

EXCERPT
OF
CITY OF CORAL GABLES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
October 20, 2021

IN RE: CASE FILE COA (SP) 2017-025
4200 GRANADA BOULEVARD

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
Gustave Ceballos, Esq., Assistant City Attorney
Nancy Lyons, Administrative Assistant

1 * * * *

2 MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you. All right, the
3 last case file of the night, Case File COA (SP) 2017-025,
4 Revised, an application for the issuance of a special
5 certificate of appropriateness for the property at 4200
6 Granada Boulevard, a local historic landmark legally
7 described as Lots Ten and Eleven, Block 99, Coral Gables
8 Country Club Section Part Five, according to the plat
9 thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 23 at Page 55 of the
10 public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

11 The application requesting design approval
12 for an addition and alteration to the residence was
13 granted approval with conditions on February 15th, 2018.

14 This application requests after-the-fact
15 design approval for a revision to the approved certificate
16 of appropriateness due to a deviation from the previously
17 approved plans. Mr. Adams.

18 MR. ADAMS: The residence is located on the
19 two interior lots between Bird Road and Blue Road. The
20 primary elevation faces west onto the Coral Gables
21 Waterway. The east elevation faces Granada Boulevard.

22 The applicant is requesting after-the-fact
23 design approval for deviations from the previously
24 approved plans for a substantial increase in the height of
25 the elevator and an amendment design for the stairs on the

1 south elevation of the addition.

2 The applicant is also requesting approval for
3 a change of design from the previously approved railings
4 and for a natural limestone finish to the front of the
5 addition at the first floor level.

6 The residence at 4200 Granada was designed by
7 Phineas Paist and is one of two residences identified as
8 part of the planned Venetian-country-style village to be
9 constructed.

10 The property was designated as a local
11 historic landmark in 1994. In 2018, the COA was approved
12 by the board. The application requested approval for an
13 addition and alterations to the property. This was a
14 two-story addition to the east of the existing residence.

15 The existing residence had a one-story wing
16 protruding from the northeast corner. The approved
17 addition expanded that wing to the south by approximately
18 six feet and placed the second story atop the expended
19 footprint. An elevator was also included in the project.

20 At the time the elevator was depicted as
21 having no impact on the elevation and no shaft was
22 intended to rise above the roof line.

23 The applicant is basically requesting
24 after-the-fact design approval for the increase in height
25 of the previously approved elevator tower, after-the-fact

1 design approval for the stairs in the south elevation of
2 the addition, approval for a change in design of
3 previously approved railings, and approval of a limestone
4 finish to be applied to the front door of the addition.

5 And with regard to the increased height of
6 the elevator tower which has already been built, the
7 applicant has stated that during construction, it was
8 determined that the elevator required higher travel above
9 the second floor than had been designated in the plans.
10 The height required by the elevator equipment resulted in
11 the elevator shaft protruding above the roof.

12 The drawings indicate the tower will be
13 topped with a pyramid roof with flat clay tile and
14 decorative elements would be a stucco band and exposed
15 rafters.

16 The tower now rises above the height of the
17 original pitched roof but is still lower in height than
18 the two original chimneys. The tower has been
19 constructed. However, at the moment there is no stucco
20 band and no exposed rafters.

21 And there are some proposed changes to the
22 previously approved stairs and the previously approved
23 railings, and neither of these are really visible from the
24 right of way so there's not any major concern about them.

25 And there is a request to add a limestone

1 finish to the first floor of the addition. Again, this
2 will not be visible from the right of way. However, we do
3 not have a sample of the limestone finish to review.

4 So basically the staff conclusion is although
5 considerably set back from the right of way, the increased
6 height in the pyramid roof with the flat clay tile of the
7 elevator tower do negatively impact the front elevation.

8 It's recommended the applicant work with
9 staff to lessen the impact on the front elevation, and the
10 proposed new railings, the amended stairs and limestone
11 finish to the front of the first addition will be
12 minimally visible from the right of way.

