



CORAL GABLES HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
Wednesday, May 18, 2022 Meeting, 4:00 p.m.
Coral Gables City Hall, City Commission Chamber
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, Florida 33134

*Historical Resources &
 Cultural Arts*

2327 SALZEDO STREET
 CORAL GABLES
 FLORIDA 33134

☎ 305.460.5093
 ✉ hist@coralgables.com

MEMBERS	D 21	J 22	F 22	M 22	A 22	M 22	APPOINTED BY
Albert Menendez (Chair)	P	P	P	P	E	P	Commission-As-A-Whole
Cesar Garcia-Pons (Vice Chair)	E	P	P	P	P	P	City Manager Peter Iglesias
Alicia Bache-Wiig	P	P	P	P	E	P	Mayor Vince Lago
Margaret (Peggy) Rolando	P	P	E	E	P	P	Vice-Mayor Michael Mena
Dona Spain	P	P	P	P	P	P	Commissioner Rhonda Anderson
Xavier Durana	P	P	E	E	E	P	Commissioner Jorge L. Fors, Jr.
Michael J. Maxwell	P	P	P	P	P	P	Commissioner Kirk R. Menendez
Bruce Ehrenhaft	P	P	P	P	P	P	Commission-As-A-Whole
John P. Fullerton	P	P	P	P	P	P	Board-as-a-Whole

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

STAFF: Warren Adams, Historic Preservation Officer, Kara Kautz, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer, Gus Ceballos, Assistant City Attorney

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

OPENING STATEMENT

Chair Menendez read for the record the statement regarding the purpose of the board and lobbyist registration and disclosure. The meeting was called to order at 4:12 pm by Chair Menendez and attendance was stated for the record.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Mr. Maxwell and seconded by Mr. Garcia-Pons to approve the minutes of the meeting of April 20, 2022.
 The motion passed (Ayes: 9; Nays: 0).

DEFERRALS: None

NOTICE REGARDING EX-PARTE COMMUNICATIONS.

Chair Menendez read a statement regarding Notice of Ex-Partee Communications. Board members who had ex-partee communication of contact regarding cases being heard were instructed to disclose such communication or contact. Board members did not indicate that any such communication occurred.

SWEARING IN OF THE PUBLIC:

Attorney Ceballos administered the oath.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES: None

Chair

Menendez read a description of the first item as follows:

AD VALOREM TAX RELIEF:

CASE FILE AV 2019-005:

An application requesting ad valorem tax relief for the property at 3701 Durango Street, a Local Historic Landmark, legally described as Lots 1 to 3 inclusive, Block 43, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part 3, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 10, at Page 52 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The related Special Certificate of Appropriateness, COA (SP) 2018-005, was granted design approval by the Historic Preservation Board on April 19, 2018.

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

1. A location map was shown, the property is located on the corner of Roderigo Avenue and Durango Street
2. Designated as a local historic landmark on April 19, 2018.
3. Permitted in 1925.
4. Mediterranean Revival Style.
5. It exhibits numerous character-defining features of the style, most notably its round tower entry.
6. Designed by architect, H. George Fink who was one of the City's well-known and early prolific architects.
7. The work was approved by the Historic Preservation Board on Special Certificate of Appropriateness COA(SP) 2018-005.
8. COA(ST)2019-169 was approved by staff administratively for work to the pool.
9. Photos of the property before and after were shown while the work performed was described, the color change making the difference between before and after obvious.
10. Improvements to the property include:
 - New impact-resistant casement windows and doors to match existing on house.
 - Reintroduced windowsills at original locations.
 - Reintroduced barrel tile roof inserts at second floor terrace.
 - New barrel tile roof on the house.
 - New paint.
 - West façade remodel (a later addition) to make it more sympathetic to the historic residence.
 - Wrought iron restoration.
 - Stucco repair.
 - One-story addition consisting of a family room and corridor approximately 749 SF, and an outdoor space to the east.
 - Restored balconette railing.
 - 100 square foot detached cabana structure.
 - Restored terracotta barrel tile into inserts.
 - 100 square foot detached cabana structure was added.
 - New landscaped garden courtyard
 - Installation of new paver walkways
 - Reconfiguration of existing swimming pool and pool deck.
 - Installation of new landscaping.
 - Later addition to the house that was removed and reconfigured.
 - Restored sidewall.
11. Staff recommends approval of the project.

Ms. Kautz asked the owner if they wanted to say anything, and they declined.

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

Ms. Spain said she was involved in the approval and designation and wanted to know if there was a conflict. Attorney Ceballos stated that if she thought she could be fair and impartial then there was no voting conflict.

A motion was made by Ms. Rolando and seconded by Ms. Spain to approve ad valorem tax relief for the property at 3701 Durango Street.

The motion passed (Ayes: 9; Nays: 0).

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

CASE FILE AV 2018-002:

An application requesting ad valorem tax relief for the property at 2907 Columbus Boulevard, a Local Historic Landmark, legally described as Lots 13 and 14, Block 15, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part One, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 8, at Page 108 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The related Special Certificate of Appropriateness, COA (SP) 2016-029, was granted design approval by the Historic Preservation Board on December 16, 2016.

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

1. A location map was shown, the property is located on Columbus Boulevard as you head to the Biltmore Hotel on the south.
2. 1920's and 1940's photographs of the house were shown.
3. Permit 187 in the City.
4. Permitted post incorporation of the City.
5. The Fishbaugh photo indicates that the residence was completed at least by August 1924.
6. It is a very early home.
7. Designated as a local historic landmark in 1989.
8. The board approved a Special Certificate of Appropriateness COA(SP)2016-029.
9. Staff administratively approved two Standard Certificates of Appropriateness for windows, pool, and deck.
10. Photos of the property before and after were shown while the work performed was described, the color change making the difference between before and after obvious.
11. Improvements to the property include:
 - New impact-resistant casement windows and doors.
 - Removal of existing wood and barrel tile window hoods in non-original locations. Some in the before pictures were original to the house and they were replicated all over, so they removed the ones that were not supposed to be there.
 - Removal of decorative tiles applied to the original windowsills.
 - Interior remodeling.
 - Painting of the house.
 - New fabric awnings.
 - Coral rock accents cleaned.
 - Stucco repair.
 - Refinishing of the original wood floors.
 - One-story octagonal breakfast nook and butler's pantry at the northeast corner of the residence.
 - One story expanded family room connecting the rear of the existing residence to the existing 2 story garage.
 - One story covered terrace at the southeast corner of the residence.
 - A detached 237 square foot gazebo in the rear yard.
 - Site improvements include:
 - Reconfiguration and removal of brick driveway pavers.
 - New swimming pool and pool deck.
 - Installation of new landscaping
 - Perimeter fence at the northeast corner of the property.
12. Ms. Kautz showed interior pictures to show that they did full tier remodeling.
13. Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Kautz asked the owner if they wanted to say anything, and they declined.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Maxell and seconded by Ms. Rolando to approve ad valorem tax relief for the property at 2907 Columbus Boulevard.

The motion passed (Ayes: 9; Nays: 0).

Ms. Spain said that the same comments of her being involved applied to this project.

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

SPECIAL CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2022-010:

An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 4100 Monserrate Street, a Local Historic Landmark, legally described as Lot 4 & S15 Feet of Lot 3, Block 1, Coral Gables Riviera Section Part One Revised, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 28, at Page 31 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant is requesting design approval for additions and alterations to the residence and auxiliary structure and sitework. Variances have also been requested from Article 2, Section 2-101 D (4) (b.i) of the Coral Gables Zoning Code for the minimum side setback, total side setback, and Article 16 for the definition of a gazebo.

