

CITY OF CORAL GABLES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE
APRIL 21, 2021

PARTICIPANTS:

Albert Menendez, Chairperson
John P. Fullerton, Board Member
Bruce Ehrenhaft, Board Member
Alicia Bache-Wiig, Board Member
Xavier Durana, Board Member
Raul R. Rodriguez, Board Member
Dona Spain, Board Member

Kara N. Kautz, Historic Preservation
ElizBeth B. Guin, Historic Preservation
Warren Adams, Historic Preservation
Gustavo Ceballos, Assistant City Attorney

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

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

10 The board is comprised of nine members, seven
11 of whom are appointed by the commission, one by the
12 City Manager, and the ninth is elected by the Board
13 and confirmed by the commission.

14 Five members of the board constitute a quorum,
15 and five affirmative votes are necessary for the
16 adoption of any motion.

17 Lobbyist registration and disclosure; any
18 person who acts as a lobbyist pursuant to the Coral
19 Gables Ordinance No. 2006-11 must register with the
20 city clerk prior to engaging in lobbying activities
21 or presentations before city staff, boards,
22 committees, and/or the city commission.

23 A copy of the ordinance is available in the
24 office of the city clerk. Failure to register and
25 provide proof of registration shall prohibit their

1 ability to present to the Historic Preservation
2 Board on applications under consideration this
3 afternoon.

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

23 Presentations made to this board are subject
24 to the City's false claims ordinance Chapter 39 of
25 the Coral Gables city code.

1 I now officially call the City of Coral Gables
2 Historic Preservation Board meeting of April 21st,
3 2021 to order. The time is 4:20 p.m.

4 Present today are board members Bruce
5 Ehrenhaft, John Fullerton, Raul Rodriguez, Dona
6 Spain, via Zoom, Alicia Bache-Wiig and myself,
7 Albert Menendez.

8 The next item is the approval of the minutes.
9 The next item on the agenda is the approval of the
10 minutes of the meeting held on March 17th, 2021.

11 Are there any changes and/or corrections?

12 Anyone? No?

13 Okay. So I call for a motion to approve.

14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: So moved.

15 MR. EHRENHAFT: So moved.

16 MR. MENENDEZ: Second?

17 (UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER): Second.

18 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Can you take the roll,
19 please?

20 THE CLERK: Ms. Bache-Wiig?

21 MR. FULLERTON: Not here.

22 THE CLERK: Mr. Fullerton?

23 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

24 THE CLERK: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

25 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

1 THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?

2 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

3 THE CLERK: Mr. Rodriguez?

4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

5 THE CLERK: Ms. Spain?

6 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

7 MS. KAUTZ: Nancy, you need to speak into the
8 microphone. And Alicia Bache-Wiig is on Zoom, so
9 she needs to respond.

10 THE CLERK: Alicia Bache-Wiig?

11 MS. SPAIN: Maybe she's muted.

12 MS. KAUTZ: I asked her to unmute. Let's see
13 what happens.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: So let me continue.

15 Notice regarding ex parte communications;
16 please be advised that this board is a
17 quasi-judicial board and the items on the agenda
18 are quasi-judicial in nature which requires board
19 members to disclose all ex parte communications.

20 An ex parte communication is defined as any
21 contact, communication, conversation,
22 correspondence, memorandum, or other written or
23 verbal communication that takes place outside a
24 public hearing between a member of the public and a
25 member of a quasi-judicial board regarding matters

1 to be heard by the quasi-judicial board.

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

10 Deferrals; do we have any deferrals today?

11 MS. KAUTZ: No.

12 MR. MENENDEZ: No deferrals. Okay.

13 All right. Swearing in; I guess swearing in
14 will take place with each case that comes before
15 us.

16 All right. Is this the order we're going to
17 take these cases, Kara?

18 MS. KAUTZ: I think Warren was going to
19 address that.

20 MR. MENENDEZ: What did she say? Repeat. Are
21 we taking the cases --

22 MS. KAUTZ: Hang on one second, let me find
23 Warren and unmute him. Everyone else should be
24 unmuted. Let me figure out how to do that.

25 MR. ADAMS: We are requesting a change to the

1 order of the agenda, and we have some city staff
2 members who will be joining us, and we would like
3 to change the order so we can accommodate them.

4 And for Item No. 1 we would like to stick with
5 1544 Sopera Avenue.

6 For Item No. 2 we would like to move Item 7.1,
7 which is 2901 Ponce de Leon Boulevard. We would
8 like to move that to second on the agenda.

9 For third on the agenda we would like to move
10 Item 7.3, which is 6801 Granada Boulevard.

11 For the fourth item we would like Item 7.1,
12 which is Pentland House.

13 And for the final item we would like Item 7.2
14 which is 603 Minorca Avenue.

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So let's start with a
16 special certificate of appropriateness, Case File
17 COA (SP) 2021-002, an application for the issuance
18 of a special certificate of appropriate -- no,
19 that's wrong.

20 It is Case File LHD 2021-001, consideration of
21 the local historic designation of the property at
22 1544 Sopera Avenue legally described as Lot 5,
23 Block 55, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part 4,
24 according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat
25 Book 10, at page 57 of the public records of

1 Miami-Dade County, Florida.

2 Kara?

3 MS. KAUTZ: This one is ElizBeth's item.

4 MS. GUIN: Can IT start the voiceover

5 PowerPoint, please.

6 (Audio voiceover placed.)

7 MS. GUIN: The property at 1544 Sopera Avenue
8 is before you for consideration for designation as
9 a local historic landmark. This designation was
10 requested by the owner.

11 As per Article 3, Section 3-1103 of the Coral
12 Gables Zoning Code, criteria for designation of a
13 historic landmark. A local historic landmark must
14 have significant character, interest, or value as
15 part of the historical, cultural, archeological,
16 aesthetic, or architectural heritage of the city,
17 state, or nation. For designation a property must
18 meet one of the criteria as outlined in the code.
19 1544 Sopera Avenue is eligible as a local historic
20 landmark based on four criteria.

21 Historical cultural significance, criteria
22 one; is associated in a significant way with the
23 life or activities of a major historic person
24 important to the past.

25 Criteria four; it exemplifies the historical,

1 culture, political, economic or social trends of
2 the community.

3 Architectural significance; it portrays the
4 environment and era of history characterized by one
5 or more distinctive architectural style.

6 And criteria two; it embodies those
7 distinguishing characteristics of an architectural
8 type or period or method of construction.

9 The single family residence at 1544 Sopera
10 Avenue is located in the Coral Gables Country Club
11 Section Part 4. It is one block north of Bird Road
12 and two blocks west of the Biltmore Golf Course.
13 It sits on an interior 50-foot by 120-foot lot on
14 the south side of Sopera Avenue between Alhambra
15 Circle Red Road.

16 George Merrick founded Coral Gables in the
17 early 1920s based on his vision for a fully
18 conceived Mediterranean-inspired city. The city's
19 developmental history is divided into three major
20 historical periods.

21 During the initial development period
22 architectural designs specifically combined
23 elements used in Spanish, Morris, and Italian
24 architecture and has become known as the
25 Mediterranean Revival style. During 1920

1 structures and amenities were built almost
2 exclusively in accordance with this style.

3 The construction of this home at 1544 Sopera
4 Avenue occurred during this initial phase
5 simultaneous to the incorporation of the city.

6 Acclaimed landscape architect Frank Button
7 penned the first comprehensive maps of Coral Gables
8 in 1921 and 1922, one of which is shown here on the
9 left.

10 In the mid-1920s Merrick announced plans for a
11 premier hotel and a redesigned golf course in
12 Section H. At this time Sections G, H, and I,
13 which were primarily undeveloped were reworked to
14 accommodate the large \$10 million Biltmore Hotel
15 complex.

16 These three sections were divided into six
17 sections and renamed Country Club Sections Part 1
18 through 6, and additional scenic boulevard were
19 added which included Anastasia Boulevard, Ocean
20 Beach Drive, which later became University Drive
21 and Segovia Street. You can see some of these
22 changes on the two maps dated 1922 and 1925.

23 The home at 1544 Sopera Avenue was built in
24 this area in the Country Club Section Part 4, which
25 is outlined in blue.

1 The single family residence was designed in
2 1925 by architect Alfred Schimek in the
3 Mediterranean Revival style.

4 As Merrick's vision for the
5 Mediterranean-inspired city continued to grow, his
6 team recruited leading investors, architects and
7 builders from across the country.

8 In the fall of 1925 Panefield Realty &
9 Investment Company comprised of investors from New
10 Jersey and Miami purchased approximately a dozen
11 lots throughout Coral Gables. They hired architect
12 Alfred Schimek, who had recently moved to Miami
13 from Chicago, as well as the construction firm S.
14 Hansen Builders.

15 Building permits were filed in November and
16 December of 1925 with 1544 Sopera Avenue being the
17 second permit filed on November 21st.

18 Evidently this endeavor was a trial investment
19 with much larger Phase 2 planned. Unfortunately
20 the 1926 hurricane curtailed these plans.

21 As you can see in this 1948 aerial photo, the
22 home at 1544 Sopera Avenue was one of the few
23 Mediterranean Revival homes built in this area, and
24 it stands as a testament to Merrick's vision for
25 Coral Gables.

1 The home is circled in red in the lower
2 left-hand corner. Hence the property exemplifies
3 the historical, cultural, political, economic, and
4 social trends of the initial development history of
5 the community.

6 The home exhibits character defining features
7 of the Mediterranean Revival style. These include
8 projecting of recessed planes, rectilinear massing
9 and floor plan, a projecting entry bay with an
10 arched door with molded masonry keystone arch door
11 surround and cast ornamental medallion, a front
12 porch bay with tiled floors, arched openings, and
13 cast masonry balustrade, a combination of roof
14 types, including a series of low pitched gabled
15 roofs covered in two-piece barrel, textured stucco,
16 a prominent and distinctive chimney, roof round
17 vents, as well as recessed casement windows of
18 various shapes and sizes with projecting sills.

19 The next few slides show some of the details
20 of the home. On the right is the protruding entry
21 bay with its arched door with a keystone arch
22 surround and a cast medallion above.

23 In this photo one can also clearly see the
24 textured stucco.

25 This is the covered front porch. It has three

1 large semicircular arched openings, two along the
2 front and one along the west side. The original
3 hip height masonry balustrades with the molded
4 balusters enclose each opening.

5 The porch also retained its original wood
6 ceiling. The pair of French doors on the southern
7 wall seen in the photo on the left also appear to
8 be original.

9 This photo taken from the street looking at
10 the northeast corner gives you a sense of the
11 massing of the home, as well as a view of the broad
12 tapered curved top chimney stack.

13 Behind the chimney is a faux mansard roof clad
14 in two-piece barrel tile.

15 The aerial photo on the right illustrates the
16 roofing of the home, and you can see that mansard
17 roof.

18 The roof side of the home is two stories under
19 a flat roof with an unarticulated parapet. Access
20 panels, as well as grouped around vent holes for
21 the ground level crawl space are clearly visible
22 and are representative of those features as found
23 on the other facade.

24 Hence as detailed further in the designation
25 report, the home portrays the environment in an era

1 of history of Coral Gables characterized by the
2 Mediterranean Revival style and it embodies those
3 distinguishing characteristics of its architectural
4 style, period, and method of construction.

5 As demonstrated by these photos the home has
6 retained substantial historic integrity over the
7 past 95 years. There have been no additions or
8 changes to the former style of the home.

9 Alterations of note include the installation
10 of hurricane impact windows and doors, and the
11 enclosing of the porte-cochère.

12 The porte-cochère was enclosed in 1946 by
13 architect Alfred Browning Parker and is pictured
14 here on the left. Its massing was retained as well
15 as the wall. As a result of the enclosure the
16 original detached garage became inaccessible. The
17 garage is also retained on the property and is seen
18 here on the right.

19 The aerial photo illustrates the location on
20 the property.

21 The door of the garage has been replaced with
22 a single door and the building is now used for
23 storage.

24 The Permuy family has owned the home for the
25 past 45 years, and the home is also historically

1 and culturally significant due to its association
2 with Jesus and Marta Permuy.

3 Jesus and Marta Permuy played a significant
4 role in the Cuban Resistance during which Jesus
5 rose to the role of national coordinator for the
6 Movement of Revolutionary Recovery with Marta
7 working closely with him on covert missions.

8 After immigrating to the United States after
9 the failed Bay of Pigs Invasion they were married,
10 and Jesus continued to champion for the cause of
11 democracy in human rights for the Cuban people
12 under the Castro regime for the next several
13 decades.

14 They purchased the home in 1976, and Jesus
15 launched several humanitarian organizations while
16 living in the home, some of which are mentioned in
17 the designation report.

18 Jesus lobbied and consulted with the United
19 Nations Human Rights Council on behalf of Cuban and
20 other Latin American people living under
21 dictatorships. After decades of lobbying the UN,
22 the UN finally began adopting diplomatic strategies
23 like those proposed by Jesus.

24 He also testified before the U.S. House of
25 Representatives for the Cuban Democracy Act, which

1 resulted in sanctions directed at the Castro
2 government in aid to the Cuban people. These are
3 just a few of his humanitarian endeavors.

4 In 2017 Congresswoman Ros-Lehtinen gave a
5 statement of congressional record on the floor of
6 the House of Representatives paying tribute to
7 Jesus Permuy's life and career. The photo on the
8 left is the congresswoman presenting him with the
9 flag that had flown over the United States Capital
10 in recognition of his contributions.

11 Also at that ceremony Permuy was presented
12 with the key to the City of Coral Gables by Mayor
13 Valdez Fauli.

14 In October 2019, Miami-Dade County honored
15 Permuy by co-designating a portion of Miami Avenue
16 at Jesus A. Permuy Street.

17 In addition, Jesus and Marta also championed
18 the work of Cuban artists. With Marta as the
19 general manager, they launched one of the first
20 commercial Cuban art galleries in the United
21 States. The Permuy Gallery had humble beginnings
22 as a converted art space on Le Jeune Road in Coral
23 Gables.

24 The Permuy Gallery was more than just a
25 gallery space. It was a community center for

1 Cubans. The Permuys held Friday night salons which
2 would start in the afternoon with wine and cheese
3 art exhibitions and moved into wide-ranging
4 discussions that lasted into the early morning.

5 After the gallery closed in 1977 in their new
6 home at 1544 Sopera Avenue, Marta continued to
7 represent artists privately and the Permuys
8 continued to host their regular Friday night salons
9 and private exhibits attended by Cuban artists,
10 collectors, writers, politicians, and business
11 leaders. Marta leveraged these salons to
12 struggling Cuban artists and on occasions even
13 offered rooms in this home as a studio space.

14 Permitted in 1925, the single family residence
15 at 1544 Sopera Avenue has been known as the Permuy
16 House for the past 45 years and is significant due
17 to its association with Jesus and Marta Permuy as
18 well as for its architecture.

19 The home played the role in aiding the Cuban
20 community on various levels. It was home to Jesus
21 during his early international humanitarian efforts
22 on behalf of Cubans under the Castro regime, as
23 well as to Marta as she aided in launching it to
24 sustaining Cuban artists.

25 The home is a touchstone to aid us in

1 remembering and honoring their efforts.

2 1544 Sopera Avenue is built in the
3 Mediterranean Revival style. It exemplifies the
4 Mediterranean ideals espoused by the city founder
5 and is indicative of the type of architecture that
6 was the founding premise of Coral Gables.

7 The home is one of the handful of homes built
8 in the initial development phase in the Country
9 Club Section Part 4.

10 The property at 1544 Sopera Avenue retains its
11 architectural integrity and significantly
12 contributes to the historic fabric of Coral Gables.
13 It is part of a collection of quality buildings
14 that serves as a visible reminder of the history
15 and the culture heritage of the city.

16 Staff recommends approval of the local
17 historic designation of the property at 1544 Sopera
18 Avenue based on its historical, cultural, and
19 architectural significance.

20 MR. ADAMS: We actually have two letters of
21 support here. Would you like me to read them into
22 the record or just state who they are from?

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

24 MR. ADAMS: Would you like me to read them?

25 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

1 MR. ADAMS: Okay. The first letter of support
2 is from Dr. Karelia Carbonell, the president of the
3 Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables.

4 "On behalf of the Historic Preservation
5 Association of Coral Gables please accept this
6 letter in support of the historic designation for
7 1544 Sopera Avenue as recommended by the city's
8 preservation staff and requested by the owner.

9 "The single family residence known as the
10 Permuy House was built in 1925 designed by
11 architect Alfred F. Schimek. The home built was
12 built in Merrick's signature Mediterranean Revival
13 style.

14 "This residence was among the first built
15 contemporaneous to the Biltmore Hotel and Country
16 Club and retains unique historic features with
17 minimal alterations and it significantly
18 contributes to the historic fabric of the city.

19 "According to preservation staff's local
20 designation report, the almost 100-year property
21 has retained a high degree of historical integrity.
22 The Historic Preservation Association of Coral
23 Gables promotes the understanding and the
24 importance of historic resources and their
25 preservation in Coral Gables.

1 "We ask the Historic Preservation Board to
2 accept the recommendation of the city's
3 preservation office and approve the local landmark
4 designation of 1544 Sopera Avenue."

5 And second is an e-mail from Jaime and Zully
6 Pardo.

7 "Dear City of Coral Gables, we support staff
8 recommendations to historically designate the
9 Permuy House. It is a significant representation
10 of our city's rich history. Thank you."

