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MR. MENENDEZ: All right. The next case file, Case File COA (SP) 2021-021, an application for the issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for the property at 1224 Country Club Prado, a local historic landmark legally described as the south 15 feet of Lot Ten, and the south 15 feet of Lot 23, and all of Lots 11 to 13, inclusive, and Lots 20 to 22, inclusive, Block 77, Coral Gables Granada Section, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book Eight at Page 113 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The application requests design approval for the demolition, relocation and/or reconstruction of historic site features. Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Okay. Constructed in 1923, designed by Kiehnel and Elliott, the residence at 1224 Country Club Prado is an example of the early type of architecture that helped define the city.

In the 1930 , the rear of the property was developed as a formal garden by the owner, Leslie Coombes, a close associate of Merrick who served as secretary to the Coral Gables Corporation and as an appointed trustee and manager for Coral Gables, Inc., a trust of the corporation.

The garden at the rear showcased his rare
plant collection and contained a central pergola flanked by inter-connecting walkways, a pond, grotto and barbecue, all constructed of native coral.

In 1992, an application was made to split the property into four single-family residential sites. At this time, the Historic Preservation Board considered the property for designation, but they were unable to come to an agreement and so the property was not designated.

The city commission agreed to the lot split. However, they approved three sites rather than the four requested, so this is quite important.

As you can see from the survey there, the red lines roughly delineate the split of the property, so the historic residence is to the east, the historic residence and the outbuilding, and the majority of the garden was to the west, and it is this line to the west that the application is made to split off into two sites.

There were a number of conditions. No developments of these two sites to the west has taken place. However, the city attorney's office has advised that the approval to split these lots is still valid.

Then ultimately in 2019, the entire property was designated.

The applicant before you is in the process of purchasing the property. His intent is to restore and
live in the original historic house and sell the two lots to the west to a developer for the development presumably of two single-family homes.

Any development on these two lots to the west will have to come back to the board for review because even if they're sold, they're still designated historic sites. The applicant is aware that all future proposals for the property and the lots to the west will have to come back to the board for review.

The applicant is really here to try and find out potentially what would get board support prior to his final purchase of the property.

A number of people have been in touch with us about this property. It has been vacant for a couple of years. Nothing has moved forward, and this applicant would like to proceed, but he would like to get some indication from the board as to what potentially he could do with these lots to the west and the property.

So the potential is to relocate some of the items, remove some of the items, and retain some of the items in their current position and restore them.

There's a number of things that have to be considered. Number one is obviously the prior approval to split the property.

The second thing is that the house has been
vacant for a number of years and it's been difficult finding a purchaser.

No documentary evidence has been found to determine whether the garden was designed as one entire landscape or whether it was added to piecemeal over time.

In addition to the Secretary of the
Interior's standards, you also have to be aware of the section of the code. There's a section of the code which relates to the removal or destruction of existing landscape features, and it states:
"No certificate of appropriateness shall be granted for the removal, relocation, concealment or effective destruction by damage of any landscape features or archaeological sites, especially designated as significant within the boundaries of the historic landmark or historic landmark district unless one of the following conditions exist."

And Condition Number One is the designated landscape feature or archaeological site is located in the buildable area or yard area where a structure may be placed and unreasonably restrict the permitted use of the property, so all of this has to be taken into consideration.

So the applicant is requesting either relocation, alteration, or removal of the following
features.
You have in your packet your landscape plan which shows the significant features which was commissioned by the applicant.

This is an aerial view of the property, and as you can see, most of it, most of the landscape is obscured. You can see a circular feature there which we'll discuss.

And so these are the main items that were identified when we were out on the site that the applicant was really requesting permission for.

Number One is a pond. The pond was partially covered when we went out there, but the applicant did have it uncovered for us. The applicant would like to remove the pond and he would like to put a swimming pool here, and staff is recommending that the pond be retained in its original location and restored as a significant feature and the swimming pool be located elsewhere.

Number Two is a small coral rock circle that may have had plants in it or something. This doesn't appear to affect any of the buildable area of the property as a minor feature, but it doesn't look as if it's going to affect anything, so the applicant would like to remove it. Staff is recommending its retention.

Number Three is a coral rock gazebo. This is
entered from a doorway in the north elevation. There are several window openings which don't ever to have appeared to have been, had any frames or glass. There is no roof, but metal poles indicate there may have been a canvas covering. The interior of the gazebo contains a number of tiers with inside it.

As you can actually see from the survey, and I'll go back to it, the lot split from the north to the south actually goes through one wall of the gazebo, so this would effectively be bisected by this proposed lot split.

The applicant is very keen to retain the gazebo, and there are a number of options.

Number One is demolish it, which the applicant doesn't want to do.

Number Two is take it apart and rebuild it on the applicant's lot, which obviously is a major project.

Number Three is actually build a fence along the north-south line and actually put the fence through the interior of the gazebo, which would mean the gazebo is not being altered, but it would cause problems with maintenance issues because it's going to be shared between two properties.

Number Four is reconfigure the lot split so that all of the gazebo is contained within the applicant's
property, but of course, that is a lengthy and costly process which may not be approved.

And Number Five is the ability to perhaps take down the coral rock walls which are within the properties to the east and use that coral rock to rebuild a new rear wall in the gazebo so the entire gazebo is contained within the property to the west.

So staff's recommendation is for the final option. It seems to be the cleanest and simplest way to do it.

The next feature is Number Four, which is a water basin surrounded by coral rock. This is actually on the north, within the north set-back, I believe. It doesn't appear to affect anything in the property, so we are recommending that is retained.

Number Five is a set of coral steps. There are two sets of steps which are bisected by the property line. We believe these are minor features, and if they were split between the properties, really they would have no significant use, so we're okay with them being removed.

Number Six are two carved pathways, and these are actually the features you can see in the aerial. The two curves actually form a circle there.

It's our determination that one of these paths is unsurfaced, one of of them is surfaced with
broken concrete which suggests this was done at a later stage. There is some coral rock along the edges of the path, but $I$ believe the circular feature really, really is visible from the air because of the plantings as opposed to the actual, actual structures themselves.

And so you know, we don't have any real issue with them being removed, especially because this obviously does really affect the buildable lots, and so that has to be taken into account as well.

Number Seven is a broken concrete walkway. This is the walkway that you can actually see on the survey that extends from west to east, across the lots to the west.

This is basically made just from broken concrete, so really it's not a significant architectural material. It does affect the buildable area and the lots, and unreasonably, $I$ would suggest yes, so that has to be considered, and it is only made of concrete slabs. Therefore, there's no real issue from staff with that being removed.

Number Eight is the coral rock fire pit.
Now, the fire pit would affect the buildable area of the northwestern lot.

However, the applicant is willing to dismantle, record, dismantle, and rebuild the fire pit on
his property, either incorporating it into the gazebo or making it a free-standing element near his swimming pool or something, so the coral rock fire pit would be saved.

Number Eight (sic) is a coral rock boulder path. The problem with this path is it doesn't read anywhere. We don't know if there was something at the end of the path. We don't know if it terminated at a fountain or a feature or what, so really there's a path that just sort of peters out.

We did have the applicant uncover some of the soil to make sure there wasn't any solid path underneath it, which there isn't, it's only gravel, and so there's no concern from staff with removing that path.

And Number Ten is another similar path and just on the other side of the lot, so there was no concern with that.

And Number Eleven is there are a number of scattered features, piles of coral rocks, parts of paths of concrete pavers, and we have no real issues with those being removed.

No variances have been requested. However, should there be any alterations to the gazebo, that will require variances. That will come back to the board at that time.
It's not been reviewed by the board of
architects. Obviously any future applications will have to be reviewed by the board of architects.

And so the conclusion is that the history of the site is complex and its future does require serious consideration. We don't know if it was all designed at the same time or designed piecemeal, and there's no documentary evidence to suggest the original intent, so even a restoration would be based on what you could find, and a lot of it would be conjectural, so these are all the things that have to be considered.

Secondly, the restoration of the house and the outbuilding has to be considered. They have been vacant for two years.

Ideally the entire site would be purchased by one person who wanted to retain everything and restore the garden. However, the inquiries we've received so far have come to nothing.

And we also have to bear in mind the approval by the city commission to split the property is still valid. We have to bear in mind the section of the code which refers to unreasonable restrictions on improved lots.

And fourthly you have to determine which features are the most significant. Some are built from coral rock which is an attractive material that requires
skill to shape and build with. Some are simple concrete, and some are prominent purely because of the vegetation. So therefore in consideration of all of the above, staff requests that the following conditions be incorporated into the approval.

Number One, All coral rock from the removed features and found scattered throughout the site shall be salvaged and reused in the properties, for example, to build a new eastern wall in the gazebo or construct new site features.

Two, All coral rock boundary walls around the site shall be retained.

Three, All significant trees and plants and groupings of trees and plants as determined by Public Works shall be retained.

Four, The applicant shall return to the board with all future plans for the restoration, alteration, relocation, reconstruction and/or removal of site features and structures.

Five, The applicant shall inform all potential purchasers of the lots to the west that all alterations and new construction shall require review by the Historic Preservation Board.

Six, The applicant shall ensure that all potential purchasers of the lots to the west will be
required to enter into a legally binding agreement that the gazebo and fire pit, if retained in the western lots, will be retained and maintained.

Seven, All features to be dismantled, relocated and reconstructed shall be fully documented through photographs and drawings prior to dismantling. Eight, An experienced conservator and architect with historic preservation experience shall be retained to oversee the dismantling, relocation and reconstruction of site features.

Nine, The preservation office shall be immediately informed of any issues arising from dismantling, relocation and reconstruction of site features, and all work on the features shall immediately cease until the preservation office has been given the opportunity to provide advice.

Ten, The preservation office shall be immediately informed if any additional features, material or artifacts not identified in this report are uncovered during excavation of the site, and all excavation work shall immediately cease until the preservation office has been given the opportunity to provide advice.

Eleven, All additional features, materials, or artifacts uncovered during excavation shall remain in situ until the preservation office has been given the
opportunity to provide advice.
Twelve, If the preservation office determines further expert advice is required for any features, material or artifacts uncovered during excavations, the property owner shall, at their expense, employ the services of an archeologist.

Thirteen, The landscape plan shall be revised to include all existing site features and submitted to the preservation office along with photographs of the site features.

And Fourteen, All future purchasers of the lots to the west shall be fully informed of and be required to comply with these conditions.

So there is a motion to approve with conditions, and the recommendation is to approve the proposal for, One, the retention in situ and restoration of Feature One, the pond; Feature Two, the coral rock circle; Feature Four, the coral rock surrounding the water basin.

Number Two, The alteration of Number Three, the gazebo, by dismantling the small sections of the walls on the eastern lots and building a new eastern wall of the gazebo in the property line using salvaged coral rock from the site so that all of the gazebo is within the northwestern lot.

Three, The relocation of Number Eight, the coral rock fire pit, with the final location to be submitted for review by the board.

And Four, The removal of Item Number Five, the steps.

Item Six, The curved coral rock path border with partial broken concrete paving.

Seven, The broken concrete walkway.
Nine, The coral rock path border.
Ten, The coral rock path border.
And Eleven, The scattered coral rock and concrete slab features.

So quite a complex site, and there's been a lot of opinions, and you know, this is why the applicant is here, to, you know, hear the board's opinions on this.

We have received two letters which I can read into the record.
"On behalf of the Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables, please accept this letter in support of staff's recommendation to approve the recommendation of the retention in situ and restoration of the following items:
"One, the pond; two, the coral rock circle; four, the coral rock surrounding the water basin.
"However, the other points should take into
account that the property was designated in 2019.
"The local historic designation report specifically includes the formal garden and all its features as part of the designation of the garden.
"It states, 'In the 1930s, the rear of the property was developed as a formal garden by the owner, Leslie Coombes, a close associate of Merrick who served as the secretary to the Coral Gables Corporation and as an appointed trustee and manager for Coral Gables, Inc., a trust of the corporation.
"'The garden showcased his rare plant collection and contained a central pergola flanked by inter-connected walkways, a pond, grotto and barbecue, all constructed of native coral rock. These features are extant among the vegetation of the rear yard.'
"For this reason, it is suggested that the board consider the significance of this property and follow the intent of the 2019 designation.
"The preservation of materials is crucial and it should be retained as part of the property.
"The Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables promotes the understanding and the importance of historic resources and their preservation in Coral Gables.

```
"We ask the Historic Preservation Board to
```

please accept this letter in support of staff's recommendations Items One, Two and Four with the conditions to consider the significance of the property and its formal garden developed by a close associate of George Merrick and which features are part of the designation."

And that's from Karelia Martinez-Carbonell, president, Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables.

A second letter is from Brett Gillis:
"Dear Members of the Historic Preservation Board, I live around the corner from the subject property and am concerned about the impending COA. Neighbors were not given notice because this was a COA. I do not believe the neighborhood has a good handle on what is going on here and the extreme changes that could occur.
"Two, The property was designated as a whole, the beautiful and unique landscape design being a significant part of the designation.
"Three, uif the lot split decision is still legally binding, then $I$ recommend the following: Preserve as much as possible. No coral rock should be removed, but should all be adaptively reused somehow in the property as a visible reminder of the past.
"Something must also be done to ensure the
historic features that may end up on lots with new houses are understood to be historic and irreplaceable, perhaps with historic markers stating this. These features are going to be in the back and difficult to monitor from the public right of way.
"This is concerning. It may be better for the coral rock landscape features on the ground to be moved to the site with historic buildings.
"Four, Any COA approved involves the moving or relocation of historic fabric such as coral rock should be contingent upon a legal agreement that the parcel will indeed be split into three lots with two lots facing Red Road that will remain designated so that two compatible homes could be constructed facing Red Road instead of one McMansion. They should not be able to move the historic fabric if they aren't going to split the lots.
"Five, Finally and perhaps my strongest point, historic preservation is not punitive. It would be nice to help the residents achieve their functional objectives, but historic preservation is not one-sided.
"It is not only what we as residents ask of history and preservation, it is also what historic preservation asks of us.
"It is my position to work with the homeowners to achieve their objectives, but that a COA
permits relocation of historic fabric to allow a lot split should include the restoration of all the historic fabric remains.
"Therefore, in summary, One, the agreement must result in two lots facing Red Road that are ununifiable.
"Two, The agreement must result in the preservation and adaptive reuse of all the coral rock in the site.
"And Three, The revenue from the sale of the two lots must be used for restoration of the historic site, including the building, features, fabric, et cetera.
"I cannot stress enough, please do not allow the lots to be split and coral rock moved just for this lovely old Spanish home to sit there and rot away."

And that's from Brett Gillis.
Now, the city attorney will advise you on the lot split and how it is still valid and how the boards may or may not use that lot split in their consideration.

MR. CEBALLOS: So as previously indicated, the lot split happened back in 1992, Ordinance 2993. If you actually go to our current zoning code, there is a cite specific for this property with this particular lot split, so it's in our code.

The issue is that when it was designated in

2019, it basically made the lot split unusable, meaning the only way they could be used is if the historic components from these lots are relocated.

So in essence, the lot split exists but is
not usable until this board approves certain components to be moved or relocated. That's basically it in a nutshell.

MS. SPAIN: So they couldn't have a lot split
and just keep -- oh, I'm sorry. They couldn't have a lot split and just keep the historic --

MR. DURANA: Elements.
MS. SPAIN: -- stuff, elements on those lots?
MR. CEBALLOS: I'm not sure whether that's
feasible or not. That is not my area of expertise.
MS. SPAIN: Okay, but legally --
MR. CEBALLOS: Legally --
MS. SPAIN: -- legally the lot split is still
absolutely valid, and I get that.
Because the entire property is designated as historic, the Historic Preservation Board would approve whatever is built on the other two lots --

MR. CEBALLOS: Correct.
MS. SPAIN: -- regardless of what historic
fabric is left on them?
MR. CEBALLOS: Correct.
MS. SPAIN: Okay.

MR. FULLERTON: I was thinking something like along those lines. The fire pit, for instance, might be left alone -- sorry, my phone is doing -- sorry. I had it on silent I thought.

So the fire pit might remain if the property line is far enough south of it to allow it to stand alone and the new house designed in some way around it.

MR. INFANTE: I'll let my architect and
friend Orlando speak about that. First of all, my name is -- may I speak?

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MR. ADAMS: It's up to the chair. This is the property owner. Would you like -- or not the owner; the potential, the potential owner. Would you like him to speak now before board discussion?

MR. MENENDEZ: Are you through with your presentation?

MR. ADAMS: I am through with my presentation, yes.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, then.
MR. INFANTE: Good evening.
MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

MR. INFANTE: My name is Jose Infante, and I reside at 840 Granada Grove Court. I am, presently have the property under contract, and I'm here to see if the
board allows me to go forward with our plan, which we concur with staff.

I plan to live on the property until whatever days I have left.

Regardless of your decision tonight, I wanted to take a minute and thank you all. For the ones that I have spoken to and staff, you have been very professional, made it very painless for me, and as a Coral Gables resident, I'm very proud of that.