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

1. The home was designed in 1925 by Robert Law Weed.
2. Mediterranean Revival Style.
3. Designated as a Local Historic Landmark on November 17, 2021.
4. The proposal is for a two-story, 970 square foot addition to the north of the existing residence, a one-story, 260 square foot addition to the west elevation which is the rear.
5. Exterior alterations include:
 - A new gazebo with bathroom attached to the west elevation of the garage and a trellis to the north.
 - New pool and pool deck.
6. The primary façade faces Monserrate Street.
7. The two-story addition is attached to the north elevation and will be visible from the street.
8. Staff worked extensively with the architect on this project to come forward with several different proposals and this seemed to be the best which respected the existing house and protected the trees on site and met the owner's requirements.
9. One of the problems with this property was the second-floor ceiling height which curves upward so the interior ceiling height is quite low.
10. The initial proposal was to raise the roof height and make a lot of alterations to the property.
11. Working with the architect, they achieved something that works with the house and retains most of the front elevations of the property.
12. The windows have been replaced with impact windows of various lighting configurations that are appropriate.
13. The historic structure will be re-roofed with barrel tiles.
14. Some windows and doors will be removed to accommodate the new additions and provide access to them.
15. The one-story addition at the rear will be located between the existing projection at the back and the new projection. Construction is of aluminum frame with the central single white French doors flanked by sidelights above which are transoms.
16. The existing garage will be retained. Other alterations include installing French doors to provide access to the swimming pool.
17. The new gazebo will be attached to the garage.
18. A new swimming pool, new driveway and a pool surround will also be installed.
19. Three variances have been requested.
 - a) For the side setback of the gazebo to be 3 feet, 3 inches as opposed to 5 feet. The Board of Architects requested that the gazebo be attached to the garage. The original intention was to keep the gazebo separate from the garage. The applicant did follow the Board of Architects' recommendation. Staff has no preference one way or the other.
 - b) For a total minimum site setback of 11 feet, 7 inches, which is 18% of the lot width versus the required 20% of the lot width. This is to do with the existing small setbacks.
 - c) The variance for the gazebo has more to do with the definition of the gazebo. Article 16 defines a gazebo as an accessory building consisting of a detached, covered, free-standing, open-air structure, not exceeding 300 square feet. The proposed gazebo is 300 square feet. It will be attached to the existing garage per the Board of Architects request. It will be partially enclosed. The gazebo will be at the rear of the garage and will not be visible from the right-of-way. This was reviewed by the Board of Architects on three separate occasions and the applicant addressed all the comments and received approval on March 17, 2022.
20. Staff believes that the proposed alterations are in keeping with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Although visible from the right-of-way the two-story addition is set back from the front of the original house. All the original elements to the front of the historic structure are retained. The addition contains elements from the historic design but is identifiable as an addition, and it could be removed in the future.
21. Staff is recommending:

- a) Approval with 6 conditions noted in the staff report.
- b) Approval of the variance to allow the gazebo addition to have an interior side setback of 3 feet 3 inches.
- c) Approve the variance to allow the single-family residential property to provide a minimum total side setback of approximately 11 feet, 7 inches.
- d) Approve variance to allow the gazebo addition to be attached to the auxiliary garage structure, not be free standing, be only partially open air and include a bathroom.

Mr. Rufino Gil the architect of record gave a presentation following the on-screen presentation. Highlights were as follows:

1. The addition was designed in the same character defining Italian inspired Mediterranean Revival Style.
2. They had gone back and forth with the historic staff to come to a solution to include owner and staff requests.
3. The ceiling height of the house on the second floor was unchanged.
4. A seamless two-story addition comes out of the existing gable roof to form a horseshoe or U-shape mirrored on both sides as shown on the elevations.
5. The windows will be double casement with muntins or applied molds in the middle to bring back the original design of the double swinging windows.
6. The new addition is defined by a much thinner windowsill as opposed to the existing structure which has a thicker windowsill detail.
7. There is another single-story addition in the back with a shed roof that mirrors the shed roof of the entry of the house.
8. The owner's requested a larger living room with a larger ceiling height, so this is the way it was accommodated.
9. The shed roof also has a window wall to allow a little more of indoor/outdoor living with an exterior terrace. It will make the room feel bigger as per the owner's request.
10. Originally the gazebo was a separate structure, but the Board of Architects thought it would look nicer and more integrated if it was attached to the existing garage.
11. Board of Architects also suggested a gazebo instead of a pool cabana as the gazebo is larger and the owner can have more square footage to enjoy the ample terrace and a couple of existing oak trees which they were trying to maintain.
12. He showed pictures of existing versus proposed.
13. The proposed front completely remains as existing.
14. All the openings will remain the same size, they are introducing the hurricane impact windows.
15. The front door tries to mimic the existing historical patio door.
16. The addition is significantly set back from the original house so as not to overtake the historical character of the house.
17. The Italian inspired revival chimney is to remain and be protected.

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

Questions and comments from the board:

1. Ms. Spain asked if variances for the existing setbacks and were they following the line of the existing house. Mr. Gil responded that the existing garage is 3.1 feet from the property line so when attaching to it, they were following the same line.
2. Mr. Adams stated that the house is extending to the other side closer to the setback.
3. Ms. Spain noted that in the past this was not a variance, and asked if the City Attorney's office had decided that this increases the abnormality of the variance? Attorney Ceballos said he was not aware of any change in policy, but he believed these could be approved. They did not request it and if there were more requests being made. Ms. Spain stated that in the past when you maintained the same setback that was originally maintained it was the previous City Attorney's determination that you were not increasing the variance, so a variance was not required and it would be brought to the board, but they did not have to be advertised. The existing line is being maintained so there is a precedence already. It did not hurt to advertise it as a variance, she was just surprised to see it. Mr. Garcia-Pons said that there was a second variance for the 20% that does make a difference because right now the 20% is there because the new addition on the right side of the building makes it less than 20% so if they had to request that variance anyway, they might as well do both.
4. Mr. Fullerton asked if there had ever been any research on the lot sizes and locations the existing buildings have and the possibility of that setback requirement, or a variance required by the relocation of the property line. A lot split for instance that might have affected the setback. Had the legal department investigated when a lot split was

required. Attorney Ceballos said that typically if there is a property or structure in the setback the lot split request would not be approved. Ms. Spain said that you could not do a lot split if doing so would create a non-confirming condition. A lot of these garages were built on the property line

5. Ms. Rolando referred to Sheet A-7 and asked if there would be muntins on the arched windows in the front and the French doors in the back. Mr. Gil clarified that she was referring to the front porch windows, and said it was the Board of Architects' recommendation to do as clear as possible to go back to the open porch look. Mr. Adams referred to the historic photo and said the screen had a central muntin, at the Board of Architects' request.
6. Ms. Rolando asked if the French doors in the back had muntins and were they depicted? Mr. Gil replied affirmatively and the French doors on the right- and left-hand side do, but the addition in the middle with the window wall does not. Mr. Adams responded to Ms. Rolando's question that staff was okay with that as it was on the rear and identified as an addition.
7. Mr. Maxwell asked if they were proposing putting a mold around the front entry door. Mr. Gil showed the original historic picture with a band around the patio door and said that after conversations with the Historic Staff and the Board of Architects they decided to mimic it.
8. Mr. Maxwell requested Mr. Gil to go back to the picture and clarify what they were doing. He asked what type of band that was and if they were proposing an inset with sidelights on a screen door and a mold over that. Mr. Gil responded by saying it would be an impact door that has the same shape, not a screen door as the original historic house. Ms. Rolando asked if the impact door had a glass frame around it to mimic what would have been a screen. Mr. Gill answered affirmatively.
9. Mr. Adams said the historic photo showed some of the muntins angled rather than straight, and one of the conditions is that the applicant work with staff to go back to the angled muntins instead of the horizontal and vertical muntins.
10. Mr. Maxwell asked if they were proposing to enlarge any of the openings as it appears on the plans. Mr. Gill answered that all the openings of the historic existing residence remain unaltered.
11. Mr. Garcia Pons said that staff condition #4 talked about the windows on the second floor, was there one or was it blocked off. Mr. Gill said it was barely visible between the two palm trees, but it is a small square window that was missed on the notation on the plans. They agreed with staff to add it (he pointed it out on the picture). Mr. Adams said the type is not identified in the window schedule, and he did not know if it was fixed or casement. Mr. Gil said it would be casement like the rest.
12. Mr. Fullerton asked if the rounded arched transoms over the two windows to the left were going to split all the way up, would they have the transom open. Mr. Gill said they originally had something like that when they approached the Board of Architects, but they did not want the transom, because historically since there was an open patio there would not be any, so they asked them to do something as translucent as possible and cutting in the middle goes with the other double swing doors.
13. Ms. Bache-Wiig said she thought the drawings were good. She asked if they were lowering the existing windowsills on the front elevation? Mr. Gil said Mr. Adams had brought it to his attention. One of the arches is slightly above where it should be in the drawing reproduction, but they were not touching it.
14. Ms. Bache-Wiig referred to sheet A-9 and asked if they were removing the door and the steps and putting a window in its place, and if they would show the ghost of what was there before? Mr. Gil answered yes, it was a current service entry. The steps protrude into the driveway causing an unsafe condition coming out, so they wanted to just leave the entry door and the back French doors. Ms. Bache-Wiig said he did a very nice job with a very difficult home.
15. Mr. Adams said they looked at 4 or 5 different proposals, to which Mr. Gil said it was a very long process, but the results are coming out nicely.
16. Mr. Gil said he agreed to make the changes staff was requesting.

