



CORAL GABLES HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
Wednesday, October 19, 2022, Meeting, 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	N 21	D 21	J 22	F 22	M 22	A 22	M 22	J 22	J 22	A 22	S 22	O 22	APPOINTED BY
Albert Menendez (Chair)	P	P	P	P	P	E	P	P	E	E	P	P	Commission-As-A-Whole
Cesar Garcia- Pons (Vice-Chair)	E	E	P	P	P	P	E	E	P	P	P	P	City Manager Peter Iglesias
Alicia Bache- Wiig	P	P	P	P	P	E	P	P	E	P	P	P	Mayor Vince Lago
Margaret (Peggy) Rolando	P	P	P	E	E	P	#	P	E	P	E	E	Vice-Mayor Michael Mena
Dona Spain	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Commissioner Rhonda Anderson
Xavier Durana	P	P	P	E	E	E	P	P	P	P	P	P	Commissioner Jorge L. Fors, Jr.
Michael J. Maxwell	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Commissioner Kirk R. Menendez
Bruce Ehrenhaft	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	E	E	Commission-As-A-Whole
John P. Fullerton	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	E	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, Gus Ceballos, Assistant City Attorney
RECORDING SECRETARY/PREPARATION OF MINUTES: Nancy Kay Lyons, Administrative Assistant

OPENING STATEMENT

Chair Menendez read for the record the statement regarding the purpose of the board and lobbyist registration and disclosure.

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 4:09 pm by Chair Menendez and attendance was stated for the record.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the minutes of the September 21, meeting with corrections.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7; Nays: 0).

NOTICE REGARDING EX-PARTE COMMUNICATIONS.

Chair Menendez 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF DEFERRAL OF AN AGENDA ITEM

CASE FILE LHD 2022-008: Consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 117 Aledo Avenue, legally described as Lots 27, 28, 29 and 30, Block 14, Coral Gables Coconut Grove Section Part One, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 14, at Page 25 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

Christina Gutierrez – architect for 117 Aledo Avenue requests a deferral based on the following:

- a) Defer to November meeting to bring proposed improvements which have already been to the Board of Architects.

Mr. Adams said that they had submitted the application for the improvement, but it was too late to get it on this agenda. The board can move ahead with the designation if they want to.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons asked what the November agenda looked like? Mr. Adams replied they have three historic designations, this would be the fourth, and not a lot of Certificate of Appropriateness.

A motion was made by Mr. Fullerton and seconded by Ms. Spain to defer CASE FILE LHD 2022-008, consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 117 Aledo Avenue to the November 16th, 2022, meeting.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7, Nays: 0).

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Durana to excuse the absences of Mr. Bruce Ehrenhaft and Ms. Peggy Rolando from this meeting.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7, Nays: 0).

SWEARING IN OF THE PUBLIC:

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos administered the oath.

Chair Menendez read a description of the first case as follows:

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2022-025: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 817 Obispo Avenue, a Contributing Resource within the “Obispo Avenue Historic District,” legally described as the Lot 15, Block 28, Coral Gables Section “B,” according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 111 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant is requesting design approval for an addition and alterations to the residence. A variance has also been requested from Article 2, Section 2-101 D (4) b.i. of the Coral Gables Zoning Code for the minimum side setback.

Mr. Adams said that the City Manager would be attending the meeting for the TDR items, he requested the items be moved up when he arrived.

Ms. Kautz made a presentation following the on-screen Presentation.

The PowerPoint played on-screen. Highlights were as follows:

1. A location map was shown onscreen.
2. The property is considered a contributing resource within the historic district that was designated in May 2008.

3. Permit Number 1622 issued in October 1925.
4. Alterations to the home over the years have been minor in nature and it retains its integrity to this day.
5. The owner is proposing to construct approximately a 275 square foot addition to the northeast corner of the rear of the property and some alterations to the existing window and door openings.
6. A variance has been requested from the zoning code regarding the side setback.
7. The existing house has a side setback, of approximately 3 feet 4 inches, and the owner wants to continue that same side set back.
8. Staff supports the request for a variance. They are not making it any worse than what already exists, and if the property were to be designated as a Coral Gables cottage (it meets conditions but is missing one or two features) the variance would not be necessary.
9. Staff has conditions for approval.

John Lee the owner of the property introduced his wife and followed an on-screen presentation and made the following comments:

1. It is a single story, simple addition going back in the northeast corner.
2. Pictures were shown of the home, the doorway, right side, back entrance and overhead view.
3. The red square on the screen indicated where the addition would be.
4. A survey of the property was shown.
5. Currently they have 3 feet 4 inches, and they want to follow the line of the existing property.
6. The proposal is an addition to the west side of the home, and will be comprised of a main bedroom, walk in closet and second bathroom.
7. The existing bedroom will be reconfigured into a second bathroom and hallway.
8. There are additional exits coming off the main bedrooms through French doors and in the dining room.
9. The variance language requires certain setbacks, they are seeking to go along with the existing property line.
10. A Site plan with close-ups of the proposed addition and elevations was shown.
11. Board of Architects approved the preliminary plans on August 1, 2022.
12. Historic Preservation Staff approves both the variance and the addition.
13. They agree with the conditions from the Historic Preservation staff.

Mr. Fullerton asked the following questions

Question: Are the new windows going to be casement windows?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Are the rest of the windows going to be replaced and made similar?

Answer: Yes, eventually the plan is to replace all with impact windows and doors. They will be casement windows instead of the awnings.

Ms. Kautz said condition #2 refers to this. They are requesting a full plan of the whole envelope of the house up front to make sure that the addition matches what is going to come later, so they will have a guide moving forward when they decide to do the rest of the windows.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor or opposition of the case. When no one did he closed the public portion of the hearing and opened it up to the board for comments.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons said he passed by this house often on his evening walks and he was excited that they were here making the addition.

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Fullerton to approve with conditions as noted in the staff report the design proposal for an addition and alterations to the residence and sitework and approve the issuance of the Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 817 Obispo Avenue.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7, Nays: 0).

Conditions are as follows:

1. *Roof tile is to be two-piece true barrel tile.*
2. *Elevations of the entire residence with impact-resistant windows and doors matching the original type and configuration are to be provided so that the muntin pattern of the windows on the addition can be finalized with Staff.*
3. *Windows and doors are to receive high-profile muntins and glass is to be clear/no tint or reflectivity.*
4. *All existing windowsills are to remain.*
5. *Provide a recess at the infilled window openings on the east and west elevations.*

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Fullerton to approve the request for a variance from Article 2, Section 2-101 D (4) b.i of the Coral Gables Zoning Code for the property to have a side setback of 3 feet 4 inches.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7, Nays: 0).

Mr. Adams stated that the City Manager was present, and they were requesting to hear the TDR's.

Chair Menendez read a description of the next case as follows:

CASE FILE TDR 2022-005: Consideration of the Transfer of Development Rights for the property at 280 Miracle Mile, the Miracle Theater, a Local Historic Landmark. A lengthy legal description is on file with the Historical Resources Department. The application requests approval of the Maintenance/Preservation Plan, pursuant to Section 14-204.4 of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.

Mr. Adams made a presentation following the on-screen Presentation.

The PowerPoint played on-screen. Highlights were as follows:

1. This is an application requesting approval of the Maintenance/Preservation Plan in association with the Transfer of Development Rights.
2. There are 40,235 square feet of development rights available, that are being requested to be transferred.
3. This application was reviewed by the Board at the meeting on September 21, 2022.
4. The board requested the Maintenance/Preservation Plan be revised to include procedures for the long-term maintenance and preservation of the site.
5. The Public Works Department has submitted a Maintenance/Preservation Plan which includes existing conditions, proposed corrective actions, maintenance schedule and estimated costs.
6. The total estimated repair cost, for the work is \$2,933,966.
7. This total excludes the cost of required structural repairs where costs are to be determined.
8. As per the board's request the maintenance plan has been revised to include procedures for its long-term maintenance, this includes yearly building inspection, roof inspections twice a year, roof replacement, HVAC maintenance and replacement and annual visits by the Historic Resources Staff for the inspection of historically significant features.
9. Staff recommends the approval of the maintenance preservation plan.
10. The Public Works Director, Hermes Diaz, and the City Manager, Peter Iglesias are here to answer questions and give additional information.

Mr. Hermes Diaz, Public Works Director introduced himself and made the following comments:

1. At the Board's request we put together a process which will allow moving forward for the identification and proper budgeting for needs that arise in historical buildings.
2. The key component of this process will be yearly building inspections that will report conditions of the property's main components and systems, including structural, roofing, electrical, plumbing, age factors, refrigeration when needed, doors and windows.
3. These reports will be used to issue work orders through the City's General Services Administration for repairs, incorporating through the city budget and notifying tenants of their duty to maintain and repair when warranted.
4. Since 2005 we have spent about a 1 million dollars in capital improvements and repairs at the theater.
5. There are certain features on these buildings citywide that are already on the matrix as was discussed previously.
6. The three lower roofs of the building are being replaced. Upon completion of the project, City staff will perform roof inspections twice a year, clean drains as needed and report evidence of leaks for repairs as needed.
7. Roof replacements are funded through a citywide roof replacement matrix included in the City's Capital Improvements budget.
8. HVAC systems receive regular maintenance by City contractors.
9. Since 2014, the city has budgeted \$50,000 per year towards the maintenance and repairs of electric, plumbing, HVAC and chiller system for the building.
10. The replacement of HVAC systems is funded through a citywide HVAC Equipment replacement matrix included in the City's Capital Improvements budget.
11. As Mr. Adams mentioned the City's Historical Resources and Cultural Arts Department will perform yearly inspections of the building's historically significant features to check for unpermitted alterations and make recommendations for their upkeep when warranted.
12. For the Miracle Theater building, these include the marquee and ticket booth, the etched glass mirrors, wood panels, poster frames, and telephone booth in the main lobby, curved, mirrored and paneled wall separating lobby from theater space, the main lobby terrazzo floors, wood clad columns, staircase leading to second floor with ornamental balustrade, display cases, surface moldings and millwork details, as well as the etched glass and mirrored surfaces.
13. The previous maintenance repair plan that was put together has been maintained, nothing has changed.
14. The termite treatment has been completed since the last meeting.

Members of the Historic board made comments and asked questions. Questions were answered and comments were made by Mr. Hermes Diaz, Public Works Director and Mr. Peter Iglesias, City Manager:

Mr. Fullerton: How many of these maintenance repairs are on the theater's list as well as the City's?

