



HISTORICAL PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
Meeting Minutes of April 20, 2022, at 4:00 p.m.
Coral Gables City Hall, City Commission Chamber
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, Florida 33134

Historical Resources &
 Cultural Arts

2327 SALZEDO STREET
 CORAL GABLES
 FLORIDA 33134

☎ 305-460-5093
 ✉ hist@coralgables.com

MEMBERS	D 15	J 19	F 16	M 16	A 20	APPOINTED BY
Albert Menendez (Chair)	P	P	P	P	E	Commission-As-A-Whole
Cesar Garcia Pons (Vice Chair)	E	P	P	P	P	City Manager Peter Iglesias
Alicia Bache-Wiig	P	P	P	P	E	Mayor Vince Lago
Margaret (Peggy) Rolando	P	P	E	E	P	Vice-Mayor Michael Mena
Dona Spain	P	P	P	P	P	Commissioner Rhonda Anderson
Xavier Durana	P	P	E	E	E	Commissioner Jorge L. Fors, Jr.
Michael J. Maxwell	P	P	P	P	P	Commissioner Kirk R. Menendez
Bruce Ehrenhaft	P	P	P	P	P	Commission-As-A-Whole
John P. Fullerton	P	P	P	P	P	Board-as-a-Whole

LEGEND: A = Absent; P = Present; E = Excused; * = New Member; ^ = Resigned Member.
 - = No Meeting; # = Late meeting arrival

STAFF: Warren Adams, Historic Preservation Officer, Kara Kautz, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer, Gus Ceballos, Assistant City Attorney, Attorney of the Board.

RECORDING SECRETARY/PREPARATION OF MINUTES: Nancy Kay Lyons, Administrative Assistant

OPENING STATEMENT

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons read for the record the statement regarding the purpose of the board and lobbyist registration and disclosure.

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 pm by Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons and attendance was stated for the record.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Mr. Spain and seconded by Mr. Garcia-Pons to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 16, 2022.
 The motion passed (Ayes: 6; Nays: 0).

DEFERRALS: None

NOTICE REGARDING EX-PARTE COMMUNICATIONS.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons read a statement regarding Notice of Ex-ParTEE Communications. Board members who had ex-parTEE communication of contact regarding cases being heard were instructed to disclose such communication or contact. Board members did not indicate that any such communication occurred.

SWEARING IN OF THE PUBLIC:

Attorney Ceballos administered the oath.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

A motion was made by Mr. Rolando and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the absences of Chair Menendez, Ms. Bache-Wiig and Mr. Durana.
 The motion passed (Ayes: 6; Nays: 0).

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons read a description of the first item as follows:

AD VALOREM TAX RELIEF:

An application requesting ad valorem tax relief for the property at 711 University Drive, a Local Historic Landmark, legally described as Lot 11 & S ½ of Lot 10, Block 137, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part Six, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 20, at Page 1 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The related Special Certificate of Appropriateness, COA (SP) 2017-006, was granted design approval by the Historic Preservation Board on June 15, 2017.

Ms. Kautz gave a presentation following the on-screen presentation. Highlights were as follows:

1. The property at 711 University drive is significant as an excellent example of the Mediterranean revival architectural style.
2. Designed by Phineas Paist for Edwin Gilbert and Ethel Merrick Bishop, the younger sister of Coral Gables founder George Merrick.
3. Designated in 2017.
4. Work on this ad valorem was approved as part of COA(SP)2017-006.
5. Project is substantially completed, and we are reviewing Part 2 now.
6. A photo from the 1940's and a rendering of the original permit by Phineas Paist was shown on the screen.
7. A series of before and after photos were shown and an explanation of the work performed was given.
 - a) New impact resistant casement windows indoors to match the original configuration.
 - b) New two-piece barrel tile.
 - c) Repair and replacement of damaged and rotten wood structural members.
 - d) New stucco finish and stucco repair.
 - e) Painting of the house.
 - f) New MEP systems.
 - g) Replacement of the south front façade balconette railings and iron window grill.
 - h) Reintroduction of the second-floor loggia, including the wood railings that match the existing found on the house.
 - i) Enclosure of an existing second floor loggia retaining the original wood railings.
 - j) Repair of the wood rafter ends.
 - k) Various structural improvements.
 - l) Demolition of later inappropriate additions.
 - m) The rear façade – paving, gates and pool.
 - n) Replacement of interior and exterior stone terracotta tile flooring.
 - o) Complete interior reconfiguration.
 - p) Interior restoration also included the replication of missing iron railing in the living room.
 - q) Repair of existing wood window grill.
 - r) Retention of the stained-glass windows.
 - s) Restoration of original iron work.
 - t) Restoration of the Pecky Cypress elements including the tower ceiling and the restoration of the interior doors.
 - u) One-story addition at the southwest corner of the residence.
 - v) Opening of an existing screen porch (shown with a red awning).
 - w) One story addition at the west side of the wing of the residence that flanks Palmarito Street, containing a half bathroom, covered terrace with built-in bar on the first floor and outdoor staircase.
 - x) Site improvements, new paver driveway and walkways, installation of new swimming pool and deck, restoration of the existing finial on the roof, installation of new landscaping, new walls fence and gates.
 - y) Before and after interior photos which did not count towards the ad-valorem, were shown to compare the new and the old. They included:
 - a) Kitchen.
 - b) Living room.
 - c) Railings and grills that were replicated.
 - d) Ceiling, staircase that was restored.
 - e) Grill that was replicated.
 - f) Staircase and doors that were restored.