A motion was made by Mr. Fullerton and seconded by Ms. Spain to approve the request for an issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 4100 Monserrate Street for design approval for additions and alterations to the residence and auxiliary structure and sitework with staff conditions.

The motion passed (Ayes: 9; Nays: 0).

The conditions were as follows:

1. *The proposed barrel roof tile shall be submitted to staff for review.*
2. *The arched porch windows shall not change in size.*
3. *The type of window proposed for the second floor of the north elevation of the historic structure shall be clarified.*
4. *The proposed design of the main entrance door and sidelights shall be submitted to Staff for review.*

5. *The proposed pavers shall be submitted to Staff for review.*

A motion was made by Mr. Fullerton and seconded by Ms. Spain to approve the request for variances from Article 2, Section 2-101 D (4) (b.i) of the Coral Gables Zoning Code for the minimum side setback, total side setback, and Article 16 for the definition of a gazebo.

The motion passed (Ayes: 9; Nays: 0).

The variances were as follows:

1. *Variance a variance to allow the gazebo addition to have an interior side setback of three feet, three inches (3'-3") vs. All Single-Family Residential building setbacks shall be as per Section 2-100, Residential Districts Table, and shall meet the following requirements: Interior side: Twenty (20%) percent of the total lot width, with a combined maximum of twenty (20) feet shall be equal on both sides. An existing contextual condition may allow an uneven distribution as determined by the Board of Architects, but in no case shall a side setback be less than five (5) feet as required by Article 2, Section 2-101 D (4) (b.i) of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.*
2. *A variance to allow the single-family residential property to provide a minimum total side setback of approximately 11 feet, seven inches (11'-7") which totals eighteen (18%) percent of the lot width vs. All Single-Family Residential building setbacks shall be as per Section 2-100, Residential Districts Table, and shall meet the following requirements: Interior side: Twenty (20%) percent of the total lot width, with a combined maximum of twenty (20) feet shall be equal on both sides as required by Article 2, Section 2-101 D (4) (b.i) of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.*
3. *A variance to allow the gazebo addition to be attached to the auxiliary garage structure, not be free-standing, be only partially open-air, and include a bathroom and BBQ vs. Article 16 of the Coral Gables Zoning Code defines a Gazebo as an accessory building consisting of a detached, covered, freestanding open-air structure not exceeding three hundred (300) square feet.*

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

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2022-011:

An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 930 Castile Avenue, a Contributing Resource within the "Castile Avenue / Plaza Historic District," legally described as Lot 1 & the West ½ of Lot 2, Peacock Resubdivision of Block 35, Coral Gables Section "B," according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 35, at Page 60 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant is requesting design approval for a one-story addition to the residence and sitework. A variance has also been requested from Article 2, Section 2-101 D (4) (b.i) of the Coral Gables Zoning Code for the minimum side setback.

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

1. A location map was shown, the property is located on Castile Avenue just south of Young Park.
2. In January 2008 the Castile Avenue Plaza Historic District was listed in the Coral Gables Register of Historic Places.
3. This property is considered a contributing resource within the historic district.
4. Designed by architects Paist and Steward.
5. Issued Permit No. 4385 in 1931
6. As noted in the staff report it is an unusual house as when originally designed the main volume of the living space was open air.
7. She showed a picture from the 40's which showed a loft in the open, and the staircase was in the open courtyard in the center. It was enclosed into living space (1980's photo). Even with the alteration it still retains its integrity.
8. The application is for a small addition that is tucked behind the existing volume of the house.
9. It is 6½ feet wide, not visible from Castile Avenue.
10. A variance is requested to have the side setback of 4 feet 3 inches for the addition, the existing house on the west side has a side setback that is currently at 3 foot 5 inches. This is not increasing or matching the non-conformity, it is slightly less.
11. It was reviewed by Board of Architects on January 2022, their only comment was that they were in support of the setback variance which will be considered by this board.
12. Staff has three small conditions.

Mr. Alfonso Jurado, architect of record stated that he was there to answer questions.

The following comments were made:

1. Mr. Jurado said it is a very small addition, just enough to make the house more comfortable for the owners who love the house, this small modification will make the house more livable for them and their kids.
2. Mr. Jurado said the requested variance does not make the non-conformity worse, there is an existing setback of 3.5 ft. to a portion of the house on that side and the total square footage of the addition is 150 square feet.
3. Ms. Kautz stated that the only sitework was to remove paving to achieve the landscape open space requirement.
4. Mr. Jurado showed the two elevations.
 - Drawing #3 – shows the existing elevation and partial elevation of the actual portion being modified on elevation #4. It is essentially a shed roof that leans up against the existing house and spans the elevation of the house past the kitchen creating a small porch for the kitchen.
 - Elevation #2 shows how it creates a small porch for the kitchen giving a little bit of shade to those windows.
 - He showed the existing condition – a small, screened porch with a stoop – access from the kitchen out to the yard which would be eliminated with the addition and replaced with the porch they were creating around the kitchen.
5. Ms. Kautz said that the conditions were indicated in the staff report.
 - a) The roof is to be 2-piece true barrel tile.
 - b) The windows and doors to have high profile muntins.
 - c) The glass is to be clear.
 - d) A score line to be provided on the south facade between the existing residence and the end of the new addition.
6. Chair Menendez asked Mr. Jurado if he had any objections to those conditions to which he answered no.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor or in opposition of this case.

Ms. Kautz said they had received one email in opposition from Susan Krupnick, she asked if she should read it into the record or indicate that it was part of the record. Chair Menendez said that she did not need to read it and attorney Ceballos concurred.

Chair Menendez closed the public portion of the hearing and opened it up to the board for comments.

Ms. Spain asked if this was a variance because it was requested by the Board of Architects. She said this was the same situation where it was not increasing the non-conformity so typically it would not be a variance. Ms. Kautz said that staff did not request it. It does not continue the same line as the existing house, it is set back a little further and staff has not been requesting those opinions of the City Attorney's Office now they are providing a public forum to allow people to comment.

Ms. Rolando stated that she thought this was a very good, tasteful and restrained renovation. Ms. Spain added that it was very efficient. Ms. Kautz said this was three years in the making, it was going to be submitted right before Covid started. Mr. Fullerton asked if the front room is 3.3 feet 5 inches from the property line? Mr. Jurado answered yes. Mr. Fullerton went on to ask if what they were proposing was more than that. Mr. Jurado answered affirmatively.

A motion was made by Ms. Rolando and seconded by Mr. Garcia Pons to approve the request for an issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 930 Castile Avenue for design approval for a one-story addition to the residence and sitework with staff conditions.

The motion passed (Ayes: 9; Nays: 0).

The conditions were as follows:

1. *Window/door muntins are to be high-profile / dimensional.*
2. *Window/door glass to be clear.*
3. *Staff requests clarification on the proposed paint color.*
4. *The new pool will be handled administratively with a Standard Certificate of Appropriateness at the time of permitting.*

A motion was made by Ms. Rolando and seconded by Mr. Garcia Pons to approve the request for a variance from Article 2, Section 2-101 D (4) (b.i) of the Coral Gables Zoning Code for the minimum side setback.

