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MR. TORRE: Okay. We shall begin. So good afternoon, everybody, and welcome to the regularly scheduled meeting of the City of Coral Gables Historic Preservation Board.

We are residents of Coral Gables and are charged with the preservation and protection of historic architecturally worthy buildings, structures, sites and artifacts which impart a distinct historical heritage of the city.

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

Any person who acts as a lobbyist pursuant to the City of Coral Gables Ordinance Number 2006-11 must register with the city clerk prior to engaging in lobbying activities or presentations before city staff, boards, committees, and with the city commission. A copy of the ordinance is available in the office of the city clerk.

Failure to register and provide proof of registration shall prohibit your ability to present to the historic preservation board on applications under consideration this afternoon.

A lobbyist is defined as an individual, corporation, partnership or other legal entity employed or retained, whether paid or not, by a principal who seeks to encourage the approval, disapproval, adoption, repeal, passage, defeat or modification of any ordinance, resolution, action or decision of any city commissioner, any action, decision, recommendation of the city manager, any city board or committee, including, but not limited to, quasi-judicial, advisory board, trust or party or counsel or any action, decision or recommendation of city personnel during the time period of the entire decision-making progress on the action, decision or recommendation which foreseeably will be heard or reviewed by the city commission or city board or committee, including, but not limited, to quasi-judicial, advisory board, trust, authority or counsel.

Presentations made to this board are subject to the city's false claims ordinance, Chapter 39 of the City of Coral Gables City Code.

I now officially call the City of Coral Gables Historic Preservation Board meeting of February 15th, 2018, to order. The time is $4: 05$ p.m.

Present today, to my left, Jan Thomson, Raul Rodriguez, Robert Parsley and Mr. Alejandro Silva, and to my right Mr. Albert Menendez, Mr. John Fullerton,
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Mr. Bruce Ehrenhaft, and Miss Alicia Bache-Wiig.
The next item on the agenda is the approval
of the minutes of the meeting which was held on January
18th, 2018. Are there any changes or corrections? If
not, is there a motion for approval?
MR. SILVA: I'll move approval.
MR. TORRE: Is there a second?
MR. MENENDEZ: Second.
MR. TORRE: All those in favor, please say aye.

MS. THOMSON: Aye.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Aye.
MR. PARSLEY: Aye.
MR. TORRE: Aye.
MR. FULLERTON: Aye.
MR. EHRENHAFT: Aye.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Aye.
MR. TORRE: All those against? Thank you.
Notice regarding ex parte communication says that please be advised that this board is a quasi-judicial board and that the items on the agenda are quasi-judicial in nature which requires the board members to disclose all ex parte communications.

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

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

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

MR. FULLERTON: Mr. Chairman, I had a brief conversation with an architect that is presenting before us on 4209 --

MS. KAUTZ: Santa Maria.
MR. FULLERTON: -- Santa Maria, but it had nothing to do with the project and nothing to do -- we're just old friends, so I just want to make sure that you're aware.

MR. TORRE: Thank you.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman, I don't have an ex parte communication to report, but $I$ do want to report and disclose to the board that the item at 4200 Granada

Boulevard is represented by Herbert Brito who is an architect who is doing work for me on another project.

I checked with the city attorney's office. I do not need to recuse myself, but $I$ need to disclose this and to state for the record that $I$ can be objective in this matter.

MR. TORRE: And impartial.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: And impartial.
MR. TORRE: Thank you.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you.
MS. SUAREZ: Mr. Chair, I want to clarify that, yes, we did speak with Mr. Rodriguez earlier today and the relationship with the designer or with the architect is not a relationship that would create a voting conflict, and he expressed that he could be fair and impartial.

MR. TORRE: Thank you. All right. Any deferrals today?

MS. SPAIN: Yes, actually the local historic designation of 122 Menores Avenue, that's case file LHD 2017-014, has been deferred.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Again.
MS. SPAIN: Again.
MR. TORRE: Thank you. All right. So we'll be starting. Anyone who will be speaking today, please
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rise to be sworn in if you will be speaking today. Thank you.
(Thereupon, the potential speakers were duly sworn on oath by the clerk.)

MR. TORRE: All right.
MS. SPAIN: I have one thing before we begin. I think Cristina would like to introduce us to someone who is just starting with the city.

MS. SUAREZ: Thank you, Dona, and thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the board.

I'd like to introduce you to the newest member of our office, Assistant City Attorney Gustavo Ceballos. He joins us from the City of Fort Lauderdale where his duties included, among other things, serving as counsel to the historic preservation board there. Before that, he was a project attorney at Greenberg Traurig working on land use and zoning matters.

So we are excited to have him on board, and I anticipate going on maternity leave in April, so he may be sitting up here serving as counsel to you, so that's why I wanted to make sure that you all knew who he was, and you'll be in good hands with Gustavo.

MR. TORRE: Thank you. Congratulations and welcome aboard. I just wanted to tell you that I know that Fort Lauderdale has a great historical board, but
this is the best board in Florida.
MR. CEBALLOS: Glad to hear that.
MR. TORRE: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: This is true.
MR. TORRE: All right. So we'll start today with Case File COA (SP) 2017-020, application for the issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for the property at 516 Alcazar Avenue, a contributing resource within the Alcazar Avenue Historic District, and this is legally described as Lot Eight, Block 12, Coral Gables Section B, and as recorded in Plat Book Five, Page 111 of the public records of Dade County.

The application requests design approval for the construction of an addition to the residence and also site work, and to note, a variance has been requested from Article Five, Section 4-101(D) (8) of the Coral Gables zoning code for allowable lot coverage.

MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. The location map. This is right in the middle of the Alcazar district on the south side of the street. This is a photo from the 1940 s which would have been shortly after this property was built.

It was constructed in 1936, Permit Number 5172, and designed by the firm of Paist and Steward in the Mediterranean transitional style.

In December 2007, Alcazar was placed on the historic register as a district. This is a contributing residence within that district. The architect is here and I'll let him walk through the plans with you.

I did want to note that there is a variance requested here for maximum ground lot coverage, and the rationale for staff being in support of this variance is that it's a one-story house on a largely one-story street.

They are allowed by right for FAR to build much more square footage which would necessitate them going to a second story, which we did not want to see happen, so we are supportive of giving a lot coverage variance to keep the property at one story.

They are well under their FAR for the property and are keeping it as a one-story structure, so we do support the variance request.

I'll go over the conditions that we have for approval at the end, and I'll turn it over to the architect.

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I am Rafael Cruz-Munoz. I am the architect of record for the addition.

What we're trying to do here is, as you will see, the house from the front, it's very appealing with the Mediterranean kind of look and the barrel tile and so
on. However, the whole rear of the house, as you can see from the aerial view, is a flat roof, and the lot is rather tight.

There is an existing addition which you'll see in the bottom photograph at the right-hand side which was apparently built in the '60s, and it may not have had a building permit. It's certainly something that doesn't look like it belongs in Coral Gables and it seems unsafe because the roof is composed of three-by-six wood beams that $I$ don't think should really be -- and you know, it's not properly built at all.

