



**HISTORICAL PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING**  
**Meeting Minutes of January 19, 2022, at 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

MEMBERS	D 15	J 19	APPOINTED BY
Albert Menendez (Chair)	P	P	Commission-As-A-Whole
Cesar Garcia Pons (Vice Chair)	E	P	City Manager Peter Iglesias
Alicia Bache-Wiig	P	P	Mayor Vince Lago
Margaret (Peggy) Rolando	P	P	Vice-Mayor Michael Mena
Dona Spain	P	P	Commissioner Rhonda Anderson
Xavier Durana	P	P	Commissioner Jorge L. Fors, Jr.
Michael J. Maxwell	P	P	Commissioner Kirk R. Menendez
Bruce Ehrenhaft	P	P	Commission-As-A-Whole
John P. Fullerton	P	P	Board-as-a-Whole

☎ 305-460-5093  
 ✉ hist@coralgables.com

**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

**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 4:13 pm by Chair Mendez and attendance was stated for the record. Mr. Durana and Ms. Rolando were not yet present.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

A motion was made by Mr. Maxwell and seconded by Mr. Ehrenhaft to approve the minutes with one correction of an incorrectly spelled name.

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

**NOTICE REGARDING EX-PARTE COMMUNICATIONS.**

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

**DEFERRALS**

Chair Menendez asked if there were any deferrals. Mr. Adams stated that they had received the following requests for deferrals.

1. The Historic Designation of 737 Minorca Avenue.

Chair Menendez then went on to announce the first case and read the description which also appeared on the television screen.

**SWEARING IN OF THE PUBLIC:**

Mr. Ceballos administered the oath.

**SPECIAL CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:**

**CASE FILE COA (SP) 2021-023:** An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 1024 Asturia Avenue, a Local Historic Landmark, legally described as a Lots 6 and 7, Block 8, Coral Gables

Section "C," according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 8, at Page 26 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The application requests design approval for the construction of a freestanding gazebo and sitework.

Mr. Adams made a presentation for the agenda item following a presentation on screen:

1. Property is built in the Mediterranean revival style.
2. Designed by Walter DeGarmo.
3. Applicant is requesting the construction of a free-standing gazebo.
4. The L-shaped Gazebo is of concrete column and tie-beam frame.
5. It has pitched gable roof of clay barrel tile to match the existing residence.
6. The total area is just under 300 square feet.
7. The height is 10 feet 9 inches which is lower than the parapet height of the adjacent guest house and lower than the ridge height of the existing garage.
8. There are some decorative features including curvilinear details of the tie beams and the stucco molding.
9. The gazebo is located to the south of the existing swimming pool.
10. Without the existing vegetation it will be visible from the right-of-way.
11. It is set back approximately 95 feet 4 inches from the front property line.
12. The applicant is also requesting installation of a new concrete paver driveway, and the installation of a new pedestrian gate.

**STAFF CONCLUSION:**

1. The proposed style and massing are appropriate for the architectural style of the existing structures.
2. The gazebo is free standing and can easily be removed in the future without damaging any of the historic fabric.
3. Although it is located in the side yard and technically would be visible from the right-of-way if the vegetation was removed it is set back 95 feet, four inches from the front property line.
4. Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:
  - a) Details and specifications of the proposed pavers shall be submitted to Staff for review.
  - b) Details and specifications of the proposed new gate shall be submitted to Staff for review.

A presentation was made by Keith Curtis the chief general contractor and owner of the SK11 Group, Inc. Mr. Curtis stated the following:

1. Richard Cortez, partner, and designated architect was not present at the meeting and so he would be speaking on both of their behalf.
2. The owner of the property, Mr. Steven Winner was present at the meeting.
3. Mr. Curtis went through the presentation showing the location of the gazebo and the plans and pictures of the proposed gazebo and the brick pavers.

Ms. Spain asked Mr. Curtis if he was okay with the conditions that staff had made. Mr. Curtis said yes and showed the board a sample of the pavers, he said the actual paver would be more of a red color.

Mr. Garcia Pons asked Mr. Curtis to go back to the slide of the barrel tile roof. He asked Mr. Curtis to confirm that it was two-piece barrel tile and not a composite S-tile that they would be using. Mr. Curtis confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Fullerton asked why they had gone with the L-shaped gazebo. Mr. Curtis responded that they did not want to harm the roots to the mango tree.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Fullerton and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application for design approval for the construction of a freestanding gazebo and sitework on the property at 1024 Asturia Avenue with the conditions stated by staff.