Answers:

Hermes Diaz: That is determined by the contract. The theater does a lot of maintenance that is related to the operations. They have a lot of internal things related to when they have events.

Peter Iglesias: The theater does minor maintenance, and the City takes care of all the major maintenance in that building. He said that they have tried to create the Historical Building Fund to try to get some of the TDR funding to help the City during a critical time and they are trying to get a few projects done including the new Fire station which is a life and public safety issue. Mr. Iglesias said that the City wants to maintain their historical buildings. There is an issue with the funding of the pension plan. The TDRs will bridge the next 5 to 10 years so the City can get to a different financial mode. The pension plan costs about 30 million dollars a year if it was fully funded it would only cost 4.3 million dollars a year. That issue should be resolved within the next 7 to 12 years. If the City had an extra 26 million dollars, the Public Safety building would have

been completed in less than 3 years cash and the Fire Station would also have been completed. The City is getting a premium for these TDR's and will act as a bridge during this period. At the same time a lot of these buildings are older and need a lot of work, they need constant repair. The City has a building matrix plan that that was initiated from the budget. All the maintenance for the buildings is budgeted every year, we accumulate the funds to deal with all our buildings, including, for instance, the roof work on City Hall and the Miracle Theater. The City has done a very good job of getting out of the retirement plan issues, we started at 50% and now we are over 70% actuarially and over 80% as of October 1st, last year. This plan is a bridge to get maintenance done now and get us to 7 to 10 years where there will be different funding sources. If the City had 26 million dollars we could do a lot of work, certainly a lot of work on our historic buildings and our needed infrastructure that haven't been done. The Public Safety Building was falling apart, which was the idea of this fund. Mr. Iglesias said they were potentially looking at two projects, the Venetian Pool and City Hall and getting these on the TDR sending sites to help us restore them. They had thought about getting restoration for City Hall next year. The plan was to go to a funding source for the mobility hub. Instead of just going for funding for the mobility hub go for an extra 10 to 15 million to restore City Hall. Mobility hub costs went from 42 million to 63 million dollars, because of the rise in construction costs so it will be put on the shelf until next year. Three projects are done at a time, and they were considering three additional projects for this year, the Mobility Hub, Fire Station #4 and restoration of City Hall. The initial drawings were completed, and the Fire Station went from a little over 4 million to over 8 million dollars. The restoration plans for City Hall have been budgeted and they would use additional funds to either do it all at the same time or in phases. The roof has been fixed and the building stabilized to prevent water intrusion which will allow time to get things done. The City is trying to save the historical buildings and be creative about the funding source.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons:

Thanked the City Manager and the Public Works Department for coming. He said that he knows the City understands their responsibility towards their historic buildings whether the TDRs are funded or not. The TDRs and the purview of the Historical Board is to protect historic properties. He understands the City Manager's point of view on the entire budget, but the board cares about the preservation of historic structures and buildings. The board's purview is the operations and maintenance plan, which is why further clarification was needed, not only for the board which is representative to the city but for the City to state their intentions for the operation and maintenance plans going forward above and beyond just the matrices of projects that are being worked on. The City has done this. He really appreciated the first six long term maintenance plan items, particularly number 6, which outlines the responsibilities of City staff, in particular the historical preservation department's role in identifying potential issues that an engineer and the Public Works Department may not be able to find. The specificity of city staff's review of the individual properties, not only this one but also the others that are upcoming will really help the City staff direct their attention to where their expertise is needed and can be provided. He read item 6 and suggested that the first sentence be reworded to read as follows:

The City's Historical Resources and Cultural Arts Department will perform yearly inspections of building's historically significant features, make

recommendations for their upkeep when warranted and check for unpermitted alterations.

Hermes Diaz: They will make the change. The item is there because the buildings have tenants, and even though they do some regular maintenance, and they don't expect them to do anything untoward they wanted to make sure that it was clear.

Peter Iglesias: The City has no intent on allowing or doing any unpermitted alterations to any of their historical buildings. The City treasures their buildings, and this is just a way of helping us bridge a difficult time. It is something that has not been used before, but TDRs can also be gotten for City Hall and the Venetian Pool. Just limited to these two buildings only, as they are Nationally registered Historical Sites. This is to get as much work as we can now. He hoped that different boards and administrations will deal with it differently when they go from a 30-million-dollar to a 4-million-dollar payment on our pension plan.

Mr. Maxwell: Thanked them for addressing what had been discussed last time. He encouraged the City to continue to take steps to strengthen and detail the preservation and maintenance plans for the City, the Historic Preservation Board and the new Landmarks Preservation Board. They needed to have a set of constant information on each building. He asked them to look at the Maintenance and Preservation Plans and come back with a more comprehensive plan. It could be online or on paper and would allow staff to implement and follow through on items. The Board didn't want to see things in the future that they could solve now. A more detailed plan would allow this and allow them to budget. It would also help the City to have a better relationship with tenants and save money. He asked them to come back with this plan in the next quarter. He recommended that they look at the Preservation Plans in other areas of the country i.e. The National Park Service. Some of the buildings in this City require specialty materials and these needed to be focused on in the preservation plan as well as important items such as roofing. The plans should look at items annually, five years and beyond.

Peter Iglesias: The City's historical buildings are on the maintenance matrix plan, including air conditioning, roofing, waterproofing. However historical buildings require substantially more work. The Miracle Theater has an infiltration issue, and consultants that are used to looking at older buildings and restoration are needed. Restoration is much more expensive than construction. Normal issues like air conditioning and roof replacement are on the Capital Maintenance Matrix and so by putting money every year, these can be completed. He said they would provide the board with the information. Some historical projects such as the Miracle Theater need more investment. They needed to look at the condition of the walls, the cracking, things that are beyond what a modern building would require. The Fink Studio was a 2-million-dollar investment. It is quite different restoring a 1927 building than a building from the 1960's. Buildings are being stabilized and normal maintenance is being done. Historic buildings require maintenance beyond that.

Mr. Maxwell: Agreed and said they were doing an excellent job. He said that it would help them address these issues in the future by looking at them when they made the maintenance and preservation plans. If the need is identified now, they will

know what needs to be done in the future. Plans should be comprehensive and specific to each building. They should work with staff to initiate this.

Peter Iglesias: This has been initiated with the City's Asset Manager. The need of each building is looked at, not just the historic ones including the Biltmore. A maintenance plan for building is being looked at, as each are unique consultants are being used. The City's entire portfolio of buildings needed to be maintained. When the plans are completed, they will be brought to the Board.

Mr. Maxwell: The Board is specifically charged by the City Manager and the City Commission to address certain items. Fire stations unless they are historic do not fall under their purview, but the Venetian pool and the Miracle Theater do. He applauded Mr. Iglesias for his work and efforts to continually improve the processes and policies so that in the future the City could continue to maintain the excellent status as the premier historic community in South Florida, and the United States.

Ms. Spain: If the entire 48,235 square feet of the Miracle Theater is transferred, they will not be able to have an addition to the building in the future as there would be no more development rights. While she was working at the city Barbara Stein had said she needed extra space for a fly space.

Peter Iglesias. This issue had been discussed with Ms. Stein numerous times. They require additional space at the top to operate. This is not FAR. If the board approved the extra height, then it would become an engineering problem to be resolved.

Alicia Bache-Wiig: Thought this was a great update and was happy to see that they were specific about the different elements. She suggested that items be put on a matrix to make it easier to track and this should be included in the plans for all the historic buildings. A base building matrix and a matrix for items unique to that building.

Mr. Brett Gillis spoke on Zoom: He introduced himself and said he did not have a problem with the TDR process but wanted to know if funds from the TDRs would go to paying off the pension? He said that he knew that there were important issues such as public safety and pension deficits, but they also had historic deficits as well. The Alhambra Water Tower is not projected to be funded until the year 2025. It's listed as having a \$1,495,000 shortfall, and City Hall is not projected to be funded until 2027, with an approximately a 14-million-dollar deficit this year. If money is coming from the TDRs, then could they fund these projects sooner versus the funds going into other areas of the budget. These are historic properties, and the spirit of the TDR ordinance is for the funds to be used for historic preservation.

Peter Iglesias: This money will go to the historical building fund for historical projects, not the general fund.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor or opposition of the case. When no one did he closed the public portion of the hearing and opened it up to the board for comments.

Mr. Fullerton: This is a one-time deal, what happens when all the money goes away.

Mr. Iglesias: In 7 to 12 years the pension plan will be fully funded, TDRs will bridge the gap. Once the pension plan issue is resolved The City will no longer have to pay the additional 26 million dollars, they will go back to a standard funding of a little over 4 million dollars. Then they will we will be able to invest a lot more in infrastructure and Capital Improvement Projects such as historical buildings.

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons and seconded by Ms. Spain to approve the Maintenance/Preservation Plan with conditions for the property (Sending Site) at 280 Miracle Mile, the Miracle Theater, a Local Historic Landmark and request that the annual report be provided to the Historic Preservation Board upon completion.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7, Nays: 0).

The conditions are as follows:

- 1) *The first sentence of item #6 of the Long-Term Maintenance Plan shall be amended to read: "The City's Historical Resources and Cultural Arts Department will perform yearly inspections of the building's historically significant features, make recommendations for their upkeep when warranted, and check for unpermitted alterations."*
- 2) *The completed Annual Reports shall be provided to the Historic Preservation Board for informational purposes.*

Chair Menendez read a description of the next case as follows:

CASE FILE TDR 2022-006: Consideration of the Transfer of Development Rights for the property at 286 Miracle Mile, a Local Historic Landmark, legally described as the North 70 Feet of Lots 1 and 2 and the West 10 Feet of the North 70 Feet of Lot 3, Block 2, Coral Gables Crafts Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 10, at Page 40, of the Public Records of Dade County, Florida. The application requests approval of the Maintenance/Preservation Plan pursuant to Section 14-204.4 of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.

Mr. Adams made a presentation following the on-screen Presentation.

The PowerPoint played on-screen. Highlights were as follows:

1. The application requests approval of the Maintenance/Preservation Plan for 286 Miracle Mile.
2. This is in association with the sale of unused development rights.
3. There are 10,368 available, and the request is to transfer 10,368 square feet.
4. The City of Coral Gables Public Works Department has submitted a Maintenance/Preservation Plan which includes existing conditions, proposed corrective actions, a maintenance schedule, and estimated costs.
5. The total estimated repair cost for work to be completed is \$346,466.
6. Per the Board's request on September 21, 2022, the Maintenance/Preservation Plan has been revised to include procedures for the long-term maintenance of the site which include yearly building inspections, roof inspections twice a year, roof replacement, and annual visits by Historical Resources and Cultural Arts Department Staff for inspection of historically significant features.
7. The Historic Preservation Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Maintenance/Preservation Plan.