So what we'd like to do is get rid of that addition and then go ahead, and in addition, there is this storage shed that appears to be part of the original house, very blocky, very square.

Initially we were going to demolish it, but in going to the architectural board, the architects had a very good suggestion of incorporating it and using it for the barbecue and so on, which then would allow us to go and match the historical rear set-back instead of having to be ten feet away, and that was considered that it was appropriate.

So we went ahead and incorporated their idea which was very, very helpful. I think it has made the whole project a lot better.

I don't know if you can -- well, you have the plans in front of you. Basically --

MS. THOMSON: I don't have them.
MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: -- what we want to do is create a new addition. We have created a transition so that we don't eliminate the back corner of the house but maintain that individuality versus, the old versus the new, and then incorporate in the other corner of the rear the shed into a barbecue spot.

We put barrel tiles to bring some of that element into the back of the house also and make it a little bit more balanced between the flat and the tile, and then we defined that little courtyard that now is created with a few -- with a trellis that consists of like three or four side by side two-by-twelves or three-by-twelves, depending -- you know, we'll do that as working drawings, and $I$ think it creates a very usable patio, a very usable, very nice ambience.

And again, I have to give credit to the members of the architects board that gave us some of these suggestions. I mean, I really incorporated immediately their ideas because $I$ thought they were great.

What we're doing is eliminating that small-ish, ugly family room and adding a little bigger one, adding a little office space and bathroom for this
part of the house, and then again being able to incorporate the barbecue and create a nice courtyard.

You can see the elevation of the side of the old addition versus the new, and then from the rear you can see the element of the barbecue versus the addition and then with the trellis tying them together.

From the other side, then you have the new addition and so forth now balances the house with the tile on either end, and then I did a little sort of a cut so you could see the barbecue and the part of the existing house and how they tie together. Those are seen in a little bit better detail here.

You know, again, about the matter of the trellis which was raised, and also there was some questions from the historic board, from the historic department people as to how we were going to attach these to the house, so I mean, this will be explored a lot more detail once we're in construction drawing, but basically, you know, they have -- believe that maybe I had to destroy too much of the house, but I believe we can just put some seats for the joists that can be anchored into the wall with either Tapcons or expansion bolts, and then cover those with some kind of a wood trim and then just let it all be a very neat detail and yet minimal impact on the wall of the house, and that's it. Thank you.
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MR. TORRE: You in your first page show some of the roof material on the existing and then on the new. Does that mean anything particular? You're changing the roof? I'm not sure I'm clear on that.

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: No, no. What's happening is the house had, a portion of the front of the house had barrel tiles since originally, and the rest of the house was flat roof as you can see it in the photographs.

And so all I'm doing is in the addition, adding some more barrel tile so that we balance all of this flat roof against the, you know, against the -- see, in this site elevation that you see the one at the top is the existing condition, and you can see that you have barrel tile and it's all flat roof and then the old addition was just a little nothing there.

And then now what we're doing is we're matching the barrel tile that's in the front in the new addition except that we created the area where the bathrooms are as a transition to separate the addition from the main house and be able to tell what's historic and what's not.

MR. TORRE: The reason I'm asking, in the site plan it doesn't distinguish the new roof from the old roof, so $I$ was just questioning whether some of --

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Yes, but the only new roof
is the addition and the little barbecue thing in the corner.

MR. TORRE: Okay. Thank you.
MS. KAUTZ: So?
MR. FULLERTON: I think you and the architecture board did a nice job in adding great space to the house and a nice outdoor space as well. I think it works very well. I move approval.

MR. TORRE: You're moving for approval?
MS. KAUTZ: Wait, wait.
MR. TORRE: I have to close the public hearing, close the public hearing and ask for comments.

MR. PARSLEY: I have one question.
MR. TORRE: Go ahead.
MR. PARSLEY: Okay. On the barbecue, you show it enclosed on kind of two and a half, three sides. If you don't have a chimney on the barbecue, I think you're enclosing it a little bit too much.

I would suggest you put some side windows in on the narrow side.

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: There is an existing window that we're going to leave it as an opening in the back or in the back wall of the barbecue.

MR. PARSLEY: Well, I see what you're trying to do and that's what I'm commenting on.

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Okay.
MR. PARSLEY: I don't quite agree with it. I think you need two more side windows on the narrow sides.

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Uh-huh.

MR. PARSLEY: I think you can just put it open to get breeze through there.

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Yeah.
MR. PARSLEY: And I certainly would center the barbecue under the window, not have half in, half out, and if you're not going to have a hood, move the sink to the side, the refrigerator underneath.

And I kind of find the wood beams above, they're just wood beams sitting there with no vine on there. I'm not quite getting the look architecturally or landscape architecturally.

I think the one that goes to the new family room hits the edge of the family room okay, but it's kind of awkward how it hits the barbecue, and the post is kind of, kind of right in the middle of where you might have a seating area, so $I$ think you ought to re-look at that.

And the other one that goes from Bedroom Two to the side of the barbecue, that's just over, over yard, and you know, let's make a real trellis and grow something, put side slats or pave underneath it so it works as a seating area, but $I$ don't see it really helping
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the space or the atmosphere of the backyard.
MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Well, actually it was made precisely to help the space because we felt that by having those boards creates some sight lines, especially because there is a two-story house that was allowed to be built very close to the back property that is like a monster there, and he sort of wants to not see it.

So when he's sitting down in the middle of his courtyard, the boards in the back are going to hide it a little bit and we felt that the ones on the side then would help define the courtyard more, you know, give you without having -- will almost give you a little more enclosed, intimate feeling, and yes, we will plan, you know, but --

MR. PARSLEY: And why wouldn't you put the, you know, kind of -- if these are the beams, the rafters of the trellis to -- for that argument, wouldn't you want a little bit more architectural mass, members going the perpendicular way to give it a little bit more decorative quality and something to grow the vine on?

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: We will certainly look at it, you know, in the next step as we develop the working drawing.

MR. PARSLEY: And when you look at the other one, how it hooks underneath the new family room, that's,


MR. CRUZ-MUNO: Yeah.
MS. KAUTZ: This is seven foot four according to this to the top of the window.

MR. FULLERTON: But that's lower than --
that's for the window, so by the time you get up to the trellis, it's close to eight feet.

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Close to nine.
MR. EHRENHAFT: May I inquire?
MS. KAUTZ: Of course.
MR. EHRENHAFT: When I was looking at the trellis, I had concern about the physical attachment between the barbecue and the new family room in that I couldn't see whether there was enough open physical distance between the bottom of the roof pitch on the barbecue and the bottom of the header that seemed to be newly built to -- at the open side of the barbecue to, you know, in order to fit adequately sized beams.

They can't things be like two-by-fours.
They're not going to be strong enough, and I'm wondering whether, you know, something that is an eight-inch beam to stand that 18 , through that 17 -foot width is going to fit under the --

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: The one in the rear, the longer one will have the support in the middle.

MR. FULLERTON: You know, there's only --
it's half that. There's a column.
MS. KAUTZ: And the beam.