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

**CASE FILE COA (SP) 2021-024:** An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 837 Obispo Avenue, a Contributing Resource within the "Obispo Avenue Historic District," legally described as Lot 20, Block 28, Coral Gables Section "B," according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 111 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The application requests design approval for an addition 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), (4.b.ii), (4.c), and (5.b) and Article 3, Section 3-308 D (1) of the Coral Gables Zoning Code for the minimum rear and side setbacks and the location of the swimming pool, pool deck, and equipment.

Ms. Kautz made a presentation for the agenda item following a presentation on screen.

1. Property is located in the Obispo Avenue Historic District.
2. Designated in May 2008.
3. A contributing resource.
4. Designed in 1926.
5. Designed by HP Taylor.
6. There have been no substantial additions and only minor alterations to the property in the past almost 100 years.
7. Ms. Kautz showed a picture of the property from 1940 showing the house in need of some repair.

The owner and architect Mr. Carols Valera introduced himself and gave a presentation on the screen showing the additions requested.

1. They had originally tried to put a second story to the house which the Historical Resources Department did not approve of.
2. The design presented today was to expand the house and connect the auxiliary parking structure with the main residence.
3. He showed a site plan showing the additions.
4. He indicated that they would also like to add a pool and equipment.
5. The variances were being requested as they were unable to expand vertically.
6. He went into detail about the variances.
  - a) Rear setback: Variance = new addition to be 5" (V.I.F) aligned with existing auxiliary structure.
  - b) Side street setback facing Pizarro Street: The new pool, its equipment, deck and the 4' high wall (for visual screening), all encroach in the 15' required setback. Variance = allow for 8' 6-1/3" and new 8' wall encroachment beyond the 15' setback requirement.
  - c) Side facing east: Aligning the new construction with the existing. The house is not technically designated as a cottage, hence a variance of this setback from 5' to 3-1-1/2".

Mr. Valera addressed the comments from the Board of Architects.

1. The Board of Architects had recommended approval of the setbacks as they understood the constraints of the site.
2. The Board of Architects were not able to differentiate between the new and the existing when they presented the elevations to them which implied that they had done a good job.
3. The Board of Architects said they had never seen anything like the styling of the parapet. Mr. Valera showed a picture of 608 Majorca Avenue which had a similar design.
4. The Board of Architects wanted them to bring back some of the original features that the house had, for example the double doors which they had agreed to.
5. The Board of Architects wanted to see a different type of grid on the impact windows, but the windows there now actually reflect the original design intent.

Mr. Valera concluded his presentation.

Mr. Fullerton asked if the drawings on the slide were added after the board packets were produced. Mr. Valera stated that they were the same, but he had added the dark gray to show what was new.

Ms. Kautz referred to the PowerPoint presentations.

1. She showed what the original request for a two-story submitted by the owner which was not approved.
2. This property was not designated as a cottage but met many of the criteria.
3. The side setback would not be an issue as you could continue the same lines. A lot of these are in keeping with the cottage regulations and the feeling of the property.
4. She referred to the Board of Architect comments:
  - a) Windows on the existing porch: Staff approved. It was a screened porch and they let them keep an open kind of feeling instead of having the muntins.  
They would explore the other three comments.
  - b) Parapet: Could be a little more convex if the board requested.
  - c) Distinguishing between the old and the new: Staff recommended some sort of demarcation on the addition from the historic residence in the back corner, and on the side.

Ms. Kautz said she would go through the other conditions if the board required.

Ms. Spain asked her to explain the bracket height to which Ms. Kautz responded that it was a was to identify the center door. Maybe it is not a fabric awning maybe it is a tiled bracketed door overhang that looks more Mediterranean. Ms. Spain said she was referring to the comment “study the height of the bracket lights”. Both Ms. Kautz and Mr. Valera said that they had wanted them to be a little lower.

Mr. Garcia-Pons asked if Mr. Valera was going to put the door in the dining room. To which he replied affirmatively. Ms. Garcia Pons said he would like him to work with staff to see if he could adjust the height of the parapet.

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

Ms. Spain had a question about the perimeter wall, she suggested that they not have pickets above the wall. Mr. Valera agreed to work with staff.

Ms. Spain said she thought they should eliminate the metalwork.

Ms. Bache-Wiig agreed with Ms. Spain.