Ms. Kautz said that this was one of the most comprehensive packages that she had ever received.

Ms. Spain said that the house was previously unnoticed, and they had done a beautiful job restoring it.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons invited the owner to speak, but she declined saying she had nothing additional. Mr. Fullerton asked if the handrail on the stairwell had to meet a code. Ms. Kautz said because it was restoration it did not, and that staff recommended approval.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia Pons asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor of the application.

Mr. Eric Sartor of 3613 Alhambra Court stepped up to the microphone and stated that he had a house on Monserrate before and he agreed with Ms. Spain that the house was a previously a disaster and the owner had done a fabulous job restoring the house. He was not sure what she was asking for, but he thought that she deserved it.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia Pons asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak against the application. When no one did he closed the public portion of the hearing.

Both Mr. Fullerton and Mr. Ehrenhaft thanked the owner for the beautiful job they had done.

A motion was made by Mr. Fullerton and seconded by Mr. Ehrenhaft to approve the ad valorem tax relief for the property at 711 University Drive.
The motion passed (Ayes: 6; Nays: 0).

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons read a description of the next item as follows:

LOCAL HISTORIC DESIGNATION:

CASE FILE LHD 2022-001: Consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 3613 Alhambra Court, legally described as Lots 31 to 33 inclusive, Block 50, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part Four, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 10, at Page 57 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

Ms. Kautz gave a presentation following the on-screen presentation. Highlights were as follows:

1. The application was as a result of the Board of Architects directive for a historic significance determination
2. 3613 Alhambra Court is eligible as a Local Historic Landmark based on three significance criteria:
 - Historical, Cultural significance**
 - 4. It Exemplifies the historical, cultural, political, economic, or social trends of the community
 - Architectural significance**
 1. Portrays the environment in an era of history characterized by one or more distinctive architectural style.
 2. Embodies those distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or method of construction.
3. The single-family home is located on a 150' x 175' interior lot that backs onto the western portion of Biltmore Golf Course in Coral Gables Country Club Section Part Four. It was amongst first homes built along the course.
4. The home was permitted in 1940 by architect William Merriam.
5. It was designed in the Modernistic style of Art Moderne for Frank Slack.
6. This was one of a few high-style Art Moderne Modernistic homes built in the City during the City's second developmental period and represents both the somewhat rare domestic use of Art Moderne as well as the architectural turning point in Coral Gables as it embraces other styles.
7. The home exhibits extensive character-defining characteristics of Art Moderne architectures:
 - Asymmetrical, horizontal massing and orientation.
 - Cylindrical form positioned to give 'ship-like' streamline form.
 - Smooth, light-colored, exterior stucco surfaces with coral rock features.
 - Low-pitched roofs with wide eaves.
 - Sparse ornamentation using only elements that selectively enhance the geometry, sleekness, and horizontality of the structure.
 - Sculptural entry.
 - Architrave's receding symmetrical planes.
 - Ribbons of fenestration.
 - Stringcourses and inscribed horizontal lines.
 - Glass brick inserts.

