

CITY OF CORAL GABLES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

_____ /

City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way
Coral Gables, Florida 33134
4:00 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.
September 20, 2018

The above-entitled cause came on for a
Historic Preservation Board meeting.

1 APPEARANCES:

2

Members of the board:

3 Venny Torre, Chairperson

Alicia Bache-Wiig

4 Bruce Ehrenhaft

John Fullerton

5 Albert Menendez

Alejandro Silva

6 Robert Parsley

Raul Rodriguez

7 Janice Thompson

8

Dona Spain, Historic Preservation Officer.

9 Miriam Ramos, City Attorney

Kara Kautz, Asst. Historic Preservation Officer.

10 Elizabeth Guin, Asst. Historic Preservation Officer.

Yesenia Diaz, Administrative Assistant.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon. Welcome to the
2 regularly scheduled meeting of the City of Coral
3 Gables Historic Preservation Board.

4 We are residents of Coral Gables and are
5 charged with the preservation, the protection of
6 historic and architecturally worthy buildings,
7 structures, sites, neighborhoods and artifacts
8 which impart a distinct historic heritage of the
9 city.

10 The board is comprised of nine members,
11 seven of whom are appointed by the commission,
12 one by the city manager, and the ninth selected
13 by the board and confirmed by the commission.
14 Five members of the board constitute a quorum.
15 Five affirmative votes are necessary for the
16 adoption of any motion.

17 Any person who acts as a lobbyist pursuant
18 to the City of Coral Gables Ordinance of 2006-11
19 must register with the city clerk prior to
20 engaging in lobbying activities or presentations
21 before city staff, boards, committees and/or the
22 city commission.

23 A copy of the ordinance is available in
24 the office of the city clerk. Failure to
25 register and provide proof of registration shall

1 prohibit your ability to present to the historic
2 preservation board applications under
3 consideration this afternoon.

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

24 Presentations made to this board are
25 subject to the city's False Claims Ordinance

1 Chapter 39, the City of Coral Gables city code.

2 I now official call the City of Coral
3 Gables historic preservation board meeting of
4 September 20, 2018 to order. The time is 4:07.
5 Present to my left is Jan Thompson, Raul
6 Rodriguez, Mr. Robert Parsley, Alejandro Silva.
7 To my right, Mr. Albert Menendez, John
8 Fullerton, Bruce Ehrenhaft, and Miss Alicia
9 Bache-Wiig.

10 Next item on the agenda is the approval of
11 the minutes for the meeting held on August 16,
12 2018. Are there any changes or corrections?

13 MR. EHRENHAFT: No.

14 CHAIRMAN: If not, can I please have a
15 motion for approval?

16 MR. MENENDEZ: I vote for approval.

17 MR. EHRENHAFT: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN: All those in favor please say
19 "aye."

20 (The motion was approved.)

21 CHAIRMAN: Notice regarding ex parte
22 communications says that, "Please be advised
23 that this board is a quasi-judicial board and
24 that the items on the agenda are quasi-judicial
25 in nature, which requires board members to

1 disclose all ex parte communications. An ex
2 parte communication is defined as any contact,
3 communication, conversation, correspondence,
4 memorandum or other verbal communication that
5 takes place outside a public hearing between a
6 member of the public and a member of the
7 quasi-judicial board regarding matters to be
8 heard by the quasi-judicial board.

9 If one has made any contact with the board
10 member and the issue comes before the board, the
11 member must state on the record the existence of
12 the ex parte communication, the party who
13 originated the communication, whether the
14 communication will affect the board member's
15 ability to impartially consider the evidence to
16 be presented regarding the matter.

17 Does any member of the board have such
18 communication to disclose at this time?

19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I don't have any ex parte
20 communication to disclose, but I want to
21 disclose for the record that one of the
22 properties is on my block. I am familiar with
23 the property, but I don't see how that would
24 affect my decision on this board.

25 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Anyone in

1 the audience today who is going to speak -- I'm
2 sorry, deferrals first.

3 Any items to be differed?

4 MS. SPAIN: No.

5 CHAIRMAN: Anyone in the audience going to
6 speak today, please rise and we're going to
7 swear you in.

8 THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand.

9 (All parties were duly sworn by the
10 clerk.)

11 CHAIRMAN: We are going to move the case
12 file for the 117 Florida Avenue forward.

13 MS. SPAIN: Yes. I'd like the Special
14 Certificate of Appropriateness for 117 Florida
15 Avenue to be taken first.

16 CHAIRMAN: We are going to do that item.
17 That is case file COA SP 2018-014. The item is
18 an application for the issuance of a Special
19 Certificate of Appropriateness for the property
20 at 117 Florida Avenue, a contributing resource
21 within the Macfarlane Homestead subdivision,
22 historic district. This is legally described as
23 Lot 5, block 2-A, Macfarlane homestead.
24 According to the Plat thereof, it is recorded in
25 Plat Book 5, page 81 of the public records of

1 Miami-Dade County.

2 This applicant is requesting approval for
3 the demolition and also the reconstruction of
4 the existing residence. Variances have been
5 requested from Article 5, Section 5-606 and
6 Article 5, Section 5-607. This is to allow for
7 a wood frame construction.

8 MS. SPAIN: Before Kara gets up here, I'd
9 like to read the e-mail that we received today
10 into the record. This is from Cheryl Gold.

11 It says, "Miss Spain, as a Coral Gables
12 resident, long-time historic preservation
13 activist and member of the Villagers, I am
14 writing to convey my serious concern about a
15 process that's resulting in the ongoing
16 demolition of historic properties."

17 "The application being heard today is for
18 117 Florida Avenue, an important example of
19 architectural significance, wooden structure;
20 but, more importantly, of black history, as well
21 as George Merrick's role in Macfarlane homes and
22 historic district, of which this property is a
23 contributing resource."

24 "Questions that must be answered: Why
25 after 15 years of deteriorating and unlawful

1 conditions is there a sudden rush to approve
2 demolition? Why were fines of 1.8 million
3 dollars never collected?"

4 "With a lien against the property, why
5 doesn't the City take the possession and explore
6 other options for its use, i.e., a historic
7 museum?"

8 "Why in this and most cases is the public
9 unable to access staff reports until the very
10 last minute?"

11 "I realize that writing today will have
12 little to no bearing on the outcome of today's
13 hearing. It is regrettable that an important
14 piece of Miami's black history has been
15 permitted to fall into such deplorable
16 condition. While replication is better than
17 not, it should never have come to this."

18 "In moving forward, I support a
19 re-evaluation of the process of how historic
20 properties are designated and how they are
21 protected after designation. Hopefully, under
22 the interim city manager, Mr. Iglesias, such a
23 review can take place."

24 MS. KAUTZ: This is the location map.
25 It's in Macfarlane homestead, a subdivision of

1 the historic district. It was designated by the
2 city in 1989.

3 In 1994, district was placed on the
4 national register, started our only national
5 register of the historic district. The photo on
6 the top of the screen is shortly before that
7 designation occurred.

8 There are no current records for this
9 house, which is common in that area. But we do
10 believe it was built prior to 1924. This is
11 what the property looks like today.

12 A very brief history, some of it you heard
13 in the e-mail. The current owners purchased the
14 residence at a foreclosure in 2001. In 2002,
15 the residence was declared an unsafe structure
16 by the building official. In 2008, a lien was
17 placed on the property and totals about 1.8
18 million dollars today.

19 You have a structural report prepared by
20 Nestor Cueto, Cueto Engineering, that was
21 submitted to the City in April of 2018, which
22 prompted the City to declare the structure
23 unsafe.

24 This is a request for a complete
25 demolition and reconstruction of the existing

1 house as it exists currently, with the exception
2 of the front porch being reopened as it would in
3 the 1920s, 1930s.

4 There are two variances that are being
5 requested as part of this application. And if
6 we were to allow for the reconstruction, it
7 would have to be a wood frame construction and
8 wood as an exterior cladding material, which
9 aren't allowed in the City. Since they are
10 doing a reconstruction, we wanted materials to
11 be authentic as well.

12 That being said, the architect is here and
13 can walk you through the plans briefly.

14 MR. MEDELLIN: Good afternoon. My name is
15 William Medellin. I am the architect for the
16 reconstruction of 117 Florida Avenue. And I'd
17 like to distribute one additional sheet that was
18 not included in the original package.

19 This particular sheet shows detail number
20 five, which showed the elevation of the front
21 entrance of the property, which was hidden by
22 the front porch.

23 First, I'd like to show the photograph
24 documentation of the existing conditions. The
25 south elevation, as you can see, the house is a

1 one-story, single family home built in the early
2 1920s and with slab siding throughout the house,
3 with a front porch, which was originally opened.
4 And it was later on enclosed with metal louvers.

5 The picture shows the existing condition
6 as well. Most of the windows -- the original
7 windows are gone. There is one particular
8 window that is still there that is a wood frame,
9 single hang window, might be original. But it's
10 in such a deterioration stage, that we would not
11 be able to keep it.

12 This is the north elevation, which is the
13 back of the property, which, to me, it seems it
14 was not originally in the house when it was
15 first built. My feeling is that the property
16 didn't have a bathroom. It was probably an
17 outhouse. So this add-on was built later on, to
18 add the bathroom and a small closet on the other
19 side.

20 This is the west elevation again, showing
21 the opposite side of the side elevation. All
22 the windows have been boarded up for many years.
23 You can see the deterioration of the siding.

24 This view shows you the condition of the
25 -- this is a typical condition of the tie beam,

1 which is totally rotted. Joists have collapsed
2 completely.

3 This is another corner showing -- the
4 house sits in isolated concrete piers. The
5 front porch has vertical three-and-a-half beam
6 and board siding. Again, you can see it's
7 completely rotted.

8 This series of photos will show you the
9 interior of the house. This is the view of the
10 porch, which originally had an open porch; the
11 ceiling showing the exposed rafters, and it was
12 later on covered by plywood.

13 This is a view of the interior of the
14 house looking north from the living room towards
15 the dining room, which showed some of the
16 original historic elements. There is thermal
17 damage throughout the house. It's just beyond
18 repair.

19 This is a view of the existing window
20 openings at the dining room area that shows the
21 non-original, single-hung metal frame windows
22 that were later installed.

23 This is a view of the bedroom number one
24 showing in the drawings that the floor has
25 completely collapsed. Believe it or not, there

1 is some siding there. You can see the yellow
2 siding that could be restored and kept because
3 it's not in such bad condition. But it would be
4 too much labor-intensive to be able to restore
5 it.

6 This is a view of bedroom, I believe,
7 three. You can see the window on the left, that
8 actually used to be an exterior window. When
9 the add-on on the north side of the property was
10 added, it became an interior window. So that
11 leads me to believe the add-on was not original
12 to the historic structure.

13 This is a view of the existing kitchen.
14 Again, the termite damage, there's mold
15 throughout, and it's beyond repair. This is a
16 view of the ceiling which shows the two-by-four
17 exposed rafters. It's completely deteriorated.

18 This is a view, the interior view of the
19 bathroom. And the photo on the left shows the
20 original exterior side before it was built. And
21 later on it was added -- converted into a
22 bathroom.

23 Now, this is the proposed floor plans,
24 slides of what we are going to do, if
25 constructed. The house will be completely

1 demolished. On the side you will notice that
2 the house encroaches into the setback about
3 seven feet. Current setback is about 15 feet.
4 We are going to reconstruct the house at the
5 existing location, so we can keep the existing
6 relation of all the homes throughout the block
7 which line up with each other.

8 This slide shows the proposed floor plan.
9 The original layout of the floor plan has the
10 bedrooms on the right side, and the dining room
11 and the living room area is on the left side.
12 We are keeping the same organization, but we are
13 re-doing the floor plan. Instead of being a
14 three-bedroom, one-bathroom residence, we are
15 making it into a two-bedroom, two-bathroom
16 residence. We are flipping the bathroom on the
17 right side to be able to add it to the master
18 bedroom.

19 One minor deviation from the original
20 layout, the lean-on in the back originally is
21 right, flush with the corner on the left side,
22 which makes a detail of -- the groove detail
23 very awkward. What I am proposing is centering
24 the lean-on to be able to have a better
25 condition for the roof joints.

1 This elevation shows the front and back
2 elevation with the front porch open, as
3 originally it was. We put it back with the wood
4 siding, five-inch-wide, concrete isolated piers
5 with crawl space ventilation.

6 East and west elevation show all the
7 windows in the same location. They will be all
8 wood -- I'm sorry -- metal framing, single hang.
9 But there will be details that shows it will --
10 there will be detail in a way that the frame
11 recesses back as it originally was.

12 The current roof is a metal tin roof. The
13 owner wants to -- I don't think we'd be able to
14 restore it, reuse it. It's in terrible
15 condition. But we would be able to install a
16 new tin roof that would match as much as
17 possible to the existing.

18 New plumbing, mechanical and electrical
19 systems will be in place. And the house will be
20 just like the original. We did a full
21 documentation of photographic, measured
22 drawings. So we have all the leads and
23 willingness of the owner and the City to
24 reconstruct it as close as possible as the
25 original design.

1 Any questions?

2 MR. FULLERTON: The new interior layout,
3 the windows remain the same, though?

4 MR. MEDELLIN: The interiors -- the
5 windows will be all the same, the same location.
6 There is only one window that will be blocked,
7 and that will be the window on the -- on the
8 east elevation of the lean-on, there is an
9 existing opening there, but there is no window.
10 So I am blocking that opening to be able to have
11 the layout of the master bathroom, to have the
12 vanity right on the other side of the window.
13 But all the window openings will be in the same
14 location and the same sizes.

15 CHAIRMAN: Is this structure an exact
16 replica or are you trying to match today's
17 building code?

18 MR. MEDELLIN: This is an exact replica.

19 CHAIRMAN: How is the building code being
20 handled?

21 MR. MEDELLIN: The building code will
22 be -- we'll be having a wood frame construction.
23 Instead of two-by-four wood studs, we'll be
24 having two-by-six wood studs, probably 12 inches
25 in center to meet --

1 CHAIRMAN: How about, for example, the
2 rafters should be two-by-four?

3 MR. MEDELLIN: Rafters, no, we are not
4 going to have rafters. We're going to have roof
5 trusses. The way we can do it is -- to be able
6 to achieve the exposed rafter of the overhang,
7 the heel of the truss will be exposed, and it
8 will be a pressure-treated wood.

9 CHAIRMAN: Is there anything from the
10 code, new code to try to meet today's code that
11 will be apparently obvious -- visibly out there
12 when you redo this?

13 MR. MEDELLIN: No.

14 CHAIRMAN: You start doing the railing,
15 you start doing, again, connections, details,
16 strapping --

17 MR. MEDELLIN: Not at all.

18 CHAIRMAN: You think all that could be
19 buried?

20 MR. MEDELLIN: Correct.

21 The only issue that I was thinking about
22 that we might have to meet current codes is the
23 height of the front porch railing, which is only
24 about 28 inches high at the moment. But because
25 of the height between the grade and the finish

1 for elevation, that is not more than 30 inches,
2 we are able to keep it at the existing --

3 CHAIRMAN: I am going to suggest if there
4 is anything that would be obviously visible or
5 higher, for example, a railing, that you would
6 ask this board to give you the leeway to go
7 around it, to the best of your ability, so it
8 does continue to be the most authentic structure
9 possible.

10 You may not find it today. But as you go
11 through your working drawings, if that comes up,
12 we need to have a way to give you some latitude.

13 MR. MEDELLIN: I don't envision anything.
14 The only concern that I had was to be able to
15 get an NOA number for the metal shingle roofs.
16 But there's a company called Bedridge, I
17 believe, that has a local rep that I have been
18 in contact with, that he assures me it will be
19 able to meet building codes.

20 Again, the only difference that I see is
21 the depth of the existing -- of the exterior
22 walls, which will have to be added. Now we have
23 two-by-fours, about 18 inches in center.

24 Now, again, structurally, we need to add
25 plywood sheeting in front on the exterior side

1 of the studs to be able to meet the lateral load
2 calculations. On top of the sheeting, we put --

3 CHAIRMAN: And from the window up, is that
4 a situation you are going to be able to pull
5 this down into these piers or small footings --

6 MR. MEDELLIN: All the members will be
7 strapped, from piers and tie beams to the top
8 layer of the roof trusses.

9 MR. SILVA: Just to be clear, when Venny
10 was talking about the code, he's talking about
11 the zoning code. We can't give relief from the
12 building code. We have to meet that.

13 CHAIRMAN: I don't know. That's the
14 question. For example, a two-by-four gets a
15 strap. And now you have these two straps
16 showing on the side, as opposed to maybe
17 drilling through the middle and you don't see
18 the straps. If you're doing a two-by-four on
19 the outside, and you have to strap it down,
20 that's obviously going to be visible.

21 I understand that needs to be there. But
22 how do you accomplish that without these visible
23 straps and hurricane clips and anchors and all
24 these things that -- I have seen these
25 structures. They're very simplistic. There's

1 very little places to hide these things.

2 MR. MEDELLIN: For example, the strapping
3 of the roof trusses to the top plate, that will
4 be done with the clips on the inside, from the
5 bottom rafter to the top plate. On the
6 exterior, if required, it also will be done from
7 the top rafter of the truss to the exterior side
8 of the stud. And the plate will be blocked by
9 the plywood sheet in front of it. So you will
10 not see it at all.

11 I am currently working on 129 Florida
12 Avenue and 110 Oak Avenue restorations, which
13 are similar in construction. And we met all the
14 code requirements from the building department.
15 And 129 Florida Avenue is about 95 percent
16 completed. And if you walk by --

17 CHAIRMAN: I am just asking because you
18 know better on how these are going to take
19 place. Some of these overhangs and porches just
20 are so simplistic, to get those things to
21 work --

22 MS. SPAIN: Those two properties that Mr.
23 Medellin just mentioned, those are the two
24 properties that our department is restoring with
25 the County funds, affordable housing funds.

1 MR. SILVA: Can I ask a question? On
2 those properties, you came to us and asked
3 permission to use cement board siding.

4 MS. SPAIN: We did.

5 MR. SILVA: This is getting -- seems to be
6 getting regular wood siding.

7 MS. SPAIN: It's getting regular wood.

8 MR. SILVA: What is the reason --

9 MS. SPAIN: I think the difference is
10 that's really a pilot program. We have never
11 done that before. And before, we started
12 applying that to all the different homes in
13 there with the wood. It really is more
14 appropriate to use wood. We need to see how
15 that reacts.

16 MR. MENENDEZ: Is this still being done by
17 the City as well?

18 MS. SPAIN: No.

19 MR. MENENDEZ: Is there any part of this
20 building that can be saved?

21 MR. MEDELLIN: Not at all.

22 MR. MENENDEZ: Nothing at all?

23 MR. MEDELLIN: Not at all.

24 MR. EHRENHAFT: May I ask another question
25 about the cosmetics?

1 So in lieu of trusses, you're going to
2 have --

3 MR. MEDELLIN: Sorry?

4 MR. EHRENHAFT: In lieu of trusses, you're
5 going to have prefabricated --

6 MR. MEDELLIN: We are going to have
7 prefabricated trusses for the roof.

8 MR. EHRENHAFT: I am sorry. I misspoke.
9 Instead of rafters, they're going to be using --
10 you said they were going to use pressure treated
11 materials?