Ms. Kautz said that since they were having a pool, they had to have a wall of 4’ and asked the board if they wanted to limit the height of the wall to 4’ or could they go to 6’. She did not feel there was anything that high on Obispo Avenue. She suggested that if they eliminate the metal work and if they wanted additional metal work, they could screen the pool location with a solid wall and do metal work on the sides where it is not required, as they were only required to screen directly in front of the pool.

Ms. Kautz asked that the same people make the motion so that it could all be in one resolution.

A motion was made by Mr. Garcia-Pons and seconded by Ms. Spain to approve the application for addition and alterations to the residence and auxiliary structure and sitework on the property at 837 Obispo Avenue with the conditions stated by staff and amended on the floor.

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

*Conditions are as follows:*

- 1. Window/door muntins are to be high-profile / dimensional.*
- 2. Window/door glass to be clear.*
- 3. Windows are to be casement type.*
- 4. Material of the pool deck/pavers was not indicated. Materials must be presented to Staff prior to installation.*
- 5. Work with Staff for the appropriate muntin patterns on the windows and doors.*
- 6. Stucco texture at the addition is not noted. It should be differentiated from the existing rough texture on the home.*
- 7. To distinguish the corner of the existing house and detached structure, the addition should be recessed slightly off the corner of the house and garage or a recess between the two provided.*
- 8. Provide a section/partial elevation looking towards the rear of the existing residence.*
- 9. Reintroduce the dining room doors on the west façade.*
- 10. Work with Staff on the design of the parapet at the addition.*
- 11. The height of the proposed wall is to be limited to 4’-0” in height overall (no pickets).*

A motion was made by Mr. Garcia-Pons and seconded by Ms. Spain to approve the application for variance to the rear setback of approximately 5’ on the property at 837 Obispo Avenue.

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

*Grant a variance to allow the proposed addition to have a rear setback of approximately five (5) feet vs. All Single-Family Residential building setbacks shall be as per Section 2-100, Residential Districts Table, and shall meet the following requirements: Ten (10) feet. If compatible with the neighborhood character, the Board of*

*Adjustment or the Historic Preservation Board, as applicable, may allow a rear setback of five (5) feet for one-story structures as required by Article 2, Section 2-101 D (4) c of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.*

A motion was made by Mr. Garcia-Pons and seconded by Ms. Spain to approve the application for a variance to allow the addition to maintain the existing interior side setback of 3' 1" as the existing residence on the property at 837 Obispo Avenue.

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

*Grant a variance to allow the addition to maintain the existing interior side setback of three feet, one inch (3'-1") as the existing residence 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.*

A motion was made by Mr. Garcia-Pons and seconded by Ms. Spain to approve the application for a variance to allow the proposed pool deck, swimming pool, pool equipment and the mechanical equipment to have a street side setback of approximately 6' 5" on the property at 837 Obispo Avenue.

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

*Grant a variance to allow the proposed pool deck, swimming pool, pool equipment, and mechanical equipment to have a street side setback of approximately six feet, five inches (6'-5") vs. All Single-Family Residential building setbacks shall be as per Section 2-100, Residential Districts Table, and shall meet the following requirements: Side street: fifteen (15) feet as required by Article 2, Section 2-101 D (4) (b.ii) of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.*

A motion was made by Mr. Garcia-Pons and seconded by Ms. Spain to approve the application for a variance to allow the proposed pool deck, swimming pool, pool equipment and the mechanical equipment to be located closer to the front or side street of the lot or the building of the main or principal building on the property at 837 Obispo Avenue.

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

*Grant a variance to allow the proposed pool deck, swimming pool, pool equipment, and mechanical equipment to be located closer to the front or side street of a lot or building site than the main or principal building vs. In no case shall an accessory building or structure be located closer to the front or side street of a lot or building site than the main or principal building, unless approved by the Board of Architects as required by Article 2, Section 2-101 (5.b) and Article 3, Section 3-308 D (1) of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.*

Mr. Fullerton asked if in a case like this, to save time if they could take voice votes to save time. Mr. Ceballos stated that they should stick with the roll call.

**CASE FILE COA (SP) 2021-025:** This item was deferred.

**CASE FILE COA (SP) 2021-026:** An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 1212 Sorolla Avenue, a Local Historic Landmark, legally described as Lots 12 thru 14, Block 2, Coral Gables Section "E," according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 8, at Page 13 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The application requests design approval for the construction of additions and alterations to the residence and auxiliary structure and sitework.