MR. EHRENHAFT: No, I understand, but to tie them into the header above the opening, is there going to be sufficient --

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Well, you know --
Mr. EHRENHAFT: -- vertical, vertical --
MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: -- we're taking the roof of the, that square storage shed off, and then we're, you know, redoing -- so we can adjust, you know, that roof to make sure that we have enough height, you know, for the beam.

Mr. EHRENHAFT: Okay. Go ahead.
MR. SILVA: My only comment was I don't, I don't have an issue with the trellises in theory. I think maybe the idea of having them screen the surrounding areas is good.

I think there's been a lot of discussion that maybe you could look at with staff just the exact composition of those trellises, how they attach. I think Robert's idea of having them planted and having the, you know, cross-members is a good one.

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Yeah.
MR. SILVA: I think if you need to address Bruce's concerns about maybe -- you're already doing
structural modifications to that little barbecue building. I think maybe raising that tie beam another six inches to have that hit a little better would be something that would probably be acceptable to us.

My other suggestion in looking at the trellis is if you're putting in that single column in the middle, that you look at having three bays, maybe two columns to get the proportions a little closer to the house, something like that.

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Well, I had two columns initially, and at the request of the -- or the comments of the architectural board, changed it to a single one because the architects of, the board of architects felt that the two columns were interfering too much with the space, and so we did it with one column then with a brace coming out to catch the trellis.

MR. SILVA: Well, I think that the single column with the brace is a good idea, but I'm talking about two -- not two side by side, but to break up the --

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Oh, yes, break it into spaces.

MR. SILVA: Right, three bays, right. I think that will work a little bit better.

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Yeah, yeah.
MR. FULLERTON: It wouldn't even have to be
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equal space. You could divide it into quarter spaces and don't put one in the middle.

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Right, right, yeah.
MR. MENENDEZ: You are getting rid of the existing family room and rebuilding it?

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: And why, why -- do you have a flat roof there in between? I don't get why you stopped at that point.

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: The decision, both, I mean, both from the historic side made a point and so on, it was decided that we should have a transition, that the addition shouldn't just come full width, full height with tiles all the way into the existing house, but that there should be a transition which is going to be a little narrower so that you can still maintain the corner of the existing house in the back and have that definition so you can tell what's new and what's old, and then at the same time, you know, separate the barrel tile coming this way from the flat, existing flat roof of the house.

MR. MENENDEZ: But was that original to the house?

MS. KAUTZ: The little hyphen piece, no.
MR. MENENDEZ: It doesn't look like it.
MS. KAUTZ: No, but it is sort of providing a
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| :---: | :---: |
|  | transition between the new pitched roof and the flat roof, |
| 2 | so we were fine with it. |
| 3 | MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. |
| 4 | MR. TORRE: Do we need to take the variance |
| 5 | separately, or can we discuss it at this point? |
| 6 | MS. KAUTZ: We do. I would like -- if you |
| 7 | read through the staff report, there was a question that |
| 8 | we had as staff about the windows. |
| 9 | MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes. I wanted -- |
| 10 | MR. TORRE: The windows that are on the house |
| 11 | now -- can you go back to the photograph? |
| 12 | MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Yes. |
| 13 | MS. KAUTZ: Go back. Here you go. The |
| 14 | windows that are on the house now are impact-resistant |
| 15 | units that were placed sometime after 2014, and no permit |
| 16 | was located for them, so they were never reviewed by us. |
| 17 | They were never approved by us, and they're not really |
| 18 | appropriate to what we would have approved originally. Is |
| 19 | there a front picture? |
| 20 | MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: Oh, yes. |
| 21 | MS. KAUTZ: So, you know, what's in your |
| 22 | staff report would have been what we would have preferred |
| 23 | which would have been two casements with much bigger |
| 24 | window, glass. |
| 25 | And so the odds are, are that they aren't |

going to replace these impact windows anytime soon because they're new, but the new addition, the windows are matching what's there now as opposed to matching what's actually appropriate.

So we just wanted some direction from you all, because we didn't really have a consensus in the office of whether or not they should be appropriate to what would have been there, or to make sense with what's there now.

So if you guys are fine with them, then we'll let them proceed as shown but with the knowledge that if something happens to these windows, we will require them to go back to what was there originally.

MR. EHRENHAFT: Mr. Chair, can I ask a couple of questions?

MR. TORRE: Sure.
MR. EHRENHAFT: So I thought a lot about the windows, and in light of the fact that all of the new ones are to the rear, not visible from the street --

MS. KAUTZ: For the addition, yes.
MR. EHRENHAFT: -- for the addition and even for those that may be on the barbecue, there are, there are six window openings in the new space plus the double doors on the west.

MS. KAUTZ: Right.

MR. EHRENHAFT: And there are, on the house existing now, nine other openings, nine other window openings, and $I$ was wondering if it might not be of interest to have them install windows that would be the kinds of casements in those six new openings that would have been what would have been original to the house and which would have been approved by staff had they been requested in the last update.

And then perhaps a cursory plan for the other nine, perhaps not to be executed, you know, in the near future, could still be contemplated, and then we might be able to go back to staff -- if the owners at some future date want to change those out, then they could be brought back to match the new ones in your additions, and that would bring the house back to the way that it would have been in the 1930s. I don't know whether --

MR. TORRE: Can I ask a question so I can follow with your thought, please?

Mr. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MR. TORRE: The proposed windows right now, are they not casements? I can't tell whether they're one or the other because there's a very sort of --

MS. KAUTZ: Are these --

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: The casements?

windows that divide into four.
MR. TORRE: To make it look like there was four? So Bruce, your -- just so I can clarify your thought, you wanted to make the addition have the most authentic windows as possible related to the old?

MR. EHRENHAFT: I thought that would be an advantage because then --

MR. TORRE: Right, correct. So is this not following what we're thinking is a casement solution?

MS. KAUTZ: Right, possibly, but the muntin divided lines are completely --

MR. TORRE: I got you. So it's more about the muntins that make up the difference.

MS. KAUTZ: Right. So we had reviewed this on the front elevation. Do you have the picture? No. They would have been two pairs of sealed casements with a transom above with one, two, three, four, five panes of glass on each, on each operable wing.

MR. TORRE: Let's look at that picture.
MS. KAUTZ: This is not close to what's, what was original so we wouldn't approve this, so.

MR. TORRE: Right. Let me find the other.
MS. KAUTZ: The casement issue is one thing, but then it's also the style of the muntins and the placement of muntins is the other issue. They're much,
they're actually much bigger glass in the original.
MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: We would have no problem with the new addition.

MR. TORRE: So your thought and I think what you're saying is try to match that old picture to a better degree.

MS. KAUTZ: Yeah. If the windows on this were done correctly, we would have asked them to, you know, match with them.

MR. TORRE: I don't think it's that far from what you have right now, right?

MR. CRUZ-MUNOZ: No. I mean, we don't have a problem with trying to -- you know, making the adjustments and then having -- because anyway at the same time, like you say, these are all in the back and we can't quite see them from the front.

So right now there's a little discrepancy between the windows, and then like you say, in the future years from now, somebody wants to change the windows, they got to bring them back for every window.

