become a Boy Scout project.

19 MR. FULLERTON: That's a great idea.

20 MR. MENENDEZ: And, you know, having used the  
21 golf course in the past and seeing the condition  
22 it's in, I don't know if, you know, it will stand  
23 the move, but certainly, you know, we can take a  
24 look at it and see if, you know, maybe there is a  
25 historical group who would provide some funding or

1 use it as a project to move it to a site like the  
2 Boy Scouts or what John had mentioned. But maybe  
3 it's something that can be taken a look at without  
4 a lot of time and lot of expense. It's a small  
5 structure.

6 MS. KAUTZ: You can certainly make that  
7 investigation part of your motion if you wish.

8 Do you want to close the public hearing or  
9 leave it open?

10 MR. MENENDEZ: Is there anyone else who would  
11 like to speak for or against this case?

12 MR. CEBALLOS: Kara, I just had a quick  
13 question. This COA is for the approval of the  
14 construction of the new golf rain shelters. The  
15 demolition's already been approved; is that  
16 correct? I'm sorry?

17 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

18 MR. CEBALLOS: Okay. Then I don't think a  
19 motion for this particular item should include --

20 MS. KAUTZ: Makes sense.

21 MR. CEBALLOS: -- the idea of a preservation  
22 of one of them. I suggest that the Board, if they  
23 so desire, make a motion in addition to this, a  
24 separate motion, directing staff to look at the  
25 possibility of perhaps saving one of these

1 structures. But I just don't think it should be as  
2 part of this motion.

3 MS. KAUTZ: Agreed. I agree.

4 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

5 MS. KAUTZ: Much better clarification.

6 MR. MENENDEZ: Well, then I'll close the  
7 public comments part of this hearing, leave it up  
8 for any other board discussion, any other board  
9 members would like to comment?

10 Peggy. Unmute yourself.

11 MS. ROLANDO: Thank you. I have a couple of  
12 questions. Is there sufficient light and water for  
13 those honeysuckle plants to stay alive?

14 MS. GURRI: Yes, there is. We have an opening  
15 in the roof, so there's a -- like in the floor  
16 plan, you should have received floor plans, and  
17 there's a roof plan. So there's a circle, there's  
18 an opening in the roof purposely to be able to  
19 allow the honeysuckle to receive light and water.  
20 And we're hoping that the honeysuckle will come and  
21 start crawling over the roof as well.

22 MS. ROLANDO: Okay. And as to the portion of  
23 the bench that extends beyond the roof, what is the  
24 purpose of that if this is a rain shelter --

25 MS. GURRI: That's a good --

1 MS. ROLANDO: -- literal but --

2 MS. GURRI: It's a very good point. It's  
3 aesthetic. We were honoring the sketch that had  
4 already been vetted by key stakeholders from the  
5 City, so part of the bench is uncovered, and the  
6 other part is covered by the roof.

7 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I just want to comment, I  
8 think the design is really successful. I know how  
9 much work and effort it takes to even design like  
10 this small vignette, if you will. It's not -- it  
11 looks simple, but it isn't. And I think it was  
12 done really elegantly.

13 I think that the opening in the roof is pretty  
14 nice, and taking into account all the maintenance  
15 and it's in within the vocabulary and spirit of the  
16 pro shop. And I think from somebody who spent a  
17 lot of time on that golf course as a kid growing  
18 up, I really appreciate, you know, the  
19 thoughtfulness that went into the design.

20 MS. GURRI: Thank you.

21 MR. MENENDEZ: I must agree. I look forward  
22 to using it in the future.

23 MR. FULLERTON: I have a couple comments,  
24 Mr. Chairman.

25 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, sir.



1           MR. FULLERTON: I was wondering if it would be  
2           a good idea, and this is a very minor point, but if  
3           you could arrange like a two to two-and-a-half inch  
4           slope one way or the other away from where the  
5           users are going to be so that the water will drip  
6           off the one side of the roof rather than around the  
7           whole thing.

8           MS. GURRI: It does it. We have that.

9           MR. FULLERTON: You do have that. Okay.

10          MS. GURRI: Are you talking about on the roof?

11          MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

12          MS. GURRI: Yes, we have that.

13          MR. FULLERTON: Okay.

14          MS. GURRI: It slopes all to one side.

15          MR. FULLERTON: Oh, perfect.

16          MS. GURRI: Actually, it slopes back towards  
17          where the water fountains are.

18          MR. FULLERTON: Yes, that's what I would have  
19          considered.

20                 The other thing I have is I notice -- I picked  
21                 up on Peggy's comment about the cluster planter.  
22                 The rendering doesn't indicate or doesn't show very  
23                 well whether there's a hole in the slab for that.  
24                 I'm sure you've made --

25          MS. GURRI: There is. There's a hole in the

1 slab and those are where the river rocks go.

2 MR. FULLERTON: Oh, great. Okay.

3 The other thing is I was going to mention the  
4 lightning protection. But the last thing is the  
5 overall landscaping on the golf course related to  
6 these things. I notice that some of the really  
7 nice landscaping is removed, some of the nice  
8 hedges that form wind breakers and so forth?

9 Has anybody from the City or Public Works  
10 Department or landscape department looked at this  
11 in terms of adding some landscaping around these  
12 things.

13 MS. GURRI: No. Landscaping is going to be  
14 done by the City's own forces. They have their  
15 landscape architect, and it's going to be handled  
16 separately. But never the less, the idea I think  
17 to remove the hedges was -- number one, we needed  
18 the space. But more importantly it's because of  
19 safety.

20 So whatever landscaping goes, it will be  
21 probably treated differently to not create an  
22 enclosure but to allow transparency and still have  
23 landscaping.

24 MR. DECARO: Yes, if I could add, it was  
25 actually the suggestion of our landscape division

1           that the hedges be removed because they've  
2           considerably overgrown. We're of course not  
3           removing any trees, it's just the hedges.

4           And it creates a situation that you can't  
5           really see who's inside some of the existing  
6           shelters, and that was something that we were asked  
7           to avoid at all cost. You don't want anybody  
8           hiding in there in the evening or, you know, hiding  
9           behind the wall or anything of that sort. So it  
10          was actually the landscape division that suggested  
11          that we should get rid of these overgrown hedges.

12          And Daphne's design team doesn't have a  
13          landscape architect again to try and minimize the  
14          cost, so the landscape division stepped up.  
15          They'll be removing the hedges and they'll be  
16          relandscaping.

17          But that's a very good question. I'm really  
18          glad that you asked it.

19          MR. FULLERTON: Thank you.

20          The last thing is lighting. Are any kind of  
21          minimal lighting effects going to be put in there?  
22          Because sometimes midafternoon, especially in the  
23          wintertime, it gets pretty dark out there, and I  
24          just wondered if there's any kind of lighting.

25          MS. GURRI: At this time we don't have any

1 lighting.

2 MR. FULLERTON: Would it be something to think  
3 about?

4 MS. GURRI: Sure. It's a budget concern, and  
5 I think, Brandon, maybe you want to address that  
6 one.

7 MR. DECARO: Yeah, Daphne, how many -- not  
8 only -- not all of the shelters have water, not all  
9 of the shelters have electrical power also.

10 MR. FULLERTON: Right.

11 MR. DECARO: And we looked at the possibility  
12 of extending water and extending the electric power  
13 and it got to be very complicated. We would have  
14 had to put in extra meters, et cetera. So we  
15 currently don't have lighting. The shelters were  
16 so open that we didn't really think that they would  
17 be -- they're not going to be certainly any darker  
18 than the surrounding area.

19 Of course, everything starts to get dark at  
20 dusk, especially before your eyes get accustomed.

21 Daphne, do you know offhand how many of the  
22 shelters actually have electric power? I guess  
23 it's only the ones that have the fountains.

24 MS. GURRI: Four.

25 MR. DECARO: Four. Four out of the --

1           MR. FULLERTON: I think very reasonably a  
2 solar panel could be put up there that would  
3 control one or two lights with just a minimum  
4 amount of wattage for --

5           MR. DECARO: A low voltage light.

6           MR. FULLERTON: Yeah, LED lights or whatever  
7 without any electrical work to be done. That's  
8 just a suggestion. I think it's a good idea. A  
9 lot of people are walking the course at dusk after  
10 the players are off the course, and it's a  
11 wonderful place to sit and watch the sky change and  
12 watch the moonlight come up and so forth.

13          MR. DECARO: Okay.

14          MR. FULLERTON: As a safety item it would be a  
15 nice thing to have, a little bit of light.

16          MR. DECARO: I will certainly bring that up to  
17 the team, it's certainly a reasonable suggestion.

18          MR. FULLERTON: Thank you.

19          MS. BACHE-WIIG: I have a quick question,  
20 slash, comment. Will there be garbage/waste  
21 receptacles at these shelters? Are you planning  
22 for that?

23          MS. GURRI: I don't think we have anything  
24 now. We don't have anything designed to be part of  
25 the shelter. I think nearby some of the shelters

1 already have like portable water, but I don't  
2 recall seeing trash cans out there.

3 MR. FULLERTON: That should be definitely a  
4 consideration.

5 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yeah, I think just because  
6 we're putting these things out there and they're  
7 new and they're so beautiful, just a thought to  
8 maybe think about how to integrate an area, you  
9 know, that is going to compliment or it's going to  
10 hide the waste receptacles.

11 MS. GURRI: I agree. Yeah, it's a good point.

12 MS. KAUTZ: They do have trash cans now next  
13 to the coolers, each of the cooling stations. The  
14 portable coolers have little trash cans next to it  
15 because we sometimes give our dog water from that,  
16 and give them cups and throw them away. So they  
17 are there. They can probably -- I'm assuming, that  
18 our public service or landscape people can put a  
19 receptacle nearby.

20 MR. FULLERTON: Kara, I'd like to  
21 move -- sorry.

22 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Anymore discussion?  
23 Okay. Would any anybody like to make a motion?

24 MR. FULLERTON: I'll move approval of the  
25 shelters as designed and with the comments that

1           were made to be considered.

2           MS. ROLANDO: I second. The comments would  
3 include providing LED lighting, solar-driven LED  
4 lighting, and an appropriate trash receptacle.

5           MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

6           MR. MENENDEZ: We have a motion by  
7 Mr. Fullerton and a second by Ms. Rolando.

8           Okay. Can we read the role, please.

9           MS. COLLAZO: Mr. Rodriguez?  
10 Can you unmute yourself, sir?

11          MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. The comments that we're  
12 addressing here they're not requirements or a  
13 condition of the approval, but rather just comments  
14 associated with the motion; is that correct?

15          MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

16          MR. FULLERTON: Yeah, I think so. I mean, I'd  
17 like to see them seriously considered, unless you'd  
18 like them as part of the motion.

19          MR. RODRIGUEZ: I wanted clarification that we  
20 have a motion that includes comments, that I wanted  
21 to know how binding those comments are as part of  
22 the motion, or whether a motion is to approve and  
23 the comments go with it but they're not a  
24 requirement to the fulfillment of the motion.

25          MS. ROLANDO: I would like them to be required

1 but -- because I think they have nominal expense.

2 MR. FULLERTON: I agree with that as the  
3 motion maker.

4 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Pons?

5 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I can appreciate the  
6 comments. I think we're actually expanding the  
7 scope of the rain shelters for golfers into a  
8 public amenity with lighting and trash, which are  
9 things that I think are good things to bring up.

10 I would be more comfortable voting to approve  
11 the project as it is and have the recommendations  
12 to staff to please study it as opposed to making it  
13 a condition of the approval, because if it's a  
14 condition of the approval and they don't do it,  
15 then they haven't met the approval.

16 So I would strongly suggest that we change the  
17 motion to an approval and the recommendations not  
18 be conditions.

19 MR. FULLERTON: Gus, do you have any guidance  
20 for us?

21 MR. CEBALLOS: My only concern is who was the  
22 person that made the original motion?

23 MR. FULLERTON: I did.

24 MR. CEBALLOS: Then if you chose to amend it  
25 it's your choice and whoever seconded it would have



1 to agree. That's strictly up to you whether you  
2 want it to be just a recommendation or a condition  
3 of the approval.

4 MS. KAUTZ: Typically, John, when we are  
5 reviewing in full construction, which we'd sort of  
6 consider this in a historic district, we're looking  
7 at the impact on the district as a whole, and so I  
8 don't know if you're getting too far afield of that  
9 review. They're good suggestions. I don't agree  
10 with them at all, but, you know, in terms of does  
11 the project -- does it impact the district? No,  
12 not really. So you could approve them as is.