Ms. Kautz made a presentation for the agenda item following a presentation on screen:

1. Property designated a local historic landmark in March 2017.
2. Designed in the Mediterranean Revival Style.
3. Designed by architect Eldred Mowery.
4. It sits on quite a few lots on Sorolla Avenue, it is sort of in the middle.

5. When the property was designated, the exact same scope of work was approved by the Historic Preservation Board COA(SP)2018-002.
6. The permit was never obtained and the COA has since expired.
7. Property has sold and the new owner wants to implement these plans and so it was necessary to go through the process again.
8. The staff report has been slightly updated but was basically the same as the one that had been approved before.
9. The architect could give the board a full presentation again if the board requested it.
10. There are no variances requested as part of this application.
11. The project has been submitted for review by the city architect, there was an informal meeting with him to go over the project. He had no substantial comments, but he has not officially reviewed the project.
12. As previously noted in the staff report the drawings that were submitted to the Board of Architects remove the scallops that staff was objecting to in the original presentation, so staff recommends that the same staff conditions be incorporated as part of the approval.

Ms. Kautz asked the board if they wanted the architect to take them through the full presentation again. The board requested that the architect give the presentation again.

Ms. Kautz showed a 1940's picture of the house and a map showing the location of the property.

The architect Mr. Pedro Bravo introduced himself and went through a presentation on the screen.

1. The property recently changed owners and the new owner wanted to do the exact same plan that was approved.
2. They had been through a lengthy program with the previous owner.
3. It was a small house on a large lot with the house right in the middle of the property.
4. The challenge was that with the amount of the square footage in the program requested by the owner, they needed to minimize the impact, physically of what this house would be. To maintain the intimate proportions throughout the project and complement the Mediterranean Revival Style.
5. Mr. Bravo showed a layout of the existing house with the attached garage which was added onto in various stages.
6. Currently it was a guest house, it had two rooms and a bathroom and would be renovated.
7. The guesthouse would be connected to the main house and wings would be added to the public and private areas on each side.
8. A hip roof in the back of the house was added in the 1990's.
9. They wanted to take it back to the original structure and build from there.
10. Mr. Bravo showed a site plan showing the main house in the center, and in the east upper side the bedroom wing (private area), on the west side a garage, and public areas, kitchen, billiard room, family room and covered terrace.
11. The front gate is not original and was done in the 90's.
12. The proposal is to take the actual vehicular gate and shift it over to the right-hand side. There is a garage on the right-hand side, so the wall and the column are being shifted to the right.
13. The pedestrian entry remains where it is.
14. The vehicle gate moves to the right where the garages are.
15. On the proposed floor plan, the main house is in the center, on the east side they are adding a master suite and a second bedroom.
16. The actual proportions are along the same lines as the existing, and they would generate from there and try to build from that piece.
17. On the west side on of the main existing house there is a public area with a large family room, kitchen, and billiard room, two car garage, laundry, storage, pantry etc.
18. They are also proposing a perpendicular shaped covered terrace which connects both main house with the garage and the old garage.
19. The old garage is a guest house that will be significantly renovated as an apartment.
20. Mr. Bravo showed the existing façade and the proposed elevation.
21. Scalloped windows on the left-hand side were modified for the permit.
22. They were following the same color lines, textures, and barrel tiles.
23. The west elevation shows the connection between the main house and the garage via a terrace which has the scalloped detail. This is the only place where it is being implemented as it is an open design.
24. The rear shows that they wanted to maximize the amount of glass for the internal view of the courtyard, pool area, deck, and gazebo.
25. Mr. Bravo continued to show slides of the proposed additions to show the scale and design.
26. The main central window of the living room has the scallop design which would be repeated in the covered terrace.

27. The following items would be removed:
  - a) The existing shed roof entry which is not original.
  - b) The little wall in the front.
  - c) The bay window in the front of the house.
  - d) The tower with a bathroom.
  - e) The huge trellis.
28. The small courtyard between the main entry and the billiard space that sets the house back so that the front entrance can stand out and creates a transition from the street.
29. In the back they were trying to create a resort style courtyard with a pool, there is a covered terrace as well as a summer kitchen with barbecue etc.
30. They had implemented full height windows in the family room and master bedroom.
31. The trellis gazebo flanks the pool on one side and the proposed covered terrace is also centered along those same line.

Mr. Bravo showed the board two images of the revisions that were done for the permit.