11 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Is there anyone in the
12 audience who wishes to speak in favor of this case?

13 Anyone in the audience who wishes to speak in
14 opposition to this case?

15 Okay. I will close the public hearing portion
16 and open it up to board discussion.

17 Mr. Rodriguez, do you have anything to say?

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I move we adopt the
19 recommendation of the staff.

20 MR. FULLERTON: I'll second it.

21 MS. SPAIN: I'll second it.

22 John can second it.

23 It's a beautiful home.

24 MR. FULLERTON: Yeah.

25 MS. SPAIN: It's so nice when owners of these

1 types of homes come forward on their own. I really
2 appreciate it.

3 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So we have a first and
4 we have a second. So would you read the roll,
5 please.

6 THE CLERK: Ms. Bache-Wiig?

7 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

8 THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?

9 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

10 THE CLERK: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

11 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

12 THE CLERK: Mr. Rodriguez?

13 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

14 THE CLERK: Ms. Spain?

15 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

16 THE CLERK: Mr. Fullerton?

17 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

18 THE CLERK: Mr. Durana?

19 MR. DURANA: Yes.

20 MR. MENENDEZ: Motion passes.

21 Okay. We're going to go to the second item
22 which is Section No. 8, Art in Public Places Fee
23 waiver, an application for waiver of the Art in
24 Public Places fee in accordance with Section
25 3-2103(B)3 of the City of Coral Gables Zoning Code

1 for the property located at 2901 Ponce de Leon
2 Boulevard, a local historic landmark legally
3 described as Tract E of Plaza Coral Gables
4 according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat
5 Book 173 at Page 78 of the public records of
6 Miami-Dade County, Florida.

7 The applicant is requesting a recommendation
8 of approval to waive the Art in Public Places fee
9 requirement providing for the restoration of the
10 historic resource in an amount equal or greater
11 than the amount of the Art in Public Places fee
12 that otherwise would be required.

13 Kara?

14 MS. KAUTZ: Before we start this item, did you
15 all excuse the absences of the two board members?

16 MR. MENENDEZ: No.

17 MR. EHRENHAFT: We didn't.

18 MS. KAUTZ: We need to do that probably before
19 we start this.

20 So Peggy and Cesar both requested an excused
21 absence for the day, the meeting.

22 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

23 MR. FULLERTON: I move it.

24 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I'll second that.

25 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Do we need to take a count, a
2 vote?

3 MS. KAUTZ: A voice vote.

4 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Let the record also show
5 that Mr. Durana is here.

6 THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?

7 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

8 THE CLERK: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

9 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

10 THE CLERK: Mr. Durana?

11 MR. DURANA: Yes.

12 THE CLERK: Ms. Spain?

13 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

14 THE CLERK: Mr. Fullerton?

15 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

16 THE CLERK: Ms. Bache-Wiig?

17 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

18 THE CLERK: Mr. Rodriguez?

19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

20 THE CLERK: Motion passed.

21 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.

22 If the PowerPoint could be put up for this
23 item, please.

24 Thank you. So just a quick recap, if you go
25 on to the next slide, please. So location map.

1 You all remember this from your last meeting. This
2 was built in 1925 designed by Phineas Paist. One
3 of the first constructed in the Craft Section and
4 known as the Art Center Building. Phineas Paist's
5 office was housed in this building.

6 Next slide, please. This is a 1940s photo.
7 We actually don't have a '20s photo, which is very
8 strange, but this is the earliest photo that we do
9 have.

10 Again, the applicant is requesting a waiver
11 from the Art in Public Places fund. Catherine
12 Cathers is on the Zoom call, as is the applicant.

13 I didn't know if the applicant wanted to give
14 an additional -- any part of their presentation
15 again. Gus Ceballos provided you all with the
16 excerpts from the development agreement that you
17 had asked for at the last meeting. So I don't know
18 how you all want to move forward, if you want to
19 just discuss or if you want to hear from Agave.
20 You let me know.

21 You can take the PowerPoint down.

22 MS. SPAIN: I'm happy to just discuss it, and
23 then if we have any questioning we can ask them. I
24 personally don't need another presentation, but
25 it's totally up to you all.

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Anyone want to see the
2 presentation again?

3 MR. EHRENHAFT: No. I would not need to see
4 it in full. I don't know whether for purposes of
5 the public who are present, whether the staff could
6 make some brief summation or whether that's not
7 necessary.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Let's see, is there anyone who
9 would like to speak -- in the public who would like
10 to speak in favor of this case?

11 Is there anyone in the public who would like
12 to speak in opposition of this case?

13 Okay. We'll close it to public hearing. And
14 we can discuss it amongst ourselves.

15 As I remember from the last meeting, there was
16 an issue regarding the dollar amount.

17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: My question or my issue the
18 last time that I wanted to have discussion of is
19 we've -- the city apparently granted this property
20 to this developer. The developer has spent a lot
21 of money, millions, hundreds of millions of dollars
22 to develop the entire parcel, but now is coming
23 back and asking us basically for what amounts to
24 public funds because there are funds that have to
25 be contributed under the law as a requirement of

1 the construction. They're asking that those funds
2 be used for the renovation of a building which they
3 now own and possess and will be used for their
4 purposes.

5 And my question was the soundness as a matter
6 of public policy of allowing that to happen, which
7 is the purpose of the waiver.

8 MS. SPAIN: I think, Catherine, you can
9 probably jump in, but the purpose of that waiver
10 was so that in addition to -- because if people buy
11 a historic building they're going to want to
12 restore it, I mean, regardless. And so but in
13 addition to that, they have to pay the Art in
14 Public Places fee.

15 So it was the intent when that ordinance was
16 first written was if they were going to restore the
17 building, then that portion of the Art in Public
18 Places fee would be waived, but it would still have
19 to go through the process.

20 It needs to go, I think I want to say -- I
21 don't know. I think it's to the city commission as
22 a recommendation.

23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah, our recommendation goes
24 to the city commission.

25 MS. SPAIN: Yes. Yes.

1 MR. RODRIGUEZ: And I'm not --

2 MS. SPAIN: But you're against the policy of
3 doing that.

4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm not objecting to granting
5 the waiver per se. I'm concerned about the fact
6 that we're recommending that these funds be used to
7 restore a building which is owned by them, which is
8 granted to them by the commission, and they will
9 then use for whatever purposes, you know, they can
10 use, which is fine. A restaurant, a cafe, but they
11 will be gaining the benefit of that use of that
12 space, but we're allowing them to renovate it and
13 bring it -- to restore to its original condition
14 for historic purposes. That I agree with.

15 MS. SPAIN: Right.

16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm just wondering where
17 the --

18 MS. SPAIN: But it's not public funds because
19 the funds that we're waiving would come from their
20 contribution and to the arts --

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: -- used for public art that --

22 MS. SPAIN: -- Art in Public Places --

23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: -- otherwise used for public
24 art.

25 MS. SPAIN: Let me tell you, these people are

1 putting out an amazing amount of art anyway onto
2 their site, and so this is only a portion of what
3 they're doing in public art.

4 I don't want the public to think that we're
5 taking public funds --

6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: But otherwise the funds would
7 be used for other art to be displayed into public
8 places?

9 MS. SPAIN: Yes, that's right.

10 MS. CATHERS: But they -- this is Catherine.
11 So what I think Dona is saying, which is true,
12 these are private development funds that they would
13 be using for public art on their private
14 development project. The project itself would not
15 be owned by the city.

16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: But otherwise those funds
17 would be used for Art in Public Places, not for the
18 restoration of a private property.

19 MS. SPAIN: Yes, you're right.

20 MS. CATHERS: Yes, per the code so they have
21 that --

22 MS. SPAIN: It's not the entire restoration --

23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, I granted --

24 MS. SPAIN: Because it's only those -- I
25 believe it's only what's visible to the public. I

1 think there may be a couple of exceptions, but --

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: There are other elements of
3 the project that go beyond what's available to the
4 public.

5 MS. SPAIN: Yes, but I don't think these are
6 funds that we're waiving for the art building. I
7 think the restoration of the building is for those
8 exterior restorations that is viewed by the public.
9 Is that right?

10 MS. KAUTZ: That's right.

11 MR. FULLERTON: How much does it cost if the
12 whole development is already covered with Art in
13 Public Places funds? I mean, does the money they
14 spent on this building and are going to spend, that
15 stands alone in terms of the money that they are
16 paying for art?

17 MR. DURANA: I would assume it's not if
18 they're asking for the variance, right?

19 MS. SPAIN: It's subtracted from the Art in
20 Public Places fee that they're going to pay or
21 provide art.

22 MR. FULLERTON: Yes. They're paying hundreds
23 of millions of dollars to which -- or from which
24 the money would come for that one percent of that
25 amount, that 400 million or whatever it is. And

1 then the one percent of the cost of the building,
2 well, the building that we're talking about, is
3 that just a fraction of that so that's what's being
4 covered or is it the whole amount?

5 MS. SPAIN: I don't understand what you just
6 said, but the restoration --

7 MR. FULLERTON: Well, I'm trying to divide
8 this project --

9 MS. SPAIN: -- of the exterior of this
10 building, the cost of that would be subtracted from
11 the monies that they would pay to either -- into a
12 fund or provide public art.

13 MS. KAUTZ: They've already spent
14 approximately 2.8 million on art.

15 MS. SPAIN: On what?

16 MS. KAUTZ: On artwork.

17 MR. DURANA: Is that artwork public art or is
18 that their personal possession art?

19 MS. KAUTZ: It is public art.

20 MR. DURANA: Public art. Okay.

21 MR. MENENDEZ: And what is the cost of
22 restoring the facade of the building?

23 MS. KAUTZ: Their budget right now is for
24 approximately 1,068,000.

25 MR. MENENDEZ: What's the total amount in the

1 Art in Public Places fund?

2 MS. KAUTZ: The city's overall fund or what
3 their contribution is?

4 MR. MENENDEZ: What their contribution is.

5 MS. KAUTZ: I don't have that, I don't know
6 that number. Do you all?

7 MS. CATHERS: I don't have the exact figure,
8 but this represents about a quarter of that.

9 MS. KAUTZ: I'm going to let Agave unmute if
10 they so wish.

11 MS. SPAIN: When you say this, Catherine, are
12 you saying for the restoration of the building or
13 what they've already spent plus the restoration?

14 MS. CATHERS: Yes. Yes. The restoration of
15 the building represents about a quarter of their
16 Art in Public Places fee.

17 MR. BECKMANN: Yes, that is correct,
18 Catherine. I think for round numbers it's a
19 \$4 million contribution and the restoration,
20 proposed restoration of the facade is approximately
21 1 million so it's 25 percent of the total fee.

22 MS. KAUTZ: Carlos, can you introduce yourself
23 for the record, please.

24 MR. BECKMANN: Sorry. Yeah, this is Carlos
25 Beckmann, manager with Agave Holdings and Agave

1 Ponce.

2 MR. MENENDEZ: He needs to be sworn in.

3 MS. KAUTZ: I just realized that. Let me
4 unmute Jessica, make her a cohost so that she can
5 swear everybody in. I'm so sorry.

6 THE COURT REPORTER: Hello. Hi.

7 Could you please raise your right hand, sir.

8 Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole
9 truth and nothing but the truth?

10 MR. BECKMANN: I do.

11 MR. MENENDEZ: The issue here is that the
12 funds are going to be taken out of Art in Public
13 Places to restore the facade of the building and
14 there's an issue with that.

15 MS. SPAIN: I don't have an issue with it. I
16 think they're doing what we've asked them to do.
17 It's private development funds. It's not public
18 funds. And I'm going to move staff
19 recommendations.

20 MR. MENENDEZ: I don't have an issue with them
21 using the funds to restore the facade of the
22 building to keep it intact, but they're going to
23 derive revenue out of the --

24 MS. SPAIN: As is anyone --

25 MR. MENENDEZ: -- inside. So as long as --

1 MS. SPAIN: -- when they restore a public -- a
2 private building.

3 MR. MENENDEZ: -- we cap it on the exterior, I
4 don't have an issue with it.

5 MS. SPAIN: Okay. I make a motion to approve
6 staff's recommendation on this project.

7 MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have a second?

8 MR. FULLERTON: I'll second it for
9 conversation.

10 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

11 MR. FULLERTON: My, not objection, but my
12 point before when I was babbling on was to quantify
13 this. How do -- like they say, oh, it's going to
14 be a million dollars.

15 MS. SPAIN: But Catherine does that. I'm
16 telling you, it is quantified. She quantifies the
17 artwork, they have to submit documentation, bills,
18 everything. That's totally taken care of by staff.
19 And their proposal will be checked to make sure
20 that it qualifies. That will absolutely be taken
21 care of.

22 MR. FULLERTON: So they're saying it's a
23 million dollars to restore the old building inside
24 and out?

25 MS. SPAIN: The only thing that they can apply

1 to this Art in Public Places waiver is the exterior
2 that the public would see.

3 MR. FULLERTON: So they pay the inside.

4 MS. KAUTZ: There's a scope of work in your
5 packet.

6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is that clear, Catherine? Can
7 you please clear what Dona just said, that the
8 money can only be used for the exterior that would
9 be seen by the public.

10 MS. CATHERS: Yes. So the part of the code is
11 that they have that choice to apply for a waiver of
12 the Art in Public Places fee if they are restoring
13 the building.

14 So in this particular case, I know part of
15 their proposal is an interior that affects the
16 exterior that we've had numerous conversations with
17 the developer about that we feel is significant
18 enough and we are willing to support that.

19 And what Dona also said, that is true, we do a
20 very thorough documentation, ask that developers
21 provide all invoices and receipts showing payments
22 for everything that's been itemized for those
23 expenses.

24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You really didn't answer my
25 question. My question is will the funds that we

1 would be authorizing to be used only for the
2 exterior restoration and no part of those funds
3 will go for interior restorations or repairs or
4 renovations?

5 MS. CATHERS: Not necessarily in this case
6 because there is one component of it there, and
7 Kara can probably speak more about the specifics.
8 But there is one aspect of the exterior demolition
9 that is required in order for the exterior to be
10 renovated to its original form.

11 So in this particular case the demolition of
12 the interior is required for the exterior to
13 happen. There is no other interior renovation or
14 restoration in this proposal.

15 MS. SPAIN: I believe that was for in order to
16 restore the windows to what they were originally?

17 MS. KAUTZ: Correct. Removing a mezzanine
18 floor --

19 MS. CATHERS: Correct.

20 MS. SPAIN: Because at some point in the
21 history of the building they put a floor in, and so
22 they made what used to be windows that went the
23 entire elevation, there was a break in them, so
24 they have to do work on the interior of the
25 building in order to put it back the way it was

1 before.

2 Is that right, Kara?

3 MS. KAUTZ: That's correct.

4 MS. SPAIN: All right.

5 MR. DURANA: I mean, what about like this,
6 this proposal, I'm looking at the proposal they
7 have for the work, I mean, you've got \$290,000 in
8 construction management of that one mil. I mean,
9 that's a lot. That's like 30 percent of, you know,
10 of the bulk of that money.

11 I mean, I don't know, I think that seems, you
12 know, why -- I don't know. I think we shouldn't
13 really pay for the management -- you know, that
14 construction fee and all that.

15 MR. FULLERTON: I'm glad you looked at that.

16 MR. MENENDEZ: Well, there's also in a scope
17 of work from Gurri Matute, replacement of four
18 air-conditioning systems with corresponding
19 condensing units --

20 MS. KAUTZ: And we've worked with --

21 MR. MENENDEZ: -- controls --

22 MS. KAUTZ: -- to narrow down the scope of
23 work to only use those items that involve
24 restoration of the historic structure. We
25 eliminated quite a few items from their initial

1 scope of work.

2 So there's a budget, preliminary budget
3 estimate that was given to all of us, a one-page
4 document, it looks like this, that outlines the
5 scope of work that we're looking at.

6 MS. SPAIN: What page is that, Kara?

7 MS. KAUTZ: It's a single, it's a single
8 document, eight and a half by 11, that's just a
9 budget estimate, looks like this, a low tech
10 version that lays it down --

11 MS. SPAIN: It's on the Agave letterhead?

12 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. Yes.

13 They originally had an AC chiller sort of
14 component to this, we eliminated that. So this
15 really does sort of get it down to bringing the
16 historic building back.

17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: What is the date of the
18 document you're reading?

19 MS. KAUTZ: It says updated 3/12/2021.

20 MS. SPAIN: 3/12? Oh, mine says 3/11.

21 MR. MENENDEZ: 3/11.

22 MS. KAUTZ: Maybe I can't see it. Hold on.
23 Mine says 3/12.

24 MR. MENENDEZ: Kara, we're basically voting on
25 this and this would go to the city commission or

1 the city manager for the ultimate approval?

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: The commission has to approve
3 it.

4 MR. CEBALLOS: You're providing a
5 recommendation whether to approve or disapprove
6 with conditions or without that goes directly to
7 the commission. The commission is the one that
8 makes the final decision.

9 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I have a quick question --

10 MS. SPAIN: -- concerned with, is the
11 ordinance not what they're doing, you know, to
12 actually allow this.

13 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Sorry, I'm at a disadvantage,
14 I'm in Zoom.

15 Quick question: Is there like a peer review
16 from the city that looked at the budget that
17 they're proposing that was provided by their GC?

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Can you please repeat that, it
19 didn't come clear.

20 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yeah, is there like a cost
21 estimator on the city side that would have looked
22 at the cost estimate for the work that they're
23 proposing?

