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MR. MENENDEZ: Good afternoon. Welcome to the regularly scheduled meeting of the City of Coral Gables Historic Preservation Board.

We are residents of Coral Gables and are charged with the preservation and protection of historic or architecturally worthy buildings, structures, sites, neighborhoods and artifacts which impart a distinct historical heritage of the city.

The board is comprised of nine members, seven of whom are appointed by the commission, one by the city manager, and the ninth is selected by the board and confirmed by the commission.

Five members of the board constitute a quorum, and five affirmative votes are necessary for the adoption of any motion.

Lobbyists registration and disclosure: Any person who acts as a lobbyist pursuant to the City of Coral Gables Ordinance Number 2006-11 must register with the city clerk prior to engaging in lobbying activities or presentations before city staff, boards, committees, or the city commission. A copy of the ordinance is available in the office of the city clerk.

Failure to register and provide proof of registration shall prohibit your ability to present to the Historic Preservation Board on applications under
consideration this afternoon.
"Lobbyist" is defined as an individual, corporation, partnership or other legal entity employed or retained, whether paid or not, by a principal who seeks to encourage the approval, disapproval, adoption, repeal, passage, defeat, or modifications of any ordinanc, resolution, action or decision of any city commissioner, any action, decision, recommendation of the city manager, any city board or committee, including, but not limited to, quasi-judicial advisory board, trust, authority or council.

Or any action, decision or recommendation of city personnel during the time period of the entire decision-making process on the action, decision or recommendation which foreseeably, which foreseeably will be heard or reviewed by the city commission or a city board or committee, including, but not limited to, quasi-judicial advisory board, trust, authority, or council.

Presentations made to this board are subject to the city's false claims ordinance, Chapter 39 of the City of Coral Gables city code.

I now officially call the City of Coral Gables Historic Preservation Board meeting of November 17th, 2021 to order. The time is now 4:06 p.m.

Present today are Dona Spain, Michael
Maxwell, John Fullerton, Xavier Durana, Alicia Bache-Wiig, Bruce Ehrenhaft, and myself, Albert Menendez.

Approval of the minutes. The next item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of the meeting held on October 20th, 2021. Are there any changes or corrections?

MR. MAXWELL: Move, move approval.
MS. SPAIN: I'll second.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Maxwell made the motion. Miss Spain seconds the motion.

MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MR. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes?
MS. LYONS: Mr. Maxwell?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MR. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: The motion -- did I miss anybody? Mr. Menendez?

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes. Notice regarding ex parte communications:

Please be advised that this board is a quasi-judicial board and the items on the agenda are quasi-judicial in nature which requires board members to disclose all ex parte communications.

An ex parte communication is defined as any contact, communication, conversation, correspondence, memorandum or other written or verbal communication that takes place outside a public hearing between a member of the public and a member of a quasi-judicial board regarding matters to be heard by the quasi-judicial board.

If anyone has made any contact with a board member, when the issue becomes before the board, the member must state on the record the existence of the ex parte communication, the party who originated the communication, and whether the communication will affect the board member's ability to impartially consider the evidence to be presented regarding the matter.

Does any member have such communications to disclose at this time?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Back in -- for one of the applications, for the correspondence for 1020 Hardee Road, when the property owner purchased the property some years ago, many years ago now, they reached out and they wanted
to know who from the Historic Preservation staff to speak with, and I just directed them to Kara at that time, and then $I$ haven't heard anything until today, so it's great. MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chair, you may want to
mention that some of them visited 1224 Country Club Prado. You may want to mention just for the record.

MR. MENENDEZ: That's right, that's right. Some of the board members did visit 1224 Country Club Prado, I believe it was Monday, to do a field visit.

MR. FULLERTON: I didn't know there was a time for it.

MR. MENENDEZ: We have an excused absence by Mr., for Mr. Garcia-Pons.

MR. FULLERTON: I'll move it, move the excuse.

MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Fullerton moves the excuse.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I'll second the motion.
MR. MENENDEZ: Miss Bache-Wiig seconds the excuse. Do we need --

MR. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Oh, yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.

MS. LYONS: Mr. Maxwell?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: MISS Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Deferrals. Mr. Adams, do we have any deferrals today?

MR. ADAMS: No, we don't.
MR. MENENDEZ: We don't, okay. Swearing in: If any persons in the audience will be testifying today, please rise to be sworn in.
(Thereupon, certain members of the audience were duly sworn on oath by the court reporter.)

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So we've got first item on the agenda, ad valorem tax relief, Case File AV 2016-006, an application requesting ad valorem tax relief for the property at 800 Coral Way, a contributing resource within the Coral Way Historic District legally described as Lots Nine and Ten, Block One, Coral Gables Section A,
according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book Five, Page 102 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

A related special certificate of appropriateness, COA (SP) 2016-006, was granted design approval by the Historic Preservation Board on March 17th, 2016.

MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. The location map of the property, right at the start of the ucoral Way Historic District which was designated as a local historic district in February of 2014. This property is considered a contributing structure within the district, permitted in 1957.

It was designed by architect Curtis Haley. It was deemed to be contributing because it had not had any substantial alterations over the years, specifically during the period of significance in the district.

I'll scroll through the photographs of the project. They're not labeled. They're before and after, so they're before shots and after. You can tell the after because they're approved, and if there's any question, I'll describe it.

MR. FULLERTON: Excuse me, Kara. I'm having a hard time understanding with that mask.

MS. KAUTZ: Sorry. I'm probably talking too
fast anyway.
So general restoration, renovation includes new impact resistant casement windows and doors, new gray flat cement roof, enclosure of the original two-car garage off of Coral Way converted into a kitchen, and this is what you see here on the screen.

Expansion of the footprint of the west wing of the house, insulation of decorative shutters, total interior remodeling, rebuilding of the front bay window structure you see right there on the front.

A one-story addition to the rear with access off of De Soto Boulevard consist of a master bedroom suite and new two-car garage.

Site improvements include the installation of a new brick paver driveway and vehicular gate and the new garage off of De Soto Boulevard, and landscaping around the property.

That's finishing the before and after photographs, and there you have it. This was approved by Special Certificate of Appropriateness 2016-06.
(Thereupon, Ms. Rolando is present.)
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Before we continue, let the record show that Miss Rolando has joined us, so she's here as well. Please continue.

MS. KAUTZ: I think the owner is here if you
have any questions of her.
MS. GUITERAS: I'm the owner.
THE COURT REPORTER: Can you state your name, please?

MS. GUITERAS: Angelica, last name Guiteras.
THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
MR. MENENDEZ: Any questions from the board?
MS. SPAIN: Well, I'm assuming that $I$ can

```
vote on this. I don't see there's any reason that I
```

shouldn't be able to vote on this even though I was
involved in that.

MR. FULLERTON: What?
MS. SPAIN: Is there any reason why I
shouldn't vote on this?
MR. CEBALLOS: You were involved in what, the original designation?

MS. SPAIN: Yes, with the certificate of appropriateness, $I$ was involved in that, but this is for the ad valorem tax relief. Is this --

MR. CEBALLOS: Do you believe you can be fair and impartial?

MS. SPAIN: Absolutely.
MR. CEBALLOS: You have no gain in this?
MR. FULLERTON: I think there's only one thing I see, is that they need to bring the roof tile, the
original garage door and the replacement for it which has the windows which I think is very attractive, very well done. It just doesn't fill the space the way the older door did, and I'm not sure if that's important or not. I didn't -- I thought I read something in here, the documentation, that said that it's supposed to be more like --

THE COURT REPORTER: Can you talk louder or more into the mic, Mr Fullerton, please? Thank you.

MR. FULLERTON: Are you talking next to the garage door?

MS. KAUTZ: Can you put the Power Point back up, please? I'm asking them to put the Power Point back up.

MR. FULLERTON: If it's immaterial, I mean if the board isn't objecting, if it doesn't have any objection, then --

MS. KAUTZ: So what happened, what the request was that was approved by the board was that the front-facing garage off of Coral Way was allowed to be enclosed --

MR. FULLERTON: Right.
MS. KAUTZ: -- as was the space to be a
kitchen, and so this was the before photograph, garage door. This is the after photograph. It included, it
included the stucco moulding that you see. It was just, it was approved by the board.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay. I understood what was going on about it, but it just occurred to me that it was a completely different modulation of the space between the two sites.

MS. KAUTZ: Right. We had requested they keep the opening so that it reads as the opening and set the in-fill, recess it so that it reads as an opening.

MR. FULLERTON: I have no objection to that.
Thank you.
MR. MENENDEZ: Do I have a motion?
MR. MAXWELL: Move to accept.
MS. SPAIN: I'll second it.
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Maxwell made the motion.
mMiss Spain seconded the motion.
MS. GUITERAS: Is that it?
MS. KAUTZ: We have to vote, but yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Maxwell?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
MS. GUITERAS: Thank you, thank you very
much.
MR. MAXWELL: Good job.
MR. MENENDEZ: Next case file, local historic designation, Case File LHD 2021-008, consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 1541 Sopera Avenue, legally described as the west one half of Lot 16, all of Lot 17, and the east half of Lot 18, Block 56, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part Four, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book Ten at Page 57 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

MR. ADAMS: Can we have the Power Point, please, for 1541 Sopera Avenue? (Thereupon, the audio/video recording was played as follows:)
"MS. GUIN: The property at 1541 Sopera Avenue is before you for consideration as a local historic landmark. It is the result of a historic significance determination required by the board of architects.
"Please note that all observations are made from the public right of way and there was no access to the property.
"As per Article Eight, Section 8-103 of the Coral Gables Zoning Code, criteria for designation of historic landmarks, a local historic landmark must have significant character, interest or value as part of the historical, cultural or archaeological, aesthetic or architectural heritage of the city, state or nation.
"For designation, a property must meet one of the criteria outlined in the code. 1541 Sopera Avenue is eligible as a local historic landmark based on three criteria:
"Historic cultural significance, Criteria Four, It exemplifies the historical, cultural, political, economic or social trends of the community.
"Architectural significance Criteria One, It portrays the environment in an era of history characterized by one or more distinctive architectural style.
"And Criteria Two, It embodies those
distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or period or method of construction.
"The single-family residence at 1541 Sopera Avenue in the Coral Gables Country Club Section Part Four is located one block north of Bird Road and two blocks west of the Biltmore Golf Course. It sits on an interior 100-by-110-foot lot on the south side of Sopera Avenue between Alhambra Circle and Red Road.
"George Merrick founded Coral Gables in the early 1920s based on his vision for a fully conceived Mediterranean-inspired city. The city's developmental history is divided into three major historical periods.
"During the initial developmental period, architectural designs specifically combined elements commonly used in Spanish, Moorish, Italian architecture and has come to be known as the Mediterranean Revival style. During the 1920 s, structures and amenities were built almost exclusively in accordance with this style.
"The construction of the home at 1514 Sopera Avenue occurred during this initial phase simultaneous to the incorporation of the city.
"Nationally acclaimed landscape architect Frank Button drew the first comprehensive map of Coral Gables in 1921 and 1922, one of which is on the left side of this slide.
"In the mid-1920s, Merrick announced plans for a premiere hotel and redesigned golf course in Section H. At this time, Sections G, H and I which were primarily undeveloped, were reworked to accommodate the large, ten-million-dollar hotel complex. These three sections were divided into six sections and renamed Country Club Sections Parts One through Six.
"Additional scenic boulevards were added to include Anastasia Avenue, Ocean Beach Drive which was later named University Drive, Segovia Street. You can see some of these changes between the two maps dated 1922 and 1925.
"The home at 1541 Sopera Avenue was built in this area, Country Club Section Part Four, which is outlined in blue.
"With the unbridled Florida land boom, the influx of new residents and winter visitors resulted in a housing shortage in South Florida by the mid-1920s. As Coral Gables grew exponentially, so did its workforce, and the construction of homes in Coral Gables could not keep pace with their burgeoning numbers.
"This, coupled with the acute housing shortage in the region, presented a challenge which, by 1925, Merrick tried to meet head on.
"Merrick began a multi-pronged approach to
this issue. He provided temporary housing in the form of a tent city as seen in the photo in the upper left.
"He commissioned the San Sebastien Apartment Hotel which provided apartments to company employees and their families, and he reached out to M.L. Rauschenberg, an Atlanta builder and a close personal friend, who agreed to build ten apartment buildings in the Douglas sections which would accommodate 128 families.
"Merrick also wanted to provide the option of single-family homes. As a result of the trip to Atlanta to broker the deal with Rauschenberg, Merrick's investment opportunity and needs came to the attention of Lindsey Hopkins and Herbert Nicholes.
"Lindsey H. Hopkins, who is pictured here, was a nationally acclaimed investor. He was the director of the Coca-Cola Company, the Federal Reserve Bank in Atlanta, and the Reynolds metal company. He was intensly interested in aviation, automobiles and road development and real estate, all passions shared by Merrick.
"But probably more important to Merrick was that Hopkins, with his partner, Herbert Nicholes, a prominent builder, were responsible for most of the homes in Druids Hills.
"Druid Hills, an exclusive suburb of Atlanta, was initially planned by the premiere landscape architect

Frederick Law Olmstead in 1893. In 1908, it was sold to Asa Candler, the president of Coca-Cola, and developed in large part by Hopkins and Nicholes between 1910 and 1936. Druid Hills is now listed on the National Register for Historic Places.
"This was one of several high profile and successful endeavors Hopkins and Nicholed undertook under the Builders Finance and Mortgage Company.
"Hopkins and Nicholes approached Merrick in early 1925 with a large building program. It was to include the construction of 500 single-family homes.
"At this point in time, Merrick had certain criteria he was asking his potential investors to meet. This included demonstrating they had readily available capital to meet their contract and that they understood the vision for the city.
"He also asked them to demonstrate the ability to build in a large scale in a planned community which these two had done in Druid Hills and also that they could mobilize quickly and independently of the construction currently underway in Coral Gables.
"To meet that requirement, Hopkins shipped ten railway car loads of building material and submitted plans to build a concrete plant in Coral Gables.
"Thus, in 1925 with the purchase of the first