13 So we are recommending approval with the
14 following conditions:

15 The applicant work with staff to amend the
16 design of the top of the elevator tower and roof to lessen
17 the impact on the front elevation of the structure.

18 The design of the proposed railings should be
19 more in keeping with the architectural style of the house,
20 and we do need a sample or specifications of the proposed
21 natural limestone to review properly.

22 Now, just to add to the staff report, the
23 applicant had apparently met with the city architect two
24 or three weeks ago. However, we only received the
25 comments today.

1 And the city architect's comments are, "I met
2 with Mr. Asrani to discuss his project issues, and he
3 subsequently provided copies of revised drawings with the
4 originally permitted drawings. We reviewed the plans, and
5 the elevator shaft extension is not appropriate for the
6 existing roof condition and overall massing of the
7 existing residence."

8 In addition, I have the following comments on
9 the submitted plans: "Owner changes shall be submitted as
10 a permit revision; include revision clouds to clearly
11 identify all changes from approved design; submit a change
12 of architect form; all revised plans shall be signed and
13 sealed by architect of record; all revised plans shall be
14 submitted to permit counter and perforated," and as a
15 note, that there are additional changes beyond the
16 elevator shaft issue.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

18 MR. ADAMS: Sorry. Have you been sworn in?
19 (Thereupon, Mr. Cruz-Munoz was duly sworn on oath by the
20 court reporter.)

21 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Okay. My name, my name is
22 Rafael Cruz-unoz, and I am now the architect of record. I
23 was not the architect of record when the addition was
24 started.

25 And I must say that the reason, the main

1 reason and the only reason that the owners wanted this
2 addition was they wanted an elevator to get to the second
3 floor because they're getting old and they didn't -- you
4 know, there's just stairs.

5 So I started a few years ago with them doing,
6 planning an addition that was going to be independent from
7 the house because we didn't think we could really
8 integrate it, and we were going along with that until the
9 fellow that became the architect for this thing had an
10 idea. He went one day to the house, had an idea, and
11 said, " Oh, we can put it here," and he had a great idea,
12 and the thing has worked very well.

13 The only problem is that he was not really an
14 architect. He was an interior designer, and he missed a
15 few things. For example, the whole purpose of the
16 addition is the elevator. He never talked to an elevator
17 company to find out how much room he needed for the level
18 of the second floor for the carrier to the elevator for
19 the equipment to work.

20 So he had planned and the initial approval
21 had plans that was approved, he had thought that he could
22 stay within the roof that was existing. He could not.
23 The elevator needed substantially more height, so that's
24 where this thing came.

25 The issue of the steps in front of the

1 addition was part of -- he had, he never really looked at
2 the difference in height, I don't know, and so he had two
3 steps which he was running it all the way across. Two
4 steps running all the way across looks nice and it's still
5 discreet, but if you now take and it turns out that you
6 need five steps -- actually the thing says three, but
7 there's actually five steps as you'll see in the
8 presentation, and now we have five steps running all the
9 way across, it looks like you're building a pyramid or a
10 temple to yourself, so it had to be reduced.

11 And the previous fellow actually changed it
12 to two stairs coming down, you know, from the terrace to
13 make it more in character with the house.

14 And so, and the third item, the issue of the
15 railings, all the railings, and as I'll show, everything
16 in the house is wrought iron, from the gate where you
17 enter through the railings on all the balconies through,
18 there's a loggia that's kind of like an outside roof space
19 that has these arches and has full wrought iron work, so
20 the original idea of wood railings was actually totally
21 foreign to the house.

22 And even we have the plans that were
23 submitted previously and the ones for the building
24 department, somebody in red marked and signed and dated a
25 thing saying that the railings were going to be metal. I

1 don't know who did that. I have no idea, but that's
2 there.