The motion passed (Ayes: 9; Nays: 0).

The variance is as follows:

Grant a variance to allow the new addition to have an interior side setback of four feet, three inches (4'-3") vs. All Single-Family Residential building setbacks shall be as per Section 2-100, Residential Districts Table, and shall meet the following requirements: Interior side: Twenty (20%) percent of the total lot width, with a combined maximum of twenty (20) feet shall be equal on both sides. An existing contextual condition may allow an uneven distribution as determined by the Board of Architects, but in no case shall a side setback be less than five (5) feet as required by Article 2, Section 2-101 D (4) (b.i) of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.

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

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2022-012:

An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at **803 Alhambra Circle**, a Contributing Resource within the "Alhambra Circle Historic District," legally described as Lot 1 Less a Portion Thereof (a lengthy legal description is on file), and Lots 2 & 3, Block 31, Coral Gables Section "B," according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 111 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant is requesting design approval for the installation of a hybrid roofing system.

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

1. Property is located on the northwest corner of Alhambra Circle and Cortez Street.
2. The primary façade faces southwest on Alhambra Circle.
3. Single family home designed in 1929 by S.R. Carroll in the Mediterranean Revival Style and retains a high degree of historic integrity.
4. The applicant is requesting design approval for the installation of a hybrid roofing system, consisting of a clay barrel tile cap with an aluminum steel pan below it.
5. The letter of intent states the roofing will include a solar thermal option.
6. The NOA submitted with the application includes various options however the specific option being proposed was not indicated.
7. The letter of intent states there will be a thermal option.
8. None of the options on the NOA appear to include a proposed thermal option.
9. Tile color has not been specified.
10. During the initial discussions the applicant had stated that the tiles were included in the purchase price of the house and had received prior approval. However, staff could not find any prior approval for these particular tiles on this house.
11. The applicant provided the addresses of five other properties where the aluminum pan with barrel tile cap had been previously approved. Three of the properties are not designated as historic. 525 Alhambra Circle and 639 Alhambra Circle are contributing resources within the Alhambra Circle Historic District.
12. The application for 525 Alhambra included the solar thermal option of pipes laid below the tile for water heating. The application for 639 Alhambra did not. Both applications were reviewed and approved by Staff.
13. The solar thermal option of the pipes below the tile to heat water appears to be a relatively inobtrusive method of utilizing solar energy on historic properties.
14. The first layer of tiles at the roof edges will consist of a true two-piece barrel tile, behind which will be the aluminum pan.
15. The application is unclear if the aluminum pans between the tiles will be painted or coated with mortar of an appropriate color.
16. There is a slight concern that the proposed barrel tiles have a slightly shallower profile than true barrel tiles.
17. The proposal was reviewed by the Board of Architects on May 3rd, and they had several comments.
18. The applicant was scheduled to go to the Board of Architects again last week for this specific application, but they did not show up and said they were given the wrong date.

Staff's Final Conclusion:

1. Roofing material is a character defining feature of the style.
2. The home originally had a two-piece barrel tile roof which is the appropriate roofing material for this property.
3. The proposed roof covering is not a true two-piece barrel tile, however there is the option to include the solar thermal option of heating water in the pipes.

4. Although there may be some differences in appearance between the proposed barrel tile and true barrel tile this does appear to be a fairly inobtrusive method of using solar energy.
5. As the detail is not clear which style and solar thermal option is being proposed, there is concern that the proposed tile differs from a true barrel tile and aluminum is being used for the pan.
6. Methods used to conceal the pan include a double first layer of tile at the roof edges and either painting or mortar coating the exposed aluminum.
7. The applicant is scheduled to go to Board of Architects tomorrow, and there is a push to move this along because this property has been half finished for quite a while. If it had been deferred the applicant would not be here until June, they would lose a month.
8. There are several conditions and these tiles have been to the Board of Architects before.
9. There are 3 different types available.
 - a) Aluminum pan with a clay barrel tile.
 - b) Aluminum pan with a clay barrel tile with pipes running below it to heat water.
 - c) Aluminum pan with a clay barrel tile with Photovoltaic cells.
10. The Board of Architects was supportive of the first two options, not the Photovoltaic cells because they are visible, and would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
11. Staff wants to encourage the use of solar energy wherever they can, but the methods to collect the energy should be as inobtrusive as possible. On the other hand, the City is very specific in most cases that if you had a barrel tile roof, you must replace it with a true two-piece barrel tile roof. To try and accommodate that medium ground, they would accept the aluminum pan with the tubing to heat the water, the double row of barrel tiles at the front. The recommendation is approval for that specific option.
12. Mr. Adams said he thought they would be seeing more of these. He asked the board whether they wanted to review these on a case-by-case basis or if they accepted one of the options then staff could review in the future.
13. The recommendation for approval has conditions.
 - a) The solar thermal option comprising of the pipes below the tiles must be included.
 - b) The proposed barrel tile cap and aluminum pan system shall be clarified to ensure that it is the system being used.
 - c) Proposed color and specifications of the barrel tile shall be submitted to staff.
 - d) The first layer of tiles along the roof edges shall be a two-piece true barrel tile.
 - e) All aluminum shall be painted or coated in mortar of an appropriate color and shall not be visible.
 - f) The proposed tile and solar thermal option shall be reviewed and approved by the Board of Architects.
 - g) Board of Architects comments must be addressed.
14. Mr. Adams said that the applicant was aware that this board could approve it, the Board of Architects could deny it, and then they will have to return.

Questions and comments from the Board:

1. Ms. Rolando asked if solar pipes were not installed would it be a true barrel tile for the entire roof? Mr. Adams said that if the applicant did not install the pipes, and proposed using the aluminum pan, and the clay cap then staff would not recommend approval because other applicants are instructed to use true two-piece barrel tile. He said he felt there would be more of these applications in the future and he thought it was important to bring it to the board and let them decide.

Mr. Dan Arguelles the owner of Artezanos, Inc. introduced himself and Mr. Mario Famada from City Roofing and gave a presentation following the on-screen presentation. Highlights were as follows:

1. A picture of 803 Alhambra Circle showed the house did not have a roof and had been sitting fallow for many years.
2. It had two peel and sticks put on it that each have expired. They are 180 days exposure, and it was ready for yet another roof.
3. Mr. Famada has just recently reroofed it with new underlayments and was proceeding forward.
4. The tile that was originally approved was Santa Fe which is no longer in business.
5. They customer changed contractors and are looking to change the tile to the appropriate system.
6. He showed a picture of 804 Alhambra Circle with the original antique Cuban tile and stated that it may have been restored, but these were the original tiles.
7. These tiles are protected in an ordinance that Coral Gables backed up about 30 years ago for the reuse, salvage and re-application of historic Cuban tile that found its exemption from the restrictions of product control and today it finds itself in the Florida Building Code under Section 12-05.

