



**HISTORICAL PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING**  
**Meeting Minutes of March 16, 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	F 16	M 16	APPOINTED BY
Albert Menendez (Chair)	P	P	P	P	Commission-As-A-Whole
Cesar Garcia Pons (Vice Chair)	E	P	P	P	City Manager Peter Iglesias
Alicia Bache-Wiig	P	P	P	P	Mayor Vince Lago
Margaret (Peggy) Rolando	P	P	E	E	Vice-Mayor Michael Mena
Dona Spain	P	P	P	P	Commissioner Rhonda Anderson
Xavier Durana	P	P	E	E	Commissioner Jorge L. Fors, Jr.
Michael J. Maxwell	P	P	P	P	Commissioner Kirk R. Menendez
Bruce Ehrenhaft	P	P	P	P	Commission-As-A-Whole
John P. Fullerton	P	P	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, Gus Ceballos, Assistant City Attorney, Attorney of the Board.

**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 4:11 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. Fullerton to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 19, 2022.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7; 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**

1. Case File COA(SP)2017-025 Revised – 4200 Granada Boulevard  
 Reason for Deferral: Mr. Adams stated that the owner was out of the country.

**SWEARING IN OF THE PUBLIC:**

Attorney Ceballos administered the oath.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

A motion was made by Mr. Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Fullerton to approve the absences of Mr. Durana and Ms. Rolando.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7; Nays: 0).

Chair Menendez stated that they would hear Item #4 first. He read a description of the case as follows:

**CASE FILE COA (SP) 2022-006:** An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness, in accordance with section 8-104(D)(2) of the City of Coral Gables Zoning Code, for the public right-of-way adjacent to 244, 250, 272, and 290 Valencia Avenue and 247 and 297 Almeria Avenue, legally described as that portion of the east-west alley 20 feet in width lying west of the northerly extension of the east line of Lot 35, Block 10, Coral Gables Crafts Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 10, at Page 40, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The applicant is requesting a recommendation of approval for an amendment to the City Plan for the vacation of the alley.

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

1. The application requests a recommendation of approval for an amendment to the city plan for the vacation of an alley and the creation of a perpetual access and utility easement perpendicular to the alley and providing access to and from Valencia Avenue.
2. An amendment to the Coral Gables zoning code to allow for the designation of the city plan was adopted in 2018.
3. The zoning code requires that any material amendments to the city plan shall be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Board who will make a recommendation for a Special Certificate of Appropriateness to the City Commission. The City Commission will ultimately render the decision whether to grant or deny the issuance of the Special Certificate of Appropriateness.
4. On October 21, 2020, the Historic Preservation Board approved a similar request for the vacation of the West 265 feet of the alley in conjunction with a proposed development of the sites.
5. The main difference from the previous approval which included a perpetual access easement to/from Almeria Avenue is that the current proposal provides a proposed access utility easement to/from Valencia Avenue. This was very similar to something the board had reviewed and approved in association with the Codina development back in 2020 except the propose accessway went to the South.
6. The board had a plan of the site in their packets showing the block in question.
7. The request is to vacate the 300 feet to the west of the alley and create the new perpetual access easement, heading from that alley north to Valencia Avenue.
8. This had been to the planning and zoning board.
9. Variances are not requested.
10. Board of Architects review is not required.
11. The staff analysis for the previous application had noted that the proposed alley vacation does not substantially or negatively impact the overall historic integrity of the historic city plan in terms of the intentional hierarchy of streets and open spaces purposely inherent in the city plan.
12. The vacation of this portion of the subject alley does rise to the level of being detrimental to the overall plan.
13. The alleys were part of the original design of the city and are visible in the Plat of the Crafts Section.
14. The only difference from the previously approved and current application is the request of an additional 35 feet of alley vacation and the proposed new perpetual access and utility easement leads to/from Valencia Avenue rather than Almeria Avenue.
15. Staff's determination is that these changes have no greater or lesser impact on the historic city plan than the previously approved proposal, therefore the recommendation is for approval of this application.

Mr. Joe Jimenez, Executive Vice President for Codina Partners stepped up to the podium and stated the following:

1. He has attended the Historic Preservation Board meeting last month with the same project. This was omitted from that application as the Planning Board meets after the Historic Preservation Board and they wanted to ensure that they had the board's approval.
2. The alleys and the easements proposed location were in the site plan that the board approved last month. He offered to point it out to the board but felt that staff had done a good job of explaining what they were requesting, and he knew the board was familiar with the project. He could answer any questions.

Mr. Adams stated that they had received 10 emails against and one email for this project.

Letters and emails of opposition were received from the following:

1. Mary E. Burke - 1243 Asturia Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
2. Sheryl Gold - 721 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
3. Linda Lawrence - 1209-1211 Aguila Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
4. Steve Littlehale - 501 Alcazar Ave, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
5. Jaime & Zully Pardo – 49 Campina Court, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.

6. Sandra L. Scidmore – 100 Lincoln Road, Apartment, 423, Miami Beach, Florida 33139.
  7. Bentley Storm – 2421 San Domingo Street, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
  8. Dr. Karelia Martinez Carbonell, President, Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables Post Office Box 347944, Coral Gables, Florida 33234.
  9. Brett Gillis
  10. Daniel R. Berger, D.O. & Ellen J Berger - 2706 N. Greenway Drive, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
- Email of support was received from:
11. Bruce Fitzgerald - 2842 De Soto Boulevard, Coral Gables, Florida

Mr. Fullerton asked if there was a consensus for the opposition as to their reasoning or was it due to the impact on the historic building or the loss of the alley. Mr. Adams said that most of the emails were generic and addressed the designation as well as this project. Many of them stated that they opposed Staff's recommendation to approve Codina's request as the historic alley was protected under George Merrick's historic city plan. There was more detailed wording on the letter from the Historic Preservation Association and Mr. Gillis.

Mr. Maxwell asked if the vacated square footage of the alley was used in the calculation of the FAR (Floor Area Ratio)? Mr. Jimenez said once the alley is vacated, by the operation of law it goes to the surrounding property owner which would be them on both sides, that becomes the whole lot which is the FAR calculation.

Mr. Maxwell asked if there was a cost involved, if there was a land purchase or a quit claim? Mr. Jimenez said it was a vacation and since it was a legal question, he deferred to the City Attorney. Attorney Ceballos said a vacation goes through the normal process, it goes to the City Commission, there is no deed, it is their property, typically rights-of-way, alleys, and things of that nature are held in trust by the city for the benefit of the public, it is not the city's property. The moment it gets vacated the city abandon's it, and it reverts back to its original owner which is the abutting property owner. Mr. Maxwell asked if could be used in the calculation of FAR ratio before vacation? Attorney Ceballos answered no. Ms. Bache-Wiig asked if the vacation of the alley go back to the tax base? Attorney Ceballos answered yes.

Mr. Garcia-Pons asked if the difference was between the 265 feet approved in 2020 and the 300 feet being requested? Mr. Jimenez responded that the difference was that when they were turning around the easement was being created further to the east, and now the Paseo is all the way on the east side of the property, and it has gotten bigger because when they originally came in it was Mercedes' application in their agreement with them, but it took such a long time they went ahead and took on the burden themselves. They were glad they did as they wound up turning it. There is now a Paseo there, and because of Public Works requirements it is bigger than a standard lot of 25 feet, so they are giving them more than the lot. They were turning it a little further down. Mr. Adams said that the previous approval was for 265 feet and the current request is 300 feet. Mr. Garcia-Pons said there was no drawing that showed the original 265 feet. Mr. Jimenez said the original 265 was never approved all the way. It stopped at the Historic Preservation Board, who made a recommendation of approval. However as there was not a full site plan provided the planning board had some issues, so they stopped it in its tracks. Once they acquired the property they took over and that is the process they are on. Mr. Garcia-Pons said requested staff to provide the previous approval when submitting it again. He said he would refer to his comments from the previous hearing as to his disapproval vote. The alleys were an integral part of the city's plan and removing them does impact the city plan and he would once more vote against it.

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

Ms. Carbonell participated on Zoom and stated that she was in opposition. She requested that the letter from the Historic Preservation Association be read into the record as it stated that the alleys were protected and are part of the historic plan. She asked why the board was approving the vacation of something that should be sacred, and why the developers continued to ask for more land and more feet when this project was the tallest in the city at 230+ feet, so another 300 feet to get more width or whatever it was, should certainly raise a flag? This project like any project, does encroach on Merrick's Historic City Plan. She went on to quote verbatim from the historic master plan "which protects rights-of-way, parkway, roadways, alleys, open spaces, parks, swales, reservations, sidewalks and waterways". She said the board does not respect that we were giving public land away. She asked Mr. Adams to read her letter into the record as it is specific as to why there is opposition. She said that if we continued to give away our alleys where is it going to stop? She requested the board to consider the master plan and that the alleys were part of the plan, and it is our public land and should not be given away. She thanked the board for letting her speak.

Mr. Adams read the letter from the Historic Preservation Society into the record.

Mr. Jimenez said this project proffers a 10,000 square foot city park next door, so if it was a continuation of a vision at the expense of the lack of a utility or whatever an alley is meant for. They were offering a trade and felt it bettered the surrounding neighborhood. He said he understood the objection but took exception to it as the alley was no longer necessary and at the end of the day an alley was a utility.