50 lots and the submission of architectural drawings, a contract was issued and the plan was announced. The 50 lots purchased were in undeveloped sections.
"Thirty of the homes were concentrated in the Coconut Grove section, just south of the planned San Sebastien Apartment Hotel which broke ground a few months later in August.
"The other 20 were scattered over Country Club Sections Part Three, Four and Five which wrap around the southern portions of the Miami Biltmore Golf Course which was then under construction.
"These 50 homes were designed by architects H. George Fink or Frank Wyatt Woods, both of who were members of Merrick's design team. As agreed, some of the homes were to be moderately priced cottages that would be affordable to Merrick's employees.
"Located in Country Club Section Part Four, the home at 1541 Sopera Avenue was amongst these first 50 homes. It was designed in the Mediterranean Revival style by architect H. George Fink in April of 1925, and the plans were permitted in June of 1925 by Mr. Nicholes.
"1514 Sopera Avenue is a one-and-two-story residence with a detached garage built in the Mediterranean Revival style.
"As will be illustrated in the following
slides, the home exhibits numerous Mediterranean Revival style characteristics defining features, including projecting and recessed planes, a combination of roof types, an entry bay with arched openings springing from twisted columns, textured stucco, a prominent and distinctive chimney, decorative vents, a wing wall, recessed casement windows of various shapes and sizes, and a series of coral rock walls.
"Here is an aerial view and a property survey to provide an overall sense of the home. The 1,645-square-foot single-family residence sits at the center of the lot with a detached garage off its northeast corner.
"A swimming pool is located in the northwest corner of the property and a pond feature is east of the home.
"There are several coral rock wall features on the property which include a low perimeter wall along the east and the rear side. In addition, a low serpentine wall extends from the home's wing wall at the southwest corner of the home to the southwest corner of the lot. Another wall curves from the southeast corner of the property, sweeping along the driveway and the pond.
"Note the faux mansard roof on the two-story section of the home. The small shed roof on its west side
juts out over the stairwell.
"This is the front facade of the home. Note the front-facing gable roof whose eastern end extends asymmetrically over the entry loggia with arch openings springing from a central twisted column. At the western end, the gable roof terminated at the chimney.
"An obscured wing wall extends from the southwest corner, giving the impression that the gable roof extends to the other side of the chimney. A clear view of this still extant wing wall and the curved coral rock wall can be seen in the 1940 s photo.
"This photo is at the southeast corner of the home and shows the entry porch. Originally a screened porch, it was enclosed at an known date. The configuration of the original arched openings has been retained.
"Also note the original detached one-car garage at the end of the paver driveway.
"The photo on the left shows the pond and a portion of the coral rock wall along the driveway as described previously. On the right, the original permit drawing is provided to show some of the details that are obscured by vegetation.
"Note the small gable roof bay projecting slightly from the north end of the two-story section of
this facade. Also note the curved parapet cascading down from the two-story section to the one-story rear bay.
"This photo shows the rear and a portion of the west side facade. The rear shed roof bay was originally a utility room with no exterior door and was opened up to serve as a rear entry at an unknown date.
"The arched windows seen in the 1925 permit drawing near the front of the home are extant but are currently obscured by vegetation.
"A comparison of historic photographs and the original architectural plans with the extant home as well as an examination of the building records indicate that the property at 1541 Sopera Avenue has retained its historic integrity for nearly 100 years. There have been no substantial changes to the form or to the style of the home.
"As mentioned previously, the front and the rear screened porches were enclosed at an unknown date and their openings have been retained. They're shown here in blue on the 1957 tax record, and the utility room, indicated here in orange, was converted to the rear entry.
"In 2013, impact-resistant windows were installed. It appears that all original openings were retained. The original barrel tile roof was removed in 2009 and replaced with the current S-barrel tile.
"1541 Sopera Avenue remains as one of approximately 100 homes built by Hopkins and Nicholes.
"After the 1926 hurricane, due to the declining economy, amongst other national issues, Hopkins and Nicholes reduced their contract with Merrick. In return, Hopkins had provided the final necessary financing for the San Sebastien, and eventually he purchased it in 1928.
"As you can see in this 1948 aerial photo, the home at 1541 Sopera Avenue was one the few Mediterranean Revival homes built in this area of the city, and it stands as a testament to Merrick's vision for Coral Gables.
"Hence, the property exemplifies the historical, cultural, political, economic and social trends of the initial developmental history of the community.
"In conclusion, the single-family residence aat 1541 Sopera Avenue, permitted in 1925, and built in the Mediterranean Revival style, exemplifies the Mediterranean ideals espoused by city founder George Merrick and is indicative of the type of architecture that was the founding premise of Coral Gables.
"Financed and constructed by the nationally acclaimed team of Lindsey Hopkins and H.W. Nicholes, it
represents an integral piece of how Merrick developed Coral Gables.
"The home is one of a handful of homes built in the initial development phase in the Country Club Section Part Four and is part of a collection of quality buildings that serves as a visible reminder of the history and the cultural heritage of the city. The property at 1541 Sopera Avenue retains its architectural integrity. It significantly contributes to historic fabric of the City of Coral Gables.
"Hence, staff recommends approval of the local historic designation of the property at 1541 Sopera Avenue based on its historic, cultural and architectural significance."
(Thereupon, the playing of the audio/visual recording was concluded.)

MR. ADAMS: We do have some letters of support.

MS. LYONS: Speak into the mic, Warren.
MR. ADAMS: We do have some letters of support. Well, can you hear me now? We do have some letters of support here, and we have one from the Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables. This is signed by Karelia Martinez-Carbonell, president, Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables.

We have another support letter from Henry and Zully Pardo from 49 Campina Court. We have another from Bruce Fitzgerald, no address. We have another from Mary Ebart, 1243 Asturia Avenue, and I believe that's it.

MS. PEREZ: Hello. I'm Dr. Perez. I'm the owner of the property. I'm concerned, when I bought the house, the house was not historical, and I have a baby, so I'm concerned because I need to do some changes in the property, if this were to be a new addition of what we planning to do, which is adding a second room on the second floor, so I am not engaged to be stalled in time.

We have been look for a house like this for three years, and finally we found it last year, but when we bought it, we didn't know that it has any historical importance like you're telling me.

And then we still need the plan in order for me to -- a lot of this is for my baby that $I$ have been sleeping with my baby for the whole year, adding a second room to the second floor without changing what we have. I just need to add it after the room that $I$ have on the second floor.

I think $I$ have a meeting with some of you, and I was explaining to them the need that I have for that. If not, I have to sell the property, so I'm here just to check to know what limitation I have if the house
becomes historical or what I'm planning to do, like the second floor, adding, that's the most important, adding a second floor room that $I$ need to continue living in the house. Thank you.

MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak in favor of this case? Anyone in the audience who would like to speak in opposition of this case?

Okay. I will close it to the public hearing portion and open it up for board discussion.

MS. SPAIN: Can I just ask how you got here? I mean, why are we seeing this?

MR. ADAMS: It was, the property owner was asked to submit it for historic significance by the board of architects because plans were submitted for alterations.

MS. SPAIN: Oh, so you've already submitted --

MS. PEREZ: I submitted the plans for --
MS. SPAIN: -- the plans for alterations.
MS. PEREZ: Yes, and then --
MS. SPAIN: Okay.
MS. PEREZ: -- they decided that you have
to --
MS. SPAIN: And that's part of their
responsibility.
MS. PEREZ: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: Okay.
MS. PEREZ: Which I, you know, I completely with your board because Coral Gables is what it is because part of that is you guys. That's 100 percent. I'm just concerned to what limitation, you know, I'm dealing with when it gets approved because I know it's got to be historical, that $I$ know, but I'm so concerned.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, in my mind there's no question about the historical significance of this house, of its background, the architect, the people involved, George Fink, Lindsey Hopkins and people like him.

MS. PEREZ: Yes.
MR. FULLERTON: And the house itself is beautiful.

I will say that people are sometimes concerned about historic preservation. They think it's another level of government and that needs to be satisfied, and while the reality is it is one of the most helpful groups that have to have oversight over these historic buildings, and staff is very, very helpful and encouraging and they'll work with your architect.

They've worked with every architect in town, and I think I've never seen one that has come away really
upset about their participation in this process, so I encourage you to embrace it and enjoy the process, and I think they'll make you feel good about this.

MS. PEREZ: Yes. That means that it's not an issue, if $I$ do it the way you want it, it should not be an issue?

MR. FULLERTON: Well, we haven't seen the addition and our approval won't be based on that.

MS. SPAIN: Yeah. We have to base it on what we've seen and whether it's significant or not, but it sounds like the addition that you have, the architect, the board of architects, they weren't comfortable with it anyway, you know, so.

MS. PEREZ: They were, but they wanted the drawings and --

MS. SPAIN: Okay. I think we need to vote on whether it meets the criteria.

MS. PEREZ: Tomorrow I have the board of architects meeting --

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. PEREZ: -- that they're waiting for you to --

MR. FULLERTON: Well, enjoy the process. It's going to work out.

MS. PEREZ: Okay.

MR. FULLERTON: You'll like it.
MS. PEREZ: Okay. Thank you, thank you.
MS. ROLANDO: I move for designation.
MR. FULLERTON: I second.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Rolando passed the
motion. Mr. Fullerton seconds.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Maxwell?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Next case file, Case File LHD 2021-010, consideration of the local historic designation
of the property at 4100 Monserrate Street, legally described as Lot Four and the south 15 feet of Lot Three, Block One, Coral Gables Riviera Section Part One, revised, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 28 at Page 31 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

MR. ADAMS: Can you play the Power Point for 4100 Monserrate Street, please? (Thereupon, the audio/video recording was played as follows:)
"MS. GUIN: The property at 4100 Monserrate Street is before you for consideration for designation as a local historic landmark. Designation is before you as a result of a historic significance determination application.
"Please note that all observations were made from the public right of way and there was no access to the property.
"As per Article Eight, Section 8-103 of the Coral Gables Zoning Code, criteria for designation of historic landmarks, a local historic landmark must have significant character, interest or value as part of the historical, cultural or archaeological, aesthetic or architectural heritage of the city, state or nation.
"For designation, a property must meet one of
the criteria outlined in the code. 4100 Monserrate is eligible as a local historic landmark based on three criteria.
"Historic cultural significance, Criteria Four, It exemplifies the historical, cultural, political, economic or social trends of the community.
"Architectural significance, Criteria One, It portrays the environment in an era of history characterized by one or more distinctive architectural style.
"Criteria Two, It embodies those distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or period or method of construction.
"Permitted in 1925, 4100 Monserrate Street is a single-family home on a 65-by-146-foot interior lot on the west side of the street, just south of Bird Road in the Riviera Section Part One.
"George Merrick founded Coral Gables in the early 1920s based on his vision for a fully conceived Mediterranean-inspired city. The city's developmental history is divided into three major historical periods.
"The home at 4100 Monserrate occurred during this initial phase and is indicative of the type of architecture that was the founding premise of Coral Gables. It exemplifies the Mediterranean ideals and
climate adaptations espoused by the Coral Gables founder George Merrick and his design team.
"Coral Gables was originally conceived as a suburb of Miami and attracted investors from across the nation during the South Florida real estate boom of the 1920s. Merrick drew from the Garden City and City Beautiful movements of the 19th and early 20 th century to create his vision for a fully-conceived Mediterranean-inspired city, which is now considered one of the first modern planned communities in the United States.
"Nationally-acclaimed landscape architect Frank Button drew the first comprehensive maps of Coral Gables in 1921 and 1922.
"During the early 1920s, sales were highly successful, and Merrick continued to substantially increase his land holdings.
"With these two maps dated 1922 and 1926, you can see how much the city grew over just four years.
"During this time, lot and home sales were highly successful and Merrick's vision for Coral Gables continued to expand exponentially. Likewise, Merrick's workforce also grew. Crews were needed to clear the land and build the structures, the plazas and entrances, lay the streets and sidewalks as well as create some of his
larger ventures such as the Biltmore Hotel and Golf Course seen here under construction in the photo on the right.
"And of course there was also the sales force and the office staff who are pictured here in a 1923 group photo.
"Merrick drew a work force from across the country, and they too wanted a piece of Merrick's dream and wished to live in Coral Gables. Unfortunately, the available housing could not keep up with the demand despite Merrick's development of streets such as Obispo and Genoa.
"By 1925, Merrick began a multi-pronged approach to this issue. He provided temporary housing in the form of a tent city as seen here in the photo in the upper left which was located where Coral Gables High School now stands.
"He commissioned the San Sebastien Apartment Hotel which would provide 72 apartments for company employees and their families, and he began to invite investors who could provide their own construction management and work force and who could mobilize quickly.
"The ad at the bottom of the slide, posted in June 1925, was specifically for investors for the newly platted Riviera section, part of which he had just acquired from James and Charles Deering.
"As always, Merrick's goal was to safeguard his design and quality, and by September he found a pair whose qualification met his needs.
"Joseph Kresse was a real estate financier who also owned a concrete business, and George Batcheller, a prominent builder. This pair lived and had collaborated together on projects and the planned community of Forest Hills.
"It's worth noting Forest Hills Gardens, which is in the New York borough of Queens, was one of the communities George Merrick studied when developing his plans for Coral Gables.
"Forest Hills, designed by architect Grosvenor Atterbury and landscape architect Frederick Law Olmstead, Jr., in 1909 was one of the earliest and still considered one of the greatest Garden City communities of the period. Hence, Kresse and Batcheller were well versed in the principles upon which Merrick had designed Coral Gables.
"Merrick reached an agreement with them to launch the Riviera section with 40 homes promarily in Part One, just south of Bird Road as circled here on the Riviera map. Merrick immediately began clearing the land and laying the roads, and by October 1925, the first homes in the Riviera Part One section were designed and
permitted by this pair.
"The home at 4100 Monserrate Street was amongst these initial homes built in the Riviera section by Batcheller and Kresse. They contracted with architect Robert Law Weed to design the homes. Weed's drawings for 4100 Monserrate Street were dated October 1925 and were permitted in December.
"In this photo you can see an as-built in 1926 just south of Bird Road.
"Merrick's decision to start the development of the Riviera Section in Part One, which was at the northwest corner of the section, corresponded to the contemporaneous construction of the Biltmore Hotel and Golf Course which opened in January 1926.
"Merrick's vision for the Riviera section was to be the recreational, educational hub of the city and was to have a different vibe from the sections north of Bird Road.
"Towards that end, Kresse, Batcheller, Merrick and Weed decided to design in a slightly different aesthetic. In the early 1920s, Coral Gables was initially designed almost exclusively in the Mediterranean-inspired style which relied heavily on Spanish and Moorish precedent.
"The Kresse-Batcheller homes were also to be