8. He showed a picture of a house that was preserved with Artezanos handmade tile, the same handmade tile on the City Hall, Coral Gables roof. It was mixed with salvaged Cuban and antique Spanish tile as per Florida Building Code. In between the tiles are black and since they act as a channel and are granular and when they get organic material, they typically become black adding to the depth of the roof. Your eye focuses more on the cover tile and not necessarily the pan.
9. The pan which is the part that they replace with an aluminum pan increases wind performance, it lowers the weight of a roof and because it is a metallic product it is used as a heat transfer plate that is FSEC Certified and also a modification of that can be used to integrate Photovoltaics on the areas of the roof that are not so visible.
10. He showed a close-up of the house that showed the gable detail - finger markings. These finger markings found their way into Section 12-05 of the Florida Building Code as it relates to the preservation of antique tiles. You have up to five finger swell markings, masonic embossments all of which are documented in language in the Florida Building Code.
11. He made note of the double cap perimeter on the edge.
12. Mr. Arguelles showed an Article in Home and Design Sunday's issue showing that they were preserving antique Cuban tile even before there was a code. He said that roofers would do it illegally on the weekends, where they could circumvent officials, but it was the right thing to do.
13. He referred to documentation from the Miami Daily News 1925 indicating that the tiles arrived here in the 1920's, were sold to Merrick, the tile was 200 to 500 years old. This was backed up by Coral Gables. Miami-Dade did make an ordinance into the Florida Building Code, and it found its way verbatim into the Florida Building Code. This is the only building material that has its own historical designation. If someone wants to reuse or reapply, they can, they do not need NOA approval to do that whether you have a historical house or not.
14. Mr. Arguelles showed additional media articles. The City of Miami where they were trying to promote the preservation of these tiles. The same tile could be found all over the Gold Coast of Florida. You could look at the roof tops, particularly that of the chimney tops that are left on Viscaya, and you would see the same stamps here in Coral Gables as in Viscaya. This is the common denominator that united all these roofs. Another article from the City of Miami showed that they had found a tile that was dated, and it had a stamp from the 1800's.
15. Mr. Arguelles showed a Memorandum May 2, 1995, Miami Dade County Ordinance 95-97 Approved for Re-Use/ Salvage of Historical Cuban & 18th Century Spanish Barrel. This showed how important historic barrel tile was to Merrick and Denman Fink because it is a character defining aspect of the Mediterranean Design Style.
16. He showed a picture of a roof he had done in 1998, City Hall of Coral Gables. They had mixed in artisan pan tile with 20% in field area. They salvaged as much as they could. Other individuals were providing for public or private salvage because it is illegal to throw it away. And they brought it back to its original splendor.
17. Section 12-07 of the Florida Building Code, Historical Cuban Tile" it had the same language of the ordinance and the resolution that the City of Coral Gables passed. It identifies any tile that does not fall into this group can be identified by the Building Official to go ahead and break the ice if anyone was in doubt if it was historical Cuban tile or not.
18. Artezanos is a 4th generation company and is South Florida's oldest roof manufacturer. His grandfather was the oldest architect from 2012 until his passing in 2019. His father is an industrial engineer with a degree in building construction as well. He did the Venetian Pool. He got into the roof tile manufacturing business trying to maintain the integrity of these homes because no one had a good quality handmade clay barrel tile. They produced the replacement for the antique Cuban tiles with all the physical attributes these tiles had. They also make machine tiles.
19. Mr. Arguelles said they had high-quality clay tiles that can be used as pan or cover tiles. They wanted to find a way to make roofs more sustainable so they last a long time so it can be tied into a federal tax credit, where they could use renewables to lower expenses while at the same time doubling wind performance. This was the sustainable way, instead of losing all the beautiful historical tile and getting replaced with concrete "S" tile or a clay "S" tile or a cookie cutter machined tile with an end glow sprayed on it that is completely lacking with the antiqueness and the authenticity.
20. The hybrid system is basically a barrel tile roof on steroids. The only sacrifice is the heavy pan tile that represents 50% of the roof that has no aesthetic properties whatsoever. For people that like instant gratification it is nice to have a dark tile off the stop before you wait for it to mildew. Brown is very important, you can do terracotta, but brown looks the best and looks historical. They have used antique Cuban tile with the brown and it looks just like antique Cuban tile. They had used a true antique Cuban tile mixed with the Artezanos tile. Because it is a universal pan tile, you could take any antique tile from around the world regardless of dimension and superimpose it on top of this field of pan tiles, modify the placement on center spacing and get the desired look. Whether you wanted an Italian look that is wider on center space or space as shown in the picture where they want to see more cover tiles and not as many pan tiles. Roofers did cheat back then, if you spaced tile really far apart, they had a concrete

pan tile that was also used as a substitute in the 50's and 60's the intention was to use less of the cover tiles because they were hard to come by and you spread the tiles out, but then you are looking at a lot of pan tile, and when that pan tile starts to patina it looks much different because it was a different material than the cover tiles. In Spain or other third world countries when you put barrel tile together these tiles did not have foam or cement, they were loose lay. They sat very close together because they would sit in their convexities and so it could support some weight.

21. He showed a picture of 1200 Alhambra Circle on the rear of the house, looking down on the second story roof, and said there was no aesthetic sacrifice. You are substituting a higher performance aluminum product and then using the more expensive handmade tile in a very conservative sustainable fashion by superimposing them on the top of this metal infrastructure.
22. He showed a lateral view from 525 Alhambra Circle. A ½ inch hex tubing spelled out in the Miami Dade NOA, FSEC Certified. They did a whole year of testing, and it pierces the veil of the tax credit. It used to be 30% tax credit, now it is 26%, next year it will be 22% and then it goes to 0% for residential and 10% for commercial. What is important here is that with that solar thermal tubing we are using the heat on the roof and putting it in the hot water tank and giving you free hot water like the fake chimneys in Coral Gables. When you have a volume of water sitting on the roof it heats up, but when you put it at a ½ inch, and spread it all over the surface area of a roof you can get a magnificent BTU. This can also hide an unsightly pool heating system, although you don't get the 26% tax credit on that you can use it as a heat dissipation system underneath Photovoltaics, which are the solar arrays they used. They counter sync, and you could put that in your pool, so you can take cool pool water and lower your air conditioning load. This means sustainability.
23. He showed an example of the Artesanos Hybrid with the Flexible PV. They are the only NOA holders on a photovoltaic panel. It is a flexible panel, contains no metal parts and no glass. You can walk on them if you want to. There is no penetration to the roof which is one of the big problems with solar.
24. He showed pictures of the same hex tubing used as a heat dissipation system. It is also a pool heating system.
25. He showed flexible photovoltaics on a flat roof adjacent to the rear less viewed side of the house.
26. He showed a picture of a gable roof which had a complete photovoltaic array which was not visible from the street.
27. This gives a low aesthetic impact, the ability to integrate the sustainability, renewables and it can be handmade or machine-made tile.
28. The hybrid is so versatile they could put flat tile on top of it and deliver a completely different setting.
29. He showed a roof with a pool system before you install the tiles and the metal pans.
30. He showed Commissioner Joe Martinez's roof, a solar thermal roof system.
31. Mr. Arguelles stated that he was trying to bring Coral Gables roofs to Kendall. He said you will be able to tap into the Federal Tax Credit with a very low investment, which is important because roofs are very expensive. Laws in Tallahassee are favoring shingle roofs. His conversation with Commissioner Raquel Regalado was about Coral Gables having issues because they do not give credits for anything other than metal roofing, and now if the roof is older than 10 years you must replace it if you want to keep your insurance policy. People in Coral Gables want to get their investments and they have been supporting roofs that could last a 100 years and 50 years, it does not make sense to have them fall into that same category. It was going into the special legislative session of May 22 or 23.
32. Mr. Arguelles showed pictures of the following:
 - a) A hybrid roof recently completed at 907 Anastasia Avenue, 639 Alhambra Circle.
 - b) 1200 Alhambra Circle which has 10KW installed on it and was not visible from any of the perspectives shown.
 - c) 525 Alhambra Circle with invisible solar thermal, the massing in front loses nothing. Using double cap parameters, close on center spacing, maximum design limit for having 2 inches in the channels. They returned the roof to its original splendor which is the same thing they want to do to 803 Alhambra Circle, to return roofs to what they were when originally installed. He referred to the prior presentations and said that the roofs replaced in the 80's did not have the same profile or fortification of the original roofs. With a hybrid system, because they are saving half the tile, they could do a more authentic installation because of on-center spacings, metal is not as thick as ½ inch, so it was easier to get the details right.
 - d) An original photo of the house provided by Mr. Adams, which Mr. Arguelles said he could bring back to the original aesthetic using hybrid and a handmade barrel tile, which would give twice the performance and the ability to use renewables.

