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MS. TACKETT: This first application on the agenda is HPB 210457. This is One Lincoln Road and 1671 Collins Avenue. An application has been filed requesting the certificate of appropriateness for the partial demolition and renovation of two buildings on this site, the total demolition of one building, the construction of an attached ground level addition at the northeast corner of the site, and the construction of an attached addition and modifications to the rear yard site plan.

This particular property is located within the Ocean Drive-Collins Avenue Local Historic District. It is also located within the Miami Beach Architectural District listed at the National Register of Historic Places.

The subject site contains three contributing buildings. The Ritz-Carlton Hotel, originally known as the DiLido Hotel, that's located at One Lincoln Road; the One Lincoln Road building, which is at the intersection of Lincoln Road and Collins Avenue; and the Sagamore Hotel located at 1671 Collins Avenue.

The applicant is proposing some modifications to two of the buildings, the Sagamore and the

Ritz-Carlton, as well as the construction of a new ground level 200 foot tower addition.

The Sagamore Hotel was originally constructed in 1948 and designed by Albert Anis in the Post War Modern style of architecture. The applicant is currently proposing to renovate the existing hotel, including the substantial restoration of the original 1948 Albert Anis design front facade. So that's the Collins Avenue facade that had been altered and added onto in the 1950s, so staff is very pleased that the applicant is proposing to restore that back to its original design as we feel like the 1950 addition actually was insensitively designed and has a negative impact on the integrity of the -- the existing building.

They're also proposing to restore the original hotel lobby and reconfigure the ground level amenity spaces. Again, staff is very supportive of the proposed modifications for the Sagamore, which we believe will enhance the City's architectural district.

The applicant is proposing the new 200 foot tall residential tower located between the Ritz-Carlton and the Sagamore. That will require the total demolition of a four-story bungalow that is located on the

Sagamore site. That bungalow was constructed in 1998, and therefore staff has no objection to that request. In general, staff is supportive of the design language in the architecture proposed for the new tower addition. It is located behind the -- primarily behind the Sagamore Hotel. In the rear of the Sagamore it's important to note what you see today is a 1998 rear addition. So we do not believe that the location of the new tower is obscuring any original historic features.

We do have some recommendations with regard to trying to minimize the perceived height, including removing the decorative roof top element and reducing the mechanical equipment to the greatest extent possible.

With regards to the modifications of the Ritz-Carlton portion of the site, the applicant is proposing to demolish a portion of the three story rear cabana and that is in order -- that was constructed in 2003 when the rooftop addition project went onto the DiLido, so staff is not objecting to the level of demolition and they're doing that, it's important to note, because currently a rooftop addition -- so we have a three story rear addition to the Ritz-Carlton. They wish to put a fourth story on
that portion; however, within this portion of the City, rooftop additions are not allowed. Ground level additions are allowed. Therefore the applicant is proposing to demolish a section of that to build a -a four story ground level addition in its location. Because this -- again, this was constructed in 2003, staff does not believe it has any significant historical architectural features and does not believe it will have any adverse impact on the contributing buildings or the historic district.

Additionally there is a proposal to connect the two properties via a stair and elevator. This -- this structure, this new circulation structure has been set back over 200 feet from the front property line which minimizes its -- its visibility significantly from Collins Avenue. We do not believe this will have any adverse impact and we understand the operational concerns of the property owner and have no objection to the construction of this particular component of the project.

The -- there are also site enhancements proposed, particularly in the rear yard. Staff has no objection to the design of these and we believe they do satisfy the certificate of appropriateness criteria. We have noted, however, that the setbacks for the pool do not
currently appear to comply with the regulations for the oceanfront overlay, so we do have a condition in our draft order that we're asking the board to consider, including in the order if -- if an order is entered into for the project, that would require that particular feature to comply with the -- with the regulation in the oceanfront overlay.

In summary, staff is supportive of the proposed project and recommends approval, subject to the conditions in the draft report that is attached. Thank you.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you.
MS. TACKETT: It's a large project. Even though there -- there's not a significant scope of work for the existing contributing buildings, there are -- you know, there are three contributing buildings on this site and it is quite an extensive new addition as well so.

MR. FINGLASS: I have a -- you --
MR. KALLERGIS: Oh, no. Go ahead. I just have two points I'd like to make before I --

MR. FINGLASS: I just have a question. Will Mr. Mooney be attending this morning?

MS. TACKETT: Yeah. And if $I$ can point out, there is a court reporter present for this particular
application, so if we can all speak on our microphones and as clearly as possible.

The planning director, Tom Mooney, I believe is -- is going to be joining via Zoom. I'm not sure if he is currently on but he -- he will be monitoring from Zoom, and if you have any specific questions for Mr. Mooney, $I$ can certainly see if he's available.

MR. FINGLASS: I do because I'd like an explanation of the extra height and also the transferring of height from the adjacent aligned property, et cetera, because he has been written to about this and I don't think he --

MS. TACKETT: Correct. So the board members did receive a -- a letter from -- in opposition from a neighboring property owner requesting a zoning interpretation. The planning director is solely responsible for zoning interpretations. This particular board does not have that authority to interpret the zoning code.

A challenge to the director's interpretation would be heard by the board of adjustment, which is the -- the Zoning Board of Adjustment. So there is a jurisdictional board that is charged with that task but it would not be the Historic Preservation Board.

MR. KLEIN: So we can't get clarification for
what Jack is referring to?
MS. TACKETT: What is the specific clarification?
MR. KLEIN: Well, I will wait until he comes.
MS. TACKETT: Okay. I will -- I will reach out and see if he's available to -- to attend.

MR. KALLERGIS: And, Mr. Chairman, I would just ask, given the level of interest in this application if we could do board disclosures at the outset, that will give the -- the applicant and -- and -- and any other interested parties the opportunity to -- to Cross-Examine later if they need to.

So can I ask the board if anyone has any disclosures to make?

MR. FINGLASS: I think I've talked to everyone in this room just about -- the MBPLs, Tucker Gibbs, Mr. Paul -- I forget this last name.

MR. KALLERGIS: Paul Savage.
MR. FINGLASS: Paul Savage.
MR. KALLERGIS: Okay.
MR. FINGLASS: And of course the parties present here today, the lawyers.

MR. KALLERGIS: The applicant. Okay.
Anyone else. Nancy?
MS. LIEBMAN: Can I have -- I -- there's a lot of things that have changed. The name of -- Alex?

MR. GONZALEZ: Alfredo.
MS. LIEBMAN: With Alfredo.
MR. GONZALEZ: Alex is good too. That's my brother's name.

MR. KALLERGIS: Anyone else?
MR. KLEIN: Other than just a slew of e-mails and a couple texts, most of which I -- I really haven't even read. I'd prefer to see the information here, so I don't -- I'm unbiased.

MR. KALLERGIS: Okay.
MR. LITT: I had an agenda review meeting with City Staff to discuss this application and I've received a number of e-mails. Did not respond to any of them.

MR. PASKAL: I haven't had any individual communications. I've only received the same e-mails.

MR. KALLERGIS: Okay. And those -- and those e-mails, any e-mails that have been forwarded to -- to staff or to me are in the public record and have been uploaded to Novis and those have -- those have been distributed to -- to the rest of you.

The next -- the next point $I$ wanted to make is, given the complexity of the application, is I wanted to ask the applicant if he'll be requesting additional time at the outset so I can -- so we have an accurate
clock.
MR. GONZALEZ: For the record, Alfredo Gonzalez, 333 Southeast Second Avenue, Greenberg Traurig.

The answer would be, yes, we will be asking for additional time. But $I$ also, prior to even starting our application, I do have two questions that I'd like to -- procedural questions that I'd like to raise.

MR. KALLERGIS: Okay. How much time you requesting?

MR. GONZALEZ: I would just need like three minutes to raise them.

MR. KALLERGIS: No. No. How much time for your application?

MR. GONZALEZ: I would say let's start at 15 minutes.

MR. KALLERGIS: Is that good with the chair?
MR. FINGLASS: Normally I would say no, but in this case it's so complex and there's so much information, I think that they should have as much time as they need to present their case. It's only fair.

MR. KALLERGIS: Okay.
MR. FINGLASS: What's your second issue?
MR. GONZALEZ: You want me --
MR. FINGLASS: No. You said you had two issues.

MR. GONZALEZ: I have two procedures questions to ask. If you want me to ask -- ask it now, I'd be more than happy to ask it now.

MR. KALLERGIS: Sure.
MR. GONZALEZ: I know you already started having the discussion regarding the Delano's counsel raised some questions and whether or not they're appropriate for this board and the legitimacy of the questions so you were waiting for Tom Mooney to respond.

I know, Debbie, you outlined that it's not in this board's jurisdiction and unfortunately it's under the jurisdiction of the Board of Adjustment if there were any disputed responses from Tom Mooney or action. So I just wanted to make clear that point before we proceed.

Is that fine, Nick?
MR. KALLERGIS: So what -- what the chairman was referring to, I believe, was -- was a letter from Mr. Savage requesting certain administrative interpretations. I think that if there's -- if there's an opportunity for -- for the plan -- if the plan director is going to be responding -- I don't know if we want to address that one right now -- but the -- the question -- the question is, certain -certain -- I'm sorry. There are certain questions
about the calculation of the project's floor area ratio that were raised in a request for administrative determination. That request is pending. Staff is reviewing that request and researching it. That request does not operate to -- to -- to block the board or -- or impede the board from otherwise ruling on this application. It's not to say board members may have individual questions about it because I've already heard two of you indicate you have questions about it, and -- and, you know, and -- and I defer to staff on -- on certain of the more technical aspects, but -- but -- but that pending request for administrative determination does not get in the way of the board's consideration of the application for a certificate of appropriateness, which is before you this morning.

MR. FINGLASS: Okay. But what -- what would happen if his response to the City's response contradicts what we decide?

MR. KALLERGIS: Well, there's -- they're really separate questions altogether. What is before you is -- is an application like any other for a certificate of appropriateness. Separately, a neighboring property owner has requested an administrative determination about the project's floor
area calculations, but this board doesn't rule on floor area calculations. You're not involved in that, in that math. It's not within your appropriateness criteria.

MR. FINGLASS: Nancy?
MS. LIEBMAN: That's -- maybe in legal language, that sounds fine; however, how are we to react to this project, which is very complicated without knowing, knowing the floor area? What is so difficult about knowing floor area? Not that we're all going to jump up and raise our hands and say -- oh, here. The expert just walked in -- I think -- I think that at least we should know everything that's attached to this project.

MR. KALLERGIS: Of course. And that was not -that was not my point. My point was more that -- that the -- that the math involved in the floor area calculations is a determination that staff makes, but, Tom, I don't know if you want to weigh in now or later but --

MR. MOONEY: I can answer any questions.
MR. KALLERGIS: Okay.
MS. LIEBMAN: Even the math, even the math, just so we understand why whoever wanted to know about floor area ratio. It doesn't affect our board. It
just gives us clarity.
MR. FINGLASS: Thank you. Welcome. Sorry to drag you down here.

MR. MOONEY: No problem.
MR. KALLERGIS: Mr. Mooney, do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. MOONEY: I do.
MR. KALLERGIS: Thank you.
MR. MOONEY: Are there any specific questions or -- well, I heard some of what was being discussed. I think Nick explained it very well. If there's anything that $I$ can clarify, I'm happy to do so.

MR. KLEIN: Just a point of clarification, if I could, as someone who sat on the board in a similar situation, anything that we do here up or down, our vote will then get clarified there or before?

MR. MOONEY: No. If there's an appeal of any decision that you make based upon Chapter 118 Article 10, any appeal of your decision regarding the certificate of appropriateness would be appealed to a special magistrate and then any appeal of a special magistrate would go to an appellate court. So that's the process of the certificate of appropriateness.

MS. LIEBMAN: But that's not what was brought up
before Tom walked in the room. It's just that this board is asking or some of the people are asking about how large a project it is, or the space. That's -that's it. It's no -- why is it a big deal that we have to waste time talking about it?

MR. FINGLASS: I have a question relating to the overhang. I don't think I've ever seen anything quite like that in six years, eight years, and how -- how does that affect -- I'm just very confused about that since it's overhanging another piece of property and it hasn't been, to my knowledge -- what's the proper term? -- deeded -- the whole thing was not put under one ownership. If we're talking about something that overhangs two properties here, is that a certainty that that would happen?

MR. MOONEY: It would have to happen in order to move forward and obtain a building permit. It would not be able to move forward and obtain a building permit unless they formally unify the site. Meaning they either unify it with either a unity in title or a covenant in lieu.

So what's before you assumes that they will effectuate whatever legal mechanism is required to wholly unify that site.

MR. FINGLASS: Nancy, do you have anything?

MS. LIEBMAN: That explains it, unless I'm missing -- is this what they're asking?

MR. KALLERGIS: Okay. Well, what I would recommend, Mr. Chairman, is, you know, I think we should -- we should follow the -- the order of -of -- of the hearing that is provided for in the city code. I think we should allow the applicant to make -- make a presentation. The applicant, you know, can -- can -- can -- can present the case in chief.

After the applicant's presentation, then we'll open the public hearing and -- and allow any other interested parties to speak. Then the applicant can close with a rebuttal. Obviously at any time board members are allowed to ask questions, but $I$ would recommend that we follow the order in the hearing code.

MR. GONZALEZ: Okay. Can I just ask -- I want a clarify -- because I think this can help clarify. Our application as submitted to staff from the very beginning has to be reviewed and a determination made whether it meets the FAR. If it wasn't for the FAR, we wouldn't be here today and it wouldn't be advertised. So at least to that point, this application is proper before you today, regardless of any new questions that may be raised now or in the
future by any parties.
MR. FINGLASS: And you will be discussing the 20,000 square foot issues?

MR.GONZALEZ: Those issues, I was not prepared to get into those issues since I -- it is under the review of Tom Mooney at this point, and in addition to the fact that he has to determine whether or not, $A$, they're legitimate questions, 2, if those questions have been asked and answered, and if there is any ability to appeal any decision he makes on any of those questions and it's under a separate process under 118-9 so -- but I'm happy to answer any questions the board may have --

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you.
MR. GONZALEZ: -- on that.
MR. FINGLASS: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Okay. Go on with your presentation, please.
MR. GONZALEZ: I had the second question. I'm sorry and hopefully it will be much quicker.

The -- the second issue, I just wanted to, for the record, restate the -- the last minute what appeared to be expert report by the attorneys of the Delano that failed to meet 30 days as required by the code under 118-6. In my opinion -- in my opinion, my
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review, these are unfortunately no different -- these expert reports are being submitted as expert reports, and as such, in opposition to our application, it would require 30 days.

I know that the National Hotel submitted some reports. We continued the item and it satisfied that issue and made it a moot point, but that does not address the existing reports by the Delano Hotel.

MR. KALLERGIS: So for the benefit of the board, Mr. Gonzalez is -- is raising an objection, a procedural objection, to a report submitted and -- and your procedural objection is -- is omnibus, right? Is what you distributed?

MR. GONZALEZ: Yes, sir.
MR. KALLERGIS: Okay. As -- as to -- as to a report submitted by the Delano Hotel owners under a provision of the code that requires that -- that reports be submitted 30 days prior to the hearing. We do not believe -- and when I say we, I've discussed this with staff -- we do not believe that that is a rebuttal report to a required expert report that -that is subject to that 30 day deadline.

Debbie, do you have anything else you would add to that? I don't think that report was submitted untimely.

MS. TACKETT: Thank you, Nick. That is correct. So we believe that, you know, that was submitted properly, and you can certainly take that into consideration.

MR. GONZALEZ: So it's not treated as an expert report then, correct?

MS. TACKETT: Correct.
MR. GONZALEZ: That's the -- okay. I just wanted that clear on the record, that the report submitted was not an expert report by the Delano.

MR. KALLERGIS: And I think, to clarify, it may well be an expert report, but it's not an -- an expert report submitted in rebuttal to a required report, which is -- which is what are subject to a 30 -- I know. I'm sorry. I know these issues are -- are -you know, but -- but $I$ just want to get that on the record, that we do not believe that this is a rebuttal to a required expert report.

MR. GONZALEZ: Okay. I guess that's a new position from last year, but staff has the ability to make any change.

MR. FINGLASS: I have a question. So that means that we can read it and use it in our judgment?

MR. KALLERGIS: Yes.
MR. FINGLASS: Okay. Because I just -- I -- to
me, it's kind of like in a -- I watch Perry Mason a lot. It's kind of like when a prosecuting -- or a defense attorney says something and we need to withdraw it but the damage is already done. It's a slippery thing.

Okay. Thank you. Thank you.
MR. GONZALEZ: Those were our procedural questions, Mr. Chairman, board. I would like to start with our presentation at this point.

MR. FINGLASS: Welcome. And we're eager to hear what you have to say.

MR. GONZALEZ: Good morning. Again, just really quick, with me here today we have from ownership Dayssi --

MS. KANAVOS: Just Dayssi.
MR. GONZALEZ: Dayssi Kanavos, Diego Lowenstein, Ronny Ben-Josef from ownership; Kobi Karp and his team; we have Arthur Marcus, historical consultant, Deborah Vicente historical consultant; and Debbie -sorry, Devon Vickers from our office.