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

Mr. Fullerton asked if a survey had been done on the number of alleys that had been vacated over the last 50 years. He said there were many buildings over the years that had whole or parts of the alley vacated for the benefit of the city as well as the development. Mr. Adams said he did not think a survey had been done, but that there had been alleys vacated before. Mr. Fullerton said it was not a new concept. Mr. Adams said the question was how many were vacated prior to the designation of the city plan and how many were done after it. Ms. Spain said that while she was in zoning there was an alley vacation committee. She asked if there was still one? Mr. Fullerton said that they needed to keep in mind that the alleys were there for the use of the businesses. Mr. Garcia Pons asked for a clarification from the City Attorney. Attorney Ceballos said that Mr. Fullerton's statement that the alley was for the use of the abutting properties was incorrect, it was for the use of all the public. Mr. Maxwell said it was a dedicated public right-of-way and he had advised Mayor Slesnick on the designation of the historic plan and the city itself had closed off many streets. There was an alley and street closure system, particularly on the northern part of the community and on Coral Way. There was precedence for this and over the years they had closed many alleys, and in fact the new city building had closed an alley. He said that they should know how many alleys had been closed over the years for future use. Mr. Fullerton said while it was for public use, it was used for trash pickup and deliveries and pick ups from the businesses along the alley, so it was not really for everyone's use. He thought it was an odd thing to suggest that the city's plan was hurt by closing alleys that aren't being used in their true respect.

Mr. Maxwell said 265 feet x 20 feet is 5,320 square feet. He asked if a 10,000 square foot park was being proposed across the street? Mr. Jimenez said it was a 10,000 square foot park, 20,000 feet of open space between loggias surrounding the building and courtyards which would be for public use, granted it was on private property, but they were turning the alley on their property to give continued service to those businesses to the East. They were giving up the easement itself, and what they were talking about the equivalent of creating a new alley. At 290 or 300 feet it was a net increase total, but that property depth is 100 so the service, the utility of the alley is still maintained. They didn't need or want it. If they had to build a tunnel over to keep that straight line it wouldn't do anything. The alley at the other end of this alley at the East end is a T, it doesn't go straight through which is unusual as the one behind Hillstone which also drops on Ponce goes straight through. There are inconsistencies to the alley. There have been several alleys vacated and they had done more than their share, but the utility remains the same, whether they take the whole block or to the neighboring property. Mr. Maxwell that we have a loss of public street space in an alley of 6,000 feet and a donation of over 10,000 feet replacing it, so we have a net gain.

Mr. Ehrenhaft said that he recalled that when it came to the board before, the alley had a truncation at the end and vehicles would have to turn around and come back out the same way they came in. Mr. Jimenez said this was incorrect and the Public Works Department would never allow that, he said a fire truck does not go into reverse. Mr. Ehrenhaft went on to say that on Page 8, Exhibit "B", the portion that is in blue and turns to the north and exits onto Valencia, was the new that they did not envision. Mr. Jimenez said that was correct. Mr. Ehrenhaft asked if it went straight through or turned to the South? Mr. Jimenez said it used to turn to the South. Because of the building they designed and the valet, they would rather have that traffic onto a two-way street (Almeria) instead of having the alley come out this way and cars come in on Valencia. It was essentially the same plan from a roadway perspective with the exception that it used to turn to the South and now it turns to the North. Mr. Ehrenhaft asked when it turned South did it go across Lot 35 & 36 in Exhibit "B", instead of Lot 11 & 12. Mr. Jimenez said yes if he could recall correctly. He could not tell him for sure because he had since forgotten that application, as it was Mercedes' application, and they were going to be a beneficiary, but he had not studied it enough to commit it to memory. Mr. Adams said it was in the explained in the previous report, the applicant was proposing the dedication of a substitute perpetual access and utility easement located on Lot 35 and the easterly 10 feet of lot 36. Mr. Ehrenhaft asked if this was simply a swap of what on Exhibit "B" was a creation of an exit alley to the north being swapped out for one that would have turned in the same position but South on Almeria. Mr. Jimenez answered yes.

Mr. Fullerton asked if they had submitted a design of the building to the board? Mr. Jimenez said the board had recommended approval of their site plan, and the planning board soon after. Mr. Fullerton asked if this turns into the back of the building, as services are usually in the back of the building and if they would regard Valencia as the back? Mr. Jimenez said no because this would internalize all the services, the yellow on the exhibit would go in and there would be a loading dock off the alley, so this building has no visible back. Almeria and Valencia are equal sides of this building with Salzedo being the front.

A motion was made by Mr. Maxwell and seconded by Ms. Bache-Wiig to approve the request for a recommendation of approval to the City Commission for an amendment to the City Plan for the vacation of the alley running east-west between Lots 1-12 and 35-46 of Block 10, Coral Gables Crafts Section and the creation of a perpetual access and utility easement perpendicular to the alley and providing access to/from Valencia Avenue and recommended approval of the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness.

The motion passed (Ayes: 6; Nays: 1).

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

**CASE FILE LHD 2021-006:** Consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 1321 Asturia Avenue, legally described as Lot 18, Block 12, 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.

A pre-recorded presentation was shown on screen narrated by Ms. Guin. Some highlights are as follows:

1. Application was requested by the owner.  
1321 Asturia Avenue is eligible as a Local Historic Landmark based on three (3) significance criteria:  
**Historical, Cultural significance:**
  4. Exemplifies the historical, cultural, political, economic, or social trends of the community.**Architectural significance:**
  1. Portrays the environment in an era of history characterized by one or more distinctive architectural style.
  2. Embodies those distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or method of construction.
2. It is a single-family residence.
3. Sits on a 50' x 125' interior lot.
4. Situated in Coral Gables Section E just south of the Granada Golf Course.
5. Style: Mediterranean Revival.
6. Permit: #406, January 1925.
7. Architect: H. George Fink
8. Original Owner: Nicholas J. Murphy
9. Mediterranean Revival Style Character-Defining Features:
  - thick masonry block walls covered in textured stucco.
  - rectilinear massing and floor plan
  - projecting and recessed planes
  - a variety of roof types including a series of low-pitched roof covered in two-piece barrel tile
  - prominent and distinctive 'bell' tower-inspired chimney with barrel tile infill and a sculpted wing wall cascading to the parapet.
  - arched openings springing from classical-inspired columns.
  - an arched entry vestibule and front door.
  - a decorative niche.
  - decoratively placed round vents groupings.
  - recessed casement windows of various sizes and configurations with projecting sills.
  - decorative masonry screen insets.
  - full-height wing wall.
  - detached garage with crenelated front parapet.
10. 1321 Asturia Avenue maintains its historic integrity. It contributes to the historic fabric of the City of Coral Gables and is part of the collection of quality residences that serves as a visible reminder of the history and the cultural heritage of the City.
11. Staff recommends approval of the local historic designation of the property at 1321 Asturia Avenue based on its historical, cultural, and architectural significance.

Mr. Adams said there were 12 letters of support

1. Daniel R. Berger, D.O. & Ellen J Berger - 2706 N. Greenway Drive, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
2. Carol Brock – no address listed.
3. Mary E. Burke - 1243 Asturia Avenue, Coral Gables, FL 33134
4. Bruce Fitzgerald - 2842 De Soto Boulevard, Coral Gables.
5. Sheryl Gold - 721 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
6. Linda Lawrence - 1209-1211 Aguila Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
7. Steve Littlehale - 501 Alcazar Ave, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
8. Jaime & Zully Pardo – 49 Campina Court, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
9. Sandra L. Scidmore – 100 Lincoln Road, Apartment, 423, Miami Beach, Florida 33139.
10. Bentley Storm – 2421 San Domingo Street, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
11. Dr. Karelia Martinez Carbonell, President, Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables Post Office Box 347944, Coral Gables, Florida 33234.
12. Leonela Rohaidy – 30 Sevilla Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.

Mr. Adams said that the property owner was present, and this designation was at the request of the property owner, so it was supported.

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

Ms. Bache-Wiig asked if they approved the change of the door to a window in 2018. Mr. Adams said the property was not designated at that time so it would not have come to the Historic Board.

A motion was made by Mr. Fullerton and seconded by Mr. Garcia-Pons to approve the local historic designation of the property at 1321 Asturia Avenue, legally described as Lot 18, Block 12, 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 motion passed (Ayes: 7; Nays: 0).

Both Ms. Spain and Ms. Bache-Wiig commended Ms. Guin on the designation report.

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

**CASE FILE LHD 2021-009:** Consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 333 University Drive, legally described as All of Block 37, Coral Gables Crafts Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 10, at Page 40 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

A pre-recorded presentation was shown on screen narrated by Ms. Guin. Some highlights are as follows:

1. Application was generated by staff.  
1321 Asturia Avenue is eligible as a Local Historic Landmark based on three (3) significance criteria:  
The San Sebastian Apartment Hotel at 333 University Drive meets **seven (7)** criteria significance. Specifically:  
**Historical, cultural significance:**
  4. Exemplifies the historical, cultural, political, economic, or social trends of the community
  5. Is associated in a significant way with a past or continuing institution, which has contributed substantially to the life of the City**Architectural significance:**
  1. Portrays the environment in an era of history characterized by one (1) or more distinctive architectural style.
  2. Embodies those distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or method of construction.
  3. Is an outstanding work of a prominent designer or builder.
  4. Contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship of outstanding quality or which represent a significant innovation or adaptation to the South Florida environment.**Aesthetic significance:**
  2. Because of its prominence of spatial location, contrasts of siting, age, or scale, is an easily identifiable visual feature of a neighborhood, village, or the City and contributes to the distinctive quality or identity of such neighborhood, village, or City.