Hermes Diaz, Director of Public Works made the following comments:

1. The process we would develop is similar.
2. The difference is that the building is smaller.
3. Termite treatment is being taken care of.
4. This building contains three separate retail spaces under one roof, the Haagen Daz Ice Cream Store and Starbucks are long term tenants and Ben and Guiles is a temporary tenant.

5. Long term tenants are responsible for the maintenance of everything inside the store including the a/c, plumbing and the interior. Starbucks is also responsible for the frontage.
6. The City is responsible for the major elements, roofing, sidewalks and the structural elements of the buildings.
7. The City will hire a company to do yearly inspections.
8. The process will be the same.
9. A lot of the responsibility for things that need to be done will probably fall on the tenant.
10. Note #3 will be revised with the Board's recommendations.
11. The historical elements on this building include its curving forms, long horizontal lines, rounded corners, horizontal bands of windows, smooth walls with no ornamentation, flat roof with no eaves, and nautical references.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor or opposition of the case. When no one did he closed the public portion of the hearing and opened it up to the board for comments.

Ms. Bache-Wiig said she had the same comments about having a matrix for items unique to the building.

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the Maintenance/Preservation Plan with conditions for the property (Sending Site) at 286 Miracle Mile, a Local Historic Landmark.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7, Nays: 0).

The conditions were as follows:

1. *The first sentence of item #3 of the Long-Term Maintenance Plan shall be amended to read: "The City's Historical Resources and Cultural Arts Department will perform yearly inspections of the building's historically significant features, make recommendations for their upkeep when warranted, and check for unpermitted alterations."*
2. *The completed Annual Reports shall be provided to the Historic Preservation Board for informational purposes.*

Chair Menendez read a description of the next case as follows:

CASE FILE TDR 2022-008: Consideration of the Transfer of Development Rights for the property at 2506 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, a Local Historic Landmark, legally Historic Preservation Board Meeting described as Lots 22 & 23, Block 7, Coral Gables Crafts Section, as recorded in Plat Book 10, at Page 40 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The application requests approval of the Maintenance/Preservation Plan, pursuant to Section 14-204.4 of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.

Mr. Adams made a presentation following the on-screen Presentation

The PowerPoint played on-screen. Highlights were as follows:

1. The application requests approval of the Maintenance/Preservation Plan for 2506 Ponce de Leon Boulevard.
2. The property is historically designated and known as the H. George Fink Studio.
3. This is a request to transfer 2,630 of unused development rights.
4. In 1999, approval was given transfer to 11,178 square feet, the 2,630 reflects the remaining square feet available for transfer.
5. The Public Works Department has submitted the Maintenance/Preservation Plan, which includes existing conditions, details of the recent restoration, and the maintenance schedule.
6. The building is currently undergoing complete restoration and renovation at an estimated cost of approximately \$2.6 million, including the building's envelope, roof, electrical and HVAC systems, as well as the restoration of the building's prominent historical features.

7. Most openings have been replaced with impact resistant doors and windows, except those deemed to be historically relevant which will be protected with either shutters or armor screens as appropriate.
8. The Maintenance/Preservation Plan includes procedures for the long-term maintenance of the site which include yearly building inspections, roof inspections twice a year, roof replacement, HVAC maintenance and replacement, and annual visits by Historical Resources and Cultural Arts Department Staff for inspection of historically significant features.
9. Staff recommends approval of the Maintenance/Preservation Plan.

Mr. Hermes Diaz, Director of Public Works made the following comments:

1. The great thing about this building is the City is basically getting a brand-new building.
2. Partial temporary Certificate of Occupancy was issued on March 25, 2022, project completion is scheduled for the 1st quarter of 2023.
3. Significant items for this building include the facade, the north and south elevations, the private office including the secretary and reception areas, the building second floor as well as multiple historical interior doors, the beautiful window that is part of the facade, all are being restored.
4. There is really nothing else to do other than keep up with regular inspections and do whatever is needed to do to ensure it stays in good condition.

Members of the Historic board made comments and asked questions. Questions were answered and comments were made by Mr. Hermes Diaz, Public Works Director and Mr. Peter Iglesias, City Manager:

Ms. Spain: Did the city ever get hurricane shutters for the building including the front window?

Peter Iglesias: Armor Screen is being used for the front door, second floor and windows. It is being fabricated now, which is part of the issue of the Temporary Certificate of Occupancy issues. Plywood is being used to cover the holes while the windows are being restored.

Hermes Diaz: All other windows have been replaced with impact windows to protect the building.

Mr. Maxwell: Congratulated them on a job well done. Now is the time to incorporate the plans and specifications into the Maintenance/Preservation Plan. Notes should be taken on the items completed and incorporated into the plan making it easier going forward.

Peter Iglesias: Development Services moved into the building next door to City Hall. Everything is now electronic and easily accessible. By the first quarter of next year the City will be completely paperless, everything will be available online. Using GIS, you will be able to click on the site and get all the information. The website is based on the Tesla website and is GIS based, there is a GIS based dashboard.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor or opposition of the case. When no one did he closed the public portion of the hearing and opened it up to the board for comments.

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the Preservation Plan with conditions for the property (Sending Site) at 2506 Ponce de Leon Boulevard a "Local Historic Landmark".

The motion passed (Ayes: 7, Nays: 0).

Conditions are as follows:

1. *The first sentence of item #6 of the Long-Term Maintenance Plan shall be amended to read: "The City's Historical Resources and Cultural Arts Department will perform yearly inspections of the building's historically significant features, make recommendations for their upkeep when warranted, and check for unpermitted alterations."*

2. *The completed Annual Reports shall be provided to the Historic Preservation Board for informational purposes.*

Chair Menendez read a description of the next case as follows:

CASE FILE TDR 2022-009: Consideration of the Transfer of Development Rights for the property at 36 Phoenetia Avenue, a Local Historic Landmark, legally described as Lot 4 & the West 23 Feet of Lot 5, Block 22, Coral Gables Douglas Section, as recorded in Plat Book 25, at Page 69 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The application requests approval of the Maintenance/Preservation Plan, pursuant to Section 14-204.4 of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.

Mr. Adams made a presentation following the on-screen Presentation.

The PowerPoint played on-screen. Highlights were as follows:

1. The application requests approval of the Maintenance/Preservation Plan for 36 Phoenetia Avenue, a Local Historic Landmark.
2. This is for 16,774 square feet of unused development rights.
3. 36 Phoenetia Avenue, known as the Douglas-Trager House, is significant for its association with John Douglas, a pioneering citizen of Coral Gables.
4. The Douglas-Trager House, standing today on a very small portion of the original Douglas land holdings is an excellent example of Mediterranean Revival style architecture.
5. The attached Historic Preservation Board Application contains a Historic Building Conditions Report and Stabilization & Maintenance Plan prepared by Martinez Alvarez Architecture.
6. The report evaluates the general condition of the building and site, identifies those areas that require immediate repairs, proposes corrective actions, proposes a maintenance schedule, and assigns corresponding repair cost estimates.
7. The report concludes that the main building has had few substantive changes, has had routine maintenance, and remains in very good condition.
8. The rear building appears to have none of the original windows and doors but overall has had few substantive changes, has had routine maintenance, and remains in good condition.
9. The Local Historical Designation report was included in the application.
10. At the Historic Preservation Board meeting of June 15, 2022, the Board approved, with conditions, a request for a Certificate of Use application for a Bed and Breakfast at the property.
11. 1,424 square feet of the requested development rights will be transferred to a Receiving Site at 1505 Ponce de Leon Boulevard.
12. The Receiving Site is scheduled for review by the Historic Preservation Board at this meeting.
13. Staff recommends the following:
 - a) Approval of the Maintenance/Preservation plan for the property located at 36 Phoenetia Avenue.
 - b) Approval of the transfer of 16,774 of unused development rights.

Mr. Mario Garcia-Serra, Gunster, introduced himself and Mr. Max Haynes and Ms. Cari Childers the owners of the property, and Mrs. Ana Alvarez, Martinez Alvarez Architects, the architect who prepared the Maintenance/Preservation Plan for the property. Highlights were as follows:

1. This is a unique property and very much part of Coral Gables, history.
2. The homestead of the Douglas family after whom Douglas Road is named.
3. Back in June the Historic Board approved the conditional use approval for a bed and breakfast at this location.
4. The bed and breakfast was the first ever done, it is up and running already.
5. TDRs rules have been on the books for 30 years, but there have only been about two or three transactions.
6. They are to relieve the burden of historic preservation for the property owners, to make it more financially viable and feasible to help maintain these properties.

Ms. Spain said that Mrs. Alvarez and her husband were the architects of the Fink Studio.

Ms. Alvarez made a presentation. Highlights are as follows:

1. She skipped through the part of the presentation which was for the Bed and Breakfast and moved to the maintenance report.
2. Pictures were shown of the buildings and items.
3. In working with the owners, they had documented the building in detail.
4. The Stabilization and Maintenance report is fifty pages and broken down by building elements.
5. There is a list of immediate repairs and woven into the report are the future recommendations.
6. The immediate repairs constituted what she thought was essential.
7. Roof: A roofer went out and identified issues.
8. Windows: The front windows are the original wood windows which are beautiful and in good condition and only a few will need immediate repair. A picture was shown of window that needed repairing. She recommended they work with a carpenter to rebuild the window.
9. Entry Canopy: Has some damage in its tongue and groove eave.
10. Rafters: Have some wood damage.
11. Strangler Fig: Located in the back corner and is a potential structure threat to the building. It is being reviewed by an arborist to see if it can be removed successfully.
12. Cost: Those items have been listed with an estimated cost that has been prepared together with a contractor and a roofer.
13. Wrought Iron Railings and Gates: The building has some original wrought iron railings and gates in the front and maintenance is recommended in the report.
14. Back Building: The building in the back has none of the original windows so the long-term goal is to replace those.
15. Roof Damage. There was visible water damage in the entry foyer that seemed to be coming from the flat roof directly above. There is some tile either broken or missing and is noted in the report as immediate work. The long-term goal would be to replace the roof with a handmade barrel tile.
16. Interior: Is in good shape.

Mr. Mario Garcia Serra said the building has been kept in good shape, a testament to the owners.