We're standing here today to reunify this parcel. As everyone has seen, this parcel, originally Carl Fisher sold it to James Seiberling, the founder of Goodyear Tire, and the building's an estate. Carl Fisher's estate was across the street which now is

Decoplage.
Over years the site went through many ups and downs and was divided up, planned to be unified, not unified. So today we're happy that this proposed project is bringing this entire site back together as it originally was. And, in addition, with touches from famous architects like as Morris Lapidus, Melvin Grossman, Igor Polevitzky, and Norman Giller.

The far -- the five star Ritz-Carlton flag will now include the Sagamore Hotel. That's basically what we're doing, is adding the Sagamore under the Ritz-Carlton umbrella, bringing 110 hotel rooms, reducing them from a maximum of 60 hotel suites in an historic building and up to 50 residential units in the tower.

I think this is especially exciting with this whole movement of residents first, and we've seen from the last election that there's been a movement now to repurpose this area, call it the development of the Cultural Art Deco District that's being renewed, and really bringing a high caliber of product to the -this area and emphasizing the arts, culture, history and residential into the mix, which is I think the direction the City wants to go, and we achieve this by only demolishing or proposing to demolish
non-contributing portions of -- of the site and restoring the contributing sections on the Sagamore and, as Debbie had suggested, bringing back that -the front facade that was originally at the hotel. And we're not asking for any variances or waivers from the code. We're asking, as a matter of fact, under the existing RF3 regulations, and I think the -at this time what I'd like to do is really quickly introduce a representative of each of the three families to quickly give you a comment on why this project is so important to them and their involvement in -- in Miami Beach over -- over 50 years.

With that, Mr. Lowenstein.
MR. LOWENSTEIN: Good morning, chair, board members and residents and stakeholders of Miami Beach.

My name is Diego Lowenstein. My family has been an owner of hotels and buildings in Miami Beach since 1966. My grandfather and father acquired the DiLido Beach Hotel in 1971 and now 50 years and going, four generations of our family have been stewards of this Morris Lapidus gem. We are one, if not the longest, of a group having owned hospitality properties in Miami Beach since this City's inception.

Many tell me that my grandfather and father were geniuses for having acquired this property. I always
reply that they were geniuses for having kept it standing during the most difficult of times, particularly the darker periods of Miami Beach in the '70s and '80s. Back then, there was no designation for historic buildings and demolition was an option, and somebody -- some took that option.

Our family made it our mission to maintain and preserve these historic MiMo period structures. Over 20 years ago, we committed with our partners to redevelop the DiLido into the Ritz-Carlton hotel, the market's first true luxury hotel property and one that was a catalyst for the redevelopment of so many historic properties neighboring us.

At that, historical assets is a pivotal part of my family business. We have transformed over the last decade many landmark buildings, including a 1928 bank building in Chicago, a 570 year old UNESCO World Heritage site in Tuscany, and a 700 year old convent in Florence. We are experienced in preservation and it matters for us. We define ourselves as custodians of these legacy assets, ones that constantly need to be nurtured to be kept relevant for the ever evolving needs of our customers and to be openly enjoyed and treasured by our communities.

Now I'd like to introduce my partner, Dayssi

Kanavos, who will share her thoughts. Thank you very much.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you.
MS. KANAVOS: Hello, chairman and board members.
MR. FINGLASS: Good morning. Nice to see you again.

MS. KANAVOS: Good to see you too. Very proud to be here.

As -- as Diego said, our family has also been in the hospitality business for over 70 years. We've built some of the first Marriott Hotels in the country in Boston, and we've also been stewards of many historical properties, one of which is 55 Wall Street which was built in the 1800s, and it is known today as one of the most wonderful restorations of a historic landmark into a hotel. It opened in 2001.

In addition to that restoration, we were also involved in other restorations around the country. We started out in -- in -- in Miami Beach by developing the Ritz-Carlton in Coconut Grove. We were selected by the Marriott family through a 70 year relationship to be a strategic developer and bring Ritz-Carlton to Miami. With that, we completed the Ritz-Carlton in Coconut Grove in 2001 and then we partnered with the Lowenstein family to bring luxury to Miami Beach.

Our restoration project was so meaningful to Morris Lapidus that he personally came and appeared before the HPB board to speak about our renovation. We had to strike a delicate balance between the needs of a Ritz-Carlton, which wanted Queen Anne style furniture, and bring in instead more of a MiMo style hotel furniture and millwork package.

Subsequently, after the Hurricane Irma, we went a step further and restored the curved wall to its original lighter color, which we can see in all of the historic pictures, and really brought it back to life in a way that $I$ think Morris Lapidus would have been proud.

In 2014 we were also stewards of the Shelborne Hotel. The Shelborne that was built in the 1940s, subsequently had an addition by Morris Lapidus, but in the ' 70 s and -- ' 60 s and ' 70 s, the lobby was completely covered in sheetrock. You couldn't see the Polevitzky beautiful stair. The mezzanine was completely sheetrocked. There was no two stories.

I convinced our partners, which was no small feat -- Russell Galbut -- to buy the condominiums in the -- in that lobby portion and to completely demolish them and not have the income from these -the condominiums so that we could restore the original
lobby.
We discovered the octagonal columns that were original to the lobby, we preserved the Tennessee granite marble, and searched high and wide to make sure that the restoration was not only complete but that it was -- but that it had the highest integrity. Today, you can go back and visit that lobby and see how beautiful it is to see the Polevitzky stair and the original mezzanine restored to its original beauty.

Restoring properties isn't just pridefully expedient to us. As a board member of Save Venice, I am deeply passionate about restoring art and architecture. The similarities between Miami Beach and Save Venice are -- are obvious to us all. Save Venice was -- it is the largest private organization that restores art and architecture in Venice, and it started because of the 1966 floods. So it's something that is near and dear to our heart.

And -- and I'm also proud to introduce to you the third family here, Ronny Ben-Josef, to talk to you about how we're going to continue contributing to our communities.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you.
MR. BEN-JOSEF: Good morning.

MR. FINGLASS: Good morning.
MR. BEN-JOSEF: Honorable chairman and members of the board, my name is Ronny Ben-Josef, and I'm proud to announce that this December is the 20 th anniversary of the Art Basel, famous Art Basel brunch held at the Sagamore Hotel.

The Ben-Josef family has made a substantial commitment and has successfully -- successfully deepened the Sagamore's role to the arts and the local community and Miami at large. By collaborating with the Perez Museum, the Miami History Museum, the South Florida Symphony, as well as the New World Symphony, and many, many more, we have positioned the Sagamore as a platform for local artists and museums.

We're especially proud that during the height of COVID last year, as all of us may remember, the Sagamore was the only hotel to offer any arts and cultural events, was the only one in Miami supporting local artists, local institutions. To achieve -- to achieve all of that takes a great amount of commitment, resources, and our own money.

Before -- before this project, the Sagamore was poised to increase the room count as of right, we had an increase of room count to 138 rooms. Instead, our proposal reduces 138 rooms approximately to 2 --
approximately 60 hotel rooms plus 50 residential units. This is significant reduction in rooms and increasing highly converted residential units. We have unique opportunity to reduce density, create residential building whose residents will be committed to improvement of our neighborhood.

We view -- we view this as the best way to secure the ability to commit to more arts to our local community. We look at this as a rare opportunity to deepen our interest, ties with the local businesses, artists, residents, and Miami Beach as a whole.

Although our project is as of right now asking for no variances, we're happy to extend a hand to our community and neighbors in order to address any reasonable concerns they might have. Miami Beach need for restoration throughout -- through South Florida development, and we are committed to do so.

Thank you very much for your time.
MR. GONZALEZ: Kobi will now start his presentation.

MR. FINGLASS: Good morning, Kobi. How are you?
MR. KARP: Good morning, Jack. Thank you for having me here this morning.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you for coming.
MR. GONZALEZ: I am going to -- Mr. Chairman, I'm
going to request a little additional time.
MR. FINGLASS: This is very important. This is probably one of the most important things we've had before us, and you need to take the time that you need to take.

MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
MR. KARP: Thank you so much for your time this morning. Kirk, Barry, Jack, everybody, good to see you. My name is Kobi Karp, 571 Northwest 28th Street for the record, and I wanted to take time and -because I've met with some of you, Jack and Nancy, and I wanted to show you the images that we have and I want to take a minute and give you the thought process of how it is that we are where we are today.

So basically just on the Sagamore, this is the original sketch that shows the four levels and this shows the addition. So this addition is what we are proposing to modify and bring back to the way it was, which is a step-back effect. This is the sketch, these are the photos, and that's what we have decided to do.

Specifically, what is interesting here, is that you have an opportunity second to none to really create a combination to bring -- and you can see here, this is a rendering showing the step-back, and the
reason we have that is because, as was mentioned before, this property was united, it was residential, and now it's hospitality, meaning the whole block historically, whether it's the Delano or whether it's the National, they were always designed as vertical high rise structures designed to be approximately 150 to 180 feet. The neighbor that we have right here, the Decoplage, is approximately that height. The Igor Polevitzky is right here, and this is the Ritz with the addition.

So when we looked at the geometry of the buildings, we felt that there is an opportunity to look at a couple of things which were quite interesting. When we met with staff, and I give you these images and they're part of the packet but I wanted to discuss them with you face to face, you do not see this building from the public right of way off the streets. You don't see it from Collins Avenue, you don't see it from Lincoln Road, and you don't see it from the other court. So that's the purpose of these images, which are right here in front of you.

If you allow me to fly like a bird 150 feet up in the air, you can see it here in the background. That's what we are showing, and this is the step down of the Sagamore being implemented in there. And
that's really why we're showing that. We're showing the contextual relationship of the massing. You can see the width of the buildings and you can see the height of the buildings, and whether they're 150, 170 or 180, you can clearly see it in the submission that we made on the elevation, but, in essence, what we are trying to do is take the available square footage, and there is, as was discussed, a building on the east side. It's in the backyard. And right now it touches the east facade of the Sagamore. So when we discussed, we saw an opportunity to disengage it and bring the east facade of the Sagamore back to its original stand alone design.

So what did we do? We took our new building and we said if we can't see it from the street, because it was set back so nicely, why don't we look at how it sits on the site. So we studied a few things, and you can see this angled facade here on the Sagamore. On the Morris Lapidus there's also an angled facade, and they reflect the angle of Collins Avenue and how it meets Lincoln Road.

And so you heard about the ownership. Ownership has owned these properties years, decades. They're not going anywhere. They have hotels here, and this is the first time, really through sheer luck, that two
individuals who own the two properties, went to high school together, and they have talked and found a way to bring this property back together, which is important because if you walk along the public right of way along the beach, you will see how open it is, yet how it is that now, more so than ever before with the new building floating up and disengaging the existing structure of the Sagamore based facade, you have an opportunity to combine the sites, open them up, but most important, you have an opportunity to create an open space that would be used by the public that cannot only see the buildings from the boardwalk but also can access them. That is the uniqueness of the site. It's both hospitality and residences in this element right here.

And this image right here is an important image because it shows how the building floats up in the air at 20 feet and let's the open space and the landscaping come underneath, so that the idea is that it has a very light footprint in the backyard and allows the light and air to come in. And the reason we did it, we did it, quite frankly, so that we can disengage from the east facade of the Sagamore and also stay further away from the east facade of the Ritz. So the further away we can do it and give you
the skinny side, and that's when we thought about the cantilever.

The cantilever allows us to really create the most open space and to set this tower as far south as possible and as far away from these facades, and you can clearly see that the east facade of the Sagamore the east facade of the Ritz is easterly of the National and the Delano, and what's interesting about it is it allows more open space that connects properly to Lincoln Road more so than ever before so that folks can enjoy the building, come into the Sagamore, come into the Ritz and walk through it and come to the backyard and enjoy the backyard whether it's for cafecitos in the morning or for a drink in the afternoon, the public has a site that is so much more porous than ever before. So that's where the thought process about the location came about.

The context in relationship -- this is obviously again up in the air and we go up in the air so we can show the full impact of the building because if I'm on the ground there's landscaping and there's trees and you don't get to see as much of the building as you would up in the air.

This image is an interesting image because it reverts back to the discussion that we had about the
cantilever. The building has right here the residential plates and it has an open space below right here and this is the Sagamore. So it allows us to disengage from the historical background because right now it's connected by the addition that was built a few years ago. So we're looking to break up that addition, and then start the new building.

But when we start the new building, we don't want to start it at the ground level. We want to float it up in the air so that when you walk along the public boardwalk, you can see through to the backyard of the Shel- -- of the Ritz and the backyard of the Sagamore.

It's interesting because the architectural design of these images, we made this collage in the office. You can see the porte-coch?re by Morris Lapidus. You can see the porte-coch?re on the Sagamore right here. You can see how what we did is float up the building in the same DNA up in the air so that the context is not only graphic, it's not only three dimensional on the site and the angle to the site, but it also relates the front yard to the backyard in a way that potentially can work quite well.

There are cupolas, as you have seen, and so what's interesting -- I'll just take a second. This is an image, it's a black and white image when the

National and the Delano was built, and you can see that historically the ocean was right there. So the buildings always had a context of relating closely to the ocean. The -- this is the first time, and you can see in this image, that you have an opportunity to combine the sites and bring them together. When you do that -- let me just jump to this for a second -and if you want to stop anytime, Jack, I'll stop, okay? -- is that this open space right here is the open space that connects the Sagamore with the open space of the Ritz along the -- this is the boardwalk, this is the foot of the boardwalk right here. So as you walk, and if you walk there, there's no big trees hiding the back elevations. There's no big bushes. You can see it. It's transparent.

I walked it together with Jack, I walked it with other folks, and I believe that if we are allowed to restore the Sagamore to what it was with -- let me step this over so I'm not blocking anybody's view, forgive me for that, Debbie -- the step-back effect on the Sagamore, and setting the building all the way in the back, I -- and, again, this building has a footprint of approximately -- how big is it, Matt? I'm allowed 15 -- I'm allowed 15,000. How -MR. MOONEY: 8,200.

MR. KARP: 8,200. So what we decided to do is, how can we be as skinny as possible and push it as far away from the Sagamore's facade? So instead of making it 15,000 square foot plates or 10,000 square foot plates, making it shorter, we felt for our benefit on the east facade of the Ritz, on the east facade of the Sagamore, as well as our neighbors to the north, that the skinnier $I$ would be, the further $I$ would be in three dimension from that facade, it would help to bring the spatial disengagement of the lightened air to allow it to come in.

MR. FINGLASS: I have a question.
MR. KARP: Anything, anytime, Jack. This is a diaglogue. It's log not a monologue.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you. I just have a question based on that drawing. I have a question based on that photograph. To me you've done a great job in trying to make the building disappear. It is glass separated by the materials. It is really a very nice building.

MR. KARP: Thank you, Jack.
MR. FINGLASS: But in this picture I think it's -- don't you think it's a bit misleading to show it as almost a vacuous cloud in the sky that has no mass? You're showing it as a glass box. Well,
obviously there's things in the box -- furniture, concrete, walls. It's really not going to look like that.

MR. KARP: So that's a good point and the glass on this building is the same glass as I have on the Surf Club, which is intended to be white and silver to reflect the ambiance, and that's why I have multiple images, which I will show you of the building, because I don't want you to think that for one second we don't have a building there. Right? You can clearly see here actually. And --

MR. FINGLASS: I understand. And, also, I guess hopefully in the last part of your talk you're going to talk about its effect from the beach side because that's very important.

MR. KARP: I think the beach side is very important. We walked it together, you and I, and we felt that by raising it up, I'm able to see to the backyard. And, on the contrary, this image, this building here's 180 feet because it has a little bit of an angle to this photo, we actually raised it because if $I$ was to take too long in coming across, the building would look shorter.

So what we did, we actually took a panorama image. It's not a straight on elevation. The
straight on elevation is right here. And so that's why the building here, arguable, looks taller than it would in reality, because it's the perspective of the photo. That's why we took the time and we put underneath the black and white elevation to show that the building is within context of its existing neighbors to the north and to the south.

MR. FINGLASS: I -- I just want to clarify why I mentioned that, it's because in the past we've been shown other buildings, the fingers in the sky as a friend of mine calls them, that I think do false advertisement about how big they are and what effect they have on the skyline, which is our prime concern here. So I just want to make sure that in your presentation you show us that this is not --

MR. KARP: And -- and, Jack, I think your point is very well taken, and you can clearly see here the building. It has the silver reflective glass that we're seeking with the white matte modernization, and we're seeking that, again, to make it look as translucent as possible.

Will it be translucent? No. But will it be here and reflective? Yes. And you can see that I could have selected a black glass or a copper or bronze material --

MR. FINGLASS: Your building is spectacular I think.