Mr. Fullerton could not locate on the plans the mast on the west side which goes up between two windows. To which Mr. Bravo replied that it acts as a chimney for the barbecue, and it was on the floor plan.

Ms. Bache-Wiig asked what had changed from the previously approved design. Mr. Bravo replied that the scallops had been removed. She also asked Ms. Kautz if staff was okay with the new windows being dark with a dark frame. Ms. Kautz said she was.

Ms. Kautz said that she had noticed that some of the roof heights on the additions were higher than what was submitted. Staff recommends that they remain as low as possible as they are shown on the drawings. Mr. Bravo agreed.

Ms. Menendez asked if they were part of the staff conditions. Ms. Kautz replied affirmatively.

Mr. Garcia-Pons asked if the landscape plan that would be handled under a separate COA that would come before the Historic Board. Ms. Kautz said it was a standard COA, and would be done administratively, the purpose was mainly to have a full complete site plan when the work was completed. If their landscape plan is incorporated into the permit set, then the staff would accept it as an amendment to the special certificate of appropriateness.

Mr. Garcia-Pons asked if staff had a series of criteria which they used to review the landscape plan. Ms. Kautz said no it was just informational.

Ms. Garcia-Pons suggest that future architects should format the elevations in black and white and in color as these were very good. His initial concern was that the original home was lost in the long bar, but he could see that it would be set forward from the wing additions and he felt that proper landscaping would allow the original to be further defined.

Ms. Kautz said that there was a large oak tree between the house and the garage structure in the rear which did not allow them to push the elevation back much forward which is why they broke up the garage.

Mr. Fullerton requested that the new structure be done without corner beads. Mr. Bravo agreed.

Mr. Fullerton said that the drawings were easy to read and should be used as the example for other architects.

Mr. Bravo said the main vehicular gate shifted over to the west by two bays and there is one column being added to hold the gate in place.

Mr. Garcia-Pons asked if the architect wanted to talk about the fence and the wall. Ms. Kautz said it was part of the original package, it was added as a loose page. The wall was built in 1991. Mr. Garcia-Pons asked if there was a change in height right under it for the driveway for visibility.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak in favor of or against this case. No one responded so he closed the public portion.

Ms. Bache-Wiig asked if the same comment regarding the metal work on the wall applied to this submittal? Ms. Kautz said that the metal work was existing. Ms. Bache-Wiig asked if they were going to change it. Mr. Bravo said there was no talk with the owner at present, but he would certainly suggest it as he agreed with her and thought once the house was built it deserved something simpler or not at all.

Mr. Ehrenhaft asked that on A-16, which shows the two garage bays at the front of the photograph, it appears to be a rise between the brick and the bottom of the door. It looks like there is concrete blocking the way for the cars to get in. Mr. Bravo said it looked like that, however the garage on the right is recessed in and there was no step there. It was a full functioning garage and thanked Mr. Ehrenhaft for pointing that out.

Mr. Durana asked about the scalloping on the window in the front. He was concerned because the window manufacturers make either square or rectangular windows and it is hard to get behind the scallop and seal the window properly. Mr. Bravo said he went through the same thing with another house, 1311 Alhambra. The plywood on the front was scalloped and the window in the back was squared. The plywood was put in place and stuccoed, and it looks like it is integrated.

Ms. Kautz said that was not successful as the original window frame hugged the scallop and in Alhambra the window was set behind the scallop so there is no framework around there. She said she wanted the scallop to remain in place. Ms. Kautz said they could restore the window and then shutter it.

A motion was made by Mr. Fullerton and seconded by Ms. Rolando to approve the application for design approval for the construction of additions and alterations to the residence and auxiliary structure and sitework on the property at 121 Sorolla Avenue with the conditions stated by staff and amended on the floor  
The motion passed (Ayes: 9; Nays: 0).