Mediterranean-inspired designs but that drew from the Italian architecture. Many of these homes now comprise the Italian Village Historic District. This was the beginning of Merrick's villages, most which were built in 1926 and '27.
"Most of the homes built in Coral Gables in the 1920s combined elements commonly used in Spanish, Moorish and Italian architecture and has come to be known as the Mediterranean Revival style.
"The home at 4100 Monserrate Street was amongst the earliest of the homes of this style that incorporated Italian elements.
"In this home, these include the hallmark features of a combination of narrow, one-room-wide, one-and-two-story sections with intersecting roof angles, clad in barrel tile, as well as its very distinctive slender one-story unengaged chimney.
"Other Mediterranean Revival characteristics includes a combination of roof types, textured stucco, decorative vents, arched openings, a decorative circular window, recessed windows with projecting sills, a detached garage with a front-facing shed roof echoing the front facade of the home, wing walls connecting the garage and the home, as well as coral rock perimeter.
"Here is an aerial view and property survey
to give you an overall sense of the home since all photos were taken from the public right of way.
"From these you can see how Weed laid out the home and accomplished the narrow, one-room-wide one and two-story sections.
"Also note on the survey the detached garage off the southwest corner of the home and the locations of the coral rock perimeter walls along the south side amd the rear property line.
"These photos of the front facade illustrate the intersecting roof lines with its front-facing and side-facing shed roofs and the cross-gabled second story.
"Note the Italian inspired unengaged rectangular chimney with its gabled hood contrasting with the receding frame circular window.
"Also note the half barrel tile vents under the side-facing shed roof. This feature is also repeated in each of the second story gable ends which you can see in the next slide.
"This photo is the southeast corner of the home. This front-facing shed roof bay was originally a screened front porch with a side entry. The arched openings were enclosed at an unknown date and the sizes were retained.
"Also note the detached garage with its
front-facing shed roof echoing the front entry bay.
"The original casement windows with their projecting sills were replaced at an unknown date with the present awning windows.
"In these photos provided by the owner, you can get a sense of the north side of the home that steps back in plan.
"The center two-story cross-gable section holds the stairwell and is lit by the arched window.
"These are photos of the detached garage. The garage is under a flat roof and has a front-facing shed roof.
"A pair of double French doors on the north side open to a patio under a large terrace feature. You can also see here the wing wall that extends from the garage to the gate entry feature leading to the back yard.
"The second pair of French doors in the center photo are the rear doors of the home.
"A low coral rock wall delineates the property boundaries along the rear and a portion of the south side, of which you can see here. The photo on the right is taken from the rear doors of the home, giving you a sense of the spacious backyard.
"It should be noted that the home is also distinguished as being the residence of Whitney C. Bliss
for 18 years. Bliss was the civil engineer who, along with landscape architect Frank Button, laid out Coral Gables for George Merrick in the early 1920s and is noted as such in the early maps as seen here.
"In 1922, Bliss and his wife Louvenia moved into the coral rock residence at 1119 Coral Way, becoing the third residents of Coral Gables.
"In September 1923, their son was the first child born in Coral Gables, a distinction honored at the city's 50th year celebration in 1975.
"Bliss moved to Miami in 1914 to take advantage of the need for civil engineers at the height of the Florida land boom. He surveyed and laid out multiple Miami area developments, including Star Island, Palm Island, Sunset Island, Bay Point, and Biscayne Point.
"In 1921, he was recruited by George Merrick to Coral Gables. Ads indicate that he remained the engineer of Coral Gables into the 1930s. He and his wife purchased 4100 Monserrate in 1946 as their retirement home where they lived until his death in 1964.
"In conclusion, the single-family home at 4100 Monserrate Street was designed in 1925 by distinguished architect Robert Law Weed for the team of Joseph Kresse and George Batcheller, a real estate financier and builder for the renowned Garden City
community of Forest Hills.
"In the mid-1920s, the need for housing in Coral Gables had outpaced construction. Founder George Merrick sought investors who could aid in developing Coral Gables at the same high-quality construction and Mediterranean-inspired design.
"Kresse and Batcheller contracted with Merrick, and as Merrick's team began laying the roads in the newly-platted Riviera section, they began construction of its first homes.
"The home at 4100 Monserrate was amongst the earliest of these initial homes, and while earlier Coral Gables homes were Mediterranean-inspired designs that relied heavily on Spanish precedents, the Kresse-Batcheller homes drew inspiration from Italian architecture, making these first homes in the Riviera section distinct.
"As demonstrated from the photos, the home has retained a high degree of historic integrity over the past 95 years. There have been no additions or changes to the form or style of the home.
"Hence, the property at 4100 Monserrate Street significantly contributes to the historic fabric of the City of Coral Gables and is part of a collection of quality building that serves as a visible reminder of the
history and the cultural heritage of the city.
"Staff recommends approval of the local
historic designation of the property at 4100 Monserrate Street based on its historical, cultural and architectural significance."
(Thereupon, the playing of the audio/visual recording was concluded.)

MR. ADAMS: I have a few letters of support for the resolution.

One is from Henry and Zully Zully Pardo, 49 Campina Court, one from Bruce Fitzgerald, and no address was given, one from Mary E. Buck (phonetic), 1243 Wisteria Avenue, and one from Karelia Martinez-Carbonell, president, Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables.

And I also received a phone message from Gilda Asencia (phonetic), and she wanted this resolved, but the message did say that she was supporting the designation of 1400 Monserrate Avenue. There's someone in the audience to speak.

MR. GIL: Hello. My name is Rufino Gil. I'm the architect working with the owners. We're well aware of the historic significance of the property, especially after the report.

However, the owner does have a few concerns.

We have been working close in hand with the staff and we have implemented several of their suggestions.

However, there are a couple of areas that the owner is still worried about, mainly -- I don't know if we could put up the Power Point. Do you have the existing?

MR. ADAMS: I think they have it (inaudible).
MR. GIL: Okay. So the existing room, which is that shed roof you see in the front facade, is 13 feet by 17 feet, the wider area being the one that's facing the street. This includes the mansard division towards the stairs, so this would reduce the living room, you know, from 13 feet to 10 feet in order to keep that area clear for circulation.

And on top of that, there's also the existing chimney which protrudes into the space two feet which leaves the living room at a very narrow for standards eight feet clear, based on those other parameters that I just mentioned.

So the first of zoning would be to enlarge the living room. You know, in order to do so, the shed roof incline is already at a ceiling height of eight feet, so if we were to continue that slope, our ceiling had to go under the seven feet minimum required by code.

So we're, if he wants to propose to raise the roof in order to be able to expand his living room from
where it is now, that would be the first of his concerns.
The second concern is on the second story. Before I go on to that, $I$ just want to quickly mention to you guys what his intent is.

He is planning on making a significant
addition, a two-story addition of 1,000 square feet. The existing home is about 1,700. The addition would include a master suite, bedroom closet, one additional bedroom with bathroom and a laundry which the house doesn't currently have.

So moving on to the second concern would be the second floor. Currently the tie beam is also about seven feet, so if you're looking at the interior of those second story rooms, you actually have a vaulted roof over scissored trusses starting at seven feet and then moving on to eight.

Once we were trying to arrange the second story addition, in order to keep roof slopes and the design, you know, working, we realized that the addition would not be able to have the scissored trusses and the vaulted roof because it would be more of a hip roof rather than a gable roof, so the ceiling height for the second story addition would be mostly at the very low seven feet minimum code.

So the owner would also like to raise the
second story just one foot in order to have at least eight feet ceiling height. This would obviously entail new trusses, new roof.

The addition already entails, you snow, adjusting a lot of the existing roof, so he doesn't see it as a financial burden as much, but you know, he is worried that the historical board would not allow him to make these changes.

That being said, all those features of the historic characteristics would remain.

You know, we would have to move the chimney, for example, but we would renovate it and place it in the new extension as is, so again, you know, all the feature would be there. It would just be with the minor adjustments in order for the owner to achieve the needs that he wants.

MS. SPAIN: So we really can't discuss those, because what we're charged with here is whether or not this property fits the criteria as it is now, period, and I understand the concerns, but you know, the only thing we're charged with now is whether or not it fits the criteria.

MR. GIL: I understand. The owner is just looking for at least a little bit of feedback, you know, saying whether it's possible --

MS. SPAIN: We're not going to --
MR. GIL: -- is it amicable towards that, or are you denying --

MS. SPAIN: We don't have any plans in front of us, nor would we look at them if we did, so it's with regard to this criteria.

MR. FULLERTON: I think the plans are out on this. (Inaudible).

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, could you speak up, please?

MR. FULLERTON: I said the plans, I mean the description of the plans you're talking about, I don't think would be approvable for this board, just so you're aware.

MR. GIL: Yes. That's already been argued with them.

MR. FULLERTON: No. We wouldn't accept the changes to the facade in the front.

Now, if you're putting an addition on the building in the back, we do that all the time.

Expanding the walls in the living room, for instance, in the front, changing the height of the living room, that's a primary elevation of this house, and location of the tower is key to part of its historic element, so I don't think we should -- any of those things
you mentioned, I think would be really tough for us. MR. GIL: So the owner basically has to accept the, you know, narrow existing living room?

MR. FULLERTON: Well, or make it something else, but leave it the way it is, but then modify the inside of the house because it works better for them without having to do it this way. Sorry. That's the way it is.

MR. GIL: It seems impossible.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes, that's the thing. I don't know the parameters of the site. I don't know how much set-backs you have and so forth, but good luck.

MS. ROLANDO: Warren, is this part of the Italian Village, this home?

MR. ADAMS: It's adjacent to it, yes.
MS. ROLANDO: Okay, so is it part of -MR. ADAMS: No.

MS. ROLANDO: It's not part of the Italian Village?

MS. SPAIN: That probably isn't part of the designation, but --

MS. ROLANDO: It's definitely geographical.
MS. SPAIN: -- for years it was changed to be made larger because we didn't catch all of the appropriate homes.

MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Adams, who brought the designation forward?

MR. ADAMS: ElizaBeth wrote the designation report. It was in June.

MR. MENENDEZ: No. I mean who requested the designation?

MR. ADAMS: Oh, the property owner requested it.

MR. MENENDEZ: All right.
MS. SPAIN: I think they filed a significance determination.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, clerical, the owner, present owner requested the designation, or is just requesting --

MR. ADAMS: Requested the --
MR. FULLERTON: -- the determination?
MR. ADAMS: -- the determination, and he felt it was eligible and a report was put together.

MR. GIL: He just purchased the property and requested the letter of significance.

MS. SPAIN: He probably should have done that before he purchased the property.

MR. GIL: Seems to be a problem a lot of the owners are having.

MR. MENENDEZ: Oh, let me -- is there anyone
in the audience who would like to speak in favor of this case? Anybody in the audience who would like to speak in opposition of this case?

Okay. Then I'll close the public portion. There's really nothing too much that we can do. We can't look at drawings that we don't have here. We have to make a determination.

MR. ADAMS: You really can't look at the drawings anyway.

MR. MENENDEZ: Exactly.
MR. GIL: We have them. We are attempting to submit them.

MR. MENENDEZ: So do I have a motion?
MS. ROLANDO: I move for approval of local
historic designation for this property.
MS. SPAIN: I second that.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Rolando, and Miss Spain seconds it.

MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Maxwell?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
MR. GIL: Thank you.
MR. MENENDEZ: All right. Thank you. All right.

The next item, a special certificate of appropriateness, Case File COA (SP) 2021-009, an application for the issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for the property at 1021 Hardee Road, a contributing resource within the French City Village Historic District legally described as Lot 16, Block 145, Coral Gables Riviera Section Part Nine, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 28, Page 29 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The application requests design approval for an addition and alterations to the residence and site work.

Variances have also been requested from Article Two, Section 2-101 (D) 6a, 6b and 6c of the Coral Gables zoning code for the maximum allowable floor area and the maximum allowable ground area cover.
(Reporter clarification.)
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Adams.
MR. ADAMS: You can see the location of the property on the north side of Hardee Road. Permitted in 1926, the residence is the west half of a duplex designed in the classical style by Mott B. Schmidt.

The French City Village is comprised of 22 residences constructed between 1925 and 1926. Of these, two are duplexes which are independently owned but share a common wall.

MS. LYONS: We're losing you on the mic.
MR. ADAMS: Sorry?
MS. LYONS: I keep losing you. The people on the Zoom couldn't hear anything.

MR. ADAMS: And the applicant is requesting a number of things.

As stated, this is an extensive rehabilitation of this property which has been on the go for some time, and the applicant is coming and requesting to enlarge the garage and the living space, construction of the carport, and installation of a plunge pool and
deck, installation of a second story rear roof terrace with decorative railing, installation of an exterior staircase, opening up the rear first floor gallery of the house which was originally opened, replacing the windows and door, restoration or replacement of existing iron features, installation of new paver driveway, tile replacement at front portico parapet, and relocation of AC units.

And there has been a fair amount of structural work done on the interior of the property, so the applicant has been addressing that, and the interior has been reconfigured. That did not require board or staff review, and approval was given to carry out repairs and the replacement of the roof with an appropriate tile.

So this application came to us mainly because the applicant wished to convert the garage to living space, and there were no concerns about that, and the applicant had a garage door there. The only difference that can be seen from the existing garage door was the new garage door would have a pedestrian entrance in it as well.

