

MEETING
OF THE
CITY OF CORAL GABLES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD

405 Biltmore Way
Coral Gables, Florida
March 21, 2019

PARTICIPANTS:

ALEJANDRO SILVA, Chairperson
ROBERT PARSLEY, Board Member
ALBERT MENENDEZ, Board Member
BRUCE EHRENHAFT, Board Member
ALICIA BACHE-WIIG, Board Member
RAUL RODRIGUEZ, Board Member

DONA SPAIN, Historic Preservation Officer
KARA KAUTZ, Asst. Historic Preservation
Officer

1 Preservation Officer
GUSTAVO CEBALLOS, City Attorney

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Welcome to the regularly
2 scheduled meeting of the City of Coral Gables
3 Historic Preservation Board. We are residents of
4 Coral Gables and are charged with the preservation
5 and protection of historic or architecturally
6 worthy buildings, structures, sites, neighborhoods
7 and artifacts which impart a distinct historical
8 heritage of the city.

9 The board is comprised of nine members, seven
10 of whom are appointed by the commission and one by
11 the city manager, and the ninth is selected by the
12 board and confirmed by the commission.

13 Five members of the board constitute a quorum
14 and five affirmative votes are necessary for the
15 adoption of any motion.

16 Any person who acts as a lobbyist pursuant to
17 the City of Coral Gables Ordinance No. 2006-11 must
18 register with the city clerk prior to engaging in
19 lobbying activities or presentations before city
20 staff, boards, committees, and/or the city
21 commission. A copy of the ordinance is available
22 in the office of the city clerk. Failure to
23 register and provide proof of registration shall
24 prohibit your ability to present to the Historic
25 Preservation Board on applications under

1 consideration this afternoon.

2 A lobbyist is defined as an individual,
3 corporation, partnership or other legal entity
4 employed or retained, whether paid or not, by a
5 principal who seeks to encourage the approval,
6 disapproval, adoption, repeal, passage, defeat, or
7 modification of any ordinance, resolution, action
8 or decision of any city commissioner, any action,
9 decision, recommendation of the city manager, any
10 city board or committee, including, but not limited
11 to, quasi-judicial, advisory board, trust,
12 authority, or council, or any action, decision or
13 recommendation of city personnel during the time
14 period of the entire decision-making process on the
15 action, decision or recommendation which
16 foreseeably will be heard or reviewed by the city
17 commission or any city board or committee and this
18 includes quasi-judicial, advisory board, trust,
19 authority or council.

20 Presentations made to this board are subject
21 to the City's false claim ordinance, Chapter 39 of
22 the City of Coral Gables City Code.

23 I now officially call the City of Coral Gables
24 Historic Preservation Board meeting of February
25 21st, 2019 to order. The time is 4:05.

1 Today present are Mr. Alejandro Silva, Ms.
2 Alicia G. Bach-Wiig, Mr. Albert Menendez, Mr. Raul
3 Rodriguez, Mr. Bruce Ehrenhaft, Mr. Parsley, that's
4 it.

5 The notice regarding ex parte communication
6 says please be advised that this board is a
7 quasi-judicial board and that the items on the
8 agenda are quasi-judicial in nature, which requires
9 board members to disclose all ex parte
10 communications.

11 An ex parte communication is defined as any
12 contact, communication, conversation,
13 correspondence, memorandum or other written or
14 verbal communication that takes place outside a
15 public hearing between a member of the public and a
16 member of the quasi-judicial board regarding
17 matters to be heard by the quasi-judicial board.

18 If anyone has made any contact with a board
19 member, when the issue comes before the board the
20 member must state on the record the existence of
21 the ex parte communication, the party who
22 originated the communication, and whether the
23 communication will affect the board member's
24 ability to impartially consider the evidence to be
25 presented regarding the matter.

1 And does anyone on this board have a
2 communication to disclose at this time?

3 Okay. Looking for deferrals today?

4 MS. SPAIN: No, sir.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: No deferrals.

6 Okay. So the next one, swearing in, and
7 anyone in the audience who will be testifying
8 today, please rise and you'll be sworn in.

9 THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand.

10 Do you swear to tell the whole truth and
11 nothing but the truth?

12 (ALL): Yes.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. CEBALLOS: This is case file, 2019-001.
2 Application for the issuance of a Special
3 Certificate Appropriateness for the property at
4 1417 Obispo Avenue, legally described as Lot 36,
5 Block 18, Coral Gables Section "E,", reported in
6 Plat Book 8, Page 13, of the Public Records of
7 Miami-Dade, Florida.

8 The applicant is requesting design approval
9 for design approval for additions and alterations
10 to the residence, construction of a two-story
11 auxiliary structure, and sitework.

12 MS. KRAUTZ: In May 2008, the "Obispo Avenue
13 Historic District" was listed in the Coral Gables
14 Register of Historic Places.

15 It is comprised of residences abutting Obispo
16 Avenue, the District boundaries are Cortez Street
17 on the East and Ferdinand Street on the west. The
18 property at 1417 Obispo Avenue is a contributing
19 resource within the Historic District.

20 Permit No. 152 was issued for the construction
21 of the residence at 1417 Obispo Avenue. The plans
22 cannot be located and the architect is unknown.
23 Constructed ca. 1923, the residence was featured in
24 the "Avenue Obispo" promotional pamphlet that
25 George Merrick published in 1924 to highlight

1 smaller homes. The residence has undergone some
2 significant alterations since the time of its
3 construction.

4 This is a 1940's photo, the property has the
5 early photos within his PowerPoint application.
6 There has been an approval for one-story addition
7 and alterations, including restoration of the front
8 porch opening back into what you see in the
9 photograph. The auxiliary structure to the rear of
10 the property, and what is interesting to note, if
11 you look at the 1920's photos, in the PowerPoint,
12 by the time this 1940's photo was taken, there's no
13 garage. The garage was removed, so where you see
14 the car in the photograph, the garage would have
15 been behind that location, so we don't know why
16 there's no permit for it to be removed, it was just
17 removed. No variances were requested, the Board
18 architects reviewed the project in January of this
19 year with two notations regarding the front
20 elevation; one was to incorporate the tile vent
21 detail found over the window, the triple windows on
22 the left-hand side, as part of the restoration, and
23 also to bring back the brickwork feature over the
24 front entry. They want it to be recessed, so it
25 reads more like the original. We have staff

1 comments at the end. I'll let the architect give
2 the presentation, then we'll go over this.

