CITY OF CORAL GABLES HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, Florida, Wednesday, 4:05 p.m., October 20, 2021.

PARTICIPANTS:

Albert Menendez, Chairperson Cesar Garcia-Pons, Board Member Bruce Ehrenhaft, Board Member Alicia Bache-Wiig, Board Member Dona Spain, Board Member Xavier Durana, Board Member John P. Fullerton, Board Member

Warren Adams, Historic Preservation Officer Kara Kautz, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer Gustavo Ceballos, Esq., Assistant City Attorney Nancy Lyons, Administrative Assistant

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. 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 ordinance, 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 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 bord 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 October 20th, 2021 to order. The time is 4:08 p.m.

Present today are, to my left, Xavier Durana,

Dona Spain; to my left, Cesar Garcia-Pons, John Fullerton,

Alicia Bache-Wiig, and Bruce Ehrenhaft, and myself, Albert

Menendez.

The next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes for the meeting held on September 15th, 2021. Are there any changes or corrections?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FULLERTON: I had three, but I had them on my phone, and I lost my phone on the way in here.

But one of them was something that Dona said in relationship to one of the items we had on, and she said that we should have -- they should be more "conservative" involved in the project, and I think she meant "conservator."

MS. SPAIN: Oh, yes.

MR. FULLERTON: It was a misstatement.

MS. SPAIN: I do remember saying that.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes, you did, you did.

MS. SPAIN: That's right, it was conservator.

MR. FULLERTON: And then there was another one that you said that I cannot remember, and so I will have to get in touch with the staff.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

MR. FULLERTON: Just little misspellings or misstatements, no big deal.

MR. MENENDEZ: Any other corrections or

		5
1	changes? Okay.	Do I have a motion for approval?
2	MR.	GARCIA-PONS: Approved as amended.
3	MR.	FULLERTON: Second.
4	MR.	MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Fullerton.
5	MR.	FULLERTON: Yes.
6	MS.	LYONS: Who seconded?
7	MR.	FULLERTON: I did.
8	MS.	LYONS: And who made the motion? Oh,
9	thank you. Mr.	Garcia-Pons?
10	MR.	GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
11	MS.	LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
12	MS.	BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
13	MS.	LYONS: Mr. Durana?
14	MR.	DURANA: Yes.
15	MS.	LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
16	MR.	FULLERTON: Yes.
17	MS.	LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
18	MR.	EHRENHAFT: Yes.
19	MS.	LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
20	MR.	MENENDEZ: Yes.
21	MS.	LYONS: Mr. Maxwell?
22	MR.	MENENDEZ: Mr. Maxwell is not here.
23	MS.	SPAIN: He's not here.
24	MS.	LYONS: I'm sorry. Miss Spain?
25	MS.	SPAIN: Yes.

MS. LYONS: Motion passes.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. 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 exparte 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.

Okay, Deferrals. Mr. Adams, any deferrals today?

MR. ADAMS: No, there are or no deferrals.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. We need to swear in anyone who would like to speak today.

	7
1	(Thereupon, certain members of the audience were duly
2	sworn on oath by the court reporter.)
3	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. We have some board
4	members that are absent today?
5	MR. ADAMS: Yes. We have received a request
6	for absence from Michael Maxwell and Peggy Rolando.
7	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So would anybody
8	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Move accepting the
9	deferral
10	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
11	MR. GARCIA-PONS: or the excused absence?
12	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
13	MR. GARCIA-PONS: So moved.
14	MS. SPAIN: Second.
15	MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have a second?
16	MS. SPAIN: I second.
17	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
18	MS. LYONS: Was that Miss Spain?
19	MS. SPAIN: Yes.
20	MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
21	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
22	MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
23	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
24	MS. LYONS: Mr. Garcia-Pons?
25	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.

	8			
1	MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?			
2	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.			
3	MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?			
4	MS. SPAIN: Yes.			
5	MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?			
6	MR. FULLERTON: Yes.			
7	MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?			
8	MR. DURANA: Yes.			
9	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. First item on the			
10	agenda is Local Historic Designation, Case File LHD			
11	2021-004, consideration of the local historic designation			
12	for the property at 1129 Sevilla Avenue, legally described			
13	as Lot 19, Block 15, Coral Gables Section A, according to			
14	the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book Five at Page 102			
15	of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.			
16	MR. ADAMS: Can we play the video, please?			
17	(Thereupon, the audio/video recording was played as			
18	follows:)			
19	"MS. GUIN: The property at 1129 Sevilla			
20	Avenue is before you for consideration for designation as			
21	a local historic landmark. This designation was generated			
22	by city staff. There is a recent new owner who is aware			
23	of the city's intent to designate.			
24	"Please note all observations were made from			
25	the public right of way. There was not access to the			

property.

"As per Article Eight, Section 8-103 of the Coral Gables zoning code, criteria for designation of a local historic landmark, a landmark must have significant character, interest or value as part of the historical, cultural, archeological, aesthetic or architectural heritage of the city, state or nation.

"For designation, a property must meet one of the criteria as outlined in the code. 1129 Sevilla Avenue is eligible as a local historic landmark based on three criteria:

"Historical, 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.

"1129 Sevilla Avenue is a single-family home on a 50-by-150-foot interior lot on the north side of the street between Columbus Boulevard and Cordova Street.

"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 and Italian architecture and has come to be known as the Mediterranean Revival style. During the 1920s, structures and amenities were built almost exclusively in accordance with this style.

"The home at 1129 Sevilla Avenue 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 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 20th 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 '22, one of which is on the left in this slide.

"The initial construction in Coral Gables was concentrated in Sections A through E which were located near Merrick's plantation at the northeast corner of Section A and in the direct vicinity of the Granada Golf Course.

"The red arrow indicates the location of 1129 Sevilla Avenue along the southern border of Section A.

These maps dating to 1922 and 1923 illustrate the vast amounts of land acquisitions by Merrick in the north and the west. Also note the changes in Section G outlined in blue.

"In 1923, Merrick turned his attention to the area south of Section A which was primarily undeveloped.

He revamped this area, initially called Section G, and renamed it Country Club Section Part One.

"In this area he built the Congregational Church to honor his father and planned for a premier hotel and golf course. The church was completed in 1925, and the large, ten-million-dollar Biltmore Golf Course complex opened in January 1926. Rapid development of this area around the church and the hotel complex was anticipated.

"During the early 1920s, lot sales were

highly successful, and Merrick continued to substantially increase his land holdings. To keep up with the demand and to safeguard design quality, Merrick's team began recruiting leading architects and builders from across the country.

"In 1926, with the goal of providing safety and security of investment, as well as ensuring that Merrick's vision of a Mediterranean-inspired city was upheld, a list of successful Coral Gables builders was published in various newspapers. It included L.J. Ursem, the builder of this home.

"After completing construction of 1129
Sevilla Avenue in early 1926, Ursem purchased the property
from Merrick's Coral Gables Corporation in April and sold
it to Dr. E. Sterling Nichol in May.

"Dr. Edward Sterling Nichol and his wife
Dorothy moved into the newly completed home at 1129
Sevilla Avenue in May of 1926. From this home, Dr. Nichol launched his career as an internationally-respected cardiac physician and researcher. He was a pioneer in cardiology, in particular anti-coagulant therapy and was a founder of the Miami Heart Institute. The photo on the left shows him looking at a model of it.

"Dr. Nichols served in the Army ambulance Corps in France and Belgium during World War II and was awarded the Croix de Guerre with silver and gold stars.

After the war, he completed medical school and moved to Florida.

"From 1926 to 1950, he developed the department of cardiology and the cardiac clinic at Jackson Memorial Hospital, bringing in the first electrocardiogram recorder to Florida in 1933. He founded the Miami Heart Association in 1939, and in 1944 began raising money to build a research and treatment clinic for cardiac patients which resulted in the opening of the Miami Heart Institute in 1951.

"The Nichols lived in the home for only a few years and it's not clear when they sold it. After a series of owners, the home was purchased in 1956 by Evelyn and Aubrey Clemens. The home remained in the Clemens family for the next 65 years. The current owner purchased the home from the family this past June.

"As mentioned previously, it was anticipated that with the completion of the Congregational Church and the Biltmore complex, that this area would develop rapidly. With this in mind, the home at 1129 Sevilla Avenue was permitted by Ursem just prior to the opening of the Biltmore Miami golf course and is located directly to its north. It's circled in red here.

"Unfortunately, the devastating hurricane of

1926 and the subsequent Great Depression curtailed future development plans. In Coral Gables, the dire downturn of the economy, coming so close on the heels of the September hurricane, had a drastic impact on new construction. Few single-family homes were built during the Depression era.

"This aerial photo from 1931 demonstrates that the area remained undeveloped.

"With the implementation of the New Deal and other incentives, the building industry finally experienced a small resurgence in the late 1930s and the early '40s. However, it abruptly ground to a halt during the war years.

"However, unlike its northern counterparts, the area around the church and the hotel complex was not developed at this time, and the home at 1129 Sevilla Avenue, which lies on the northern edge of the section, remains as one of the few residences in this area built during the early years of the city.

"The post-war prosperity that followed these lean years created an optimism which reigned through the 1950s and '60s and resulted in the unprecedented building boom and it is when this area was finally developed.

"During this era, single-family homes in Coral Gables followed national trends both in numbers and style and were a distinct departure from the ornamented

and picturesque Mediterranean Revival style that had dominated the city's landscape since its inception.

"Hence, the extant home at 1129 Sevilla

Avenue remains as one of the few Mediterranean-Revivalstyle homes in this area.

"As will be illustrated in the following slides, the home exhibits numerous Mediterranean-Revival-style character-defining features, including projecting bays, two-piece barrel tile roofs, flat roofs with parapets, a one-and-a-half-story tower feature with arched opening ensemble complete with original wooden spindles, porte cochere, wing walls, decorative vents, casement windows and textured stucco.

"Here is an aerial view and floor plan to give you an overall sense of the home since all photos were taken from the public right of way.

"Note the home is primarily under a flat roof with parapets. At the southeast corner of the home is a one-and-a-half-story tower. At the front of the home is a projecting gabled bay.

"Along the rear of the property is an auxiliary structure that contains a garage and a studio. Records indicate that very early in the property's history, this auxiliary structure was rented as a guest cottage and early tax cards record the current footprint.

"The next few slides show some of the character-defining features of the home. The front projecting bay of the home is comprised of a covered entry porch and a porte chochere under an asymmetrical extended gable roof.

"In this photo you can see the auxiliary building through the segmental arches of the porte cochere. The photo on the right shows the exposed rafters in the porte cochere's interior. A wing wall extends from the southwest corner which is currently obscured by vegetation. Also note the chimney that rises just behind the porte cochere.

"The adjacent covered entry porch has a series of semi-circular arched openings with protruding sills. Also note the circular vent incised in the gable end and the exposed carved rafter ends from the eave of the side gable. You can also see the stucco texture in this slide.

"Here is the corner tower feature with its curved wing wall. Note the casement window grouping on the first story. Most of the windows throughout the home like this one are original.

"It should be noted that there are very few alterations to the home. It retains a very high amount of original historic fabric on the exterior.

"At various places in the home, through-wall air conditioning units were installed. You can see here that the sill was cut to accommodate this unit. This is one of the very few alterations to the exterior of the home.

"The corner tower is a hallmark feature of the home. Here is a detail of the arched opening ensemble with its original delicately curved wooden spindles sitting on the projecting sill. Also note the curved rafter tails under the pyramidal roof and its two-piece barrel tile.

"Looking down the east side elevation, you can see the grouped round vents centered over the windows. The projecting bay at the rear was likely an original sleeping porch whose screened openings are now enclosed with windows.

"In conclusion, the single-family residence at 1129 Sevilla Avenue was built during the initial development phase of Coral Gables and is amongst the first homes built in the city.

"It was permitted by the firm of Ursem and Marquard in November 1925. Designed in the Mediterranean-Revival style with its hallmark corner tower, the home is indicative of the type of architecture that was the founding premise of Coral Gables and it

exemplifies the type of Mediterranean ideals espoused by founder George Merrick.

"As demonstrated by these 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 the style of the home.

"Hence, the property at 1129 Sevilla Avenue significantly contributes to the historic fabric of the City of Coral Gables 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.

"Staff recommends approval of the local designation of the property at 1129 Sevilla Avenue based on its historical, cultural and architectural significance."

(Thereupon, the playing of the audio/visual recording was concluded.)

MR. ADAMS: You were just recently given a timeline of the recent history of the property from when the property, and the previous owner of the property passed away, the house was in disrepair. It passed on to her son who tried to do some repairs. It went through the code enforcement board process, and then to the sale of the new owner.

So what you were given just gives a brief

summary of the more recent history and the timeline of the property.

We also have a number of letters of support here, and there are quite a few, so is it sufficient just to read the name of the person who submitted it and their address into the record?

MR. MENENDEZ: I think so.

MR. ADAMS: Yes, okay. We have a letter of support from Michelle Dunaj, 1224 Castile Avenue; another one from Adriana and William Munoz, 4804 Biltmore Drive; another from Rabbi Howard A. Berman, 501 Alcazar Avenue.

We have another from the Historic

Preservation Association of Coral Gables, submitted by

Karelia Martinez-Carbonell, president. We have another

from Cheryl Gold, 7212 Biltmore Way, Number 302; another

from Leslie Rivera, 73 Edgewater Drive, Number One;

another from Bruce Fitzgerald, 2842 Desoto Boulevard; one

from Loyda Lewis, president of The Villagers, Inc.;

another from Alice Goldhagen, 6395 Maynada Street; one

from Zully Pardo, 49 Campina Court.

One from Brett Gillis, this on was e-mailed. There is no address on it. Another from Daniel Ciraldo, executive director of the Miami Design Preservation

League; another from Bruce Fitzgerald, Coral Gables; and another from Sandra L. Scidmore, 100 Lincoln Road,

Apartment 423.

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

MR. ADAMS: The property owner is here.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Would you like to

speak?

MS. DUBROVINA: Hello. I'm Irene Dubrovina, owner of the property, and I just wanted to come here and convey that I have met with Mr. Adams over the past week or so.

We went over the details of what my plans are for the property, and he's made me feel very comfortable that the design ideas that I have for this property are going to be most likely in line with what the Historic Preservation Board would want to see, and I don't -- he's made me feel very comfortable that I shouldn't have any issues getting my designs approved, obviously in consultation with the Historic Preservation Board, and I am happy to agree to or consent to the designation or support the designation, the historic designation of this property.

MS. SPAIN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. SPAIN: Did she state her name?

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, she did.

MR. ADAMS: And just for clarification, we

also discussed the ad valorem tax program for this 1 2 property. This is a sort of ideal candidate for that because of the condition and because of the alterations 3 that the owner wishes to do. 4 5 MS. DUBORVINA: Yes. 6 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you. 7 MS. DUBROVINA: Thank you. 8 MR. MENENDEZ: Is there anyone in the 9 audience who would like to speak in opposition of this 10 case? Okay. Well, I'll close it to public hearing 11 12 portion, open it up for discussion or motion by the board. 13 Any questions? 14 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I think I'm ready to -- I'd 15 like to move it for designation. 16 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Do I have a second? 17 MR. FULLERTON: I'll second. MR. CEBALLOS: Mr. Chair, I would just ask if 18 19 there's anyone on Zoom. I believe there are a few 20 participants. I don't know if any of them actually want 21 to speak on this item, but you may want to ask. 22 MR. FULLERTON: What? 23 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. 24 MS. LYONS: There's no one there.

Okay. So we have Miss

MR. MENENDEZ:

25

		22
1	Bache-Wiig.	
2	MR.	FULLERTON: And I seconded.
3	MR.	MENENDEZ: And Mr. Fullerton has
4	seconded.	
5	MS.	LYONS: Miss Spain?
6	MS.	SPAIN: Yes.
7	MS.	LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
8	MR.	MENENDEZ: Yes.
9	MS.	LYONS: Mr. Durana?
10	MR.	DURANA: Yes.
11	MS.	LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
12	MS.	BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
13	MS.	LYONS: Mr. Garcia-Pons?
14	MR.	GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
15	MS.	LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
16	MR.	EHRENHAFT: Yes.
17	MS.	LYONS: And Mr. Fullerton?
18	MR.	FULLERTON: Yes.
19	MS.	LYONS: Motion passes.
20	MR.	MENENDEZ: All right. Thank you. Okay.
21	The next item on	the agenda is Case File LHD 2021-007,
22	consideration of	the local historic designation of the
23	property at 1230	Genoa Avenue (sic) legally described as
24	Lot Nine, Block	44, Coral Gables Granada Section Revised,

according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book

25

Eight at Page 113 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florid

a.

MR. ADAMS: Can we play the video, please?

(Thereupon, the audio/video recording was played as follows:)

"MS. GUIN: The property at 1230 Genoa Street is before you for consideration for designation as a local historic landmark. The designation was generated by city administration.

"The home was recently purchased, and the new owner is aware of the city's intent to designate.

"As per Article Eight, Section 8-103 of the Coral Gables zoning code, a local historic landmark must have significant character, interest or value as part of the historical, cultural, archeological, aesthetic or architectural heritage of the city, state or nation.

"For designation, a property must meet one of the criteria as outlined in the code. 1230 Genoa Street is eligible as a local historic landmark based on three criteria:

"Historical, 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 our more distinctive architectural style.

"Criteria Two, It embodies those distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or period or method of construction.

"1230 Genoa Street is a single-family home on a 50-by-100 interior lot on the west side of the street between Columbus Boulevard and Cordova Street in the Granada Section of the city.

"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 development period, designs specifically combined elements commonly used in Spanish, Moorish and Italian architecture and has come to be known as the Mediterranean Revival style. During the 1920s, structures and amenities were built almost exclusively in accordance with this style.

"The home at 1230 Genoa Street 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 adaptation espoused by Coral Gables founders

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 20th 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 '22, one of which is on the left in this slide.

"The initial construction in Coral Gables was concentrated in Sections A through E which were located near Merrick's plantation. Through 1922 and into 1923, Merrick continued to amass additional land holdings.

"He was particularly interested in obtaining the land north to Tamiami Trail in the area outlined in blue on these maps. As you can see in the map on the left, in 1922 he only held the lots on either side of Granada Boulevard.

"Over the next year, he acquired large portions of land in this area and he renamed it the Granada Section.

"In November 1923, Merrick launched the Granada Section, publishing numerous ads and articles stating his intention for the area like the one illustrated here.

"Merrick wholeheartedly incorporated the Garden City precepts of offering housing for different income levels without sacrificing quality, and he invested heavily in this northern area towards that end.

"In 1923, he commissioned architects Keihnel and Elliott and Walter De Garmo to design 15 homes along Country Club Prado in accordance with his vision of the Prado as a premiere prominent residential boulevard.

"On Obispo Avenue, his design team built 33 one and two-story homes, and on Genoa Street, which was centrally located in the Granada Section and is highlighted in yellow here, he had 18 one-story, five-room homes built to show his vision for the moderately-priced homes. These were designed by two members of his team, H. George Fink and Lewis Brumm.

"In accordance with his Garden City beliefs,
Merrick platted areas for homes that could be affordable
to the middle class. He dedicated large portions of the
Granada Section towards that end, in particular Genoa
Street. Merrick had his architects design finely detailed
Mediterranean-Revival-style homes on a smaller lot to

demonstrate that the moderately-priced homes in Coral Gables would have the same quality of construction and aesthetics as the larger homes. Many of these smaller homes are now classified as Coral Gables Cottages.

"The home at 1230 Genoa Street is also a very early example of Architect H. George Fink's interpretation of Merrick's vision for the homes in this category. Fink became the leading architect in the Cottage genre in subsequent years.

"Thus the home at 1230 Genoa Street, along with the other early homes on this street, played a significant role in the development of the Coral Gables Cottage in the city and Fink's evolution in this genre.

"Genoa Street runs north-south from Eighth Street to Milan Avenue and encompasses Blocks 29 through 50 and is comprised of 50-foot lots.

"Genoa Street was one of the first streets ready for development in the Granada Section. In November 1923, while other streets in the Granada Section were still being laid, Merrick had Architects H. George Fink and Lewis Brumm begin construction of 18 very moderately-priced, attractive houses.

"These 18 homes were spread along the entire length of Genoa Street. They are depicted here in red, and the photos show three of them as they neared

completion in March of 1924.

"Newspapers indicate that by April of 1924, some of the homes were occupied. The new owners included George Wariner, a newlywed and Merrick's chauffeur, as well as Troy Bishop, who served both as the chief police officer and chief mail clerk for Coral Gables.

"As intended, these homes sparked interest in Genoa Street, and 12 additional homes were built on it prior to the September '26 hurricane. These are depicted here in blue.

"The home at 1230 Genoa Street was among this cadre and is denoted by the blue block on the map. It was also designed by H. George Fink.

"These 30 homes on Genoa Street are amongst the earliest of the Coral Gables Cottages.

"The home at 1230 Genoa Street was permitted in 1925 by owner-builder Paul Kramer who held the home until it was foreclosed in 1929.

"There have been two long-term owners of the home. Hilliard Earnest, the president of Terminex Miami Company, lived in the home for 43 years, from 1940 to 1983.

"Linda Marling purchased the home from Earnest in 1983 and owned it for the next 38 years.

Marling, a captain in the Miami-Dade police department,

lived in the home until her marriage in 2004.

"After this time it appears the home was only sporadically occupied.

"1230 Genoa Street is an example of an early Coral Gables Cottage in the Mediterranean Revival style that demonstrates George Merrick's vision for the city.

"In addition to the home being one story on a 50-foot-wide lot, it possesses the following Cottage character-defining features: textured stucco finish, combination of roof types and heights; distinctive chimney; detached garage whose parapets mirror the main home; a porte cochere; wing wall; two-piece barrel tile roof; a diamond-shaped vent in the masonry cross on the front facade; decoratively arranged groups of round vents; a foundation over the crawl space; and recessed casement windows with protruding sills.

"This 1925 floor plan shows the original layout of the home. The front porch is under a gabled roof and a portion of the living room is under a shed roof as seen in the photo on the right. The remainder of the home has a flat roof with parapets that step down towards the rear.

"The orange box on the floor plan marks the small 1952 bathroom addition at the rear of the home.

There have been no other alterations to the form or the

style of the building.

"In this photo, note the wing wall protruding diagonally from the southeast corner, the texture of the stucco, the diamond-shaped vent under the gable end two-piece barrel tile.

"The front southeast corner of the home was originally a screened entry porch. As illustrated in the 1925 drawing here, the openings originally held spindled screen door and spindled panel. The historic photo dating to the 1940s shown here in the lower left indicate that the spindle ensembles were replaced early in the home's history with the louvered door panels.

"At a later, unknown date, the porch was enclosed for living space and the front door was moved to the front facade as shown in the current photo on the right. Also on the current photo, note the variety of casement windows with protruding sills down the south side of the facade with grouped round vents centered above them.

"These views show the north side of the home. Note the round corner porte cochere openings as well as the Spanish-style chimney at the juncture of the shed roof of the front bay and the flat roof parapet of the rear of the home.

"In the photo on the lower right, you can see

the location of the original detached garage.

"The left photo is the rear facade of the home. The center protruding bay is the 1952 bathroom addition abutting the back door. The large window ensemble was originally a screened opening of the sleeping porch.