MR. KARP: Jack, I -- I'm just trying to be clear because I know that my dear friends are going to come and attack me in a couple of minutes. I just want to be, you know, clear -- clear about it, because, you know -- and so what happens is that this glass actually, and I'll be happy to submit it, has a full reflection of the -- of the community, of the surrounding area, and that's why I think it's important for me, if $I$ may just show you something, if I may, please. Just give me a second. Because what Jack was talking about is that now this is a view on the property looking back to the Sagamore, which will be opened up, and this is a view from the Sagamore looking back again with the footed columns to give you that overhang, or as Alon Shulman called it a tong or a cantilever like Morris Lapidus had, to see the ocean more so than ever before. And if nothing else, if you can walk by the -- because you're not going to see the building from Collins Avenue. You're not going to see it from Lincoln Road. It's important to understand that when you see it from the ocean, we have taken every step possible to make it as -- as correct as possible.

And what is important here is that you have an opportunity to restore -- this is the lobby and the public areas, and this is an image, again, up in the air so you can clearly see the spatial relationship between these two buildings because once I bring you down to the ground, you're going to be able to see the other buildings in the background as well.

This is an important image because it clearly shows the separation between the east facade of the Ritz and the Sagamore and the west facade of this new building.

I wanted to do this on boards so that I can briefly show you what it is that we're talking about. I took the geometries -- give me a second, please.

MR. FINGLASS: How much time do you think you might need?

MR. KARP: Sixty seconds, max.
MR. FINGLASS: Okay
MR. KARP: So -- because we are on the beach and we like the sand and the sand is glass and glass is sand, but I don't get into that whole discussion, right, but that's where the inspiration and environmental is coming from, and we felt that because the beach was so close and because these high rises were always designed to be as tall and slender as
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possible, what we had an opportunity is to take the geometry of the original Sagamore, whether it's the canopy or the vertical and the horizontal, or even the angled walls on Lapidus and implement it into the building. And I gave you blogs of these images in relationship to the Igor Polevitzky geometry, which is quite nice and strong, to the angled walls of how the building sits on the site, and they allow -- the ability now, more so than ever before, to open it up and make it as porous as possible with the two properties combined together, which has not existed since the original residence were built there.

Thank you very much for your time.
MR. FINGLASS: I want to compliment you on your beautiful presentation. You did a really good job and I think it is very enlightening and it has raised many qu- -- many, many questions in my mind, which we'll get into. Thank you.

MR. GONZALEZ: And, Mr. Chairman, with that, that concludes our primary presentation. I would like to reserve rebuttal --

MR. FINGLASS: You said the primary presentation?
MR. GONZALEZ: Well, the rebuttal after the public comments, but yes, we -- I could give you another presentation if you want me to repeat it.

MR. FINGLASS: I think whatever you'd like to do, we're happy to hear it.

MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With that, we conclude our presentation.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you very much. Very, very, very well done.

MS. TACKETT: Mr. Chair, if the board does not have any specific questions, $I$ think we can open it up to the public.

MR. FINGLASS: Does the board have any specific questions?

I do have one little one, hopefully. I was told when I visited the site, and I just want to make this clear for the other board members who may not have heard this or understand this, that the new building that you proposed to replace the building that is there and on the ocean side will be the exact same footprint as what is there, forget the overhang, but the actual caliber will be the exact same footprint as the building that's there from --

MR. GONZALEZ: Oh, actually, we -- it's set -it's going to be less.

MR. FINGLASS: Less?
MR. GONZALEZ: There's a reduction of about -about ten feet towards the -- the south. So since the
building cantilevers --
MR. FINGLASS: Towards the south? Which --
MR. GONZALEZ: So if you're looking at the rear of the Sagamore today, the -- the cabana structure opens up and actually connects -- almost connects into the rear of the Sagamore. So by demolishing that, you're first creating a 50 foot separation between our tower and the rear of the Sagamore, and when it cantilevers over, over half the building is over the Ritz-Carlton side and the current setbacks, that it actually opens up so that if you're standing at the beach walk, you will see more of the rear of the Sagamore than you do today.

MR. FINGLASS: And when you say it opens up, the view corridor of 17 stories versus 8 or 9 now? MR. GONZALEZ: Correct. MR. FINGLASS: Thank you. MR. GONZALEZ: You're welcome. MR. FINGLASS: Anybody else have any questions? MR. PASCAL: I have a question, I guess probably for the architect. I'm obviously going through lots and lots of paperwork. I'm just trying to get a clearer sense of the uses.

I get that the Sagamore lobby becomes the residential lobby. The Ritz-Carlton remains -- the

DiLido remains hotel use. The front section, the historical section of the Sagamore is hotel use, correct?

MR. KARP: Yes.
MR. PASCAL: And what about, I mean, in terms of amenities, restaurants, that sort of thing? Can you just give an overview of how this works as well as parking for -- for residents in the tower and all of that sort of thing, access points. I just want to understand the big picture and how it all functions.

MR. GONZALEZ: While he's doing-- while he's getting the board, Kobi, let me clarify. The Sagamore lobby will be both for residents and hotel guests because the historic Sagamore building will become Ritz-Carlton suites and Kobi will walk you through how you still check in at the Ritz-Carlton, the main lobby, the Morris Lapidus lobby, and access all the site.

MR. KARP: So just to be straightforward, the Sagamore stays open to the public as well as the Ritz. So you and I can go walk through the lobby of the Sagamore or the Ritz, connect onto the backyard, walk through the backyard, walk to the beach, and from the beach back into the property. So the site becomes more porous and ultimately more open as originally
combined.
Most important is that because you saw the section that has the cantilever, that's where the residential component is. So the residential component is sitting in a -- here it is. So this is the cantilever. Right here on top of this roof we're building the pool and amenity area for the residences which allows us then to connect also into the Ritz. So the residences, which this building will be only residential, and the rest of the project shall stay a hotel.

So specifically as was mentioned, there's currently hotel rooms in the Sagamore. We will make them bigger, there will be less of them, there will be 60 of them, and then there will be 50 non-residential units in total. The rooftop will be the amenity area. And this is how they enter. They enter right here in the Sagamore, walk on through, public, public, straight on through to the beach.

Yet, if you live there and it's your unit, you come to this point, you make a right, and you walk within a garden and you'll enter the court. So you only enter the elevators and staircases. The only thing that comes down to that level are the elevators and staircases. Everything else floats up in the air.

And the reason is to allow you to come in and also right here there's a doorway that connects you to the garage, to the existing garage on the building.

MR. GONZALEZ: You asked about the parking as well. The parking, there is sufficient parking within the Ritz-Carlton to satisfy any parking requirement in our proposed project. So it would be housed in the current garage.

Did that answer your questions?
MR. PASCAL: Yeah. Thank you.
MR. KARP: And just as a note, so this is the open space that we have and it opens up more from the Sagamore because, like Jack said, are you confirming to me the width of the tower because the tower is like 60 feet wide, and so what it does is cantilevers 30 feet over the Ritz and stays 30 feet over the Sagamore for round numbers and this opens up so much more comes around and lets the public in. This right here is the pool for the residents only.

MR. FINGLASS: Anyone else have a question before we --

MR. KLEIN: Kirk hit on something about amenities and restaurants. How does that affect the Sagamore?

MR. GONZALEZ: Right now the $F \& B$ programming as existing today at the Ritz-Carlton will continue.

There's some restaurants at the Sagamore and bars. That will be remaining. It will be repurposed and then -- and -- but the overall site is not going to intensify for additional venues. So it will be tweaked; however, it will be all under the Ritz-Carlton hotel flag, whether it's a bar at the Sagamore lobby or the Ritz-Carlton lobby or on the property.

Does that answer --
MR. KLEIN: Yes.
MR. GONZALEZ: Any more questions?
MR. FINGLASS: Yeah, I do.
MR. GONZALEZ: Sure.
MR. FINGLASS: One more.
MR. GONZALEZ: As many as you'd like, Jack.
MR. FINGLASS: I don't want to delve into your economics because it's not germane particularly to this discussion, but an underlying question that $I$ have is how did you decide on the height of the new tower?

MR. GONZALEZ: And I could let Kobi elaborate, but I know that ownership was very much concerned about the impacts in the area and they were trying to find the smallest footprint to accommodate the residential plates.

MR. FINGLASS: I'm not talking about the smallest footprint. I'm talking about the height.

MR. GONZALEZ: Right. If we were happy to have a short, much larger type of --

MR. FINGLASS: You're heading in the same direction as everyone else who comes before us.

MR. GONZALEZ: Okay.
MR. FINGLASS: And it's in a direction that $I$ don't like and $I$ never have before. But why not five stories? Why not eight stories? Why not ten stories? Why do we have to have another big finger sticking in the sky when the buildings that exist there operate perfectly normally the way they are?

That is my underlying complaint about all of these proposals that come before us. It's just apparently about money and we're here to preserve buildings and not to deal with the issue of money. It's very important. It makes the world go round. But it is a finger in the sky that is really not necessary and $I$ question why it has to be so high.

I mean, it says -- it says you can up have up to, what is it, 200 feet. It's not by right. You have to earn it. You have to get this board's approval. You don't have it by right, and it bothers me that -- I know we're not supposed to compare one side to
another, but it's apparent in everything that has come before us, one after another after another tries to capitalize on the ability to gain height and that's really clouding our postcard view and it's -- it's just not the way to be.

So why -- I'm asking the question: Why is it as high as it is?

MR. KARP: If you'll allow me to jump in, Jack? Because when we walked the site, and in this section you can see, what we basically have, we have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve floors of residential right here on this existing fault.

By cutting it down, right, and disengaging from the east side of the Sagamore, we take the floor and put it on top of each other, it's eight floors, right? So what did we try to do? We tried to say let us push it as far back as possible.

But your question is how did you get to the height? Why can't you make it shorter? Because we wanted the space between the east facade of the Sagamore and the east facade of the Ritz, which by definition is also the east facade of the National, is to move it as far away to the east as possible. So if I -- I'm allowed to make plates that are bigger, I
decided, we decided all of us together -- you see I have clients that are pretty sophisticated -- they decided with us to make the plates as small as possible and to increase the cantilevers as much as possible, and the reason for that is that you have an ability to have a greater space open between the historic buildings and the new building. So that's where the logic came from.

Does that answer your question?
MR. FINGLASS: Not really.
MR. KARP: Okay. Anything else I could do?
MR. FINGLASS: Yeah. We'll get into that. Okay. Okay. Thank you for the answer.

Okay. Anybody else have any questions? No. Okay.

MS. TACKETT: Yeah. If the board would like to open it to the public, right now $I$ don't see anyone on Zoom. So if there are any members of the public on Zoom wishing to comment, please raise your hand and we will call on you.

Mr. Chair, if you want to begin with members of the public who are present in chambers?

MR. FINGLASS: Sure. Anyone from the public would like to come up and speak? Good morning.

MR. GIBBS: Good morning. My name is Tucker

Gibbs and I represent the National Hotel, law offices at 3835 Utopia Court in Coconut Grove.

The National and the Delano would like to make presentations in tandem, if possible. Is that --

MR. FINGLASS: Yes.
MR. GIBBS: Therefore, so the orders of the presentation, so you all will know, would be first Mr. Steven Avdakov who is the principal of Heritage Architectural Associates, our expert witness. He would be followed by Paul Savage. He represents -- is representing the Delano -- he represents the Delano. And by Tucker Gibbs who represents the National.

So I'd like to introduce to you Mr. Avdakov.
MR. AVDAKOV: Thank you, Tucker. Good morning.
MR. FINGLASS: Good morning.
MR. AVDAKOV: Mr. Chair, members of the board, it's a pleasure to speak before you, to be present. For the record, I am Steven Avdakov, principal at Heritage Architectural Associates, 4300 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami.

As I previously mentioned in other presentations to this board, I'm a registered architect and my architectural preservation expertise meets federal criteria. My firm prepared and submitted reports on behalf of the National and the Delano to analyze the
compatibility with the proposed design of the Sagamore with the historic context of the historic district, including the adjacent and common properties.

We reviewed this proposed design in accordance with the certificate of appropriateness criteria of the ordinance, including the secretary of the interior standards. I'll provide a brief Power Point presentation, which we sent to you earlier, of our analysis and the findings.

In summary, in our expert opinion, the design of this project does not comply with the certificate of appropriateness criteria as defined in the ordinance. So, with that, can we please have the Power Point slides? There we go. Next slide, please?

To start, I think it's essential to take a step back to consider the intent and purpose of the historic preservation ordinance itself. Preservation and conservation of the historic and architectural merit are the cornerstones of the intent and have been formulated as public policy of the city in the interest of its future prosperity. These are the reasons that there is a historic preservation board. These are the reasons why we're here today: To preserve and conserve by protecting historic sites, by assuring compatibility of work, restoring,
rehabilitating, redesign within the scope.
Next image, please.
And there it is, the postcard view of the skyline. The postcard view of the skyline. The proposed project is located at the heart of this section of the district. This part of the district has an iconic level of significance. The design must be viewed with a consideration of 360 degrees of visibility. Not just from one perspective on Collins Avenue.

By its very nature, as you can see, this is actually a postcard. The skyline is viewed thus from distance to take in the significance of the crown jewels of the district -- the National, the Delano, and the Ritz. The vantage point of the greatest perspective to view this postcard skyline is from the east, from the boardwalk as a pedestrian, as a rollerblader, as a bicyclist, like myself, who can pause to take in the experience of this iconic skyline.

I have to note the historic districts are not museums. They need to evolve and accommodate appropriate development and redesign, and in an historic district, that design needs to be contextual, it needs to be deferential to the surrounding historic
architecture, it needs to be referenced and interpreted by that architecture, and especially it needs to be compatible with architecture in the surrounding district.

And the location of this -- next image, please. This just shows the location; that it's within the heart of the Ocean Drive-Collins Avenue historic district, as well as the National Register District.

As it was noted earlier, the three historic buildings have been designed by prominent architects, including Polevitzky, the building on the corner, Grossman and Lapidus who did the DiLido, which was modified in 2004 and became the Ritz-Carlton, and the Sagamore, which was built in 1948 and designed by Albert Amis. Next slide, please.

Consider the proposed design. There is a 200 foot tall tower in that context. When notably discussing the postcard image, a design within any of the historic district, it needs to be contextual and it needs to establish a deferential dialog with the existing story of the fabric and be referential to that, and, above all else, be compatible.

The proposed design depicted here, in my expert opinion, does the opposite of that. It is not differential in the contextual design, it does not
infer by imposing its will upon its iconic neighbors and neighborhood. It does not comply with the regulations and the requirements of the ordinance. In my opinion, it's not compatible.

Next image, please.
So let's further consume the impact of the proposed upon the historic contributing resources of the historic district. This is the Sagamore. We've seen that from the east. It's six stories tall.

Next image, please.
Now, this rend- -- this is a rendering that depicts the proposed tower and its impact upon the site, which is nearly obscured there. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, Number 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Additionally, under Chapter 118, 564: Any addition on a building site shall be designed, sited, and massed in a manner which is sensitive to and compatible with the existing improvement. I think
this image indicates clearly that this design does none of these criteria.

Next image, please.
Now this is what's really important here. This is the view, the postcard view. From a distance in context of the adjacent buildings, the view from the pedestrians of the ocean from the east and from their point -- this is the postcard view with the crown jewels of the district -- the National Hotel built in 1948 by architect Roy France; the Delano Hotel, 1948, by Robert Swartburg; and the Ritz Plaza, 1940, by Murray Dixon. Once again, this view has iconic significance and is in the heart of the district.

Next image, please.
This is the rendering that depicts the proposed tower and its impact on the crown jewels and that skyline. As I refer to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards before, it's the same context here. The new work must be compatible with historic materials, feature, size, scale, and proportion, and masked to protect the integrity of the property and the environment on this Chapter 118.564, the existing structure is appropriate to -- compatible with the environment and adjacent structures and it should enhance the appearance of the surrounding properties.

Particular attention shall be given to the relationship to the surrounding neighborhood, the impact on preserving the historic character of the neighborhood and the district, and contiguous and adjacent buildings. This character and iconic significance of the postcard skyline has been diminished considerably with this addition here.

Next image, please.
This is a view from the National, one of the crown jewels. Why? It has integrity and incredible design. It also has integrity context.

Next image, please.
This is the viewshed of that context which has been diminished by that addition. Once again, particular attention to the pedestrian sidelines and view quarters of the integrity of the National have been adversely impacted by that addition.

Next image, please.
Once again, the Delano, it's an iconic building. It's the same thing: Integrity of design, integrity of context, integrity of viewshed.

Next image, please.
Once again, that viewshed, the integrity of that context and the site lights on that iconic property as well.

Next image, please.
These are some -- these are some solar studies we put together, the winter solstice, which is really, you know, just about a week away. You can see how developed the property, the crown jewels would be during midday covered in shade by this addition. This is not appropriate too and not compatible with the environment and adversely impacts these areas.

Next image, please.
This is again a solar study from the equinox. The pool at the National, as you can see here, is adversely impacted by the shade during the day in that instance as well.

Next slide.
So let's get down to it here. It comes back to Certificate of Appropriateness criteria, Chapter 19-564. It's based upon compatibility with the physical alteration, improvement in the surrounding properties. It needs to comply with the Secretary of Interior's Standards, which I've referenced multiple times. It needs to comply with other criteria in Chapter 19-564, especially compatibility.