Questions and comments from the Board:

1. Mr. Fullerton asked if they used a true bottom tile at the eave where it is visible. Mr. Arguelles replied affirmatively and that he would not do it any other way, or it would be a peak. He showed the board a sample tile and indicated the ridge cap, the eave starter, and then the cover which they would break off, flip it around and you would have your double cap perimeter. All they were doing is including the hybrid metal pans, they were cheating there, but performance wise, their NOA, the highest attached resistance is 111-foot pounds, the equivalent with ICP foam in their hybrid NOA is 190-foot pounds and the aesthetics are easier to achieve, plus it is less tile, less expensive to install and it has a lot more flexibility.
2. Mr. Maxwell asked how long the metal pan lasts? Mr. Arguelles said they had one of the only NOA's that say it is a 50-year life cycle. Miami-Dade chopped all their high-performance numbers by 50% because of the safety factor. The same holds true with their design pressures. Theirs was the only NOA that has design pressures and foot pounds with movement-based system. Fifty years is the minimum you can expect. He said he knew that there are roofs in Coral Gables that have never been changed and are the original tile and the underlayment served absolutely no purpose because in third world countries and around Europe this is your primary roofing. A true two-piece barrel tile every 18 inches you have a place where water can filter, if replaced with channel that's 4 or 5 feet there was less places for water to come underneath. Basically, what you had is their embedded gutters. For aesthetic purpose and for performance to allow the clearance for a ½ inch tubing to traverse underneath these metal pans they have a step that's ½ inch that would be the ½ inch every 16 inches. You can obey the steps and get an exact 2-inch overhead without having to do 3 inches, or you can not respect the lines at all and do a rustic installation where we stagger them. I love to stagger them as when you line up all the tiles that leading edge multiplied by the force of the wind that makes it vulnerable. If you stagger them the wind can't organize itself on a long enough leading edge, and then you make the roof more resilient.
3. Mr. Fullerton asked if on the metal they had regular plywood, or whatever the wooden decking is and then the 30 and other membranes and then the metal goes on, then it is mopped in, or it is laid in with the tie-back. Mr. Arguelles said that his preference was not to use prescriptive underlay. It was part of the problem in the industry that makes roofs with low life cycles. When doing a barrel tile roof, he did not want to redo it again, being sustainable he liked to cut corners and get fourfold of what he would ordinarily get. 30 pound felt, 90 pound felt, or any organic or asphaltic material is limiting the lifecycle of the roof. You get the higher performance underlayments when you use this which is why their NOA's are mostly with aesthetic polypropylene that is cross woven because those underlayments can deliver the longevity. Barrel tile on their own with bad underlayments can last a very long time, so having a synthetic underlayment and these metal panels that create a very modular application perpendicular to that, do a lot to offset the dynamic wind forces. Whenever you have wind, you don't have any one tile transferring that force down to the underlayments. They had performed tests with the synthetics and been able to deliver negative 420 PSF on just an underlayment which is better than most Miami Dade NOA metal roofs. The failure mode was always the underlayments. No one is buying 30 lb. and 90 lb. felt as they don't make as good quality anymore, they are buying polysticks and items like that.
4. Mr. Fullerton asked how it was fixed to the roof.? Mr. Arguelles said you foam it; they eliminated the fasteners because they are detrimental to a Class A Fire rating. A metal product must have a Class "A" fire rating, some put the VersaShield that has a Class "A" fire rating, but it is an additional cost. He stated that they were Class "A" fire rated without any type of fire protection underneath it, so if you used fire protection underneath it as with the Photovoltaics, you get a double Class "A" fire rating.
5. Mr. Fullerton said the cost of the traditional barrel tile, Cuban tile versus "S" tile was always an issue. "S" tile was preferred because it was cheaper. He asked what the was the implication of the metal pan? Mr. Arguelles said their NOA was not classified as a roof tile system by Miami-Dade County. It was uncategorized, a hybrid roof tile system that does not have to obey the rooftop codes. They had to do tests from 10 years ago and have been adding to that. They were able to reroof shingle roofs. In Coral Gables annexed areas there were shingle roofs and the question was how to get them to reroof with barrel tile. From 2001 forward, there are 12 different systems in the NOA, and a few of them allow for the recovery of asphalt shingles. They could install synthetic underlayment, mechanically fastened, foamed directly to the mechanical base felt without a more expensive peel and stick application and deliver much higher wind performance. The idea is allowing the deck to breathe. When you have negative forces on a uniform area, and you have a place where the air could pass through a vented air permeable surface you keep those negative forces from ever accumulating. A barrel tile roof with a metal pan, foam down with no fasteners it is not going to be subject to corrosion, it is not going to be subject to the decomposition from constant expansion and contraction of the sun, and as your Class "A" fire rating, you never have to worry about fire transferring the heat down to the fastener because it goes straight down to the wood. A one-hour fire rating gets you the Class "A" fire rating. He said he had used a variance of these systems in Kendall they could right on center spacing. It is a completely different aesthetic but is a sustainable system. It is economizing on the tile, they use a machine-made cookie cutter tile, that is 10 times better.

6. Mr. Maxwell asked about the insulation factor: Mr. Arguelles said clay is a great insulator, aluminum dissipates heat quicker than steel. During the day the clay tiles mitigate heat transfer because of the air spaces and the clay itself, and during the night you have parallel heat transfer, and the heat is allowed to escape through the aluminum like a radiator, so it lessens your air conditioning. It is a passive energy efficient system before you put in the entry level solar thermal tubing to tap into that 26% tax credit.
7. Mr. Maxwell asked if he would use rigid insulation beneath any of this. Mr. Arguelles said it was not necessary. FSEC has testing from the 80's that say barrel tile roofs are the most energy efficient system because it has the air spaces. He said he had created an edge detail because unlike Miami-Dade's specification he didn't like to mortar in and put the weep holes. The problem with the weep holes is if you are using an organic based underlayment and you are putting the weep holes even if you get flush on the outside, the tech never gets it so that it is flush in the inside where it counts because the water can't find its way out, and it rots the perimeter. Instead, they do an Artezanos vented eve closure, using a smaller barrel tile and create a reducer, it looks like a Genoa in detail. They could recess it and it acts also as an anchor for the cover tile. So instead of having it fastened on two sides, you also have it fastened in the middle. It looks aesthetic, it is allowing for air circulation, so it is getting the heat out. The most important thing is that when wind rushes overhead if the air can filter out of the roof system and out from underneath the roof tile you are mitigating uplift. He said that aesthetically the reason why they were here is to show they could recreate the barrel tile look.
8. Chair Menendez asked what system they were putting in 803 Alhambra Circle. Mr. Arguelles said it would be a system with off-center spacing like what was already accepted, from the details, from the extant information that they had from the picture they would emulate exactly the original installation.
9. Mr. Menendez said that were talking about 3 different systems, which one would they install. Mr. Arguelles said City Roofing was proposing to use a thermal system with the hybrid system
10. Ms. Spain asked if it was without pipes. Mr. Arguelles said the proposed was with pipes.
11. Chair Menendez asked Mr. Adams if that had ever been done in Coral Gables on a historic home? Mr. Adams said there are two prior staff approvals for historic buildings. The applicant had given him five addresses which all the houses he believed were in the 20's, but only two of them were designated. The two had prior staff approvals, one was for the piping and the other one was unclear, but it did not appear to contain any solar element, He thought they would be seeing more of these applications and had brought it to the Board to see if they were willing to accept #1 or #2, and maybe allow staff to review them in the future.
12. Ms. Spain said she remembered approving one on Alhambra and each Board of Architect member came out and they had it mocked up because we were so stressed as to whether it would look aesthetically appropriate, she did not remember one that did not involve a solar panel. Mr. Adams said it was after her time.
13. Mr. Adams said his concern was that when applicants wanted to use an "S" tile they were told they had to use a true two-piece barrel tile and he was not sure how this would be categorized.
14. Ms. Spain said the "S" tile does not look anything like a true barrel tile and this could, but she was concerned with approving them if there was not a solar component involved. She thought it was important that they try to put solar on historic properties, unless there was a situation where structurally the house was so old that it couldn't take the weight of that additional tile. It had to be well monitored by staff. She knew in Italy they had it very wide and it was a cool look but was not appropriate for Coral Gables.
15. Mr. Fullerton said there was nothing worse than looking at a solar collector on top of a beautiful tile roof.
16. Ms. Bache-Wiig said that in some of the examples shown it was not visible on the rear of the property, she suggested a stipulation that they could be approved if away from the line of sight, allowing an option not currently available.
17. Mr. Adams asked if she was referring to the option with the Photovoltaic cells. Ms. Bache-Wiig suggested the middle of the road option made sense now and maybe adding Photovoltaic in the future if they were away from the line of sight.
18. Ms. Spain said they did this on Alhambra, there on an outbuilding facing the street. They had them lay it up and had gone out there three or four times, but it was not directly on Alhambra and had solar panels.
19. Mr. Maxwell recommended they take this under consideration. He said they could address this application today but needed more information to move forward with a policy decision.
20. Mr. Adams said if the board was going to accept any of the options would the board be comfortable to have staff review them in the future. He suggested addressing this application and then getting more information before proceeding.
21. Ms. Spain requested a mock-up. Before she delegated approvals, she wanted to see it first. She thought this was interesting and a way to incorporate solar and sustainability in an aesthetic attractive manner and was willing to try it.