2. Multi-family residence.
3. Sits on a 60,000 SF triangular lot.
4. Located in the Coral Gables Craft Section.
5. Bounded by Le Jeune Road, University Drive, and Santander Avenue.
6. Built to help address the housing shortage.
7. The Miami Herald reported that the first families moved into the building April 18, 1926.
8. The San Sebastian Hotel was designed to house employees and their families, accommodate winter visitors and year-round tourists as well as to provide services and social gathering spaces for the public.
9. Architect: Phineas Paist.
10. Mediterranean Revival Character Defining Features:
  - thick masonry walls to keep the structure cool.
  - light-colored exterior stucco walls to reflect the sun's heat.
  - covered porches, arcades, loggias, balconies, and courtyard to provide natural ventilation, as well as shade and covered rain protection from the tropical climate.
  - triangular shape with central courtyard plan allowing all apartments direct access to natural sunlight, breezes, and landscape.
  - asymmetrical massing.
  - architectural emphasis of corner and main entrances.
  - multiple roof types and towers clad in two-piece barrel tile.
  - rough textured stucco.
  - Pecky Cypress half-timbered oriel windows.
  - Juliet balconies with metal ironwork.
  - wooden half-timber window protrusions.
  - multiple arch and column typologies.
  - chimneys, decorative vents.
  - pilasters and entablatures to create vertical rhythms in the façade.
  - masonry finials, balustrades, porch screening.

The San Sebastian Apartment Hotel retains a high degree of historic integrity due to its prominent location, architectural character, and notable history it is a landmark to generations of Coral Gables residents and staff recommends approval of the local historic designation of the San Sebastian Apartment Hotel located at 333 University Drive based on its historical, cultural, architectural, and aesthetic significance.

Mr. Adams said that they had 19 letters of support.

1. Daniel R. Berger, D.O. & Ellen J Berger - 2706 N. Greenway Drive, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
2. Kathleen Bowker – no address listed.
3. Carol Brock – no address listed.
4. Mary E. Burke - 1243 Asturia Avenue, Coral Gables, FL 33134
5. Bruce Fitzgerald - 2842 De Soto Boulevard, Coral Gables
6. Brett Gillis – No address listed
7. Sheryl Gold - 721 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
8. Linda Lawrence - 1209-1211 Aguila Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
9. Steve Littlehale - 501 Alcazar Ave, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
10. Jane Maranos - 1261 Milan Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134
11. Jaime & Zully Pardo – 49 Campina Court, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
12. Linda Pollack - 250 Sarto Avenue, Coral Gables
13. Sandra L. Scidmore – 100 Lincoln Road, Apartment, 423, Miami Beach, Florida 33139.
14. Carol Smith - 824 Galiano St., Coral Gables FL 33134
15. Bentley Storm – 2421 San Domingo Street, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
16. The Vidal Family - 301 Alesio Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida
17. Loyda Lewis, President, The Villagers, Inc.
18. Dr. Karelia Martinez Carbonell, President, Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables Post Office Box 347944, Coral Gables, Florida 33234.
19. Leonela Rohaidy – 30 Sevilla Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.

Mr. Adams said the property owners and the representatives were present.

Mr. Mario Garcia-Serra, with offices at 600 Brickell Avenue, representing the property owner SRG Corporation stepped up to the podium and introduced Mr. Juan Castro Lopez the principal of SRG Corporation who was also present in the audience.

His comments were as follows:

1. SRG Corporation, owned by the Castro Lopez family owned the property since the late 1960's. Mr. Castro Lopez's grandfather was first the janitor of the building and then purchased the building. They recognized the historic importance of the building and support the designation.
2. After the designation vote he requested the board consider approving a resolution requesting and endorsing the creation of a residential parking zone along University Drive and Santander, this would allow only residents with permits to park in this area. They owned the plot of land across the street, but it only had 50 parking spaces creating a shortfall and much of the street parking was taken up by commercial users or tenants from other buildings.

Mr. Adams stated that he had met with the parking director, and this was the best option. The language of the resolution should be as follows: "Resolution of the Historic Preservation Board, requesting and supporting the creation of a residential parking zone along Santander Avenue and University Drive, consistent with the property's historic use and zoning."

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

Ms. Spain complimented the present owners and their families for their maintenance of the building and said that they had contacted the Historical Resources Department. Chair Menendez and Mr. Fullerton expressed surprise that this property had not been designated before and Ms. Spain explained that the previous owners were not as supportive but took care of the building, so it had not been a priority. Mr. Adams said it had been deferred a couple of times. He said that often staff gets criticized for not designating a property but sometimes it takes time to work with the owners. Mr. Garcia-Pons congratulated Ms. Guin on the presentation and the owners. He noted that only one criterion was necessary to designate, but there were 7 that applied. He was glad to see it designated as they had lost the other property. Ms. Bache-Wiig stated that the design of the building was still relevant even though it had been built a hundred years ago.

A motion was made by Ms. Spain and seconded by Mr. Garcia-Pons to approve the local historic designation of the property at 333 University Drive, legally described as All of Block 37, Coral Gables Crafts Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 10, at Page 40 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The motion passed (Ayes: 7; Nays: 0).

A motion was made by Ms. Spain and seconded by Mr. Garcia-Pons for a Resolution to the Historic Preservation Board requesting and supporting the creation of a residential parking zone along Santander Avenue and University Drive consistent with the properties use and zoning. The motion passed (Ayes: 7; Nays: 0).

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

**CASE FILE LHD 2021-013:** Consideration of the local historic designation of the property at 122 Menores Avenue, legally described as Lot 6, Block 36, Coral Gables Douglas Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 25, at Page 69 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

A pre-recorded presentation was shown on screen narrated by Ms. Guin. Some highlights are as follows:

1. The property at 122 Menores Avenue was originally known as the La-Gene Apartments.
2. An evaluation of 122 Menores Avenue, (outlined on the screen in yellow), was requested by the Historic Preservation Board after 102, 114, and 118 Menores Avenue, (shown on the screen in red), were designated as the result of a historic significance determination. The context is discussed in the designation report.
3. 122 Menores Avenue is eligible as a Local Historic Landmark based on three criteria:
  - Historical, Cultural significance**
  - 4. It Exemplifies the historical, cultural, political, economic, or social trends of the community
  - Architectural significance**
  - 1. It Portrays the environment in an era of history characterized by one or more distinctive architectural style
  - 2. It Embodies those distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or method of construction



4. It is a multi-family residence.
5. Sits on a 50' x 110' interior lot.
6. Located on the south side of Menores Avenue between Galiano Street and Ponce de Leon Boulevard.
7. Permit was issued in September 1922 to Atlanta Builder M. L. Rauschenberg.
8. Architect: H. George Fink.
9. Designed as apartment buildings that had a street presence of a single-family home making them distinctive from other contemporaneous apartment buildings in the Douglas Section.
10. 122 & 126 Menores were one of two sets of paired apartment buildings that Fink designed for Rauschenberg, they shared a garden court and were set back from street like single-family homes. They were joined by a metal archway. A demolition permit for 126 Menores was issued in 1982.
11. The original 1925 building permit refers to the property as La-Gene Apartments. It retained this name until at least 1965. It was designed with 8 units and a large, shared reception space. There were 7 one-bedrooms and 1 efficiency.
12. Built in the Mediterranean Revival Style. Character-defining features include:
  - thick masonry walls, which keep the home cool and light-colored textured, stuccoed exterior walls which reflect the sun's heat.
  - recessed casement windows with projecting sills spaced to provide ventilation and light in this tropical environment.
  - projecting bays which include an octagonal tower.
  - variety of roof types; pitched roofs clad in barrel tile.
  - series of arched openings with engaged columns and articulated surrounds.
  - decorative masonry framing.
  - wing wall & built-in planter.
  - balconette with metal grille work.
  - dentils, masonry plaque, & and distinctive hoods.
13. In conclusion, from a comparison of historic photographs and the architectural plans with the extant apartment building, as well as an examination of building permits and records it is determined that the property at 122 Menores Avenue has retained its historic integrity for nearly a century.
14. The multi-family residence at 122 Menores Avenue was built by Atlanta builder M. L. Rauschenberg, a personal friend of Merrick to help alleviate the housing shortage in the mid-1920s. It is a prime example of architect H. George Fink's distinctive use of the Mediterranean Revival Style and was the City's first apartment district. It is additionally significant as the apartments Fink designed on Menores Avenue for Rauschenberg utilized this style in a slightly different manner to create distinct multi-family units which had a street presence of a single-family home.
15. This multi-family residence was amongst the first built in the Douglas Section and it stands as an example of the early development of the City as well as George Merrick's vision for a Mediterranean-inspired City which included both high-end and affordable housing as well as embracing Garden City precepts of apportioning sections of the city for various uses.
16. The property at 122 Menores Avenue retains its architectural integrity and significantly contributes to the historic fabric of the City of Coral Gables. It is part of the collection of quality buildings that serves as a visible reminder of the history and the cultural heritage of the City.
17. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Local Historic Designation of the property at 122 Menores Avenue based on its historical, cultural, and architectural significance.

Mr. Adams said that they had 16 letters of support.