Next image, please.
So if we take a look at this, compatibility, I referred to these items extensively. Both of these
criteria led to the adverse impact upon the site, adjacent historic structure, and character of the neighborhood and district, including the iconic postcard skylines and the crown jewels of the historic district.

Next image, please.
Now, this states that any proposed new structure shall have a massing which is sensitive to the compatibility with the building sites and surrounding areas. That's not the case in this instance.

Additionally, any additional building that's not compatible with this case, the existing improvements, the orientation site, scale, and orientation, the Sagamore which is six stories tall, the placement so far east of the walking of the beach will dominate that waterfront view of the postcard skyline.

Next image.
Finally, my expert analysis demonstrates the proposed design will not be -- the proposed Sagamore project will be adverse in its compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will destroy the historic special relationship between the property, it will not be compatible with the historical materials, scale, size, and portions to
protect the integrity of the property and the environment. It will dwarf the Sagamore and contributing resources.

It will irreparably impact the integrity of the postcard section of the skyline and will have an adverse impact upon the neighboring buildings, including the integrity of its context.

Next image, please.
I'm going to conclude with this: The proposed design of the tower are not compatible with the surrounding properties, which are all contributing resources; it will be of significant adverse effect on the resources on site, adjacent properties, and the iconic character of that skyline neighborhood. The proposed design of this Sagamore project fails to comply with the criteria for compatibility required, and the request must be denied.

So, in closing, I'd like to add this: In the 1970 s and 1980 s it was mentioned about there were issues coming. I remember. I came down here in 1984. Some significant structures were lost. More proposals for demo were presented. These proposals were presented as progress for the community. It is really impossible to comprehend how different Miami Beach's future would have been if this trajectory were allowed
to continue.
Fortunately, there were individuals who refused to listen to the false notion of progress and stood up for the protection of this unique place in these efforts that were considered radical at the time. They were opposed by many. Utilizing the tool of historic designation as a means to protect and create an historic district and the result has been tremendously successful.

In fact, these efforts to protect the historic architecture of Miami Beach have been so successful that the threats to the irreplaceable sense of place have now come full circle. Rather than demolition and neglect, the district's character is now threatened by development that is not compatible with this historic character.

I respectfully request that you fall in the footsteps of those that stood with all of us in the irreplaceable of architectural legacy, make a statement, and ensure that the non-compatible, non-contextual design is not allowed to be constructed in the heart of this postcard district. Thank you.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you for your comments.
MR. SAVAGE: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of this board. My name is Paul Savage. I
have law offices at 2555 Ponce de Leon Boulevard in Coral Gables, Florida. I'm here this morning representing Hotel Beach Associates, LLC, who are the owners of the iconic and contributing Delano Hotel. I'm required to recite that we are not part of the Delano Luxury Brands, as that is known, but we are the owners of that hotel and we maintain the signage and the nomenclature because it is not part of the contributing nature of the iconic hotel and we're happy to do so.

I'm handing some things out and I also have a Power Point. I'd like for the technical staff to go ahead and bring that up. And, also, I'd like to ask the chairman to go ahead and put the clock on, say, 15 minutes. I don't intend to take that time, but just so it's not beeping every three minutes, et cetera, if that's okay?

MR. FINGLASS: Hello. Thank you. First of all, welcome. It's nice to see you here today and I assure you everybody else had the time they needed and I'll be sure everyone is treated fairly, so you take your time.

MR. SAVAGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And if I did not have a friendly salutation to the board and to the chair, please let me go back and do that.

It's my pleasure to appear before you and I thank you for your service on this important board and for taking serious your charge, which I'm going to talk about a lot of detailed code issues as quickly as I can, but, overarching, you are the protectors of what we have here, which is something unique in all of the world, and whether you -- whether you enjoy it and appreciate it as a matter of public policy and just art, like people in the Miami-Dade Preservation League and others and you just love it and you do it without charging any fees, et cetera, that's great.

And then there's others, like my clients, who also love it, but they also have a business to run and they are very interested in keeping people literally from all over the world to come here to see this special sense of place and the unique place we have with the Art Deco, International, and other styles that are so famous here.

So, with that, I'd like to just go through some of my slides. I will commit to you that I will not belabor points that other people have said and so I don't want to tire the board out, but if we can go ahead and start clicking through the slides, I will make some commentary here.

This is, again, the postcard. We are in the
middle of the iconic postcard of hotels with the Delano, with the National. I wanted to make sure that I put on the record that my client, the owners of the Delano Hotel, are approximately 115 feet to the north of the subject site. We're just on the other side of the National. The National is the only thing that separates us. So we are two doors down, if you will.

But if you look at the existing and also the postcard views, we -- we are in the heart of the -what's known as the -- as the -- the postcard hotel district and -- and technically known as the architectural district and the historical district. And -- and this skyline as mentioned by Chairman Finglass has been preserved all these many years and we want to continue to do so.

If you can please move through the slides. Thank you.

This is a postcard concerning the terrace room, talking about overlooking the azure waters of the Atlantic Ocean, et cetera, and as our -- as Mr. Avdakov showed, we're -- we're endangered of being shadowed by the new tower, as well as bringing a crystalline disengaged modern residential condominium tower into the field of view, which we believe have no interaction with the community and -- and certainly
does not enhance the architectural and historic districts.

Next slide, please.
Again, not to belabor the point, but just side by side you can powerfully see the postcard with the -the modern tower behind it. That's one of the applicants renderings, and they like to say that, oh, look, you'd have to be in a -- in a, you know -- in a helicopter or -- or, you know, in some unusual place to be able to see we're going to hide it so well.

Well, the problem is is that may be true if you're a pedestrian on Collins Avenue and you have this very severe angle of attack in terms of your line of sight, but if you go ahead and walk back towards this building on 17 th -- where we are now, we could walk out the front door, take a look to the left, to the east out here by the bus stop, and you would see the skyline and you can -- you can see the top of our property, the Delano, you can see the top of the cupola, the iconic National, and you can just barely see the top of the existing Ritz-Carlton, formerly DiLido structure, and right there is that hole where that's going to be, and you're going to see it, maybe not as a pedestrian on Collins, but certainly from the rest of the City, just a block away, et cetera. So we
really think that it will constitute what the Chair characterizes as a finger in the sky.

Go ahead to the next slide and I'll talk about why I think the Certificate of Appropriateness should be denied today by this board.

We believe it's incompatible as a matter of height. It has no -- our -- our property, the National, are substantially less high. The 200 feet will loom over the contributing structures. As I mentioned, the modern glaze tower is incompatible as a matter of architectural relationship to the nearby contributing structures.

There are some very thorny zoning questions open as to the transfer of FAR under a 2019 ordinance that discussed the ability to go to 200 feet, and I think it's already been established by the chair, but I want to reiterate very strongly because the applicant has gone through this community saying that they have a zoning entitlement of 200 feet as a right and love to say that this is a squeaky clean application with absolutely zero variances.

I will get to that -- the variance part in a second, but the first part of how they're entitled to 200 feet is an incorrect statement. The code says that you can go to 50 feet in this district, and then
the 2019 amendment came along. It said you may go between 50 and 200, but the word may, very important. All of our cases and the code and everybody knows that shall is mandatory and may is permissive. So if they had it as of right, they could go straight to building permit.

That's why we're here today and it's your job and duty in charge to stand as a defender of these -- of these districts to see, well, should we let them or not? They're not entitled to it as a right and so when they start talking about it as that's an assumed piece of the conversation, well, you've already sort of lost the game because you're talking about, well, you know, where are you going to put it and things like that, they do not have this entitlement as a right.

Further, they rely on an amenity bonus, a hotel amenity bonus of 20,000 square feet that is all -- all the -- all the available FARs going up into the new tower and that hotel amenity bonus has been strictly enforced in this jurisdiction, that it has to be new hotel amenities, people -- other people have applied for it and been, you know, taken to task. They -- it has to be for new hotel amenities. That's the legislative intent of that section.

So now I have an obligation with all the available FAR going up into the tower. It's not allowed for. It's not permitted to be used for new condos. It's hotel amenity bonus. So that's an issue that's pending with Mr. Mooney, it's still open, and those issues are critical because as Ms. Liebman note -- stated in the beginning, these questions will change the massing of the structure and the FAR and the height, so we need an answer.

I will take a little break and let you know that under the provisions that -- that this board operates under, the factors of the Certificate of Appropriateness, one of compatibility, which we all know about, two is a -- is a more refined definition of how you get into compatibility and certain subfactors, but three, that $I$ want to draw your attention to under 118-564 is the examination of the drawings to make sure that they're consistent with both historic preservation concerns and the zoning district.

It says the Historic Preservation Board and Planning Department shall review plans and to test their compliance for, $A$, the location of all of the buildings, the drives, the parking spaces, and B, most importantly, the dimensions of all buildings,
structures, the setbacks, parking spaces, floor area ratio.

That's one of my questions, the height and the requirements, quote, of the underlying zoning district.

So while you may not be on this -- obviously this board's charge is the protection of historic resources and you're not sitting here with an Excel sheet doing floor area ratio calculations, which I couldn't do I don't believe either; however, you need to evaluate those items or have your professional staff carefully evaluate them for you because they will change the nature of the project and how high it can be, how big it can be, and where it can be sited.

So those are critical issues. I don't think this board -- and I want to say this very conf- -- very carefully and with every compliment to every member who is working on this board, but to be -- but to have the information that you need to be able to make a competent -- and I -- when I say the word competent, I don't mean your -- I don't question your competence. I'm saying to be a -- to have evidence in front of you as quasi-judicial judges and officials, you've got to know these -- these -- these zoning questions and have them confirmed.

Okay. That's the zoning diatribe, and I appreciate you listening. Let me just keep going through the slides here. I will talk about the compatible height and why it's incompatible.

This is a photo simulation from the beach side of the proposed tower. You can see that it's -- we have our iconic structures and from the beach side here you have a -- you know, the building is being complimented, but it's a building that could be in Sunny Isles Beach or another location. It doesn't have a relationship here.

Next slide, please.
The applicant, you know, likes to talk about, well, you know, from an east/west perspective it's only -- it's not very wide. It won't have that much of an impact visually. But look at the north and south. This is their drawing that's at the bottom of the north and south -- north elevation, rather, and that's a very broad and -- building.

Next slide, please.
We did some massing studies. This is also from the beach of the new tower. Also massive in our estimation and also impugning the architectural resources surrounding it.

Next slide, please.

Some -- some other photo simulations here. This is from our fourth floor deck where we're going to look out and see this tower, and, as the chair says, it's not going to be as crystalline and see-through as that shows.

If you can go, please, to the next one.
This is also from our rooftop, you can see at the bottom rendering. Also, we're going to be -- our patrons are going to be experiencing this new tower instead of the Ritz-Carlton and the National and the other contributing structures.

Now, the next slide is important, if you can please go to it, and that is depicting -- well, I got ahead of myself.

So, yeah, the applicant talks about the tower is disengaged. It is not appropriate as a term of art in scale. It's not appropriate to the design aesthetics and the massing relative to the neighborhood under the postcard trio, the National, Delano, and Ritz Plaza, formerly the DiLido, and then it diminishes the architectural integrity of both the architectural and the historic districts.

If you go to the next slide, you can see this business of the -- the cantilevering over the north cabana wing of the Ritz, and this is actually going to
get into another reason why $I$ think we have a legal and zoning problem today and that is that the -- the building is depicted on the right as cantilevering over the top of the existing north wing of the Ritz and from that rendering you can see on the right there's a pool tucked in there and that's, as the applicant told us, that's going to be a pool exclusive to the residential residents of the new condo.

But if you -- if you could -- if we were able to go around and get a drawing from the southern elevation looking into that pool area, after the pool is a fitness center, gym. Okay. Keep in mind that whole area existing now is the roof of the cabanas, and as the -- as Deborah Tackett explained to us, the preservation officer explained to us in the beginning, the code prohibits rooftop additions in this district.

The code prohibits rooftop additions in this district, and what we have today is the pool, and I'm sure I'll get some argument, well, the pool is not an addition and that's probably -- that's probably right, but the gym which you don't see under there but it's tucked in there, there's a whole new fifth floor. And I don't think it's inaccurate to say, oh, it's not a problem because they're demolishing an existing floor. No, that's not true.

They're building on top of the roof of the north wing of the cabana. They're adding a rooftop addition, it's particularly the -- the gym, and after that there's about 150 feet of a new tower, which also boggles the mind as to why that is not a rooftop addition. I think they're relying on this cantilevering business, but there's a lot on the roof and rooftop additions are prohibited, and it even goes so far as to say that you can't get a variance permit, even if you wanted to and tried to ask for it. So on that ground, I think there's a significant problem. If you go to the next slide, please. This is, again, another -- a drone shot, I meant to say. The applicant says, well, you've got to get in a drone to see this. Again, if -- if you -- if you come back from it -- I hear the beeping. I'm just going to go ahead and click through some of these. I think others have established the view issue. If you can go to the next, please.

MR. FINGLASS: Just a couple more minutes.
MR. SAVAGE: Pardon me?
MR. FINGLASS: Just a few more minutes.
MR. SAVAGE: Yes, sir. I will go through these quickly. If you can -- okay. So this slide here, we talk about the crystalline tower, if you look at the
right-hand rendering, which is the applicant's rendering, that's not so much the glass as I think it's more of a realistic view of what's going to be there, but, you know, that could be -- that could be in Sarasota, Florida. What -- is that what our -- is that what our patrons are going to come and take a picture of when they come to iconic Miami Beach? That has no relationship to the -- to the historic district.

If you can please go through -- I guess go to Slide 18. Again, there's some more visual impacts.

That's the proposed Raleigh and Shore Club. By the way, just to touch on what Mr. Avdakov said, we don't want to get into a condo canyon here that is filled with towers that you could walk from Sunny Isles Beach to Palm Beach to -- you know, to Jacksonville Beach and see glass condominiums on the beach. That's not what we're here for.

If you can go to the next slide.
Again, they -- they're not entitled to the 200 necessarily. That's what we're figuring out here.

Go to the next slide, please, so I can conclude.
We don't think the massing or the materials are appropriate under the factors and -- and the modern glass we believe is -- is -- does not show
sensitively.
Go to the next slide, please.
This is from my expert report that enumerated the factors that you consider and that it's not satisfied. By the way, one of the words in here is enhance. I want to bring that out. In other words, a lot of these kinds of hearings are, you know, is it going to impact adversely? Is it going to be okay? This is one of the few codes I've seen where it says, no, it's not just will it do harm. Does it bring positive enhancement? And I think under that language, we cannot say that it brings positive enhancement.

Go to the next slide, please.
I think, again, there's -- this is the -- this is the -- the properties are bifurcated now legally. The covenant is going to be very important. I think that should be done first and not at the end, at the time of building permit, which is a difficult activity.

Next slide, please.
Again, we need to know about how the FAR is being parsed across these two sites. I've written Mr. Mooney that I don't think that they can be. I don't think we can upzone the Sagamore site without a charter referendum.

Next slide, please.

MR. PASKAL: Excuse me, Mr. Savage?
MR. SAVAGE: Yeah.
MR. PASKAL: We've got a lot of public comments. Can we wrap it up in two minutes say?

MR. SAVAGE: Yeah. Yeah. Sure. And this is a cut out of -- of what I'm asking Mr. Mooney to determine.

And I will -- I will conclude, because I know when I've been signaled that $I$ need to say the magic words of in conclusion, and I do want to thank the chair for all the additional time and I -- you've all listened to me with rapt attention, which is more than I could ask for.

So I'm going to thank you one more time. I will be here for any additional questions or my friend Alfredo may have things to say and we may go back and forth, but this will conclude my -- my presentation.

I just want to conclude by saying that there are many zoning determinations going to FAR -cantilevering legality -- all of that needs to be hashed out before you can make a decision. I -- in my opinion, secondly, putting all that aside, the massing, the glass, all of that does not meet the factors; it does not -- it does not enhance the area; and for all of those above reasons, the factors of the
code as established by Mr. Avdakov and myself and Mr. Gibbs, who's going to -- who's going to have some remarks also, it does not meet the factors and I urge this board to, please, deny this application at this time.

Thank you so much and I appreciate your time. MR. FINGLASS: Thanks for the input. Continuing with public comment.

MR. GIBBS: Okay. This is -- my name is Tucker Gibbs, law offices at 3835 Utopia Court in Coconut Grove, and, as you know, I'm here representing the National Hotel, which exists right in the middle of this -- of the Ocean Drive-Collins Avenue Historic District.

This Art Deco gem has been owned and operated by Delfine Drake and her family since 2007. The National reflects the Drake family's love for all things Art Deco and this respect for the Art Deco style and visual arts, architecture, and design is why the National has taken the extraordinary step -- this is a very rare thing for a business to do, as you know -to object to this particular application.

If approved, this proposed tower would be a jarring, out of scale, modern building that would come -- become the focal point of this important block
of the predominantly Art Deco Historic District, and I say predominantly Art Deco because that's what the designation report for this district specifically says. It would detract and diminish the architectural context and importance of the contributing buildings in the surrounding area, as well as the district itself.