- Geometric and dominant chimneystack with flared top.
 - Flared masonry window hood.
 - Scalloped window ornamentation.
 - Geometric masonry screens.
 - Attached garage.
 - Casement windows (originally steel).
 - Loggia with columns.
8. A full discussion of extant home is found in the designation report.
 9. Staff did not have access to the property, so photos are limited to those supplied by the owner, found online, or taken from the public right-of-way.
 10. William Merriam was well-versed in the Mediterranean Revival style and Merrick's vision for the City.
 11. Merriam's work during the late 1930s and early 1940s embrace the Modernistic aesthetic while paying tribute to the City's foundational style.
 12. With this home Merriam chose to employ Art Moderne in a manner that aesthetically blended with other comparable Mediterranean Revival style homes from the 1920s rather than be in stark contrast to them.
 13. This home is a significant example of the interpretation of Art Moderne in this Mediterranean-inspired City.
 14. Ships, trains and automobiles were the inspiration for the streamline Art Moderne. In the less common residential examples, the inspiration was more subtle and figurative as aptly seen at 3613 Alhambra Court.
 15. Bowed projections and rounded corners are hallmark features of Art Moderne.
 16. In this home Merriam loosely suggests a ship with the two-story cylindrical projection with its large curved, glass block window and its chimney reminiscent of a smokestack.
 17. In addition to the large, curved glass block feature the home also retains another original glass block window.
 18. The home stretches nearly the full width of the 150' lot with a two-story central core and a series of one-story bays.
 19. The horizontal nature of the home is further accentuated by a series of low-pitched roofs with very wide eaves and a number of horizontal decorative features.
 20. While the core portion of the home is two stories it gives the impression of a lower-slung home.
 21. It has the visual impact of one-and-a-half stories rather than its actual two stories due to the arrangement of features on the façade.
 22. A prominently projecting molded stringcourse runs at approximately the one-and-a half-story level.
 23. The smooth stucco façade aids in emphasizing the stringcourse.
 24. The windows of the upper story are smaller and sit on the stringcourse taking the place of a sill.
 25. The low-pitched roofs further add to the forced perspective of a lower home.
 26. Also adding to this impression is the one-and-a-half story entry feature which has the visual impact of making the lower one-and-a-half story read as one-story and the upper story read as a half-story.
 27. The front entry assemblage is the most ornamented element of the home. With a Modernistic stylized ziggurat surround it has a strong sculptural quality.
 28. A series of symmetrical receding stepped architrave 'frames' in smooth stucco lead to the deeply inset front door.
 29. The 'entablature' above is in locally sourced coral rock with geometric and floral bas-relief ornamentation which imparts added geometric interest to the front façade.
 30. The stringcourse defines the upper limit of this element and projects to form a round corner sill shelf for a pair of deeply inset second story windows.
 31. Framing the windows are scalloped bas-reliefs in smooth stucco.
 32. The steps, entry landing, and small terrace are also coral rock.
 33. Immediately next to the front entry is a pair of windows deeply inset with a flared opening.
 34. An elegant, swooped hood in smooth stucco projects above the pair.
 35. Below is a molded projecting sill.
 36. These elements contribute to the horizontality of the façade and balance the entry feature.
 37. Additional photos provided a view of some details not visible in previous slides, which showed the depth of the window and door openings which had the appearance of being cut-out and add to the geometric nature of the home.
 38. The other primary defining feature of this portion of the home is the rectangular two-and-a-half story chimney pierces through the roof with its west face flush with the front façade to its north.