1. Leonela Rohaidy – 30 Sevilla Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
2. Norma E Arenas - 508 Mendoza Ave, Coral Gables, FL 33134
3. Daniel R. Berger, D.O. & Ellen J Berger - 2706 N. Greenway Drive, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
4. Carol Brock – no address listed.
5. Mary E. Burke - 1243 Asturia Avenue, Coral Gables, FL 33134
6. Bruce Fitzgerald - 2842 De Soto Boulevard, Coral Gables
7. Brett Gillis – No address listed
8. Sheryl Gold - 721 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
9. Jose Johnson – no address listed.
10. Rachel Lauzurique – Co-Proprietor – 123 Salamanca Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134
11. Linda Lawrence - 1209-1211 Aguila Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134

12. Steve Littlehale - 501 Alcazar Ave, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
13. Jaime & Zully Pardo – 49 Campina Court, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
14. Sandra L. Scidmore – 100 Lincoln Road, Apartment, 423, Miami Beach, Florida 33139.
15. Bentley Storm – 2421 San Domingo Street, Coral Gables, Florida 33134.
16. Dr. Karelia Martinez Carbonell, President, Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables Post Office Box 347944, Coral Gables, Florida 33234.

Mr. Adams said that the owners were present.

Mr. Garcia-Serra of 600 Brickell Avenue representing the current property owner TWJ 1505 Ponce LLC, and the contract purchaser Location Ventures LLC had the following comments:

1. This was the remaining building of a much larger assemblage which is vacant.
2. Most of that assemblage was previously a car dealership (Angel Buick).
3. Both the property owner and the purchaser agree that the building should be preserved.
4. The contract purchaser would propose an adaptive reuse of the building as an amenity space for a larger development on the property, which had already been previewed by Mr. Adams.
5. When they presented the proposal for adaptive reuse, he hoped the board would remember the good faith they showed today by presenting the property for designation.

Ms. Spain remembered the discussion and Mr. Adams noted that the owners had committed to start the required repair work. This item had been deferred, but they had come to an agreement.

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

Mr. Ehrenhaft expressed his pleasure in the designation as it was an important H. George Fink building that was intact except for the awning windows.

A motion was made by Mr. Ehrenhaft and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the local historic designation of the property at 122 Menores Avenue, legally described as Lot 6, Block 36, Coral Gables Douglas Section, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 25, at Page 69 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7; Nays: 0).

Mr. Fullerton asked why the architect was not part of the designation criteria. Ms. Kautz gave an explanation that using that term had caused problems in the past. Mr. Maxwell noted this was a significant property in an area with buildings that were some of the last remnants of the community and encouraged the preservation of the remaining units. He went on to say that historic designation can provide financial incentives, which could save these buildings considering the push for redevelopment which would affect the city. Preservation would allow the city to preserve itself. Ms. Spain said that TDRs would generate money for restoration. Mr. Adams said they were actively working, but designation takes time, and working with owners and sometimes the financial incentives were not sufficient to get them on board. He stated while there were a lot of properties to be surveyed commitments and resources forced them to prioritize. Mr. Maxwell said they were doing a good job but the city commission needed to be made aware that the board was supportive about designations, and it was the only way of keeping the city's identity. Multi-family units were more endangered than single family homes. Ms. Bache-Wiig said the area had a uniform fabric and there was potential for it to be a district which would allow the board to review any new development. She noted that the development on Ponce de Leon Boulevard was not complimentary to that district. Mr. Maxwell mentioned that the possibility of the development of the large Crippen Oldsmobile was high.

The board took a 10-minute recess.

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

**CASE FILE COA (SP) 2022-001:** An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 1036 Andalusia Avenue, a Local Historic Landmark, legally described as Lot 3 and the East 25 Feet of Lot 2, Block 12, Coral Gables Section "A," according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 5, at Page 102 of the Public

Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The application requests design approval for an addition and alterations to the residence and sitework.

Ms. Kautz made a presentation following a presentation on the screen. The comments were as follows:

1. A location map showing the location of the property on the south side of Andalusia Avenue near Salvador Park.
2. A 1940's photo of the house was shown.
3. Designed by H. George Fin in 1925, permit number 166 in the city.
4. Built in the Mediterranean Revival Style.
5. An addition was approved in 1990.
6. Designated as a local historic landmark in May 2001.
7. They are proposing to do an addition to the rear, alterations to the auxiliary structure.
8. No variances have been requested.
9. The Board of Architects had two comments when they reviewed it back in January, both of those comments have been addressed in the application that the board had before them.

Ms. Kautz stated that staff had recommendations, but she would go over them after the architect made his presentation.

Mr. Poza, architect from 1900 Ferdinand Street stepped up to the podium and introduced himself. He made the following comments:

1. The letter of intent states that the additions or remodeling will not alter the historical significance of the home.
2. He had met with the Department, and they were very helpful.
3. The plans show the connection to the historical portion of the house. It was as slim as possible, and zigzags to maintain a view of the rear lot and all the pool and existing areas as the addition grows.
4. Work to be performed: Gym, new screened covered terrace and large primary suite balcony, reduction of the driveway (which is wide and hard to maneuver in), landscaping and removal of a non-historical wall at the sidewalk.
5. He went over the comments from the department:
  - a) Comment: Show how the wall that is being removed ends.  
Architect's response: In the packet the site or floor plan shows the front wall makes a turn and the turn is kept. Only the inner portion of the wall, plus or minus 3 or 4 feet from the edge is being removed. There is no reason to end the wall as it will end at the existing column.
  - b) Comment: On the West elevation there is a triple window (three windows), 8" apart and the one in the middle had an arch which should be eliminated.  
Architect's response: Completed.
  - c) Comment: Continuous reveal that followed the window tops  
Architect's response: Removed.
6. Smooth stucco was used as opposed to the highly textured stucco on the house.
7. The addition will have two-part barrel tile, the existing house does not.
8. Board of Architects unanimously approved the project.
9. Staff Comments:
  - Item #1 - Window and door muntins to be high profile and dimensional.
  - Item #2 - Windows and doors to be clear glass.
  - Item #3 - Roof tile to be a true two-part barrel tile.  
Architect's Response: Agreed
  - Item #4 - Gym – gable height be reduced or changed to a flat roof.  
Architect's response: On the west elevation the actual proportion of that gym area is a good transition from the two-story existing residence and the two-story garage, otherwise there is no connection (transition). He suggested to keep as proposed.
  - Item #5 - Eliminate the eyebrow over the East elevation.  
Architect's response: Board commented on the one on the west and asked that the parapet incorporate or eliminate that eyebrow. The parapet was modified at the west, but they did not suggest that the one at the east be eliminated. Staff suggested an awning might be more appropriate. He stated that an awning would be free of the sidewalls and may be too narrow, but it could be addressed.
  - Item #6 - The rafters should be differentiated from the existing residence.  
Architect's response: He would do this. This was a preliminary proposal without significant details of these things, but you always tweak the out lookers or the rafter ends. He would come up with a detail that staff would approve.

Item #7 - Windowsills and additions at the new windows to be eliminated or detailed and be differentiated from the existing sills.

Architect's response: All new windows have a high fringe projection. Existing windows on existing house, have a 2-to-2 1/2-inch projection, they are precast in nature rather than stucco. All new ones would have 1/2 inch projections as shown in plans. Only where the new window is would it match the existing. The garage is the historical portion and would be the only one to match an existing windowsill.

Item #8 - Recess provided and block up the west garage door opening, and the window be eliminated.

Architect's response: The plan shows the east side is a compliant garage with the code back then, but the right side was never meant to be for a car. While it is 10 feet deep, there is a wall original to the house there, and a cabana bath in the garage which services the yard. A car cannot fit. The client wanted to eliminate the useless garage door and place a window to allow light into the garage. The staff is recommending to either eliminate the window or recess the 7 x 8 opening of the garage door if it is eliminated. He stated that the Board of Architects did not have an issue, although he knew they had different rules.

Item #9 - The proposed wing wall at the second floor,

Architect's response: The existing historical portion has a little wing wall into the second-floor terrace balcony, and they are doing the same thing on the west, it comes off the end that is not historical. He had done what was there historically as it was a minor detail, and it better captured the balcony. Otherwise, one end is one way and the other end another. Had it been independent elsewhere in the building, he would have done something unique rather than copying the existing.

Item #10 - Material to be specified for new pavers.

Architect's response – Would be addressed in the construction drawings. The Chicago brick was almost impossible to get, even though it is a recycled product, it is being recycled again as it was not available. He would work with staff to find a replacement if not available.

Item #11 - Detail to terminate the remaining portion of the wall.

Architect's response: They would terminate at an existing end point. They were not cutting it off, it is right at the edge of the west edge and the east edge of the existing approaches or driveway openings. If not, they would detail appropriately.

Ms. Spain requested an explanation of the wall and if there were photographs or drawings? Ms. Kautz said #10 was because the east and west sides on A-3 were dashed as if removed. The pictures showed the columns terminating there and questioned whether they were going up to the columns leaving them to make the turn. Mr. Poza responded that they could terminate it at its termination point, but if needed they could cut it back and make it an appropriate detail such as introducing the same column at the end. Ms. Spain asked if they were keeping the wall in front? Mr. Poza said yes, and the dashed lines were an error. In the event he had misinterpreted what the clients wanted he would meet with staff to figure out a solution. Ms. Kautz said she thought they had discussed the wall being removed which is why it was dashed. Mr. Poza said the whole center portion would be gone. Ms. Bache-Wiig asked if the ends were not historic? Mr. Poza answered yes.