Members of the Historic board, Mr. Adams, Mr. Haynes, Ms. Childers, Ms. Alvarez and Mr. Garcia-Serra made comments. Questions were answered by Mr. Haynes, Ms. Childers, Mr. Adams, Mr. Garcia-Serra & Ms. Alvarez.

Mr. Haynes & Ms. Childers: Thanked the board for having them and said everything is going well with the Bed and Breakfast. Using the TDR program would help them maintain and improve the house. They commended their lawyer and architect and stated that they live at the property and have very high standards; they want to repair everything all at once and the TDRs will allow them to do that quicker and more efficiently. They want to preserve the house, not change it.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Asked if there was a time frame attached to the immediate repairs?

Mr. Haynes & Ms. Childers: They want to do everything as soon as possible. They already have the contract in place.

Ms. Alvarez: Repairs will be done immediately or within 6 months.

Mr. Menendez: Asked Mr. Adams if the department followed up on the items to make sure they were completed.

Mr. Adams: The TDR program is just getting started now. He thought it prudent for staff to put it in place and asked if the board wanted to make it a condition that staff inspect the ongoing work, or the applicants let them know when it is done.

Mr. Menendez: As the program grows there needs to be some oversight.

Mr. Maxwell: It was a good opportunity to create a policy that the city would have a more uniform preservation plan to provide a format to property owners that they could follow, that they can do the same thing the city has to do. They need to have short term, long term and emergency plans in the event of fire or hurricanes or damage to the property.

Ms. Childers: Mr. Haynes was a boat captain and fire trained so there are fire extinguishers in every room, fire alarms everywhere and exit signs.

Mr. Maxwell: He was certain they were doing well, but they needed to have a standard procedure which will allow others to address these issues.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor or opposition of the case. When no one did he closed the public portion of the hearing and opened it up to the board for comments.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Asked about the recommended future improvements, did they have protection now for the doors and windows, was it was armor screen or something else.

Ms. Alvarez: They did not have protection now, it would probably be armor screen as it would be a shame to remove the windows as they were in good shape.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: In addition to the immediate he would like some plan to protect the doors and windows.

Ms. Alvarez: The two options were listed on the future improvements. Either complete Armor Screen or complete window replacement.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: They needed a solution for the present. Either they need to do the Armor Screen or replace the windows today or tell the board how they planned to protect the windows and doors today. His approval would be conditioned on this, and he was open to any solution.

Mr. Durana: Suggested plywood.

Ms. Alvarez: They had the same problem with the Fink Studio, and they had exhausted every option and decided on Armor Screen because everything else is so invasive.

Mr. Fullerton and Mr. Maxwell discussed the options of protection between themselves.

Mr. Maxwell: It was to their benefit to figure out how to protect the building. They were trying to help everyone look at these issues and put them in the Maintenance Preservation Plan.

Ms. Bache-Wiig: Maybe they were talking about a design guideline for the particular property for the future property owner.

- Mr. Haynes: They would use the funds from the TDR to move up the repairs, but in any event, they would invest their own money. Ms. Childers said they were looking for input from the board as they had never owned a historic home.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Either the Historic Preservation staff or Ms. Alvarez could help. He asked what their hurricane plan was and if they could move up items 1 and 3 or put a timeline on them?
- Mr. Haynes: They would move the windows up to the highest priority.
- Ms. Alvarez: It will be moved up on the list. They would give the owners a cost.
- Mr. Fullerton: It might be dependent on what would be available in the next six months.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Everyone agreed that they wanted a feasible plan as to how they would address the hurricane protection issues. He suggested that the board approve the Maintenance/Preservation Plan conditional on the incorporation of a hurricane protection component into the plan.
- Mr. Maxwell: It should be called a disaster plan to deal with hurricane protection, flood and fire. It would affect their bottom line and their risk management and help them address it and reduce their operating costs.
- Mr. Garcia-Serra: Suggested the owners work with Mr. Adams and either come to an agreement or if he was not satisfied, they could bring it back to the board.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Wanted a date certain and specifically what they would do.
- Mr. Garcia-Serra: They could come up with an immediate and a long-term plan.
- Mr. Adams: Suggested the installation of an appropriate and approved hurricane and disaster protection system prior to the start of the next hurricane season.

The board agreed.

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the Maintenance/Preservation Plan with conditions for the property (Sending Site) at 36 Phoenetia Avenue a “Local Historic Landmark”.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7, Nays: 0).

The conditions were as follows:

1. *The installation of appropriate and approved hurricane and disaster protection systems prior to the start of the next hurricane season.*

- Ms. Spain: Commended the owners on having the first Bed and Breakfast in Coral Gables.
- Ms. Bache-Wiig: Hoped this program will attract people to come to the north Ponce area that desperately needs life and activity and the bed and breakfast enrich the area. She hoped the TDR program would attract investors to do these innovative types of uses to get an urban European setting like what George Merrick had imagined.

Chair Menendez read a description of the next case as follows:

TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS (RECEIVING SITE): The proposed development (receiving site) is located at **1505 Ponce de Leon Boulevard**, legally described as Lots 1 through 5 and Lots 17 through 22, Block 36, Coral Gables Douglas Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat book 25, Page 69 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The following historically designated properties are within five hundred (500) feet of the proposed development located at 1505 Ponce de Leon Boulevard:

- 1721 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, legally described as Lot 4 and the North 5 Feet of Lot 5, Block 3, Coral Gables Section "L," according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 8, Page 85 of the Public Record of Miami-Dade County, Florida.
- 131 Zamora Avenue, legally described as Lot 19, Block 39, Coral Gables Douglas Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 25, Page 69 of the Public Record of Miami-Dade County, Florida.
- 102 Menores Avenue, legally described as Lot 11, Block 36, Coral Gables Douglas Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 25, Page 69 of the Public Record of Miami-Dade County, Florida.
- 114 Menores Avenue, legally described as Lot 8 & the West ½ Lot 9, Block 36, Coral Gables Douglas Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 25, Page 69 of the Public Record of Miami-Dade County, Florida.
- 118 Menores Avenue, legally described as Lot 7, Block 36, Coral Gables Douglas Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 25, Page 69 of the Public Record of Miami-Dade County, Florida.
- 122 Menores Avenue, legally described as Lot 6, Block 36, Coral Gables Douglas Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 25, Page 69 of the Public Record of Miami-Dade County, Florida.
- 111 Salamanca Avenue, legally described as Lots 10 and 11, and the East 30 feet of Lot 12, Block 29, Coral Gables Douglas Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 25, Page 69 of the Public Record of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

Therefore, per Section 14-204.6 of the Coral Gables Zoning Code, the Historic Preservation Board's review and approval of the proposed development is required to determine if the proposal adversely affects the historic, architectural, or aesthetic character of the historic property.

Mr. Adams made a presentation following the on-screen Presentation.

The PowerPoint played on-screen. Highlights were as follows:

1. If the Receiving Site of TDRs is within 500 feet of a local historic landmark, Section 14-204.6.A.3. of the Coral Gables Zoning Code requires the Historic Preservation Board's review and approval of the proposed development to determine if the proposal adversely affects the historic, architectural, or aesthetic character of the historic properties.
2. There were determined to be seven historic properties within five hundred feet of the proposed development.
3. The seven properties are local historic landmarks.
4. On March 16, 2022, the Historic Preservation Board approved the historic designation of the property located at 122 Menores Avenue.
5. This property, which adjoins the proposed development site to the east, is owned by the applicant and will be rehabilitated for commercial use.
6. On April 7, 2022, the proposed development was reviewed by the Board of Architects. The Board made a motion to approve Level 1 and Level 2 Mediterranean bonuses.
7. This means that the proposed development must be a Mediterranean designed building to qualify for level 2 bonus.
8. There was a second motion to defer preliminary design approval with the following comments:

- i) Study tower height for extra.
 - ii) Study location for Art in Public Places.
 - iii) Study roof features at pedestal parking.
 - iv) Study west park as urban and east park residential.
 - v) Study west paseo for more transparency and east paseo at park.
9. They went back to Board of Architects On May 5, 2022, the proposed development was approved with the following conditions by the Board of Architects:
- i) Add columns at east lower balconies.
 - ii) Off set/recess at garage bay.
10. On June 1, 2022, the Planning and Zoning Board reviewed the proposed land use change, zoning change, planned area development (PAD), and site plan.
11. On July 25, 2022, the Coral Gables City Commission approved an application to redevelop the property at 1505 Ponce de Leon Boulevard with a building consisting of 87 luxury residential units, 23,764 square feet of commercial space, 319 parking spaces in a structured parking garage, and 20,144 square feet of open space, including a park with improvements along Ponce de Leon Boulevard, over which it intends to convey a public access easement to the City as well as a garden/dog park that serves as a buffer to the properties to the east and which will similarly be open for use by the general public.
12. The City Commission also approved the following changes:
- i) An amendment to the City’s Future Land Use Map.
 - ii) An amendment to the City’s Zoning Map
 - iii) Planned Area Development (PAD) and mixed-use site plan approval for the project.
13. On October 12, 2022, the Planning and Zoning Board reviewed and recommended approval of receipt of TDRs.
14. The sites proposed for the new development are currently vacant.
15. The proposed development is a mixed-use building of two-hundred ninety-seven thousand and twenty-seven (297,027) square feet which includes fifty-nine thousand, four hundred and five (59,405) square feet of Transferred Development Rights from the following sending sites:

Address	TDR Amount	Sending Site Approval
118 Menores Ave.	3,300	HPB approval June 16, 2022
36 Phoenetia Ave.	1,424	Just Approved by the HPB
235 Majorca Ave.	24,089	HPB approval March 4, 2020
301 Majorca Ave.	30,592	City Commission approval June 28, 2022. This is a park and did not come under the Historic Preservation Board’s review.
Total	59,405	

16. There is a description of the proposed development.
17. Staff recommendation is as follows:
- a) The proposed development does not adversely affect the historic properties located at 1721 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, 131 Zamora Avenue, and 111 Salamanca Avenue. Street views were included from these properties towards the development site.
 - b) The proposed new development will have a moderate impact on the setting of 102 Menores Avenue. (View from 102 Menores Avenue towards the development site.)
 - c) The proposed development will have the greatest impact on the settings of 114, 118, and 122 Menores Avenue as the development site is immediately to the west of these properties, all of which are individually designated. The impacts to the historic sites are due to the height of the proposed new structure and its proximity to the historic structures, especially 122 Menores Avenue. Which is immediately adjacent to the development site. The west façade of 122 Menores Avenue will be approximately fourteen feet (14’) from the proposed two-story paseo on the east façade of the new structure and approximately twenty-four feet, eight inches (24’-8”) from the 16-story tower.
 - d) The photographs in the report show, high-rise development on Ponce de Leon Boulevard has started encroaching towards the Menores Avenue area.