MR. TORRE: Right.
MS. KAUTZ: And that's fine, but our, you know, the internal debate we were having, just so you all are clear, is that, like I said, the odds are that these windows will not be replaced unless they fail, which is
going to be, you know, 15, hopefully 15 years from now. In the meantime they're living with mismatched windows.

So that was our -- you know, do we reward behavior that didn't get a permit or do we do the right thing, and that's sort of the internal debate we were having with no conclusion.

MR. TORRE: Okay, so your comments primarily were the trellis which we've discussed, the windows which we've discussed. Anything else a problem or concern?

MS. KAUTZ: If you all do agree to -- if the trellis is not removed and it is left in place in a modified version, we would like to incorporate the BOA comments that are noted here which include brackets and adding a column and a base to -- I'm sorry, adding a capital --

MR. TORRE: Even if we add more columns, that will --

MS. KAUTZ: Yes, add a capital and a base to both of those so it's not just a pole --

MR. TORRE: Okay.
MS. KAUTZ: -- to, you know, doing the cross-members as Mr. Parsley was discussing, that the windows are actually high-profile muntins and the roof is to be two-piece barrel tile roof.

MR. TORRE: Okay. Does that satisfy you,
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Robert, that they're going to deal with this trellis as requested by staff and it's going to satisfy you with the windows?

MR. EHRENHAFT: Absolutely.
MR. TORRE: I think we both have accomplished here what was required and said to you, and then let's go back to the variance.

MS. KAUTZ: Sure.
MR. TORRE: And we can wrap it up.
MS. KAUTZ: Sure. Do you all understand why we're in favor of the variance, because they're keeping it at one story? And you know, the idea is that -- and we are in favor of that and do support the variance.

MR. SILVA: I just want to say, this is a -people always bring up the negatives, right, of having a house historically designated. I think this is a positive. I think the fact that we can look at this and possibly grant a variance is a result of the house being historically designated.

MS. KAUTZ: Yes.
MR. TORRE: Any more comments from the board?
MS. KAUTZ: And there would be two motions.
MR. TORRE: Sorry?
MS. KAUTZ: Two motions.
MR. TORRE: Yes. I wanted to see if anybody

```
wants to speak and we can close the discussion here.
Anybody from the audience want to speak for or against
this item? If not, we'll close the public hearing and see
if we can make the motion happen, and we have two motions.
    MR. RODRIGUEZ: Someone made a motion
earlier.
    MR. TORRE: John, you want to come back with
the motion?
    MR. FULLERTON: Okay. I move staff
recommendations for approval and incorporating the
comments we've made about the trellises and --
    MR. TORRE: The windows and the barrel tile.
    MR. FULLERTON: -- the windows.
        MR. TORRE: And the two-piece barrel tile.
        MR. FULLERTON: Yes, that too.
        MR. TORRE: Okay. There's a motion. Is there
    a second?
        MR. RODRIGUEZ: Second.
        MR. TORRE: Mr. Rodriguez made the second.
        MR. EHRENHAFT: Do we need to be more
        specific about the variance?
        MS. KAUTZ: That's the next one.
        MR. TORRE: That's next, so hold that
        thought.
        MS. KAUTZ: I think you all, just so I'm
```




MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
THE CLERK: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
THE CLERK: Miss Thomson?
MS. THOMSON: Yes.
THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
THE CLERK: Mr. Torre?
MR. TORRE: Yes. Thank you, sir.
MR. PARSLEY: The next one is 4200 Granada.
MR. TORRE: You need the chart here again?
Are you going to be the one presenting? So the next item on the agenda is Case File COA (SP) 2017-025.

It's 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 Ten and Eleven, Block 99, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part Five, as recorded in Plat Book 23, Page 55 of the public records of Miami-Dade County.

This application is requesting design approval for an addition and alterations to the residence.

MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. This is the location map. This is on the east side of the waterway on Granada just south of Bird Road.

This was actually designed by Phineas Paist.

It is a local historic landmark not within a district. However, it was intended to be part of the planned Venetian Country style village in the City of Coral Gables. We don't have a '40s photo, and it was one of 16 groups of thematic housing groups.

This one actually was never completed due to the bust of economy. There are only two that were constructed, and what makes this house rather unique in the city is that its front entrance was supposed to be the waterway, so the part facing Granada was actually the service area and the back of the house, so it's a little bit turned around.

No variance has been requested as part of this application. The board of architects approved it in November with notations regarding the addition, the roof overhang, the stucco texture, $I$ believe, and the high profile muntins. Those have been addressed within your submittal.

Staff has a few comments as a condition of approval, but I'll turn it over the architect and let him explain the project.

MR. BRITO: Thank you, Kara. So this was the first house of what was destined to become or was supposed to become the Venetian Country Village or it has also been referred to as the Venetian Canal Village.

This is the area to the south of Bird Road bound by Granada Boulevard and University Drive. There are only two houses that comprise what was to be that grand scheme. The other is in the 4500 block.

So as Kara mentioned, the actual principal elevation faces the waterway, and these are literally not only on the water, they're about a foot in the water.

The house was designed by Phineas Paist with the, on the left-hand side, first floor, was actually an open porch, and just a few years after construction, it was enclosed by George Fink.

So this is actually the water side which is the principal elevation for this house. You can see the terrace, a very wide terrace. Had this been, had this village been fully built, it would have been a miniature Venice, wall to wall, a wonderful canal scene on both sides, but so be it. The economic conditions caused it to be different.

This is the actual street elevation, and you can see how the house sits further back. This is really the service wing or the rear of the house. As you come on in, you see the garages and the service buildings to the right and left, and you can see on the aerial there from Google maps how the house is positioned.

We had met with the historic resources
department staff three times on this, and they adjusted and gave us wonderful guidance. One of the things that they did was, take a look at how the ridge, the ridge lines -- I guess is there a pointer?

MS. KAUTZ: It used to work on that.
MR. BRITO: Okay. Well, you can see that there. You can see the ridge line from the first floor addition to the left behind the house and to the right. They requested that we align that ridge line with the addition.

And the addition is actually going to be a portion of the first floor right behind the house what is now a family room. That is going to be increased in size to accommodate both a kitchen and a family room. Then there is an elevator shaft that's going right in that corner adjacent to the house which opens up to a foyer.

All the zoning compliance data meets with the current building code. The building has height for the ratio of set-backs and open landscape, and as you can see here the first floor plan, this is going to become the new kitchen.

You can see the dashed line and you can see the solid line represent the new masonry wall that delineates the first floor addition portion, and the second floor constitutes a fully accessible master suite.
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That was the reason for beginning this addition project.
Here you have existing and proposed
elevations. This is the street elevation, so you can see the first addition, the first floor addition at the top, and this is what will happen to it with the addition in place.

This is the south elevation. You can see that the three small windows are replaced with a balcony in the master suite and then pairs of French doors providing light and accessibility into the great room kitchen below.

And then to the north it abuts the northerly neighbor, and you can see what happens to the elevation there.

So in effect, we're keeping the principal elevation intact and all the work takes place on the rear, so we're here to ask for a special certificate of appropriateness to encompass the elevator shaft and a fully accessible master suite.

MS. SPAIN: Mr. Brito, I don't believe you stated your name. Would you introduce yourself?

