HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
405 BILTMORE WAY
CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA

June 21, 2018 Thursday 4:00 p.m.

B E F O R E:

VENNY TORRE, Chairman ALICIA G. BACH-WIIG BRUCE EHRENHAFT JOHN P. FULLERTON ALBERT MENENDEZ ALEJANDRO SILVA ROBERT PARSLEY RAUL R. RODRIGUEZ

ALSO PRESENT:

KARA KAUTZ ELIZABETH GUIN GUSTAVO CEBALLOS, Assistant City Attorney YESENIA DIAZ, Secretary

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

1 (Thereupon, the following proceedings were 2 had:)

2.0

CHAIRMAN TORRE: Good afternoon 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, neighborhoods 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, one by the city manager, and the ninth is selected by the board and confirmed by the city 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

No. 2006-11 must register with the city clerk prior to engaging in lobbying activities or presentations before city staff, boards, committees, and/or the city commission. A copy of the ordinance is available in the office of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Page 3

the city clerk. Failure to register and provide proof of registration shall prohibit your ability to present to the Historic Preservation Board an application 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, authority or council, 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 council.

So, presentations made to this board are

Page 4 subject to the city's False Claim Ordinance, 1 Chapter 39 of the City of Coral Gables City 3 Code. I now call the City of Coral Gables 4 5 Historic Preservation Board meeting, June 21, 2018, to order. The time is 4:07. 6 Present today, to my left, Mr. Raul Rodriguez, Mr. Robert Parsley, Mr. Alejandro 8 9 Silva; to my right, Mr. Albert Menendez, 10 Mr. John Fullerton, Mr. Bruce Ehrenhaft. 11 Approval of the minutes. The next item on 12 the agenda is the approval of the minutes for the meeting held on May 24, 2018. Are there 13 14 any changes or corrections to that meeting 15 minutes? 16 MR. SILVA: Move approval. 17 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Is there a second? 18 MR. MENENDEZ: Second. 19 CHAIRMAN TORRE: All those in favor of approval, please say aye. 2.0 21 (Board members respond "aye.") 22 CHAIRMAN TORRE: All those against? 23 (No response) 24 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Thank you. 25 The notice regarding ex-parte

2.0

Page 5

communications says that this board is a quasi-judicial board and the items on the agenda are quasi-judicial in nature, which requires the board members to disclose all ex-parte communications. 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, when 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 that communication will affect the board member's ability to impartially consider the evidence to be presented regarding the matter.

So, would the board have such communication to disclose today?

(No response)

Page 6 1 CHAIRMAN TORRE: We're good? Perfect. (Ms. Bache-Wiig enters.) 3 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Any deferrals today? 4 MS. KAUTZ: Yes, actually. The standard 5 Certificate of Appropriateness for 200 Edgewater. It's the last item on the agenda. 6 7 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Got it. MS. KAUTZ: Will be deferred. 8 9 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Okay. So anyone in the 10 audience who will be testifying today, please rise to be sworn in. 11 12 THE SECRETARY: Please raise your right 13 hand. Do you swear to tell the whole truth and 14 nothing but the truth? 15 (Audience responds affirmatively.) 16 THE SECRETARY: Thank you. 17 CHAIRMAN TORRE: If you would all remember 18 to silence your phones, that would be great. 19 Thank you very much. 2.0 And then we also, before we get started, 21 we have a request from Ms. Thomson, Ms. Jan 22 Thomson, to be excused for today's meeting? 23 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. CHAIRMAN TORRE: If anybody has an issue 24 25 with that. If not, could I get a motion for

Page 7 1 approval? MR. MENENDEZ: Move approval. 3 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Second? 4 MR. FULLERTON: Second. 5 CHAIRMAN TORRE: All those in favor, 6 please say aye. 7 (Board members respond "aye.") CHAIRMAN TORRE: Thank you. So, today's 8 first item is Case File LHD 2018-002. 9 This is consideration of the local historic designation 10 11 of the Coral Gables Historic City Plan. 12 lengthy description is on file with the City of Coral Gables Historic Resources and Cultural 13 14 Arts Department. 15 MS. GUIN: Good evening. 16 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Hello. 17 MS. GUIN: So, you have in your packet the 18 designation report, which is comprehensive and 19 includes a lot of details. So, tonight our 2.0 presentation is gonna -- just gonna be a very 21 brief overview of significance. We'll take 22 questions after the presentation. Gus, our 23 intrepid city attorney representative, is here, 24 as well as Gary Resnick, who's an outside 25 counsel. He can answer any questions along

those lines that you might have.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

So, the designation of the Coral Gables Historic City Plan includes but is not limited to right-of-ways, parkways, roadways, alleys, open space, parks, swales, reservations, sidewalks, waterways, and associated features. For those of you that might not be familiar with the term "reservations," that's where the grid meets those diagonal or curved streets. It's those little geometric shapes. Some of them are pretty large, but some of them are pretty small. Those were intentional in the plan and they are included in our designation. You can see, somewhat -- some examples of those reservations in this plan. And this map is found on page 20 of your report, if you want to take a clearer look at that.

So, what is outlined here in red is the approximate boundaries of the Coral Gables
Historic City Plan. This map is the last page in your report. In short, it's predominantly the land that George E. Merrick acquired and the city acquired during the early 20th century and that follows the precepts of the garden city suburb.

2.0

Page 9

What's not included in the designation are the later 20th century and present day annexations, and those are the ones that are called out and colored here. This map, if you want to look a little bit closer, let's see, is on page 45 of your report.

So now reading for the record, Article 3, Section 3-1103 of the Coral Gables Zoning Code, criteria for designation of historic landmarks or historic districts, states that to qualify for designation as a local landmark, properties must have significant character, interest or value as part of the historical, cultural, archeological, aesthetic or architectural heritage of the city, nation or state.

The Coral Gables Historic City Plan is eligible as a local historic landmark based on its historical, cultural, architectural and aesthetic significance. For designation, a property must meet one of the criteria. The Coral Gables Historic City Plan meets the following seven criteria.

In the historical, cultural significance,
Criteria 1, is associated in a significant way
with the life or activities of a major historic

person, important in the past. In Criteria 4,
exemplifies the historical, cultural,
political, economic or social trends of the
community.

The architectural significance, Criteria

and the past. In Criteria 4,
political, cultural,
political, economic or social trends of the
community.

2.0

2, embodies those distinguishing
characteristics of an architectural style or
period or method of construction. Criteria 3,
is an outstanding work of a prominent designer
or builder. And Criteria 4, contains elements
of design, detail, materials or craftsmanship
of outstanding quality or which represents a
significant innovation or adaptation of South
Florida environment.

And then finally, the aesthetic significance, Criteria 1, by being a part or related to a subdivision, park, environmental feature, or other distinctive area, should be developed or preserved according to a plan based on its historical, cultural or architectural motif. And then lastly, Criteria 2, because of its prominence of spatial location, contrasts of sighting, age, or scale is an easily identifiable feature of a neighborhood, village or the city. It

2.0

Page 11

contributes to the distinctive quality or identity of such neighborhood, village or the city. In the case of a park or landscape feature, is integral to the plan of such a neighborhood or a city.

So the historic significance of the Coral Gables Historic City Plan. Incorporated in 1925 by developer George E. Merrick, Coral Gables, was originally conceived as a suburb of Miami. It attracted investors from across the nation during the South Florida real estate boom of the 1920s. Merrick drew from the Garden City and City Beautiful movements of the 19th and early 20th century to create his vision for a fully-conceived Mediterranean inspired city which is now considered one of the first modern planned communities in the United States.

The City Beautiful Movement, sorry, strove to define new communities and to mitigate urban sprawl. The movement's premise was that through thoughtful planning, that included tree-lined streets, monumental public buildings, planned housing, and extensive park development, as well as control of such

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Page 12

distractions as billboards, utility poles and noise, a city can provide its inhabitants with improved environmental and living conditions.

By the 1920s there were several movements, such as the Garden City movement, that expanded upon it to include comprehensive problem solving of urban and planned city needs. Ιt addressed beautification, parks and playgrounds, as well as addressing traffic, the uncontrolled overlapping of industrial, commercial and residential uses, the conflicting role of government and business, and housing and social welfare responsibilities. One of the strengths of the Garden City movement was that it dealt with plan -- with town planning in a comprehensive manner. And it was in this context that the City of Coral Gables was conceived by George Merrick.

Advised by landscape architect Frank
Button, artist Denman Fink, and architects
H. George Fink, Walter DeGarmo, H.H. Munday and
Phineas Paist, Merrick converted 3,000 acres of
citrus plantation and native hammock into
ornate plazas, grand entrances, small parks,

2.0

Page 13

monumental buildings and tree-shaded streets.