Because the garage is being constructed to living space, the applicant is required to provide a covered parking space, so she wishes to install the carport, and the carport will be set behind the front
portico and to conceal it from the street.
And the carport will have a flat roof supported by eight columns, and the carport is supported by staff. However, the carport is set back closer to the garage from the portico.

Staff would prefer it as pulled forward towards the portico to obscure it from the street, so if you're standing in the street and looking through the archway, we know as you get closer to the archway, you're going to see less of it rather than it being pushed seven feet further back against the garage, so we would prefer it to be moved closer to the portico.

And the city architect is recommending removal of two interior columns on each side of the carport. Staff supports the recommendation, but it would have to be approved by a structural engineer.

So they're moving forward with the posts. I'm not sure if that would be approved or not, and the current portions supporting the roof would not cover any architectural features on the house.

It's being designed for impact windows, although it will partially obscure the decorative band that runs between the first and second floor.

And if there's any questions about the portico, I understand your concerns about that.

And there's a proposal to create a second-story and rear roof terrace, and the roof terrace will be a near flat roof. It would not be visible from the right of way, but would be accessed from an existing second floor door on the rear of the building, and it will be enclosed by a decorative railing.

The drawings indicate the terrace will be surfaced with wood decking. However, the material hasn't been specified.

And the plans indicate two new structural features will be added to the deck and the access door. We need clarification with what that is.

And the city architect has stated that he has a number of concerns here which I'll go over them with the conditions, and staff supports the proposed repairs. However, we want to make sure no negative impacts to the adjoining neighbors because it is very close to the rear property.

And we want to make sure that all the drainage issues from the rear of the property are addressed because that has been an issue in the past as well.

And there's a proposal to install an exterior staircase, and it was measured again. It's very close to the rear wall, and we do require a clarification of
whether the staircase was attached to the existing garage, or whether it's attached to the rear wall. We're looking for more information on that.

The applicant wishes to open up the rear first floor gallery. There were portions of that that will be reinstated on the rear first floor gallery.

There is a proposal to replace all the windows and doors. The major concern is that the majority of the windows are currently double casements, and the applicant is proposing to change them to single casement which staff does not support. You'll get a chance.

MS. DELGADO: Okay. Thank you.
MR. ADAMS: You'll get a chance. There's also a concern with some of those as well and will be addressed in the comments.

Restoration of all the existing iron work, we don't have any concerns with replacing anything that needs to be replaced.

Installation of a new paver driveway, there's no real concerns.

Replacement of tile at the front portico, there are no major concerns.

And relocation of the AC units, the applicant proposes putting these on a flat roof behind the pitched projection of the roof. There is a concern that this may
be visible by the neighbors, so you want to ensure that it's covered in time to use the existing windows.

The request is also for three variances. The first variance is part of what you can vote. The first two variances, all variances are required to accommodate the existing square footage for conversion of the garage to living space and construction of the carport.

And the first one is, the zoning code stipulates that all single-family residential properties shall have a maximum ground area coverage on a principal building of 35 percent of lot. The applicant is requesting 47 percent.

The second point, and the zoning code stipulates that all single-family residential properties shall have a maximum ground area coverage of principal building and accessory structures of 45 percent. The applicant is requesting 48 percent.

And the final one is the zoning rules stipulates that all single-family residences shall have a maximum floor area ratio of 48 percent. The applicant is requesting a floor area ratio of 77 percent.

The board of architects had a number of comments that should also -- it hasn't actually, sorry, it hasn't been reviewed by the board of architects yet, but the city architect did provide a list of comments which
will be addressed in the conditions at the end.
And so that $I$ know the conditions here, and I'll go through them one by one, if you have any questions. There are actually 20 of them because this is where some of them deal with the suspension of the project.

And the first one is the new garage door shall be inset into the wall.

Two, Specifications for the garage door shall be submitted to staff for review.

Three, The carport should be moved closer to the existing portico to further minimize its visibility from the street.

Four, The two interior columns on each side of the proposed carport shall be removed if approved by a structural engineer.

Five, Details of the proposed pool deck tile shall be submitted to staff for review.

Six, Specifications for the proposed new railing shall be submitted to staff for review.

Seven, The proposed roof terrace decking material shall be specified and submitted to staff for review.

Eight, The applicant shall identify the two circular features shown on the plans at the roof terrace
access door and submit specification to staff for review. Nine, The applicant shall clarify the design of the north wall of courtyard/terrace with the railing above the abutting neighbor. This will be required from the architect.

Ten, The applicant shall confirm the height and coordinates of the top of the party wall of the second floor terrace which are inconsistent between Sheets A302 and A303.

Eleven, The applicant shall clarify the proposed use of the open second floor terrace overlooking the north neighbor's courtyard.

Twelve, The proposed roof terrace will cause no negative impacts to the adjoining neighbors.

Thirteen, All roof terrace drainage issues shall be appropriately addressed.

Fourteen, Details and specifications for the proposed new exterior spiral staircase along with proposed methods of attachments to existing walls shall be submitted to staff for review

Fifteen, Details of the proposed floor tiles for the rear first floor gallery shall be submitted to staff for review.

Sixteen, All windows shall resemble the original windows in appearance and in operation unless
egress is required by code.
Details and specifications for all proposed windows shall be submitted to staff for review.

Eighteen, All doors shall resemble original doors in appearances and operation.

Nineteen, Details and specifications for all proposed doors shall be submitted to staff for review.

Twenty, All historic ironwork shall be assessed by a conservator to determine which features can be restored and which features require replication.

Twenty-One, The applicant shall retain all ironwork that can be restored.

Twenty-Two, All restoration work shall be undertaken by a conservator.

Twenty-Three, All replicated ironwork shall match the original in material, dimensions, texture and color.

Twenty-Four, The pattern, color and material of the proposed pavers for the driveway, courtyard and front steps will be submitted to staff for review.

Twenty-Five, Specifications for the proposed new front portico parapet tile shall be submitted to staff for review.

Twenty-Six, The AC units shall be screened from view from the right of way and all neighbors.

Twenty-Seven, The applicant shall provide a landscape plan for review.

Twenty-Eight, The applicant shall provide a storm drainage system for the courtyard and the carport.

And with regards to the variances, the existing residences in the French City Historic District, due to their dense townhouse design, are generally non-conforming in a number of ways with the current Coral Gables Zoning Code.

For example, the properties in the village employ shared property walls, irregular or non-existent set-backs, and higher floor area ratios than other single-family residences constructed elsewhere in the city.

All of the homes in the French City Village currently exceed the maximum floor area ratio allowed by the Coral Gable Zoning Code.

The variances are required to allow the conversion of the garage to living accommodation and for the construction of the carport.

Therefore, we require four motions here, so the first one is a motion to approve with conditions the design proposal for the construction of a carport, the installation of a plunge pool and the alterations, 1021 Hardee Road.

Secondly, a motion to approve a variance to allow the residence to have a maximum ground area coverage for the principal building of approximately 2,344 square feet.

The third motion is for the approval of a variance to allow the residence to have a maximum ground area coverage for principal buildings and accessory structures of approximately 2,400 square feet, which is about three percent of the lot.

And a motion to approve a variance to allow the residence to have a maximum floor area ratio of approximately 77 percent.

And the property owner is here here, and I also think some members of the public are here.

MS. DELGADO: Now can I make my presentation?
MR. ADAMS: Yes. Can you show the Power
Point presentation, please?
MS. DELGADO: Hi. My name is Angelina Delgado. I'm the property owner.

So I bought this house a while ago as I think was mentioned earlier, and then I had a family issue. My brother actually passed away so I couldn't actually start the construction of this house.

I'm actually going to be in charge of all of it essentially because I own a construction company. It's
a family-owned construction company, so I'm going to be using that construction company to do this house, and because it's historic, I need to be there all the time because it's a delicate situation so I don't want to leave it in the hands of anyone else, so that's why $I$ wasn't able to get to as of yet, now, I guess,

This is basically just a summary of what we're going to go over, the carport, the pool, the second floor terrace, windows and doors, and the approach.

So this is the existing garage space which actually doesn't qualify as an opening for a garage space. They didn't give you enough space. It just says like, it just says that it's like -- it just tells you there are requirements or that you have to have a covered car area if you don't have a garage, so.

And then those are just sketches of the carport.

This is actually the proposed carport after the comments from the board of architects. He said they only wanted -- he suggested only four columns, so here we have them labeled, the four columns, as to where they would go.

The issue with putting it closer to the portico wall, it wouldn't be less visible from the street. It's not actually -- I don't think it will help that.

And then the issue is, it kind of defeats the purpose of a carport because the entrance to the carport would be through the garage so it goes to the side door, so if I were to move the carport further closer to the portico wall, it would kind of defeat the purpose of having a covered car area. That would mean you entered through the garage without getting wet, or through the side door.

Also, I don't think it would actually make that much difference visually because technically what $I$ plan to do in the driveway, up along the carport before the portico wall is landscaping, so you wouldn't even probably see it.

This is the proposed area, the green area, the lot coverage. You've already seen all this. I don't think you can see this.

This is the proposed pool plan. This over here is where we're reverting to the original floor plan, so those floors could be nonexistent. They would just be like curvature entrances.

And then on the other side where you see those doors which are actually also new, it would be a window which it would look like this.

So that would be the terrace railing on top, the pool, and then $I$ would be changing that and opening up
that to the original layout from what it was before.
And then this would be the second floor
terrace, the schematic perspective of it. It would not be on the parapet of the north wall. It would be actually on my property, on my rooftop, so it wouldn't be on the north wall, which is something that $I$ discussed at one point with Kara and Dona. I think she was there too.

MS. SPAIN: The whole time you're talking, I know this property. I didn't even get that when I read the report.

MS. DELGADO: Yeah.
MS. SPAIN: It's already been like totally gutted, right?

MS. DELGADO: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: I mean the inside.
MS. DELGADO: We demo'd it completely in 2017.

MS. SPAIN: Oh, that was a while ago.
MS. DELGADO: And then right after that is when my father got sick.

MS. SPAIN: I remember that.
MS. DELGADO: So I couldn't really attend to the house, and this is the type of house that you need a good set of eyes on it all the time. This historic house, when $I$ was doing the demo, it was a very delicate
situation.
Little by little it will be home. This is going to be my primary residence, so it's my baby potentially, and I want to restore it and make it as beautiful as it once was, you know, and without changing so much of the exterior, but at the same time making it up-to-date standards so that I could have a covered car area and I can have a little pool, a little plunge pool.

So this is technically another sketch of the open terrace. That is where it is planned, not on the parapet wall, not on the north common wall which I share with my neighbor, and then that's that view, that first view which is to the east view, right.

And then this is the door which leads out to the second terrace, and then this would be the view of my (inaudible).

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I'm sorry, can you speak up, please?

MS. DELGADO: That's the west view. This would be the railing that we are designing to do, and then this would be the spiral staircase.

The landing to the spiral staircase will not be on the north wall. It would kind of be just like hanging, I guess, there. It will be visible from the neighbor, but it won't be on top of the wall or abutting
the wall.
The decking, again, material, $I$ have so many months ahead of me of just structural work, but this is a view from the common wall to my neighbor's house, so nothing would be abutting really their property. It would still be on mine.

And then they also don't really have views of the second terrace. I mean, I don't -- I can see vents from those windows, but they look like hallway windows to me.

This is the interior courtyard. These are the proposed windows and doors railings restoration.

So when I started this way back when with Dona, the main issue was these railings that you see here in the master bedroom.

I've now changed the door and window schedule so that they are in-swing doors. I still have to find a manufacturer.

Again, I have so many months of just structural work that I'd like to get approved with conditions, so I'm still looking for a subcontractor that does in-swing doors because originally what $I$ wanted to do was go with Fenestra, so any suggestions that you have for windows and doors would be very welcome and helpful at this point.

I connected with someone. They do not do in-swing, and the issue is that $I$ have to have railings, so if we try to do a transom or tried to -- it would look different, and that's not the look that $I$ want to go for anyways, and I wouldn't be opposed to in-swing doors, but now, just to keep the look of the original doors, I'm willing to do that.

To refer back to the issue of single casement, the issue with these windows and doors is that the glass that is existing there now is paper thin. That's why the frame was able to -- that frame is so small ad it's able to handle that window base.

If $I$ was to put impact windows and doors and do them double casement, the frame would be enormous because they have to -- the technique in order to pull the weight of the window.

But if $I$ do the single casement, $I$ can play with the frame a little bit better, but if they have to be double, it just, it wouldn't -- I've talked to several manufacturers and they tell you the same thing.

Regardless, when I change the windows and doors, they will always be a little bit slightly, the frame will be a little bit bigger because it's a bigger window, but if $I$ keep the single casement, I can keep the frame more similar to what is originally there.

That's why I decided on single casement doors instead of -- plus the door, some of the door seams are tight. To have like double little doors is very not practical.

You see here the existing condition of the windows and doors. When I bought the property, the windows and doors were already not in good condition. I mean, putting it a nice way, the house needed a lot of love and care. You can see here that they've been damaged.

And then this is the front courtyard, the driveway and the main entrance which I plan, the original -- the front door is not original, so I would like to -and I discussed this with Kara and Dona at one point, because I maybe want more light in the house.

Maybe I could do something with like a -- of course, all of this is stuff that $I$ can -- we can decide on later, so that's why $I$ was wanting to get approved with conditions because $I$ still don't know what's going on between my windows and doors, and I have months of structural work ahead of me.

As Warren mentioned, the structural engineer of the City of Coral Gables came out, and he said because of code, I have to reinforce all the walls, so that essentially means I would have to make small breaks in
each and every single wall to make sure there's rebar in the wall. That's going to take me months.

So what $I$ wanted to do was just get a preliminary approval, and then start doing that, and go back to the staff level maybe and go over like the windows and doors and everything else, essentially.

MS. SPAIN: I'm sorry, I'm losing my voice.
Can you go back to the issue of the carport?
MS. DELGADO: Sure.
MS. SPAIN: Are you saying that if you move it forward, that the access into the house, the door that you would need to get into the house from the carport, that you would no longer -- it would no longer occur under the carport? You would have to go out? What did you say?