3 So anyway, to get on with the thing, that
4 again, the addition which was approved is basically two
5 story. On the first floor, there was, it was a family
6 room which was expanded now to make a kitchen and family
7 in it, and on the second floor it became the master
8 bedroom.

9 The elevator was tucked in right by the
10 entrance, and it opens from the first landing of the
11 stairs which has one step and then a landing, and that's
12 where the elevator opens, and then it comes in the second
13 floor into a little lobby taking you to the bedroom, and
14 that was the whole purpose of this.

15 So initially, and as you can see in the
16 elevation, initially it was going to be, he thought that
17 he could stay in there, and he couldn't, so the elevator
18 had to go higher because of the carriage, and the height
19 where the sloping roof is shown, that basically is the top
20 of the concrete slab that was put.

21 In other words, whatever it needed for the
22 carriage, right above that level, concrete, you know,
23 without going any higher or anything, extra space, it was,
24 a concrete slab was put, and now on top of the concrete
25 slab to make it balanced with the house, sort of roof with

1 the tiles being placed.

2 Because of the smallness of this roof, in
3 other words, in the sense that it's not like a large
4 expanse, if you put barrel tiles, it becomes a little bit,
5 you know, where they get cut all over the place, you know,
6 barrel tile, you know, requires, you know, when you're
7 cutting it at the angles to -- you know, because of the
8 hip roof.

9 So we thought that maybe, and again, because
10 the idea of being a historical house, you want to make
11 sure that it's compatible but you have a slight difference
12 to what was originally there so you can tell the
13 difference, we said maybe, you know, we'll go with flat
14 clay tiles.

15 This is what is seen from the pool which is
16 the closest to the south elevation. On the left, the
17 before, you know, shows that there used to be a one-story
18 element there which was the family room, and now, beyond
19 that now is two story.

20 You can see the door entrance to the house,
21 and you can see sort of behind a pine, because
22 unfortunately, there's all kinds of landscaping, it was
23 very hard to find the photo that we have chosen, you can
24 see the tower and you can see that it's substantially
25 lower not only of the chimneys, but it's actually lower

1 than the roof of the main portion of the house.

2 That's why, as you'll see when we show the
3 elevation from the canal side, you can't see the elevator
4 tower. It's lower than that.

5 Seen from the driveway, you know, as you,
6 once you enter the house, on the left, the before, again
7 you see the one-story thing. The two story was approved,
8 and obviously it's incomplete. In other words, it's in
9 construction right now, and the balcony is going to have,
10 you know, wood, decorative wood covers on the steel
11 columns.

12 The elevator tower is going to have, you
13 know, a stucco band created around it, and then the
14 outriggers, you know, similar to what is in the existing
15 portion of the house, will have them on the little
16 elevator tower also.

17 Again, that is the east elevation or from the
18 street, and you can see that the elevator tower, once you
19 see it straight flat, it's not that higher.

20 Here is the view of the house before the
21 addition, and then with the addition, and again, the
22 higher you are from the street, then the less impact the
23 thing has. See, this is from the opposite side of the
24 canal, and no tower is visible except the chimneys.

25 From the, the view from the other side of

1 what would be the opposite of that elevation where you see
2 the balcony is very tight because there's only a few feet
3 to the fence with the neighbor, and what you do, can
4 appreciate is the steps that are there coming out.

5 That's the same level of the addition and the
6 steps are existing, so in other words, you knew that it
7 had to be more than two steps. How, why that was
8 forgotten and nobody noticed, I can't answer.

9 And then from this side, again, here is a
10 closer look where the steps are, and again, cutting it,
11 breaking it into two instead of having this huge stairs,
12 you know, thing, that then you would need to have
13 intermediate railings and everything would look like, you
14 know, some bank, bank entrance or a Supreme Court or
15 something like that.

16 So I think by cutting it into the two steps
17 and then having the railings that will be provided
18 eventually, you know, because they're not there yet, it
19 will be better.