24 MS. KAUTZ: There is not to date. I'm not
25 sure how, Catherine, on the art aspects for this,

1 or who reviews and whatnot. They still have to --

2 MS. CATHERS: The --

3 MS. KAUTZ: Go ahead.

4 MS. CATHERS: No. I was just asking
5 about the -- they're asking about the construction?
6 That we just did it as a staff review for the
7 construction budget.

8 MS. KAUTZ: So as noted in the staff report
9 though, too, they are going to need to hire an
10 architect to develop a scope of drawings to get
11 permitted, to go through the city.

12 So once actual construction documents are
13 drawn up and submitted there's probably a better
14 idea of the dollar amount that's going to have to
15 be associated with the scope of work. So this will
16 all get a little bit more fleshed out when that
17 happens.

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: So let me ask --

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Who at the city is going to be
20 in charge of, you know, shepherding this through
21 and keeping tabs on costs and on scope so it
22 doesn't get out of control?

23 MS. KAUTZ: I'm not sure I understand your
24 question.

25 MR. MENENDEZ: Well, we have a scope of work

1 here for an amount. Who at the city is going to be
2 in charge of making sure that this is the budget
3 and it doesn't grow?

4 MS. KAUTZ: It may very well grow. I don't
5 think that's -- I mean, any restoration project
6 normally costs more than what people think it does,
7 which is why they put a pretty large unforeseen
8 contingency in here.

9 MR. MENENDEZ: What I'm saying is there has to
10 be some checks and balances.

11 MS. KAUTZ: Of course. Of course. And we can
12 provide that with someone in the city.

13 MR. FULLERTON: Normally would it have been --

14 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Kara --

15 MR. FULLERTON: -- Carlos Mindreau? Would it
16 have been Carlos Mindreau?

17 MS. SPAIN: Carlos Mindreau retired.

18 MR. FULLERTON: What?

19 MS. SPAIN: He's retired.

20 MR. FULLERTON: Oh, no, I know. Would it have
21 been Carlos if he was still here, somebody on staff
22 that's going to oversee our interest in the
23 project?

24 MS. KAUTZ: For a dollar amount, probably not,
25 would not have been --

1 MS. SPAIN: Yeah, it's not really set up that
2 way because it's not a city project. If it were a
3 city project, like the restoration of the Fink
4 studio, then absolutely. We look at every penny.

5 But when they submit their bills, then is when
6 that the department, Kara's department, Warren's
7 department will look at the cost that they put into
8 it and decide whether it qualifies for that, and if
9 they don't think it does, then they'll bring it
10 back to the Board.

11 MR. FULLERTON: I feel it is kind of a city
12 project, you're using -- they're using the money
13 that would come to the city to do --

14 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Right.

15 MR. FULLERTON: -- a project that we're not
16 even going to find out -- or we're not even going
17 to check how they're doing.

18 MS. SPAIN: I think your concern is with the
19 process that's set up in the ordinance, not with
20 this project.

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Who is the GC? Kara, on this
22 document, who is GC? Because there's no dollar
23 amounts, it's just by GC, by GC.

24 MS. KAUTZ: Right. Their general contractor
25 has not been chosen yet. The dollar amount --

1 MR. RODRIGUEZ: So this is their general
2 contractor?

3 MS. KAUTZ: Right. It was based off of it did
4 receive --

5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: What he charges --

6 MS. KAUTZ: -- estimates from -- I'm sorry.

7 MR. RODRIGUEZ: The amount is \$940,000, all to
8 be determined by the general contractor?

9 MR. FULLERTON: Yeah.

10 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: So this is a blank check.

12 MS. CATHERS: No. All accounts -- everything
13 that will be -- it's all -- it's an itemized list
14 and all invoices and all the paid receipts will
15 have to be submitted for those itemizations, those
16 itemized items, and they'll go through, you know, a
17 permitting process.

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: For these purposes we'd be
19 voting on a blank check to be determined by someone
20 else at a later time.

21 MS. KAUTZ: Well, as part of your application
22 for submittal there was an 11-by-17 spreadsheet
23 from Red Door Construction which is what generated
24 the numbers for that list.

25 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Kara, question, so this has

1 to be a million dollars or above for them to get
2 the waiver; is that the right understanding?

3 MS. KAUTZ: No, I don't believe so.
4 Catherine?

5 MS. CATHERS: No.

6 MR. CEBALLOS: Construction projects under --

7 MS. CATHERS: Yeah --

8 MR. CEBALLOS: -- qualified are not required
9 to be subject to the Art in Public Places program.

10 This project obviously exceeds construction
11 costs well over a million dollars, and that's the
12 reason it has to meet the criteria of the Art in
13 Public Places program.

14 MS. BACHE-WIIG: But you say it exceeds well
15 over, but we're just talking about the restoration
16 of that historic building, correct?

17 MS. CATHERS: Correct.

18 MR. MENENDEZ: We're talking about --

19 MS. BACHE-WIIG: So but according to the --

20 MR. MENENDEZ: -- the restoration of the
21 exterior of that building.

22 MS. CATHERS: Yes.

23 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Right. According to the
24 estimate you're only at 940.

25 MR. CEBALLOS: The Art in Public Places

1 program is applicable to the entire Agave project.
2 That is who is requesting this waiver, and as part
3 of their waiver they're using the Art Center
4 Building as their historic property to qualify for
5 the exemption under Subsection B(3) I believe it
6 is.

7 MR. ADAMS: Catherine, can you maybe confirm
8 if for any reason the project comes in under the
9 estimate they would still be required to spend the
10 total required amount on public art, so if they're
11 estimating a million and it comes in at 800,000
12 final numbers, they would still have to put the
13 additional 200,000 back into public art?

14 MS. CATHERS: Absolutely, Warren. Thank you
15 for bringing that up. We would make that part of
16 the resolution, that would go to commission, and
17 that's standard for any of the other Art in Public
18 Places waiver requests. We always put in that
19 provision so if there are excess fees that those
20 fees are paid back into the fund.

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'd like to point out that
22 \$940,000 that were mentioned, almost a third of
23 that is these construction management fees.

24 MR. DURANA: More. Because if you add the
25 architect fee for 110 --

1 MR. MENENDEZ: You're at 40 percent.

2 MR. DURANA: -- you're at 40 percent just in
3 designing fees and construction management.

4 I mean, I don't -- to me personally, this is
5 probably -- I would assume this is the biggest
6 Coral Gables has going on right now.

7 I don't like the idea that they're already
8 starting with this of like, you know, asking for
9 this credit because to me it just doesn't seem
10 right. You know, it seems this is pennies compared
11 to what they've spent on that building, and to us
12 this is the most important part because this is the
13 one building that's historic on that property that
14 they've swallowed up.

15 I mean, I don't know, I think they should
16 almost be happy to be doing it, you know, and not
17 asking for this variance or whatever you want to
18 call it.

19 MR. FULLERTON: Or could the city commission
20 or whoever's in charge of this limit the amount of
21 the Art in Public Places fee amount, limit that to
22 a specific number and say, you know, do what you
23 want to do, finish the project, but you can't take
24 any more out of your Art in Public Places funds?
25 Limit it to --

1 MS. SPAIN: So you want them -- you're asking
2 them to limit the amount that they put into the
3 preservation? Is that what you just said?

4 MR. FULLERTON: I just said of the 940,000
5 say, okay, that's your number. You can't have
6 anything more out of your Art in Public Places --

7 MS. SPAIN: For Historic Preservation?

8 MR. FULLERTON: For Historic Preservation.

9 MS. SPAIN: But why would the Historic
10 Preservation Board want to do that? You would
11 think that we would want them to spend as much as
12 is necessary on --

13 MR. FULLERTON: I'm not saying that --

14 MR. DURANA: Yeah, but they're required --

15 MR. FULLERTON: -- the Historic Preservation
16 Board should do it. I'm saying the city.

17 MR. DURANA: The agreement with the city was
18 that they had to restore the building. That's the
19 agreement.

20 MS. SPAIN: Right.

21 MR. DURANA: They're just trying to use the
22 Art in Public Places to find money to do that. So
23 it's kind of like the city's basically paying for
24 it.

25 MR. FULLERTON: It's in their interest --

1 MR. CEBALLOS: Pardon my interruption --

2 MS. SPAIN: No. No. They're still paying for
3 it because any money they put into the Art in
4 Public Places is their money. It's not taxpayers'
5 money. So they're just taking a portion of that
6 money that they're already requiring to put into
7 Art in Public Places Fee and spending it on the
8 restoration of this building.

9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: And that's money that
10 otherwise would have to go to public art.

11 MS. SPAIN: That's right. But the ordinance
12 allows them to do that.

13 MR. FULLERTON: I guess they're not limited to
14 the cost of other public art they're putting in,
15 they could pay whatever they want for it, and
16 that's what it is so...

17 MS. CATHERS: Right.

18 MR. EHRENHAFT: Through the chair --

19 MS. CATHERS: Gus, can you clarify that it is
20 not a requirement for them to restore this
21 building?

22 MR. CEBALLOS: Yes, that is correct. I just
23 want to clarify the record that under the contract
24 and under the development agreement section that I
25 sent to you, it is not a requirement that they

1 restore this building.

2 As an owner of a historic property they need
3 to do the minimum, which is maintain said building.
4 They can make renovations as they choose, but they
5 are under no duty to basically do anything but
6 prevent this property from falling in disrepair.
7 So basically falling into demolition by neglect.
8 That cannot happen.

9 MR. DURANA: The agreement you guys gave us
10 says "Accordingly, owner and city agree that any
11 proposed use of the Art Center Building should
12 celebrate its important role in civic planning and
13 architectural history and in the history of the
14 city and should increase the prestige of the
15 overall project."

16 I don't know how that building will increase
17 if they don't fix it up, I mean...

18 MR. FULLERTON: They would full stopped from
19 abandoning it and letting it fall apart and --

20 MS. SPAIN: Well, that's true, but they don't
21 certainly have to put the windows back where they
22 were originally.

23 MS. KAUTZ: Or the three-story balcony
24 courtyard they're going to reopen --

25 MR. DURANA: Then they won't be increasing the

1 value of the project, I mean...

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: It's in their financial
3 interest to do this. They're asking us to allow
4 public funds to be -- public art funds to be used
5 for that purpose, so it's either yes or no, but
6 that's what's happening.

7 MS. SPAIN: But that's what the ordinance
8 allows.

9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Otherwise there wouldn't be a
10 waiver. If it was allowed, we wouldn't have to
11 have a waiver.

12 MS. SPAIN: But right in the Art in Public
13 Places ordinance it lists those things that would
14 qualify that they could do in lieu of --

15 MS. KAUTZ: Paying.

16 MS. SPAIN: -- paying into the Art in Public
17 Places fund.

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: If a waiver is granted.

19 MS. SPAIN: If it's granted. That's right.

20 MS. KAUTZ: But even adding public art to
21 their property, Catherine, correct me if I'm wrong,
22 still requires a waiver because they're not paying
23 into the collective art fund; is that correct,
24 Catherine?

25 MS. CATHERS: Correct. That's right.

1 MS. SPAIN: That's right. They provide art,
2 but that's a waiver. Because typically the city
3 wants the money.

4 MS. CATHERS: So it's really an incentive, you
5 know, it's an incentive for them to restore the
6 building, it's an incentive for them to incorporate
7 public art on their development property, which
8 yes, increases the value of the property overall,
9 whether it's art or in this case the restoration of
10 the building.

11 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft, you have
12 something to say?

13 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes, please.

14 I also recognize that we still have a motion
15 before us from Ms. Spain. I agree with Dona that
16 it's in the interest of the community that the
17 exterior of this historic building be brought back
18 to the form that it had before the curtain walls
19 and the open loggias were closed in and glass,
20 significant amounts of glass that's not
21 architecturally compatible with the original
22 architectural style of the building, and I would be
23 willing to support Dona's motion, but I would ask
24 that to the extent that there could be vetting of
25 what line items are actually being spent, that it

1 go to the restoration of the exterior, as Dona
2 said, so that when the public is on the plaza or
3 driving past what they see with their eyes on the
4 exterior of the building has been restored as best
5 as possible to the original state that it was.

6 And I would thereby offer an amendment, if
7 Dona would accept it, that they limit the line
8 items that are being put on the listing of costs
9 that they're going to seek to things that are to
10 the exterior, and if there's something that has to
11 be done on the interior, that it be done and
12 included because it's structurally necessary to
13 restore the exterior.

14 And, for example, another item might be that
15 there were loggias and those loggias had floors and
16 architectural details in them, so if any of that
17 was disturbed and they were going to restore it
18 back to what can be seen on the exterior walking --
19 because the loggia if the public goes onto it will
20 be part of the exterior of the building so --

21 MS. SPAIN: Isn't that what we are approving
22 if we approve this, Kara?

23 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

24 MS. SPAIN: I think that's what my motion
25 would have -- was, right?

1 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

2 MS. SPAIN: That's what they're presenting.

3 MR. EHRENHAFT: I just wanted to clarify.

4 There were concerns from other board members
5 that --

6 MS. SPAIN: Yes. Well, we can certainly -- I
7 can certainly add it that I would approve staff's
8 recommendation that the Art in Public Places waiver
9 for the historic restoration of this building be
10 limited to what was presented in their application,
11 which is what was on the exterior and those items
12 on the interior that were necessary for the
13 exterior restoration.

14 Is that what you mean?

15 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yeah. I just wanted to make
16 sure because I thought I heard concerns that they
17 wanted to specifically be stated by this board that
18 some of the other members that interior -- I mean,
19 that interior restorations not be included, okay,
20 that the scope be restricted to the exterior
21 restoration.

22 MS. SPAIN: It's not going to be used to
23 restore somebody's office on the other side.

24 MR. EHRENHAFT: So if that's the case then I'm
25 willing to support Ms. Spain's motion.

1 MS. SPAIN: John seconded it. Is he okay with
2 that?

3 MR. FULLERTON: Yeah. I do have one more
4 comment, and it's the relationship between
5 construction management and construction work in
6 place. The work in place is \$650,000 and the
7 construction management is \$291,000. That just --

8 MR. DURANA: Plus 110 for the architecture, so
9 you're talking \$400,000 of the 1 million is in soft
10 costs.

11 MR. FULLERTON: Where's this?

12 MR. DURANA: At the top of the first -- on the
13 first page of the proposal. It's the smaller
14 eight-and-a-half by 11, you see it in blue, like
15 the top has like a little blue highlight. It's
16 attached to the large 11-by-17.

17 Bruce, like if you flip it over, yeah, flip it
18 over.

19 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

20 MR. DURANA: So at the top you have the 100
21 for architecture and engineering fees plus the 300
22 in GC management or whatever. Yeah, \$400,000 in
23 soft costs.

24 I mean, that's my only issue with it, I think,
25 is that's a lot. I mean, I want the building to

1 get restored, I want it to look beautiful, you
2 know, but I just, I don't know, I don't think the
3 city's getting a fair deal here.

4 MS. SPAIN: Well, that's laid out in the
5 ordinance, I believe, Catherine, as to what would
6 count and what wouldn't, is that right?

7 MS. CATHERS: Yes. There's certain
8 percentages that are allowable for consultation
9 fees, that sort of thing. I don't know --

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You don't know that
11 percentage?

12 MS. CATHERS: Yeah, the percentage is -- I'm
13 sorry, I don't have it in front of me and I'm off
14 site right now.

15 There's a percentage for consulting fees. I
16 don't know that there's a percentage for the
17 contractor fees, but we can look into that. And we
18 would absolutely hold them to whatever it is for
19 their allowable expenses.

20 And Carlos knows this, we've had multiple
21 conversations about it already.

22 I don't know, Carlos, maybe you can address
23 the high general contractor fees.

24 MS. KAUTZ: Let me unmute him again.

25 MR. BECKMANN: Yeah. Well, we have three

1 bidders. Actually, this was not that way. We had
2 Gurri Matute prepare a request for proposal and we
3 did get three different proposals, and they were
4 all in line. And you have that information. We
5 sent that to you, Catherine and Kara.

6 And the reason for that is, obviously, any
7 type of historic restoration or when you're working
8 in a 100-year-old building there's surprises to be
9 had, and this is going to take time. It has to go
10 through the city, permits need to be issued,
11 inspections and so forth, structural, windows,
12 waterproofing, et cetera, et cetera.

13 So the actual work, removing windows and
14 installing new windows, it's not a lot of hard
15 costs, but doing the details and going through the
16 inspection, I mean, this is just going to extend
17 the schedule probably by four times.

18 If I were to just change the windows myself,
19 which is an option that we have seriously
20 considered at our own costs, but without going
21 through historic restoration, we could do that in
22 probably three months, four months with \$80,000 of
23 general conditions for the contractors.

24 But due to the historic nature of this and the
25 loggias and everything that has been discussed, it

1 is a challenge to restore all that, and it's going
2 to take more than ten months, almost a year to do
3 the work. That's why those ratios are
4 disproportionate and it's nothing comparable to a
5 new building.

6 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Kara, I have a comment to
7 what was just said, and I think, you know, you have
8 to have the right consultants to guide this work
9 and, you know, everybody at the city knows that.
10 And I think it's just for the comfort level of some
11 of the board members is just for us to understand
12 what the ordinance allows, what we were just -- you
13 just mentioned, Catherine, about the percentages on
14 what -- you know, what are those percentages for
15 consultants just to give us a comfort level that
16 we're meeting that or if we exceed that then, you
17 know, what happens then? Does that amount that
18 gets exceeded, does that not count? You know, just
19 that kind of details so that it's really black and
20 white.