"The photo on the right shows the north facade of the 1952 addition, and the building at the right of the screen is the garage, and you can see its proximity to the home.

"The original detached garage sits at the northwest corner of the property. The photo on the left is the front facade of the garage. Note the stepped parapets.

"The original vehicular doors were removed at an unknown date and replaced with these windows. The outline of the original opening is easily discernable as the texture of the in-fill stucco is different.

"The photo on the right is the side facade of the garage facing the backyard. The rear of the garage has been consumed by a large tree.

"In conclusion, the single-family residence at 1230 Genoa Street was built during the city's boom years of the early 1920s. Genoa Street was specifically developed with financing from George Merrick as a street

of what he called very moderately priced attractive homes. The houses on this street are among the earliest of what's now known as the Coral Gables Cottages.

Permitted in 1925, this residence is an example of the modest homes built in the Mediterranean Revival style that defined Merrick's vision for the city. These modest homes were built smaller in size but with the same construction and Mediterranean-Revival-style features as other structures that shaped the new city.

"The home at 1230 Genoa Street is also a very early example of Architect H. George Fink's interpretation of Merrick's vision for homes in this category. Thus this home and other early homes on Genoa Street play a significant role in the development of Coral Gables Cottage in the city and Fink's evolution in this genre.

"As demonstrated by these photos, the home has retained its historic integrity over the last 96 years. There have been no substantial changes to the form or style of the home.

"Hence, the property at 1230 Genoa Street significantly contributes to the historic fabric of the City of Coral Gables and is part of a collection of quality buildings that serves as a visible reminder of the history and cultural heritage of the city.

"Staff recommends approval for the local

designation of the property at 1230 Genoa Street based on its historical, cultural and architectural significance." (Thereupon, the playing of the audio/visual recording was concluded.)

MR. ADAMS: Again, you were just recently given a timeline over the past couple of years of the property regarding its disrepair and the change of ownership, some work that was done without approvals, and the involvement of the code enforcement board and with the current owner, and so that was just recently passed to you.

Again, we have a number of letters of support. We have one from Michelle Dunaj, 1224 Castile Avenue; one from Rabbi Howard E. Berman, 501 Alcazar Avenue; one from Karelia Martinez-Carbonell, president of the Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables; one from Cheryl Gold, 7212 Biltmore Way, Number 302; one from Leslie Rivera, 73 Edgewater Drive, Number One; one from Loyda Lewis, president, The Villagers, Inc.; one from Alice Goldhagen, 6395 Maynada.

One from Brett Gillis, which was submitted by e-mail with no address; one from Bruce Fitzgerald, Coral Gables; and one from Zully Pardo, 49 Campina Court. I am not sure if the owner is here.

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 this case?

MR. MANES: I would on Zoom.

MR. MENENDEZ: Zoom, okay. Go ahead.

MR. MANES: My name is Oscar Manes

(phonetic). I'm the current owner of the property, and I
can appreciate the history of Coral Gables. That's what
has drawn me to live and work and buy this property in
Coral Gables. I did not buy this property with the
intention of designating it or requesting for it to be
designated.

The property has been in disrepair for over 20 years, and some of the things that were mentioned earlier and the description of what has been done to the property take away from the original design of the property, for instance, the sleeping porch in the front that was modified and enclosed; in the back, the additional bathroom; and then in the master bedroom, that was also modified in the '50s as was mentioned earlier.

As I mentioned earlier, that house has been in disrepair for -- I've been driving past it for over a decade, as the previous owner hasn't lived in the property since the early 2000s, neighbors have confirmed that.

I have a tree that's growing inside the

auxiliary structure that has compromised that structure 100 percent, and I'm waiting for an engineer's report to determine the integrity of that, the main structure.

So for these reasons, I'm not in favor of it being designated as historical.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Would anyone else like to speak in favor or in opposition? If not, I'll close the public hearing portion, open it up to the board.

MS. SPAIN: I have a question for the attorney's office. The testimony that we just heard --

MR. CEBALLOS: That was not testimony.

MS. SPAIN: Exactly.

MR. CEBALLOS: It clearly states that is simply public comment. To provide sworn testimony, you need to be in person.

MS. SPAIN: That's what I thought. We can't take that into consideration when we're making our determination.

MR. CEBALLOS: That is just general public comment that was provided. It's stated right literally in the first page of the board's agenda.

MS. SPAIN: Right. That's what I thought. I just wanted to clarify.

MR. MANES: If I may, I was not able to

attend. My daughter is sick. I'm also sick. So this is the reason why I attended via Zoom and not in person.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Any comments?

MS. SPAIN: So I also should comment that about the discussion on whether it's structurally sound or not, that's an entirely different application for this board. If, in fact, it's designated, then that argument can be made, but we need to look at, just at whether or not it fits the criteria for designation.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I have a quick question. Sorry. The attorney was providing the description, is that something that the city has requested, or --

MR. ADAMS: The timeline.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

MR. ADAMS: We thought it would be useful to the board to see the recent history of the property and the fact that it had fallen into disrepair, had been through code enforcement, and as part of that process, it was brought to our attention, and we believed that obviously it was potentially eligible for designation, and so we moved the designation forward.

And as it says, on October the 11th, the city sent the owner the notice of its intent to designate the structure.

So we just felt it would be useful to see

that.

In some cases, properties that are in a state of disrepair, you know, obviously if they're historically significant, we want to give them every opportunity to be saved.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Okay. So we basically hired a third party to come up with this timeline?

MR. ADAMS: No. This is the attorney who actually works with the code enforcement board --

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Okay.

MR. ADAMS: -- and I believe has been in touch with the property owner as well, and so he's really the attorney that advises on these cases --

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Got it, okay.

MR. ADAMS: -- as they proceed through code enforcement.

MR. CEBALLOS: Mr. Palenzuela is an extension of our office, so he is part of the city attorney's office. Okay.

MR. FULLERTON: I'd like to say also that several years ago, if not two decades ago, it was determined by the City of Coral Gables and this board that the decision whether a building qualifies as historic is, unfortunately for this owner, not up to the owner. It's either a fact that it's historic or not, and it has

	38
1	nothing to do with the opinions of the ownership.
2	So I think the staff has done a good job
3	reporting what the historical details of this building
4	are, and I would like to move approval to designate.
5	MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have a second?
6	MR. EHRENHAFT: I'll second.
7	MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft seconds.
8	MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
9	MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
10	MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
11	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
12	MS. LYONS: Mr. Garcia-Pons?
13	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
14	MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
15	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
16	MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
17	MR. DURANA: Yes.
18	MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
19	MS. SPAIN: Yes.
20	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
21	MS. LYONS: And Mr. Ehrenhaft?
22	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
23	MS. LYONS: Ehrenhaft, sorry.
24	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
25	MS. LYONS: The motion passes. Tell them I

can't hear you. Dona, I can't hear you.

MS. SPAIN: I keep pushing the thing. I can't tell whether it's on or off. Can you hear me now?

MS. LYONS: Yes.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. The next item on the agenda is Special Certificate of Appropriateness, Case File (SP) 2021-005, an application for the issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness in accordance with Section 8-104 (D) 2 of the City of Coral Gables zoning code for the public right of way adjacent to 216 and 224 Catalonia Avenue, 3000 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, 203 University Drive, and 225 Malaga Avenue, legally described as Lots Eight through 20, Block 29, Coral Gables Crafts Section, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book Ten at Page 40 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The applicant is requesting a recommendation of approval for an amendment to the city plan for the vacation of the alley and the abandonment and vacation of a segment of University Drive.

The proposed development is also a receiving site for transfer of development rights.

The following historically designated properties are within 500 feet of the proposed development:

The Historic White Way Street Lights, a local historic landmark located on Riviera Drive between Anastasia Avenue and University Drive, and on University Drive between Bird Road and Ponce de Leon Boulevard.

2901 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, legally described as Tract E, Plaza Coral Gables, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 173, Page 078 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

And 247 Malaga Avenue, legally described as Lots 26 and 27, Block 29, Coral Gables Crafts Section, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book Ten, Page 40, of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

Therefore, per Section 14-204.6 (A)(3) of the Coral Gables zoning code, the historic preservation's review and approval of the proposed development is required to determine if the proposal adversely affects the historic, architectural or aesthetic character of the historic property.

MS. SPAIN: I'm going to recuse myself on this item. When I was the historic preservation officer, I met multiple times with the applicant and made determinations, and I'm not comfortable now voting as a board member. I don't believe I can be fair and impartial, so I am going to leave the room. Just remember

to come get me when this is over.

MR. MENENDEZ: No. Mr. Adams?

MR. ADAMS: Okay. The subject property consists of the east half of Block 29 within the Crafts Section and is bounded by Catalonia Avenue to the north, Ponce de Leon Boulevard to the east, and the intersection of University Drive and Malaga Avenue to the south.

The certificate of appropriateness application is submitted in conjunction with the development project known as Ponce Park Residences, and there are really three actions being requested of the Historic Preservation Board.

Number one is the recommendation of approval for an amendment to the city plan for the vacation of the 20-foot-wide public alley that runs north-south within the boundaries of the proposed project.

Number two is a recommendation of approval for an amendment to the city plan for the abandonment and vacation of that segment of University Drive north of the Malaga Avenue right of way and west of the Ponce de Leon Boulevard right of way.

Number three is to review and approve the proposed development to determine if the proposal adversely affects the historic, architectural, or aesthetic character of historic properties located within

a 500-foot radius of the proposed development.

Just as some background, this proposal was reviewed at the planning and zoning board on August 11th, 2021. The PZB reviewed seven requests related to the proposed development, including the vacation of the alley and abandonment of that portion of University Drive.

The PZB made seven motions to recommend denial to the city commission of the requests as presented, and the planning and zoning board recommended denial of, one, the abandonment and vacation of University Drive.

Two, the abandonment and vacation of the alley.

Three, comprehensive plan map amendment from commercial low-rise intensity to commercial high-rise intensity land use.

Four, a development agreement.

Five, receipt of transfer of development rights.

Six, conditional use review for mixed use site plan.

And seven, tentative plat.

The board initially considered deferring the project as requested by the applicant to substantially revise the proposed building, including the removal of the

additional floor area from University Drive, but this motion failed.

The board ultimately denied the project seven to zero in order to require the applicant to either significantly redesign the building or allow the city commission to consider it.

The zoning code requires that any material amendments to the city plan shall be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Board who will make a recommendation for a special certificate of appropriateness to the city commission and they will ultimately render the decision as to whether to grant or deny the issuance of the COA.

And it should be noted that each request for an amendment to the city plan will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as is the normal process for any certificate of appropriateness application. Approval of one amendment by the board will not be used as a precedent or a blanket approval for other applications.

So we'll deal with the first two requests first regarding the historic street plan.

Request One, recommendation of approval to the commission for an amendment to the city plan for the vacation of the 20-foot-wide public alley that runs north-south within the boundaries of the proposed project; and Request Two, approval to the city commission for an

amendment for the abandonment and vacation of that segment of University Drive north of Malaga Avenue right of way and west of the Ponce de Leon Boulevard right of way.

Staff observations, and the zoning code reads as follows:

"In the event that the city plan is designated historic" -- which it is -- "any material amendments to the plan including, but aren't limited to, the closing of streets and any development that would affect such plan shall be in accordance with the following procedure:

"The Historic Preservation Board, at a public hearing, shall review and make recommendation for a special certificate of appropriateness on any proposed amendments to the city plan under a balancing of interests weighing the following factors: historic integrity; development; and public purpose."

So with regard to Request Number One, in planning the City of Coral Gables, Founder George Merrick incorporated the Garden City precepts of comprehensive planning which included defined areas for different uses, quality housing for various income levels, and a wealth of public facilities.

He built distinct sections, single-family residences, multi-family residences, business and

industrial uses. Numerous sections were dedicated to single-family residences. The Douglas section was planned as a multi-family area.

Commercial activities were restricted to the business section or along the main thoroughfares such as Ponce de Leon Boulevard. An industrial section was implemented and located along the eastern border just north of Dixie Highway.

Within those sections of the city dedicated to business and commercial use, alleyways were introduced as a mechanism to keep services such garbage pick-up or deliveries off the streets, allowing for a more pleasant and cohesive front-of-house street experience. The alleyways can be seen in the plat of the Crafts Section.

The alley being proposed for vacation runs north-south at the eastern end of Block 29, bifurcating the assembled site.

Vacating the alley contributes an additional 3,002 square feet to the development site. The proposed site plan indicates that the service functions of the project are being internalized and shifted to the southwest corner of the property.

With regard to Request Number Two, nationally-acclaimed landscape architect Frank Button drew the first comprehensive map of what would become the City

of Coral Gables. It was based on an infrastructure of the inherited grid of fruit trees from the Merrick family's citrus plantation weighed carefully over the resulting grid of orthogonal streets and avenues at a series of diagonal and curved roadways.

The meeting of diagonal and orthogonal thoroughfares created both the large open areas at the intersections often used for roundabouts as well as smaller geometric spaces known as reservations or breathing spaces. The intention was to serve both the motorist and the pedestrian.

An international -- an intentional hierarchy of roadways was thoroughly planned and included wide parkways with center-planted medians that were thoroughfares across the development as well as wide parkways with substantial swales for tree planting. The residential streets were purposefully smaller in width to limit traffic.

The city's unique street grid was developed intentionally to conform to the vision that Merrick had for Coral Gables, every aspect of the built environment, the earliest homes and commercial structures being built, the landscaped plazas and entrances, civic structures and planned amenities and even the layout and hierarchy of the city's roadways.

University Drive, originally called Anastasia Avenue, and Ocean Beach Drive is one of the diagonals that cut across the established grid from Ponce de Leon Boulevard to Granada Boulevard and is highlighted by the blue arrow.

The diagonal of University Drive and the architect's intersection with Ponce de Leon are still discernable to this day.

At some point a triangular island was inserted into the intersection, presumably to direct the flow of traffic and provide clarification to vehicular movement. While this particular parcel is not original to the city plan, it is an appropriate intervention. This type of triangulation was an original feature of Merrick's earliest plans and are called out as reservations left over at the intersections of the grid and the diagonals.

The applicant's proposal includes incorporating the abandoned sidewalk, street and the majority of the triangular parcel into the site.

The carved footprint of the proposed building encroaches into the existing right of way as illustrated in this diagram and the following diagram.

The applicant proposes to create a landscaped open space within the abandoned right of way and transfer it back to the city upon completion of the project. The

applicant proposes to maintain the open space.

Please also note that an alternate site plan depicting a modified roadway between Ponce de Leon Boulevard and Malaga Avenue was submitted at a late date to the department. It was not accompanied by any written supplement or any further detail. It has been supplied to the board at the request of the applicant but is not referenced here for discussion.

This site plan has not been reviewed by the planning and zoning board.

So staff conclusion with Request Number One, in weighing the alley vacation against the historic integrity of the city plan and the effect of the proposed amendment on the integrity of the city plan, the historic integrity, the development and the public purpose being served by staff, staff finds the proposed alley vacation negatively impacts the overall historic integrity of the historic plan.

In terms of the intentional hierarchy of streets and open spaces purposely inherent in the plan, the vacation of the subject alley is detrimental to this plan. By eliminating the alley in its entirety from Block 29, the city plan loses a piece of its historic fabric.

Additionally, there is no direct public purpose being achieved by the alley vacation. The

vacation would allow the development to increase exponentially in size, and that's to the allowable FAR.

With the vacation of the alley, the development services are not to be handled back of house as is the intention of the alleys, but rather at the southwest corner of the site. The alley vacation and subsequent proposed handling services at the southwest corner also necessitates the relocation of a historic landmark, the extant White Way Street Lights located just south of the site.

Additionally, staff is not comfortable recommending approval of the vacation of an alley for a project that in its current iteration, with the recommendation of denial from PZB, may not move ahead as designed. The request for an alley vacation could be considered at a later date if another plan is submitted.

Therefore, the first motion would be to deny the request for a recommendation of approval to the city commission for an amendment to the city plan for the vacation of the alley.

Request Number Two, In weighing the proposed abandonment and vacation of the portion of University Drive against the historic integrity of the city plan and the effect on the proposed amendment of the historic integrity, development and the public purpose being served

by the amendment, staff finds the proposed abandonment is detrimental to the overall historic integrity of the historic city plan.

The diagonal streets and boulevards cutting through the regular grid of the city street were an important feature of George Merrick's plan for the city. Eliminating a portion of this diagonal diminishes the importance and effect of the design.

As for the development and public purpose being served, staff finds that there is no public purpose being served.

The proposed development is absorbing the public right of way in order to increase the floor area ratio and the footprint of the structure, allowing them to build a larger structure. Landscape open space may be given back to the city, but to the developer's benefit.

As noted in the PZB staff report, the use of the development rights of the current right of way will result in additional bulk to the proposed abutting building.

Development of this site can be accomplished within the confines of the existing platted lots, not by one that required an amendment to the historic city plan.

Therefore, the recommendation for Request Number Two is a motion to deny the request for a

recommendation of approval to the city commission for amendment to the city plan for the abandonment and vacation of that segment of University Drive north of the Malaga Avenue right of way and west of Ponce de Leon Boulevard right of way.

With regard to Request Number Three, the proposed development is asking to be considered as a receiving site for transfer of development rights.

Article 14, Section 14-204.6 (A)(3) of the code states,

"An application to transfer development rights to a receiver site shall being reviewed subject to all of the following:

"If the receiving site is within 500 feet of a local historic landmark, Historic Preservation Board review and approval is required to determine if the proposal shall not adversely affect the historic, architectural or aesthetic character of the property."

Therefore, the Historic Preservation Board review of and approval is required to determine if the proposal adversely affects the historic, architectural or aesthetic character of the historic properties.

The following historically-designated properties are located within 500 feet of the development:

Historic White Way Street Lights located on Riviera Drive between Anastasia Avenue and University

Drive, and on University Drive between Bird Road and Ponce de Leon Boulevard; 2901 Ponce de Leon Boulevard; and 247 Malaga Avenue.

The White Way Street Lights were designated as a local historic landmark in 1981. The Arts Center building at 2901 Ponce de Leon Boulevard was designated in 1987, and the building at 247 Malaga was designated in 2004.

The proposed development does not adversely affect the historic Arts Center building at 2901 Ponce de Leon which has been absorbed into the Plaza at Coral Gables project surrounding it, all the historic property at 247 Malaga Avenue which received approval for a substantial addition in July 2020. This proposed project will not further harm the integtity of either site.

However, a historic White Way Street Light located on the right of way adjacent to 203 University Drive is proposed to be relocated and will be adversely affected by development. The existing pole is just south of the existing structure at 203 University Drive and is one of the 11 extant poles that still remain in their original locations lining University Drive east of Le Jeune.

Relocation of historic landmarks is addressed in the code which states, "The moving of significant

improvements from their original location shall be discouraged.

"However, the Historic Preservation Board may grant a special COA if it finds that no reasonable alternative is available for preserving the improvement on its original site and that the proposed relocation site is compatible with the historic and architectural integrity of the improvement."

So there doesn't appear to be any viable reason for relocating the existing historic landmark. The historic pole resides on the public right of way, not private property, and has done so for almost 100 years. Any new development should be designed in such a way to retain the pole in its original location.

Therefore, with regard to Request Number

Three, staff recommends a motion to determine that the

proposal does adversely affect the historic, architectural

or aesthetic character of the historic properties located

within 500 feet of the site, namely the White Way Light,

White Way Street Lights, a local historic landmark, and to

deny the proposal referred to as Ponce Park Residences

with the understanding that it requires further review and

approval by the city commission.

MS. KAUTZ: And the Power Point.

MR. ADAMS: The applicant needs to be sworn

1 in.

(Thereupon, Mr. De Yurre was duly sworn on oath by the court reporter.)

MR. De YURRE: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Anthony De Yurre. I'm here on behalf of the applicant, the Allen Morris Company. I just want to take a chance to walk you through briefly the Power Point to get a sense of what we're trying to accomplish with the project, and then we added some specific slides to help clarify some of the stuff from the report, not that it's necessarily wrong, but it's important to point out a couple of factors in there.

This is the original plat of the City of Coral Gables. Where the number 29 is and the property fans out, that's the block that we're talking about.

You'll notice here on this particular slide that -- can you see it there? Okay, perfect.

You'll notice on the particular slide that the original site plan, the city plan -- this is the historic city plan that was recorded and was approved. It wasn't one of the green space reservations like Merrick Park across the street or Pittman Park which are platted reservations that were made.

This was an open right of way, and in the same line of 121 Alhambra for the same developer, there

was also an open right of way which became the southwest corner of the building.

And so in the 1960s, what occurs is -- well, this picture is from 1951, so you can see it. Also, if you want to try and reference the alley there, it's not really ascertainable on this slide.

This is your slide from 1968 where you see the introduction of the landscaped median. This is the same time the landscaped median was introduced at 121 Alhambra. There was a landscaping project at the City of Coral Gables at the time, and in the 1960s they added these two landscaped medians. Again, 121 Alhambra is the one that ultimately became the southwest corner of that project.

This is the site as you see it today. As you can tell, there's really, it's very difficult to discern where exactly the alleyway here is between all the different surface lots. You had different uses here over the years of a -- I mean, it depends how long you've been in Coral Gables, but I used to go here and buy fire crackers illegally at the Circle K for New Year's and the 4th of July.

This has also been a Chevron. This has been a Royal Castle if you ever were around in that time.

We've also done -- that Chevron still has environmental

considerations that we've had to go in there, we are going to fix relative to the underground tanks that were there during the operation of the gas station.

So I mean, if I can create a narrative for you, this is probably one of the least desirable leftover pieces or assemblages of property in downtown Coral Gables, especially given the environmental concerns which we have come to do our project on. I'm sorry.

MR. FULLERTON: Could you go back and show us the alley --

MR. De YURRE: Absolutely.

MR. FULLERTON: -- with the pointer?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I don't think the pointer

14 works.

MR. De YURRE: The pointer? You know, I'll try it on the TV. Let's see what I can do. It won't work? It disappeared, it disappeared.

So the alleyway, if I could do a job of describing it, if you can see the grass lot at the end, the narrow end of the grass lot is the beginning of the alleyway, and it's between the grass lot and the building that you see kind of a U-shaped, flat roof, continues south, and then bends southeast.

And it's a good question to raise because it's one of the points that we discussed with Historic, is

that, you know, this originally was meant -- so if we talk about the historical context of it, George Merrick creates these commercial districts. This is zoned commercial, and these alleyways are meant to service back of house.

This is, from that point, from the discussion of integrity, it's not doing that at this point in time, but you'll see what we're going to replace it with. We created an overlay, but I'll show you an overlay that we added to the Power Point that will help you out. This I'll go to in some detail later.

Ava Moore Parks was our consultant on the project. The discussion of the city plan was happening at that time, the late Avra Moore Parks, excuse me, and so we were very interested in the discussion of the city plan, how it worked, the research we did.

As board member Miss Dona Spain said, when she was the historic preservation director, we had several meetings with her and we went back into the history of the city, talked about whether this was like Merrick Park or Pittman Park, was it a green space, what was it originally platted as, and Ava did that research for us as well, and it was part of the application, but I'll touch on a couple of points. I don't want to take too much time, but out of respect of Miss Parks, I want to make sure that I touch base on that.