20 And so you can see it, in this case over
21 there, the way that it will eventually look with the
22 railings, and the railings will -- as you can see on the
23 other side, that is the existing loggia with all the and
24 wrought iron work, and above it is a balcony coming from
25 the old master bedroom, which again is a wrought iron

1 railing, and what we've done with the railing is try to
2 work with that and keep it in a way that it will be
3 compatible with the house without being exactly the same.

4 This is iron work on that loggia, and that is
5 the detail that we're incorporating into the railings.
6 You know, we're using the same little leaves, so to speak,
7 and working them into our railing, and you know, keeping
8 it, without making it too elaborate, and thank you very
9 much.

10 MR. ADAMS: Just a couple things, Chair, and
11 having looked at the photographs and there are five steps
12 there, I think the drawings have to be amended because the
13 drawings only show three steps and possibly four in one of
14 them, so there's obviously a discrepancy still in the
15 drawings, which is what the report is based on.

16 I don't have a major issue with it. I just
17 think the drawings need to be corrected.

18 And secondly, if you look at the photograph
19 in the staff analysis, when you go into the property, the
20 driveway actually slopes down, so he is correct that when
21 you're in the yard and looking at it, it looks a lot more
22 impactful than it does from the street, so the street view
23 is actually the photograph I included in the report.

24 And with regard to the tower, you know, a
25 couple of possible ways to minimize it may be flat roof

1 with barrel tile coping, or possibly even a flat roof
2 maybe with a small canopy coming off, so I think there are
3 options there to bring it more into character with the
4 house and minimizes its impact.

5 And again, you know, we would like the
6 opportunity to work with the applicant at a staff level if
7 the board felt that was appropriate and it didn't have to
8 come back to you.

9 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Questions, comments?

10 MS. SPAIN: Can you explain to me where the
11 limestone is, keystone is going? I couldn't figure that
12 out.

13 MR. ADAMS: If you look at the south
14 elevation, it's very hard to see, but underneath the
15 balcony it's sort of dotted.

16 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: This is like actually here
17 in City Hall.

18 MS. SPAIN: City Hall.

19 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Yeah.

20 MS. SPAIN: But where is that supposed to go?

21 MR. DURANA: I think they want it here, just
22 natural limestone finish on the wall (inaudible).

23 MS. SPAIN: Oh, okay.

24 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: This is going to go --

25 THE COURT REPORTER: Wait a minute. I'm not

1 getting this on the record, so.

2 MS. SPAIN: That's okay. Just go back there.
3 I'll figure it out.

4 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Right.

5 MS. SPAIN: Here we go, natural limestone
6 finish.

7 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: The limestone is simply
8 going below the balcony --

9 MS. SPAIN: I got it.

10 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: -- from the elevator to the
11 corner of the thing, you know, surrounding the doors, and
12 that's it.

13 MS. SPAIN: And that elevation is --

14 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: And the doors, you know, all
15 the doors have --

16 MS. SPAIN: -- facing --

17 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: -- trim.

18 MS. SPAIN: -- that elevation is facing
19 the --

20 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: The pool.

21 MS. SPAIN: -- the pool.

22 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: In other words, it's not
23 facing the street.

24 MS. SPAIN: I understand.

25 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: It's all along the side of

1 it to the street.

2 MR. FULLERTON: This is probably a moot point
3 at this point, but is the contractor who did this work
4 still on the job?

5 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: The contractor is, not the,
6 not the designer or whatever he --

7 MR. FULLERTON: And it did not occur to that
8 contractor to contact the City of Coral Gables to let them
9 know that they were changing the elevation of this
10 building?

11 MR. ADAMS: No. The first we heard of it was
12 when I received a phone call maybe, I don't know, six
13 weeks ago, eight weeks ago when the owner actually called
14 and asked me if I would go out and meet him on site, and
15 it was already, it was already there.