MS. ROLANDO: That doesn't make sense.
MS. DELGADO: There's a door off, there's a door off to the side, but the main entrance through the carport essentially for you not to get wet would be through this, through the garage.

And then this door off to the side got shifted to the front. It will end up at one of the columns, the landing in front of the door. It will be very difficult coming into it.

I moved that carport around several times, moved it forwards, backwards. I mean, you can ask Warren.

He's seen it before several times.
MR. ADAMS: I think if you look at the drawing, you can see the carport is set nine feet back from the portico. Staff is recommending you move it closer to the portico to minimize accessibility from the street.

The applicant $I$ know is claiming that if she moves it forward, then to enter the house either through the vestibule door coming in the garage or the portal door, you can see the portal just at that area. If she moves it forward, she'll have to come out from under the carport.

MS. DELGADO: And in the report, there's a window there, so the call-out would end up in front of a window. That's why it's placed where it is, in order to avoid calling it landing in front of any windows or doors.

MR. MAXWELL: I have a question. May I? Do you have to put columns there? Can you not attach it to the wall?

MS. DELGADO: It's not attached to the wall. It's a free-standing structure.

MR. MAXWELL: Could it have been?
MR. ADAMS: I think one of the advantages is --

MR. MAXWELL: Could it be?

MR. ADAMS: -- that it is not attached to any existing structures.

MR. MAXWELL: Could it be?
MS. DELGADO: It could be, but that's not what you guys originally wanted.

MS. SPAIN: I would not want that attached to the historic structure that God knows if there's any structure in the historic wall.

MS. DELGADO: Well, remember, again, I have to reinforce all the walls in the house with rebar so if that's an option, we could revisit that. I mean, I would be open to that if you don't want columns or less columns or no columns at all.

MR. FULLERTON: Personally, I want columns and gates. I like the idea of repetitive columns going in there, but it seems to be counter-productive to its use because now you are narrowing your carport --

MS. DELGADO: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: -- down to less than -- like ten feet, and I think one of the articles in the application was that the existing garage was too narrow --

MS. DELGADO: It is.
MR. FULLERTON: -- for its proper use, yet there's almost 14,15 feet of width by looking at the same drawing.

MR. MAXWELL: Right.
MS. DELGADO: But that was before me.
MR. FULLERTON: It looks like they narrow down to close to ten for those columns. I mean, I like the look of it, but it doesn't seem to work that well.

I'm not sure how it's covered. If it was some sort of an interesting glass cover or something like that, I think it would be great.

My thought is I would not be hesitant to move it away from the garage that used to be there, let some light in there so that the dining room would share some light and move the carport forward at the same time.

And I don't know where the door is on the plan. I can't tell where the door is.

MS. DELGADO: There's a side door right there, so then the column, if you moved it forward nine feet, one of the columns would end up without a window or a door.

It's a very tight space. There's a lot of -I think I have a picture somewhere here where --

MS. SPAIN: Well, it doesn't have to. You can put the columns where there isn't a window or a door. I mean, I don't understand that.

MR. FULERTON: Yeah. I can't even see the doors on the plans.

MR. FULLERTON: Can you show me what page it is, what page on the plan?

MS. DELGADO: You see here, this is where the carport would be. You see all these windows and doors?

MR. MAXWELL: He can't see.
MS. SPAIN: He can't see where you're pointing.

MS. DELGADO: So if I move it forward -- you see the picture?

MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. DELGADO: So if I move it forward, the column will land smack in the middle of that window.

MS. SPAIN: But it doesn't have to.
MS. ROLANDO: You can move the column.
MS. SPAIN: Just move the column. The columns don't have to be -- first of all, it's not built, so you can put the column where there isn't a window or a door. It doesn't have to necessarily be --

MS. DELGADO: Right, but then you would have a carport with an overhang. Is that what -- you'd be okay with that?

MS. SPAIN: I don't understand what you're saying. I don't follow what's happening.

MS. DELGADO: Well, columns have to be against -- let's say I'm putting a column at each end of
the carport.
MS. SPAIN: You're talking about the end column?

MS. DELGADO: Right.
MS. SPAIN: Because you only have four columns now because of one. I got you.

MS. DELGADO: Right.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: I see what you're saying.
MR. FULLERTON: No. It's very difficult, I apologize to the architecture --

MS. DELGADO: I mean, if we end up with four columns -- if I went ten to six, then maybe, yeah, okay, move it around maybe to the front, but when you have only three or four like the board of architects recommended, then it's going to be --

MS. SPAIN: Are they saying to move it past that door?

MS. DELGADO: The board of architects actually suggested $I$ move it back to the garage.

MS. SPAIN: Well, I think it should be separated from the garage but --

MS. DELGADO: That's why I was thinking of moving it back to the garage when I didn't know what kind of space I would have.

MR. ADAMS: If you put it near the portico,
that you're going to see like a tunnel --
MS. DELGADO: Yeah, yeah.
MR. ADAMS: -- more so than --
MS. SPAIN: Darker, it will be darker.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: If it's pushed back, try and
get -- if you push it back, you may see less of it. It would be more recessed. I think if it's at the portico, I think it will darken the whole --

MR. FULLERTON: That's why I made my suggestion, was to open it up toward the old garage. Let there be light. It's a dining room.

MS. DELGADO: That would be the entrance.
MR. FULLERTON: What?
MS. DELGADO: That would be the entrance, like if it's raining, to the carport.

MR. FULLERTON: No, I understand what you're saying. The problem $I$ have is reading the plan. I'm sorry, I cannot tell -- I mean, columns don't show like columns, like every column should show like little boxes.

The height, the building walls, everything has low walls that $I$ don't think go up to the ceiling, go up to the roof. Everything is the same. I can't read the drawings.

MS. DELGADO: I think that's a good --
MR. FULLERTON: That helps.

MS. DELGADO: That helps.
MR. FULLERTON: Well, I see an opening at the windows.

MS. DELGADO: This is the top windows, and then there's an opening on the other side and then opening in the front so either side can get light, either side of the driveway.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's what I'm hoping for. That's what $I$ was trying to achieve.

MS. DELGADO: Yes, it's a foot in. There's space of a foot on either side.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: They're very light. They're right here.

MR. FULLERTON: I know where they are.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: There's a big light that comes in between.

MR. MAXWELL: While that discussion is going on, I have a question. Miss Delgado?

MS. DELGADO: Yes.
MR. MAXWELL: Question: Are you objecting to what the staff's recommendations are?

MS. DELGADO: No.
MR. MAXWELL: Okay. So we really don't have any objection here. It's just a matter of discussion.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

MR. MAXWELL: So we can move the question as to whether or not we're for the -- since you're not objecting to what the staff is recommending --

MS. SPAIN: No, no, not at all.
MR. MAXWELL: -- we can go ahead and do a motion.

MR. ADAMS: You may want to hear from the adjacent neighbors and --

MR. MENENDEZ: We will.
MR. MAXWELL: We will, but I'm just trying to move this forward.

MR. ADAMS: Before maybe discussing all the elements, you may want to hear what their concerns are. It's up to the chair.

MS. ROLANDO: And I don't think we should be designing --

MR. DURANA: Yes, you're right.
MS. ROLANDO: -- the carport during this meeting. I think it's inappropriate, so if there are objections to any of the staff recommendations, $I$ think we need to know what your objections are. Then we need to hear from the neighbors.

And then $I$ think in terms of any question marks, you need to come back to us with specifics so that we have something that we're looking at, maybe two
different versions, but this, we can't be doing this. It's too vague.

MS. DELGADO: I have two different versions. This is the first, which has the four columns, and you can see it, and it shows you the clear space in.

MS. ROLANDO: I can't tell from this what you're proposing.

MS. DELGADO: The arrows right there show you
where the columns --
MS. ROLANDO I can't tell from this what you are proposing.

MR. FULLERTON: Really, its the drawings.
MS. ROLANDO: We need architectural drawings.
MR. FULLERTON: They're not clear.
MR. MENENDEZ: All right. So let's go with the staff recommendations. Do you have any issues with those?

MS. DELGADO: The staff recommendations would be --

MR. MENENDEZ: The 28 items, the 28 items. Have you read those?

MS. DELGADO: Yes. Hold on.
MR. FULLERTON: There's an awful lot of stuff in there having to do with design.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: But a lot of them I think
are also finishes and selections and materials that I think they're not ready, they haven't gotten to that point maybe.

MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: And then that will be something that staff will work with her on.

MR. ADAMS: Yes. A lot of the information just hasn't been submitted, as the applicant has said, because of not finalized things, but a lot of these things, were these the only changes being made, there's a good chance we would have done them at staff level anyway.

But we brought everything to you because the applicant is really keen to get this project moving, and so the suggestion was let's just take everything to the board, and if the board wants to see anything back, then they can.

However, if they're comfortable delegating a number of the things to staff, then we're more than happy to review them.

MR. FULLERTON: I think there's a bit of a danger in that, going too far and then coming back here and we say, "Hold on," you know. I'm willing to be lenient. I just don't know if we have too many things.

MR. MENENDEZ: Let's, you know, let's go step by step.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay.
MR. MENENDEZ: The staff recommendations, do you have any issues with any of those?

MS. DELGADO: I mean, no, not really. I

```
mean, they're all --
```

MR. FULLERTON: Huge.
MS. DELGADO: It's, I mean, yeah, it's really
long. It's basically just telling me that $I$ have to submit all these like things, right?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes.
MR. FULLERTON: Half of them are things that we might not --

MS. DELGADO: There are things that I can't even like --

MR. MENENDEZ: Exactly, so.
MS. DELGADO: No, I don't have any issues, I don't think so.

MR. ADAMS: You did have issues with the window comments. You want to use single casement travel and double casements.

MS. DELGADO: Yes, yeah.
MS. ROLANDO: Could you repeat that, Warren?
MR. ADAMS: The applicant does have an issue with the staff requirement for double casements rather than single casements.

The applicant wishes to install single casements, so that was a, that's a fairly major one that we would need the board's direction on as to whether the applicant can install single casements as requested, or if she should install double casements the way the building originally had the windows, and a similar thing with the doors.

MR. FULLERTON: Now, there are window --
MR. MENENDEZ: I think that we would lean towards the double casement

MS. DELGADO: But there's no way of me putting impact windows and doors with double casements.

MR. FULLERTON: There's some limitations to that.

MS. DELGADO: The frame would be huge.
MR. FULLERTON: It's what she --
MS. DELGADO: Yeah.
MR. FULLERTON: That's the difficulty. These are beautiful --

MS. DELGADO: I would have zero --
MR. FULLERTON: -- windows as they are today.
THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. I need one at a time.

MS. DELGADO: -- windows.
MR. MENENDEZ: One at at time.

MR. FULLERTON: The windows are beautiful the way they are now. To take a window this wide and make it a double casement is very difficult to do. If it looks like a double casement --

MS. DELGADO: Right, with the muntin.
MR. FULLERTON: -- it does this instead of that, I have have no objection to that.

MR. ADAMS: Staff does not have the ability to approve that, which is why we're bringing it to you.

MS. ROLANDO: I think it would be nice if we were able to see the profile of what was selected.

MR. MAXWELL: Exactly.
MS. SPAIN: -- because it's super important, and there are crazy expensive windows. I mean, you're spending a fortune, but, already, but I believe there are really expensive.

MS. ROLANDO: Custom.
MS. SPAIN: -- windows that do make very slim profile double casements.

MS. DELGADO: Which I can't afford.
MS. ROLANDO: Well, that may be the issue.
MR. FULLERTON: May I --
MS. DELGADO: I can't afford $\$ 100,000$ doors from Hope's or something like that, I just can't.

MR. FULLERTON: May I suggest that you
actually have the manufacturer that you select bring an actual --

MS. SPAIN: Exactly. That's something that would be important.

MS. DELGADO: The thing is I'm so far away and removed from that, I have like the structural that I have to do for that house, which is going to take me at least six to seven months just to fix that house structurally and redo the roof and everything.

I can begin to do that, but $I$ can't guarantee that I'm going to like submit something tomorrow or the next day.

MR. FULLERTON: No, no; whenever you do. I mean, it's up to you.

MS. SPAIN: Well, $I$ think then that we should approve double casements, and if she brings in single casement.

MR. MAXWELL: Yes.
MS. ROLANDO: But I'm more comfortable going along with staff on this.

MR. FULLERTON: I agree.
MS. SPAIN: And then if she doesn't -- isn't able to find something that she's comfortable with, then she can come back with a single casement when she get.

MR. FULLERTON: You know what, honestly, just
to express an opinion, I've never seen a house come in with requesting so many, or with so many things that staff doesn't agree with. I've seen lists of five or six or seven.

I've never, ever -- I've been on the board many, many, many years over the 50 years I've been here, and I have never seen an application like this.

MS. DELGADO: I mean, I'm trying to make this -- when I bought this house, it wasn't in the best condition, and what $I$ want to do is, you know, make it beautiful again.

MR. FULLERTON: What we want to do is try to help you do it, but when we're stepping out of our comfort zone a little bit, I think you need to be definitive about what you're going to do --

MR. MAXWELL: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: -- very quickly. Now, you tell us on each one of these things what you plan to do to correct it in some form or another, maybe with staff, but let's find out a little bit.

MR. ADAMS: I mean, a lot of these are very straightforward. They're just like general conditions to her that you would impose, and I am very conscious of the fact that this has been going on for like, you know, since like four or five years.

The applicant really wants to move ahead, so short of saying, "Well, you know what, you've already waited four or five years, let's wait another six months till you know what bricks you're using."

MR. FULLERTON: I mean, it's not any of our fault if the timeline has taken like this.

MS. DELGADO: Right, but here is the thing: All these staff conclusions, most of them like the pool deck tile, $I$ don't know at the point when I'm doing the pool what's going to be available, what tile is available.

MR. FULLERTON: I have no objection to that.
MS. DELGADO: Technically, I would probably use, off the top of my head, something that $I$ would use in the driveway if it's like a brick paver, probably something pink, in the pink -- I mean, I can tell you that.