Ms. Spain asked if he understood that the Board of Architects would make recommendations to the Historic Preservation Board, but they made the final decision. Mr. Poza responded affirmatively. Mr. Poza said when he initially met with staff, they had no comments and told him that it was okay to go to the Board of Architects who unanimously approved his design. Staff then gave recommendations and said it was "no good and he should start over". Ms. Kautz said she had told him that the roof proportions bothered her when they first met. She felt that they the connector piece should have been the pitched roof and the rest of it flat or vice versa. Ms. Spain said that was the only major thing. The whole idea of putting a memory of what used to be there was typical of this board as it was part of the Secretary of the Interior Standards for rehabilitation. Mr. Poza said he had done that in the past but preferred to eliminate the garage door. Ms. Spain said to put indentation of what was there before.

Mr. Garcia Pons said he could put the recess in, but he thought they were suggesting removing the window, and that #5 was imperative, removing the eyebrow and replacing it with a canopy or some other element. He also recommended recessing the garage door, and agreed to eliminate the window, but offered an alternative to be considered by the board. On page A-6, the new window on the façade of the North elevation the location of the window did not seem to be part of the door opening or the window placement on the elevation of the building. He understood wanting to have a window in that location, and he said this comment had been made before with this type of project. He asked if there a way to integrate that window as a solution to either the façade which would mean lining it up to the center line of the window above, so it looks like it is part of the composition of that elevation, or somehow creating an element within the recess of the garage door an element of the window that

makes sense with the proportions of that recess. Mr. Poza said he could investigate that, but he was thinking ahead because structurally the walls were so old and not secure, so he was introducing a starter column as the edge for that new window, otherwise you put in an impact door and the weak link is the connection to a very old wall.

Mr. Garcia Pons also addressed item #9, the second element of the wing wall. He agreed with the staff's recommendation and said there was a reason why it worked so well on the existing part of the elevation, the relationship between the building and the building on the front. Page 8. By removing that wing, you would not lose much because the balcony is new, if you return the railing up to the wall, it would be more consistent with the new balcony instead of trying to introduce an architectural feature that was not necessary. He recommended that to staff. Mr. Poza said he would keep the railing where it was and take away the top curve so it would not match the existing. Mr. Garcia Pons said that he could run the railing up to the existing wall. Mr. Poza said he was just trying to line it up with the perforated grill block below. Mr. Garcia-Pons said they were two very different things. One is a balcony; the other is a puncture through a wall. He did not think he needed to. He said to get rid of it and then they could discuss how to do it.

Mr. Garcia-Pons addressed the other item in the staff report: the smooth stucco, he said there needed to be further differentiation between the old and the new, the rough and the smooth was not enough and even though it was mentioned by staff in the text, it was not one of the recommendations. Ms. Kautz said he was noting it as smooth stucco and the house does have rough textures, so that is a differentiation. She said they wanted there to be more items which had been called out in the comments such as the rafters, the eliminating of the wing walls and other items. Mr. Garcia Pons repeated that they had not specifically said the stucco. Ms. Kautz said it was called out in the drawings as being smooth already. Mr. Garcia Pons said the language was not specifically stated in the conditions. He went on to say that on page A-8, the proposed precast concrete vent block that had to go with the wing wall and the balcony, seemed as if too much was being done with something so simple. He said he knew the window on the drawing above was not the window on this wall, that it was further back, but there was something nice about the proportions of that opening that could be a recess or something like that. He understood that there was an element behind the wall that the architect was trying to screen, but this type of horizontal screen was completely foreign to the architecture and that proportionally something might be done that would help organize that entire portion of the elevation. Mr. Fullerton said that removal of the portion of the wall on the balcony would make the opening below it better centered on the wall and would feel like it was related to the slab which is the balcony. Repeating the opening in some way would be a good idea and at the minimum they could remove the wall return and run the railing all the way. It would simplify things and make sense of the opening below it. Mr. Maxwell said he agreed with Mr. Garcia-Pons on the precast vent block and suggested mirroring the window on the previous wall and taking the four vents and put them there. Mr. Poza said he could possibly rearrange the vent block to mimic more of the windows in the rear because the idea was to get a lot of cross ventilation, but also some privacy.

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

Mr. Joy Soane the owner of 1036 Andalusia, stepped up to the podium and introduced herself and gave some history of her family and the house. She said it was a great pleasure to work with Mr. Poza who understood their ideas. Her family were recent newcomers to Coral Gables from Palm Beach and had done several historic restorations in the US and Europe. They restored a landmark house in Palm Beach with an addition. They would remove the 1980 additions to 1036 Andalusia to restore George Fink's vision, everything they would do would be with great consideration and respect for the original design. A previous owner of this house had sent her photographs and told her the history of the house. She was removing the front wall. They had also purchased 1104 Malaga Avenue, another George Fink historical house which they would restore and keep in their family. They were committed to this area, and she hoped the board would give them the opportunity to work on 1036 Andalusia and eventually 1104 Malaga. Mr. Poza said that if something was not original his client wanted it removed.

Chair Menendez asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in support or opposition of the case, when no one responded he closed the public portion.

Ms. Bache-Wiig said it was a pleasure to have newcomers to Coral Gables willing to preserve historic homes, and her favorite thing was the screened porch. Mr. Garcia Pons said he would like to have a discussion on items #4 and #8 before he made a motion to give them some direction.

**Item#8 – Window**

Staff recommends eliminating the window.

Recommendations from the board: Rethink the windows. In the past they had done a window the size of the recess, depending on what is happening behind. They could have it the size widthwise to fit into the recess and then just bring it up a little bit so it does not go all the way to the ground, resulting in a light filled room and you can see the intent.

**Item #4 – Roof Height.**

Staff recommends lowering the height of the gable roof or replace it with a flat roof to reduce its impact on the historic structures.

Recommendations from the board: Reduce the height. It was a flat roof and would be more congruent rather than it coming out. If they needed the overhang he could understand.

A motion was made by Mr. Garcia-Pons and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the addition and alterations to the residence and sitework at 1036 Andalusia Avenue with all eleven staff conditions. Items #4, #8, #9 and #11 are to be reviewed and approved by staff and if staff is okay with it to proceed and if not to bring it back to the board.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7; 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. *Roof tile is to be true two-piece barrel tile.*
4. *On the one-story addition, reduce the height of the gable roof section or change the roof type to be more in keeping with the proportions of the existing residence.*
5. *Eliminate the eyebrow over the door to the addition on the east elevation.*
6. *Any new rafters should be differentiated from those on the existing residence.*
7. *Windowsills on the addition or at new window openings are to be eliminated or detailed to be differentiated from the existing sills.*
8. *A recess is to be provided at the blocked up west garage door opening and the window is to be restudied.*
9. *The proposed wing wall at the second floor of the terrace addition is to be removed and the railing to be returned to the wall of the house. Further, restudy the vent block opening below.*
10. *Material to be specified for new pavers and front step.*
11. *Provide a detail for the termination of the remaining portion of front wall/fence.*

*The motion specified that Staff was given the ability to review and approve any changes to the proposed design as a result of conditions #4, #8, #9, and #11.*

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

**CASE FILE COA (SP) 2022-004:** An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 4225 Santa Maria Street, a Non-Contributing Resource within the “Santa Maria Street Historic District,” legally described as Lots 13 and 14. Block 96, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part Five, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 23, at Page 55 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The application requests design approval for the installation of an aluminum fence with gates and concrete posts.

Ms. Kautz followed a presentation onscreen and made the following comments:

1. A map showing the location of the property was shown.
2. In November 2007 the Santa Maria Historic District was listed on the registry of Coral Gables registry of historic places. It is composed of all the properties on Santa Maria Street from Bird Road to Blue Road.
3. This residence is considered a non-contributing resource within the district.
4. Designed in 1952 by architect Carl Bloom.
5. It was deemed to be non-contributing as the house had undergone alterations prior to the introduction of the district.
6. Ms. Kautz showed a picture of the house soon after it was built.
7. The staff reviewed the application initially requesting the installation of an aluminum fence with gates and concrete columns.
8. Rejection comments noted that the height should be limited to 4 feet.

9. Photographs of the house were not provided, staff wanted to see how the design matched the style of the house. The style was too ornate. They wanted a full street elevation of the proposed fence and gates, and another showing the house as context and noted that it might require full Historic Preservation Board review.
10. The item before the board showed a slightly less ornate gate, but height remains as does the ornateness of the fence.
11. Proposed posts have an overall height of 5' 6" and the fence panels are approximately 5' tall.
12. The vehicular gates shown start out at 5' and rise to a height of 6' 6" at the center of the gates. They are too tall for the street.
13. Ms. Kautz stated she had comments in the conclusion. In the past they had been (with board support) very specific on limiting the heights on that street to 4 feet. The last four applications have all been limited to 5 feet and very simple picket styles.