Nationally acclaimed landscape architect
Frank Button drew the first comprehensive map
of what would become the City of Coral Gables
in 1921. And you can take a closer look at
this map on page 12 of your report. It was
based on an infrastructure of the inherited
grid of fruit trees from the Merrick
plantations, citrus plantation, as well as the
native pineland.

Laid carefully over the resulting grid of orthogonal streets, which run north-south, and the avenues, which run east-west, are a series of diagonal and curved roadways as depicted in this 1925 map. This map is found on page 19, if you want to take a look.

The meeting of the diagonal and orthogonal thoroughfares created both large and open areas at the intersections, often used for roundabouts, as well as smaller geometric spaces known as reservations or breathing spaces that provided additional green space and visual appeal. This aerial photo dates to 1925. That's DeSoto Boulevard running through the middle with the Venetian Pool at the

center. And you can see the DeSoto Fountain
there in the lower left-hand corner under
the -- under construction.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Merrick's intention was to serve both the motorists and the pedestrian alike and to provide modern amenities for both. international hierarchy of road was -- an intentional hierarchy of roadways was thoughtfully planned. It included a series of wide parkways with center planting medians that were major thoroughfares across the development, as well as parkways with substantial swales for tree planting that provided internal access and scenic routes. The residential streets were purposely -purposefully smaller in width to limit traffic in the neighborhoods, but still included planting swales and sidewalks. The business, industrial and commercial sections also had narrow internal streets along the rear of its And throughout the city lights formed an lots. extensive white way.

As part of Merrick's Great Development
Program the grid was opened up at strategic
locations to include grand entrances, plazas

2.0

Page 15

and fountains in order to give focus to the major arteries and vistas. Tree-lined parkways provided tunnels of green which opened to light-flooded plazas. Broad boulevards were curved around planned features which included vast park land, monumental public and community buildings, and other amenities. Picturesque canals, cut deep into rock outcroppings, provide vertical relief in contrast to the naturally flat landscape.

The design team carefully planned the city to maximize the potential that's intrinsically part of the tropical environment. They laid out broad sweeping boulevards with grand vistas and tree-lined streets, plazas with fountains that invited visitors to linger, and Mediterranean homes that conveyed a quality of centuries-old permanence with generous street setbacks for front yards that celebrated, as Button said, "tropical vegetation in a delightful profusion."

The planned community employed restrictive zoning to control development in residential, business, industrial and recreational areas.

And the significance of the Coral Gables

Page 16

Historic City Plan lies in its unique sense of place that it imparts. From the rational nature of rhythmic placement of streets, buildings and open areas, to the great variety of spatial experiences planned throughout the city, it resulted in a harmonious integration of planning, landscaping and architecture. It was comprehensive in thinking, poetic in ambiance, and detailed in execution. Merrick's vision and plan resulted in a modern -- master modern suburb who precepts continue to be hailed today.

In summary, the over-arching plan for the City of Coral Gables is -- is inextricably I'm having a good time tonight - bound with its developer and founder, George E. Merrick. When Merrick turned his attention from the family's agricultural enterprise to real estate, he envisioned the development of the modern community of Coral Gables as a Mediterranean themed city which celebrated its tropical environment. He formed a talented team of architects, artists and landscape architects responsible for carrying out this vision.

After careful and comprehensive planning, the

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Page 17

Coral Gables Historic City Plan was created and Merrick undertook the initial phase of the city's development in the 1920s. He was responsible for the development of the city's initial infrastructure as well as its buildings. The Coral Gables Historic City Plan has been used to inform the city's development from the 1920s through present day.

Successful, comprehensive community building is an experiential art, an art that Merrick achieved at Coral Gables. Its plan was rooted in the Garden City and City Beautiful It implemented a new concept of the precepts. times by designing dually for the pedestrian and the motorist. Its fully planned concept as a Mediterranean inspired Garden City included wide tree-lined streets, plazas, grand entrances, ample green space, and a hierarchy of roadways, community amenities, coupled with careful zoning. Coral Gables is considered one of the first modern planned communities in the United States. The concept of the modern city as a vast garden complete with botanical parkways and winding canals is still evident in Coral Gables. The plan succeeded in

2.0

Page 18

harmoniously integrating planning, landscaping and architecture to create a city with a distinct sense of place which we still honor today and is deserving of protection and preservation for future generations.

Therefore, staff recommends approval of the Local Historic Designation of the Coral Gables Historic City Plan based on its historical, cultural significance, its architectural significance, as well as its aesthetic significance.

Also, included in your packets is a memo from Dona, since she couldn't be here today.

And you can read this, but I would like to read her last paragraph into the record. She said,

"Since I'm not able to attend the hearing, I want to share with you how excited I am that this is finally happening. Historic

Preservation does not happen automatically. It takes scholarship, commitment and passion to ensure for future generations the wealth of their past. For many years we've talked about the importance of preserving George Merrick's vision by designating the Historic City Plan of Coral Gables as a Local Historic Landmark.

2.0

Page 19

This is particularly true today with the increased development potential. The designation is one of many ways that the city is undertaking to ensure proper growth while maintaining its rich heritage."

And then also included in your packet is another letter of support from architect Jorge Hernandez. And I'd like to read the last paragraph of his letter into the record. "The artistry that is Coral Gables is now increasingly understood and known as one of the nation's great early 20th century suburbs.

Merrick's place in the pantheon of American planning is on the ascend. This decision tonight is an important step in granting that plan, the very design of our beautiful city, the distinction, protection and care that it merits."

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TORRE: I have a question. In regards to -- you call it the, um, the original Historic City Plan, but the city kept growing in the -- the -- the city kept growing as you -- George kept purchasing more land. At what point did that become the official final

plan that you call historic?
MS. GUIN: It it it was about mid
century. Because they did acquire some more
land right after the city was incorporated.
CHAIRMAN TORRE: So so we're moving
the the freezing of the plan all the way
towards the middle of the century?
MS. GUIN: Yeah. Well, there I mean
there wasn't much changes in the interim. Um,
there were some redefining of the boundaries
that happened in the '40s. And Merrick had
originally, when he acquired the lower section,
the southern section, part of that came with
pieces of Key Biscayne and other Keys, which we
lost in the '40s, um, with a court case. So,
we wanted to make sure that, you know, it was
clear that that was not included.
CHAIRMAN TORRE: So so Frank Button did
the original master plan. Who kept adding or
changing the plan as as it went? Do you
know?
MS. GUIN: Well, Button, uh, till, yeah,
till the late '30s
MS. KAUTZ: It just evolved.
CHAIRMAN TORRE: The the city just

Page 21 adopted a new plan? 1 MS. GUIN: Frank Button worked for the city until the late '30s when, um, he passed 3 4 away. 5 CHAIRMAN TORRE: What -- what we're doing is we're -- the city kept adopting the plan as 6 7 it went along, growing and changing with it. MS. KAUTZ: Yes. 8 9 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Then at some point we're saying that's the end of the adoption, we're 10 11 calling that the end of the line. 12 MS. KAUTZ: Right. 13 MS. GUIN: Yes. Because what it was, we 14 annexed over the other areas, they came with 15 their own, uh, zoning precepts. So that -that began to change a little bit with some of 16 17 those areas. 18 MS. KAUTZ: The, um, the -- the feel kind 19 of started to change a little bit, too. 2.0 MS. GUIN: Yeah. 21 MS. KAUTZ: This is just basic with the --22 the most historic portion. 23 MR. PARSLEY: Okay. Can I ask a question? How, if we adopt this, uh, how might it be 24 used, uh, if -- if you go back to Dona's memo 25

1 to the -- the second to last sentence it says,

"This is particularly true today with the

3 increased development potential."

4 MS. GUIN: Mm-hmm.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PARSLEY: She might -- might have said pressure. It might have been another word I think she could have used. Um, so how -- how could that be used to, uh, if somebody... What would be other circumstances where we would go back and say no, this is not in our Historic City Plan? Uh, or this is and can be allowed, how -- how might that be?

MS. KAUTZ: Okay. We discussed -- we discussed the closing of alleys. We discussed the closing of roadways or changing a dir -- like changing a -- shifting a roadway, um, things like that would come to you all for review for recommendation at the city commission.

CHAIRMAN TORRE: So -- so one that comes to mind that could come, now that I think about it, Ponce Circle, (inaudible) obvious project. That probably will reshape a little bit of what happens in that area. Would that come to us, for example?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

25

Page 23 MS. KAUTZ: That -- the -- the pond. CHAIRMAN TORRE: The big circle. MS. KAUTZ: The --MR. PARSLEY: Mediterranean. CHAIRMAN TORRE: That section. MS. KAUTZ: Mediterranean Village, that's already -- that's already been approved. That's in permit. CHAIRMAN TORRE: But would there be some changes that go along with -- with that circle there maybe or the way that... Because I know, for example, they changed, when you turn right, at some point they added some -- some green space, for example. That kind of stuff, is that coming to us, for example? That was --MS. KAUTZ: If that -- if it's proposed to

be eliminated or, um, yes it would.