MR. FULLERTON: Those sort of decisions are not germane to what I'm talking about. I say if $I$ saw in your photograph a picture of the railings, and those railings were protecting a drop-off into your courtyard, they would never approved like that. That railing would not be approved.

MS. DELGADO: So you're saying the second, uThe second terrace would never be approved, is what you're saying.

MR. FULLERTON: No, not the terrace. The railing, that open railing, basically the cross and the circle and all that, unless you reject a four-inch object, that's not going to be approved by code.

MS. DELGADO: Well, the idea was $I$ was trying to replicate the original design already there.

MR. FULLERTON: Doesn't matter.
MS. DELGADO: I can work with staff.
MR. FULLERTON: You can put glass in front of it and be all fixed.

MS. DELGADO: I could do lots of things.
MR. FULLERTON: Okay, but those are things that are real important to your coming back for a permit to do the work.

MS. DELGADO: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: You can't do things that are not appropriate for the code. You know, on a drop-off you have to have a certain kind of railings. In-swinging doors, you want to have that. Code won't allow it. I understand --

MS. DELGADO: No.
MR. FULLERTON: -- maybe on residential it will.

MS. DELGADO: I don't want in-swing doors. I have no option but to have in-swing doors because I have a
railing.
MR. FULLERTON: Well, you have to have some sort of a --

MR. MAXWELL: Barrier.
MR. FULLERTON: -- protective storm cover
over the door in order to protect it because an in-swinging door can be destroyed in a hurricane.

MS. DELGADO: I know. That's why I was opposed to having in-swinging doors, but I have no option because in the master bedroom, all the doors have a railing, so therefore the doors can't open out, and then you can't have them all fixed because you need a door by code that you can leave if there's a fire.

MR. FULLERTON: No. You need an opening.
MS. DELGADO: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: You need a window opening.
MS. DELGADO: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: You need a window opening.
MS. DELGADO: But there are no windows in
that room. In the master bedroom, there's no windows. It's just doors with railings, and they're all railings in the master bedroom.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay.
MS. DELGADO: So I had no choice --
MR. FULLERTON: But it's just that, you
know --
MS. DELGADO: -- but to put in-swing because I had been back and forth with Dona.

MR. FULLERTON: The code doesn't care whether you have an option or not. They just say, "These are the codes."

Now, if you can get around it in some way, fine. I'm just trying to inform you that there are roadblocks that we have no control over.

MS. DELGADO: Right.
MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Adams, we have four items to vote on in this?

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MR. MAXWELL: Okay.
MS. SPAIN: Don't we have -- are they still here?

MS. ROLANDO: We have neighbors too that we need.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes. We need to hear from the neighbors.

MR. MENENDEZ: Well, let's do that. Let's hear from the neighbors. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak in favor of this case? In favor?

Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak in opposition of this case?

MS. SCHMIDT: Hello. My name is Stephanie
Schmidt. I reside at 1028 Cotorro Avenue which is immediately behind this property, and I have to say there are portions of it that I absolutely approve, but I need to voice the things of concern to us.

The property was sold in 2017, and we're very anxious for our whole village to see this restored, so we want to support what we can support, but because we live in such close proximity, there are issues that we have at our residence that nobody else has, which I'd like to bring up.

We have three feet, six inches between our building, which consists of a kitchen, a downstairs bedroom, and a laundry room, 3.6 feet between that area and the wall, which brings us very close to the wall that we share and the property at 1021 Hardee that goes right against the wall, so we have no buffer because there's no space between their building and the wall, so we share this wall.

The concerns that we have are around privacy, they're around noise, and they're around safety.

We are opposed to the second floor terrace with the three-foot railing because we will see that from our downstairs kitchen. We will see that when we are in our small courtyard which is immediately behind, and that
just creates a monstrous elevation for us where we're already very close.

I understand it looks nice. I understand from a safety standpoint, $I$ believe it's there too, but we can't approve that. It just, it is not appealing to us, and it's very, very tall where there is no space, so we are concerned about that.

So there's actually two heights in the back. We have the wall height which is where their open courtyard is, where the pool, proposed pool, which is nine feet, and then there's a higher elevation which is currently the carriage house or what's being referred to as the garage. That's 11.5 feet.

If we start adding additional railing, it is all getting very high in the back, so we are opposed to that railing.

We're concerned about noise, because that terrace is going to bring people, and we understand that people need an area for entertainment and enjoying themselves, but between the pool and that terrace, it's going to bring noise that is very close to our house.

There is a party agreement for this wall, and I'm not sure -- it's in the public records and I didn't have time to get it because we actually didn't have it in our residence, but it may be something that you all want
to look at. It's called -- it's on our survey. It's called Party Wall Agreement. It's recorded in the official records. It states here Book 16070 on Page 3701.

And it was, when we purchased our house which was 17 years ago, it was something we had to sign off on that addressed how we handled this wall, and my suggestion is that you look at it because we did not have a chance The exterior spiral staircase that's intended to go from the second floor terrace to the pool area, we also are opposed to that. That is not, as Angie says, attached to the wall but it's right next to the wall. someone spirals up, I think it's a privacy issue, someone could peer over the wall.

We've been fortunate enough in the village not to have problems with robberies or intruders, but if someone wanted to jump the wall, we've made it, we've put a ladder there for them, so we are opposed to that stairway.

The owner has worked with me because when she purchased the home, there were drainage issues that she just inherited, and we believe that the age of that wall is original from 1925 because we have no reason to think otherwise, and what we saw was the flat roof that's on the other side of our wall had drainage actually coming through that roof, across, and entering our property.

That's how the water was drained from that roof.
So the owner did plug that temporarily. We do not have that at this time because we've known there's going to be a roof replacement, but the configuration of that, and there were some electrical wires that came through, so we believe that that's an original wall. Whether that wall is in good condition, we have no idea, but we do believe that's original.

And we can see some, in the central part of the wall, there's a rougher cementing area where, in the past, since our house was built in 1980, those houses from the 1920s had an opening or they had a window there and it looks like that was patched up. We have since put a trellis so we really can't see it that much.

But I do believe that wall is original, and perhaps that citation in the record book will show something different.

The AC unit, looking at the architectural drawings, $I$ get an idea of where they're going to go, but again, we really don't want to look up -- even from our second floor master, we have a window there that we can look out to and see the terrace. We would be able to see the AC units.

So I don't know how that application will be, as it's stated, screened, but we want to make sure that we
don't see AC units because $I$ saw in the description that the intent is to move them from the driveway area, and I don't know where that might be, to the roof, so we are concerned about that.

I did note that the adjusted square footage appears to be increasing substantially enough that when you compare it to the other residents that have 5,000-square-feet property, it's going to exceed all other residents'.

So I know that there is nonconforming issues of many sorts with the village, but with regard to the increase, that does put it in excess of, I think there's 12 other residents and everybody is going to be below what's proposed to be the new adjusted square footage of this house for $3,853$.

So I wanted to bring note of that because again, that concerns me with about drainage because we've already had issues with water, and I know that, you know, the City of Coral Gables is trying to make provision with pervious tile, all kind of things, for water issues.

But I'm concerned about runoff from the roof. I'm concerned about when the pool is emptied. I'm concerned about excess water when there's a storm, et cetera.

And lastly, with regard to the buildings that
will be again abutting without any space the wall that we share, I'm concerned about the electrical. There's the dryer and the ventilation of the dryer that's on that wall.

There is the kitchen oven and the electric and the ventilation of that. There is the pool pump.

All of this is going to be against the back wall that we share. If there was a fire, if there was a problem, that puts us very close because again we only have a distance of three feet, six inches between that wall and our residence, our wall. That's all I have.

MR. MAXWELL: Thank you.
MS. SCHMIDT: Thank you.
MR. FULLERTON: Could somebody explain the wall configuration? Are the two side walls --

MS. DELGADO: I'm sorry.
MR. FULLERTON: -- on the east and west of the house, are they all party walls? Do you share that wall with your neighbor to the east?

MS. DELGADO: My neighbors, yes, but I don't share the back, I don't -- I mean, I know it's a common wall, but the back wall doesn't actually touch her property.

MR. FULLERTON: Right, so the back wall -MS. DELGADO: So the common walls that I
share-share are neighbor to the left, neighbor to the right.

MR. FULLERTON: And I can't tell --
MS. DELGADO: And actually my neighbor, 1017, has her AC unit on the roof already, which I did show on the Power Point presentation. I don't know if you saw it. I don't know if you can go back to it.

MR. FULLERTON: So but your wall, all your walls are on your property line, your back wall, your side walls.

MS. DELGADO: My back wall is a part of the back of the house, essentially.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, of course, no, but --
MS. DELGADO: But it doesn't attach to any part of her house. There was space in between us.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay, so --
MS. DELGADO: I calculated five feet, but again, $I$ don't know. I haven't been on her property, so I could only do it from my angle.

MR. MENENDEZ: The side wall.
MR. FULLERTON: No, I understand, so, but the back wall that the other lady says is three feet, six inches or 3.6 feet away from her wall, there's a property line somewhere between your two walls?

MS. SPAIN: Where the wall is, where -- the
wall is on the property line.
MR. FULLERTON: Well, then does her property line come right up to that wall, or is there an easement or something through the three feet?

MS. KAUTZ: That's all the space available from the wall to the property.

MS. DELGADO: Right, but that wall is part of my home on the inside.

MR. FULLERTON: Right, I understand that.
I'm trying to figure out what the space between two homes in the rear is.

MS. DELGADO: I believe it to be five feet.
MS. SPAIN: She's saying she has three and a
half feet to the wall --
MS. DELGADO: Yeah.
MS. SPAIN: -- which is part of her building.
MS. DELGADO: Can I go back to that Power Point of the survey?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: It looks like it's on the center line of that back --

MS. KAUTZ: Speak into the microphone.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: -- on the survey it looks
like the property line falls --
MS. DELGADO: On the CBS wall.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: -- on the center line, yes,
on the center of that wall.
MR. FULLERTON: So the neighbor, her wall is three feet into her property line rather than being on this property line.

MR. DURANA: Her house.
MS. SPAIN: The wall of her building.
MR. FULLERTON: Her house.
MS. SPAIN: Her house.
MR. DURANA: The structure.
MS. SPAIN: The structure.
MS. DELGADO: The structure is right there.
MR. FULLERTON: Okay, all right.
MS. SCHMIDT: May I make an additional
comment?
MR. FULLERTON: Sure.
MS. SCHMIDT: So if you look at miamidade.gov and you look at the aerial of the entire village, unlike all the other homes, ours is the only home that, with hers, that comes that close together. Nobody else's does. They either have a courtyard, they have lawn, they have something as a buffer.

We have no buffer. That just makes our property different, and that's just the way it is. I mean, nobody created that, but that's what we're dealing with. We're dealing with very close proximity, and you
can see that on that aerial if you have access.
MR. FULLERTON: I'm feeling pretty stupid here, but your property, your house, your walls take up your entire property?

MS. DELGADO: I'm sorry?
MR. FULLERTON: Your walls take up your entire property? They're property line to property line to property line?

MS. DELGADO: Uh-huh.
MR. FULLERTON: Okay. That's all I needed to know.

MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Durana, do you have any
comments?
MR. DURANA: No. I mean, I kind of just want to, you know, I want to know exactly like what our jurisdiction is here.

I mean, I kind of agree with, you know, letting staff and her architect sort out the points if she has no -- she's not opposed to any of these, you know, 28 points. I'm fine with them moving forward with that.

I think as far as -- I mean who would do the final say for like the AC units, or you know, in terms of the concerns that the neighbor has with the terrace? Wouldn't that go to zoning, to board of architects?

I mean, is that relevant for us? Who is
making that determination?
MS. SPAIN: I think that zoning would have an issue with it depending on a set-back issue on where the AC goes.

MS. DELGADO: Zoning didn't make comments on the AC.

MR. DURANA: Are we allowed to approve that, or is that something that --

MS. SPAIN: Even if we approved it, if zoning says no, it's not going to happen.

MR. ADAMS: I don't believe zoning commented on it.

MS. DELGADO: They did.
MR. ADAMS: There were zoning comments, and the major ones were really regarding the variances.

MS. DELGADO: Right. It was just the variances. It wasn't anything to do with the AC unit.

MS. SPAIN: Right, and is it true that this will be the largest in the -- have you looked at that?

I just remember when $I$ was in graduate school, I did a whole study on this.

MS. KAUTZ: The house on Cotorro next to the sister's house, there was an in-fill construction that was done by George Hernandez maybe eight or ten years ago. He did a study of the block --

MS. SPAIN: Right.
MS. KAUTZ: -- that looked at the square footage of each of the homes in the village, and they're all already over --

MS. SPAIN: Way over.
MS. KAUTZ: -- the square footage of what's allowed.

MS. SPAIN: So that issue doesn't really bother me at all.

MR. ADAMS: And part of it is a carport.
MS. SPAIN: Well, yes.
MR. ADAMS: It's not like additional,
addition.
MR. FULLERTON: So this carport that's being proposed is not part of the FAR?

MR. ADAMS: It's all been included.
MS. ROLANDO: Part of the ground coverage.
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft, questions?
MR. EHRENHAFT: No, not in particular separate from what's already been discussed.

MR. CEBALLOS: If I may just provide some clarification to your previous question.

So with your approval today, you're approving the changes and modification to the historical components of the property.
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If you do not overtly make a motion or an approval for a variance, it assumes that everything else that you are approving must comply with the underlying code.

MS. SPAIN: Right. That makes sense. MS. BACHE-WIIG: So we're going to go step by step --

MS. SPAIN: Right.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: -- for the variances.
MR. CEBALLOS: Any variances, you are basically granting an exception or a variance from the code.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Right.
MR. CEBALLOS: If you do not grant that variance, anything in the part of the approval that you are approving assumes that during the process, whether it's zoning, planning, Florida Building Code, all of those things will have to be, have to comply, basically.