16 MR. FULLERTON: Are there fines or any other
17 punitive --

18 MS. SPAIN: No. I can tell you, that doesn't
19 happen.

20 MR. FULLERTON: That doesn't happen?

21 MS. SPAIN: Uh-uh.

22 MR. MENENDEZ: No building --

23 MR. FULLERTON: So anybody can do anything
24 and then do it and then tell the city that they've done
25 it, and they've got to just live with it?

1 MR. ADAMS: No. The board should --

2 MR. GARCIA-PONS: That's why they're here.

3 MR. ADAMS: That's why they're here.

4 MS. SPAIN: No. That's why they're here, but
5 there's no fine levied.

6 MR. FULLERTON: Well, I know, but this
7 gentleman unfortunately has to bear the brunt of that.

8 MS. SPAIN: Right.

9 MR. FULLERTON: And it seems to me that the
10 contractor responsible for it should bear some
11 responsibility for this.

12 MR. ADAMS: I mean, as you said, the correct
13 approach is, "Hang on, there's something not going to work
14 out here," contact staff, see how we can resolve this
15 situation, either review it at a staff level or bring it
16 back to the board, is how it should work.

17 MR. FULLERTON: I think your suggestion to
18 allow staff to work with the client to decide what's going
19 to happen here, but I think, and I know the city probably
20 can't say this, but the contractor should do this work pro
21 bono, to put it back where it belongs. I mean, this is
22 outrageous I think that somebody can get this far away
23 from a plan and then have to come back to us for us to
24 solve it.

25 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

1 MR. CEBALLOS: John, one other thing, what
2 about the city inspectors that went out there?

3 MR. FULLERTON: Good point.

4 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes. For the Chair, are
5 you going to do public comments, or?

6 MR. MENENDEZ: I can't hear you.

7 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Are you going to do public
8 comment, or are we going to be addressing --

9 MR. MENENDEZ: Let's do public comment. Is
10 there anybody in the audience who would like to speak in
11 favor of this case? Anybody in the audience who would
12 like to speak against this case? Okay. We're closing the
13 public hearing.

14 MS. SPAIN: So code enforcement, I believe,
15 assumes that if there's a deviation -- and Kara, you can
16 correct me if I'm wrong, but it's a pet peeve that I had
17 for years. Code enforcement believes that if they deviate
18 from the plans, that they have the ability to revise the
19 plans and get it approved, which is why they don't cite
20 people for a deviation from plan.

21 MS. KAUTZ: So if there's an open permit and,
22 there's an open permit on a property and there's something
23 that's different, they just assume that they're going to
24 do a revision or an as-built and take care of it, so it
25 doesn't get picked up that way.

1 MS. SPAIN: So they don't cite for something
2 like this.

3 Now, if there's a situation where they've
4 destroyed historic fabric, that's a different situation,
5 but this deviation from plans would not kick in code
6 enforcement, which is good and bad, because you don't want
7 the owner to have to pay for something the contractor has
8 done.

9 MR. MENENDEZ: Right.

10 MS. SPAIN: But you also don't want the
11 contractor not to be held accountable or the architect for
12 doing that.

13 What amazes me, because this was in February
14 of 2018, you know, had anybody asked me about your home, I
15 would have assumed that it was done. I remember talking
16 to you about that elevator and that how important it was
17 for you to, as you're aging in place, to have one, so I'm
18 so sorry, I'm really so sorry for you.

19 MR. MENENDEZ: And we would have never found
20 out if the owner didn't come forward.

21 MS. SPAIN: That's right. Well, eventually
22 they would have.

23 MR. ADAMS: Possibly on final inspection, but
24 by then it would have been even more complete.

25 MR. MENENDEZ: But all the other inspections

1 missed it.