39. The chimney top is flared with a series of horizontal raised and incised lines below creating a ‘cornice-like’ terminal horizontality on this vertical element.
40. To the south of the chimney, the second story is stepped back while the roofline is maintained hence giving the impression that a cube was cut out at this corner and providing additional geometric impact to the front facade.
41. A stringcourse also runs across at this section but at a lower height drawing the eye down from this vertical element.
42. The floorplan showed a garage at the northern end of the home whose vehicular entry is at the rear facade. On the front and side facades of the garage are the original long Modernistic horizontal masonry screens with a decorative geometric pattern. Their locations were denoted by the orange arrows.
43. It appears that the later fences and gates on the property were patterned after these original Modernistic panels.
44. There have been no substantial changes to the style of the home.
45. While there have been a number of additions, they are all on the rear of the home and do not substantially impact the style of the home.
46. The major character-defining features and street presence remain fundamentally intact.
47. Alterations of the home for the most part attempted to respect its Art Moderne style.
48. Primary alterations to the front of the home include a change of roof tile from flat to “S”-tile in 2016.
49. At an unknown date it appears the material of the front entry may have been altered.
50. In the 1940s historic photos it reads as if the receding framework around the front door was also coral rock or perhaps ‘marbleized’ to give that appearance. It is now a smooth stucco.
51. Recently, the original steel casement windows were replaced with hurricane impact windows whose muntin pattern kept the memory of fenestration pattern. During this campaign one window on the front façade was infilled with glass block. (Circled in red).
52. The following photos and floorplan as noted below were shown:
 - a) Floor plan with three addition campaigns to the rear of the home.
 - The first in 1962 was a 181 square foot Florida room by the original architect William Merriam. It was one story, flat-roofed filling in the rear nook of the original L-shaped two-story portion; (denoted in orange). In 2001 the flat roof of this addition was converted to a second story open-air terrace.
 - In 1998 a 221 square foot addition was constructed along the northeast portion of the rear; (denoted in purple). This addition is under a hipped roof that rises slightly higher than the original streetside gabled roofs it sits behind.
 - In 2001 there were two new additions - a one-story, flat-roof bedroom at the southeast corner and a one-and-a-half-story cylindrical breakfast nook attached to the southeast corner of the 1998 addition (denoted in blue).
 - b) Photo of rear façade of the home and floorplan.
 - In 2001 (along with the additions noted in blue), the rear fenestration was converted to a series of clear-view French doors that form a modern horizontal band across the rear facade. This along with the cylindrical breakfast nook, and the rounded glass block southeast corner, (shown in the next slide), was reportedly done with the intent of producing a 21st century nod to the Art Moderne.
 - c) Floor plan and two photos.
 - Photo #1 - The addition at the southeast corner of the home. The design of the addition was acknowledging the style of the original home with its rounded full-height curved glass block corner, the banded cornice parapet, and the rounded corners of the doorway.
 - Photo #2 - Looking north along the rear façade, and the rounded corners of the second story terrace.
 - d) Photo from the second story terrace.
 - The rear yard layout and its view of the golf course.
 - e) Photo from back patio showing Biltmore Hotel and golf course.

- f) In conclusion, designed by architect William Merriam in 1940, the single-family residence at 3613 Alhambra Court, was one of the first homes built along the golf course and it is one of a handful of homes built in the City in the Modernistic Art Moderne style. This style emphasized curving forms, sleek and smooth surfaces with long horizontal lines. While this home is clearly Art Moderne, it is also influenced by the Mediterranean Revival style and is a significant example of the interpretation of Art Moderne in this Mediterranean-inspired City. Comparison of original permit plans, historic photos and building records with the extant property indicate that this residence retains its historic integrity. Thus, the property at 3613 Alhambra Court contributes to the historic fabric of the City of Coral Gables and is part of the collection of quality residences that serves as a visible reminder of the history and the cultural heritage of the City. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Local Historic Designation of the property at 3613 Alhambra Court based on its historical, cultural, and architectural significance.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons asked if the staff wished to add anything else. Ms. Kautz said no and referred to the 5 letters of support that had been received. They were read into the record:

1. Mary E. Burke - 1243 Asturia Avenue, Coral Gables, FL 33134.
2. Sandra L. Scidmore – 100 Lincoln Road, Apartment, 423, Miami Beach, Florida 33139.
3. Jaime & Zully Pardo – 49 Campina Court, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
4. Dr. Karelia Martinez Carbonell, President, Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables Post Office Box 347944, Coral Gables, Florida 33234.
5. Brett Gillis – No address listed.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons asked if the owner was present and wanted to speak.

Mr. Sartor stepped up to the podium. He stated that he had not asked for the designation, that it was the Board of Architects. Back in 2019 he had received approval from the Board of Architects for an addition to add an extra bedroom upstairs and raise the ceilings. They had never followed through with the addition and they were here with their new architect Julian Quinn who had come up with a design that embraces the house. He wanted more information about the designation and whether he could still do the addition.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons said that he would let staff explain the designation process which did not preclude him from doing any work or additions, but they would be required to be reviewed by staff and the board. Ms. Kautz said that the board's sole focus at the meeting is to determine whether the property met the criteria for designation. If they property is designated, then at a subsequent meeting he could apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness to determine whether the addition was appropriate. She said that the addition should be sympathetic and in keeping with the historic architecture of the house.

Mr. Sartor said he was worried that the addition it would not be approved. Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons stated the board received Special COA's every month at their meetings. He would have to go to the Board of Architects for review. They were another board to ensure that changes did not negatively impact the historic nature of the property. Both staff and boards were helpful in ensuring that applications were well received by the board and respected the original architecture of the property. The board could not review the plans for the addition today.