3 MR. SUAREZ: It is 25 years, my name is Pedro
4 Suarez. I'm a registered architect in Florida and
5 New York. This particular project here is the kind
6 of work I like to do. It is a small scale.
7 However, it has a lot of significance bringing back
8 this home is what the Gables was all about, not
9 what I'm seeing lately. My client wishes to
10 restore the house to its original look, as close as
11 possible, while making it attractive to today's
12 living. This is how the house looked a few years
13 after the previous one (indicating). There was a
14 garage in the back, we can only assume it was
15 knocked down by a hurricane, because at that time
16 the garages were built out of frame construction,
17 rather than most of them, out of CVS, more than
18 likely, it was leveled by a hurricane, maybe the
19 1946 hurricane, or Andrew, who knows. My client
20 wishes to live in the property while restoring the
21 house. In order to do that, he's decided to, here
22 you can see the property is on the left and right,
23 he's decided to billed a garage apartment that he
24 can live in the property, monitor the development,
25 and at the same time there so in case there's no

1 any questions. What we would like to do, there was
2 an addition done on the grounds of the property,
3 that is like a long segment going back, and this is
4 really atrocious the way it was done, it didn't
5 keep in context with the ceiling heights in the
6 house, it was a disaster. We would like to level,
7 just keep the exterior wall on the east side, and
8 configure the house, so he can get a master
9 bedroom, a nicer kitchen, family room, a new
10 covered terrace, going back to the front, we are
11 demolishing that enclosed porch, which was not
12 original to the house and it really takes away from
13 the beauty of the house. We would like to make it
14 look like in this actually, on this picture. Other
15 than that, the windows, the house, they have
16 changed all of the windows, they have used standard
17 sized windows, some of them don't keep in mind the
18 original openings, so we are replacing all of the
19 windows and when the demolition begins, we will be
20 able to find the exact size that the window was
21 supposed to have. It has had all kinds of windows,
22 from wooden framed windows to jalousie, to
23 single-hung. I didn't see any casements in it, but
24 we would like to make it all cohesive. Here on the
25 right, you can see the segment that sticks out. I

1 don't know if you guys can see? Oh, yes, you can.
2 The segment that was built in the 1970s, I believe,
3 here is the scope of work that we are undertaking,
4 remove the existing front cover porch and I don't
5 want to bore you with reading all of this, but the
6 last note here that our lot coverage is 39.5, that
7 was a mistake in the calculations. Actually, we
8 are within the required lot coverage, and the
9 plans, I'm open to any questions you may have and
10 look forward to do this work.

11 MR. SILVA: Thank you. Before Kara takes us
12 through recommendations, do you have an objection?

13 THE WITNESS: For the most part, no, I think
14 there was only a couple of them, like we want to
15 introduce the house, it does have, if you see on
16 the left side, upper left, it does have variation
17 in parapet height, which looks to me something that
18 was done, maybe there was some tile in the area and
19 moved and not put back, we would like to address
20 that condition and use the more period solution,
21 which is like a tile copying over the window area
22 as you can see in this, in the right side, which is
23 the bottom left. That is one of the things that I
24 think you had some concerns with, I don't have any
25 other objections towards anything else, we are

1 willing to comply.

2 MR. SILVA: Great, thank you. Kara, you
3 wanted to take us through these? I think it is one
4 that we are in disagreement with.

5 MS. KAUTZ: All right, so, as part of our
6 conclusion, this is sort of an odd comment, not one
7 we usually make, they are proposing restoration
8 work, which is great. It will change for the
9 better, the front facade closer to what it
10 originally was, if they are applying, go for a tax
11 abatement, it has to be restoration work and not
12 guessing what was there. The first condition, the
13 dimensions or locations of items restored, are
14 replicated, should be verified and confirmed in the
15 field, not relying just on the dimensions on the
16 plans, that will be when they are under
17 construction. We would like to be called out in
18 the field, to verify features, or they can provide
19 photo documentation of what they find. Once you
20 start uncovering it, you will find a lot of what
21 was supposed to be there and where. The windows
22 and doors are hard to receive. Of the window
23 relocation, is not part of the application, a lot
24 of the openings were existing and proposed to be
25 moved around, and that was initially agreed to,

1 because we didn't know that the existing elevation
2 drawings were not drawn properly. So what it looks
3 like were the photographs of the house as it
4 economists now, the windows are closer to the right
5 proportion and size from the 1020s and 1040s photo.
6 We would like to table that and bring it back
7 later, or work with staff to shift the windows, if
8 they need to be. Roof tile, is two-piece barrel.
9 The roof structure is not to be removed. The
10 retaining wall on the front porch should be lowered
11 to the original height. The permit for when it was
12 moved over, he showed you, there's a concrete cap
13 poured on top of the original wall. We would like
14 it to be lowered to what it was originally. The
15 wind wall to the east, if you want to put the plans
16 back up on the screen, that would be helpful. The
17 wind wall to the east of the front porch, it is
18 proposed to be embellished. If you look at the
19 early photos, it did have a different -- it was
20 detailed and much more playfully than now. It is
21 now squared off. We would like that to be figured
22 out in the field or not done at all, we don't know
23 the dimensions and the location of it. It is also
24 on the plans as it is to be rebuilt, we don't want
25 it to be removed. The clay tile details found on

1 the front porch, they are above the porch and on
2 the other side, and what those set within the
3 retaining wall, you can't see it here, there's tile
4 proposed to go within that inset. The match is
5 closer than shown in the early elevation, that can
6 be investigated during selective demo, as to final
7 location and size. A detail for the brickwork
8 needs to be done on the front and side elevations.
9 We are not sure if the stucco can be chipped away.
10 If it can, to expose the brickwork, it is not clear
11 on the drawings, they want to put something back,
12 but not what it is or how -- that needs to be
13 established or eliminated. We don't want something
14 fake added there. The details of the front door
15 modification are included here, the existing front
16 door, I'm not sure how that will actually work.
17 They need to put it on the permit set or pick a new
18 door. Existing attic and crawl space vents are
19 shown shifted, so that they are center line,
20 depending on the location of the windows, they
21 should remain as is. The step condition in the
22 original parapet, on the back of the picture, it
23 steps down to the rear, that is the original
24 condition, that should remain, not to be raised.
25 And the coping that is being proposed, it was never

1 there, it should be not be added. There's a
2 decorative wind wall at the northwest wall of the
3 new edition that matches exactly what the original
4 was supposed to be. It should be eliminated in the
5 top left-hand corner, or modified, so it doesn't
6 match exactly. The stone columns, the staffer
7 reviewed the design, we don't know if they are
8 twisted, or what they have, at the detached garage
9 structure, I'm not sure if he walked you through
10 the elevations. There, the proposed, there's a
11 base proposed around the house to match the
12 existing. It should be modified or removed, not
13 match exactly. There's a stucco texture, that is
14 not clarified, on that building, there's a note
15 that applies to the new doors on this, provide
16 brick molding to all doors, not added to the
17 garage.

18 MR. SILVA: Thank you, Kara.

19 Is there anyone in the audience that wants to
20 speak for or against this item? Seeing none, I
21 will open it up for Board questions and comments.

22 Which condition did you take exception to?

23 MS. KAUTZ: Adding of the coping.

24 MR. SILVA: Which item?

25 MS. KAUTZ: I know it was discussed. I don't

1 see it as an item. I discussed it as part of the
2 description of the elevation, so it should be
3 added. The condition I had about the parapet, is
4 that it should not be raised, it should not be
5 leveled out. The coping should not be added.

6 MR. SILVA: Where is the coping?

7 MS. KAUTZ: Going back to the plans, sorry.

8 You see the proposed on the rear (indicating),
9 actually, if they wanted to do that coping detail
10 towards the rear, that is the 1950's edition, that
11 is fine. The first two and the left, do you see
12 it, Robert?