So with that I've said, I would like to present my friend, Orlando Comas, and landscape architect, and if you have any questions on how we plan to do it, he is the man.

MR. ADAMS: May we have the Power Point, please?

MR. COMAS: Hello, Mr. Chairman, board members, staff. My name is Orlando Comas. I'm a registered landscape architect. This one?

MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MR. COMAS: Okay. I made a very brief presentation here. This wall is on 57 th Avenue, and it has one little gate that you can see the center, but it will remain, from the red mark to the red mark, which is the property lines, it will remain intact.

MR. FULLERTON: Even when a new house is
built?
MR. COMAS: Yes. That's one of, one of the conditions that, well, when they approved the splitting of the lots, they have that as a condition.

MR. ADAMS: Yes. There will be access to the houses which will come back to the board at that time, and when the lots were split, there was a condition that both houses should have a semi-circular driveway.

Staff would not support that because it involves loss of a lot more of the wall, so we would work with the applicants and the board to minimize the amount of the coral rock wall that would be removed for access.

MR. COMAS: I feel that when whomever comes in front of the board with those two lots, it should have one cut, not two, but that will be up to you.

MR. FULLERTON: So would you do that kind of in the center and let them go?

MR. COMAS: Could be, yeah, but that will be at that time your decision.

MR. FULLERTON: That would kill my idea about leaving the fire pit where it was.

MR. COMAS: This was thanking you all. This, the purple -- yes, but they're seeing that line.

MR. FULLERTON: The mic.
MR. COMAS: The purple dashed line in the
center of the property practically has no trees. There is a couple of, a tract is here for Chinese fan palms and a few solitaire palms.

But the majority of the trees are within the perimeter of the property, of the two lots, nothing in the center, so it will provide for the new developer to be able to build without necessarily having to disturb the existing vegetation.

I was asked to prepare a vegetation survey, and Public Works, Jim Avel (phonetic) called me, "Are you moving?"
"No, no, no. I just prepared a vegetation survey for records."

Because there was no documentation in files, any previous records of any existing trees or anything like that.

So that itself is a convenient asset for the new developer whenever it comes.

Now, we have all the way in the back in red the fire pit, which has several options in the conditions. One option is to place it where "A" is, next to the grotto.

Another option is to move it all the way inside the property that Mr. Infante will live in.

And another one, which is not in the
conditions but could be, is leave it where it is and let the new owners --

MR. FULLERTON: Take care of it.
MR. COMAS: -- come in front of you.
MS. SPAIN: Well, they'll have to anyway.
MR. FULLERTON: Right, yes.
MR. COMAS: Yeah. It's really up to you. He will, Mr. Infante will accept any condition.

The issue of the grotto, I have a light green and a dark green. The grotto goes all the way to the structure. I don't know what they call that.

Now, we can either remove the dark green and build the wall right on the property line, or to allow some set-back to the new lot, remove the dark green and the light green and build a wall there. That way the property line will have a set-back on both sides and rebuilding the grotto shouldn't be a problem.

In dark blue is the pond. Unfortunately, I don't have a photo of the pond. You do?

MR. ADAMS: There was one.
MS. ROLANDO: It's in the book.
MR. COMAS: You do.
MS. ROLANDO: It's in the book.
MS. SPAIN: We have one.
MR. COMAS: Yeah. I really -- you know, it's
about 14 inches deep, all cracked, full of grass. Some of the sides are in coral, which I don't know how it kept the water, but it probably did.

It's not a basin designed for kois or -because it's not too deep or anything like that; maybe for a little fountain, or it's really up to you if you want to keep the motion of keeping it or --

MS. SPAIN: Do you know if there's plumbing that goes to it?

MR. COMAS: I'm sorry?
MS. SPAIN: Have you found any plumbing that goes to it or any type of --

MR. COMAS: No.

MS. SPAIN: Doesn't the one at the Merrick House have plumbing, water that goes to it, or not?

MS. KAUTZ: In the back?

MS. SPAIN: No, no, no, no; the pond in the front.

MR. COMAS: No, and it doesn't have drainage.
MR. FULLERTON: Is it possible --
MR. COMAS: So it was either they filled it up with a hose and they pumped it out.

MR. ADAMS: I don't believe you've dug all the way down to the bottom of the pond, though.

MR. FULLERTON: Pardon?

MR. ADAMS: You haven't dug all the way down to the bottom of the pond. It's still filled in with soil and --

MR. COMAS: No, no. I mean, it's visible, so, yeah.

MR. FULLERTON: Is it possible for them to come back with an idea, at some point in the future, maybe five, ten years from now --

MR. COMAS: Yeah.
MR. FULLERTON: -- then with an idea to reestablish it as something but leave it there in that place?

MS. SPAIN: I think those ponds were fairly typical in the '20s.

MR. FULLERTON: Yeah.
MS. SPAIN: And someone told me, and I can't think of who it is, but they would go fishing and they would bring the fish back and put them in the pond.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: I don't know if they ate them, $I$ don't know. I have no idea.

But they were very typical for the ' 20 s, but I thought that they were actually piped.

MR. COMAS: Mr. Fullerton is right. I mean, we can -- you can approve it to stay, and then when we
come back --
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MR. COMAS: -- when the pool is going to be built, maybe it's on the way of the pool.

MR. FULLERTON: If it remains there
undisturbed for now, I mean --
MR. COMAS: It's not going to bother anybody.
MR. FULLERTON: -- at some point --
MR. COMAS: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: -- you come back and you say,
"Hey, I've got and idea for it."
MR. COMAS: And then there is the little
round circle, and you know, we don't mind --
MR. INFANTE: And you just gave me an idea for the fish because my father and I were fishers.

MS. SPAIN: There you go. I know that sounds really stupid. Who could possibly --

MR. COMAS: This is the grotto.
MS. SPAIN: That's very cool.
MR. COMAS: Which with some good professional stone mason, it could be rebuilt.

MR. INFANTE: I already have two outfits.
MR. COMAS: This is the grotto from the back, from the west.

MS. SPAIN: Very cool. I am so sorry I
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missed going out there.
MR. FULLERTON: That's why you want to keep it.

MR. COMAS: This is the walkway through the center of the property which is just pieces of concrete. There are some, by the way, some beautiful trees, beautiful.

MR. FULLERTON: There's one amazing tree that must be 150 years old, lying down.

MR. COMAS: That's dead.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes, that's quite dead.
MS. SPAIN: Oh, well.
MR. FULLERTON: But I saw it from the Red Road side.

MR. COMAS: Two of them.
MR. FULLERTON: Really? That's the biggest tree I've seen in Coral Gables, like the biggest oak I've ever seen.

MR. COMAS: But there are two, one in the front and one all the way close to 57 th Avenue, wild tamarinds which are probably --

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: -- 35 inches in DVH.
MS. SPAIN: Wow.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes, I think in
circumference, it might be eight, nine feet.

MR. COMAS: Yes.

MR. INFANTE: And you know, bulk trees like that, they're called dead fallen trees. If you go to Metro Zoo, you'll see them there and we put them there, with permits.

MR. FULLERTON: No kidding.

MR. INFANTE: Yeah, with permits, so I had to pay for those. If I had known --

MR. FULLERTON: Why aren't you going to sell
them to the zoo?

MR. COMAS: Maybe he didn't mention -- and $I$ know this because we're friends since we were 14.

MR. INFANTE: Right.

MR. COMAS: -- but he is the founder and co-owner of SFM which does a lot of maintenance work for Coral Gables.

MS. SPAIN: Oh, yes.

MR. INFANTE: Landscape installation, et cetera.

MR. FULLERTON: You need to get your card.
MS. SPAIN: SFM.

MR. COMAS: The little orange cars. That's the little circle that you want to keep also, right?

MR. ADAMS: I'm just trying to retain as much

```
as possible --
```

MR. COMAS: Right, right.
MR. ADAMS: -- on the non-developable lots, but that's a decision for the board.

MR. COMAS: We don't have a problem -- I have a feeling, I have a feeling that that basin there was in the center of that circle.

MS. ROLANDO: Was in the center of what?
MR. COMAS: Of the coral rock circle, but that's just gut feeling.

Oh, this is the other one that you can barely see it. Right behind the pole, there is a metal basin -is it metal? -- metal basin surrounded by coral rock, which we don't mind it, you know, staying there. It's right next to the grotto.

Some of the trees eventually are going to have to come with a tree disposition and be removed. I would recommend to him that he leaves all of that, he doesn't remove it now because it will open up the view to 57th Avenue.

MR. FULLERTON: Right. You don't want to do that.

MR. COMAS: So just leave it there. Just a bunch of -- this is part of the fire pit. That's the fire pit --

MS. SPAIN: I think it should stay there.
MR. COMAS: -- which could be rebuilt. That is just a colored one $I$ did so that it would be easier to understand, but the light green in the center are just -let me see if there is -- no. It's just intertwined mixed shrubs and vines, and it's really messy.

MR. FULLERTON: It's beautiful, though.
MR. COMAS: Yes, yes.
MR. FULLERTON: It's lovely, lovely compared to the front.

When you look at the front, it's so sterile and open, and you go to the back, I walked along the whole wall there and I was over the wall and hoping I wasn't being watched by the police or anything, but it's so beautiful back there.

MR. INFANTE: The most important thing is the house.

MR. COMAS: Yes, yes.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MR. INFANTE: I want to maintain the house and live in the house.

MR. COMAS: He has a love affair, a new love affair with the house.

MR. FULLERTON: I had a thought about the wall, and I don't want to take it down in any way.

MR. COMAS: No way.
MR. FULLERTON: But I thought rather than do one hole in the middle of it which would take down that fire pit, you do two like 12-foot openings on the north and the south.

MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MR. FULLERTON: And then you allow access to a courtyard, and the houses are, houses are kind of made to fit together in such a way to create a nice space between.

MR. COMAS: If it's designed by one developer, it could.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes, yes.
MR. COMAS: You could design it with a mutual entrance.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes, and that way you'd preserve the longest section of it without any break and you could make some sort of -- I'm concerned about access to Red Road also with that, so you know, you got to figure out how to make sure it's safe.

MR. COMAS: Yeah, because it would not be easy to back up.

MR. FULLERTON: Sorry?
MR. COMAS: It would not be easy to back up.
MR. FULLERTON: No, you couldn't.

MR. CEBALLOS: Pardon my interruption, my apologies. It's just something I should probably bring to light so that everyone is aware of it.

As part of the original ordinance back in

1992, there are certain conditions that they need to still abide by, the first of one, we can't find a vegetation plan from 1991. I believe everyone has attempted to and they haven't been able to, so I think we probably have to go off of the most recent vegetation plan.

But there are different, there are three -four more points, and I'll read them just so that everyone has them. They're very short.
"One, In addition to the specified trees," which we have to go off the most recent record, "as much of the existing vegetation as possible shall be preserved.
"As much of the existing coral rock wall, house and guest house as practical be preserved with no major modifications made to the residence." That is the part that is now historic.
"The development for the plans of the two building sites include circular driveways to facilitate safer access to Red Road."

So there may be a few more intrusions than originally anticipated on that coral rock wall, but that was considered by the commission back in 1992.

And that basically any plans for the development on the homes on Red Road and any tree removal permit will need to be reviewed by the planning department with the plans with these records just so that everybody knows.

MR. FULLERTON: You could have a single entrance on the north and a single lane in the south and a cul-de-sac of some sort inside the property which allows you to turn around and come back out.

MR. ADAMS: Question, Gus: That was, those conditions were made before it was a historic site?

MR. CEBALLOS: That is correct.
MR. ADAMS: Now it's a historic site. Does the board have the authority to override the condition and the circular driveways? I don't think we need to know right now. It may be something that we need to consider.

MR. CEBALLOS: As of right now, I'd have to look into it.

MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MR. CEBALLOS: But my inclination is that would probably need to go back to the commission --

MR. ADAMS: Okay.
MR. CEBALLOS: -- for some sort of approval. Although the site plan itself is part of the code which the board has the authority to, frankly, override, these
conditions are not part of the code. They were part of an ordinance by our city commission, so I would recommend that they probably have to go back to the commission if they needed to be modified.

MR. COMAS: Gentlemen, ladies, thank you.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Comas?
MR. COMAS: Yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Do you agree with all the conditions and stipulations that have been addressed here in the --

MR. COMAS: Yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: You would abide by all the conditions here?

MR. INFANTE: Yes, I do.
MR. MENENDEZ: Fire pit, you would --
MR. INFANTE: Relocate.
MR. MENENDEZ: -- relocate to your side of the property?

MR. INFANTE: My side or in the same lot, but I would have to come back to you and ask you permission.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MS. ROLANDO: What about leaving the fire pit as is in its current location?

MR. INFANTE: That might be a hindrance to whoever wants to buy the lot if you have --

MR. MENENDEZ: The thing is when he sells the two properties to the north, he loses access --

MR. FULLERTON: No, to the west.
MR. MENENDEZ: To the west, he loses access to that fire pit.

MS. ROLANDO: Yes, I know.
MR. FULLERTON: Well, yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: So I would much rather that that fire pit and any coral rock be saved and moved.

MR. COMAS: It will be better for him if we relocate it.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. ROLANDO: I'm sorry?
MR. COMAS: It will be better for him if we relocate it because he will be able to sell the lot clear of any --

MS. ROLANDO: No, I understand.
MR. INFANTE: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: The big thing that I get concerned about is that item we had three or four months ago, the house that somebody wanted to move that had a coral rock base on it.

There is no way to move coral rock without -you know, it has to be dismantled completely and then built again, and that would mean to me you'd have to
present some sort of plan how to do it.
MR. ADAMS: There are conditions there that dictate, you know, a conservator, a preservation architect, full recording of the structure before dismantling, and again, that would all have to come back to you so you can determine if the plan is strong enough or not.

MR. MENENDEZ: That's one of the conditions.
MR. FULLERTON: You almost have to dismantle it stone by stone, mark the stone, where it went and you --

MR. INFANTE: Let the experts do it.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes, thank you, and the other question $I$ had is where do you find an archeologist? Do we have --

MR. ADAMS: There are plenty archeologists in there.

That is really just $a$, that is sort of $a$ safeguard just in case either the applicant or any future developer starts uncovering the site and they start uncovering other landscape features that are perhaps buried, we would want them uncovered carefully, fully documented, and then they will have to come back to you as well should they, you know, should any future developer wish to move them.

And that's, $I$ 'm not anticipating it, but better be safe than sorry.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak in favor of this case?

MS. LYONS: There was someone in the audience who had their hand up, but they put their hand down.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Is there anyone in the audience --

MS. LYONS: Wait, wait, wait. Okay. There's someone in the audience -- I'm asking them to unmute.

MS. MARTINEZ-CARBONELL: Hello? Hi. This is Karelia.

MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.
Ms. MARTINEZ-CARBONELL: Hello?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. MARTINEZ-CARBONELL: Okay. Hello, everyone. Good evening. Yes. Thank you for reading the letter from the Historic Preservation Association. I am representing our group as president.

And I do want to just again emphasize that the whole property was designated historic in 2019. The designation report does not mention a lot split. It designated the whole garden and all the coral rock that is part of the garden.

So, and I am listening to everybody speaking.

I think we all agree the coral rock really cannot be moved without it being then destroyed.

So you know, please consider that even if the lots are split, those coral rock features should remain because the lots are historic in and of themselves, and hopefully, you know, that is going to be the consensus.

But again, splitting these coral rock features and the barbecue pit and the grotto, you know, strongly please go back to the designation report, and let's -- and we need to honor that because then that is our document that we go by, and if we don't, you know, if we don't abide by it, then, you know, you know, there's an issue.

So that's what I'd like to just emphasize, please, to please consider the designation report and do not split these features. Thank you.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Anyone in the audience who would like to speak in opposition to this case?

Okay. We'll close out the public hearing portion. Any discussion, questions?

MS. ROLANDO: I know a number of you were able to visit the site. Some of the features that -- and I'm usually very deferential to the staff report and recommendations.

There's a few of the things that the staff has recommended be preserved that I don't feel strongly about. You know, the rusted-out tub with the coral rock around it, $I$ would not throw myself in front of the bulldozer for that, or the circle of rocks.

I feel strongly about the gazebo, and I think either severing it at the property line or a few feet set-back and building a wall there would be a positive thing because you wouldn't be disrupting the existing structure and you'd figure out some way to stabilize it structurally.

I was kind of wondering how the beam across, above the opening for the window was staying there, but you know, $I$ didn't get real close to it.

I do feel strongly about the gazebo, and I think the fire pit, slash, fireplace is a wonderful feature, and I'm not really in favor of moving that. I think any creative architect can plan around it and design around it.

So you know, the pond, I can't get excited about one way or another, but you know, I'm willing to accept the staff recommendations on the pond, but I don't think it's life or death.

The gazebo, though, and the fire pit I think are significant architectural features, and they're very
charming, you know. They're, it's, you think, when you come upon it, you think, "Oh, gee, this is like a movie of some sort, you know, it's Indiana Jones."

So I would respectfully request that this board consider the fire pit remaining.

