

**PUBLIC MEETING OF THE  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 2018, 5:30 P.M.  
CITY HALL, 9101 BONITA BEACH ROAD  
BONITA SPRINGS, FLORIDA 34135  
MINUTES**

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Meeting called to order 5:30 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

**Present**

Dallas Revord  
Elly McKuen  
Alex Grantt  
Jay Welsch  
Ronda Lawhon  
Trish Welles

**Council Liaison and Staff**

Mike Fiigon  
Arleen Hunter  
Carly Sanseverino

**Public**

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public present

IV. SPECIAL CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

- a. Skinner House; Mortgage and Mortgage Note have been recorded

Mr. Revord asked what they were going to do about the garage. Mr. Fiigon reported that the owners were supposed to submit a demo permit to make a request to tear down the garage. Mr. Fiigon would bring that request to the board since it was part of the designation and the board would make a decision at that point. They have not submitted a demo permit, so Mr. Fiigon does not know where it stands.

Ms. McKuen asked why there are two separate documents that get recorded, a mortgage and then a note. Mr. Revord explained the mortgage is for the full amount and the note is for installments of \$2000 per year over the five year period. Ms. McKuen stated she has seen it when you have the mortgage and note together in one document and it makes it easier when you're doing title searches. Mr. Revord stated it would cut down on cost.

Ms. McKuen asked what happens if a property owner has more than one loan for rehab for historic money. Ms. Hunter stated each individual document would get recorded. If they made a partial payment before they receives the check, that portion would get recorded and then the next payment would be recorded.

Ms. McKuen asked what happens if within that five years, they sell the property and have to pay back the proportional share, where does that money come back to. Does it come back to our grant fund. Ms. Hunter explained it comes back as income to the City and would have to be appropriated during the budget process.

## V. HISTORIC VILLAGE CONCEPT DISCUSSION

### a. Scope of Services

Mr. Welsch presented a revised document incorporating everyone's changes as discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Welsch said that City Attorney, Audrey Vance, had a few suggestions after the last meeting and all those suggestions are in this document. Mr. Welsch stated the general description would be helpful to be part of the RFQ. Ms. Hunter recommended that Assistant City Attorney, Carly Sanseverino, review the revised document.

Ms. Welles recommended the following change on page 1, item A where it states "List of Professional Services to be delivered" number 3:

"structure mix of diversity" change to "diverse structural mix".

Mr. Welsch will send the document to Ms. Sanseverino for review. Ms. Hunter explained that standard language is required for the Finance department for identification and insurance requirements, so after Ms. Sanseverino reviews the document, it goes to Finance. This document would be the attached scope of work to our legal document.

The Board discussed if it's going to be an RPP or RFQ. Ms. Vance had suggested an RFP because they will want to know who the team is who will be working on the study, how they are going to approach it and which would be the better instrument.

Mr. Revord asked the Board if they had any questions. Ms. Welles asked about the \$200K. Mr. Welsch explained the \$200K was the amount discussed when we reduced the scope of services, and it was suggested we put in a number so the prospective firms would know what kind of scope we are talking about. Ms. McKuen stated if you look at the scope, it's a \$200K scope. Ms. Hunter advised they don't typically include the dollar amount in the RFP/RFQ. It's up to interested vendors to look at the city budget. Potential vendors might submit questions which the City requires to be submitted in writing. The answer is published on the website so every firm interested will see it. Ms. Hunter stated that the answer would be that it's listed in the fiscal year 17-18 in the Historical Preservation budget. They do not say that they would ask for more and would not be having discussions with them on prices. Mr. Welsch asked if they could give the consultants a feeling for the budget. Ms. Hunter explained that the Board has \$25K, for a potential study as well as the remaining historic preservation fund budget. The Board has allocated some of those funds. As was discussed with Council during the budget process, the Board has the ability, once a proposal comes in, to go to Council and ask that some of

the grant funds be transferred to the project costs. The Board would then use the funds for project costs not grants.

Ms. Lawhon suggested under Item C. Fee and Time Frame where it reads “for a GUARANTEED LUMP SUM not to exceed \$200,000.00” take out “not to exceed \$200,000.00 and replace with “to be delivered in a lump sum”.