13 MR. PARSLEY: On the body?

14 MS. KAUTZ: On the roof parapet, the two on
15 the left are within the original house footprint,
16 so two should be removed, the one on the right can
17 stay, but that was a later edition.

18 MR. MENDEZ: How are you requiring the stucco
19 texture?

20 MS. KAUTZ: You know, I thought about that.
21 This texture is not original, it is not noted that
22 they are going to change the texture of the house.
23 There's nowhere to do a clean break between the
24 1950's edition, 1920's, and new edition. I wasn't
25 sure how to address that, so I didn't. If they try

1 to match what is there, it won't, because what is
2 there, has initially a rough texture. That was
3 smoothed. I don't think it will ever match
4 exactly, so they can put -- do you know how you
5 want to stucco the house?

6 MR. SUAREZ: Eastern wall, the only wall that
7 will remain from the early addition, has a plaster
8 wall different from the plaster from the original
9 of the house. Back in those days, they would mix
10 the grout on site and go up and down. Nowadays,
11 they buy it in a bag, mix it, and they go left and
12 right. So by de facto, the technique they use now,
13 will never duplicate the original plaster.

14 Now, on the western wall, I created an
15 indentation, to clearly separate the existing from
16 the new.

17 MR. MENDEZ: What about the front of the
18 house?

19 MR. SUAREZ: We really, just bringing all of
20 that construction down to the sill level of that
21 little wall, which we will uncover it, as we
22 demolish it, and it will be the original plaster,
23 because no work was done there. We will be
24 removing all of the add-on.

25 MS. KAUTZ: Within the existing enclosed

1 porch, the stucco texture of the original house is
2 within that room, is that what you are saying?

3 MR. SUAREZ: No.

4 MR. YNGERTO: I'm the homeowner. Taking this
5 task, I want to be clear on the stucco. I don't
6 think we really talked about redoing the stucco.
7 What is there is there, we will keep.

8 MS. KAUTZ: I didn't think they were
9 re-stuccoing, but if you are revealing the original
10 texture.

11 MR. MENENDEZ: I think they will in the
12 process, that is why I asked.

13 MS. KAUTZ: I don't think they are going to
14 strike off the rest of the house to reveal it, you
15 understand? But on the west elevation, they are,
16 he is creating a little hyphen, that separates the
17 old from the new. I don't think it would be
18 worthwhile to ask them to change a stucco texture
19 there that comes around and then hits a 1950s
20 edition. I think there's enough other work that
21 they are proposing to restore.

22 MR. SILVA: I think the trickiest piece is the
23 front patio, we need to make an effort to match, as
24 closely as possible, the existing stucco.

25 MR. SUAREZ: We would love to do that and

1 strive for that.

2 MR. SILVA: You will end up rebuilding the
3 curved part of the wall.

4 MR. SUAREZ: The curve itself, because --

5 MR. EHRENHAFT: When you do the demolition,
6 you may see where the curve was?

7 MR. SUAREZ: Yes.

8 MR. MENDEZ: Yes, like some of the windows.

9 MS. KAUTZ: Once you start taking stuff off,
10 more will come out.

11 MR. EHRENHAFT: Once you established where the
12 curve in that front wall is to be, you are also
13 going to reestablish the steps missing now,
14 correct?

15 MR. SUAREZ: Yes.

16 MR. EHRENHAFT: Then just behind the back edge
17 of the steps, closest to the front facade, there's
18 that wind wall there that is now missing, correct?

19 MS. KAUTZ: It is there.

20 MR. EHRENHAFT: I couldn't tell because of the
21 vegetation in the photograph.

22 MR. SUAREZ: It is somewhat in there, but we
23 want to make it look like the original.

24 MR. EHRENHAFT: I see. Thank you.

25 MS. KAUTZ: Originally, it had acrylic here on

1 the top and some point, they just shaved it off.
2 It is being shown as thickened and rebuilt, we
3 don't want it rebuilt, but add the features back?

4 MR. SUAREZ: Yes.

5 MS. KAUTZ: That is acceptable.

6 MR. SILVA: I think it is a great project, the
7 front patio is important. I think you are doing a
8 great job.

9 MR. PARSLEY: I have one question about the
10 front door, the brick that you are asking him not
11 to do. Go back to the photograph, the 1940s
12 photograph.

13 MS. KAUTZ: I'm not asking them not to do it.

14 MR. PARSLEY: I thought it was brick.

15 MS. KAUTZ: It was brick. If you look at the
16 pamphlet, it was, all of the houses are built circa
17 1923, quickly done, highlighting the cottages on
18 that street, that brick detail around arch work,
19 repeats. If you look at the photo.

20 MR. PARSLEY: I thought it was cut stone?

21 MS. KAUTZ: The columns are also brick.

22 MR. SUAREZ: I'm pretty sure the brick is in
23 there, they filled in the bottom to put in a
24 regular-sized door. Our goal is chip it out,
25 discover it, acid wash it. If it doesn't exist,

1 then we will --

2 MS. KAUTZ: A detail.

3 MR. SUAREZ: I think --

4 MR. PARSLEY: The color there looks more like
5 a line versus the clay.

6 MS. KAUTZ: It is a horrible picture, this is
7 right after construction, and you can see it up
8 there, if you look at it with a loop up close, it
9 is bricks, and those columns under the awning on
10 the left, between the triples, they are all
11 brickwork, too. It is repeated over and over in
12 that pamphlet. It is really interesting.

13 MR. EHRENHAFT: Are they bricks that are
14 rectangular?

15 MS. KAUTZ: I believe so.

16 MR. EHRENHAFT: Is one end wider?

17 MS. KAUTZ: No, they are rectangular. It
18 reads like a structural support for the arch, so...

19 MR. SUAREZ: That is the reason.

20 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Is that the original photo,
21 Kara.

22 MS. KAUTZ: This was just after construction,
23 you can see underneath the events on the right-hand
24 side, that horizontal line, that the awning is
25 coming, it is the framework.

1 MS. BACHE-WIIG: They are proposing to add
2 that one on that one side?

3 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

4 MR. YNGERTO: I want to add one thing, we are
5 taking every measure and precaution to bring the
6 house back to what it used to be, what it looked
7 like, however as you all know, there are budgetary
8 constraints, so we are going to do the best we can.

9 MR. SILVA: Ready to make a motion?

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'll move that we accept the
11 recommendation of the staff and approve the
12 project.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: I second.

14 MS. KAUTZ: Does that include my amendment
15 about the coping?

16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

17 MR. SILVA: Motion on the second, please?

18 MR. YNGERTO: Can you clarify the amendment.

19 MR. SUAREZ: Removing the coping and the
20 existing.

21 MS. KAUTZ: You can.

22 MR. SUAREZ: Perfect.

23 MR. PARSLEY: Yes, earlier, yes.

24 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

25 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

1 MR. SILVA: Yes. Item No. 1. Case file
2 COA(SP)2017-027. Application for the issuance of a
3 Special Certificate for the property 1510 Madrid
4 Street. Lots 3 and 4, Block 54, Coral Gables
5 Granada Section, according to the Plat Book 8, Page
6 113 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County,
7 Florida, together with the South 30 feet of plots
8 23 and 24 and all of lots 25, 26, 27, and 28. And
9 Block 1 of Davis Orchid Addition, according to the
10 plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 9, Page 87 of
11 the public records of Miami-Dade County for
12 alterations to the existing residence, the
13 reconstruction and enlargement of the pergola and
14 sitework.