CHAIRMAN TORRE: How about the use of what circle does -- the park could look like? The -the use of the park, would that be something that we would look at?

MS. KAUTZ: I believe so.

MS. GUIN: Yeah, for the parks they would.

CHAIRMAN TORRE: So if an amphitheater 24

wants to be placed there, for example -- I

www.taylorjonovic.com Taylor, Jonovic, White, Gendron & Kircher-Echarte

305.358.9047

don't know. I'm just thinking.

MS. KAUTZ: Yes, right.

come to you for a recommendation.

MR. RODRIGUEZ:

in the definition.

et cetera.

June 21, 2018 Page 24 MR. FULLERTON: Those are all enumerated MR. FULLERTON: Parks, rights-of-way, MS. KAUTZ: Mm-hmm, yeah. That would all What would be the impact of this plan or adopting the plan on these various other areas that we're annexing or discussing annexing like little, you know, little Gables? What impact would that have on MS. KAUTZ: They wouldn't be included in the designation. They would be like the other

- CHAIRMAN TORRE: So when something is, as you said, annexed, that becomes part of this
- 2.0 then automatically? Or do we have to

the community or not at all?

21 enlarge --

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22 MS. KAUTZ: No, no.

annexed areas.

- MS. GUIN: The boundaries would have to 23
- 24 change.
- 25 CHAIRMAN TORRE: When we looked at that

www.taylorjonovic.com Taylor, Jonovic, White, Gendron & Kircher-Echarte

305.358.9047

Page 25 little street deviation off Segovia and 1 Alhambra a while back, that came to us. MS. GUIN: 3 Mm-hmm. CHAIRMAN TORRE: How did that differ from 4 5 this? In other words, how did that come about? MS. KAUTZ: That came to you all 6 specifically because when we designated Alhambra as a historic district --8 9 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Mm-hmm. MS. KAUTZ: -- um, it was important to us 10 11 to designate the rights-of-way at Alhambra so 12 that nothing could happen to the -- the wide median. Um, so when we did that particular 13 14 district, we included the rights-of-way, 15 specifically so that the street couldn't be widened, the, um, the median couldn't be 16 17 narrowed, things like that. So in that case, when they, um, the intersections abut that 18 19 district, they'll come to you all. 2.0 CHAIRMAN TORRE: But all these in the 21 future would be similar -- similar to that 22 would come here, because we're talking about 23 whether a curve takes up wider or lesser turn 24 or something? 25 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. Correct.

Page 26 1 MS. GUIN: Mm-hmm. CHAIRMAN TORRE: The ones that also come 3 to mind are the Granada intersects with Columbus and all those little things you guys 4 5 were working on in terms of expanding, taking away asphalt or expanding green space and all 6 7 that. Mm-hmm. 8 MS. GUIN: 9 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Similar things, right? 10 Right. That would all come to MS. KAUTZ: 11 you. 12 MR. SILVA: I -- I have some logistical questions. 13 14 MS. KAUTZ: Sure. 15 MR. SILVA: Um, so things like -- like 16 run-of-the-mill public works projects, right, 17 sidewalk repairs, things like that, those would 18 technically fall under this purvey, right? 19 MS. KAUTZ: If it's repair work, it's 2.0 maintenance, it's the same we would do with the 21 historic landmark, if it's a maintenance thing, 22 it wouldn't come to you all for review. 23 it's -- if it's substantially altering the 24 portion of that feature, then yes. 25 MR. SILVA: But that would be like an

Page 27 administrative review or something? 1 MS. KAUTZ: Yes, yes. Correct. 3 MR. SILVA: Unless it's something --4 MS. KAUTZ: The same that we would do --5 the same that we would do for a normal landmark, yes. The minor things would not come 6 7 to you all. MR. SILVA: And -- and things like, like 8 kind of a radical re-imagination of -- of 9 streets like Miracle Mile, right? And like 10 11 Helda (sic) Plaza which is something fairly 12 substantial, we're changing the street section, we're changing kind of the parking, the 13 14 planning of -- of that area. How -- I mean that -- that's, I think, a successful project. 15 MS. KAUTZ: Mm-hmm. 16 17 MR. SILVA: Um, something like that would 18 come to us. And what's staff's position on --19 on -- on kind of street sectioned issues and 20 street landscaping issues? Are we really 21 looking at kind of the plan, the platting 22 really, or are we looking at street section? 23 Are we looking at landscaping and -- and kind of details? 24 25 MS. KAUTZ: I think it depends on the

project, what it is. Um, and correct me if I'm 1 wrong, but I -- I think it's given to me a case by case basis on what -- what substantially 3 4 alters what we've done, what we're preserving. 5 And I know that's sort of a wishy-washy answer, but until we sort of get into it, um, we won't 6 7 know. Because it -- it can be 8 CHAIRMAN TORRE: 9 as minor as, uh, extension of sidewalks when 10 you get to corners. If you -- there are a ton 11 of sidewalks --12 MS. GUIN: Right. CHAIRMAN TORRE: -- in the Granada 13 neighborhood which just go around the block. 14 MS. GUIN: 15 Mm-hmm. 16 CHAIRMAN TORRE: And there's no crossing 17 to the next where one side has it, the other side doesn't. And there's some pressure every 18 19 once in awhile to start adding these. 2.0 actually like the way it looks without them. 21 But it doesn't make sense to have sidewalks 22 that don't actually go -- go where you want to 23 go which is across the street.

MS. KAUTZ: Well, I think they're

extending them now because (inaudible).

www.taylorjonovic.com Taylor, Jonovic, White, Gendron & Kircher-Echarte

24

25

- There's, you know -- I know, um, but a lot of them --
- 3 CHAIRMAN TORRE: But that would come to us 4 first, not just necessarily administrative, 5 anything it does.
- MS. KAUTZ: Any -- anything, from the way

 I understand it, anything that would go to the

 city commission for their review, you all would

 be a recommending body for the city commission.

 So if those items would go to the commission,

 then I assume they would come here as well.

 That's what I understand.
- MS. GUIN: That's our understanding.
- MR. SILVA: One last question. Things
 like, um -- so the -- the agencies that
 currently trump the city now, like FDOT and -and the state for state roads, they would
 still -- we would be a recommending body to
 them or they -- how would that work?
 - MS. KAUTZ: The -- it's the way it would work now. Um, with the state historic roadway when they do work, they -- they -- they ask us for input.
- 24 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Like, for example, US-1 25 and -- and -- and, you know, the Metro-Rail

2.0

21

22

23

	Page 30
1	line, right?
2	MS. KAUTZ: Mm-hmm.
3	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Where that's included in
4	this area that we're designating, right?
5	MS. KAUTZ: Mm-hmm.
6	MR. SILVA: So that
7	MS. KAUTZ: Mm-hmm.
8	MR. RODRIGUEZ: How about a situation like
9	FPL putting these light posts I mean the
10	telephone poles along Ponce de Leon Boulevard,
11	would that have to come here?
12	MS. KAUTZ: I believe so, yes.
13	MR. RODRIGUEZ: So we can stop FPL from
14	doing that?
15	(Crosstalk)
16	MS. KAUTZ: (Laughs). You all can make a
17	recommendation.
18	MS. GUIN: You can recommend it to the
19	city commission (laughs).
20	CHAIRMAN TORRE: All right. Anything
21	else? Hello, Alicia, you snuck in.
22	For the record, Alicia is in attendance.
23	All right. Any further comments or
24	questions for staff?
25	(No response)
1	

Page 31 1 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Good. Close the public hearing. Anybody in the audience want to speak for or against this item? That will close the 3 4 public hearing. 5 Any further discussion? Motion? Robert, 6 you're always so quiet. How about --7 MR. PARSLEY: I -- I -- I'll move. CHAIRMAN TORRE: You'll move? 8 9 MR. PARSLEY: To -- I'm not sure how to 10 move it, but I'll move to include the historic 11 neighborhood plan, whatever the official title 12 is --13 MS. KAUTZ: It would just be designating 14 as a historic landmark, the Historic City Plan. 15 (Crosstalk) 16 MR. PARSLEY: Yeah, yeah, yeah. That's why I'm doing it. 17 18 CHAIRMAN TORRE: That's right. 19 MR. FULLERTON: I'll second. 2.0 CHAIRMAN TORRE: We have a second from 21 John Fullerton. Any further comments? 22 (No response) 23 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Close the public hearing, Roll call, please. 24 uh. 25 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Menendez?