MR. BRITO: I'm sorry. Thank you very much. Herbert Brito with Brito Design Studio, B-R-I-T-O. Any questions, please?

MR. TORRE: Does the space in between the
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addition and the structure to the right, the sitting room, I guess, just becomes the same space as it was?

MR. BRITO: Same space that is there, right. The addition -- right. The east side of the addition is actually where that wall is.

MR. TORRE: Right.
MR. BRITO: We're just moving the addition southward a little bit.

MR. TORRE: When you address the second floor balcony, are you trying to match anything in particular? Are you trying to play off anything in particular to the house, or how are you handling that?

MR. BRITO: It's actually a new design, but we are reinforcing the Venetian theme, and it just so happens that the homeowners have corbels, decorative corbels which will be applied to the underside of the balcony at the end of the structural beams.

MR. SILVA: Would you mind going back to the photograph of the canal side? I didn't get that whole issue on that. Thank you.

MR. BRITO: It's very nice had that been all continued across the canal.

MS. KAUTZ: Are the corbels stone or are they wood?

MR. BRITO: No, they're wood, pecky cypress.

They're decorative, strictly decorative.
MR. SILVA: I think the addition is very, very well done.

MR. BRITO: Thank you.
MR. SILVA: I think it's a little, it's a little odd that we're talking about -- we're always worried about what the thing looks like from the street, but in this case the facade is actually from the canal, so it's just an interesting flip, but I think it's sensitively done.

My only question is, is are you planning on differentiating, since it's in the same plane as the existing residence and you're kind of in-filling above the first floor, is the intent just to feather the stucco and just match it?

MR. BRITO: There will be variances in the stucco and the sills, subtle differences to differentiate it. The roof tiles will be the same. The ridge lines will match.

And as a follow up to Kara's earlier comment, we will retain the existing front door. We will also provide muntins for the windows, and we're going to develop a full window schedule so when some of the existing windows are replaced, and we do have original drawings for this house so we know what was there
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| 1 | originally. |
| 2 | MR. TORRE: Do you have to change the |
| 3 | existing windows for those? |
| 4 | MR. BRITO: For the time being, no. |
| 5 | MR. TORRE: Okay. |
| 6 | MR. BRITO: Just for the addition because |
| 7 | we're focusing on the addition. |
| 8 | MS. KAUTZ: They're not impact, right? |
| 9 | MR. BRITO: No. |
| 10 | MS. KAUTZ: Right, so that will get changed |
| 11 | eventually. That was part of the discussion. |
| 12 | MR. BRITO: She wants a window schedule that |
| 13 | shows all the windows. |
| 14 | MR. TORRE: Interesting. |
| 15 | MS. KAUTZ: Those are our comments. |
| 16 | MR. BRITO: You think that's unfair? |
| 17 | MR. TORRE: We're very particular with |
| 18 | windows around here. |
| 19 | MR. BRITO: I know you are. We will be very |
| 20 | happy to provide her with the window schedule. It's |
| 21 | actually better because it's a guide to the future. |
| 22 | MR. TORRE: All right. I think while you're |
| 23 | ahead, we should just maybe take some comments and see if |
| 24 | we can get a motion. Let's do this. |
| 25 | MR. MENENDEZ: How about questions from the |

audience?
MR. TORRE: Well, any questions for the architect from us before we close it?

MR. SILVA: No. I just want to make sure that you pay attention when you -- we are differentiating the stucco, but that north elevation where it's in the same plane, just make sure we -- you do some sort of detail so it doesn't just bleed into --

MR. BRITO: I know how to do a reveal.
MR. SILVA: Yes.
MR. BRITO: A reveal.
MR. SILVA: There you go, perfect.
MR. TORRE: Are you making the motion? All
right. Without any more comments, we'll close the public hearing. Actually, we'll ask audience for comments or input. Anybody? No.

Then we'll close the public hearing. All
right. You ready?
MR. SILVA: Sure. I will, I will move
approval with staff comments and the additional comment that a reveal be detailed to differentiate the old from the new stucco on the north elevation.

MR. TORRE: All right.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: I'll second it.
MR. TORRE: We have a second from Miss

you'll be stuck with that.
MR. BRITO: Thank you.
MS. THOMSON: It's on the record.
MR. TORRE: Famous last words. All right. Last item, Case File COA (SP) 2015-005 revised, and it's an application for the issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for the property at 4209 Santa Maria Street, a local historical landmark and a contributing structure within the Santa Maria Street historic district. This is legallly described as Lots 11 and 12, Block 96, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part Five, according to the plat thereof recorded in Plat Book 23, Page 55 of the public records of Miami-Dade County.

The application is requesting design approval for addition and alterations to the residence which was approved with conditions on June 18th, 2015. The revision requests design approval for modification of previously approved shutters.

MS. SPAIN: I just want to state -- I'm going to turn this over to Kara. I just want to state for the record that this is my previous home, and I sold it to the present owners.

MR. TORRE: We have her at the back of the line again. She's always at the back of the line.

MS. KAUTZ: I have a location map, obviously,
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east side of Santa Maria Street. This is not part of the colonial village. This was again intended to be part of a rustic country, Italian country village which two homes were constructed. This was a very sad-looking 1940s photo that we have of the property. It's the only early photo we have.

These are the original permit drawings and I put these on your memo and also in here just to show you that when the house was designed, it wasn't sort of intended to be colonial. It wasn't intended to be super Mediterranean elaborate. It was really a rustic sort of house, and the only shutters that were on the property in the lower left was one with very rustic board and batten.

These were the drawings that were approved. I sort of tried to blow up the bottom one so you could see it a little clearer. The drawings are also in your packet.

They were framed board and batten with vertical battens with, you know, a surrounding frame. This is what's installed. The pictures aren't very good. You also got copies. What was installed sort of matches the shape and the outline of what was depicted.

However, they are very thin, horizontal louvers much like you would find -- well, that didn't work at all. You can see it better there.

Much that you would find on a colonial house. They are very colonial in nature. The one on the right, I just showed you a close-up so you could see how thin they are, and the left was the arch of the same style.

This was -- I took this photo today. This is the house on Alhambra that is actually very similar to what was depicted without the little inserts that was installed. This is actually the same architect's job.

This is from a manufacturer off the Internet that makes these. They are paneled shutters with a frame. These were the same ones installed which we think are actually the appropriate way to go.

So the architect is here to talk to you about plans to modify what's currently installed if you guys are amenable to doing that. Staff -- this was part of a final inspection on the property and one of the reasons why we rejected it, so he decided to come to you and ask if it's okay if he modifies what's there.

MR. SILVA: Before we start, Kara, three questions just to clarify. So these are -- it's hard to tell from the pictures. These are those louvered shutters?

MS. KAUTZ: Yeah. They're thin horizontal lovers.

MR. SILVA: And are they true? Are they
operable or are they decorative?
MS. KAUTZ: No.
MR. SILVA: They're decorative?
MS. KAUTZ: They're applied.
MR. SILVA: And we didn't -- were the
shutters discussed at all like specifically when we looked at the plans?

