

From: [Gonzalez, Jessica](#)
To: [Bueno, Lizbeth](#); [Fons, Monique](#)
Cc: [Mooney, Thomas](#); [Sanchez, Carmen](#); [Tackett, Deborah](#)
Subject: FW: important to deny this fire station project
Date: Monday, March 7, 2022 5:36:23 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Lizbeth,

Please see below and make sure that it has been sent to the board, placed on Novus and EnerGov.

If you have any questions let me know,



Jessica Gonzalez

Clerk of Boards
Planning Department

1700 Convention Center Drive – 2nd Floor, Miami Beach, FL 33139
Tel: 305-673-7550 / www.miamibeachfl.gov

It's easy being Green! Please consider our environment before printing this email.

From: Mooney, Thomas <ThomasMooney@miamibeachfl.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 4:55 PM
To: Tackett, Deborah <DeborahTackett@miamibeachfl.gov>; Gonzalez, Jessica <JessicaGonzalez@miamibeachfl.gov>; Hernandez, Maria <MariaHernandez@miamibeachfl.gov>; Novack, Allison <AllisonNovack@miamibeachfl.gov>; Martinez, David <DavidMartinez@miamibeachfl.gov>
Cc: Kallergis, Nick <NickKallergis@miamibeachfl.gov>
Subject: FW: important to deny this fire station project

FYI

From: David MCKINNEY <daviddmckinney@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 15:12
To: Stuart Reed <stuartreedesq@aol.com>; Mooney, Thomas <ThomasMooney@miamibeachfl.gov>
Subject: Fwd: important to deny this fire station project

Dear Stuart,

I am asking your assistance in ensuring that the attached email reaches you and the other members of the Historic Preservation Board. As of the time of this email, it does not appear in the public comment section of the HPB agenda online nor does a letter that I understand that Deborah Desilets has written. In addition, my paper on the case for the preservation of the South Shore Community Center does not appear in the online comments while Mitch Novaks' "historic resources" report is posted. Also missing from the comment is the letter from the Society of Architectural Historians calling for the preservation of the South Shore Community Center. and the notification of the Florida

Trust for Historic Preservation's designation of the South Shore Community Center as one of its buildings to save in 2021.

I have no way of knowing what actually reaches you and your colleagues. And even if you are receiving everything, there is a huge disservice to the public because the posts by being selective are misrepresentative of the concerns of the public and noted experts.

My apologies for placing this burden on you. I have included the director of Planning on this email chain so he is fully aware of the situation.

With my sincere thanks for your assistance in this matter, I am

Yours truly,

David McKinney

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Clotilde L Luce** <clluce@bellsouth.net>

Date: Mon, Mar 7, 2022 at 12:23 PM

Subject: important to deny this fire station project

To: <HPB@miamibeachfl.gov>

Cc: Beth Dunlop <beth.dunlop@gmail.com>, Jack Finglass <jackfinglass@gmail.com>, Christina LaBuzetta <christina@locationresources.com>, nina worth <ninanevanu@gmail.com>, David McKinney <daviddmckinney@yahoo.com>, AUGER007@aol.com <AUGER007@aol.com>, <johannmoore859@gmail.com>

To the HPB

Esteemed HPB members

The preservation issues revolving around this building are obvious and have been well-stated by widely regarded architectural historians and experts. But those are not the only considerations here.

Please consider three fundamental (and common sense) reasons for denying the fire station project before you.

1. A series of bad planning decision, barely discussed in public--even though they entail the expenditure of a considerable amount public money-- that have produced a proposed building with incompatible massing and design to be thrust on a low-scale very pedestrian neighborhood disrupting the architectural harmony of the district.

- 2- The choice of this site would also cause havoc: fire engines rushing to emergencies, would make wide turns into narrow streets before reaching wider streets endangering some lives (it is a

pedestrian district) as they rush off to save others,. It is not too late to reverse a poor planning decision made two years ago and pushed through with insufficient transparency.

