

HPB Minutes

April 15, 2004

~~DEBATES~~
Ms. Lubin reported that Case [redacted] Avenue, was deferred.

~~REVIEW THE MINUTES~~
Nancy Morgan [redacted] members of the audience who planned to testify during the meeting.

LOCAL HISTORIC DESIGNATION:

CASE FILE LHD 2003-18: Consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 1044 Coral Way, legally described as Lots 1 and the west 32 feet of Lot 2, Block 11, Coral Gables Section "A".

Ms. Lubin explained that this application was deferred from the February Board meeting as she displayed photographs of the residence. She spoke about the property's recent history, stating that in August 2004 staff received a historic significance request for the potential demolition of the property. Staff contacted the architect and potential buyer of the property to advise them of its significance. She called attention to the correspondence regarding the issue.

Since that time, Ms. Lubin continued, staff has worked with the current owner on plans for an addition to the structure. When the application was deferred from the February meeting, it was agreed that the owner would return to the Board with plans for an addition. However, Ms. Lubin stated, they have not yet submitted plans for an addition. Therefore, today's application seeks designation as a local historic landmark, and not for an addition. Plans for an addition will be submitted at a later date.

Ms. Lubin continued by displaying past and present photographs and describing the history of the property, stating it is very similar to Merrick House. She stated that the application is proceeding without the owners' consent, and that staff recommends approval of the designation. The owners were not present at the meeting; however, their architect, Glenn Pratt, was in attendance.

Ms. Bondurant invited Mr. Pratt to address the Board.

Mr. Pratt introduced himself and briefly described conceptual plans for the residence as well as original construction materials. However, since the addition was not part of the application, further discussion was not held, and the public hearing was closed when no one else requested to speak.

Ms. Turner made a motion to approve the local historic designation of 1044 Coral Way. Mr. Santos seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Santos, Ms. Turner, Ms. Bennett, Ms. Maroon, Ms. Bondurant. Nays: None. Absent from the vote: Mr. Fullerton, Mr. Beeman, Ms. Meyers.

CASE FILE LHD 2004-01 and COA (SP) 2004-03:

~~Consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 1328 Castile Avenue, legally described as Lot 4 and the North 1.5 feet of Lot 10, Block 8, Coral Gables Section "E" with an application for the issuance of an Accelerated Special Certificate of Appropriateness. The accelerated application is requesting design approval for the alteration of the existing structure and the construction of an addition. A variance has also been requested for total side setback.~~

HPB Minutes

August 17, 2006

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT and DISCLOSURE OF CONTEXT:

Ms. Bondurant read for the record the statement regarding lobbyist registration and disclosure. She then stated that if any members of the board had any ex parte communication or contact regarding any cases being heard, it was necessary to disclose such communication or contact. Board members did not indicate that any such communication occurred.

SWEARING IN OF THE PUBLIC:

Nancy Morgan swore in members of the audience who planned to testify during the meeting.

Ms. Stewart stated for the record that one of the applicants appearing before the Board at this meeting was a client of her firm; however, she stated that this would not affect her impartiality.

ITEM FROM THE SECRETARY:

737 Alhambra Circle:

At the request of staff, Ms. Bondurant announced that an Item from the Secretary would be addressed first. Ms. Millicent Bain, Code Enforcement Lead, Building and Planning Department, was present to provide a status update to the Board on the property located at 737 Alhambra Circle.

Ms. Bain stated that the property was first noticed by Code Enforcement in April 2005. The property owner never appeared before the Code Enforcement Board. He requested an extension, stating he had issues to clear with the Historic Preservation Board. He was granted the extension; however, he never proceeded. The case was brought before the Code Enforcement Board, at which time he was found guilty. He did not comply with the Board's order within the 30-day limit, and the total of his fines is currently in excess of \$57,000. Ms. Alfonso Ruiz, Assistant City Attorney, stated the case would be before the Commission on September 22 to seek authority to file suit and for demolition.