21 But obviously the right construction
22 management and the right consultants to guide the
23 work is, you know, vital.

24 MS. KAUTZ: Do you all want the copies of the
25 ordinance to review or?

1 MS. SPAIN: I don't.

2 MR. MENENDEZ: We have a motion and second,
3 and I don't know if there's any more discussion
4 that the Board would like to have, but I think we
5 need to get through the motion.

6 MR. CEBALLOS: If I may, two quick items just
7 for the Board's information, and maybe perhaps
8 helps in your decision-making process. Directly
9 from the Art in Public Places section of our most
10 recent code revision, there's no percentage that I
11 can see anywhere, but specifically under (B)3 "the
12 value of the donations shall be determined by a
13 qualified appraiser acceptable to the city, which
14 in the case of real estate, shall be an appraiser
15 who's an Appraisal Institute member holding the MAI
16 designation, and the cost of such appraisal will be
17 borne by the developer."

18 So there is a certain check and balances built
19 into the code that the work that is being donated,
20 if you will, will need to be appraised and needs to
21 be assessed to make sure that it is the value that
22 they are getting a waiver for in Art in Public
23 Places.

24 Additionally, I looked at the definition
25 section and I could not find anything that

1 referenced any percentages, but I thought I'd read
2 what construction costs are defined as. And it
3 means, "the total cost of construction or
4 renovation of a project as determined by the
5 building official in issuing of building permit for
6 construction or renovation, plus soft costs of
7 architectural and engineering fees. The
8 construction costs includes all labor, structural
9 materials, plumbing, electrical, mechanical,
10 infrastructure design, permitting, architecture,
11 engineering, lighting, signa=ge and site work. All
12 construction costs and renovation costs shall be
13 calculated based on good faith projections for the
14 whole project and paid as of the date the building
15 permit is issued. This definition is not intended
16 to include the definition as listed under the
17 Florida Building Code."

18 I don't know if that helps, but I thought I'd
19 provide that.

20 MR. MENENDEZ: You said that the Art in Public
21 Places was recently revised?

22 MR. CEBALLOS: The zoning code was recently
23 revised, mostly reorganized. I do not believe any
24 part of this was amended. But I think Catherine
25 may be able to chime in. But I believe this was

1 just numbering that was changed, none of the actual
2 language was.

3 MS. SPAIN: It was not changed.

4 MR. CEBALLOS: Yeah.

5 MS. SPAIN: I'd be shocked if it was changed.

6 MS. CATHERS: It was not changed.

7 MS. SPAIN: Because one of the changes it
8 wanted to do was to eliminate the word waiver.
9 It's confusing.

10 MS. CATHERS: That's correct.

11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Before we vote, may I just say
12 something, Mr. Chairman?

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

14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I completely support the
15 notion that this building should be restored to its
16 previous condition, and what rubs me is out of a
17 half billion dollar project we're being asked for a
18 minor, small amount to contribute what would
19 otherwise go to art to go to the restoration of the
20 building which will be used by them for their own
21 pecuniary purposes.

22 MS. SPAIN: But if it helps you, it should
23 help you that it's on the exterior, number one.

24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, it does.

25 MS. SPAIN: And, number two, they didn't have

1 to do this. They could have put everything into
2 public art or they could have just paid the money.

3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: It's in their interest to
4 renovate this building --

5 MS. SPAIN: It is.

6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: -- and to make it look
7 beautiful.

8 MS. SPAIN: It totally is. And it's for that
9 reason that staff put in that they could use it in
10 lieu of paying the city for public art, that it's
11 to their benefit to restore a historic building so
12 they should get some kudos for doing that and part
13 of that is not to have to pay into the public art
14 place.

15 I think you might want to blame me for doing
16 this because I was adamant that historic
17 preservation be part of it, so anyway.

18 My motion stands.

19 MR. FULLERTON: Okay. Call the question.

20 MS. SPAIN: Pardon me?

21 MR. FULLERTON: Call the question. So call
22 the roll.

23 THE CLERK: Ms. Spain?

24 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

25 THE CLERK: Mr. Fullerton?

1 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

2 THE CLERK: Mr. Durana?

3 MR. DURANA: No.

4 MS. KAUTZ: I can't hear who you're calling.

5 THE CLERK: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

6 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

7 THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

9 THE CLERK: Ms. Bache-Wiig?

10 MS. BACHE-WIIG: No.

11 THE CLERK: And Mr. Rodriguez?

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No.

13 THE CLERK: The motion passes four to --

14 MS. KAUTZ: The motions fails. It didn't
15 achieve --

16 MS. SPAIN: They needed five votes.

17 MS. KAUTZ: So we can bring this back at the
18 next meeting?

19 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Kara, can I ask a question?
20 What Gus read -- and the reason I voted no is
21 because it's still unclear to me if we will be
22 hiring a third party or the developer will be
23 hiring a third party, you know, as per the
24 ordinance for, you know, that appraisal. Like I'm
25 still not understanding if that's taking place

1 because from my point of view, if they're saying
2 this is going to cost \$5, we just -- I think it's
3 important that since we represent the city that
4 those -- somebody is vetting that those five
5 dollars are actually correct to be spent for
6 whatever line item it is.

7 So that's my only concern, and that's why I
8 said no. I'm not opposed to the notion of --
9 because they're allowed to do this by right. I
10 mean, the ordinance is allowing this. It's just
11 like are the checks and balances, are they are?
12 That's my only concern. So I'm sorry if I threw
13 the whole thing out.

14 MS. SPAIN: I understand. But I think what
15 Gus read on the definition of the construction
16 costs was when they calculate the entire
17 construction cost of the project itself so that
18 they can then figure out what the percentage needs
19 to be to pay into the Art in Public Places.

20 So I don't think what he read was how to
21 calculate the construction costs of the restoration
22 of the building.

23 Having said that, we can ask them to hire a
24 consultant that will oversee the restoration of it,
25 you know, if that gives you comfort.

1 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Can I ask a question of staff,
2 please. Our recommendation or non-recommendation
3 goes to the commission who can review this de novo;
4 is that correct?

5 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Which means that whatever
7 we've decided is just a mere recommendation to the
8 commission, who can then consider this issue, and
9 they're more concerned about dollars and cents than
10 we are so, perhaps that's a place where this should
11 be decided.

12 MS. SPAIN: This vote I think can go to the
13 commission as it stands, it doesn't need to come
14 back to us. It's just a recommendation.

15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I would suggest that we just
16 send it to the commission with the explanation as
17 to what the concern was and let them decide.

18 MS. SPAIN: I think that makes a lot of sense.

19 MS. KAUTZ: Gus, do they need to make an
20 affirmative recommendation or?

21 MR. CEBALLOS: In this particular case no
22 action was taken, so basically what would move
23 forward is no recommendation, neither against or
24 for it, and basically we would detail exactly what
25 happened and we can pass along the --

1 MS. SPAIN: They'll have the verbatim so...

2 MR. FULLERTON: Yeah, they can see that we
3 want it restored. It's just --

4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I think the record is clear
5 that we want it restored. We're just concerned
6 about the financial aspects of this and who should
7 pay with what money.

8 MR. ADAMS: Catherine, is it a requirement
9 that if this had been approved that the developer
10 must submit proof of all expenses?

11 MS. CATHERS: Yeah, that's part of the
12 closeout.

13 MR. ADAMS: Because I think we have to
14 realize, as was said, historic restoration,
15 particularly restoration projects are notoriously
16 difficult to get any sort of exact value, whether
17 that's the cost of construction or the soft costs,
18 it's notoriously difficult.

19 So the bottom line is all you really have to
20 go by at the moment is an estimate. The final
21 checks would come in when they actually submitted
22 the proof of the amount paid. So that's really
23 where your checks and balances come in, the actual
24 physical stuff that provide proof this is the money
25 that was spent on this project.

1 Anything at the moment is an estimate, and
2 they can be wildly off, as anyone that has done
3 work in historic buildings knows.

4 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

5 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Right. And I think the issue
6 is just as somebody from our side said, you know,
7 on the line items, has somebody from the city said,
8 okay, the windows and doors, and done an estimate?
9 Yes, \$218,345, yes, that's in line with, you know,
10 historical numbers.

11 You know, like, it's just, I don't know.

12 MR. ADAMS: Unless you open the building up
13 and suddenly find there's structural issues, your
14 218,000 could suddenly be 418,000. You aren't
15 really going to know until you open the building
16 up. That's, I think, what the developer was trying
17 to get across. This is completely different from
18 building a new building.

19 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yeah, just how it could go
20 up, it could go down. So it's just a baseline of,
21 hey, yes, you're at the right place for your
22 baseline and --

23 MR. ADAMS: But I think the protection is if
24 the costs go down, the project comes in under the
25 estimate, they still have to put the total amount

1 into public art. If it comes \$200,000 under the
2 cost, that \$200,000 has to go back into public art.

3 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Okay.

4 MR. ADAMS: If the building goes over the
5 estimate, then that would be a decision as to
6 whether they come back to you and ask for a
7 recommendation to take more money out of the public
8 art fund or whether they just eat the costs
9 themselves.

10 Am I correct in that, Catherine?

11 MS. CATHERS: Yes, that's correct.

12 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Okay. Well, that wasn't
13 clear before so...

14 MR. MENENDEZ: We need to move on to the next
15 item. And the next item is Case File COA (SP)
16 2015-015 revised, an application for the issuance
17 of a special certificate of appropriateness for the
18 property at 6801 Granada Boulevard, a local
19 historic landmark legally described as Lot 1, Block
20 1, Cartee Homestead II, according to the plat
21 thereof as recorded in Plat Book 170 at Page 88 of
22 the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

23 The application requesting design approval for
24 additional alterations to the residences and the
25 relocation of a swimming pool was approved with

1 conditions on January 21st, 2016.

2 This application requests after-the-fact
3 design approval for a revision to the approved
4 certificate of appropriateness due to deviations
5 from the previously approved plans.

6 Kara?

7 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. If you could put the
8 PowerPoint up, please. Thank you. Let me change
9 my view.

10 This is the location map. The property's
11 located on the intersection of two waterways. As
12 you all might remember the property immediately to
13 the right was subdivided from the original lot in
14 2014. This is all noted in the background portion
15 of the staff report, so I'm going to keep that
16 portion brief.

17 The property -- the house was permitted in
18 September of 1951, designed by Alfred Browning
19 Parker. It's a fine example of Parker's modern
20 style and his sense of architecture.

21 Later additions to the house and site are also
22 outlined in the report. It was designated a local
23 historic landmark in June of 2007.

24 As Albert just said, the COA in 2015 was --
25 COA 2015 was approved in January of 2016, and at

1 that meeting for the approval the Board passed a
2 motion approving aspects of the proposed project,
3 and one of the conditions of approval was that the
4 planters adjacent to the terrace on the screened
5 terrace are to remain.

6 Next slide, please. This application requests
7 after-the-fact design approval for revision to the
8 approved certificate of appropriateness due to
9 deviations from the previously approved plans.

10 A revision to the building permit was applied
11 for on November 4th, 2020. Those plans were
12 reviewed by Historic for pre-board of architects
13 and rejected with the comments found in the staff
14 report.

15 Those have to do with the existing oolite
16 walkway to remain, that no photos were provided at
17 the wall perpendicular to the front door, no photo
18 elevations were provided of the window
19 replacements, no details were provided for the real
20 installation of the Persianas, the louvers,
21 mechanical exhaust, that the front elevation was
22 not to penetrate any decorative elements and be low
23 enough to screen of landscaping, and a question
24 about how the AC units were being screened from
25 view.

1 A roof inspection was requested by the roof
2 contractor in September of 2020. Staff visited the
3 site to perform the inspection and found the work
4 outside of the scope the original permit had been
5 undertaken.

6 Upon review of preconstruction photographs and
7 photographs of current site conditions, additional
8 deviations from the approved plans were noted and
9 relayed to the architect. Those have not been
10 addressed in the submittal and staff will describe
11 those later on.

12 Next slide, please. Thank you. So starting
13 with the items that were noted by the architect in
14 the letter of intent, the first one is the
15 previously approved door and window louver shop
16 drawings. What you see on the screen is a photo
17 from 2006 at the time of designation.

18 The original windows and doors and the
19 original historic portion of the home were never
20 indicated on any approved building permit to be
21 removed or replaced.

22 Next, please. This is a photo from 2015
23 before the COA. The removal of the windows and
24 doors were never discussed with department staff or
25 the historic board and no solution of their

1 replacement was ever proposed to either staff or
2 the Board.

3 A shop drawing for window and door replacement
4 on the historic portion of the house was submitted
5 to the city on September 29th, 2020. Those
6 drawings were submitted without an approved master
7 building permit showing any revision. The city
8 routed the drawings for building plan review but
9 did not route to Historic or Board of Architects
10 for their review. The shop drawings were approved
11 and issued on October 2020.

12 Next photo, please. This is a photo from
13 2020. I just want to note that when we did visit
14 the site for the roof inspection on September 25th,
15 the windows had already been installed.

16 The architect then applied for revisions to
17 the master building permit in November of 2020 as
18 noted earlier attempting to permit the removal and
19 replacement of the windows and doors. The revision
20 drawings were rejected in part because historic
21 staff was unaware of the shop drawing submittal.

22 Next slide, please. The original Persiana
23 louver system was one of Parker's signature
24 features which has now been removed.

25 The architect states in the letter of intent

1 that the original 1951 mahogany louvers could be
2 resourced from the original material and repurposed
3 into the fenestration of a new glazing, and
4 utilizes the original louver material, shape,
5 order, color, and arrangement. These are two
6 photographs of the before and after louvers, which
7 do not resemble the original.

8 Moving forward, please.

9 This is another photo from 2015.

10 Next. The door on the right in this slide is
11 the same location as from the previous slide. The
12 door on the left is just another example of the
13 original louver system.

14 The new windows and doors are the wrong color
15 and have tinted and reflective glass. The louvers
16 do not match the original in any way. They're the
17 wrong size, color, density, and by that I mean the
18 number of louvers and angle.

19 Next slide, please. This is a photo of the
20 northwest evaluation from 2015.

21 Next. And this is the same elevation in 2020
22 as provided by the architect.

23 Also note the loss of coral stone and planters
24 that will be addressed later.

25 So we did this a little bit differently. In

1 the staff report we put each recommendation after
2 each section to make it easier for the Board to
3 refer to. So for the windows and doors, staff
4 requires proof that the original Persiana louver
5 system was in fact retained. Are they being stored
6 somewhere, how are they being reused?

7 We recommend denial of the window and door
8 removal. The new windows should be installed to
9 reflect the material, clear window glass, and
10 louver system as originally on the residence. The
11 drawings should prepared and permitted that detail
12 the replacement to accurately match the original in
13 size, color, number of louvers and angle.

14 Next, please. The next item is to maintain
15 the existing oolite walkway. This is a photograph
16 looking to the southwest taken from the original
17 front door in 2006.

18 Next. This is a photo from 2015 looking back
19 towards the original front door. You see the
20 walkway leading that it was the original front door
21 location.

22 Next, please. And this, the architect's
23 letter of intent stated that the original oolite
24 walkway leading to the original front door was
25 disassembled during construction to prevent damage.

1 It goes on to say that the walkway was temporarily
2 disassembled during construction of the septic tank
3 system, yet in this slide you can see that the
4 architect has the replacement oolite, is on site
5 for installation, so it was not temporarily
6 removed. It was definitely removed.

7 The oolite walkway was an original Parker
8 design feature of the house which as shown in the
9 existing plans -- the original permitted plans as
10 existing to remain.

11 We have not been given any legitimate reason
12 as to why the septic tank had to be placed in this
13 location or why the walkway had been to be
14 recovered in part or its entirety.

15 We recommend the drawings be prepared and
16 permitted that detail the replacement of the oolite
17 walkway to accurately match the original in pattern
18 and dimension.

19 Staff requires that the installation be done
20 by a coral stone mason or conservator approved by
21 the historical resources department staff. The
22 walkway also needs to connect to any proposed or
23 existing driveway as shown in the previously
24 approved plans.

25 Next. The next item is the removal of the

1 existing planter wall. Our initial note referred
2 to the removal of an existing to remain wall that
3 encircled the original pool location. It's not
4 original to the home. The stucco clad wall was
5 shown as existing to remain and was supposed to
6 screen the new air-conditioning units. The wall
7 was removed and has not been indicated that it's
8 going to be returned.

9 However, the architect's letter also mentions
10 the planter that was removed to accommodate the
11 septic. Again, the oolite clad planter was an
12 original Parker design feature. You can see it in
13 the plans that are the screen.

14 Next. This is a photo of the property looking
15 towards the original front door again. The
16 original planter is on the left. A later but
17 symmetrical planter is on the right.

18 Staff had not been given any reason as to why
19 this planter had to be removed in part or its
20 entirety.

21 Next, please. And this is the condition in
22 2020.

23 Staff recommends that drawings be prepared and
24 permitted that detail the replacement of the coral
25 planter to accurately match the origin and pattern

1 and dimension. Staff requires the installation be
2 done by a coral stone mason or conservator as
3 approved by the historical resources staff.