MR. ADAMS: And bear in mind, any of the smaller, more insignificant features, the applicant can come back to you, back to you in the future, so I agree, they are smaller and more insignificant features.

The attempt was to try and keep everything that was not on a lot that was going to be developed because it doesn't appear to be as affected by that section in the code, so that was what, that was what the thinking was behind recommending the retention.

MR. FULLERTON: I understand what the applicant's concerns is about selling property and working around it, but if you're able to open the driveways on the two ends, you could arrange those two homes so that that fire pit is a feature of both of them. They could have porches looking out at them or so forth.

MS. SPAIN: Or it's on one property. I don't know where that line ends.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, it appears to be included in the north lot.

MS. SPAIN: In the north one, right.

MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: So that's just an amenity that they have.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: That's just a quirkiness of, you know, "Oh, not only do you get a lot, but you get this amazingly cool fire pit."

MR. FULLERTON: And if you put the
entrance --
MS. ROLANDO: And the weird gazebo.
MS. SPAIN: And the weird gazebo in the back.
How cool is that?
MS. ROLANDO: Two for the price of one.
MS. SPAIN: Yes, I'd buy it.
MR. FULLERTON: And if you place the entrance drives on the north and south, you can orient the homes that way and put a circular driveway and which would allow a U-turn or turn, turn around on both, on the north side and on the extreme south side.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
MR. FULLERTON: Yes, that's right.
THE COURT REPORTER: I didn't hear you.
MR. FULLERTON: I want that lot.
THE COURT REPORTER: I didn't hear what you
said.

MR. COMAS: The north lot gets both the grotto --

MS. LYONS: Sir, can you step up to the microphone, please?

MR. COMAS: The north lot gets the grotto and the fire pit --

MS. SPAIN: And the fire pit.
MR. COMAS: -- if they stay.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: They will.
MR. COMAS: Yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So can I get a motion from somebody?

MR. COMAS: But that may make things a little bit difficult.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes, I know. The architects can be very creative when they need to be.

MR. COMAS: They can be.
MR. FULLERTON: And I think that big fat tree ought to remain there too.

MS. ROLANDO: Let me just ask, what is the sense of the board about the fire pit?

MS. SPAIN: Are you taking a little poll here before you make a motion?

MS. ROLANDO: Yes, yes. You know, let's like
edit in advance.
MS. SPAIN: I would like it to stay.
MR. FULLERTON: I would like it to stay. I
hope we're not --
MR. INFANTE: We can do that.
MS. ROLANDO: Bruce?
MR. FULLERTON: -- making it an extreme
difficulty.
MR. EHRENHAFT: I'm sorry. I would like -- I don't think the mic is working. I would like it to stay in situ if possible, but that would be a matter of who your buyer would be or who likes that lot.

I have a question. Is it conceivable that you might find the perfect buyer who would buy both of those lots? If that, I mean, if that happened, that would make -- and if you had a purchaser for the northwest lot, the two portions, and they were adamant that they were not going to buy it unless the fire pit were gone, then you have committed to working with stone masons that are experienced and your landscape architect, and you would move it to your property which is on the east side.

MR. INFANTE: That's correct. That was my whole intention.

MS. ROLANDO: Albert, the motion.
MR. MENENDEZ: Please, please approach, come
to the podium.
MR. INFANTE: I apologize. Yes, that would be the idea, and I do have already two contractors that specialize in coral rocks.

MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay, but my preference would be that if you find a buyer for that lot, that it be left in situ and not disturbed.

MR. INFANTE: If it's possible, if it's possible, I think.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Rolando would like to make a motion.

MS. ROLANDO: Okay.
MR. ADAMS: It may help if we just go through them, numbered one -- you know, go through them one at a time and give your recommendation; in other words, "Must remain," "Can be removed," "Can be altered," you know, whatever you feel best.

MS. ROLANDO: Okay.
MR. ADAMS: But maybe if we go through them one at a time.

MS. ROLANDO: Okay. Let's see. I would -- I move, okay, first of all, that any motion is subject to the staff's conditions, and I would move for the retention in situ and restoration -- no, the alteration of the gazebo by dismantling the small sections of the gazebo
where it intersects with the existing garage or auxiliary structure so that all of the gazebo would be located within the northwest lot.

I would also move for retention of the coral rock fire pit, and as to the other landscaping features, that the retention and restoration be subject to staff's approval and they be optional, whether they remain or not.

Or do you want me -- let's say -- let me amend that. We'll okay the removal of the steps, curved rock path borders, the broken concrete walkway which is dangerous, the coral rock path border, the coral rock, both Nine, Ten and Eleven, so okay the removal of Five, Six, Seven, Nine, Ten and Eleven.

MR. MENENDEZ: What about the pond?
MS. SPAIN: What about the restoration of the pond, the coral rock circle and the --

MS. ROLANDO: See, I would leave that up to staff, but $I$ have no problem saying that they would remain in situ and be restored if that's the sense of the board.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, the coral rock pond is on your property, right?

MR. INFANTE: Yes, sir.
MR. FULLERTON: So it's not even on --
MS. ROLANDO: Yes. This is -- but it's
shallow, and some of it is concrete and some of it is
coral rock, so it's -- and I don't see how it holds water.
MR. FULLERTON: Well, I don't think it
matters. I think if they want to do, come back to us with what they want to do with that, that's one thing.

I'm concerned what's happening on the
property that he's going to sell.
MS. ROLANDO: So then why don't we say
retention in situ and restoration of the pond --
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. ROLANDO: -- and leave it at that?
MR. FULLERTON: Okay, and then --
MS. ROLANDO: But the coral rock circle and the coral rock surrounding the water basin, I don't -- I would authorize the removal of those.

MR. FULLERTON: But retaining the coral rock.
MS. ROLANDO: Absolutely, retaining and
reusing all of the materials.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MR. FULLERTON: Right.
MS. ROLANDO: Should I try recapping that again?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: No.
MS. SPAIN: No.
MS. KAUTZ: No.
MR. MENENDEZ: Do we have a second?

MR. FULLERTON: Second, I'll second.
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Fullerton seconds.
MS. ROLANDO: Whatever.
MR. FULLERTON: Whatever she said.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MR. FULLERTON: I'm very excited about it.
MR. INFANTE: Thank you, thank you.
MR. FULLERTON: And appreciate your attitude
toward the whole thing.
MR. INFANTE: When it's all done, we'll have
a roast pig or something.
MR. FULLERTON: I'd like to come over --
MR. INFANTE: Thank you so much.
MS. ROLANDO: Good luck.
MR. INFANTE: Good night.
MR. FULLERTON: I'd like to come over -- is it okay if $I$ come over and walk -- I wasn't there to visit the site.

MR. INFANTE: Anytime, anytime, sir.
MR. FULLERTON: Is somebody there most of the time?

MR. INFANTE: No, but he has my number.
MR. FULLERTON: Oh, okay.
MR. INFANTE: And you know, you can reach out to me and I'll be happy to walk you through.

MR. MENENDEZ: Charge him. Thank you.
MR. INFANTE: Good night, everybody. Thank you.

MR. MENENDEZ: Good night. The next case file is Case File COA (SP) 2017-025, revised, an application for the issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for the property at 4200 Granada Boulevard, a local historic landmark legally described as Lots 10 and 11, Block 99, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part Five, according to the plat thereof, as
recorded in Plat Book 23 at Page 55 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The application requesting design approval for an addition and alterations to the residence was granted approval with conditions on February 15th, 2018.

This application requests after-the-fact design approval for a revision to the approved certificate of appropriateness due to a deviation from the previously-approved plans.

MR. ADAMS: Okay. This application was actually at the prior meeting, it was before the board at the prior meeting, and at that time the applicant was directed to amend the design and bring it back to the board.

The applicant felt that he could amend the design and still not get board approval. He was not in a position to appeal the decision of the board because a denial wasn't actually given. He was just told that he had to go away and come back with a new design.

So basically this is for the after-the-fact design approval for deviations from previously-approved plans for an increase in the height of the elevator tower, amended design for the stairs in the south elevation of the addition.

And there was also a request for approval for
a change of design of previously-approval railings and for a natural limestone finish to the front of the addition at the first floor, the first floor.

So the previously-approved plans included the construction of a new elevator tower as part of the new two-story addition on the east elevation. The approved elevator tower was depicted as having no impact on the elevation, and no part of the tower was intended to rise above the roof line per the applicant's letter of intent.

During construction, it was determined the elevator required a higher travel above the second floor than had been designated in the plans. The height required by the elevator equipment resulted in the elevator shaft protruding above the roof, and then on top of the shaft at the moment is a pyramidal roof structure as well which also adds to the height.

So as I said, all of this was reviewed by the board previously. The applicant didn't feel that there was direction in what he had to bring back, and he did not have a decision that was appealable to the city commission, so he's appearing before you again to request again the recommendation made by staff in the previous report, and so I'll let him, I'll let him take it from here.

MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Asrani, have you been
sworn in?
MR. ASRANI: No, but I'm glad to. (Thereupon, Mr. Asrani was duly sworn on oath.)

MR. ASRANI: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen.

Unfortunately, this is not as interesting as lychee trees and mango trees and the other application that you approved, but it is, however, something that is five years into the making.

My wife and I have owned this house for about 12 years, and five years ago we filed an application to install an elevator because of the challenge that a two-story house poses when you get a certain age, so at that point we received a certificate of appropriateness from the board and the staff.

Unfortunately for us and to make matters worse, we had hired someone who represented himself as an architect and designer. Unbeknownst to us, he was not an architect, and so we became victims of his incompetence, and now we are having to pay the price for all the mistakes he made. Until this day, we don't know who signed off on the drawings.

During the course of construction and when the tie beams were being placed, he realized that the two-story elevator in a standard cab height and its
equipment would not fit into the existing height of the house, so he told the general contractor to raise the height of the elevator shaft.

He did not make any attempt to consult with the staff or leave alone make an application to get another certificate of appropriateness.

So at the October 20 th meeting, we were chastised for this transgression and perhaps rightfully so.

On the other hand, you're fully aware of the fact that any building that has been approved will have some alterations or changes that occur during the course of construction, and the process starts you off from the very beginning if you want to make those changes, so it's not possible, practically speaking, to just stop all construction and start this process all over again to get prior permission. That's the practical end of things.

On the October the 20 th meeting, the staff had recommended approval of the changes we wished to make in conjunction with them. Mr. Adams had visited the site twice since and noted the shaft, that the shaft and its roof were not visible on three sides of the shaft and was barely visible from the street.

Technically speaking, we got the approval for appropriateness based on the fact that the front entrance
to house is to the west on the waterway, and that's an important point to note.

At this point the elevator is in its place, and there's no substantive structure changes that can be made without acute hardship.

We didn't want to come back, as Mr. Adams mentioned, because we had no guidance and there was no certainty that the board would entertain any other option that we might have.

So therefore I urge the board to approve the changes as presented at the last meeting, and you have my word that we will do everything possible so we stay true to form and that the elevator shaft conforms to the architectural facade of the house.

We value the significance of this house, so please do not punish us for the mistakes made due to circumstances that were beyond our control. Thank you.

MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Adams, you've been to the site several times?

MR. ADAMS: I've been twice.
MR. FULLERTON: Have you been able to observe the equipment on the, above the cab?

MR. ADAMS: I have not seen the equipment, no.

MR. FULLERTON: I'd love to get a picture of
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what's above the cab to see how much space really is necessary for the mechanical equipment.

MR. ASRANI: What we placed on top
of the shaft --
MR. FULLERTON: Right.
MR. ASRANI: -- is the motor and some other technical equipment, enough room for a technician to come and service the elevator. It has to have by code enough room to be able to get in and service the elevator.

MR. FULLERTON: Do they have to stand up in there, or can they crawl around?

MS. SPAIN: That's not very -- I have an elevator in my home, and it's really not very much space. It's an amazingly small space that they were able to get into to service the elevators.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes, yes.
MR. ASRANI: We didn't go up any more than what we had to.

MR. FULLERTON: Do you have any photographs of the space?

MR. ASRANI: I don't, I don't have any photographs. I do have photographs of the shaft itself, but I show you that it will not, it was not intended to go anywhere beyond, as a matter of fact, we had to really be very cautious to make sure that we don't exceed what we
need to service the elevator.
MR. FULLERTON: I feel for you, and I feel terrible that these people have taken advantage of you in such a way.

But it bothers me that something so radical could have been built without somebody seeing what was going on, you particularly, and I know, you know, I feel badly for you, but I don't know what to say about it. I mean, it's certainly --

MR. ASRANI: A regular --
MR. FULLERTON: If it was built that way, I'd say, "Okay, it looks okay," but it wasn't intend to or shown to be built like that.

MR. ASRANI: Unfortunately, because of the inexperience of the architect --

MR. FULLERTON: Brito, Brito?
MR. ASRANI: I didn't want to mention his name. Yes, it is.

MR. FULLERTON: Mr. Brito is quite an experienced architect, as far as I remember.

MS. SPAIN: I don't think he's registered.
MR. FULLERTON: Huh?
MS. SPAIN: I don't think he's registered.
MR. FULLERTON: He's not registered.
MR. ASRANI: I'm sorry, I'm losing my voice.

MR. FULLERTON: This isn't Romero Brito, the artist?

MS. ROLANDO: No.

MR. ASRANI: No.

MS. SPAIN: Can I ask one question? Why has this not been to the board of architects?

MR. ASRANI: I beg your pardon?
MS. SPAIN: I mean, it's supposed to go to the board of architects before us, and I was looking for the recommendation of the board of architects, because $I$ can't imagine that they would approve it if they saw this, and because it's coming to us without the board of architects seeing it, it falls all on us.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes, but I've been on the board of architects, and there are 80 applications --

MS. SPAIN: I understand.
MR. FULLERTON: -- for two or three, groups of two or three guys, and something like this, say, "Hey, it looks about the same as the other stuff," you know, it would squeak by.

MS. SPAIN: No, I don't think they would do that for this one, and at least it should have been, gone to the city architect to get --

MR. FULLERTON: Oh, yes. That's where it would have been -- yes.

MS. SPAIN: I mean, they could easily have looked at it and we could have had their recommendation. MR. FULLERTON: Yes, yes, good point.

MR. ASRANI: We got the original approval for
the elevator without realizing that there wasn't enough room to put the elevator in, so if we had come before you --

MS. SPAIN: It doesn't take that much room for an elevator. We have a two-story home, and our elevator does not go above the roof, which is a flat roof.

MR. ASRANI: It has, it has a standard cab, a standard six-foot, eight-inch door, so if you take a standard cab and you take into account what it needs to traverse itself, it was hitting the tie beam so we had to go beyond that to accommodate the elevator.

MS. SPAIN: I'm sure that's the case. I'm just telling you it's not the case in my own home. I have no knowledge on elevators.

I only know that the one we have, it doesn't go above the flat roof that we have. There's no attic space. It's a concrete roof.

MR. FULLERTON: And access to it by maintenance people, is that --

MS. SPAIN: The side, there's a laundry room next to it and there's an opening in the side, and they go
through there.
MR. FULLERTON: Well, this goes up as a tower.

MS. SPAIN: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: So the access has to go, because it's above the roof, it has to go in not from another room.

MS. SPAIN: Right, right, right, right.
MR. FULLERTON: But still there's not
enough --
MS. SPAIN: But originally, I'm saying originally the design would have been able to incorporate that.

MR. FULLERTON: Of course, of course.
MR. ASRANI: The cab is seven feet, two inches, and the door to the entrance to the cab is six foot eight, and it does not work.

MS. SPAIN: Well, you should have looked at another manufacturer of elevators. I don't know.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, I'm not debating you because, you know, I think you're right, but if this --

MS. SPAIN: It doesn't help him now.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes. If the contractor just said, "Well, we're getting this elevator and whatever happens, happens," see, he's not helping you and he's
putting you in a bad position, he ought to be responsible.
MR. ASRANI: Well, it's easy to say things in hindsight, really, but practically speaking, you're stuck with it.

MR. FULLERTON: No, but if he had done something egregious as that that cost you money, I would sue the guy. You could do that.

MR. ASRANI: I'm at a disadvantage. I signed
the contract with my name on it.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

MR. ASRANI: And if I sue, I'm going to sue
Herbert Brito --
MR. FULLERTON: Exactly. He drew it --
MR. ASRANI: -- as LLC.
MR. FULLERTON: -- he drew it the way it wouldn't have been approved.

MR. ASRANI: From what I hear, he has dissolved that corporation.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, I don't know.
MR. MENENDEZ: Well, Mr. Ehrenhaft, do you have something to say?

MR. EHRENHAFT: I just have one essential question. It's very late in the game, so, to get this done, so when the property owner is advised by his consultant, be it an architect or designer or whatever,
whatever profession, that the plan would not work, I don't understand why at that moment things did not stop in their tracks and not -- and forego building the shaft higher. MR. FULLERTON: Right.

MR. EHRENHAFT: They needed to come back to the city immediately with that. Instead, they simply proceeded with the construction without saying anything, okay, and now here we are five years later. Okay?