13 MR. FULLERTON: I'd like to have these  
14 considered, but I don't want to get in the way of  
15 the progress of this getting done, so I will make  
16 it a suggestion.

17 Peggy, I don't know if you agree with that  
18 but...

19 MS. ROLANDO: Well, I'd like to know how  
20 strongly and confident the City is to accept the  
21 recommendation. If they're going to blow them off,  
22 then I would suggest we make it a requirement. If  
23 they're amenable to incorporating this into the  
24 design, I'll go with a strong recommendation.

25 MR. FULLERTON: Well, if they can look at each

1 of them and give reasons why they aren't  
2 appropriate, like the lighting, I can see that that  
3 might be a problem. I think it would be a minimal  
4 cost if you do it with the small solar-collector  
5 and LEDs, and the garbage, trash can, I think is  
6 probably a minimal impact as well.

7 The other things are not really -- they're not  
8 even issues regarding taking care of the slope and  
9 planter, and, you know, that kind of thing. So  
10 there are only two things that I think have impact.

11 MS. SHU ZHANG: Hi, this is Sherry Shu Zhang  
12 with Public Works CIP. Could I speak just a little  
13 bit regarding the trash receptacle?

14 MS. ROLANDO: Yeah.

15 MR. MENENDEZ: She needs to be sworn in.

16 MR. DECARO: Sherry, you have to be sworn in.

17 MS. SHU ZHANG: Okay. How do we do that?

18 THE COURT REPORTER: This is the court  
19 reporter, ma'am.

20 Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole  
21 truth, and nothing but the truth?

22 MS. SHU ZHANG: Yes, I do.

23 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

24 MS. SHU ZHANG: So in regards to the trash  
25 receptacles, my understanding is the park

1 department who's the client, the owner of the golf  
2 course, so they will provide them afterwards, and  
3 we can certainly speak with parks to confirm that.

4 So I don't see that's going to be a big issue  
5 if you all feel very strongly about making that a  
6 condition approval.

7 MR. DECARO: Likewise regarding the lighting,  
8 I was going to speak up and say again, the parks  
9 department is our client on this, and I'd have to  
10 get their take on the lighting. I know we  
11 discussed it at one point. I think that the  
12 conversation led to the decision to not light them  
13 because they don't want to encourage them to be  
14 used in the evening.

15 This is more or less like all of the parks  
16 within the city, that they're not really supposed  
17 to be used after dusk, you know, so I was going to  
18 take the issue up with them. But they're our  
19 client, so I'm really not in a position to be able  
20 to say yes unconditionally, I can guarantee that  
21 they would be put there. So I just want to be as  
22 sincere and transparent, you know, as possible.  
23 But I certainly will take up the issue with them.

24 MR. FULLERTON: Well, there are certain  
25 requirements for handicap accessibility that might

1 include lighting. Now, I'm not sure, in the  
2 summertime we have a very long dusk period at which  
3 time it's difficult to play golf, but there are  
4 hundreds of walkers and people who are on that golf  
5 course every night. I'm a block away and I see it  
6 ever single night, and it goes on and on and on.  
7 And whether they're supposed to be on there or not,  
8 they are so...

9 MR. DECARO: No, absolutely agree with you.  
10 Absolutely. The perimeter of the golf course is  
11 used -- well, in the morning also, both the morning  
12 and the evening.

13 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

14 MR. DECARO: It's used very heavily by  
15 walkers.

16 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

17 MR. DECARO: No. I fully understand the  
18 requirement.

19 MR. MENENDEZ: John, what if you amend your  
20 motion and you direct staff to work with parks and  
21 rec and public works and see what can be done?

22 MR. FULLERTON: I would add that. I would add  
23 that.

24 Staff, do you mind if I do that to you?

25 MR. DECARO: Of course not, no, that's very

1 reasonable.

2 MS. ROLANDO: I'm fine with that too.

3 MR. MENENDEZ: That way we can move this  
4 forward.

5 MS. ROLANDO: Yeah.

6 MR. FULLERTON: Are you okay Raul? You okay  
7 with that?

8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I never had a problem. It was  
9 just a question I had.

10 MR. FULLERTON: Good point, very good point.

11 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Make your motion, John.

12 MR. FULLERTON: I move approval and ask staff  
13 and the applicant to work together to study the  
14 possibility of adding minimal lighting and the  
15 trash cans.

16 MR. MENENDEZ: Peggy?

17 MS. ROLANDO: I'm fine with that. Second.

18 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Can we have the role  
19 then, please.

20 MS. COLLAZO: Mr. Rodriguez?

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

22 MS. COLLAZO: Mr. Fullerton?

23 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

24 MS. COLLAZO: Mr. Garcia-Pons?

25 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.

1 MS. COLLAZO: Ms. Bache-Wiig?  
2 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.  
3 MS. COLLAZO: Mr. Menendez?  
4 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.  
5 MS. COLLAZO: Mr. Durana?  
6 MR. DURANA: Yes.  
7 MS. COLLAZO: Ms. Rolando?  
8 MS. ROLANDO: Yes.  
9 MS. COLLAZO: And Mr. Ehrenhaft?  
10 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.  
11 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Looks like the motion  
12 passes.  
13 MR. FULLERTON: Thank you.  
14 MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you, everybody.  
15 MS. GURRI: Thank you. Appreciate it.  
16 MR. DECARO: Thank you very much.  
17 MS. SHU ZHANG: Thank you.  
18 MR. MENENDEZ: The next item on the agenda is  
19 a special certificate of appropriateness, Case File  
20 COA (SP) 2020-007, an application for the issuance  
21 of a special certificate of appropriateness for the  
22 property at 603 Minorca Avenue, a local historic  
23 landmark legally described as Lots 14 and 15, Block  
24 18, Coral Gables Section B according to the plat  
25 thereof as recorded in plat book five, page 111 of

1 the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

2 The application requests design approval for  
3 the relocation of the residence, an addition, and  
4 sitework.

5 MS. COLLAZO: I think Dona is still in the  
6 waiting room.

7 Rayza, can you let her in because I don't see  
8 her on my --

9 MR. MENENDEZ: Here she is.

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Whoever's controlling the  
11 system is not allowing me to unmute unless I hold  
12 the spacebar down.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

14 Kara, does staff have a presentation?

15 MS. KAUTZ: Absolutely.

16 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have a point of order, would  
18 like to clarify something, please.

19 MS. KAUTZ: Okay.

20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: This item and the next item,  
21 regardless of what we do today, cannot go forward  
22 until planning and zoning has decided the issue of  
23 a disaggregation of parcel.

24 MS. KAUTZ: The second item, not the first  
25 item. The first item is --

1 MR. RODRIGUEZ: The first item is never going  
2 to be done unless the second item is approved.

3 MS. KAUTZ: Not necessarily, no.

4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: We're going to talk about  
5 agreeing to move it over just to have an empty lot  
6 next door?

7 MS. KAUTZ: No, in case they want to do a  
8 better addition to the property.

9 MR. FULLERTON: Just do an addition.

10 MS. KAUTZ: They're two separate issues at  
11 this point.

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Let's go along with it, but I  
13 just find this a little -- we're putting the cart  
14 before the horse when planning and zoning, we know  
15 they have a strict policy against the  
16 disaggregation of parcels, and I think we're  
17 wasting our time. But let's go forward and let's  
18 see what we can do. But I just wanted to make this  
19 point of order.

20 MS. KAUTZ: Okay.

21 MR. FULLERTON: I have one also. I have one  
22 too, Mr. Chairman.

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

24 MR. FULLERTON: I've been by the house this  
25 afternoon and yesterday, and I went around the



1 block ten times and I looked at this house up and  
2 down over and over, I couldn't find a posting.  
3 There was no posting on this property.

4 MS. KAUTZ: We did -- we did post the property  
5 on the 7th as required. We also put a notice in  
6 the newspaper, and we also mailed out a notice, a  
7 thousand foot radius, all of those things ten days  
8 in advance of this meeting.

9 MR. FULLERTON: Okay. Good. Then somebody  
10 took the posting down then. It wasn't there  
11 today --

12 MS. KAUTZ: Our requirement was the build.

13 MR. FULLERTON: Okay. Thank you.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: Kara, proceed.

15 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.

16 MR. FULLERTON: Doesn't look like the house I  
17 looked at.

18 MS. KAUTZ: I'm sorry, Albert, did you read  
19 this already?

20 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, I did.

21 MS. KAUTZ: All right. So this is a location  
22 map of the property. It's located on the northwest  
23 corner of the intersection of Minorca Avenue and  
24 Segovia Street. The lot size overall is 110 by  
25 112.5 feet.

1           And so on this slide I just want to point out  
2           for you all, the majority of the properties on this  
3           block of Minorca are already 50 feet.

4           So this home is amongst the earliest homes  
5           constructed in Coral Gables. It was designed by  
6           H. George Fink and given the Permit No. 39 in the  
7           city after it was incorporated.

8           A Miami Herald article dated in March of 1922  
9           noted that the house would be finished in  
10          approximately two months. It was one of eight  
11          homes whose renderings were included in the  
12          full-age ad you see on the screen entitled "The  
13          first Coral Gables season ends with fall sales of  
14          over \$1 million" in April 1922.

15          The pictures of the houses shown in this ad  
16          are coral rock residences. The other two are this  
17          home, which is circled in red and then blown up on  
18          the left, and one other similar home at 519  
19          Alhambra Circle.

20          An addition was made to this property on the  
21          north end of it of the original structure in 1950  
22          by Edward Rempe that consisted of a carport that  
23          was later enclosed into a garage, a bathroom,  
24          storage, and enlarged the screen porch that was  
25          then again later enclosed.

1           The original casement windows were replaced  
2           with awning windows at an unknown date. The front  
3           porch was also enclosed, and the date of the  
4           alteration of the facade window is also unknown.

5           It was designated as a local historic landmark  
6           in 2005.

7           This is a photo of the home in 1923 shortly  
8           after construction.

9           This is a photo of the home from the 1940s.  
10          You can see it's been a little bit more overgrown.

11          The applicant is requesting approval to  
12          relocate the existing residence east from its  
13          current location in the middle of Lots 14 and 15 to  
14          be contained solely on Lot 14.

15          The applicant's also requesting design  
16          approval to remove the later additions to the rear  
17          of the home, approximately 408 square feet, and to  
18          construct a new addition of approximately 800  
19          square feet comprising a bedroom suite and a  
20          one-car garage to the rear.

21          Additional alterations are also planned, like  
22          the windows and things like that.

23          No variances have been requested or are  
24          required. And the Board of Architects reviewed  
25          without comment in February of 2020.

1           So rather than turning this right over to the  
2 architect as we normally do, who is Callum Gibb, I  
3 am going to sort of walk you through our reasons  
4 why we brought this for you and why we believe it's  
5 appropriate before I turn over for his  
6 presentation.

7           So we're of the opinion, staff is of the  
8 opinion that the relocation of this home to a  
9 single lot is considered an appropriate option on  
10 this property as it will preserve the original  
11 cottage intention of this very early Coral Gables  
12 H. George Fink home.

13           In 2005 when the property was designated it  
14 was noted that this house fit the criteria as a  
15 Coral Gables cottage, which is defined as a  
16 smaller, more modestly sized residence designed to  
17 provide the same quality and construction and  
18 detail at a more affordable level to less wealthy  
19 clientele despite the fact that it sits on a larger  
20 lot.

21           Cottages are limited to a street frontage of  
22 65 feet or less. This property sits on a 100-foot  
23 wide frontage, and the property was designated in  
24 2005 for its architectural significance and its  
25 architecture, not for the size of the lot.

1           So in 2005 the previous owner applied for and  
2           received a special certificate of appropriateness  
3           for an approximately 2800-square foot two-story  
4           addition to the east of the residence, a covered  
5           terrace to the west, sitework, walls, fences,  
6           obviously a circular driveway that you can see  
7           there.

8           This project is completely allowable by right  
9           under the City's zoning code and would have  
10          overwhelmed the existing one-story residence and  
11          obliterated its east elevation.

12          These are the floor plans proposed.

13          This is the front elevation that you see on  
14          top, the east Segovia side street elevation, which  
15          completely obliterates that elevation completely.  
16          Thankfully this was never permitted. It was  
17          inappropriate for the house.

18          In 2019 the current owner approached the  
19          department about a substantial addition to the  
20          residence, but again, would have overwhelmed the  
21          residence and diminished its architectural  
22          integrity in our opinion.

23          The initial proposal called for the removal of  
24          approximately 80 percent of the structure because  
25          it is a wood framed structure.