There are several points to remember when you consider this application -- and I'm trying to finish my presentation in about seven minutes -- the applicant has failed -- first, the applicant has failed to meet its burden to show that it complies with the Certificate of Appropriateness criteria, and I'm going to bring up three of them. Three? Yes, three of them.

The Secretary of Interior's Standard 9, which is included in your code, it requires that new development shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. So I'm talking about the property, and that property includes the Sagamore and you all know the size of the Sagamore. It's approximately 61,000 square feet, 72 feet in height. That's what it is. So this project needs -- this tower needs to be
compatible with the massing and size of that.
Criteria Number 3 requires that the proposed structure is compatible with the environment and adjacent structures and enhances the appearance of the surrounding properties. Okay. So look at the surrounding properties, contributing properties, non-contributing properties, and the Sagamore itself as well, and you need make that determination if this is compatible with the appearance of the surrounding properties, if it enhances that, and enhances is something very difficult. You have to make it better if you're going to enhance it.

So think about this: How is this 200 foot tower 120,000 square feet in -- in square footage, 17 stories, how is that going to address making this -enhancing the appearance, and criteria $3 E$ which requires new building to be reviewed with particular attention to the relationship to the surrounding neighborhood, the impact around preserving the historic character of the neighborhood and district, as well as the continuous -- contiguous and adjacent buildings and lands.

And I had one more; I apologize. And criteria 3J which requires new structures to have an orientation and massing which is sensitive and compatible with the
building site, as well as the surrounding area.
Those are basic issues that you all have to decide. That's what your code requires. So I'm going to go back and tell you and remind you, the 200 foot is not an entitlement. It's part of your review as the certificate of appropriateness if it's compatible and all of the rest of that. Any statement -- excuse me. And then just because the staff opines in its report, which I know you all have looked at and you've seen this before, but just -- just because the staff opines that an application satisfies a particular certificate of appropriateness criteria, it does not necessarily make it so.

Any statement made by staff or the applicant must be supported by relevant facts that relate to these, as to the assertion of an opinion being made, according to the Florida courts. Without supporting facts, the word satisfied is nothing more than a baseless opinion. There are no facts in the word satisfy. The historic presentation -- preservation compatibility regulations require compatibility with the subject site, the other properties, and the district.

The staff reports analysis section presents opinion with no corroborating facts which support the
assertions made in that provision. And I'm going to focus on that. It's on Page 11 of the staff report. Staff asserts that the proposed tower's contemporary design shows a high level of compatibility with its immediate neighborhoods. Think about that.

I know what they're talking about, you do too, because they said it, and that was the modern architecture of the three contributing properties on the Sagamore property, on the Ritz/Sagamore property, but that's not the -- that's not the only immediate neighbor. But that's an issue because the report presents no facts showing compatibility with the vastly smaller Sagamore Hotel, which is the immediate neighbor, and its adjacent and nearby neighbors as required by criteria $2 \mathrm{~B}, 2 \mathrm{D}$, and 3 E .

So nowhere in this report is there any analysis or mention of the height, massing, and scale of the proposed tower. Go look at your staff report where it's relative to the structures on site, adjacent to the site, or within the surrounding community. No discussion, no facts, no analysis, nor is there any explanation how the proposed tower would be appropriate and compatible with the environment and the adjacent structures, and as I said before, as everybody else has said before, and actually enhance
and make better the appearance of the surrounding properties, that includes my client's property, that includes the Delano, that includes the Sagamore, that includes everything that surrounds this property and in the district.

So for these reasons, including those set forth in my letter to the board, the reports and testimony of Mr . Avdakov, the documents and arguments by Mr. Savage, and the Delano, the National Hotel strongly, strongly urges you to deny this application. Thank you very much.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you very much, Tucker, for that insightful presentation.

Who would like to go next?
MS. STREITFELD: Good morning, everyone.
Rachel Streitfeld. My law firm is Bright Side Legal, 1455 North Treasure Drive in North Bay Village. I'm here on behalf of the Decoplage Condominium Association this morning, and we, like Mr. Gibbs and Mr. Savage, are opposed to this application and would respectfully request you to deny the application. The residents at the Decoplage are unlike the National and the Delano, obviously. They're residents of this neighborhood. They live just across Lincoln Road from the proposed residential tower, and there
are four reasons, four concerns why the Decoplage residents are opposed to this application.

First is the disingenuous parking analysis. There is no additional parking being added for a brand new residential tower. There are about I think 247 spaces today. The reduction is going to be to 236. The underlying zoning requirements for parking should be considered in your decision today, and for units that are above 1,200 square feet, two parking spaces are required. So for 50 residential units, they should be adding 100 parking spaces.

Now, mind you, the Ritz-Carlton is still going to be running a full scale hotel operation here with staff, with guests, and so on and so forth. And these new Ritz-Carlton residences are going to be lived in by folks who have cars. Probably more than one or two cars, considering the caliber that this development is proposing. So to have 50 new residential units with no parking is going to exacerbate what is already a nuisance at the intersection of Lincoln and Collins.

Speaking of a nuisance at Lincoln and Collins, the second concern that the residents at the Decoplage have is with the loading. So the only loading for this site is also at Lincoln Road, right across the street from the Decoplage Condominium Association, and

I would show you video today, but, unfortunately, my residents didn't get the videos to me on time so I don't have anything to show you, but everyone knows what it sounds like when an 18-wheeler backs up. That beep, beep, beep, beep, beep, that beeping starts at 6:00 in the morning. You have pedestrians, we have bikers, $I$ roller blade, the residents are walking their dogs and there's a major traffic circulation issue at the end of Lincoln Road where it meets the beach. And so if we're going to have the existing loading operation, plus 100 -- 100 cars or however many cars and the addition of this residential tower with all of these beautiful amenities, something needs to be done about the loading, so that's the second concern.

I do want to endorse -- or adopt, rather, the arguments that have been made by the attorneys speaking before me, both Mr. Savage, Mr. Gibbs, and the expert. I want to adopt their arguments and I certainly don't need to add anything to what they already said.

My last concern -- actually, there are two, and -- and one of them may not have been a concern before June 24 th, but on June 24 th we saw how neighboring development, especially when you're
driving piles into the porous limestone that is the foundation of our island, can have unintended impacts and reverberating consequences on neighboring properties, and I'm sure that the owners of the Ritz and the Sagamore are probably concerned about this as well so maybe that's something we have in common, but we are concerned about geotechnical testing and issues related to the construction of such a major structure adjacent to all of these contributing structures from a geotechnical standpoint.

And the last point before you deliberate is the sea level rise and climate change concerns. Now, there may be, again, unintended consequences, but we know that for every one foot of sea level rise, we get one foot of ground rise, and we are concerned that where today you have open space -- when the residents of the Decoplage on the north side look out, when they look north, it's uninterrupted dunes and mangroves and open space where storm water percolates down. We're worried about erosion of the dunes, pervious -- not enough pervious space, and basically a massive footprint where what once was a significant amount of open space.

So for the sea level rise and climate change concerns, geotechnical concerns -- I also -- one of my
residents at Decoplage has made reference to the erosion of the road bed on Collins and Lincoln and how there have been concerns with the Transportation Department in the past.

So for all of these reasons, we're asking you to oppose this project so we can have an historic block that remains sensitive to all of the concerns that are at play here. Thank you.

MR. FINGLASS: Well said. Thank you very much.
Would someone else like to speak?
Hi, how are you?
MR. WILSON: Hi. My name is Thomas Wilson, I am one of the owners in the Decoplage, and I had sent you in October a petition to deny the application and a follow-up a few days ago.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you.
MR. WILSON: I will make it short here because you have heard many arguments. But we owners at the Decoplage will look directly at this tall building. The building itself, if you see it alone it's nice, but if you have it directly in front of your nose, and it is really under your nose, it's only 20 feet away, it goes up 200 feet. It's too much. It's as if you have a block in front of your nose, and that you don't like of course.

Ms. Streitfeld mentioned this, we have concerns regarding the Surfside disaster again. We have also concerns that the traffic will increase. Keep in mind these residences are for rich people who have not only one car, likely they have three cars. So -- so the traffic will increase, and on the top of the increases, $I$ don't know if you're aware, the Sagamore is applying with -- with the Planning Commission for an entertainment application for 300 outside people for parties and the like, plus 400 inside. That means 700 people to have parties at the Sagamore. Can you even imagine the traffic?

I don't know if this application will be denied or not, but the application is there. In the application they're saying it's only for the time until they start the construction of the tower, but if the tower is done, you can imagine that a new expanded Ritz will do the same.

So we at the Decoplage have concerns and we'd really like that you deny the application.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you very much. Who else would like to speak?

MS. TACKETT: Mr. Chair, we do have some members of the public on Zoom.

MR. FINGLASS: Oh, we have someone here.

Good morning.
SPEAKER: Good morning, Jack and board members. You all have a letter from me from the Collins Park Neighborhood Association, so I'm not going to belabor the point. We support it because it goes along with all the projects that are going along on Collins Avenue and ones that are still coming, but I'd like to talk about other things that have been said today, and I'm obviously for it. But how tall is the Decoplage? Have you looked down the road at the Setai? How tall is the Setai? How tall is -- is -- is the Shelborne?

I mean, we're not looking at something that's going to be a huge impact. And all of them talk about postcards. I have a postcard collection. It's the history of the Miami Beach. When was the last time any of you sent a postcard. I don't send any? I collect them. It shows the history of Miami Beach, but Miami Beach is always going to be changing and -and we have to preserve what we have, which I feel they've done with historic parts of the building, but you also have to be prepared for change.

If you're looking at a hotel room that rents for $\$ 100$ or less versus a hotel room that rents for $\$ 1,000$ or more, look at the difference in the clientele. Look at the problems that we have in other areas of
the city -- which we won't go into right now at the moment, but you all know what I'm talking about -- you have to look at the fact that we do not have enough residences for people to buy and live in this neighborhood. We certainly don't in the Collins Park neighborhood, and this is just one block south.

If you're trying to improve the image of Miami Beach and bring the upscale people that we all want to Miami Beach, you need to really look at this project, look at the fact, at least according to what I've heard, there is no variations, no -- no asking for changes or whatever. I think that this project is a real win for Miami Beach and you should seriously say yes. Thank you.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you. Daniel?

MR. CIRALDO: Hi. Good morning, members of the board. Daniel Ciraldo with Miami Design Preservation League, and for the public watching, we publicized all of our positions in advance and it's available on the MDPL.org blog, so $I$ won't belabor any of those points. Our overall -- first of all, we want to thank the applicants. You know, one problem we have sometimes here is people, you know, kind of, you know, disagreeing on things, but $I$ think we all agree that
they've been great stewards to their properties at the Ritz and the Sagamore. Just in the last month I was at an event at the Sagamore, the beautiful brunch that they all do, and I was also at the National for a wonderful event, so they're both amazing properties and -- and the Delano, it's really just an iconic view.

So we do think they're acting in good faith with the applicant because the commission did change the zoning. You know, at the time $I$ think we weren't really maybe fully aware of what the impact would be, but we were always told that it -- the final say is at the HP board. So it does put all of you in a tough situation. And I agree with some of the comments. That's the whole reason we're always here and we are spending hours, because you all are given that power by the community to decide what is compatible and what is not.

And so our concerns remain about the overall impact of the new tower on this site, both its positioning, its massing, its height, and the potential impacts on that. There was some talk from the attorneys that there is other zoning language that might preclude you all from making a decision, but actually I disagree. I think you all have enough
information and you have the certificate of appropriateness criteria to decide whether or not you believe that it fits or not.

About a month or two ago an audio tape was leaked where a developer said that the HP board can never decide anything. They're always so wishy washy. So I urge all of you to be decisive. Make a decision. If there are five votes for it, vote for it. If there aren't, go that way. But let's -- let's make the decision, let's move forward, and show that $H P$ is judicious and sticks to the criteria.

Thank you.
MR. FINGLASS: I don't think anyone's ever accused me of being wishy-washy.

MR. CIRALDO: Probably true. Thanks.
MR. FINGLASS: Okay. Anyone else?
Hi. Come on up.
MR. DOSA: I will be quick. My name is Frank Dosa. I live at 950 Brickell Bay Drive in Miami. I used to live in Miami Beach when I came here 20 years ago. I had taught in the Miami Beach Preservation League classes. I was very invested in Miami Beach.

This project, the architect spent a lot of time showing how it will not pervert the historical -historical value of this block. He spent a lot of
time saying that because he knows that it is actually perverting the historical value of this block. We don't have so many blocks in Miami Beach right now that are still original. If you go a little bit south you're going to see the Decoplage, which is not really contributing.

So I think that this massive tower -- and even if the architect says that the tower is very narrow on one side, that if the tower is going to be very narrow on one side that means it's going to be very large and massive on the other side and people are not going to look at this tower from only one specific angle, they are going to be walking around.

I think this tower doesn't have any justification and doesn't enhance this block and I think that this vote should be denied, this application.

I tried to be short.
MR. FINGLASS: Thank you. You did a good job. Thank you.

Anyone else. And thank you for being patient. You've been sitting patiently all morning.

MS. BONIG: That's okay. My name is Carol Bonig. I live -- I grew up in New Jersey. I know all about Florida. I grew up in Florida, Miami Beach, with the romanticism of the historic district of Miami Beach.

Moved to Switzerland, bought a property at the Decoplage --

MR. FINGLASS: Could you come forward? We can't hear you. We won't hold it against you.

MS. BONIG: I grew up knowing about the historic district of Miami Beach and being fascinated by it and enjoying it when $I$ can come down here and see it. I moved to Europe, and then eventually $I$ was able to buy a property at the Decoplage, which $I$ totally enjoy this -- this ambiance in the historic district, and I know living in Europe, living in New Jersey, going to study in Arizona and everything, Miami Beach, the historic district has such a fascination for the world, and that's why they come here, and I -- I'm married to an architect so I totally understand why you would want to build a beautiful tower, but I think beautiful towers belong in certain places, and if you've got a designated district, then you should keep it a designated district because that's what people treasure in a property, in a -- in a city.

I've seen too many cities turn into Benidorm, and -- and just tall towers everywhere, and there's a good section for that in Brickell, a good section for that in many other places in Florida, in Miami, and just consider that when you're thinking about the
acceptance of this tower. That's all.
MR. FINGLASS: Thank you very much. I don't see anyone else.

MS. TACKETT: We have some speakers on Zoom.
MR. FINGLASS: Should we take this lady first?
MS. DRAY: Hello. Good morning.
MR. FINGLASS: Good morning.
MS. DRAY: Thank you for listening. I am the owner of the National Hotel. This is not about being the owner of the National Hotel that $I$ am here right now.

I am a very conservative woman and I have the chance and we all have the chance to live in a beautiful city that is known all around the world, and every time that $I$ am in Europe, you know, $I$ am so happy to see how they are describing Miami Beach and how everybody wants to come and to see our beautiful city. So I am very appreciative of my neighbor because they are very, very professional and I appreciate them very much, but, you know, we are here to preserve our historical heritage.

It's about DNA. It's not about money and profitability, and when you were asking why a 200 feet tower, it's about profitability. So I understand that, you know, there is business people that are here
to make money, but not in this designated historical district of Miami Beach. Please, I am asking you to reject the project.

Thank you very much.
MR. FINGLASS: Thank you very much.
Can we take Tanya next?
MS. TACKETT: Yes. I see Tanya Bhatt on Zoom.
MR. KALLERGIS: Hi, Tanya. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. BHATT: Yes, I do.
MR. KALLERGIS: Thank you.
MS. BHATT: Good morning. I would ask just for a little bit of lenience. I'm feeling a little under the weather, which means $I$ can't do in rapid fire the question-response the way I normally do, but $I$ would just ask your forbearance for the opportunity to get my points out, but $I$ will be as concise and quick as possible.

I would like to state for the record I'm not here in any official capacity for any of the boards or the organizations upon which I serve. I am here as an almost 20 year resident and property owner in Miami Beach and a passionate advocate for preserving and evolving what we have in a responsible way.

I would like to compliment the owners of the proposed project, and as others have stated, I think this is a well-intended project and the stewardship has been excellent. My compliments to that. And to Kobi Karp who had a really fantastic presentation. It's so interesting to see how much detail and thought goes into the explaining of projects when the other side has an opportunity. So I thank you all for that.

I would like to -- I'm not going to rehash a lot of the points that have been made. I will say that there are many with which I agree. I think a really problematic issue, as has been discussed by several speakers before me, is the fact that when you are on the beach walk and on the beach and swimming off the beach, you will see this tower, this current tower in this iteration, and that is not really a viable proposition in my view.

Mayor Gilbert has talked at length about reimaging the City and helping to incentivize different kinds of -- of rehabilitation and means with the caveat that it will not affect the sightlines and the views from people who come here to enjoy those sightlines, those views that is Miami Beach, and I use that phrase very carefully because it is not a museum
that only pays homage to architectural styles in the past. It also embraces new architectural styles and I think what makes it so special is the ability to mill them together to elevate the game of the entire area. If you look at the 1111 Lincoln parking garage, that's one great example.