Ms. McKuen asked if there has ever been a situation where a consultant has created a menu cost. Ms. Hunter stated that is determined in the second phase. Ms. Hunter gave an example of the process used with the Bonita Beach Road Land Use Study:

- RFQ was issued
- Four firms submitted and included ideas and examples of projects done in the past with pictures
- Interviews were scheduled with the City Council
- Questions asked back and forth
- Firms were ranked 1 – 4
- Staff contacted the top ranking firm and negotiated scope and cost, which included menu items of services they could provide. Same process with Alta with four different menu items.
- They contracted at a lower dollar amount to be on call to review future projects to make sure it's consistent with the plan.

Ms. Hunter explained there are a lot of opportunities once a contract is completed and as projects move forward and there are thresholds of dollar amount.

- The proposal would come back to the Board and the Board would go to City Council with a recommendation.
- A dollar value would be determined and they would move forward with a contract.

Ms. McKuen asked could they consider having a cost per task. Ms. Welles stated she thought it would be something the bidders would include in their proposal. Ms. Hunter advised that bidders typically don't do that in the response. If they don't get a match for the scaled down scope, they would need to reconsider what they are doing or move to firm B.

Ms. McKuen suggested the scope of the study and be broken out by tasks (as an example):

- Task A: \$25K
- Task B: \$25K
- Task C: \$50K

If they only have \$25K to do Task A, they would not have to go back to Council and ask for more money. Mr. Welch stated it would be very hard to split up the fee. Ms. McKuen stated, in her experience, you can ask the firms whatever you want to ask them and they will provide it. They have to know how many staff hours they are going to have

and what their hourly rate it. They would calculate to get to a final number. Ms. Hunter stated it is a proposal on how each firm would approach the project. The firms would provide examples of how they have replicated projects like this in other communities. Whether nationally or internationally. If they were going to request bid prices, then it's high bid versus low bid. Ms. Hunter stated the firms are not going to give you bid price because that is part of negotiations. Ms. McKuen stated she has had a different experience. When you're not asking for a cost along with the scope, then you are just asking for qualifications and it's an RFQ opposed to an RFP. Ms. Sanseverino explained that the cost is not included with the proposal because then it has different obligations entailed with it. Ms. Sanseverino thinks that was Ms. Vance's intent to put a cap on what they could spend. Mr. Welsch concurred. Mr. Revord stated they are trying to avoid someone coming in at million dollars.

Mr. Welsch was hoping a firm might come up with \$20K because they want to get their foot in the door. Ms. Hunter advised if you place a monetary amount in the proposal, the bid will come in at that amount. Ms. McKuen said master plans themselves are \$100K. The City of Naples spent twice as much for the pier study. They could go to council and say we'd like to have another \$25K that would get us to phase I. Asking for \$25K is a lot easier than asking for \$175K. Mr. Welsch asked if there is anything against asking them to provide prices. Ms. Hunter stated once you do that, you establish a high and low bidder. Ms. McKuen stated what she's asking for is the consultant to tell us what they would charge per task. She wants the consultant to say how much each task will cost. Ms. Hunter said if they do that we'll have to ask Ms. Vance because then we're getting close to request for bid. What you're looking for is someone who understands the situation the Board is in. If they walk away, and they're not interested in talking about \$25K or \$50K and they are not interested in a long term relationship, then that's not the firm we want to work with.

Ms. McKuen suggested explaining what Ms. Hunter just said in item C, that it's a long term project with multiple phases. Ms. McKuen suggested stating the total cost of the project at the *end of all phases* would cost \$200K. Then they know each phase would not be \$200K. Mr. Welsch concurs with Ms. McKuen's idea. Ms. McKuen suggests changing the wording in C 1. Mr. Revord stated they need to make that clear from the beginning and ask Ms. Vance the best way to word it. I think that's the approach we need to take. Mr. Welsch thinks this is a good approach because they get a feeling for the grant proposal.