1           We went over and over this property working  
2           with the owner and the architect to find an  
3           appropriate solution while attempting to balance  
4           the property rights that are afforded the owner, he  
5           is allowed to make substantial additions to the  
6           property and with the historic preservation and the  
7           standards that we have to uphold.

8           We did not take this decision lightly. We did  
9           not come to this conclusion as a first choice, but  
10          we determined that the relocation of this historic  
11          residence was a viable option in this case in order  
12          to preserve its architectural and historic  
13          integrity.

14          Because this small wood frame cottage was  
15          constructed in the middle of an 1100-square foot  
16          lot it will always be susceptible to large  
17          inappropriately scaled additions. Moving it to Lot  
18          14 keeps the house intact, allows for a modest  
19          addition, and keeps the east elevation and the  
20          front elevation visible from the streets as it is  
21          now, and it also keeps the property almost  
22          completely intact.

23          So what we're trying to avoid by moving this  
24          house over is being overwhelmed by additions. So  
25          all of these properties that I'm going to show you

1           were approved by the Historic Preservation Board.  
2           They're allowed by right to do substantial  
3           additions to these properties.

4                   This is on 519 Alhambra Circle. This is the  
5           home in the advertisement that I showed you  
6           earlier. The cottage itself is in the four  
7           pictures on the top and the bottom one is on the  
8           left. What's different, even though this is the  
9           same time period as 603 Minorca, this house is not  
10          wood framed. This is a CBS structure. And it also  
11          is on one of the two lots. It sits on the west  
12          side of these two lots. So there was room on the  
13          side to do the addition. Again, that was approved  
14          by the Historic Preservation Board.

15                   Same for this property. This is the twin  
16          house, referred to kind of as the twin house to  
17          this property. It's on Alcazar. This also is not  
18          wood framed. This is a CBS structure. And again,  
19          this one sits to the far right on the two lots,  
20          again, allowing for a nice modest addition to be  
21          done to the left.

22                   This is a property at 927 Valencia that I'm  
23          sure you're all familiar with. The historic house  
24          is shown in the center above, and what was left  
25          after the approved additions is below.

1           This is a house at 1433 Mendavia. The small  
2           cottage here sits on two lots. The empty lot was  
3           to the right-hand side. And this was what was  
4           approved by the Historic Preservation Board.

5           Section 3-1109 of the Coral Gables Zoning Code  
6           entitled moving of existing improvements reads as  
7           follows: The moving of a significant improvement  
8           from their original location shall be discouraged,  
9           however, the Historic Preservation Board may grant  
10          a special certificate of appropriateness if it  
11          finds that no reasonable alternative is available  
12          for preserving the improvement on its original site  
13          and that the proposed relocation site is compatible  
14          with the historic architectural integrity of the  
15          improvement. So obviously this would be relocated  
16          to the same site, then it's appropriate to be sited  
17          there.

18          Typically of moving historical resources is  
19          avoided as once the resource is relocated it loses  
20          its site context and association. In this case the  
21          resource remains on its original site and will  
22          retain that association and will ultimately result  
23          in the home retaining a higher degree of integrity.  
24          It's one of the earliest homes in the city and is a  
25          unique case in which this measure would be deemed



1 appropriate and feasible. It has also been  
2 determined that the property can be moved safely.

3 And I'm going to unshare my screen briefly.  
4 All right. So I e-mailed you all letters we  
5 received from individuals in opposition to this  
6 proposal. I'm not going to read letters into the  
7 record. I will read the names. These are  
8 considered part of the record at this point.

9 We received an e-mail from Josephine Johnson  
10 who lives down the street at 427 Alcazar; Sandra  
11 Skidmore who lives on Miami Beach; Marlin Ebbert  
12 who lives at 6510 San Vicente; Howard Berman at 501  
13 Alcazar Avenue; Greg Gillis, 1915 Ferdinand;  
14 Patricia Button at 1245 Obispo Avenue; the  
15 Archeological & Historical Conservancy, Inc.; Jose  
16 Valdes Fauli at 536 Alhambra Circle; the Historic  
17 Preservation Association of Coral Gables; Norma  
18 Arenas, 1231 Madrid Street; REG Architects  
19 Interiors & Planner; Herbert Brito at 447 Alcazar  
20 Avenue; and Bruce Fitzgerald, whose address I do  
21 not have off the top of my head; Roberta Neway at  
22 1236 South Alhambra Circle; and a letter from the  
23 Florida Trust For Historic Preservation.

24 There seems to be quite a bit of  
25 misinformation contained or being circulated about

1           this property as evidenced by the letters we did  
2           receive. So I'd like to just sort of counter some  
3           of that information.

4                    What we're doing here is trying to preserve  
5           the historic integrity of this small cottage by  
6           relocating it and allowing for its preservation.  
7           The intent is to preserve it as a cottage by  
8           preventing additions that will destroy three sides  
9           of the home and also take away its cottage  
10          integrity.

11                   The coral rock elements being in jeopardy was  
12          a big concern to many people. It's speculative and  
13          assumptive. Structures that are far more complex  
14          and large than this have been moved and relocated  
15          and restored successfully. I have full faith that  
16          a company chosen to perform this work will have the  
17          knowledge and expertise to execute the move.

18                   The Board certainly has the option to  
19          condition an approval on any number of items  
20          including a moving plan being submitted, complete  
21          documentation of the home before, during, and after  
22          the move, a structural report, a coral rock  
23          specialist being called in to assess or supervise.  
24          Those are any of the things in your purview.

25                   We are not negatively impacting the historic

1 integrity of the site as a whole, and moving the  
2 house 20 feet while remaining on its original site  
3 does not diminish the integrity of the property.  
4 This does not lose its setting, as it's staying on  
5 its own site.

6 Moving the home to the east allows the eastern  
7 facade to remain visible to the public from  
8 Segovia, which if an addition is done, it won't.

9 It allows all of the facades to remain intact  
10 with the exception of the rear which was already  
11 altered.

12 The designation of this home is not contingent  
13 upon the size of the lot. It is contingent upon  
14 the architecture and architectural integrity of the  
15 home despite the size of the lot.

16 The twin house on Alcazar and the similar home  
17 on Alhambra as I mentioned are not wood framed like  
18 this house, and they were not sited in the middle  
19 of their double lots, but were already located on  
20 one side making an addition, whether you find it  
21 successful or not, was feasible.

22 As for setting a bad precedent, that too is  
23 speculative, and frankly, the alarm called when  
24 someone doesn't agree with a proposal.

25 Every item we review is case specific. We

1 believe this is a feasible option as this house is  
2 nearly completely intact. It is wood frame. It's  
3 the only one that I'm aware of. It is 1922 and  
4 sits smack in the middle of an 11,000-square foot  
5 property. This is definitely unique within the  
6 city.

7 I'm going to turn this over to the applicant  
8 for his presentation and PowerPoint, and then we  
9 can discuss the staff conditions at the end.

10 So, Callum, you're good to go.

11 MR. GIBB: Good afternoon. I think I need to  
12 be sworn in.

13 MS. KAUTZ: Indeed.

14 THE COURT REPORTER: Do you swear to tell the  
15 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

16 MR. GIBB: I do.

17 Would you like me to go through the PowerPoint  
18 of the drawings first?

19 MS. KAUTZ: Yes, please.

20 It's up to you, but, yes, please.

21 MS. CARBONELL: Before I do that, I just want  
22 to reiterate that we had numerous meetings with  
23 Kara and the staff, and we proposed numerous  
24 options of varying sizes of additions to the  
25 property, and it was really just through trying to

1 find a unique or creative way to resolve these sort  
2 of issues that we thought of moving the property.

3 And it just so happened that the dimension of  
4 the existing house fits on one single lot. If it  
5 had been ten feet wider we wouldn't have been able  
6 to move it and subdivide. So it was maybe by  
7 happenstance or probably because the house was  
8 originally designed to be possibly on a 50-foot lot  
9 elsewhere and created on this lot. I'm not sure  
10 about that. But certainly the initial intent was  
11 to move it and then create room for an addition,  
12 and it just so happened that by moving it we also  
13 got the opportunity to potentially split the lot.

14 So let's just have a look at the presentation.

15 So this is the existing survey. I hope  
16 everybody can see that fine. So just showing the  
17 existing boundary of the lot, the house in the  
18 center.

19 This is a side-by-side drawing showing the  
20 existing location and moving it towards Segovia.  
21 This outline shows that the new location and the  
22 existing will overlap, so we will have to take that  
23 into account during the moving process.

24 This slide is better in person. It just shows  
25 a comparison size of the lots. Obviously, you can

1 see that majority of them are 50 or 65-foot or less  
2 with a few exceptions in the center, and obviously  
3 the existing one.

4 This is a zoning diagram for the zoning review  
5 just showing the amount of green area lot coverage,  
6 which we meet the general conditions for.

7 A side-by-side comparison of the existing and  
8 proposed floor plan.

9 The later additions to the original structure  
10 that were described as being the bathroom and the  
11 garage are here, so they would be removed prior to  
12 relocation. And then a new addition incorporating  
13 a bedroom suite and a single-car garage access from  
14 Segovia is what is proposed, which would then fit  
15 on the 50-foot lot.

16 Side-by-side elevations. The original front  
17 elevation had these windows separated, and staff  
18 asked that we sort of go back to that design  
19 removing the large picture window in the front.

20 Rear elevation, obviously these are additions.

21 So this is the Segovia street elevation, which  
22 the benefit is most given to the house by  
23 relocating by going to a 15-foot setback. Here it  
24 puts it back on the street, makes it visible and  
25 keeps its prominence in the neighborhood.

1           These are the additions to remove.

2           This is the bedroom and garage wing, if you  
3 will, with a slight small breakfast room on the  
4 inside, but what it does, it adds a little break to  
5 clearly define the original structure and the  
6 addition.

7           And this is the west elevation to the interior  
8 lots, similar break. And here you can see clearly  
9 where we're going to let the original stone  
10 foundation stop and then just go to a stuccoed  
11 water table plinth to carry the line through. But  
12 we're not going to continue the stone.

13           And these are a selection of photographs of  
14 the existing property. The corner elevation  
15 obviously would still be maintained when we locate,  
16 with this being the primary Segovia Street, and  
17 this is the Minorca Avenue elevation.

18           Do you have any questions?

19           MR. FULLERTON: What's the front setback  
20 requirement along Segovia there, Cal?

21           MR. GIBB: The side street as it will be is 15  
22 feet.

23           MR. FULLERTON: But that would be the front  
24 street, Segovia -- well, no, that would be --

25           MR. GIBB: No, Minorca's the front entrance

1 street.

2 MR. FULLERTON: Yeah. Yeah.

3 MR. GIBB: Yeah, the front door faces Minorca,  
4 and that's a standard 25 requirement, but I think  
5 the house is maybe 26. We would maintain that  
6 distance.

7 MR. FULLERTON: Well, if you moved the  
8 structure you couldn't maintain that distance.

9 MR. GIBB: Well, you couldn't maintain the  
10 site, but maintain the distance to Minorca reducing  
11 their distance to Segovia down to the 15 feet.

12 MR. FULLERTON: I see.

13 MS. SPAIN: I have a question of staff. This  
14 is Dona Spain.

15 Kara, did the -- particularly, the Florida  
16 Trust, did they reach out to you, and were you able  
17 to give them your staff report or any information  
18 about the reasons that you were recommending  
19 approval of this?

20 MS. COLLAZO: Is Kara there?

21 MS. KAUTZ: Sorry, I'm just having a little  
22 conversation with myself over here.

23 No, we did not. They did not reach out to us.  
24 In fact, after we received the letter from the  
25 Florida Trust I reached out to them and sent an



1 e-mail, and I said if you would like to know our  
2 position on this, you know, please let me know and  
3 I'm happy to discuss with it you. But, no, they  
4 did not reach out to us.

5 MS. SPAIN: Wow, that's surprising that they  
6 would issue a letter without talking to the  
7 preservation officer.

8 MS. KAUTZ: Yeah, I was surprised too.

9 MS. SPAIN: What about any of the people that  
10 wrote these letters? Did any of them contact the  
11 officer and talk to you about the rationale in  
12 moving it? Because I can tell you, you are hard  
13 core about not moving things, and so I -- you know,  
14 anyhow...

15 MS. KAUTZ: I will tell you, one of the  
16 letters, Rosa Lowinger, rescinded her letter. I  
17 spoke to her.

18 MS. SPAIN: I saw that.

19 MS. KAUTZ: She did rescind her letter after  
20 discussing it with us and what our position is.

21 MS. SPAIN: Yeah. I mean, it certainly  
22 preserves a historic home.

23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Are we discussing this with  
24 staff now, or is the presentation over?