MS. ROLANDO: Right. That makes sense.
MS. SPAIN: Can $I$ just make a motion so we can go forward? Because, you know, we've got stacks here. All right, I'm going to start and go through each one. I'd like to make a motion to approve with conditions, those conditions that were in the staff report, the design proposal for the construction of the
alterations to the residence at 1021 Hardee Road. That's the first motion.

MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have a second?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: I'll be the second to that
motion.
MR. MENENDEZ: Miss Bache-Wiig seconds the
motion.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Maxwell? Oh, sorry. Miss
Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
MS. SPAIN: Okay. I'd like to make another
motion. This is a motion to approve the issuance of a
special certificate of appropriateness with the conditions.

MR. ADAMS: Is that not what was just approved, the COA?

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: This is just for a special certificate of appropriateness with those same conditions, so this is approval of the -- I think there has to be two different motions for that, right?

MR. MENENDEZ: No.
MS. SPAIN: Doesn't? Okay, cool. Then I'd like to approve a variance to allow the residence to have a maximum ground area coverage for the principal building of approximately 2,344 square feet versus 1,750 square feet as required by Article Two, Section $2-101$ (D) 6a of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.

MR. DURANA: I'll second it.
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Durana seconds it.
MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

MS. LYONS: Mr. Eherenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
MS. SPAIN: Okay. I'd like to make another motion to approve a variance to allow the residence to have a maximum ground area coverage for principal buildings and accessory structures of approximately 2,400 square feet, 48 percent of the lot, versus 2,250 square feet, 45 percent of the lot, as required by Article Two, Section 2-101 (D) 6a of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I'll second the motion.
MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have a second?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: I said it. I seconded.
MR. MENENDEZ: Miss Bache-Wiig seconds the motion.

MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?

MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Can I just be sure that what
was said earlier, that there are others, other houses in
the same development that are over their FAR? Does somebody have documentation of that?

MS. SPAIN: Oh, for sure.
MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: They all are.
MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: They're all over FAR and over ground coverage.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, that was the only reason I would have said yes.

MS. DELGADO: Thank you.
MR. CEBALLOS: From my quick review of the property appraiser's, I mean you take the property appraiser's information for what it is, every single property is well over 2,400 square feet.

MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MR. FULLERTON: Okay. Thank you. Yes.

MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
MS. SPAIN: Okay. I'd like to make a motion
to approve a variance to allow the residence to have a maximum floor area ratio of approximately 3,383 square feet versus the maximum square foot floor area for a single-family residence on a 5,000-square-foot building site is 2,400 square feet as required by Article Two, Section 2-101 (D) 6b and 6c of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.

MS. ROLANDO: Again, I just want to make clear that all these variances are being granted based on satisfaction of the conditions, correct?

MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MS. ROLANDO: The 28 conditions?
MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MS. ROLANDO: Including the issues with
drainage that the neighbor made and the visibility with the compressors and other equipment.

MR. ADAMS: If the applicant has any issues with any of these conditions, $I$ will bring it back to the board if the conditions are not met and we feel that the board requires further review.

So the board can be assured that if the
applicant says, "No, I'm not screening the AC units," then it will not be approved until it comes back to the board, so we can assure you of that.

MR. FULLERTON: I think the circular
staircase is a particularly troublesome one, so, I mean as far as --

MS. SPAIN: I didn't include that in my motion.

MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MR. ADAMS: If there are any significant
issues, I will bring it back to the board if there's anything we can't resolve between, between us.

MS. ROLANDO: Yes. I think it's pretty clear that the board, or at least this board member thinks that this is pretty half-baked, and I'm generally very reluctant to approve something that is this squishy, especially with an important house in a really significant neighborhood.

MR. FULLERTON: I agree with that.
MS. ROLANDO: So I'm just expressing the concern that these conditions be strictly enforced.

MR. ADAMS: Absolutely, yes.
MS. SPAIN: So was there a second, and did we vote on the very last --

MS. ROLANDO: We haven't voted on the last
item yet.

MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have a second?
MS. SPAIN: I don't know. I don't think so.
MR. EHRENHAFT: I'll second the motion.
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.
MR. FULLERTON: Could I make a request of the
architect?
MS. DELGADO: Sure.
MR. FULLERTON: Do you have an architect
employed?
MS. DELGADO: Yes, Don.
MR. FULLERTON: I've known Mr. Sackman very well for a hundred years.

MR. SACKMAN: Thank you.
MR. FULLERTON: And I would like -- and I'm sure you're not responsible for these drawings.

MR. SACKMAN: I am.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, okay. There are things here which $I$ can't read, and that's just a matter of the ink on the page.

MR. SACKMAN: All right.
MR. FULLERTON: And I've had this problem with architects' drawings for many, many years, and it's because we have to take a working drawing or a preliminary drawing and then reduce it --

MR. SACKMAN: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: -- to this size.
MS. DELGADO: Size.
MR. SACKMAN: Correct.

MR. FULLERTON: And you end up not being able to read anything.

The language are unusable at this stage, and I tell that to every architect that comes here with one that I can't read, and I can read plans pretty well.

MR. SACKMAN: I'm sure.
MR. FULLERTON: But $I$ can't tell the difference between a full height wall that's got a roof on it and a surrounding wall that's low, that might be seven feet tall or something. They're all treated the same.

The columns are not delineated like a structure, the columns in the garage area. They're so light, you can't read them.

And I just ask you to, you know, make the drawings so that it can be --

MS. DELGADO: More visible.
MR. FULLERTON: -- legible, really.
MR. SACKMAN: But we do have full-size
drawings.
MR. FULLERTON: Huh?
MR. SACKMAN: We do have full-size drawings.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes. Well, I don't think you want to print 17 copies, but you know, I accept that you have limitations here, but maybe for these kind of things you could change the line weights.

MR. SACKMAN: We'll take a look at that.
MR. FULLERTON: See what you can do.
MR. SACKMAN: Thank you.
MS. DELGADO: Thank you.
MR. FULLERTON: And shade the columns like
concrete. Thank you. I don't want to call you on the carpet for anything.

MR. SACKMAN: That's all right,
Mr. Fullerton.
MR. FULLERTON: You know more about this than
I do, so.
THE COURT REPORTER: Can you state your name?
MR. SACKMAN: Don Sackman, architect and a member of the board of architects.

MR. FULLERTON: Extraordinaire, extraordinaire. Yes, he's been on the board of architects longer than, well, probably from McKinley.

MS. SPAIN: A long time.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes, a long time.
MR. SACKMAN: We both have white hair.
MS. SPAIN: Yes, as do I.
MR. MENENDEZ: All right. I'm going to call a ten-minute recess at this point.
(Thereupon, a brief recess.)
MR. MENENDEZ: All right. I call the meeting back to order.

The next case is Case File COA (SP) 2021-019, an application for the issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for the property at 155 Cocoplum Road, a local historic landmark legally described as Lot 69 and

70, Block Four, Coral Gables Biscayne Bay Section Part One, Plat B, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 25 at Page 50 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The application requests approval to maintain the existing auxiliary structure as a guest house.

Variances have also been requested from Article Three, Section 3-505 and Article Three, Section 30505 (A) of the Coral Gables Zoning Code to permit a guest house as an accessory use.

MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. The location map for the property. This is the only designated property in Cocoplum. It was built in 1928, designed by Waldron Seagron. It's an unusual kind of take on Mediterranean Revival design.

This is a picture that we believe is from 1969, the earliest that we have.

To the rear of the property is a detached one-story auxiliary structure originally designed as a garage and servants quarters. The structure was modified over the years to be fully converted into living space.

The property was designated as a landmark in 1998.

No modifications or alterations to the structure are proposed with this application, and board of
architects review is not required. There is in the future going to be anticipated a special COA for modifications to the structure and an addition.

I'm going to let the representative of the owner take you through the Power Point and the request.

There are two variances that we can discuss at the end, we are in favor of.

MS. RUSSO: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the board. For the record, Laura Russo with offices at 2334 Ponce de Leon Boulevard.

I'm here this evening representing the owners of the property, Jonas Nilsson and his wife, Sara Goff. We are asking for variances to allow the existing detached structure which was built originally with the house to remain.

The house has a very unusual history. It was originally built on that lot, and it had another lot, and if you're looking at the house, it would be to the left of the house that they built a swimming pool on that lawn, and they had a boat --

MR. FULLERTON: Slip?
MS. RUSSO: Slip, thank you, a boat slip, and the house changed addresses about four times. The street names changed from Granada to Tahiti Beach to eventually Cocoplum.

The house was designated in 1998. The people who designated it purchased it in '94. It only has a history of about three or four owners.

At the time the house was designated, Ellen Uguccioni makes reference in her report that the portion, the last portion of the garage had already been converted and was existing living quarters with French doors.

My clients bought the property a couple of years ago. They're in the midst of working on some plans for an addition, and zoning said, "Well, you can't have this because it was never approved."

So in 1963, and I'll take you quickly through the Power Point, in 1963, the owners of the house at the time, the Clarks, requested that a portion of the garage be turned into more living area.

And that, there are plans, and I'll show you the plans, and they made some changes to windows and doors of the detached structure.

It appears that after he did that, he decided to try to get more of it done, and they denied turning the whole thing into living quarters in 1963.

So we don't really know whether he then just took it upon himself to do it, because $I$ find it hard that the owner in '94 who requested designation would request designation and allow the city to know that he had what
was something illegal at the time, so I suspect it was already purchased that way in '94.

So it's been existing, and other than the changes that were made in 1963, you'll see that the structure remains the same. There's no intent to make any changes to the structure.

This is the house as it appears now. It was recently painted with a permit and approval from the city.

This is the detached auxiliary structure, and this is the facade of the structure that faces the water, which is the single window, and this is the current site plan, and these are alterations which were done in July of 1962.

So after he did this, which is, you'll see this area references existing servants quarters and garage, it was, I guess he thought, "Once I did this, maybe I'll just keep going and get the whole thing done," in 1963, and he was shot down.

MR. FULLERTON: Was that Mr. Clark?
MS. RUSSO: That was Mr. Clark, yes. Did you know Mr. Clark? Okay.

MR. FULLERTON: He was quite an esteemed structural engineer.

MS. RUSSO: Oh, okay. Well, so he went ahead and maybe made the changes anyway. So in Ellen

Uguccioni's report, and I have this just for you to see -because some of you may or may not remember, but this was part of a very contentious lot separation.

MS. ROLANDO: I remember.
MS. RUSSO: I remember. We were there.
MS. SPAIN: I was in zoning at the time.
MS. RUSSO: And this woman had apparently, the woman that owned the house had sold the lot, and then when somebody tried to build on the lot, they were told they couldn't, and it ended up at planning and zoning, a lot of tears at commission, more tears.

MS. SPAIN: I was the person I think that said that because $I$ was in zoning.

MS. RUSSO: At the time, yes.
MS. SPAIN: At the time. When I first
started with the city, I was in historic preservation for like six months, and then $I$ went to zoning afor a few years.

MS. RUSSO: Yep, yep. This house has had a history.

MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. RUSSO: So Ellen notices that, "An alteration to the detached structure in 1963 converted the two-car garage with a single bay garage to house an additional bedroom. The garage has been converted to
another room enclosed by French doors and windows.
"Despite these alterations, the essential form and character of the original residence have been retained."

So this is the picture from the '60s when they did it, and as you can see, taking away the areca palms makes a big difference, and that's how it looks today.

Those are the famous French doors from, you know, at least in the '90s, probably longer than that.

And that is the elevation, this is the stairway, so this is the elevation that faces the house, the one with the three openings on it, and this is the interior.

So we are here requesting that what is
existing be allowed to remain as existing. There is no intent to increase the auxiliary structure, to make any changes to the exterior of the auxiliary structure, and in order to move forward, we need to have this situation legalized.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. So what Laura didn't touch on was that when the pool was constructed on the property, it was placed in such a way that made the garage inaccessible from its original orientation, coming from
the carport through the back, and it was approved with ribbon strips running along what was then the back side of the garage.

The pool was constructed, can't access the garage anymore. The permit was closed, inspected without that alteration being made to the structure.

So in our view the city kind of caused this problem to begin with, and so we recommend supporting the variance because the garage in its original use is now inaccessible.

MR. FULLERTON: Who built the pool?
MS. KAUTZ: Who built the pool?
MS. RUSSO: Oh, wait. It's here.
MS. KAUTZ: The previous owner.
MR. FULLERTON: I mean was it one of the people that did the alterations to that building?

MS. RUSSO: No. The person who built the pool was the owner that had it designated.

MS. KAUTZ: In 1998.
MS. RUSSO: So he had it designated in March of '98, and then he pulled and got a special, I guess a certificate of appropriateness and got permission and a permit to build the pool, and then later on he actually got another permit to do a driveway, and then he got another permit for a generator in the back.

So the assumption is that somewhere in the approval for the pool, there was a requirement that the garage be accessed, but what doesn't make sense is you would have had to submit plans to show the opening because the back never had a door opening --

MS. KAUTZ: Right.
MS. RUSSO: -- like the original garage entrance did.

So it's one of those things, I call it, that kind of fell through the cracks in that era that maybe there was, maybe there wasn't, but you have a building that, you know, you would then be changing the historical texture of the structure if you were to now make the back an opening and you wouldn't be driving through the carport.

MR. FULLERTON: There is a carport there. MS. RUSSO: There is, so it does meet, it does meet the code, and it was built before 1964, so.

MS. KAUTZ: And the two variances that are requested have to do with the size of the auxiliary structure. It's a bit larger than what would be allowed if it was being built today, and the size of the lot, you're only allowed a detached structure on an estate-sized property, and this does not meet an estate size, so again, we do recommend in favor.

MS. RUSSO: Right, but this was all built before there was a zoning code.

MS. KAUTZ: Correct.
MS. SPAIN: So this was caught by zoning now because -- wow.

MS. RUSSO: Yeah, yeah.
MS. SPAIN: There you go.
MS. RUSSO: There you go.
MS. SPAIN: And it can't be considered a legally non-conforming structure?

MS. RUSSO: Because it's not legal. There's no -- they couldn't find a permit for it, right, because it's only legal as to the 1963 alteration.