3 - The third reason for denying this project concerns a flawed process from insufficient notice to parents and residents (whose lives will be disrupted) to the city's evasions on comparing costs of replacing the daycare center and playground. Left undiscussed, at least in public, are the true costs of demolition (not to mention the environmental impact) compared to costs of far better alternative sites. The flaws in the process include the city's failure to post public comment sent to the HPB from respected authorities on preservation, to a very perfunctory review of better alternative sites which would allow saving money, saving a public facility, and of course saving the architecturally important Lapidus ensemble and playground. The city even barred an architectural photographer, with previous published photos of Lapidus in his own design environment, from taking photos of the building's interiors.... in sum, months of eluding the public right to know.

As the attached January 22 email a group of us sent to the Commission stated, residents had urged the HPB " to question the murky pattern of clearly inadequate notification of residents, parents, plus evasiveness on true costs of replacing the daycare center and playground. " Not only were parents not noticed and local residents not noticed, while the project was being pushed, but no public meeting was even called until shortly before the Commission was to vote, and only at the urging of one commissioner were the high costs of renting a space for the daycare finally provided.

Far safer 'turn ratio' conditions can be found in other sites, one being the City-owned empty lot at the NE corner of 4th and Alton, offering wide open fire truck exits immediately onto a 4 - lane thoroughfare.

A win/win solution would be to 1 - not pay to demolish the Lapidus center and the lovely and irreplaceable outdoor playground, thus saving both history AND money by 2 - choosing the City-owned empty lot for a new well-designed station, the lot providing sufficient space and proximity to city parking, for fire fighters to park their own vehicles. The lot abuts empty retail and our two biggest north south/east west streets. As is being implemented in Europe, sirens can go quiet at night.

This would be a WIN for the fireman's union, a WIN for preservationists, for parents, for reduced public costs, for real sustainability not the gratuitous demolition of a Lapidus, and a real WIN/WIN for the city's public relations image.

Yours truly,

Beth Dunlop
Jack Finglass
Christina Labuzetta
Clotilde Luce
Nina Worth

Begin forwarded message:

From: Clotilde L Luce <clluce@bellsouth.net>
Subject: questions of process for HPB 21-0483 833 6th St item tomorrow
Date: January 10, 2022 at 11:45:50 AM EST
To: Jack Finglass
<jackfinglass@gmail.com>, HPB@miamibeachfl.gov
Cc: "Rosen Gonzalez, Kristen" <kristen@miamibeachfl.gov>, "Meiner, Steven" <stevenmeiner@miamibeachfl.gov>, Mark Samuelian <mark@miamibeachfl.gov>, "Gonzalez, Jessica" <JessicaGonzalez@miamibeachfl.gov>, David MCKINNEY <david.d.mckinney416@gmail.com>

To:
HPB Chairman Jack Finglass
c/c Commissioners Rosen Gonzalez Meiner Samuelian
c/c Jessica Gonzalez
c/c David McKinney

re: why the omission of David McKinney's and Professor Wilson's public comments for item HPB 21-0483 833 Sixth Street?

Dear Chairman Finglass,

On the agenda my name is cited among those whose public comments appear in your File for Tuesday's meeting. In fact ours was a group statement signed by Beth Dunlop, Nina Worth, Franziska Medina, David Grieser, Patrick Breshike, Christina Labuzetta, and David McKinney, in which we urge the Board to question the murky pattern of clearly inadequate notification of residents, parents, plus evasiveness on true costs of replacing the daycare center and playground.

Thank you for again reviewing our suggestions on obtaining a far better outcome.

But are you and other Board members aware that the most seriously researched public comments were for some reason not included in the package, nor online?

Highly pertinent comments sent in from David McKinney and Professor Richard Guy Wilson, of the National Landmarks Committee, had been

omitted.

Was this due to some oversight?

Even if this has now been rectified, we must ask, is there a protocol allowing Staff to edit out and discard public comment?

Would this not compromise 'the public right to know' — including your Board's right to know ?

Failure to sufficiently notice residents and parents on a major upheaval in their lives, then not posting McKinney and Prof. Wilson's fully researched information, raises questions on protocols for serving the public interest.

And again, said public interest would be far better served with a far safer fire station location, and retention of an essential services hub designed above grade by our most important architect.

Yours truly,
Clotilde Luce
Miami Beach



Virus-free. www.avg.com