Mr. Raz Biton, the contractor representing the owners (Mr. & Mrs. Sommers) stepped up to the podium and introduced himself and presented a PowerPoint presentation on the screen. He made the following comments:

1. Everything originally in the permit was approved by building and zoning but had been held by the city architect until the historical comments were addressed.
2. The Requests from the Applicant were as follows:
  - a) Keep proposed height of 6' for the gates and fence.  
Reasons:
    - House is at a higher elevation than the gates and fence area/location
    - Security Purposes
  - b) Keep proposed design for gates/fence.  
Reasons:
    - Mr. & Mrs. Sommers are set on the design and think it would complement the complete look of the house and match the light fixtures and other items on the house.
    - Original plan was revised after they received historical comments about the fence being too ornate.  
(Fence Type 1 on Page #2 was revised)
3. The original plan submitted to the city was revised after they received the historical comments and they brought it to historical for approval before they resubmitted it to the city.
4. He showed a survey of the house.
5. Page #2 – Fence Panels Type 1 & Concrete Wall/Columns Locations - originally the fence sitting on top of the wall used to have arches, but after comments the fences between the walls and columns and on the walls were changed to be fully flat with no arches.
6. Page #3 – Sliding Gate Location – All the gates have arches and the fence panels on each end of the house will also have arches.
7. Page #4 – Fence Panels Type 2 Location – there had been a question if the panels were gates? They are regular fence panels that are not going to be sitting on top of any wall or between any columns. They would be completing the ending of the fences making sure the property is fully enclosed so that no one can walk around and enter the property.
8. Page #5 – Pedestrian Gate Location – will be beyond the last panels. He showed two options of the gates. The difference between the options was the hinges, either a true close adjustable hinge or the j-bolts. Most likely it would be the true close adjustable hinges.
9. Mr. Biton then showed pictures of the house elevations where the house was higher than the gate and fences.
10. He showed the architectural plans showing the front elevation of the house which had been requested by the historic department showing the revisions. He stated that if the Historic Preservation Board approved the revision, they would resubmit to the city who had approved the prior submittal.

**Wall Height:** Ms. Spain asked about the height of the wall that went into her old house. Ms. Kautz responded 4 feet. They had seen a couple of houses in the neighborhood where the fences were 5 feet high. The columns they were proposing would be 5' 6" at the highest point. The highest point of the gates at the arches were at 6' 6". Ms. Spain asked if anything on that street went above 4'. She stated that they had issues on this street in the past and therefore needed to be consistent and not allow one person to do something that had not been approved for another. Ms. Kautz said the only house she could think of is the house that used to be Chesterfield Smith's house, and since this area was a district 4' was the maximum height allowed. She had driven the area and none of the fences were much higher. The Portuondo house on the other side of Ms. Spain's old house was also 4 feet.

Mr. Steven Sommers stepped up to the podium and was sworn in, he gave some background on himself and his family and asked the board to give their project due consideration.

**Columns:** Mr. Biton said the columns were going to be stuccoed white like the other houses in the neighborhood. Mr. Biton, responded to a question about the brick facing of the columns by referring to Page 2 – Aluminum fence panel Type 1 - the detail of the concrete column had a plain white stucco finish. Ms. Spain said the drawings needed to be corrected as they showed brick.

**Elevations:** Ms. Bache-Wiig said the elevations were incorrect. The roof looked huge as if there was another story in there and they needed to correctly document their elevations. Mr. Biton said that the elevation was not a specific request that came from the city, just from historical. The original plans that were submitted and approved by the city showed the location plan based on the top elevation and exactly where everything was located. This was only an example, so every detail had not been followed.

**Gates and Fencing:** Mr. Fullerton said he only saw one location for a pedestrian entrance. Mr. Biton said the architect based his design on the engineering plans, as an example to the board, but had not taken into consideration the actual outline of what they would be doing. They would have only one pedestrian gate in the exact location shown in the PowerPoint, on the left side of the house. Mr. Fullerton asked if the entrance would be in the middle. Mr. Biton responded that there were two sliding gates for both driveways and then to the left of the left driveway there would be a pedestrian gate with a walkway to the side of the house. Mr. Fullerton said the drawing did not reflect that. Mr. Ehrenhaft referred to page C-1 – and said there was a pedestrian gate on the extreme left side of the house but on the extreme right of the drawing there was a pedestrian gate with a flat not an arched top. Mr. Biton said he copied from one side to the other, to show what it would look like in front. Mr. Ehrenhaft said the reason for the gate being higher than the house did not make sense as the house elevation was not related to the street facade at the sidewalk, so he did not understand their request. The board normally approved fencing that was horizontally at 4 feet and even when the columns were higher because of a cap the fence height stayed at 4 feet. Mr. Biton said they indicated an elevated house to show the fence did not cover the front of the house to answer the question of why they were requesting a higher fence. Mr. Ehrenhaft that had nothing to do with the norm 4-foot fencing on the street. In the past they had permitted an exception because the lot was pitched, and the sidewalk was significantly sloped. Ms. Bache-Wiig added they were matching the neighbor. Mr. Fullerton said they could build a 4-foot wall with a 2-foot open aluminum/picket fence on top, but this street might be different. Ms. Kautz said that they were concerned about the streetscape, and it had been the board's purview to maintain the street elevation and be consistent, nothing was higher than 4 feet on Santa Maria Street. Mr. Biton said the height was chosen for security and they had done this in response to a comment from the city, but when asked if the fence ran all around the house, he responded that it was only at the front. Mr. Maxwell stated that could not be for security if people could just walk around it, to which Mr. Biton responded that this would be eliminated by a closure on both sides. Mr. Maxwell commented that anyone could enter the house from the golf course. Mr. Sommers returned to the podium and said that 4421 Santa Maria Street had a wall and fence much higher than 4 feet, which was higher than their request. Mr. Fullerton asked if there were specific requirements on specific streets to which Ms. Spain responded no. Mr. Fullerton said they would have to allow the owner to do what was allowed by code. Mr. Garcia-Pons said there was an existing character on this street which had historic designation of the character of the neighborhood and would have different considerations than the rest of the city. In response to Ms. Bache Wiig's question Ms. Kautz said all picket fences were 4 feet and Ms. Spain added that this was the only place other than the MacFarland district where wooden picket fences were allowed, and the historic ones on the street are all 4 feet. It was not put in the zoning code, but when the district was created the idea was to match, and not overpower the original wood picket fences. Mr. Fullerton asked if what was shown was a 2-foot solid and 3 1/2 to 4 feet on top of that. Mr. Biton answered that it would be 5 feet to the fence and 5' 6" to the edge of the column on both sides. Mr. Fullerton asked if staff could look at the rest of the street and see how impactful this was, 1 foot higher was a picket fence, not a heavy-duty wall. Ms. Spain said that this area of the street did not have picket wooden fences. Mr. Fullerton said they were metal, and Ms. Spain said they were all at 4 feet around this house.

Mr. Garcia Pons said that staff had recommended deferral and since the height and the ornateness were still up to a major debate, it was not ready to be voted on today. More work was needed as the drawings did not accurately depict what was being done, and the design didn't meet the intent of the district so they could not give an approval with conditions. A deferral would give Staff another opportunity to work with the applicant. Ms. Kautz agreed but asked the board for direction. Mr. Biton asked what they wanted less ornate?

Mr. Garcia Pons asked if the board was amenable to a deferral with some direction to the applicant and staff? He stated the following:



1. The 4-foot height was an important aspect of the street, while the posts had caps and would be higher, he thought they were looking at the entire street not just the house itself particularly since this was a noncontributing structure. He recommended that they keep that at the top of the list when taking another look at the design as there was a relationship between the style of the house and the architecture and the elements on the property itself, of which the fence and wall would be a part of. One did not need to be a twin of the other, the fence has two lives, one that lives with the building and one that lives with the street. Some relationship could be had between those 2 elements that inform the style and presentation. The current presentation was foreign to both and that the removal of all the arches to the more horizontal was a positive move, but within the panels themselves, it just it seemed foreign to both the architecture and the street. Mr. Biton should look at both in the new design. Mr. Fullerton stated that straight on top with no arches at all was important to the identity of use. The pedestrian and automobile gates could be slightly different and have some designation from the street, they could deviate from the flat. Mr. Biton asked if they made changes to the heights and everything around it would everything have to be 4 feet high? Chair Menendez said they were looking for a simpler more streamlined fence. He said the drawings didn't reflect what they wanted to install. Mr. Biton should resubmit drawings that accurately depicted what was there. Mr. Fullerton said the proportion between the solid wall and the metal areas was important and had to be in proportion. Chair Menendez said they should take comments into consideration and work with staff, they needed something simpler and more streamlined. Ms. Bache-Wiig said the house was a mid-century ranch but had evolved to a more Mediterranean style and the addition of the high ornate fence was adding another style to the house. She would be amenable to a higher fence if it was simpler. Ms. Kautz said it had only come to staff and she wanted the Board of Architects to give their recommendation.

A motion was made by Ms. Spain and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to defer the application request for design approval for the installation of an aluminum fence with gates and concrete posts on the property at 4225 Santa Maria Street to a future meeting, and prior to coming back to the Historic Preservation Board it should go the Board of Architects, not the City Architect with the following concerns: the context of the street being all but primarily 4 feet tall and also the issue that was brought up about the style to the fence in relation to the other houses on the street and the house itself.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7; Nays: 0).

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

**CASE FILE COA (SP) 2022-005:** An application for the issuance of a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 1024 Cotorro Avenue, a Non-Contributing Resource within the "French City Village Historic District," legally described as Lot 6, Block 145, Coral Gables Riviera Section Part Nine, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 28, at Page 29 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The application requests design approval for the demolition of the existing residence and the construction of a new single-family residence, auxiliary structure, and sitework. Variances have also been requested from Article 2, Section 2-100 and 2-101 (D) (3), (6a), (6b), and (7b); Article 3, Section 3-308 D (2); and Article 10, Section 10-102 (A) 4a of the Coral Gables Zoning Code for the minimum rear setback, front door facing, maximum allowable floor area, maximum allowable ground area coverage, minimum allowable landscaped open space, and minimum allowable garage length.