22. Mr. Fullerton agreed and said if it was compatible with “S” tile prices then he agreed. Mr. Arguelles said it was the same piece count as the “S” tile. If you place 100 tiles on top and you have 16 metal pans you are looking at 116 and that is very close on center spacing. With close on center spacing on 90 pieces and 16 metal pans that will bring your piece count to 106, with 80 your piece count is 96. It was a lot easier due to the larger pieces.
23. Mr. Fullerton referred to a sketch and asked if they installed the line completely down the roof. Mr. Arguelles said it has the equivalent of four 16-inch slabs with a ½ inch cutoff on each end. They had a variance now that would be approved, but it was for shingle recovery. If he made it 22 inches, he was able to tap into the movement-based system and multiply it by their aerodynamic multiplier by .23. That would allow it to be used on anything even high rises. Mr. Maxwell addressed Mr. Fullerton and said that there is a historic house on Palermo by the church that does have solar that is built into the roof.
24. Ms. Bache-Wiig asked what the process was for approval of installation of solar panels on historic homes with barrel tiles. Ms. Spain said she had approved the house on Alhambra Circle administratively but did not know if Mr. Adams was comfortable doing that. Ms. Bache-Wiig said it was unsightly to which Ms. Spain responded that it was not visible from the street. Ms. Rolando said it was a very prominent house because there were three roads that came together there.
25. Mr. Garcia Pons asked staff or the city attorney if the State of Florida has certain rights available to property owners with solar, is it solar or Photovoltaic. Mr. Arguelles stated a solar energy device as defined by the solar access law is a clothesline. Any energy device would have to be accepted by a HOA if it produced energy.
26. Mr. Maxwell asked if there was any color other than what was being shown. Mr. Arguelles said they had just gotten a new UL for a new product, they had different color schemes that would be feasible to put it on the front exposure of a historic home, but they were not yet available.
27. Mr. Garcia Pons asked if this made this application allowable by state statute because it is solar energy producing element. Attorney Ceballos asked Mr. Garcia Pons to clarify the question, whether he was asking if he had the authority to even chime in because it is simply solar, and thereby by default had to approve it because of its solar nature. Mr. Garcia Pons said yes, and what restrictions could be placed on it. Attorney Ceballos said the current code, law, regulation about an HOA stated that they did not have the authority to regulate the installation of solar panels. The City is not an HOA and had its own aesthetic review boards that can apply to solar. They could not pass a law that has the effect of preventing the installation of solar panels, but they can regulate where and how they are installed regardless of their efficiency and cost.
28. Mr. Fullerton showed a photo and asked Mr. Arguelles if this was a representation of his system right now. Mr. Arguelles answered affirmatively.
29. Mr. Fullerton asked staff to assemble a list of houses that the board could look at. Mr. Adams said he had been provided with five addresses that he would send to them.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in favor of this case.

Mr. Famada from City Roofing, contractor of record said if the board could see it installed on 639 Alhambra Circle a one-story house and 525 Alhambra Circle, they would get a better visual than 803 Alhambra Circle which was two-story. Mr. Adams said he had three other addresses which upon Chair Menendez’s request he would supply to the board.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in opposition of this case.

Lawrence Percival a community activist in West and East Kendall and a business consultant to Mr. Arguelles and his roofing business introduced himself and his service dog Margo. He said he had not spoken in City of Coral Gables before but had addressed the Historical Preservation Board in the City of Miami helping the Ace Theater move into its modern era. He felt Mr. Arguelles was the future of roofing in Miami-Dade County as he wanted to bring his ideas to West Kendall regarding the affordability issues for homeowners and insurance. They would be meeting with State representatives and legislatures to discuss using his products and underlayment systems. This would help the insurance industry understand and grasp Mr. Arguelles’ concepts and allow them to move forward comfortable with the knowledge that houses would last and be able to withstand the rigors of a Category 5 hurricane. Homeowners would not have to worry that they would have to replace their roofs within 10 years or face the possibility of not having their insurance renewed. He felt that these systems were innovative and that the board had the opportunity to create standards for them. He invited the board to go out and view some of Mr. Arguelles’ projects. Mr. Arguelles was an innovator and 4th generation roofer architect and felt he had done a good job presenting here today.

Ms. Rolando voiced her concern on approving something before they saw it and suggested the contractor do a mockup and give the board an opportunity to review it before approving it.

In answer to Chair Menendez, Mr. Adams said it would go to the Board of Architects the next day. He questioned the mockup as the house had not had a roof for a long time and they wanted to move forward. He asked if the board would approve based on the condition that they approved the mockup.

Ms. Spain suggested a motion to approve based on the mockup and a special meeting to decide after the board had seen it. Mr. Garcia-Pons asked how long it would take to do a mockup. Mr. Famada said the roof they would have to have the tiles delivered and charge the customer. He suggested they look at 639 Alhambra Circle which had the same system including the solar running underneath that was invisible.

Mr. Maxwell asked if they had put the roof on Adrienne Arsh's house? Mr. Arguelles said he did it in 1998 and her driveway. Ms. Rolando asked if it is the same color tile? Mr. Famada said none of the tiles were the same color, they were rustic, it did have the brown pan.

Ms. Bache-Wiig said her concern was the pan which she wanted to see and if 639 Alhambra Circle was the final product. Mr. Famada said the double tile at the eave gave the roof its pop. Ms. Spain said the "S" tile had been done with the double at the eave, and it did not look good especially on one-story houses that it was so visible. Mr. Carlos Mindreau had done that for non-historic homeowners.

Mr. Fullerton asked if the pans were painted or shiny aluminum. Mr. Famada said that they were a matt finish brown. He said the owner of the house was ill and might not live to see the completion. He answered Mr. Fullerton's question by saying they could see everything on 639 Alhambra and responded to Mr. Garcia-Pons by saying that the packet submitted showed the exact system they were proposing.

Chair Menendez said there were six conditions here for motion for approval. He asked if they would take some time to meet? One of the conditions it to go to the Board of Architects and getting it approved there. Mr. Adams said it was going to the Board of Architects tomorrow. Mr. Adams asked the City Attorney, if this Board approves it, and tomorrow the Board of Architects denies it would the Historic Board take precedence over the Board of Architects? Ms. Spain said the Board of Architects is a recommending board to the Historic Preservation Board. Attorney Ceballos said he would have to investigate it. Mr. Adams suggested that the motion include something about it being denied by the Board of Architects so as not to hold them up for another month.

Mr. Famada said before he came here Simone Chin sent him information on September 30th when he appeared in front of the Board of Architects and the same three applications came before the board. They approved a blanket policy on the first one, on the second one with the solar thermal, and the one we had to come back on a case-by-case basis is with the Photovoltaics.

Chair Menendez said they were talking about the second option. Mr. Arguelles said it was already approved because it was not visible. Ms. Bache-Wiig asked if the Board of Architects had approved a blanket for "A" and "B", and "C" was on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Arguelles said yes. "A" and "B" had been approved, they presented to the board three times, but it had not been recorded in the minutes from the prior meeting and he had to come back for another contractor for 613 Ponce, so this time he had made sure it was in the minutes. He didn't know he had to do that for the Historic Preservation Board as well.