MR. MENENDEZ: Is the construction complete?
MR. ASRANI: The finishes are being done as we speak.

MR. MENENDEZ: So have you closed out the permit?

MR. ASRANI: No, not yet.
MR. MENENDEZ: Not yet?
MR. ASRANI: Not yet.
MR. MENENDEZ: I'm surprised that this wasn't caught by an inspector at some point.

MR. ADAMS: Yes. It was actually Mr. Asrani that contacted us and said, "I think you need to come out and look at this."

MR. MENENDEZ: Well, what can we do here?
How can we help him and --
MR. ASRANI: Well, at this point, as I
mentioned, the hardship involved, and I've consulted with
the elevator company, and trying to displace the roof, the dust, the elements, it's just -- and besides we are both using the elevator.

I remember having met Kara and explained to her that my wife was having trouble with her knees. That was five years ago, and now when we actually can get to use the elevator, we are stuck, and really for no fault of ours. It was not done with intentions otherwise. I mean, why would we even go there?

MR. FULLERTON: Yes. I feel badly for you, you know. It's a shame.

If we deny this, they then can go to the city commission and get relief?

MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: And appeal it to the city
commission.
MR. FULLERTON: Huh?
MS. SPAIN: They can appeal it to the city commission.

MR. FULLERTON: That's what I mean.
MS. SPAIN: And the city commission --
MR. FULLERTON: Yes. The city commission
would then look at this maybe with a more sympathetic approach. I don't know.

I'd hate to suggest that we're going to just
say no to you, but maybe the city commission can make the judgment.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

Last time we looked at this, didn't we talk about them coming back with some studies about what that would look like as a flat roof?

MR. MENENDEZ: We did, and I think
Mr. Garcia-Pons requested --
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Okay, yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: -- requested, you know --
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Right.
MR. MENENDEZ: -- some --
MS. BACHE-WIIG: So has that occurred? Has that taken place?

MR. ASRANI: As I had mentioned to you, and this is for me repetition, I think the impression $I$ get is that we're being chastised because we did this without permission, and I've explained the circumstances to him as to how this ended up happening.

And it's not so easy to just stop construction when it's raining. By the time he realized what had happened, it was too late.

It wasn't the general contractor's fault. He was going according to the instructions of the architect,
the so-called architect, and now we're stuck with it, and I wish you would reconsider your decision and approve it.

We will try and mitigate any invasive
features that you think it might have in conjunction with the staff. He's gone and looked at it. If anyone else wants to look at it, by all means, please take a look at it.

I can take pictures of the equipment if you wish. As a matter of fact, I should have brought the catalogue to the elevator with me.

MR. MENENDEZ: That would have helped.
MR. ASRANI: So like I said, we've reached a point where having a historic house is -- we've owned several historic homes during our lifetime, and we still do, so we've stayed true to form. We spared no effort in making sure that it stays true to form, but in this case, it's one of those things that happened, and now we have no control over.

MS. ROLANDO: Let me ask, I was not at the last meeting, what is your objection to coming back with an alternative to the problem is less intrusive?

Because you have a spectacular house, and this is really like a giant pimple sitting on the nose of this beautiful building.

So you know, I get that you don't want to
consider other things, but why not?
MR. ASRANI: We will mitigate.
MS. ROLANDO: How do you mitigate?
MR. ASRANI: Okay, so we put a stone band around it, okay. We put a trellis so the bougainvillea takes over the shaft all together. The rest of the house has a lot of bougainvillea which has gone on top of the roof.

MS. ROLANDO: So you're basically saying you don't want to do anything but disguise it.

MR. ASRANI: It's difficult.
MS. ROLANDO: Pardon?
MR. ASRANI: It's difficult. It's a lot of hardship and expense involved.

MR. FULLERTON: You know, it kind of bothers me a little bit that we are the bad guys now.

MS. ROLANDO: Yes,exactly.
MR. FULLERTON: And we didn't -- we're not the bad guys. Your architect and contractor are the bad guys because you did something -- you allowed something to happen that was against what we had approved.

We gave you approval to do this, and you came back and did complete, something completely different.

MR. ASRANI: Had we approached this thing in the very beginning, you would be hard-pressed not to
approve it.
MR. FULLERTON: Well, if you had done this, we would have approved, so.

MR. ASRANI: So we need an elevator, and --
MR. FULLERTON: There are many elevators, sir. I mean, there is a hydraulic elevator that has nothing on the roof, and they're used all the time in residential uses.

I'm sorry, but the facts are there. I mean, we approved something that was usable, and you came back with something completely different.

MR. ASRANI: If you want, I can bring the gentleman from the elevator company who will tell you it was not possible to install that elevator, it was not possible to install the elevator.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, that's when you were negotiating with him, you should have come back to the city and said, "I'm sorry, but I cannot put the elevator in this design."

MR. ASRANI: And you would have said no.
MR. FULLERTON: No, not necessarily. We would have looked for a solution that wasn't quite as obtrusive as what you put in. I'm sorry.

MR. ASRANI: The only elevator $I$ can put in that house or could have put are the suction elevators
they make which are located in the house.
MR. FULLERTON: Tell me that again.
MR. ASRANI: They make elevators that work on vacuum. You get into the glass elevator.

MR. FULLERTON: Oh, I know what --
MR. ASRANI: And it sucks you up.
MR. FULLERTON: Right, and?
MR. FULLERTON: I refused to do that.
MR. FULLERTON: Okay. There's a hydraulic elevator. It has a thing on the ground that goes up like that, pushes the elevator up and brings it back down, very usable.

It's the box on top of a post, and there's nothing on top of it. All the mechanical equipment is downstairs where you can get at it. I mean, there are alternatives that your contractor could have gone to you and said, "Look, we can't put this one in, but we can put this one in."

MR. ASRANI: Well, the hindsight is always late to you.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, you're putting us in a bad position, sir.

MR. ASRANI: Like I said, I would urge you to reconsider it, approve it, so we can go on with this thing rather than keep coming back to you. I'll work with the
staff to see what we can do about the roof, and it's not visible from three sides.

The front of the house is to the west on the lake. It's not on the street. That's a legal issue.

MS. ROLANDO: That's a somewhat deceptive approach, because how many people approach the home from the lake or the water?

MR. ASRANI: In those days, they had canoes.
MS. ROLANDO: No. I think that you should honor the request of the board from last meeting and come back with an alternative --

MR. FULLERTON: To be honest with you --
MS. ROLANDO: -- to deal with the objection.
MR. FULLERTON: I'm sorry for interrupting.
MS. ROLANDO: Go ahead.
MR. FULLERTON: But to be honest with you, I don't think there's anything that can be done to that other than bringing it down about five feet or more. I mean, I'd rather have this than a big wall there.

MR. ASRANI: Well, that's the other alternative, is to just take the roof off all together, put a flat roof.

MR. FULLERTON: No. I don't think that's --
MR. ASRANI: I think it's going to look
really ugly.

MR. FULLERTON: I think that's --
MS. ROLANDO: I think that's less obscene.
MR. FULLERTON: Less obscene?
MS. ROLANDO: Obscene. At least it
disappears. This becomes a feature.
MR. ASRANI: When we get done with this --
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Well, it's just how you're going to finish the tile. It's going to look like that mushroom, you know, result.

MR. ASRANI: When we get done, when we get done with this elevator, this is a matter of perception, like a glass of wine. You will totally change your view. As I said, you know, I'm not the one who tries to bastardize a historic house. It's not us.

MR. DURANA: Somebody did it for you.
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Adams.
MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Is the tower to code, or is it not to code?

MR. ADAMS: I don't believe it's been -- it's not been inspected yet, has it, the tower? Has it been inspected?

MR. ASRANI: All the structural inspections have taken place. They're all done.

MR. DURANA: I think what he's saying is you
may have a problem when you do your final elevation certificate if your rooftop is a certain height. It's not just Historic. You might have a problem later on with zoning or something later. I think that's what he's alluding to.

MR. ASRANI: Well, we'll handle it when that occurs, I mean.

MR. MENENDEZ: And this still has to go to the board of architects, is what this says, correct?

MR. ADAMS: Well, the impression was the design would be changed, and then it could go to board of architects and then come to the board, but the applicant was not willing to change the design, so.

MR. ASRANI: Well, as you said, a flat roof would be worse than what it looks like.

MS. ROLANDO: I don't think so necessarily. Some people may, but $I$ think that you -- there's, clearly there is an objection to what is there. It doesn't comply with the plans.

I understand in-the-field conditions, we're finding out that there is an issue because of, real or imagined, because of this elevator issue, but what's there, we've given you the opportunity, we've asked you to come back with an alternative.

MR. ASRANI: What guarantee do I have that
you would approve it? So I can --
MR. MENENDEZ: There is no guarantee.
MS. ROLANDO: There is no guarantee.
MR. ASRANI: Exactly.
MR. MENENDEZ: There's no guarantee.
MS. ROLANDO: But just because -- but you're saying you don't want to do anything.

MR. ASRANI: I'm not saying that.
MS. ROLANDO: So I hear that.
MR. ASRANI: I just told you, Madam, that we will mitigate that appearance that you don't like by putting stone beading around it, putting trellises for bougainvillea, that we can also install a very tall tree, a cypress tree like we have 40 -foot cypress trees in the house right now.

This is nowhere near that tall. You will never see it again, but it's done. There's nothing I can do at this point.

A flat roof, I'll come back with a flat roof so we'll chop it off.

MR. ADAMS: A question for legal: One of the applicant's concern was that at the last meeting, he neither got an approval nor a denial, and therefore there was nothing to potentially appeal. Can the applicant request a definitive decision? "I either want you to
approve this or deny this and not leave me" --
MR. CEBALLOS: Yes --
MR. ADAMS: So the applicant --
MR. CEBALLOS: -- if the applicant makes that request. Right now there seems to be discussion going back and forth on --

MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MR. CEBALLOS: -- whether they come back with a flat roof or not, but if the applicant does not wish to consider that and wants it to be what's presented is what the board considers today, he has that right.

MR. ASRANI: I got no guidance from anyone. I goaded Mr. Garcia at the last meeting without getting adversarial with him. He kept on chastising us for doing this, finding the contractor who was the inspector, and it went on, the same discussion. There was no guidance. There was no guidance from anyone.

The staff recommended it so we could work with the staff, and because of that encounter, we're stuck just going around in the same --

MR. MENENDEZ: Well, the guidance was to come back with an alternative design or another solution. That's what was in the minutes, correct?

MR. ADAMS: Correct, yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. My fear isn't this. My
fear is that this was constructed incorrectly, and code enforcement will see it, and they could require you to take it down and rebuild it.

MS. SPAIN: So as long as there's an open permit, code enforcement is not going to cite him because there's always an ability for them to come back and get it approved.

And I had that argument with code enforcement for 25 years, because $I$ wanted people that didn't abide by the plans that were approved to be cited, but they don't do that. They may have changed, but when I was working for the city, that didn't happen.

MR. CEBALLOS: If I may provide some clarification, if the permit is not closed because the final inspection does not take place --

MS. SPAIN: Right.
MR. CEBALLOS: -- it will eventually become an expired permit. At that moment, code enforcement can cite --

MS. SPAIN: At that moment they can.
MR. CEBALLOS: -- for an expired permit. At that moment they can, so you can't perpetually keep a permit open unless there's inspections being called for.

MS. SPAIN: Right.
MR. MENENDEZ: Right, and you can't inhabit a
residence without a permit, without a certificate of occupancy.

MR. CEBALLOS: I don't know if, $I$ don't know if there's a CO that's been removed from this parcel.

MR. ASRANI: I wish you would find a do-able solution.

MR. MENENDEZ: Well, we have, the way I see it, one of two solutions. Either we --

MR. ASRANI: You've seen --
MR. MENENDEZ: -- either we approve it -MR. ASRANI: Yeah.

MR. MENENDEZ: -- with the conditions set forth here, or we deny it and you can appeal it. That's the only, the only two options I see. Does anybody see any other option?

MR. FULLERTON: And if the commission denies it, does it come back to us?

MS. SPAIN: No. He goes to court if he wants to, or he comes back. He can come back to us then, but. MR. CEBALLOS: The commission could do one of many things. They can approve it. They can deny it. They can remand it back --

MS. SPAIN: Right.
MR. CEBALLOS: -- to Historic for further
determination. would either deny it or approve it.

MR. ASRANI: As long as you don't take a prosecutorial approach to this, I think it will work out. I mean, $I$ don't know what to do with it.

MR. MENENDEZ: I don't know. Any ideas?
MR. ASRANI: Just coming back to you to appease you, to make changes just for appeasement, even though it looks ugly, to me it makes no sense.

MR. DURANA: I mean, so staff is, you guys are saying approve, but for you to work with the applicant to fix the solution -- I mean fix the problem.

MR. ADAMS: Yes. There have to be changes --
MR. DURANA: There what?
MR. ADAMS: There have to be changes to what's there. The bottom line is if it's going to stay, then its appearances has to be muted or more in keeping with the historic structure.

On the other hand, if the board really believes that this is incompatible, it's on the street-facing elevation, it's now a feature of the house, and you do not think there's a way to mitigate it to your satisfaction, then maybe denial, and that would allow the option to appeal, meaning, and mind, as appealed, it may be approved in its current condition.

MR. MENENDEZ: Or denied.
MS. ROLANDO: Well, the only thing is in the conditions, it says, "The applicant work with staff to amend the design at the top of the elevator tower."

He's already said he doesn't want to, so we're, if we approve, we are approving it with a condition that he said he won't do, so we're in a Catch-22.

MR. ASRANI: Is it really --
MS. ROLANDO: So it sounds like he wants us to disapprove it so he can appeal it. That's what he wants.

MR. ADAMS: There is also, there is the possibility that, you know, any suggestions made won't be, won't be accepted, in which case we'll --

MS. ROLANDO: Well, what suggestions do you have?

MR. ADAMS: Well, I would need to sit down with him and look at it.

I mean, my first concern would be how low can that tower be cut; in other words, can the roof come off and can the height be brought down further. That would be Approach Number One.

The second approach is how do you finish the tower to, one, make it more compatible with the house; and two, to try and obscure its view as much as possible.

But there is no guarantee that these suggestions will be accepted.

MR. FULLERTON: Can we request the City of Coral Gables building department send somebody over there and look at the physical condition of the space above the elevator cab and see if there's room, really room?

I mean, Dona has said that the equipment above her elevator is nothing like -- this one is at least like eight or nine feet above the ceiling of the room it serves, seven or eight feet, something like that. That's like a lot of space for a two-story elevator equipment.

MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MR. ASRANI: You have five feet of the shaft. You have three feet of the roof. We can bring the roof down to two feet if that will help.

MR. FULLERTON: Wait a minute, wait a minute.
The elevator, let's do a little -- the floor level is here.

MR. ASRANI: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: The elevator, the last elevator floor is here. You got a seven foot two cab.

MR. ASRANI: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: How many feet above this do you need for elevator equipment?

MR. ASRANI: I need about five feet.

MR. FULLERTON: See, that's the thing I can't believe. I cannot believe you need five feet above that. MR. ASRANI: So that's the shaft, the shaft and then all the equipment.

MR. FULLERTON: Of course.
MR. ASRANI: There's an access door to service that. There is absolutely no room above that other than the roof which we can bring down. The roof is three feet.

MR. FULLERTON: What we have right now is something that looks like that with five feet between the cab and the roof. Is that what we're saying?

And the cab is here, and there's a little piece of structure here which holds all this equipment.

So I'd like the City of Coral Gables to send a building department specialist over there and show us, document what's above, how high the existing floor, this bedroom floor here where the roof is here, how high above this cab, what kind of space is above there and what kind of space the equipment itself takes in that space.

MR. DURANA: Well, there's also elevator shop drawings probably.

MR. FULLERTON: Huh?
MR. DURANA: Elevator shop drawings that the city received.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, I don't know.
MS. SPAIN: That's true, that's absolutely
true.
MR. FULLERTON: They might show the elevator itself, but not necessarily --

MS. SPAIN: Did we get shop drawings to the elevator?

MR. ADAMS: I haven't seen them. Shop drawings showing the elevator, the design of the elevator?

MS. SPAIN: No, no.
MR. ASRANI: We have shop drawings from the elevator company.

MS. SPAIN: Pardon me?
MR. ASRANI: We have shop drawings from the elevator company.

MS. SPAIN: And they were obviously submitted to the city.

MR. ASRANI: They put these elevators by the hundreds, and if there was a way we could have accomodated that elevator without the shaft, we would have. It's not the same elevator --

MS. SPAIN: We need to finish this somehow.
MR. ASRANI: You're most welcome to send anyone you wish and verify what I'm saying is correct.

MR. FULLERTON: I'm not calling you a liar.

I'm just -- or questioning your veracity. I just want to see what possibilities there are.

If this doesn't need to be, you know, if this doesn't need to be up here, maybe your easy, the easy solution is to take this off, bring this down three or four feet, two or three, whatever you can do it, and then put some sort of decorative thing around the edge and make it --

MR. ASRANI: I hate to be repeating this stuff. I keep telling you that the roof itself, the hip roof is three feet above the grade. Where the elevator equipment ends, the roof starts. We can bring that roof down. Then it would not be so invasive.