15 MS. SPAIN: I believe what the applicant would
16 like to do is eliminate the pergola portion of this
17 application and go forward with the rest.

18 MR. SILVA: That will come back.

19 MS. SPAIN: For the moment, they would like to
20 take that out and work with staff on that. They
21 only want the rest of the application to be
22 discussed. I went to graduate school with the
23 architect on this and have not seen him since.

24 MS. KAUTZ: The property is located at 1510
25 Madrid, part of what is known as the "Zinmaster

1 Estate." As you see on the site plan, it is
2 comprised of quite a few lots. Single-family
3 residence, detached one-car garage, five cottages
4 spread throughout the property made of coral rock.
5 This application concerns the existing single
6 family residence, this is a photo from the 1940s.
7 So the application, I guess, that you are going to
8 consider now consists of alterations to the
9 existing residence and sitework, which includes
10 building a ramp, the south. This is the
11 architect's application. I will let him do his
12 thing. There's no variance, approved. We had a
13 few at the end, I'll go over when they are
14 finished.

15 MS. RUSSO: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman,
16 Members of the Board.

17 For the record, my name is Laura Russo,
18 offices at 2655 Le Jeune Road. I'm here this
19 afternoon representing the property owners, Ray
20 Jordan and Gladys Jourdain, who have owned the
21 subject property for almost nine years. They
22 purchased it in 2000. They are both involved in
23 the real estate industry. Mr. Jourdain is a broker
24 and Gladys holds a Masters in Design and
25 Architecture.

1 As you heard, we are here today, we are not
2 going to discuss one portion of the application, we
3 are leaving out the pergola, we are here for
4 replacing windows with hurricane-proof doors and
5 doing some sitework that involves a ramp. Let's
6 see. It is a walkway. As you saw from the map
7 before the property is located in the northern,
8 northwestern quadrant of Coral Gables, Milan is on
9 the south, Madrid is on the eastern elevation. The
10 area in question is the long rectangular is what we
11 are leaving out today, so what we are discussing
12 is -- this is the main part of the application, so
13 the top picture is the south facade that faces
14 Milan. It currently has three windows and the
15 bottom is the proposed work, as is shown. The City
16 made comments about not moving the windows as much
17 as they were shown in the actual plans. The staff
18 made comments, we agree, we will abide by the
19 comments. The only editorial comment that I will
20 make, apparently, the windows referenced, the north
21 window, so on the north side of this building that
22 they are trying to match, is not an original
23 window. All of the windows were changed in the
24 seventies. We understand the comment, we agree
25 with the comment, we also agree with the comment

1 regarding the little rubble wall, the entranceway.
2 We will make that revision to the plans. The
3 reason for moving the door -- to moving the door
4 opening to the east a little bit, you can see in
5 the window opening, it is directly under the eave,
6 so that allows for water to just be a not favorable
7 condition. So, here are the plans. Staff made
8 comments based on the drawings, and we are good
9 with the comments made by staff with respect to
10 taking out the little rubble wall at the east end,
11 the little section at the very beginning, and we
12 are okay with doing that, and also removing the
13 mosaic at the top of the bathroom window. I've
14 neglected to mention earlier, the architect Victor
15 Morales is here if you have any other questions.
16 I'm happy to answer any questions that you have.
17 Just to let you know, we do accept the staff
18 comments and conditions.

19 MR. MORALES: You want to walk us through
20 quickly? You note in your report about the
21 shifting of that opening, but it is not a formal
22 condition, as far as I can tell.

23 MS. KAUTZ: I missed that one this weekend.
24 So, on this drawing, which was not -- I don't
25 believe in the thing before, the part in blue, if

1 that is where the new windows are going to go. If
2 they keep the eastern most of the left window and
3 the western most of the right window, and go out
4 from there for the doors, I think that will be
5 sufficient, because you are keeping the opening
6 side the same, you are not shifting it any further?
7 Does that make sense.

8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: We don't see what you are
9 pointing to.

10 MS. KAUTZ: See the window opening on the
11 left-hand side? If they can keep that -- sorry.
12 The right side of the right window.

13 MS. RUSSO: In order for the proportion to be
14 maintained symmetrical.

15 MRS. JOURDAIN: These two dimensions are
16 different, and what we were aiming for was
17 symmetrical, the window as the center. So these
18 dimensions --

19 MR. EHRENHAFT: Can you restate your
20 clarification?

21 MS. KAUTZ: The inside openings of the two
22 windows we want to maintain. The symmetry is less
23 important, than actually keeping the line of the
24 original existing window.

25 MR. RODRIGUEZ: The blue lines will be where

1 the windows would be replaced?

2 MRS. JOURDAIN: My name is Gladys, the
3 property owner.

4 The standard size of a door is six feet wide,
5 seven feet, eight feet, and basically in order to
6 have the standard-sized door, this door is 88
7 inches wide. There's no door that matches that
8 size. So, we wanted to move away from the
9 overhang. The overhang impinges about a
10 foot-and-a-half. This photograph is elongated,
11 stretches horizontally. The windows are narrower,
12 the bottom line is when we did the mathematics on
13 making the property, the aesthetic of the
14 composition of this facade to have symmetry around
15 the center access, and basically, this is the
16 largest space, it is an open green area, and it is
17 what faces the street from Milan Avenue, so
18 therefore, the scale of this has to be
19 proportionment to its anti-room, so to speak, which
20 is the gardens. So I think they are going to vary
21 eight inches, three inches here, four inches here,
22 I don't know. I would like to keep the symmetry.
23 That is the only reason why this diagram is the way
24 it is.

25 MR. PARSLEY: That is not the way it is drawn

1 on the proposed plans?

2 MS. JOURDAIN: This is responding from the
3 comment from the City. This was created to see if
4 we shifted the doors around, how it would look.

5 MS. KAUTZ: The plans shown, these don't
6 match, this is different, this is higher. These
7 two plans, the elevations.

8 MR. PARSLEY: On the plan, I'm not seeing
9 symmetry. Symmetry for what? The bathroom window?

10 MS. JOURDAIN: Yes, it is. Whether it is the
11 bathroom's window or Pope's window, it is the
12 center.

13 MR. PARSLEY: I think this is faux symmetry.

14 MS. JOURDAIN: When you have a certain rhythm.

15 MR. PARSLEY: I understand what you are
16 saying, I don't agree with it.

17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm trying to make this clear;
18 what you have outlined in blue, is that what you
19 are proposing to do?

20 MS. RUSSO: Correct, it had the doors in a
21 different location. Kara is correct. The plans
22 didn't match. When the owners received the
23 comments, the staff report, she prepared this slide
24 to say, I agree, I will shift them over less than I
25 intend or originally requested, but still want to

1 maintain a symmetry and agree to take off the
2 decorative mosaic proposed for the top of the
3 bathroom window, so this slide with the blue lines
4 is a proposal in response to this.