Mr. Beeman pointed out that the structure was unprotected and appeared to be potentially hazardous. Ms. Bain said the City has maintained the property, though Board members said the fence was open. Ms. Bain said she would have an officer ensure that the fence was secured.

Mr. Fullerton received confirmation that the historic designation would remain with the property, even if the structure were demolished.

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2006-13.

An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 1044 Coral Way, a local historic landmark, legally described as Lot 1 and the west 32 feet of Lot 2, Block 11, Coral Gables Section "A". The applicant requested approval for demolition of the existing structure.

Ms. Kautz reviewed the details of the property's history as current and historic photographs were displayed via Powerpoint. On or about May 8, 2006, the City became aware that the structure partially collapsed. The same day, the Historic Resources department signed a permit for an emergency chain link fence. The structure was deemed unsafe on May 10, 2006, and continued to deteriorate. She explained that typically, prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, the design of the new construction had to be submitted for a Special Certificate of Appropriateness. However, due to the nature of the property and the determination by building officials that the property was unsafe, staff did not require the applicant to submit an application with full drawings for the replacement of the structure. Staff met with the applicant and architect to discuss preliminary sketches of the new structure. Once received the application for the new structure must be reviewed and approved by the Board.

Ms. Kautz said it was necessary to remove the debris from the site. The construction of the new structure should reflect the original character of the lost residence and integrate into its design the features that defined the house. The entire site is deemed historic and, as such, it is appropriate that the building style be utilized in the rebuilding of a new residence, which must comply with all applicable regulations. Staff has communicated with the owners and architects, and has requested that the north façade be reconstructed in its entirety and that any new portions of the home be constructed beyond the front façade, and be designed in a similar and compatible architectural style.

Ms. Kautz said staff recommended a motion to grant approval of the demolition of the structure on the property at 1044 Coral Way, a local historic landmark, with the condition that the owners continue to work with staff to develop an acceptable design and approve the issue of a Certificate of Appropriateness with this condition.

Dr. Parnes requested information about any progress made on actions from the previous Board meeting. Ms. Kautz explained that Zeke Guilford, attorney for the owners who was present at the meeting, agreed to Board conditions. Shortly after the meeting, Mr. Guilford appealed the agreement. That appeal was to be heard at the next City Commission meeting. Prior to the appeal, staff and the Assistant City Attorney endeavored to secure a forensic engineer to fulfill the Board's request. However, after the appeal was submitted, that action stopped. Ms. Kautz said the owners, architects and Attorney Guilford were present at this meeting and available to address the Board.

Mr. Guilford pointed out that Mr. and Mrs. Toyos, the owners of the property, and Marshall Bellin and Glenn Pratt, architects, were also present, after which he reviewed City officials/departments' meetings and conversations that had taken place since the June Board meeting. On July 27th, the property was inspected by multiple City departments, at which time it was determined the structure could not be rebuilt using the materials on the property. He described the conditions as a life/safety issue since there was a lot of debris on the property and it was hurricane season. He said it was the applicant's aim to work with staff to build a front façade as depicted on a displayed drawing with the addition in the rear of the property. The application would be reviewed by the Board at a future meeting when architectural drawings were complete and could be properly presented. He requested support of staff's recommendation.

Ms. Bondurant invited other members of the audience to speak in support of or against the application. Hearing no requests, the public hearing was closed and Board comments were sought.

Mr. Beeman said it was previously agreed that a forensic engineer was going to inspect the property and make a determination about why the second oldest house in Coral Gables collapsed. Mr. Guilford indicated that the issue was that the house did collapse and was, in effect, gone. Mr. Beeman responded that he was not satisfied with the response.

Mr. Pratt, one of the project architects, stated that he was on the property with the owner's structural engineer when Peter Iglesias reviewed the structure on multiple occasions. He said efforts were made to determine ways to tie the original structure to new construction; however, structural damage was partially caused by the application of a substantially heavier roof that was installed on the original framing, intended for a much lighter weight roof. He described possible methods that were discussed that could help preserve the structure, though did not state that any of those methods were implemented.