1 MR. FULLERTON: Can I correct you? It's 2 Arva. 3 MR. De YURRE: I'm sorry, did I say Rosa? 4 MR. FULLERTON: Arva Parks. I said Arva, didn't I? 5 MR. De YURRE: You said Avra. 6 MR. FULLERTON: 7 I'm sorry. That's another MR. De YURRE: 8 client of mine, who was a developer in the City of Miami. 9 MR. FULLERTON: Especially Arva. MR. De YURRE: 10 Yes. MR. FULLERTON: She's very important to the 11 12 city. MR. De YURRE: No, no, absolutely, but, you 13 14 know, one of the times -- not only do they have similar 15 names, but they both are adamant about historic preservation, one in the City of Miami and here in the 16 17 City of Coral Gables. Out of curiosity, the reason we came with 18 19 this park is because the city engineer at a point in time 20 did a beautification project for Ponce Park, I mean Ponce 2.1 de Leon. It never came to fruition, but in our public 22 records search of the historical context of the property, 23 we came across this sheet, and this really became the 24 genesis of the park concept. 25 We never thought about doing a park.

wasn't really in the books, but everybody seemed enthusiastic about it, and that's how the kernel of it came up, not that the city told told us to do it. Let me make sure I'm clear about that. Right?

And this is, there's a reference to a slip lane in the application. We have gone out and done a bunch of meetings with the neighbors at this point in time, large meetings, smaller meetings, meetings at our office, and one thing was clear. They all were concerned about respecting the travel lane from that corner, and so what we proposed with them was to reintegrate the travel lane.

And the interesting thing is when we went to the historic preservation originally to discuss this project, we had this design. Public works came back to us and said, "Look, you know, we've looked at the intersection, the traffic issues, we think it makes more sense to create just a solid park."

We actually like it with the slip lane or without the slip lane. It works both ways, but we want to be respectful to the neighborhood, and our proposal is to reintroduce the travel lane, but without the parking spaces. There are parking spaces there.

And as an architect, you all are well familiar with Felix Pardo, he made statements when we were

at planning and zoning that really that the issue here is the parking space. People are backing up into a flow-through street without a stop sign, so we found a way to respect the historical context of, to the extent there is one -- if you want to say that once the landscaped island was created and this slip lane now has some historical context even though it's not part of the historical city plan, we're all in for that, the neighbors are all in for that.

And so the plan is to reintroduce this exactly as the travel lane stands today, obviously improved to match the quality of the landscaped area around it, with some traffic calming so people stop blowing through here at high rates of speed.

This will probably be interesting to you,
Mr. Fullerton. This is the overlap of what we're
proposing. We're proposing to replace this with a
pedestrian paseo, and so when we talk about public
purpose, in the zoning code it encourages and in certain
instances requires as a matter of public purpose the
introduction of paseos, mid-block paseos in projects to
reach the comprehensive land use objective of the city and
other public policy of the city which is to increase
pedestrian activity in the pedestrian realm.

And so we did the best that we could to

replace what is an alleyway, as you aptly pointed out, was difficult to figure out where it was in regards to the rest of the surface lots and respect it with, instead, a pedestrian paseo which is explicitly in the code of the city, part of the public purpose of the code, and I think that we accomplished something much better than its utility today.

If it was at one point in time created in the commercial sector to serve back of house, it is not doing that today.

I think Mr. Garcia-Pons, at a recent hearing, you made a comment, we were talking about when you were reviewing Almeria and the Mercedes Benz project, you made specific comment about the importance of keeping back of house, back of house, and garbage and things of that nature, to keep it off the streets.

And so even though there's no back of house activity here, all our back of house activity in the new project will be contained within the project and be off the street, and we'll talk about that, that approval because that's been the only other approval -- I'm sorry, that's been the only other approval that's gone before Historic Preservation after the city plan was designated historic.

MS. KAUTZ: I just wanted to clarify

something.

MR. De YURRE: Sure.

MS. KAUTZ: The previous slide and the one before it, those plans are not under consideration for the board at the moment. These were not part of your packet, so this, this iteration was not presented to you all in that application.

MR. De YURRE: Yes, to Kara's point, this is, we made the application and at the same time we were having meetings with the neighbors, and the funny thing is, this is what we originally discussed. It came out, and we're happy to do it today.

Now, I just want to clarify that, and Kara can correct me if I'm wrong, but she's pointing out the travel lane. We did have the pedestrian portion of the project that replaces the alleyway in our application.

I wanted to address the White Way Light, so this is what the White Way looks like today. This is the structure that's been the Circle K and a number of other uses over the years.

You can see it just between the gray and the white vehicle, and you can also see it on the bottom left-hand corner of the frame of the bottom picture.

It's a little hard to tell, but I'm going to point it out to you, that there is language on the bottom

left-hand corner with an arrow, and that is the White Way
Light, and it may be that the graphics we gave were a
little difficult to read because of the size of the font,
but we're not going to move the White Way Light.

What we are going to do is remove these parking spaces, and those were the discussions to improve the right of way with public works so that the White Way Light will actually become more of a prominent feature on this site than it is today, and you can see the eave or the roof of this building is almost on top of this White Way Light.

What we're doing to do is pull it back approximately, that's going to be about ten feet, so we're going to separate the line of the building between five and ten feet. Ultimately it may, you know, be a foot or two. We have to still do as-builts and plans for the building department.

But you're going to see, the White Way Light is not going to move. We understand the historic significance of that. The building will actually be peeled back significantly relative to what you see today, and the parking, the vehicles are going to be removed.

So I think where, you know, to the extent that comments are, "We want you to accentuate further the White Way Light," we're very happy to accomplish that, and

my apologies if the images came out too small because of the size of the site plan, and if it was difficult to read, that's on us, and I want to apologize to Kara and Warren if that was the case.

There is a slight jogging of the property line. The dotted line is the new property line, and the orange is the current property line. This was done at the request of the city so we could comply with Florida department of transportation, FDOT sight line requirements on the northeast corner of the property.

They asked us to pull it back, and what we did in exchange was, you see there's a small piece of green that's within our property line now and a larger swath of red that's outside the property line, so ultimately what we did was we gave the city an extra, it's approximately going to be between 500 and 1,000 square feet of our land on that.

MR. FULLERTON: And you took a little bit more from the city on the southern edge.

MR. De YURRE: Right. Well, the green area, and you know, I'll touch base on it right now, is that the green area, because with the adjacent property owner we have what is called a reversionary interest over it, so if it gets vacated from the city, we don't need a deed. We always are owners of it by reversionary interest. The

city holds it in trust for the neighboring property owner.

Alhambra.

And the idea was to increase the square footage of the building and the unit count in exchange for the dedication back to the city of a fully improved park. There was a significant investment in that. It's a vehicle that's been used in the city before. Again, just referencing 121 Alhambra, that's how Allen did 121

And look, at the end of the day, if that doesn't end up being a feature that's amenable to the commission, or if that's the purview of the Historic Preservation Board, we can talk about perhaps separating that, but you know, there are multiple things for consideration before you today.

MR. FULLERTON: To clarify, the green area you're showing there is now a part of your property?

MR. De YURRE: If you look at the green area that's behind, or let's just call it to the northwest of the dotted line --

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

MR. De YURRE: -- that bisects, that's our property line today.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay.

MR. De YURRE: And the property that you see that on the southeast corner of the line that bisects

that's orange, that's land that is ours today that we would give to the city.

So we're switching some of that land to change the contour of the building so that the city -- so we comply with the FDOT requirements, and that was at the request of the city, in particular that northeast corner, they needed more of a sight line.

In good faith, we told the city, "We'll give you more land, in theory, than you're giving us because that would be the dedication."

All the green area is ultimately going to belong to the city. It's vacated to the city. We don't own it, so while the city -- excuse me, will dedicate it to them is the proper term, so while the city vacates temporarily to us so we can use it for our development rights, we're going to give it back improved and dedicated in fee simple title.

Right now the city holds it in trust for our benefit as the reversionary interest holder next door. I know it's, these are discussions sometimes that are not at the heart of the Historic Preservation Board discussions, but I wanted to touch base with them.

And this is, these are renderings of what we contemplate. We can do this with the slip lane or without the slip lane, but this is what you're going to see here.

You're going to see, to use almost direct quoted languages, language from the city plan, lush streetscapes at entry features to the city, and this is what we hope to accomplish today instead of what you see there, which is an alleyway that's really lost and become kind of blended in with other surface lots, a Circle K, a former Chevron.

And this is, so you understand what we're replacing it with, this is not a small, tiny tunnel. You know, if you're thinking about the paseo between Miracle Mile perhaps by the Massage Envy and the garage on Andalusia, it's completely different. They were adamant, at the board of architects, about light, about features, about retail lining the entire, the entire thing.

So, and this is what you're going to see on the north side of Catalonia. You're going to have a plaza here and again an entrance feature plaza on the other side.

So this is essentially what we're going to replace, and this is what we talk about, you know, public purpose and the zoning requirement of mid-block paseos wihin the zoning code and pedestrian activity, and we hope that that's really the driving force.

The only thing I would leave you with is, out of respect for time and brevity, I just want to make a comment that Arva made, the late Miss Arva Parks made in

regards to it.

She said, "To summarize, while the city plan should continue to be respected and maintained by the city, the existing condition of University Drive is not reflective of the city plan and has been modified from its original form.

"Closing this portion of University Drive to vehicular traffic will not only make the intersection safer and more pedestrian friendly, but will also increase the amount of landscaped open space and allow for a design more consistent with the city plan.

"The project's Mediterranean features, curvi-linear shape and lush landscaped area all honor and further George Merrick's original vision for the city."

I appreciate your time, and obviously I'm available to take questions, and the only other comment I'd make to you is just putting the alleyway apart, the precedent was a vacation of a 265-foot-long alley that was discussed, that had back of house service.

We're talking about here the smallest alleyway in the commercial area of the City of Coral Gables. It does not bisect our block, and you know, in the point where alleyways were discussed at all during the process, it was, and I quote, "It's not about the alleyways, it's about the streets," and that was Miss Dona

Spain's comment when a board member from planning and zoning, Robert Behar, asked her about it, and his concern was, "We're going to create a historic component to non-historic applications for alleys."

I want to make sure that that's in the designation report and it was agreed to that that would be the case. I've reviewed the designation report, and you know, there's no material mention of the concept of alleys. I leave that to another discussion on other projects.

But if it's about materiality, which is the first prong of discussion of the city plan, it would be a precedent where the city always, has always vacated when you're the adjacent land owner on both sides, and this is the smallest alleyway in the commercial district, so the precedent would be set that there would be no recommendation ever for any alleyway because any one of them would by default be larger than this one.

This one serves no back of house, and it doesn't create any bisection, and it's probably close to half the size of the one that was vacated of almost 260 feet recently for the Mercedes Benz. Thank you very much.

MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

THE COURT REPORTER: Could you just spell your last name?

MR. De YURRE: Sure. My last name is De Yurre, D, E, space, capital Y, U-R-R-E.

MR. ADAMS: Just a couple of points, Chair. It is quite clear that approval of one amendment by the Historic Preservation Board will not be used as a precedent or blanket approval for other applications, so you have to review this application on its own merit.

With regard to the White Way Light, if it is not being relocated, you still have to take into consideration any adverse impact that may be imposed on the White Way Light from any new development there.

And we have received a few letters, and these letters are in opposition to the request. We have one from Zully Pardo, 49 Campina Court. We have one from Alice Goldhagen, 6395 Maynada Street; one from Lesley Rivera, 73 Edgewater Drive, Number One; one from Cheryl Gold, 7212 Biltmore Way, Number 302; and one from Karelia Martinez-Carbonell, president, Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables; and another from Rabbi Howard A. Berman, 501 Alcazar Avenue.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, thank you.

MS. LYONS: We have someone on Zoom.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak in favor of this project?

Anybody on Zoom who would like to speak in favor of this

1 project?

2 MS. LYONS: I don't know.

MS. MARTINEZ-CARBONNEL: Yes. I would -- no.

4 I want to speak in opposition.

5 MR. MENENDEZ: Excuse me. I'm asking if
6 there's someone who would like to speak in favor of this
7 project. Okay. Is there anyone in the audience who would
8 like to speak in opposition to this project? Sir?

9 MS. MARINTEZ-CARBONELL: This is me. Thank 10 you. This is Karelia.

MR. MENENDEZ: Please, please come up.

12 Excuse me, excuse me. We're speaking with people inside,

in the building right now. We'll get to you shortly.

MR. KIRK: Good evening. My name is -- is this on? No.

MR. MENENDEZ: Now it is.

MR. KIRK: My name is Joseph Kirk. I live on 18 117 Santander Avenue, less than 500 feet from this

19 project.

MR. CEBALLOS: Mr. Kirk, were you sworn in?

21 MR. KIRK: Yes. I stood up and raised my

22 hand.

MR. CEBALLOS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KIRK: I'm here to recommend that you

25 follow the staff's recommendation and deny all three

requests. What is proposed to being built here is a massive structure that's going to change, further change the character of the Crafts neighborhood which is supposed to be low-rise artisan buildings, and now we're going to have to potentially face, if these things are approved, a multi-story, very large building that will create a canyon effect between The Plaza and this project across the street.

I'm in a group of neighbors that have been meeting with the developer. We're trying to reach a consensus on what would be acceptable that wouldn't severely impact our neighborhood.

We have children living nearby, and this is a huge project, a huge structure, more than a hundred units, and it would devastate the quality of our neighborhood and it would impact our lives.

So the developer has been gracious. We've had several meetings. We haven't reached an agreement.

We are relieved that the slip lane will stay, but that's not under your -- apparently you can't consider that because it's not in the proposal.

So at this time I recommend you follow the staff's recommendation and deny this, all three proposals.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

MR. KIRK: Thank you very much.

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

2 MR. De YURRE: This is a quasi-judicial

hearing, correct, or no?

MS. SPAIN: Yes.

MR. De YURRE: Yes. If I could just, as such

could I briefly respond?

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

MR. De YURRE: I just, I believe that, you know, we would proffer that if it met with your approval, to condition it on the inclusion of the slip lane, and thank you very much for appearing, I appreciate it, but I would just qualify the comment in terms of the size of the project.

Across the street is The Plaza, and the tallest structure there is 297 feet with millions of square feet of development, and if you see the Power Point that you saw of the building, we've purposely brought it back, at it's closest point in the northeast corner, it's 35 feet from the right of way, and as you go south, you end up, you know, in triple digits away from the right of way, and that was done on purpose to avoid, knowing that The Plaza was across the street, so thank you very much.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, thank you. Okay.

Anyone on Zoom who would like to speak in opposition of this project? Nancy, do we have anybody?

,	74
1	MS. LYONS: Yes.
2	MS. MARTINEZ-CARBONELL: May I speak?
3	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, go ahead.
4	MS. MARTINEZ-CARBONELL: This is Karelia.
5	Thank you. I apologize for earlier. I was
6	MR. MENENDEZ: Please, please state your full
7	name.
8	MS. MARTINEZ-CARBONELL: This is Karelia
9	Martinez-Carbonell.
10	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
11	MS. MARTINEZ-CARBONELL: Can you hear me?
12	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
13	MS. MARTINEZ-CARBONELL: This is Karelia
14	Martinez-Carbonell.
15	MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.
16	MS. MARTINEZ-CARBONELL: I am president of

the Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables. Wе have submitted a letter in support of staff's recommendations to deny the approval of all three items, but I do want to read from the letter a very specific paragraph.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And it says that, "As per the Coral Gables city plan, "which is a historic landmark, "alleys are one of several protected historic resources."

I hear that alleys, you know, we don't need

them, they're not protected, they're not historic, they're not part of any plan.

Well, if you look in the master plan, which is George Merrick's master plan that was designated historic in 2018, specifically alleys are part of the historic resources, and I will quote the section.

It says that it protects, the city's historic plan protects, "Right of ways, parkways, roadways, alleys, open space, parks, swales, reservation, sidewalk, waterways."

Alleys are 100 percent part of the city plan. Presently the code allows seven stories, and this proposed Ponce Park Residences is more than twice the zoning height at 17 stories. They want to grow by swallowing up this additional historic public land.

Additionally, the project encroaches on public historic property in the city plan, and then, of course, the several landmarks that have been already mentioned, especially the rare, endangered 1926 White Way Street Light that is basically, you know, next to this potential structure.

It's at, the address is at 205 Malaga Avenue, and so it is right, right there among many others that are on that corridor.

So please bear with me. I just want to end

this, end this by saying that Ponce Park Residences will encroach on Merrick's historic city plan which protects, and I already mentioned, all the parts of it which include the roadways, University Drive, alleys, and it will adversely affect the historical, architectural and aesthetic character of the historic area as per the Secretary of the Interior standards and National Historic Preservation Act guidelines.

So as the historic preservation association, we promote the understanding and importance of historic resources and their preservation and we ask that you, we ask that the Historic Preservation Board to reject the proposed special certificate of appropriateness in its entirety due to its irreversible effect on the integrity of the Coral Gables city plan, officially recognized as a a local landmark by the Historic Preservation Board in 2018.

Thank you for listening, and I heard some noise back there, but I hope you were all listening to me. Thank you.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone else on Zoom or here in person who would like to speak in favor or in opposition to this case?

Okay. I'm going to close the public hearing portion and open it up to discussion and questions on the

1 | board. Mr. Garcia-Pons?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like two clarifications from staff, and then I have a

question for the city attorney.

The first one with regard of the light location, it is apparent that the existing light is to remain in place in the right of way. Does staff have any comments on that?

MR. ADAMS: Obviously we would support the light staying in the same place.

However, our concern is that this development or any proposed development has no other approvals at the moment. By granting approval of these requests and not necessarily ultimately knowing what is going there, we believe if the design is ultimately going to change, then it will be brought back to you anyway, the lights, the alleyway, University Drive, if the proposal is more appropriate for the historic street plan and for the historic street light, so that's what our concern is.

Ultimately this has to go to city commission for the final approval anyway. This is only a recommendation, and no one knows what the city commission are ultimately going to determine.

But I would believe it would be prudent to at least wait to see if a more appropriate design potentially

comes along and not necessarily grant or recommend any approvals based on something that we don't even know if it's going to go ahead at the moment.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Thank you, but Mr. Adams, the question was if apparently the light is in the right of way and not to be moved, the staff analysis says something different than that.

Do you agree that the light is to remain and not to be moved per the presentation and the application?

MR. ADAMS: Do I agree it has to remain?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: That the applicant is not moving it or replacing it per their application.

MR. ADAMS: Based on what was shown to us, then yes, I believe it's going to remain in the same place.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Second question for staff for clarification, Miss Carbonell mentioned it but I want to hear it from staff, is that alleys are part of the master plan?

MR. ADAMS: Yes.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Thank you, and my third question is for the city attorney. The dispute resolution agreement that's included in the packet, does that have any tie to this particular site, or just have the ability to transfer TDRs?

MR. CEBALLOS: I haven't reveiwed the dispute agreement. It doesn't have a particular bearing on this particular board's review, so you have to follow the criteria.

I think staff did a great job to articulate all three items that are being presented and that dispute resolution doesn't, wouldn't apply to those characteristics.

MR. De YURRE: The dispute resolution only pertains to the TDRs and has nothing to do with this particular project, and the design that you see there, you know, is the design that's moving forward.

The one caveat is, you know, the slip lane was always part of the discussion. We're happy to reintroduce that.

I mean, it's a concession that we're giving.

I don't want to be, you know, treated punitively because we're giving concessions to the neighborhood in our discussions.

And you know, to me, the TDRs, the only objection to the TDRs was the White Way Light. I understand the street is more of a complicated issue, but the alley, again, step one is, is it a material amendment to the city plan? I mean, if this is material to the city plan, then every alleyway is in Coral Gables and we're

1	nover going to approve one again	
	never going to approve one again.	
2	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Thank you.	
3	MR. MENENDEZ: Miss Bache-Wiig?	
4	MS. BACHE-WIIG: I have a couple comments.	
5	So I'm going back to when Ponce Park came to us some	
6	months back and that the city brought it to our attention	
7	because they were, I believe, if I recall correctly, they	
8	were expanding into the existing lane and making them,	
9	making the park, you know, enlarging the park essentially	
10	to make those lanes a bit smaller, because right now	
11	they're wide and they invite for speeding. Right? That's	
12	one thing.	
13	I remember they also came to us with was	
14	it to in-fill the triangle there? Can we get the	
15	MR. De YURRE: Power Point?	
16	MS. BACHE-WIIG: the Power Point back up?	
17	MR. De YURRE: Yes, sure, if I'm given the	
18	Power Point.	
19	MS. BACHE-WIIG: I don't think you'll see it	
20	here, but.	
21	MR. De YURRE: I don't know where the person	
22	is, but are they listening to us right now? Okay.	
23	MS. KAUTZ: Yes.	
24	MR. De YURRE: It's not like the good old	
25	days when they were sitting right there next to us.	

,	81	
1	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Is it A Three?	
2	MR. De YURRE: Here, this is probably a good	
3	one.	
4	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes, but can you go back to	
5	the	
6	MR. De YURRE: That one?	
7	MS. BACHE-WIIG: 1958 or the 1960	
8	MR. De YURRE: Sure, absolutely.	
9	MS. BACHE-WIIG: 1951, 60?	
10	MR. De YURRE: This is 51.	
11	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes, that's fine.	
12	MR. De YURRE: And this is 68.	
13	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Okay. So if I remember	
14	correctly, what the city was proposing was to in-fill, you	
15	know, that, on the north, like the block north of this	
16	property, actually, yes, the north, yes, the property	
17	north of this property, to in-fill	
18	MR. De YURRE: Sorry.	
19	MS. BACHE-WIIG: that triangle, right?	
20	Okay, and they wanted to do that to lessen those lanes.	
21	Right now it's like an open invitation. So that's one	
22	thing. That's the second thing.	
23	Another thing, there were strategies that	
24	they were trying to implement with the design of the park	
25	to slow down traffic, as you got to essentially the	

entrance of this park, if you will, and slow that traffic down as you go, you know, down parallel to this park.

So I'm just bringing it up because I think that's the spirit that the city is going with this, you know, Ponce Park and with this area with regards to the public, you know, right of ways and the lanes, existing street lanes.

So going to this, this, the first item that's before us, right, the vacationing of University, that slip lane is dangerous from a pedestrian and from a vehicular point of view. There isn't one time that I'm not going south on Ponce and I'm turning on University that there isn't a pedestrian waiting to cross that crossway, and it's difficult to see at night. There's no, there's no device that's telling you to stop. You know, just the nature of that is to go quickly.

So I have been both a pedestrian and a driver, so both sides of that, and I think that that slip lane inherently has issues. It's dangerous.

I think that just talking concept, the strategy of giving back that area that is dangerous, okay, as a park, if you will, or as a pedestrian-friendly area where you're protected from traffic is in the spirit of what we're trying to do and accomplish at Ponce Park, which is encourage walkability, pedestrian safety,

vehicular safety.

And because of what's happening across the street at The Plaza, you know, whatever is going on at this property, if you have something that's softening that edge with landscaping and a place of respite for people, that's exactly what this, I'm going to call it this pivot point is really needing, because you have The Plaza which is millions of square feet of development at 200 feet up in the air, and then across the way, you know, you have the building, and then just north of it you have the bank building. I forgot the name of the bank.