2 MS. SPAIN: That's right.

3 MR. MENENDEZ: Final inspection would
4 probably miss it too.

5 MS. SPAIN: Not ours.

6 MR. ADAMS: Not from preservation staff, but
7 by that point the entire job --

8 MR. MENENDEZ: Exactly.

9 MR. ADAMS: -- would have been finished.

10 MR. GARCIA-PONS: To the Chair, if I may, I
11 hear a board, it sounds like we're seeing this as a
12 foregone conclusion.

13 I would just like to then give my comment, is
14 I disagree with staff. I don't think this is far enough
15 along to put back in your hands, because what was a
16 non-element is probably the featured design element of the
17 facade now, and I don't agree that we should approve and
18 put it in your hands.

19 I think this needs to come back with some
20 solutions as to what it is because I think it's just too
21 much, it's too substantive a change from what the
22 intention was to what the result is, and I hope it can be
23 resolved, and I would love to give the architect a chance
24 to resolve it, but I don't want to put you in the position
25 of doing that. I think this needs to come back to the

1 board, and that is my opinion.

2 MR. MENENDEZ: This has to go back to the
3 city architect anyway, right?

4 MR. ADAMS: Yes. There's a number of things
5 that he wants to see again, yes.

6 MR. MENENDEZ: So maybe, as Mr. Garcia-Pons
7 is saying, those comments should be taken up and with the
8 comments that you've heard from us today and come back.

9 MR. ADAMS: The best I could come up with was
10 maybe flat roof with a barrel tile coping or maybe even --
11 at least it's going of get rid of, it's going to get rid
12 of the pitch on the roof. It's going to bring the height
13 down some.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: Right.

15 MR. ADAMS: Or maybe a canopy, a small canopy
16 with some barrel tiles on it, but.

17 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Sorry, Mr. Adams. Again, I
18 think that's why I don't want to put it in your hands,
19 because I don't think that's enough. Right?

20 The condition of, "Work with staff to amend
21 the top of the elevator tower," it's not the top of the
22 elevator tower. It's the entirety of the elevator tower,
23 right, it's the entire element that needs to be rethought
24 on how it's addressed as part of the elevation as opposed
25 to the condition that somehow --

1 MR. ADAMS: Well, my way of thinking was
2 there was a tower approved anyway.

3 MS. SPAIN: There was.

4 MR. ADAMS: The design was approved up to the
5 eaves level effective with the roof.

6 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Internal to the wall.

7 MR. ADAMS: They've gone beyond that, so are
8 you now saying that they need to design all of the tower?

9 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I think it needs to be, the
10 new element needs to be designed as part of the
11 composition of the elevation, and it could be done in a
12 million different ways. I don't want to limit it to tile
13 on top of the pyramid-level thing. If there's a better
14 solution, I would love to see it.

15 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Right, but the one thing
16 that cannot change is the height of that tower because the
17 elevator is there and it has to operate, and that's the
18 whole purpose of this addition.

19 MR. GARCIA-PONS: That's why I'm saying it's
20 not a height issue, it is an element issue, and we would
21 love -- I would love, and again, this is me, we haven't
22 voted, for you to address it as an element in the
23 composition of the element versus trying to dress it up
24 and put a hat on it.

25 MR. FULLERTON: There are other types of

1 elevators that don't require an overhead machine room.

2 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Yeah, but at this time the
3 elevator is in place, and he's not going to buy a second
4 elevator.

5 MR. FULLERTON: Well, the contractor can buy
6 it. I'm very free with other people's money.

7 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Can I ask a quick question,
8 can I ask a quick question? Was it the interior designer
9 that designed this, they had somebody else sign and seal
10 the documents?

11 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Sorry, I couldn't hear.

12 MS. BACH-WIIG: The interior designer who
13 designed the original plans, they had somebody else sign
14 and seal their drawings?

15 MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: I imagine. I don't know.

16 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Okay. No -- just, okay,
17 right.