Dr. Parnes pointed out that these meetings occurred over a year prior to the collapse of the building, and stated that the owners had made no attempts to protect the building or maintain the property in the intervening time. Mr. Pratt had no response.

Mr. Fullerton asked how, other than photographs and drawings shown at this meeting, the porch and other elements of the structure were documented. Mr. Guilford said at the original application over a year ago, drawings were previously provided to staff. Mr. Pratt stated that the drawings were field measured and field documented. Photographs were also taken. Mr. Fullerton pointed out differences he noticed between photographs and drawings, and asked about the level of diligence applied to the documentation effort. Mr. Pratt described the effort.

Dr. Parnes asked if scaled architectural drawings were available, and inquired about preservation of building materials, architectural details and ornaments in terms of the amount of existing material could be applied to the new structure. Mr. Pratt indicated little likelihood that original materials could be preserved.

Mr. Fullerton and Mr. Pratt discussed the double hung windows. Ms. Kautz stated that staff asked the applicant to replicate the wraparound porch where it attached to the existing house. Mr. Fullerton suggested providing input to the applicant to ensure that they proceeded in accordance with recommendations. Ms. Kautz commented that the intent of the provision of drawings was to demonstrate that the owners were working toward staff's recommendations, and with the intent to allow the Board sufficient information to approve the COA for demolition with the condition that they proceed in this general path. She said actual design drawings would be presented to the Board when they were completely prepared.

Mr. Santos said that when last year's drawings were submitted, he recalled that a structural engineering report was also included. Mr. Pratt said he didn't recall a report, though the documentation effort included photographs, site visits, measurements, though he was unsure if written documentation existed. Mr. Santos said it was important for record purposes that any documentation be submitted and reviewed. Dr. Parnes concurred, restating that this was one of the oldest residences in Coral Gables and documentation was important to reassure the Board that every effort would be made to replace the original structure with a structure that closely resembled the original.

Ms. Maroon and Mr. Beeman recalled past applicant history regarding the property, agreements made and not kept, alternate plans not submitted as requested. Mr. Guilford explained how the owners perceived the circumstances and said they did not feel confident they would receive Board approval. He also said they explored an unsuccessful effort to relocate the house.

Marshall Bellin clarified the circumstances in question, stating that they appeared three times before the Board, responding to Board requests. They were told that the FAR was not an issue, and complied with all suggestions. At voting time, the Board voted to deny the application. He said it appeared that FAR was the issue.

Dr. Parnes said it was his understanding, assuming demolition, that the new structure would be positioned closer to Coral Way, which would allow it to be built without a variance and, because it would be more spacious, make it more compatible with the existing structure. Mr. Bellin confirmed. The house would also be shifted toward the east and north to center it on the property. Mr. Pratt said one issue raised by the architects as a hardship was the placement of the house on the site, a contributing factor for the current design. It was pointed out that the intact house's position on the property created a hardship. Discussion of design issues continued.

Mr. Fullerton made a motion to approve staff's recommendation: to grant approval of the demolition of the structure on the property at 1044 Coral Way, a local historic landmark, with the condition that the owners continue to work with staff to develop an acceptable design and approve the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness with this condition. Mr. Santos seconded.

Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Fullerton, Mr. Santos, Ms. Stewart, Dr. Parnes. Nays: Mr. Beeman, Ms. Maroon, Ms. Bondurant. The motion failed.

Dr. Parnes made a motion to approve staff's recommendations pending receipt next month of more information, more supporting architectural drawings, photographs and the existing structural report previously referred to in order to provide sufficient assurance to the Board that the new structure will be acceptable. Mr. Beeman amended the motion to add forensic documentation. Dr. Parnes agreed to the amendment. Ms. Maroon seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Dr. Parnes, Mr. Fullerton, Ms. Maroon, Mr. Santos, Mr. Beeman, Ms. Stewart, Ms. Bondurant. Nays: None.

Consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 537 Majorca Avenue, legally described as the East 1/4 of Lot 2 and all of Lot 3, Block 1, Coral Gables Section "B". The applicant also requested issuance of an Accelerated Special Certificate of Appropriateness and design approval for the construction of an addition and alterations to the existing structure.

Ms. Bondurant called that the application was initially reviewed by the Board at the July 20th meeting, and welcomed Ms. Maroon to the meeting.

Ms. Chin stated that the architect, George Lopez, was present to review the project. She added that he applied the Board's suggestions to the design. Ms. Chin then displayed historical and current photographs, previously viewed by the Board. Drawings were also displayed, and Ms. Chin pointed out differences between drawings.

Mr. Lopez expressed appreciation for the Board's previous suggestions, and stated that all comments were taken into consideration. He also thanked Ms. Chin for her assistance with all the details. He then comprehensively reviewed the drawings and revisions.

Ms. Bondurant invited members of the audience to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Hearing no requests to speak, she closed the public hearing and asked for Board comments.

Dr. Parnes made a motion to approve staff's recommendation. Mr. Beeman seconded.

Ms. Kautz pointed out that staff did not make a recommendation for the re-submittal and, although staff was pleased with the re-submittal, suggested the Board address the perimeter wall within the design. The Board indicated that they agreed with the architect and did not care for the wall; however, the wall design was the wish of the owner.

Mr. Santos stated that, as a matter of record, mechanical drawings were needed and the follow up elevations needed to match. Mr. Lopez agreed to provide them.

Dr. Parnes made a motion to approve the plans as submitted. Mr. Beeman seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Beeman, Mr. Fullerton, Ms. Maroon, Dr. Parnes, Ms. Stewart, Mr. Santos, Ms. Bondurant. Nays: None.

HPB Minutes

October 19, 2006

Special Certificate of Appropriateness – Case File COA (SP) 2000-05 was granted design approval on September 12, 2006 by the Historic Preservation Board

Ms. Kautz stated that this application represented the completion of work done to restore the property. She reviewed the history of the property and internal and external renovations, changes and additions as photographs were displayed via Powerpoint. At the conclusion of the presentation, she introduced the owner Robert Briele, who spoke briefly with the Board and responded to questions.

At the conclusion of discussion, Ms. Bondurant solicited comments from the audience. Hearing no requests to speak, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Maroon made a motion to approve the request for ad valorem tax relief. Mr. Beeman seconded the motion.

Roll Call. Ayes: Ms. Meyers, Mr. Santos, Ms. Maroon, Ms. Stewart, Mr. Beeman, Ms. Bennett, Ms. Bondurant. Nays: None.

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2006-13 Continued:

An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 1044 Coral Way, a local historic landmark, legally described as Lot 1 and the west 32 feet of Lot 2, Block 11, Coral Gables Section "A". The applicant requested approval for the demolition of the existing structure. (This case was reviewed by the Historic Preservation Board at a public hearing held on August 17, 2006.)

Ms. Kautz recalled that during the meeting of August 17, 2006, the Board moved that the applicant return to the Board with a set of conditions to grant the Special Certificate of Appropriateness, and read from the August minutes. She pointed out the submittals required of the applicants by the Board, copies of which were included in Board packets. In addition, she stated, the City hired a structural engineer (Douglas Wood) to conduct an assessment, a copy of which was distributed to each Board member. Architects for the project, Marshall Bellin and Glenn Pratt, were present and requested to speak to the Board about one of the requirements.

Ms. Bennett initiated discussion with Ms. Kautz about the documents, photographs and reports. The assessment of Mr. Wood regarding the instability of the house and difficulty of working at the property was discussed. Ms. Alfonsin-Ruiz reported that the City has been diligently working on this case, culminating with the engineer assessing the property a few days previous. In the City's estimate, she continued, the applicant has complied with all requirements. She described numerous meetings and discussions that have occurred over recent weeks. Ms. Alfonsin-Ruiz stated that there is no current demolition by neglect in the code, and said that fines of approximately \$300,000 are still outstanding. The case will be heard by the Ticket Officer on November 3rd.