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

1. This property is a non-contributing resource within the French City Village.
2. The application requests approval for demolition of the existing residence, construction of a new single-family residence, auxiliary residence and sitework.
3. The demolition is for a non-contributing structure in the district.
4. This is not part of the original assemblage of 1926 buildings that make up the thematic village.
5. Constructed in 1977 the residence will not be eligible for inclusion into the district because of the very specific period of significance.
6. Staff supports the demolition of the non-contributing resource and the construction of the new residence.
7. The proposed residence has many characteristics of the district.
8. It is a two-story French styled home with a hip roof.
9. The report shows that it has several features that are consistent with that district.
10. 7 variances have been requested.
11. Most variances are standard and relatively consistent with the district as a lot of existing properties are above the coverage of the lots.
12. It has been to the Board of Architects and was reviewed and approved by them in January 2022.

13. A motion was made to support all the variances and the following was approved as architectural features: the flat roof of the garage, the garage deck, the front door not facing the street (consistent with the district).
14. The design of the residence proposes to emulate the other houses in the historic district and required by the zoning code.
15. Staff concerns are:
  - a) The proposed roof height of 35 feet 1 inch. The report shows the main structures in the district are approximately 33 feet tall, measured from established grade and have moderately pitched roofs. In 2008 the historic preservation board deferred an application for the construction on a new residence at 1042 Cotorro Avenue for design modifications to accommodate concerns about a building height of 32 feet. In 2012 the Historic Preservation Board approved an amended design for the construction of a new residence at 1042 Cotorro Avenue and approved a variance request to allow a roof height of 31 feet versus an allowable height of 29 feet.
  - b) The scale of the dormer appears large when viewed from the front elevation as it extends from the roof ridge rather than further down the roof slope. Mr. Adams said he could not find any dormer windows within the district, but most dormer windows in this style start further down the slope not actually at the roof ridge.
16. Several variances have been requested in a similar manner to the other residences in the district do not conform to the current zoning code standards relating to setbacks and landscape open space. Many of the original residences such as 144 Cotorro and 6105 Leonardo are located at the front property line or very close to it. They do not meet front setback requirements and thus do not provide the required percentage of landscape open space in the front yard.
17. Historical Resource staff finds that the necessary criteria required for authorization of variances do apply with 2 exceptions:
  - a) Reduction in the length of the proposed one car garage.
  - b) Location of the swimming pool in the rear yard.
 Both should be addressed in the design of a new residence. There is nothing peculiar about the property that prohibits a garage size that meets current code or moving the pool edge an additional 2 feet 2 inches to the north to satisfy the minimum rear setback requirements. The applicant provided new justification as to why these two variances were required. The recommendation for the designers and recommendation for approval have some minor conditions including a reduction in the roof height and the dormer should extend from lower down the roof slope rather than the actual roof ridge.
18. Staff recommends the approval of all variances with the exception as stated below:
  - a) Deny variance to allow the interior length of the proposed one car garage to be 20 feet versus the requirement for 22 feet.
  - b) Deny Variance to allow the proposed swimming pool to have a rear setback of 2 feet 10 inches versus the minimum rear setback for a private swimming pool and or spa to be 5 feet.

Mr. Mario Garcia-Serra (offices at 600 Brickell Avenue) stepped up to the podium representing the owner Mr. John Paul Souto and was joined by Jorge Hernandez, Project Architect. He made the following comments:

1. Proposal was for the demolition of a non-contributing structure and construction of a new building which they believed given enough passage of time would ultimately rise to the level to be considered a contributing structure within the French City Village Historic District.
2. The single-family zoning regulations of the City of Coral Gables really do not lend themselves to the style of architecture and construction that exists in the French City Village and is emblematic of it which explains the variances requested.
3. Staff is in support of all variances except for two. They would withdraw the variance for the garage, but Mr. Hernandez would provide information justifying the pool variance.

Mr. Jorge Hernandez (337 Palermo Avenue, Coral Gables) made the following comments:

1. He showed a picture of the north side of the district, the street on the top of the slide was Hardee, and on the bottom was Cotorro. It was the half of the district that was designed by Mott Schmidt. The other half of the district on the South side was designed by Phillip Goodwin. A dot on the flat roof indicated the house in question.
2. The house immediately to the right has the main structure pushed way back on the lot.
3. The southern face of the structure is the property line wall.
4. The structure in the middle with the hip roof is a historic structure, the back of the structure is a duplex. There are two twins, the hip roof is where there is a party wall, and the houses mirror one another. It evokes one larger house, but it is 2 separately owned houses.

5. There is a flat roof on the lower right-hand side of the property with is backed right up to the property line of Mr. Souto.
6. They were asking for a relaxation of the pool setback; the pool is considered an accessory structure. The required setback for an accessory structure is 5 feet, they were asking for 2 feet 9 inches for two reasons.
  - a) The HRS requirements for septic tanks get more stringent each day. They had to be 5 feet away from every wall, whether it is a building wall or a property line wall from the drain field, and the drain field would be very tight, almost untenable to put in there with the limitation of 5 feet.
  - b) There are physical structures that are projections up from the earth's plane that you see on the neighboring houses, include the house immediately behind this one that are built right up to that zero-lot line level, and it is an actual structure and not a pool that doesn't obscure sight. He apologized for it not being on the documentation.
7. Mr. Hernandez showed a map of the Mott Schmidt half of the village with all the non-contributing houses shaded.
8. The house in question was the fourth from left to right and the front of the house was set back way further than any other house which breaks the urban line.
9. Previous discussions stressed the importance of the front yard fence, a line is made by structures themselves, not just 4-foot fences, this breaks that urban line and that is part of the charm of this village.
10. Two houses in the western corner of the village have the urban facades right on the sidewalk, and the other house on the eastern corner of Cotorro has the two pavilions right on the sidewalk.
11. The ones on Hardee proper show the main houses pulled back to get sun into gardens that are like courts, but pavilions and 8-foot walls keep that sort of urban line.
12. The existing house breaks that urban line as much as possible.
13. He showed a drawing with the shaded houses showing the proposed structure, built 5 feet back as there is a terrace to the sidewalk. It was built to that urban line so that the consistency of the urban mass is now almost complete except for the one right to the west.
14. He showed a picture of the front façade of the house and stated that the driving surface populated the entire front width and making it more difficult to deal with in terms of contextuality of the district was the subterranean garage, a gaping hole in the urban perimeter of the block.
15. He showed the site plans with shaded slivers showing the footprint of the adjacent properties. On the left-hand side, a shaded sliver indicated a garage that backed up to the property line. The large portion of the house to the left was slid back almost to the back wall and then the neighboring house on the east or right has a 2-foot gap and southwards is the portion of the house to the south that is built all the way to the wall.
16. The material palette is very simple as these houses are based on 18th century Hotel Particulars. They are 18th century townhouses rendered by Smith & Goodman. The very restricted material palette has decorations or moldings, coining or any entablatures simply done in rendered stucco and they were proposing the same to keep the sensibility of the district. The roof tile is flat tile as is common there. It would be grey to emulate slate. They were using Marvin windows and a cobblestone for the driveway.
17. Most of the houses on the north side of Hardee were side entry houses. From the large side hall at the entry, you move either to a large salon that faces the street which is living and dining or another large salon which faces the garden which is family. The working part of the kitchen is tucked behind the stair, the kitchen counter is strung all the way along the Western property line, so that it encourages socialization through the kitchen and threads that through the three bays of the plan.
18. The second floor has two small bedrooms facing the street on your left and the master bedroom facing the garden on the right.
19. A gymnasium is attached to the house but is considerably lower than the house, so it reads as a dependence or an accessory building. It is entered from the garden.
20. The roof plan shows the front and rear facades and the lower height of the flat roof garage with the gym structure above.
21. A balcony that is the same slab as the second floor conceals the air conditioners as there was very little space on the ground.
22. The tryptic of doors align with the paired windows, very much in the manner of the historical French facades, the garden façade is more whimsical with the contemporary bifold doors that open so that the garden and the family room become one, and a large balcony.
23. The height of the gym garage element is subordinate to the neighboring cornice height. Done on purpose to come down to the house just to the east of it which was done in the 80's.
24. The wall height would be removed to be contextual to the 1980's wall height.
25. The east elevation shows the party wall of the gym and the neighboring houses. Very little of the gym extends beyond the neighboring house.