MS. KAUTZ: They were actually because what was, you know, what was presented to you all, this is sort of an as-built -- I'm sorry. This is the previously approved one.

Part of our recommendation at the time when this came in 2015 was that only the shutter where it was originally be reinstalled, and that was discussed here, and you all gave them the okay to do more shutters, and they were these.

MR. TORRE: This particular shutter was not there, and then they wanted to put it, and we said if it's going to go, right?

MS. KAUTZ: Yes.
MR. TORRE: This window did not have a shutter originally, right?

MS. KAUTZ: It did not, no, not when Dona owned it, it did not.

MS. SPAIN: No.

MR. PORTUONDO: Good afternoon. My name is Rafael Portuondo, Portuondo Perotti Architects, and we're here just to be able to discuss the shutters and the sort of evolution of the shutters as the house sort of evolved. One of the things that $I$ just wanted to state before starting the presentation was that one of the things that I'm constantly striving to do is to do the right thing, so one of the things that $I$ would start off by saying is that during the process of the design of the house, we ran into certain conditions with zoning and things which maybe Kara didn't bring up.

But the rear porch which was actually originally a screened porch was our dividing -- a division between the rear property and the pool, so one of the things that we ended up doing through zoning was actually coming up with a louvered system that actually was able -you were able to see through the louvers but not having people and not having a child be able to go into your property.

One of the things that $I$ always take pride in doing and one of the things that $I$ think $I$ will do today is also be self-critical.

One of the things that happened with the decision from zoning was that if we wouldn't have done the louvers, we would have had to have put a fence on the
backyard which would have defeated the whole purpose of that transparency and the whole thing.

One of the things that $I$ also did at that point is kind of respond to things as they come up.

MS. KAUTZ: Can I just -- I just need to bring something up. We're only -- you all are not here to discuss those installation of the louvers. That's not part of this, what's being brought to them. They don't have any knowledge of that, so I just want to make that very clear. The shutters are the only thing being addressed.

MR. TORRE: The front.
MS. KAUTZ: The shutters in the front.
MR. PORTUONDO: That's fine. I couldn't have said it any better. So one of the things that $I$ did is I looked -- I kind of look at a house as being whole.

Right? So one of the things that I went ahead and did is I started to do research on the types of louvers that are used on Italian farm houses.

And one of the things that $I$ did is $I$ went back to sort of historical precedent and started to look at what is a solid louver and what is a horizontal louver and the applications for that. I'm going to agree with Kara and say that that's not part of it, but it's part of my decision making in the process of things, but Kara is

1 absolutely right.

So what I did was I went back and I started looking for historical type, and I started looking at, at the end of the day, what's going to make the house better as a house, right?

So this is George W. Smith, George Washington Smith, and this is actually an Italian farm house, and one of the things that you -- it's difficult seeing it, but these are actually horizontal louvers with the intent that when the windows and things are closed, that they actually allow the house to breathe and become part of this whole thing.

One of the things that is important with that is that it starts to establish the style of the house and the style of the rear as a whole.

So in this particular drawing, which is very difficult to see on the screen, it's actually the horizontal louvers which are on the top windows and in the bottom windows.

And then one of the things you also see in the sort of Italian farm houses is that the louvers are actually divided so that there's actually -- they become a series of panels, so when you add a certain level of texture to those panels.

So the other thing that I was looking at was
under what conditions is a louver, an open louver being used and in what conditions is a solid louver is being used, so it wasn't that we were just changing the louvers for the change of the louvers. We changed the louver for the intent of the houses.

So this balcony is actually reminiscent of the balcony we have on the rear of the property, which is a new balcony, which is actually established in the back.

This is a farm house that has horizontal louvers on the top and then flat shutters on the bottom. This is another farm house that has the horizontal louvers as part of the fabric and the horizontal, the doors which becomes solid, and these are actually louvers that, these are actually shutters that are actually solid, and they're part -- they're all indicative of what is the sort of Italian farm house. This is a combination of both.

One of the things that you'll notice in the bottom on the doors is going to be a critique on myself. One of the things that $I$ didn't pick up was the division and the strength of the division in the larger louvers, in the larger louvered doors.

So one of the things that I ended up doing is going back, back to the owners, which are here, we have them here, and saying that as a farm house louver, I fell
short in some of the details that I provided for you, and I'm going to show you what $I$ did as sort of remedial to regain that type of louver.

This is also to show that part of the analysis that we go through is that in the farm house, in the Italian farm houses there is both a combination of horizontal louvers and solid louvers, and I'm not arguing the fact that both aren't perfectly viable.

One of the things that happens with the farm louver -- the solid louvered shutters is that it's typically indicative of houses that are actually more to the north where they would actually keep them and the cooler air and stuff would actually be maintained inside.

One of the things that happens with the horizontal louvers is that it's actually made to be much more tropical and much more open, and the shift was, what Kara was saying, was that in order to get the privacy from the rear, it started to affect what I thought was the design decisions.

And this is a combination of the solid panel, louver, and horizontal open louvers, and you can see the application that when it's in a closed position, the doors can be opened and there would be a breeze going through the house. Combination of solid, then you have the solids, another option of the solids, and there was one
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So going back and looking at the combinations of farm houses, louvers and solid panels, one of the things that $I$ did is $I$ went back, and if you look at the middle one in the center, it's a horizontal louver that we're adding a horizontal thicker mullion to reinforce the idea of the transom, so it's actually a combination of what was some of the louvers that $I$ showed you in regards to the photographs where it divided so that they reinforced the actual windows behind.

On the bottom with -- in the middle, the one, the first one is the one that was installed, and the one that was installed, if $I$ were to critique it myself, $I$ would say that it's devoid of a level of refinement that doesn't reinforce the existing house.

So what I did was actually -- if you looked at George Washington Smith, he actually had the middle one which was actually the divided panel on the bottom which actually aligns with the windowsills in the house, so in other words, it ties together the windowsills of the house.

But then the one that $I$ thought was actually kind of interesting as well was the fact that the bottom part of that panel is actually a solid panel which gives you a little bit more density, a little bit more color.

The other thing that $I$ did which is not --
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for whatever reason, it did not show that well -- is you see the transom on the first -- on the second option? I actually added another line to actually define so that last one is actually divided into three instead of being into two, so it would be, the top portion of it would be reinforcing the transom. The middle shaft would be reinforcing the fabric of the shutters, and then the bottom would be a more solid panel, so it becomes kind of a hybrid of all the ideas.

One of the things that happens with me is, and it happens with me with clients, like all the time, and the next thing that I wanted to do is I wanted to actually apologize to Kara and Dona because one of the things that happened with me was that in fighting zoning and fighting moving the plans and keeping everything going, I actually lost sight of going back to historic, and I was telling the clients last night that I'm mostly upset at myself for not having done that.

So one of the things that I take pride in is understanding the situation and actually trying to make it better. My goal is to actually meld the farm house solid, which is in an odd sort of way out of context, with the horizontal louvers, but adding the solids so that it actually brings back that recall.