MS. SPAIN: I see.
MS. RUSSO: So in order for, even though, even though -- I tried that argument, I tried, I tried that argument based on the fact that historic acknowledged its existence in its report.

MS. SPAIN: You would think that would work.
MS. RUSSO: You would think, right? I tried.
MR. FULLERTON: If it was attached, if it was somehow attached to the house, would it become legal?

MS. RUSSO: Yes.
MR. FULLERTON: Well, you could put a little, a little roof from someplace on the house --

MS. SPAIN: I think now it has to be air-conditioned.

MR. FULLERTON: -- to the door --
MS. KAUTZ: Yes.
MR. FULLERTON: -- and it would be legal?
MS. KAUTZ: It has to be air-conditioned now.
MS. SPAIN: You used to be able to do that in
the old days.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: But now it has to be an air-conditioned link.

MS. RUSSO: Right, in the old days you're thinking.

MS. KAUTZ: So I wanted to also bring your attention to letters that were received. One -- they were all given to you in advance of the meeting so I'm not going to read them into the record.

One is from Juan Galan who is a neighbor at 355 Cocoplum who is in opposition of the application, and there are two in favor of the application, one From Brett Gillis who lives on Ferdinand Street, and one from the Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MR. FULLERTON: What is the basis for the objection?

MS. KAUTZ: It was in your packet. Hold on a
second.
MR. FULLERTON: I don't see it. Oh, yes, I do see it.

MS. KAUTZ: "While the current owners have done a nice job of sprucing up the place, the request for a guesthouse of this size indicated seems to be far in excess of the criteria used to usually permit these guesthouses, so we would vote against it."

MS. RUSSO: So I suspect the neighbor thinks it's being built, right?

MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. RUSSO: But it's not an existing structure, so I think if that were the case, he would be correct.

MR. MENENDEZ: Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak in favor of this case? Anyone in the audience who would like to speak in opposition of the case? Okay. We'll close the public portion.

MR. FULLERTON: I'll move it, approval.
MR. MENENDEZ: Go.
MS. ROLANDO: Second.
MS. KAUTZ: There is a staff condition. Is the approval including the staff condition as well?

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. ROLANDO: Could you reiterate what the staff condition is?

MS. KAUTZ: It's just only that the area of the living space will not be increased.

MS. RUSSO: Right, so you can't make the structure bigger.

MS. KAUTZ: It won't be added on to.
MS. RUSSO: You can't make the structure bigger or add a second story to it.

MR. FULLERTON: I have a comment about something in here. "Coral Gables stipulates the guest house shall only be allowed on residential estate property that is defined as having a lot area of 1.5 acres or," in parentheses, "43,560 square feet." That's only one acre.

MS. RUSSO: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: So it says --
MS. RUSSO: Well, we don't meet it, so that's
why the variance is here, because I can't -- you can't have a guest house in a plain single family, and even though this is a nice size lot at 15,000 , it's, you know, far less than --

MR. FULLERTON: It's 65,000 square feet.
MS. KAUTZ: You're right. That's my mistake.
MR. MENENDEZ: There you go. Okay.


Fernandez \& Associates Court Reporters
305-374-8868 service@fernandezcr.com
first variance?

MR. FULLERTON: So moved.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: I'll second the motion.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, Miss Bache-Wiig with the second.

MS. LYONS: Was that Mr. Fullerton?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, and the second variance, do we have a motion?

MR. FULLERTON: I'll move that too.

MR. DURANA: I'll second.
MS. ROLANDO: John, you're on a roll.
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Durana seconds.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
MR. MENENDEZ: All right. Thank you.
MS. RUSSO: Thank you very much.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Next case case file, COA (SP) 2021-020, an application for the issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for the property at 416 Garlenda Avenue, a local historic landmark legally described as Lots Four to Six, Block 265, Revised Plat

Riviera Section Part Two, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 28 at Page 23 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The application requests design approval for additions and alterations to the residence and site work.

MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. This is the location map of the property. It was built in 1925, designed by architect Frank Wyatt Woods.

These are two early photographs, 1926 just after construction on the left, 1940 at the right. You can see the garage has already been altered by the 1940s in the background. It was an addition by H. George Fink.

It was designated in February of 2020. Some of you may recall that concurrent with the designation in 2020, as an accelerated special COA for an addition and alterations to the property was approved. That proposal was abandoned, and the owner is proposing a different scope of work in this application.

And we're going to turn it over to the architect who -- why is there no Power Point here? That was weird. Oh, that's why, the Power Point. Never mind. You can take that off.

There are no variances that have been requested as part of the application. The board of architects did review on September 30th, 2021.

We had about nine staff conditions that I believe the architect has already responded to, to us at least internally, and you know, is in agreement or in accordance, is fine with them, those conditions.

So if you're going to use boards, you need a hand-held microphone.

MR. POZA: Good evening, board and staff. Albert Poza, architect.

Like staff mentioned, this project, totally different scope, was presented prior to COVID, approved by the board of architects. Permit was a little difficult right at the beginning of COVID, and quite honestly, the client got extremely frustrated and abandoned the project.

Henceforth, he changes the scope dramatically, and we're at it again.

So like staff said, I have responded to the staff. There was nine comments, none of them really major, just the typical two-part barrel tile, raised muntin windows and that sort of thing.

So all of the recommendations, nine of them, they accepted and they'll be part of the final submittal to the board of architects.

So the design and, the scope and design of the project doesn't alter any of the historical portions of the house. Right now the existing garage is not
historical, the rest of the house basically is, and we're not addressing any of the existing historical portions of the house.

The board, it went to the board several weeks ago, maybe a month ago already, and it was unanimously approved as presented in your packet by the board, no comments. They approved it as is.

What the scope entails is an addition of a new carport. That's because of the existing garage is being converted, which is not historical, is being converted to a galley-type kitchen. It is not your typical nowadays kitchen.

The owner of the house is an amateur chef, so to speak, so he wants the kitchen to be his domain, and it's quite narrow and long because that's the way he's going to -- he doesn't want anybody in there, basically, that's the bottom line.

So in the garage there's also now a powder room and a laundry area and some storage and so forth for the kitchen.

What used to be the kitchen is just going to be an enlarged family room. He's very proud of his eight or nine grandsons and granddaughters that come in almost religiously every couple of weeks, Sunday family dinners, and he's a cook, and they all start running around, large
family room and so forth.
The existing dining room is also going to be part of the family room, and the existing covered terrace will be the new dining room, so in keeping with historical norms, that had some very nice arches, so the intent is to mimic those arches with fenestration so it's very light muntins on the glazing. It's almost like, almost all glass, whatever might be needed to meet today's impact requirements and so forth.

So it's a very limited windows and whatnot on what is existing now as the covered terrace.

Additionally, all the elements of the new additions and remodelings, they all respect the materials, so they're basically the same materials as what's there. They're just used in a different fashion.

Like all the existing stucco is Spanish, the lumpy stucco. The new addition of a small storage room in the back and the covered, or the carport, those are smooth stucco. There's some banding in fenestration and openings below the windows and even lower than the windows. In the openings in the garage, the banding is on top of the opening.

It's just little subtle things that don't really hurt, you know, the aesthetics of it, but eventually when it's all said and done, you're going to be
able to distinguish what was new and what was old.
There is a trellis that's also being added in the rear of the house, in between the accessory building and the rear of the house.

In the accessory building, there's a deck and an open stair that goes up to the deck. That deck right now has water infiltration issues because there's no really real height to flash that deck properly, so there is some water intrusions.

Plus the very open rail that it has is really bad for little toddlers to be running up and down or crawling up and down the stairs, and then that open, which Mr. Fullerton mentioned in one of the previous presentations here, that railing is, I mean a 20-inch sphere will fit through it.

So what we're doing is we're creating a parapet to be able to flash it and take care of the water infiltration issue, and then just put one single railing on top of it which kind of implies the simplicity of the existing railing but meeting code.

All in all, $I$ think that the -- all right. It's pretty late. I don't really want to get into it too much, but the intent of the project is to respect the existing residence in all terms and aesthetically and proportionately. We're trying to enhance it, but we're
not trying to outdo the original house.
It's very low key, you know, without
overwhelming aesthetics or scale, and I don't know if you want to see the boards, or it might be just as well to see it in the packet. The boards are the same. It's a very low key type of an addition and remodeling.

None of the windows or fenestrations are being altered other than for, because the board of architects originally -- I had a door in the dining room to be able to get to, out to the pool from that dining room area. They did not like to interrupt the sequencing of all of the arches all the way around.

So a very good suggestion on their part, one of the dining room windows became a French door, so then, since it isn't obvious and as grandiose as the new dining room or the former covered terrace, there's a French door that comes out in that breezeway/hallway type thing out to the backyard.

There's also a trellis which is kind of a modern touch. It's not your typical trellis. It's a very humid area with the very limited space, maybe eight, nine feet between the two structures, so it's an aluminum trellis.

We don't want to hang anything on these older walls, so it's like inverted L. Structurally it will be
designed, it's like aluminum tubes and then aluminum trellis on top. It's a little modern touch to, you know, the historic portion of the house.

So I'm open for any questions or anything else.

MR. FULLERTON: I have a question. Are these new windows here that look like casements?

MR. POZA: Yes.
MR. FULLERTON: What are they?
MR. POZA: All of them are, they're all new windows, casements, impact throughout the house.

MR. FULLERTON: Are they double hung, or
casement?
MR. POZA: They're casement. Let me make sure.

MR. FULLERTON: Are they the double casement like the ones we were talking about earlier today? I'm looking on Page A Five.

MS. ROLANDO: They're drawn that way.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MR. POZA: Yeah, they're casement, and the new ones are all casement. Some of the -- you have there the existing and the new facade. Some are single hung and -- but all the new ones are casement.

MR. FULLERTON: So the new ones are on the
north elevation?
MR. POZA: The new ones --
MS. KAUTZ: The existing house has the single
hungs. They're just not labeled, so the top drawing is the existing drawing and that's the proposed.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay.
MS. KAUTZ: They're just not labeled that way.

MR. FULLERTON: So that is, those are nice looking, by the way, and maybe for the lady who was looking for casement windows, a window of that proportion may work.

MR. POZA: Maybe.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes. Maybe, you know, Kara, maybe you could show her this. They could communicate.

MR. POZA: I mean, there's a lot of possibilities nowadays. You know, as an architect, I must get an e-mail on a daily basis about some new window company.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MR. POZA: You know, the problem is many of them are, you know, they might be from Canada, and they're trying to sell you a window here that they don't have approval on.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

MR. POZA: They figure if enough people reply, then, "Okay, let's go ahead. It's worth the $\$ 80,000$ or whatever to get it tested."

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MR. POZA: So but you know, that's, they have
all, they have, they have windows here that in other places, like in, you see the profile, they have cut through, and they could withstand a tank, not a hurricane.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MR. POZA: But they don't have Dade County approval.

MR. MENENDEZ: So you are in sync with staff regarding the nine --

MR. POZA: 100 percent. I've already replied, and there's nothing there that would even -- a lot of those comments not in the drawing already or either were not found in their haste of reviewing it, or because these are not final construction drawings.

MR. MENENDEZ: Right.
MR. POZA: But they will be all in there.
MR. FULLERTON: I think I might have
mentioned -- were you here just recently with this? I dreamed this.

MR. POZA: I don't know. I'm here, I'm in -MS. KAUTZ: In 2020 .

MR. FULLERTON: Huh?
MS. KAUTZ: In 2020 was the previous.
MR. POZA: In 2020.
MR. FULLERTON: Okay.
MR. POZA: But I probably was here this
morning and yesterday too.
MR. FULLERTON: No, no.
MR. POZA: But not necessarily to the board.
MR. MENENDEZ: And he'll be here tomorrow for
you too.
MR. POZA: I'll be here tomorrow.
MR. MENENDEZ: There you go.
MR. POZA: Yes. I'll be here tomorrow and for the special session on Friday.

MR. FULLERTON: On, "The stucco at the new additions is noted to be smooth, sample provided," yada yada --

MR. POZA: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: -- "Reviewed by the
architect," I think maybe I mentioned it to another applicant, but $I$ hope you know that, a guy that does stucco without corner beads.
(Reporter clarification.)
MR. POZA: Okay. That's fine.
MR. FULLERTON: Because the corner beads make
it look sterile and too contemporary.
MR. POZA: Yeah.
MS. KAUTZ: You can add that as a condition
if you want.
MR. FULLERTON: We should.
MR. POZA: Yeah. That's fine with me.
MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have anybody in the audience who would like to speak in favor of this case? Anyone in the audience who would like to speak in opposition of this case?

Okay. We'll close the public hearing portion. I will entertain a motion.

MR. FULLERTON: I've been too busy.
MR. MENENDEZ: You've been too busy
MS. ROLANDO: Okay.
MR. MENENDEZ: I can't, I can't do it.
MS. ROLANDO: I know.
MR. DURANA: I'll do a motion to approve.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MS. SPAIN: All right.
MS. ROLANDO: With the no corner bead --
MR. DURANA: Right.
MS. ROLANDO: -- condition?
MR. DURANA: With, correct, with John's comment of no corner beads on the new addition.

MR. POZA: Yeah, that will probably be something that the stucco guy will like.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MR. POZA: They save a lot time that way.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes, yes.
MS. ROLANDO: Second.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So Miss Rolando seconds it.

MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
MR. MENENDEZ: All right. Thank you.
MR. POZA: Thank you.

MR. FULLERTON: Mr. Pozo, this is the first
time I've seen in, I don't know, maybe ten years an
architect bringing boards to a meeting.
MR. POZA: Well, to historic presentations, I
definitely want to be old fashioned about it, you know.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes, there you go.
MR. MENENDEZ: He has an answer for everything.

MR. FULLERTON: I know.
MR. MENENDEZ: There you go.
MS. SPAIN: He's one of the good guys.
MR. POZA: It's a good excuse. It will work for a while probably.

MR. FULLERTON: I was just wondering where your tripod -- what do you call it?

MR. POZA: No. My easel is back there. He had it.
(Please see Volume II.)
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