MR. FULLERTON: So if we could get the shop drawings or some inspector to go over there. Don't they have to send inspectors to close out the permit anyway?

MR. ADAMS: At some point, yes.
MR. FULLERTON: Well, $I$ want this gentleman to be able to go home and say, "Okay, we got this worked out. It's going to be this."

MR. ASRANI: Just don't keep me hanging. Give me your directions, what will satisfy you --

MR. FULLERTON: Well, 1 think right now -MR. ASRANI: -- without having to tear it all down.

MR. FULLERTON: -- we'd have to deny you. I think tonight we might have to deny you unless -- or we can extend this another month and you could come back with all the documentation, your shop drawings, the inspector's report, photographs and so forth.

MR. ASRANI: Okay. I can give you anything you want.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay.
MR. ASRANI: But where will that take me?
MR. FULLERTON: Does that make sense to anybody?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes, it makes senses to me. MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

MR. FULLERTON: I make a motion then, to help this gentleman out and to take the burden off of us a little bit because this is not our fault, that we have the city building department send a qualified inspector there to measure, document, photograph the area in question above the floor of the bedroom up to the ceiling of the tower, measure it, show us what it looks like, how much space the equipment is actually taking up there, and send -- and give us the shop drawings from the elevator company, any related documents pertaining to this space and operation of this elevator that might be pertinent to determining what might be possible here.

MR. ASRANI: So what you're saying is that once you have ascertained that the space above the elevator was designed to accommodate the equipment --

MR. FULLERTON: No more.
MR. ASRANI: -- not a dime more, so to
speak --
MR. FULLERTON: Okay.
MR. ASRANI: -- you will be satisfied at that
point?
MR. FULLERTON: Well, I'm not -- I mean, it's still a pimple on the nose, I mean.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I think, to your point, I think it's just to understand what then is possible. Then if there's nothing possible, then that's another conversation.

MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: But at this time your architect or your designer hasn't come back with any of this information which is what $I$ think we asked for last time.

MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: So we have nothing to go by except your testament that there's three foot above the ceiling.

MR. ASRANI: Okay, so you have nothing to go
by other than what I said.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MR. ASRANI: I'll be happy to be corroborated by an inspector and say --

MS. BACHE-WIIG: They're not going to corroborate you. They're just going to document what is there.

MR. ASRANI: That's what corroboration means.
In other words --
MR. FULLERTON: No, but we don't need to hear
it from you. I want to hear it from the city and the elevator people.

MR. ASRANI: I can submit to Mr. Adams that information.

MR. FULLERTON: No. I want the city to independently go over there and look at it without your even being in the room.

MR. ASRANI: And your instructions to the city inspector would be, "Go and verify, make sure that where the space for the equipment is no higher than the need for the equipment."

MR. FULLERTON: Well, I want him to dimension it, photograph it, prove what's there --

MR. ASRANI: Prove that --
MR. FULLERTON: -- not what you say, but
what's there.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Just what's there.
MR. ASRANI: Of course.
MR. FULLERTON: I trust you but I just --
trust and verify.
MR. ASRANI: Believe me, this exercise is not pleasant for either one of us.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MR. ASRANI: You know, this is --
MR. FULLERTON: Especially for you. I feel terrible that you, having to spend an hour arguing with us about this.

MR. ASRANI: I just told Laura Russo on the way out, I said, "Who in the world would have their mind examined to have a historic home?" She said nobody.

MS. ROLANDO: I second your motion.
MS. SPAIN: Can I ask both of you to make one small amendment? And that is to make sure that the design that he is submitting goes to the board of architects even if it's just to Juan Riesco, that's a final design unless you still want to work with him --

MR. ADAMS: So you want, after everything is documented and all the information you want, you also want the current as-proposed design reviewed by Juan?

MS. SPAIN: I want to have it go to the board
of architects, I want it to have it go to the board of architects before it comes to us.

MR. ADAMS: The current, the current design as an as-built?

MS. SPAIN: Well, if the inspection comes back and says, you know, this guy has like six feet more than what he needs, then --

MR. DURANA: Well, then it should go to the board for them to decide I think because --

MS. SPAIN: Even that, yes, just go to the board. You're right.

MR. ADAMS: The current, the current -MR. ASRANI: So why wouldn't --

THE COURT REPORTER: I need one at a time, please.

MR. ASRANI: Sorry about that. It's three feet above.

MS. SPAIN: Okay.
MR. FULLERTON: Okay.
MR. ASRANI: So at the most, we have three feet above.

> MR. FULLERTON: Okay. So we could then -MS. ROLANDO: It looks like more than that. MR. ASRANI: Make it two feet. MR. FULLERTON: -- reduce it --

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So we have a motion by who?

MS. ROLANDO: Mr. Fullerton.
MR. MENENDEZ: By Mr. Fullerton, and we have a second by?

MS. ROLANDO: "Moi."
MR. CEBALLOS: My apologies. Pardon the interruption.

I'm going to ask the applicant, because the intention of coming to this meeting was seeking a denial to move forward to what's being --- a motion is being made to defer the item and a fact finding expedition to be take place. Is that okay with you?

MR. ASRANI: As long as the guidelines for approval --

MR. CEBALLOS: There is no condition on whether they will approve it or deny it in the future.

They are simply making a motion to defer the item to get facts from our city officials and from your shop drawings so that they may consider it at a future meeting.

There is no guarantee and no condition that the board can put whether they're going to deny it or approve it.

So I just want to make sure that the record
is clear that you are aware that by going through this, you are then deferring again and you are not able to appeal it to the city commission until they make a decision.

MR. FULLERTON: Maybe you're better off having us deny it and you go to the commission.

MS. LYONS: We have someone in the audience on Zoom that wants to comment.

MR. CEBALLOS: I'm sorry, I just wanted to make sure the record was clear because his original request was for an appeal. We told him he couldn't appeal because the board hadn't made a decision and the motion on the floor right now is to defer with a fact finding expedition, so I just want to make sure that he is aware.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay.
MR. ASRANI: Well, are you inclined to look at that data and then maybe be inclined to approve it, or are we going to go through the same exercise?

MR. FULLERTON: I wish I could, I wish -- I mean, if it were up to me alone, $I$ don't know, but $I$ can't speak for the board, but you know.

MR. DURANA: I think also if you have that information, you present it. Let's say we still deny. When you go to the commission, having all that information when you present it to them will help you explain your
case better so they have a better understanding, because if not, they're going to keep pushing you and pushing you and pushing you.

MR. FULLERTON: Also if it proves what you're saying --

MR. ASRANI: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: -- then you have a big case to --

MR. DURANA: Yes, just go to the commission and say, "Look" --

MR. ASRANI: So then if you deny it, you have to be specific why you denied it, because you felt that there was no need to go that high and that you feel that the equipment didn't need to be there, or has to be some reason.

MR. MENENDEZ: But we're not there yet.
MR. FULLERTON: Well, I think we denied it because it's not built according to the plan.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. We have somebody in the audience who would like to speak.

MR. CEBALLOS: And there was a motion with a first and a second, so at some point a vote needs to be taken on that particular motion.

MS. LYONS: I asked them to unmute. Okay, they're on.

MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.

MS. MARTINEZ-CARBONELL: Hi. This is

Karelia. I am -- yes. I am -- this is Karelia.

I just want to offer my support to
Mr. Asrani. Him and his wife are, you know, just wonderful neighbors and advocates of preservation. They're, you know, great members of HPACG.

But I'm here, I'm actually a personal friend as well, so I am just empathizing with what he's gone through, and I understand the board's position, but you know, for whatever it's worth, I know that his intentions and their intentions were always to preserve the integrity of the property.

So you know, please make your motions and recommendations, but $I$ am in solidarity with Mr. Asrani and hopefully this will turn out to be a positive experience at the end of everything, so thank you for listening to me. Thank you.

MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

MR. ASRANI: Thank you, Karelia.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. We have a motion and a second.

MS. LYONS: The motion to defer.

MR. FULLERTON: No. The motion was to --

MR. CEBALLOS: The motion --

MS. ROLANDO: Basically it was to defer.
MR. CEBALLOS: -- was to defer with a
particular set of requirements or requests for a fact finding mission.

MR. FULLERTON: It was to defer.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: No.
MS. SPAIN: Aren't you being difficult.
MR. FULLERTON: I want to deny it so he can go to the commission.

MR. DURANA: I mean, would you prefer to go
to the commission?
MR. ASRANI: Well, it seems like I'm trying to catch my tail, so go ahead and deny it.

MR. MENENDEZ: Continue because we have to finish this vote.

MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: No.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?

MR. DURANA: No.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: No.
MS. LYONS: Okay. The motion failed.
MR. ASRANI: Mistrial.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MR. DURANA: I think your best option is to get the shop drawings, get all that stuff and go to the commission and present it.

MR. ASRANI: I'm happy, but --
MR. DURANA: I thank that's going to be your --

MR. ADAMS: Just to be clear, does someone need to make a motion to deny?

MR. DURANA: Yes.
MR. FULLERTON: I move to deny the applicant's request and allow him to do what he needs to do to get beyond this so he can move ahead.

MS. SPAIN: I think he could just move to deny it.

MR. ASRANI: Thank you, Dona Spain.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Do we have a second?
MR. DURANA: Hold on.

MR. EHRENHAFT: I'll second.
MR. CEBALLOS: Just for the -- because I
believe that part of the motion was for them to get shop drawings and all these things, if there's an appeal to the city commission, the city commission appeal is not de novo, meaning it's not open to new information.

MR. FULLERTON: Right.
MR. CEBALLOS: So they're going to consider the information that was presented to this board, so a bit of an issue if that information, you believe it's paramount to the decision to be brought to the commission. At the end of the day, I don't believe you should deny something because you want it to go to the city commission. You deny it because what's presented to you, you don't agree with and you don't see a motion forward, and the applicant is requesting an approval or denial and you have to make that decision.

MR. FULLERTON: I see.
MS. ROLANDO: Why don't we move to approve, allow the applicant to work with the city, with the preservation officer, get the information, and then -MR. FULLERTON: That's what we just voted down.

MR. ASRANI: That seems a lot more palatable than -- get the information from me through him.

MS. SPAIN: The vote was not to --
MR. DURANA: No. The vote was --

MS. ROLANDO: The vote was to deny.
MR. DURANA: No. The vote was to defer.
MS. ROLANDO: I mean to defer. That lost, so the next motion needs to be either approve with the conditions or deny.

MR. ADAMS: Or approve with new conditions. You can't add conditions.

MS. ROLANDO: Okay, good point, good point.
MR. CEBALLOS: Or there could be another motion for deferral, just saying.

MS. ROLANDO: For what, Gus?
MR. CEBALLOS: Deferral.
MS. ROLANDO: Okay. That lost, though, didn't it?

MR. CEBALLOS: It did. I'm just saying that for the deliberation, that the board has taken no action, so any motion is available to you, so somebody else can make a motion to defer if you deem it appropriate.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, the last, my motion was not -- it died.

MR. CEBALLOS: The motion was denied. It failed.

MR. FULLERTON: It died.
MR. CEBALLOS: So that means the board has taken no action. That doesn't preclude the board from
making a similar motion for deferral.
MS. ROLANDO: Okay. I move for approval subject to the conditions in the staff report, plus the inspection by the city and the furnishing of the shop drawings or the review of the shop drawings by our preservation officers.

MS. SPAIN: I'll second that.
MR. ASRANI: I'm happy to negotiate the situation to our mutual advantage or disadvantage.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: So who would then decide that how much can be, you know, mitigated on the roof?

MR. MENENDEZ: Staff.
MS. ROLANDO: It's going to be staff.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Okay.
MS. ROLANDO: And if the applicant is not happy, he can come back to us.

MR. MENENDEZ: That's right. Okay.
MR. ASRANI: So then if you lay down specific conditions for approval right now, which means if you're satisfied that the shaft exists only for the sake of the equipment that's in there, we can go forward with this.

MR. MENENDEZ: No. That's not what we're saying. We're saying that you're going to work with staff --

MR. ASRANI: Yes.

MR. MENENDEZ: -- to see if there's a
solution.
MR. ASRANI: When you said "you," meaning I am.

MR. ADAMS: Staff will review all the documents, make sure the tower and the roof and everything else is lowered as much as possible, and if there's any other design features that we can incorporate, you know, whether it's banding or anything to have it incorporated more into the house, and then that's the approach that we'll take.

And if Mr. Asrani is not willing to do that, then --

MS. SPAIN: Bring it back.
MR. ADAMS: -- he'll have to come back to you.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. We have a motion --
MS. BACHE-WIIG: I will second Peggy's
motion.
MR. MENENDEZ: -- by Miss Rolando --
MS. SPAIN: I second.
MR. MENENDEZ: -- and a second by Miss Spain.
MS. ROLANDO: Alicia, did you have
anything --
MS. BACHE-WIIG: No.

MS. ROLANDO: -- that you wanted to add?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: No. I think it was
clarified that staff would review the findings, and if they needed to come back to us, then they will.

MR. FULLERTON: I think we're leading him
down a path that we can't support in the end. I think we're --

## MS. ROLANDO: You know --

MR. ASRANI: As long as --
MR. FULLERTON: -- extending it for --
MS. ROLANDO: -- John, let me just say this.
I think right now it's the end of a long evening, and we've been talking about this and talking about it. You've talked about it last month as well.

Let's give the two smart people the opportunity to sit down together, establish the existing conditions, and let's give them the opportunity to have a productive discussion, and I think reasonable people can figure this out.

MR. FULLERTON: If I got this information and I was standing in Mr. Asrani's shoes, I would say, "Well, if it comes out the way I think it is, that my elevator is just small as it can be, they're going to have to approve it."

And that's where we are, I think, and I think
that's --
MR. ASRANI: That makes sense.
MR. FULLERTON: -- not an unusual or
unreasonable assumption on his part, so I think we're leading him down to the point where it's going to be another month.

MS. SPAIN: He doesn't have to come back to us. We're saying that Warren can handle it.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay.
MS. SPAIN: He doesn't have to come back to us.

MR. MENENDEZ: We're giving him a road to resolution, is what we're doing.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay. So are you ready to say, if it's exactly the way he says it, are you ready to say, "Okay, go ahead"?

MR. ADAMS: If there is no room to lower the tower?

MR. FULLERTON: Right.
MR. ADAMS: I may still want a change in the roof design and some decorative detail added to it.

MR. FULLERTON: And will that have to come back to us then?

MS. SPAIN: No.
MR. ADAMS: Not if you determine it doesn't.

MR. MENENDEZ: But it still has to go to the board of architects.

MR. ADAMS: We can take it to the board of architects for comment, and we can take the current design and the amended design if that's going to make the board feel more comfortable.

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, okay.
MR. ADAMS: We can take both.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. We have a motion and a second, so let's get through it.

MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig, Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: No, I'm going to say no.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Motion passes.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MR. ASRANI: Would anyone like to join me for a drink?

MR. MENENDEZ: Before. Okay, the last case file of the evening.

MR. FULLERTON: Thanks for your patience.
MR. MENENDEZ: Case File COA (SP) 2015-015, revised, an application for the issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for the property at 6801 Granada Boulevard, a local historic landmark legally described as Lot One, Block One, Cartee Homestead II, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 170 at Page 88 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The application requesting design approval for addition and alterations to the residence and the relocation of the swimming pool was approved with conditions on January 21st, 2016.

An application requesting after-the-fact design approval for revisions to the approved certificate of appropriateness due to deviations from the previously-approved plans was denied by the Historic Preservation Board on April 21st, 2021.

This application again requests after-the-fact design approval for a revision to the
approved certificate of appropriateness due to deviations from the previously-approved plan.

MR. ADAMS: And this application was before you several months ago, and can we have the Power Point, please?

This is the location of the property here at the intersection of the two waterways. In the current application, the applicant is requesting design approval for replacement of existing mahogany louvers, replacement of exterior doors and windows, lowering of the first floor at the northwest corner of the property, and raising of the 1984 roof at the southeast corner of the property.

Now, though not identified in the letter of intent, I did want to bring it to the board's attention that many of the after-the-fact alterations that the board denied in the last application have been requested, and so I felt it only right to bring them back to you, one, to show that the applicant was making the effort to redress some of the things that the board had concerns with.

And number two, just to, you know, get the board's okay for them because some of the work had been done was the removal or changing of significant features.

So with regard to Item Number One, the applicant wishes to replace mahogany louvers. The original Persiana louver system was one of Parker's
signature features.
The proposed replacement louvers have been manufactured from the original Persiana louvers to meet current code requirements, and the architect has stated, "We disassemble one original mahogany louver to recreate each new one."

There is an image that shows the various louvers, and there are the original louvers, the old louvers that the board were not happy with, and the proposed new louvers. The proposed new louvers are more consistent with the original design.