25 MS. SPAIN: I think he finished his

1 presentation, didn't he?

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: May I be heard? May  
3 I be heard?

4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Can we please decide the  
5 issue?

6 MR. MENENDEZ: The presentation is over.  
7 We're having discussion between board members right  
8 now and staff.

9 Let me -- I'm going to open it up to people  
10 who are for this project. I'll put a caveat, at  
11 the beginning there are a lot of people who want to  
12 speak. I'm going to keep each speaker to two  
13 minutes so that we can get everybody in and move  
14 this forward.

15 So if there's anybody who would like to speak  
16 for this project, anybody at all?

17 Okay.

18 MS. KAUTZ: You're on.

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Anyone who wants to  
20 speak in favor, they need to be sworn in, please.

21 MS. KAUTZ: Before you begin, I'm sorry,  
22 Callum, can you unshare your screen please so we  
23 can see who's speaking.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Hello, can you hear me?

1 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. Yes.

2 Whoever's speaking now, can we just get  
3 everyone sworn in at the same time for or against?

4 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

5 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. Everybody, please  
6 raise your right hand to be sworn.

7 Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the  
8 whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

9 (ALL): Yes.

10 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, Mr. Goldstein, go ahead.

11 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Hi. My name is Greg  
12 Goldstein. I'm the owner of the property, and I  
13 understand the application or proposal to move this  
14 historical structure at first glance is a bit  
15 shocking, and I read several e-mails in opposition  
16 of the move, and I understand everyone's concerns.

17 I want to assure everybody that this wasn't my  
18 original plan to purchase the property to move the  
19 house and split the lot. That wasn't the original  
20 intention at all.

21 Today's proposal to move the house is actually  
22 a result of the work that was done by myself and  
23 Callum over the past year working with Historical  
24 to try to figure out the best solution for this  
25 property and lot. We considered every option I

1 believe possible to add to the existing structure.  
2 We considered an addition to the north of the  
3 property. We considered an addition to the east of  
4 the property. We considered an addition to the  
5 west of the property. We considered one-story  
6 additions. We considered two-story additions.

7 We analyzed the view from the elevation on the  
8 Segovia side of the street. We looked at the front  
9 gable. We looked at the bump-out in the middle of  
10 the home. We considered building in front of the  
11 bump-out, behind the bump-out. I mean, we looked  
12 at every option and spent the last year doing it.

13 So I want to reiterate what Kara said earlier,  
14 we're not taking this move lightly either. We  
15 found that we're in an extremely unique situation  
16 being that this is an old frame home literally in  
17 the center of this very large lot. The location of  
18 the house really made it impossible for us to come  
19 up with a plan that was going to be workable for  
20 the property and still keep the historical nature  
21 of the home to what I think everyone will be happy  
22 with. And that's how we, you know, reached this  
23 conclusion, you know, to bring the proposal to  
24 where it is today.

25 And I know I only have two minutes. I just

1           want to give a little bit of background about  
2           myself. I live at 1203 Asturia Avenue. This home  
3           I purchased with my family a few years back and we  
4           actually made the house a historical home with the  
5           historical department.

6                   And with Callum we added a second-story  
7           addition to a mostly one-story home. It was very  
8           important for me to maintain the original foot  
9           print of the home, and I think -- you're welcome to  
10          drive by. I think we came up with a really good  
11          solution, a seamless two-story addition.

12                   So I just want to let everyone know that I'm  
13          not just coming in here trying to move things  
14          around. I have experience working with the  
15          historical department. I have experience with  
16          structure. My house here, there was no foundation.  
17          We had to build a foundation under an existing  
18          one-story home to support a second story. I'm also  
19          a general contractor.

20                   So these are the things I'd like to do. I  
21          have experience doing it. This is a very unique  
22          project. I hope you give me the opportunity to do  
23          it, and I think everyone will be happy with the  
24          results.

25                   MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

1           Anybody else who would like to speak in favor  
2 of the project?

3           Ms. Bondurant? You need to unmute yourself.

4           MS. BONDURANT: Can you hear me?

5           MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

6           MS. BONDURANT: Thank you. I need to be sworn  
7 in. No, I was sworn in with the group.

8           Okay. My name is Jane Gaye Bondurant, and I  
9 live at 446 Alcazar.

10          I want to make sure I understand the situation  
11 here. The house is sitting in the middle of the  
12 two lots; is that right?

13          MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

14          MR. GIBB: That's correct.

15          MS. BONDURANT: That's correct. I haven't  
16 heard anybody talk about density. I would be for  
17 this move as long as the lots are not allowed to be  
18 split. I would like to maintain the same density.

19          It's interesting that -- I don't live on the  
20 same street, but I live on Alcazar. There are 80  
21 houses on this street and it's only four blocks  
22 long. I don't know about this particular house --  
23 I know the house, but I don't know the rest of the  
24 street that well.

25          But it's just a comment about keeping the same

1 density, because if you move the house over and you  
2 can split the lot and somebody's going to come in  
3 there and try to put up a mega house, and so I'd  
4 like to make sure that that doesn't happen.

5 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

6 Anybody else who would like to speak in favor  
7 of the project?

8 Okay. Those who would like to speak against  
9 the project?

10 MS. CARBONELL: I would like to speak against  
11 the project. Hello?

12 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

13 MS. CARBONELL: My name is Karelia. Can you  
14 hear me?

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

16 MS. CARBONELL: Okay. My name is Karelia. I  
17 was sworn in before.

18 I am president of the Historic Preservation  
19 Association of Coral Gables. And if I may, I have  
20 been asked by another resident who had sent in his  
21 letter, his computer, I guess because of lightning,  
22 he asked me to read his letter after mine, if  
23 that's okay. So that would be two minutes for me  
24 and then two minutes for him.

25 Is that acceptable?

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

2 MS. CARBONELL: Okay. So I'm going to read my  
3 letter, because I think Kara mentioned that there  
4 was some misinformation regarding this particular  
5 item or issue, and, you know, from the perspective  
6 of the historic community, there was nothing  
7 mentioned. We were waiting on the staff report  
8 that we received last Friday, so nothing before.  
9 There was no discussion, there was nothing that  
10 was -- there was no position taken until the staff  
11 report was made public, which was last Friday.

12 And from that staff report there was also a  
13 request for the 2005 historic designation report of  
14 603 Minorca.

15 So, please, as far as the Historic  
16 Preservation Association, this is not done on a  
17 whim and it hasn't been done lightly. It has been  
18 done very academically going through the documents  
19 that the City has provided.

20 So here's the letter from the Historic  
21 Preservation. On behalf of HPACG please accept  
22 this letter in opposition to the issuance of  
23 special certificate of appropriateness for the  
24 relocation of the historic residence designed by  
25 H. George Fink located at 603 Minorca, and I'm



1 quoting here. Quote, "the uniqueness of this home  
2 is characterized by the size of the property. It  
3 is one of the few homes of this type to still exist  
4 on such a large parcel of land while maintaining  
5 its integrity."

6 This is right from the 2005 local designation  
7 report of the City. It's on page 2 if you care to  
8 look. And these are -- so in opposition to what is  
9 stated in the designation report, the city staff's  
10 recommendation overlooks the fact that this lot is  
11 a significant characteristic trait. In effect, the  
12 subdivision of this lot will negate the  
13 designation.

14 It will also jeopardize the delicate coral  
15 rock stem and could ultimately damage it. It could  
16 also negatively impact the historic integrity of  
17 the whole property, including the house and the  
18 green space. It would compromise the property's  
19 historic designation as per the 2005 local  
20 designation report of the City, and it will set  
21 that precedent for the future of historic  
22 properties in Coral Gables that sit on extra lots.

23 Recommending the potential destruction of  
24 significant historic structures should always be  
25 the last resort and an option only exercised in

1           accordance to the Secretary of the Interior's  
2           Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.

3                   We ask that the Historic Preservation Board  
4           oppose staff's recommendation to allow the  
5           relocation of 603 Minorca Avenue.

6                   And, yes, once that relocation is done that  
7           Lot 15 will have a two-story house going up,  
8           because that is part of -- you know, that's the  
9           next item on the agenda. So that's HPACG.

10                   I am going to now read from Herbert Brito who  
11           has asked me to read his letter, so please bear  
12           with me.

13                   I am writing -- this is from Herbert Brito. I  
14           am writing to express my opposition to the issuance  
15           of special certificate of appropriateness for the  
16           relocation of the historic residence located at 603  
17           Minorca Avenue.

18                   First, the relocation of a historic residence  
19           is not an approved treatment according to the  
20           Secretary of the Interior's Standards and  
21           Guidelines For Rehabilitation. When in certain  
22           rare cases relocation is deemed preferable to the  
23           loss of a building or to preserve the sense of its  
24           setting, the relocation proposal must verify that  
25           all reasonable alternatives to relocation have been

1           considered and documentation must be provided to  
2           confirm that the relocation is the preferred  
3           alternative.

4           In past legal challenges the only accepted  
5           reason for justifying a move are that the building  
6           has been moved in the past or that the only means  
7           of saving the building from certain loss is a  
8           relocation.

9           Number two, architect H. George Fink located  
10          the house on a double lot with large side setbacks  
11          to maximize natural ventilation and views outward.  
12          The side and open space around the house contribute  
13          to its character. Crowding another house on the  
14          existing site will detract from its significance.

15          Third, there are high risks, both financial  
16          and material, when moving a historic building.  
17          There is a chance that the architectural fabric of  
18          the building will be damaged or obliterated  
19          altogether. Recall the tragic 1995 collapse of the  
20          historic brown house in part due to its coral rock  
21          foundation.

22          Fourth, moving a historic house also sets an  
23          unfortunate precedent in Coral Gables that can  
24          result in more historic house relocation, the  
25          erosion of historic districts, and weaken our

1 city's uniqueness.

2 As a rule houses that are moved usually lose  
3 their historic designation at the local, state, or  
4 federal level because their architectural integrity  
5 and site characteristics have been irretrievably  
6 altered.

7 And, fifth, according to the city's zoning  
8 plan reviewer, the proposed two-story house  
9 adjacent to the historic house exceeds the maximum  
10 allowed 1969 square feet of ground area coverage.

11 With the numerous deficiencies cited by the  
12 zoning plan reviewer, I believe that consideration  
13 of a special certificate of appropriateness by the  
14 Historic Preservation Board is premature and  
15 unnecessary.

16 The zoning plan reviewer has stopped the  
17 review until a building site determination letter  
18 is issued for the approval of the split of the  
19 current folio.

20 So in closing, I reiterate my belief that  
21 there's no need to subdivide the existing folio to  
22 add another residence or relocate the historic  
23 house that sits between Minorca Avenue. I strongly  
24 recommend that you vote to deny the issuance of  
25 special certificate of appropriateness, as a denial

1 is essential for the sake of our city's future and  
2 to retain our special sense of time and place.

3 Herbert Brito is an architect. He is also of  
4 national acclaim in terms of the historic  
5 preservation community, and he lives at 447 Alcazar  
6 Avenue.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

9 MS. KAUTZ: For one moment, Herbert Brito is  
10 not an architect.

11 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Anyone else who would  
12 like to speak?

13 MS. BRANNIGAN: I would like to speak.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: Ms. Brannigan?

15 MS. BRANNIGAN: Yes. Hi.

16 I've been trying to draw attention. I'm not  
17 too familiar with how to do this online deal, but I  
18 was trying to draw attention earlier on when there  
19 was a mention with respect to notice.

20 Oh, first of all, I should tell you I am the  
21 owner of 609 Minorca, the property immediately west  
22 of the property under discussion.

23 But I notified the Historic Board, the  
24 historic preservation department this morning that  
25 I do not believe that this meeting has been

1 properly noticed, and I would like an opinion from  
2 the city attorney.

3 I saw on August 7th, I was driving by and I  
4 saw a woman putting two small signs, legal signs in  
5 the front yard. I came back a few hours later and  
6 no signs were posted. No signs have been posted  
7 for any of the time since then. So rather than  
8 being posted for ten days, it was posted for  
9 perhaps a few houses.

10 I would like a statement from the city  
11 attorney as to whether that's adequate notice.

12 MR. CEBALLOS: That would not invalidate this  
13 hearing. This hearing can continue. If the  
14 property was posted properly and somebody was to  
15 take it down, it does not invalidate this hearing  
16 and the hearing can continue.

17 MS. BRANNIGAN: Okay. Got it. I would like  
18 to then go forward and express my own concerns  
19 about this.

20 The lot in question, it's simply a double lot,  
21 it's not a football field. It's just a little more  
22 spacious. Because it sits on a corner, it looks a  
23 little bit bigger. But this is a pristine example  
24 of an old Spanish house and old Spanish cottage.  
25 It's a George Fink house.