	Page 32
1	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
2	THE SECRETARY: Ms. Bache-Wiig?
3	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
4	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Parsley?
5	MR. PARSLEY: Yes.
6	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Rodriguez?
7	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
8	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Fullerton?
9	MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
10	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Silva?
11	MR. SILVA: Yes.
12	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
13	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
14	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Torre?
15	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Yes. Thank you.
16	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well, we congratulate the
17	staff for the write-up. I'm keeping this.
18	CHAIRMAN TORRE: That's very nice.
19	(Crosstalk)
20	BOARD MEMBER: It's so good. You could
21	make a book out of this.
22	MS. GUIN: It felt like it could. I was
23	saying I was writing another thesis.
24	MS. KAUTZ: She graduated. We gave her an
25	A plus (laughs).
1	

1 MS. GUIN: I graduated. Thank you. MR. SILVA: Wow, very impressive. 3 Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN TORRE: 4 (Agenda item concluded.) 5 CHAIRMAN TORRE: All right. Next item on the agenda is Case File LHD -- this is local 6 7 historic designation for the property at 741 Navarre Avenue, legally described as Lot 26, 8 Block -- Block 26, Coral Gables Section B, 9 according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in 10 11 Plat Book 5, Page 111 of the Public Records of 12 Miami-Dade County. MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. So this is a -- a 13 14 1940s photograph of the property in question on 15 Navarre Avenue with the location map, um, it's just North of Alhambra Circle and kind of to 16 17 the southeast of, um, the country club. 18 So, this application was brought to us by 19 the owner of the property, um, owner-driven 2.0 designation. Just gonna make that -- it is a 21 single-family residence that was designed in It was permit number 285. 22 The first, 23 um, pages of the city's permit books, up until

about number 1300, um, were lost many years

So, um, it was built prior to the

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Page 34

designation of the city and permitted, um,
permitted after the city was incorporated. It
was designed by H. George Fink, who was a very
prominent and important member of George
Merrick's initial design team. The -- the
original owner was Mr. E.C. Schwab. And the
builder is unknown.

So Article 3, Section 3-1103, as Elizabeth, um, had just mentioned previously of the Zoning Code, states the criteria for designation of local historic landmarks or landmark districts. We must meet one of the criteria outlined in the code. And 741 Navarre Avenue meets two. Both architectural, uh, it portrays the environment in an era of history characterized by one or more distinctive architectural styles and it embodies those distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style through a period or method of construction. In this case it is a Mediterranean revival. Um, and it's also qualified as a cottage. So Coral Gables' development history can broadly be divided into major historical periods. Uh, the Coral Gables initial phase and development, um, the land

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Page 35

boom prior to the hurricane of 1926, then the aftermath of the 1926 hurricane, followed by the Great Depression, the New Deal, and the beginning of the war, so it's 1927-44 and post World War II and the modern period.

It was designed in 1924, this home, uh, occurred during the city's boom years and is indicative of the type of architecture that was the founding premise of the city.

So this was, uh, located within subdivision platted as Coral Gables Section B, as it sounds. It was one of the earliest sections after section A. Um, this property is located in an area of smaller lots. Um, and is an example of the more modest residences designed to provide the same level and quality of construction as the larger homes, um, that flank the major boulevards. Merrick had his architects design these finely detailed Mediterranean Revival style homes on smaller lots, uh, to demonstrate that smaller and moderately priced homes can be just as charming and beautiful as the larger homes. And this type has become known as the Coral Gables Cottage.

Page 36

And as, um, as it was one of the earliest sections to be platted, Section B was built out rather early. So you can see it in the pre-1935 homes, uh, are in blue here on the map, and the quite, um, large number of them that surround this property.

These are aerial photos from 1938 on the left. So you can see, um, little bit fuzzy, but you can see how -- how much was built out by 1938. And construction actually did continue pretty steadily in this area, didn't sort of drop off after, um, after the -- the area went bust. So there are a lot of properties from the late 30's, from the 40's, into the 50's, and by 1954 on the right, it was virtually built out.

So this is an example of a Mediterranean Revival Style architecture and George Merrick's vision for a planned community that included affordable, middle-class housing. Uh, they felt this type of architecture harmonized best with South Florida's climate and lifestyle. And of the features that, uh, this house exemplifies of that style, has a rectilinear floor plan. The covered front porch, the

loggia, which has now been enclosed, with the
three arches on the front, to the right of the
screen, um, which are typical of the time
period.

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Has first floor over a crawlspace, um, a textured stucco finish which appears to be original. Flat roof with a parapet, um, parapet is stepped in varying heights. Uh, there's a porte cochere to, uh, the side, with segmental arched openings, um, on all three sides. Has decorative clay scuppers on the front that you can see on the right-hand photo. The windows are highly recessed. Um, this is on the east side. That's an original configuration where there was a -- a rectangular window set into a recessed opening. Um, you can see the vents, uh, above as decorative accents, both single and double. the right is a wing wall that comes off the porte cochere that's a really beautiful shape. Has a prominent chimney to -- that you see to the right with, um, with shoulders with -- that have barrel tile on them. Um, oops, sorry. Um, and there's the really prominent feature on the front, the stylized mission revival curved-top

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Page 38

parapet that looks sort of like a bell tower, and then barrel tile coping throughout the parapet. It also has a detached garage, which has since been enclosed. Um, French doors sort of delineate the opening of what would have been the garage door. And these are the two facades, the front and, uh, and the side.

So, comparison of the permit drawings, and historic photos, um, with the existing house, show this house retains its integrity over the years. As was often the case, as-built features may differ from the permit drawings, um, that we have on file. And based on the comparison of the two, there were a few changes that occurred, most likely during construction. On the permit drawing that you see on the bottom of the screen, um, two of the arched openings that flank the center, um, have some sort of iron. It's called out as ironwork. Um, I don't know if they were railings, if they were scree -- to hold the screens. I'm not sure what they were, but these iron elements that were never, um, constructed.

In the 1940's photo that -- the loggia has been screened, but there are no, there's no

Page 39

ironwork, there's no pickets, except there's a wooden picket, um, railing, on the east side, which you can see in the 40's photo. Other deviations from the drawing, uh, includes the construction details of the front steps. Um, in the bottom it was supposed to be sort of splayed out and as it was built with two retaining walls. Um, the elimination of the cement moulding, um, at the masonry columns, that you see right where the spring point of the arches is, and the design of the winged wall at the southeast corner, um, also changed design.

Alterations to the property include the enclosure of the front porch, a rear addition, changes in window type, and the alterations to the attached garage structure. In 1979 a permit was issued to enclose the front porch and move the front door to the front facade as you see it now. At some unknown date, unfortunately the wing wall at the southeast corner was also removed. Um, it was sh -- not shown on the elevations that, um, were provided that, that enclose that front porch. So it was removed at some point prior to that date.

2.0

Page 40

In 2010 a permit was issued for new driveway ribbon strips, new front walkway, installation of pavers, tiling of the front steps, installation -- I should say reinstallation of the barrel tile coping, and removing some non-original planters. Uh, an iron gate was added in 2012 at the rear of the porte cochere. And in 2015 the current impact windows were installed.

Other permits issued were basic roof, painting, things like that.

So this is the addition that was done in 1983. Um, it's to the rear of the property at the northeast corner, and, um, it's very distinguishable when you walk around the property. It's got some highly textured, um, stucco that is -- it's very clear. Um, very simple addition, does not detract from the, um, from the home; can't see it from the front.

The single-family home at 741 Navarre

Avenue was designed by prominent architect

H. George Fink in 1924. He was a member of

George Merrick's core design team and

responsible for much of the early design and

planning of Coral Gables. His work in the '20s

created the fabric of Mediterranean Revival 1 architecture, which became emblematic of the city. Built during the boom years, the 3 4 residence, um, typifies a distinctive 5 architectural type that was prevalent in the city in the '20s, known as a Coral Gables 6 7 Cottage. They were modest in size, but built with the same high quality construction, and 8 9 Med Revival style features as other structures that shaped the new city in the early '20s. 10 11 This home, with its original detached garage, 12 is a largely intact cottage and retains its integrity, and contributes to the historic 13 14 fabric of the city. And we recommend approval. And the owner is in the audience. 15 CHAIRMAN TORRE: 16 Ouestions --17 MS. KAUTZ: Oh, and I do want to note, 18 too, finally. I'm sorry, um, there is on the 19 desk, uh, it was received earlier today, an 2.0 email from Historic Preservation Association, 21 that is, um, noting their support of both this 22 designation and the one that follows. 23 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Any questions for staff? 24 (No response) 25 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Thank you.