Ms. Kautz confirmed that the applicant was requesting demolition of the house on the historic site. The City's position, she stated, was one of satisfaction with the compromise that has occurred regarding the front facade being replicated to match the existing one, and working with the applicant to determine what is acceptable behind the main house. Eventually, the new plan will be presented to the Board for approval because the entire property is designated historic.

Mr. Pratt said they hoped the Board might gain awareness of some difficulties the architects were experiencing trying to incorporate the façade of the house into the design for the new house, to explain what they were trying to accomplish and to explore possible new directions.

A lengthy discussion followed among Board members, Mr. Pratt, Mr. Bellin, Ms. Alfonsin-Ruiz and Ms. Kautz as numerous issues were addressed related to the demolition, difficulties in reproduction of specific areas of the existing

house, design of the new house, replication of the original house, and salvaging as much as possible for use in constructing the new house.

Mr. Beeman made a motion to allow the demolition of the property with the understanding that as much as possible be salvaged from the ruins, saved and secured to be used in the future home. Ms. Maroon seconded the motion. Mr. Beeman amended his motion to require the owners of the property, in resubmitting the new plans for the new home, to be as sensitive to the Board's request to identify the front and side façades as much as possible. Ms. Maroon agreed to the amendment. Mr. Beeman and Ms. Maroon withdrew their amendment. Ms. Bennett amended the motion for the Board to grant the motion to demolish the property with the understanding that the original historic building would be re-created unless the Board agrees to a lesser solution when they see the specific plans with additions. Both Mr. Beeman and Ms. Maroon agreed to Ms. Bennett's amendment.

Discussion continued, with Mr. and Mrs. Toyos joining in. Points made:

- Board comments: Ensure clear understanding of the importance of the issue of recreating the second oldest house in Coral Gables' history. Amplify that the job is to recreate 100% of the façade of the original house, with the onus on the applicant to demonstrate to the Board how anything less than 100% would be made acceptable to the Board. Square footage is a problem.
- Staff: Recreation of the original house as a starting point was not necessarily what the applicant was led to believe at the last meeting.
- Mrs. Toyos: The house is an eyesore and a safety issue. They want to move forward, and will work with the Board to do as much as possible to recreate the façade of the house. The remainder of the house will be difficult to reconstruct as the original if it is going to meet the Toyos' family needs. The new design includes the replication of the front façade of the house. Other options will be presented to the Board for input and approval after the design process moves forward.
- Architects: We will work with the City to determine the best way to incorporate original materials in the new structure.
- Mr. Toyos: Allow the architects to prepare options for designing the new house and bring it back for review. Instead, today, focus on the demolition so the project can move forward.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Maroon, Ms. Meyers, Mr. Santos, Ms. Stewart, Mr. Beeman, Ms. Bennett, Ms. Bondurant. Nays: None.

application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 1004 Cotorro Avenue, a contributing structure within the "French City Village Historic District", legally described as Lots 8, 9, 10, Block 145, Revised Plat of Coral Gables Riviera Section Part Nine. The applicant requested design approval for the construction of additions and alterations to the existing structure. Variances have been requested from the Coral Gables "Zoning Code" Interim Single Family Residence Regulations for the maximum square foot floor area ratio and the minimum height of a parapet.

Ms. Kautz reported that the applicant was no longer requesting a variance for the minimum height of a parapet. As she conducted a Powerpoint presentation and displayed photographs of the property, she explained its history. At the conclusion of her presentation, she introduced project architect Albert Poza to explain the proposal.

Mr. Poza described the house, the applicant's plan and the features some of which, he said, were not functional for everyday life. As drawings were displayed, he explained how the changes to facilitate function were incorporated in the design. When he finished speaking, Ms. Bondurant invited other members of the audience to speak for or against the application. Hearing no requests, she closed the public hearing.