5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You are proposing this for us
6 to approve.

7 MS. RUSSO: Correct, and it will have revised
8 drawings that corrects the sheet.

9 MR. MENENDEZ: Kara, these were approved in
10 December 2017?

11 MS. KAUTZ: By whom? By the Board of
12 Architects? Yes.

13 MR. MENENDEZ: Have they seen (indicating).

14 MS. KAUTZ: No.

15 MR. MENENDEZ: It will go back to the Board of
16 Architects, as well?

17 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

18 MR. PARSLEY: You are okay with the blue shown
19 on that photograph?

20 MS. KAUTZ: No. I'm going to talk loud for a
21 second.

22 MR. PARSLEY: The plans are not helpful.

23 MS. KAUTZ: So, we are asking for, instead of
24 creating a new opening, part of the Secretary of
25 Interior' standards is that you can remove what is

1 done, theoretically, so if the door starts here and
2 goes six feet that way, starts here, at least you
3 are maintaining one line of the original window
4 opening.

5 MS. JOURDAIN: The problem is that the
6 dimensions do not align; in other words, we would
7 like to do that, we would love to do that, but then
8 the door proportion doesn't work, and I want to
9 keep the panels as large as possible, because the
10 windows are wide, 38 inches wide.

11 MR. SILVA: Kara is saying, you don't have a
12 problem closing them off to make the correct
13 proportion, we would prefer to --

14 MS. JOURDAIN: I don't think --

15 MS. KAUTZ: I think what would be helpful to
16 have the dimensions on the drawings drawn properly,
17 to see where they really are, because right now,
18 what Robert was saying, this elevation doesn't even
19 match the proposed elevations, this set. If you
20 dimension this wall across here with the original
21 opening, then your proposed door, that would be
22 very helpful.

23 MR. SILVA: You may have an issue aligning the
24 interior, if you shift the door over to the right,
25 it will be heading into the bathroom.

1 MRS. JOURDAIN: No, there's room. It is not
2 more than six or seven inches. It is small. We
3 have to do an adjustment.

4 MS. KAUTZ: If you move it over, you are
5 showing it in your bathroom on your plan.

6 MR. PARSLEY: I think like most jobs, projects
7 that we get, where we get an accurate drawing of
8 existing conditions above and proposed conditions
9 below and then elevation, so we can see all of the
10 measurements laid out, we would have a much
11 better --

12 MS. KAUTZ: I agree.

13 MR. PARSLEY: Right now, I'm going to say no
14 based on the sketch drawings and that sketch.

15 MS. KAUTZ: I'm going to keep going, it is up
16 to you.

17 MR. SILVA: I think they agreed to all of the
18 other conditions.

19 MS. KAUTZ: One was not addressed. Put it
20 back up, sorry. The other comments not discussed,
21 the terrace on plan and site elevation that was
22 presented to staff in this proposal, it engages the
23 freestanding wind wall on the house on the far
24 right of that, we want that to remain freestanding
25 and not be engaged at all.

1 MS. RUSSO: I agree.

2 MR. MORALES: Victor Morales, do you need my
3 address?

4 MR. SILVA: Sure.

5 MR. MORALES: 3030 Bengal Drive, Naples,
6 Florida.

7 Yes, this was corrected a while back. I'm not
8 sure why. We kept the rubble wall away from the
9 wind wall, behind it to the west, behind it. I
10 think it is reflected in this elevation. Correct.
11 Here is the wind wall, which is what we showed on
12 the other plan.

13 MR. EHRENHAFT: On A-2, we see the proposed
14 drawing of the walkway, which is behind what is a
15 wall at the most southern exposure of the house
16 toward the street. You will have a wall which is
17 horizontal and the top surface of it will be for
18 horizontal, behind it, the walkway will slope that
19 you have access for wheelchair or people with
20 walkers making it more accessible. So the rubble
21 wall that you are discussing now is -- is north of
22 the sloped --

23 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

24 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

25 MS. KAUTZ: It is on one side of the ramp.

1 The one I'm talking about is the eastern-most edge
2 of the terrace.

3 MS. JOURDAIN: May I help you?

4 MR. PARSLEY: What is the elevation of the new
5 terrace?

6 MS. JOURDAIN: Plus-two.

7 MR. PARSLEY: I couldn't visualize from this,
8 the rubble wall is 26 -- I'm not crazy about
9 there's nothing linear in here anywhere else, now,
10 we have a walk coming in on an angle into a corner.
11 You don't like the rubble wall. I say take a big
12 step back, look at how you think up the grades, 1
13 to 20, don't make it a handicap ramp, but maybe
14 there's a way to come in straight.

15 MS. MORALES: The owners would like to propose
16 to drive and then you would have that curve.

17 MS. JOURDAIN: That is a drop-off.

18 MR. MORALES: It is a fairly sharp drop-off.

19 MR. PARSLEY: I think there's other ways to do
20 it. I understand what you are trying to do.

21 MR. SILVA: Is there anyone from the public
22 who wants to speak? How many folks are going to
23 speak?

24 MS. JOURDAIN: Four.

25 MR. SILVA: As you come up, give your name and

1 address for the record.

2 MRS. JOURDAIN: My name is Gladys Bravoli. My
3 name is Gladys Bravoli. My address is 8636
4 Northwest Second Street, Miami, Florida, 33126, and
5 I have MS. I've been in a wheelchair since 2001.
6 Previously, I was lucky enough to be fine, even
7 though my MS started when I was 16 and right after
8 I was lucky enough to play tennis, on a tennis team
9 for Lawrence Academy. I worked mostly. I
10 graduated in finance at FIU. I ended up, although,
11 I studied finances, I ended up doing taxes for
12 banks, for the bank, so then I went back to school,
13 and I completed enough courses to be able to sit
14 for the CPA exam, which I did in October or
15 November of 1987. At the end, my hands, they were
16 numb. I didn't know what was going on, throughout
17 all of this time, I was getting different things.

18 MS. RUSSO: We want to talk about the project,
19 the walkway, and the changes to the house.

20 MS. BRAVOLI: I do not know, sorry. Sorry, I
21 didn't get the drawing.

22 MS. JOURDAIN: Gladys is my cousin, that is my
23 sister, that is my other sister, and we are doing
24 this for this reason, for accessibility. The same
25 reason we were presenting the pergola with

1 expansion, which has been withdrawn, because it is
2 an ADA issue. We are going to talk about
3 accessibility in this house.

4 MS. SPINOSA: My name is Ileana Espinosa.
5 This is my sister, and this is my husband's cousin
6 and my daughter has Turrets Syndrome. She's in a
7 wheelchair. It would be great if it would be more
8 accessible, I appreciate how you want to keep
9 everything how it was, special, but we need access,
10 if possible, to my sister's house, and her
11 gatherings, and our family gatherings. That is
12 all.