MR. FULLERTON: Regions.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Regions Bank, so you know you have this like epicenter, and I think that that corner is a big -- it should respond to everything that's going on right now and the evolution of this area.

So for those reasons, I would be in support of vacating that piece, giving it back to people, pedestrians, beautifying it, and making it usable, because right now it's dangerous.

MR. De YURRE: I don't know if any of you live in the area or you've been there before, but I would mirror those sentiments.

MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Fullerton, do you have anything to say?

MR. FULLERTON: I think, Miss Bache-Wiig, sorry, you brought up a good point and it has some merit. My original thoughts were to allow the slip lane, but I'm not really here to talk about that so much as the alley.

To me, the alley is a service, a method of servicing whatever businesses are within this development as are all alleys in Coral Gables, of which we have modified, I would say if not most, many.

I don't have any objection to the alley modification to service the building. I think that's what it's there for, and that's what Merrick intended those alleys to be. I don't think it was a design issue per se, excuse men, per se, but a service issue, so the alleys are for servicing the buildings that are there.

I would like to know more about the zoning upgrade from seven stories to 17 stories.

MR. ADAMS: I don't believe that's under our review at the moment.

MR. FULLERTON: Not under our review?

MR. ADAMS: No.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay.

MR. ADAMS: The historic street plan and the effect on historically-designated sites within 500 feet.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, I have very big reservations about the building itself and its scale.

MR. ADAMS: Again, that's not part of what

we're here to --

MR. FULLERTON: I would hate to approve something that looked like this and have somebody at the city commission level assume that we as historic preservationists believe that this is appropriate, but that aside, if we're not talking about that today, then I think it needs to be explained how it got from seven stories zoning district to a high-rise district.

MR. De YURRE: If you'd like me to, just a brief comment on that.

MR. FULLERTON: I'm sorry. I'm sure you would be able to educate me, but our discussion here is really for us and staff.

MR. De YURRE: Sure.

MR. FULLERTON: And so if we have a question for you, I think we can address you directly.

MR. De YURRE: Thank you. My apologies.

MR. FULLERTON: So the bottom line for me is the alley is not a big question. I think we have had some very intelligent input on the use of a public parkway instead of a street.

I do think that the extension of University is kind of an important, important street that I think I would go along with leaving the slip lane, but I'm not

1 going to argue about that one.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The architects for The Plaza, aren't they the same architects as for this building?

MR. De YURRE: No.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay. I'm sorry.

MR. De YURRE: Oppenheim is our architect.

MR. FULLERTON: Pardon?

MR. De YURRE: Oppenheim is our architect.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes. I thought he had

something to do with some of the buildings in --

MR. De YURRE: I can answer that. Once upon a time, Allen did own a portion of The Plaza site many,

many eons ago --

MR. FULLERTON: Okay.

MR. De YURRE: -- and in the great recession of 2008, sold it to one of the people that then eventually sold it to The Plaza, but that's it.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay.

MR. De YURRE: We have no tie to them.

MR. FULLERTON: Thank you for clarifying.

MR. De YURRE: No problem.

MR. FULLERTON: I appreciate that, because

23 those buildings I think speak to what Merrick meant by

24 historic -- by Mediterranean architecture. If you look at

25 | the main building on The Plaza, on the Ponce Park Plaza, I

think the details and everything are very sympathetic to our Mediterranean ordinance, and I think that to me is a better example than what we're looking at today in this presentation.

I don't understand why the architect would put a 200-foot tower up against the neighborhood to the south. I would think that he would use the depth of the property and move the bulk of the building, have the plats, the plinth, lower section of the building, add a couple of floors of residential or so on that side, but then move the bulk, the high-rise building back against the high-rise building to the north of it, which is a very nice building until that bird flew into the side of it and got smashed into it.

MR. De YURRE: I didn't know where you were going with that.

MR. FULLERTON: That kind of -- and apparently that was a Mediterranean building which, with all respect to the architect whom I am very friendly with, I think that was a mistake, whatever.

That's pretty much my take on this, on this process right now, and I hope that smarter people will look at it and analyze this a lot more and give credence to the concern we have about the White Way Light. I know it's a tiny detail, but there is importance in tiny

1 details.

2 MR. De YURRE: Absolutely.

MR. FULLERTON: And I think that is one that

4 deserves special recognition.

5 The other buildings on the site are not

6 historic. Is that true, Mr. Adams, on the existing

7 buildings?

10

12

16

8 MR. ADAMS: On the proposed development site,

9 no, no. It's only the street plan that you are reviewing

for, and it's the only designated element.

There are three other designated sites within

500 feet which we went through.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes, I understand.

MR. ADAMS: Not on that.

MR. FULLERTON: I know they're not taking, I

know they're not taking the development rights of a

17 historic building they're going to knock down.

MR. ADAMS: Yes.

MR. FULLERTON: That would not be too good.

MR. ADAMS: No.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Can I just say one more

22 | thing --

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

24 | MS. BACHE-WIIG: -- about the slippage lane?

25 | Sorry. I'm emotional about it because I have crossed that

a lot of times with my kids, and it's not the experience you want in City Beautiful.

But I will say I recognize that maybe we need to, you know, give a nod to, you know, University Drive and maybe there's a way of, in the paving plan, you know, put in, you know, brick pavers that honor it or celebrate it or give a nod to it. I'm not saying open it for vehicular, but you can.

I just think you're still going to have the same issue, but still, you can still, you can still keep it historic without leaving the use of it in place. You know what I mean?

MR. ADAMS: Well, the other side of that is there may be other appropriate ways to make it safer without altering it to the same, to the same extent, and unless any of us are traffic engineers, you know, that's going to be based on personal opinion.

So I do believe that, yes, some of the streets were slightly reshaped at Ponce Park to the north to make them safer, but these were just gradual changes to the --

MS. BACHE-WIIG: No, I understand.

MR. ADAMS: -- to the actual carving in the roads to carry traffic more.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Right.

MR. ADAMS: This is a more significant 1 2 alteration --3 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yeah, but you know --MR. ADAMS: -- to the plan --4 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes. 5 MR. ADAMS: -- which your decision should be 6 7 based on basically three things: balancing of interests 8 weighing historic integrity, development, and public 9 purpose. 10 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Right. 11 MR. ADAMS: So you really need to weigh all 12 three. 13 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes. I think you can strike 14 a balance and give a nod and identify it as a street, but it doesn't have to act as a street. 15 MR. ADAMS: And just to make clear, we can't 16 17 discuss the amended proposal that was presented because staff haven't had an opportunity to review that. 18 19 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Right. 20 MR. ADAMS: So approving this based on a new 21 design that was submitted to us only a few days ago is 22 not, you know, is not something we would recommend. 23 MS. BACHE-WIIG: No, no. I'm not looking at 24 the new design. 25 MR. ADAMS: Yes.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I'm just thinking, you know, as a condition, you know, saying, "I approve it," I'm saying.

MR. MENENDEZ: Well, If there was a new design, wasn't it -- why wasn't this deferred then so that we could review the new design?

MR. ADAMS: The amended plan was only submitted to us last week, I believe it was after the reports had been prepared.

It was included in your packet and it was mentioned in the report, but staff had already done the reports and things, but not completed the report, but we didn't have time to review it in the way we would review applications normally.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Durana, do you have anything to say?

MR. DURANA: I just kind of want to be clear on what we're voting on, so maybe this is a question for the city attorney.

So we're saying does the closure of the alley, turning it into a pedestrian walkway, does that affect any sort of historic integrity to the area? That's part one, correct?

MR. CEBALLOS: Basically you're looking at two vacations.

	92
1	MR. DURANA: Two what?
2	MR. CEBALLOS: Two vacations, the street,
3	University
4	MR. DURANA: Yes, the slip-through.
5	MR. CEBALLOS: the alley, and the TDRs as
6	a receiving site. Those are the three items that you're
7	looking at.
8	MR. DURANA: Okay.
9	MR. CEBALLOS: So I know there's been
10	multiple discussion about the building and the height and
11	things of that nature. That really would only apply to
12	the TDR discussion that would be appropriate, but not
13	necessarily for the vacation.
14	I believe staff did a great job in their
15	report in delineating exactly the criteria that you should
16	be reviewing for each one of those, so if you have any
17	questions, I would defer to the report. That does provide
18	the actual zoning code sections that would apply.
19	MR. DURANA: Okay, I'm good.
20	MR. CEBALLOS: You're good?
21	MR. DURANA: Yes.
22	MR. CEBALLOS: Okay.
23	MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Adams?
24	MR. ADAMS: Yes.
25	MR. MENENDEZ: These are three different

,	93
1	items that we're going to vote
2	MR. ADAMS: Yes.
3	MR. MENENDEZ: on each?
4	MR. ADAMS: Yes.
5	MR. MENENDEZ: Correct?
6	MR. ADAMS: Yes.
7	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
8	MR. FULLERTON: May I ask another question?
9	MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Fullerton.
10	MR. FULLERTON: Sorry.
11	MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead, yes.
12	MR. FULLERTON: The TDRs are coming from
13	historic properties. That's been adjudged
14	MR. MENENDEZ: No.
15	MR. DURANA: He's saying no.
16	MR. MENENDEZ: No, no.
17	MR. De YURRE: So there was a lawsuit with a
18	property down south off of Old Cutler that got down-zoned,
19	and as a result of that, it was called a Bircher-Harris
20	claim where the property got down-zoned.
21	The city entered into that dispute resolution
22	agreement and essentially detached the development rights
23	that were lost by the change in zoning and allowed them to
24	be transferable development rights, and they're different
25	in a sense that they can be excuse me. They're treated

94 a little differently than the regular TDRs in the city 1 2 because they don't come from an originally historic 3 property. MR. FULLERTON: Okay. So those TDRs are 4 gone? 5 6 MR. CEBALLOS: These are a very unique set of 7 These are the last of them to the best of my TDRs. 8 knowledge. 9 MR. De YURRE: That is correct. 10 MR. FULLERTON: Are you getting any 11 additional square footage for the FAR by virtue of the 12 vacation of the alley? 13 MR. De YURRE: Yes. The alleyway is 14 approximately 3,000 square feet. 15 MR. FULLERTON: Right. MR. De YURRE: So just like any other alley 16 17 in the city, when you vacate, as the reversionary interest 18

owner on both sides, it becomes part of your property automatically.

MR. FULLERTON: Are you getting any square footages from the vacation of the portion of the -- sorry.

19

20

21

22

23

MR. De YURRE: The street, University?

Yes, the street. MR. FULLERTON:

24 MR. De YURRE: Yes. That is a much larger 25 portion, and to the point, if you think one is appropriate and one is not, you know, it might give us better guidance to go to the commission and continue the conversation with the community.

MR. FULLERTON: That's the one that I object to. Even though you're beautifying it and everything, you're taking a portion of the historic arrangement of Merrick's genius, and then getting the land and the benefit of it in square footage, which makes the building even bigger and even more of an intrusion on the area, so I would have a difficulty with that.

MR. De YURRE: I understand.

MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft, do you have any questions, comments?

MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes. Sorry. Can you hear me now?

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

MR. EHRENHFT: Okay. I have a basic reservation about vacating the alley, and I understand the proposal is essentially to turn it into a pedestrian passageway, but it is going to be serving a privately-owned project, which is a mixture of retail and residential, and I think, I think that the historic plan that includes the alley should be honored, so.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Garcia-Pons, do you have another question?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: No, some, actually some statements.

So I'd like to thank the board members. I think a lot of the concerns and thoughts about the potential benefits of pedestrian safety and traffic circulation and all these things are incredibly important, but what I would -- and I think Mr. Adams had alluded to it, is these things are not solely impacted by this development.

These are design issues that can be solved with the current plan. It doesn't have to be a whole new development to solve pedestrian safety or traffic circulation within the existing city plan, so although I can appreciate the conversation, I'm not sure if it relates specifically to the task before us today.

The three, sort of the three things that we've been asked to do is review the vacation of the alleyway, review the vacation of University Drive, and then take a look at the transfer of development rights with regards to the affected site.

I think, listening to my fellow board members, the scale, massing and character, and I've said this before particularly with the vacation of streets, is the creation of a thoroughfare, whether it be an alleyway or roadway or any sort of public park, creates a boundary

for development, so if you have a parcel size that is bounded by an alley and streets, that is the size of your parcel which equates to the scale, the massing and the character of the building that can be placed on it.

When you vacate alleys and vacate roadways and enlarge the development parcel from, let's say a third to three times that amount, you get a building that would be a third to three times that amount.

So I'm going to be consistent, I've said I'm going to be consistent on this item, is whenever we talk about the vacation of an alleyway that impacts the potential scale, massing and character of the buildings that would be built on the affected parcels, I think that's a problem because the city plan was designed in such a way so that these parcels have a development capacity and a size commensurate to the size of that parcel.

So I don't know if it's clear, but, you know, my recommendation is going to be to not approve either the alley or the roadway vacation because I think the problems that were cited are fixable through design and not necessarily through development.

Although I can appreciate what the developer is proffering here with the public spaces and the pedestrian passageways, I don't think it's enough to

	98	
1	change the historic city plan of the City of Coral Gables.	
2	Now, when it comes to the transfer of	
3	development rights, I might have a different position, but	
4	I would just like to sort of state those two for maybe	
5	further discussion, or I'm happy to make a motion.	
6	MR. MENENDEZ: I'll entertain a motion.	
7	MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I'd like to I'm going	
8	to do this in order. The first one is we need three	
9	votes, Mr. Adams?	
10	MR. ADAMS: Sorry?	
11	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, three separates votes.	
12	MR. ADAMS: Yes.	
13	MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I'd like to make a	
14	motion recommending denial of the amendment of the city	
15	plan for the vacation of the alley.	
16	MR. MENENDEZ: Request One, correct, Request	
17	Number One?	
18	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Do you want to vote?	
19	MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have a second?	
20	MR. EHRENHAFT: I'll second.	
21	MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft seconds.	
22	MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?	
23	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.	
24	MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?	
25	MR. DURANA: Yes.	

	99
1	MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
2	MS. BACHE-WIIG: No.
3	MS. LYONS: Mr. Garcia-Pons?
4	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
5	MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
6	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
7	MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
8	MR. FULLERTON: No.
9	MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'm willing to make a
10	second motion, so.
11	MR. FULLERTON: So that passes, correct?
12	MR. CEBALLOS: That does not pass.
13	MR. MENENDEZ: No.
14	MS. LYONS: The motion failed.
15	MR. CEBALLOS: That does not pass.
16	MR. GARCIA-PONS: That does not pass.
17	MR. CEBALLOS: That motion failed.
18	MS. BACHE-WIIG: You need a quorum
19	MR. FULLERTON: Four out of seven.
20	MR. GARCIA-PONS: You need five.
21	MR. DURANA: You need five.
22	MR. CEBALLOS: The Historic Preservation
23	Board is unique in that it needs a majority of the full
24	board, meaning for any, passing of any sort of decision,
25	you need five affirmative votes.

	100
1	MR. FULLERTON: I beg your pardon. Then I
2	would reverse my vote and say yes.
3	MR. GARCIA-PONS: How do we do that?
4	MR. FULLERTON: Can we do that?
5	MR. CEBALLOS: If somebody would like to
6	reconsider that motion.
7	MR. FULLERTON: I want to reconsider it.
8	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Is it the winner or loser
9	who can make that?
10	MR. CEBALLOS: You can reconsider the item.
11	You can ask to reconsider the item.
12	MR. FULLERTON: He's the loser.
13	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
14	Mr. De YURRE: It has to be that, according
15	to the rules, it has to be that the winning side has to
16	allow the reconsideration of the item.
17	MR. CEBALLOS: But there is no winning side.
18	The board took no action. A four-two vote is basically
19	like if no vote would have taken place, which means no
20	action, so you can
21	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So he can rephrase his
22	motion and we can vote again.
23	MR. CEBALLOS: Correct.
24	MR. MENENDEZ: So please rephrase the motion.
25	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Okay. I would like to make

	101
1	a motion recommending denial of the amendment of the city
2	plan for the vacation of the alley.
3	MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have a second?
4	MR. EHRENHAFT: I'll second the motion.
5	MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft.
6	MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
7	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
8	MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
9	MR. DURANA: Yes.
10	MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
11	MS. BACHE-WIIG: No.
12	MS. LYONS: Mr. Garcia-Pons?
13	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
14	MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
15	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
16	MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
17	MR. FULLERTON: With apologies, I vote yes.
18	MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
19	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Do I have a motion for
20	Request Number Two?
21	MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'd like to make a motion
22	to, a recommendation of denial of the amendment of the
23	city plan for the abandonment and vacation of a segment of
24	University Drive.
25	MR. MENENDEZ: Do I have a second?

		102
1	MR.	FULLERTON: Second.
2	MR.	EHRENHAFT: I'll second the motion.
3	MR.	MENENDEZ: Mr. Fullerton
4	MR.	EHRENHAFT: Okay.
5	MR.	MENENDEZ: seconds.
6	MS.	LYONS: Mr. Garcia-Pons made the motion?
7	MR.	MENENDEZ: Correct.
8	MR.	GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
9	MS.	LYONS: Thank you. Mr. Fullerton?
10	MR.	FULLERTON: Yes.
11	MS.	LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
12	MS.	BACHE-WIIG: No.
13	MS.	LYONS: Mr. Garcia-Pons?
14	MR.	GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
15	MS.	LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
16	MR.	MENENDEZ: Yes.
17	MS.	LYONS: Mr. Durana?
18	MR.	DURANA: Yes.
19	MS.	LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
20	MR.	EHRENHAFT: Yes.
21	MS.	LYONS: Motion passes.
22	MR.	MENENDEZ: Do I have a motion for Request
23	Number Three?	
24	MR.	GARCIA-PONS: I'll make that motion.
25	This is a motion	to approve the proposed development as a

1 receiving site for the transfer of development rights.

MS. KAUTZ: Can you please word it the way that it's outlined in the staff report? Just reverse it, "To determine the proposal does not adversely affect the historic," dah, dah, dah. Last page.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: I would like to make a motion determining that the proposal does not adversely affect the historic, architectural or aesthetic character of the historic properties located at, located within 500 feet of the site.

MR. FULLERTON: I need an explanation of that, I'm sorry.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: It might fail just because there's no second motion, or no second. It's a motion so I don't know how you want to do it. He wants discussion.

MR. FULLERTON: Does it need a second to discuss it?

MR. MENENDEZ: Well, it needs a second to have a vote.

MR. FULLERTON: Oh, yes, but to discuss it.

MR. CEBALLOS: You can make a second for the purposes of discussion.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

MR. CEBALLOS: Or you can let the motion die, whatever you prefer.

MR. FULLERTON: I just don't understand the 1 2 motion, I'm sorry. 3 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I can withdraw it. MR. CEBALLOS: You can withdraw or provide 4 5 clarification, whatever you prefer. MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'll withdraw it and then 6 7 we can have discussion. Is that okay, Mr. Chair? 8 MR. MENENDEZ: Proceed. 9 So my thought process MR. GARCIA-PONS: 10 behind here is the specific of does it impact the historic 11 properties within 500 feet? 12 I agree with staff that it does not impact 13 2900, 2901 Ponce, or 247 Malaga, and based on what I heard 14 today, I do not believe this project impacts the light because it is going to remain in place. The proposed 15 building is separated from that location 16 17 And again, I don't believe that, based on what I think I need to review this for, that the proposed 18 19 development negatively impacts either of the three 20 historic elements. That is my opinion. 21 MR. ADAMS: Bear in mind that the proposed 22 development was denied at planning and zoning, so we're

MR. ADAMS: Bear in mind that the proposed development was denied at planning and zoning, so we're not -- unless it's approved by commission, at the moment we're not going to know what the potential development is.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes. That's a big problem in

23

24

25

my mind.

MR. De YURRE: If I could please speak to that point. The prior project that Palance (phonetic) had and Mercedes Benz was also denied at planning and zoning. There wasn't even a site -- there wasn't even a plan in place.

This project is going forward as it is to the commission for them to review the project that's there. There will be considerations that are given, and I do not want my client to be prejudiced. Imagine the chilling effect of telling somebody, "Hey, you met with the neighbors, but now you can't give them a better project, okay, because of comments where someone might say, 'Well, we can't vote on this now because they might make it better.'"

That's, I want to make sure that I clarify that statement appropriately because we want to make the project better and I don't want my client to be prejudiced by doing things, as you heard the resident here say, that in fact, that was a positive move for the project, so I would just put that forth, and I appreciate the time.

MR. MENENDEZ: Would you like to resubmit your motion? No? Would someone make a motion?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: The motion is (inaudible)

25 approve?

THE COURT REPORTER: I can't hear you. 1 2 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Sorry. Your motion is to 3 approve? I'll second that motion. 4 Well, I didn't make it. MR. GARCIA-PONS: MR. MENENDEZ: He didn't make the motion. 5 I withdrew it. 6 MR. GARCIA-PONS: 7 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Oh, you withdrew it. 8 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Somebody else can make any 9 motion they would like. 10 MR. MENENDEZ: Well, I cannot make a motion, 11 so somebody has got to make a motion. 12 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Okay. I'll make the motion. 13 14 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. 15 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'll make a motion to recommend to determine that the proposal does not 16 17

recommend to determine that the proposal does not adversely affect the historic, architectural or aesthetic character of the historic properties located within 500 feet of the site, namely the White Way Street Lights, a local historic landmark, and to approve the proposal referred to as Ponce Park Residences with the understanding that it requires further review and approval by the city commission.

MR. FULLERTON: I'll second the motion.

25 Now we can discuss it.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	107
1	MS. LYONS: Mr. Garcia-Pons?
2	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
3	MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
4	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes
5	MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
6	MR. DURANA: Yes.
7	MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
8	MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
9	MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
10	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
11	MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
12	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
13	MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
14	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
15	MR. FULLERTON: So Mr. Adams
16	MR. De YURRE: Thank you very much for your
17	time.
18	MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you for your time.
19	MR. FULLERTON: Mr. Adams, when are we
20	going to see a project, the project? All of this
21	beautiful presentation here doesn't really mean anything
22	to us. Is that correct?
23	MR. ADAMS: I don't think you'll actually see
24	the project, as far as I'm aware, because the only
25	historic site that potentially, or sites that would

potentially be affected were the street plan and the three properties within 500 feet of the White -- the development.

So ultimately, I believe you've done your part, and if there is a major redesign, then obviously it may come, it may come back to you with another request for the alley and any amendments.

MR. FULLERTON: So they can come back with the same request for another vote.

MR. ADAMS: Well, the city commission could approve it.

MR. De YURRE: Yes. Look, what you see before you today is the project. Do we create benefits that are more in line with what -- or to provide responses, to be responsive to requests from neighbors or commissioners on the projects? Of course we could, absolutely.

But the design is going to be what you see there. Ultimately if they decide to vacate the street, I couldn't tell you, but it's going to be subject to that discussion, and I think people want to have the public discourse and allow the commissioners, the elected officials to make the decision, obviously based upon your recommendation, so thank you very much for your volunteer --

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Where does this project go now, to the commission?

MR. De YURRE: Next to the commission, yes, and thank you very much, again, appreciate it.