4 Next, please. The next item is mechanical
5 duct terminal. The board packet includes a
6 mechanical sheet that we believe to be part of the
7 proposed revision, but has no revision clouds or
8 revision marks. Our rejection comment from 2020
9 initially stated that the mechanical exhaust front
10 at the front elevation is not to penetrate any
11 decorative elements. This is the southeast
12 elevation of the historic portion of the home in
13 2015.

14 Next. This is the portion of the southeast
15 elevation in 2020. The rejection note was in
16 response to this condition where the decorative
17 cornice was cut for the installation. Contrary to
18 what this architect states in the letter of intent,
19 no photos of this installation were ever provided
20 to staff, and obviously location is not
21 appropriate.

22 Staff recommends that the vent be removed and
23 the coral and cornice be patched to match the
24 adjacent services. Staff requires this work be
25 performed by a conservator approved by the

1 historical resources staff.

2 The next item is the location of HVAC
3 equipment.

4 Next slide, please. So there's a discrepancy
5 between the site plan, which you see on the screen,
6 and the landscape plan as to location of the four
7 air handling units. In the site plan they're
8 arranged in an east/west line roughly and hidden by
9 a four-foot high wall intending to replace the
10 removed wall that I mentioned.

11 Next, please. In the landscape plans the
12 units are arranged in a roughly north/south line
13 with no screening. Also note the walkway shown in
14 the landscape plan does not correspond to the site
15 plan either.

16 Next, please. In the architect's site
17 PowerPoint, which you'll see in a moment, the AC
18 units and screening wall don't seem to match either
19 plan.

20 Staff recommends the units be relocated to the
21 least obtrusive location away from the historic
22 portion of the house and screened from view. This
23 must be coordinated across all drawings by all
24 disciplines.

25 So there are items that not included the

1 architect's letter of intent included by staff for
2 consideration by the Board.

3 Next slide, please. The first is the balcony
4 railing, which can be seen here in 2015. After
5 staff pointed out the removal of the original
6 balcony railing, the architect noted in an e-mail
7 that the railing was temporarily removed during
8 construction stating it was removed by the general
9 contractor temporarily and was instructed by WHA to
10 put back in its original position. Same for the
11 new addition, the railings should match and the
12 contractors been advised not to deviate.

13 In 2020 an entirely new railing system had
14 been installed.

15 Next slide. This is what it looked like in
16 2020.

17 Next slide, please. The photo on the left is
18 included in the architect's submittal. The
19 original railing is on the right. The railing was
20 existing to remain and the new railing does not
21 match the original.

22 Staff recommends that drawings be prepared and
23 permitted that detail the replacement of the
24 railing. Shop drawings will be required for the
25 railing as well once the permits are obtained.

1 Next please. Next is the removal of the coral
2 stone at the steps. These are two examples from
3 the original coral stone as the step and terraces
4 showing the historic house taken from 2016.

5 Upon review of the submittal it was noted the
6 coral steps surrounding the residence had been
7 removed. The planters that were to remain as a
8 condition of approval for the 2015 certificate
9 appropriateness have also been removed.

10 In an e-mail to the architect staff requested
11 they provide documentation where the coral steps
12 were permitted as existing to remain were approved
13 to be eliminated. The response from the architect
14 stated that there is no documentation. Neither the
15 architect or owner proposed elimination of steps or
16 made any application to have the steps removed.

17 Next slide, please. This is a photo from 2020
18 provided by the architect. In this photo was what
19 appears to be new concrete slabs and steps have
20 been installed. The terrace has been truncated,
21 and please note the regrading of the site that
22 basically eliminates the steps.

23 Staff recommends that drawings be prepared and
24 permitted that detail the replacement of the coral
25 steps and planters to accurately match the original

1 in pattern and dimensions and with the previous
2 grading. Staff requires that the installation be
3 done by a coral stone mason or conservator approved
4 by the historical resources staff.

5 Next slide, please. The next item is the
6 removal of a roof overhang. You can see it here.
7 It's the portion of the one story that extends sort
8 of around the two story portion. It was visible
9 also in the original permit drawings seen earlier,
10 has been removed. These are the photos from 2015.

11 Next slide, please. And this is the condition
12 in 2020.

13 Staff recommends that drawings be prepared and
14 permitted to have the roof overhang reinstated.

15 In you -- can fast forward two slides. An
16 additional item has been noted as well.

17 Next slide, please. The front gate has been
18 replaced on the property. This is a photo, Google
19 image, from 2019. The origin iron gate is visible
20 here. It's noted on the current site plan as Note
21 No. 6 as existing, do not disturb.

22 Next slide, please. It has since been
23 replaced with this gate. This is from the Historic
24 Preservation Board posting this this month.

25 This item should also be drawn in plan and

1 elevation, permitted with shop drawings.

2 No variances have been requested with this
3 application. The revision has not yet been
4 reviewed by the Board of Architects, and staff
5 recommends denial of the application for the
6 reasons noted in the staff report.

7 If you could take the PowerPoint off. I will
8 make the architect a host.

9 You can share your screen.

10 THE COURT REPORTER: Kara, I need to swear
11 them in.

12 MS. KAUTZ: Yes, please.

13 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I'm looking
14 for them on my screen. I see two gentlemen.

15 Both of you are going to be speaking? Please
16 raise your right hands.

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

19 MR. ARTHUR: Yes, we do.

20 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

21 MR. ARTHUR: So good afternoon. My name's
22 William Arthur. I am the architect for the
23 project. I'm actually the second architect for the
24 project. Originally it was designed by RJ, RJ
25 Heisenbottle.

1 We do have a PowerPoint presentation. I don't
2 have access to my screen at this location. Is
3 there somebody there at the city who's going to be
4 running the slides for us?

5 MS. KAUTZ: No. You were supposed to be able
6 to.

7 MR. ARTHUR: Okay. What I'll do is we'll
8 switch over to the other screen and then we can do
9 some screen sharing for the PowerPoint. Is that
10 all right?

11 MS. KAUTZ: Sure. That's fine.

12 All right. You should be able to share now.

13 MR. ARTHUR: Okay. Can you guys hear us okay?
14 Okay. Can everyone hear me all right?

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

16 MR. ARTHUR: Kara, can you hear me all right?

17 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. Go ahead.

18 MR. ARTHUR: So this is the front entry of the
19 gate.

20 MS. KAUTZ: You need to turn the speaker off
21 on the other computer that you're on.

22 MR. ARTHUR: How about that? Is that better?

23 Okay. So, yes, this is the front entry to the
24 new gate that needs to be submitted.

25 Kind of some things to overcome with this

1 meeting, Kara, a lot of this stuff, just to kind of
2 preface this presentation a little bit, the
3 applicant had reached out to you by e-mail.
4 Another thing to mention here is that the applicant
5 is no longer Granada Holdings. This project was
6 taken over by Marcos, who's sitting to my right
7 here. Marcos DeSouza is the new owner. The
8 previous owner was Granada Holdings.

9 I believe Ms. Spain might recall the Dalmau
10 family. They were involved with the lot split.
11 This was a troubled project that Marcos had taken
12 over.

13 Marcos has, like myself, a pretty keen
14 interest in Mr. Parker's homes. Obviously, this is
15 a Parker project that was in peril. It's been
16 under construction for more than three-and-a-half
17 years. And, Marcos, you know, being such a fan of
18 Parker took, this project over.

19 It's a very financially risky project, it's a
20 very expensive project, but I think because of his
21 love and admiration for Alfred Parker, he was
22 willing to take this on for us.

23 So moving forward, our most recent revision is
24 2011-5271, and that was initially submitted as
25 landscape improvements and revisions to the

1 interior. There was quite a few interior changes
2 we wanted to take on and that went through the
3 building department.

4 That made its way into historic preservation
5 November 20th, as you mentioned, but we didn't
6 realize we needed a COA until January 29th of this
7 year, which prompted this application.

8 The staff report, which was prepared by Kara,
9 was retitled as an application as a request for
10 after-the-fact design approval. There's a lot of
11 things mentioned in that report that we're not
12 actually applying for.

13 We realize that those are deviations from the
14 plans, deviations from the approved COA, but we're
15 not trying to get those approved. Those are things
16 that we're working with our contractor to change so
17 it does meet the COA.

18 Trying to seek that approval is, again, we got
19 to emphasize, it's not something that we wanted and
20 definitely not something that we're applying for.
21 Really the only thing we're applying for here is
22 the doors and windows.

23 So primarily for that reason, this staff
24 report, it really mischaracterizes the ongoing
25 construction. It was labeled as an egregious

1 desecration, but that's despite the applicant not
2 being finished with the work, not having applied
3 for any final inspections, nor applying for any
4 changes related to the exterior.

5 That staff report mischaracterizes the owner's
6 intent and logic for the project, which is to make
7 an exemplary effort to revitalize the works of the
8 great Alfred Browning Parker.

9 Finally, absent of that extensive e-mail
10 history, which I don't think we need to get into
11 all the e-mails, but this owner has been seeking
12 help from historical resources and hasn't been
13 getting it. In fact, we hadn't made any progress
14 on this CO, honestly -- COA -- until Mr. Adams came
15 on board, and really it's only because of Mr. Adams
16 that we're before you today.

17 There was a site visit that Kara had mentioned
18 regarding the roof. I think the problem with that
19 visit is that nobody was there to let her in. Kara
20 had toured the site by herself, which is not a good
21 thing, and I think that's what really led to a lot
22 of these inaccurate presumptions about the owner's
23 installation of these exterior doors and windows.

24 This report, it fails to distinguish temporary
25 construction from permanent, insisting that that

1 temporary AC that you saw that was used to
2 dehumidify millwork because we have kitchens
3 installed, that's not permanent.

4 The oolite relocations made to avoid
5 destruction, avoid conflicting with septic systems,
6 that's not permanent either. That's all temporary
7 construction.

8 There was also some porcelain tile at the
9 steps that was in the photographs that Kara had
10 taken, those are just temporary. We have oolite
11 that's shipped at the site. We included it in our
12 photos. We totally intend to put that oolite back.
13 Those oolite steps were beautiful. We have no
14 intention of changing them.

15 This report, it really mischaracterizes the
16 most is those installed exterior doors, windows,
17 and louvers. I would characterize it as an
18 unfortunate circumstance culminating from those
19 e-mail requests that you had.

20 MR. DESOUZA: The only reason, the change in
21 ownership, the change in, you know, whoever was in
22 control of the construction, I've written dozens of
23 e-mails to Kara throughout the years requesting
24 guidance, you know, help, and I got an e-mail back
25 in December that just said, oh, I'm going to look

1 into some things and get back to you, and,
2 unfortunately, this is, now that I'm hearing the
3 things that we need to do.

4 So it's been a while. It's been two years, a
5 lot of expenses, a lot of money.

6 MR. ARTHUR: So what the contractor did about
7 the doors and windows, and really the doors and
8 windows, like I said, is the only thing we're
9 applying for here. The contractor went ahead and
10 submitted shop drawings for the doors and windows
11 because it matched visually what was in the
12 approval, the original 2015 COA. Those plans got
13 routed to the city, they were approved in any
14 departments that the city required, and he went
15 ahead and installed all of them, over \$800,000
16 worth of exterior doors and windows.

17 The louvers have not been installed. They
18 fabricated a couple examples. Again, those are not
19 permanent. Those are not the ones that we're
20 trying to get changed or passed --

21 MR. DESOUZA: We did only one and that's why
22 we haven't done anything. We did one as an example
23 to get approved.

24 MR. ARTHUR: As an example, and we haven't
25 gotten any feedback on that example until today,

1 until today at the COA do we hear that the -- I
2 guess they're egregious.

3 MR. DESOUZA: Yes.

4 MR. ARTHUR: Well, we need feedback. We need
5 help from historical resources. We don't need to
6 wait 16 months we've been in historical resources
7 to go to a COA and then be told an egregious
8 desecration. I mean, that's not what historic
9 presentation is about.

10 In other cities we get feedback. In other
11 cities we work hand in hand with historical
12 resources. We get advice, we get responses to
13 e-mails, and we don't have that.

14 I think that Mr. Adams coming aboard is really
15 going to help the system. I think that moving to
16 an online permitting system is really going to
17 help.

18 But as far as this application goes and what
19 we're requesting now, is just really help we're
20 asking for the Board to approve the doors and
21 windows, ignore these other changes to the site
22 because those aren't changes that we're applying
23 for, and help us get responses out of historical
24 resources for the louvers. And that's really it.
25 That's all we're asking --

1 MR. DSESOUZA: I mean, as far -- I mean, as
2 the owner as far as I'm concerned, I followed the
3 instructions I received from a GC. They submitted
4 the shop drawings, we went to the engineer, picked
5 up the shop drawings, they were submitted to the
6 city, they were approved, and they were installed.

7 I mean, to me it's -- I'm confused because,
8 you know, I was told the windows are approved, pay
9 for them, you know, it was a little bit over
10 800,000, almost a million dollars in windows and
11 doors, and all of a sudden, no, you couldn't have
12 installed them. You know, I'm obviously confused.

13 MR. ARTHUR: This is an image of the submitted
14 and approved shop drawings for doors, windows, and
15 louvers. You see it's got the approval stamps
16 there. It's got the perforations, elevation here,
17 elevation here. Here's the louvers submitted with
18 this drawings back on September 14th. You have
19 this, this, this, these, and now historic is saying
20 that they weren't part of the approval.

21 This is the temporary ACs, which actually this
22 installation here was made at the direction of
23 Kara. We had believed that's where she wanted us
24 to relocate the temporary ACs, but if we need to
25 relocate it again, we're happy to. It's not part

1 of a COA request.

2 These are those temporary ACs here to the
3 left. They were just in there to protect the
4 dehumidification of the kitchen.

5 So I think what Marcos is really asking for is
6 three things, that the Board please reject staff's
7 motion to deny because the intent of his
8 application is really being misrepresented. I
9 think it's based on one staff member's inability to
10 distinguish temporary installations from permanent,
11 and I think it was made at a time when construction
12 was incomplete. The applicant hasn't even filed
13 for final inspections yet. He's not even there.

14 I think, too, that the Board approved the
15 doors and windows. Removing the doors and windows
16 I believe is inconsequential to the design and the
17 integrity of the house. And, honestly, we did a
18 lot of things with the doors and windows that were
19 original to Parker's intent.

20 Dr. Caudle, the original owner of the house, I
21 learned from Robin, Al Parker's son, is that he
22 wanted less windows, and even though the house is
23 on the corner of the yacht basin, the turning basin
24 for Gables Waterway, the doctor really wanted
25 privacy, however the doctor's wife and Al wanted

1 more windows.

2 And we restored those windows. We actually
3 found some of the original openings when we removed
4 the walls from the 1984 addition and we undid that.
5 A lot of the things of the 1984 addition we undid.

6 Whether the doors or windows stay or not is
7 inconsequential. The only thing removing them is
8 going to put this project in further financial
9 peril, which is totally unnecessary.

10 MR. DESOUZA: Well, we also requested a
11 revision to the MEP, right, and we haven't been
12 able to move forward for months. We've been asking
13 for the approval. The MEP revisions are simple
14 revisions, but they haven't been able to get them
15 approved because of historical.

16 So, you know, it's a large project and it's
17 simply they're stalled. It can't move anyway
18 because we haven't been able to move forward.

19 MR. ARTHUR: So the third thing that we're
20 asking for is that the Board please recommend to
21 staff, give Marcos whatever advice he needs on the
22 louvers, allow the interior revision to proceed
23 because the interior building application has
24 nothing to do with any of these things.

25 MR. DESOUZA: It's basically -- yeah, we

1 understand, the oolite, of course we want the
2 oolite, it's beautiful.

3 The planters, of course, we're going to put
4 them back. They took them out because of the -- I
5 had to do -- I didn't know, but then they asked me
6 to do two new septic tanks, which I did. It was
7 very expensive and everything, but we did it. And
8 we're going to put it back. So nothing is going to
9 be taken away from the house.

10 MR. ARTHUR: This is my third Parker
11 restoration. I've done a bunch of them, not just
12 Parkers. I've designed two houses with Al's son.
13 You know, I have a personal connection with that
14 family. I was at University of Florida when
15 Mr. Parker passed away, and he was teaching at the
16 time I was a student there.

17 You know, it's just hard to watch a project
18 like this go through that much struggle when having
19 already known that Parker homes are difficult to
20 modify. The windows that the contractor installed
21 is the same windows that I installed at the other
22 two Parker projects that I worked on.

23 So, please, please work with this applicant.
24 We have other projects to do. The city has other
25 projects to work on. I think we need to let this

1 project move on. Let the applicant continue with
2 his interior. Let the applicant finish the other
3 items that Kara is pointing out. Don't hold the
4 whole show and stop the project over something that
5 it doesn't need to be.

6 That's it.

7 MR. DESOUZA: Yep.

8 MR. ARTHUR: Thank you.

9 MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

10 Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to
11 speak in favor of this case?

12 MS. KAUTZ: You need to unshare your screen.
13 The architect needs to unshare his screen.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: They need to be sworn in.

15 Kara, by the way, Nancy had to leave.

16 MS. KAUTZ: I saw that. Thank you.

17 So I just wanted to reiterate the fact that
18 the windows and doors were never included in any
19 approved permit to be removed. When that permit
20 was applied for in 2015 they were not shown to be
21 removed or replaced.

22 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Is there anyone in the
23 audience who would like to speak in opposition of
24 this case?

25 Okay. I will close the public hearing

1 portion. Open it up to board discussion.

2 MS. SPAIN: I have a couple of comments.

3 MR. MENENDEZ: Ms. Spain?

4 MS. SPAIN: Mr. Arthur, is this the first time
5 that you've worked on a historic home, a
6 historically designated home in Coral Gables?