13 Hello. My name is Erin Yanowitch. My address
14 is 910 South Greenway Drive in the Gables. Ray and
15 Gladys are my neighbors. I run by their house.
16 Regularly. I know the importance of beautifying
17 their house for house values. I also know the
18 story behind it. I know she has her niece, she has
19 a very large family, a lot of them are in
20 wheelchairs. They need that accessibility. She's
21 opening to improve the size of the house, getting
22 the precautions ready, so when she has the large
23 family gatherings, I think it is important. I
24 explained the story to my son, he had a difficult
25 time understanding that she could not do that for

1 her own family at her own house, I think it is a
2 consideration. It is important for the value of
3 the home, how it affects the neighborhood, as well,
4 thank you.

5 Good afternoon. I live at 1245 Milan, one
6 block away from Gladys and Ray's property, and I
7 look forward to these renovations. I think it is
8 going to be great for the property and for my
9 property values in there. I'm a fairly new
10 resident at this house on Milan, I grew up on the
11 900 block of Milan. I've seen this property for
12 years. I was at the Merrick House, I'm from there,
13 I have respect for the history of The Gables. I
14 think what Gladys is proposing will not only
15 enhance, but provide access and do a positive thing
16 for what is a beautiful and spectacular property
17 and provide the needs for her family and enhance
18 the neighborhood. Thank you.

19 MR. SILVA: Anyone else in the public that
20 wishes to speak? Seeing none, I will close the
21 public hearing.

22 Just so everybody is aware, accessibility is
23 sometimes a challenge on these historic residences.
24 We recognize that. Certainly none of us here want
25 to be a barrier here. We are just tasked that it

1 is appropriate. I don't think any of these
2 comments preclude you from building a ramp. None
3 of us have an issue with the ramp. The issues on
4 Ms. Kautz' report deal more with the aesthetics and
5 definitely not going to preclude the building the
6 ramp to make this residence accessible.

7 That being said, do we have any other
8 comments?

9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: The whole issue comes down to
10 the placement of the doors and the drawings you
11 have do not coincide with what you are suggesting.

12 Staff, Kara, is there a way for us to describe
13 what you think she can accept and go forward with
14 that, as opposed to coming back for another
15 hearing?

16 MS. JOURDAIN: We would like to have the
17 opening large enough to have handicap-accessible
18 doors. The minimum width for interior doors is 36
19 inches. I need a double door, 72 inches wide, and
20 put two concrete columns on either side. I need to
21 be able to do that. If I don't move the opening to
22 the right six or eight inches, I may not be able to
23 get a six-foot-wide door. That is the
24 accessibility issue, as opposed to just an
25 aesthetic one. That is why the proposal is for a

1 double door, 72 inches wide. So if I can get that
2 within the boundaries of what they are suggesting,
3 as long as I can have that.

4 MR. SILVA: A good compromise would be, we
5 move this with the staff conditions, and staff is
6 competent. If it is technically possible to comply
7 with the request, 72 inches, that may be --

8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Are you willing to accept
9 that?

10 MS. KRAUTZ: Yes, as long as the drawings are
11 modified with the dimensions, and to show what they
12 need to show, because right now, that can't be.

13 MR. PARSLEY: With the first intent working
14 with the inside existing frame as much as possible?

15 MR. EHRENHAFT: They would still have to go
16 before the BOA again?

17 MS. KAUTZ: If there's a site plan change, but
18 once you approve it with the condition, they do
19 away with the BOA the second time.

20 MR. EHRENHAFT: It will only come back to us
21 if you have difficulties in accommodating what
22 their intentions are?

23 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

24 MR. PARSLEY: One more suggestion to the
25 architect: If you do the walkway between the two

1 rubble walls, as soon as you hit that mouth, the
2 east mouth, where you eliminated the arc wall, I
3 would see, trying to get them to do elevations, you
4 might be able to run that straight out at a 25.

5 MR. MORALES: Exactly, no rubble wall.

6

7 MR. SUAREZ: I let the walk start right behind
8 the way wall, I agree. I'm sure if we get past
9 this point, we can work it out, so we can explore
10 the wall, what needs to be done in there.

11 MR. SILVA: Ready to make a motion?

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'll move to approve the
13 project with the conditions we've established. I
14 would like to be able to articulate what you just
15 said, so we know what the motion is. Your
16 description, again, of what you would do. They are
17 proposing something subject to --

18 MS. KAUTZ: Approving it.

19 MR. PARSLEY: The existing double windows that
20 are being converted to French doors work with the
21 inside edges of the window frames as first choice
22 and any modification beyond that would be for Ms.
23 Krautz' discretion.

24 MS. KAUTZ: Staff. Don't leave it up to me.

25 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I will second.

1 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Count the fact that the
2 modification is needed for a wheelchair access.

3 MS. KAUTZ: Of course, correct. Do any of the
4 walkway modifications --

5 MR. PARSLEY: I think you said it.

6 MS. KAUTZ: Would you include staff conditions
7 and a motion to defer the pergola at whatever comes
8 back?

9 MR. SILVA: We have a motion? We have a
10 second, as well.

11 THE CLERK: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

12 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

13 THE CLERK: Mr. Rodriguez?

14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

15 THE CLERK: Ms. Bache-Wiig?

16 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

17 THE CLERK: Mr. Parsley?

18 MR. PARSLEY: Yes.

19 THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?

20 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Mr. Silva?

22 MR. SILVA: Yes.

23 MS. SPAIN: We added a property that I would
24 like you to look at. If you could move to the next
25 PowerPoint, the next presentation.

1 MR. SILVA: 2710?

2 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

3 MR. SILVA: Case File COA (ST) 2011-104

4 Revised. An application for revision to a Standard
5 Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at
6 2710 Columbus Boulevard, a Local Historic Landmark,
7 legally described as Lots 6 and 7, Block 5 of Coral
8 Gables Section "D," as recorded in Plat Book 25
9 Page 74, Florida. The application requests design
10 approval for revisions to a previously approved
11 application. These revisions include the addition
12 of two doors and a window, the removal of muntins
13 on all windows, the location of an air-conditioning
14 unit, and the installation of new columns in place
15 of the historic columns on the front elevation.

16 MS. SPAIN: This is an ongoing issue for quite
17 some time. It may be placed on the City Commission
18 next Tuesday. I wanted it to come to you first.
19 The process would be, the normal process, it would
20 go to the Board of Architects, get an approval,
21 come here for revision to Certificate of
22 Appropriateness that was issued, then it would`
23 only come to the Commission if there was an appeal.

24 I'm just going to go through the slides and
25 explain to you what happened. This is the location

1 on Columbus (indicating). This is the way it
2 looked in the 1940s. This photo was take at the
3 time that it was designated in 1993. This photo,
4 also. This is from the Page of the Designation
5 Report showing that originally, it was a screened
6 porch on the right-hand side of the photograph,
7 enclosed with glass in the 1990 rehabilitation.
8 The screening was added to the center, that had
9 been added, removed in 1990 rehabilitation, that
10 restored the original appearance. Again, this was
11 taken for the designation report. These turned
12 wooden piers were dividing the porch opening with
13 glass behind this when it was designated in 1993,
14 wrought iron and plate glass installed in 1990
15 behind the column. When the owner first came to
16 us, we had a long discussion with him in the
17 office. We went to the property to explain the
18 process and go over with him what he needed to do,
19 which was obviously to keep these columns, if at
20 all possible, because they are wood. They had
21 fallen into disrepair. So if he had repaired them,
22 that would be fine. If, for some reason, they had
23 to be replaced, they would have to go back looking
24 identical to what it was. So he called for an
25 inspection, final inspection, having done the work.