Mr. Sartor said that had met with Mr. Adams who suggested that if the house was designated, it might be more appropriate to do an addition at the back instead of a second floor which he did not want. Ms. Spain said there were ways to do this which had been approved by the board in the past.

Ms. Kautz stated that the Board of Architects had directed him to come to the Historic Preservation Board. They had some concerns about some aspects of the addition and that she would work with Mr. Sartor to come to an understanding of what was appropriate. Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons stated that their task today was to determine if the property was appropriate for designation. He asked if there was a time clock if they did not decide today and instead deferred the application. Ms. Kautz said there was an appeal period. Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons said that in the past staff was

able to work with hesitant owners to allay their potential fears of the process. He was not sure if those discussions had already been had or they needed further discussion, but the board had enough information to decide today.

Mr. Sartor asked if he would still go to the Board of Architects for his addition. The answer was yes. Ms. Spain explained that if it was designated and he wanted to do an addition, it would first go to the Board of Architects who would make comments, and then it would come to the Historic Preservation Board with the comments. The Board of Architects is a recommending board to the Historic Preservation Board who makes the final decision. Mr. Fullerton added that the board would not review future plans, they would only decide if it was appropriate for designation. In the past owners had a say in the designation, but that was no longer the case, he felt Mr. Sartor was on the right track, and would get help from the staff and board and himself and his architect should meet with the Historic Preservation staff and present their ideas. Mr. Sartor asked if a second floor on a historic property had been done before and Mr. Fullerton said yes. Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons said the staff were very good at their job and were residents as well and wanted to make sure that it worked for everyone. Ms. Spain said she had never seen a project that was not made better by coming to the board. The Board of Architects must be a registered architect for at least 10 years, and they either must work or live in Coral Gables, and were committed to make a better project.

In answer to Mr. Fullerton's question, Ms. Kautz said that if there is a component of restoration work to locally designated properties there is a tax abatement available for ad-valorem taxes for a period of 10 years for city and county tax. She went on to answer Mr. Sartor's question by saying that It was a 10-year abatement of the increased value of the property based on the improvements made and it could be substantial.

Mr. Sartor asked if there were any height restrictions for historic properties. Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons and Mr. Fullerton said there are no specific restrictions related to historic properties just the general code.

Ms. Kautz said she had misspoken and because this was a historical significance determination, they were obligated to get the report to the board within a certain number of days. It can be deferred at the decision of the board and the mutual agreement of the owner. It does not start or stop a clock.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak in favor or opposition of this case. When no one answered he closed the public portion of the hearing for this case.

Mr. Fullerton asked if the previous additions on the house which had been approved could be part of the ad valorem? Ms. Kautz said that the project had to be approved by a Certificate of Appropriateness and the application had to be in before any work was performed. It was not retroactive. Ms. Rolando said she thought it was a magnificent house and there were not many Art Moderne house especially of this consequence in this location.

A motion was made by Mr. Maxwell and seconded by Mr. Fullerton to approve the local historic designation of the property at 3613 Alhambra Court.
The motion passed (Ayes: 6; Nays: 0).

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons read a description of the next item as follows:

SPECIAL CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2022-009: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 1264 Coral Way, a Contributing Resource within the "Coral Way Historic District," legally described as Lots 1 and 2, Block 1, Coral Gables Section "D" Revised Plat, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 25, at Page 74 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant is requesting design approval for a one-story addition to the residence and sitework.

Mr. Adams gave a presentation following the on-screen presentation. Highlights were as follows:

1. Permitted in 1924, prior to the incorporation of the City of Coral Gables.
2. Architect is unknown.
3. Built in the Mediterranean Revival Style.
4. In 2014 it was deemed a contributing resource within the Coral Way Historic District.