7 I don't hear him.

8 MR. ARTHUR: No.

9 MS. SPAIN: Is the architect still there?

10 Hi. Is this the first time you've worked on a
11 historic home in Coral Gables?

12 MR. ARTHUR: No.

13 MS. SPAIN: Obviously. So, you know, why
14 would you think it is appropriate to eliminate and
15 destroy a historic fabric? I mean, you know how
16 difficult that department is.

17 And why would you install permits without
18 going into Kara and talking, particularly -- I
19 mean, windows, particularly reflective that are
20 reflective on an Al Parker home? That's my number
21 one concern.

22 Number two, you were concerned that Kara was
23 there by herself. If there's an open permit on a
24 property, staff is absolutely allowed to go on the
25 property. In fact, it's encouraged to go on the

1 property so that things like that don't happen.

2 And you removed the steps.

3 That vent installed, is that temporary that
4 you eliminated the facade of that portion where the
5 vent was stuck on there? That's horrible.

6 I don't know. I'm just so disappointed in
7 this, and it's not like you to do things like this
8 without first going to the historic department.
9 There's really no reason to continue on doing work.

10 You said that you've been stalled. Well,
11 obviously not. You've been ripping out the
12 historic fabric. If you were really stalled
13 nothing would have been done.

14 But instead you've continued to do things that
15 are not appropriate, and I'm really -- this home is
16 so important because of it being Al Parker's home,
17 and it was fairly intact. I don't know.

18 MR. ARTHUR: Is that a question you would like
19 me to respond to or --

20 MS. SPAIN: No. It just was a comment, I
21 mean, I know you've done work before in the Gables
22 on historic homes, and you think I always come in
23 and talk to staff first before you did anything,
24 particularly before you're removing historic fabric
25 that wasn't noted on the plans.

1 Just follow the plans. It's not, you know --
2 it's not really difficult. Just do what's on the
3 plans, and if you don't want to or the owner
4 doesn't want to, come in and talk about it.

5 MR. ARTHUR: So, Dona, I think there's two
6 things in response to that. One, remember, I'm the
7 architect, I'm not the builder. I agree with you.
8 There was many things done to this house that I
9 would not do as an avid follower of Parker, or, B,
10 as an architect.

11 But that's the problem, Dona, because since
12 you left it's been really difficult to communicate
13 with historical resources. We can't come in any
14 more like I used to. We can't get responses to
15 e-mails.

16 And what happens is that it's not just this
17 project, Dona, it's other projects. When there's
18 no involvement from historical resources, that's
19 when you get contractors submitting shop drawings,
20 taking off eaves. All of those things have to be
21 corrected, and nobody's paying for that other than
22 Marcos.

23 MR. DESOUZA: And if I can make a comment,
24 Dona, you know, I'm taking over from the previous
25 owners, and one of the things we're trying to do is

1 correct all of the things that you see over there.
2 And I've got dozens of e-mails that I wrote to
3 Kara, and the only response I got from her, it was
4 in December 20th, I believe, when she says I'm
5 going to check on a few things, can I get back to
6 you? And I'm still waiting for her to get back to
7 me.

8 MS. SPAIN: Well, Kara and ElizBeth have
9 basically been a two-man show since I left. And,
10 you know, it's very difficult when you only have
11 three people working in historic preservation and I
12 was working with other things too to cut it down to
13 just two.

14 MR. DESOUZA: I feel like the --

15 MS. SPAIN: I retired in December of last
16 year, and Kara has had a really difficult time
17 being there without that third person. So I'm
18 going to cut her a little bit of slack as far as
19 that goes.

20 MR. DESOUZA: I know but, I mean, Dona, we're
21 talking about almost two years that I've sent
22 dozens of e-mails --

23 MS. SPAIN: So why do the work? But why do
24 work that's not on the plans?

25 MR. DESOUZA: We didn't do --

1 MS. SPAIN: -- continue doing the work on the
2 plans that you already have approval for.

3 MR. DESOUZA: When I took over we stopped the
4 work and we requested some help, some guidance.
5 We're trying to make things the right way.

6 I took over this in May 2019, and ever since
7 we're trying to, you know, get things approved or
8 do it the right way. And I've be asking guidance
9 and help and, unfortunately, never got it.

10 MR. MENENDEZ: If you follow the drawings
11 you'd do it right.

12 MS. SPAIN: Just follow the drawings. If you
13 want to do something else, don't.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: I can't believe the total
15 disregard and disrespect for this building.
16 Basically you did whatever you wanted to do, now
17 you're throwing it on the historic department here
18 who --

19 MR. ARTHUR: That's inaccuracy.

20 MR. MENENDEZ: -- from everyone that I've
21 talked to, they're very responsive, they're very
22 helpful, they always have been.

23 MR. ARTHUR: You're on the board.

24 MR. MENENDEZ: You know, we are living in --
25 you know, the last year has been a COVID nightmare,

1 but we meet every month. We receive phone calls.
2 I know Kara receives phone calls in her department,
3 and I've gotten phone calls saying how helpful, how
4 responsive they've been. So I think to
5 miscategorize that Kara and her staff have not done
6 anything in two years, I mean, that's a lie as far
7 as I'm concerned. I don't accept that.

8 MR. FULLERTON: And if you were to be
9 subjected to that, why didn't you bring your plans
10 in and demand a conversation? I don't understand
11 how you can sit back at the job site, make
12 decisions on your own, and not make sure that
13 they're being answered, that is, by taking
14 aggressive action.

15 The other thing I'd like to know is did
16 anybody in your group take a look at the Persiana
17 doors that Al Parker puts on every single building
18 he's ever done in Florida and say, hmm, the ones
19 we're putting in don't look much like that? I
20 mean, do you guys look at what you're doing as
21 you're doing it? This is absurd. I don't even
22 know why we're talking about it.

23 I'm really disappointed in the whole process,
24 and I don't know what your excuse is, William, and
25 I'm sorry to be rude if I am, but this is just

1 unacceptable for you to then come back -- maybe you
2 had nothing to do with all the modifications that
3 were done while you weren't watching. Reducing the
4 size of overhangs? Al Parker is known for his
5 overhangs and his oolitic limestone walkways and
6 things like that.

7 For you to arbitrarily remove or allow them to
8 be removed without talking to somebody about it and
9 say, oh, yeah, that's okay, we'll just do that,
10 we'll just take that whole elevation of steps and
11 planters off that facade and take the overhangs off
12 and change the windows. I'm shocked.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: I'm going to move to deny this
14 application.

15 MR. FULLERTON: I'll second that one.

16 MS. SPAIN: I don't think you can move because
17 -- you can pass the gavel to somebody, but you
18 can't make a motion because you're the chair.

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. I'm sorry.

20 MS. SPAIN: You can pass the gavel and make
21 the motion.

22 MR. FULLERTON: I'll make the motion to deny.

23 MS. SPAIN: I'll second it.

24 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Kara, I guess you need
25 to call the roll.

1 MS. KAUTZ: That's on me.

2 Let's see, Alicia Bache-Wiig?

3 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes, to deny, right?

4 MS. KAUTZ: The motion is to deny.

5 MS. BACHE-WIIG: So yes means to deny?

6 MS. KAUTZ: Correct.

7 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

8 MS. KAUTZ: Okay.

9 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I'm agreeing with
10 Mr. Fullerton, right?

11 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

12 Javier Durana?

13 MR. DURANA: Yes.

14 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Rodriguez?

15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

16 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Fullerton?

17 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

18 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

19 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes to deny.

20 MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Spain?

21 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

22 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Menendez?

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

24 MR. FULLERTON: I'm really sorry, Mr. Arthur.
25 I knew your dad. He was an architect and I was on

1 the architect's board with him back a hundred
2 years. So I knew him, if I'm being correct. Is
3 that your dad?

4 MR. ARTHUR: My grandfather. Same name.

5 MR. FULLERTON: Huh?

6 MR. ARTHUR: My grandfather of the same name,
7 William Arthur.

8 MR. FULLERTON: Oh, well, he served on our
9 architect's board and a couple other boards at the
10 same time I was here years ago, so I knew him. He
11 was a good guy. I learned the term frisneras (ph)
12 from him. Maybe you know that one.

13 MR. ARTHUR: Yeah. Thank you.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. We have another case
15 file, Case File COA (SP) 2021-002, an application
16 for the issuance of a special certificate of
17 appropriateness for the building currently on the
18 University of Miami main campus referred to as
19 Pentland House, Building 34 located at 1238
20 Dickinson Drive, legally described as all the
21 "Apartment Building 34" Pentland, as now existing
22 laid out and in use, the same being a portion of
23 the Tract 5 of Amended Plat Portion of Main Campus
24 University of Miami, according to the plat thereof,
25 as recorded in Plat Book 46, at Page 81 of the

1 public records of Dade County, now Miami-Dade
2 County, Florida.

3 The applicant is requesting approval for the
4 replacement of the existing windows, interior
5 renovations, and the addition of an elevator tower.

6 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.

7 Could you put the PowerPoint up, please.

8 So this is a location map located on the
9 southern portion of the main campus of University
10 of Miami on the southern shore of Lake Osceola.
11 The closest external road is Ponce de Leon
12 Boulevard to the south.

13 Next slide. This was built in 1947. The
14 structure that's now known as Pentland House,
15 Building 34, was one of 27 structures designed by
16 Robert Law Weed and Marion Manley built to house
17 veterans taking advantage of the GI Bill. They
18 were both International style.

19 Four of the buildings were designated as local
20 historic landmarks in 2010, this being one of them.

21 So in December of 2015 the Historic
22 Preservation Board approve a special COA for the
23 same scope of work. There were no conditions of
24 approval at the time the COA was granted. However,
25 it did expire in 2017 without the work being

1 implemented. This proposal represents the exact
2 same scope of work as previously applied for in
3 2015.

4 It will have -- they are repurposing the
5 building for a new use, possibly for the theater
6 arts program or another university department.

7 No variances have been requested with the
8 application. It was reviewed and approved by the
9 city architect on May 18th, 2020, without comments.

10 Staff only has one item, it's a condition of
11 approval that the window glass be clear with no
12 tint or mirror finish.

13 I'm not sure, Ricardo, do I hand it over to
14 you to make the presentation?

15 Okay. Let me make you cohost. Give me one
16 second. You can unmute.

17 You're on two devices; one says computer
18 screen, one just says your name. Okay.

19 MR. MENENDEZ: He needs to be sworn in.

20 MS. KAUTZ: Yes, let me get him to unmute
21 first.

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

24 MR. HERRAN: I do.

25 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

1 MR. HERRAN: Well, good evening, board members
2 and staff. My name is Ricardo Herran. I'm the
3 campus planning director here at the University of
4 Miami. With us as part of the UM team today we
5 have Joaquin Fardales, who's the executive director
6 for facilities planning and construction. And we
7 also have Mr. Osvaldo Landera, who's the architect
8 of record.

9 Mr. Landera has been involved with the project
10 since it came to the board back in 2015, so he's
11 intimately aware about the details.

12 As Kara mentioned Pentland House was
13 voluntarily designated back in 2010 along with La
14 Gorce House and Buildings 48 and 49 of the School
15 of Architecture. These are four of our seven
16 designated buildings on our campus. We're happy to
17 have these buildings on our campus. They speak
18 very much to not only our history, but the history
19 of the city, and we're happy to be stewards of
20 these buildings.

21 As Kara mentioned we came to the board back in
22 2015. The expected use at the time was for the
23 counseling center. Once the COA was approved,
24 planning shifted a bit at the university and the
25 counseling center was rolled into what is today,

1 our student services building. The student
2 services building was opened up in 2019, and it
3 houses all student-facing services, academic
4 resources, the counseling center, and financial.

5 So we're back to you today with the same
6 application. The only thing that has changed is
7 the use. The use now will be for the theater arts
8 program. There will be a small portion of the
9 building that will be used for another academic
10 program which is yet to be determined.

11 Kara mentioned the condition of approval of
12 having the clear windows. We're happy to comply
13 with that condition, and in fact, that was our
14 intent from the beginning. So we're happy to
15 comply with that.

16 That being said, I'll turn it to Mr. Landera,
17 who will walk you through the changes and will be
18 here to answer any questions.

19 Thank you.

20 MS. KAUTZ: Okay. Who needs to present? Who
21 do I need to --

22 MR. HERRAN: Osvaldo Landera.

23 MS. KAUTZ: Okay. I'll make him cohost as
24 well. Give me one second.

25 MR. HERRAN: Thank you.

1 MS. KAUTZ: All right. You should be able to
2 unmute yourself, and share your screen.

3 MR. LANDERA: I need to be sworn in.

4 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, sir.

5 Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole
6 truth and nothing but the truth?

7 MR. LANDERA: Yes, ma'am. I do.

8 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

9 MR. LANDERA: Thank you.

10 Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Osvaldo
11 Landera. As Ricardo indicated, I am the architect
12 of record with Landera Associates.

13 We've been working on the Pentland House since
14 2015. If I may, if you will allow me to share my
15 screen, I'll put up a few short PowerPoints that
16 will help explain --

17 MS. KAUTZ: You should be able to, you should
18 be able to do that.

19 MR. LANDERA: Okay. I'm sorry for the delay
20 here.

21 We've already gone through the location, so I
22 won't repeat that. We've already gone through the
23 historical significance of the Pentland House.

24 What I do want to discuss basically is the
25 current scope of the work, which is the same

1 exterior scope that was presented previously in
2 2015 for which a certificate of appropriateness was
3 awarded.

4 The scope involves the replacement of the
5 original steel Hope's windows, and they will be
6 replaced with new steel impact-resistant windows
7 that are manufactured by Hope's and to the same
8 configuration as the original windows.

9 The color of the windows will also match the
10 original color of the building as has been
11 determined by a study that was done, and analysis
12 of the paints on the windows to define the original
13 blue color of the windows.

14 The windows, if I may show you some
15 photographs, the windows currently have been
16 somewhat destroyed by the installation of window
17 units, which have been installed in just blocked
18 out section of windows. The windows are in poor
19 condition and somewhat deteriorated, so the
20 replacement really is necessary.

21 We are also going to clean the exterior of the
22 building, a wall exposed installation of conduits
23 and piping, that over the years have just been
24 placed along the exterior. That'll all be removed.
25 All of the distribution of conduits and piping will

1 occur inside the building.

2 This is a photograph of what the existing
3 condition looks like. As you can see, window units
4 have been installed in plywood block sections of
5 the building. There's application of window film
6 in several locations, and basically you can see the
7 deterioration of the existing windows.

8 These photographs of the existing building.
9 Here is a photograph of the current stair tower.
10 And our new elevator tower is set directly adjacent
11 to the stair tower. It's a simple design to match
12 the simplicity of the existing building, and it
13 will be connected to the existing building with
14 concrete walkways to match the existing and all of
15 our railings -- the existing railings will remain,
16 and all of our new railings will match the existing
17 simple railings of the building. This has already
18 been submitted and approved by the building
19 department.

20 Basically the scope of the work that we're
21 doing today on the exterior of the building is
22 exactly the same as was presented and approved back
23 in 2015.

24 Interior modifications are somewhat different
25 because they're adapted to a new program for the

1 building interior, but there is no reflection of
2 that to the historical exterior nature of the
3 building.

4 And all of the existing bearing walls -- this
5 building is designed with a series of bearing walls
6 12 feet apart running across the building, and all
7 of that structure, which was inherent to the
8 existing original building, remains as it is.

9 A few photographs of the building as it sits
10 today. And this was the original certificate of
11 appropriateness received in 2015, and again the
12 exterior scope remains the same.

13 That's it. If you have any questions?

14 I'll stop my screen sharing.

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

16 MR. LANDERA: Thank you.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Is there anyone in the audience
18 who wishes to speak in favor of this case?

19 Anyone in the audience who wishes to speak in
20 opposition of this case?

21 I'll close the public hearing portion and open
22 it up to the board.

23 MS. SPAIN: Can I speak to Ricardo Herran?
24 Can he come back on the screen?

25 MR. HERRAN: I'm here.

1 MS. SPAIN: So did I hear you say that you
2 were the director?

3 MR. HERRAN: I am the campus planning
4 director, yes.

5 MS. SPAIN: Does that mean Janet retired?

6 MR. HERRAN: So Janet retired last summer,
7 yes. We miss her dearly.

8 MS. SPAIN: And they made you director.

9 Oh my, God, I'm so happy for you and for the
10 university. That's such a good thing.

11 MR. HERRAN: Thank you.

12 MS. SPAIN: And you're such a pleasure to work
13 with, so I'm really happy for you.

14 MR. HERRAN: Thank you very much.

15 MS. SPAIN: These windows are beautiful. I'm
16 happy to listen to people talk about them, but
17 Hope's windows are amazing. They're going to be
18 the same configuration.

19 Just we can still have a discussion, but I'd
20 like to make a motion to approve them and stipulate
21 that it needs to be clear glass and not have any
22 type of energy rating to make them green and
23 reflective.

24 MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have a second.

25 MR. FULLERTON: Second.

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Fullerton seconded
2 it.

3 Kara, can you call the roll?

4 MS. KAUTZ: Sorry, I didn't know if you guys
5 wanted to discuss anymore.

6 Mr. Durana?

7 MR. DURANA: Yes.

8 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Rodriguez?

9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

10 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

11 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

12 MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Bache-Wiig?

13 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

14 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Fullerton?