Anybody in the audience want to speak on 1 2 this site? Please, come up. MR. GARCIA: Good evening. I'm Enrique 3 I'm the 4 Garcia and I live in 741 Navarre. 5 current owner along with my wife. I want to really congratulate the staff here, about the 6 7 stand that you guys have taken on the historical, uh, protection of -- of -- of this 8 9 beautiful community. I've -- we've been living here since three years, for -- for the past 10 11 three years and fallen in love with it. I am 12 very glad that our house has been considered and I -- from what I can tell, it's going to be 13 14 approved as a historical, or a landmark 15 designation. I walked that street today from 16 the 400 block to the 800 block, and I counted 60 homes that were built in that time it's like 17 18 a beautiful, beautiful street. I strongly 19 recommend we look into it, so we keep the, uh, 2.0 the scale and the beauty of the street. There 21 is new developments. They are very nicely done 22 but, you know, they're new developments. 23 let's see if we can protect the integrity of 24 the street. And thank you very much. 25 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Thank you for your kind

	Page 43
1	words. Anybody else?
2	(No response)
3	CHAIRMAN TORRE: We'll close the public
4	hearing. Discussion.
5	MR. SILVA: I think it's a
6	MS. KAUTZ: Anyone?
7	MR. SILVA: I think it's a beautiful home.
8	And I think it's very deserving of historic
9	designation. So I would move approval.
10	CHAIRMAN TORRE: There we go.
11	MS. BACHE-WIIG: I second.
12	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Perfect. Any further
13	comments or questions? Discussion?
14	(No response)
15	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Good to go.
16	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
17	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
18	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Menendez?
19	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
20	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Silva?
21	MR. SILVA: Yes.
22	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Parsley?
23	MR. PARSLEY: Yes.
24	THE SECRETARY: Ms. Bache-Wiig?
25	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.

	Page 44
1	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Fullerton?
2	MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
3	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Rodriguez?
4	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
5	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Torre?
6	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Yes.
7	MS. KAUTZ: Great. Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Thank you. Thank you
9	very much.
10	(Agenda item concluded.)
11	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Next item. Case File LHD
12	2018-007, this is consideration of the local
13	historic designation of the property at 1311
14	Pizarro Street, legally described as Lot 22 and
15	South 10 feet of Lot 1, Block 6, Coral Gables
16	Granada Section Revised, according to the Plat
17	thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 8, page 113
18	of the public records of Miami-Dade County.
19	MS. GUIN: Local historic landmark
20	designation for the single family home at 1311
21	Pizarro, where you can see a 1940's historic
22	photo of the home. The property is located on
23	an interior lot on the east side of Pizarro,
24	between Ortega and Venetia Avenues. The site
25	dimensions are 60 feet wide by 107 feet deep.

Primary elevation faces west.

2.0

The designation was requested by the owner. The owner is Mr. Moredo, is in the audience here tonight, and he is very excited about bringing this property back. Um, he's hired an architect we've met with several times on site. Um, we've come up with a plan. And there's concurrently a permit, um, for restoration of the property in process.

So as I read into the record before, um,
Coral Gables Zoning Code gives the criteria for
historic landmarks. For the designation of a
property, it must meet one of the criteria.
This property is eligible on two. For
architectural significance, it portrays the
environment in an era of history characterized
by one or more distinctive architectural
styles. It, two, embodies those distinguishing
characteristics of an architectural style or
period or method of construction.

So for this home, permit 2149 was issued in January of 1926. The plans that are filed under that permit don't seem to correspond with what we see in the site. Um, so either it had extensive alterations early on, um, or during

construction, or the plans just don't match.

Um, and we haven't found any other early plans,

3 um, for this property, which is why you don't

4 have them in your packet. The architect listed

on the permit was H. O. Vanderlyn.

The property was built during the initial planning and development period of the city, and reflects Merrick's vision for the Mediterranean inspired city, with housing for varying income brackets.

The home is located in the Coral Gables
Granada Revised section. These, the lots, as
Kara talked about, closer to the golf course,
and the boulevards were much larger. And then
part of Merrick's plan was to have sections of
the city that were built for the modest, um,
income, which is what this section is. You can
see this section of the city with the -- the
smaller homes. There was a number of them
built, um, during the land boom era prior to
1935. Um, in the period between '35 and '48
there was not a lot of construction in this
area. But then in the 1950's is really when
this area got -- became totally built out. It
was conceived as a single-family home area for

2.0

Page 47

modest income, and it retains that character today.

So the residence at 1311 Pizarro Street is a significant example, um, of Mediterranean Revival Style architecture as Merrick envisioned it for the modest home. It exemplifies the building archetypes upon which Coral Gables was founded. Built on a 60 foot wide lot, it was built as a two-bedroom, one-bedroom ba -- one-bath home, with a front porch, sleeping porch, a porte cochere, and what we believe was a detached garage. And I'll come back to that in a minute.

The home retains the Mediterranean Revival style hallmark features, such as the rectilinear floor plan, asymmetrical design of the main elevation, roofs of varied heights and types, projecting facades, planes including the front porch with the distinctive arch opening, and a turned porch column, grouped vents, a prominent chimney, decorative rafter tails, as well as the recessed windows with projecting masonry sills.

So here's a -- a picture of the front facade from a little different angle, so you

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Page 48

can see the massing of the home. Zooming a little you can see the, um, open-air front porch with its low wall. You can see the decorative vents up above. And the -- a glimpse of that, uh, distinctive chimney. This central portion of the front facade was originally a screened porch. You can see the column still is, um, there in the middle, the windows originally went all the way down, um, and the plan was to return them to that. Also, on this section you can see the decorative vents. The feature that's currently hidden behind the gutter system are a series of carved rafter tails.

The south elevation remains intact in its original configuration. You see the deeply recessed windows and the projecting sills there.

Now, this home has had a -- a number of additions over the years. We believe that there was originally a detached garage, um, in the north, is that, east corner. But early on, the -- the portion that's in green was an infill and that became the new garage, which you can see in the historic photo, which I'll

Page 49

show you in a minute. Um, but that happened early in the '30s, early '40s. The building records, uh, talk about what was the original garage then being called out as a maid's quarter. So it seems like they built a garage in front of the original garage; turned the original garage into living quarters.

There was an early permanent addition that you see in orange of one room to the rear. And then we have a series of smaller -- well, some of them smaller, um, unpermitted and undated additions. Probably fairly recent. Um, and I'll talk -- I'll show you those in a moment.

And then we have the, um, enclosing of the porte cochere, which we don't -- we don't have a date for that either. So when you look at the historic photo, you can see the porte cochere in the front, and you see that new garage, or what we believe is a -- an addition for a new garage. And then the original garage being converted to living space. And see, the -- the connection is, um, not elegant, which sort of lends credence that it wasn't original. Looking at the enclosed porte cochere, the openings are clearly, um, outlined

Page 50

in the stucco. So actually bringing back this feature is not gonna take any guesswork. We know exactly where those openings are.

Here are those additions on the north facade. Their -- they have two undated. One is used as a laundry room, the one more towards the front. And then towards the back there was a -- an addition, it's a wood frame addition, to that original garage, um, that's now used as storage. And then the rear, another undated addition that stretches, um, across a good part of the rear facade.

And then what you can see here, jutting back, where the addition juts back, that's the original sleeping porch. And those openings and the sills, um, have been retained, so it clearly reads, um, as it originally was.

There's just windows in the openings now.

So the, um, the -- the one point that I wanted to make about this property is that it has had several additions. Some of them can easily be reversed, um, and that's the owner's intent however, um, if Dona was here she would remind you all that you need to designate it as you see it now. Um, but letting you know that

the owner is definitely on board with it becoming a historic property.

2.0

So, in summary, the single-family home at 1311 Pizarro Street was permitted in 1926. Built during the early boom years, it's a good example of the Mediterranean Revival style architecture that defined George Merrick's vision for the city. Merrick dedicated numerous portions of Coral Gables to lots and homes that could be affordable to the middle class. And he had his architects design homes in that style to show that they would have the same quality and construction as the larger homes.

The house at 1311 Pizarro Street is an example of one of these modest homes. The Mediterranean Revival home retains a number of hallmark features, including its rectilinear floor plan, asymmetrical design of the main elevation, roofs of varying heights and types, projecting facades, including the rectilinear front porch with the distinctive arched openings, a turned porch column, grouped vents, prominent chimney, decorative rafter tails, as well as recessed windows with projecting

masonry sills.

2.0

The staff recommends approval for the local historic designation of 1311 Pizarro Street, based on its architectural significance.

And I believe these letters were, um, left for you on the desk, but I have three letters of support, uh, for this property. And I'll read those into the record. One is from Sheryl Gold, who lives at 721 Biltmore Way. It says, "This is a modest but detailed home in the Spanish Mediterranean style from the 1920's that is part of the historic fabric of Coral Gables. With more and more pressure to demolish and develop, it is increasingly important to preserve the unique character of the city. I urge you to vote for the historic designation of this property."