12 MR. MEDELLIN: Yes.

13 MR. EHRENHAFT: Will those tolerate being
14 painted on the ends and retain the paint?

15 MR. MEDELLIN: Correct.

16 MR. EHRENHAFT: Because the original --

17 MR. MEDELLIN: Yes.

18 MR. EHRENHAFT: -- rafters would have had
19 painted ends.

20 MR. MEDELLIN: Yes. Visually, you will
21 not notice the difference. There's actually a
22 truss system.

23 MS. KAUTZ: Actually, I did want to note
24 that on the east elevation, I don't know if you
25 all can see it, the bedrooms, two of the windows

1 are casement faux, single egress -- we talked
2 about the zoning code. The current size of the
3 windows can't meet egress.

4 MR. MEDELLIN: One of the windows of --
5 each bedroom will be a casement window to be
6 able to meet the egress code. But in the
7 elevation, you will see a fake muntin in between
8 to be able to mimic the single elevation style.

9 MR. SILVA: I have a question about how we
10 landed here, I guess. In general, we try to
11 avoid reconstruction where possible. I
12 understand we are at this point now. I
13 understand. We're here. And being here, this
14 is the best solution moving forward. Right?
15 Kind of a true as possible reconstruction.

16 Can you kind of walk us through how we got
17 here, how we can avoid getting here maybe in the
18 future, and what's happening with that lien, and
19 who was behind this reconstruction, I guess?

20 MS. KAUTZ: I actually can't do that for
21 you.

22 MR. MEDELLIN: I came on board about two
23 years ago. I think that the history was that
24 the owner bought the property in 2002, I
25 believe.

1 MS. SPAIN: My view, this is classic
2 demolition by neglect. I have Mr. Ortiz who
3 is -- what's your title? You are the code
4 enforcement division manager. So he is better
5 able to answer those questions.

6 MR. ORTIZ: Good afternoon, everyone. My
7 name is William Ortiz. I'm the code enforcement
8 division manager for the City of Coral Gables.

9 What was the question?

10 CHAIRMAN: How we got here? How did we
11 get here?

12 MR. ORTIZ: So this property was cited
13 back on August 2007 for demolition by neglect.
14 Then on September 19, 2007, the fine for the
15 citation was capped because it was converted
16 into a code enforcement board violation. From
17 that moment on, there was a separate running
18 fine of \$500 per day, as per the board order.

19 And then, now, in August of 2017, August
20 29, 2017, it was cited again, now with the
21 assistance of outside counsel. He's outside
22 counsel for the City Attorney's Office that
23 assists us with code enforcement cases.

24 This case was brought before the code
25 enforcement board. There were additional code

1 sections that were cited with this case. And
2 now we have an additional recorded lien. But,
3 essentially, there was a recorded lien back in
4 2007 for the issues.

5 At that time, obviously, the recorded lien
6 was in place to make sure the property owner
7 deals with whatever issues and he can't just
8 sell the property. Unfortunately, there wasn't
9 really a policy or there isn't a policy for any
10 additional action, or there wasn't at that time.
11 There isn't just yet, but we do have outside
12 counsel that is now offering additional layers
13 of enforcement, if you will, to proceed with
14 additional actions against the property.

15 CHAIRMAN: The lien was issued in 2017,
16 correct?

17 MR. ORTIZ: The original was in '07.

18 CHAIRMAN: That was the first lien the
19 City was able to put on the property? That's
20 '07?

21 MR. ORTIZ: Correct.

22 CHAIRMAN: That's how come we got up to
23 1.8 million?

24 MR. ORTIZ: It's a little over 2 million,
25 actually.

1 CHAIRMAN: That's how you get to the
2 number, correct? You're talking 11 years of
3 neglect.

4 So why couldn't the City foreclose on this
5 property in 2008, 2009? Or why did they choose
6 not to foreclose?

7 MR. ORTIZ: It hasn't been the City's
8 policy to foreclose on properties.

9 CHAIRMAN: So any property that has
10 violations or it starts accumulating, the City
11 does not have a way to take that lien and
12 actually cash on it? Is that true?

13 MR. ORTIZ: So currently, with the
14 assistance of outside counsel we do have
15 additional layers of enforcement that go beyond
16 our standard code enforcement process by way of
17 suing the property, injunctions, and other
18 actions that are beyond the quasi-judicial board
19 authority.

20 CHAIRMAN: Did Mr. Lean not recently get
21 something changed where that was available to
22 the City? There she is.

23 MS. RAMOS: Good afternoon, everyone.
24 Miriam Ramos, City Attorney.

25 We do have an abandoned property ordinance

1 that my predecessor had put in place. It's been
2 extremely successful. But the focus of that
3 ordinance was during the financial downturn when
4 you had a lot of houses that were being
5 foreclosed on. They were bank owned. Different
6 banks weren't keeping up with their end of the
7 bargain.

8 So we went after a lot of these banks,
9 made them either do what they needed to do or
10 have serious consequences. And it worked out
11 very well. It hasn't been applied in this type
12 of context. We're moving into a new era.

13 Most of those types of properties have
14 been cleaned up. So we're adding other types of
15 properties to that abandoned property list, even
16 though some of them aren't actually abandoned.
17 But we're putting them kind of on that strict
18 enforcement list, for lack of a better term.
19 And our outside counsel is keeping a close eye
20 on them.

21 But how that abandoned property ordinance
22 intended for banks is going to apply to regular
23 property owners that aren't banks or personal
24 property owners is something we are still
25 developing. And we're seeing it happen in cases

1 like this. So it has to be addressed. The
2 reason it hasn't been addressed is for the
3 reasons I just explained.

4 Now, Alex has it on his list. Mr.
5 Valenzuela has it on his list as of last year,
6 and, obviously, we're taking more serious
7 action. But that just hasn't been done in the
8 past.

9 CHAIRMAN: If this had been, for example,
10 a very important piece of property, maybe Miss
11 Macfarlane's house, there wouldn't have been
12 anything to have been done to protect the house
13 from going into disrepair legally?

14 MS. RAMOS: Unless the City made a policy
15 decision to foreclose.

16 CHAIRMAN: Even under extreme cases, that
17 wouldn't have been permitted, right?

18 MS. RAMOS: Well, it's available. It
19 hasn't been the policy. The question is: Is
20 there a policy shift to start to move towards
21 foreclosing on a home that is privately owned
22 versus owned by a bank?

23 MR. FULLERTON: Seems to me that when the
24 fine, the lien, becomes greater than the value
25 of the property, if the City just says, I am

1 sorry, we are taking it --

2 MS. RAMOS: What ends up happening, in
3 reality, is in the cases where they do bring it
4 into compliance, then that amount is
5 significantly reduced in order to allow the
6 person to buy the property and to get somebody
7 in here that's going to actually fix it.

8 MR. SILVA: That's my concern. Because,
9 to me, looking at just the numbers and the
10 enormous lien on the property, it doesn't make
11 financial sense to build anything on it because
12 you're never going recoup your money.

13 CHAIRMAN: Let me speak to that. I have
14 been involved with two properties that have that
15 problem, and Bruce has probably also been
16 involved with that.

17 The house has a negative value. It has a
18 negative value. So to get into the house, you
19 have to go under. You're going to fix it for
20 more than it's worth when it's finished. So
21 nobody takes it. The City of Miami was giving
22 it to us for free. Have it. Nobody will take
23 it.

24 If the City takes over a property that is
25 negative, because it's trying to save it, then

1 somebody is going to have to spend money to fix
2 it because the regular folks outside will not do
3 it. They're just not interested. It's a
4 negative. Then you get into the
5 not-for-profits. Can you help us make this
6 happen, that whole process goes forward.

7 This is a slippery slope there because
8 historic properties that have this kind of
9 issue, nobody wants them. They're just too much
10 of a headache. It becomes an issue. This one
11 is that perfect example.

12 MS. RAMOS: It is.

13 MR. FULLERTON: It seems to me there is no
14 point in the lien if you're not going to enforce
15 it.

16 MS. SPAIN: Honestly, the whole idea about
17 mitigating fines down if it comes into
18 compliance with these types of properties, he's
19 never going to be in compliance because it's
20 gone. The historic fabric is gone.

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: What is the status of the
22 person who is about to invest in this property?
23 What title do they have? Are they just buying a
24 lien?

25 MS. RAMOS: What would probably happen and

1 what's happened in other properties -- this
2 property is kind of the perfect storm of
3 everything that has gone wrong. What normally
4 happens is the purchaser would come here and we
5 would negotiate -- in any other property.

6 Forget for a moment it's historic. They would
7 come here and negotiate the amount of the lien
8 down --

9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Has that happened in this
10 case?

11 MS. RAMOS: No.

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: This person is investing
13 this money without having resolved that issue?

14 MS. SPAIN: I am sorry. It's the existing
15 owner that's doing the reconstruction. This
16 isn't a --

17 MS. RAMOS: This isn't a new buyer.

18 MS. SPAIN: In this case, this is not a
19 new buyer.

20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: But he is investing this
21 money knowing he has a lien for 2 million
22 dollars?

23 MS. SPAIN: That's the requirement of the
24 historic preservation ordinance.

25 MS. RAMOS: And I fully expect that if he

1 were to restore the house, he would probably
2 come back and try to mitigate the amount of the
3 lien.

4 MR. EHRENHAFT: Mr. Chairman, can I
5 interject another comment?

6 There's a gap, a six-year gap that we
7 haven't even talked about. The first lien in
8 '07 came six years after the property was
9 designated, and it had already been in
10 foreclosure. So it sat for six years with
11 nobody doing anything.

12 If the City has designated it or marked it
13 as an unsafe structure, okay, then -- I
14 understand that staff may be overwhelmed with
15 lots of things. But when you've got a property
16 that's been designated contributing in a
17 historic district, perhaps we should ask
18 questions about tightening the focus so that a
19 property like this can't even -- in the future
20 can't even start to go down that road.

21 Because I would imagine that in '01 the
22 house might have been in salvageable condition,
23 and perhaps even all the way through 2007 if
24 there had been code enforcement.

25 CHAIRMAN: The question is: Does it

1 require special conditions so that not every
2 time you have a right to do it, be it a special
3 housing, special conditions or, for example,
4 this is one of a kind -- I'm not sure to give
5 you the broad spectrum. Any house that has
6 violations, you guys can foreclose on.

7 Maybe it becomes where it's tied to,
8 again, a very special house or a house that is
9 one of a kind or a house that's in jeopardy of
10 being one of a district, so that we can make a
11 motion for that to be -- again, this is a legal
12 question for you guys.

13 MS. RAMOS: I can tell you that the
14 interim city manager and myself have had many
15 conversations. And we talked to Dona about
16 having a better process. We need to have a
17 better process so that this doesn't happen
18 again.

19 I think that we all admit that this
20 probably should not have gotten to where it got.
21 It did. How do we stop it from happening again?
22 We need to come together. And if you want us to
23 bring something to you so that you can recommend
24 it as a policy decision for the commission,
25 we're happy to do that.

1 MR. FULLERTON: I know of a case right
2 next door to my house. The gentleman who owned
3 the house knew that it was going downhill, and
4 it was going to be falling down by itself. And
5 he elected not to do anything until he got good
6 and ready to do it. The fines were building up
7 and so forth. I don't know where they got to.

8 But you have to have some coordination --
9 cooperation with the owner. Either that, or
10 take it away from him so you can do the stuff
11 yourself. So our ordinance needs to be a lot
12 stronger.

13 CHAIRMAN: I also fear somebody could
14 start to do a little repair, and I have seen
15 this before, start to appease the situation.
16 Then they take -- three or four years later, all
17 they're doing is adding a couple of nails.

18 MS. RAMOS: And that does happen a lot.

19 MR. FULLERTON: That's part of the code
20 enforcement. You watch the progress. You see
21 if it's an ongoing situation, and you make
22 judgment calls. You go along on a short-term
23 basis and give him six months and look at it.

24 CHAIRMAN: John, they still don't have the
25 teeth to foreclose. You have to figure out how

1 to get that.

2 MR. FULLERTON: You need to get that
3 somehow.

4 MS. RAMOS: We have to get -- the legal
5 requirements are there. The legal requirements
6 is not the right word. The ability to do it is
7 there. The issue is it has been -- from the top
8 down, it has not been the policy of the City for
9 many, many years to foreclose. We may be moving
10 in that direction. But it's something that
11 needs to be discussed.

12 CHAIRMAN: That also involves, again, what
13 does the City do with property, takes it?

14 MS. RAMOS: And that's the bigger
15 question.

16 CHAIRMAN: But then, again, that goes to
17 special conditions where the City says: This is
18 house we want to save. We're going to have to
19 figure out how to save it. We're going to have
20 to spend money on saving it. We're going to
21 have legal fees to save it. Are we willing to
22 save it?

23 And then the board has to say: We feel
24 that -- this could happen. It's going to cost
25 us \$200,000 to save a house, or whatever it's

1 going to cost. And then that decision comes
2 before us. But how do we get that flag to be
3 raised, is the question?

4 MS. RAMOS: I think we need to put
5 together -- which is what the interim city
6 manager and I are wanting to do with Code as
7 well as Historic -- put together a plan and
8 policy that might include an ordinance change.
9 It may not, depending on what we need; take it
10 to the commission for some direction, and then
11 proceed from there.

12 But there has to be commissioners that
13 want to be able to -- or that they're willing
14 spend money. Because that's exactly right. We
15 foreclose on the property. Now it's ours. We
16 got to do something with it.

17 CHAIRMAN: Again, you may not know some
18 house is special, and then it's too late, and
19 then you have forgotten it. So it's a matter of
20 raising the flag and then saying forget it. It
21 gives you time to react. If you don't have a
22 process or ways of planning -- it could be
23 MacFarlane's house. It could be something
24 important, and then, all of a sudden, it's gone.
25 And we didn't have time to act.

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Let me ask you this. The
2 owners basically abandoned the house. The
3 house, it has to be torn down. It's going to be
4 rebuilt.

5 What status does this house have after
6 it's rebuilt? Does it have a designation? Does
7 this happen again to the same property because
8 the owner let the original property go? Is it
9 going to happen again? How are we going to
10 safeguard this?

11 MS. SPAIN: So this property would now
12 become a non-contributing property because it
13 doesn't have any historic fabric left. There is
14 not a tax break available to the property owner,
15 where there would have been if he had been able
16 to salvage the house and restore it.

17 MR. SILVA: This is like something we can
18 talk about. Because this is in a historic
19 district, it would come before us. It becomes a
20 non-contributing, right?

21 MS. SPAIN: Right.

22 MR. SILVA: So it would still come before
23 us. But if this same situation happens to a
24 house designated outside the historic district,
25 and now we're saying that it is not going to be

1 designated when the reconstruction is
2 completed -- is that the case?

3 MS. SPAIN: No. I don't think that we
4 would be -- we haven't really discussed that.
5 But if it's a replication of a historically
6 significant house, it hasn't been designated, I
7 don't believe that we would be able to designate
8 it.

9 MR. SILVA: Then it loses architecture,
10 and somebody could come the next week and tear
11 that down.

12 MS. SPAIN: But if it's designated and
13 it's demolished, they are required by the
14 preservation ordinance to rebuild it.

15 MR. SILVA: But after rebuilding is done,
16 there is no further protection after the
17 reconstruction is done. Maybe that's something
18 we can address looking at this.

19 MS. SPAIN: I understand what you're
20 saying. That's a good point.

21 CHAIRMAN: This district, specifically,
22 MacFarlane district, are there a lot of them
23 left of the original homestead? What are we
24 looking at? Do we need to take action to
25 protect more of them? What is the whole --

1 MS. RAMOS: I have already had Mr.
2 Valenzuela make a list for us of all of them and
3 their status. So that's a place to start.
4 Because this is a particular district that we
5 are very concerned about.

6 CHAIRMAN: Excellent.

7 MS. SPAIN: I am happy to share that with
8 you.

9 CHAIRMAN: If you guys can hopefully come
10 back in six months from now and say this is how
11 we can proceed to fix this problem, that would
12 be great.

13 MR. FULLERTON: Are they all included in
14 the national register?

15 MS. SPAIN: Yes, this entire district is
16 on the national register.

17 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

18 MS. SPAIN: I think you have someone who
19 would like to speak on this.

20 CHAIRMAN: Let's do that next.

21 Is there anybody who would like to speak
22 on this matter?

23 MS. SPAIN: Go ahead.

24 MR. PRIME: Good afternoon. My name is
25 Carl Leon Prime. I live at 209 Florida Avenue.

1 I am a lifelong citizen and resident of the
2 MacFarlane area. I am a member of the citizens
3 crime watch board.

4 My grandfather was a street sweeper for
5 City of Coral Gables. He raised a son and
6 distinguished himself as a teacher and a
7 community leader. And I remember his taking me
8 to the meetings and showing me exactly why we
9 need to preserve our neighborhood and why it's
10 so unique.

11 I come here today to express my deep
12 concern about what is happening to elements
13 within our historically-designated neighborhood.
14 The property at 117 Florida Avenue has been
15 allowed to fall into disrepair, and has now been
16 slated for demolition and replacement.

17 Preserving our historic structures is of
18 major importance. Growing up, I played in and
19 around that property. I have fond memories of
20 it. Presently, the avenues that are available
21 to resolve this problem are limited. In a
22 better world, I would say we should have the
23 whole thing rebuilt exactly as it is to preserve
24 its historical elements. However, if only a
25 replacement or a replica is available and it can

1 add to our historic designation, I am in favor
2 of it.

3 It's incumbent upon this board to make
4 sure that this doesn't happen again, especially
5 for the unique structures that we have in our
6 area. I happen to live in one of them. I grew
7 up in it. And this city these needs to remember
8 its historic roots so that our future can be
9 built upon it. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN: Can I have name again? Your
11 name, sir?

12 MR. PRIME: My name is Carl Leon Prime.

13 CHAIRMAN: Prime. Just so I can refer
14 back --

15 MS. THOMPSON: I went to elementary school
16 with you.

17 CHAIRMAN: Mr. Prime, I thank you for your
18 comments. I think that they're very important
19 comments, and I share the same sentiments as
20 you. And I think this board wholeheartedly
21 agrees with you. And if you could help us do
22 what you're suggesting, please, any time come
23 here and raise a flag. Talk to us. Make
24 whatever you feel is happening be known to
25 staff, and be active in that regard so we can

1 help you and you can help us do what you're
2 suggesting. Thank you very much.

3 To that end, we need to step up and figure
4 out what else we can do to continue to protect
5 the MacFarlane district and the surrounding
6 area. If it means we need to discuss capital
7 budgets with the commission as to moneys for
8 this, that may be the case.

9 I don't know the status of the whole area.
10 I know I drive by Grand Avenue, and I see some
11 houses that look like they're not in such great
12 shape. I don't drive around too much. The ones
13 that I see already look like they're in pretty
14 bad shape.

15 So I stand to say I think we need to go
16 ahead and determine that this is a call to
17 action for us, and we need to involve staff and
18 the legal department to do anything possible to,
19 I guess, import to the commission that this
20 needs to be attended to. And whether it's
21 dollars that need to be raised or set aside,
22 then that should happen. We need to keep this
23 on the front burner and have continual watch of
24 this matter.

25 MS. CARBONELL: Thank you. Good

1 afternoon, everyone. I'm here representing
2 HPCG. My name is Karelia M. Carbonell. I am
3 president of the organization. I have a board
4 member next to me.

5 We're here because, as we have heard, this
6 is the big red flag. We are calling it the road
7 to demolition. This is not the first property.
8 318 Viscaya was demolished in the same way. It
9 was demolition by neglect. Neighbors were up in
10 arms, basically, from one day to the next where
11 the house was just gone. And it was historic.
12 It had all the code violations. It had all
13 kinds of things, and it was still gone.