One of the other things too that happens in
my reality is that -- and it's not an excuse, but it's actually still the things that $I$ have to deal with, is when we get close to the end of jobs, many times the budgets that we have aren't necessarily there to do the right thing, so one of the things that we ended up doing, and I think the question came up before, is are they operable or they're not operable, so one of the things that we're doing is we're adding the parts to the shutters to make them look like they're operable, and so we're going to add a certain level of detail that is going to bring them back.

And even though we haven't talked to the contractor, one of the things that we're also going to do is separate them from the back wall because that was something that actually bothered the owners and it actually kind of bothered me as well.

So one of the things that I come to many times in my practice is it isn't my idea, it isn't your idea. It's kind of their idea which I felt was the best idea because I think I was able to, at that point, when you look at solid shutters they become, in a closed position, they become very oppressive which is actually the intent in the northeast when they are closed and the house is heated.

And so in responding to the things that I had
to deal with, with zoning, I actually feel that it's actually better than it started out to be, yes, and I was the author of the house on Alhambra with that shutter that we showed you which was actually a beautiful shutter.

The combination of the louvers in the back and then now the combination of what would be the solid shutters in the front, $I$ felt was a contradiction in the architecture, so we -- I feel personally that this is better than before.

So I will, I will look at the shutters that the way they are now, and they're actually in a very simple format, and I will say that even though that it works better as a whole, it still falls short of what I feel is the proper use of the horizontal shutter, so the combination of the solid, the horizontal, and the upper solid actually I think works really, really well.

So thank you for listening, and I am hopeful that this is actually something that's better than before. Amen.

MR. TORRE: Thank you.
MR. SILVA: Questions before I get the whole scope straight here. I completely understand. I know there was no, there was no ill intent here. You know, you explained I think very well the process and then what happened.

single window --

MR. SILVA: Right.
MR. PORTUONDO: -- stay as they are, except we'll be adding the kit of parts for them.

MR. SILVA: For the hardware --
MR. PORTUONDO: For the hardware and everything else.

MR. SILVA: -- to face off the house, okay.
Then so the only windows, the only shutters we're talking about are the two, two larger door opening and the larger, the larger window with the transom.

MR. PORTUONDO: Correct, which are the two facades that are facing the street which is the regular window size plus the transom.

MR. SILVA: Now that I've asked you, my thinking is I think you're right in the treatment of the elements to offset them. I think they look very flat here, so I think that's really going to help and be a good, good thing.

I think that the solution where the bottom piece has a stronger reinforcement on the horizontal on the doors is a good one. I think picking up that, the line of the sill and the line actually of the other louvers on the new portion of the residence makes sense.

If you're leaving all the smaller single

```
                                    Page 59
```

```
windows without the divisions, I understand the whole discussion of introducing the other horizontal on the transom, but \(I\) would maybe consider leaving that as is as well, just, you know, adding the hardware and bringing those forward and then doing something on the two-door ones.
MR. PORTUONDO: The two-door ones are the most important.
MR. SILVA: I think those are -- yes.
MR. PORTUONDO: I'll be the first to acknowledge that.
MR. SILVA: The other shutters, last question is the other shutters on the, let's say on the east elevation where you have the wooden spindles --
MR. TORRE: The cabana.
MR. SILVA: -- on the cabana --
MR. PORTUONDO: Yes.
MR. SILVA: -- those are horizontal louvers to remain with no horizontal divisions, right?
MR. PORTUONDO: Where, where?
MR. SILVA: This elevation. These are proposed to stay?
MR. PORTUONDO: No. Those would be changed to the same as this, just reinforcing. I was just going to say since we're reinforcing the transom --
```


shutters.

MR. TORRE: Okay.
MR. EHRENHAFT: Mr. Chairman, can I ask Mr. Portuondo a couple more questions?

MR. TORRE: Absolutely.
MR. EHRENHAFT: Are the small shutters to the right and left of each window fixed to the wall, or are they hinged so that they can close? If they do close, do they completely cover the window openings?

MR. PORTUONDO: When $I$ went to go measure them, they're actually spread out a little bit further than they should be. It's going to be about an inch or so off.

MR. PARSLEY: But they're not meant to be off.

MR. ENRENHAFT: So if you close them, then there will be a gap between them. Is that what I'm understanding?

MR. PORTUONDO: Yes.
MR. PARSLEY: But are they meant to be operable?

MR. PORTUONDO: No.
MR. PARSLEY: You'll never see them if they're operable.

MR. EHRENHAFT: They're not hinged at this


MR. EHRENHAFT: They're also decorative?
MR. PORTUONDO: Yes. It was a way of not spending the amount of money, but it's --

MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. I understand.
MS. KAUTZ: Let me ask a question. Aaron, can you put the Power Point back up on the screen?

One of the things that makes us a little crazy in the office are shutters that aren't proportionately sized to the window, and we've looked at this a gajillion times, and I cannot see how that arched shutter is proportionate to that window, and it sort of makes us a little nuts.

So I don't know if we can measure that off and make sure it's actually the right size, because when you get the arch and that arch is truncated, it seems just a little off, so that's --

MR. TORRE: Well, not --
MS. KAUTZ: I know the square ones and the rectangular ones won't matter as much, but I don't know. It just looks like it's too small.

MR. SILVA: The drawing, the drawing looks correct. I don't know about the --

MR. TORRE: The one on the right is more off than the one on the left, but that's another discussion.

MR. PARSLEY: But I don't want to start
precedent where you have shutters that large on those doors. I mean, that's a modern proportion anyway, and we're trying to sort of retrofit a faux shutter that is not proportional anyway.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have a question, Kara.
MS. KAUTZ: Yes.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: You're saying that these shutters, the metal shutters are still an issue we're not supposed to discuss today?

MS. KAUTZ: Yes.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: However, we're discussing these other shutters because they were to follow the lines of the metal shutters.

MS. KAUTZ: Well, that's --
MR. RODRIGUEZ: And that's his argument, so if we were to make a decision today on these shutters, we may have to reverse that decision or modify it, depending on what's done with the metal shutters.

MS. KAUTZ: The rear, that breezeway was supposed to be enclosed with a screen porch, with the screen doors, the transom, you know, so that it was, it was still open but the view was there and it wasn't a solid thing.

So what is installed is what $I$ think are the issues that zoning said that did not meet the pool
enclosure because the screens were breakable. Is that correct?

MR. PORTUONDO: That's correct.
MS. KAUTZ: So there are these metal, very large louvered doors. Are they doors? I don't know what they are.

MR. PORTUONDO: They're actually, I think they're actually really beautiful, and they're -- one of the things also with the house is that the house is, at the end it's a little bit more transitional, so the fact that the shutters come with a little bit of sheen actually, $I$ thought it was actually kind of a beautiful thing.

MR. TORRE: So you said a magic word that I wanted to bring up. You said the word transitional, so if this project had been handled to the highest, utmost, to the authentic design of this house originally or if it was true to everything Italian-esque, but this house was not followed in that fashion. This house has more of a transitional.

MR. PORTUONDO: Right.
MR. TORRE: And I get it and I see that, and whether that was the way we approved it or that's the way it turned out, there's a lot of things that I think removed the authenticity of the Italian-esque and of this
original house.
At this point $I$ think we're so far into it -had it been perfectly in tune with everything, I think we would have gone back and said, "You need to put those shutters exactly how they were because that's just the right thing to do."