1           The fact that it sits in the middle of a  
2 double lot on the corner makes it all the more  
3 important to preserve it in its current form in its  
4 current place, not to squeeze it over to the side  
5 so that some spec development can go on next door.

6           There's no valid historic preservation reason  
7 to move the property. It's simply a way to allow a  
8 developer who has no intention of ever living there  
9 to maximize profits. And I don't see that as a  
10 valid reason for moving it.

11           The planned envision moving the lot to the  
12 corner of Segovia and adding an extension and then  
13 shoehorning in a too big story house right next to  
14 that house, which will also damage the view of that  
15 house, as well as my house, which is also an old  
16 Spanish house, although not designated historic.  
17 It's also an old Spanish cottage.

18           This would be with no regard for air space or  
19 green space. I would also bear the brunt of the  
20 development. If you look at the plans I would look  
21 out at a wall to wall concrete two-story structure.  
22 So that's really not very appealing.

23           If it must be redeveloped, it should be done  
24 in a more equitable and a smaller fashion that  
25 gives consideration to me as a neighbor who has

1 owned my home for 34 years and intend to stay here  
2 more.

3 If it's approved the newly created lot should  
4 be restricted to no more than one story. Approving  
5 this measure today puts the City on the road to  
6 allowing this two-story house.

7 There are additional problems that would  
8 happen. The project, which should be viewed as,  
9 you know, both lots together, this envisions two  
10 very old native mahogany trees being removed. The  
11 newly created lot will have its driveway exiting on  
12 to Minorca. That's not permitted as it being a  
13 double lot right now. It's supposed to exit to the  
14 side street of Segovia.

15 And with all this inadequate green space there  
16 would be runoff from the concrete to my lot  
17 potentially causing flooding.

18 That's all that I have for now. Thank you for  
19 your consideration.

20 MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

21 Anyone else who would like to speak?

22 MR. MACHADO: I would.

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Machado?

24 MR. MACHADO: Hi, how are you.

25 My name is Javier Banos Machado. I live at



1 1801 Casilla Street about two-and-a-half blocks  
2 from this particular property.

3 I enjoy driving through the neighborhood and  
4 seeing this property. I walk through the  
5 neighborhood and I see this property. It is to my  
6 view part of what Coral Gables -- what we all come  
7 to love about Coral Gables. What I see and what  
8 I've seen with this May around my neighborhood is  
9 there being an increase in build out of every  
10 single lot that's available for sale. I've seen  
11 larger home being built.

12 There's nothing wrong with development.  
13 There's nothing wrong with building larger homes,  
14 so long as we preserve the character of the  
15 neighborhood, and unfortunately, my view -- and I  
16 respect the perspective of the homeowner -- this  
17 will be a significant modification of the original  
18 intention of what the neighborhood should look  
19 like.

20 So respectfully, I just think it doesn't  
21 really conform with the entire design, especially  
22 the moving of the property which, respectfully, I  
23 would disagree, would I think damage the underlying  
24 structure and underlying base of the property.

25 It doesn't meet the look of the neighborhood

1 or what the neighborhood should look like,  
2 especially in the North Gables where we live in a  
3 more compact neighborhood.

4 But I would respectfully request that you guys  
5 deny the application.

6 MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

7 Anybody else who would like to speak? Nobody  
8 else?

9 Okay. I'm going to then close the public  
10 portion of the hearing.

11 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Albert, would it be  
12 appropriate for me to respond to a couple of those?

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

14 MR. GIBB: As far as the zoning determination  
15 letter or review, that was actually to do with the  
16 interior lot, where the proposed house was going to  
17 go. So it doesn't affect this particular reading  
18 because this is really about moving the house.

19 Secondly, the determination of a lot split,  
20 you know, takes on another conversation which is  
21 different from the relocation. So we can address  
22 other things if we get to that.

23 And as far as the density, obviously, again,  
24 those questions are more pertaining to the future  
25 potential of the property, not the relocation of

1 the house.

2 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

3 Okay. I'll close the public hearing portion  
4 of the case, and open it up to discussion among the  
5 Board.

6 Any questions?

7 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have question, if I may.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead, Raul.

9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Just let me unmute myself.

10 The staff report on page six says it has been  
11 determined in the passive voice that the existing  
12 structure is sound and can be moved -- safely  
13 moved.

14 Who made that determination and when?

15 MS. KAUTZ: Greg, do you want to speak to  
16 that?

17 MR. GOLDSTEIN: We preliminarily took a look  
18 at the structure in the crawl space and I had  
19 several structural moving companies come take a  
20 look and analyze the property and see if it would  
21 be feasible to move. And every company that I had  
22 come in to take a look at the property did say the  
23 move is feasible.

24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman, may i follow up  
25 on this, please?

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, go ahead.

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. The very first staff  
3 recommendation and staff request is that they  
4 provide a complete structural report on the  
5 existing structure prior to obtaining a permit for  
6 the relocation of the structure. It seems like  
7 we're doing this, again, half ass backwards.

8 Why is the staff recommending based on the  
9 self-serving statements of an applicant that it has  
10 been determined that the existing structure is  
11 sound and can be safely moved, and then ask as a  
12 condition of our approval that we require a  
13 structural report? That structural report should  
14 have accompanied this recommendation, not the other  
15 way around.

16 MS. KAUTZ: Your opinion. I abide by your  
17 opinion, but we would request one moving forward.

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Anyone can say anything. This  
19 board should have before it a structural report  
20 allowing -- that says that this structure, which is  
21 a historic building built almost 100 years ago, can  
22 be moved safely and soundly, not a representation,  
23 a self-serving representation of an applicant.

24 MR. FULLERTON: Mr. Chairman?

25 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Fullerton, go ahead.

1           MR. FULLERTON: Yeah, I think those are good  
2 points Raul brought up, and aside from that I think  
3 we should never allow this building to be moved if  
4 it means that the lots can be split up, we'd have a  
5 lot split. Once the move is made, there's nothing  
6 to prevent the applicant to come back for a lot  
7 split.

8           I've been on many cases where even a walkway  
9 to a front yard or front door is on the adjoining  
10 property and they wouldn't let the lots be split.  
11 There are many cases where surrounding walls have  
12 been built across property lines that prevented the  
13 applicants from lot splitting.

14           I would hate to have us approving moving this  
15 thing, even if it's -- I mean, if it is possible  
16 safely, and then have them come back and say, well,  
17 there's nothing to prevent us now from the lot  
18 split.

19           MS. KAUTZ: John, that's why we split that up  
20 into two certificates of appropriateness. One is  
21 allowing them to move the house if they wish to,  
22 either for building site determination to go that  
23 route, or to do a more sympathetic addition to the  
24 property. So this particular case, just the  
25 relocation of the house and the addition that they

1 are currently proposing.

2 The second COA involves the potential lot  
3 separation and a recommendation to the Planning and  
4 Zoning Board, because we are only a recommending  
5 body to them and to the city commission, they make  
6 the ultimate recommendation to the commission, the  
7 commission makes the ultimate decision, and then  
8 the construction of the proposed new residence.

9 So they're separated for that reason.

10 MR. FULLERTON: I understand that.

11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: May I speak, please,  
12 Mr. Chairman?

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead, Mr. Rodriguez.

14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Kara's asking us to put on  
15 blinders and forget about the fact that there is a  
16 request that has to go to the Planning and Zoning  
17 Board for the disaggregation of this parcel.

18 And what John said, it's absolutely correct.  
19 There is an ironclad policy in this city against a  
20 disaggregation of parcels. So what we're doing is  
21 we're splitting angels on the head of a pin and  
22 making an advisory comment on something that will  
23 never be or may never be.

24 MS. KAUTZ: There's a process for them to --

25 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Excuse me.

1 MS. KAUTZ: There's a process in the City for  
2 them to follow.

3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I did not interrupt you.

4 MS. KAUTZ: There's a --

5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I did not interrupt you.

6 The next proposal requires the fiction that  
7 there is a parcel upon which this property can be  
8 placed. Let's be realistic.

9 MR. MENENDEZ: All right. Yeah, I understand  
10 that. We haven't gotten to that point. We're  
11 talking about, you know, being able to move this  
12 now. Let's focus on this and --

13 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I am focusing on that. Why  
14 should we consider moving a property where we don't  
15 even know that it safely can be moved, and our job  
16 is to preserve the historic properties of Coral  
17 Gables. We don't have a structural report from  
18 anyone who says we can do this.

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

20 MS. SPAIN: I think that's a very good point,  
21 if I may. I think that's a very good point on the  
22 engineering report as far as the lot separation,  
23 which we haven't discussed yet.

24 The only way that this can go to the Planning  
25 and Zoning Board is if it comes to the Historic

1           Preservation Board first because they have to have  
2           a recommendation either for or against the lot  
3           separation on any historic property.

4           So we have to go forward. It's not like it  
5           can go to the Planning and Zoning Board without  
6           that. So I think that's why Kara has it in front  
7           of us.

8           MR. FULLERTON: And, Dona and Board, I served  
9           on the Planning and Zoning Board for six years  
10          years ago, and we had to consider lot splits on  
11          many cases, what I said about the walls and  
12          walkways --

13          MS. SPAIN: Right. That's right.

14          MR. FULLERTON: -- prevented that.

15          I would hate to think that by doing this and  
16          them being careful about how they do it, make sure  
17          that it fits the setbacks for its own lot and so  
18          forth, and then to allow them then to come back  
19          without any encroachments --

20          MS. SPAIN: No. I understand what you're  
21          saying. I get that. I think that's one of the  
22          criteria that they cannot have. I was a zoning  
23          administrator for a fair number of years, and  
24          that's one of the criteria that you cannot have had  
25          or ever had an encroachment onto another lawn.



1           But I think that's one of the criteria.

2           MR. MENENDEZ: Any other discussion from other  
3 board members?

4           MR. CEBALLOS: I just need to bring up one  
5 particular item. I understand that it seems odd  
6 that you're being asked to put on blinders, but  
7 that's exactly what you have to do in this  
8 situation, because you're reviewing this per the  
9 code, which if it meets the criteria and would  
10 allow for the relocation of the residence and the  
11 addition, the sitework, the fact that they can then  
12 in the future split it and build a second shouldn't  
13 be part of the consideration of this particular  
14 COA. I hate the fact that I have to tell you that,  
15 but you in essence do need to put on blinders and  
16 take each item individually and not consider the  
17 factors of the second one or the possibility of  
18 Planning and Zoning and then the city commission  
19 splitting the lot months down the road.

20           MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Ms. Rolando?

21           MR. RODRIGUEZ: We can't consider the fact  
22 that this is going to change the character of this  
23 neighborhood and the historic character of that  
24 house in that neighborhood.

25           MR. CEBALLOS: The move, yes, 100 percent. If

1           you believe that the move, the relocation of the  
2           property, shifting it over would affect everything  
3           you just mentioned, 100 percent. That is well  
4           within your right to consider that.

5           MR. RODRIGUEZ: And that's 100 percent what  
6           I'm saying.

7           MR. MENENDEZ: Ms. Rolando?

8           MS. ROLANDO: Yes. I think that I have not a  
9           lot of objections to moving this home, especially a  
10          few feet over because this is a home that would  
11          have comfortably fit on a 50-foot lot.

12          What I am struggling with is when we look at  
13          what could be done in terms of adding onto this  
14          home, and you look at what was previously approved,  
15          it makes -- one, it's not preserving three of the  
16          facades of the house, and what was previously  
17          approved was a really massive addition. So I think  
18          what we have to be aware of is in the event we say  
19          no to moving this structure and adding on a modest  
20          addition, that we risk having a massive and/or  
21          unsympathetic addition.

22          So be careful for what you wish. I personally  
23          would rather have two modest homes side by side  
24          rather than a massive home that was out of scale  
25          with the neighborhood.

1 My concern is if we agree to sever or --

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: We don't agree.

3 MS. ROLANDO: -- allow the move and then are  
4 not sure what goes up next door, we could end up  
5 with something out of scale next door.

6 So I'm struggling here. I'm not opposed to,  
7 one, a sympathetic addition, nor am I opposed to  
8 moving the home and allowing the construction of a  
9 modest in scale home next door.

10 MS. SPAIN: May I comment on that?

11 MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

12 MS. SPAIN: Did you notice in the staff report  
13 that the floor area that they are contemplating,  
14 the new residence and the existing historic  
15 residence with a small addition, is going to be  
16 less than what they could do if they built an  
17 addition and didn't do any type of a lot separation  
18 and did an addition to the structure. Because you  
19 really can't -- the City cannot prevent someone  
20 from maxing out on FAR. I mean, that's just not  
21 appropriate.