5. One of 17 remaining residences built prior to 1926 in the district.
6. In October 2016 the owner and architect appeared before the board for a discussion regarding the auxiliary structure that was originally a detached garage but had been converted into a guest house. The board determined that due to alterations the structure could be removed.
7. In 2018 the board approved with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness application for the construction of a one- and two-story addition to the rear of the property.
8. The application is requesting design approval for a one-story addition to the residence and sitework.
9. The addition will be to the east elevation and will consist of a family room with exterior patio.
10. To accommodate this addition an existing wood deck and one-story wood framed covered patio structure with barrel tile shed roof will be demolished.
11. A rectangular one-story addition will contain a family room and exterior patio.
12. Access from the existing house will be via two existing openings, existing patio doors and the openings will be removed.
13. Addition will be of concrete block and stucco and a flat roof with parapet.
14. The north elevation will contain double casement window with fixed side lights.
15. The impact of the proposed addition is most apparent on this elevation which faces Coral Way as the addition extends to the side of and is slightly higher than the existing den making it visible from the right-of-way.
16. This elevation will contain two double casement windows, the south elevation two sets of folding doors.
17. No variances have been requested.
18. The proposal was reviewed and approved by the City Architect.
19. In conclusion the application requests design approval for an addition, it is to the side of the residence and will be visible from Coral Way. However, it will be partially obscured by the existing one-story den, and the flat roof helps to reduce its height and minimize the massing. Access to the addition from the existing structure will be via two existing openings. The proposed addition takes its cues from the existing residence, but it can be differentiated from the historic structure by the proposed light texture stucco, differing window light configuration and the 2-inch stucco base.
20. Staff is recommending approval with the following conditions:
 - a) Window and door muntins shall be high-profile / dimensional.
 - b) Window and door glass shall be clear.
 - c) The stucco texture shall be similar to the texture applied to the other recent additions

Mr. Adams said the property owners were present.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons asked the property owners if they wanted to speak, but they declined, and then asked if there were any questions for staff, when no one answered he asked if anyone had anyone in the public wanted to speak in opposition or in favor of the case. When no one did he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Maxwell said the plans were clear, he said that that it was large and according to the plans it looked like it fit very well. He said he noticed that the house had been restored somewhat on the outside previously, particularly the second-floor windows where the reveals were opened up down below and the very complimentary fenestration that was put on. He said he had walked by the house, and it looked good, and he thought it was a real addition to the community. Mr. Fullerton agreed. He said that he knew Mrs. Jackaway well and he trusted her work.

A motion was made by Mr. Maxwell and seconded by Mr. Fullerton for approval a one-story addition to the residence and sitework on the property at 1264 Coral Way with staff conditions.
The motion passed (Ayes: 6; Nays: 0).

The conditions were as follows:

1. *Window and door muntins shall be high-profile / dimensional.*
2. *Window and door glass shall be clear.*
3. *The stucco texture shall be similar to the texture applied to the other recent additions*

BOARD ITEMS / CITY COMMISSION / CITY PROJECTS UPDATE: None

ITEMS FROM THE SECRETARY: None

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Recommendation to the City Commission for changes to the code.

Mr. Adams said they were looking for a recommendation to the City Commission for some amendments to the existing code. Article 8 – Historic Preservation and Article 14 – Process. Changes are being made to:

1. Address some inconsistencies in the code.
2. Revise the designation process to make things a clearer.
3. Allow additional time for property owners to receive their property designation reports. The property having been determined by staff to be eligible for designation. It would allow the owner to read and understand the report and get additional expert advice if necessary.

Mr. Adams said he could go through the changes individually or the board could ask him questions. The whole intent was to make things clearer and simpler for the benefit of the property owners and historic designations.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons said the information provided to the board was clear, he said it would be helpful for anyone watching if Mr. Adams would just hit the bullets.

Mr. Adams explained the following recommended changes:

1. Flowchart:
 - a) An amendment to the flowchart to clarify the process for applicants where a designation application is not recommended for approval by staff. This allows the applicant to proceed with the preparation and submittal of the designation report.
2. Section 8-107 – Demolition:
 - a) When staff receives a request for a determination of historical significance, they must provide a response within 45 days.
 - b) Determination of eligibility must include the criteria considered in the review and allows them to change the criteria in the final report after research.
 - c) A public hearing shall take place within 90 days of the determination as further on in the code the report is provided to the owner 14 days before the meeting to allow them to review it.
3. Section 8-104 – Designation Procedures:
 - a) Clarification of who may submit an application for designation.
 - b) Minimum submittal requirements for historical designations: Basic research must be performed and provided as to why it is eligible for designation. If someone nominates a district or multiple properties, this information is required for each property.
 - d) Submittal time requirement for applicants: If staff has determined that the property does not meet the minimum eligibility criteria for designation the applicant must provide a report within 30 days of the determination to bring it to the board themselves and it must describe in sufficient detail the criteria. The application will then be scheduled for the next available board meeting which allows sufficient time to send out public notices.
 - e) A copy of the historic landmark designation report must be provided to the property owner no less than 14 days prior to the board review.
4. Article 14:
 - a) Correct the time period for which historic significance determinations are valid from 6 months to the correct 18 months which is stated in the letters sent out, but not in the code.