MR. MENENDEZ: With the board's approval, we are going to take a ten minute recess.

(Thereupon, a brief recess.)

MR. MENENDEZ: Call to order. The next case file is COA (SP) 2021-016, an application for the issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for the property at 4615 Santa Maria Street, a contributing resource within the Santa Maria historic district legally described as Lot 29 and south 54.1 feet of Lot 28, Block 96, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part Five, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 23 at Page 55 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The application requests design approval for a two-story addition and a covered terrace addition and alterations to the residence and site work.

MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. Just, this is up to the control room. This is the Power Point that was a stand-alone. This is just for you all. This is the location map of the property. Well, it was. Never mind. The Power Point is too big.

I'll get started while they're putting it up.

So in November of 2007, the Santa Maria Historic, Street Historic District was listed in the Coral Gables Register.

This property is considered a contributing resource within the district. It was designed in 1951 by Architect Upton Ewing in the traditional style that responds to the Florida pioneer village found elsewhere on the street.

The applicant is requesting design approval for alterations and two additions to the existing home, a two-story addition at the northwest corner, sort of the front corner of the house, and a one-story covered terrace addition at the southeast rear of the residence.

The project also includes interior remodeling at the first and second floors and site work.

The board of architects reviewed the project without comment on July 8th. No variances have been requested.

Staff did have some comments and about six conditions that we'd like incorporated into any motion, so we can do that at the end. I'll let the architect walk you through. You were here, you were sworn in.

To the control room, for some reason the clicker isn't working on this Power Point. Oh, wait. There we go. Thanks.

MR. DeLEON: We'll jsut start with the

context of the home which --

MR. MENENDEZ: Please state your name.

MR. DeELON: Sorry, Mr. Chair. Nelson DeLeon, Locus Architecture, Inc. Thank you, board members, staff.

So I'll just get right into it. The scope of work for us was pretty straightforward, a growing family that needs an additional two bedroom suites and some outdoor covered space which the home currently does not have any of, and as I go through the presentation, I'll let you know what parts of the home we developed the scope with based on existing conditions.

You're all familiar with Santa Maria, the context of the neighborhood. This is a front view of the house.

So our major portion of our addition will be to the left side of the home which is currently a one-story garage, and to that end, what we're doing is we're going to work with the massing that's on the existing right side of the home, which is a one-story guest house, and get our cue from there to start with a one-story element, and then push our two-story element further back.

So looking at the existing site, there was limited opportunities to where we could add our new work.

The home had been through several remodelings, several additions. A relatively new one-story wing on the northeast side of the property facing the golf course is the master bedroom suite.

To the right of that was a one-story kitchen addition with a flat roof, and then to the right of that next to the original two-story home was a family room addition, also one story.

So where we could connect to the home basically became limited to the existing garage side of the home and outdoor space on the right edge of the home, so our site plan shows you in dark gray where the existing garage is that we'll be replacing, and the plan is pretty straightforward. I'm going to get right into the plan.

So with the two bedroom suite addition, we were able to bring the garage into current code compliance as far as depth and width, and being on the golf course, they requested to have a golf cart spot, so it's, at the end of the day, it's two-and-a-half-car garage with a one -- two-car garage with a half-car addition to accommodate that golf cart.

Some miscellaneous interior remodelings next to that garage, which is the laundry, the pantry, and a work space at the front of the house.

And to the left side of the house creating

now a courtyard is an open, one-story entertainment covered space, and that connects directly to the existing guest house. The guest house, we're going to open that up a little bit, put double doors so that connects to that entertainment space.

Second floor of the house, one of the existing bedrooms is now converted to an upstairs small family room, and then the new two bedroom suites you see on the right of the home.

So after this remodeling, the home will be a four-bedroom home with a guest suite.

Our roof plan showing how we stepped back the second floor mass to respect the front of the home.

And this is, on the top view is the existing elevation of the home, and then our proposed addition to the left of that, again stepping back the front portion of that, the one-story portion of that picks up the massing of the guest house on the right end of the property, so you maintain a flanking one-story element, and then our two-story element is stepped back.

The rear of the home which shows on the left portion of the drawing that existing guest room, which the gray around it is the new double doors that are being inserted.

So the new covered terrace actually dovetails

very nicely into that one-story gable end, and we create a gable end at the other end, and -- I'm sorry, we create a hip end which is primarily what the home has. With the exception of the gable end at the guest, everything else is a hip or flat.

And the side-view of the existing home with that one-story covered entertainment element.

So that part of the project is about 15 feet from the street, but there actually happens to be a very nice green hedge and landscaped area that the client did not want to lose visual connection from the kitchen.

Hence that, what I normally would have done which would have maybe turned that entertainment space and made it a little bit more private on the street side. It's actually very open to the street because it maintains their sight lines through that courtyard and across the new covered space, so it maintains a very light, kind of open connection to the home.

This is the view from the north side, so showing you the existing one-story garage, and then the replacement which is the two-car garage with the one-story -- I'm sorry, two-car garage with the smaller garage for the golf cart.

And you see here probably the best view where you see that second-story mass pushed back almost eight

feet from the edge of the home, so the home does have a very, very low sloped roof. You know, it's really at, it's at the minimum.

So when we go back to the street view, standing on the edge of the street, really all you read is, you read the fascia drip edge of the home.

You don't really pick up the roof because it's such a -- but even though it's such a low slope, we still felt that it would be respectful for the home which actually, even though it has very simple detailing, there's no sill, there's no header, it's a window system that's un-gridded, it's a clear-view system, that we just felt that stepping back a little bit would just let the original portion of the home breathe and kind of hold its own to what we're doing.

I did read through staff's recommendations on their six elements, five or six elements that I think,

Kara, maybe we'll highlight on, one of which is the shutters.

Again, the home, very simple detailing. The shutters that exist are very simple, and we just picked up on the language of those shutters.

One of staff's recommendations is maybe to delineate those shutters differently. I think there's so few of them on the front that if we did them differently,

it might be more of a visual shock than a complementary shift to delineate what was a 1950s design to what we're doing now, so I just felt personally keeping the window style, no sill, no header, in this particular case would be more in keeping with the home rather than having a different type of shutter system.

One of the other points was that the windows, the three windows at the second floor also have the shutters removed. I don't really have an issue with that. Again, I think it's more in keeping with the style of the home to keep them, but if staff recommends removal and you recommend to follow that suit, I think that's fine, and I can't, Kara, remember your other items.

MS. SPAIN: "Relocate the proposed AC unit, existing house is not to be re-stuccoed."

MR. DeLEON: Yes, exactly. So we have the small guest portion of the house, which is the one-story element on the bottom drawing all the way to the right. There's no air conditioning in that space. The current system, when designed, did not reach that space, so they have a floor unit in there. They have a humidity issue in there, so I recommended they put in a small mini-split.

And while we could locate that mini-split maybe at the back end of the new entertainment wing, those units are so small that the condensing line, when it's too

far apart, it just breaks down the efficiency of the unit, the condensing portion of it. For those of you that are architects, know that those type of units are probably 20 inches high, eight inches wide. They're very small units that in essence could be hid behind hedges.

I recommended a wall only because I figured zoning would look at it more favorably in that light, but in reality where we've had no choice but to put them in the front in other cases, the hedge more than adequately hides the small size of the unit.

MS. SPAIN: So does zoning have an issue with the placement here?

MR. DeLEON: Zoning only wanted that the board of architects would okay it, and the board of architects had no issue with it.

MS. KAUTZ: Did they discuss, did they discuss? Did they point that out at all?

MR. DeLEON: I pointed it out to them as a condition that zoning would need to have approved, yes.

I personally would rather not have the low wall because the existing slump brick is prevalent at the entry porch of this house, and it does appear again in a few, on planter edges and on -- I don't think it's on the side or the back of the house. It's mostly, mostly at the front elevation.

So adding the wall, I don't know anybody who does slump brick anymore, so ideally I wouldn't have a wall at all, but again, if we have to move the unit, it's really just a technical matter of just moving it further back, so that would not be something that would cause us any real stress, to move it.

MS. KAUTZ: We just never recommended AC units be put on the front of a property. We've had them, it occurred once or twice, a split unit, a mini-split on a property on Columbus that was done without approval, and hedges don't work. They just -- you could always see it. It was right in the front.

So that's our, that's just sort of a blanket comment, is that we just don't want to see them on the front.

MR. DeLEON: Yeah, and believe me, I try to avoid them as much as possible. I think in all the projects you've seen of mine over the years, this may be the first one.

MS. KAUTZ: Agreed.

MR. DeLEON: And that was really just because of an unusual condition that you have one space without air conditioning, and you know, an issue with mold and just never being able to get that room to the right temperature.

MS. KAUTZ: So with the shutter comment, it was a suggestion as a way to provide some sort of differentiation. It's a very simple house. It's smooth stucco, I believe, with, you know, with just some shutters, are basically its only ornamentation besides the slump brick.

two?

And so that was just sort of thinking of any way to make a distinguished, you know, be able to distinguish the two.

I'm open to suggestions if you all don't want to, you know, mess with the shutter style.

The three window grouping with the shutters is just a personal preference for me because they're not really functional. They're just decorative at that point, and it makes me a little crazy, but if you all want to leave it there, it's totally fine.

MR. DeLEON: Well, I would add to that particular, that section of the house, the two-story portion, if we do remove the shutters, I think I would go with a four-window grouping and just add one more window just to break down the amount of wall space.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Two separate, two and then

MR. DeLEON: I would just do four because the view is actually nice.

1 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes. 2 MR. DeLEON: You know, the street is 3 beautiful. There's a lot of oaks, there's a lot of mahoganies, there's a lot of, you know, greenery looking 4 out of that window, so I think adding more windows would 5 6 be --7 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Window with the shutters, 8 without the shutters? 9 MR. DeLEON: We could remove the shutters but 10 add one more pane so we would have four windows, yes. 11 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Exactly. 12 MS. LYONS: Alicia, talk into the mic. Wе 13 can't hear you. 14 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Sorry. The brick that you have on the new, is that going to be painted white, the 15 new brick? 16 17 MS. KAUTZ: What new brick? MS. BACHE-WIIG: Oh, no, never mind. 18 19 reading it. I take it back. 20 MR. MENENDEZ: Have you completed your 21 presentation? 22 MR. DeLEON: Yes, I have. 23 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. I'll open it up to --

is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak in

favor of this case? Anyone in the audience who would like

24

25

to speak in opposition to this case?

Okay. I'll close the public hearing portion, open it up to discussion among the board. Any questions, comments? Mr. Garcia-Pons.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: So one quick follow up, I think the recommendation or the suggestion to put four windows up on the second floor, I think that would actually help.

And one of the things that I appreciate about it, it's a simple building, but it does have sort of the balance of the windows above lining up with the windows below, the windows above lining up with the door below. It was a little bit odd in that section, the new section.

And I think when you re-look at it, if there's four windows on top, if perhaps the outside windows, I think they kind of do now line up with the below windows in the storage room and the bathroom, that might actually help balance that elevation a little bit, so I think that's potentially a good move.

I would also maybe recommend on those two windows on the first floor that is the storage and the bathroom, I think that you are harkening back to what was in the garage beyond before. I don't even know if that's necessary anymore because that was a different use. It was a garage. These are two different things. There may

be, you know, issues of privacy.

But if you so felt inclined to make them a little bit bigger, I think that would really look really wonderful from the front elevation, but I really do, I think it's important to have the, sort of the balance between the upper windows and the below windows with the alignment.

MR. DeLEON: Okay.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: That's all for me,

10 Mr. Chair.

MR. MENENDEZ: You haven't specified roof

12 tile?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MR. DeLEON: We have not selected that with the clients, but it will either be a medium gray or a dark gray. The current tile is sort of a white-ish creamy colored, and there's so much staining from the oak leaves that it's, right now it's almost like a mottled roof, so they want to get rid of the entire roof and go with either --

MR. MENENDEZ: I walk by this house every day.

22 MR. DeLEON: Okay.

MR. MENENDEZ: So I know exactly what you're talking about.

MS. SPAIN: Yes. You're very close to this

1 house.

2 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, so.

3 MS. SPAIN: And I know this house very well

4 also.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, and it's a beautiful

6 property.

MS. KAUTZ: If you look at the '40s photo in your staff report, and there was one in the Power Point as well, the tile has a dark hue. I don't know -- I'd have to pull the plans to see what it was intended for, but it already does look dark, so I don't think we'd have a problem with it being dark or medium gray.

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

MS. SPAIN: So how were you going to differentiate it if not -- the old new from the new, you know that pesky rule that we have to differentiate the old from the new?

MR. DeLEON: You know, on the homes that we've done that are '20s, it's a lot easier I think --

MS. SPAIN: Yes.

MR. DeLEON: -- because the contrast with the more contemporary work --

MS. SPAIN: And doing the stucco.

MR. DeLEON: -- is easy to, it's easier to

handle, but a home that has for the most part smooth

stucco is already in the style of what many people are doing now. It's hard to differentiate those pieces without adding rather than being subtractive --

MS. SPAIN: Right.

Mr. DeLEON: -- because you can't subtract any more. There's nothing left to subtract, so we'd have to actually add, and that would make the addition seem heavier, so we just kind of, in this particular case, just kept to what was there.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Through the Chair, though, I think staff's recommendation about differentiating through the use of shutters or removal of the use of shutters is a very clear way to do that, so I don't know if these shutters are all operable and/or required, but that might be the way to do it.

MS. KAUTZ: And they could also introduce a score line on the south elevation to distinguish between the covered terrace and the corner of the existing house. I mean, it's very minor, but it's at least a nod.

MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Durana, do you have any comments?

MR. DURANA: I mean, I think I'm fine with it. I would say, just, it seems like the comments are pretty minor, that I hope that, you know, you can resolve it with staff without having to come back here.

1 MS. KAUTZ: Absolutely.

MR. DURANA: Okay.

MR. MENENDEZ: Anyone else?

MR. DeLEON: Yeah. I will say sometimes with these particular style homes, they're much harder to work with than a very elaborate 1920s home, right? A Spanish eclectic, or you know, a revival style, these become really much more challenging.

MS. SPAIN: It's very efficient, your addition, though, it's very efficient. I mean it's nicely done, and it's really nice to see young people move onto that street and houses grow with them, and you know, every generation, there's more children on that street. It's nice. Do we have any other discussion?

MR. MENENDEZ: No. I'm entertaining motions actually.

MS. SPAIN: Yes. I'd like to make a motion to approve -- I don't know whether you want to go through these staff recommendations. Study the use of shutters as a means, you can figure that out with Kara, I think.

Mr. DeLEON: Yes, and I think removing them works perfectly fine too.

MS. SPAIN: Okay. Specify roof tile type, again, you can do that with staff.

MS. KAUTZ: You guys are okay with gray as a

1 whole?

restuccoed.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

MS. SPAIN: Yes. Window glass to be clear.

Eliminate the shutters at the triple front facing window,

we've already discussed that. Existing house is not to be

And relocate the proposed AC unit at the front facade, if zoning is okay with it, I'm okay with it

I mean, it's weird to have it in the front.

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

MS. SPAIN: And we haven't done that before. I'm not sure why zoning is okay, but if you can't see it, I would be okay with leaving it there. I don't know how anyone else feels.

MS. KAUTZ: Then would you clarify to not raise the wall?

MS. SPAIN: Raise the wall?

MS. KAUTZ: No, to not raise the wall. The existing planter wall is a slump brick planter.

MS. SPAIN: Oh, no, you should not raise the wall.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't hear you, Mr. Fullerton.

MS. KAUTZ: Turn the mic on.

MR. EHRENHAFT: You need to approach the mic.

25 They can't hear you.

1 MR. FULLERTON: I'm sorry. Thank you for 2 helping me with my wheelchair.

I have a small mini-split at my house for my garage, and it's quite unobtrusive and small, and you can cover it with landscaping quite effectively.

MS. SPAIN: Okay. Well, I don't know whether that's an appropriate motion, but.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Do I have a second?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: I have a friendly amendment to the motion.

MS. SPAIN: Okay. Tell me what it is.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: With regards to Number Four, the eliminate shutters at the triple front facing window grouping, I appreciate the suggestion from the applicant to turn that triple front facing into a quadruple front facing window.

MS. SPAIN: Yes, I would agree.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: And to work to align the windows with the ground floor.

MS. SPAIN: Yes, I would accept that.

MS. KAUTZ: So is that an "or" situation? Eliminate the shutters "or," or you would just replace it with, put four windows and align them?

MS. SPAIN: Eliminate the shutters and put four windows.

	128
1	MR. FULLERTON: With no shutters.
2	MS. KAUTZ: Okay.
3	MS. SPAIN: No shutters.
4	MR. MENENDEZ: Do I have a second?
5	MR. GARCIA-PONS: I will second that motion.
6	MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Garcia-Pons seconds the
7	motion.
8	MS. KAUTZ: Just again, I'm sorry, to
9	clarify, so Number Six is not to relocate it. It's to
10	leave it as is
11	MS. SPAIN: Yes.
12	MS. KAUTZ: in the front without altering
13	the wall?
14	MS. SPAIN: Yes.
15	MS. KAUTZ: Okay.
16	MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
17	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
18	MS. LYONS: Mr. Garica-Pons?
19	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
20	MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
21	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
22	MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
23	MS. SPAIN: Yes.
24	MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
25	MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

1 MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?

2 MR. DURANA: Yes.

Miami-Dade County, Florida.

MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes. Motion passes. All

5 right.

MR. DeLEON: Thank you.

MR. MENENDEZ: All right.

MR. DeLEON: Have a good evening.

MR. MENENDEZ: All right. Next case file,
COA (SP) 2021-017, an application for the issuance of a
special certificate of appropriateness for the property at
840 Coral Way, a local historic landmark and contributing
resource within the Coral Way Historic District, legally
described as Lots One and Two, Block One, Coral Gables
Section A, according to the plat thereof as recorded in
Plat Book Five at Page 102 of the public records of

The application requests design approval for a two-story addition and alterations to the residence and site work.

MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. So here you have the location of 840 Coral Way. It's on the corner of Toledo and Coral Way on the southeast corner.

It was designed by John and Coulton Skinner in 1926. It is a national -- I'm sorry. It's a local

historic landmark in 2003, and was also a contributing resource in the Coral Way Historic District in 2014. No additions or substantial exterior alterations have really occurred to the residence over the years.

The applicant is requesting design approval for a two-story addition to the south elevation of the residence, alterations to the existing structure and site work,

The addition consists of a new loggia and cabana bathroom on the ground floor and new bedroom with closet and bathroom on the second floor.

Alterations to the property itself include interior remodeling and alteration of existing windows and doors.

Site work includes the installation of a new swimming pool, terraces, gates, and alterations to the perimeter wall for the creation of a garden entry gate at the northwest corner of the site.

The property was reviewed by the board of architects on August 26th without comment. No variances are requested.

We do have quite a few comments and quite a few conditions that we would like to address at the end. That takes care of it. Were you sworn in?

MS. TRELLES: No.

(Thereupon, Ms. Trelles was duly sworn on oath by the court reporter.)

MS. TRELLES: This is the Maxwell house.

MR. MENENDEZ: Could you state your name for the record?

MS. TRELLES: Oh, sorry. Mari Trelles from Trelles and Cabarrocas Architects.

This is the existing Maxwell residence. What we're basically doing to the Coral Way side is just changing the physical tops of the gate. The original walls do not -- are not original to the house. The walls were added, the garden walls were added in '89 by the previous owner, which have a typical casted cap.

We just wanted to change those and provide lanterns for lighting, casted lanterns.

We're opening up on the garden wall on the northwest corner which is the corner of Coral Way and Toledo. We're kind of stepping back on the corner, giving it a radius, opening up the view because we get a direct axial view towards the Merrick House, which is a beautiful relationship and apparently they were very good friends, so we want that visual connection there.

On the Toledo side, again, the concrete piers, we're changing out the caps.

Okay, as you see on the drawing on the

bottom, that's, the walls are actually meeting the corner of Toledo and Coral Way. We're actually pushing the walls back for that viewing corridor toward the Merrick House.

On the Toledo side entrance -- the house has two major entrances. We're just removing the casted caps, again putting in casted light lanterns, and then providing gates there. Those openings do not have gates. The car drive area does not have a gate for security reasons.

The only thing that does exist of this garden wall is the southwest corner, is the original wall.

In terms of the Coral Way facades, we're not touching the house, the original house other than providing impact doors and windows. We're looking at this moment at both steel and aluminum products to match the existing in style and in type throughout. Based on budgets, we'll see which direction we go.

On the Toledo side is where this addition will occur. The addition is set back ten feet from the face of the house. This is an area that is going to basically be a loggia, a dining loggia downstairs. The house has no covered terrace, and a guest suite upstairs.

The current house does not have a maid's room, maid's bath area, nowhere in the house, so we are unfortunately taking over half the garage to accommodate a butler's pantry and service quarters in that area by

eliminating one of the garage doors, which we will, in our drawings, we're leaving it where you kind of see where the garage door existed, but we are providing a window lining up with the window above so that we do have natural light, ventilation, and a second means of egress to that room.

When you wrap the corner of the house, you're going towards the rear of the house, we're adding a pool in the form of a fountain. It's a raised pool with borders and stone borders on the top of it to keep it more in line with the house. It's a beautiful garden back there.

In terms of the rear facade which is the east facade, we are widening a window in the kitchen and on the corner of the east elevation and south elevation, which is a breakfast, currently a breakfast room that the windows came down to the floor, we're raising them because they're, we're doing like a breakfast nook in that area.

It's, we're still within the same arched opening. We're just closing off the bottom in that area, and then making the window larger in the kitchen which is on the east elevation, you have the arch on your left window, the one adjacent to it before the two other windows on the first floor, that's the location of the kitchen.

And then again, all doors and windows will be

impact, trying to match the style of the house as it is today.

There was some additions -- not additions, but extensive remodeling done to the house in '89 by the previous owners where doors were changed, windows were changed, kitchens were brought up, porches were enclosed, et cetera. We're staying with the same footprint. We're just trying to enhance the house with a little bit more detail in certain areas.

We will be matching as close as possible the barrel tile, which is a Cuban barrel tile with a stamp from Havana, and, but trying to stay in keeping with the house, I know there's comments -- because I mean, from what we've seen is we have approval with conditions.

There's a few items that are listed that I would like to discuss with you all, why we did it.

So other than that, you know, they have -- we have lovely, lovely clients that are in love with this house. We've never had anyone better in our career.

They're truly a delight, and they're really happy about this opportunity, so that's it.

MR. MENENDEZ: Kara?

MS. KAUTZ: Do you all want to discuss?

MR. MENENDEZ: Anything else?

MS. KAUTZ: No. We can go over the comments

afterwards if you all want to discuss first, however you 1 2 want to do it. 3 MR. MENENDEZ: Let me just go through --MS. TRELLES: I think we've got to go through 4 5 the comments, perhaps, the suggestions. 6 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes. Let me get the public 7 portion out of the way. 8

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 to this case?

Okay. Well, then I'll close the public portion, and then, you know, we can discuss. Any questions from any board members?

MR. FULLERTON: I have a comment, which is only that I think this is probably the, if it's not the top best example of Merrick's vision, it's very close to the top. It's the most beautiful house.