Board members entered in discussion with the architect, covering topics that included:

- A suggestion was made to work with staff to reconfigure the pool area to make it less competitive with the house.

HPB Minutes

July 21, 2007

June 21, 2007

Continued

Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Beeman, Ms. MacIntyre, Ms. Maroon, Ms. Meyers, Ms. Stewart, Ms. Bondurant, Ms. Bennett. Nays: None.

CASE FILE COA (ST) 2007-42: An application for a Standard Certificate of Appropriateness for paint color for the property at 1044 Asturia Avenue.

Ms. Silvia Unzueta, the owner, explained that her original window paint color was white, but her present request was for a dark color for window to match mahogany doors on the house. Ms. Kautz said staff's opinion was that the color had too much red in the pigment, which was why the issue was brought to the Board.

Board members asked for window samples. Ms. Unzueta said the windows were approved in white. Ms. Meyers pointed out that the dark color would mask the details of the windows, which would dramatically change the appearance of the house.

Contractor Horacio Sweita displayed different window color options, after which Board members posed clarifying questions and comments.

Mr. Beeman made a motion to approve the paint color for the windows. Ms. Meyers seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Maroon, Ms. Meyers, Ms. Stewart, Mr. Beeman, Ms. MacIntyre, Ms. Bennett. Nays: Ms. Bondurant.

MEETING TIME TERMINATION:

At 9:00 p.m., Ms. Bennett reported that the majority of the Board would need to formally approve continuing the meeting past 9:00 p.m. Ms. Alfonsin-Ruiz advised the rules pertaining to temporarily suspending the meeting, and the necessity for reconvening prior to the next meeting.

Ms. MacIntyre made a motion to continue to 10:00 p.m. Ms. Maroon seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Maroon, Ms. MacIntyre, Ms. Stewart, Mr. Beeman, Ms. Bennett.

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2007-13: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 1044 Coral Way, a local historic landmark, legally described as Lot 1 and the west 32 feet of Lot 2, Block 11, Coral Gables Section "A," according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 102, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant requested design approval for the construction of a new residence and installation of at-grade improvements.

Ms. Kautz briefly reviewed the history of the property. She stated that no variances were requested for the new structure, introduced the proposal and said the applicants were present. Thereafter, she said the architects would present the proposal, and staff would then present its recommendations.

Mr. Pratt and Mr. Bellin addressed the Board, displaying and reviewing drawings of the proposed design of the new residence. They said the plan was to recreate the front façade and parts of the main body of the original house. They pointed out connection points between the new addition and the body of the recreated house to properly delineate the difference. The architects responded to Board questions about details of the design, setbacks, walls, decorative elements, size, front fountain and parking. It was suggested that the design of the front fountain be simplified so as not to compete with the historic house, in addition to staff's comments. Ms. Meyers requested that the design for the overall wall on the perimeter of the property be brought back to the Board for review.

Ms. Kautz presented staff's comments as follows, all of which have been reviewed with the architects:

- concern that some of the features of the original house were not accurately portrayed, including sash windows, the window proportion of the dormers, wood frames, proportions;
- concern with the wall feature along Cordova Street, which appears slightly mission style and needs to be simplified;
- concern that at grade features are not detailed.

With these conditions accepted, staff recommended approval. Architects and Board members discussed these concerns and changes. Homeowner Waldo Toyos joined Mr. Pratt and Mr. Bellin at the podium. Ms. Meyers suggested, to achieve privacy, the design should consider landscaping as a solution rather than a large wall. Mr. Toyos agreed to consider the suggestion.

Ms. Meyers requested that the final rendition of the design be brought back to the Board with more detailing and all changes recommended by staff incorporated.

Ms. Meyers made a motion to approve the application, subject to incorporating staff's and the Board's comments, and to have an opportunity to review more landscaping and the perimeter wall design.