22 And so my fear is the same as yours, that  
23 if -- and I think a couple of those that Kara  
24 showed, I was recommending approval of them, but  
25 they did gobble up these small little cottages.

1 MS. ROLANDO: Yeah, that one on Alhambra  
2 Circle it's --

3 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

4 MS. ROLANDO: -- a cottage.

5 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

6 MS. ROLANDO: You can't even tell what was  
7 there.

8 MS. SPAIN: No. And that's exactly what will  
9 happen with this one because in order to max out  
10 they have to build on both sides of it and all  
11 three sides of it. And so that's a big concern.

12 And I would also like to comment, and I can't  
13 find it now, but on the designation report where it  
14 talks about -- I'm commenting on this because I  
15 wrote it. It says, it is one of the few homes --  
16 this is what Karelia pointed out. It's one of the  
17 few homes of this type to still exist on such a  
18 large parcel of land while maintaining its  
19 integrity.

20 The reason why I added that is that this is a  
21 very small cottage on a very big lot. If we allow,  
22 if it stays in that location and we allow a massive  
23 addition to it, that is no longer the case. Moving  
24 it and allowing it to retain its integrity would  
25 not negate the designation report. That's just in

1 my opinion.

2 But the whole idea on that report is that it  
3 was this tiny little cottage on this massive lot.  
4 Typically there's additions done to those.

5 And so anyhow...

6 MR. FULLERTON: What you end up with is a  
7 15-foot setback on Segovia, 15 feet. That's pretty  
8 tight.

9 MS. KAUTZ: It's allowable.

10 MS. SPAIN: I think that's the allowed  
11 setback. I don't think that's a variance, is it?

12 MR. FULLERTON: No. No, it's not. But I'm  
13 just saying, it's very close to Segovia, the  
14 longest side of the house.

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Does anyone else have any  
16 comments?

17 Mr. Garcia-Pons?

18 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I can really -- I share  
19 the concerns that some of my board members have on  
20 both sides of it. I think this is a really  
21 interesting case, and I really appreciate staff's  
22 attempt to find a way to save the character of this  
23 particular building.

24 I do want to ask staff a very specific  
25 question on one of the Secretary of Interior's

1 Standards, particularly standard No. 2.

2 There's language specifically to the character  
3 of a property, and I want to make sure that we all  
4 understand what property means, and the alteration  
5 of features and spaces that characterize a  
6 property. I know that in the past we have been  
7 held to certain standards with regards to property.  
8 It's not just the building.

9 I want to hear staff's point of view on this.

10 MS. KAUTZ: ElizaBeth, do you want to take  
11 this one?

12 MS. GUIN: Sure. Can you hear me?

13 MS. KAUTZ: Uh-huh.

14 MS. GUIN: I think some of you are aware that  
15 I worked for the National Park Service for the  
16 better part of ten years, and part of what I did  
17 for them was interpreting the Secretary of  
18 Interior's Standards. So I can speak to this.

19 This particular property was designated for  
20 its architectural merits. Moving it under park  
21 service, Secretary of Interior's Standards,  
22 national register, what it needs to maintain is  
23 that architectural merit. By moving it we  
24 definitely are maintaining the cottage, the  
25 architectural features, and that is what the

1 Secretary of Interior's Standards -- when you move  
2 a structure based on its designation, architectural  
3 value, that's what you need to maintain.

4 This property was not designated by its site,  
5 by its context. It was solely -- it's always  
6 designated under two criteria, both on the  
7 architectural features.

8 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I can appreciate that.  
9 It sounds to me that there is room for  
10 interpretation that staff has taken with regards to  
11 that because the designation report does mention  
12 the property.

13 Ms. Guin just mentioned that right now, and it  
14 could be interpreted a couple of different ways.

15 I say that because, you know, these  
16 particular -- the Interior's Standards are reliant  
17 upon professionals reviewing them and stating an  
18 opinion as to what we think is appropriate to these  
19 things, and I think this is true for all projects  
20 at all times with all of these standards. I can  
21 appreciate city staff making that professional  
22 opinion of that.

23 I have a second question, Mr. Chair, if I may?

24 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

25 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So Section 31109 of the

1 zoning code, the moving of existing structures, was  
2 read. It states pretty clearly, appropriateness,  
3 if it finds that no reasonable alternative is  
4 available. So it's staff's opinion that there's no  
5 reasonable alternative to moving this building?

6 MS. GUIN: Maintaining the cottage nature, we  
7 could not come up with one.

8 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Okay. So again, it's  
9 staff's professional opinion that there's no  
10 reasonable alternative other than to move this  
11 structure to the new side of the lot?

12 Is there an affirmative, please?

13 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. Correct. Sorry.

14 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Okay. Those are my two  
15 questions for staff.

16 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Any other board members  
17 have any questions? Discussion?

18 MR. FULLERTON: Another comment. It seems to  
19 me logical that an addition to this house would be  
20 easier to accommodate in terms of its scale than an  
21 entirely new house on the adjoining property. An  
22 entirely new house doesn't have to be 3,000 square  
23 feet, but it's approaching that. It has to have a  
24 new kitchen, has to have a new garage, has to have  
25 extra bathrooms, et cetera, et cetera.



1           An addition doesn't have to have a lot of  
2           those things that are already in the existing  
3           house. So the impact on that site has to be less  
4           than doing a brand new building, two-story  
5           building.

6           And the addition may not have to be two  
7           stories. And maybe it does encroach somewhat on  
8           one of the elevations with the other.

9           Obviously, the addition that's being  
10          contemplated right now of the building extends to  
11          the south of the garage and additional bedroom. So  
12          there's an area there that can be used.

13          I just think we're treading on thin ice with  
14          the potential of moving. First of all, moving that  
15          house is going to be a very delicate troublesome  
16          situation with coral stone plinth and the stucco on  
17          a frame house, that's very, very sensitive and  
18          delicate.

19          I don't know how you can do it and -- well,  
20          we'll wait for the study. But how do you move  
21          something like that 20 feet or 15 feet without  
22          risking damage to that coral stone house?

23          The other ones that were added to in the  
24          neighborhood, they're beautiful, and they are large  
25          additions, yes. But they are beautiful. They are

1 really beautiful additions. They're one story, the  
2 ones that I saw. Maybe there are other ones that  
3 are two.

4 But regardless, I think something can be done.  
5 We're not negating making that a valuable piece of  
6 real estate. Even if in the long run you ended up  
7 moving the house six feet to accommodate the  
8 addition you want to put on there without going two  
9 stories, there's got to be a way to do it. If  
10 you're willing to move it now, then maybe moving it  
11 slightly less would make sense.

12 Anyway, I'm against it so...

13 MR. CEBALLOS: Mr. Chair, pardon my  
14 interruption. I've received a couple e-mails from  
15 a resident who's been trying to speak, but I guess  
16 he is strictly on the phone and he raised his hand.  
17 I do see it on the Zoom call, but he was not given  
18 an opportunity to speak. I was just asking if you  
19 mind acknowledging him and if IT can unmute the 412  
20 number.

21 MS. KAUTZ: I'm now IT, they had to get off,  
22 so that would be me. Give me a moment.

23 MR. CEBALLOS: Mr. Gillis, when you are  
24 brought on, please state your name, address, and if  
25 the court reporter can please swear him in.

1 MS. KAUTZ: There you go.

2 MR. GILLIS: Hello. Can you hear me?

3 MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

4 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

5 MR. GILLIS: Hello, this is Brett Gillis, 915  
6 Ferdinand Street. And I did submit a letter, but I  
7 was only able to access via the phone due to my  
8 location.

9 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay --

10 MR. GILLIS: I would like to point out a few  
11 factors here that I think are being --

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You need to be sworn in.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, he needs to be sworn in  
14 before he can continue.

15 THE COURT REPORTER: Sir, can you please raise  
16 your right hand.

17 Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the  
18 whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

19 MR. GILLIS: I do.

20 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Gillis.

21 MR. GILLIS: Okay. Thank you.

22 We're talking about moving a historic home  
23 that's built out of coral rock and wood. I  
24 reviewed all of the reports that were submitted as  
25 a public records request, and I did not see any

1 note about any bonding proffered by the applicant  
2 that they are insuring that they have the funds and  
3 the ability to restore those elements.

4 If that wood and coral rock crumbles, what  
5 assurance do we have that that is going to be  
6 preserved? The architecture that ElizaBeth was  
7 speaking about, it's so important about this house  
8 to preserve. This is a 1922 George Fink wood and  
9 coral rock house. So if those elements are damaged  
10 during the move, what's the point of even moving  
11 it?

12 I'm very concerned about this and the way that  
13 it's been undertaken. And I do appreciate with  
14 Kara and ElizaBeth, I know they've taken every  
15 possible option to try to resolve this and work it  
16 out in the best solution, but I would just ask this  
17 board if you are going to approve it to make sure  
18 that the appropriate measures are in the motion to  
19 make sure that they have the funds available to do  
20 it and the experts to do it.

21 So thank you.

22 MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Gillis.

23 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Mr. Chair, I have a quick  
24 question.

25 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead, Ms. Bache-Wiig.

1 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Kara, ElizaBeth, has moving a  
2 historic structure taken place before in the city?  
3 Sorry, I don't know, so I'm asking.

4 MS. KAUTZ: Not to my knowledge, no.

5 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Okay.

6 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

7 MR. EHRENHAFT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8 I wanted to follow up on a comment or extend  
9 my thoughts after Cesar Garcia-Pons's comments.  
10 And he asked the staff if there was no reasonable  
11 alternative.

12 If I understand, Kara, the reason there's no  
13 reasonable alternative is because the property  
14 owner, if they were not able to go forward and  
15 split the lot, then they were going to try to build  
16 up to a 2800-square foot as of right structure  
17 appended to the cottage; is that correct? And that  
18 your opinion was that the damage to the historical  
19 integrity of the property with that would be much  
20 greater than their agreement to put the modest  
21 addition in the back and then consider seeking a  
22 lot split?

23 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

24 MR. EHRENHAFT: Is that correct?

25 MS. KAUTZ: Correct. And just to point out,

1           they don't have to put a 2800-square foot addition  
2           on the property. Even if they were to put a small,  
3           you know -- small one-story additions on both sides  
4           of the house, that's still -- I mean, you still  
5           lose two facades of an existing historic 1922  
6           cottage.

7           So in our opinion moving it was the best way  
8           to preserve it.

9           MR. EHRENHAFT: Right. If I may continue,  
10          Mr. Chair?

11          MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead, Mr. Ehrenhaft.

12          MR. EHRENHAFT: My concerns are that the two  
13          structures, the proposed one for the lot to the  
14          left built is that they are going to literally be  
15          on top of each other, and it's in large part  
16          because mid lot on the new construction on the  
17          two-foot vacant lot, if this home is moved, has a  
18          swimming pool and they have a garage which is up  
19          front, but you're going to have between four feet,  
20          eight inches of setback and five-and-a-half feet of  
21          setback on either side of the lot line.

22          So the two properties will literally be on top  
23          of each other. The left-hand wall, I'm not  
24          remembering the direction, you know, in terms of  
25          north, south, east, west, but if you're facing the

1 house, then this historic property house when it's  
2 moved will set five feet from the lot line, and  
3 five feet in from that you're going to have a  
4 garage up front, behind which you're going to have  
5 the swimming pool, and then a proposed two-story  
6 structure.

7 Now, I understand staff has mentioned that  
8 they don't necessary have to go the two story, and  
9 that would be my preference if that happened. But  
10 I think it's the swimming pool in sense that is a  
11 problem because if the second home were placed all  
12 the way to the left and the garage could go to the  
13 rear of the lot, then it would leave much more  
14 visually much more open space between the two  
15 structures. I never love to see two houses that  
16 are ten feet apart.

17 And then I want to go back to my other concern  
18 which is that I really would like to see  
19 engineering reports, and hopefully ones that are  
20 independent showing that the house -- I tried to  
21 look at the structure. I don't know whether the  
22 historic home is sitting on simply piers at the  
23 corners and perhaps -- and maybe Mr. Goldstein can  
24 address this. And then that the rest of the  
25 oolitic stone cladding at the foundation is simply

1 a wall that's not weightbearing. I don't know.