26. The west side shows how close most of the neighboring house was.
27. The shaded silhouette is the party wall on the west side and the little pediment their garage. The pediment would abut the party wall.
28. The drawing of the upper section showed the dormer. There are dormers in the village on the south side of Hardee designed by Goodwin in the 1000 house and one other, whose number he did not know.
29. In answer to Mr. Fullerton's questions Mr. Hernandez said there were no code restrictions for the fenestrations on the side walls., they were done mostly for privacy.
30. They were retracting the variance on the garage as they could try and reconfigure the cabana bath within the existing footprint and produce a 22-foot depth garage and there would be no exterior change.
31. The variance for the pool was driven by the septic tank the existing physical structures that abut right to the zero-lot line. He asked the board to reconsider this variance as they were just shy of 3 feet away.
32. In response to Mr. Garcia Pons' question, about Staff Comment #3, roof height slope 6 on 12 and the dormer coming right up to the ridge line, Mr. Hernandez said he would restudy pulling the dormer down, bring it back to staff and then to the City Architect. The dimensions that they were given when staff did the comparison, were from established grade to ridge, and it is no longer how the code measures height. The code for single family houses throughout the Gables was changed about a year ago because of a blue-ribbon committee that was appointed. The first floor must be within 30 inches, and first floor to the top of the tie beam can be no more than 25 feet. The pitch of the roof is determined by the Board of Architects. Mr. Garcia Pons questioned the reference of the 34 feet in comparison to the district and the maximum height being a little bit lower. He said the 6 on 12 made sense and were reflected in the section, but had they given any thought to 5 1/2 on 12. Mr. Hernandez responded that 5 1/2 on 12 were Mediterranean slopes. 6 on 12 roof was an appropriate slope for a roof on a house that emulated French 18th century residential architecture due to snow loads, but he was willing to diminish it by a foot. Mr. Ehrenhaft said there was a typo where they were talking about the roof height at 35 if you are at 34 feet one inch for the top of the ridge. A reference had been made to a case in 2012 where they had a variance request to allow a height of 31 versus what was an allowable height of 29. On drawings A3.1 and A 3.2 there were numbers for the elevation levels. If you had the ceiling on the ground floor at 11 feet 8 inches, 2 feet higher you have the top of the slab which is for your second story at 10' 6", then you get to the top of the tie beam above the second floor that's at 24 feet 2 inches. Were the dormers simply an architectural element enjoyed from the outside? Sheet A-4.1 - cross sections show in the top drawing that the opening (the light in the dormer) looks like they had filled in through the trusses a channel of open space. Was this to let light into the stairwell which is open all the way through the second floor down to the first floor? Mr. Hernandez responded that the stairwell was a double height space, and the room gets top lit from the dormer, the dormer emits light from the vertical plane. Mr. Ehrenhaft said that if staff was suggesting capping the height at 31 feet, they would lose those 3 feet. He requested the board to review and discuss the effect that it would have on the trussing and the function of that dormer. He noted that lowering the dormer positions by 2 or 3 feet would affect the function as it would encroach on the laundry and the functional rooms that are framed out and have ceilings. Mr. Hernandez agreed. Mr. Ehrenhaft went on to say that it might not change the pitch, but if the top of the roof comes down 3 feet that is going to reset everything. Mr. Hernandez said they would lose that effect and the board has purview for things seen from the right of way, but in terms of the quality of the architecture, in 50 years if someone wanted to designate or include the house in the village it would become a less intelligent or interesting experience to walk through the house. The 6 on 12 is the standard pitch for French architecture. Mr. Ehrenhaft said lowering would destroy those internal concepts. Mr. Garcia Pons said his question was similar, he was looking at it from the outside and Mr. Hernandez had built it from the inside. They did not have to recommend #3, if they reduced it slightly, they could come to an agreement. He suggested leaving it to staff with the recommendation to review and if possible, reduce it. Mr. Hernandez's response was sufficient for him to understand the rationale. Mr. Ehrenhaft asked if there was a functional code requiring not more than 31. Mr. Hernandez explained that when Commissioner Keon was last on the board, she deputized a group of architects to sit on a board for residential construction, and review, clean up and incentivize it with some of the principles of Coral Gables architecture. Those best practices which was done with Ramon Trias and then city architect Carlos Mindreau produced a new way of measuring height, this design conforms to that new way of measuring height which was up to 25 feet from finished floor to top of tie beam, and if the Board of Architects (and this board would have to second their opinion) agrees that the roof pitch is appropriate for the house, then that is it. They didn't measure from top of tie beam to the peak anymore.

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

Mr. Hernandez added that they had 2 letters from the 2 adjoining property owners, and Mr. Souto and he had met with them at the same time and gone through all the plans, and their letters were in support of the proposal as submitted. They were the most impacted given the nature of the party wall construction.

Mr. Fullerton asked if he was going to do a 22-foot garage. Mr. Hernandez said yes, and they had rescinded the variance Mr. Fullerton said it was amazing to see the role of septic. Mr. Hernandez said it is all in septic, that whole village is on septic, and they knew what had happened to the HRS rules. It is really wedging something in there along from this new version of this urban 18th century house. It was in the backyard, which was discouraged before, but in these conditions, they will let it go because they had no other option. There was a French door to the garden to allow a small bobcat access to the septic tank and the pool.

It was noted that Philip Goodwin, the co-designer of MoMa (Museum of Modern Art) was known as a traditionalist and trained in the Bozar ("Palais des Beaux Arts," now the Center for Fine Arts) and then he becomes one of the darlings of modernism in relatively old age.

Ms. Bache-Wiig said that they had not only kept the urban line but respected the historic side. The movement of the gardens facing south was a beautiful move for a beautiful gem in this non-conforming part of this amazing village. She referred to his comment about the setbacks and the zoning and agreed that people wanted to live in this zoning situation because it allowed for this urban village environment and lifestyle. She applauded someone coming in and bringing this tremendous value and rebooting, restarting this conversation about urbanism. She noted that the reason for the variance on the pool was the party wall there and bringing that setback back was not going to affect anyone and the requirements drain field requirements today were insane which is something she had seen across the board.

Mr. Hernandez said Mr. Souto has lived in this house for 7 years because he loved it, but now wanted to stay because he loves the village but wanted to make a new house that improves the problems that the existing house has in terms of the urban ensemble.

A motion was made by Mr. Fullerton and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to approve the addition and alterations to the residence and sitework at **1024 Cotorro Avenue** with staff conditions. The clarity on Item #3 is removing the "shall be consistent with" and directing the applicant to work with staff with regarding the roof height. The motion passed (Ayes: 7; Nays: 0).

*The conditions were as follows:*

1. *Window and door glass is to be clear / non-reflective.*
2. *Muntins must be high-profile.*
3. *The applicant is to work with Staff with regard to the roof height.*
4. *The dormer shall extend from lower on the roof slope as opposed to extending from the roof ridge.*
5. *The pool will be reviewed by Staff as a separate Standard Certificate of Appropriateness when the permit application is submitted.*

A motion was made by Mr. Fullerton and seconded by Mr. Maxwell to blanket approve the variances on **1024 Cotorro Avenue** with exception of the third garage.

The motion passed (Ayes: 7; Nays: 0).

*The variances were as follows:*

1. *Grant a variance to allow the proposed residence to have a maximum floor area ratio of approximately three thousand eight hundred sixty-four (3,864) square feet (77.3%) vs. two thousand four hundred (2,400) square feet, (48%), as required by Article 2, Section 2-101 (D) 6b and of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.*
2. *Grant a variance to allow the single-family residential property to provide approximately twenty eight (28) percent landscaped open space of the area of the building site (approximately 1,400 square feet) with zero (0%) percent in the front yard area vs. single-family residential properties shall provide landscaped open space of not less than forty (40%) percent of the area of the building site (2,000 square feet) with at least twenty (20%) percent in the front yard area, as required by Article 2, Section 2-100 and Section 2-101 (D) 7b of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.*
3. *Grant a variance to allow the residence to have a maximum ground area coverage for a principal building of approximately two thousand four hundred sixteen (2,416) square feet (48.3% of the lot) vs. one*

*thousand seven hundred fifty (1,750) square feet (35% of the lot), as required by Article 2, Section 2-101 (D) 6a of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.*

4. *Grant a variance to allow the residence to have a maximum ground area coverage for principal buildings and accessory structures of approximately two thousand eight hundred nineteen (2,819) square feet (56.4% of the lot) vs. two thousand two hundred fifty (2,250) square feet (45% of the lot), as required by Article 2, Section 2-101 (D) 6a of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.*
5. *Grant a variance to allow the front door of the proposed single-family residence to not face a street vs. any building shall face the front of the lot and be subject to the restrictions governing buildings on each street on which it is deemed to face, as required by Article 2, Section 2-101 (D) 3 of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.*
6. *Grant a variance to allow the proposed swimming pool to have a rear setback of two (2) feet ten (10) inches vs. the minimum rear setback for a private swimming pool and/or spa shall be five (5) feet, as required by Article 3, Section 3-308 (D) 2 of the Coral Gables Zoning Code.*

Mr. Fullerton said at least two members on the board remembered Mr. Hernandez from his time on the board, he welcomed him back and thanked him for his good work. Ms. Spain said that she and Mr. Hernandez had arranged the cocktail party in the French City Village when they had for years not wanted to be designated as a district and Mr. Hernandez and herself went and spent quite a few hours with them. They convinced them to submit for the designation of the district.

**BOARD ITEMS / CITY COMMISSION / CITY PROJECTS UPDATE:** None

**ITEMS FROM THE SECRETARY:** None

**DISCUSSION ITEM:** None

**OLD BUSINESS:**

Landmarks Advisory Board: Mr. Garcia-Pons had asked for the date of the next Landmark Advisory Meeting, which is March 28, 2022, at 9am. This is a special meeting they requested as the meetings are meant to be once every quarter. An agenda will be sent out. The meeting is held in the commission chambers and televised.

**NEW BUSINESS:** None

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Garcia Pons made a motion to adjourn and was seconded by Mr. Maxwell and the board responded with a collective aye.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:07 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Warren Adams  
Historic Preservation Officer