Chair Menendez said he did not have a problem delegating final approval to staff.

Mr. Garcia Pons said he really appreciated the presentation; it sounded great, but he had not seen the end result and was not comfortable approving it today. He would go and see 525 and 639 Alhambra. Mr. Arguelles said he had some visuals on acrylics, but Mr. Garcia-Pons said he needed to actually see it.

Mr. Fullerton said he had no objection if it looked like what had been presented if they were not spread too far apart. He had been working with an idea for a barrel tile alternative for a long time. Based on his own roof he noticed the pan tile was hardly visible. Mr. Arguelles said since you were saving tile it made sense to put them in the visual field and if you put them close tother you would have a Cuban tile roof. Depending on the width of the roof panel you can push it in, add a couple of barrel tiles on top and just narrow the base tile.

Mr. Ehrenhaft asked if everyone on the board went to see 639 Alhambra Circle within the next 24-48 hours could the board be polled today to see if there is a consensus for a brief special meeting within a week. Ms. Spain said it had to be advertised as a public meeting. Mr. Fullerton asked if they could see if a motion to approve would pass based on the presentation.

Mr. Fullerton made a motion to approve the application as presented. Chair Menendez said Ms. Rolando had already made a motion, but Ms. Rolando said that her motion was theoretical and conditional on them having the option to review the application. Mr. Fullerton agreed, but said he wanted to give the applicant a direction for the future instead of keeping them on the hook. Ms. Rolando recognized that they were dealing with a specific situation that had time constraints but was uncomfortable deciding before seeing something that would have long term policy implications.

Mr. Fullerton asked Attorney Ceballos that if the board decided in three months this was a mistake could they vote again. Attorney Ceballos answered affirmatively and said there were two items that needed to be discussed.

- 1) The overarching blanket approval for city staff to move forward and approve these in the future.
- 2) This specific Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Adams said they could deal with this Certificate of Appropriateness today and bring up the blanket approval at a future meeting after the board had time to see the results. If they liked the end result, they could allow staff to approve any identical applications, bring all Photovoltaics to the board and not accept any without a solar element.

Chair Menendez asked Ms. Rolando if she wanted to complete her motion. Ms. Rolando ceded the motion making to Mr. Fullerton for this specific COA and none other. Ms. Bache-Wiig said she was comfortable with staff moving forward with this case exactly as Mr. Adams has presented it for this case only and then voting later on the blanket approval.

A motion was made by Ms. Fullerton and seconded by Ms. Bache-Wiig to approve this specific application for an issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 803 Alhambra Circle for design approval for the installation of a hybrid roofing system.

The motion passed (Ayes: 5; Nays: 4).

The conditions are as follows:

1. A solar thermal option comprising of rubber pipes placed below the roof tile to heat domestic water shall be incorporated into the proposal.
2. The proposed barrel tile cap and aluminum pan system shall be clarified.
3. The proposed color and specifications of the barrel tile shall be submitted to Staff for review.
4. The first layer of tiles along the roof edges shall be true two-piece barrel tile.
5. All aluminum shall be painted or coated in mortar of an appropriate color and shall not be visible.
6. The proposed tile and solar thermal option are reviewed and approved by the Board of Architects and all Board of Architects comments are addressed.

Mr. Famada asked if the approval was conditional on review of the existing installation. Mr. Adams said no, it was approved with the conditions stated in the report.

BOARD ITEMS / CITY COMMISSION / CITY PROJECTS UPDATE:

1. Application Requirements:

Responding to the boards question from the last meeting Mr. Adams said he had discussed with Attorney Ceballos how to inform applicants that “S” tiles are not supported, and he did not think it should be added to the ordinance. He suggested putting a series of statements (which would be approved by the board) on the website and attached to the Certificate of Appropriateness application. The applicant would be required to check a box stating that they had read and understood the statement “Staff can only approve the original roof covering or window design on the house, anything further required board review and approval. “S’ tiles are not supported in replacement of barrel tiles”. He also suggested addressing clear glass, window type and raised profile muntins. The other solution would be design guidelines which he did not think they would want to do for the roof only. Answering Ms. Bache-Wiig’s question he said the design guidelines would be available online. When asked by Ms. Bache-Wiig if there were currently other design guidelines Mr. Adams stated that every other municipality, he had worked for had design guidelines that covered everything. He thought that it was working well without them. Design guideline development could be a long process and would require public input. The current Standards gave the board flexibility, and he was not in favor of them being in the code and thought the statement would be a better option

by ensuring the applicant had to check the box prior to downloading the application online. Ms. Spain agreed. Mr. Adams suggested including items that are of the greatest issue.

Mr. Maxwell said that houses that have the potential to be designated or had a true barrel tile before and had been replaced would make things more complex. Mr. Adams said if they were not designated, they would not come to Historic, and Ms. Spain said this would only be for Certificate of Appropriateness applications. Mr. Maxwell said the idea was to let people know that “S” tiles were not acceptable. Which is why Mr. Adams said he had brought the request for a hybrid tile to the board. Mr. Maxwell thought the hybrid presentation interesting and if the aluminum pan obviated the need for many items that deteriorate quickly and if it had the true barrel tile look, he felt the board would be open to review it, but this might open the door for “S” tiles. Ms. Rolando said the roof tile on 639 Alhambra Circle was flatter and wanted to know if they had a more traditional rounded profile.

Mr. Garcia-Pons thanked staff for their efforts and said this was a great first step and agreed that it should be made part of the application process.

2. **Coral Gables Congregational Church:**

Mr. Maxwell said Coral Gables Congregational Church was the first public building in Coral Gables and was used as City Hall for years. They were applying for a State of Florida grant for \$500,000 (which the church would match) to repair the roof. He was requesting not as a member of the Historic Preservation Board, but as a member of the Historical Preservation committee for the church, that Mr. Adams to draft a letter of support on behalf of the board which the Chairman would sign. He added that if the board members wanted to send letters individually, they would be welcomed.

Chair Menendez, said one letter should be sent from the board as a whole and anyone could send one individually and Mr. Maxwell would supply the address.

A motion was made by Mr. Garcia-Pons and seconded by Ms. Spain to approve Mr. Adams to send a letter on behalf of the board to the State supporting the grant to the Coral Gables Congregational Church. The motion passed (Ayes: 8; Nays: 0). Mr. Maxwell recused himself.

3. **Coral Gables Country Club:**

Mr. Adams reported that a presentation from the Parks Department showed mold, rotting wood, structural issues and roofing issues that were being addressed. The City was moving ahead with the repairs and there were substantial structural issues underneath the swimming pool. Ms. Kautz said the section between Liberty Caffé and the 2-story structure is the historic part. The original arches were screened openings and very early on they were converted to casement windows which now had severe termite damage. They were doing a lot of structural work and looking at how best to preserve the windows.

4. **Merrick House Coral Rock Wall:**

Ms. Kautz reported that the Coral Rock Wall at the front of the Merrick House was underway, it would follow the property line and curve in at the pedestrian entrance with two columns with pyramids on top. She invited the board to go see it.

5. **City Purchase of vacant Land in Campina Court Historic District:**

Mr. Adams reported that originally there was a proposal to put three or four townhomes on the site, but the residents did not approve and reached out to City Staff. The City purchased the land for the purpose of creating another entryway to the City and turning it into a public park. This would come to the board for review. Ms. Bache-Wiig commented that the Ponce and 8th Street entrance was not successful as a good example of the City.

6. **Wall Vents:**

Mr. Maxwell asked staff to recommend that property owners not paint their wall vents the same color as their house as they were originally terracotta. He said these small details are what makes architecture rich.

7. **Shade Pavilions on Granada Golf Course:**

Mr. Adams had no updates.

8. **Gondola Building on Biltmore Golf Course:**

Mr. Adams reported that the Mayor was in Tallahassee requesting funding to have it rebuilt.

ITEMS FROM THE SECRETARY: None.

DISCUSSION ITEMS: None.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS: None.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Menendez asked for a motion to adjourn.

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Warren Adams
Historic Preservation Officer