MS. SPAIN: It's a great house.

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

MS. SPAIN: It's a beautiful, beautiful

house --

MS. SPAIN: Have you been in it and in the

24 | garden?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

MR. FULLERTON: -- in every way, in every

1 | way, in every view.

MS. SPAIN: Yes.

MR. FULLERTON: It's a remarkable place, and I'm glad that you guys are doing such a beautiful job with it. The drawings are wonderful.

MS. TRELLES: Thank you.

MR. FULLERTON: And I'm really happy that it's in good hands.

MS. TRELLES: It's a very special place.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes, it is.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: To the Chair, I would love for staff to go one by one over the items.

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, yes.

MS. KAUTZ: Sure. So the first one is that just a general comment that we feel that more needs to be done to differentiate -- sorry, differentiate the new from the old.

So the existing windows, as was mentioned, are steel casements that are the original windows that are on the house, and so the drawings reflect the thinness of a steel casement as drawn, so we -- I know you're working through that, but prior to submitting for a permit, you need to have a choice made --

MS. TRELLES: Right, right.

MS. KAUTZ: -- so that they're drawn

appropriately to the current thicknesses if you use aluminum, because that will change the configuration of the windows --

MS. TRELLES: Okay.

MS. KAUTZ: -- and the muntin pattern and whether the transom is still a viable options. We're having that discussion right now with another property, so that's going to be important.

We would, of course, prefer steel casements, but we can't make that, we can't make that --

MS. TRELLES: Us too.

MS. KAUTZ: -- we can't make that claim. We would also prefer that the southern garage bay remain as is, or at least, if it is being blocked up, that a faux garage door remain in its place.

Just having the in-fill with the small window inset reads like you've blocked up an opening, and having that sort of secondary important facade, it just seems like it's, like you're missing an opportunity to do something else.

So we would recess -- if the board is okay with in-filling it and just having a little window there, then there should at least be a recess and not just a score line, but we would prefer that it either remain open or that a faux garage door to match the other one is in

place there.

2 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Can we pause on that one?

MS. KAUTZ: Sure.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Through the Chair, can we do it one by one, or do you want to do them all and come back?

MS. SPAIN: It's easier for me if you do them one by one because my attention span, you know, bad, so.

MR. MENENDEZ: All right.

MS. KAUTZ: Can you put the Power Point back up, please?

MR. MENENDEZ: Let's do them one by one.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Well, I think it's a question for the applicant: Are they amenable to the proposal?

Because I would agree with staff, and in fact, maybe more so would think of incorporating the window into the design of the garage door. It looks like you're going to get a new garage door, so if there's, instead of just a scoring pattern, if you can actually create or recreate the door and then have an inset window, I think that would, that may be a little bit more interesting. I'm interested to hear your opinion.

MS. TRELLES: We're actually good with that. We don't have a problem with that whatsoever. We're

especially happy to get the room.

MR. MENENDEZ: Have you seen the list of items that --

MS. TRELLES: Yes.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Do you have an issue or questions regarding any of these items?

MS. TRELLES: With the window on the second floor which is on the right side of the chimney on the Toledo Street, it's currently a very small window. Back in the day, that was a bathroom. There was a toilet and a sink.

Today it's being incorporated as part of the master bedroom. We want to actually match the window so it's symmetrical on the facade, therefore bringing more natural light and more view to the master bedroom. I know it's a tricky area because it's the front facade, but just keeping in mind when it was designed back there for its function, it makes sense to have a small window, being the fact that today it would be a master bedroom.

You know, like we think, like we channel, like John and Coulton Skinner in this whole process, "What would they do, how would they see it today," and we see it as something that would be positive. I think they wouldn't have an issue with making the windows symmetrical.

		140
1	MS.	KAUTZ: Can I ask you to pause for a
2	moment?	
3	MR.	MENENDEZ: Okay.
4	MS.	KAUTZ: Can the control room put the
5	Power Point back	up, please?
6	MS.	SPAIN: Is this on the east elevation?
7	MS.	TRELLES: It's on the west elevation.
8	MS.	KAUTZ: West.
9	MR.	MENENDEZ: The west.
10	MS.	TRELLES: On Toledo Street.
11	MR.	MENENDEZ: Yes.
12	MS.	TRELLES: It's left to the main entry on
13	Toledo.	
14	MS.	SPAIN: Okay.
15	MS.	KAUTZ: Waiting for the Power Point,
16	please.	
17	MR.	GARCIA-PONS: Kara, I have a
18	recommendation,	unless you want to wait for the Power
19	Point.	
20	MR.	MENENDEZ: Here we go.
21	MS.	KAUTZ: It's to the left of the arched
22	windows that we -	
23	MS.	SPAIN: That's the front elevation.

MS. TRELLES: That's the side elevation to

The front elevation is on Coral Way. The side

24

25

the house.

- 1 | elevation which is street facing is on Toledo.
- MS. KAUTZ: I mean, it's essentially another
- 3 primary facade because it's --
- 4 MS. SPAIN: Is that her front -- I'm sorry.
- 5 | I knew it when Barbara Reese (phonetic) owned it, so when
- 6 | I say "her."
- 7 MS. TRELLES: Yes.
- 8 MS. SPAIN: That's her front door, that's the
- 9 front door of the house there. Is that right?
- 10 MS. TRELLES: That's the, you can -- actually
- 11 it has two front doors. The original -- the current, the
- 12 | front door on Coral Way was actually the front door to a
- 13 ballroom. The front big room is a ballroom which was used
- 14 | for events back in the day with George Merrick.
- The family entrance is this entrance here
- 16 | which is on Toledo.
- MS. KAUTZ: She used it as her front door.
- MS. SPAIN: That was used for years as front,
- 19 a front door, so in my mind --
- 20 MS. TRELLES: Oh, it has always been, yeah,
- 21 | it's always been a front door, yeah.
- 22 | MS. SPAIN: -- it's the primary facade, yes.
- 23 | So do you have a suggestion?
- MR. GARCIA-PONS: I do.
- 25 MS. SPAIN: Because I agree with staff. Go

1 ahead.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

24

25

MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I agree with staff, but maybe it's a compromise. Right?

Looking at the relationship or the proportion of opening to wall between the chimney and the entrance, there's something really gorgeous about the proportion of that little opening, but it was a bathroom and it's not a master bedroom anymore.

Maybe my recommendation is instead of making it symmetrical to the other window which is not in the same room, that it doesn't need to be that, and that the chimney -- that window can be placed still in line with the window below it, but in a not symmetrical way. It doesn't have to be the five by four --

MS. TRELLES: Right.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: -- that it could be something a little bit more proportional --

MS. TRELLES: Right.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: -- while still be a bedroom

window --

MS. TRELLES: Right.

22 MR. GARCIA-PONS: -- instead of a bathroom

23 window.

MS. TRELLES: It's actually in the same room.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: These two?

	143
1	MS. TRELLES: It's just part of a closet,
2	yeah.
3	MR. GARCIA-PONS: But it's not visible from
4	the bed?
5	MS. TRELLES: No, no, no.
6	MS. SPAIN: One is in the closet and
7	MS. TRELLES: The right and the left of the
8	chimney is the master bedroom.
9	MR. FULLERTON: There you go.
10	MS. SPAIN: One is in the closet, I believe.
11	MR. FULLERTON: The one on the left is in the
12	closet.
13	MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I'm sorry, the window,
14	one is in the closet?
15	MS. TRELLES: Right.
16	MR. GARCIA-PONS: One is in the bedroom.
17	MS. TRELLES: Right.
18	MR. GARCIA-PONS: So you don't see it from
19	the same room, so that they're not internally to the
20	space
21	MS. TRELLES: No, no.
22	MR. GARCIA-PONS: you don't perceive both
23	windows.
24	MS. TRELLES: Correct, correct.
25	MR. GARCIA-PONS: So they're not necessarily

1 | need to be twins.

2 MS. TRELLES: Right.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: So we should think of it from the front.

MS. TRELLES: Right.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: And I think, let's think about the relationship between the top window and the below window instead of the side to side, would be my recommendation.

MS. TRELLES: Right.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: It doesn't necessarily -- not the bathroom window, but something other than the twin.

MS. TRELLES: Right. There, just to -- are you doing it again? I think there's such strength in the facade. I know it's, I know the small window -- I love, I mean, I love blank walls, you know, in architecture.

I think in this case just making it a little bigger or a little subtle, I think at that point we just leave it alone.

Our intent here was really to try to get the symmetry on the facade, which I think originally that was part of the master. When it was designed in 1926, I think these two windows would have been symmetrical. He wouldn't have had the bathroom window dimension.

	145
1	MR. MENENDEZ: You're in agreement with all
2	the other items outlined, correct?
3	MS. TRELLES: Yes. I don't think we had any
4	issues with anything else.
5	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, and you could work with
6	staff to come up with a solution on that window?
7	MS. TRELLES: 100 percent.
8	MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'm actually in
9	disagreement with one of the staff recommendations, Number
10	Eight, which is the new French doors into the ballroom.
11	Is the ballroom the gallery, Kara?
12	MS. TRELLES: It's the
13	MS. KAUTZ: No. The ballroom, the
14	ballroom
15	MS. TRELLES: front living room off
16	MS. KAUZ: off Coral Way.
17	MS. TRELLES: off Coral Way.
18	MS. SPAIN: It's just the Coral Way outlet.
19	THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I need one at
20	a time.
21	MR. MENENDEZ: All right.
22	MS. KAUTZ: It's the big room
23	MS. TRELLES: Big room
24	MS. KAUTZ: to the left of the picture.
25	MS. TRELLES: Yeah.

MS. KAUTZ: And so that comment has to do 1 2 with the windows in all of the remaining, the facades of 3 the ballroom are very, you know, very tight muntin pattern, and then when you're changing the two windows on 4 the east elevation into French doors, it then becomes --5 6 you know, you have two horizontal muntins, so it becomes a 7 very wide expanse of glass. 8 And I feel like if you're in that room, it's 9 going to look very strange that you have, you know know, a 10 very compact, tight Colonial pattern, and then --11 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Hey, Kara, I just, I don't 12 see "ballroom" in the plans. 13 MR. FULLERTON: Ballroom is the (inaudible) 14 of that room right there. MS. TRELLES: We had to take the word off due 15 16 to --17 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Living room. It's the living room. 18 MS. TRELLES: It was 19 originally the ballroom. 20 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Right. MS. TRELLES: But we had to take it off --21 22 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Right. 23 MS. TRELLES: -- because of zoning. 24 MS. KAUTZ: So Cesar, you see the right, the 25 two doors on the right that are being made from the

window? They're just showing a six, you know, a two -- what is it, two over, two by three?

MS. TRELLES: It's the two to either side of the chimney that has --

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Again, I do understand. I just didn't see the word "ballroom.".

MS. KAUTZ: Okay, got it.

MS. TRELLES: Yes, yes.

MS. KAUTZ: So you should know where I'm talking about.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: But I still, I don't, I don't, I don't, I don't necessarily think you need that, so I think the proportions of those doors are attractive and the muntins are attractive on those doors, so I don't -- unless you want to change them? I don't care.

MS. TRELLES: I mean, just following what Kara is saying, in terms of the windows, the windows, the division of the muntins are smaller to glass, the steel-to-glass.

Here was more or less mainly picking up -because I guess they turned that side into a garden. It's
actually a beautiful space right now that's unused. It
was kind of like when we were looking at the facade, even
though you're not going to see it, standing in either
space is just trying to match, because these will be done

in steel. All the exterior doors will be impact steel.

What we're working right now is on the budget for the windows so it's trying to match the arched doors that are going in the loggia which will be full arch doors.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: What you're saying, again, I hear what you're saying, but that's now what this is saying, so if you want to keep what you have, you do not want to do Number Eight, and I'm agreeing with you.

So you could decide what you want. I mean, right now it's, we can run the slate, but obviously -
MS. TRELLES: No, no, no, no. I'm good.

Agreed. I just want to make sure Kara is okay with it too.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Kara listens to the board.

MS. KAUTZ: It's not up to me at this point.

MS. TRELLES: No, no, no, I know.

MR. MENENDEZ: I don't have any issues with this list.

MS. TRELLES: Let me ask you one question. You just brought it up to me now.

If we were to switch the window size on that facade looking at both windows off that master bedroom where the small window goes to the closet and the bigger windows goes to the bedroom, that's altering the facade in

- 1 | two positions. That's too much.
- 2 MR. GARCIA-PONS: No.
- MS. SPAIN: Yes, that went through my mind,
- 4 but no.
- MR. MENENDEZ: No. That's not --
- 6 MR. GARCIA-PONS: It's the relationship of
- 7 | the front to the chimney?
- 8 MS. TRELLES: Right, right, right,
- 9 right.
- MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have any other comments
- 11 from anybody? Mr. Ehrenhaft.
- 12 MR. EHRENHAFT: I have a question just for
- 13 | clarification. I'm looking at the east elevation which
- 14 | you now have (inaudible).
- MS. LYONS: Speak into the mic, Bruce.
- MR. FULLERTON: Forgive me. I'm sorry. So
- 17 | I just had a question for some clarification.
- 18 I'm looking at the east elevation which is
- 19 your A 202, and existing in what was a gallery or a loggia
- 20 down below, what I assume was just a large open room, you
- 21 have existing, I guess you would call them palladian
- 22 | windows --
- MS. TRELLES: Yes.
- 24 MR. EHRENHAFT: -- at the bottom, and you are
- 25 proposing now, and you just were discussing to put in

arched-shaped metal doors, steel doors, so you have four 1 2 of them that are going to go in, but when I'm looking at 3 the facade, obviously where those doors are sitting, the line of the facade is set back --4 5 MS. TRELLES: Yes. 6 MR. EHRENHAFT: -- I don't know how many 7 feet, but then you have switched what was a small pool in 8 the garden there, and you're turning that into a dining 9 space --10 MS. TRELLES: Yes. 11 MR. EHRENHAFT: -- as you described, a patio 12 for dining.

MS. TRELLES: It's actually not a pool. It's actually a fountain. It's very, it's very shallow. Yes, we're turning that into a dining area.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. EHRENHAFT: But where I read, on G002, this schematic and the existing showed that outside of that loggia, there was a fountain or described as a pool, but then that is becoming a dining space.

MS. TRELLES: An outdoor dining, yes.

MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay, and then to the, I believe it's to the south of it --

MS. TRELLES: East, east southeast, yes.

MR. EHRENHAFT: -- then you're putting -- east southeast. Then below that you are putting in oval

1 shaped --

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. TRELLES: A long -- exactly.

MR. EHRENHAFT: -- a long pool.

MS. TRELLES: Yes.

5 MR. EHRENHAFT: But the doors, I don't,

forgive me, but I don't understand putting those metallic doors in there unless, unless they are hurricane protection or something, but --

MS. TRELLES: Well, currently --

MR. EHRENHAFT: -- why would you close in with steel doors an open space like that? I'm just trying to understand that.

MS. TRELLES: Oh, no. When the house was done in 1926, that was an open loggia. At some point -- which we believe was '89. Prior to '89, it had sliding glass doors there, which the owner, the previous owner actually, when they were pulling the permit for the house in '89 --

MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

MS. TRELLES: -- they switched it to the palladian-style door.

MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. Those were not original to the house?

MS. TRELLES: Those are not original to the

25 house.

1 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay, okay.

MS. TRELLES: And it's just basically, it's an eight-foot door or nine-foot door with a semi-circle above.

MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

MS. TRELLES: What we're going after is a full, arched, tall door that opens, in steel, out, these will be impact, that opens out to a dining area, because the original fountain to the house is actually, when you're looking at the fountain on the plan, it's on the east wall. When you walk out --

MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

MS. TRELLES: -- there's a fountain with a lion head with a spigot. That's one of the fountains that we actually want to restore the original fountain.

Remove the middle, which is not original to the house, remove the little, so-called classic little pool, pond, so that becomes an outdoor dining.

MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

MS. TRELLES: The owners, they're young.

They highly entertain. They're travelers, so this is a big deal for them, to have outdoor dining, and they're amongst a beautiful garden.

MR. EHRENHAFT: So these doors will remain functionally closed except when you're using that dining

153 1 space. Is that correct? 2 And they'll be opaque? There will be no 3 They'll read almost like garage doors, but --4 No, no, no, no. It's full MS. TRELLES: The dining area is exterior to the house. 5 qlass doors. 6 This is like a courtyard. You're in the courtyard. 7 MR. EHRENHAFT: The arches, the four arches, 8 the four arched openings that are doors --9 MS. TRELLES: Right. MR. EHRENHAFT: -- looked to me like -- I 10 11 didn't read that as being glass, I'm sorry, the way the 12 drawing is. 13 MS. TRELLES: No, no, no. That's glass. 14 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay, okay. MS. TRELLES: You have like --15 MR. EHRENHAFT: End of discussion. 16 17 understand. Okay. 18 The living room of the house --MS. TRELLES: 19 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. 20 MS. TRELLES: -- which is the ballroom --21 MR. EHRENHAFT: Got it. 22 MS. TRELLES: -- pushes out. The courtyard 23 pushes in where the arches are. 24 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

25

MS. TRELLES: And then the next wing --

	154
1	MR. MENENDEZ: Got it.
2	MS. TRELLES: pushes out halfway.
3	MR. EHRENHAFT: Thank you for clarifying. It
4	was just the way the drawing was
5	MS. TRELLES: It's just the shading of the
6	drawing.
7	MR. EHRENHAFT: Got it. Thank you, thank
8	you, thank you, thank you. All right.
9	MR. MENENDEZ: Would somebody like to make a
10	motion?
11	MS. KAUT: Can I revisit two things?
12	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
13	MS. KAUTZ: One is the garage bay, how you
14	all want them to interpret that.
15	And the second is the perimeter wall and the
16	columns and the gates and their style relating back to the
17	house.
18	Give me the Power Point. So just to know how
19	you all fall on the blocking up with the garage door and
20	what you want to see there, and then also with the
21	lanterns and the gates that are proposed for the exterior.
22	We just didn't think that the lanterns were
23	really appropriate for the style of the house.
24	MR. GARCIA-PONS: So the staff's
25	recommendation is to restudy the perimeter wall, columns

1 and gates?

2 (Reporter clarification.)

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Staff's recommendation or Condition Number Nine is to the restudy perimeter wall, columns and gates?

MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: I was assuming that would be part of the motion.

MS. KAUTZ: That's fine. Do you all want to see those again when they come? Do you want them to come back to you?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Whoever makes the motion --

MS. KAUTZ: Okay.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: -- could probably bring it back to staff.

MS. KAUTZ: Okay.

MR. FULLERTON: And I don't understand why the oolitic street marker is not permitted.

MS. KAUTZ: Because those are historic street markers and we can't make them out of coral rock.

MS. TRELLES: No. Actually they're not coral rock. It's the existing corner address, except currently right now it's on the parkway, and the parkway has very old, large trees, and it's all crooked, so we wanted to take it off the parkway and actually put it on our little

1 plaza.

2 MS. KAUTZ: Okay. They're not oolite,

3 though.

oolite.

4 MS. TRELLES: They're what?

5 MS. KAUTZ: They're not oolite. They're 6 called out in your plan as an oolitic. They're not 7

8 MS. TRELLES: No, no, no. Ours is the existing one. We're not making it new out of oolite. 9

10 MS. KAUTZ: But your note says oolitic 11 limestone marker.

12 MS. TRELLES: On the floor, it's on the floor, it's on the floor, it's on the benches, but it's 13 14 not the marker. That's a City of Coral Gables street 15 marker.

MS. KAUTZ: All right.

MR. FULLERTON: It's just made out of poured concrete, our typical corner --

MS. TRELLES: Yeah.

MR. FULLERTON: Yeah, it's just poured

21 concrete.

16

17

18

19

20

22 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yeah, oolitic stone

23 It's not the marker. planters.

2.4 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Oh, yeah, it's not the

25 marker. MR. GARCIA-PONS: There's a note that I can read now.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes, the tiny text.

MS. KAUTZ: Yes, that's part of the problem, couldn't read it.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Too small.

MS. TRELLES: I mean, in terms of the, I mean the columns where these, where the lanterns are going, those columns are, that's the new thing. These are casted lanterns. If you need us to study again, we're trying to stay within the Spanish feel.

MR. MENENDEZ: I think the lanterns need to be looked at a little bit more, and you can work with staff on that.

MS. TRELLES: Okay. Is there any comment like what you don't like so we don't do the same thing again?

MS. KAUTZ: For them?

MR. FULLERTON: Is that a water fountain, or

a planter?

MS. TRELLES: Sorry?

MR. FULLERTON: Is that a water fountain, or

23 | a planter?

MS. TRELLES: A planter. There's no water

25 there.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I think they look too, I don't know, too square.

MS. TRELLES: We could do something a little bit more subtle in that area there.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I mean, is there anything on the existing house that you can just try and complement?

MR. DURANA: What about a surface-mounted lamp, like bring the column up and then just buy a surface-mounted lamp, like a gas lamp?

MS. TRELLES: I mean, we can eliminate the actual cast lantern and just go to a purchased-type lamp.

We just like to throw in a little original custom on these things.

MR. TRELLES: Can I mention something? Hi. I'm Jorge, Mari's partner, an architect, and we've been designing cast concrete detail, detailed vents and lamps, and we have a number of them already accomplished.

They're very similar actually to the vents that we see here at the bottom of the base and that kind of cast concrete work that we see in Coral Gables, and it's actually called cast stone because it looks like stone at the end.

So we were thinking of something very special there that we could design, custom, and it could be a lantern for a little corner plaza, and the little corner

plaza is obviously relating with the Merrick House, giving the position and kind of the memory of the two houses together and the importance in their history, so those are very special and custom pieces.

We like working with staff and we will continue to work with staff on every one of these items, and we'll be happy to. I think we'll come to all of those conclusions, but it's a difficult question because it starts with do something like the house, you know, be inspired by the house, but at the same time we want to be distinctive and original.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes, sure.

MR. TRELLES: That's all I would say about those.

MR. FULLERTON: I think we should trust the architects to do something that's commensurate with the the rest of the house. If they do this professionally already, I think we should trust their vision.

MR. MENENDEZ: And again, they can work with staff.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

MS. KAUTZ: We can always bring it back to you if we're not comfortable with either.

MR. MENENDEZ: Exactly, exactly.

MS. SPAIN: If you're not comfortable you can

1 bring it back. Otherwise you can work with Kara.

2 MS. SPAIN: I'd like to make a motion,

please. Sadly, we're on the last one.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MENENDEZ: Please, please.

MS. SPAIN: I'd like to make a motion to approve with conditions the design proposal for the addition to 840 Coral Way, and I would work with staff on those issues.

I don't know what you want to do with the garage door, maybe work with staff on that also and see what she's comfortable with.

My motion includes not re-sizing the window on the second floor.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: So as is?

MS. SPAIN: As is.

MR. MENENDEZ: As is.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I'd like to make two friendly amendments, please.

MS. SPAIN: Here you go.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: One is to, the garage door, to work with staff to create a second door similar to the other door with an inset window. Is that clear enough, Kara?