This project could be a really cool project if the new tower proposed did not overshadow everything in this neighborhood, and to say that we can't see it from Lincoln Road is immaterial in my view. When you look at the GMC website or anybody using Miami Beach to market their product or brand, one of the primary images that is used is that image of -- that image of that stretch of historic architecture. The Boucher Brothers chairs and rentals don't even make it into those photographs because it's such a stunningly iconic vista of what makes it so special.

The World Congress on Art Deco, which is a global organization, has had their biannual events here a couple of times, and, in fact, is coming here again in 2022, and all of that leads to elevate our profile with tourists who come to appreciate what we have to offer. I think it would be really hard to explain why we're allowing a building of this magnitude smack in the center of this historic and protected district.

It doesn't add anything in the size of what it is being proposed. I understand the economic development but it's a daunting task, but $I$ also understand there are a number of questions about what is actually permissible. There -- it shouldn't be concluded at this hearing until all of the details are worked out so that the best possible project to do the most for the City of Miami Beach in general and for this district in particular for the residents who choose to live here, who -- for the visitors who dream of coming here can really get to experience the full majesty of what exists here and that shouldn't be chipped away by towers that are tremendously out of scale.

So I'm happy to answer any questions of anybody at any future time, but $I$ don't want to overstay my welcome. So I thank you for your forbearance.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you. Thank you, Tanya, very much for your comments.

MS. TACKETT: Mr. Chair, our next speaker online is Julie Isaacson.

MR. KALLERGIS: Hi, Julie. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

MS. ISAACSON: Good morning.
MR. KALLERGIS: Do you swear that the testimony
you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

MS. ISAACSON: I do.
MR. KALLERGIS: Thank you. You have three minutes, although I think there's an echo on your end. MR. FINGLASS: Julie?

MS. TACKETT: Julie, you went on mute. If you could unmute yourself and disconnect any other audio that is streamed into the meeting or turn off your television, that would be helpful.

Okay. Mr. Chair, while we get Julie situated -MS. ISAACSON: Hi. Sorry about that. Good morning, everybody.

MR. FINGLASS: Make it quick, Julie.
MS. ISAACSON: Okay. I will.
I love the hotels. I am in -- I'm -- I've been living in Miami Beach for 29 years. I've been in the travel industry for 40 years. My primary clientele is luxury, media, and celebrity clientele. I love the -well, $I$ love all of the hotels that were mentioned -the Ritz-Carlton, the Sagamore, the National. I truly appreciate the -- all of the owners giving great consideration to historic preservations and to appreciate the buildings that they have and I want them to know how much I appreciate that.

However, I am completely -- I'm against the big tower for all of the reasons that everybody has mentioned. I don't understand why a tower needs to be added. I'm also against additional residences in that area because I feel that we have too many luxury residential towers that are not filled with residents. They have transient people, transient people that own properties all over the word. They're not here all of the time and we really don't need any more of that. I feel we need more affordable housing, more affordable housing and more workforce housing.

And I also object to the environmental impact that this is going to have on our dunes and destruction down there on a very delicate part of our environment and it just makes absolutely no sense to me to add another tower and then to have construction and for them to destroy the dunes -- or I don't know if destroy them but definitely impact them, and then to add luxury residences we don't need and also destroying the skyline of the postcard.

And yes to whoever said that previously, I do send postcards. So I don't object to the whole -- I don't object to the whole project, but I do object to the building of a new structure.

MR. FINGLASS: Okay. Thank you very much, Julie.

MS. TACKETT: Our next speaker Johann.
MR. KALLERGIS: Hi, Johann. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. MORG: Hi. Yes, I do.
Johann Morg, resident of -- of Flamingo Park. I'm sorry I'm in two meetings at once. I hope this comment hasn't been made in support of the comment that we don't want canyons of towers. I want to remind us that our beach up to about 20th Street will soon be the donor beach for up beach replenishment, and having spoken with my husband yesterday, I can confirm that down in about 8th Street we will lose about a third of the width of our beach. I think we're happy to donate, but my point is from the point of view of those on the beach, these towers will appear to move even more.

Thank you.
MR. FINGLASS: Thank you very much.
MS. TACKETT: I see no more speakers on Zoom.
MR. FINGLASS: Okay. So we're closing public comment and moving on to board's deliberation.

MR. KALLERGIS: I believe, Mr. Chairman, I think the applicant asked for a few minutes of rebuttal.

MR. GONZALEZ: Hello. Yes.

MR. FINGLASS: I'm sorry. Welcome back.
MR. GONZALEZ: Mr. Chair, yes, I would like to have some time for rebuttal, given we have had a very lengthy public comment and many questions to respond to.

MR. FINGLASS: Good. We eagerly await your return.

MR. GONZALEZ: I do have some boards as well.
Mr. Chair and board, I understand you heard a lot of issues, a lot of discussion over the last public comment, and I would like to respond in part and we've made some rebuttal reports as well to shorten my discussion, but I wanted to start off by discussing how this site was always intended to be.

After it was a Seiberling Estate, Igor Polevitzky designed a master plan to try to create the first convention center hotel in Miami Beach.

Unfortunately, because of the lack of funding, it was never realized, and you'll see from images and different historic research reports that Igor had proposed a tower almost at the same location we are, we're proposing one today.

And we understand the value of the rear facade. The land owner regulations clearly have us evaluate the impact on contributing buildings from the street
side, from Collins Avenue, we're calling it that -we're calling it the person across the street, and what are those -- what -- what views it impacts.

Clearly the code and the standards do not contemplate that there will be invisible buildings or additions added anywhere within the city, including historic districts, so we painstakingly took time to minimize the primary view so it wouldn't be an impact upon the historic -- integrity of the historic buildings from Collins Avenue, and how to minimize the view of the rear addition, and the rear additions are what you typically see in any project along the City of Miami Beach that come before this board -towers regarding in the rear, whether it's a cabana, whether it's a building, whatever it may be, and it does have views and -- and it can be seen from the beach walk, but we are -- we painstakingly designed the building in order to minimize impacts also from the beach side.

There was a lot of talk about views. We understand that views are -- and shadows are not protected by -- by the code, by law, by the standards, but I did still want to walk through some of those views that both the Delano, the National, the Decoplage, everyone seem to have raised, and I do have
a few exhibit boards just to kind of give you some context as far as how the views are or are not impacted as you are being led to believe it is.

So we ran some shadows some studies showing what the views would be from the hotel units at both the Delano and the National Hotel. Actually our team, Kobi's office, was invited to go to the National and go to specific rooms and take photographs from those rooms and see what kind of impact it may or may not have. I will tell you from the National, at worse case, at worse case in the National Hotel they would have 86 percent of their ocean views preserved. That's not every unit. Actually, most are greater than 86 percent. We went the most conservative route, looking at the worst angles, and it had an impact of 14 percent. So we're not talking about removing ocean views from the neighboring property, a site reduction.

In the National Hotel -- the Delano Hotel, we came up -- came up with a similar analysis. You have over 77 percent of their ocean views will remain today with our tower. So there is minor impact. I'm not saying we're building invisible towers, but $I$ want to make it clear to the board that what are their actual impacts to an ocean view, which every building wants protected. And then when it gets to the Decoplage,
which is, we all agree, the wall of the area, their ocean views from which ever unit you're in, they will have the same ocean view they have today. So with our tower or without our tower, because our tower is set back over 300 feet from the Decoplage, their ocean views will not be changed.

So I do know that you also talk about the views to the north. I want to be clear that any structure creates an impediment to the views to the north at any site. Actually, when the Decoplage just demolished Carl Fisher's house to put a 182 foot wall to the east and west of their property, they closed what we talked about, that postcard view. So today, if you're at the Ritz-Carlton, the DiLido Hotel, which pre-dated the Decoplage, they had no south view except for the Decoplage, and building south of the Decoplage had no view of the area we're discussing for that same reason.

So we took our consideration in trying to put in the smallest footprint, and that's why the value of whether they have a larger scale building or a smaller scale building, where it still preserves as much of the views, even though that's not a matter of right, to the north as we could.

I also wanted to talk about the shadow. There's
been a concern, a concern about the impacts of shadows. Yes, I -- do we cast some shadows at the Delano and the National? We do. You saw all these images in the various presentations about a very sunny, open Delano and National. While they use their historic postcards back in the day when all of those areas were open and it was a very sun drenched backyard, I challenge anyone to go there today and find that level of sun at any time without any tower. If you look at their towers -- their sites today, they have created this shadow light experience, so it's unfair to characterize our proposed tower would eliminate their sun.

Would we contribute some to the shadows that they already have on their property? We would. In the case of the National, we do add to their shadows that they already have on their pool about six months a year. We don't completely engulf their property in shadow at any given time, and at the -- and $I$ just took these images from December at 12:00. You can see the shadows, but you can also see all of the vegetation, how they have -- and they're right, their choice, over the years, both the National and Delano chose to close out their rear and add substantial shade into their site, unlike their early 1950s or

1960 post that had just sun, concrete, pool, and chairs. That's not what you have today.

So I wanted to make a very clear comparison that, yes, we do add some shadows on both properties. We're just contributing to the shadows that they already created for themselves.

There was talk about endangering the dunes, the wildlife, the beach. This project doesn't cast a shadow onto the beach until 5:00, and I'm looking at December, which is our worst time. I mean, today we're in December. It will be sunset, what, at 5:05? The sun sets early. But, nonetheless, our shadows onto the beach at no time of the year start encroaching to the beach walk before the beach until 5:00. So you do have a full day of sun at the beach that would not create an impediment to visitors, tourists, marine life, or even the dunes.

So I wanted to get rid of those and put these up. I want to shorten this up. Sorry about that. It is not my intent to try to kill my client, so I apologize for that.

But -- so we talk -- there's a lot of discussion about this postcard view and you've heard backward and forward the postcard view continues to change, whether it's from the ocean, whether it's from Collins. The
issue with the postcard view in your discussions with any of the stakeholders, the postcard view originated from what you would see from Collins, from the New World Symphony when you're on their outside terrace looking back at the properties, and I submit to you that I noticed that one thing, the Ritz Plaza, the Delano, the National, that's your postcard view. The Ritz-Carlton as a box at 154 feet has always served as your frame, your southern frame of your postcard view, and by adding a 200 foot tower primarily behind that and the -- and the Sagamore, you're not eliminating or negatively taking away that postcard view you have today. So I think that should be noted.

I want -- you know, and to restate, there were quotes about how it's about light and air. When he built these hotels and other architects built those hotels, it was all about the sun but there had been an evolution where there is a combination of light and shadows. As I had said, you go to either the Delano or the Sagamore -- or, I'm sorry, the Delano or the National, you do find a lot of overbearing shadows right now at noon in December.

I want to give you clear -- a couple other points and then I'm going to have Kobi answer a few things. There -- we have a lot of zoning issues thrown at you.

It's crystal clear and you've asked your own staff that this application has been evaluated and if it was in violation in their opinion, under their review of FAR issues, over FAR we couldn't go forward. If there were setback issues and they did catch that there was some minor dune overlaying the rear setback issues where the pool encroaches, we're not asking for a variance in any -- and we're going to -- we will scale back the pool so that it would not require by building permit a variance.

But outside that, you have a whole laundry list of zoning questions that some of the opposition has thrown out to try to cloud the issues and -- and bring it into maybe the jurisdiction of another board, but I want to make it clear that your staff has certified that this application is properly before you today and you heard from Tom Mooney.

Now there -- you saw comments about other projects in the area. Yes, the Raleigh this board approved last year, it was an approved project, and referenced to the Shore Club. I assume that's a comment we're going to hear in the future sometime, but it shouldn't be part of the consideration of what's here before you today, and if you -- as -- as Mr. Savage tried to compare those to our project, our
footprint is 45 percent smaller than the Raleigh, what was approved for the Raleigh last year, it's a much smaller tower, and what's being proposed by the Shore Club from the submittals is over --

MR. FINGLASS: We're not talking about the Shore Club. That's not --

MR. GONZALEZ: I understand, but Paul Savage provided rebuttal -- opposition documents dealing with the Shore Club, so he opened the door; otherwise, I would have not brought it up.

MR. FINGLASS: That's not before us.
MR. GONZALEZ: I understand. But since you have one part of the record, I want to be clear on the rest.

But I also want to -- for the record, you heard from the so-called expert Steven Avdakov who provided reports for both the National and Delano and sat here and said how inappropriate it is to propose a 200 foot tower behind a 154 foot Ritz-Carlton and a 7-story Sagamore, but at the same time he's providing reports that it's appropriate to -- to build a 200 foot tower, substantially larger than we're proposing, behind the 3-story Shore Club, and I just want the record to be clear.

Again, I didn't introduce it. I'm only rebutting
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to what was introduced by the public opposition. So I do want that for the record to be noted as well.

MR. GIBBS: Given past issues in dealing with -with these issues --

MR. FINGLASS: We have to do --
MR. GIBBS: I just need to put it on the record.
MR. FINGLASS: We need him to finish. One at a time or there will be chaos. I'm sorry.

MR. GONZALEZ: At this point I'd like to have Kobi just walk you through the renderings that you saw from the opposition.

MR. FINGLASS: You want to show us renderings --
MR. GONZALEZ: We're going to show you how they're incorrect, and how when you look at the reports, they're showing you how -- what impact our proposed tower has on the neighboring properties.

MR. FINGLASS: Can we speed this up?
MR. GONZALEZ: Yes, sir. While Kobi is getting the boards, $I$ just want to clarify that the tower is pushed to the -- more towards the north than proposed, so it's showing greater impacts than what really this application is proposing.

Mr. KARP: So these are images which show -- and you can have them -- but basically the landscaping and the building. Obviously they're being photoshopped,
but that's okay. Here it is. You have the size and the massing and the comparison, likewise over here and likewise in the bottom.

You know, we checked it, we double checked it, but, regretfully, that's the reality that we're facing right now.

MR. KLEIN: So you're saying their images are inaccurate, they're false?

MR. KARP: I'm saying that they're not. Correct, yes, sir.

MR. GONZALEZ: They're shifted more to the north than what we've proposed in our -- the application. I do want to tackle a few more --

MR. FINGLASS: I'm sorry.
MR. GONZALEZ: Yes, sir?
MR. FINGLASS: I'm sorry. We're all here to swear to tell the truth. You have one party swearing one thing is the truth and now you're saying they're incorrect and you're telling the truth.

How do we form a judgment of what the truth is? There is -- there is one truth. Not two different truths.

MR. GONZALEZ: Mr. Chair, all I can do is respond to all of the vast reports, submittals, presentations, some of the things I had time to review -- enough time
to review, and some that have come in at the last minute and I'm responding to them as we can.

MR. FINGLASS: How am I supposed to know what the truth is if you're -- if you're totally conflicting -they're saying the first party's images are wrong and then they say their images are wrong. I mean, they're both fingers in the sky as far as I'm concerned, so, you know, I want to know what the truth is.

MR. GONZALEZ: Well, we're representing that our plans are accurate. They're CAD drawings. We've reviewed them. We've reviewed them with staff, and we've provided the distances from the different points, the actual distances, so it's clear that we're actually -- for example, with the Sagamore, we're opening up more of a view corridor --

MR. FINGLASS: Yeah. You said that. That doesn't answer the question. If you can please move on. Thanks.

MR. GONZALEZ: I will. I just have a few more points of things that were raised. I've already addressed all of these zoning theories that are -- I'm not going to belabor. I'd like the plan director to answer those when we feel it is the appropriate time.

And I will say that I did want to make comment that one of the public comments from the Decoplage,
they have made some reports to you. They live on the south side and as far as the testimony they gave, they're not here on behalf of anybody but themselves and they're not registered to speak on behalf of the buildings or any other individuals, as far as I'm aware of.

I will then go over a few more points and then I'll end it. As far as the Decoplage, the parking lot analysis is correct. It has been submitted as part of the record. There is no issue. The Ritz-Carlton today has surplus parking above what is required by the code. Now, could at some operational times and large events -- Basel -- there be a demand on the parking? There may be. That's an operational discussion that each property needs to address. But as far as the required parking, we have the required parking, and the site has the required legal parking needed for the conversion.

MR. FINGLASS: Move on.
MR. GONZALEZ: The loading -- the loading -- we're not intensifying the site, so the loading that we create -- there was a complaint about the loading by the Decoplage attorney. I'm just making it clear that the street --

MR. FINGLASS: How can you say you're not -- that
makes no sense.
MR. KLEIN: You're intensifying the site with this -- with this tower. How are you not intensifying this site?

MR. GONZALEZ: We're not intensifying the site because we're reducing hotel rooms. So we're converting what is over 110 hotels rooms --

MR. KLEIN: And adding 50 --
MR. GONZALEZ: No. No. No. We're reducing -so it's saying the same. I'm not -- we're not keeping 110 hotel rooms and then adding more residents. We're not doing that.

We're actually reducing from 110 hotels rooms that are currently permitted and we're not -- as -and bringing it down to at least 60 or less and then 50 residential units. So it is not an intensification of the site. Our traffic analysis shows that we're not going to intensify the site. It is a neutral change, so $I$ just want that to be clear.