14 This particular home, there is no excuse.
15 17 years of neglect. The owner bought it in
16 '01, knowing it was historic. That in itself is
17 something to think about. The other is the
18 chances that were given to continue to protect
19 the property.

20 As far as the lien, it really makes no
21 sense, and I am happy to hear that the way
22 residents see it and Preservation see it is
23 there is really no conversation between Code and
24 Historic. At this point, the process is there
25 is a missing link there. Because if a property

1 is historic, it's gotten to the point where it's
2 got liens on it. Where is that step to take
3 control?

4 Maybe this property can no longer be
5 saved. I hope that you think about some way to
6 save it. The liens in itself, I mean, the City
7 can just take it and do something with it.

8 The MacFarlane district is the only
9 national historic district. And Chairman Torre
10 is correct. This house could have been as
11 significant as the original homestead. We don't
12 have that information. Maybe we could get it.

13 But as far as that's concerned, I think
14 that placing -- demolishing the property and
15 then rebuilding, really makes no sense, at least
16 to the historic factor. Because it's not going
17 to be historic. It's really not going to play
18 any role in the contributing factor.

19 And at this point, I can't speak for
20 financial costs. But it makes no sense as far
21 as -- and what the City -- if there is a lien on
22 the property, then do something with that and
23 actually negotiate with the owner to keep the
24 property.

25 As far as from our preservation

1 standpoint, the rebuilding of the property,
2 because it's historic and it's going to be
3 demolished and now it's going to be rebuilt, and
4 then that's all in the historic code, makes no
5 sense. You either keep the property, do
6 something with it as far as historic. I mean,
7 protect it. If it's demolished --

8 MS. SPAIN: I can address that. The
9 reason we put that in the code is -- with the
10 previous city attorney is because we really do
11 not want to report bad behavior. If you own a
12 historic property and you allow it to fall into
13 disrepair, you should not be able to build your
14 dream house on that property. You shouldn't be
15 able in this case to do a CBS block home. We
16 need to rebuild it.

17 And that's an incentive. For those people
18 out there that own homes that are similar to
19 this, that they're allowing to fall into
20 disrepair, they should repair those homes.
21 Otherwise, they're not going to get any
22 advantage they have to the historic preservation
23 ordinance. And there is a lot of advantages.
24 This man could have had a tax break.

25 That's why we put it in there. I really

1 believe that portion should stay.

2 MS. CARBONELL: I agree with that. I know
3 an it's incentive. Basically, it kind of sort
4 of outweighs the benefit of it being historic.

5 There is another two homes that are maybe
6 going this route. It's 1220 Ortega Avenue, and
7 it's also 1101 Astoria, which has a roof caved
8 in -- 1109 Astoria. It's for sale. The roof is
9 caved in. That's a property, you know, prime
10 for demolition. I don't know if it's
11 historically designated yet, but it is a
12 historic --

13 MR. FULLERTON: Astoria is in the
14 district, isn't it?

15 MS. CARBONELL: It is in the district.

16 So to finish, what we are asking, as an
17 organization and as residents, we want to make
18 sure -- I know it was discussed with the City
19 attorney -- is having a policy of not letting
20 this happen again. And I think it's in the
21 code, but it hasn't been acted on.

22 CHAIRMAN: It's an economic issue at the
23 end of the day. So it's not just take it over.
24 Because, like I said, the City has to invest not
25 only in the foreclosure, but then keeping the

1 house, fixing the house, trying to sell the
2 house. That's a long, complicated process.

3 MR. FULLERTON: But if the City is willing
4 to negotiate a 1.8 or 2-million-dollar fine, a
5 lien against a piece of the property, and let
6 the owner off with something less that would
7 allow him to have value in the property and do
8 something with it, I think that negates the
9 whole reason to put a lien on the property.
10 Just say: That's the lien. You pay it off or
11 go away.

12 CHAIRMAN: But, John, what happens is the
13 City does take the house. Then the City
14 inherits this house. Tomorrow this house is the
15 city's. Now it becomes an issue. Again, what
16 do you do with the house?

17 MS. SPAIN: You restore it.

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Restore it.

19 MS. SPAIN: Not this one.

20 CHAIRMAN: It's a 300,
21 400,000-thousand-dollar restoration. You got it
22 for free. And now the City has to be the
23 investor. You can't tear it down. It has its
24 own problem in its hand. I can't tear down this
25 house --

1 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You think the City is
2 willing to do that?

3 CHAIRMAN: That's why we don't take over
4 the houses. That's why they end up where they
5 end up, because nobody wants to take the house.

6 MS. CARBONELL: Maybe it should be once
7 there is a lien and it goes to a certain amount,
8 it's gone. You no longer --

9 MR. FULLERTON: Once it's over 2 million
10 dollars, there is nothing you could do with that
11 property. It makes economic sense. You have
12 got to let the lien fit the value of the house.

13 CHAIRMAN: Compliance.

14 MS. SPAIN: I am here just to talk to you
15 about 1109 Astoria. That is a historic property
16 that came to the board for an addition. The
17 contractor went way beyond the scope of the
18 permit -- I'm sorry this is Astoria. 1109
19 Almeria. Thank you.

20 So that is now a code enforcement case.
21 We're dealing with that also.

22 MS. CARBONELL: Thank you. And I have
23 said my two cents.

24 MR. GILLIS: Brett Gillis, 915 Ferdinand
25 Street. I'm a member of the Villagers and

1 Historic Preservation Association of Coral
2 Gables.

3 So Karelia covered most of the issues. I
4 thought I would put out there -- I think if I
5 showed all of you two weeks ago those photos,
6 would you think this was in Coral Gables? It's
7 very alarming that it's gotten to this
8 condition. It's not unique. This didn't happen
9 overnight.

10 I have a list here of properties. We were
11 discussing 717 Florida Avenue, which would
12 probably be demolished soon, 318 Viscaya Avenue,
13 Frank Wyatt Woods design. It's probably not
14 going to be rebuilt in the exact replica of what
15 was there. Even if it is a replica, it's not
16 going to be the historic structure.

17 1013 Castille and 1109 Almeria were
18 illegal demolitions. Today we found out about
19 1109 Astoria. This is just after one week of
20 research. I could probably do more research and
21 come up with more properties. 1220 Ortega was
22 also brought up next door.

23 We have a problem in this city where,
24 apparently, the rules we have in place aren't
25 strong enough to prevent this from happening. I

1 think if people were really -- the residents
2 were truly in fear of what would happen to
3 them -- not in fear, but if the penalties were
4 there, this wouldn't be happening. I can
5 understand if it's an older resident or somebody
6 that has financial issues, that's one thing.
7 But in the one case of 717 Florida Avenue,
8 that's a non-homesteaded property. It was
9 bought as an investment.

10 I just ask the board to please consider
11 all of this and try to make a positive motion to
12 get this to stop happening. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. Anyone else?

14 MR. FULLERTON: Is that 1013 Castille?

15 MR. GILLIS: 1013 Castille, yes.

16 CHAIRMAN: Do you have any suggestions how
17 do we work this forward as a discussion item for
18 us with you? Are you guys going to think it
19 through and come back and suggest some things?
20 How do we keep this ball rolling?

21 MS. SPAIN: There's a meeting scheduled
22 with staff and the City Attorney's Office and
23 code enforcement. That meeting has already been
24 scheduled. So we'll come back with you with a
25 report.

1 CHAIRMAN: Let's make sure we keep on
2 this.

3 Anyone else?

4 MR. EHRENHAFT: Can I ask her one more
5 question? So getting to the point where you
6 have got a lien, is it possible for IT to
7 generate reports that would come across your
8 desk, Kara's or Elizabeth's, to monitor when
9 something is not -- I understand you get an
10 unsafe structure or just because there is a
11 broken window or something. But when something
12 is in a code status that's waiving a big flag or
13 red flag --

14 MS. SPAIN: That's what we need to discuss
15 with staff. I have already had a brief
16 discussion with Peter Iglesias about that and
17 changing the code enforcement policies. It
18 really needs to start with code enforcement.

19 I am now being sent code enforcement
20 agendas. And I have attended the code
21 enforcement hearings on these properties, and I
22 will continue to do that. But it starts with
23 code enforcement because they have to catch the
24 property early enough for us to be able to save
25 it.

1 MS. THOMPSON: I wanted to mention, too, I
2 was looking -- when I was looking at the floor
3 plan of this house, the floor plan is
4 reminiscent of the New England camps, and George
5 Merrick was from New England. So that's why I
6 thought that's why they built these houses like
7 this. And that to me was historic. That's my
8 interpretation.

9 I don't understand in the City of Coral
10 Gables, as you are talking about code
11 enforcements and stuff, I don't understand how a
12 house could get into this condition in Coral
13 Gables.

14 CHAIRMAN: I'm going to close the public
15 hearing. Any more discussion here?

16 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Are we so far down the
17 road that there is no way of saving this
18 structure? Is it to that point?

19 MS. SPAIN: Did we give them the
20 structural report?

21 MS. THOMPSON: Yeah.

22 MS. SPAIN: Yeah, I believe so.

23 CHAIRMAN: The public hearing is closed.
24 Any further discussion, motion?

25 MR. SILVA: Just two quick technical

1 questions on the house. The house is on
2 concrete pilasters. There is a note on the
3 reconstruction drawing saying that there is
4 no -- the concrete wall has a stucco finish, but
5 it's drawn like a screen on the bottom. What is
6 the intent --

7 MR. MEDELLIN: Could you repeat the
8 question again?

9 MR. SILVA: What's the intent on the crawl
10 space on the reconstruction?

11 MR. MEDELLIN: The crawl space is concrete
12 piers, isolated concrete piers, with lattice
13 enclosure, with screened --

14 MR. SILVA: It may be a typo on the
15 drawings. I just want to make sure that was the
16 intent, that there is a lattice covering here,
17 not a concrete wall.

18 And then, secondly, you said that there
19 was an encroachment on the setback. Is that
20 going to require a variance as well?

21 MS. SPAIN: No.

22 MR. FULLERTON: We're granting a
23 variance but --

24 MS. SPAIN: That was the City attorney's
25 determination.

1 CHAIRMAN: I am going to follow up with
2 another question on this type of house. Let's
3 see if we can get anybody to decide how we want
4 to move here.

5 Are we okay with this? Can we get a
6 motion to approve? Anybody?

7 MS. THOMPSON: A motion to approve what?

8 CHAIRMAN: The structure as being designed
9 to match the existing structure replica.

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: As recommended by staff.

11 CHAIRMAN: As recommended by staff.

12 MR. SILVA: At this point, I will make a
13 motion to approve the reconstruction as
14 recommended by staff.

15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I will second the motion.

16 CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

17 Roll call.

18 THE CLERK: Mr. Fullerton?

19 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

20 THE CLERK: Miss Bache-Wiig?

21 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

22 THE CLERK: Mr. Parsley?

23 MR. PARSLEY: Yes.

24 THE CLERK: Mr. Silva?

25 MR. SILVA: Yes.

1 THE CLERK: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

2 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

3 THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?

4 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

5 THE CLERK: Mr. Rodriguez?

6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

7 THE CLERK: Ms. Thompson?

8 MS. THOMPSON: Can you please repeat the
9 motion? I am sorry. I can't hear. The thing
10 doesn't work either.

11 MR. SILVA: The motion was to approve the
12 reconstruction of the house as recommended by
13 staff.

14 MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Yes.

15 THE CLERK: Mr. Torre?

16 CHAIRMAN: Yes.

17 MR. MEDELLIN: Just for purposes of
18 clarification, the staff recommendations
19 included the granting of two additional
20 variances, not the setback variances, as
21 previously discussed? Those are part of your
22 approval?

23 MS. SPAIN: Typically, we ask that that be
24 a separate motion.

25 CHAIRMAN: You want a separate motion?

1 MR. SILVA: Each one separately?

2 MS. KAUTZ: Unless there is a discussion
3 about one, you do both together.

4 MR. SILVA: I move to grant the variances
5 to allow a wood frame construction and all
6 exterior walls in the building, as per staff
7 report. Also, I move to grant the variance to
8 permit wood facing on the exterior structure, as
9 per staff report.

10 MR. PARSLEY: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

12 Roll call.

13 THE CLERK: Miss Bache-Wiig?

14 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

15 THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?

16 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

17 THE CLERK: Mr. Parsley?

18 MR. PARSLEY: Yes.

19 THE CLERK: Mr. Silva?

20 MR. SILVA: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

22 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

23 THE CLERK: Mr. Rodriguez?

24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

25 THE CLERK: Miss Thompson?

1 MS. THOMPSON: No.

2 THE CLERK: Mr Fullerton?

3 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

4 THE CLERK: Mr. Torre?

5 CHAIRMAN: Yes. As much as we don't like
6 the replica versus the original -- we agree on
7 that. However, in this area where there is a
8 lot of lots, empty lots, some houses do show up
9 here once in a while. They're nice. They try
10 to match this style. Still, this would be a
11 better solution than those, that you could get
12 something that was more of a replica, something
13 more authentic.

14 Is there a way to incentivize the
15 construction of those houses that would come
16 forward to be authentic, the more authentic
17 house than a block, that tries to be, but it's
18 not -- I prefer to have this, if I could get it
19 on a lot, than not that.

20 Is there a way to get city tax-free
21 dollars, maybe five years of tax free, maybe
22 something that gives that person an incentive to
23 do that?

24 MS. SPAIN: We will have to discuss that
25 as part of the discussion.

1 MR. EHRENHAFT: That would not make sense
2 if it's the original owner.

3 CHAIRMAN: Empty lots. We are not trying
4 to give it as an incentive to tear down the
5 house.

6 MS. SPAIN: That's interesting.

7 MS. THOMPSON: May I ask, historically
8 speaking because -- I am sorry. I just had this
9 question on my mind. I am a third generation
10 Gable-Lite. And I know that that section of the
11 City for a lot of people was like -- they didn't
12 want it to be in Coral Gables because it was not
13 a very nice part of town.

14 However, it's a lovely designation of an
15 historic district. To me, I have driven down
16 those streets -- am I saying something wrong?

17 MS. SPAIN: No, not at all.

18 The designation of this area came from the
19 residents. It was the residents that wanted to
20 save their neighborhoods. It's really a true
21 neighborhood. Everyone knows everybody else.

22 MS. THOMPSON: The people that live there
23 love it. They're very proud of that
24 neighborhood. As a historic preservation board
25 member, I would like to see more emphasis, more

1 attention given to this neighborhood. It really
2 needs it.

3 CHAIRMAN: I think that's what we're going
4 to try to get out of that meeting today.

5 MS. THOMPSON: I'm probably restating
6 this. I can't hear because they didn't give me
7 a thing that works.

8 CHAIRMAN: I am going to check on that.
9 Thank you very much. Thank you.

10 The first item today that we skipped over,
11 that was case file LHD-2018-11. It's COA (SP)
12 2018-011. Items for consideration are a local
13 historic designation of the property of 1552
14 Murcia Avenue.

15 It's legally described as Lots 3 and 4,
16 Block 61, Coral Gables Country Club section part
17 four, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded
18 in Plat Book 10, page 57 of the public records
19 of Miami-Dade County.

20 The applicant is also requesting the
21 issuance of an accelerated Special Certificate
22 of Appropriateness and design approval for
23 additions and alterations to the residence and
24 site work.

25 MS. SPAIN: The property owner of this

1 property is here. They need to leave at 5:30.

2 CHAIRMAN: I can move quick.

3 MS. SPAIN: He needs to leave by 5:30.

4 MS. GUIN: We can move quick.

5 Here's a historic photo of the property in
6 question. It's located on the south side of
7 Murcia Avenue, between Bird Road and Alhambra
8 Circle.

9 The street is closed access to Bird Road,
10 and the property dimensions are 100 by 125.

11 This is a short street. It's closed to Bird
12 Road. There are about seven properties, seven
13 single-family homes, which were built in the
14 20s.

15 The application was requested by the
16 owner. So in accordance with Article 3, section
17 3-1103, the Coral Gables zoning code, the
18 criteria for designation of historic landmarks
19 must have historical, cultural and architectural
20 significance. The designation of the property
21 must meet one criteria.

22 This property is eligible as a local
23 historical landmark based on four of the
24 criteria. Specifically, historical, cultural
25 significance, exemplifies the historical,

1 cultural, political economic or social trends of
2 the community, and also based on architectural
3 significance. It portrays an environment in an
4 era of history characterized by one or more
5 distinctive architectural style. It embodies
6 those distinguishing characteristics of an
7 architectural style of a period or method of
8 construction.

9 It contains elements of design, details,
10 materials or craftsmanship of outstanding
11 quality, or which represent a significant
12 innovation or adaptation of the South Florida
13 environment.

14 It's a single-family residence. It was
15 permitted in 1925. The architect is H. George
16 Fink. The original owner and the builder was
17 H.W. Nicholes.

18 The home was built during the first phase
19 of development in the City, is indicative of the
20 type and architecture that was the founding
21 premise of Coral Gables. It was chosen by
22 George Merrick as the type of architecture that
23 harmonized best with South Florida's climate and
24 life-style. When Merrick began the plan
25 developing of Coral Gables, he envisioned a

1 cohesively designed Mediterranean city.

2 The property is located in Coral Gables
3 Country Club section, part four, which was
4 platted in December, 1924. Just to the west of
5 the Biltmore Golf Course, you see the red arrow
6 points to the location of the property.

7 On this map, the blue blocks indicate the
8 location of single-family homes that were built
9 pre 1935. And as we talked about before, you
10 see the larger and the density around the
11 Granada golf course and north of that.

12 When the Biltmore Golf Course and the
13 Biltmore Hotel were planned in 1924, we began to
14 see more interest and more development beginning
15 to happen in south of Coral Way. The Biltmore
16 Golf course opened in January 1925. We see that
17 the area is beginning to be platted and planned.

18 The country club part three, which is to
19 the east, just east of the Biltmore Golf course
20 was platted in November of '24. Where this
21 property was, that was part three, part four in
22 December of 1924, which is where this property
23 is. And then the Coconut Grove section, which
24 was just east of Le Jeune was platted in March
25 of 1925.

1 Now, why that's significant has to do with
2 the original owner and builder of this property,
3 H.W. Nicholes. As we know, when Merrick was
4 planning the City he went out and was looking to
5 recruit nationally acclaimed architects and
6 builders, financiers.

7 And in June of 1925, Miami News Article
8 announces a partnership with Nicholes
9 Construction, who was a nationally acclaimed
10 construction firm based in Atlanta. The
11 partnership that Nicholes brought to the City
12 would finance Lindsay Hopkins. At that point
13 they had committed to building 500 homes in
14 Coral Gables.

15 At the time of the article it said that 13
16 houses were under construction. 15 more had
17 been permitted, and an additional 15 would be
18 started within two weeks.

19 What we see then, most of the homes that
20 they were planning is all of those in these
21 three areas, just south of Coral Way, around the
22 Biltmore Golf course. The permit records we
23 have are prior to '26. We don't have a complete
24 set. Mr. Merrick had made this partnership with
25 Nicholes to begin development of this part of

1 the City.

2 What occurred after 1926, after the
3 hurricane, we don't see any new permits by
4 Nicholes. So he evidently packed up and went
5 back to Atlanta at that point. But we have
6 identified about 150 homes that were built as a
7 result of this partnership. And the property --

8 MR. FULLERTON: Were they all Fink houses?

9 MS. GUIN: They weren't all Fink houses.
10 Most of the very early ones were those that were
11 permitted in March of '25. And those that were
12 permitted in September of '25, which is one of
13 these houses, was part of that Fink partnership.