However, they do lack the wider bottom reel as shown on the originals. Also the color is notably different as they match the frames of the new-but-previously-denied windows.

So the original louvers have been stored in site for some time and their condition is unknown. The architect has stated they do not meet current code requirements, whereas the proposed louvers have been engineered to meet these requirements.

So staff supports the proposed louvers with the condition that the bottom louver reel should be widened, and, if approved by an engineer, and the color of the louvers shall match the frames of whichever windows are ultimately approved by the board.

The second request is the replacement of exterior doors and windows. The applicant is requesting after-the-fact approval for the replacement of the doors and windows with CGI Estate collection using matching dark bronze factory finish mullions and clear low E glass to meet Florida's energy requirements.

There was much discussion about the windows at the last meeting, basically because the windows appeared to be or the determination was they were inappropriate.

We did a bit of further investigation, and it was noted that shop drawings do contain a note stating clear glass shall comply with historic department approval.

The applicant is again requesting after-the-fact approval for the windows and doors due to -- and that were previously denied by the board.

In support of the request, the applicant has submitted photographs of annotated glass samples of the installed glass which state, Clear Low E 366.

The applicant is stating in further support of the choice of glass that due to the substantial amount of fenestration in the building, the installation of glass without a low E rating would require a large increase in the size and number of AC units required to keep the house
cool and meet current energy requirements.
And while all of the above may be considered by the board along with any additional support material brought by the applicant, staff is unable to change the previous recommendation of denial, and based on aesthetics and as no changes have been made to these windows since the last application. They're the same windows.

The third item was for the request of lowering the existing floor at the northwest corner of the property. This is an interior alteration. It doesn't require board review.

The fourth request is raising of the 1984 roof, and the photographs in the report show that the roof height and part of the '84 addition has been raised. The architect has stated that the 15 -inch increase in height was undertaken by the previous owner.

As this alteration is to a later addition and does not significantly impact the design, you know, staff has no issues with this.

Some of the other things that the applicant has corrected from the previous application to the board has been the reinstatement of the oolite walkway. There are photos in the report.

The reinstatement of the planter wall, there are photos in the report.

The removal of the mechanical duct terminal and the reinstatement of the architecture feature.

The location of the HVAC equipment.
The replacement balcony railing now is much more in keeping with the original that was removed.

MR. CEBALLOS: Warren, if I may.
MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MR. CEBALLOS: Just a quick interruption. So
the city code does not allow for any board meetings or commission meetings to exceed past 9:00 without a motion of that board. If you'd like to make a motion, it's now 9:00, so $I$ would need a motion.

MS. ROLANDO: I'll make a motion that we extend beyond 9:00, not a whole lot beyond nine.

MR. ADAMS: We're moving.
MR. DURANA: I'll second it.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Durana seconds it.
MS. LYONS: Who made the motion?
MS. SPAIN: I did, Dona Spain.
MS. LYONS: Dona, put your mic down, please.
MS. SPAIN: I'm so sorry.
MR. FULLERTON: Let's do a voice vote.
MR. CEBALLOS: That's fine.
(Thereupon, the board members responded "aye"
collectively.)

MR. ADAMS: Okay. The reinstatement of all the coral stone steps and planters as they had all been removed, and so they had been replaced.

And the regrading of the site, and then a roof overhang had been removed and that has been replaced.

No variances have been requested, and the revisions have not been reviewed by the board of architects, but the applicant has discussed the windows with the city architect, but staff has not received any comments from the city architect.

And the owner of the property asked for a couple of clarifications in the report.

It says that Page 15 indicates the applicant had undertaken a substantial amount of work without approval. The correct fact is that the previous owner had undertaken work without approval.

The new owner has requested guidance and is working with staff, following staff recommendations.

And on Page 16 it was asked that we add, "The installation of the windows and doors and louvers had been approved by the City of Coral Gables under Permit Number SD 20095928."

These windows had not been reviewed by the historic preservation office, so they had been approved and the permit had been approved, but they had not been
reviewed by the preservation office.
So ultimately the conclusion is that as noted at the previous meeting, the applicant had undertaken certain work without prior approval. Much of this work involved removal of character-defining features and the installation of inappropriate substitutes.

The applicant has attempted to rectify most of these issues by reversing the alterations. The replacement of historic features with new materials is never going to be the same, but you know, as these materials had already been removed, to try and reinstate some integrity to the property, they have to be replaced with new materials, and that's what the applicant has attempted to do.

So with regard to his actual requests, there are some conditions, and the bottom louver rail shall be widened to match the original louvers if approved by an engineer.

The color of the louvers shall match the frames of whichever windows are approved by the board.

The chamfer at the edge of the coral steps and planters shall be reinstated.

Updated drawings showing all of the alterations shall be submitted to the preservation office.

And all necessary permits shall be obtained
for all work.
So, and the recommendation is that you will need two motions, a motion to approve with conditions the replacement of the existing mahogany louvers; lowering of the existing floor at the northwest corner of the property; raising of the 1984 roof; reinstatement of the oolite walkway; reinstatement of the planter wall; removal of the mechanical duct terminal; the location of the HVAC equipment; the replacement balcony railing; the reinstatement of the coral stone steps and planters; and the reinstatement of roof overhang; and our recommendation to deny the after-the-fact design approval for the replacement exterior doors and windows.

And as I said, no changes have actually been made to that. The applicant is here.

MR. ARTHUR: Good evening. My name is William Arthur, 2920 Ponce de Leon Boulevard.

So a little bit of a back story on the project, I'm the second architect. The first architect was Mr. Heisenbottle. He had done the initial design for the addition, and that's, the original COA was approved under his plans.

When we came on board, we made some improvements to that design. Working with staff, I think that the improvements that we did back in 2016 were a
little more in keeping with Parker's original intent. We made larger windows, larger fenestration. We reduced the size of the addition quite substantially, reduced the heights.

We increased more of the indoor/outdoor experience that's characteristic of Parker properties.

I'm an avid follower of Parker. I've been befriended by Mr. Parker's son. I've done some projects with him, and this is not my first Parker project.

Before I get back to Granada, I was hoping there would be a little bit more people in the audience, but for those of you who are followers of Parker, one of his most significant homes is under threat of demolition. It's not in the City of Coral Gables, it's City of Miami.

Unfortunately $I$ was the only person at the hearing other than a handful of neighbors, but if there's anyone here that's interested, it has a new owner, and that owner intends to -- well, I can't speak for the owner, but it's under threat of neglect, so.

MR. FULLERTON: Is that his mother's place?
MR. ARTHUR: So Mr. Guerre --
MR. FULLERTON: I was asking if it was, this picture is his mother, is Al's mother --

MR. ARTHUR: So Mr. Guerre was a close friend of Al's mother. Jewel in the Treetop, which was her home
just down the street from this one, was demolished.
MR. FULLERTON: Oh, it was?
MR. ARTHUR: And it was owned by this owner, the person who owns it now, so it's especially under threat, and for those of you who know Mr. Henning, Mr. Henning gave me the permission to use this photo and he knows that I'm here tonight, and he might even be watching.

He had mentioned that this is one of his most significant works, so definitely.

MR. FULLERTON: So who wants to knock it down?

MR. ARTHUR: It's been bought by Carrollton, Carrollton School for Girls.

MR. FULLERTON: Oh, Carrollton.
MR. ARTHUR: They own Jewel in the Treetop.
They neglected it and it got demolished, so.
Mr. FULLERTON: Wow.
MR. ADAMS: A designation report was prepared by the City of Miami.

MR. ARTHUR: Yes.
MR. ADAMS: I don't know if it's been
presented.
MR. FULLERTON: I'm sorry, I didn't hear
that.

MR. ADAMS: A designation report was prepared at the City of Miami. I don't know if it's been to the board level.

MR. ARTHUR: So it hasn't been to the board. It's still in staff's hands. The motion was for a deferral, and it ended up getting deferred, and all the time the new owner is making modifications to the house, so check it out.

Going back to our original -- not original, but our previous hearing, it didn't go so great. There was a lot changes to the home that were done by the previous owner, also done with the previous contractor. There was some deviations from my plans, but there was also some work that was kind of misidentified.

For example, that staff report mentioned that the applicant was trying to install AC units next to the front door. That was never a part of any application or plan.

The contractor had installed, just like you normally would in any luxury home, temporary air-conditioning to keep the interior cool, keep the millwork from warping, so that was never part of the application.

The real application was for the doors and windows, and the reason why we're here for the doors and
windows is because the contractor had submitted plans to the City of Coral Gables. Development Services reviewed and approved those plans.

The issue was, is that they were never routed to Historic. Because he had that approval, he went ahead and installed them. He installs impact-rated low E CGI Estate series, the 238 and the 450 series which has been installed all over the City of Coral Gables.

MS. SPAIN: Can I ask you a question?
MR. ARTHUR: Yes, ma'am.
MS. SPAIN: Did he have a permit to do that?
MR. ARTHUR: Yes, he did.
MS. SPAIN: So he did not have a permit to do that.

MR. ARTHUR: He had a permit. The problem was, is that when Development Services approved the shop drawing --

MS. SPAIN: I think, $I$ believe he did not have a permit, just it was approved by the Development Services department, not the Historic department, but I don't think he had a final permit. I would be shot if he had a final permit.

MR. ARTHUR: Yeah. So he had a permit. The problem was, is that the windows that were on the shop drawings that were approved were not on the master permit,
and I brought a packet showing the shop drawings.
The problem was, is that nobody in
Development Services realized that it wasn't just the windows from the master that were being presented, it was those for the historic house.

So under the Florida building code, with an approval from Development Services, he was within his rights to install those doors and windows.

Now, unfortunately, it's caused this problem that we're here for tonight.

MS. SPAIN: I'd like staff to check on that and bring it back next month, whether or not they had a permit.

MR. ARTHUR: I think you can log into Development Services' website right now and look at it.

I definitely don't want to get into a deliberation with any board members. I would like to present the photos that $I$ have and finish my presentation.

MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.
MR. ARTHUR: Okay. So the doors and windows is the only item that staff has a motion to deny for. I don't think we need to go into the other items that staff has a motion to approve.

I realize it's late. We all have spouses and families to go home to. If you have any questions, I'm
happy to answer, but $I$ just want to focus on the doors and windows.

And the first thing $I$ want to do is pass out a packet so you can take a look, as did I, driving around the City Beautiful, Coral Gables, of other homes that have been approved by staff or the board in the same year, 2019.

These are windows that are also clear, low E, and some of those are even tinted. I wanted to emphasize that in the last staff presentation, they had mentioned that these windows are tinted. They are not.

I brought a sample of the glass and actually brought four samples of glass from different manufacturers just to make sure that my manufacturer didn't give me a glass that wasn't what they said it was.

All of them are clear low E, and that's the sample before you now. You can compare that sample with the other photographs in this packet.

And I'm going to scroll through the approval of the louvers which I did, as Mr. Adams had explained, very inventively reused Mr. Parker's original louvers which I have a story about, which I probably shouldn't have put on public record, but if you have any questions about how the louvers arrived to the house and where the mahogany came from, I'd be happy to tell you.
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Over here going from left to right, the left is the latest iteration of the louvers. I agree with Mr. Adams, it should have a larger style at the base. We are happy to do that.

MR. FULLERTON: It's the one, when you call it to the left, our right?

MR. ARTHUR: It's the item that says Proposed.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay.
MR. ARTHUR: Here's an enlarged view of the approved doors and windows on the shop drawings. I included a copy of the back of the plans with the stamp so you see the problem. It doesn't have the signature from Historic Preservation, but it is perforated.

This is sort of a before and after, and I had mentioned before that it's important to know that the house is still under construction. Construction has been going on for three and a half years, almost four years under this residence. Part of that had to do with the previous owner.

The project has a new owner. The new owner, Mr. DeSouza, is probably listening right now and hopefully he'll speak a little bit later, but he is also an avid follower of Parker, and part of him taking over this project, which he's put a tremendous amount of money in,
was really to preserve the house.
I've given tours of the house while it was on
sale. I feel obligated to tell you that some of the people I've given tours of this house said they'll demolish it because it doesn't suit the property, in their opinion.

MR. FULLERTON: Wow.
MR. ARTHUR: The problem with this
application is the applicant is asking you to approve the doors and windows that they thought were approved. That's why they installed them.

If they're not approved and the applicant has to remove the doors and windows, that's $\$ 850,000$.

Now, I'm not here to speak in regards to the owner's financial wherewithal or his ability to pay or not pay, but I've done other big projects like this. Some of you are builders. Some of you are architects. You should know that the carrying costs for these projects is tremendous, I would estimate for this house, probably around $\$ 65,000$ a month.

He's been trying to get these doors and windows reapproved for almost a year. That's three quarters of a million dollars on these doors and windows. If this motion is denied, he's going to have to tear those out, spend $\$ 850,000$ more, lose his wind insurance for the
property, and who is to say that maybe it would be sold?
Here's a copy, just for the record, on the screen the homes that are before you in that packet, also with the same low E, and some of these are even tinted but also enjoyed COA approvals.

One last thing to mention is the Florida energy code. We would not be able to get a permit for those doors and windows if we didn't have the low E component.

On the left, your left and my left, you see the passing rating for the low E, which again is clear, emphasize on the clear, nontinted, and then if we remove the low E component, the same test, same results, the baseline would fail pretty poorly actually. The passing grade is 806 and the baseline on the fail is at 316, so the low E is a substantial component.

And the interior is not part of the COA, but I wanted to mention that these doors and windows dramatically reduce the heat gain component of this particular house. Out of the other Parker homes that I've worked on, this one probably has the most and largest openings out of any of them.

There used to be a very large soffit that was added in 1984 that concealed the original Parker roof. There's a part of the house in the living room that --
scroll back -- that used to blend the interior and exterior, and in 1985, they took that away because they needed a tremendous amount of air-conditioning to cool that space.

With the low E, I was able to reduce that soffit quite a bit, and it's almost more exactly how it was on the interior of that, that room before you.

So if you could give the owner an opportunity to speak, I'm sure he'd be happy to.

MR. DeSOUZA: No.
MR. ARTHUR: And if you have any questions of me, I'd be happy to answer.

MR. DeSOUZA: Hello? Hi.
MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.
MR. DeSOUZA: Hi. Good evening. Can you hear me?

MR. ARTHUR: Go ahead, Marco.
MS. LYONS: Yes.
MR. DeSOUZA: Hi, hi. Thank you very much, William, for the, you know, presentation, and you know, basically what we are doing, working with staff, Mr. Adams has been helping us a lot, tremendously actually, and we have been correcting all the issues that, you know, were made by the previous owner and trying to make the house, you know, more like a real Parker house.

The issue with the windows as William
explained, you know, the GC, when he got the permit, he went ahead and installed the windows as he was installing all over the house.

There was a lot of confusion, and obviously, you know, we never intended to do something that was not approved. It was approved by the city. He went ahead, installed.

Later on we found out that the city did not route the plans for historical approval, but then obviously it was too late.

So what we are requesting is for the board to approve the windows, not because, you know, we did something wrong, but also because these windows have been previously approved for other homes in Coral Gables, and you know, we used the low E, clear glass, which obviously is the one that I think we spoke with the board of architects at the city, and they had no problems with it. They said they were fine, that you know, it looks good. They're not tinted.

So I don't see any reason why, you know, they wouldn't be approved if they had been approved for other homes in Coral Gables, and obviously not even considering the financial impact of the cost of taking down $8 \$ 50,000$ in windows and replacing them again with probably what
would be similar windows.
So that's our request, and I hope you guys can help us. Thank you so much.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
MS. SPAIN: So is he the present owner of the house?

MR. ARTHUR: Yes, Mr. DeSouza.
MS. SPAIN: And when did he purchase the house?

MR. ARTHUR: So it wasn't exactly a purchase. I think he should probably explain that better than I. My understanding is --

MR. DeSOUZA: Yes.
MR. ARTHUR: -- is that the previous owner, the DeMaios (phonetic), had lost the property, and Mr. DeSouza had gained the property due to some sort of an agreement.

MR. DeSOUZA: Yes. It was, Miss Spain --
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MR. DeSOUZA: -- the house was transferred to me with a deed in lieu of foreclosure.

MS. SPAIN: Okay. I had just not heard of you before, so it was a surprise.

MR. DeSOUZA: Yes, yes.
MS. SPAIN: Okay, thanks.

MR. DeSOUZA: Thank you.
MS. SPAIN: Okay.
MR. ARTHUR: And then just another note, Marco brought me back involved in the project. I had mentioned it was previously Heisenbottle, then myself.

Normally we do a lot of construction
administration. The previous owner did not hire me to do that, in my opinion, part of the reason why they've gone into all these deviations that have since been resolved, but it was unnecessarily long time to get here.

MR. FULLERTON: Mr. Heisenbottle involved in any of the part of the building that wasn't according to the direction that Mr. Parker would have gone? And I'm confused about them.

MR. ARTHUR: His addition, and if you look at the original COA, it's quite large, he had gotten preliminary approval at the $B O A$ after the $C O$, and then that's where he left off of the project.