1 And these were the columns that are there. And not
2 only were the profile wrong, but it also stuck out
3 beyond the stucco, which is just a problem being
4 wood, once you get in, they were not painted on the
5 sides, so we had a problem with this. This shows
6 that the original photograph that we took just
7 before the work began compared to the new columns.

8 MR. PARSLEY: Is that wood or stucco?

9 MR. SILVA: They installed windows and?

10 MS. SPAIN: And put plywood. That shows a
11 side that hadn't been painted.

12 MR. EHRENHAFT: This is not the front
13 elevation?

14 MS. SPAIN: It is. In addition there were
15 doors and windows that were supposed to have high
16 profile muntins on them installed. This was taken
17 at the time of the inspection, as you can see, they
18 are crooked and they are one-dimensional. They
19 were just put over one another. In fact, they
20 didn't meet the edges and some of them were on the
21 floor. For instance, this window, if you can see
22 the muntin pattern, on the left is what was there,
23 on the right are the drawings that were approved.
24 This shows the elevation of the pool and the bottom
25 is on the drawings, the top is what was actually

1 installed. So, we talked to the owner, explained
2 to him what he needed to do, he called for another
3 inspection November 5, 2013. So now we have a
4 window that had these muntins been in the right
5 position, but one fell, it was on the sill. And
6 the columns had been painted. We failed both of
7 those inspections. In addition to that, there were
8 other things that were done to the house, there was
9 two doors and a window, that was added to the scope
10 of work that were not on the drawings, that were
11 obviously new. Can you go back to the PowerPoint?
12 So, here is a site plan. There's an
13 air-conditioning condensing unit in the front.
14 Behind the wall, there's an AC, a condensing unit
15 without a permit.

16 MR. SILVA: There is a wall?

17 MS. SPAIN: Front wall. Look at the
18 photographs. This shows the two doors added on
19 either side of the logia, and the window, which is
20 a different configuration of what it should be.
21 This drawing shows the windows and doors added to
22 the scope of work. What they are requesting is to
23 eliminate the muntins, the owner said that he -- he
24 had people, or he called twelve different companies
25 to get the proper type of muntins, profiles, just

1 added to these doors. He said it was impossible to
2 do. He was willing to do it. He was unable to get
3 anyone to come out, not the company that did the
4 doors or any other company would come out. He's
5 requesting that we just take off the muntins.
6 Also, he's requesting the condensing unit to be in
7 the front. It is actually surrounded by
8 landscaping and there's a wall there. So I believe
9 that is the extent of the application. I'm not
10 sure it will be discussed at the Commission level,
11 I wanted you to weigh in on it. Don Hackman is
12 here. He was just given this duty yesterday. So,
13 he has some images that he can go over with you.
14 The owner was not able to make it.

15 MR. SILVA: Do you have a picture of the AC?

16 MS. SPAIN: They would like you to approve the
17 wood columns. My recommendation is that they need
18 to get wood columns that look like the originals.
19 They are sticking that far out from the stucco,
20 they are going to rot away.

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Can I ask a question?

22 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Why is this going to the
24 Commission tomorrow?

25 MS. SPAIN: That is a good question. I don't

1 know the answer. It was going to be on the
2 Commission's agenda. I believe one of the
3 commissioners is putting it on, because they want
4 him to be able to be approved, because it has been
5 so long. It was scheduled as a discussion item, no
6 action, I know my understanding is it will continue
7 as a discussion or be removed.

8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Our job today is to make a
9 recommendation?

10 MS. SPAIN: Yes, you are a Board with final
11 authority, so my view is the business coming before
12 you, and you can approve it or not, then there's an
13 appeal process, that is how a property owner gets
14 onto the City Commissioner agenda.

15 MR. HACKMAN: What is on the commissioner
16 agenda, is not, strictly, just a discussion, the
17 Commission could take pretty much no action.

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Even if it is discussed,
19 someone makes a motion, they don't have the
20 authority to grant the motion?

21 MR. HACKMAN: Depends on the extent of the
22 motion.

23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: What if it is the motion to
24 approve the request of the owner?

25 MR. PARSLEY: Grandfathered and existing

1 conditions.

2 MS. BACHE-WIIG: It is not going through the
3 rank protocol.

4 MR. MENENDEZ: The Commission is depending on
5 us.

6 MS. SPAIN: I'm the one that put it on. I
7 wanted you all to see what happened and not have it
8 discussed at a commission meeting, and you are not
9 aware.

10 MR. SILVA: Has there been any process since
11 2013, was that the last time you had seen or heard
12 of this project?

13 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

14 MR. PARSLEY: What is the AC doing in the
15 front yard? What part of the house is it?

16 MS. KAUTZ: Center.

17 MR. PARSLEY: Zoning?

18 MS. SPAIN: It is a zoning issue.

19 MS. KAUTZ: It was for the enclosed sun room,
20 split system, and they didn't --

21 MR. MENENDEZ: Why hadn't Code Enforcement
22 done anything about this?

23 MS. SPAIN: I don't have the answer to this
24 question. Why don't we focus on the windows.

25 MR. SILVA: I was going there next.

1 Don, I know you got this five minutes ago,
2 have you done any research, whether it is
3 technically feasible to apply the correct muntins?

4 MR. HACKMAN: Don Hackman, architect here in
5 Coral Gables. I'm not familiar with the muntins
6 there before. I think there was a suggestion to
7 remove all of them, and leave it flush.

8 MR. SILVA: If the decision is leave the ones
9 that are there versus none, I think it is pretty
10 clear, the right decision is no muntins.

11 MR. MENENDEZ: Or do it right.

12 MS. SPAIN: The easiest thing is to call the
13 window company that did the doors and ask them to
14 do muntins. He said he did that, but they were not
15 able to do the high profile muntins. They are
16 probably not used to them at all, because no one
17 would put those on.

18 MR. HACKMAN: It is a flat bar.

19 MS. SPAIN: There was not an intersection of
20 the muntins on it.

21 MR. SILVA: The original drawings called for
22 raised.

23 MS. SPAIN: Now, we stamp them.

24 MR. SILVA: That is not a question.

25 MS. SPAIN: It is.

1 MR. HACKMAN: I don't know what was there
2 originally.

3 MR. PARSLEY: If we say it is okay, there's no
4 such thing as high-profile muntins to be applied.
5 I believe there are.

6 MS. SPAIN: There are. There is a home on
7 Alhambra that has multiple types of windows in
8 there, that ICGI and one series is much flatter and
9 one is a high profile. That owner called and asked
10 to have the higher profile on the lower grade of
11 window, and they were told they would not provide
12 them with those muntins. There's an issue with
13 getting muntins applied. I think if the windows
14 were a company that, you know, had muntins.