We have another one from Carolyn Reyes, who lives at 814 Mariana Avenue. "We are unable to attend the meeting regarding the above property. However, we would like to voice our support for the historic designation of 1311 Pizarro Street. The old Spanish style proclaims the history of our neighborhood and

2.0

Page 53

exemplifies the charm and character for which our city is known. This property is definitely worthy of designation."

And then finally we have one from Mr. Bret Gillis, from 915 Ferdinand Street. He says, "I am unable to attend the meeting this week, but would like to offer my strong support for the historic designation of 1311 Pizarro Street.

The old Spanish Mediterranean style still holds sway in this home and gives our neighborhood charm, character, and distinction."

CHAIRMAN TORRE: Thank you.

MS. GUIN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TORRE: Will the homeowner want to speak? Were you intending to speak or not?

MS. GUIN: Do you want to speak?

CHAIRMAN TORRE: No? I -- I kind of wanted to have a back and forth on some of the questions that pertain to, um, intentions and things. So maybe you can -- So my -- my concern is that this has a lot of things that, like you suggest, are not exactly something I would feel comfortable with, because I don't like setting bad precedents for other people to come in and say, "Look, look what you guys did

over here." Is there a way to define what exactly we want to protect, and some things that we don't want to protect, so that this can be shaped back into the -- more of the original house, or -- I -- I just feel some of that stuff shouldn't be protected.

MS. GUIN: Right.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN TORRE: How -- how do we deal with that?

MS. GUIN: And we've been working with him. The architect had actually intended to be here tonight, and actually had to go out of town. Um, but we've been working with him as to what's appropriate and what's not. And we're -- we are comfortable with what they're putting forward, um, see it's -- we're sort of in a catch-22 in this. You might remember we had another, uh, property on Pizarro Street that, um, had a lot of -- where features were missing, had some additions. And they did all of the restoration work before it came to you for designation. And then they, um, were presented to you with an addition. Now they applied for the ad valorem, and all the work they did in the restoration, because that was

before the designation, didn't apply. 1 that's one of the reasons that we're bringing this property forward now, so it's designated, 3 so all of the work that he does would be 4 5 included. CHAIRMAN TORRE: Do -- do you have enough 6 7 basis to look back at how this house should look, or what, um, we only saw one elevation. 8 9 And you don't have the plans here. So what's 10 the way to -- to see what was right and wrong? 11 How do you -- how do you restore -- how do you 12 work that house back into something as he moves 13 forward with design? 14 MS. GUIN: Well, we've -- we've done a bit 15 of ground -- you know, on the site looking what's there. We've been out to the site a 16 couple times. 17 18 CHAIRMAN TORRE: And by the way, I'm not 19 against the historic designation of this house. 20 But I just want to make sure that this is done 21 in the best way --22 MS. GUIN: Yeah, it's --23 CHAIRMAN TORRE: -- possible. 24 MS. GUIN: You know, and --25 MS. KAUTZ: A lot of -- a lot of times

when you look at properties, um, bad 1 workmanship is our best friend. Because it's really clear what's not original. Um, and 3 4 it -- because, you know, the carport, you can 5 see the arched openings exactly where they are; it's really easy to tell. I mean, what's 6 7 later -- a later addition, is not a good one. So it's gonna be very easy for them to 8 9 distinguish what's -- what comes off. And they have, um, and we've -- like she said we've 10 11 worked with them to sort of help them through 12 that. And they're completely on board with 13 doing the right thing. 14 MR. MENENDEZ: So is staff gonna require certain work to be done? Certain things to be 15 16 brought back? 17 MS. KAUTZ: Not require, because we can't. 18 But they're in permitting already, if I'm not 19 mistaken, for restoration work that we've 2.0 signed off on. 21 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. 22 MS. KAUTZ: So it's -- it's something that 23 we are completely happy that they're doing. Um, and it's all good work. 24 25 (Crosstalk)

	Page 57
1	CHAIRMAN TORRE: So it has to come back to
2 -	us.
3	MR. MENENDEZ: Well, but
4	MS. KAUTZ: No.
5	MS. GUIN: No.
6	MS. KAUTZ: It's restoration work only.
7	(Crosstalk)
8	MS. KAUTZ: They're just they're only
9	removing bad stuff.
10	CHAIRMAN TORRE: But if we designate it
11	today, it will that's not permitted. When
12	it does get permitted, it will have to come
13	(Crosstalk)
14	MS. KAUTZ: Not nec not for restoration
15	work. But if like if they do impact
16	windows, we do that administratively.
17	Restoration work typically doesn't come back to
18	you all because they're doing the right thing.
19	They're doing something good we want to see
20	happen.
21	MR. MENENDEZ: Well, my question, the
22	the unpermitted additions, are those gonna go
23	away? Required, correct?
24	MS. KAUTZ: Yeah.
25	MS. GUIN: Correct.

Page 58 1 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. (Crosstalk) 3 MR. FULLERTON: And the carport enclosure? 4 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. 5 MR. FULLERTON: That's going away? MS. KAUTZ: Yes. It's opening. They're 6 7 opening back up the carport. MS. GUIN: They're opening it back up. 8 9 (Crosstalk) 10 MS. KAUTZ: No. 11 MR. MENENDEZ: That's -- that's my 12 concern, grandfathering in --13 MS. KAUTZ: No. No, you're not. There --14 there are -- there's un -- unpermitted work on 15 this property, that is, it's a violation. So 16 there's -- there's nothing that if you 17 designate something as is now, if it doesn't 18 meet code, it's not -- doesn't have to stay. 19 CHAIRMAN TORRE: You -- you lost me a 2.0 little bit on the restoration. Okay. So, so a 21 permit that has -- um, house that's like 22 designated has to go to your department? 23 MS. KAUTZ: Mm-hmm. 24 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Obviously. And when you 25 say de -- uh, restoration means that there's

Page 59 not enough reconstruction, or -- or something 1 that requires our viewing? That you are able to just do that on your own? 3 4 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. 5 CHAIRMAN TORRE: That's -- that's all that 6 means. 7 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. CHAIRMAN TORRE: And the removal of all 8 9 carports, demolition of that type is -- is 10 still considered restoration? MS. KAUTZ: Yes. 11 12 MR. MENENDEZ: But we can request it to 13 come back, can we not? 14 MS. KAUTZ: You can. You can. Ιt 15 would --16 MR. MENENDEZ: So we might want to do 17 that, to review it. 18 MR. FULLERTON: If we don't designate it, 19 or is it already designated because it's in --2.0 (Crosstalk) 21 MR. MENENDEZ: No, it's not. 22 MS. KAUTZ: This is -- this is just for 23 the designating. 24 MR. MENENDEZ: That's what we're doing. 25 MR. FULLERTON: Yeah, I'm -- I'm sorry.

Uh, if we don't designate it, do you lose 1 control over, uh, what they do? MS. KAUTZ: Yes. 3 4 MR. MENENDEZ: Yup. 5 MS. KAUTZ: I mean, the way -- the way that we've talked about this, is we've -- it --6 7 it came to us because it -- there was, um, they were proposing work that was really 8 9 incompatible with the historic nature of the house. We went out to go visit it. We talked 10 11 to the architect. We spoke to the owner. 12 told them what we'd like to see happen, for it 13 to be brought back. And they've been 14 completely agreeable thus far. Which is why we 15 didn't -- we wanted to let them go forward into 16 permitting and start getting that accomplished 17 and not hold them up. Because we are --18 CHAIRMAN TORRE: I just --19 MS. KAUTZ: -- comfortable with what 2.0 they're doing. 21 CHAIRMAN TORRE: My concern is that if 22 someone points a finger at the house later on 23

and says, "Look, this is what you guys did," and -- and I don't want it to be used an example of something that makes me look like a

24

25

hypocrite, or some of -- something of that sort. I -- I want to stand comfortable with what we're going forward with.

2.0

MS. KAUTZ: I -- if -- if it were -- if -if I were looking at this and, which is how you
should, as Dona would remind you, if you look
at the house now, are there enough features
that you think that it still qualifies for
designation? And the reason why we are
proposing it to you for designation is that if
it came to us for a demo, we would say no, that
it can't be demolished. So it should be
designated. Does that make sense? Did I
explain that --

CHAIRMAN TORRE: I -- I think what I'm saying is, how do we make it look the best or bring it back to the best? What's the options for us to try to perfect the house as much as possible? And if that's up to you guys, that's fine. If we have no control over that, that's fine but since we're gonna designate it, how do we make sure that it -- it comes back to be the best, best design possible? And that's my question.