I think at this point, we're so far into the ocean with this issue that I'm willing to give you the correction because it means nothing more than another thing that's not appropriate, or not necessarily appropriate; not in tune with the perfection of this house.

Again, you know, we're trying to perfect the shutters when so many other things are not authentically Italian-esque.

MR. PORTUONDO: That's correct.

MR. TORRE: So, you know, I feel a little bit hypocritical to that point.

MS. KAUTZ: So just for two things, so I think that the louver, the metal louvers that were added that are not in keeping with the style of the house, I think those in relationship to these have no, no connectivity in my mind at all. They're metal louvers. They're much thicker.

They sort of -- I don't buy the argument that
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they're connected in some way, and I understand that may very well be your design mentality, but when I look at the house, I don't see any connection between the two, so I would treat them as separate issues.

The second, the second issue is that the applicant has requested ad valorem tax relief for this property, and so to me, to do something that's appropriate to the property, that makes the difference.

MR. TORRE: But so are we coming back for the other shutters or not?

MS. KAUTZ: They are not approved by staff.
MR. TORRE: Okay.
MR. FULLERTON: They're not what?
MS. KAUTZ: Approved by staff.
MR. TORRE: All right. So what are you proposing to do with the other shutters if you're going to be without a historical approval? What is the proposed solution here?

MR. PORTUONDO: I think that the other louvers are actually really nice.

MR. TORRE: But you're not there yet, so what are we -- how are you going to get to the end?

MR. PORTUONDO: So I think that the one thing that we can say at this point is I think that the louvers that we have now actually are, are actually, with the
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adjustments that we're making, they're actually going to be really quite beautiful.

MR. PARSLEY: I think you can argue it like this: Even though we're not supposed to think or refer to these louvers in the breezeway, if we do end up approving those and they have the horizontal banding and they're metallic and they're more modern looking, then these shutters that are here will be somewhat in keeping with that.

I think pulling them away from the wall and adding a little hardware, giving a little relief, gives them a little bit more feeling of maybe they're operable instead of just looking like they're slapped on the facade which they do now, so I'm kind of okay approving --

MS. KAUTZ: Can I -- sorry. Go ahead.
MR. PARSLEY: -- these shutters. I think the modification where you put a solid panel in the bottom helps a little but not enough to do it. I would, I would -- so I'm okay with these if those are okay, so.

MR. TORRE: But $I$ think you can't make a judgment on the other one at all.

MS. KAUTZ: Can I make a suggestion?
MR. PARSELY: I think the other side of the argument, if you came to me with these big plank shutters on those doors in front, I would say I think the scale is
way too heavy, and you've got these big, solid wood planks, and you would never -- they would never make those in solid pieces because wood, wood would never hold that shape. You would always have to have vertical bi-fold doors, you know, like the old kind where -- kind of the privacy type shutters. You would have done something like that.

So I'm not sure we would have approved just a straight plank even if they had had it.

MR. TORRE: But you did; not you, but --
MR. PARSLEY: So in some ways I think everything is sort of in keeping now, even though it may not be our ideal solution had we been to your point at the very beginning.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Do we have a picture of the shutters that you're discussing, that we're not discussing?

MS. KAUTZ: Okay, so here is the kick, and I've already told this to Rafael, I will vehemently defend my position on those metal louvers to the rear of the house be referred to you all at some point because I think they're wildly inappropriate.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: But we don't have a picture of them now.

MS. KAUTZ: However, if you are basing the
discussion on these shutters on those, which I believe are inappropriate, I would rather you have them, discuss them all at the same time and get it all done at once, rather than choosing these now and --

MR. TORRE: I see you guys taking two positions that -- so how were you planning to solve this issue with the other shutters? I still ask the same question.

MS. KAUTZ: I don't know, I don't know.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Shouldn't we be doing that at the same time?

MS. KAUTZ: That's what --
MR. TORRE: Were you going to allow her to bring that over at some future point, or are you going to stand your ground and say, "We need to" -- I mean --

MR. PORTUONDO: I have no problem bringing it up, all up at the same time.

MR. TORRE: Okay.
MR. PORTUONDO: In other words, the issue of the shutters came up, and I wanted to address the shutters, so it was, to me it's, to me it's looking at the house as a whole, and the louvers in the back are actually really beautiful and the louvers in the front are actually really nice as well, so, and even -- and with the understanding that with -- I think we can make them even
better.

MR. TORRE: I see a contextual issue here. I think we had discussed it. There's a contextual issue, so maybe we do have to listen to the whole thing as one then for the sake of everybody. I think that would help you.

MR. PARSLEY: Not if we disapprove these and allow those.

MR. TORRE: I think we're going to have to look at it in context again.

MR. PARSLEY: We have planks and we have the louvers.

MR. TORRE: So I think you get to see everything at one time and make a judgment call on everything. Let's listen to the other side.

MR. FULLERTON: I agree with Mr. Parsley about the planks being kind of heavy and clunky, but, and I think the proportion of these vertical louvers are pretty nice and I like the texture that they add to the front of the house as well, so, and then $I$ think it will ultimately look a little more delicate, I think, than the big planks would be.

And it seems to me that on the last drawing we looked at, that the proportion, the width of them is pretty reasonable and proportionate. It feels like it would close all the way.

precedent for anything else that's going to come before us, so.

MR. PARSLEY: Meaning you're more likely to approve the others because they're a similar style.

MR. TORRE: Or vice versa, but who knows?
MR. MENENDEZ: Well, no. What I'm saying is there are louvers now that are not approved, the ones that you were talking about, so if we accept these, then, you know, the others would have to fall in line with these, is what I'm saying. That's the way I would be thinking.

MS. KAUTZ: Unless they do some modified screen version. I don't know the whole semantics behind the zoning, but.

MR. TORRE: Does anybody want to try to make a motion, see how it flies? Alicia, do you have any thoughts on how to proceed?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I do have a question about the metal louvers. So they were installed, and what now? I'm sorry.

MS. KAUTZ: We rejected their final inspection.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Okay, because they weren't --

MS. KAUTZ: They were, they were -- I don't believe they went to the board of architects. I don't


MR. RODRIGUEZ: -- I don't see how we can decide one thing and then not the other. We don't even have a picture of these other ones.

MS. KAUTZ: I agree.
MR. EHRENHAFT: I would like to see the matters before us deferred. We all will have the memory of this discussion which will abbreviate whatever consideration there is, but I think that it would be helpful at least to me to have everything considered as a whole.

MR. TORRE: I see that almost like a motion, so let's make it a motion and we'll get this thing moving.

MR. EHRENHAFT: I move that the matter before us be deferred and that when staff and the owners can coordinate the question of the shutters on the rear of the house facing the pool be brought back for consideration of them as well as these, at the same time.

MS. KAUTZ: I would like to request that the board of architects does review those prior to you all seeing them.

MR. EHRENHAFT: Thank you.
MR. TORRE: Is that amended?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes, with that amendment then.

MR. TORRE: Is there a second to this motion?
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