14 A little bit later in '25, in early '26,
15 you see Nicholes be the designer as well as the
16 builder. He also partnered with Frank Woods.
17 But a lot of the early homes was a Fink/Nicholes
18 partnership.

19 Now, Nicholes, we talked about before,
20 based in Atlanta, he was responsible for
21 designing a number of 20th century suburbs,
22 predominantly around Atlanta, some of which were
23 on the national register.

24 You may remember we have had a
25 Nicholes/Fink partnership, some recent

1 designation, 315 Romano, 325 Romano, Coconut
2 Grove section. 222 Romano, 234 Viscaya are
3 other examples of that partnership. These were
4 the early permitted ones of March of '25.

5 In September '25, we begin to see more,
6 including the property we're talking about
7 today, its neighbor at 1556, its neighbor.

8 As I said, after the hurricane of '26 we
9 don't see new permits, especially in relation to
10 this partnership. You can tell by this aerial
11 photo, construction in this area pretty much
12 stalled after the hurricane. So what was done
13 with the initial partnership is what we see on
14 the ground well into the 1950s. And then we
15 begin to see this area begin to get built out.

16 So this home was built in the
17 Mediterranean revival style. And it is very
18 indicative -- it has a lot of the hallmark
19 features that we see of this style. The
20 asymmetrical massing and detail basically
21 involve textured stucco, projecting bays,
22 projecting screened porch, distinctive chimney,
23 recessed casement windows, protruding sills.

24 The most distinctive character defining
25 feature on this house has to do with this roof

1 line. We can see it very clearly. This is the
2 front facade from the original permit drawings.
3 And see with that hipped roof of the two-story,
4 you have that half gable towards the back here
5 -- well, you see that back half-gable, which is
6 actually over the stair hall, and then the other
7 half gable? You can see how he meant for that
8 to be a very distinctive line, which he
9 emphasized with those round vents.

10 Other character-defining features is the
11 arched openings or the porte cochere, protruding
12 window sills, the original openings. You have a
13 series of arched openings, a distinctive
14 chimney.

15 There have been a few additions to the
16 home over time. The blue area indicates the
17 original plan. It was originally designed as a
18 two-story, three-bedroom, two-bath,
19 single-family home with a front screened entry
20 area, rear porch, as well as attached garage, a
21 service quarter behind the garage.

22 In 1949 William Merriam did what was at
23 that time a covered terrace porch area that
24 later got converted into a family room. In
25 1995, you see the two-bedroom addition that

1 happened to the east of the property.

2 Also, with the addition of that back
3 addition in the southeast corner, Merriam moved
4 the front entry, moved it from the center of the
5 screened porch to the side of the screened
6 porch. And then later the porch was enclosed.

7 With the 1995 addition, the red arrow
8 shows you the location of that addition. Then
9 the purple arrow will show you this large coping
10 added over the parapet. It was designed with
11 the addition in '95.

12 The reason I am pointing that out is the
13 intention with the Certificate of
14 Appropriateness coming forward next is to remove
15 it off the original porch. That's one of the
16 features of restoring. They'll take that back
17 to a simple round-up parapet that was there
18 originally.

19 This shows you the east facade, the side
20 of that 1995 addition. You can see it has a
21 shed roof with the large parapets. So it reads
22 a little different than what you think when you
23 see it from the front.

24 The reason I am pointing that out is what
25 they did at the time -- the green arrow shows

1 you the location of the picture I showed you.
2 What they did with the original -- the red arrow
3 points to the garage. They added this shed roof
4 and these very tall parapets that you can see in
5 the picture, the purpose of which is not really
6 clear. It's an alteration you don't see from
7 the street.

8 What you do see from the street is the
9 addition of the garden wall that was done in
10 1985, which actually was very contentious. But
11 eventually it was built in an altered manner
12 from what was first proposed by starting at nine
13 feet high, cascading down, and extending across
14 the properties. So it really elongates your
15 sense of the house from the street.

16 Other notable alterations, in 2013, the
17 windows were changed to impact-resistant. In
18 1996, the paver walkway and driveway was added.
19 So there have been a few changes to the
20 character-defining features of the structure.
21 It retains its historic integrity.

22 So, in summary, permitted in 1925, the
23 single-family residence at 1552 Murcia Avenue
24 was built in the Mediterranean revival style, is
25 indicative of the type of architecture that was

1 the founding premise of Coral Gables. This
2 style characterized Coral Gables in the 1920s,
3 and was chosen by founder George Merrick, shows
4 that it harmonized best with South Florida's
5 environment and life-style.

6 The architect was H. George Fink who was
7 part of George Merrick's original design team
8 and was instrumental in developing the style of
9 the City.

10 The single family home at 1552 Murcia
11 Avenue was a result of this collaboration
12 between Nicholes and Fink. It is one of the
13 earliest homes built in the country club section
14 part four and is a significant example of
15 Merrick's vision for the City.

16 The home retains its historic integrity
17 and is considered to be part of the collection
18 of quality structures planned during the land
19 boom era, and, thus, significantly attributes to
20 the historic fabric of the City. Staff is
21 recommending the approval of the local historic
22 designation of the property.

23 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Can you go back to the
24 four photos of the other houses designed in
25 similarity to this?

1 This one sloped roof, did George Fink use
2 that a lot? I am seeing that on the bottom
3 right, and I see it on the top left.

4 MS. GUIN: I think that Nicholes played a
5 role in designing some of these. A lot of these
6 pictures --

7 CHAIRMAN: You don't see that often, the
8 Mediterranean having a single-sloped roof.

9 MS. GUIN: You see it a couple of times in
10 the Coconut Grove section, and then you see it
11 on this property. Nicholes later becomes a
12 designer. I think he had a role in designs
13 similar to these.

14 MR. FULLERTON: One of the shots shows a
15 pair of urns in the center archway of what looks
16 like a porch. Was that the original entrance?

17 MS. GUIN: That was the original entrance,
18 and then Merriam moved it to the side.

19 MR. FULLERTON: Merriam did?

20 MS. GUIN: Yeah.

21 CHAIRMAN: Are we locking the S-barrel
22 tile in by doing this approval?

23 MS. GUIN: No. Actually, that's one of
24 the recommendations, that they use two-piece
25 barrel on the addition. And then it went over

1 the --

2 CHAIRMAN: Can we make that request going
3 forward, upon this designation, that would be a
4 requirement of any remodeling going forward? Is
5 that something we can do? It's going to be
6 happening, but I wanted to lock it in.

7 MS. GUIN: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN: By this vote.

9 MS. GUIN: Yes. When you do the
10 Certificate of Appropriateness --

11 CHAIRMAN: We can lock that in? Well,
12 that's going to happen.

13 MS. GUIN: That's not part of the
14 designation, though.

15 MS. SPAIN: She's right. That's right.
16 You need to base the designation on the
17 criteria. But when you go forward with the COA,
18 that can be part of the --

19 CHAIRMAN: Could we call him up? Are you
20 finished?

21 MS. GUIN: So we need a motion for the
22 designation.

23 CHAIRMAN: Do we want to have them speak
24 to this item?

25 Would you like to speak as to the

1 designation or wait it out?

2 Would you like to speak as to the
3 designation report or wait it out?

4 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I'd like to make a
5 motion. I would like to make a motion for the
6 designation, approved designation.

7 MR. FULLERTON: I'll second.

8 CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

9 THE CLERK: Mr. Parsley?

10 MR. PARSLEY: Yes.

11 THE CLERK: Mr. Silva?

12 MR. SILVA: Yes.

13 THE CLERK: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

14 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

15 THE CLERK: Mr. Rodriguez?

16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

17 THE CLERK: Miss Thompson?

18 MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

19 THE CLERK: Mr. Fullerton?

20 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?

22 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

23 THE CLERK: Miss Bache-Wiig?

24 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

25 THE CLERK: Mr. Torre?

1 CHAIRMAN: Yes.

2 MS. GUIN: We can do the COA.

3 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

4 MS. GUIN: The applicant is requesting a
5 design approval for additions and alterations to
6 the existing home.

7 The scope of work consists of a
8 second-story addition along the rear of the
9 existing home. On the first story, a portion of
10 the patio area along the east facade will be
11 enclosed to expand to the family room, and the
12 patio will be reconfigured.

13 And then work also includes the removal of
14 cornice detailing over the original front porch
15 that was added in 1995 to match the addition.

16 The Secretary of Interior Standards. New
17 additions, exterior alterations or related new
18 construction shall not destroy historic
19 materials that characterize the property. The
20 new work shall be differentiated from the old
21 and shall be compatible with the massing, size,
22 scale and architectural features to protect the
23 historic integrity of the property and its
24 environment.

25 New additions and adjacent or related new

1 construction shall be undertaken in such a
2 manner that if removed in the future, the
3 essential form and integrity of the historic
4 property and its environment would be
5 unimpaired.

6 There are no variances requested with
7 this. The Board of Architects approved these
8 plans on July 19, 2018.

9 Call the architect up.

10 MR. NEVILLE: Hello, everybody. My name
11 is Gregory Neville, architect. I am not Michael
12 Steppans, who is the architect who prepared the
13 drawings and did the design work. Mike is out
14 of town, and he asked me to cover for him. I am
15 here with the owners, Philippe and Lauren De
16 Lavelette.

17 First of all, I want to thank staff for
18 their positive recommendation and this great
19 report they put together. I am pretty much here
20 to answer your questions. I have to admit, I
21 wasn't involved during the design process. I am
22 taking over the project for Mike. I am doing
23 the construction drawings. So I am basically
24 coming in at the back end. But, again, I am
25 here to represent him and answer any of your

1 questions.

2 If I can take you through this. This is
3 the first time I have ever presented to this
4 board. Stop me whenever you can. Obviously,
5 these are contacts, photographs. If you have
6 any questions, you want me to stop, just chime
7 in.

8 This is a view of the house we have seen
9 before. It's a beautiful house. Another shot
10 of the front. Our addition is going -- it's
11 basically a second floor addition. It's barely
12 going to be visible from the street.

13 There's already a second floor that you
14 can see there. You see also the sloping roof of
15 the stair structure, I guess. So we are not
16 building a new stair, but we are building behind
17 that second floor and kind of over. So it's
18 barely going to be visible from the street.

19 It would be more visible from this side
20 perhaps, but it's going to be back there. The
21 elevations you see in the drawings are flat.
22 But since it's a good distance back, it's not
23 going to have a whole lot -- it's not going to
24 have much of a visual impact from the street.

25 It's a beautiful house. There is a very

1 small addition. If you look at the plan on the
2 right side, to the left of the back, there is a
3 small addition on the ground floor. We're
4 extending the living room, and that lines up
5 with the second floor.

6 There is a second floor addition, again,
7 towards the back. The second floor that you see
8 in the photographs, and the stairs, it's clearly
9 visible towards the bottom. Actually, on the
10 left you can see it very clearly. It's the only
11 structure -- it's on the second floor.

12 We're adding a bedroom, master bath and
13 the master closet. Here are some elevations;
14 before and after, before and after. Obviously,
15 we want this addition to be compatible and fit
16 in with the house. We appreciate the positive
17 vote for the historic designation. We respect
18 that, and the addition will respect that as
19 well. Here's some other elevations. That's it.

20 And I just wanted to address staff
21 recommendations at the very end. They have six
22 recommendations here. We are okay with all of
23 them, except for number one.

24 Number one is -- they want us to lower the
25 roof. I don't see the point of that. Also,

1 it's not infeasible to do so, but we are trying
2 to -- right now the roof of that living room is
3 lower than the rest of the house. We want to
4 remedy that, make it more consistent with the
5 rest of the house. All the ceilings line up,
6 and that makes it look better, function better.

7 Also, we're taking away a roof structure
8 and putting in floor structure. We need space
9 for the duct work. That's going to have
10 air-conditioning on that ground floor.

11 And once you move up a little bit higher,
12 and you have that roof structure that goes over
13 and connects with the existing house, we need to
14 connect that in a delicate way so it all works
15 structurally and is water-tight, and we don't
16 have problems with expansion.

17 It's been worked out carefully to have the
18 roof height to be where it is. To reduce that
19 roof height would throw this whole thing in
20 disarray. So I ask that you do not include that
21 into any motions of approval, if that's the way
22 it's going. We would really like to keep the
23 height where it is.

24 So I am here to answer any questions. And
25 we would appreciate your positive vote. Thank

1 you very much.

2 MR. SILVA: A quick housekeeping note.
3 Our chairman, Mr. Torre, had to leave. So I
4 will be taking over the remainder of the
5 session.

6 In regards to the roof, Kara or Elizabeth,
7 can you address your concerns?

8 MS. GUIN: I think the main concern was to
9 keep the major character-defining feature of
10 that continuous roof, that we not lose that with
11 having the higher roof behind.

12 Our main concern is that we -- I think,
13 originally, they had talked about a textured
14 stucco back there. By making it all smooth, I
15 think it will help it, but I think that is the
16 concern.

17 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Which roof in the two
18 roofs or two heights back there in the addition,
19 which one is staff wanting to lower? Is it the
20 highest one?

21 MR. NEVILLE: Which sheet are you on?

22 MS. GUIN: It's behind the stairwell,
23 pitched roof, that area, which I believe is the
24 area where you are raising the ceiling.

25 MR. NEVILLE: Right, right.

1 MR. PARSLEY: That whole roof will be the
2 same height as the little cap as existing?
3 That's what you're asking for?

4 MS. GUIN: Yes. That's what we are asking
5 for.

6 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Is that two-and-a-half
7 feet? Do you know that it is two-and-a-half
8 feet that you're --

9 MS. GUIN: Two-and-a-half is what you're
10 raising the ceiling from below?

11 MR. NEVILLE: Basically, two-and-a-half
12 feet, I'm responding to the recommendation from
13 staff. We'd like to keep it where it is.
14 Wherever the extra feet and inches come from,
15 it's all been worked out. I have talked to Mike
16 about this previously. It's been very carefully
17 worked out.

18 We just don't want to go backwards on
19 this. I don't know if we have to go back to the
20 Board of Architects when we do things like this.
21 We just want to move forward with this thing.
22 We feel like the massing is -- it's not going to
23 impact from the street because it's so far back.
24 And it's being blocked by a second floor that's
25 already there.

1 MR. SILVA: Go ahead.

2 MR. FULLERTON: I was going to refer to
3 what appears to be a connector. From the second
4 floor, original second floor bedroom connecting
5 to the second story to the new bedroom, the
6 master, is that square element that --

7 MR. NEVILLE: Yeah.

8 MR. FULLERTON: That flat roofed element?
9 That one section couldn't be the same height as
10 the original bedroom?

11 MR. NEVILLE: There are additional, I
12 think, three steps that lead you up into the
13 bedroom. That's why that is high. You'll
14 starting to getting into bedroom problems if we
15 lower that.

16 MR. SILVA: That caught your eye and it
17 caught my eye as well. I think, in general, I
18 am okay with the height of the hip roof area,
19 back there. I think it's far enough back. I
20 appreciate your respecting that stair. You're
21 leaving the existing stair isolated.

22 What jumps out at me is that square flat
23 roof area. I think that is going to read much
24 more than the house to the rear.

25 So you are coming up to that -- I guess my

1 question is, you're coming up to the rear
2 addition from there, right?

3 MR. NEVILLE: Yes. I just want to point
4 out that there is a good distance back there
5 from the front -- the elevation, as we all know,
6 you guys read these things for a living, is
7 flat. And that item that you are talking about,
8 it's a good distance back. I don't feel like
9 it's going to have any visual impact, very
10 little, if any. It's 25 feet back. And it's
11 about 20 feet --

12 MR. SILVA: I feel like you could -- maybe
13 a combination of lowering it somewhat. If you
14 push those steps back towards the end of that
15 hallway, maybe you start in the floor plan --

16 MR. NEVILLE: If anybody has ever -- I
17 know John is involved in a lot of projects. One
18 of the things architects worry a lot about is
19 the transition of existing to new, especially
20 the roof. Because why? Because that's where it
21 likes to leak. That's what we're trying to
22 solve right there. We're trying to minimize the
23 opportunity of a leak in the future.

24 So when you bring that down, you start
25 coming into some really, very difficult flashing

1 situations. You know, existing houses move
2 differently from new houses or new structures.
3 And there is going to be some movement there.
4 And we don't want to have -- you know, we don't
5 want to have leaks where we can avoid them.

6 So that's what we are trying do. We are
7 trying to be proactive. We are trying to keep a
8 descent ceiling height. We are trying to have
9 simpler flashing conditions. And, hopefully,
10 that will alleviate these kind of problems.

11 Visually, again, I can stand here all day
12 and say the same thing, and you guys are going
13 to have another opinion. I just don't think
14 there is going to be any visual impact. And
15 once it's constructed, I think it will be very
16 beautiful. And I am not sure if anybody would
17 ever notice the fact that it's two feet higher
18 than what it should have been or could have
19 been.

20 I, respectfully, would like to request
21 that you keep that ceiling height the way we
22 show it on the drawings. It would mean a lot
23 for us, and probably for the owner who doesn't
24 have to worry about potential leaks for some
25 crazy flashing condition that might happen.

1 MR. PARSLEY: Change of subject. Out of
2 curiosity, how do you build a whole second
3 story, existing walls with new columns?

4 MR. NEVILLE: Yeah. There is going to be
5 some new structure in the house.

6 MR. PARSLEY: But those drawings haven't
7 been done yet?

8 MR. NEVILLE: No. We're in the process of
9 that doing that. The structural just started.
10 We are going to a geotactical report out there
11 next week to make sure that there is a varying
12 capacity and the existing footing to be able to
13 handle the second floor.

14 There will be a new beam because there is
15 an existing wall that's sitting without the help
16 of sky hooks that will need a beam. You're
17 going to have a -- yeah, we are going to have a
18 beam. The structural details will need to be
19 developed, but they will be.

20 MR. PARSLEY: If I look on 02, could you
21 show me -- is there a way to zoom in to the --

22 MS. GUIN: I don't think there is.

23 MR. PARSLEY: Go back to where you were.
24 That little wing wall, flat parapet. Go back to
25 three. Where on the second floor plan is that

1 wall coming down?

2 MR. NEVILLE: If you see the stair,
3 towards the top of the page. You go to the
4 left. That's where that wall is.

5 MR. PARSLEY: Top of the stairs.

6 MR. NEVILLE: See the stair there? You
7 follow the wall to the south, yeah.

8 MR. PARSLEY: If I'm in the bathroom at
9 the top of the steps, that right-hand wall as I
10 enter the bathroom, that extends up?

11 MR. NEVILLE: If you're walking up the
12 steps, you put your right hand out. You
13 continue up. That's where the wall is once
14 you're standing at the top landing. The wall
15 will go above that. Yes, where the bathroom is.
16 The toilet, sink, that wall.

17 MR. PARSLEY: Before the bathroom, or
18 inside the bathroom? Where that little jog is,
19 where the tub is? There is a little jog where
20 the tub is.

21 MR. NEVILLE: Yeah. To the left, where
22 that wall continues on.

23 MR. FULLERTON: There are no windows on
24 the sides, the north and south sides of the
25 division bedroom, up there on the second floor?

1 I see a window facing the front, but not on the
2 sides.

3 MR. NEVILLE: Which sheet are you on?

4 MR. FULLERTON: Well, I was looking at the
5 plan on 02.

6 It's not important, except I think if they
7 were rendered differently, you might realize
8 what that wall was going to do.

9 MR. NEVILLE: I think there is a window in
10 the bathroom there. There is not much of a
11 view.

12 MR. FULLERTON: I understand. It's just
13 for light. But if it's not there, it's not
14 there. But you're adding one in the hallway?