*Conditions are as follows:*

- 1. Maintain the roof heights on the additions as shown in the drawing set submitted to the Historic Preservation Board.*
- 2. Eliminate the wing walls at the northwest and northeast corners of the additions.*
- 3. The windows, garage door opening, and terrace openings of the additions shall not mimic the curved-corner windows of the historic home. The proposed curved corners ("scallops") on the new window and garage door openings are to be eliminated or recessed to differentiate them from the original feature of the historic house.*
- 4. On the guest house, only original sills should be retained. Sills should not be installed in the new openings.*
- 5. The new tile roof is to be true, two-piece barrel tile.*
- 6. Window and door glass is to be clear/non-reflective and muntins are to be high-profile.*
- 7. New pedestrian and driveway gate and perimeter wall adjustments are to be handled under a separate Standard Certificate of Appropriateness.*
- 8. The pool, pool deck, and associated security wall and gates are to be handled under a separate Standard Certificate of Appropriateness.*
- 9. The landscaping plan is to be handled under a separate Standard Certificate of Appropriateness.*
- 10. Corner beads are not to be used on the addition.*

**CASE FILE COA (SP) 2021-027:** An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 1203 N. Greenway Drive, a Contributing Resource with the "Country Club of Coral Gables Historic District," legally described as Lots 17 and 18, Block 4, Coral Gables Section "E," according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 8, at Page 13 of the Public Records of Miami Dade County, Florida. The application requests design approval for the construction of a two-story garage addition and sitework.

Mr. Adams made a presentation for the agenda item following a presentation on screen:

1. Contributing resource within the City of Coral Gables Country Club Historic District.
2. Corner lot located on the northwest corner of North Greenway Drive and Columbus Boulevard.
3. Designed by H. George Fink in 1923.
4. The request is for a two-story garage addition on the northeast corner of the residence.
5. The first floor will be a two-car garage and the second floor will have a bedroom, bathroom, and closet.
6. There is also some site work such as work to the driveway, sliding vehicular gates on Columbus, brick paver walkways, relocation of pool equipment.
7. The addition was reviewed twice by the Board of Architects. The first time there were several comments, and the second time only one which was to widen the column in the west elevation.



8. The addition is connected to the main structure by a small hyphen. The hyphen is open, and it is minimally connected to the existing building. It is connected to an existing open terrace and the architectural style is consistent.
9. There are several conditions, the main condition is that the staircase when viewed on the east elevation, the handrail is solid concrete, and it slightly obscures the existing building, and it appears to be massive. Mr. Adams recommended that the handrail of the new staircase to the second floor of the addition, should be made of a metal like the balcony railing or of concrete with openings. Staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Mr. Tatis, the architect introduced himself and made a presentation following an on-screen presentation.

1. The proposal was for the board to review a two-story addition of approximately 800 plus square feet.
2. He showed the existing survey indicating that the property was in the northeast corner on Columbus Boulevard.
3. The existing drive flows into a space that is not being used for anything now, and then it leads back to the pool.
4. The existing house only has a one car garage, the owner is a car collector and wants to have more space.
5. They are proposing that on the northeast corner they expand the garage and have a two-car garage on the ground level and a bedroom on the second floor with the stairs going up the side to the second floor.
6. The new addition will bring back all the details of the existing house and try and assimilate it into the expansion so there is a cohesiveness between two. It will look like it has been there forever.
7. He showed pictures of the house including the main entrance to the house on the North Greenway side, across from the golf course.
8. There was a question about the garage, the garage will follow the same look as the existing house.
9. The existing house has window boxes on the bottom, the windows are high profile with white mullions and clear glass. All canopies are blue in color and the canopies for the garage will be the same.
10. They would maintain the existing brick pavers on the northeast corner, there will be some alterations as they get closer to the addition.
11. There is a pool and a terrace and there is a breezeway connecting the existing house.
12. Columns will be in the breezeway that attaches the addition to the existing house. It will be a continuous element.
13. There is a low wall on the outside.
14. The Columbus driveway which is the existing will be expanded to 18 feet.
15. The opening in the wall will be expanded to 19' 6" to allow the cars to back out.
16. He showed the picture of where the expansion would be. It showed a halfway concrete floor as well as the previous addition to the house.
17. He went on to show pictures of the house from Columbus Boulevard.
18. The paint colors were approved Benjamin Moore colors. BM 2148-50 Sandy White for the stucco walls and BM-2148-70 Mountain Peak White for the trim, sconces and railings which would match the existing.
19. Railing would match the existing.
20. They would either reuse or rebuild.
21. Planter boxes would match the existing.
22. He showed site plans including landscape plans. Very few trees would be disrupted.
23. He showed a plan of the garage including the stair and the new brick walkway which would lead you back into the existing walkway of the house. The garage is a 24 x 24 space.
24. He also showed the existing asphalt driveway which would be expanded to 18 feet and the column.
25. He also indicated where the new gate would be which would replace the existing small gate and be an exact replica.
26. He also showed a plan of the addition from the lower level showing the existing house and the breezeway between them.
27. The plan of the upper level shows the stairs to the balcony and the entrance doors which are French doors to match the existing ones in the house. It also showed the bedroom and the closet.
28. He showed the addition in relationship to the second floor.
29. The house had an addition in 1991, they added the second floor and he thought they also added parts of the terrace.
30. He showed elevations including the main elevation facing the Columbus side which showed the two garage doors and the windows for the second floor.
31. He showed the flower boxes and indicated that the finishes were all the same. They would replicate the tiles on the roof and some of the vent pipes would match the existing house. This ensured that no matter what side you looked at it would look like the rest of the house. Also, the breezeway (connection) would have the same columns.
32. He went on to show different views of the house and walls ensuring the board that all additions would look like the original house.
33. Windows were going to be PGT with white mullions and clear glass.