Mr. Toyos stated that his family has been waiting four years to resolve these issues and asked that the design be handled administratively. Ms. Toyos joined him at the podium. Ms. Bennett requested that they return next month. Ms. Toyos urged the Board to recognize the effort they had made over a four-year period.

Ms. Meyers restated her motion. Mr. Toyos again indicated they would not accept having to return for further review. Ms. Bennett asked the Board if they would approve allowing staff to administratively approve changes. Discussion continued.

Ms. Bennett suggested that the most critical issue was the wall and all the ornamentation on it, and suggested the architects prepare a new wall design that could be reviewed by staff and the Board.

There was no second to Ms. Meyers' motion and it failed.

Ms. Maroon made a motion to allow staff to administratively review a plan that takes into consideration the wall, the softening of the green space and staff concerns about the wall's mission style elements. Ms. Bondurant seconded the motion.

Mr. Pratt said that sketches were created which would be refined and reviewed with the Toyos' family and staff. Ms. Kautz said the perimeter wall would come back to the Board as well as the Board of Architects as details and specifications were not included in the packet. Numerous design suggestions were discussed.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Meyers, Ms. Stewart, Mr. Beeman, Ms. MacIntyre, Ms. Maroon, Ms. Bondurant, Ms. Bennett. Nays: None.

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2007-14: An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 1044 Coral Way, a local historic landmark, legally described as Lot 1 and the west 32 feet of Lot 2, Block 11, Coral Gables Section "A," according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 102, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant requested de-designation of the historic property.

Ms. Meyers made a motion to deny the application. Ms. Bondurant seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. MacIntyre, Ms. Maroon, Ms. Meyers, Mr. Beeman, Ms. Bondurant, Ms. Bennett. Nays: None. Abstention: Ms. Stewart.

HPB Minutes

December 20, 2007

Ms. Meyers made a motion to approve the demolition and the installation of at-grade improvements as proposed. Mr. Beeman seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Beeman, Ms. Thomson (*with the condition that Mr. Parrish get input from the Lola B. Walker Homeowners Association regarding the proposed wall), Ms. Meyers, Dr. Parnes, Mr. Santos, Ms. Bennett. Nays: Ms. Stewart.

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2007-26 Continued An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 600 Alhambra Circle, a local historic landmark, legally described as Lot 1 and 3, Block 21, Coral Gables Section "A," according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 5, Page 111 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County Florida. The applicant is requesting design approval for the construction of an addition and at-grade improvements. A variance has also been requested for the allowable height for a wall.

Ms. Kautz conducted a Point Point presentation as the history and photographs of the property were reviewed. She stated that the applicant requested construction of an exterior terrace as well as a wall height variance. The existing wall on the east side of the property, she advised, was the same height as the wall the applicant wanted to install.

Architect Peter Kiliddjian reviewed and described displayed plans, after which Mr. Santos discussed the variance requests and reasons for the request. Ms. Kautz reported that staff recommended approval of the variance, but commented that the large, mature palm trees on the northwest corner of the property should not be disturbed by the wall. Mr. Kiliddjian agreed to install the wall at a safe distance from the trees to ensure their preservation.

Ms. Bennett invited members of the audience to speak to the application.

Rex Wilkinson, 422 Alcazar Avenue: Regarding the proposed wall height, Mr. Wilkinson commented that permitting the proposed height would set a negative precedent and would not provide privacy on a 15,000 square foot lot.

Ms. Kautz said staff opined that the wall would provide privacy and screening on Alhambra Circle. Mr. Kiliddjian said landscaping would be added to the front of the wall. Ms. Thomson suggested that two feet of wrought iron on top of normal wall height could be acceptable. Ms. Meyers advised that the request did not appear to be a hardship or reason to compromise historic integrity, and expressed preference for a four-foot wall. If the Board did decide to approve it, she continued, she suggested setting the wall back at least five feet, and adding a landscape buffer. Ms. Bennett, Mr. Beeman and Dr. Parnes concurred.