15 MR. NEVILLE: Yes. Yeah, there is one
16 added to the hallway. It's hard to make out the
17 small plans.

18 MS. GUIN: There's a window that shows up
19 on the north elevation. It's not in the floor
20 plan.

21 MS. BACHE-WIIG: They're talking about
22 this wall here? You're saying there is a blank
23 wall behind the closet?

24 MS. THOMPSON: It's recessed.

25 It's almost a shame. I hate to say this,

1 I am dating myself, but it's almost a shame that
2 you didn't have a perspective drawing made --
3 that your friend didn't have a perspective
4 drawing because then you could see it from your
5 eye point of view, and it would be more
6 settling, I think.

7 MR. NEVILLE: Is that a requirement? Do
8 more architects provide a perspective drawing?
9 They do. Okay.

10 MS. THOMPSON: Did you ask me a question?

11 MR. NEVILLE: Yeah. I was asking if
12 that's what the standard is here? Do applicants
13 bring in perspectives regularly?

14 MS. THOMPSON: No.

15 MR. FULLERTON: Most of them do.

16 MS. THOMPSON: Perspectives? No, they
17 don't.

18 MR. FULLERTON: Yeah, they do. They do
19 just to help us through the process. We got to
20 do this --

21 MR. NEVILLE: I'll bring that up to
22 Michael.

23 MR. FULLERTON: I think the second floor
24 bedroom for the new master has worked out very
25 nicely. I like that. It's just that connector

1 but --

2 MR. NEVILLE: It is a difficult connection
3 to make.

4 MR. SILVA: Would you come up to the mike
5 and state your name and address, please?

6 MR. DE LAVALETTE: Hi. Phillip De
7 Lavalette. The board of architects process has
8 been very long. Even though it wasn't
9 historical or historic, it was still historic.
10 There was a lot of back and forth on that
11 attachment. Part of that was we had to make
12 sure the water and the connections -- it had
13 been raised. Can we lower it. In the end the
14 result was -- for structural reasons, it was
15 approved that way.

16 So it was a debate. It is fairly far
17 back. I don't think you have -- you really
18 don't see anything from the street. It isn't
19 going to be visible. I love this house. I
20 don't want to ruin it. We're going to be there
21 forever. So we will do what we have proposed,
22 what we thought was really the best solution to
23 aesthetics. Anyway, that was my two cents.

24 MR. SILVA: Does the board have any other
25 comments or concerns? Does anyone from the

1 public wish to speak for or against this item?
2 Being no one, I will close the public hearing
3 and open the floor for motions and further
4 discussion.

5 MR. EHRENHAFT: May I ask, there was an
6 earlier discussion about removal of some newly
7 placed parapet caps, I believe, and maybe the
8 tops of those surfaces rounded. Was that
9 correct?

10 MS. GUIN: Yeah, and that's in the
11 drawings.

12 MR. PARSLEY: They're doing that.

13 MS. GUIN: That's part of their proposal.

14 MR. EHRENHAFT: Is the only parapet that
15 they're talking about the one that is above the
16 three relating windows that used to be the main
17 entrance? So the cap that is to the left, which
18 goes horizontally and then it curves in
19 horizontal increments --

20 MS. GUIN: That was the '95 addition. It
21 was built that way. We are only talking about
22 taking what was over that original screen porch
23 back to what it was.

24 MR. PARSLEY: Any discussion of bringing
25 the entrance back to the center of those three

1 windows and the porch? Because that's a great
2 picture.

3 MR. DE LAVALETTE: It's a beautiful
4 picture. The inside has been redesigned. There
5 is no main door there. It would be beautiful,
6 but, no.

7 MR. NEVILLE: It works pretty well right
8 now the way it is. And those three windows
9 really look nice.

10 MS. THOMPSON: It is a beautiful house. I
11 drove passed it.

12 MR. NEVILLE: Pardon me?

13 MS. THOMPSON: I said it's a beautiful
14 house. I drove passed it, very beautiful.

15 MR. NEVILLE: It's a pretty house.

16 MR. PARSLEY: My concern with lowering it
17 is maybe not so much technical on the roof
18 issues, leak issues. But tell me again, because
19 this may help sway me. On the interior height
20 issue -- because I don't think we should be
21 recommending changes that diminishes the
22 interior spaces in the house and get awkward low
23 ceilings.

24 MR. NEVILLE: Well, that is part of the
25 issue. That was the catalyst to getting more

1 volume in the house, was that the existing
2 living room, the ceiling is lower than the
3 ceiling of the rest of the house. So the owners
4 wish to have the ceiling of all the spaces in
5 the house match each other.

6 Of course, the living room is an important
7 room. It's an important public space. It's got
8 a lower ceiling than -- just like the other
9 public spaces in the house. So they wanted to
10 have that continuity of the same ceiling
11 heights. So the ceiling height will be raised
12 slightly or somewhat.

13 And then we need structure in there. We
14 need space to run air-conditioning ductwork. So
15 the space between the ceiling and the first
16 floor -- I'm sorry -- the second floor of the
17 bedroom needs to be such that it needs to be
18 enough to handle the depth of the truss and also
19 some space for ductwork to pass through. Then
20 from there, it's just the typical ceiling height
21 for the bedroom.

22 MR. SILVA: The way I see your drawings,
23 they're only proposing a nine-foot ceiling on
24 the second floor. So it's nothing crazy, I
25 don't think.

1 MR. NEVILLE: If we lower it two feet, we
2 are going end up with a really low ceiling and
3 the ground floor. If they're spending a lot of
4 money doing this addition and they can't fix one
5 simple problem, there is something wrong.

6 MR. FULLERTON: Back to the connector
7 again. I have to beat this horse until I am
8 finished.

9 The parapet wall there appears to be even
10 higher than the new -- well, providing a roof
11 structure that's higher than the new bedroom, it
12 appears, on the elevations. How high is the
13 elevation of the parapet of that particular
14 element, that flat roof element? It looks like
15 it's about --

16 MR. NEVILLE: I am not really sure.

17 I have actually drawn a section to that
18 already. I can't answer your question.

19 MR. FULLERTON: I see that's roughly about
20 two, three feet from the top of the rounded
21 parapet.

22 MR. NEVILLE: I think that's two feet.

23 MR. FULLERTON: Basically, whatever you
24 could take out of that would be -- I guess maybe
25 take a foot out of that.

1 MR. NEVILLE: If you're looking at that
2 elevation on HPO-04, the right of that flat
3 parapet area, if you lower that -- I am going to
4 say if you lower that six inches, you're going
5 to have a flashing problem with a sloped roof
6 under a parapet. Because the parapet gets too
7 low and the top of the flashing starts hitting
8 nothing.

9 MR. FULLERTON: What's your structure
10 there?

11 MR. NEVILLE: What do you mean?

12 MR. FULLERTON: Are you using trusses?

13 MR. NEVILLE: It's going to be wooden.

14 MR. FULLERTON: Two-by-eights or
15 two-by-tens?

16 MR. NEVILLE: For us, it's just difficult.
17 It's running an unneeded risk for bad things to
18 happen to the house in the future. For me,
19 that's a big reason. For the owner, it's to get
20 the ceiling heights that are fairly normal for
21 this type of a house.

22 MR. FULLERTON: I wouldn't suggest
23 lowering the ceilings. I think the structure
24 could be looked at to minimize the height of the
25 parapet.

1 MR. NEVILLE: I have been involved -- I
2 have looked, as an architect, coming after the
3 fact, I tried to resolve leaking buildings at
4 the job I used to work at. I respect leaks. I
5 know what kind of havoc that can cause. I know
6 they can be fixed. I know how to avoid them.
7 This is one of the ways to avoid them.

8 MR. SILVA: I think, John, from what I am
9 hearing, we're okay with the height on the rear
10 of the addition. The only possible issue is
11 that connector piece. Maybe you can make it
12 part of your motion or part of someone's motion
13 to study it with staff, so we can move on in the
14 process. If that's something that you could --

15 MR. FULLERTON: I'd make a motion --

16 MR. NEVILLE: If I can talk to my
17 structural engineers, maybe we can go with
18 two-by-eights, something like that. We can work
19 out flashing details.

20 MR. SILVA: We don't want to enforce
21 anything that's going to be impossible to build.

22 MR. RODRIGUEZ: What is your motion?

23 MS. THOMPSON: What about the copper roof,
24 though? Is that --

25 MR. FULLERTON: The copper roof?

1 MS. THOMPSON: Yeah. Is that permitted in
2 the Gables?

3 MR. NEVILLE: I don't think there is a
4 copper roof. It's tile.

5 MR. FULLERTON: That could be flashing.

6 MR. NEVILLE: That's acceptable, right?

7 MR. FULLERTON: I move approval of this
8 thing, this case, with staff recommendations and
9 asking the applicant to please study the height
10 of that element that joins the existing bedroom
11 to the new addition.

12 MS. SPAIN: But that doesn't include --
13 number one, we're modifying number one. The
14 motion doesn't include the number one, which was
15 to lower it?

16 MR. FULLERTON: Not the way you guys wrote
17 it.

18 MS. SPAIN: Exactly. I'm just trying to
19 clarify.

20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'll second the motion.

21 MR. SILVA: We have a motion and a second.
22 Call the roll, please.

23 THE CLERK: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

24 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

25 THE CLERK: Mr. Rodriguez?

1 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

2 THE CLERK: Ms. Thompson?

3 MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

4 THE CLERK: Mr. Fullerton?

5 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

6 THE CLERK: Miss Bache-Wiig?

7 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

8 THE CLERK: Mr. Parsley?

9 MR. PARSLEY: Yes.

10 THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?

11 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

12 THE CLERK: Mr. Silva?

13 MR. SILVA: Yes.

14 MR. NEVILLE: Thank you very much.

15 MR. SILVA: The next item is case file COA
16 SP 2015-15, application for the issuance of a
17 Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the
18 property at 1108 Obispo Avenue, a historic
19 district, legally described as lots 10 and 11,
20 Coral Gables section C, according to the Plat
21 thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 8, at page 26
22 of the public records of Miami-Dade County,
23 Florida. The applicant is requesting design
24 approval for additions and alterations to the
25 residence and site work.

1 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. This is the
2 location map of the residence as it is in the
3 Obispo historic district. This house was built
4 in 1937. This is a 1940s photo; so shortly
5 after it was built.

6 It did have some alterations over the
7 years, most notably, an addition in 1947 to the
8 right-hand side of the garage, that it made kind
9 of squared off in that corner with a bathroom.
10 And it also converted that garage into a living
11 space. So there is currently no garage
12 structure on the property.

13 MR. FULLERTON: Was that done with a
14 permit?

15 MS. KAUTZ: Yeah, 1949.

16 The application is for an addition to the
17 rear of the property. They're going to be
18 returning the garage back to its original
19 location, which is a really nice feature to
20 install, re-roofing, covered terrace, swimming
21 pool, site work.

22 It went to review by the Board of
23 Architects, without comment. No variances are
24 requested. The applicant is also the architect.
25 Go through his proposal. And then I have a

1 couple of things that we would like some
2 discussion from the board.

3 MR. FULLERTON: Here's a beautiful
4 rendering of the house.

5 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I got the memo before you
6 guys came. Good afternoon. Peter Kiliddjian.
7 I'm not only the architect, but the owner of the
8 house. Thank you for seeing this today.

9 Let me just run really quickly through the
10 plans, and we can talk about some of the points
11 that staff had at the end.

12 We agree with most of them. We have three
13 points that we want to discuss. I think we are
14 going to get -- you're going to have to excuse
15 me for the power point.

16 Again, that's a historical photo. We are
17 returning the garage back to a garage. We
18 picked up all the cues on the addition from the
19 historical photos. Originally, we drew the
20 house with barrel tile. And then when we got to
21 the photo, we realized that it had a flat tile.
22 So we went back, and that's what we're
23 proposing. We're proposing casement windows,
24 window shutters, operable.

25 We're flank to the east and the west with

1 also the contributing property on Obispo, and
2 one to the northwest that's contributing. And
3 the one in the middle is our house.

4 Let's see. Those are the pictures of the
5 house. You can tell it needs paint and
6 remodeling. You see in the back, there is the
7 area that was originally a terrace, that was
8 enclosed with a wood wall. That's presently our
9 dining room. You can also see an open patio,
10 which is not part of the original plans. You
11 can see on the bottom right a walk-in closet.
12 That was not part of the original plans.

13 You can see the front, how it was altered
14 with a permit. You can see the awning windows
15 that are being replaced.

16 I think the site plan clearly illustrates
17 what we are trying to do. We are trying to grow
18 this thing organically and create a house that's
19 a courtyard house. We are adding two wings, a
20 master bedroom wing, a family and kitchen wing,
21 linking them together with a terrace and
22 creating a courtyard, trying to touch the
23 original house as little as possible, only in
24 the back where needed.

25 I don't know how clear the succession of

1 plans is here. We presented it with a 1936 and
2 a 1947 plan, and then the plans produced today.

3 You do see the walk-in closet, which is
4 there today, which is not original. The dining
5 room is what used to be a terrace. The patio is
6 obviously an enclosure of the garage, which is
7 now where my two older sons sleep.

8 This is the demolition plan. We are
9 really not demolishing anything from the
10 original 1936 house, except windows and doors.
11 And we are altering some openings on the two
12 volumes in the back. But, basically, everything
13 else is staying the way it is, as it would have
14 been in '36, which I think it's a good thing.

15 Floor plan. Giving you dimensions of the
16 spaces. To the right we have a kitchen,
17 functional elements, kitchen, family, powder
18 room, and so on.

19 To the left we have a master and an
20 additional bedroom. The front elevation, you
21 see also a succession from '36, '47, the
22 present, the demolition. Again, we're trying to
23 keep as much of the original front. As you can
24 see in the renderings, the house maintains its
25 presence. There is a small area to the left,

1 which is a bedroom that comes forward that was
2 done to basically -- but for the bathroom and
3 closets and give a real front with some windows.

4 This is the west elevation, which shows
5 the kitchen and family room addition. The rear
6 is the most affected. But you can see we've
7 carried through the use of the gable ends, the
8 exposed rafters, which will have a different
9 design than the rafters of the house; casement
10 windows.

11 We're employing the use of the double
12 thick walls in some of the north and south
13 walls, and kind of borrowing some of the details
14 that were present in the original house. We'll
15 alter them somewhat so they're not an exact
16 copy. You can see that there in the windows.

17 This is the east elevation, which has the
18 master bathroom and the room up front. Again,
19 the view from the street, you can see the
20 addition minimally impacts the street. The
21 original house maintains its presence, its
22 character, and its scale. The addition just
23 compliments it.

24 Another view from the northeast, an
25 elevated view from the same area. A rear view

1 of what that pool area, terrace, courtyard, and
2 procession would be like, the feel of the
3 backyard, and then some small vignettes of those
4 spaces.

5 I'd like to talk about a couple of the
6 comments, whenever it's appropriate to. I think
7 staff did a great job with the report, by the
8 way. I think I learned some things about my
9 house that I didn't know. That's always
10 interesting.

11 So we have nine comments. We are okay
12 with the first five. We agree with that. We
13 will work with staff on the muntins,
14 proportions, and so on.

15 Comment number six has to do with the use
16 of the curved wall detail. I would like to keep
17 it in the north and south. It's being used in
18 the west at the pantry. I am okay with removing
19 it there, but in the north and south, I think it
20 helps keep the vertical proportion of the
21 opening. So if we remove it, we are just going
22 to end up with a horizontal -- which I think is
23 not as elegant. And we already have the thick
24 wall there, so we'd like to keep that.

25 I am on the fence about the shutters. I

1 have a feeling that -- you know, the shutters
2 are only on two or three windows. It looks a
3 little bit less integral to the house. To at
4 least encapsulate the original house's shutters,
5 it's a better -- it's more expensive, but I
6 think it's a better move. So I would like to
7 try to keep that.

8 I don't understand the comment of the
9 columns. Really, the idea is to create a green
10 garden wall and sort of accentuate where you're
11 coming in. So I'd like to keep those pilasters
12 at the property line.

13 And then the copper awning at the entrance
14 was an attempt to just do a version of an
15 entrance. It's a little more permanent than a
16 fabric entrance. I'd like to keep, at least the
17 option of either two.

18 We're using copper in the back terrace.
19 So it would be nice to have some visual copper
20 up in the front.

21 MS. KAUTZ: I spoke with Peter on the
22 phone about this. So the detail was -- at the
23 big, barge front window, it's got the curve
24 detail which is the only place it's used on the
25 historic house.

1 MR. SILVA: It's just in the front of the
2 living room?

3 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Where it is now existing.

4 MS. KAUTZ: Yeah. So when I talked to him
5 about this, the use of it on the side pantry, to
6 me, having that sort of blank panel with the
7 upper window, I don't read that as a horizontal
8 feature. It doesn't bother me. I don't think
9 it needs the recessed panel there. It's the
10 same on the rear elevation.

11 The two that plank on the left side -- so
12 the two that plank on the left side of this,
13 there are more appropriate locations. The
14 larger, more prominent window -- the use of it
15 on the little windows, it just doesn't feel
16 right to me. And that's being repeated again
17 here on the right here on this larger window.
18 It's a very distinctive feature. I don't know
19 how to --

20 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I thought about that. I
21 think one way may be to alter the radius. The
22 radius of the existing house, basically, it's a
23 16-inch wall, and the radius is a complete eight
24 inches. So it's a semicircle. So maybe by
25 altering the radius --

1 MR. SILVA: Go four-inch or something
2 less?

3 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Yeah. So it's like an
4 extraction of that detail. It's not an exact
5 copy.

6 MR. SILVA: You're building that out with
7 a double --

8 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Yeah. We are doing --
9 the south wall and the family room and the
10 master bedroom, part of that wing are 16 inches,
11 and so is the front wall on the front room.

12 I agree with Kara, that the detail on the
13 west side diminishes the importance of the other
14 elevation. But I'd like to keep it on the
15 family room side because I do have the three
16 elements. And I think the repetition is kind of
17 nice.

18 MR. FULLERTON: And it opens up those
19 window openings to more light a little bit, too.

20 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Yeah, you're right.

21 MS. KAUTZ: That was where that comment
22 came from.

23 The shutters, we just -- typically, if
24 they weren't on there historically, we just
25 don't like them added. Put them all over the

1 new house if you want, the new addition, that's
2 fine. It's a comment that we always give. If
3 they weren't there, they were obviously only
4 used on the front elevation for a reason. Keep
5 them on there.

6 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Well, I was taking a look
7 at the drawings. They're actually in the front
8 and in the rear. If you look at the rear
9 elevation, it also had shutters. I don't know
10 if it's for economic, they didn't put them on
11 the east and west. I thought it might be a way
12 to accentuate the original house. It's only two
13 or three more shutters.

14 Again, I am flexible on that. I think
15 it's a better approach than just two shutters in
16 the front. And sometimes when you read -- for
17 example, that front bedroom, it will have a
18 shutter in the front and not on the side
19 windows. It looks less important, I guess.

20 MS. THOMPSON: Kara, that question has
21 popped in my mind sometimes, things like
22 shutters. Perhaps back when the house was built
23 years and years and years ago, and they had
24 different economic times, and so they would not
25 put shutters on. It's kind of like frivolous.

1 MS. KAUTZ: They're on the drawings. On
2 the one side, which, again, is -- in the west
3 side it gets into the garage. It was the grill
4 originally. So it wasn't even windows. They
5 would not have put a shutter on that window.