Ms. Hunter advised discussing with Ms. Vance that this is considered a multi-phase project because if they say "Lump Sum", they might think it's a lump sum for Phase I. Ask Ms. Vance if it's necessary to put the \$200K in there. Ms. McKuen feels it is because gives them perspective. Mr. Welsch concurs it's a good idea to ask Ms. Vance to help modify C1.

Ms. McKuen asked, under B, when Jay referred to the developer, what he envisioned. Mr. Welsch said he was referring to what the scope of the developer would be. Whatever

they need to provide the scope of services, it's their responsibility. Ms. Hunter recommends revising item B to read:

***These advisors listed below may include but are not limited to..... there should be no additional cost to the City.***

Mr. Grantt recommends instead of using the term project developer, use Senior Advisor. Ms. Hunter recommended using "may need, but not excluding" or "may require, but not limited to". Ms. Lawhon agreed stating it reads "needs to include" and should read "it may require, but not limited to." Mr. Revord stated this should be discussed with Ms. Vance, but that is the right language. Mr. Revord asked Mr. Welsch to send the document to Ms. Hunter and she and Ms. Sanseverino can talk to Ms. Vance.

Mr. Welsch voiced his concern to get this project going. Mr. Revord stated if they have this ready for the next meeting they'll be good to go.

b. Path to RFQ

#### VI. ORAL TRADITION PROJECT

a. Anthony Correia: Request to discuss a continuation of the project

Ms. Hunter reported that Mr. Correia could not be here this evening, but he did get the information to contact Mr. Stinchcomb and interview him. Ms. Hunter explained that each panel goes through a portion of history. Mr. Correia will be at our next meeting with more proposals and cost estimates. The Board has allocated \$5000 from the budget this year for this project.

#### VII. TRAVELING PHOTO EXHIBIT

a. Proper procedure for using photos – City Property

Mr. Revord stated the photographs that Mr. Tietz took are property of the City, how do they go about letting people use those. They have partnered with the Historical Society. Ms. Hunter stated if the Board adopts a program and decides to participate, they would make a motion to support the event and have the photos available for that event. A Board member and staff will be responsible to make sure the photos are safe. If it's a historical educational project approved by the Board, then it would be the Board supporting it. You could vote on it or give direction to staff. Having an outside organization borrow the pictures would be challenging.

b. Portfolios and Easels

Mr. Revord asked Ms. Chiamonte to price portfolios and easels and to order one portfolio and one easel to see how it works. Mr. Revord also asked Ms. Chiamonte to purchase foam pouches to protect the photographs.

Ms. Welles would like to take two pictures over to Ms. Bridges at the Art League for recommendations on portfolios and easels. Ms. Welles is concerned about the sturdiness and longevity of the easels. Mr. Revord said the pictures will not be displayed outside. Ms. Lawhon stated logistically it would look much nicer if they were displayed on easels rather than hung on the wall.

c. Art Festivals at Riverside Park; Need Volunteers at 2hrs each

1. February 9-10
2. March 4—5 3 – 4

***Mr. Revord made a motion for the pictures to be on display for the Art Festival at the Liles Hotel and that each Board member donate some time to be at the event, all were in favor, motion passed unanimously.***

Mr. Revord will ask Ms. Chiaramonte to send out a schedule of times and asked Board members to select two hours during each event on February 10 and 11 and March 3 and 4.

The Board decided to show 15 pictures at Art Fest and show the photographs featuring buildings at the first event.

Mr. Revord would like to have write-ups on each picture displayed on 3 x 5 “foam board. Mr. Revord asked Ms. Lawhon to prepare write-ups on each picture that they could display on 3x5” foam board next to each picture. Mr. Revord asked Ms. Lawhon to email the word document to him and he will have staff print it out.

Ms. Welles asked if they needed a banner reading “Icons of Bonita”. Ms. Lawhon wants to thank Mr. Tietz as well. Mr. Welsch suggested the 3x5” cards read:

Icons of Bonita  
By Photographer Brian Tietz  
Ms. Lawhon’s text

Mr. Grantt suggested having a label reading “Property of the City of Bonita Springs” on the back of the photographs.