MR. FULLERTON: I see, and I know Richard is very historically involved. That's his business, really.

MR. ARTHUR: Yes.
MR. FULLERTON: Is this mostly about the color of the glass or the type of glass that's in there?

MR. ARTHUR: I think staff, before Mr. Adams came, previous staff had thought the glass was tinted when
it wasn't. That's why we went through all the effort of getting different samples.

MS. SPAIN: I think it's reflective also. MR. ARTHUR: Huh?

MS. SPAIN: I think it's reflective also. It's not so much the color, but it's a mirror.

MR. ARTHUR: It's not mirror. It's right there.

MS. SPAIN: I know, and I can see through it. MR. ARTHUR: It's clear, yeah, clear low E, but the same clear E that we have -- you know.

MR. FULLERTON: My opinion, and mine alone, I'm very close to Al Parker, his family. His daughter was my college roommate's wife for a while, so we were very close for a long time. I know your dad too, by the way, knew your dad.

Anyway, I am much less concerned with the type of glass than the architecture of the building and the scale and proportions that Al Parker gave us and blessed us with.

His houses are spectacular. The ones he showed us before, the one near his mom's place, I mean it's just beyond anybody's capabilities that I know, and I think we were -- it's a shame that we lost at least one of those. I hope we don't have to lose another one, and this
one should be, we should be welcoming it. We should be doing everything we can to allow it to get going, you know, move along.

So I'd like to move -- I don't know what kind of a motion we need for this except to -- do you have any problems with any of the conditions for this?

MR. ARTHUR: No, but I'll give you a story about this house.

When I talked to Robin about it, he had said that the couple, the Cottles, were fighting about the views to the water, and Dr. Cottle had preferred to have no views. He wanted the privacy from the waterway because he didn't want people floating down boats, looking at him, but the wife wanted the views.

So on one side of the house, Mr. Parker put all fenestrations, and then the other side by the fireplace is all blocked up. There was two skinny windows.

And I was just thinking, I was like, "Man, gee, wouldn't it be nice if there was three windows?" Because on the other side, it looks like there should be this rhythm going with three windows.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MR. ARTHUR: So when -- we designed the third window right next to the other two.

When the contractor removed all the finishes and started work, he found that the 1951 construction, the opening was already there in the same exact spot that we spec'd it, we built it, we built it because it was there. He designed it.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, I was in his house many times in Cocoplum, too, the one that he designed for himself, beautiful.

But anyway, I'd like to make a motion to approve, if you're okay with the conditions, I'd like to move the approval with the conditions.

MS. ROLANDO: The first motion --
MR. MENENDEZ: There are two motions here.
MR. FULLERTON: Okay, that is the first one.
MR. ADAMS: One of them is for a denial, but if you ultimately decide you want to approve everything, you can just do one motion.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay. The denial would be -you're going to use the Persianas?

MR. ARTHUR: Yeah. We're refabricating them.
(Reporter clarification.)
MR. FULLERTON: You are using those?
MR. ARTHUR: Yes. We're refabricating them. I can go back to the slide. I think the portion that staff had brought a motion to deny was the doors and
windows.
MR. ADAMS: That was the only thing, deny the doors and windows. Everything else was recommended for approval, but if you're going to recommend approval for everything including the doors and windows, you only need one motion.

MR. FULLERTON: I would like to do that.
MS. ROLANDO: Please don't.
MR. FULLERTON: No? Okay.
MS. ROLANDO: No.
MR. FULLERTON: All right. I will hold my -I would like to hear your concern.

MS. ROLANDO: On the doors and windows, I think they're just huge and out of scale.

MR. FULLERTON: They are a vision of the architect's design content.

MS. ROLANDO: I don't think they're replacing.

MR. ARTHUR: The doors and windows are not under debate. Those have already been approved. It's the tinting of the glass that's under debate.

MS. ROLANDO: Okay.
MR. FULLERTON: And if you're familiar with Parker's work, he uses a lot of glass.

MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

MR. FULLERTON: So I move approval of everything.

MS. ROLANDO: There's, on the doors and windows here, there's no louvers here, correct, or are there?

MR. ARTHUR: Because we haven't been approved to do the louvers. Where you have your finger there, that's, there's not going to be any louvers there because that wasn't part of the original design.

MS. ROLANDO: Okay.
MR. ARTHUR: But where your right hand is, there are some louvers that are coming. We just need staff's approval to move forward.

MS. ROLANDO: Okay.
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Adams, can you explain the second motion so that everybody is clear?

MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MR. ADAMS: Staff was basically, staff had two motions because one of them was to approve pretty much everything, but there was one denial, and the denial was for the replacement of the exterior doors and windows because nothing had changed from the last application when it was before you when ultimately they were denied.

But what I'm saying is if you're going to approve everything, there's no need for a denial motion at
all if your approval includes the windows.
MR. MENENDEZ: If we denied it, why, why hasn't anything been done?

MR. ADAMS: Sorry?
MR. MENENDEZ: Why has nothing been done if it was denied before?

MR. ARTHUR: Because in the previous report, it was thought that the glass was tinted or reflective when, in fact, it was not.

MR. MENENDEZ: And why are you recommending that it be denied now?

MR. ADAMS: Because nothing had changed in the design. The applicant has now come forward basically disputing the fact that the windows were regarded as tinted, and he's brought samples to show you, and there are photographs of glass in the report which state clear --

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MR. ADAMS: -- clear glass on them, and he's arguing that the glass is clear, and there is also the energy efficiency which is --

MR. MENENDEZ: But staff is still
recommending denial?
MS. SPAIN: Well, I think it's because we had denied it before, and so at this point --

MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: -- it's our denial --
MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: -- because he hasn't done
anything about it.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MR. FULLERTON: When did that come up? I
wasn't here. I don't remember seeing this one.
MR. MENENDEZ: You were here.
MR. ARTHUR: April 2021.
MR. ADAMS: But what's happening is because you denied it the last time, we can't turn around and say, "Now we're recommending approval."

You have to take on board the additional information that Mr. Arthur has presented to you.

MR. ARTHUR: I think the reason why you might not have remembered this is because there was so many issues created by the previous owner that we couldn't even talk about the doors and windows. We didn't even get to it. I think we deliberated like an hour and a half.

MR. FULLERTON: I remember you being there.
MR. ARTHUR: And nobody remembers the windows.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MR. FULLERTON: So I move approval in total.

MR. ARTHUR: And then if $I$ can make one more, the house is still under construction. The house still has to be reviewed and approved during the construction process.

It's going to be inspected again by Historical Resources. By approving this motion, you're not condoning everything that's ever happened to the property. You're not approving the house to be finished. It's just needed to proceed with the construction.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. I have a motion. Do I have a second?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Can I just ask a stupid

```
question?
```

MR. ARTHUR: Yes, ma'am.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Is this the original design of the home?

MR. ARTHUR: That's the original orientation, the size of the openings. It used to be screened. Now it's glazed. That was part of the original COA approval.

MS. ROLANDO: That's the issue.
MR. DURANA: I'll second it.
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Durana seconds it.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: No.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?

MR. DURANA: Yes.

MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?

MS. ROLANDO: No.

MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

MR. EHRENHAFT: No.

MS. LYONS: Was that no?

MR. EHRENHAFT: No.

MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?

MR. MENENDEZ: No.

MS. LYONS: Motion fails.

MS. ROLANDO: Can we re-up this with
bifurcating the motion?

MR. MENENDEZ: It's a new motion.

MS. ROLANDO: Okay. I would move for
approval with conditions of everything but the replacement exterior doors and windows.

MS. SPAIN: I'll second that.

MR. MENENDEZ: Miss Spain seconds that.

MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?

MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: No.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Was that yes?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. I need a motion on --
the second motion.
MR. FULLERTON: I move to approve.
MS. SPAIN: Oh, my god, he's just being difficult.

MR. ARTHUR: Yeah. I mean, we're not approving the entire house. We're just allowing the construction to proceed here. We still need inspections. We still need --

MR. FULLERTON: How can -- what is wrong with this glass?

MR. MENENDEZ: Do I have a second?

MR. DURANA: A second for what?

MR. FULLERTON: I approved, moved to approve
the glass and the glazing going into the house, which should have been on the first motion.

MR. DURANA: I'll second it, but I thnk we're doing the same thing, so.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes, we are.

MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Durana seconds it.

MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I just want to say it's much
more beautiful open, no glass.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, could you speak up, please?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: It's much more beautiful open with no glass, but $I$ know you want to enclose it for interior purposes.

MR. ARTHUR: The enclosure has already been approved.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Right, no, no, I know.

MR. ARTHUR: I think there's some confusion.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: No, no, I'm not confused.

MR. ARTHUR: We're not applying to --
MS. BACHE-WIIG: I just wanted to make
that --

MR. ARTHUR: -- enclose it with glass.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: I know. I just wanted to make the comment. Yes.

MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: No.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: Wow. Was that a yes?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: One, two, three. We might hit it.

MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: No.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: No.
MS. SPAIN: Did it pass?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MR. ARTHUR: Getting closer. Is there any reason why these other homes are approved with the same exact glass?

MS. SPAIN: I can't answer that question. I have no idea, but it isn't obvious as this one when you can see the water if you look at it from -- I mean, it's so reflective, and maybe it's because of the amount of glass.

MR. DURANA: I mean, is there like a happy medium that we could do? Like maybe that particular room, you change it to clear, and then the rest of the house stays on low E or something?

MR. ARTHUR: If that becomes a condition. I just, I just, I am really surprised that a bunch of professionals in a room think that destroying $\$ 850,000$ of --

MR. MENENDEZ: We're not here, we're not here to debate money. That's not in our purview. We don't take that into consideration.

MR. ARTHUR: How would it pass the energy code?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I have a question.
MR. ARTHUR: How would it pass?
MR. FULLERTON: You've got to be somewhat flexible. You have to meet the code. Otherwise, you take some of the glass away.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Do we have another motion?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I have a question. Is there a way to mitigate the reflectivity? Is there a film?

MR. ARTHUR: Happy to apply a film.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: No, I don't know the answer.
I just --
MR. ARTHUR: We're happy to apply a film if it makes it less reflective.

MR. FULLERTON: Let me suggest, first of all, the reflectivity is minor.

Secondly, at night you see out -- no, you see, you have more reflectivity inside, but you don't see the water at night. In the daytime, it's perfectly visible, so your views to the water, there's no argument about that. This is, this is not a highly reflective glass.

MR. ADAMS: I've been informed that replacement windows in historic properties don't necessarily have to meet code, replacement windows in historic properties per the building department don't have to meet energy code, and of course, I think you also mentioned about the increase in the AC units?

MR. ARTHUR: Yes. There's about eight additional tons of cooling required without the low E glazing.

What Miss Kautz had mentioned does not
exactly apply to Level Three alterations, and besides I would proffer that there's laws out there that allow you to do plenty of things that may be allowed, but you shouldn't do them.

Eight tons of cooling in that one room alone, I think that's irresponsible not to put the low E glazing.

MR. FULLERTON: You have environmental concerns.

MS. SPAIN: So it passed, right? Is that right?

MR. MENENDEZ: No. It's three to four.
MR. ARTHUR: There was a great idea about adding a layer of film. I'm sure the owner would be amenable to that. If that's what it takes to satisfy Miss Spain, if we put a layer that reduces the reflectivity, happy to do it.

MS. SPAIN: You don't have to satisfy me. This is a board decision. Don't make me the bad person.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I think something that wouldn't darken it either.
(Reporter clarification.)
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Is there a way to put an amendment to the approval by saying that the architect will work with staff to try to minimize the reflectivity? I mean, just as a side note, I think the issue is that
this was never meant to have glass.
MS. ROLANDO: Right, that's exactly it.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: That's the real -- that's where we are, we're at. Obviously we're beyond that because it's been approved, so I think we're fighting something that should never have been, but it's there.

So how do we mitigate it? Maybe there's a way for you to go back to staff?

MR. ARTHUR: Happy to do that. I think it's a great idea. I think it's totally possible. I can get with the supplier and we'll come up with a few samples of film. We'll show them to Warren. For good measure, we'll introduce them to Miss Spain if she so desires.

MR. MENENDEZ: Or we could just defer this item.

MR. ARTHUR: The thing with the deferral is we could do the glass now. I can get people out there next week to apply the film, and we could be moving. The deferral, $I$ don't know what's on next month's agenda, but --

MS. ROLANDO: Well, right now you have a denial, so that's not going ahead, so the question is do we defer? I don't think we're going to reconsider without seeing the proposed solution, and it sounds like you believe you have a good solution.

MR. ARTHUR: Yes. I think if it's
approved --
MS. ROLANDO: Or let's see the solution.
MR. ARTHUR: -- if it's approved with the condition that it has a tinting to reduce the reflectivity, we can abide by that condition.

What I'm hoping to prevent is that we keep getting deferrals. It's already been over a year. We've been trying to resolve this for over a year, and another deferral is more carrying costs.

MS. SPAIN: How many times have you been to the board trying to resolve it?

MR. ARTHUR: I'm sorry?

MS. SPAIN: How many times in that year have you been to the board trying to resolve it?

MR. ARTHUR: This board is the second time.

MS. ROLANDO: Okay, so.

MS. SPAIN: Okay, so.
MR. ARTHUR: Yeah. It's taken that long. So the nonreflective tinting, totally possible. We could do it next week. We can gain staff approval, make sure that Warren is satisfied. If he's not, then we'll come back.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MS. SPAIN: I really don't care if --
MR. ADAMS: But my only concern with that
would be would it not make the windows darker? If another -- so then you have dark windows rather than -- you know.

MR. MENENDEZ: There are some board members who want to see the solution before they vote, and there are other board members who are fine, so.

MR. FULLERTON: Well, do you need a motion to allow staff to work with the architect to determine what tint you would accept? We've trusted you with more complicated things.

MR. ADAMS: I would argue this is more complex than, you know, reviewing a tile for around a swimming pool.

MS. ROLANDO: I think maybe we've batted enough hot potatoes to Warren, so why don't we put this on, have this on the agenda for the next meeting?

MR. FULLERTON: Are there Persianas on any of these windows?

MR. ARTHUR: I think the Persianas are in the first motion which was approved. I think we're down to just the reflectivity of the glass.

MR. FULLERTON: No, I know, but if there are Persianas in front of this glass, does it make --

MR. ARTHUR: It makes no difference, honestly. It's just delaying the construction and delaying the preservation of his home even more. That's
all it does.

MS. SPAIN: But why is it delaying anything?
You're already resolved.

MR. ARTHUR: Because the next hearing is a month away.

MR. DURANA: Are you guys red tagged?
MS. SPAIN: But in the meantime, what are you doing? Has this stopped construction?

MR. ARTHUR: Yes.

MS. SPAIN: Why?

MR. ARTHUR: Because you saw how many windows we have. We would be basically ruining the entire house if we removed all the windows.

MR. DURANA: He can't install tile, he can't do finishes if he's going to have to rip out --

MR. ADAMS: One question: How many of the windows or what percentage of the windows are covered or will be covered by the Persiana shutters?

MR. Arthur: Can we go back to that image? It's not the largest ones. It's the smaller ones. It's everything on the second floor.

MR. ADAMS: But the largest ones weren't originally windows, were they?

MR. FULLERTON: Are the open ones on the --
MR. ARTHUR: No. They were screen, and the
screen was very dark, by the way, so if anything, if you compare the photos, the glass --

MS. ROLANDO: Wait, wait, wait.
MR. ARTHUR: -- you see much more in the glass.

MS. ROLANDO: Don't try selling us screen and glass are the same. Just move ahead and talk about things that are realistic.

MR. ARTHUR: Okay.
MR. FULLERTON: Let me ask you a quick question: The open glass that does not have the Persianas on it, is that on the north elevation?

MR. ARTHUR: It is.
MR. FULLERTON: So it's on the least
sun-affected side of the building, so that makes a difference.

MR. DURANA: But so he was approved for shop drawings. How did he get approved for shop drawings without being approved by Historic? That doesn't make any sense. Like that's why -- I mean, I understand their standing because if I'm the owner, I'd say, "You approved these. I'm putting in what you approved."

MS. SPAIN: What happens sometimes, though, is the shop drawings don't come to the city until after it's already installed. They get approval, and then the
shop drawings come. I mean, that's happened.
MR. DURANA: Yes, but even then they approved the shop drawings, they approve them.

MS. SPAIN: That happened with the University of Miami architecture school windows, which we had on the drawings and the architect had on the drawings clear glass, and I got the shop -- it was almost my last day of working before I retired, and I got the shop drawings and it had a tint to it.

MR. DURANA: Yes, but I'm saying these got approved. These are shop drawings that got approved.

MS. SPAIN: Well, everyone else had approved the shop drawings. I went out to look out to -- they were already installed, so it all depends.

MR. ARTHUR: My understanding is that the process has been improved in Development Services. I don't think it's a Historic issue. I think it was, Development Services should have routed it to Historic.

MR. DURANA: Yes, correct.
MR. ARTHUR: I understand from the director it's since been improved to prevent these types of issues.