2 Okay.

3 But the concern about being able to move it  
4 without damaging the stones, you know, is  
5 significant. I can't conceive of how this  
6 structure would be lifted and moved by trying to  
7 actually lift the coral rock at the same time as  
8 the rest of the structure. It would seem to me  
9 that they would have to put structural engineering  
10 bars the entire length of the house and put it  
11 under the frame part, sever the coral walls, and  
12 then reconstruct them when the house is moved, if  
13 that's what's going to happen.

14 And there were also concerns about the, you  
15 know, maintaining the integrity of the chimneys.

16 But I'm not really inclined to vote yes unless  
17 I could know first that we were going to have  
18 positive structural engineering, detailed ones,  
19 saying how and why it's going to be able to be  
20 moved without destroying it.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Durana, do you have  
23 anything to add?

24 MR. CEBALLOS: I'd like to just reiterate once  
25 again, we should be not considering what is being



1 built on the second lot and how it may or may not  
2 affect this particular property once the move  
3 happens.

4 So, please, let's limit the discussion to only  
5 this property and not the location of the garage or  
6 pool of the second structure. That will be taking  
7 part in the second COA.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

9 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Mr. Chairman, I have a quick  
10 question and I know we've already gone over it, but  
11 if staff feels that we wouldn't be able to as staff  
12 and as a board dictate or shape a future, you know,  
13 proposal for an addition to the existing home that  
14 would be, as Peggy put it, sympathetic.

15 MR. MENENDEZ: I don't think that, you know,  
16 that's our purview.

17 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I mean, the example we were  
18 provided with that was done a couple years back,  
19 that's the maximum addition that can be put on that  
20 lot, correct, Kara?

21 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. They were maxing out their  
22 FAR.

23 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I mean, they did -- and I'm  
24 just looking at the site plan, they did step back  
25 quite a bit from the facade so you do have some of

1 the east and the west facade of the existing  
2 structure in play. So, I mean, for me I think  
3 setting a precedent to move this structure, it  
4 makes me uncomfortable, that's one. But also I  
5 feel that -- I know -- I mean, it's difficult. The  
6 concern about not having a future addition to this  
7 structure overtake the, you know, cottage is  
8 relevant.

9 But here, you know, you can see the two sides  
10 to a point, not the full elevations, but you can  
11 see them, they were maintained on the east side, I  
12 guess, where the fireplace is, that was kept. And  
13 then, you know, then the rest was changed. And on  
14 the other side, you know, it was even further back.  
15 So it's like what's the lesser of the evils. It's  
16 difficult. I'm not sure.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: That's the issue here,  
18 whatever's done, that corner is going to change  
19 dramatically. And I think back to the architect  
20 when he, you know, designed the house and sited the  
21 house, he didn't site it on a 50-foot lot. He  
22 sited in on that lot, on those two lots.

23 And if the house were to be moved, it could be  
24 irreparably damaged. So there's a lot of, you  
25 know, different things that can happen, a lot of

1 pros, a lot of cons. It's a difficult decision.

2 That being said, Mr. Durana, do you have  
3 anything to add?

4 MR. DURANA: Yeah. I mean, I'm kind of, you  
5 know, in the same boat as Alicia and I think a lot  
6 of people, split 50/50. I mean, I see, you know --  
7 honestly, I kind of appreciate the creativity of  
8 thinking out of the box of, you know, moving a  
9 house over and try to preserve it. I see that.  
10 You know, I like that they tried to -- I'm sure  
11 it's not a cheap undertaking, so it's an added  
12 expense that, you know, they're going to do to  
13 preserve the historic integrity of the house which  
14 we appreciate.

15 I just feel that, you know, to move a house  
16 that doesn't need to be moved, it's not in danger  
17 of being damaged by anything, it's not like we have  
18 a natural disaster next door or anything, we need  
19 to move this house to preserve it.

20 I mean, that's the only thing. I would really  
21 want to see like a report, you know, real like  
22 Bruce said, I think an independent report, because  
23 I'm sure, you know, the companies that are going to  
24 move the house, they can give you a great report  
25 that says it's going to move perfectly without

1           being destroyed. But maybe like an independent  
2           party, you know, give a fair and unbiased report  
3           that kind of says what they think, you know, how  
4           this house would hold up during a move.

5           It's just tough. I mean, I'm honestly split  
6           50/50 on it. I'm wondering if maybe the report can  
7           sway one way or the other, you know.

8           MR. MENENDEZ: What board members would like  
9           to see a report before moving forward with this?

10          MR. CEBALLOS: We can't poll the board  
11          members.

12          MR. MENENDEZ: We can't. Okay.

13          Well, then what I suggest is somebody make a  
14          motion.

15          MS. KAUTZ: Peggy wants to speak.

16          MS. ROLANDO: What I'm thinking is that we  
17          move to defer consideration of this proposal until  
18          we reach a report from a structural engineer  
19          independent of whatever moving company and the  
20          owner as to the feasibility of moving the  
21          structure.

22          MS. KAUTZ: There's a provision in the zoning  
23          code that you all are allowed to ask for  
24          supplemental information, that staff can hire  
25          somebody to provide to you. It's not limited to

1           like a property appraiser or, you know, someone  
2           comes in with a request where -- you're allowed to  
3           direct us to do that.

4           MS. ROLANDO: I guess is that something that  
5           the other members of our board would be receptive  
6           to?

7           MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman, may I speak?

8           MR. MENENDEZ: Hold on. Ms. Rolando has a  
9           question out on the table.

10          MS. SPAIN: I would be comfortable with that.  
11          I don't know what else we want to add. Maybe Raul  
12          has a comment.

13          MS. ROLANDO: Yeah. Raul?

14          MR. MENENDEZ: Do we need to put a motion  
15          together?

16          MS. ROLANDO: Maybe what we would do is if  
17          someone is so inclined, second the motion and then  
18          we can vote on it.

19          MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well, I have a comment before  
20          we have a motion, if you don't mind.

21          MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, Mr. Rodriguez.

22          MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. I brought up the issue  
23          of the report, the first person to do that, I  
24          believe strongly that we need to have a serious  
25          independent structural report on whether it can be

1 properly moved. But before we go there, I would  
2 like to read into the record a comment that goes  
3 back to the issue that Mr. Garcia-Pons raised and  
4 others have raised, and it's a comment -- I'd like  
5 to read two short sentences from a letter from the  
6 Florida Trust Historic Preservation.

7 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. The lot itself -- this  
9 is dated August 18th, 2020 from Melissa Whiley, the  
10 CEO and president of Florida Historic Preservation.

11 "The lot itself is a significant  
12 characteristic of the historic resource.  
13 Allocation could negate the City's 2005 historic  
14 designation of the property, negatively impact  
15 historic integrity, and create a precedent that  
16 will be detrimental to preserving historic  
17 resources in the future. Preserving historic  
18 buildings on the land where they originally were  
19 built with the original landscape, features and  
20 views, is the preferable preservation solution.  
21 Additionally, the continued subdivision of  
22 properties will significantly change the fabric and  
23 character of historic communities. "

24 And I concur with that statement.

25 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So --

1 MS. SPAIN: I'd like to second Peggy's motion  
2 and see where it goes. This is Dona.

3 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Ms. Rolando, please  
4 restate your motion.

5 MS. ROLANDO: My motion is that we defer  
6 consideration of the adoption of the certificate of  
7 appropriateness pending receipt of a report from a  
8 structural engineer independent of the homeowner as  
9 to the feasibility of moving the structure to the  
10 location proposed in the staff -- in the report.

11 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. And Ms. Spain has  
12 seconded that motion.

13 MS. SPAIN: Yes. Yes.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: And can you read the role,  
15 please?

16 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

17 Mr. Garcia-Pons?

18 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.

19 MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Bache-Wiig?

20 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

21 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Durana?

22 MR. DURANA: Yes.

23 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Fullerton?

24 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

25 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

1 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

2 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Menendez?

3 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

4 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Rodriguez?

5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, for the reasons I just  
6 read for the record.

7 MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Spain?

8 MR. FULLERTON: You know, if I may, this is a  
9 little late, I'm sure. I tried to get in but I  
10 was --

11 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

12 MR. FULLERTON: -- muted. I had muted myself.

13 But a structural engineer may or may not be  
14 able to really judge appropriately whether a house  
15 can actually be moved. He can look at it  
16 structurally and say, yeah, we can pick that up.  
17 But the actual guy who has to move it and attest to  
18 his ability to do so is the guy who's going to --  
19 whose opinion makes sense to me.

20 I know a lot of structural engineers, dealt  
21 with them all my life, and, you know, they know  
22 about how to hold a building up, but they don't  
23 know how to hold it together while we're moving it.

24 So I don't know if the structural engineer is  
25 the appropriate guy, and I don't want to step on



1           your toes, but I think that maybe we should modify  
2           that, maybe staff can do this, to make sure that  
3           it's signed by or accepted by an actual house  
4           mover.

5           MS. ROLANDO:   Okay.  I have no objection to  
6           that.

7           MR. GARCIA-PONS:  Mr. Chair, how do we do that  
8           after we voted?

9           MS. KAUTZ:  You haven't finished the vote  
10          necessarily.  Ms. Rolando didn't vote, actually.

11          So, Gus, can they go back and do a friendly  
12          amendment?  Is that how it works?  How does that  
13          work?

14          MR. CEBALLOS:  They finish the vote for the  
15          original motion, and then the original -- anybody  
16          who voted yes for it could then --

17          MS. ROLANDO:  Gus cut out.

18          MS. KAUTZ:  I lost you, Gus.

19          Oh, no.

20          I think what he was saying that anyone --

21          MR. CEBALLOS:  -- basically the motion forward  
22          to amend it --

23          MS. ROLANDO:  Okay.  I vote yes.

24          MS. KAUTZ:  Okay.

25          MR. MENENDEZ:  Okay.  Now, a motion to amend

1           it.

2           MS. ROLANDO:   Okay.   John --

3           MS. SPAIN:    Xavier has something to ask.

4           MR. DURANA:   Yeah, I mean, John, I agree with  
5           kind of what you're saying, but my fear is the guy  
6           who is going to move the house, I mean, he stands  
7           to gain, you know, financially from moving the  
8           house.   So why wouldn't he put a report that says,  
9           yeah, I want to move the house, you know, or, yes,  
10          we can move it, you know safely.

11          MR. FULLERTON:   That's a good point.

12          MR. DURANA:   Is there somebody like, I don't  
13          know, maybe like a guy who moves -- you know, a  
14          specialist.   I don't know if there's a specialist  
15          for that type of thing or maybe somebody from out  
16          of state maybe or something that's done these, or  
17          someone who doesn't have anything to gain.

18          MS. BACHE-WIIG:   And I know --

19          MR. FULLERTON:   -- somebody from here.

20          MS. BACHE-WIIG:   May I just say, I know that  
21          in Miami Beach they've done this on several  
22          occasions on several properties on Collins, because  
23          you have the hotels, you know, developing  
24          multistory, you know, structures, and they have,  
25          you know, historical homes that were there.   And so

1           they've incorporated that into the properties if  
2           they've had to move them.

3           So locally I know that there are people that  
4           have done it and have done it successfully. So I  
5           don't know how we find out who those are.

6           MR. FULLERTON: Xavier, you're right. You're  
7           right. There is a danger in that, and that's a  
8           concern. But a structural engineer is not going to  
9           be behind it --

10          MR. DURANA: I agree. I mean, no, you're  
11          right. The structural engineer knows how to keep  
12          it up, but how to move it, he may not really know.

13          MR. GARCIA-PONS: Ms. Rolando, may I suggest  
14          that you amend it leaving it up to staff, and that  
15          they find the appropriate person or firm to find  
16          out the feasibility of moving it, and that if it is  
17          a moving company, that they would preclude  
18          themselves from actually moving the structure.

19          MR. CEBALLOS: My apologies, I was cut off.

20          Was the motion -- was the final vote completed  
21          on the first motion?

22          MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.

23          MR. CEBALLOS: No, it wasn't.

24          MS. KAUTZ: Yes, it was. Ms. Rolando voted  
25          yes.

1 MS. ROLANDO: Now, Cesar, I like that concept.  
2 So let me think out loud here, which is dangerous.

3 Okay. I move we amend the motion that was  
4 adopted to read as follows: That we defer voting  
5 on or consideration of the special certificate of  
6 appropriateness for 603 Minorca pending receipt  
7 of --

8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No. No.

9 MS. ROLANDO: -- receipt of a report from a  
10 consultant selected by city staff advising on the  
11 feasibility of moving the structure as indicated to  
12 the location indicated in the report.

13 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman, may speak to  
14 that motion?