- e) By right and without TDRs, the subject property can still be developed to 16 stories and 190'-6" in height (as proposed). If the board does not approve the TDRs almost the same property could be put on that site.
 - f) The TDRs allows the building to be wider.
 - g) The inclusion of the paseo on the east elevation of the proposed structure and the park to the rear of 122 Menores Avenue provide small buffers between the subject and the historic Menores Avenue sites. Increasing the east elevation step backs of the tower would further help to lessen the impact on the historic structures; however, any 16-story structure at this location will have a negative impact.
 - h) This impact could be further increased by the development of the land currently proposed as a garden/park which is to the rear of 122 Menores Avenue.
 - i) Staff recommends a motion to determine that the proposal does adversely impact three of the seven historic properties located within 500 feet of the site but recognizes that any sixteen-story development of the subject property could result in a similar or possibly even greater adverse impact.
18. There is a recommendation to APPROVE the use of TDRs on this building because if the TDRs are not approved there will still be a 16 story 190-foot building on the site. At least this way 122 Menores is going to be restored and incorporated into the development and it is going to allow the sale of TDRs from the other properties on Menores Avenue.
19. There are two letters of recommendation, one is from the owner of 118 Menores Avenue and just prior to the meeting Mr. Adams received a letter from the owner of 114 Menores Avenue.

Mr. Garcia-Serra, Gunster representing Locations Acquisitions LLC., the contract purchaser for the site at 1505 Ponce de Leon Boulevard introduced Mr. Hamed Rodriguez, Hamed Rodriguez Architects Inc, Project Architect and Leonard Roberts from Locations Acquisitions LLC. and made a presentation.

Highlights of his presentation are as follows:

1. Before we were talking about the Sending Site of TDR transactions, now we are talking about the Receiving Site and where they are ultimately going to be used.
2. There's a lot to like about the 1505 Ponce project.
3. It's less than half of the maximum permitted density.
4. 179 units will be permitted on this property, and there's 80 proposed.
5. Almost a third of the project site is open space.
6. It is going to be both public open space, fronting Ponce and a park in the rear of the property acting as a buffer between the neighboring properties.
7. They were also preserving and adaptively reusing a historic building.
8. The 122 Menores building will be part of the project site and part of the adaptative reuse of that will be a sort of an amenity and a commercial space to the project.
9. What is especially likeable about the TDR transactions is the public benefit that will be created by them.
10. 301 Majorca Avenue, Receiving Site for 30,592 feet was acquired by his client and is going to be conveyed to the city for use as a public park.
11. They will be utilizing the development rights to which that property is entitled as part of the project.
12. In an area where there isn't much public open space, there will be a 6,000 square foot public park.
13. 235 Majorca Avenue is a historic property that that initiated making North Ponce property a TDR donor site and 24,00 square feet will be coming from that property.
14. 36 Phoenetia Avenue TDR Sender Site homestead of the Douglas family, which is now bed and breakfast would be send about 1,500 square feet.
15. 118 Menores Avenue, the property immediately to the west of 122 Menores Avenue, also designed by H. George Fink, would be another of the TDR donor sites that will benefit from having income to maintain and preserve the building.
16. TDR transfers are going to lead to a new project site that has two new city open spaces and an additional city park that is going to be offsite and assist in the preservation of three separate historic buildings.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons asked to see the two letters of support. Mr. Adams said one he had one copy of and the other was in his phone because he got it right before the meeting. Mr. Menendez said he could pass it around.

Mr. Hamed Rodriguez, Hamed Rodriguez Architects Inc, Project Architect made a presentation:

The following are highlights:

1. He showed a rendering of the building which he said showed the full usages of the FAR, it would not be any bigger.
2. They were purposely able to position the building a little bit further in, while maintaining a buffer to the east, creating that park that in the East, therefore reducing the canyon effect that would otherwise happen on Ponce and give it a breather.
3. There is a linear park in the front.
4. An aerial photo of the site was shown, the building to be restored are in the upper right-hand corner.
5. Pictures of the park and 235 Majorca Avenue, 36 Phoenetia Avenue and 118 Menores Avenue were shown.
6. A photo of the building pushed back showing the difference between the other two buildings immediately to the south.
7. A site plan showing what they were proposing for the historic building possible a type of ice cream shop with an immediate opening to the back park.
8. They would really open it up and create a covered space plus an upper terrace.
9. On the second floor it might be an executive office use as it would not be a good retail space.
10. Ideas were being generated for its exact use, but it would be a public element.
11. A Zoning plan was shown.
12. Study of the setback was shown. It would have a large setback to the back creating a lot of light and space between the neighbors to the east and where the building begins.
13. Renderings of the following were shown:
 - a) A nice articulated façade on the base so that the building itself steps back and the base wraps around and created these work/live environments on the ground floor and then there are apartment plats above that.
 - b) The Menores building which has a connectivity to the paseos that they created.
 - c) The south side with the park which allows you to walk all the way through to the Menores building.
 - d) The front of linear park.
14. A parking study was shown.
15. A plan showing the proposed use showing a space in the back, creating a separation and buffer to the neighbors.
16. The landscape plan showed shade trees in the rear and front parks and the perimeters on both sides.

Members of the Historic board made comments and asked questions. Questions were answered by Mr. Hamed Rodriguez, Hamed Rodriguez Architects Inc, Project Architect.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons:

Asked for them to show a slide that shows the relationship between 118 and 122 Menores and the building.

Mr. Rodriguez:

Indicated on screen the rendering where they were dropping the scale of the paseo. They start with a 2-story element (shown on another slide) and then they drop this down into a trellis. They have an opening that they have already developed from the space directly over to a little plaza for the restored building. It is about 24 feet between the building and what would be the face of the tower if it didn't not have the paseo, and then there's about 12 feet between the paseo and the actual historic building but there is landscape there. The podium is 40 feet, but the paseo is about 40-42 feet. He showed a view from the other side which

is approximately 22 feet and then they drop the scale on both sides to have just a one-story trellis feature.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons:

Asked if the podium is 40 feet and the tower is 190 feet.

Mr. Rodriguez:

Replied affirmatively.

Mr. Maxwell:

Asked if the two-story overhang went all the way through?

Mr. Rodriguez:

Replied affirmatively. In response to Mr. Fullerton's questions, Mr. Rodriguez said the rendering in question was on the southeast corner of the property on the right-hand side looking towards the northwest and it was all open paseo. He showed another slide, where there was completely open space and indicated the paseo, a covered walk that was a little more than 12 feet wide. He indicated where it was 12 feet and said it was about 14 feet inside the paseo from the wall to the outside face of the column.

Ms. Bache-Wiig:

Asked about the height of the tall building behind on the south.

Mr. Rodriguez:

Referred to the aerial view and said that it was about 55-60 feet. He said that if they were to start the building their setback would be 10 feet. It would have been a more imposing situation so that wanted to try to move it towards the West and create that part, so that with the trees and the site lines the tower would be minimized and the same is true from the Ponce side they wanted, to create that Seagram's building effect where it just stepped back and produces that relief. They were trying to get the tower as close to the center of the property as possible. They did not want to get it too close to Ponce because they wanted to give it a relief from Ponce. As everything gets built it creates this canyon effect and they have the unique opportunity with a lot this size that they could step it back a bit and provide a park behind the historic building otherwise they would have to do the same thing that the other buildings have done.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons:

Said they had less effect on Ponce, but more effect on the historic properties. He needed to think through that the tower is the right height and the right distance that cannot be changed. He asked if something could be done on the north side of the building to give slightly less impact on 114, 118 and 122 Menores Avenue. He looked up the front set back and the step back from Ponce and it was 0 and 10 feet, scooting it all the way to the front would have a significant improvement to these 3 priorities. The Board's purview is only about these three historic properties.

Mr. Rodriguez:

Said that the moment they start moving the building towards the east then they need to line it with more units, and it starts getting crowded towards the Ponce side. Looking at all the factors, and weighing in the benefits of the city, and of the historic buildings, this one was the most beneficial universally. They studied in great detail and pushed the building towards the west as much as they could while it still functions. Otherwise, it starts falling apart as far as getting the mechanics of it to work. They felt that this one with the buffer of the park and the

Menores building being a transitional type of use would be this added benefit. Looking at previous projects that were there, they were close if not closer to the back property line. They thought they did an improvement.

Ms. Spain:

Said if you were just talking about the height, she did not think tall buildings adversely affected historic property, ugly tall buildings do. In New York you have high rises next to historic buildings, but you are still able to appreciate the beauty of the historic buildings. She did not have a problem with the height and location and appreciated the buffering that they attempted to do. She lived next to Villa Valencia also designed by Mr. Rodriguez and felt it raised the level of architecture in her block. She hoped other developers would follow. She went on to expound on the virtues of the development.

Mr. Rodriguez:

It was the same developer.

Ms. Bache Wiig:

She hoped that it would be a very positive contribution to the North Ponce area. The buffering, the parks were all the things missing on this corridor.

Mr. Rodriguez:

They did not lose any parking space; they gained one as there were some old curb cuts that they no longer needed. There is extra parking in their own parking garage so that when the retail function happens it is not going to be a burden as parking was important in that section.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor or opposition of the case. When no one did he closed the public portion of the hearing and opened it up to the board for comments.

Mr. Durana:

It was a nice project. He liked the green space they provided that they did not have to. He thought it would add to the value of the building and stand out from the other one.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons:

Explained his vote by saying the renovation of 122 Menores is part of the project and 114 and 118 Menores Avenue submitted letters in support of the project and the staff report very clearly delineated the difference between not affected, moderately affected and possible greatly affected. The information provided by actual property owners will help him make his vote.

A motion was made by Ms. Spain and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the Transfer of Development Rights to the proposed development at 1505 Ponce de Leon Boulevard as it will not adversely affect the Local Historic Landmarks located at 1721 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, 131 Zamora Avenue, 102 Menores Avenue, 114 Menores Avenue, 118 Menores Avenue, 122 Menores Avenue, and 111 Salamanca Avenue.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7, Nays: 0).

Chair Menendez read a description of the next case as follows:

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2022-026: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 2003 Alhambra Circle, a Contributing Resource within the "Alhambra Circle Historic District," legally described as the Lots 6 and 7, Block 14, Coral Gables Section "E," according to the Plat thereof, as recorded

in Plat Book 8, at Page 13 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant is requesting design approval for additions and alterations to the residence and sitework.