What I want to say, though, is that I'm afraid these types of things is like we're throwing the baby out with the bath water.

MS. ROLANDO: I understand.

MR. ARTHUR: Removing these doors and windows at this point would basically be pretty much demolishiing the rest of the house.

All of the interior would be destroyed. All of the furnishings, the air-conditioning, all of the lighting, all of that would be gone without doors and windows, and we would probably be looking at another owner who, honestly, will never come to this board, because there are people out there who buy these types of properties and they demolish them.

And I think by denying the doors and windows, not looking into the film which I thought was a great idea, that's what we would be doing.

So if I could get a motion to look at the reflective film, if it's not acceptable by staff, we'll come back, but I think the film is a great idea.

MR. FULLERTON: I move that we allow the applicant to bring a sample of several, if there are several, films that might be used to mitigate the reflective quality of the glass.

MR. MENENDEZ: So then that's a deferral.
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MR. FULLERTON: Yes, but I don't want to have to come back -- if it's okay with you, I think it should
be, they should be allowed to move ahead.
Honestly, I think we are batting at mosquitoes and getting run over by Mack trucks.

MS. ROLANDO: Right.
MR. DURANA: I mean, look, I don't like the way it looks, but $I$ think we're giving him a much harder time for something that was approved by the city than we gave the previous applicant that completely built something that was not approved, I mean.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Do I have a second?
MR. DURANA: For what?
MR. MENENDEZ: For his motion.
MR. DURANA: I don't know what --
MR. FULLERTON: It's not a deferral.
MR. DURANA: I didn't even know what the
motion was.
MR. FULLERTON: It's not a deferral.
MR. CEBALLOS: Just to be clear, just to make the record clear, I don't know and I don't believe anyone in this room from the city can confirm whether these were approved or not.

I have shop drawings that were approved, but there's a revision that happened on the very next meeting, which obviously you have a building, you have a revision, and you have shop drawings. The shop drawing was
approved.
The revision, I have denials from a week or two from Kara in regards to those windows, so I don't know what was approved or not approved, and I don't want the board to make a decision on that because we simply don't have an answer to it, and I don't trust my interpretation of these on line permits. I would defer to Building.

I would love to bring it back to you in the next meeting, just make sure that that's clear. I haven't confirmed that, and I don't think staff has confirmed it either.

MR. ARTHUR: That revision was withdrawn. That revision was canceled.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MR. CEBALLOS: Okay. I'm just going off, once again, my preliminary review --

MR. MENENDEZ: Well, we're not going to have any more arguments. We've been here almost six hours, and patience is running thin for everybody, so we have a motion. Do we have a second?

MR. DURANA: Can we repeat the motion?
MR. FULLERTON: The thing is that the motion was not to defer. It was to allow staff to work with the applicant to see what is available in the way of mitigating film.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I will second that motion.
MS. LYONS: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: I will second the motion.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Bache-Wiig seconds the motion.

MS. LYONS: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Is the motion to approve the doors and windows subject to a satisfactory --

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. ROLANDO: -- resolution acceptable to the preservation officer?

MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you for clarifying.
That's a good clarification.
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Miss Bache-Wiig?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MS. LYONS: Motion passes.
MR. MENENDEZ: All right.
MR. ARTHUR: Thank you. Good night.
MS. ROLANDO: Warren, you better not screw up.

MR. ADAMS: Because $I$ knew that was coming, I knew that was coming.

MR. ARTHUR: We're not going to hide the sample. We'll show you the sample.

MR. ADAMS: It's like, "Warren, we're concerned about you approving a pool tile and a brick paver" --

MS. SPAIN: I know.
MR. ADAMS: -- "and making sure the garage doors, but we want you to approve a film for an entire glass building." Thank you. Sorry.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Adams, do we have any additional items?

MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MR. ADAMS: We do. I think Miss Spain --
MS. SPAIN: I requested that this be added, and I apologize. I knew it was going to be late. Do we
have the images that we can put up?
MR. ADAMS: Can we have the Power Point, please?

MS. ROLANDO: Is this the gondola?
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. ROLANDO: Oh, it was in The Herald.
MS. SPAIN: Well, and that's the thing, so --
MS. ROLANDO: Wait. Oh, my god.
MS. SPAIN: So this is the gondola
building --
MS. ROLANDO: What happened?
MR. DURANA: It collapsed?
MS. SPAIN: -- at the Biltmore Hotel, and this is what happened.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: How did that happen?
MR. MENENDEZ: Who knocked it down?
MR. FULLERTON: What is that?
MR. DURANA: That's on the seventh hole, right when you shoot, when you hit over the water. You know what I'm talking?

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MR. DURANA: You lay up and then you hit.
MS. ROLANDO: What happened?
MS. SPAIN: That was on the endangered list
that Bruce Ehrenhaft actually worked on with DHT, and
these came in an e-mail that was sent to Chris Rupp, the executive director of DHT, and she sent it to me, and I just couldn't believe it.

And there is, if you go on line to the Miami Herald, there is an article that talks about it, and then there's a city spokesperson, and I apologize for doing this, but I'm reading this article and it made no sense.

It says, it goes on about how important it was, and it says, "'The building has been uninhabited for decades,' city spokeswoman Martha Pantin wrote in a text."

Well, yes, it was never inhabited. It was a gondola storage building, so that's one thing.

And then it said, "Needed an investment of more than 1.5 million dollars to restore it."

Well, that's assuming you're going to repurpose it as an event building the way Rich Heisenbottle in 2017 suggested, and he did a 260-some-page report --

MR. FULLERTON: Good.
MS. SPAIN: -- on how important it was, and he did a proposal to the city.

But that included bringing water to it and bringing electricity, which it didn't have, but to restore that building back to its original state didn't need it, it doesn't need water, it doesn't need electricity, and it
certainly wouldn't have taken 1.5 million dollars.
MR. FULLERTON: No.
MS. ROLANDO: Is this demolition by neglect?
MS. SPAIN: I don't know. "In 2019, the city passed a resolution authorizing $\$ 500,000$ to be used for matching grants to the Florida Department of State," which is true.

And then it has, "Unfortunately, we have been unsuccessful in securing a matching grant from the State of Florida," and this next sentence, "We have secured the structure and are evaluating our path forward."

So my question is, because apparently this text was written after it looked like that --

MR. FULLERTON: Did it fall down by itself?
MS. SPAIN: I don't know, but does the city think that securing it means putting crime tape around it and now it's secure because people that are getting near it? Because honestly --

MR. ADAMS: I can give a bit of an update. I received a message yesterday morning, and I was out to the site. I was the only person there.

So I was taking some photographs, and a couple of people turned up with an excavator. I asked them what they were doing. They said they were going to move the rubble.

I asked them to leave it because my thoughts were if it's going to be rebuilt, I'd rather the rubble stayed where it was. It's going to be easier to figure out what's what.

At this time the back wall was still standing up, so there was a back wall there, and I contacted the building official, and just for confirmation, you know, to make sure the site was safe, and I got an e-mail back saying, "Tell them not to touch anything at least until the walls are braced and secured," so it was left at that.

I returned this morning, and another wall had come down, and we did meet with two shoring companies today, and who are going to give us proposals for at least shoring up what's left. The Biltmore were today putting a six-foot fence round it.

And I was in the office early today because last night the mayor's office requested that $I$ help prepare funding appropriation forms from the state, one for the house and one for the senate, which would involve requesting, $I$ believe it's $\$ 750,000$, plus $\$ 750,000$ from the city.

So that's been done, and they were being submitted today, and the mayor is presenting that in Tallahassee I believe on Friday, so that's --

MS. SPAIN: It's so troubling and so
unavoidable. There's no reason --
MS. ROLANDO: It's avoidable.
MR. FULLERTON: Avoidable.
MS. SPAIN: But this --
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: -- this was absolutely avoidable, I mean, but you're right, but it was so stupid. I mean, when they took all of the trees away from it, because there were trees that had fallen on top of it, I asked that we shore it up, we make sure that it's secure because there was no roof.

So anyhow, I just wanted to bring it to your attention. Bruce?

MR. EHRENHAFT: Can I interject?
MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.
MR. EHRENHAFT: Are people saying that this is simply a collapse of the structure, or did somebody demolish it?

What I wanted to know was -- because we've had demolition by neglect going on for decades on this building. It's on Biltmore property, and I think the city is somehow involved in it. Okay?

When you've got demolition by neglect, there are fines that accrue. It's a private home, and eventually then it exceeds the value of the property, and
then it gets seized. Okay?
And if it was demolition by neglect but somebody -- it did not collapse by itself, and somebody demolished it, was there a demolition permit requested?

MR. ADAMS: There is no demolition permit requested, no.

MR. EHRENHAFT: So did somebody come with a machine and knock this down, or did it fall all by itself?

MR. ADAMS: I don't know.
MR. FULLERTON: It looks like it's been really knocked apart.

MR. EHRENHAFT: It looks like it was
mechanically --
MR. FULLERTON: Yes, it looks like, because otherwise some of that rubble would be like in a pile.

MR. MENENDEZ: In a pile.
MR. EHRENHAFT: It would be in a pile and a lot of it would be inside, you know, so.

MS. SPAIN: Very troubling.
MR. FULLERTON: Very troubling.
MS. ROLANDO: Was it vandalized?
MR. FULLERTON: Maybe that's what I'm
thinking.
MS. ROLANDO: I'm wondering if there was video at all.

MS. SPAIN: I don't know.
MR. ADAMS: It's in the middle of the golf course so it's unlikely there would be any, I wouldn't think be any video.

MR. MENENDEZ: I'm sure there are homes around that golf course that have cameras.

MS. ROLANDO: Absolutely.
MS. SPAIN: I don't know whether there were lights on it.

MR. FULLERTON: So nobody knows how it got this way other than just God?

MR. ADAMS: How it ended up collapsing?
MR. DURANA: Well, we had a lot of rain I think over the last couple days. No?

MS. ROLANDO: It doesn't look like collapse. It didn't fall in on itself.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes. It doesn't look like a collapse.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: It's too spread out.
MR. DURANA: Could it be a lightning strike,
I don't know, a lightning strike?
MS. ROLANDO: I don't know.
MR. MENENDEZ: Somebody hit it with a golf ball.

MS. ROLANDO: It's very troubling.
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MR. DURANA: To do that type of damage, you would have to hit that with a truck, not with a golf cart.

MS. SPAIN: Honestly, that has been an issue since, when it first came to my attention was when Bill Kerdyk was commissioner, so how many years ago was that? That he brought it up at a commission meeting and said, "You know, we really need to save this building, it's amazing." He was a golfer, and it's out in the middle --

MS. BACHE-WIIG: What will happen now? Will
they have to rebuild it to its original --
MR. ADAMS: Well, that would be, $I$ mean, that would be the recommendation.

MR. FULLERTON: Do we have any drawings of it?

MR. ADAMS: Yes. I mean it was documented.
MS. SPAIN: Rich Heisenbottle did drawings.
MR. FULLERTON: Huh?
MS. SPAIN: Rich Heisenbottle did drawings and he documented, it was in 2017, he documented the buildings.

MR. ADAMS: Which is why, when I went out there, I asked that it be left the way it was, because it's going to be far easier to piece together like that than if it's shoveled up --

MR. MENENDEZ: Right.

MR. ADAMS: -- in a corner, put in a pile, but ultimately, you know, we need to wait and see.

MR. FULLERTON: I think we need to talk to Rich Heisenbottle.

MS. SPAIN: I already sent him images. I
forwarded it to him yesterday.
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Adams, any other items?
MR. ADAMS: Yes. I'd like a discussion on window films for historic.

MR. MENENDEZ: That's your baby.
MS. LYONS: Mr. Gillis has his hand up, and Karelia also.

MR. FULLERTON: Do we need another motion to stay after ten?

MR. CEBALLOS: Technically no.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: I have to catch a flight early in the morning. Can I exit? Is that allowed, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: If you'll allow me? Thank you.

MS. SPAIN: We're not going to vote on anything.

MR. FULLERTON: I move, I move that you can move.

MR. MENENDEZ: I think what we're going to move is to --

MR. FULLERTON: Adjourn.
MR. MENENDEZ: -- adjourn. I can't move --
MS. SPAIN: Wait. We have people who want to talk.

MS. LYONS: What do we do about these people who want to talk?

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Bring somebody on.
MS. LYONS: Go ahead, Karelia.
MS. MARTINEZ-CARBONELL: Hello, hello. Hi, it's Karelia. I know it's late, and bear with me, please, and thank you for staying all this time.

In terms of the gondola building, it's really very sad. It's actually not a happy day for many preservationists, and $I$ was there in August with Mr. Adams, and that building, we all agreed that it needed immediate attention, and the city did not act on it, and that was in August.

But back in 2019 -- I don't understand how the Historic Preservation Resources department didn't flag this even back then when it was on an endangered list, and there was a grant and there was $\$ 500,000$ put towards this building.

So just, you know, just for the record, I

## 297

just want to make sure that the city, something is happening with the collapse of a historic building, it's something to really take seriously, and funds need to be put into the budget, and these buildings have to be maintained, and that's why this committee that was just formed just two weeks ago, I believe, is something that is good, you know, for preservation.

So you know, the gondola building is a sad, sad thing that happened to the city, and I see -- you know, I hear people laughing about it and conjecturing things, and that building has been really in a mode of neglect for many, many years.

So whether it just, you know, all of a sudden collapsed, or somebody pulled a rock and it collapsed, you know, we don't know. Maybe we will know at some point.

But the matter is, just back in August there was an emergency call out for this building for the city to secure it and make sure that it would be, you know, maintained and obviously restored.

So not only is it going to maybe cost twice as much now to restore it, now that is the consequence.

But please, you know, these buildings, these historic buildings, these landmarks that we are all proud of, they just don't exist. They have to be maintained and they have to have money and they have to have a budget.

So you know, when we're all thinking about budget, please make sure that historic preservation is a priority.

So thank you again, good night, and I hope it will be a better day tomorrow in terms of this gondola building. Hopefully there will be some positive that we can draw from.

MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you. Mr. Ehrenhaft.
MR. EHRENHAFT: I have an objection because nobody in this room, on this committee --

MR. GILLIS: Hello.
MR. EHRENHAFT: -- was making jokes about this.

MS. SPAIN: Not at all.
MR. EHRENHAFT: I said nobody in this room -I have an objection to what she was saying. Nobody in this room on this committee was making jokes or laughing about this or making making little of it. Okay? I find that offensive. I need to say that for the record.

MR. MENENDEZ: Duly noted. Do we have anybody else?

MR. GILLIS: Hello. Yes. This is Brett Gillis.

MR. EHRENHAFT: I think it would be nice to note for investigation to find out what really happened,
was it knocked down or was it collapsed.
MR. FULLERTON: Good point. I certainly did not mean to be jocular.

MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Gillis?
MR. GILLIS: Good evening. I'll be very
fast. Thank you for staying.
I was there on August 25 th with Mr. Adams, and my understanding was that the public works department was going to secure the building.

Do we know why that didn't happen? I mean, that was an emergency call that was made to public works. It doesn't seem like they did anything.

MR. ADAMS: That's something I'll have to look into, and I believe a request was made to the city to actually secure the building the day after that meeting.

MS. SPAIN: I know I sent an e-mail in
August.
MR. GILLIS: Okay. Mr. Adams, are you willing to go look one day at the Alhambra water tower, the north part of that?

I believe it started to have spalling. Water appears to be getting in and I think you're going to have a similar situation going on there if something is not done to that Alhambra water tower.

That is probably the thing that I hear from
neighbors and residents the most right now more than anything, because a lot of people don't know about the gondola building if they're not golfers, but that Alhambra water tower, people go by every day, and the condition of it is disgusting. Thank you.

MR. ADAMS: I can look into that. I know we were out there a couple of months ago with the insurance adjustors and for damage caused by one of the last hurricanes, so $I$ can certainly find out where we are in that process.

So I do know that's something that's ongoing. I just don't know if public works heard back from the insurance adjustors yet.

MR. FULLERTON: That building is a huge problem because it's framed.

MR. ADAMS: Yes.
MR. FULLERTON: And it's not concrete and it's meant to be destroyed. I mean, I think Merrick rebuilt it, he thought, "Well, it lasts as long as it will last."

It's a terrible shame because a lot of people have done a lot of work to try to preserve it.

MS. LYONS: Speak into the mic.
MS. SPAIN: I was, except it was off. Sorry.
I said in the time $I$ was with the city, it was totally
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restored twice.
MS. ROLANDO: At great expense.
MS. SPAIN: At great expense, so it was like every ten years, it has to be rebuilt.

MR. FULLERTON: My brother painted it one three-month period.

MS. SPAIN: Yes. I remember that.
MR. MENENDEZ: Anything else, Mr. Adams?
MR. ADAMS: No.
MR. MENENDEZ: Can somebody make a motion to adjourn, please?

MS. SPAIN: Let's adjourn.
MR. ADAMS: Thank you.
MR. MENENDEZ: We're adjourned.
(Thereupon, proceedings were adjourned at 10:08 p.m.)
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