Ms. Spain asked Mr. Adams to repeat who could submit a historic designation request. She did not understand what was meant by citizen. Attorney Ceballos clarified the meaning of citizen in the code. Anyone who resides within the city and is a registered voter. Ms. Spain asked if someone who was renting a property and was a registered voter could submit a designation request? Attorney Ceballos said yes. Ms. Spain went on to ask if it didn't have to be within 500 feet of the property or within the notice, if it was anyone in the city? Attorney Ceballos said currently there was no limitation, but if she would like to suggest it. Ms. Spain said she was just clarifying as she thought it should be that way. Mr. Adams said that this was their opportunity to make changes. Ms. Spain said that people have said that it should be someone within the affected area that are noticed, but it has always been the city's opinion that it should be anyone in the city because everyone as a whole is affected so she is glad to see that it was not changing.

Ms. Rolando asked if this was the opportunity for them to address the issues that we repeatedly encounter with a true barrel tile versus “S” tile. Mr. Adams said it was not in the code. She went on to say that at least 3 or 4 times a year she received this issue. Mr. Adams said that the homeowners that come to the board have already met with staff and staff has explained to them, and they have decided to go to the board despite staff telling them that the board would not approve the “S” tile. Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons said that he was a major proponent of conversation of doing that, but he did not think that this piece of legislation would be the right method to do that. Ms. Rolando asked how they would put the property owner on notice, so they did not feel like they were ambushed.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons referred to the legislation and the language proposed on the second page and asked Mr. Adams if the change on the second page at the top which changed “any necessary information” to “all necessary information” is what is described in the previous section which said all information inclusive of “the property address, the legal description, the tax, folio number, the location map, date of construction, architectural style, architect (if known), color photographs of the property, and a written statement. Mr. Adams responded affirmatively. He then asked Mr. Adams if this information was for someone who may not be as sophisticated as staff. Mr. Adams said they had given it some thought and they were going to request additional things for example he had put in there that if someone wanted to nominate a district they would need the boundaries of the district, but he felt it was too much to ask an applicant. However, most of the information requested is available in the Property Appraiser’s website. They would expect that anyone submitting a designation request should visit the property and take a photo. If they are unsure of the architect or architectural style, or any other information they can contact the Historical Resources Department. Mr. Adams responded to Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons question saying that the applicant can provide a photocopy of the property appraiser or google maps as a location map.

Ms. Spain asked who had generated the change. Attorney Ceballos said a lot of the items were being addressed to clean up the process as they had lost the 649 Palmarito case which had been remanded back to the city due to certain due process issues, and the city has not taken any action.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons asked Mr. Adams what the requested action was from the board on the discussion item. Mr. Adams said they were looking for a recommendation to the City Commission as to whether they approve the changes, it would go to the Planning and Zoning board and then the City Commission.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons asked if there was someone in the audience who wanted to speak in favor or opposition to the zoning amendment? Mr. Rishi Sehgal from 439 Minorca Avenue stepped up to the podium and said he was in favor of the process. He said that the city had a reputation of being difficult to work with, but that was not his experience with the boards and city staff. He said the process needed to be shored up so that applicants would know when to apply and not spend a lot of money and then have to redo their plans if they were not approved. He thought it could go a little further to clarify things, to allow the process to be efficient and transparent.

A motion was made by Ms. Rolando and seconded by Ms. Spain to make a recommendation to the City Commission to approve the changes to the code.

The motion passed (Ayes: 6; Nays: 0).

2. Barrel Tile VS “S”-Tile:

Ms. Rolando said she had no problem that they were being asked to vote or comment, but if they were making recommendations or bringing issues to the attention of the city, they should address the roof tile issue so that they did not end losing a legal fight. Attorney Ceballos said that their concern was that if it was put in the code, it would open the city to litigation which is why it was decided to address it on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Rolando responded that she thought not putting it in the code opened the city up to litigation because they were not consistent. She thought that they should recommend an ordinance which would provide guidance and if there is truly an issue applicant could apply for a variance. Ms. Spain asked if it could be a policy decision of the Board of Architects that all historic homes need to have true barrel tile? She thought that the Board of Architects requires true barrel tile on all 1920’s Mediterranean homes, regardless of their designation status.