And when we talk about that street end, understand it was when the Ritz-Carlton was approved in the late '90s by the city and this board that they provided that beach access that didn't exist prior. It's not there because of the Decoplage Property. It's there because of the Ritz-Carlton had opened the
avenue to go from Lincoln Road to the beach walk, which we all enjoy.

MR. FINGLASS: Okay. Can we wrap this up?
MR. GONZALEZ: Yes, sir. I just have a couple more points. I understand and have all sympathy for what happened at Champlain Towers but what happened in Surfside is a -- will be -- you know, is not the subject of this meeting.

We are -- we're in a situation where we evaluated our construction, all projects are monitored and the City is very diligent in making sure we've done monitoring at other sites to make sure there is no negative impact on neighboring projects when it comes time for construction. So -- and I -- I can tell you we'll evaluate and we'll work with our neighbors when it gets down to construction, just like all projects throughout the city have done.

And I'll -- and, with that, I will tell you that we do meet all of the standards as dictated in the staff report, your professional staff recommendations, and we support the recommendations by staff, that's why we changed the Sagamore front facade, and we'd ask you -- we'd like to hear comments from the board.

MR. FINGLASS: We will. Thank you.
MR. GONZALEZ: And if there's any additional
comments, then $I$ will ask for a re-rebuttal.
MR. FINGLASS: After -- after we -- we're going to debate it and that's the end of it.

MR. GONZALEZ: Okay. No. No. I -- I --
MR. FINGLASS: Okay. Thank you. For your --
MR. GONZALEZ: With that, I end my rebuttal.
MR. FINGLASS: Thank you. Okay. Debbie -- oh, sorry. I'm sorry.

MR. GIBBS: Just real quick. I just wanted to object to any of the comments related to our expert. This appli- -- each applicant, as you know -- each application as you know stands on its own. The experts who work on other applications is absolutely not relevant to this issue, and I had to put my objection on the record. Thank you.

MR. FINGLASS: Okay.
MR. SAVAGE: Very quickly, Chairman.
I respectfully disagree with the arguments of Mr. Gonzalez. I'm sure he feels the same way about my positions, and I'll leave it at that, mercifully, for the time, but $I$ just wanted to clean up the record and make sure that I readopt and incorporate and introduce all of the submissions that I've made through the portal of the City, through the staff, and also adopt Mr. Gibb's arguments as my own and those made by the
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counsel for the Decoplage and other objectors will all be also adopted our -- as our objection also on behalf of the Decoplage. And I'll just stop there and won't give any further debate. Thank you, sir.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you. We're going to close.
MR. GONZALEZ: Mr. Chair, the applicant is
usually afforded the last word.
MR. FINGLASS: You just closed. Come on.
MR. GONZALEZ: We feel that this application could be approved today on its merits. It meets all of the criteria from the HPB and I would thank you, the preservation staff board.

MR. FINGLASS: Okay. Now we can close, and we will be in discussion, please. Thank you.

Who would like to go first?
MR. KLEIN: Again, a lot of problems here. As with previous projects, and I said I'm not going to be part of the destruction and the elimination of that postcard image that I grew up with here and that my family enjoyed prior to me coming around, I do really, really appreciate the restoration of the original elevation. I worked a little bit on the Sagamore, had an opportunity a number of years ago, and I really appreciate that and the restoration of the lobby.

A question was asked why do we need this big
tower and -- and how does -- how do you determine 12 stories, 8 stories, 17 stories, 200 feet, 150 feet, and then how wide this thing is. We've had this issue before. I appreciate so much the -- the creation of these suites in -- in the hotels and I hope they're not just small suites and I doubt they are because you're trying to generate some real income here and create quality suites and I would prefer that we do something more respectful to the building that's there, to the assemblage of buildings that are there, and that's how I find this. I find this disrespectful. I don't know any other way to put it.

I don't think that we're distracting, that we're so much diminishing. I think we're being disrespectful to what we have in Miami Beach history.

The proposal, I find it incompatible, I find it out of character, $I$ find it out of scale, and I can't back it at all, at all. And $I$ am -- I'll let the others speak, but $I$ am in favor of denial for this. I think it -- I think the proposal here is so far off what Miami Beach needs, what this area deserves, that it is not at the level of a continuance.

So that's my thesis, short and sweet.
Okay. Thank you. Laura?
MS. WEINSTEIN: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank
you so much and thank you to the families for your commitment to Miami Beach and what makes it so special.

You know, I -- I am pro development and I definitely believe in a world where historic and new work together. Personally, I really don't have any issues with the zoning or the entitlements, and, again, that's -- I don't believe that is our jurisdiction, and though it is -- my -- my issue is, though it is a beautiful building, I really don't see how it fits the context. I really don't find it compatible, and if there is a way that you can kind of explain how it fits into the historic preservation criteria, I personally would appreciate that.

And, you know, I think as most people have said here, the issue is the beach view. It's not the street view. I do think you did a fantastic job from the street view and how pedestrian's access it. I -I, personally, am all for extending the life and vibrancy of our historic resources, and I just -in -- in the GT memo, just to provide some, you know, constructive criticism, when you're on compliance with COA criteria, Section C, it states: The proposed structure and/or additions to an existing structure are appropriate or compatible with the environment and
adjacent structures and enhance the appearance of the surrounding properties for the purposes for which the district was created, and I really don't think that's satisfied here. I think it could be in the future.

I'm not saying that I would totally deny the application but I don't think the building, as designed, meets that criteria.

Thank you.
MR. FINGLASS: Thank you, Laura. Thanks.
MR. LITT: Thank you. Given that I don't see this really moving forward with an approval today, I wanted to offer a few thoughts of how this could move forward. I'm, you know, open to elaboration on the design for this, and I'm going to focus my comments -or I'm not going to engage on the zoning. I think we can focus on $C$ of $A$, and if the zoning interpretation changes, the requirements are going to change the design and we can revisit it then.

So with respect to the -- the Sagamore, I -- I understand the strategy of wanting to revert back to the original facade, since that was successful up the street with the Richmond South Seas, but I appreciate hearing perspectives from anyone on the board that's willing to engage on this idea, but in thinking about whether the -- the addition has required significance
in itself and if there are some levers here where if the size of the new tower is being driven at all by the cost of the restoration from the Sagamore because they're removing the additions, if that might be something you could consider with offsetting and changing the scale of the tower.

And also just to -- not to add additional, you know, trips on the ideological merry-go-round on this, but just for thinking about how the board has treated the Grossman additions on other hotels, are we -- you know, do we have any thoughts about changing that legacy in terms of the restoration management that we have?

A few of the points $I$ guess that will be at various scales in terms of, you know, what people think are the important facets of this, but given that this is our opportunity to speak about it, I'll mention a few different things. So there wasn't a lot in the presentation about the elimination of the basement. I think that was a good decision. I was wondering about leaving the electrical equipment in the crawl space. The letter of intent talks about it not being feasible to move, but interested in what the criteria were for that decision and what are the resilience tradeoffs, risks of leaving the equipment
down there versus if it was at all possible to move that and what the impact would be on the design.

For the residential tower, I mean, it's -- it's generally some parallels and consistencies with other approved projects, but, you know, it sounds like we have some work to do with the scale and the massing. I think the answer to why 200 feet is pretty easy. It's because that's what's allowed and that's why we see this.

And, yeah, I would have made a note about the shadow studies, but $I$ appreciate that was addressed in the follow-ups so I don't think we need to make an issue of that here as well.

The rooftop addition, that does seem to me to be pretty close to an administrative maneuvering, but if the City's staff Attorney's Office backs up the rational for how this is not an addition, I'm comfortable with considering that.

And then just another, you know, as I've maybe brought up a few minutiae in this, but just if we're put everything on the table and if this is going to be reconsidered, the open space calculations, it looked like what was being provided is less than the requirement. So I wanted to check to see whether that was a typo or if there was something we need to
consider there. I was looking at Page L0.00A.
But, in summary, I'm willing to sort of continue the dialogue to keep this project moving forward. Thank you.

MS. LIEBMAN: I have a question to ask first and it has little to do with anything, except information that I need as I then discuss.

I would like to know the actual height that this building will go to after the 200 feet for all of the technical stuff that goes on the roof.

MR. KARP: Hi. I want to thank you all for your comments. The mechanical cupola with overhang, we are looking to not exceed 20 to 25 feet, depends on --

MS. LIEBMAN: So it would be 200 --
MR. KARP: 220 feet, with the mechanical equipment, trellis work around it.

MS. LIEBMAN: 220. Okay. Okay.
MR. KARP: Yes. Yes. Yes, ma'am.
MS. LIEBMAN: Okay. So it is larger than I first saw it when I met with you?

MR. KARP: Yeah. We always had the roof at 200 and we always had the mechanical area above it, and if it was unclear, I'm sorry about that.

MS. LIEBMAN: Other than that, I respect what you have done. I'm sorry that you have to go through
this, but $I$ think you should have known it was coming because it became a big City issue unfortunately and I know that you can do better so I am hoping that you will be able to look back with our group, our committee, and find a better way.

You know that when I met with you I said you'll never make it with this large building. It doesn't belong there. I have always thought and I still think and I've been doing it, thinking, from the past 40 years that it's really not what the height is supposed to be. It's really the compatibility, and I believe I discussed that with you too, that these -- in this district the two -- I -- I'm sorry but I'm going to compliment the two architects who talked about compatibility. They were right on target. I only wished that they did work for us sometime or other because they are -- they told it exactly the way it is, and that needs to be looked at.

I don't want to see you just go away today and say good bye because I know you'll come back and you'll do something else, but this project, this area of Miami Beach needs your direction to do something.

So as far as your building, it's a step sister, a sad step sister to what could have been a wonderful addition to where you're working. But it's not. It's
just every time -- every picture that I saw -- I'm tired of looking at them. This big hulk is standing in the way.

So I don't want to see you throw this out the door. I don't know if everybody else here thinks that way but $I$ hope not, and $I$ would just ask you to think about how to improve this. That big hulk in the middle just can't survive the way it is.

MR. KARP: Thank you for your comments, Nancy, and I'll be happy to implement yours and the other people's comments. Thank you very much.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you, Kobi, very much.
MR. PASKAL: Okay. Just some comments in no particular order. First of all, you know, it's -it's wonderful to have the families here that have been maintaining these properties. This block really has been a celebration of, you know, the allure of our City and there's a lot to consider. And one of those things with the -- the DiLido, I sort of look at the renovations that were done to the DiLido in 2003 and see those as sort of a compatible compromise where they're -- you know, you can never not see them, but they sort of -- you know, they seem to -- to -- to embrace and defer to the original design intent.

I want to say that the tower design I think is
beautiful. I also want to mention the -- the Sagamore facade. It's interesting because I think it was maybe five years ago or so we had a proposal in front of us to remove the knee wall, right, at the Sagamore and -and at that time $I$ actually discussed with Mr. Ciraldo from MDPL, wouldn't it be great if the original facade for the Sagamore could be brought back. I think, you know, that is really nice.

At the same time, I think -- I want to start with the text amendment because it wasn't that long ago that the zoning was changed that many of us on this board participated and were a part of that early discussion, and as $I$ recall it, and I think it's important moving forward, when you set the tone for how those sort of dialogs are going to translate into code, into the future of our City, and what it's going to look like.

There was a public benefit that was discussed relative to -- to the Raleigh at that time and the state it was in and it being maintained as a hotel use. I am not seeing it at this instance -- I am seeing benefits, right? I'm seeing a nice -- nicely designed tower and I'm seeing the -- the facade renovations at the Sagamore, but I'm having a hard time seeing that value, that it -- that it balances
with a lot of issues I'm having with the project, and I just want to go over those and they've all been stated by -- by -- during the public comment, and -and I appreciate everyone that came in.

I do want to touch on -- on the parking because I don't think that that was really -- we had the representative from the Decoplage who mentioned that and obviously there's a concern with the functionality of that district and it wasn't really explained to me how that happened. How do you get a pretty substantial size residential building with no parking and, zoning wise, how that actually comes to be. Could I ask that question?

MS. TACKETT: Yeah. They do have parking, and according to their parking calculations, which we have reviewed, they satisfy the parking requirements. So they're reducing the number of hotel units. The existing contributing buildings do not have a parking requirement, the new tower will, and they have ample spaces allocated for the new construction.

MR. PASKAL: Got it. So they're acquiring spaces that had been used for the hotel functions versus residential function personally.

I want to say to the -- Alfredo, great presentation, but -- but you sort of called up the
question of whether you can legislate view and you sort of hinted at this whole dialog with the spite wall and -- and I understand that -- that legally you can't legislate that, but the Historic Preservation Board does have the authority to legislate the interest of the viability of that historic district, so there's a couple of really big issues for me.

One of them -- one of them is -- is the public interest and the public good and -- and I feel that that skyline is so iconic and postcards may be going away but -- but Instagram makes imagery a million times more pertinent. Imaging matters and matters tremendously and, again, this block is the toast of the town. It's what we stand for across the word, and -- and I think we have a responsibility to legislate in the better interest of that historic district.

In addition, I want to say that -- that even -and the concerns that the Decoplage brought up, they call into question, you know, how well -- and as a City I think we struggle with this. We're a tourism City and we're an amazing place to live and work and play, as we say, and, yet, there's -- you know, we're always trying to balance the interest of -- of being a tourism City and -- and having hotels as a -- an
economic driver but also offering quality of life for residents and I'm really, you know, struggling with the idea of taking these two hotel properties and plopping a residential tower where, not only does it impair the view of those two properties themselves, but, you know, I -- I don't feel that it's going to block the ocean view completely from the National or the Delano, but it is going to be there and it is going to impair the enjoyment of a historic district; when you're looking out on your balcony for tourists and there's a tower right there. You know, you're going to make the person stand there while you take a picture so you don't see the tower and I'm struggling with that.

Initially when $I$ saw this proposal, for me there's no way that $I$ would be okay, in favor of a structure that would go to -- to -- to -- to tower over the -- the cupola at the National. It's too iconic. But, in addition to that, no matter what, you're still going to impair the views when you're putting a residential tower in front of the balconies of the existing historical hotels, and I feel like the viability of this historic district is our responsibility and placing a residential tower where it impairs the view of these iconic hotels, I think we
take a risk of rendering them obsolete. Those buildings, I think we're encouraging the other property owners -- the National, the Delano, what's to stop them from putting residential condos, and there we go.

I think -- I think the gravity was an extenuating circumstance and we all struggle with the fact that the Raleigh was left gutted. We wanted to see that continue forward. We wanted to see the vibrancy of that property continue as a hotel. This is not a repeat of that, and I think we really need to be careful of not setting the wrong precedent because I think it would be a horrible legacy for this board to encourage and incentivize condo towers going up along the back side of that whole block. I don't see how we're not doing that.

So whereas -- with respect to the hotel owners and the applicants and the amazing job you did on this proposal, you know, I wish that I could be offering a recommendation to try to bring it in line with -- with what $I$ feel is my responsibility here, but I'm leaning in the direction of Barry and thinking that $I$ don't really, unfortunately, see a way forward on this proposal, from my perspective.

Thank you.

MR. FINGLASS: Thank you. Thank you very much, Kirk.

Okay. Now it's my turn. Okay. First, I want to thank you, the families of all of the properties, especially the Sagamore. They had me over. They were extremely polite and they -- they really gave me the full story and I appreciated the time they spent and at the time I hadn't read anything from the City, nor had I read the package, so $I$ was very -- I wouldn't say accountable, but $I$ was very open to any opinion that was being given to me.

They do have a lot of good points and I don't want to be accused as $I$ was the first year six years ago I was on this commission, board, and I remember John Alamond severely criticized me because I said this is the Historic Preservation Board, not the Economic Development Board, and I will say it again very clearly. This is the Historic Preservation Board. We have to look at economic development. It's an important part of the puzzle and it should not be shunned aside, but our main purpose here is to look at how we can preserve -- I hate to use the word iconic postcard; that has been drilled into my head every time I walk into this room -- the iconic postcard view, and that's I think what we're here to try to
preserve in the best way possible, without excluding progress. And I say without excluding progress because, you know, life changes, things move on, and as Laura, I think, once said, every building has its life, which $I$ thoroughly disagree with, but that's a different point of view, which we like all points of view.

But in this particular case several things which developed my attitude on this was this little simple drawing submitted by the architects that there's a 1-, a 3-, a 3-, a 9-, a 7-, an 11-story building all around this -- this proposed tower, which would be at least 17 stories or 225 feet, which was just stated by the architect. I just think -- I just think it's out of place. I give great kudos to what you have done in the existing buildings and what you propose to do through this historic preservation.

We have to come to some agreement here eventually after I'm gone as to what constitutes economic development versus the historic buildings that are already there, that's the key point here, and it will be brought up again and again and again and again and I think that's not a decision for us to make. We have to look at historic preservation first.

And getting back to the comments, I think this
particular tower, I love this phrase, this is a disengaged crystalline tower. That kind of says it all. It's not engaged to anything around it. Its materials are in complete opposition to what's around it, and it's another finger poking into the sky, which I just can't go along with, period.