Mr. Ehrenhaft stated that in his presentation he was trying to make everything look like the existing house, on the color and materials page the stucco or wall texture would match the existing, but as he understood it a new construction should not attempt to match exactly that of the historic house. He also referred to the wall that is adjacent to the staircase going up to the second floor, it was above the height of a pedestrian's head, and he thought Mr. Adams had suggested lowering the wall.

Mr. Adams said he had recommended a metal railing to match the balcony.

Mr. Tatis said that the solid wall follows the angle of the stairs and there is a keystone cap on the top, there is no rail.

Mr. Adams said there would be code requirements for the house and his recommendation was to open it up.

Mr. Ehrenhaft said he was looking at the wall on A-2. Mr. Tatis said the owner had gone around the neighborhood and seen similar stairs as the one proposed. There was some discussion of the wall and the architect passed around a picture of the stairs to the board members. He said that if they thought it was better to have the railing coming down it was fine. He had a cap on it, and he wanted to do a little bit of topiary, because when you are facing the wall in front there is a break in the wall, because they go in on the side of the garage, there is a wall that breaks the bottom which is shown on A-3.

Mr. Garcia-Pons said he had a similar comment, but with a different approach. He said that it appeared that the stairwell stops short of the balcony, it looks like he could get a couple more steps on the long side versus the short. The architect said they had to change it because of the height and how long it had to be. Mr. Garcia-Pons said it doesn't have to be that way. On the balcony on the second floor, you have the balcony and then you have a return on the balcony of a certain distance. So, you need the number of stairs from that line all the way down. If you move the number of stairs up, and remove the bottom two stairs, the street facing wall will be two feet shorter, and the stairs would be a foot shorter. The architect said he thought they could do this as if you look at the plan, he could put two more and cut two more from the bottom. Mr. Garcia Pons said it does two things, it reduces the wall, and it reduces the height a little bit. He did not agree with staff's recommendation of putting a railing there, as the Gables has a history of these walls, he just thought that the wall was too big, and needs a little more care in the design of the wall, because it could be a beautiful feature. Unfortunately, it currently wasn't, and he was not just talking about the street facing wall. More importantly the south facing wall is visible from the street and should be designed well.

He also said that he noticed that they had two openings at the door and at the shower, and they should think of that wall of the stairwell as an elevation to be designed, he thought that it could be beautiful from the street.

Mr. Ehrenhaft agreed, he liked the wall and would not like to see a railing there. Mr. Tatis also agreed.

Mr. Fullerton asked about the details being the same. He asked staff if they agreed with those statements. Mr. Adams said that he thought it was already distinguished with the breezeway, but if the board wanted to impose a further condition of changing the stucco texture or changing something on the windows then they could do that. Mr. Fullerton agreed.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone had any more questions.

Mr. Garcia Pons said there seemed to be a lot of details and specs to be provided regarding the windows. Mr. Adams said he had clarified on the record that the muntins would be high profile and the glass would be clear and he had included a detail of the awning. Mr. Tatis said the city architect had reviewed it and wanted to see a detail of the awning. He had also asked about the windows, but he said they already had the NOA's on the drawings. He said that he had taken care of his comments. He showed Mr. Adams a picture of the new gate but said it would be hard to specify as he had to get the contractor or the GC to go out to bid for the item. He wanted the board and everyone there to know that the gate is going to be the same as the gate on North Greenway.

Mr. Adams said they just needed confirmation of these items submitted to them to which the architect agreed.