Mr. Revord reported that Brian Tietz will be attending the next City Council Meeting scheduled for February 7, 2018, at 5:30 to receive a certificate of appreciation from the Mayor. Mr. Revord, Mr. Welsch and Mr. Tietz will come earlier so Mr. Tietz can sign the photographs and then set them up in Chambers.

Ms. Welles asked how the photographs were going to be displayed at City Council. Ms. Hunter recommended using some easels and lining them up on the dais.

Ms. McKuen stated that at the last meeting, they had spoken about some of the prints being dark. Did they get reprints? Ms. Hunter explained that Mr. Tietz did come by City Hall and look at the photos and thought they were reflective of what he intended. Mr. Welsch said that Mr. Tietz explained it looks different printed on metal.

#### VIII. BOARD MEMBER ITEMS

Mr. Grantt asked about the status of the McSwain House and if there were any updates. Ms. Lawhon stated concerns regarding the renovations at the McSwain House. Ms. Lawhon stated that it was discussed at the August 3 meeting, third page, last paragraph, that the porch would be built the same size as the rendering. The porch was not built as specified, it is not the same size as the rendering. In Mr. Vincent's rendering, the porch should be 15 feet deep. The porch is 10 feet deep and it will not meet the old Chicago antique brick. Mr. Vincent's original plan was for a nice spacious porch. That's what was approved by the City that's what this Board approved.

Ms. Lawhon stated on page 3, last sentence of the August 3 minutes, Mr. Vincent had drawn up plans for seating which will make the whole porch usable. Instead of seeing pickets and something pretty you'll see the back of seating. Ronda said there will be no pickets, nothing pretty. Ms. Lawhon is concerned that they are deviating from the plan that has been approved without going through Community Development.

Ms. Lawhon is also concerned about the roof which needs to be fixed. Ms. Lawhon does not want the inside of the house to be ruined because of a damaged roof. Mr. Revord stated that the Board did not approve a new roof. Ms. Hunter said the Historical Society would have to come forward and ask for an amendment to the plans if they wanted to include the roof, but they have not done that. The Historical Society is required to meet the Certificate of Appropriateness that has been approved by the Board and by the City. Mr. Fiigon report that Tri Town Construction, their contractor, submitted for a building permit and it was rejected because it did not match the plan, so Tri Town was made aware that what was submitted did not match the plan. As well, Mr. Fiigon made Mr. Vincent aware on Tuesday that the plan was not matching and as of this date, they have no approvals with Community Development. Ms. Hunter stated they will not get the funds unless they get a building permit and it is constructed per the Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Hunter explained that there are several steps before they would get funding.

1. They get a building permit
2. They construct the work
3. The work needs to be inspected
4. Building inspector determines if they built to the plans that were approved
5. If not, they do not get the funding.

Ms. Hunter explained that staff does not approve it, the Board approves it. It is a property that is on the designated list.

Mr. Fiigon explained if they were to deviate from the Certificate of Appropriateness, it must come back to the board. That's our reference point from the building permit process. The City is not going to approve anything that deviates from the plans.

Ms. Lawhon asked if anyone need to let them know. Mr. Fiigon already did by rejecting the permit that was submitted because it was not to plan to the City development permit. The Land Development Order was approved off Mr. Vincent's plan. The opportunity was offered to them that if they want to amend the Land Development Order, they would need to come back and redo a Certificate of Appropriateness through the Board. Right now the two things don't match and until they do, they will not get a permit.

Ms. Lawhon is concerned about the roof as far as prioritize the health of the structure. Mr. Revord does not think they'll get a certificate of occupancy without a good roof.

Ms. Lawhon asked if she should offer to help them navigate through the process. Mr. Revord said she's welcome to do that as a private citizen, but not on behalf of the Board.

Ms. McKuen suggests inviting the Historical Preservation Society to the next meeting. Ms. Hunter said it's appropriate to invite them to get a status report. For budgetary purposes it's important to know where we stand.

Mr. Revord spoke to Ms. Whittemore at the Historical Preservation Society about the photo exhibit and once the McSwain house is open they could have an unveiling cocktail reception.

Ms. McKuen asked about the Dixie Moon Cafe. Ms. Hunter reported that it was reported to Code Enforcement and identified with code enforcement.