In the future perhaps another board can maybe talk about lowering it more to a compatible height to the buildings around it, the historic buildings, it may be no higher than what is there, that has objections too, but this issue of scale here, that's the number one thing for me. I can't get by that.

I think the design, the aesthetics, the massing are damaging to the neighborhood. I think that it diminishes the architectural integrity of the Miami Beach architectural historic district. It's -- it's just incompatible as a matter of height and as a matter of architectural relationship to the nearby contributing structures. It's just not acceptable to me.

And I will read probably for the last time what the Certificate of Appropriateness says, because every developer who comes here in my six years says -- tends to ignore these three things and this is what is important. Additionally, the board shall consider

Section 118564A3 of the MBPB, appropriate and compatible with environment, enhance appearance of the surrounding properties. This is not satisfied due to the size, scale, and placement of the proposed tower, as well as the modern design proposed of the last tower which will conflict with the historic character of the neighborhood.

E, relationship to the surrounding neighborhood, impact on preserving historic character of the neighborhood and district, pedestrian sightlines and view corridors. Not satisfied due to the size, scale, and placement of the proposed tower, as well as the modern design proposed of the last tower which will conflict with the historic character of the neighborhood.

And J: Orientation and massing which is sensitive to and compatible with the building site and surrounding area and which creates or maintains important view corridors. Not satisfied due to size, scale, placement of the proposed tower.

I wish a developer would come here and read this first and tell us how this building really complies with this. They never -- in six years I have never had a successful developer do this first. It's always what $I$ can do, what's for my benefit, what's for my
building, what I want. It's not what individual people want. It's what's for the benefit of the community.

So, therefore, $I$ join Barry, it's a big no, and I'm not sorry to vote no on it in its entirety. Thank you.

MR. GONZALEZ: Mr. Chairman, I know there were a lot of questions asked --

MS. TACKETT: We did close, and we do have a full agenda this afternoon.

MR. GONZALEZ: I do -- I just want to make a request from the applicant. You have a lot of questions. I'm not asking you questions. I know that this board has a lot -- has taken a lot of time.

I will request this board to continue this application and allow us the time as a new applicant -- we continued it last month because we wanted the opportunity to start talking to the neighbors, which because of time we weren't able to; we heard for the first time many of the board comments; and allow us the opportunity to take those comments and work and potentially bring back something that this board could review and answer every question. So with that --

MR. FINGLASS: I think we have something before
us now, which we should deal with. Thank you.
I said my opinion. Thank you.
MS. LIEBMAN: I suggest that we look at it again. They've been working on this for, I don't know how many years.

How long have you been at this? At least two years that $I$ can remember.

MR. GONZALEZ: Ownership has been working on this for well over a year and a half, almost two years. So we've been trying to come -- this is the first time making a presentation before the board, first time coming here.

MS. LIEBMAN: I don't think that we should be so cavalier as to just tell them out the door. Let us put them on the agenda again. I don't care if it's next or let it go over to the new year, but $I$ don't think that -- under the circumstances, it's not just what we talk about, under the circumstances of what a lot of people have been put through that we just send them home.

MR. FINGLASS: Well, I think every proposal that comes to us takes a year or two of preparation. This is not unique in that regard. Every -- every architectural firm and owner works for a very long time on the project and should be respected for that.

MS. LIEBMAN: However, we have allowed -- it's different because I have seen us allow people to come back in here three, four, or five times, and nobody cared. They allowed everybody.

For some reason, maybe it's because we have a lot of people here who just didn't like the idea, but I think it's our purpose to think about one more chance. And I don't think that is too much.

MR. PASKAL: At the current time though it doesn't seem like there's a consensus on the way to move forward.

MS. LIEBMAN: Well, that's because we haven't thought about maybe we should be allowing them to come back. I brought that up.

MR. PASKAL: So -- so, I mean, there's -there's --

MS. LIEBMAN: Do you all think that it's such a terrible thing that it shouldn't be heard for a second time? Let them go back?

MR. KLEIN: I don't want to see them to come back 10 or 12 story lighter building.

MS. LIEBMAN: Well, let's suggest what they should come back with, rather than -- rather than out the door.

MR. KLEIN: And I think, you know --

MS. LIEBMAN: You haven't heard from them before, right? Have you heard from them before? Have you, Jack? You went to visit them.

I don't know if everybody -- we don't even have our seventh person here, by the way.

MR. KLEIN: If we put any sort of tower or block on the east side of the Sagamore, you just pretty much obliterated the view of --

MS. LIEBMAN: Well, that's your interpretation, but I think the people who are involved should be allowed to at least come back with something that they can do, and I think that Kobi, unless, Kobi, you're willing to give up?

MR. KARP: I would love to come back. I would love the opportunity to come back because this is the first time I'm hearing your comments. That's why we came in here. It's a -- like I said, it's a dialog, not a monologue, and my clients are very -- they own these properties and we would love to come back, and that's why we also met with you, Jack, on to the site.

MR. FINGLASS: You're going to come back, but every time this has happened -- and this is pandemic throughout six years of seeing these things -- instead of making it -- you'll make it shorter and then wider
to the buildings existing, wider to the beach.
The whole point is to lessen the impact of your building, not to give you a way around what you've presented and still get your numbers, square foot, and whatever. That's the problem. It's the -- it's the massing, the scale, the scope, everything about it, and, with all due respect, you're very good, I've seen it before, at manipulating it around so you still get just about what you wanted but in a totally different format, and that's the problem. The problem is the scale and the scope and the size.

It's not making it wider and shorter. It's not making a big voluminous mass hovering on that beach. That is iconic and should remain basically the same. That's why it's historic. This is not Sunny Isles, and, God help us, I hope it never will be, and that's the important thing. That's where we're headed if this type of development that has no respect for what's there now continues.

MR. KARP: And -- and, again, Jack, that's why I come in front of you and $I$ could have come in front of you for an opinion and a direction in the beginning. We met with certain people, but, again, I'd love an opportunity to come back and see if there's a way we can work with you. I think it's an important project
in an important location, and I think we have the ability to find a way to come to a dialog and make all parties or some of them happy at the end. So that's why we'd appreciate that opportunity very much.

MR. FINGLASS: We'll see.
MS. LIEBMAN: I keep persisting because I know in sitting here for these moments that I have that we have brought people back with worse projects, and you remember, and we gave them a second chance, they came back, some of them three or four times we had to listen to them, and, all of a sudden, this is like a new thing.

MR. PASKAL: It's just that this is far, Nancy. It's much further than people that were -- people've said, oh, if you lowered it maybe, you know, ten stories or five stories or three stories. This is not that.

And I don't actually, personally, I don't see what the difference is if we deny it, because, the way I see it, it needs to come back as something totally different than what is here --

MS. LIEBMAN: But -- but --
MR. PASKAL: -- right now. What is the difference? We continue it for a long enough time to develop something completely new? What's the
difference?
MS. LIEBMAN: I am not asking you to do anything. You are all injecting what you think might happen. I think it is worth the time to bring them -- we spent a whole day on this. This is 1:30 in the afternoon.

MR. FINGLASS: This is the most important property on that whole area. It should be discussed at great length.

MS. LIEBMAN: It was discussed but it was discussed in one day without any thought that maybe it could become a better project.

MR. FINGLASS: This project, I'm sure if they come -- have a change of heart, they can propose something else. But that's not going to happen today and it's not going to happen next month. We're talking about a major, major redo.

MS. LIEBMAN: Well, exactly. Whatever it is.
MR. FINGLASS: We're voting on this. That's the issue.

MR. PASKAL: Can somebody make a motion here?
MR. KLEIN: I just want to say I think the -the -- for me and for some of what $I$ hear on the board, the -- the direction to make. This work is so different than what is proposed here that it would take a separate, new application to make it work, this
is the way that $I$ see it. And to make the reference to the Decoplage as the wall, yeah, that's there and that's a mistake. Doesn't mean we have to -- and I've said it before, doesn't mean we have to keep making these same dumb mistakes, and I'm not going to be a part of it.

MR. FINGLASS: Okay. I think --
MR. PASKAL: And I'm not anti-development and I don't want to come off like that. I just think that this is the wrong building in the wrong place. I think we're close to the --

MR. FINGLASS: Yeah. Okay. So I think someone raised the question, do you want to make a motion?

MR. KLEIN: I'll make a motion to deny the project, and if the applicant wants to develop this project and come back with something that is compatible, fits in the neighborhood, scale, is not a glass box tower that tries to be invisible which it can't. So I would make that motion.

MR. GONZALEZ: Would it be without prejudices?
MS. TACKETT: Okay. Do we have a second?
MR. PASKAL: I would second.
MS. TACKETT: Okay. We have a second and --
MR. GONZALEZ: I asked if it's with or without prejudice.

MR. FINGLASS: What does that mean?
MR. GONZALEZ: If it was with prejudice, I have to wait six months to file an appeal.

MS. TACKETT: That's not true. You would have to wait six months to file the same application. You can file a new application within a shorter period.

MR. FINGLASS: We're talking about this particular --

MS. TACKETT: Okay. We do have a motion and second. Let me call the roll.

Mr. Litt?
MR. LITT: No.
MS. TACKETT: Ms. Weinstein-Berman?
MS. WEINSTEIN-BERMAN: No.
MS. TACKETT: Ms. Liebman?
MS. LIEBMAN: No.
MS. TACKETT: Mr. Paskal?
MR. PASKAL: Yes.
MS. TACKETT: Mr. Klein?
MR. KLEIN: Yes.
MS. TACKETT: Mr. Finglass.
MR. FINGLASS: Yes.
MS. TACKETT: Okay. So that motion fails because it was a tie.

MR. KALLERGIS: That's right.

MS. TACKETT: Do we have another motion?
MR. PASKAL: So if we continue it -- I mean, how -- can we just quickly talk about how much time we'd need for --

MS. TACKETT: For a complete redesign?
MR. PASKAL: Yes.
MS. TACKETT: I would say the earliest that we could as staff fully evaluate the complete redesign project would be the March agenda.

MS. LIEBMAN: We've done that before and this is not new territory that we're talking about.

MR. KALLERGIS: Is -- would any board member like to move a continuance until March?

MR. PASKAL: We're at a standoff, right? I mean, something has to happen, correct?

MS. TACKETT: Well, if no motion passes, then the application is -- is denied. It would not move forward. They would have to file a new application.

So we can -- we can have a motion for a continuance, which I believe some of the board members were interested in.

MS. LIEBMAN: I'm -- I'm concerned because we'll do it and we're going to have the same --

MR. KLEIN: Well, but that's --
MS. LIEBMAN: That's not because we're missing
somebody.
MR. FINGLASS: That's irrelevant.
MS. LIEBMAN: It is not.
MS. TACKETT: Well, right now we need to -- we -we can conclude at this point or we can have another motion. If -- if no motion passes on the item, the item fails and they would need to file a new application.

MS. LIEBMAN: Well --
MR. LITT: I'll do the motion to continue to March so that they can continue in good faith towards the application.

MS. TACKETT: Do we have a second?
MS. LIEBMAN: I'll second.
MS. TACKETT: Okay. Second by Ms. Liebman. Okay. I'll call the roll.

Ms. Weinstein-Berman?
MS. WEINSTEIN-BERMAN: Yes.
MS. TACKETT: Mr. Finglass?
MR. FINGLASS: Yes.
MS. TACKETT: Oh, you're chair. I should do you again but -- sorry. Mr. Finglass?

MR. FINGLASS: No.
MS. TACKETT: Mr. Paskal?
MR. PASKAL: No.

MS. TACKETT: Mr. Klein?
MR. KLEIN: No.
MS. TACKETT: Ms. Liebman?
MS. LIEBMAN: Yes.
MS. TACKETT: Mr. Litt?
MR. LITT: Yes.
MS. TACKETT: Okay. So that also fails because that was a three/three, and unless we have another motion or someone wants to reconsider on one of the previous votes, then we can conclude.

MS. LIEBMAN: Is it --
MS. TACKETT: And the applicant may file a new application and be -- and be brought back to this board.

MS. LIEBMAN: Is it out of order to continue this until next -- our next meeting which is --

MS. TACKETT: That -- you could make that motion. You may want to discuss it with your fellow board members because based on the previous two motions, it doesn't look like you have the votes, but that is a motion you can make.

MS. LIEBMAN: Well, it seems to me that if we have seven people, seven people should be voting on this.

MR. FINGLASS: No.

MS. LIEBMAN: And just because --
MR. FINGLASS: That's not the way it works, Nancy.

MS. LIEBMAN: Well, it may not work for you, Jack, but it works for me. So I would --

MR. PASKAL: I want to make the argument that $I$ really don't think that's fair to --

MS. LIEBMAN: To who?
MR. PASKAL: -- to -- to everyone in the public that has to come and call in and spend the whole day to -- to speak on something, just to punt it down the field --

MS. TACKETT: Was that a motion, Ms. Liebman?
MS. LIEBMAN: Yes.
MS. TACKETT: Okay. We have a motion to continue it to the January 11th meeting.

Do we have a second?
MS. LIEBMAN: So we would have seven people here.
MR. FINGLASS: Oh, so you're trying to stack the deck?

MS. TACKETT: I don't -- I don't see a second --
MS. LIEBMAN: I have no -- I have no --
MS. TACKETT: I don't -- Ms. Liebman, I don't see a second to your motion, so that motion fails due to a lack of a second.

MR. FINGLASS: Okay.
MS. TACKETT: All right. Mr. Chair, we do have, you know, other --

MR. GONZALEZ: One more -- just a clarification. So no action? It is deemed denied and we can submit a new application?

MS. TACKETT: Yes. Please contact me and I'd be more than happy to meet with you and your team to discuss.

MR. FINGLASS: Okay. Thank you very much. (This portion of the meeting concluded at 12:40 p.m.)
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MS. TACKETT: Mr. Chair, we have -- we have lunch. We can take a break.

We -- I did forget to -- to ask for motion on the November 9th minutes. I think we can do that very quickly.

MR. PASKAL: I move to approve the minutes.
MR. FINGLASS: Second.
MS. TACKETT: Okay. We have a motion to second.
All those in favor?
(All board members raise hands.)
MR. FINGLASS: Aye.
MS. TACKETT: Any opposed?
No. Okay. Thank you very much.
Mr. Chair, do you want to take -- it is 12:40. We do have one board member leaving at $2: 30$, so I would ask that a lunch break be very brief. We could come back in 15 minutes and be back on the air no later than 1:00 p.m.

Is that okay with everyone? Okay. So we're going to take a brief break, and then we will -- we'll be back live by 1:00 p.m.
(Lunch break taken.)
MR. FINGLASS: Good afternoon, and welcome to the
afternoon session of the Miami Beach Historic Preservation Board.

We're ready to move on to our second item, Debbie.

MS. TACKETT: Yeah. Before we start the second item, Mr. Chair and members of the board, could -- I need some clarification on the previous application that failed due to a lack of an approved motion.

I would like to have the board clarify on the record that that was without prejudice so that the -the applicant can come back and submit something to the City for consideration within the next six months.

MR. PASKAL: Something entirely new?
MS. TACKETT: Correct.
MR. PASKAL: So would do you need us to do? To make a motion to clarify?

MS. TACKETT: To clarify that that --
MR. PASKAL: Make a motion to clarify that the last failure to come up with --

MS. TACKETT: Was without prejudice.
MR. PASKAL: -- was without prejudice?
MR. KLEIN: I'll second that.
MS. TACKETT: Okay. All those in favor?
(All board members raise hands.)
MS. LIEBMAN: Aye.

MS. TACKETT: Any opposed to that?
Okay. So that was clarified that it was without prejudice.

MR. GONZALEZ: So I can bring back any project -almost any project than.

MS. TACKETT: Well, the direction was not to bring back the same project.

MR. GONZALEZ: No. I understand --
MS. TACKETT: Refile --
MR. PASKAL: We clarified a new -- new project.
MR. KLEIN: The motion -- listen to the motion. The motion was a --

MS. TACKETT: Well, it's --
MR. KLEIN: -- new project.
MS. TACKETT: It's with --
MR. KLEIN: Not the same project.
MS. TACKETT: It's -- it's -- the -- the prejudice is either with prejudice or without prejudice. So this does give the applicant the ability to file any application.

MR. KLEIN: Even to refile?
MS. TACKETT: Even refile. However, I think it was clear that that was not the direction of this board.

MR. GONZALEZ: No. No. And I understand.

MS. TACKETT: Okay.
MR. GONZALEZ: That part I understand. We -- we get the --

MS. TACKETT: So --
MR. GONZALEZ: -- opportunity to --
MS. TACKETT: And the board --
MR. GONZALEZ: (Audio unheard.)
MS. TACKETT: And the board clarified you are without prejudice, so they -- we just voted on that and --

MR. GONZALEZ: Sorry.
MS. TACKETT: Okay. Thank you, Alfredo.
MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you.
MS. TACKETT: Sorry for the confusion.
Okay. Mr. Chair, we are moving on to our next application.
(That concludes this transcript.)
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