Mr. Adams made a presentation following the on-screen Presentation.

The PowerPoint played on-screen. Highlights were as follows:

1. A location map of the property was shown.
2. The applicant is requesting design approval for an additions and alterations to the residence and sitework.
3. In January of 2008, the "Alhambra Circle Historic District" was listed in the Coral Gables Register of Historic Places.
4. The residence, designed by Architect C. Leroy Kinports and constructed circa 1936.
5. It is a contributing structure within the "Alhambra Circle Historic District."
6. It is in the Mediterranean Transitional architectural style.
7. A two-story addition, designed by Kinports, was added to the southwest elevation of the house circa 1937.
8. Staff met with applicants and architect on several occasions, including an on-site meeting prior to the design of the additions.
9. When Staff advised a two-story addition would be possible, but it should be set back from the historic structure and should be secondary to the historic structure.
10. Staff provided further advice on which existing architectural elements should be retained and what could be demolished.
11. Staff provided comments for Pre-Board of Architects Review on February 24, June 22 and August 12, 2022.
12. What is consistent through these comments was the concern over the scale and location of the addition.
13. The proposed work is:
 - a) Demolition of a rear one-story wood frame original porch and porch addition and demolition of a two-story enclosed porch and stairs to the rear of the circa 1937 addition.
 - b) A one- and two- story addition attached to the southwest elevation of the house.
 - c) A one-story addition attached to the southeast elevation of the house that is a two-car garage, and carport.
 - d) Siteworks include a new motor court with parking for three cars in front of the new garage and carport, expansion of the existing driveway to accommodate parking for two cars, a rear covered terrace with outdoor kitchen, swimming pool and, a covered terrace to the southwest of the two-story addition, and a new pathway leading to the original front door, new motor court, and existing driveway.
14. Mr. Adams said there was a description of the alterations in the package.
15. The one- and two-story addition will be set back from the existing façade (dimensions have not been provided on the plans).
16. Construction will be of smooth stucco, shed and gable roofs with barrel tile to match.
17. The new front entry porch will have a curvilinear parapet, exposed rafter tails, arched door surround, and lighting.
18. There is concern over the scale of the new entrance porch as, along with the proposed parking, this draws attention away from the original house and entrance.
19. It appears a stucco band is to be incorporated to differentiate the new construction from the existing house.
20. This elevation will also feature two towers with shaped parapets to accommodate the stairs and the elevator.
21. The shape of the parapets is not consistent with the architectural style of the house.

22. The construction to the additions to the southeast, southwest and the northwest is all very similar.
23. Siteworks: A new paver motor court with parking for three cars will be installed in front of the new double garage and carport. The existing driveway will be expanded and surfaced with pavers to accommodate parking for two cars. Staff raised concerns over the two proposed driveways/parking areas as, per Section 2-101.D(10) of the Code, driveways and associated curb-cuts shall only be permitted when providing access to a garage, carport or porte-cochere. The driveway and associated curb-cut accessed from Alhambra Circle will not provide access to covered parking as the existing garage is to be converted to living accommodation. The applicants raised this question with the prior Development Services Assistant Director for Planning who provided an email stating “The existing driveway may remain, unconnected.” However, the current Principal Planner disagrees with this opinion and has requested the driveway and apron on Alhambra Circle be eliminated.
24. Staff will not support a waiver request to address this issue if required.
25. Staff has no issues with the rear covered terrace with outdoor kitchen, swimming pool and deck, or the covered terrace. The proposed new pathway to the original front door is also supported as this draws attention to the original entrance to the house.
26. The proposal was reviewed by the Board of Architects on three separate occasions.
 - a) On March 17, 2022, the Board of Architects made a motion to reject with the following comment:
 - i) “Additions out of scale with the existing historic home”.
 - b) On July 14, 2022, the Board of Architects made a motion to defer with the following comments:
 - i) Restudy two story garage volume.
 - ii) Restudy stair tower.
 - iii) Restudy two story garage volume.
 - c) On September 1, 2022, the Board of Architects approved the proposal as now presented to the Historic Preservation Board.
27. Staff Conclusion:

The application presented requests design approval for additions and alterations to the residence and sitework. While the design of the additions is fairly consistent with the design of the original house, Staff still has concerns over the massing, scale, and position of the two-story addition. The applicants have made significant changes and improvements to the original design; however, the two-story element still appears large when viewed from Alhambra Circle and Greenway Court. The two-story element dominates the historic structure and contravenes Secretary of the Interior’s Standard number 9. Staff will support a two-story addition but are of the opinion it should be pushed further back on the lot or reduced in scale. This opinion has been consistent throughout all meetings with the applicant and architect. Staff does also not support raising the roof level on the circa 1937 addition, although this was done after discussion with the Board of Architects. Board of Architects advised this. There is also Staff concern over the unresolved Zoning issue with the driveway on Alhambra Circle.
28. There are two issues, massing, size, scale and location and the unresolved zoning issue of the driveway.
29. Mr. Adams has worked at length with the applicants, they met on site before any plan had been drawn. This concern has been consistent from day one.
30. After meeting with the applicants on numerous occasions, they got to a point where Mr. Adams said it should be pushed further back and the applicant said they were not pushing it further back.
31. Based on these reasons the Historical Resources Department Staff recommends denying the application as it is now.

Herman and Katherine Rodriguez, the owners of the home made the following presentation following an on-screen presentation.

Highlights were as follows:

1. Married in 1994, they have lived in the North Gables for their entire married life.
2. As their family has grown, they moved from Valencia Avenue to Malaga Avenue to Alhambra Circle, three doors down from this house.
3. They had their eye on this house, when they bought it, they were shocked to see the condition inside.
4. They interviewed many architects and hired Mr. Raymond Pacheco who is very focused on respecting the house and how important it was that the house should shine and be a key and central part of any new development that takes place there.
5. This is a key component of the house with the plans, most of their time living in this house is going to be spent in the historical house a lot of effort was expended.
6. It is a 2200 square foot home on an approximately 23000 square foot wedge shaped lot.
7. There are very few 23000 square foot lots, and most have much larger homes.
8. They are below the maximum density and are not asking for any variances or any height allowance above the code.
9. They were approved for the parking and then someone else said no.
10. They have thoughtfully set back the home and created a plan that should be acceptable while respecting the historic home and incorporating it into a larger lot.

Mr. Raymond Pacheco, Pacheco Architects, LLC. introduced himself and gave some history on himself and his credentials. He introduced Project Manager, Mr. Miller Porter and made a presentation following an on-screen presentation.

Highlights were as follows:

1. He tried to respect the original architects work and was bringing back original elements such as the fountain and the trellis.
2. They are over the required green area space and under the allowable square footage.
3. The two-story portion will be set back 17 feet from the original house.
4. The one-story portion will be set back another 7 feet.
5. He has been working with staff and the Board of Architects.
6. He visited the house with Mr. Adams who allowed them to convert the two-car garage into the dining room.
7. The garage continues to the other garage on North Greenway, it is more appropriate than facing Alhambra Circle.
8. The openings of the garage doors have been reduced to a more residential scale as per the Board of Architects recommendation. He has followed most of their recommendations.
9. He is trying to remain with the space that they have with the living room which is going to be Mr. Rodriguez's library and the fireplace looks great.
10. He is trying to keep the existing windows on the entire ground floor in the same location as they are in now, they will be changed to impact.
11. The house was built in 1935 with an addition on top in 1937.
12. The architect put the bedroom on top of one of the one car garages. To access the master bedroom, they must go outside which is strange.
13. The stairs will remain in the same location.
14. An elevator is needed because of the size of the house.

15. The one-story portion on the back and the side is to preserve the identity of the other two houses on each side and on the back.
16. The two-story portion is along the center to be able to look towards the back and create a nice pool in the back.
17. Pools in Coral Gables should not be visible from the street, it is in the center courtyard to comply with Coral Gables code.
18. He is under the height; it is 25 and he is at 22.
19. He loved the sculptural approach that architect Kinport did which he tried to achieve with his parapets.
20. They have tried to come to an agreement with Mr. Adams on every item.
21. The house and the two-story is pushed back from the property line, it is now at 44 feet.
22. If they put the two-story on top of the master bedroom, it will be invading the other properties. It is being kept in the center to prevent that. It is surrounded by the historical house and a courtyard is between the historical house and the garage area.
23. This is one of his best projects and he is requesting the board's consideration.

Members of the Historic board and Mr. Adams made comments and asked questions. Questions were answered by Mr. Raymond Pacheco, Pacheco Architects, LLC. and Project Manager, Miller Porter.

Mr. Adams: Said they had worked together for a long time. They are doing a lot of restoration work on the existing house, including the interior. He said the difference comes down to his opinion that second story should be over the one-story section at the back which the applicants don't want to do and there is the unresolved zoning issue of the driveway at the front. They have made significant headway based on the comments from the Board of Architects. Initially the plane along Alhambra Circle was literally a flat plane. They were almost there but could not get past this issue.

Mr. Pacheco: If they put the two story over the master bedroom it would invade into the next-door property and invade their privacy.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Said he liked the layout of the house he was initially confused with the entrance being on the corner and then it was moved over, so that he can maintain the integrity of the original house and create a new pass through. He had a question regarding the pedestrian access to the front door. He did not share Mr. Adam's concern as to the location of the second story, the depth that it was pushed back was adequate for what is happening on the street. His major concern was the existing 2 story part of the house is at a certain height and the proposal is going to raise it so that it is even with the new portion. When he looked at the three-dimensional rendering and the plan it felt wrong. It needed to be different. He asked if he would consider putting just that portion down to the original height.

Mr. Pacheco: Because they were putting the dining room level with the garage, they needed to raise it level with the rest of the house to avoid stepping down to the dining room. The garage level is a little lower. The fact that they were putting the second level bedroom there they are leveling it with the level of the house. Originally there was a step down to the bedroom. He is raising 2 feet 4 inches to accommodate even levels. They are doing the same roof system on top, so they are raising it a little bit.

- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Asked if the bridge on the second floor will be the same level all the way across?
- Mr. Pacheco: The same level of the second floor, the same level of the ground floor.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons; What was the height of the 2nd floor bedroom?
- Mr. Pacheco: Plus, or minus nine feet. 25 feet is the required tie beam height they are at 22, almost 3 feet below. They could raise it but did not want to. The only portion that they raised was to level with the floors.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Said he understood the choices he made, was it a vaulted or flat ceiling in bedroom #3?
- Mr. Pacheco: Flat ceiling.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Said he felt relatively strongly about the eve line of the existing massing and even though it is only a little over 2 feet it felt like a lot.
- Mr. Pacheco: Originally it was lower, but they were stepping down to the existing bedroom.
- Mr. Porter: Originally there were four steps going down and Mr. Pacheco's solution was to raise it and use the bougainvillea to hide the space. He was going to use the bougainvillea to create the new trellis.
- Mr. Fullerton: It was beautifully thought out. He was not concerned with the scale. He thought the setback was adequate. He thought the biggest concern was that it appears to be two front doors. The new front door overshadowed the old front door. He thought that it could be overshadowed with landscape.
- Mr. Pacheco: They did not want to touch the original front door as he respected what the original architect did. The second front door was the entrance to the library. It will have the same vaulted ceiling that it has now, and they wanted to create it for that purpose. It is leading to the library with the same ceiling and fireplace, he was not touching that. There were two huge trees they wanted to keep.
- Ms. Spain: She was concerned about the raising of the roof of the existing two story and asked Mr. Fullerton if he was?
- Mr. Fullerton: Said he was not as it was overshadowed intricacy of the lower floor.
- Mr. Pacheco: As none of the owners' daughters wanted to go down to that bedroom, the only solution was to raise the floor to the level of the other bedrooms. He could not accommodate the air conditioning if he did not raise the floor.
- Ms. Spain: Appreciated that he was keeping the details of the historic home like the wing wall and putting the fountain behind it. She asked about the top of the towers.
- Mr. Pacheco: He had a competition in his office for parapets, and they thought flat was boring.

- Ms. Spain: He should go for boring because it takes away from the historic portion of the home. When you look at an addition to a historic home you should be able to appreciate the original home and have that be the centerpiece and the addition just complements it. All the design features like the prominent entryway detract from the historic home. The addition should not be more elaborate.
- Mr. Pacheco: When he did the other house and the porch was rough stucco, she told him to keep the addition smooth so you could see the difference, here he did not have rough stucco. He had looked at ten options for the entrance to the main house.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Liked the parapets.
- Mr. Durana: The front entrance was the only sticking point.
- Mr. Maxwell: Was okay with the front entrance, but not raising the height on the second floor, as it absorbs it into the addition and homogenizes the addition into the existing house in a way that is inappropriate.
- Mr. Durana: Had walked this house when it was for sale, and you must walk through the outside to get to the upstairs. The garage is funky because it has a low ceiling so even if you raise the floor, you still have the ceiling issue. He understood the issue and asked if enlarging the windows would help. He liked the house as it was designed. He liked that they kept the original house intact.
- Chair Menendez: Asked about the parking issue.
- Mr. Adams: The parking was a zoning issue and the owners mentioned that they would take that off the table now if the board was inclined to move ahead with the design.
- Mr. Rodriguez: He was told that they would talk about the house and revisit the parking. Either leave the two that are there or do something else later. He did not want that to be part of this conversation.
- Mr. Adams: When the project first came to Board of Architects the fact that the driveway does not lead to a cover parking space was one of his concerns. He told them to check with zoning, which they did. Zoning emailed them that it was okay and since zoning approved it Mr. Adams said okay. At the last minute they went back to zoning who told them that they can't do it. It is up in the air now. If they wanted to take that off the table, they could do that and wait until it is resolved. He asked the board if zoning approves it if the Board wanted it to come back. says they can do it, does the board want it to come back.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Understood the driveway, it makes sense, but does not meet the criteria. Additional driveways and curb cuts negatively affect pedestrians in a very pedestrian oriented place. If it comes back to the board, he had several comments with relationship of the front door to the front sidewalk which is not connected. He would hold his questions if it was going to come back to the Board.

- Chair Menendez: Requested a clarification.
- Mr. Adams: If zoning says rejects it, staff will not support a variance request which would come back to the board, or they may decide not to do it or redesign it. If zoning says they can do it, does the Board want it to come back?
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Asked if there was currently a wall or fence around the top?
- Mr. Rodriguez: Replied no and said one was not proposed.
- Mr. Adams: A wall had been proposed, but it was further cutting off the corner access, so it was removed.
- Ms. Bache-Wiig: Admired Mr. Pacheco and his work. She had an issue with the tiles, as the original home was a transitional Mediterranean style, with a bit of art deco with the curves at the corners and the tower parapets is introducing a new element, a mission style.
- Mr. Rodriguez: They would satisfy the need to have them boring going forward.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Requested to return to the image. He was looking at page 3.0. The middle row of renderings on the left hand shows the relationship with the existing house to the raised second floor on the front, bedroom #3. It looks like from the drawings that the top of the windows are at the height of the previous eve height. According to page 3.0 which shows the cut line above the windowsill.
- Mr. Pacheco: Those windows were made a little longer in the raised portion, but the code says that he must keep the windowsill 3 feet from the floor. So, from the 3 feet from the floor, he raised it up for the amount of the proportional wall because he was raising it 2 feet forward.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Asked him to go to page 3.0 where he said the line looks like it is aligning with the top of the windows.
- Mr. Pacheco: It was a mistake, and it should come a little farther down.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Asked if there could be some sort of treatment of the non-historic element above that line and not just the stucco one, but something that could be interesting. If the material could be a little bit darker something that will clearly show the path.
- Mr. Pacheco: Thought it was an excellent idea and said they could do a banding to create that transition and that would respect the line they had before.
- Mr. Maxwell: Suggested that they lower the floor in the dining room. They could achieve the same height. He understood that they wanted to have everything on one floor, but the addition, the replacement above the roof, is overscale, it presents a much larger massing and was contrary to the early Mediterranean design principle where one has a whole series of elevated and staggered roofs which give a skyline to a city that has not skyline.

- Mr. Pacheco: Wanted to have 9 foot high in the dining room, and he had to accommodate the air conditioning. Keeping the finished ceiling that the garage has is going to be very difficult for a dining room to have any type of fixture above the dining table.
- Mr. Maxwell: They were taking the floor out of the garage and were not going to use the floor in the garage, they could lower the floor two feet so you can step down into the dining room.
- Mr. Pacheco: It will be below flood and carrying food into the dining room would be difficult with a step down.
- Ms. Spain: Asked if code allowed him to do that? There were lot of the issues when people convert the Coral Gables Cottages, and they allowed them to turn the garage into a living space. The building official has required the finished floor to be above the crown of the road. She liked Mr. Maxwell's suggestion but was not sure that the code would allow it.
- Mr. Pacheco: Agreed.
- Ms. Bache-Wiig: Referred to A-3.0, she said the roof is tight to the exterior walls on both sides, there is no overhang, and in the new one there is an overhang. Their rendering does not have an overhang and she suggested that they should not have an overhang but keep it tight like the original.
- Mr. Pacheco: The overhang was to create the difference.
- Mr. Porter: Because they were doing something in the roof, they tried to make it the same overhang.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: If you go to the last elevation, you will see the twin hats and it works.
- Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor or opposition of the case. When no one did he closed the public portion of the hearing and opened it up to the board for comments.
- Mr. Adams: If was a motion to approve there is a list of conditions that staff had that he could pass to the board that he would like to have. He passed the list to the applicants and the Board at Mr. Fullerton's request.
- Mr. Fullerton: Asked if there were zoning issues that had not been resolved.
- Mr. Adams: The driveway so the board might want to have a different condition for that item.
- Mr. Pacheco: Agreed with the conditions.
- Vice Chair Garcia-Pons: Asked if the conditions would address the driveway, he wanted it addressed.
- Chair Menendez: It was a zoning issue.
- Mr. Adams: If zoning denied it would be back in the applicants' hands and they would have to decide what they wanted to do. If zoning approves it, does the board want to see it.

- Ms. Spain: If the driveway is approved by zoning did anyone have a problem with it.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: If zoning approved it and staff reviewed it, he wanted to see a pedestrian access from the sidewalk to the Alhambra front door. So that you do not have to walk through the parking area. Even if there is not a driving area, he wanted to see a pedestrian connection from the new front door to Alhambra Circle.
- Mr. Adams: This was a request by staff.
- Mr. Fullerton: Asked if there would be two front doors and if the original front door would remain a primary access. He thought it was a zoning issue that you could not have two front doors.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: If zoning allows the driveway to remain on Alhambra Circle, the architect shall incorporate a pedestrian access from Alhambra Circle to the front door and it goes back to the Historic Preservation staff for their review and recommendation. There also should be some sort of architectural detail between the existing eave height of the building up, generally above the windows, above the garage and more than just a stucco joint.

A motion was made by Ms. Bache-Wiig and seconded by Mr. Durana to approve the request for design approval for additions and alterations to the residence and sitework with conditions and to approve the issuance of Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 2003 Alhambra Circle, a Contributing Resource within the “Alhambra Circle Historic District,”

The motion passed (Ayes: 5, Nays: 2).

The conditions are as follows:

- 1. The shape of the parapets on the stair and elevator towers be amended to be more consistent with the architectural style of the house.*
- 2. Details and specifications for all new doors and windows be submitted to Staff for review.*
- 3. The proposed sills are removed from the windows on the additions to further differentiate the new construction from the original.*
- 4. Details and specifications of all proposed new columns and railings be submitted to Staff for review.*
- 5. Details and specifications of all proposed new pavers be submitted to Staff for review.*
- 6. All Zoning issues are resolved.*
- 7. On the new additions, all glass shall be clear and all muntins shall be high profile.*
- 8. Provide pedestrian access (walkway) from the sidewalk at Alhambra Circle to the new front door location.*
- 9. Delineate the change in the eave height at the garage by providing an architectural treatment - with material, not just a change in stucco - between the original eave height and the new eave height.*

Chair Menendez read a description of the next case as follows:

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2022-028: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 410 Alcazar Avenue, a Contributing Resource within the “Alcazar Avenue Historic District,” legally described as Lot 10, Block 5, Coral Gables Section “B,” according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 111 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant is requesting design approval for the enclosure of the open front porch with impact-resistant windows and doors.

Mr. Adams made a presentation following the on-screen Presentation.