6 The prominence goes during this economic
7 times, the major facades, which would be the
8 front windows. It's a standard that we give. I
9 know you all in the past have allowed shutters
10 to be used elsewhere. It's up to you all to do.

11 The comment about the concrete columns, we
12 discussed this at last month's board meeting.
13 We just don't like concrete columns demarcating
14 driveways and walkways. If you are going to put
15 a fence and a wall in, do it all at the same
16 time. If you all feel differently, we can
17 revisit that. It's just something it begs for a
18 future wall or fence that you all would have to
19 review and approve.

20 And the copper awning, it's just
21 introducing a more permanent feature that we
22 would not like.

23 MR. KILIDDJIAN: On the comment on the
24 wall, if we do ever come back for a wall, it
25 will be something like a -- it will not be a

1 four-foot. It will be something just to
2 demarcate the edge of the property. It's not
3 going to be your typical privacy, you know,
4 four-foot masonry, two-foot security gate-type
5 of thing. The idea was just to keep a low hedge
6 and really demarcate those two points.

7 But I think all the comments are
8 detail-oriented. In all honesty, none of the
9 comments are a make-it-or-break-it for the
10 project, in my opinion. I think it's just a
11 differing point of view.

12 It is the first time that I really -- I
13 think I designated a house many years ago. You
14 guys did all the work. So it's the first time I
15 really present to the board. I do take your
16 comments seriously, and I appreciate them. Some
17 of them, I think, it's a matter of opinion.
18 That's why you guys are here.

19 MS. KAUTZ: There was one item that I just
20 don't have an answer to. I can't tell from
21 looking at the property.

22 The front steps appear to be original.
23 They're sort of plants off the sides. I can't
24 see what the sides look like. And this proposal
25 does change the front stoop.

1 So I just wasn't sure what was there now
2 because I couldn't see it. So that's why it was
3 brought up, not as a comment from us, as a
4 condition, but more as a discussion item; if you
5 all are okay with the front stoop being
6 enlarged, altered or not.

7 MR. PARSLEY: I noticed that, too. I am
8 not sure what you're gaining.

9 MR. KILIDDJIAN: The whole front stoop
10 thing is a little bit of an experiment, an
11 exercise. But I do think that if it's not
12 favorable, that at least we are allowed to move
13 forward.

14 Right now, we have less than three feet in
15 front of our door, which is really hard. If
16 somebody comes to visit, two persons -- two
17 people can't stand on the steps. So if we can't
18 widen it, I would like to at least bring it
19 forward with the same width and be able to put a
20 finish on it. Right now it's concrete,
21 unfinished material.

22 So I am okay with that, because I am on
23 the fence with that, because it does create kind
24 of the pseudo porch, which really doesn't -- it
25 does hinder the landscaping. So I am okay with

1 that.

2 MR. SILVA: I think I saw a soft ridge.

3 MR. PARSLEY: I think you're messing it
4 up -- either enlarge it enough and do something
5 with the porch, pots, benches, fountain, a
6 variety of things, or just increase the depth.

7 MR. KILIDDJIAN: We would be okay with
8 keeping the original width and coming forward
9 with it. And that's fine.

10 MR. FULLERTON: I'd take advantage of what
11 --

12 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Kara is saving me about
13 \$100,000 with her comment. So I am flexible
14 with that.

15 Again, we would like a functional front
16 entrance, some coverage. Right now when it
17 rains, you have no cover from the rain. The
18 door doesn't last because there is splashing of
19 the water. And there is no substance to the
20 entrance.

21 So we are not trying to make a grandiose
22 entrance by any means. We are trying to make
23 something that at least it has a --

24 MR. PARSLEY: I am okay with --

25 MS. KAUTZ: For the most part, the

1 additions are very nice. To the rear, it's
2 one-story, which is always preferable. They're
3 re-opening the original garage back to its
4 location, which will add a lot to the front
5 facade than what's there now. So it's a very
6 nice set of plans.

7 MR. FULLERTON: I don't think a larger
8 front stoop would affect the historic quality of
9 this house in any way. I think you ought to
10 take advantage of the possibility of making
11 something really nice as a welcoming area.

12 MS. KAUTZ: I thought that maybe the gap
13 between the large stoop and the garage, it
14 leaves a very small gap between the two. That
15 was a little bit odd to me.

16 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I can work with staff
17 with that. We can re-work that. Again, it was
18 a move that -- I have added to the front but --

19 MR. SILVA: I think there is consensus on
20 the curve detail. I think we're okay, as long
21 as you differentiate it from the original. The
22 shutters, it's kind of a gray area. There is a
23 discrepancy on where they existed in the
24 beginning. So you can work with staff to
25 finalize that. So, really, the big thing is

1 the --

2 MS. KAUTZ: I'd actually like direction on
3 that. If you guys are okay with them putting
4 shutters that did not exist on the existing
5 house, then that's one thing. Otherwise, I'm
6 going to tell them to take them off.

7 MR. SILVA: They're only exposing them.
8 That's why I am not clear on where they existed
9 before.

10 MS. KAUTZ: They're on the drawings, on
11 the elevations.

12 MR. KILIDDJIAN: If you look at the front
13 elevation, in the 1936 version it only existed
14 in that front room. Then when they enclosed the
15 garage --

16 MR. SILVA: That picture was from the
17 later -- because the 1940s picture showed --

18 MR. KILIDDJIAN: That picture is between
19 '36 and '47.

20 MS. KAUTZ: They're there. That's it.

21 MR. KILIDDJIAN: When they enclosed the
22 garage, then they put shutters on the windows
23 that they did on that side. And then if you
24 look at the original rear elevations --

25 MR. SILVA: So we for know for a fact zero

1 shutters on the existing house.

2 MS. BACHE-WIIG: You're just proposing it
3 next to the garage?

4 MS. KAUTZ: And on the other side.

5 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I thought it strengthened
6 differentiating the existing house from the
7 addition. In other words, if you can really
8 identify -- if shutters is an identifying
9 element for the existing house, you know where
10 it ends, and that side elevation has a shutter,
11 I think it's strengthens that comment that --

12 MR. SILVA: We try to stay with the
13 original. That would be my preference, to stay
14 with the original shutter layout.

15 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I agree with that.

16 MR. SILVA: I think we have a consensus
17 there. The only two other things are the copper
18 awnings and the columns on the --

19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have a comment on the
20 columns. I happen to like the columns. My
21 house has columns at the entranceway. It's on
22 the same street. It looks very nice. It
23 differentiates the entrance.

24 MS. KAUTZ: Your house has them?

25 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. You have driven

1 through them several times. It's on the same
2 block. I happen to like the way it
3 differentiates the sidewalk from the street from
4 my house. And for that reason, I would support
5 the retention of the columns.

6 MS. BACHE-WIIG: The only thing is there
7 was an application that came before us the last
8 time that proposed the same solution at the
9 driveway. And we agreed with staff, and saying
10 that to eliminate these columns. So I don't
11 know what that says --

12 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Can we come to a
13 compromise and accentuate the pedestrian
14 entrance and leave the driveway without the
15 columns? That way, you're at least -- leave the
16 columns at the pedestrian entrance, to call
17 importance to the pedestrian entrance and not to
18 the vehicular entrance, and just remove them
19 from the driveway?

20 MR. EHRENHAFT: Can I add another
21 question? It might go Mr. Parsley's input.
22 Would you be okay with differentiating using
23 hedging, if you're using -- I don't know what
24 you're using. But have simply taller columnar
25 plants that are part of the hedge instead of

1 the --

2 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I'd rather not do it.

3 The street is -- most of the houses on the
4 street, except the corner lot -- which I think
5 it's because of the corner lot that they walled
6 it. But most of the houses on the street have a
7 column or the front lawn is -- we want to do a
8 soft edge. It's not: We're here, you're there.
9 It's more of a demarcation of the property, very
10 low hedge. It's going to be 30 inches, at most,
11 three feet.

12 So, for me, it's either that or -- I would
13 be okay with the pedestrian ones only and
14 leaving -- the vehicular ones, I will tell you,
15 also from the usability standard, you have cars
16 with opening the doors, this or that. I am okay
17 with removing those.

18 I think it's a nice gesture to at least
19 punctuate where the sidewalk meets the walkway
20 to the house. I think that's a universal
21 architectural principle. But I understand if
22 you have precedent for not approving that.

23 MR. FULLERTON: Again, it doesn't take
24 away at all from the --

25 MR. KILIDDJIAN: In my opinion, from

1 sitting on the Board of Architects, it's how you
2 do it, right? If you put two monstrous columns,
3 it's not a good precedent. But in this case,
4 I'm taking cues from the house. So that's the
5 idea.

6 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Would it have lighting?

7 MR. KILIDDJIAN: No. It might have the
8 number of the house, but maybe not even that.

9 MR. SILVA: I think it's a reasonable
10 compromise.

11 MS. THOMPSON: The wall that comes out
12 from the back, that low wall, that's a wall
13 there, right?

14 How does that end when it gets to the
15 sidewalk?

16 MR. KILIDDJIAN: That's an existing wall
17 from the neighbor.

18 MS. THOMPSON: Does it look like the end
19 piece?

20 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Let me see if I caught it
21 in the picture.

22 So that wall comes -- that's the
23 neighbor's wall. And then it turns, it just
24 follows the property line of the neighbor. It's
25 an existing wall. What we are doing is we're

1 adding walls to, you know -- parallel to the
2 front property line just to enclose the
3 property.

4 MS. THOMPSON: I was questioning it
5 because of the little -- the columns, per se,
6 that they're talking about. Because if that
7 wall came to an end at the sidewalk, which I
8 don't remember --

9 MR. KILIDDJIAN: It doesn't.

10 MS. THOMPSON: And then you had that
11 little column right there, that would kind of
12 balance it, I think.

13 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I really see the columns
14 as just a hyphen to that part of the front
15 property. We are not talking about a wall
16 design issue here. It's either something that,
17 you know, you see as a positive or -- but it's
18 not about creating -- it has a different purpose
19 than creating security or the typical use of a
20 wall in the Gables when they come and they want
21 a gate and this and that. That's really the
22 purpose now of those two columns.

23 And it's an interruption of the green.
24 You have this green wall. Then, all of a
25 sudden, you get two white loops.

1 MS. THOMPSON: Accent?

2 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Yes.

3 MR. FULLERTON: Generally speaking, Peter,
4 I think this is a really, really nice addition
5 to this house. It will be a beautiful living
6 space. Well done.

7 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Thank you very much.

8 MR. PARSLEY: Can I add one quick question
9 about A-1.0? And then also refer to the front
10 elevation, which is 30.

11 I think the more interesting thing is on
12 the left addition where you have the little
13 gate, it reads -- you're showing one window
14 there. It looks like it's symmetrical on the
15 hip of the roof line beyond. But I think in the
16 plans here, you have got two little windows
17 against that courtyard. I am not sure that one
18 window in the center, like the elevation, isn't
19 the way to go.

20 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I don't think I'm
21 understanding you.

22 MS. KAUTZ: Actually, I did. I saw this,
23 too. But it's not what you think it is. These
24 two, you can only see one in the elevation.

25 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Right. But in

1 perspective, you will catch both windows on
2 center with the courtyard. There is two ways
3 about it. Either you put one in center with the
4 courtyard, and then, as you're walking by the
5 elevation, that gets cut by the building.

6 MR. PARSLEY: But the window to the left
7 is on the center line?

8 MR. KILIDDJIAN: That's a little bit of
9 fudging on my part.

10 That second one is right on the edge.
11 It's right on the edge of the building. So the
12 idea is to have, I would say, the one right on
13 center with the gable because it really
14 accentuates that mass.

15 MR. PARSLEY: If there was one larger one
16 that was on center, would it make a difference?
17 As long as that wall -- looking to skew from the
18 existing bedroom number one, as long as it was
19 enough off center from the center of the wall to
20 look okay --

21 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I don't really see an
22 issue with those two windows. They're on center
23 with the courtyard. One of them is on center
24 with the gabled end with the addition. I think
25 they're not primary windows.

1 The proportions that I am using, it's
2 either -- that proportion is half of a window.
3 So they're all tied in together. We are not,
4 you know -- we are not creating new window
5 proportions or anything like that. So I think
6 it's a different way to use the same window,
7 let's call it. I don't see an issue with it. I
8 appreciate your comments, but I don't think
9 there is an issue with it.

10 MR. SILVA: So the last thing we haven't
11 talked about is the copper awning.

12 MR. EHRENHAFT: Can we address -- I just
13 have one question about shutters again. I'm
14 sorry.

15 If you look at A-3.3, there is a window on
16 the bottom proposed east side elevation, on the
17 extreme right, where there is a hip roof coming
18 in, and that window is off center. But I am not
19 talking about the position of the window itself.
20 But it looks strange to me to have a single
21 hanging shutter on one side of a window --

22 MR. KILIDDJIAN: That would be a double
23 shutter folding onto itself. All the shutters
24 would be operable. All the shutters that I
25 would be putting on the house would be operable.

1 If the shutters are accepted the way that
2 they're drawn by the board, that would be a
3 double shutter. So when you have that
4 condition, you have a shutter that folds on
5 itself. So visually -- it doesn't look
6 ridiculous. It's not like you're only
7 shuttering half the window. It opens up and
8 shutters the whole window.

9 MR. EHRENHAFT: My question is if I am
10 looking at the facade and the shutters are open,
11 you're seeing an off-center window with a
12 shutter only on the right side. That looks
13 strange to me.

14 MR. KILIDDJIAN: You would also have it on
15 the interior, next to the entrance. That's just
16 the way -- that window is existing.

17 MR. EHRENHAFT: I understand. I would
18 omit the shutter.

19 MS. KAUTZ: I have a little check mark
20 next to my comment about the shutters being
21 eliminated, thinking that you guys had already
22 moved on from that. Am I wrong?

23 MR. SILVA: I thought we were on the same
24 page, that we were eliminating the shutters.

25 MR. KILIDDJIAN: And your comment is

1 valid. In an elevation, it looks odd because
2 this only happens in real life. When you see
3 it, it's double the thickness. So,
4 psychologically, you know that it's --

5 MS. SPAIN: We need to move on from this.
6 But if you are looking at that double shutter,
7 there is a shadow that's cast. You can tell
8 it's thicker, and it would cover the whole
9 window in real life. But I understand what
10 you're talking about.

11 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Your comment is correct.
12 It looks odd in elevation.

13 MR. SILVA: It's a function of the
14 existing window.

15 MR. EHRENHAFT: Is it a double shutter
16 that you can close because you're going to use
17 it for hurricane protection?

18 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Yeah. It's almost like a
19 bi-fold door type of thing. In real life, it
20 doesn't look odd.

21 MR. EHRENHAFT: I thought it was only
22 being decorative.

23 MR. KILIDDJIAN: No. All of those
24 shutters would be operable.

25 MR. SILVA: Do we have any opinions on the

1 copper awning?

2 MR. FULLERTON: I am not sure I understand
3 what it looks like.

4 MR. KILIDDJIAN: What it looks like? I
5 haven't drawn a very detailed drawing of it.
6 Really, if I was to describe it, it would be
7 trying to be as thin as possible, okay, and not
8 an overpowering element at all. All the
9 elements are thin. Then it would be one single
10 sheet.

11 Actually, the house to the west of me has
12 a copper entrance. It's a little more
13 substantial than what we're proposing.

14 MR. FULLERTON: I couldn't visualize
15 how --

16 MR. KILIDDJIAN: If you have ever been to
17 Savannah or Charleston, and you see those side
18 porches that have very -- it's kind of fragile
19 metal work. It would be something to that
20 extent.

21 MR. FULLERTON: It will oxidize and turn
22 green. Is it really aluminum or is it copper?
23 Is it real copper?

24 MR. KILIDDJIAN: It has to be copper.

25 MR. FULLERTON: It's not copper colored.

1 MR. SILVA: The original house had nothing
2 there. So your point is that if it's an awning,
3 it's technically --

4 MS. KAUTZ: Less permanent. It's a
5 temporary thing, whereas this is adding sort of
6 structural --

7 MR. PARSLEY: If it's in the rear, why do
8 we care?

9 MS. KAUTZ: If it was in the rear, it
10 would be great.

11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You can still remove it.

12 MS. KAUTZ: It's more of a conjectural
13 feature.

14 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I see this all the time.
15 So I guess the question for me was: Would I
16 rather see a fabric awning that after a year and
17 a half, you know, it starts deteriorating?
18 You're not going to change it immediately. It's
19 always in flux, right? Or would you rather see
20 something of that same nature that's a little
21 bit more permanent? It doesn't look out of
22 place. It looks like this -- had they been able
23 to do it, they might have done it. It's an
24 interpretation of a fabric awning with a little
25 more substance to it. I think I can see both

1 points of view.

2 MR. SILVA: To me, historically, the
3 fabric awning is the same as the other one. If
4 you're going to put something -- if you're going
5 to allow something to be put there, allow
6 something to be put there. I don't necessarily
7 see a difference.

8 MR. KILIDDJIAN: In reality, the only
9 difference is the material. The spears are the
10 same. The tubing might be thinner on this than
11 on a fabric awning. In reality, the only thing
12 you're trading off is the skin of the awning,
13 which, in my opinion -- who knows, the fabric
14 awning may be more permanent.

15 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Maybe to a more
16 historical context, it's just that in that time,
17 something fabric would have been more of what
18 was selected.

19 MR. KILIDDJIAN: That's why I am pointing
20 to the house next door, which has -- if you look
21 at the context photos, the yellow house has
22 exactly what I am talking about. 1106 --

23 MR. FULLERTON: Those were all over Coral
24 Gables, the copper roof.

25 MR. SILVA: I think we've had a good

1 amount of discussion. Are we ready for a
2 motion?

3 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I can meet with staff and
4 bring examples of -- I realize maybe it's hard
5 to visualize, but I can bring examples of this.

6 MS. KAUTZ: I am curious how structural --
7 how they would look at this. An awning, you can
8 take the fabric off, and the structure would be
9 okay during a hurricane. I don't know how they
10 view this sort of thing.

11 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I don't think it's the
12 first time a copper awning has been done.

13 MR. FULLERTON: I'd like to move approval,
14 with staff recommendation, one through five
15 approved, and six through nine to be reviewed by
16 staff.

17 MR. SILVA: Incorporating our comments?

18 MR. FULLERTON: Yes, incorporating our
19 comments.

20 MR. SILVA: Is it clear, Kara?

21 MS. THOMPSON: One through five.

22 MR. FULLERTON: When we were going through
23 them, I checked off one, two, three, four, five
24 as acceptable to the owner.

25 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Those are fine.

1 MR. FULLERTON: Six through nine --

2 MS. KAUTZ: Six to be differentiated.

3 MR. KILIDDJIAN: And six, I am willing to
4 compromise on that west facade. As long as we
5 keep it to the south, I'm fine with that.

6 Seven, again, I can live without it.

7 Personally, I think the shutter -- I understand
8 of setting a precedent for future historical --
9 I understand that.

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: May I add something to
11 your motion before you second it? Can we add
12 number eight to one through five and eight?

13 MR. FULLERTON: Yes, yes.

14 MR. SILVA: I thought we were okay with
15 the pedestrian.

16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: That's eight.

17 MR. FULLERTON: We're okay with eight.

18 MR. KILIDDJIAN: It's like a modified
19 eight.

20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Without the driveway.

21 MR. SILVA: But eight eliminates it
22 completely. I want it on the record we're
23 allowing the pedestrian --

24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: We are allowing number
25 eight, minus the driveway. One through five,

1 plus eight, minus the driveway. Six, eight --
2 six, seven and nine to be discussed with the
3 staff.