MS. KAUTZ: So they can still block it up, but they will have like a faux with a window in it. Do

161 you want to see the same window on the other side so 1 2 they're matching, or no? Okay. 3 MR. GARCIA-PONS: And that's one friendly 4 amendment. 5 MS. SPAIN: That's for the garage, right? 6 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes, yes, ma'am. 7 MS. SPAIN: Okay. 8 MR. GARCIA-PONS: And then the second 9 friendly amendment is to not require Condition Number 10 Eight regarding the French doors. MS. SPAIN: Oh, I'm okay with that. 11 I would 12 accept that. Oh, see, that's pretty good. 13 MR. MENENDEZ: So we have --14 MR. FULLERTON: What about the oolitic limestone --15 16 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Doesn't matter. 17 MR. FULLERTON: -- street marker? 18 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Doesn't exist. 19 Right, right. MS. BACHE-WIIG: 20 MR. FULLERTON: But do you want the street 21 marker there, the concrete one? 22 MS. TRELLES: Yes.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: It's on their plan.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay.

23

2.4

25

162 MR. FULLERTON: Yeah. No, I know. I just, I 1 2 said --3 MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have a motion? MR. TRELLES: We clarified Point Number Five, 4 5 and the second floor window on the west elevation is not 6 to be re-sized? 7 MS. SPAIN: Yes. That's what my motion 8 included. 9 MS. TRELLES: Yes. 10 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes. It's not to be resized. 11 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Unless somebody else has a 12 friendly amendment. 13 MR. TRELLES: Interior design, you understand the master bedroom will have an old little bathroom 14 15 window? MS. SPAIN: I understand that. 16 17 MR. MENENDEZ: Understood. 18 MS. SPAIN: I'm sorry. I just need to say 19 that when I went back to school and studied architecture 20 as an old person, George Trelles was one of my first 21 professors. 22 MR. TRELLES: Don't count those years. 23 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So we have a motion by 24 Miss Spain, a second by you? 25 MR. GARCIA-PONS: No. I just said friendly

	163
1	amendment.
2	MR. MENENDEZ: Oh, we have a friendly
3	amendment. Do I have a second from someone?
4	MS. BACHE-WIIG: I would like to second the
5	motion.
6	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Bache-Wiig seconds
7	the motion. Call roll.
8	MS. LYONS: Mr. Garcia-Pons?
9	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
10	MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
11	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
12	MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
13	MS. SPAIN: Yes.
14	MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
15	MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
16	MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
17	MR. DURANA: Yes.
18	MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
19	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
20	MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
21	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
22	MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
23	MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.
24	MS. TRELLES: Thank you very much.

MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

25

1 MS. SPAIN: Sorry about the window.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Case File COA (SP) 3 2021-018, an application for the issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for the property at 1203 4 Asturia Avenue, a local historic landmark legally 5 described as Lot 17 and 18, Block Five, Coral Gables 6 7 Section E, according to the plat thereof as recorded in 8 Plat Book Eight at Page 13 of the public records of 9 Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The application requests design approval for a covered terrace addition and alterations to the residence and site work.

A variance has also been requested from Article Two, Section 2-101 (D) (4c) of the Coral Gables zoning code for the minimum rear set-back.

MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. This is a location map, corner of Asturia and Columbus.

You guys have seen this property before. The same architect did some work on it back in 2012.

This is a photo of the house from the 1940s. It was Permit Number 506 in the city in 1923. There are no original plans available so we don't know who the architect was. It was designated and had an accelerated COA in 2012.

The application requests design approval to

renovate a trellised porch on the east side of the residence that was added previously in 2012, and to construct a new one-story covered terrace of approximately 315 square feet to the rear of the existing residence, and also adding a swimming pool and pool deck.

There is a variance that has been requested regarding the rear set-back. We can discuss that after, and we had just a very few minor comments at the end, so I'll turn it over to the architect.

MR. GIBB: Good evening. This has been a long night. I'll try and keep this brief.

My name is Callum Gibb. I'm the architect for the property. It's owned by Mr. Goldstein who has lived there since 2012 when we did the last renovation. Go through the plans.

So these are photographs of the existing house. In our original renovation, the front basically stayed as is. What we did back in 2012, you can see in the photograph on the lower left, we added a second floor to the rear of the house.

Originally it had a two-story front and a one-story rear. We added that so that everything you see there, that second floor there is new.

At the same time, we did a sort of a trellis off the kitchen, creating a benched and porched sort of

kitchen/dining area. Unfortunately, it has become quite problematic because it has a lot of heavy, big leaves around the property and it tends to collect the leaves and gets a bit moldy, so part of our renovation is to modify that previous addition.

And then you can see in that same photograph, you can see the rear yard extending, you know, sort of across fairly sort of narrow and long, and the owner really wants to add a swimming pool in that area. That's the main genesis behind the addition, and at the same time add an outdoor covered area.

Let me -- so looking at the site plan, the Shaded area is the existing house. You can see the location of the pool in the rear, and then to the left of that is a covered terrace. It is shown as an extension of the existing residence in size and proportion, and sort of just extends back to the rear property line.

The dashed lines on the right of the house is the area for the new porch off the kitchen. Some diagrams, some floor plan really just showing the existing floor plan plus the new covered area, ground floor plan obviously shows the dimensions of the rear porch and the swimming pool. Front elevation which doesn't change, really.

So this elevation, which is I believe it's

Columbus, shows the existing trellis off the kitchen, and then below you can see the same French doors and above that we're doing sort of a shed roof covered area.

We did that, chose that roof so it avoided any conflict with the original little bay that pushes out there, and then to the right of that on the proposed elevation is the scale of the covered terrace with the three arched openings facing the pool.

This is the rear property line -- rear, sorry, rear elevation where you can see the covered terrace to the left and the new covered terrace facing the pool.

There is an opening shown on this elevation to bring in some breezes. The idea was that we would have a sort of an opening at the top which is an ellipse which matches the arches, and then underneath that sort of a louvered gate or shutters that sort of can be opened and and closed if you need more ventilation.

This is the west elevation, the existing above. It has always had, you know, a blank wall, so with this design we're sort of extending that same portion of the house and we're adding a nominal elliptical opening, again just basically to encourage some cross-ventilation, not too much because the pool equipment, we have a fairly large-size set-back there so we were able to locate all

our equipment along there, so there is the little existing air-conditioning units are there, and so we didn't want to have too many openings.

That would be it, I guess. As far as the variance goes, sorry, I was just going to mention that, looking at the site plan, the house is set back from Asturia by 41 feet, is our front set-back, which I think as Kara mentioned, it's a 1923 house, so it kind of predates almost probably the platting.

So that, although it gives a great front sort of street effect, it does limit the rear yard, so that's why we're taking or requesting that that rear set-back be five feet, you know, the original previous, shall I say, Coral Gables rear set-back line, and that's the main reason for that request.

MS. KAUTZ: So they're asking for a reduction from ten to five feet.

The zoning code does allow for a five-foot set-back if it's one story in height, if the board of architects recommends in favor it, if it's historically contextually appropriate, and this property is, as mentioned in the staff report, set back about 41 and a half feet from the front property line, which 25 is what's standard.

If you look at an aerial of that streetscape,

- you can see that it's pushed way farther back than most of the houses that front Asturia, so for that reason, it's a one-story addition, we were supporting the variance request, for that reason.
- 5 MR. FULLERTON: You sure you don't want to 6 move the house a little bit?
- 7 MR. GIBB: That's an interesting idea. I'll 8 look into that.
- 9 MR. FULLERTON: I'm sorry, I didn't mean --
- MR. GIBB: That's okay.
- MR. MENENDEZ: Kara, you want to go over the four items, conditions that you've got?
- MS. KAUTZ: Yes. The roof tile is to be
 two-piece barrel tile. An elevation of the proposed gate,
 which I'm assuming is just going to be a picket fence.
- 16 | The new --

25

- MR. GIBB: To the left there, just, yeah,

 for the pool, to complete the pool enclosure.
- MS. KAUTZ: I'm just guessing it's going to be a picket --
- MR. GIBB: Well, we'll submit something to you.
- MS. KAUTZ: Okay, that's fine. I just see it on the permit drawings.
 - There is, so that one-story portion that

they're adding onto, the terrace, was the original garage of the house before an addition was done and the garage was moved forward, so it is an original structure to the house, so we just ask that a score line be introduced to the stucco to demarcate that edge.

And then the last one was that there is an open terrace -- if you can go back to the photographs -- at the rear corner that you see.

MR. GIBB: Bottom left, yeah.

MS. KAUTZ: Bottom left, that picture kind of to the right of the trellis feature, it's an original feature on the house, and so we just thought that the low wall shouldn't be opened up.

MR. GIBB: Sorry. I should have mentioned that. Yes, so if we go to the site plan -- or I think it's on the floor plan. Let me see. Sorry.

So in the floor plan, it's the area to the left of the breakfast nook -- I'm sorry, to the right of the breakfast nook, and currently it's -- I think it used to be, well, it was sort of, it's called the monkey cage.

It was a little sort of enclosed area, a screened-in porch, so it had a low wall, maybe two feet, and it had a single screened-in, screen door that you entered, sort of, the wall sort of created that sort of C shape, and the owner would like to open that up a little

bit more to allow for a seating area overlooking the pool.

Now, there are some quite nice details looking at the photographs, sort of a scroll or a bracket that comes down from the wall. You can see it just on the corner of the house closest to us. It sort of has like a scoop, and that is repeated against the little breakfast nook addition.

So we wanted to keep that but take it down, only the wall that sort of faced the pool to sort of just open it up, so it's a remnant of a previous thing that no longer is there, and it is in the back, and we thought that --

MS. BACHE-WIIG: What part of that is historic or original, just to the wall?

MR. GIBB: As far as what's historic in this photograph, the ground floor of that house is historic, so that breakfast nook that pushes out into the rear, that's original, the window next to that, and then the only thing we added to this -- well, "only thing" -- is the whole second floor and the trellis.

That whole area that you see in the foreground of that photograph, if you are looking at the top right, that trellis area and that wall is all new. It's all 2012.

MS. BACHE WIIG: Okay. So the low wall is

1 | new and the trellis is new.

MR. GIBB: The new -- the low wall where the trellis is, is new. The wall that Kara is asking to remain and we're asking to remove is actually the, underneath the window of the kitchen in the rear of the property. I'll go --

MR. EHRENHAFT: The ones that has the metal beds in it?

MR. GIBB: Yes.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: That's original, Kara.

MR. GIBB: Yes, that little low wall is original, and you can imagine now, that used to have a little lean-to screen, it was a screened roof. It was never tiled or anything. It was like a little enclosure, like a glass, you know --

MR. EHRENHAFT: You're asking to open that wall so that --

MR. GIBB: We want to open that area up to make it a little easier to get from the pool and to put some seating in that area.

MS. KAUTZ: The breakfast nook originally was an entry. There were steps leading into that.

MR. GIBB: Oh, that's right. I think that maybe the window you see on the side of the breakfast nook --

MS. KAUTZ: the door, so you went in the --1 2 MR. GIBB: -- probably was a door, so you 3 sort of went into the little screen enclosure and then walked into the house, essentially. 4 So Alicia, on Page 2.0 on 5 MR. GARCIA-PONS: 6 the top right-hand corner. 7 MR. GIBB: Yes, correct, so what we're 8 showing as an an L-shaped bench right now is more of C 9 shape. 10 MR. EHRENHAFT: And if (inaudible). 11 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry I can't hear 12 you. 13 MR. EHRENHAFT: I'm sorry, the mic wasn't on. 14 So with respect to that space, the wall where you now have 15 the metal bench --16 MR. GIBB: Yes. 17 MR. EHRENHAFT: -- you made a comment earlier about being able to see the pool from that space if 18 19 somebody was sitting there. Is that correct? Was that 20 part --21 MR. GIBB: No. You can definitely see. It's 22 not a visual obstruction. 23 It's just more that right now you have to 24 enter through a three-foot-wide little opening in that low

wall, and then, you know, the furniture is within that,

25

and the idea was to widen that opening so that it was just an easier in and out and felt more part of the pool deck.

All right. So this plan, 2.0, shows the current size of it, which shows sort of the walls that come around and enclosed it, and 2.1 shows the -- and then, sorry, 2.1, the right side L is removed and just leaving the bracket.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: What was that before, Kara? You said that space was something before, a screen porch?

MS. KAUTZ: When it was, I think this was before the current owner purchased it, it was like, it was screened in, and then that pop-out, that breakfast nook now was the entry to the kitchen, like the service entry.

So it was, it had like lattice work on it, and I think it had a covered like flat roof.

MR. GIBB: But it wasn't, yeah, it wasn't tile. It was sort of --

MS. KAUTZ: Yeah.

MR. GIBB: -- it was definitely a sort of a screened-in lean-to roof.

MR. EHRENHAFT: Kara, was there a doorway there when the house was constructed?

MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

MR. EHRENHAFT: So they blocked it up and simply put a window in?

MS. KAUTZ: In what's now the breakfast nook, yes, there was a door there.

MR. GIBB: That was I guess the equivalent of a mud room or entrance. Just to raise it, there was, one of the conditions was to delineate between the new covered porch addition and the existing wing. Staff is recommending a score line.

It actually sparked a conversation with our client, and we're thinking that to get a better or clearer separation, we could widen the rear porch. We have a little extra room to the side set-back, making it slightly wider, slightly taller, which would change it a little bit, but that might be something we could work through with staff.

MS. KAUTZ: You're tying it into the existing roof line right now, correct?

MR. GIBB: Right now it's a gable end, so right now the idea was to extend that same profile straight across.

The thought was if we wanted to make a clearer distinction, we could widen it, which would then raise the ridge a little bit above the existing tile line, but that might -- it's just a way -- we hadn't really thought of that before, but when we were discussing what the best way to sort of mark the difference between

the existing and the proposed, that was, just came up. 1 2 MS. KAUTZ: And get a bigger turn. 3 MR. GIBB: It was, like I say, it was not something we thought of before. My default is to continue 4 5 what was there as opposed to change it. 6 MR. MENENDEZ: Any other questions, comments? 7 Anybody like to make a motion? 8 MR. FULLERTON: Anybody for or against, 9 anybody else for or against? 10 MR. MENENDEZ: Oh, I forgot. Anybody in the 11 audience would like to speak in favor of this case? 12 Anybody in the audience who would like to speak in 13 opposition of this case? No, Mr. Fullerton, no one is 14 there. Then I'll make a motion to 15 MR. FULLERTON: 16 approve. 17 MS. KAUTZ: Wait, wait. MS. SPAIN: With the conditions. 18 19 MS. KAUTZ: So you need --20 With conditions. MR. MENENDEZ: 21 Okay, so with conditions, and --MS. KAUTZ: 22 MR. MENENDEZ: Are you okay with those, Callum? 23 24 MS. KAUTZ: And we need two separate motions. Well, I prefer if we could modify 25 MR. GIBB:

1 | the wall, the low wall first.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: So are you doing the first one, approve with conditions of the changes, not the variance, right?

MS. SPAIN: Right.

MR. MENENDEZ: Variance is separate.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes, variance is separate.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'm happy to second the motion, but I do have a friendly amendment.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay.

MS. SPAIN: He's so good at those.

MR. FULLERTON: Your amendments are very unfriendly sometimes.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Or open it for discussion, I'll second for discussion, through the Chair. I think that little low wall corner is -- I don't know if it still functions in any way, shape or form like it used to function.

There's no door. There's no access to the mud room. It's a breakfast nook. I don't see the benefit or value of maintaining it the way it is. I'm not sure that your solution is good, but I don't know what else to do.

So I'm actually, as far as discussion, hopefully my board members can come up with something

better, but I can't, so I don't think it's -- I think it's too much to ask of the architect to save it because I think it's too different than its original intention unless something else can be done. I don't know if anybody has any discussion around that.

MR. EHRENHAFT: Mr. Garcia-Pons, I do have a suggestion with respect to that.

My concern about taking the wall out is that there are, on both sides of that patio, architectural details that flow downward beautifully to the wall, and if Mr. Gibb and his client need to open that patio space up a bit, I would suggest considering, if you're going to cut parts of the wall out that actually are facing the pool, perhaps leaving a memory of it, a slight L at the end where the wing wall comes down and comes forward, and open the access that way. I don't know how many feet wide that is.

MR. GIBB: You're suggesting to open the access as it directly faces the pool as opposed to turning any corners, so rather than --

MR. EHRENHAFT: I would like to see the wing walls remain. That's my personal --

MR. GIBB: It's only -- any decorative elements as wing walls would remain. The question is I guess how close you would then cut the low wall up against

that, and we would do it in a manner that -- the goal
would be to do it in a manner that it leaves a little bit
of the wall, the end of the detail, so it looks like it's
an abutment, or you know, sort of a --

MR. EHRENHAFT: So you would take, you would actually take the L out. I was suggesting perhaps just the wall that is parallel to --

MR. GIBB: No. That's what I was saying, you take the narrow opening and made it wider, but not take it round the corner.

MR. EHRENHAFT: Again if where the wing wall comes down and turns the corner, even if you left just that much on it --

MR. GIBB: I understand.

MR. EHRENHAFT: -- you would still open it up perhaps.

MR. GIBB: Right.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: This is existing.

MR. GIBB: Exactly.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: And this is what he's

proposing. You see here?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GIBB: No, yes, that --

MR. FULLERTON: And then if you need --

MR. GIBB: -- would basically be --

MR. EHRENHAFT: -- to bring the --

180 1 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I need one at 2 a time, please. 3 MR. GIBB: Sorry. I mean, that's a compromise that you're -- you know, that you can discuss. 4 5 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So is that a friendly 6 amendment, Mr. Ehrenhaft? Bruce, is that a friendly 7 amendment that you're --8 MR. EHRENHAFT: That's a friendly amendment, 9 please. 10 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Okay, so if somebody needs 11 to describe that. 12 MR. GIBB: Could we put I would work with staff --13 14 MR. EHRENHAFT: Exactly, to work with staff. MR. GIBB: -- on the amount of wall removed 15 16 to --17 MS. SPAIN: That's what I think, that they should be able to. 18 MR. GIBB: -- my maximum, staff's minimum? 19 20 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I will accept that as a 21 friendly amendment. 22 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. 23 MR. FULLERTON: That it's worked out with staff. 24 25 MS. KAUTZ: So we're doing Conditions One,

	181
1	Two and Four, and working out the surrounding low wall of
2	the open terrace to be worked out with staff to some
3	solution.
4	MS. SPAIN: Yes.
5	MR. MENENDEZ: Correct.
6	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes, please.
7	MR. FULLERTON: Okay. I moved.
8	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Second.
9	MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Garcia-Pons seconded.
10	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Mr. Fullerton.
11	MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Fullerton made the motion
12	MR. FULLERTON: With help.
13	MR. MENENDEZ: It was so long ago, I forgot.
14	MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
15	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
16	MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
17	MR. DURANA: Yes.
18	MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
19	MS. SPAIN: Yes.
20	MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
21	MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
22	MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
23	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
24	MS. LYONS: Mr. Garcia-Pons?
25	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.

		182
1	MS. L	LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
2	MR. M	MENENDEZ: Yes. Thank you.
3	MS. L	LYONS: Motion passes.
4	MS. K	KAUTZ: No, no, second motion.
5	MR. M	MENENDEZ: Oh, that's right.
6	MR. G	GARCIA-PONS: Yes, the variance.
7	MR. M	MENENDEZ: The second one is for the
8	variance.	
9	MS. K	KAUTZ: To approve the variance, the
10	five-foot set-back	ς.
11	MS. S	SPAIN: I'll make that motion. I'd like
12	to make a motion t	to approve the variance.
13	MS. K	KAUTZ: As noted.
14	MS. S	SPAIN: As no.
15	MS. K	KAUTZ: As stated.
16	MS. S	SPAIN: I mean, I can read it, but.
17	MS. K	KAUTZ: That's okay.
18	MR. D	DURANA: I'll second.
19	MR. G	GARCIA-PONS: I'll second it.
20	MS. L	LYONS: Who seconded it?
21	THE C	COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, who seconded?
22	MS. L	LYONS: Miss Spain?
23	MS. S	SPAIN: Yes.
24	MS. L	LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
25	MR. F	FULLERTON: Yes.

	183
1	MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
2	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
3	MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
4	MR. DURANA: Yes.
5	MS. LYONS: Mr. Garcia-Pons?
6	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
7	MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
8	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
9	MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
10	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
11	MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
12	MR. MENENDEZ: I think we're done.
13	MR. GIBB: Thank you very much.
14	MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you. All right, the
15	last case file of the night, Case File COA (SP) 2017-025,
16	Revised, an application for the issuance of a special
17	certificate of appropriateness for the property at 4200
18	Granada Boulevard, a local historic landmark legally
19	described as Lots Ten and Eleven, Block 99, Coral Gables
20	Country Club Section Part Five, according to the plat
21	thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 23 at Page 55 of the
22	public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.
23	The application requesting design approval
24	for an addition and alteration to the residence was
25	granted approval with conditions on February 15th, 2018.

This application requests after-the-fact design approval for a revision to the approved certificate of appropriateness due to a deviation from the previously approved plans. Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: The residence is located on the two interior lots between Bird Road and Blue Road. The primary elevation faces west onto the Coral Gables Waterway. The east elevation faces Granada Boulevard.

The applicant is requesting after-the-fact design approval for deviations from the previously approved plans for a substantial increase in the height of the elevator and an amendment design for the stairs on the south elevation of the addition.

The applicant is also requesting approval for a change of design from the previously approved railings and for a natural limestone finish to the front of the addition at the first floor level.

The residence at 4200 Granada was designed by Phineas Paist and is one of two residences identified as part of the planned Venetian-country-style village to be constructed.

The property was designated as a local historic landmark in 1994. In 2018, the COA was approved by the board. The application requested approval for an addition and alterations to the property. This was a

two-story addition to the east of the existing residence.

The existing residence had a one-story wing protruding from the northeast corner. The approved addition expanded that wing to the south by approximately six feet and placed the second story atop the expended footprint. An elevator was also included in the project.

At the time the elevator was depicted as having no impact on the elevation and no shaft was intended to rise above the roof line.

The applicant is basically requesting after-the-fact design approval for the increase in height of the previously approved elevator tower, after-the-fact design approval for the stairs in the south elevation of the addition, approval for a change in design of previously approved railings, and approval of a limestone finish to be applied to the front door of the addition.

And with regard to the increased height of the elevator tower which has already been built, the applicant has stated that during construction, it was determined that the elevator required higher travel above the second floor than had been designated in the plans. The height required by the elevator equipment resulted in the elevator shaft protruding above the roof.

The drawings indicate the tower will be topped with a pyramid roof with flat clay tile and

decorative elements would be a stucco band and exposed rafters.

The tower now rises above the height of the original pitched roof but is still lower in height than the two original chimneys. The tower has been constructed. However, at the moment there is no stucco band and no exposed rafters.

And there are some proposed changes to the previously approved stairs and the previously approved railings, and neither of these are really visible from the right of way so there's not any major concern about them.

And there is a request to add a limestone finish to the first floor of the addition. Again, this will not be visible from the right of way. However, we do not have a sample of the limestone finish to review.

So basically the staff conclusion is although considerably set back from the right of way, the increased height in the pyramid roof with the flat clay tile of the elevator tower do negatively impact the front elevation.