MR. FULLERTON: I think there are enough

Page 62 things that were done incorrectly to say no, it 1 shouldn't be designated. Possibly. CHAIRMAN TORRE: Well, that's why I wanted 3 4 to -- I like the designation option. And I 5 think a lot of people are -- are for it. And I think it's a good thing. But how do we -- how 6 7 do we extract the best part of this house back? MR. SILVA: Well, I -- I -- I think, 8 9 Venny, we need to look at it from kind of a 10 holistic view and say, okay, these blue 11 additions were unpermitted. Right? And I 12 think they're a big part of the problem that we have with this. Right? Um, so those are 13 14 coming down. Right? 15 MS. KAUTZ: Mm-hmm. 16 MR. SILVA: Those -- those have to come 17 down, those additions. 18 MR. FULLERTON: Coming down or just --19 MR. SILVA: So I think -- I think we say 20 okay --21 (Crosstalk) 22 MR. SILVA: -- if those additions are not 23 there, then following the secretary of interior standards --24 25 (Crosstalk)

MR. SILVA: -- do we -- is there enough, 1 is there enough there to designate? And I -and I think there is. I think that then 3 4 you're -- then you're talking about the 5 enclosure of the carport, um, actually that was unpermitted as well, so -- so, you're opening 6 7 that up already. You're getting rid of those unpermitted additions. Then we're just talking 8 9 about opening maybe those -- those bay windows on the front. And those are things that I 10 11 think are easily reversible and do fall under 12 that definition. So I think we're justified. And I think furthermore that we should be 13 14 encouraging, um, the restoration and -- and not 15 penalizing folks for -- for doing things in --16 in the proper way, like the other house was, 17 where they couldn't take advantage --18 MS. KAUTZ: Right. 19 MR. SILVA: -- of that ad valorem. And --2.0 and here we can and we can kind of support 21 them --22 CHAIRMAN TORRE: And -- and I agree. 23 And -- and I don't think anybody here is saying that we shouldn't designate it. It's just how 24 25 do we work this so it's best done in the -- in

Page 64 1 the reversal process. MR. MENENDEZ: But these drawings still have to go through the Board of Architects. 3 4 MS. KAUTZ: I believe they have. MS. GUIN: Yeah, they've been through the 5 6 Board of Architects. They're now in the 7 construction drawing phase. MR. MENENDEZ: Well, shouldn't it come 8 9 here to us then? 10 (Crosstalk) 11 MS. KAUTZ: Again, as a restoration, we 12 typically -- if someone is just --13 MR. RODRIGUEZ: It's the cart and horse. 14 MS. KAUTZ: If someone is just doing 15 restoration work, and modifying, um, something 16 that's wrong on a property, we typically don't 17 bring it back to you. Because we -- we handle 18 that. We know what they're -- they're removing 19 something --2.0 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Are those brackets coming 21 off? 22 MS. GUIN: Yes. Mm-hmm. 23 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Okay. MR. RODRIGUEZ: If this were not 24 25 designated, you could have it, you could sign

Page 65 off on demolition? 1 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. 3 (Crosstalk) 4 MR. SILVA: Take a leap of faith. 5 MS. GUIN: Yes. CHAIRMAN TORRE: Can we at least agree 6 that we'll -- the motion should carry the removal of the non-permitted pieces of the 8 9 house, and the brackets that I'd -- for sure should come off? Can that be part of the 10 11 designation? 12 MS. GUIN: Yeah. MS. KAUTZ: I think so. 13 14 MS. GUIN: I think so, yeah. 15 CHAIRMAN TORRE: At least, um, we know that --16 17 MS. KAUTZ: We don't like to, um, 18 condition a designation, uh, only because I 19 don't know if -- I don't know if any of you all 2.0 were here. There was a house on Cordova, um, 21 that the designation was conditioned on them 22 doing remedial work to the property to add features back that had been lost. In this 23 24 case, we're not adding features essentially 25 back. We're taking things off.

	Page 60
1	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Mm-hmm.
2	MS. KAUTZ: Um, in that case, the work was
3	never done. And five or six years later, they
4	came back to remove the designation of the
5	property, because they didn't complete the
6	work, and they weren't they had no intention
7	of completing the work.
8	So, conditioning it is a little bit
9	trickier than just accepting the designation
10	and then letting us follow through with them
11	doing the work
12	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Can we do it so those
13	areas are not designated?
14	MR. CEBALLOS: I'd like to interrupt for
15	one second. I'm very hesitant to the board to
16	make any sort of conditions
17	MS. KAUTZ: Right.
18	MR. CEBALLOS: that lack teeth.
19	Meaning if there's no way for us to enforce it,
20	there's no point in making the condition. If
21	we put a condition that A and B needs to be
22	removed, but there's no way
23	CHAIRMAN TORRE: No, no, that's so
24	that's what it is. So leave those pieces alone
25	for now. Only the original part of the house

Page 67 is designated. And the pieces that are added 1 are not designated. MS. KAUTZ: Well, we desig --3 4 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Is that -- is that it? 5 MS. KAUTZ: We designate the property. It's the -- it's the whole --6 7 CHAIRMAN TORRE: We can't do that? MS. KAUTZ: -- the -- everything. I mean, 8 9 that would be sort of piecemealing it together, which I wouldn't be really comfortable with. 10 11 It's the whole property. 12 MS. GUIN: But are -- are you concerned 13 that if you designated that those --14 CHAIRMAN TORRE: That back roof has got nothing to do with that house. 15 16 MS. GUIN: Right. CHAIRMAN TORRE: I mean --17 18 MS. GUIN: But that was --19 CHAIRMAN TORRE: How do I live with that? 2.0 I don't know how I'd live with that, if that 21 stays. And then it continues to operate --22 MS. GUIN: But it was unpermitted, so 23 it -- it will need to come off once that goes in --24 25 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Right. Somebody comes

Page 68 back and says, "How did you guys approve this?" 1 And I have to say, "I don't know. We -- we --I don't remember." 3 4 MS. KAUTZ: And they -- they, you know, 5 they have, there's no off-street parking currently provided. That porte cochere was 6 enclosed without a permit either. That has to They have to have off-street 8 come off. 9 parking. So there are -- there are things that 10 they have to do. 11 We've designated properties that have been 12 altered in the past through either windows have, you know, inappropriate windows. And we 13 14 say, "When you go to replace the windows again, 15 we will make you put the right ones back in." 16 So, it's a -- in those cases it's more of a 17 gradual process. In this case we know what 18 they're going to do, and -- and --19 MR. SILVA: But just -- just so we're 20 clear, I think that the zoning code requires 21 them to remove those non-permitted additions. 22 Is that correct? 23 MS. KAUTZ: As far as I know. 24 (Crosstalk) 25 MS. GUIN: Yeah.

1 MR. SILVA: And we are not granting any sort of variance --MR. CEBALLOS: If they're in violation and 3 4 we've already cited the property, then it would 5 go through the normal procedure. It would be cited, eventually be -- fines would go -- would 6 amount to a lien, and there would be a lien placed on the property. 8 9 CHAIRMAN TORRE: So --10 MS. KAUTZ: So to get -- they would have 11 to get compliance. 12 CHAIRMAN TORRE: What you said just a few 13 seconds ago, says, we know what they're working 14 That's also a condition. Tomorrow they on. 15 sell a property or they decide they have to 16 leave town, that -- then it doesn't happen. 17 that's still a condition, that we're approving 18 with your -- we think it's gonna happen. We 19 know it's in the process of being done. 2.0 MR. CEBALLOS: I would --21 CHAIRMAN TORRE: It's still not done. 22 MR. CEBALLOS: I would consider -- I would consider taking a look at the property the way 23 24 it currently stands right now. 25 MS. KAUTZ: Mm-hmm.