15 MR. EHRENHAFT: Are there muntins throughout
16 the windows in the house?

17 MS. SPAIN: No.

18 MR. EHRENHAFT: What is the profile?

19 MS. SPAIN: I think there's one door that was
20 done right.

21 MS. KAUTZ: They have muntins.

22 MS. SPAIN: There's none without muntins. Are
23 there any windows in the house that he did not
24 change? That have muntins? No. I want this out of
25 my life. This has been an ongoing problem, endless

1 conversations about these windows, so if you are
2 comfortable not having muntins, I don't think it
3 sets a precedent. Nobody is going to go through
4 this, like this, and try to put them on. Right
5 now, we have a stamp that says, "High-Profile
6 Muntins," put it on every window pattern.

7 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Does the interior --

8 MR. HACKMAN: It is around the pool?

9 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Interior doors?

11 MS. SPAIN: Yes. The majority of them are in
12 the back of the house. There's very few windows,
13 that the area to the right was a porch anyway, they
14 have -- only the windows under the logia, which are
15 not as visible.

16 MR. HACKMAN: This is the original, correct?

17 MS. SPAIN: We are not asking for muntins on
18 that location, anyway.

19 MS. SPAIN: Go back to the PowerPoint.

20 MR. SILVA: If the original drawings call for
21 raised muntins, that is one thing. If they did
22 not, seems like they did not, from what I'm
23 hearing.

24 MS. SPAIN: I checked the plans, I don't
25 believe they did.

1 MR. SILVA: Then they tried to comply. They
2 tried to do the muntins, either shotty workmanship
3 or materials or whatever, they fell off. It is a
4 different place, then if they flouted the whole
5 process. I think it is a different situation than
6 what we typically see on the after effect thing.

7 MS. SPAIN: Look at the front of this house,
8 you are only talking about the one under the
9 arches. Those doors would be visible without
10 muntins.

11 MR. SILVA: I do think that they should do
12 something.

13 MS. SPAIN: The columns have to go. That is
14 the only part of it that really bothers me,
15 obviously the windows bother me, too. Took that
16 into consideration initially, but if we can get the
17 columns right, I think it would make a huge
18 difference in the front facade.

19 MR. PARSLEY: Those are just applied, as well.
20 You just pop them off, shave them off, put them
21 back.

22 MR. EHRENHAFT: The profile is different.

23 MR. MENENDEZ: It came before the Board in the
24 past.

25 MS. SPAIN: No, because windows are handled

1 administratively.

2 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.

3 MS. SPAIN: We spent a long time with this
4 owner. We went out to the property, walked the
5 property with him, explained what he needed to do.

6 MR. SILVA: Spend some more time with him on
7 those?

8 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

9 MR. SILVA: My thought is to kind of approve
10 the removal of the muntins and require them to do
11 something.

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Can we approve something when
13 there's nothing before us to be approved?

14 MS. SPAIN: This is a standard Certificate of
15 Appropriateness that we typically handle
16 administratively, so if you approve the ability of
17 the owner to remove the muntins.

18 MR. MENENDEZ: It will not set a precedent.

19 MS. SPAIN: I don't believe it is, because in
20 the future, they will be stamped "high-profile
21 muntins," you know.

22 MR. PARSLEY: The AC is a separate issue.

23 MS. SPAIN: Zoning, if we handle that, if it
24 has to come back for a variance, you can't see that
25 from the front, so I need to talk to zoning.

1 MR. HACKMAN: The air-conditioning is a split
2 system, enclosed area?

3 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

4 MR. HACKMAN: The compressor is in your plans,
5 inside corner, it is this wide and that high
6 (indicating). It is not typical.

7 MS. SPAIN: It is not one of the large ones.

8 MR. HACKMAN: Very small for that one room.
9 It is hidden by landscaping. You don't see it in
10 the photograph. In the plans you can see where it
11 is located. On the inside corner of --

12 MS. SPAIN: I'm fine with the air-conditioner
13 where it was. It bothered me it didn't have a
14 permit.

15 MR. HACKMAN: It is in the front elevation,
16 but in the L shape.

17 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

18 MR. EHRENHAFT: One for clarification, I'm
19 still confused. We talked about two doors, two
20 windows. But it sounds like from the description
21 here, they want to go throughout the entirety of
22 the house and any window with muntins on it, strip
23 them off.

24 MS. SPAIN: Yes, that is correct. All of the
25 windows are new now. They all have the really

1 horrible flat muntins.

2 MR. MENENDEZ: Was he required to put muntins
3 up before?

4 MS. SPAIN: He was required, but we didn't
5 have the stamp we now have, that says high-profile
6 muntins.

7 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Do the owners want to remove
8 them?

9 MS. SPAIN: They do. They have not been able
10 to at this point, they just want them removed.

11 MR. MENENDEZ: Definitely looks better without
12 them.

13 MS. SPAIN: They are horrible the way they
14 look now. That is my recommendation, to remove
15 them from all of the windows, focus on the columns.

16 MR. PARSLEY: Qualified Certificate of
17 Appropriateness?

18 MS. SPAIN: Yes, I don't think so. We give a
19 standard Certificate of Appropriateness.

20 MR. SILVA: With the condition they come back.

21 MS. SPAIN: Come back with columns.

22 It would be a revision already to an issued
23 Certificate of Appropriateness.

24 MR. EHRENHAFT: I would add at any such time,
25 all of the windows in the house were replaced for

1 some reason, then they need to come back with the
2 original muntins that would match that was original
3 to the house.

4 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

5 MR. SILVA: No one here from the public.
6 Close the public hearing. Anyone ready to make a
7 motion? I think we talked this out.

8 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I make a motion to approve
9 the item before us based on the comments from staff
10 to allow the owners who remove the muntins, and
11 then we'll revisit the columns at a later time.

12 MR. MENENDEZ: I second.

13 MR. SILVA: Motion has a second.

14 MR. HACKMAN: Includes the revision of the two
15 doors and the windows?

16 MS. BACHE-WIIG: All of the windows.

17 MS. SPAIN: The revision of the two doors and
18 the window that he added to the scope of work.

19 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes, correct.

20 THE CLERK: Mr. Rodriguez?

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

22 THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?

23 MR. MENDEZENDEZ: Yes.

24 THE CLERK: Ms. Bache-Wiig?

25 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

1 THE CLERK: Mr. Silva?
2 MR. SILVA: Yes.
3 MR. PARSLEY: Motion to adjourn.
4 MR. EHRENHAFT: Second.
5 MR. SILVA: All in favor?
6 (Aye.)
7 So say all.
8 Adjourned.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

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

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF BROWARD

I, Melissa Kallas, Florida Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Florida at large, that I was authorized to and did report said meeting in stenotype; and that the foregoing pages inclusive, are a true and correct transcription of my shorthand notes of said meeting.

I further certify that said meeting was taken at the time and place hereinabove set forth and that the taking of said meeting was commenced and completed as hereinabove set out.

I further certify that I am not an attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel of party connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.

The foregoing certification of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or direction of the certifying reporter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 9th day of April, 2019.


Melissa Kallas