It's recommended the applicant work with staff to lessen the impact on the front elevation, and the proposed new railings, the amended stairs and limestone finish to the front of the first addition will be minimally visible from the right of way.

So we are recommending approval with the

following conditions:

The applicant work with staff to amend the design of the top of the elevator tower and roof to lessen the impact on the front elevation of the structure.

The design of the proposed railings should be more in keeping with the architectural style of the house, and we do need a sample or specifications of the proposed natural limestone to review properly.

Now, just to add to the staff report, the applicant had apparently met with the city architect two or three weeks ago. However, we only received the comments today.

And the city architect's comments are, "I met with Mr. Asrani to discuss his project issues, and he subsequently provided copies of revised drawings with the originally permitted drawings. We reviewed the plans, and the elevator shaft extension is not appropriate for the existing roof condition and overall massing of the existing residence."

In addition, I have the following comments on the submitted plans: "Owner changes shall be submitted as a permit revision; include revision clouds to clearly identify all changes from approved design; submit a change of architect form; all revised plans shall be signed and sealed by architect of record; all revised plans shall be

submitted to permit counter and perforated," and as a note, that there are additional changes beyond the elevator shaft issue.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

MR. ADAMS: Sorry. Have you been sworn in? (Thereupon, Mr. Cruz-Munoz was duly sworn on oath by the court reporter.)

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Okay. My name, my name is Rafael Cruz-unoz, and I am now the architect of record. I was not the architect of record when the addition was started.

And I must say that the reason, the main reason and the only reason that the owners wanted this addition was they wanted an elevator to get to the second floor because they're getting old and they didn't -- you know, there's just stairs.

So I started a few years ago with them doing, planning an addition that was going to be independent from the house because we didn't think we could really integrate it, and we were going along with that until the fellow that became the architect for this thing had an idea. He went one day to the house, had an idea, and said," Oh, we can put it here," and he had a great idea, and the thing has worked very well.

The only problem is that he was not really an

architect. He was an interior designer, and he missed a few things. For example, the whole purpose of the addition is the elevator. He never talked to an elevator company to find out how much room he needed for the level of the second floor for the carrier to the elevator for the equipment to work.

So he had planned and the initial approval had plans that was approved, he had thought that he could stay within the roof that was existing. He could not. The elevator needed substantially more height, so that's where this thing came.

The issue of the steps in front of the addition was part of -- he had, he never really looked at the difference in height, I don't know, and so he had two steps which he was running it all the way across. Two steps running all the way across looks nice and it's still discreet, but if you now take and it turns out that you need five steps -- actually the thing says three, but there's actually five steps as you'll see in the presentation, and now we have five steps running all the way across, it looks like you're building a pyramid or a temple to yourself, so it had to be reduced.

And the previous fellow actually changed it to two stairs coming down, you know, from the terrace to make it more in character with the house.

And so, and the third item, the issue of the railings, all the railings, and as I'll show, everything in the house is wrought iron, from the gate where you enter through the railings on all the balconies through, there's a loggia that's kind of like an outside roof space that has these arches and has full wrought iron work, so the original idea of wood railings was actually totally foreign to the house.

And even we have the plans that were submitted previously and the ones for the building department, somebody in red marked and signed and dated a thing saying that the railings were going to be metal. I don't know who did that. I have no idea, but that's there.

So anyway, to get on with the thing, that again, the addition which was approved is basically two story. On the first floor, there was, it was a family room which was expanded now to make a kitchen and family in it, and on the second floor it became the master bedroom.

The elevator was tucked in right by the entrance, and it opens from the first landing of the stairs which has one step and then a landing, and that's where the elevator opens, and then it comes in the second floor into a little lobby taking you to the bedroom, and

that was the whole purpose of this.

So initially, and as you can see in the elevation, initially it was going to be, he thought that he could stay in there, and he couldn't, so the elevator had to go higher because of the carriage, and the height where the sloping roof is shown, that basically is the top of the concrete slab that was put.

In other words, whatever it needed for the carriage, right above that level, concrete, you know, without going any higher or anything, extra space, it was, a concrete slab was put, and now on top of the concrete slab to make it balanced with the house, sort of roof with the tiles being placed.

Because of the smallness of this roof, in other words, in the sense that it's not like a large expanse, if you put barrel tiles, it becomes a little bit, you know, where they get cut all over the place, you know, barrel tile, you know, requires, you know, when you're cutting it at the angles to -- you know, because of the hip roof.

So we thought that maybe, and again, because the idea of being a historical house, you want to make sure that it's compatible but you have a slight difference to what was originally there so you can tell the difference, we said maybe, you know, we'll go with flat

clay tiles.

2.4

This is what is seen from the pool which is the closest to the south elevation. On the left, the before, you know, shows that there used to be a one-story element there which was the family room, and now, beyond that now is two story.

You can see the door entrance to the house, and you can see sort of behind a pine, because unfortunately, there's all kinds of landscaping, it was very hard to find the photo that we have chosen, you can see the tower and you can see that it's substantially lower not only of the chimneys, but it's actually lower than the roof of the main portion of the house.

That's why, as you'll see when we show the elevation from the canal side, you can't see the elevator tower. It's lower than that.

Seen from the driveway, you know, as you, once you enter the house, on the left, the before, again you see the one-story thing. The two story was approved, and obviously it's incomplete. In other words, it's in construction right now, and the balcony is going to have, you know, wood, decorative wood covers on the steel columns.

The elevator tower is going to have, you know, a stucco band created around it, and then the

outriggers, you know, similar to what is in the existing portion of the house, will have them on the little elevator tower also.

Again, that is the east elevation or from the street, and you can see that the elevator tower, once you see it straight flat, it's not that higher.

Here is the view of the house before the addition, and then with the addition, and again, the higher you are from the street, then the less impact the thing has. See, this is from the opposite side of the canal, and no tower is visible except the chimneys.

From the, the view from the other side of what would be the opposite of that elevation where you see the balcony is very tight because there's only a few feet to the fence with the neighbor, and what you do, can appreciate is the steps that are there coming out.

That's the same level of the addition and the steps are existing, so in other words, you knew that it had to be more than two steps. How, why that was forgotten and nobody noticed, I can't answer.

And then from this side, again, here is a closer look where the steps are, and again, cutting it, breaking it into two instead of having this huge stairs, you know, thing, that then you would need to have intermediate railings and everything would look like, you

know, some bank, bank entrance or a Supreme Court or something like that.

So I think by cutting it into the two steps and then having the railings that will be provided eventually, you know, because they're not there yet, it will be better.

And so you can see it, in this case over there, the way that it will eventually look with the railings, and the railings will -- as you can see on the other side, that is the existing loggia with all theand wrought iron work, and above it is a balcony coming from the old master bedroom, which again is a wrought iron railing, and what we've done with the railing is try to work with that and keep it in a way that it will be compatible with the house without being exactly the same.

This is iron work on that loggia, and that is the detail that we're incorporating into the railings.

You know, we're using the same little leaves, so to speak, and working them into our railing, and you know, keeping it, without making it too elaborate, and thank you very much.

MR. ADAMS: Just a couple things, Chair, and having looked at the photographs and there are five steps there, I think the drawings have to be amended because the drawings only show three steps and possibly four in one of

them, so there's obviously a discrepancy still in the drawings, which is what the report is based on.

I don't have a major issue with it. I just think the drawings need to be corrected.

And secondly, if you look at the photograph in the staff analysis, when you go into the property, the driveway actually slopes down, so he is correct that when you're in the yard and looking at it, it looks a lot more impactful than it does from the street, so the street view is actually the photograph I included in the report.

And with regard to the tower, you know, a couple of possible ways to minimize it may be flat roof with barrel tile coping, or possibly even a flat roof maybe with a small canopy coming off, so I think there are options there to bring it more into character with the house and minimizes its impact.

And again, you know, we would like the opportunity to work with the applicant at a staff level if the board felt that was appropriate and it didn't have to come back to you.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Questions, comments?

MS. SPAIN: Can you explain to me where the limestone is, keystone is going? I couldn't figure that out.

MR. ADAMS: If you look at the south

- 1 elevation, it's very hard to see, but underneath the
- 2 | balcony it's sort of dotted.
- 3 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: This is like actually here 4 in City Hall.
- -
- 5 MS. SPAIN: City Hall.
- 6 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Yeah.
- 7 MS. SPAIN: But where is that supposed to go?
- MR. DURANA: I think they want it here, just
- 9 | natural limestone finish on the wall (inaudible).
- MS. SPAIN: Oh, okay.
- MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: This is going to go --
- THE COURT REPORTER: Wait a minute. I'm not
- getting this on the record, so.
- MS. SPAIN: That's okay. Just go back there.
- 15 I'll figure it out.
- MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Right.
- MS. SPAIN: Here we go, natural limestone
- 18 finish.
- MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: The limestone is simply
- 20 going below the balcony --
- MS. SPAIN: I got it.
- MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: -- from the elevator to the
- 23 corner of the thing, you know, surrounding the doors, and
- 24 | that's it.
- 25 MS. SPAIN: And that elevation is --

197 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: And the doors, you know, all 1 2 the doors have --3 MS. SPAIN: -- facing --MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: -- trim. 4 MS. SPAIN: -- that elevation is facing 5 6 the --7 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: The pool. 8 MS. SPAIN: -- the pool. 9 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: In other words, it's not 10 facing the street. 11 MS. SPAIN: I understand. 12 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: It's all along the side of it to the street. 13 14 MR. FULLERTON: This is probably a moot point at this point, but is the contractor who did this work 15 still on the job? 16 17 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: The contractor is, not the, not the designer or whatever he --18 19 MR. FULLERTON: And it did not occur to that 20 contractor to contact the City of Coral Gables to let them 21 know that they were changing the elevation of this 22 building? 23 No. The first we heard of it was MR. ADAMS:

weeks ago, eight weeks ago when the owner actually called

when I received a phone call maybe, I don't know, six

24

25

- and asked me if I would go out and meet him on site, and 1 2 it was already, it was already there. 3 MR. FULLERTON: Are there fines or any other 4 punitive --I can tell you, that doesn't 5 MS. SPAIN: No. 6 happen. 7 That doesn't happen? MR. FULLERTON: 8 MS. SPAIN: Uh-uh. 9 MR. MENENDEZ: No building --
 - MR. FULLERTON: So anybody can do anything and then do it and then tell the city that they've done it, and they've got to just live with it?
 - MR. ADAMS: No. The board should --
- 14 MR. GARCIA-PONS: That's why they're here.
- That's why they're here. 15 MR. ADAMS:
- That's why they're here, but 16 MS. SPAIN: No. 17 there's no fine levied.
- MR. FULLERTON: Well, I know, but this 18 19 gentleman unfortunately has to bear the brunt of that.
- 20 MS. SPAIN: Right.

10

11

12

13

- 21 MR. FULLERTON: And it seems to me that the 22 contractor responsible for it should bear some 23 responsibility for this.
- 24 MR. ADAMS: I mean, as you said, the correct 25 approach is, "Hang on, there's something not going to work

out here," contact staff, see how we can resolve this situation, either review it at a staff level or bring it back to the board, is how it should work.

MR. FULLERTON: I think your suggestion to allow staff to work with the client to decide what's going to happen here, but I think, and I know the city probably can't say this, but the contractor should do this work pro bono, to put it back where it belongs. I mean, this is outrageous I think that somebody can get this far away from a plan and then have to come back to us for us to solve it.

MS. SPAIN: Yes.

MR. CEBALLOS: John, one other thing, what about the city inspectors that went out there?

MR. FULLERTON: Good point.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes. For the Chair, are you going to do public comments, or?

MR. MENENDEZ: I can't hear you.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Are you going to do public comment, or are we going to be addressing --

MR. MENENDEZ: Let's do public comment. Is there anybody in the audience who would like to speak in favor of this case? Anybody in the audience who would like to speak against this case? Okay. We're closing the public hearing.

MS. SPAIN: So code enforcement, I believe, assumes that if there's a deviation -- and Kara, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but it's a pet peeve that I had for years. Code enforcement believes that if they deviate from the plans, that they have the ability to revise the plans and get it approved, which is why they don't cite people for a deviation from plan.

MS. KAUTZ: So if there's an open permit and, there's an open permit on a property and there's something that's different, they just assume that they're going to do a revision or an as-built and take care of it, so it doesn't get picked up that way.

MS. SPAIN: So they don't cite for something like this.

Now, if there's a situation where they've destroyed historic fabric, that's a different situation, but this deviation from plans would not kick in code enforcement, which is good and bad, because you don't want the owner to have to pay for something the contractor has done.

MR. MENENDEZ: Right.

MS. SPAIN: But you also don't want the contractor not to be held accountable or the architect for doing that.

What amazes me, because this was in February

- of 2018, you know, had anybody asked me about your home, I
 would have assumed that it was done. I remember talking
 to you about that elevator and that how important it was
 for you to, as you're aging in place, to have one, so I'm
 so sorry, I'm really so sorry for you.
- 6 MR. MENENDEZ: And we would have never found 7 out if the owner didn't come forward.
- MS. SPAIN: That's right. Well, eventually they would have.
- MR. ADAMS: Possibly on final inspection, but
 by then it would have been even more complete.
- MR. MENENDEZ: But all the other inspections missed it.
- MS. SPAIN: That's right.
- MR. MENENDEZ: Final inspection would probably miss it too.
- MS. SPAIN: Not ours.
- MR. ADAMS: Not from preservation staff, but
- 19 by that point the entire job --
- 20 MR. MENENDEZ: Exactly.
- 21 | MR. ADAMS: -- would have been finished.
- MR. GARCIA-PONS: To the Chair, if I may, I
- 23 hear a board, it sounds like we're seeing this as a
- 24 | foregone conclusion.
- I would just like to then give my comment, is

I disagree with staff. I don't think this is far enough along to put back in your hands, because what was a non-element is probably the featured design element of the facade now, and I don't agree that we should approve and put it in your hands.

I think this needs to come back with some solutions as to what it is because I think it's just too much, it's too substantive a change from what the intention was to what the result is, and I hope it can be resolved, and I would love to give the architect a chance to resolve it, but I don't want to put you in the position of doing that. I think this needs to come back to the board, and that is my opinion.

MR. MENENDEZ: This has to go back to the city architect anyway, right?

MR. ADAMS: Yes. There's a number of things that he wants to see again, yes.

MR. MENENDEZ: So maybe, as Mr. Garcia-Pons is saying, those comments should be taken up and with the comments that you've heard from us today and come back.

MR. ADAMS: The best I could come up with was maybe flat roof with a barrel tile coping or maybe even -- at least it's going of get rid of, it's going to get rid of the pitch on the roof. It's going to bring the height down some.

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Right.

MR. ADAMS: Or maybe a canopy, a small canopy with some barrel tiles on it, but.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Sorry, Mr. Adams. Again, I think that's why I don't want to put it in your hands, because I don't think that's enough. Right?

The condition of, "Work with staff to amend the top of the elevator tower," it's not the top of the elevator tower. It's the entirety of the elevator tower, right, it's the entire element that needs to be rethought on how it's addressed as part of the elevation as opposed to the condition that somehow --

MR. ADAMS: Well, my way of thinking was there was a tower approved anyway.

MS. SPAIN: There was.

MR. ADAMS: The design was approved up to the eaves level effective with the roof.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Internal to the wall.

MR. ADAMS: They've gone beyond that, so are you now saying that they need to design all of the tower?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: I think it needs to be, the new element needs to be designed as part of the composition of the elevation, and it could be done in a million different ways. I don't want to limit it to tile on top of the pyramid-level thing. If there's a better

solution, I would love to see it.

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Right, but the one thing that cannot change is the height of that tower because the elevator is there and it has to operate, and that's the whole purpose of this addition.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: That's why I'm saying it's not a height issue, it is an element issue, and we would love -- I would love, and again, this is me, we haven't voted, for you to address it as an element in the composition of the element versus trying to dress it up and put a hat on it.

MR. FULLERTON: There are other types of elevators that don't require an overhead machine room.

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Yeah, but at this time the elevator is in place, and he's not going to buy a second elevator.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, the contractor can buy it. I'm very free with other people's money.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Can I ask a quick question, can I ask a quick question? Was it the interior designer that designed this, they had somebody else sign and seal the documents?

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Sorry, I couldn't hear.

MS. BACH-WIIG: The interior designer who designed the original plans, they had somebody else sign

- 1 and seal their drawings?
- 2 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: I imagine. I don't know.
- MS. BACHE-WIIG: Okay. No -- just, okay,
- 4 right.
- 5 MR. ASRANI: My name is --
- 6 MR. GARCIA-PONS: We have to recognize them.
- 7 MR. ASRANI: Do you wish to swear me in? I
- 8 just need to make a quick comment.
- 9 MR. ADAMS: No, he's not been sworn in.
- 10 (Thereupon, Mr. Asrani was duly sworn on oath by the court
- 11 reporter.)
- MR. ASRANI: My name is Mr. Asrani from 4200
- 13 Granada. I just wish to point out something, that you
- 14 | seem to feel this was done with some mal-intent.
- MR. GARCIA-PONS: No.
- MR. ASRANI: The elevator, a two-story
- 17 | elevator cannot fit into the height which was stipulated
- 18 by the so-called architect.
- It is not easy when you're in the midst of
- 20 construction to say, "Well, stop all this construction and
- 21 | now we're going to have to go before the architecture
- 22 | board to get permission, and you would be hard pressed
- 23 | not to allow us to put the elevator where it belongs.
- 24 | That's all I have to say.
- This is year number five that we are having

to go through this arduous process, and it's no fun having
a historic home if I have to go through this punishment,
so gentlemen, please, don't make us run around like -- you
know, we're not young anymore, and therefore we deserve a
little, not concession, but certainly a little deference
to the situation that we are in, which was not
intentionally.

If the gentleman here, Mr. Adams, is saying that we'll try and mitigate the elevator shaft in some way or another by working with them, other than that, I see no other solutions. If you have one, give it to me right now.

MS. SPAIN: But Mr. Asrani, the deviation from the plans has nothing to do with you having a historic home. I mean, you know, it isn't because it's historic that the contractor deviated from the plans. It would have happened whether it was designated or not. This whole process would, if it happened, it wouldn't have had to come to the historic board, but it would have had to go back through the permit process.

MR. FULLERTON: Could also go back to the city commission to reverse any decisions made here if you need to.

MS. SPAIN: Well, I personally think we should work with what we have and not make him do a new

1 | elevator.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, I do, of course, but I'm just saying that you have alternatives after --

MS. SPAIN: I'm not comfortable with that.

MR. ASRANI: But anyway, I said what I had to out of sheer frustration, but if you have an idea, the gentleman said we'll come up with some solution so it doesn't look -- and as he said, from the street. He's been to the site. Perhaps you should come to the site and take a look and tell me what I can do.

So I think I've said enough, and I hope you'll take that into consideration. Thank you.

MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: To the Chair, I would to, for the record, I did not express any ill intent on the behalf of the architect or the owner.

MR. MENENDEZ: So noted. Any comments, suggestions?

MS. SPAIN: I would like to make a motion to have the architect work with staff and then come back to the board with a solution, and hopefully, you know, make it soon, like next month, so that we can actually see what it would be.

And I like your idea of having it be a flat roof with a parapet. I mean, there is a certain height of

1	a parapet that is required in Coral Gables. Maybe in
2	order to make it a little bit shorter, we could approve a
3	variance for a smaller parapet for him so that the height
4	will come down. That's my motion.
5	MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'll second that motion.
6	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Spain, and
7	Mr. Garcia-Pons seconds.
8	MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
9	MS. SPAIN: Yes.
10	MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
11	MR. DURANA: Yes.
12	MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
13	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
14	MS. LYONS: Mr. Garcia-Pons?
15	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
16	MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
17	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
18	MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
19	MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
20	MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
21	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes. Okay, thank you.
22	Mr. Adams, do we have any old business, new business?
23	MR. FULLERTON: I have new business.

MR. MENENDEZ: Oh, bring it on.

MR. FULLERTON: Thank you for your

24

25

1 | confidence, appreciate that.

Can we do something in this wonderful electronic age in which we live, can't we do something that would allow the applicant to point at something on that TV thing --

MS. SPAIN: Yes.

MR. FULLERTON: -- and make it understandable

8 to us?

2

3

4

5

6

7

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

9 MR. MENENDEZ: Or at the very least, a long 10 stick.

MS. SPAIN: When they ordered that, I
requested them to have a surface on it that you could use
a laser pointer.

MR. FULLERTON: Laser point.

MS. SPAIN: And they said no problem, but when it came in, it wasn't, so I believe that there is a screen that they can put --

MR. FULLERTON: I'm sure there is.

MS. SPAIN: -- over it --

MR. FULLERTON: There is a --

MS. SPAIN: -- so that a laser pointer would

22 be allowed to be used.

MR. MENENDEZ: There is a film or coating

24 that they can put on that.

MR. FULLERTON: Right, right.

1 MR. ADAMS: We can ask, yes. 2 I make a motion then --MR. FULLERTON: 3 MS. SPAIN: I second it. MR. FULLERTON: -- that we put a film on all 4 the boards, TV sets, which allows somebody to use a 5 6 laser --7 MS. SPATN: Yes. 8 MR. FULLERTON: -- on them. 9 MS. SPAIN: Yes. I think that's a great idea. 10 11 MS. LYONS: Okay. 12 MR. FULLERTON: And I also make a motion that 13 the applicants can only speak for two minutes. 14 MS. SPAIN: There's a timer right there. MR. ADAMS: I think that's everything. Doc 15 Dammers Day is this Sunday. I don't know who's all is 16 17 going to it. It's being hosted by the Merrick House, and 18 19 it's effectively a trolley tour round the Venetian Pool, 20 the Biltmore, the museum, the Merrick House, and there 21 will be drinks and foods at the locations and music, and 22 tickets are on sale on line. I believe it's \$75 a ticket, 23 and that's this Sunday if anybody is interested in going. 24 MR. FULLERTON: Free to board members,

25

though, right?

1	MR. ADAMS: Sorry?
2	MR. FULLERTON: It's free to board member,
3	though, right?
4	MR. ADAMS: No, unfortunately, no, no, and
5	with regard to the golf course shelters, I know that you
6	had brought that up before, and I did speak with them,
7	parks again, and at the moment there is no intention to do
8	anything with the ones that are remaining. They're going
9	to stay there at the moment.
10	If you would like for the next meeting, I'm
11	happy just to go out and get some photographs and at least
12	let you see the conditions they're in at the moment, if
13	that's something you'd want to see.
14	MR. DURANA: They look the same.
15	MR. ADAMS: Yes.
16	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Not necessary.
17	MR. ADAMS: No? I know there was concern
18	over their condition. That's it.
19	MR. MENENDEZ: Nothing else?
20	MR. ADAMS: No.
21	MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
22	MR. GARCIA-PONS: Motion to adjourn.
23	MR. ADAMS: Thank you.
24	MR. FULLERTON: Second.
25	MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

CERTIFICATE

2 | STATE OF FLORIDA)

COUNTY OF DADE)

I, DOREEN M. STRAUSS, do here by certify that the foregoing pages, numbered from 1 to including 213, represent a true and accurate transcription of the record of the proceedings in the above-mentioned case.

WITNESS my hand in the City of Miami this 12th day of November, 2021.

Dorean Straus

Doreen M. Strauss