Mr. Adams said that if the board was going to make the recommendation for the stairs, if it was something that they wanted brought back or did they believe that staff could review. Mr. Garcia-Pons said he had faith in staff, but if they wanted to bring it back to the board they could. He suggested that whoever was going to make the motion to include that.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak in favor or against this case. When no one answered he closed the public portion.

Ms. Rolando asked if they wanted to make an amendment regarding the stairs leading to the second floor of the addition.

A motion was made by Mr. Fullerton and seconded by Mr. Ehrenhaft to approve the application for design approval for the construction of a two-story garage addition and sitework on the property at 1203 North Greenway Drive with the conditions stated by staff and amended on the floor including that #6 in the staff report should be rephrased to say “the solid concrete walls of the staircase shall be redesigned to lower the height of the wall facing Columbus Avenue.

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

*Conditions are as follows:*

- 1. Specifications and details of the proposed motorized sliding vehicular gate shall be submitted to Staff for review.*
- 2. Details and specifications for all proposed new doors and windows shall be submitted to Staff for review.*
- 3. All muntins shall be high profile.*
- 4. All glass shall be clear.*
- 5. Details and specifications of the proposed awnings shall be submitted to Staff for review.*
- 6. The solid concrete walls of the staircase shall be redesigned to lower the height of the wall facing Columbus Boulevard.*
- 7. Details and specifications of the proposed garage doors shall be submitted to Staff for review.*
- 8. Details and specifications for the proposed balcony rail shall be submitted to Staff for review.*

## **BOARD ITEMS / CITY COMMISSION / CITY PROJECTS UPDATE:**

### **Landmark Advisory Board:**

1. The first meeting would be in February.
2. Mr. Adams is the liaison to the board.
3. There is a requirement that the Landmarks Advisory Board and the Historic Preservation Board have at least one joint meeting a year, Chair Menendez suggested that it be sometime in September.
4. The ordinance stated that they would meet once per quarter.

### **Gondola Building:**

1. Mr. Adams had met with the city manager on site and had been requested to put together various options for the building.
2. Ms. Spain would like to see it rebuilt, it was a storage building and did not need electricity or plumbing which would cut down on the cost.
3. The mayor had requested \$750,000 in Tallahassee.
4. Various use options were being explored.
5. The board expressed concern that if it was rebuilt and not used it would fall into disrepair.
6. It was suggested that it be rented to provide revenue for its maintenance.

### **Water Tower:**

1. The board expressed concern about maintenance of older buildings like the water tower.
2. Mr. Adams had visited the site six months before.
3. The City was waiting on the insurance company to see if they would pay for the repairs.
4. Mr. Adams would provide updates to the board.

### **City Hall:**

1. Drawings and building permits for the repair of the City Hall tower had been received and would be reviewed at staff level.
2. The Certificate of Appropriateness had been requested.

Mr. Maxwell said that if Coral Gables was going to be the city of historic preservation in South Florida we needed to continue to invest in our historic building. He felt they were not maintaining the buildings properly. They City needed to have a conservator on staff who knows about materials.

**Coral Rock Feature - 1224 Country Club Prado**

1. An archaeologist would be on site during any excavation work and staff would work with the owner to determine whether an archaeologist would go out there to do some investigation and/or tests before the work is done.
2. The next application would be for the restoration of the house.
3. The way the approval was given before, regardless of what was built on the two lots it would come back to the board for review.
4. The board would review any alterations to the remaining historic building or the historic coral rock structures and any new construction on the two lots, if they were split.
5. Any new homes built on those two sites should take into consideration the location of coral rock feature to try to preserve it and plan for that to happen before any legal action is taken or allowed to be done.
6. The home should be designed around it to preserve it, as it could not be moved.

**Elevator Tower – 4200 Granada Boulevard**

1. Mr. Adams reached out to the building code department and was told city staff does not review elevators it was the county.
2. The City Architect had advised Mr. Adams what the minimum clearance requirements were.
3. Mr. Adams would inspect the tower to see if it conformed to those requirements.
4. The board requested the dimensions measured and photographed.
5. The homeowner had reached out to see when someone would be out to look at the elevator.
6. Mr. Adams would work with the homeowner to conform to the requirements.

**ITEMS FROM THE SECRETARY: None**

**DISCUSSION ITEM: None**

**OLD BUSINESS: None**

**NEW BUSINESS: None**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Maxwell made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Garcia-Pons. The board all agreed with aye.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Warren Adams  
Historic Preservation Officer