The PowerPoint played on-screen. Highlights were as follows:

1. The applicant is requesting design approval for the enclosure of the open front porch with impact-resistant aluminum windows and iron doors.
2. The house is designed in the Mission Style, was built circa 1923 and issued permit #172 after the City's incorporation in 1925.
3. Permit drawings and permit records do not exist for this property.
4. The frame color for the doors is indicated as light brush copper and the glass selection as clear.
5. The original proposal for the windows and doors was amended to comply with the comments from the Board of Architects.
6. The original porch does appear to have been altered when compared to historic photographs.
7. The front steps to the central archway appear to have been removed.
8. The current openings contain metal railings of an inappropriate design.
9. No variances have been requested.
10. The application has been reviewed and approved with comments/notes by the Board of Architects on August 4, 2022. Those comments, included in the applicant's submittal package, have been incorporated into the submitted drawings.
11. While there are many examples of glass-enclosed porches on historic houses in the City, research shows that it appears these alterations were undertaken prior to designation.
12. No applications for this type of proposal have been presented to the Board in recent years.
13. This is one of the earliest houses in the City and, as the open porch is such a dominant significant feature on this small house.
14. Staff does not support the request, but this is a determination the board to make as these types of requests will probably be forthcoming.
15. Staff's recommendation is a motion to deny the proposal.

Mr. Maxwell said one of the enclosed porches belong to one of the members of the Historic Board.

Mika Bektor and Carla Boucher, the property owners made a presentation following the on-screen Presentation. Highlights were as follows:

1. Pictures of the porch from different angles and the interior were shown.
2. This is a Mission style residential property built in 1925.
3. There are many examples of enclosed porches in the City on historic houses, however through research it appears that most of these alterations were undertaken prior to historic designation.
4. There have been no recent applications coming to the board for this type of proposal.
5. Located at Alcazar Avenue, two houses away from Le Jeune Street.
6. The house has been altered from its original design
7. The iron work is not original and of historically inappropriate style. More of an art deco style.
8. They had been to the Board of Architects, and it was approved with comments that were applied.
9. Elevations were shown:
 - a) Existing elevation: shows windows and open iron work currently.
 - b) Proposed elevation: Clean simple lines, one vertical, two horizontal, dividers in the front and similar style on the doors which is a full arched top, French doors style that was recommended by the Board of Architect that we agree is a better option. More expensive option.
10. Before and after pictures were shown of windows and doors.
11. Because the porch is such a dominant significant feature of the house, they could not change it. By adding glass windows and doors they were removing or altering anything of architectural or structural importance.
12. They were keeping the three arches in the front and the two openings on the side.
13. A Photoshop image of the new windows was shown which looks like the original.

14. The clear glass allows you to see into the porch, and along with the dark frames sets the windows back from the façade. From the street you see the arches not the windows. They want to keep the look and see the three arches from the street.
15. In the historical photo of the house from the 1940's you cannot tell if the porch is enclosed or not, it looks more enclosed because of the canopy and screened windows.
16. The inappropriate art deco iron work will be removed.
17. Minimally intrusive windows and doors will replace the existing and is more in line with the original screen design.
18. In the before and after photo you cannot tell that windows have been installed.
19. It will provide protection for the porch as currently it takes 4 days for the porch to dry out after rain, so furniture cannot be put on the porch.
20. The house is two doors down from LeJeune Road, when the house was built 100 years ago there was as much traffic, the porch and furniture must be constantly cleaned because of the pollution.
21. They are unable to spend time on the porch, in addition there are snakes and lizards and cats marking their territory.
22. Pictures of other properties on Alcazar with enclosed porches were shown, while they might have been done before they were designated, they wanted to show that they could do it in a way that it still looks like an open porch.
23. Light frames will not be used as it would make it look more like a part of the house, whereas the dark frames will blend in, and it will still look like an open porch.
24. A photo of Mr. Fullerton's house at 2214 Granada Boulevard was shown, it was similar to what their house would look like, but with wider openings and black frames behind the glass.

Members of the Historic board and Mr. Adams made comments and asked questions. Questions were answered by Mr. Adams, Mr. Bektor and Ms. Boucher.

Mr. Fullerton: Said his house had impact glass with a 4' wide door. He disliked the intrusion of metal in those sleeping porches he did not like the windows on the house shown at 716 Alhambra Circle as they said the canopy hanging over gave it a similar look to their north facing façade.

Mr. Maxwell: They had a clean simple solution and asked if they would consider re-establishing the front door in the center rather than on the side and put the tiles back on the parapet in the front.

Mr. Bektor: They had thought about it, they wanted to keep it as simple as possible, less intrusion as possible.

Mr. Bektor said they were trying to do the following:

1. Not alter anything architecturally or structurally that can't be reversed.
2. The house may be one of the earliest houses in the City, but it has already been altered.
3. Not do anything that had not already been done on other historic houses.
4. Remove historically inappropriate element and replacing them with appropriate ones
5. Preserve the porch area from weather conditions.
6. Requesting special consideration because of the proximity to heavily trafficked Le Jeune St. If it was located a block up the street or closer to the center of Coral Gables, they would not have to ask to close the porch because there would not be that amount of traffic.
7. Be able to enjoy the space.

Ms. Bache-Wiig: Asked Mr. Adams what was the basis of the denial.

- Mr. Adams: It was an early house and has such a prominent large porch compared to the size of the house. It could and it is potentially going to set a precedent as they did not see any the other applications. None have come before the board since he started with the City. It is the board's decision. Mr. Adams asked if there were currently had French doors leading into the main house at the back of the porch.
- Mr. Bektor: They were windows. There was a central door and windows on each side. They were not changing them.
- Mr. Adams: Going by the standards and the board not having any prior applications and knowing that it would potentially set a precedent he felt the board should make the decision and not staff.
- Ms. Spain: If this done before it was designated, and they had these identical windows installed, and it was up for designation would Mr. Adams recommend approval or denial?
- Mr. Adams: It is more than just the windows, there are existing designated houses where that had already been done.
- Ms. Spain: When they did the houses in MacFarlane it was a preservation grant from the county, and so we required them to return them to being porches, because it was important. There were a lot of these around that were designated with glass in them because they did not think it detracted from the historic integrity.
- Mr. Fullerton: Invited them to come to his house to see how he had done it and would give them his contractor's name to get prices. The metalwork is necessary to hold the impact glass, how they offset the cost is not using the metal work and just doing it all in a glass. He was not sure, but it seemed counterintuitive, because 2 pieces of glass like that in a sandwich is expensive. He asked if they were using impact glass.
- Mr. Bektor: All are impact windows; the front windows are solid pieces of glass and the muntins are applied.
- Mr. Fullerton: If they used one solid piece of glass, they would not have to put the muntins on and they would get rid of the noise and dirt.
- Ms. Bache-Wiig: Asked if the porches were screened when the houses were built.
- Mr. Adams: Replied affirmatively. The board needed to decide if they wanted one sheet of glass with no muntins, a sheet of glass with muntins that reflect the screen pattern or a screen of glass with the muntins that they are proposing.
- Ms. Spain: Board of Architects believed it was better to put the muntins.
- Mr. Maxwell: Originally it would have been styled down below, and then it would have been open, above. He suggested to push them as far back as far as possible.
- Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: This would be looked at on a case-by-case basis, he did not see a one-size fits all solution.

Mr. Maxwell: They would have to worry about is the room getting hot as there is no air conditioning and the windows are inoperable.

Mr. Bektor: The a/c duct comes out in line with the front door, so they could cool the room by opening the door. It does not get direct sunlight, so it does not overheat.

Mr. Fullerton: Had the same thing at his house.

A motion was made by Mr. Maxwell and seconded by Mr. Durana to approve the design for the enclosure of the open front porch with impact-resistant windows and doors, an approve the application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 410 Alcazar Avenue, a Contributing Resource within the "Alcazar Avenue Historic District".

The motion failed (Ayes: 4, Nays: 3).

Ms. Bache-Wiig: Because the porch is such a prominent element in this floor plan and in the house, she was voting not to enclose it. The porch is an integral element of the house and wants to see it preserved with screens.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Did not mind the enclosing of the porch, he just did not agree with the method. He supported having the doors on either side so that the doors are operable. His vote was no.

Mr. Durana: Under the purist part of it and he thought that it was a nice feature, but it is somewhat of a smaller house, and they are not asking to build on top of it. Times have changed and if they were building the house today, he did not think it would be a porch and it would be air conditioned as it is too hot, and technology does allow for a/c. The porch is nice but that is when you have a big house and you can use the porch in the winter and nice weather, but 90% of the time in Miami you need an enclosed porch.

Mr. Fullerton: Said he wished they would not use the muntins.

Ms. Spain: They could install them later.

Mr. Bektor: The Board of Architects wants the muntins.

Chair Menendez: He was voting no as he was a purist, and it was setting a precedent.

Mr. Maxwell: This is changeable, and it meets the Secretary Standards.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos responded to a question from the Board and said there was no action taken on the motion so they could either deny it or make a new motion.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons: Restated his opinion again. He said they would miss the porch when it is gone. If they had double doors that opened out, they would need something to protect the floor on the outside.

The board discussed the options.

A motion was made by Mr. Maxwell and seconded by Mr. Fullerton to approve the design for the enclosure of the open front porch with impact-resistant windows and doors, and approve the application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 410 Alcazar Avenue, a Contributing Resource within the "Alcazar Avenue Historic District".

The motion passed (Ayes: 5, Nays: 2).

BOARD ITEMS / CITY COMMISSION / CITY PROJECTS UPDATE: None.

ITEMS FROM THE SECRETARY:

1. House with hybrid roofing system:
Mr. Adams showed pictures of the house from the front and the back that they had approved with the barrel tiles and the water pipes running below them as a heating element. He wanted them to see what it looked like if another one came before the Board.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons said he thought it would save tile, but it looked like it was double the amount of tile.

Mr. Adams said only the front was double, the rest was single.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Restriction on communication between Boards:
Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons asked Assistant City Attorney Ceballos if there was any restriction on communications between the Historic Preservation Board and the Landmarks Advisory Board as per the Sunshine Law.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos said they were a quasi-judicial board so communication on an item that was likely to come before the board would be considered ex-parte communication and should be avoided. If it does happen it would be stated as an ex-parte communication and if they could be fair and impartial, they could still consider the item.
2. TDR handouts:
Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons said the handouts on the TDRs which was in their packages had just the first few pages of the first section and asked if they could get the complete report electronically.

Mr. Adams said they got the entire report for TDRs were over 200 pages on their flash drive.

Vice-Chair Garcia-Pons said he was talking about the TDR legislation, not the application and asked for the entire report electronically.

Mr. Adams said yes.

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

Coral Gables Historic Preservation Board
October 19, 2022

ADJOURNMENT:

A motion was made by Mr. Maxwell and seconded by vice Chair Garcia Pons to adjourn the meeting.
The motion passed with a collective aye.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:54 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Warren Adams
Historic Preservation Officer