15 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

16 MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Spain?

17 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

18 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Menendez?

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

20 MS. KAUTZ: Okay. Motion passes.

21 MR. MENENDEZ: All right. Thank you.

22 MR. HERRAN: Thank you very much.

23 MR. LANDERA: Thank you very much.

24 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Our last item is Case
25 File COA (SP) 2021-003, an application for the

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

8 The application requests design approval for
9 additional and alterations to the residence and
10 site work. A variance has also been requested from
11 Article 4, Section 101(D) (4c) of the Coral Gables
12 Zoning Code for the minimum rear setback.

13 MR. ADAMS: Can you start the PowerPoint,
14 please?

15 Next slide, please.

16 So you can see the property shown on the
17 PowerPoint. It's a south-facing property on the
18 northwest corner of Minora and Segovia. This home
19 is amongst the earliest constructed in Coral Gables
20 and was designed by H. George Fink and given Permit
21 No. 39 in the city.

22 It was one of eight homes that were included
23 in a full-page advertisement entitled "The First
24 Coral Gables (inaudible)" and with total sales over
25 \$1 million. The property was designated as a local

1 historic landmark in 2005.

2 The next slide, please.

3 The proposed lot consists of removal of later
4 additions to the rear of the home, construction of
5 a one-story addition and the covered terrace to the
6 west of the home, construction of a one-story
7 addition to the north of the home.

8 The original remaining fenestration will be
9 returned to its original configuration.

10 There'll be construction of a new swimming
11 pool and deck with a stone finish at the northwest
12 corner of the lot and new site work consists of a
13 new front walkway and driveway.

14 The new additions will be differentiated from
15 the original house through the incorporation of
16 smooth stucco rather than rough stucco, and a
17 stucco wall rather than in coral rock.

18 The front elevation of the west addition will
19 be set back approximately 14 feet from the front
20 elevation of the existing home, although the
21 projecting breakfast nook will be set back
22 approximately four feet from the front elevation.

23 And on the east elevation the existing
24 multi-light arched windows in the original porch
25 will be replaced with fixed single white windows

1 which will better define the original streamed
2 openings.

3 And staff has suggested the applicant consider
4 adding fenestrations to the blank walls of the
5 addition on the west elevation and on the north
6 elevation.

7 The applicant is also requesting a variance.
8 The request is to grant a variance to allow the
9 proposed addition to have a rear setback of five
10 feet versus the required ten feet. The Coral
11 Gables Zoning Code requires all properties maintain
12 a ten-foot rear setback. The Board of Architects
13 may recommend a five-foot rear setback be allowed
14 with an addition of one story in height. The
15 additions being proposed to the residence are one
16 story in height to maintain the scale of the
17 existing residence.

18 The proposal was reviewed and approved by the
19 Board of Architects on March 4th, 2021.

20 The staff recommendation is for approval,
21 although there are a number of conditions, that the
22 windows be clear glass and the window muntins are
23 to be high profile. The new windows are to be
24 differentiated from the existing, all details are
25 to be done on permit drawings. Details of all new

1 windows, doors, gates and columns for the covered
2 terrace shall be provided in permit drawings. And
3 the remaining original windows are being proposed
4 to return to their original configuration.

5 In the absence of original drawings we took a
6 look at 1920s photographs. The home at 67 Alcazar
7 Avenue is essentially the twin of this house, and
8 its west elevation can be seen in the photos in
9 your application packet. On 16 Minorca Avenue this
10 can be seen in the background of the 1920s photos.

11 So staff is recommending the original windows
12 flanking the chimney should be returned. Their
13 location is visible and the subfloors are patched
14 in the photographs in your packets. The
15 recommendation is to approve basically with those
16 conditions.

17 We did receive one e-mail in opposition to the
18 granting of the variance. The e-mail is from Henry
19 and Julie Pardo. It states "we are not in favor of
20 granting any variance that would in any compromise
21 the integrity of the coral rock foundation and
22 chimney of the above referenced property, as it
23 would be in direct conflict with the city's
24 preservation guide."

25 Our response to that would be the variance is

1 being requested for the addition to the rear, and
2 there is already a rear addition on the property
3 that obscures any remnants of the existing coral
4 rock wall, and the new rear addition would be in
5 the same location. And the addition does not
6 affect the chimney on the west elevation, and the
7 addition to the west elevation does not obscure to
8 any significant part the existing coral rock
9 chimney. The chimney will still be visible from
10 the public right of way.

11 I believe the applicant is here.

12 Can you stop sharing the screen, please.

13 MS. KAUTZ: You should be good to go, Callum.

14 THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Gibb, are you ready
15 to be sworn in?

16 MR. GIBB: I am.

17 THE COURT REPORTER: Can you please raise your
18 right hand, sir?

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

21 MR. GIBB: Yes.

22 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

23 MR. GIBB: Good evening. I'm Callum Gibb, the
24 architect for the residence at 603 Minorca. I can
25 go through the drawings if you'd like.

1 I assume everybody can see that.

2 So as described, you've seen this property
3 before. We had previously come in for potential
4 larger scheme involving relocation of the house and
5 et cetera.

6 This is, you know, a rework of the old
7 development having met with staff who asked for
8 that meeting. This is the existing survey. You
9 can see that the house is located sort of in the
10 middle of the double lot. It is our intention to
11 add an addition to the west side of the existing
12 house and to the north.

13 The main sort of criteria for these locations
14 was to preserve the street frontage of the original
15 door elevation on Minorca and also the side yard
16 elevation on Segovia.

17 This is a drawing showing the existing floor
18 plan and site plan. This is the proposed floor,
19 the original house being in the bottom right of
20 that scheme. The addition to the west with a
21 breakfast nook, and an addition to the north, which
22 it includes two bedrooms, a master suite and a
23 secondary bedroom along with the required one car
24 garage. It does project closer to Segovia than the
25 main house, but does not cover any of that

1 elevation.

2 The existing front and the proposed. The
3 addition to the west is set back as described, and
4 the addition as you see on the east are also set
5 back from the front elevation to maintain it.

6 The existing house has a large picture window
7 between the two individual windows on the front
8 elevation, which we in discussion with the city was
9 proposed that we should reinstate those.

10 There will be obviously issues with matching
11 the stucco, but also we would have to rebuild a
12 wood framed portion of the wall to do this, and
13 obviously we would have to have discussions with
14 the city regarding structural requirements to build
15 that portion of a new wood framed wall, so it is
16 our intent to achieve, and if there's some issue we
17 would obviously come back.

18 The existing rear elevation above.

19 The new elevation for the rear, the window is
20 for the addition, and to the right is the rear
21 porch off of the west addition.

22 And this is the Segovia elevation. Again, the
23 full extent of the original house is maintained and
24 then the addition is to the right.

25 And that concludes the presentation.

1 If I might also ask, it was brought up in the
2 report to consider adding or reinstating windows
3 left and right of the existing fireplace. We
4 hadn't sort of discussed this before, and again, as
5 long as we can do that under the permitting
6 requirements for reopening the window, and
7 depending on how they were blocked up, but as they
8 say they were probably just infilled and stuccoed.
9 We will investigate the practicality of opening
10 those windows. If that could be something that we
11 could sort of discuss with staff, that would be
12 great.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

14 Okay. Anyone in the audience that would like
15 to speak in favor of this case?

16 MS. KAUTZ: Callum, if you can unshare your
17 screen.

18 MR. GIBB: Yeah, I was just trying to do that.

19 MS. KAUTZ: There's one person who has their
20 hand raised. Give me one moment.

21 Karelia, I asked you to unmute.

22 MS. CARBONELL: Okay. Hi. Am I unmuted?

23 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

24 MS. CARBONELL: Okay. Hi everyone. I don't
25 know if the letter from Historic Preservation

1 Association was read, but if not I'd like to read
2 it into the record.

3 Here it is.

4 MS. KAUTZ: Go ahead.

5 Warren, did you receive anything --

6 MS. CARBONELL: Hello?

7 MS. KAUTZ: Hang on one second.

8 Warren, have you received anything?

9 MR. ADAMS: I received the letter of support
10 for the designation. I don't recall receiving the
11 letter regarding this project, no. I will check.

12 MS. KAUTZ: Go ahead, Karelia.

13 MS. CARBONELL: Yes. The heading was a letter
14 discouraging variance and all, and it was sent, I
15 think, right after the letter for designation. And
16 the guide for historic preservation was included in
17 the e-mail.

18 THE COURT REPORTER: Kara, do I need to swear
19 in --

20 MS. CARBONELL: You know, it should be here.

21 THE COURT REPORTER: Do I need to swear this
22 person in that's on the phone? I'm sorry.

23 MS. KAUTZ: I don't think you're able to if
24 they can't be seen.

25 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. And, I'm sorry,

1 may I ask who's speaking?

2 MS. CARBONELL: I just want to make sure that
3 my letter -- okay. I just want to make sure that I
4 read my letter into the record. And it should be
5 in that e-mail, I don't know where it would go, and
6 I did copy Billy, I did copy Billy.

7 MR. ADAMS: I do not see the e-mail here. But
8 please read it into the record, yes.

9 MS. CARBONELL: Okay. So let me do that.

10 "This is regarding 603 Minorca Avenue, Coral
11 Gables, COA 2021-003. On behalf of the Historic
12 Presentation Association of Coral Gables, please
13 accept this letter in discouraging the special
14 certificate of appropriateness that requests
15 granting a variance as this is always a dangerous
16 precedent, but there can be no negotiating on the
17 protection of the coral rock foundation and the
18 coral rock chimney structure that must not be
19 compromised.

20 "Neighbors are concerned with the aesthetic
21 design and scale of the new addition, and plans
22 adhere to standards No. 9 and No. 10 of the guide
23 to historic preservation in Coral Gables.

24 "The size and scale of the addition and new
25 construction must not negatively impact the

1 historic integrity of the coral cottage. There's a
2 quote from the local designation report which says,
3 'the uniqueness of this home is characterized by
4 the size of the property. It is one of the few
5 homes of this type to still exist on such a large
6 parcel of land while maintaining its integrity.'
7 And that's from the designation report page 2.

8 "The Historic Preservation Association of
9 Coral Gables promotes the understanding and the
10 importance of historic resources and their
11 preservation in Coral Gables. It is their
12 recommendation to adhere to standards No. 9 and No.
13 10, quote, 'that pertain exclusively to addition
14 and related new construction and are inextricably
15 related to one another.'

16 "The key concepts which must be applied to any
17 design for a new addition are that they, number
18 one, are theoretically removable; number two, are
19 related to the existing in scale, material,
20 massing, and detailing; number three, are
21 differentiated from the historic building; number
22 four, do not destroy the detail and integrity of
23 the historic building itself and in accordance to
24 the secretary of the interior standards and the
25 guidelines for rehabilitation.

1 "We ask the Historic Preservation Board to
2 analyze carefully the application request for
3 design approval for additions and alterations to
4 the residence and variance at 603 Minorca Avenue.

5 "Sincerely, Karelia Martinez Carbonell,
6 president of the Historic Preservation Association
7 of Coral Gables."

8 I will e-mail this letter once again to the
9 parties that I did yesterday just so that they also
10 have it.

11 But thank you again.

12 MR. ADAMS: Thank you.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Is there anyone else who would
14 like to speak in favor of this case?

15 Is there anyone who would like to speak in
16 opposition to this case?

17 MS. KAUTZ: There is one more person with
18 their hand raised. Give me one second.

19 You do need to be sworn in, please.

20 MS. BRANNIGAN: Okay.

21 THE COURT REPORTER: Could you please raise
22 your right hand.

23 Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole
24 truth and nothing but the truth?

25 MS. BRANNIGAN: I do.

1 Shall I go ahead?

2 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

3 MS. BRANNIGAN: Okay. Thank you.

4 My name is Martha Brannigan. I live at 609
5 Minorca Avenue. That's the house immediately to
6 the west of this property. I've lived here for
7 34 years, and it's my much beloved home.

8 I wonder if you could put up the drawing of
9 the green area, so I that I could -- it would help
10 me to describe my concerns. Or if you have access
11 to just looking at the sketches on the green area.
12 Is that a possibility? Can you put it up on the
13 screen?

14 MR. GIBB: Could I do that, Kara?

15 MS. KAUTZ: Yes, please.

16 MS. BRANNIGAN: Thank you.

17 So my property is immediately running down the
18 left side here to the left, the western -- his
19 western boundary is my eastern boundary.

20 So as you can see the development by design,
21 the expansion by design is intended to focus on the
22 western and northern ends of the property in order
23 to protect the street view and the integrity of the
24 front and the side view. And I perfectly
25 understand that, but as you can see from this

1 picture, I bear the brunt of that with the boundary
2 on the western side being very heavily the area for
3 the development.

4 Now, what I'm asking, I think, is very
5 reasonable, and I don't think it would make it too
6 difficult for the developer to accomplish what he's
7 hoping to accomplish. But basically if you see on
8 the sketch there the two little squares on the
9 bottom left side there, that's air-conditioning
10 units, that it would be right outside my beautiful
11 picture window, which I don't know if you can see
12 it here, this right behind me here, this is from my
13 living room, this beautiful picture window that I
14 now look out onto two old mahogany trees that are
15 going to be removed.

16 Instead I'm going to have two gigantic
17 air-conditioning units right outside my window. I
18 think that that's something that can probably be
19 changed without a big detriment to the project and
20 certainly not to the value of the effort at all.

21 If you go further down a little bit north on
22 that side, you'll see two more little squares right
23 by the pool cabana, the outdoor pool cabana. It's
24 marked pools. I believe that's pumps for the
25 pools. Those are extremely noisy. They run 90

1 decibels, sometimes worse. Those would be right
2 outside my windows as well.

3 I think that in addition to that, I would have
4 the 28-foot pool running right along my western
5 boundary, but I'm trying to be as reasonable as I
6 possibly can. But this idea of these
7 air-conditioning units and these pool pumps, if
8 that's what they are, I believe that's what they
9 are, that seems unnecessarily offensive.

10 And my second concern is just with the heavy
11 focus of concrete on that area. I've seen this
12 happen on a house of a good friend of mine on
13 Alcazar where a big property was built right next
14 to hers, and she suffers from terrible flooding.

15 I spoke to someone at the city about this more
16 than a year ago, and they said, oh, no, when you
17 build something like that, all the storm water
18 runoff has to be retained on the property. But the
19 water doesn't know that and it's flooding her house
20 every time it rains heavily, and when there's a
21 heavy storm she really gets bad flooding, and
22 there's nothing that can be done about it.

23 So I would just request, is all I can I
24 suppose, those two ideas. Please don't put the air
25 conditioning and the pool pumps right outside my

1 windows, and please take extra pains with all this
2 concrete to try to do it in a way that won't be
3 flooding my property because that's what it looks
4 to me like is going to be the future, it's going to
5 be flooding.

6 And that's really all that I have, so thank
7 you.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

9 Anyone else who would like to speak in
10 opposition to this case?

11 Okay. I will close the public hearing portion
12 and open it up to board discussion.

13 MS. BACHE-WIIG: It looks like somebody's
14 raising their hand to speak.

15 MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Brannigan, are you finished?
16 I think that was it.

17 MR. GIBB: Kara, would I able to mention
18 something?

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

20 MR. GIBB: Obviously, the letter from the
21 historic association was read in today. Normally
22 we get those if there's one sent out. It's just so
23 I wanted to sort of clarify that the setback is the
24 rear setback, or the variance is for the rear
25 setback. A couple of things on that. The nature

1 of the design was to not impede that side elevation
2 from Segovia, and, therefore, utilize that rear
3 property as much as possible.

4 And we obviously went to five feet because
5 that's, you know, what the rear setback would have
6 been, you know, it was in Coral Gables for a long
7 time before it was then changed to ten. But it was
8 not -- I don't -- I want to say we took advantage
9 of that option because that was a piece of land
10 that was really best available for the addition.
11 And so, yes, we maximized the length of that, but
12 it was done with consideration, not just out of
13 sort of development maximization.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

15 MR. FULLERTON: Mr. Gibb, can you tell us if
16 there's any options for your air-conditioning units
17 that you can think of that will be helpful to your
18 neighbor?

19 MR. GIBB: Well, yes. They would -- if they
20 were to be relocated, we could sort of -- if they
21 were to be relocated from the side yard they would
22 have to either be located around the pool area or
23 potentially between the existing house and the
24 breakfast nook with a privacy wall of some nature
25 between that and the street. But, I mean, you

1 know, the location of equipment on the interior
2 side is the preferable location so that they're not
3 visible from the street. You can screen them if
4 they are visible at all, and, you know, a five-foot
5 interior side setback is the sort of standard
6 interior side setback, so we are meeting those
7 setbacks.

8 MR. FULLERTON: And you probably only need one
9 pool pump; isn't that correct?

10 MR. GIBB: Yes. And would be a filter and
11 then one would be a pump, right, so it's one
12 piece --

13 MR. FULLERTON: -- yeah, it's a noise-maker --

14 MR. GIBB: -- of mechanical equipment, yes,
15 exactly.

16 MR. FULLERTON: Well, let me say that I'm so
17 relieved that you came up with a plan that didn't
18 require moving that house. I knew that was a
19 difficult day for you guys, but you've done a
20 pretty good job here of making a success of that
21 addition, and I appreciate the effort.

22 MR. GIBB: Thank you.

23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: May I ask a question?