18 MR. ASRANI: My name is --

19 MR. GARCIA-PONS: We have to recognize them.

20 MR. ASRANI: Do you wish to swear me in? I
21 just need to make a quick comment.

22 MR. ADAMS: No, he's not been sworn in.

23 (Thereupon, Mr. Asrani was duly sworn on oath by the court
24 reporter.)

25 MR. ASRANI: My name is Mr. Asrani from 4200

1 Granada. I just wish to point out something, that you
2 seem to feel this was done with some mal-intent.

3 MR. GARCIA-PONS: No.

4 MR. ASRANI: The elevator, a two-story
5 elevator cannot fit into the height which was stipulated
6 by the so-called architect.

7 It is not easy when you're in the midst of
8 construction to say, "Well, stop all this construction and
9 now we're going to have to go before the architecture
10 board to get permission," and you would be hard pressed
11 not to allow us to put the elevator where it belongs.
12 That's all I have to say.

13 This is year number five that we are having
14 to go through this arduous process, and it's no fun having
15 a historic home if I have to go through this punishment,
16 so gentlemen, please, don't make us run around like -- you
17 know, we're not young anymore, and therefore we deserve a
18 little, not concession, but certainly a little deference
19 to the situation that we are in, which was not
20 intentionally.

21 If the gentleman here, Mr. Adams, is saying
22 that we'll try and mitigate the elevator shaft in some way
23 or another by working with them, other than that, I see no
24 other solutions. If you have one, give it to me right
25 now.

1 MS. SPAIN: But Mr. Asrani, the deviation
2 from the plans has nothing to do with you having a
3 historic home. I mean, you know, it isn't because it's
4 historic that the contractor deviated from the plans. It
5 would have happened whether it was designated or not.
6 This whole process would, if it happened, it wouldn't have
7 had to come to the historic board, but it would have had
8 to go back through the permit process.

9 MR. FULLERTON: Could also go back to the
10 city commission to reverse any decisions made here if you
11 need to.

12 MS. SPAIN: Well, I personally think we
13 should work with what we have and not make him do a new
14 elevator.

15 MR. FULLERTON: Well, I do, of course, but
16 I'm just saying that you have alternatives after --

17 MS. SPAIN: I'm not comfortable with that.

18 MR. ASRANI: But anyway, I said what I had to
19 out of sheer frustration, but if you have an idea, the
20 gentleman said we'll come up with some solution so it
21 doesn't look -- and as he said, from the street. He's
22 been to the site. Perhaps you should come to the site and
23 take a look and tell me what I can do.

24 So I think I've said enough, and I hope
25 you'll take that into consideration. Thank you.

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

2 MR. GARCIA-PONS: To the Chair, I would to,
3 for the record, I did not express any ill intent on the
4 behalf of the architect or the owner.

5 MR. MENENDEZ: So noted. Any comments,
6 suggestions?

7 MS. SPAIN: I would like to make a motion to
8 have the architect work with staff and then come back to
9 the board with a solution, and hopefully, you know, make
10 it soon, like next month, so that we can actually see what
11 it would be.

12 And I like your idea of having it be a flat
13 roof with a parapet. I mean, there is a certain height of
14 a parapet that is required in Coral Gables. Maybe in
15 order to make it a little bit shorter, we could approve a
16 variance for a smaller parapet for him so that the height
17 will come down. That's my motion.

18 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'll second that motion.

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Spain, and
20 Mr. Garcia-Pons seconds.

21 MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?

22 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

23 MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?

24 MR. DURANA: Yes.

25 MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Garcia-Pons?
MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes. Okay, thank you.

* * * * *

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF FLORIDA)

COUNTY OF DADE)

I, DOREEN M. STRAUSS, do here by certify that
the foregoing pages, numbered from 1 to including 28,
represent a true and accurate excerpt of the record of the
proceedings in the above-mentioned case.

WITNESS my hand in the City of Miami this 4th
day of November, 2021.

Doreen Strauss



Doreen M. Strauss