Mr. Fiigon reported that he has met with the property appraiser to update the list of properties that may fall under the demolition delay ordinance. There are 999 new properties plus the 169 that are currently on the list. Mr. Fiigon asked the Board if he could remove the mobile homes from the list. Mr. Fiigon does not have a time table for when he will get through all the properties. He is going to sift through which will take him a little bit of time. Ms. Hunter mentioned that they did not charge us for this list, typically there is a charge, but as this list expands in the future as it will as the years goes by, we may have to figure out what a potential cost may be and add that to the budget.

Mr. Welsch thinks that 1968 is young. Mr. Revord said our ordinance states 50 years or older. Mr. Grantt said maybe cut it off at 1960 or 1959. Mr. Revord said you have to think about 100 years from now and then you have that 1960 limit and recommended making it 70 or 75 years. Mr. Revord asked for Mr. Fiigon's opinion with this. Ms. McKuen asked if the year the structure is built was the only criteria. Ms. Hunter stated for the demolition delay it has to be 50 years or older. Mr. Fiigon said he would go through the list and add it as an agenda item at next meeting for discussion.

## IX. PUBLIC COMMENT



No public present

X. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

a. June 2017, August 2017, October 2017, November 2017

Ms. Welles said please correct the use of the word palette for color palette (was incorrectly spelled pallet). Correct the October and November 2017 minutes.

**June 2017**

Ms. Welles asked if they allocated a total of \$12,000 - \$18,000 for the Couture home and they have only submitted \$9700. Ms. Hunter said they can come back. Ms. Welles stated that means that the money they have in 2017-18 has totally been allocating. Ms. Hunter said it means it's not to exceed, so it's additional up to \$15,000. Ms. Welles stated, in this fiscal year, the Board has allocated \$32,000 for the McSwain house and the additional for the Skinner house.

***Mr. Grantt made a motion to approve the June 2017 minutes, Mr. Welsch seconded; motion passed unanimously.***

Let the record show, Ms. Welles needed to leave the meeting early.

**August 2017**

Ms. McKuen asked if the minutes should reflect that Ms. Lawhon was absent. Ms. Lawhon said please do.

Mr. Grantt asked to please correct the spelling of his name (was incorrectly spelled Grant). Alex said my name has two "t's" instead of one T.

***Ms. Elly McKuen made a motion to approve the August 2017 minutes approve the minutes as amended above, Mr. Alex Grantt seconded; motion passed unanimously.***

**October 26, 2017**

Mr. Welsch made the following corrections:

On page 2 at the bottom where it reads "Mr. Welsch *volunteered*" please change *volunteered* to ***reflects***.

Next line, Mr. Welsch's company said "***possibly***" deliver the services. Add the word ***possibly***.

Page 3, top of page, first paragraph, Mr. Welsch said “no his company would not be putting in a proposal at this time – add “*at this time*”. And where it reads “This was only and approach” change to “This was *more an of an approach*” to help the City

*Ms. Ronda Lawhon made a motion to approve the minutes as amended above; Mr. Jay Welsch seconded; motion passed unanimously.*

**November 2017**

Ms. Lawhon said to correct the spelling of the word palette.

Mr. Grantt asked for the spelling of his name to be corrected (with two “t’s”)

*Mr. Revord made a motion to approve the minutes as amended, Ms. McKuen seconded; motion passed unanimously as amended.*

XI. CONFIRM NEXT MEETING DATE: February 22,2018

XII. ADJOURNMENT

*Mr. Welsch made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:36 p.m., Mr. Grantt seconded; meeting adjourned.*

Respectfully submitted,

Nadine Chiaramonte  
Nadine Chiaramonte, Office Assistant

APPROVED  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD:

Date: 4/26/18

AUTHENTICATED:

Dallas Revord  
Dallas Revord, Chairman

Any person requiring special accommodations at any of the meetings because of a disability or physical impairment should contact Arleen Hunter, Assistant City Manager, at 239-949-6262, at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

If a person decides to appeal a decision made by the Council in any matter considered at this meeting/hearing, such person may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, to include the testimony and evidence upon which such appeal is to be based.