4 MR. FULLERTON: Correct. I accept that
5 modification.

6 MR. PARSLEY: Second.

7 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'll second the motion as
8 modified.

9 MR. SILVA: We have a motion and a second.
10 Call it.

11 THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?

12 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

13 THE CLERK: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

14 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

15 THE CLERK: Mr. Rodriguez?

16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

17 THE CLERK: Miss Thompson?

18 MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

19 THE CLERK: Mr. Fullerton?

20 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Ms. Bache-Wiig?

22 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

23 THE CLERK: Mr. Parsley?

24 MR. PARSLEY: Yes.

25 THE CLERK: Mr. Silva?

1 MR. SILVA: Yes.

2 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I second that.

3 And one other thing. I have never seen it
4 how you showed the original elevation and then
5 the updated. That's so helpful. That was
6 great.

7 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I sat on the Board of
8 Architects. When somebody comes with a
9 historical property, it's impossible to tell
10 what was before, what was after. I was lucky
11 enough to find the microfilms of the change.

12 MS. BACHE-WIIG: And your renderings are
13 beautiful.

14 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Thank you. I try to make
15 it short for you guys.

16 MR. SILVA: Thank you for being patient
17 with us. We are moving on to the last item
18 today. This is case file COA SP 2018-16, an
19 application for the issuance of a Special
20 Certificate of Appropriateness for the property
21 at 3621 Monserrate Street, a local historic
22 landmark legally described as Lots 5 and 6,
23 block one, Louis Park, according to the Plat
24 thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 30, at page
25 25, of the public records of Miami-Dade, County

1 Florida.

2 The applicant is requesting design
3 approval for additions and alterations to the
4 residence and site work.

5 MS. KAUTZ: Again, location map. It
6 should be fairly familiar to you. It was
7 designated as the landmark in 2018 in April of
8 this year. It was permitted in 1937, historic
9 photo from the 1940s. They are requesting a
10 two-story addition to the rear and to the south,
11 interior remodeling, impact-resistant windows
12 and doors, reroofing, swimming pool, deck, front
13 wall and gates, and no variances were requested.

14 In June, this was reviewed by the Board of
15 Architects with notations that are included in
16 your staff report to alter sort of the roof edge
17 and to restudy the balcony connection. They
18 have done that. Those are incorporated in here.

19 The Board of Architects also made a
20 comment to continue the existing decorative
21 banding around on the additions. And as our
22 view, we don't want to confuse what's old and
23 what's new. We have requested that that not be
24 incorporated into their set. So it is not on
25 the set of drawings.

1 There are a couple of discussion items at
2 the end of this and some comments. I'll turn it
3 over to the architect.

4 MR. LEWIS: Good evening. My name is Dan
5 Lewis. I'm the architect for Jeff and Karen.

6 I'm not going to rehash a lot of what we
7 have gone over before and what the staff has
8 worked with us on; just a couple of things that
9 I want to start out with.

10 The existing house is in pretty much its
11 original state. There hasn't been any additions
12 put onto it over the years. Even the windows
13 appear to be the original windows.

14 And part of the process that we went
15 through, the entire project, even before we had
16 the historic designation, was to try and be very
17 respectful of the past of the house. And we
18 worked, again, with Historic to try and maintain
19 that throughout our design process.

20 Not much you can see on the sides. There
21 is a lot of growth there. The back of the
22 house, again, seems to be original. Even the
23 corner windows that we have on the original
24 kitchen bump out, seem to be the original
25 windows.

1 MR. FULLERTON: Are those awning windows?

2 MR. LEWIS: Yes. Yeah.

3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: On the kitchen, but not
4 upstairs?

5 MR. LEWIS: I believe they're casement
6 upstairs.

7 MR. RODRIGUEZ: But these are awning?

8 MR. LEWIS: I believe so.

9 So this is the addition of the house, and
10 you can see where the existing walls were. The
11 thing that I want you to note from this is that
12 the profile facing the street, and it will be
13 more noticeable on the elevations, is unchanged.
14 We maintain the profile and the face of the
15 house facing the street. We didn't come forward
16 to any of it. We don't encroach on it in any
17 way.

18 This also helps to understand that with
19 the second floor, the small second floor
20 original part in the heart, and the additions
21 towards the sides and back.

22 This is the profile of the house as it
23 exists right now in its original state. And
24 what I'd like you to notice when we switch to
25 the next side is how this profile remains

1 unchanged on the addition. We have kept the
2 profile of the house, so the additions are just
3 parts that are added behind it. But the
4 original profile of the house remains. I'll do
5 that one more time.

6 So on the side -- in the rear is a little
7 more significant because that's where most of
8 the addition is. This is our north elevation.
9 And what I want you to notice on this is that
10 the profile of the house to the street side
11 remains unchanged.

12 So looking at our south elevation, the
13 same comment applies. Just watch the profile of
14 the house facing the street, which is on your
15 left. It remains unchanged.

16 This is the house as it is modeled
17 currently, without any of the addition. The
18 next slide will show from the same position what
19 we are proposing.

20 And, again, this is to emphasize how we
21 are not changing the profile of the house,
22 towards the street, outside of what we're doing
23 with the addition.

24 This is from the southwest corner of the
25 property looking towards the house, and from the

1 northwest street side looking back at the house.

2 MR. FULLERTON: Are those front walls
3 there already?

4 MR. LEWIS: No, they're not. That would
5 be part of the addition. This is facing our new
6 pool courtyard from the southeast, and then from
7 the northeast neighbor's property.

8 The staff has two sections that I think we
9 can pretty easily and address. At this time,
10 I'd like to have Karen and Jeff come up and join
11 us.

12 As an easy part, I think, before we get
13 into the topics of discussion, I'd like to just
14 go to the list of staff requests for
15 incorporation. Items one, two, three, four,
16 five, six, seven, and nine are all acceptable.
17 And we will incorporate those.

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Can you go through that
19 again?

20 MR. LEWIS: Sure. Number one, the
21 Certificate of Appropriateness for the pool and
22 deck -- one, two, three, four, five, six, seven
23 and nine.

24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Ours are broken up
25 differently.

1 MS. KAUTZ: There is two separate
2 sections. One is conditions of approval and
3 then one is discussion items.

4 MR. FULLERTON: Eight is the only one --

5 MR. LEWIS: Right. I think eight is
6 appropriate for the other -- the four topics
7 that staff has as well.

8 MS. KAUTZ: Donna and Elizabeth both -- we
9 discussed these, adding and then keeping them
10 the same size that they were now.

11 MR. LEWIS: I remember it a little bit
12 differently.

13 MS. KAUTZ: I made sure -- Elizabeth
14 remembers everything. I made sure and I asked
15 her. I thought we discussed this.

16 MR. LEWIS: Right, of course.

17 MS. KAUTZ: Discussion items, this is --
18 just so you all know, this is something that we
19 -- we are probably going to change the way our
20 process works. Because right now, when we get
21 Zoning comments back, we get one set of
22 drawings, send it to Zoning, get the Zoning
23 comments back. We send it to the applicant.
24 They submit all their 16 sets, and then we write
25 a staff report, typically, which is delivered to

1 you on a Friday or Saturday before the meeting
2 so you have time to read it. Sometimes they
3 don't get it until that following Monday or that
4 Friday, if they're lucky.

5 When we have met 1,000 times already, much
6 to their chagrin, we look at the overall things.
7 But as you start to dive into the staff report,
8 you get really involved in what's being put
9 where precisely. So that's where these
10 discussion items came up.

11 So we are changing this process to sort of
12 do a preliminary dive-in review to give to them
13 with zoning comments, so that there is not a
14 last minute discussion about stuff. So they
15 don't go, okay, we met with you a zillion times.
16 And now you're telling me you have a problem
17 with X, Y and Z.

18 So, hopefully, this sort of thing will not
19 happen again in the future. It has made it a
20 little bit more difficult for us to review at
21 the last minute, and then pass the comments on.
22 So you all know that, you have the impetus
23 behind this.

24 That being said, there were a couple of
25 things that, as I was reviewing the different

1 elevations, that I wanted your input on.

2 MR. SILVA: Before you jump into that,
3 Kara, I just have a question. The wall along
4 the front of the house, which is not existing,
5 is that part of this? I don't see elevations.

6 MS. KAUTZ: There is an elevation.

7 MR. LEWIS: There is a street elevation.
8 It should be A-500.

9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah, it's there.

10 MR. SILVA: Okay. Got it.

11 MS. KAUTZ: So this is the existing house.
12 On the present elevation on your left, the four
13 new windows that are being added, they are of a
14 different proportion than the other windows
15 found on the existing house. They are a much
16 narrower type.

17 The repetition of it seems different than
18 the existing house, and then the sort of
19 simplicity of the addition on the right. And
20 the question was if it were possible for two of
21 those to be eliminated and the two remaining to
22 be widened, so it's a little bit more uniform.
23 That was the question. I don't know if that's
24 possible. It seems like there is enough of the
25 interior space that could work. Again, if you

1 guys are okay with it, then, you know, I can
2 live with it. That was the first one.

3 Do you want me to go through all of them
4 or do --

5 MR. FULLERTON: Could you point out which
6 window -- is it on that elevation?

7 MS. KAUTZ: The narrower ones that are
8 found -- sort of the regular kind of size, that
9 happens throughout the house. It seems if you
10 could eliminate one or two and make them wider
11 to sort of make it a more consistent
12 elevation --

13 MR. FULLERTON: How does that work on the
14 interior?

15 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: Sorry. That's where we
16 run into a little bit of a challenge. The
17 second floor plan, you will see that the first
18 window serves as a light for that, also the
19 bathroom. So we feel it needs to stay. Then if
20 you start pulling other windows out, the
21 geometry gets a little bit --

22 MR. SILVA: Can you go back to the
23 elevation a second? Kara, your concern is
24 verticality. I don't know if maybe actually
25 adding a third window in the middle starts to

1 get that thing more horizontal instead of this

2 --

3 MR. LEWIS: We had three points for why we
4 chose to do it this way. The first one is to
5 get the maximum amount of light we could into
6 the master bathroom. This is on the northwest
7 corner of the house. The master bathroom is
8 going to be used mostly in the morning. So we
9 wanted to have as much opportunity to get light
10 in there, indirect light as possible.

11 The second one was we want it to be
12 distinct from the existing house and try and be
13 fair to the guidelines, saying we want to be
14 architecturally distinct from the historic part
15 of it. So that was the second part of that
16 distinction.

17 I would, respectfully, disagree that
18 having the four narrow windows imparts a
19 vertical element. I think the rhythm of the
20 four gives that horizontal movement through it.

21 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Are you doing the same
22 narrow window on the other side?

23 MR. LEWIS: On the southwest corner?

24 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yeah.

25 MR. LEWIS: No.

1 MS. BACHE-WIIG: You're only doing it
2 there?

3 MR. LEWIS: Yes.

4 MS. BACHE-WIIG: On the new part?

5 MR. LEWIS: Yes.

6 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Will you do it on the
7 other, the remaining new part, so that it all --
8 so what's new has a narrowing?

9 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: I am certainly open to
10 different configurations on the right, on the
11 extension. I think what is nice about what is
12 there now is you have got that with the lining
13 in the middle. Even though you don't have the
14 trip of repeating itself, the one, two, one
15 configuration -- which I'd also be open to if
16 you think that was a good design. I think when
17 we talked with staff, this was a consensus we
18 got to.

19 So I'm not opposed to that, but we do have
20 a few different -- to be honest, even in the
21 existing house we have a number of different
22 widths and heights, a small two above the
23 central door. And certainly if we are talking
24 about the horizontal things you were trying to
25 maintain, even in the existing structure, that's

1 there already with two small narrow windows.

2 Bottom line, I like what we have here. If
3 we were forced to do something else, it wouldn't
4 be the end of my world. I think it works quite
5 well with the interior. Again, I also think, to
6 Dan's comment, it does play out nicely and sort
7 of makes this house feel wide and low, which was
8 the original design intent.

9 MR. FULLERTON: I agree. I think the
10 windows need to reflect what's going on on the
11 inside and not to try to manufacture some sort
12 of rhythm on the outside that doesn't make sense
13 on the inside. I don't mind different size
14 windows in different locations, for their
15 different purposes. That's my general view.

16 MS. THOMPSON: My two cents is I think the
17 rhythm is just fine.

18 MR. PARSLEY: I would take it a step
19 further and say I'm okay with the different
20 window size to help differentiate the old from
21 the new. I almost think you need to find more.
22 I like what you did, but I think the layman
23 would be real hard pressed to see where the old
24 house was and the new house started or ended.

25 Usually, on these things where we had the

1 Mediterranean ones, two-story additions in the
2 back, we were finding to be too big, too bulky,
3 overpowering the existing. Here, it's just sort
4 of a stretching of all the proportions in the
5 roof lines and the existing. You just sort of
6 blew it up. The only real differentiation I see
7 is that little banding, where it stops and
8 starts, which no one else is ever going to see.

9 MR. SILVA: On the roof ridge line, too.

10 MR. LEWIS: The roof is one thing, that we
11 worked very hard to make sure that we did not go
12 at any point above the existing roof.

13 MR. PARSLEY: I am not sure that was --
14 maybe you shouldn't have done that, to break the
15 roof line, to make it look different.

16 MS. KAUTZ: We're okay with the roof line.

17 MR. FULLERTON: What did you say, Kara?

18 MS. KAUTZ: We're okay with the roof line
19 being lower. It makes it subservient --

20 MR. SILVA: Kara, maybe the issue with the
21 windows is one of -- these are single-panel
22 casements, right?

23 MR. LEWIS: Yes.

24 MR. SILVA: Maybe it's just eliminating
25 that center -- and then you get into a more

1 horizontal, like the other windows are. The
2 other ones have kind of a more horizontal
3 proportion. Leaving it, you just get rid of
4 that center decorative --

5 MS. BACHE-WIIG: On the new addition?

6 MR. SILVA: On the four windows we're
7 talking about.

8 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: So they would read more
9 like two --

10 MR. LEWIS: We basically have four lights
11 as opposed to eight. I would like that. I
12 think that would work well.

13 MR. FULLERTON: As long as they don't look
14 like awning windows.

15 MR. LEWIS: Yeah.

16 MS. KAUTZ: So the window size is repeated
17 on the two side elevations as well. The upper
18 story of this elevation has the same size
19 windows, and some of these are the same.

20 MR. LEWIS: That window size is used in
21 other places.

22 MS. KAUTZ: I don't think that might be a
23 horrible thing, if they're going to use that
24 type throughout, that it is limited.

25 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: My only concern would be

1 if the windows ended or were too wide, so you
2 have got this very, very horizontal feel to it.

3 MR. LEWIS: I think with these windows,
4 the proportions will be fine if we eliminate the
5 center muntin. On any wider window, yes, I
6 would not want to do that.

7 MR. EHRENHAFT: You would have then four
8 panels?

9 MR. LEWIS: Yes.

10 MR. EHRENHAFT: They're going to become
11 more horizontal.

12 MR. LEWIS: No, just on this one type.

13 MR. FULLERTON: It looks like the wider
14 windows are double casements. They're not
15 single.

16 MS. KAUTZ: They're single casements with
17 the thicker center muntin.

18 MR. FULLERTON: You mean, the ones that
19 look fairly wide right now?

20 You're going to have that big thing going
21 out like this, instead of this?

22 Look at the width of that upper --

23 MS. KAUTZ: That's one single, one-leaf
24 casement.

25 MR. FULLERTON: That's huge for one leaf.

1 You're going to have -- the hardware for that is
2 going to last -- I have a couple of those.

3 MS. KAUTZ: Do you want to continue with
4 the comments, or do you want to reach some sort
5 of consensus? Or do you want to keep going
6 around on the discussion items?

7 So the second one, the banding that exists
8 on the house is a stucco mold that we want to
9 stay, obviously. On the existing house, you can
10 see it ends sort of at the window.

11 In looking at this elevation, I see that
12 there are windows being added to the existing
13 house just prior to the addition. I don't know
14 how you do that. How do you make a new window
15 opening and keep that banding in place?

16 So I know that because the addition is
17 placed where an existing window is, they're
18 eliminating a side window in that bedroom. Does
19 that little window add that much light that it's
20 necessary? There's a window to the front of the
21 house, but there is one window.

22 MR. LEWIS: Right. We are losing two
23 windows on that bedroom. So we're going from
24 three down to one. So even having that small
25 window adds a significant amount of light to

1 that room.

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Which window?

3 MR. PARSLEY: Second floor or first floor?

4 MS. KAUTZ: I don't know how that happens.
5 How do you add -- cut that window opening and
6 keep this very delicate stucco mold that's not
7 going to fall off?

8 MR. PARSLEY: Can't you putty it back up?

9 MR. LEWIS: We prefer not to have to
10 repair anything. This is something -- we
11 actually did something similar to this on the
12 Alhambra Circle project a couple years ago where
13 we had an issue with -- the openings in the
14 existing windows were structurally deficient.
15 And what we ended up doing was creating a
16 concrete structural ring from the inside to
17 support the new windows to where we did not
18 disturb the stucco on the outside. And that
19 would be the same kind of process we could use
20 for that.

21 MS. KAUTZ: But that's an existing
22 opening. Now you're making an opening that's
23 going to saw cut an exterior -- and I think the
24 window below that isn't necessary, just to be
25 adding one to make it symmetrical. So I would

1 like that bottom one removed. It's in a little
2 tiny corner of the living room.

3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Where is it on the plan?

4 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: This is on the south
5 elevation.

6 MR. SILVA: I think, constructability, I
7 think they're going to have issues with that
8 trim anyway because they're putting up that new
9 wall up against there. I think they have to
10 resolve it one way or the other.

11 I think the bigger question is: Do we
12 want that window there at all? I think that the
13 trim, they can deal with it. They can repair it
14 or do whatever they need to do. Question is:
15 Do those two windows, I guess, belong --

16 MS. KAUTZ: The bottom one, in my view,
17 doesn't do anything to that corner. It doesn't
18 help anything in that room. The upper one, I
19 understand the light issues because you're
20 eliminating the side window. I don't know how
21 much light that will provide, but the bottom
22 one, just to be symmetrical doesn't do anything
23 for me.

24 On this facade as well, this was just --
25 again, noticing this, the rest of the house has

1 some fairly regular alignment, the windows.
2 Both on the original house, you can see here
3 where they're in line. And then also -- so,
4 again, everything sort of very regularly spaced.

5 That one elevation is very random. You
6 are very even here, and then this elevation just
7 loses that entirely, which seems very out of
8 place. So I don't know if there's a way to
9 clean it up and make some sort of things line
10 up, if possible.

11 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: I want to kind of be as
12 systematic as I can on this. Before we leave
13 those two narrow windows, I'd like to make a
14 couple of comments from a homeowner's
15 perspective.

16 Certainly in the upstairs bedroom, as you
17 have seen in the original design, we had windows
18 on three elevations, east, south and north.

19 MR. LEWIS: East, west and south.

20 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: East, west, south.
21 You're right. Clarity, the three most light
22 generating or light -- where we're going to get
23 the best light are those three elevations.

24 So to meet the requirements that were
25 placed on us with this renovation and the

1 requirement -- to meet the historic
2 requirements, we had to really swallow pretty
3 hard and make that decision to eliminate two of
4 those windows.

5 And while I fully acknowledge that having
6 a window, which is, I guess, about twelve inches
7 or so, is not ideal, it's not my first choice, I
8 have to say it's better than nothing. If that
9 goes, we have gone -- we have literally reduced
10 the light in the room by 66 percent. We have
11 lost two-thirds of our window opening. By
12 keeping about a half size window, give or take,
13 at least we're down to half; not great, but
14 better than nothing. So I really strongly want
15 to request the board to allow us to keep that
16 window in the bedroom.