24 MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

25 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Sir, are you willing to try to

1 work with the staff, and perhaps also the neighbor,
2 to see if there's an appropriate place for the
3 relocation of those ACs without making it an
4 expressed condition, but at least an effort in good
5 faith to work with the staff and the neighbor to
6 see if something could be worked out?

7 MR. GIBB: We would be happy to work with
8 staff, yeah. I mean, like you say, if there can be
9 a different location found, then assuming it's, you
10 know, non-conditional, then we certainly want to be
11 a good neighbor, so, yes.

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: And within the same vein, the
13 possibility of moving the pool pump to a different
14 location?

15 MR. GIBB: Well, yes. I mean, obviously the
16 intent would be to house it in its best location
17 for both properties, you know, in the same manner
18 that it would be a running pump for the neighbor,
19 it would also be a running pump for the owner. So
20 we have to -- and also the rear neighbor, so we're
21 kind of limited to either then moving it to the
22 street location, which isn't really practical for a
23 pool pump. So the pool pump might be -- well, it
24 would either be five feet from the neighbor to the
25 west or five feet from the neighbor from the

1 right -- to the north so --

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: It is possible to move it
3 behind the garage?

4 MR. GIBB: Well, yes, we could put it anywhere
5 in the pool deck, but then it's in the pool deck
6 which is not, you know, desirable to, you know, the
7 owner so --

8 MR. FULLERTON: Not to minimize --

9 MR. GIBB: The perfect location would be
10 putting it on the other side where we don't have a
11 neighbor, but that's against the street frontage
12 which then causes other issues.

13 But as far as an accommodation --

14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: There seems to be a space
15 between one side of the garage and the side of
16 the -- what is that -- the bedroom?

17 MR. GIBB: There is a blank area that could be
18 used for -- there's a small return there outside
19 the window. We could possibly put it on the
20 interior corner outside the guest bathroom next to
21 the --

22 MR. FULLERTON: You could put a --

23 MR. GIBB: -- terrace, that would be --

24 MR. FULLERTON: -- a four-foot wall around
25 it --

1 MR. GIBB: Right. Where --

2 MR. FULLERTON: -- where it is.

3 And not to minimize the effect of the motor
4 being objected to, that's always used in daytime, I
5 mean, the pump only runs during the day.

6 MR. GIBB: Sure.

7 MR. FULLERTON: And that's not as egregious as
8 all night like the AC units.

9 MR. GIBB: Right. And as I say, the AC unit
10 is not -- is sort of within the setback, but it is
11 quite a distance from the actual unit inside, so if
12 it were to move, we would probably look to move it
13 somewhat closer to the proximity of the air
14 handlers inside. And we could work with staff for
15 a better option for that if you insist.

16 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Gibb, are you accepting of
17 the four conditions that staff are requesting?

18 MR. GIBB: The four conditions that staff is
19 requesting, that would be the reinstatement of the
20 two windows left and right of the chimney, correct?

21 MR. MENENDEZ: Yeah.

22 MR. GIBB: The window at the front, and there
23 was also -- let me see, sorry, I don't have the
24 drawing at hand. So windows to be clear glass;
25 yes, absolutely. High profile, absolutely. The

1 wood outlookers, definitely.

2 Well, I think the method of construction, if
3 you will, the tectonic nature would be similar, but
4 like you say, the detailing should be distinctive
5 enough to be similar but not identical. And then
6 details of new doors, windows, gates, yes, we'll
7 include those and submit those shop drawings to
8 historic to make sure that they get all those
9 details at the time of permitting.

10 And then let me see. Yes. So then the other
11 ones are the two windows left and right of the
12 chimney. I hadn't -- we had seen them on the twin
13 house, but we hadn't actually looked into the
14 possibility of reinstating those before, but I
15 think there was a photograph that seemed to show a
16 shadow line of a blocked-in opening. So we would
17 be happy to work with staff and see whether we can
18 open those up and see what effect there is on the
19 interior.

20 I apologize, but I think there might be a
21 library sort of set built in left and right of the
22 chimney or the fireplace on the inside, which is
23 why they obscured them. So maybe we could tour the
24 house with staff and see whether that -- you know,
25 whether there's a give-and-take that could occur

1 there.

2 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

3 MS. KAUTZ: We're happy to work with you.

4 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft, do you have
5 anything to say?

6 MR. EHRENHAFT: You know, initially I was
7 concerned about the overall scale of the two
8 additions, but I see that they leave the integrity
9 of the front facade intact and also the original
10 structure along the Segovia exposure.

11 If they were to increase the side setback it
12 would do major changes to the one-story addition to
13 the west, and I suppose the pool could have been
14 made smaller, but overall I think that the plan
15 makes sense.

16 I'd like to know with respect to the finish
17 that you would -- the exterior textures and
18 finishes that you would put on the additions, I
19 don't know whether staff has any comments or
20 recommendations, but I'd like to know a little bit
21 about how it would blend with the original
22 structure which has a rather unique texture to it.

23 MR. ADAMS: I believe the application said it
24 would be a smooth stucco so it could be
25 differentiated from the rough textures, and perhaps

1 we could find something that isn't necessarily
2 completely smooth but still can be differentiated.

3 MR. FULLERTON: Who will be looking at that
4 while construction's going on?

5 MR. ADAMS: We can inspect it or the architect
6 has --

7 MR. FULLERTON: Will they be submitting
8 samples of textures to you, to staff?

9 MS. KAUTZ: We can request that. We've done
10 it in the past.

11 MR. GIBB: We could find a similar or a stucco
12 sort of texture that is, like you say, a medium
13 between the existing and totally smooth, maybe we
14 can reference that in some way during the
15 application and during the procurement of the
16 stucco contractor, give him a photograph at least
17 or a reference of the, you know -- in all cases, I
18 think even if we tried to match it, I think there's
19 pretty much a standard assumption that they would
20 fail if they -- that's one of the concerns we have
21 with taking out the picture window, is that we're
22 going to ask this contractor to not redo the whole
23 evaluation, but match that patch in the best way
24 possible.

25 So we can certainly ask him to not match it

1 and be different. I don't think that would be a
2 problem.

3 MR. FULLERTON: I generally have a personal
4 aversion to corner beads on stucco exterior on an
5 older building. The stucco beads make the changes
6 at the corners so abrupt and so perfect that they
7 just don't look like they're handmade, hand done,
8 which I prefer. So if there's any way we can -- I
9 don't know if we can say that we don't want you to
10 use any corner beads. I personally would like
11 that.

12 MR. GIBB: Certainly on the outside corners of
13 the structure you mean to make it -- you know, to
14 make that vertical line a little softer?

15 MR. FULLERTON: How do you feel about that,
16 Callum?

17 MR. GIBB: When done well, it's a vast
18 improvement. I always have an objection to the
19 glinting smoothness of the exposed corner bead,
20 even with a smooth stucco finish. So it is not
21 typical, but I think the gentleman who's going to
22 patch the center one to match the existing will
23 probably be able to create a sort of a more
24 artisanal feel around the new windows and the new
25 corners. I don't think it's a code issue, so we're

1 not required to use corner beads.

2 MS. KAUTZ: The board has made the
3 recommendation in the past to --

4 MR. GIBB: Yeah, I have done it and it is a
5 vast improvement.

6 MR. FULLERTON: The board mentioned something
7 like that?

8 MS. KAUTZ: In the past, yes.

9 MR. FULLERTON: Oh, good. Oh, good.

10 MR. MENENDEZ: Would someone like to make a --

11 MS. KAUTZ: The owner wishes to speak. Let me
12 allow that, if you guys so wish.

13 MR. EHRENHAFT: And I have one more question
14 before we close then as well.

15 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you.

16 I just wanted to mention that I do have
17 experience not using corner beads because I did
18 that on my personal residence, which I worked with
19 Callum on, so I also do like the look. I just
20 wanted to mention that.

21 MR. FULLERTON: Good. Thank you.

22 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

23 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. There was one other
24 issue that was raised by the neighbor about
25 drainage from the pool patio, and I'm looking at

1 the drawings and I note that the long dimension of
2 the pool is against a very narrow deck to -- I
3 guess that's to the west adjacent to the neighbor's
4 home, and the lion's share of the rain that's going
5 to fall, except maybe for that that's shedding from
6 the one-story addition on the west, is going to
7 pour into the, I would believe, either into the
8 pool or onto the larger exposed area of the deck
9 that's behind or to the side of the one-story
10 addition in the rear.

11 If the water drains out the rear five-foot
12 easement, if the variation is granted by the board,
13 then I'm looking at the drawing adjacent to this
14 plat, and it shows the rear of two homes there. I
15 don't know the distance between them, you know,
16 green space and lot that would be capable of
17 absorbing any water that would be shed.

18 But have they ever thought about having
19 drainage fields that are almost like a cistern and
20 allow water that's shed to go back into the
21 ground --

22 MS. SPAIN: Typically doesn't the building
23 department or the zoning department require a
24 drainage plan? We used to.

25 MR. FULLERTON: Typically you have to have a

1 slope away from the pool edge all the way around
2 it. However, you could also do this deck with
3 pavers on sand which would allow a great deal of
4 drainage directly through the deck. So that's
5 another option.

6 Because you typically are technically supposed
7 to have a slope away from the pool from the deck,
8 and there's not much deck on what is that -- the
9 east end or west end north?

10 So I suggest some sort of a nice paver pattern
11 on there that would allow drainage. That way your
12 neighbor would be --

13 MR. GIBB: No, that makes sense. Obviously,
14 we don't want the dirty water from the roof runoff
15 to go into the pool, so we would have to manage
16 that anyway, but as say, the north and west areas
17 might take a portion of that. Luckily, most of the
18 roof seems to shed and will go out towards the
19 Segovia or Minorca.

20 But I think incorporating a landscape area or
21 pavers with sand or gaps in them that would allow
22 percolation would help that definitely.

23 MR. FULLERTON: You could put a full French
24 drain all along the east and north edges --

25 MR. GIBB: Yes, or we can create a French

1 drain within the pool deck and slope to that.

2 But it's a good point to consider in the
3 development of the permit plans.

4 MR. EHRENHAFT: Thank you.

5 MR. MENENDEZ: Anything else?

6 MR. GIBB: I guess we're also lucky we're on
7 the coral rock here, so we should be pretty
8 permeable.

9 MR. FULLERTON: So I'll move staff
10 recommendations.

11 You say you're all right with the
12 requirements?

13 MR. GIBB: Yeah, as long as we can work with
14 staff on reintroducing the two small windows on the
15 interior. I just wanted to have the option to look
16 at that, see how they were blocked up and see
17 whether there's any details on the inside which
18 would have to be compromised to reinstate.

19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Fullerton, I'd like to ask
20 you if you'd accept an amendment?

21 MR. FULLERTON: Of course.

22 MR. RODRIGUEZ: A very simple amendment to add
23 it to the conditions that the owner and staff work
24 in good faith with the next door neighbor to see
25 the possibility of moving those ACs to a different

1 location without making it a mandatory requirement,
2 just good faith effort.

3 MR. FULLERTON: Okay. I'll accept that.

4 MS. SPAIN: Me too. Absolutely.

5 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. We have a motion by
6 Mr. Fullerton and a second by Ms. Spain.

7 And we also have an approval here for a
8 variance.

9 MS. KAUTZ: That will be a second motion.

10 MS. SPAIN: I'll make a motion to approve the
11 variance.

12 MS. KAUTZ: We have to vote on the first one.

13 MS. SPAIN: We have to vote first.

14 MS. KAUTZ: You do.

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Let's vote on the first and
16 then we'll vote on the variance.

17 MS. KAUTZ: All right. Mr. Rodriguez?

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

19 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Fullerton?

20 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

21 MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Bache-Wiig?

22 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

23 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Menendez?

24 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

25 MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Spain?

1 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

2 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

3 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

4 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Durana?

5 MR. DURANA: Yes.

6 MS. KAUTZ: You want to make another motion

7 for the variance.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Motion for a variance?

9 MS. SPAIN: John, do you want to make a motion

10 for the variance also?

11 MR. FULLERTON: No.

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'll move that we accept --

13 MR. FULLERTON: I've done way too much moving
14 today.

15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I will move that we approve
16 the variance.

17 MR. EHRENHAFT: I'll second.

18 MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Rodriguez and
19 Mr. Ehrenhaft.

20 MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Spain?

21 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

22 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Fullerton?

23 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

24 MS. KAUTZ: Dr. Durana?

25 MR. DURANA: Yes.

1 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Menendez?

2 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

3 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

4 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

5 MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Rodriguez?

6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

7 MS. KAUTZ: Ms. Bache-Wiig?

8 Ms. Bache-Wiig, you're muted.

9 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Sorry about that. Yes.

10 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.

11 Both pass.

12 MR. GIBB: Thank you.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Let's see, do we have

14 any board items, city commission or city project

15 updates?

16 Kara?

17 MS. KAUTZ: Warren, do you have anything to --

18 MR. ADAMS: Nothing to update, no.

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

20 MS. SPAIN: I have a quick question. I know

21 they're working on the roof of city hall. Are they

22 going to restore the ceiling of the cupola to put

23 back one of the faces that fell off like ten years

24 ago and is in your office, Kara? Is there any talk

25 about doing that?

1 MR. FULLERTON: Whose face fell off?

2 MS. SPAIN: They have the four seasons up on
3 the top of the cupola. If you walk out and look
4 up, one of them's gone.

5 MS. KAUTZ: Winter.

6 MS. SPAIN: It fell off.

7 MS. KAUTZ: We have it in our office.

8 MS. SPAIN: Pardon me?

9 MS. KAUTZ: We have winter in our office in
10 the archives.

11 This is the first phase, and, Warren, if you
12 want to jump in. This is the first phase that
13 they're doing the roof tile work and the roof
14 replacement of the flat roof of the cottage
15 building, and then there's going to be a second
16 tower restoration section that involves stucco work
17 on the exterior, as well they're going to be
18 replacing those windows, the windows up in the
19 cupola, we had talked about it ages ago to make
20 them fixed. They'll match exactly.

21 MS. SPAIN: Yeah, that makes sense. But I
22 think they already have been closed, haven't they?

23 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. Yeah. And as part of that
24 all of the plaster work inside that's been damaged
25 will be restored and the face be put back on.

1 MS. SPAIN: Okay. Cool. Thank you.

2 MR. ADAMS: And we're being kept in the loop
3 pretty well every step of the way, so we are being
4 updated regularly with these proposals.

5 MR. FULLERTON: Can I ask a real quick
6 question, kind of a silly question maybe, but when
7 do you think all staff could come into our
8 meetings, when? Is there an estimate of the time
9 that is safe?

10 MR. ADAMS: The most recent estimate we have
11 was we are trying to get back to some normality by
12 mid-June, and we do not have a return-to-work plan
13 yet, so I'm not exactly sure what the details will
14 be, but the plan seems to be to shoot for the
15 middle of June. But we're still waiting on exactly
16 what the plan will be.

17 MR. FULLERTON: My question comes out of the
18 fact that I'm having a very difficult time
19 understanding the --

20 MR. MENENDEZ: The presenters.

21 MR. FULLERTON: -- words coming out of those
22 speakers.

23 MS. SPAIN: Yeah, me too. You're not the only
24 one.

25 MR. FULLERTON: It's really hard to keep up

1 sometimes.

2 MR. MENENDEZ: All right. Any old business?

3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have a question. Normally
4 we leave our documents here for recycling and staff
5 is not present. Should we take them with us or
6 should we leave them here?

7 MS. KAUTZ: If you want -- I picked them up
8 last time, too. Some of you had left them. If you
9 can leave them underneath what used to be the
10 reporter's table where Miriam sits, I can pick them
11 up tomorrow.

12 Dona, do you know what I'm talking about?

13 MR. FULLERTON: So don't leave them on top,
14 leave them underneath?

15 MS. KAUTZ: Underneath.

16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Where's the reporter's table,
17 over there?

18 MS. SPAIN: It's the low table right if you're
19 looking at us, it's on the left-hand side.

20 MS. KAUTZ: Right. Correct. If you just tuck
21 it underneath, tuck your packets underneath, I'll
22 pick them up tomorrow.

23 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Anything else?

24 MR. FULLERTON: Does the architect's board
25 meet here tomorrow?

1 MS. KAUTZ: No.

2 MR. EHRENHAFT: I have one final question with
3 respect to the chair. We also vote at least
4 annually to select a chair or reelect a chair.
5 Refresh my memory, is it during May or do you do in
6 the June meeting which is --

7 MS. SPAIN: I think you should probably wait
8 till you have a new board. It usually takes -- I
9 mean, there's that runoff, and it usually takes
10 them a while to figure out that they have to make
11 nominations.

12 MR. MENENDEZ: He wants to get rid of me
13 already.

14 MR. EHRENHAFT: Well, they're on notice now.

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Motion to adjourn, please.

16 MR. FULLERTON: I motion.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Second?

18 Okay. We're adjourned.

19 MR. FULLERTON: I didn't get a second on that.

20 MR. MENENDEZ: I heard one.

21 MS. KAUTZ: Thanks everyone.

22 MS. SPAIN: I'll second it.

23 MS. KAUTZ: You're done.

24

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

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 Meeting in stenotype; and that the foregoing pages, numbered from 1 to ^, inclusive, are a true and correct transcription of my shorthand notes of said Historic Preservation Meeting.

I further certify that said Historic Preservation Meeting was taken at the time and place hereinabove set forth and that the taking of said Historic Preservation 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 14th day of May, 2021.



Jessica A. Donnelly