Ms. Stewart made a motion to deny the variance for a five foot, six inch wall. Ms. Thomson seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Dr. Parnes, Mr. Santos, Ms. Stewart, Mr. Beeman, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Meyers, Ms. Bennett. Nays: None.

Ms. Thomson made a motion to approve the project with the four-foot wall. Mr. Santos seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Santos, Dr. Parnes, Mr. Santos, Ms. Stewart, Mr. Beeman, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Bennett. Nays: None.

CASE FILE COA (SP) 2007-13 Revised An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 1044 Coral Way, a local historic landmark, legally described as Lot 1 and the west 32 feet of Lot 2, Block 11, Coral Gables Section "A," according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 102, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant is requesting approval for variances from the Coral Gables Zoning Code for the allowable floor area ratio.

Ms. Kautz stated that the application requested a revision to the original COA that was granted on June 21, 2007. On July 25 and 31, project architects presented revised drawings to staff for administrative approval. Subsequently, a zoning analysis was performed, at which time it was discovered that the property exceeded the FAR of the new Code. The only change in this application was for the courtyard because of City zoning changes. Ms. Kautz pointed out the presence of the owners, attorney and architect.

Mr. Guilford, as a representative of the owners, reviewed Code provisions as they related to this issue, relating meetings with staff during efforts to resolve problems attendant to the new Code provisions, during which time unanimous agreement was reached that this section of the Code did not make sense and would need to be re-addressed. With staff's recommendation of approval of the FAR variance, Mr. Guilford urged Board approval.

Mr. Pratt briefly spoke about the issue. A discussion was held about Planning and Zoning's intent for the provisions, with Ms. Meyers advising, as an Urban Planner, about reasons for the provision.

Dr. Parnes made a motion to approve the variance. Mr. Beeman seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Meyers, Dr. Parnes, Mr. Santos, Ms. Stewart, Mr. Beeman, Ms. Thomson, Ms. Bennett. Nays: None.

Mr. Guilford spoke to another part of the application related to an extension of the time period for building permits, stating that the applicant wanted to waive it. Ms. Kautz stated Staff's recommendation to grant the extension of the variance to three years, so as not to leave it open-ended.

Mr. Santos made a motion to approve the request. Mr. Beeman seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ms. Thomson, Ms. Meyers, Dr. Parnes, Mr. Santos, Ms. Stewart, Mr. Beeman, Ms. Bennett. Nays: None.

~~Application for the historic structure of the property at 435 Alcazar Avenue, a potential contributing structure within the "Alcazar Avenue Historic District", locally described as Lot 21, Block 4, Coral Gables Section "B", according to the Plat thereof as recorded in Book 5, at page 111, of the Public Records of Miami Dade County, Florida. The applicant is requesting design approval for alterations to the existing structure.~~

~~Ms. Kautz stated that this property was one of the newest designated homes as a part of the Alcazar District. Ms. Chin conducted a PowerPoint presentation as current and historic photographs were displayed and the property's history was related. She pointed out that the applicants' proposed changes included relocating the front door, extended steps on the stoop, a wall on the left side of the steps, and a front wall treated with coral stone. As a Coral Gables cottage, the garage structure could be enclosed to be used as living spaces, which in this application were proposed as a den and laundry facility. The proposal called for the removal of one window, for which staff recommended the memory being retained by scoring or relief. She concluded that staff recommended approval of the application, excluding the proposed wall on the left side of the steps to be instead treated with metal railing, and that coral rock should not be applied to the front wall. Ms. Chin also said that sill lines should be maintained for continuity in appearance and muntins should be added.~~

~~Owner Maria Suri reviewed the changes proposed in the application, noting that the wall on the side of the steps could be changed. Ms. Kautz pointed out that the Zoning Code required a handrail on both sides of steps and Ms. Suri agreed to the change. Ms. Kautz displayed the proposed and original windows as Ms. Suri explained her reasons for the proposed design. Mr. Santos expressed problems with the proportion of the window, and Ms. Suri clarified that the proposed window could not be as wide as the original if a new front door were to be added.~~