17 In terms of the matching window down on
18 the ground floor, I get it, that it may not add
19 much, but I certainly don't think it detracts in
20 any way. I think it's a nice little corner, if
21 you look at the ground floor plan. Having the
22 window there is going make for a nice little
23 sitting area, bring in a little bit more light.
24 Again, the fact that it's in the south means we
25 are getting a descent amount in there, or as

1 much as we can reasonably get from that small
2 window.

3 I would really like to keep it. If you
4 don't feel it's doing historic harm, then I
5 really would like to keep those two windows as
6 they are designed currently.

7 MR. SILVA: My two cents regarding those
8 windows, I think, in general, we try to keep the
9 original portions of the house as intact as
10 possible. I think in the bedroom, there's a
11 compelling reason to add that window, right? We
12 found a single window. It's going to be dark in
13 there.

14 I think in the living room, you have got a
15 lot of natural light coming in from the east
16 side. I think maybe if we can live without that
17 little sliver window there, maybe that's a good
18 compromise. Keep the one upstairs. Eliminate
19 the one downstairs.

20 MR. PARSLEY: I think you are asking for
21 two different things. The one part of this
22 facade that does have some alignment are the
23 skinny windows.

24 MS. KAUTZ: You're adding them to the
25 historic house.

1 MR. PARSLEY: There are five different
2 window sizes there. I don't mind the
3 misalignment. I am thinking maybe if we got
4 some of the windows a little bit -- the two on
5 the right upstairs, are they the same size as
6 the two on the left downstairs?

7 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

8 MR. LEWIS: Yes.

9 MR. PARSLEY: And the two tall skinny ones
10 on the downstairs, is there any reason they have
11 to be so tall?

12 MR. LEWIS: That's the cabana area, and
13 that's more of the social gathering area.

14 MR. PARSLEY: What if you made those the
15 same size?

16 MR. LEWIS: So we would end up having six
17 of the shorter on this elevation.

18 MR. PARSLEY: Take the two broader windows
19 upstairs left, and use those in the cabana
20 bottom right. You get the same amount of light.

21 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: Yeah, it could be. Do
22 you gain anything from that? You are still
23 going to have asymmetry. You're not going to
24 have windows lined up top and bottom. You're
25 going to have the repeating of an existing size.

1 Obviously, to the point made earlier, the
2 windows are where they are because of what works
3 best from the interior layout. Those windows on
4 the bottom having the separation gives us
5 descent wall space on the inside. We are
6 envisioning exercise equipment, a couple of
7 things in there. It gives us a nice solid wall
8 to put things against. So it really functions
9 well in the interior.

10 I absolutely get like -- you're talking to
11 somebody who is. I am a symmetry, alignment --
12 I obsess over this stuff. My architect can
13 confirm that. I do want to say that this is a
14 south elevation. There is not going to be a
15 vantage point where anybody is ever going to get
16 in this view. You have got ten feet of
17 clearance to a lot line. So it's nothing that
18 we are going to be able to have a direct
19 perspective on, ever.

20 So are we trying to attain symmetry on a
21 facade of a house that's simply not going to be
22 very visible ever?

23 MR. SILVA: Kara's request was to align
24 the cabana and the upstairs. And I think, at
25 the very least, the ones on the right. That's

1 certainly doable.

2 MS. KAUTZ: I don't know what the use of
3 that room is. Because if you look at the first
4 floor plan, it's shifted in a weird place. The
5 windows are not -- they don't line up in the
6 room. I just asked that question. I don't know
7 if there was something planned to make that a
8 reason --

9 MR. SILVA: I think maybe if you book-end
10 that facade with two sets of windows that align,
11 maybe it will help a little bit. Maybe the ones
12 all the way on the right should align. The ones
13 on the left should align. I don't see anything
14 in the plan why they shouldn't.

15 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: In terms of the upstairs
16 one, we just want to make sure we have got
17 enough room for a king size bed in between the
18 two. That's the only concern upstairs. And
19 then downstairs, it was just not breaking up the
20 wall too much.

21 MR. LEWIS: Having the opportunity to have
22 a large TV and then things like that on that
23 wall --

24 MR. PARSLEY: Or we could hide it all with
25 the landscaping.

1 MR. SILVA: It's a little difficult
2 because this seems like it needs a little more
3 study.

4 MR. LEWIS: This is one of those things
5 where the location of the windows is more set by
6 the uses of the interior rather than what we're
7 doing on the outside. That was a deliberate
8 decision, again, because this is a south side
9 elevation.

10 MR. FULLERTON: I have a hard time telling
11 which way is north and south on your plans.
12 There is no north arrow to help us out. At
13 least, I couldn't find one.

14 MS. KAUTZ: North is the garage.

15 MR. LEWIS: The garage is at the north
16 entrance. The house faces west. The front of
17 the house faces west.

18 MR. FULLERTON: That's what I deduced.
19 You should put a north, though, on your plans.

20 MS. KAUTZ: The last comment that I had,
21 again -- maybe if we go to the one you all have
22 an issue with as well.

23 On the rear elevation, the only portion of
24 the house that's pretty much staying intact,
25 with the exception of the first floor of this

1 lower -- it's a one-story little jet-out. It's
2 get a getting second story added. So that first
3 floor, the corner windows are staying. They're
4 adding a window in between.

5 But the upper part with the three windows,
6 a portion of that is the only part of that
7 elevation that's remaining. To my recollection,
8 and staff recollection, we could be wrong, we
9 talked about leaving those window proportions
10 exactly as they were, not lengthening the one on
11 the right, not adding one, but sort of
12 maintaining at least part of that facade as
13 original.

14 MR. LEWIS: Our main concern is more about
15 the center window and adding the center window.
16 Because now, we have created a hallway there
17 that we don't want to be this dark hallway with
18 these two isolated windows on either end of it.

19 MR. SILVA: To be honest, we are used to
20 getting something that's a little more -- kind
21 of everybody on the same page before we see this
22 thing. We're being asked to make a lot of
23 design decisions at this meeting, which --
24 usually, they come with one or two disagreements
25 and we get that. But this is a whole list of

1 things that maybe -- I don't know if it can be
2 resolved today. I don't know what the feeling
3 of the rest of the board is.

4 MR. PARSLEY: Let's change the subject for
5 a minute while we mull. We pass the windows.

6 Let's talk about the front wall. This is
7 a neighborhood where there are a lot of front
8 walls already there. I find the proportions of
9 the columns a little heavy. What's the width of
10 the property?

11 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: It's 100 feet wide.

12 MR. PARSLEY: It just looks a little heavy
13 to me. These are what, 24-inch columns or 16?

14 MR. LEWIS: 24.

15 MR. PARSLEY: What's the wall height?

16 MR. LEWIS: The wall height, the CMU part
17 of it is going to be 18 inches, and then 18
18 inches of railing. And that's limited by the
19 zoning code.

20 MS. KAUTZ: 24.

21 MR. PARSLEY: 24? So three-sixths total?

22 MR. LEWIS: Yes.

23 MR. PARSLEY: Anybody else feel --

24 MR. LEWIS: I would be fine making those
25 pilasters smaller. I have no issue with that.

1 MS. THOMPSON: How about that rounding on
2 the corner? Rounding like the corners, like the
3 opening of the driveway. Maybe the corners
4 could be rounded in just on that one side. I
5 don't know how to describe it what I am trying
6 to say. Squared, but curved just on that one
7 corner.

8 MS. KAUTZ: You want to match the front
9 elevation to the door?

10 MS. THOMPSON: Yeah. I guess that's what
11 I'm trying to say.

12 MR. LEWIS: I think that would work having
13 both, at the walkway entrance, having a smaller
14 scale version of that. And then a larger scale
15 version at the driveway I think could work.

16 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: You're suggesting to
17 mimic the --

18 MR. LEWIS: Not mimic it, but give some --

19 MS. THOMPSON: Suggest.

20 MR. PARSLEY: I think you need to bring
21 the wall down so it's not so heavy. The balls,
22 I am not sure what an alternative is. The balls
23 remind me a little bit more of a Mediterranean
24 house than kind of a '40s.

25 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: Fair enough. I don't

1 think we're wedded to that in any way. The
2 proportion of the columns, whatever kind of a
3 cap is appropriate. There is nothing about
4 having the balls on tops of the columns that
5 are -- it was more of an attempt to simply
6 distinguish the entrance posts from something
7 else.

8 MS. THOMPSON: Doesn't your property curve
9 in? I drove passed it. It seemed like there
10 were a lot of curves.

11 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: No. It's straight.

12 MS. THOMPSON: Maybe the streets that were
13 driving into the neighborhood, it's all curving
14 in.

15 MR. PARSLEY: So back to the windows.

16 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Before we go to the
17 windows, are there any comments from staff on
18 the -- I don't know if it's the proposed garage
19 door? Are you set on that design?

20 MS. KAUTZ: No. Typically, things like
21 that get flushed out as they go through.

22 MR. LEWIS: It's not the original --

23 MS. KAUTZ: I don't think that's what it's
24 going to probably end up looking like.

25 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Okay.

1 MR. LEWIS: We'll have a shop drawing note
2 to be submitted.

3 MR. EHRENHAFT: Have we still digressed
4 from the walls?

5 MR. SILVA: Do you have comments on the
6 wall?

7 MR. EHRENHAFT: I am wondering, from one
8 of the -- when I look at A-506, and then I
9 recall one of the colored elevations that had
10 been shown, it looked like you had pipe-like
11 posts going towards the rear with a fabric fence
12 on it. That's the way it appeared.

13 MR. LEWIS: No. That's just the
14 chain-link fence.

15 MR. EHRENHAFT: It's chain-link. Okay.

16 MR. FULLERTON: But it can't go all the
17 way to the front.

18 MR. LEWIS: No. We are going to push all
19 of that back for the wall comment that staff
20 had.

21 MR. EHRENHAFT: On A-506, I see that it
22 runs all the way to the rear of the lot line,
23 but there is a break.

24 MS. KAUTZ: I think that's just a
25 rendering issue. It can't break.

1 MR. LEWIS: We have to have a continuous
2 48-inch --

3 MR. EHRENHAFT: It will come up and touch
4 the CBS?

5 MR. LEWIS: Yes.

6 MR. EHRENHAFT: Thank you.

7 MR. SILVA: Going back to the windows, to
8 summarize my take on it, I would be okay
9 with those four punched openings on the front
10 facade, kind of leaving them in their same
11 position, having staff study maybe the pattern
12 change, something like that.

13 On the east facade, I agree with staff's
14 recommendation to not add that extra window in
15 the dining; to kind of keep the existing masonry
16 openings on the ground floor as they were. I
17 think it's important, keeping the corner windows
18 the same size and not having the window in the
19 center.

20 MS. KAUTZ: That wasn't -- no. We were
21 actually okay with that center.

22 MR. SILVA: Your comment number eight
23 was --

24 MS. KAUTZ: That has to do with the
25 muntin. They need a horizontal muntin.

1 MR. SILVA: But your comment number eight,
2 I thought, said -- it says that -- "existing
3 windows shall not be lengthened, but maintain
4 its existing opening. Similarly, a new window
5 should not be added." Isn't that in there?

6 MR. LEWIS: It's on the second floor.

7 MS. KAUTZ: We have got the symmetry
8 with -- they're lengthening the right one,
9 adding it in the middle, which we had discussed,
10 and we all thought that we were on the same
11 page.

12 MR. PARSLEY: You're saying to eliminate
13 the center one?

14 MR. LEWIS: To have the two dissimilar
15 size windows and not add the third one in the
16 hallway.

17 MR. PARSLEY: I kind of like it.

18 MR. EHRENHAFT: Is that in the hall?

19 MR. LEWIS: Yes.

20 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: I got to say, I get it,
21 that this is going to be an interpretation.
22 Everyone weighs in, but I just can't see how the
23 homeowner, the community, the historic nature of
24 the building benefits from the asymmetry that
25 would be retained. I just don't see the wind

1 for any of us there, versus going with what we
2 have here. It brings light in. I don't think
3 anyone has made the argument it looks worse. I
4 think it looks much better.

5 MR. PARSLEY: I am okay with this drawing
6 myself.

7 MR. SILVA: I thought we were talking
8 about -- that's the new portion of the house,
9 right?

10 MS. KAUTZ: No.

11 MR. SILVA: The second floor.

12 MS. KAUTZ: That's existing.

13 MR. LEWIS: That's an existing wall.

14 MS. KAUTZ: It was the rear wall of the
15 two bedrooms, the bathroom in between. And now
16 it's a hallway.

17 MR. PARSLEY: The function has changed
18 enough to justify a different window. And it's
19 towards the rear.

20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You're talking about --
21 they look like there are doors, and a few
22 windows above that. You're talking about the
23 middle window?

24 MR. LEWIS: Middle window would be new.
25 The one on the right would be a little bit

1 taller than the original.

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You're making them
3 symmetrical?

4 MR. LEWIS: Yeah.

5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I don't have a problem
6 with that. This is the south elevation?

7 MR. LEWIS: This is the east elevation
8 facing the back of the property.

9 MR. PARSLEY: Okay. We're okay with that.
10 Where was the one where you had 16
11 different window sizes?

12 MR. LEWIS: That's the south elevation.

13 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is that 504?
14 Is that 504 we're talking about now?

15 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: Correct, yes.

16 MR. LEWIS: I think we can probably work
17 and get some better alignment here. I don't
18 think we can get a perfect alignment for
19 everything, simply because we have such
20 dissimilar uses for the spaces behind the
21 windows. But I think we can work and try and
22 come up with something a little bit more
23 aligned.

24 MR. PARSLEY: To that point -- so if you
25 look at the two skinny windows -- which,

1 actually, I don't mind having those both there
2 and aligned. I think you actually see the first
3 part of the corners of the house. So being
4 vertically aligned there I think actually helps.
5 But I am okay with, if everybody else agrees, to
6 eliminate the other one.

7 Then the next two pairs are different
8 sizes and offset enough that you don't -- it
9 looks purposeful to be unaligned.

10 And if you go to the far right, you have
11 got two narrower windows, and it's a near-miss.
12 So there, I think, align or miss them more.

13 MR. LEWIS: I think that's reasonable.

14 MS. THOMPSON: I would agree.

15 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: So it's the four windows
16 on the right, if we can get those aligned, you'd
17 be happy with --

18 MR. LEWIS: Or make it look more
19 purposeful, was the word he used.

20 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: Either get them aligned
21 or completely --

22 MR. PARSLEY: Those are the worst to the
23 far, far right. That's the near-miss.

24 MR. LEWIS: And then eliminating the first
25 four small windows at the front, I think he

1 stated.

2 MR. PARSLEY: I am okay with that
3 personally.

4 MS. THOMPSON: Don't eliminate that one.

5 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: My position is I do want
6 -- I realize the board will have to make its
7 decision.

8 MR. LEWIS: If that's the only thing that
9 we can come down to, I think we're pretty good.
10 I think we can figure that out.

11 MR. PARSLEY: I am not the architect here.

12 MS. KAUTZ: I think, historically, you
13 shouldn't add it. The upper one is being added
14 for -- you're taking away the windows. I think
15 there is plenty of light in that living room,
16 that you don't want to start adding a --
17 something that wasn't there.

18 MR. SILVA: I think we should give staff
19 direction on that. My two cents is that we
20 eliminate the one in the living room on the
21 bottom, and we align or more misalign the ones
22 on the right. Anything else?

23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You're talking about
24 eliminating M?

25 MR. SILVA: M on the bottom, yeah, because

1 not an existing masonry opening to the house.

2 All right. Does somebody want to make a motion?

3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: What's the motion?

4 MR. PARSLEY: I'll make a motion to
5 approve the plans as presented, including
6 staff's recommendations for one, two, and three
7 were okay.

8 MS. KAUTZ: Everything but eight, I think,
9 was.

10 MR. PARSLEY: So on eight, eliminate the
11 living room window on the --

12 MR. LEWIS: Eight is the rear elevation
13 for the three windows on the hallway.

14 MR. PARSLEY: We are okay with that.

15 We are okay with the three windows.

16 How do we do the other one? Shall we
17 eliminate window M on the ground floor living
18 room, south facade, right? Is that where it is?

19 MR. SILVA: Either align these --

20 MR. PARSLEY: And study a more purposeful
21 approach to the other windows, particularly, the
22 southeast windows, first floor, second floor on
23 the south facade.

24 MR. MCCOLLOUGH: And that would be
25 something we would work with staff on directly?

1 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

2 MR. McCOLLOUGH: Before you take a vote,
3 we had a couple of questions on the muntins.
4 Can we also have the okay to just work with
5 staff -- there's a couple of questions, two
6 versus three. I think we can come to terms --

7 MR. PARSLEY: You're going to scale down
8 the columns on the front wall to 18. I would
9 look at doing a 36-inch height instead of a
10 42-inch height. If you look at some of the
11 walls on Almeria -- what's the next street south
12 of Almeria? You know where Almeria is? Catty
13 corner to those are some houses.

14 MR. LEWIS: There is one house that I am
15 thinking of in particular on Alhambra Circle
16 north, that I think the same architect did that
17 house. They have got a similar kind of wall, a
18 very low wall that I might to want to look at.

19 MR. McCOLLOUGH: We are not interested in
20 being a fortress here.

21 MR. PARSLEY: Reduce the scale on the
22 maps.

23 MR. McCOLLOUGH: There are two houses away
24 that have 48-inch walls on them existing.

25 MR. PARSLEY: But the lower walls are

1 nice.

2 MR. LEWIS: We want a really low key.

3 MR. PARSLEY: They're much friendlier --

4 MS. KAUTZ: The front elevation on the
5 left-hand side, the windows, were you guys
6 leaving them as is?

7 MR. LEWIS: The four windows on the
8 addition on the front elevation left side,
9 northwest corner.

10 MS. KAUTZ: Are those to remain?

11 MR. SILVA: I would like to have staff
12 study the patterns on the windows. If you
13 accept that as a --

14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Repeat your motion.

15 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Can I second a motion?

16 MR. SILVA: We have a motion and a second.

17 THE CLERK: Mr. Rodriguez?

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

19 THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?

20 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Ms. Thompson?

22 MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

23 THE CLERK: Mr. Fullerton?

24 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

25 THE CLERK: Miss Bache-Wiig?

1 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

2 THE CLERK: Mr. Parsley?

3 MR. PARSLEY: Yes.

4 THE CLERK: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

5 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

6 THE CLERK: Mr. Silva?

7 MR. SILVA: Yes.

8 MR. LEWIS: Thank you very much.

9 MR. SILVA: Do we have any discussion
10 items tonight? I hope not.

11 Motion to adjourn?

12 MR. PARSLEY: Motion to adjourn.

13 MS. THOMPSON: I second it.

14 MR. SILVA: Thank you.

15 (The meeting was concluded.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE

2
3 I, LILLIAN RIVERA, Court Reporter, certify
4 that I was authorized and did stenographically report
5 the foregoing minutes and that this transcript, pages 1
6 through 170, is a true record of the proceedings before
7 the Board.

8
9 I further certify that I am not a relative,
10 employee, attorney, or counsel for any of the parties,
11 nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'
12 attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I
13 financially interested in the action.

14
15 Dated this 15th day of October 2018.

16
17
18 _____
19 LILLIAN RIVERA

20 Notary Public - State of Florida

21 My Commission Expires June 13, 2020

22 Commission # FF 980677
23
24
25