Ms. Kautz responded that there are some historic houses with flat tile roofs that are appropriate. Ms. Spain said she understood, but if it is appropriate to have barrel tile it had to be true barrel tile.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons said that the board had already asked staff to look at the barrel tile issue and the staff had returned with comments and no clear way forward. He said the board shared Ms. Rolando's concerns and he understood the city's point of view to review each on a case-by-case basis. He wanted to be clear on at least one of the items which is process and procedures and is different than content. Ms. Rolando suggested that they vote on the proposal for the changes to the code and then discuss the barrel tile issue.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons asked Ms. Rolando if she wanted another discussion item. Ms. Rolando said yes, or they could schedule it for another time, she wanted to put architects and homeowners on notice that the city requires true barrel tile when it was in the plans originally or is otherwise appropriate. She did not know the right vehicle whether it should be in the building code. She did not think they were properly addressing it by having it ad hoc as to whether it happens or not is dependent on how persistent the homeowner is.

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia Pons addressed Mr. Adams and said that many of the board members had this conversation before and he himself had made a motion that was passed for staff to come back, and the answer was no. He wanted to know what staff could do to help the board achieve their goal. Mr. Adams suggested that the middle ground was a set of design guidelines. He was not sure if it was a good idea as things seemed to be working well using the Secretary of Interior Standards. He said that design guidelines could be a way to address barrel tile, clear glass, high profile muntins and the other things that staff continually had problems with. However, guidelines were not law, but could state that it was the City of Coral Gables' policy to only approve 2-piece barrel tiles. Ms. Spain said the Board of Architects give applicants a barrel tile drawing with dimensions on the height and curve of the tile, and if the suggested tile was shallower than what was stated they would not approve it. She said if they could require barrel tile. She suggested that staff speak with the City Architect and present it at a Board of Architects meeting and ask them how they could deal with the problem. Ms. Spain asked if the Board of Architects was approving roof tile. Ms. Kautz said that the staff was approving roof tile and the only things going to the Board of Architects were major additions and new construction. Mr. Ehrenhaft said the historic building designated today was Art Moderne with a traditional flat tile roof and in 2016 they had put "S" tile on it. It was not Mediterranean Revival style, could be open for discussion as to whether the "S" tile was appropriate. Ms. Spain said that in 1994 when she started working with the city roofing applications did not go to the Board of Architects, nor did it have any type of design approval, instead Manny Lopez the building official, only reviewed it for method of application. While she was in zoning, everyone thought she was crazy as she said they could not put faux barrel tile on 1940's Moderne Buildings and why they were allowing flat tile on a 1920's Mediterranean house, but it had not gone anywhere.

Mr. Maxwell asked if Mr. Adams and the City Attorney could give them some guidance at their next meeting on what the appropriate and effective way to address the situation without putting themselves in a box for the future. Mr. Adams said he would do that and in response to questions he said he would have an answer by the next meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. 4200 Granada Boulevard Elevator:

Mr. Adams said he had spoken to the property owner and the various conditions that were in the approval. One of the conditions was that staff would get someone from the City to go out and inspect the elevator, however no one in the city does elevator inspections. The owner suggested the elevator installer inspect the elevator, but Mr. Adams refused. Mr. Adams went out and inspected the elevator which is at the top at the second floor, with the workings are above it and an access hatch on the side wall. When the elevator is at the second floor the space is required to access the workings. When he asked why the hatch could not be in the roof, he was told that if the elevator is stuck at the first floor or if the elevator plummets the roof access would be useless. The property owner has agreed to provide new drawings where to lower the pyramid roof and put a banding around the tower. The amended drawings have not yet been submitted.

2. 1013 Castile Avenue:

A new owner is going to finish the job. There was a revision to their permit that they needed to reactivate and get the changes approved. The revision was approved, and windows and doors were installed. Ms. Kautz had met with the owners regarding their stucco sample which she did not approve so they had to submit a new one. The architect is making a few other revisions, but they are actively moving forward to get the job completed under a code issue.

NEW BUSINESS: None

ADJOURNMENT:

Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons if there were any other issues when no one had he asked for a motion to adjourn.

A motion was made by Mr. Maxwell and seconded by Acting Chair Mr. Garcia-Pons to adjourn the meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:38 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Warren Adams
Historic Preservation Officer