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: That's exactly what the staff  
17 is recommending now, their report they filed with  
18 them. I don't think -- this is -- we're putting  
19 the cart before the horse. We're making -- we're  
20 deciding -- we're asking for a report from an  
21 independent structural engineer or from a mover who  
22 has no access, will not get the business to give us  
23 an honest appraisal of the feasibility of moving  
24 this house. That's assuming that we're going to  
25 agree to move this house.

1 MS. SPAIN: No. No, it's not. It's not.

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: That's exactly what we're  
3 doing.

4 MS. ROLANDO: We need facts, and I --

5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: How can we possibly agree  
6 to --

7 MS. ROLANDO: Let me finish.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Rodriguez, all we're doing  
9 is asking for more information in order to make a  
10 more informed decision. That's all we're asking  
11 for.

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah, but she's suggesting  
13 that we agree to the appropriateness at this point  
14 subject to that. That's exactly --

15 MS. SPAIN: No. I don't believe that's what  
16 the motion is. I hope it isn't.

17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: That's what her motion is.

18 MS. KAUTZ: It was to defer. Her motion was  
19 to defer the item.

20 MS. ROLANDO: We are not --

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: -- appropriateness now, not  
22 to --

23 MS. ROLANDO: No.

24 MR. GARCIA-PONS: No. No. There was a  
25 deferral.

1 MS. ROLANDO: A deferral. That we defer  
2 consideration --

3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. Okay.

4 MS. ROLANDO: -- pending receipt of this  
5 report. That's a whole -- each of the board  
6 members is expressing is -- or many of us are  
7 expressing a discomfort with considering even  
8 moving the structure without knowing what will  
9 happen to the integrity of the structure.

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I was the first person to  
11 raise this issue --

12 MS. ROLANDO: I know. And it's a great idea.

13 MR. FULLERTON: I'll make it easy for you to  
14 decide whether we should move forward on that or  
15 not. I move that we deny the application.

16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I second that motion.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Hold on a second. We have Ms.  
18 Rolando with her --

19 MS. ROLANDO: There's a motion pending.

20 MR. MENENDEZ: So one motion at a time.

21 MS. SPAIN: So did you finish the motion,  
22 Peggy?

23 MS. ROLANDO: Yes, I did.

24 MS. SPAIN: Okay. Then I would second that.

25 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

1 MS. KAUTZ: All right. Role call.  
2 Ms. Bache-Wiig?  
3 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.  
4 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Menendez?  
5 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.  
6 MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Rolando?  
7 MS. ROLANDO: Yes.  
8 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Garcia-Pons.  
9 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.  
10 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft?  
11 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.  
12 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Rodriguez?  
13 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No.  
14 MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Spain?  
15 MS. SPAIN: Yes.  
16 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Fullerton?  
17 MR. FULLERTON: No.  
18 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Durana?  
19 MR. DURANA: I mean, I'm sorry, but can  
20 someone repeat exactly what we're voting on,  
21 because I kind of got lost there.  
22 MS. KAUTZ: It's to defer the item --  
23 MR. DURANA: I know it probably doesn't matter  
24 because I think they already have majority, but,  
25 you know, just in case.

1 MS. KAUTZ: It's to defer the item pending  
2 receipt of a report, a consultant's report advising  
3 on whether it's feasible to move the structure.

4 MR. DURANA: Okay. And assume let's say the  
5 consultant reports says yes, it's feasible, it  
6 doesn't mean that we're approving this, right?  
7 We're simply --

8 MS. KAUTZ: That's right. It comes back to  
9 you.

10 MR. DURANA: Okay. I mean, if it comes back  
11 to us, then I'm fine with that.

12 MS. KAUTZ: Okay. Motion passes.

13 MR. FULLERTON: So motion carries?

14 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

15 So then I would say it's premature to consider  
16 the second certificate of appropriateness.

17 Gus, is that correct?

18 MR. CEBALLOS: That's correct.

19 MR. MENENDEZ: I think that needs to be --

20 MS. ROLANDO: Do we need to have a motion to  
21 defer that as well?

22 MR. CEBALLOS: There was a second motion. I  
23 don't know if it got a second.

24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: The second motion got a  
25 second, but it was before the first motion was



1 ruled on, was voted on.

2 MS. ROLANDO: I'm talking about --

3 MR. FULLERTON: Out of order.

4 MS. ROLANDO: I'm talking about do we need a  
5 motion to defer the second motion --

6 MR. FULLERTON: Application --

7 MS. ROLANDO: -- application for consideration  
8 of the certificate of appropriateness for the  
9 proposed second home.

10 MR. CEBALLOS: No.

11 MS. ROLANDO: Okay.

12 MR. CEBALLOS: The consideration to the second  
13 item was contingent on the approval of the first.

14 MS. ROLANDO: Oh, okay.

15 MR. FULLERTON: Good. We don't even have to  
16 hear the second.

17 MS. ROLANDO: Okay.

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Right.

19 MS. ROLANDO: Thanks, Gus.

20 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So --

21 MS. KAUTZ: That's all I have for you.

22 MR. MENENDEZ: Those are all the items on the  
23 agenda.

24 Any discussion items?

25 Hold on a second. Alicia?

1 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Hi. We were going to make a  
2 motion about the shelters, the Granada Golf Course?

3 MR. MENENDEZ: Yeah, I was going to come back  
4 to that because we left that out, and one of the  
5 citizens who called in had expressed interest in  
6 saving a shelter, and I think that staff should  
7 take a look at that and see if a shelter could be  
8 saved, and as I had mentioned before, maybe moved  
9 to the Boy Scout troop area there on the golf  
10 course or somewhere else where it could be  
11 exhibited and used.

12 How would we go about doing that, Kara?

13 MS. KAUTZ: It would be a motion to recommend  
14 retention of one of the existing golf course  
15 shelters to a suitable location.

16 MR. MENENDEZ: Alicia, you want to go ahead  
17 and do that?

18 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Sure. Okay. What Kara said.

19 MR. FULLERTON: That sounds like one of my  
20 motions.

21 MS. BACHE-WIIG: It's a long day.

22 I move to recommend consideration of -- or  
23 staff's consideration or city's consideration to  
24 preserve one of the existing Granada Golf Course  
25 structures to be renovated and rehabilitated so

1           that it can be properly moved and displayed to a  
2           strategic location that makes sense within the  
3           Coral Gables golf course -- Granada Golf Course.

4           MS. ROLANDO:    Second.

5           MR. GARCIA-PONS:  Can I make a friendly  
6           amendment request, Alicia?

7           MS. BACHE-WIIG:  Please do.

8           MR. GARCIA-PONS:  I know this is difficult,  
9           but would you consider including the word  
10          "reconstructed" to that in case they're not  
11          rehabilitatable?

12          MR. FULLERTON:  Yeah.

13          MS. BACHE-WIIG:  Yeah, I think that makes  
14          sense.  So let's add to that motion.  Do I have to  
15          say it all over again?

16          MR. GARCIA-PONS:  No.  Just say add  
17          reconstructed to the adjectives.

18          MS. BACHE-WIIG:  Okay.  So rehabilitated,  
19          remodeled or reconstructed where necessary or as  
20          necessary to preserve the structure.  I move it  
21          appropriately.

22          MR. GARCIA-PONS:  I appreciate that.

23          MR. MENENDEZ:  Okay.  I think Ms. Rolando  
24          seconded it.

25          MS. ROLANDO:  Yeah, and I second the

1           amendment.

2           MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Kara?

3           MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Rolando?

4           MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

5           MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Garcia-Pons?

6           MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.

7           MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

8           MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

9           MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Rodriguez?

10          MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

11          MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Spain?

12          MS. SPAIN: Yes, assuming I can vote on this.

13          I think I can.

14          MR. FULLERTON: Yeah.

15          MS. SPAIN: It has nothing to do with the

16          approval.

17          MS. KAUTZ: True.

18          Mr. Fullerton?

19          MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

20          MS. KAUTZ: And, Mr. Durana?

21          MR. DURANA: Yes.

22          MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Bache-Wiig?

23          MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

24          MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Menendez?

25          MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

1 MS. KAUTZ: Great.

2 The only thing that I had for you all is,  
3 John, before all of this started you had asked for  
4 an update on the property at Castile, 1013 Castile.

5 MR. FULLERTON: Right.

6 MS. KAUTZ: Cristina Suarez, who is not  
7 available to come to this meeting to give you --  
8 had written a prepared statement about it. So I  
9 can share it with you guys.

10 This is the property that had started their  
11 construction and it's been sitting untouched for --  
12 John, you can say how long. I don't actually know  
13 the year.

14 MR. FULLERTON: About 20 years. No, five or  
15 six years.

16 MS. KAUTZ: Just off of Granada on Castile,  
17 1013.

18 So this is the 1013 Castile background and  
19 update 8/13/2020. The current owner, 1013 Castile,  
20 LLC acquired the property in April 2014. The first  
21 construction permits for the property were issued  
22 between 2014 and 2016, however, construction ceased  
23 in 2016.

24 In October 2017 the City began code  
25 enforcement proceedings against the owner. The

1 owner took a second mortgage in February 2018 and  
2 resumed construction. Approximately one year later  
3 construction stopped again and the owner  
4 unsuccessfully attempted to refinance the debt.

5 Consequently in July 2019 the City filed an  
6 injunction action. In September 2019 when the  
7 owner did not comply with the court's injunction  
8 order, the court appointed a receiver.

9 On the same day the first mortgagee filed a  
10 foreclosure. At the City's request the court  
11 considered both cases -- consolidated the cases  
12 under the injunction action.

13 The receiver sought bids to complete the work  
14 and obtained two appraisals for the property. When  
15 the receiver compared the bids and the appraisals  
16 in the amount of the two mortgages he determined  
17 there was insufficient equity to pay the  
18 contractors to finish the house.

19 Instead, the receiver decided to request that  
20 the first mortgagee expedite the foreclosure so  
21 that the buyer sale would complete the house. In  
22 January 2020 the court ordered the mortgagee to  
23 expedite the foreclosure.

24 In the meantime, the first mortgagee who was  
25 also loaned money to various other entities owned

1 by the same principal of the owner stated that he  
2 intends to acquire the property at the sale and  
3 finish the building -- the house himself.

4 On August 7th, 2020 the mortgagee filed its  
5 motion for summary judgment of foreclosure. The  
6 hearing on the motion is set for October 13th,  
7 2020. Assuming the motion is granted, the sale  
8 should take place by the end of 2020, and it's  
9 expected that the receivership will survive the  
10 foreclosure sale and the receiver will work with  
11 the buyer to ensure the buyer completes  
12 construction of the historical structures on the  
13 property.

14 MR. FULLERTON: Could I get a copy of that?

15 MS. KAUTZ: Sure. I can forward that to you.

16 MR. FULLERTON: Thank you.

17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: It sounds like a law school  
18 examination question.

19 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

20 MS. KAUTZ: I'm not sure I understand any of  
21 that, but...

22 MS. ROLANDO: Kara, is the city a party to the  
23 foreclosure or did it intervene?

24 MS. KAUTZ: I do not believe so, but I do not  
25 know the answer to that question. I'm just passing

1 along legalese.

2 MS. ROLANDO: Okay.

3 MR. CEBALLOS: On the actual foreclosure, we  
4 are not.

5 MR. MENENDEZ: Any other business?

6 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Albert, I have a request for  
7 staff. If these applications don't change, I don't  
8 need another copy, so I don't know if you legally  
9 have to provide them to us.

10 MS. KAUTZ: Okay. If it's deferred -- I'll  
11 check. I don't think so. We can keep the same  
12 packet, but I'll check and make sure.

13 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Thank you.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

15 MS. SPAIN: You'll need to re-notice it again,  
16 Kara.

17 MS. KAUTZ: I know.

18 MR. MENENDEZ: If there's no more business,  
19 I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

20 MS. ROLANDO: So moved.

21 MR. FULLERTON: Second.

22 MR. MENENDEZ: All right. The meeting is now  
23 adjourned. We'll see you next month.

24 (The proceedings concluded at 6:47 p.m.)

25



REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

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 PALM BEACH

I, Jessica A. Donnelly, Florida Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Florida at large, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did report said Historic Preservation Board Meeting in stenotype; and that the foregoing pages, numbered from 1 to 128, inclusive, are a true and correct transcription of my shorthand notes of said Historic Preservation Board Meeting.

I further certify that said Historic Preservation Board Meeting was taken at the time and place hereinabove set forth and that the taking of said Historic Preservation Board Meeting was commenced and completed as hereinabove set out.

I further certify that I am not an attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel of party connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.

The foregoing certification of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or direction of the certifying reporter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 10th day of September, 2020.

*Jessica A. Donnelly*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jessica A. Donnelly