MR. CEBALLOS: And if it meets the 1 criteria for designation, then you would go forward with the designation. But yes, you are 3 4 going forward with the designation of a 5 property that tomorrow could be sold, and it stays at its current status. Until the -- the 6 property is cited, and it goes through the process of violations, and eventually becomes a 8 9 lien, and until somebody owns that property and decides that they want to update it, the only 10 additional benefit that this board will have 11 12 is, if it is designated, all of those modifications would come back before this 13 14 board. 15 CHAIRMAN TORRE: 16 MR. MENENDEZ: What if they want to knock If somebody buys it and they want to 17 it down? 18 knock it down --19 MS. KAUTZ: If -- if it's designated, they 2.0 cannot. 21 CHAIRMAN TORRE: They can't. 22 MR. CEBALLOS: And if it is not 23 designated, it still has to get approval through Historic, for demolition. 24 25 MS. KAUTZ: But if -- but if they say that

Page 71 it's not designatable, that's then -- then 1 that's it. 3 MS. GUIN: No. Then that's it. CHAIRMAN TORRE: I think what he said is 4 5 right. MR. PARSLEY: I think we have more teeth 6 7 with a designation than without it. CHAIRMAN TORRE: 8 I mean --9 MR. PARSLEY: To use your analogy of 10 teeth. 11 CHAIRMAN TORRE: It -- what he said is 12 This is a leap of faith, in a way. correct. 13 And we prefer the house is designated than not, 14 yes. 15 MR. PARSLEY: There's -- there's --16 there's more to designate than not to designate. 17 18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: If it's not designated, it 19 can be demolished tomorrow. 2.0 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Right. 21 MR. CEBALLOS: Right. 22 CHAIRMAN TORRE: And -- and it's --23 there's a bad example -- well, it -- there's some bad features of that house that should 24 25 never stay there with that house, if you're

gonna be designated again. 1 But there's no quarantees from what I'm hearing. Except hoping that the -- the code compliance people 3 4 help us out. 5 MR. EHRENHAFT: Um, can I muddy the waters? 6 7 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Let's do it. MR. EHRENHAFT: Your hypothetical that if, 8 9 for some reason, they decided to put the house back on market, these unpermitted additions, 10 11 the ones that bother the board, and the -- the 12 closure of the -- well, the closure of the porte cochere may or may not have been 13 14 permitted. I don't know. But then does that 15 mean that, if there were liens that were cited, 16 anybody who's going to purchase the house would 17 be having to know about that at the time of the 18 purchase, and they would be facing that? 19 MS. GUIN: Mm-hmm. Correct. 2.0 MR. MENENDEZ: You -- you can't purchase 21 it without -- with the lien on it. 22 MR. CEBALLOS: The liens would exist --23 MR. EHRENHAFT: That's right. 24 MR. CEBALLOS: -- and they would be 25 recorded to maintain the permits. I could

Page 73 purchase a home with two million dollars worth 1 of liens. I'd have to purchase the property cash, because no -- most, uh, mortgagers would 3 4 never finance a home that has liens. But yes, 5 it could be -- it could be sold. MS. KAUTZ: But then the owner is 6 7 responsible for bringing the property into compliance -- but then the owner's responsible 8 9 for bringing the property into compliance. MR. CEBALLOS: The liens would remain. 10 11 Simply transferring property from one person to 12 another, the liens would remain. MR. EHRENHAFT: So if there were successor 13 14 owner --15 MS. KAUTZ: Mm-hmm. MR. EHRENHAFT: -- then if we were to 16 17 designate it, they're still going to have to 18 bring the -- the property into compliance. 19 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. 2.0 MS. GUIN: Yes. 21 MR. EHRENHAFT: The only thing that would 22 keep that from happening is if we -- if -- if 23 they were to make a sale before the 24 administrative processes of placing the liens

were there or with the --

Page 74 1 MR. CEBALLOS: If the property --MR. EHRENHAFT: Would the city still be able to --3 4 MR. CEBALLOS: If the property's currently 5 in violation? MR. EHRENHAFT: Mm-hmm. 6 MR. CEBALLOS: The -- it would be hopefully the duty of the purchaser to do his 8 9 due diligence and find out that there's 10 violations on the property. But it wouldn't be 11 recorded unless there's liens. But even if the 12 change -- the possession of the property 13 changed from owner A to owner B, if the 14 property is still in violation, it still 15 becomes the responsibility of owner B to resolve the violations. 16 17 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. 18 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Now, the issue of the 19 property violations is assured or pending, or 2.0 you -- you said there's going to be or there is 21 violations? Or these things are already on 22 record? 23 MS. KAUTZ: There are -- there are unpermitted additions to them. I don't believe 24 25 there are violations recorded on the property

Coral Gables Historic Preservation Board Page 75 yet because we are working with the owner. 1 MS. GUIN: Correct. 3 CHAIRMAN TORRE: So, if it fell apart you 4 could -- then at that point you'd go upstairs 5 and you'd say, "Let's file these violations." MS. KAUTZ: Yes. 6 7 MS. GUIN: Correct. CHAIRMAN TORRE: So, while you're still 8 9 working on removing them, that's still a work in progress, if there's nothing to be done --10 11 MS. KAUTZ: Yes, if they --12 CHAIRMAN TORRE: You have to think we rely 13 on -- so we're relying then on you to put that 14 marker in place if it doesn't --15 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. 16 CHAIRMAN TORRE: -- if it doesn't happen. 17 Okay. 18 MR. SILVA: That make you more 19 comfortable? CHAIRMAN TORRE: At least that makes me 2.0 21 more comfortable. Okav. 22 MS. KAUTZ: We -- we have no problem

24 MS. GUIN: True. 25 CHAIRMAN TORRE: All right. I think we

calling code enforcement.

- 1 have at least some idea what's going on here.
- Raul, you have any questions? I see
- 3 you're quiet today.
- 4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Me?
- 5 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Yes.
- 6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, no.
- 7 CHAIRMAN TORRE: You're good?
- 8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm more concerned about
- 9 the ability to demolish the building if we
- 10 don't designate anything.
- 11 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Okay. That's always our
- 12 strongest concern.
- MS. BACHE-WIIG: I just want to make a
- 14 comment about the area. And it -- it seems
- 15 like there's attention to this area --
- MS. GUIN: Yeah.
- MS. KAUTZ: Uh-huh.
- MS. BACHE-WIIG: -- coming back, and so
- things coming along to get designated. And
- it's really exciting because it's a, it's a
- 21 super area with a collection of every style --
- MS. GUIN: Uh-huh.
- MS. KAUTZ: Yes.
- MS. BACHE-WIIG: -- that's significantly
- contributing.

	Page 77
1	MS. KAUTZ: Absolutely.
2	MS. BACHE-WIIG: So, that's really, um,
3	exciting.
4	MS. KAUTZ: Yeah, we've we've got
5	now we have four up there
6	MS. GUIN: Four.
7	MS. KAUTZ: like within three blocks on
8	Pizarro.
9	MS. GUIN: Yeah, four that are.
10	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Excellent. Okay.
11	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Isn't it also close to
12	Little Gables?
13	MS. GUIN: Uh-uh.
14	MS. KAUTZ: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Does anybody else want to
16	speak? This side?
17	(No response)
18	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Okay. So we'll close the
19	public hearing. Thank you both.
20	Anybody else? Got it.
21	(No response)
22	MR. SILVA: I'll move approval then.
23	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Okay.
24	MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'll second it.
25	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Motion for approval,
I	

	Page 78
1 0	designation, and there's a second. Any more
2	discussion?
3	(No response)
4	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Okay. Jessie.
5	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Rodriguez?
6	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
7	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Parsley?
8	MR. PARSLEY: Yes.
9	THE SECRETARY: Ms. Bache-Wiig?
10	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
11	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Fullerton?
12	MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
13	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
14	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
15	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Silva?
16	MR. SILVA: Yes.
17	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Menendez?
18	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
19	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Torre?
20	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Yes. Thank you.
21	MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.
22	(Agenda item concluded.)
23	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Okay. We're going to go
24	to Case File COA, Certificate of
25	Appropriateness for 2018-006. An application

1	for the issuance of a Certificate of
2	Appropriateness for the property at 4733 Santa
3	Maria Street, contributing resource within the
4	Santa Maria Historic District. And this is
5	described as Lots 21 to 23 inclusive, Block
6	112, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part 5,
7	as recorded in Plat Book 23, page 55, of the
8	Public Records of Miami-Dade County. The
9	application requests design approval for the
10	addition and alterations to this residence.
11	MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.
12	This is the location map. Um, it is
13	towards the south end of Santa Maria on the
14	corner at Blue Road. This is a picture from
15	1940's. This would have been shortly after it
16	was desig uh, after it was completed. Um,
17	it was, uh, designed and built in 1949,
18	architect Earl Wolfe. It's a contributing
19	residence within the Santa Maria Historic
20	District, which was designated in November of

The application, uh, requests design approval for two, uh, one-story additions to the rear of the home, interior renovations, installation of new impact resistant windows

2007.

21

22

23

24

2.0

Page 80

and doors, uh, within existing openings and site work. The Board of Architects did review and approve this without comments. Um, no variances are requested and, um, there are a couple conditions that we'd like to note at the end, um, and one brief discussion item. But I'll let the architect give his presentation first.

MR. BRAVO: Good evening, everybody.

Pedro Bravo, with Bravo Architecture, 250

Catalonia Avenue.

Uh, our clients recently purchased this house, um. It's a young family, very, very young family who have two young children. Uh, those young children will be going to school at private school here in Coral Gables. Uh, they've hired us to change kind of the look and the dynamic and the feel of the house a little bit.

Uh, the house was added into in 2015, um, where the existing garage used to be towards the back and that was changed to the front.

And the old garage was converted into a playroom. That whole section at the back, that is the playroom, and the kitchen. This is an

2.0

Page 81

existing plan. The playroom in the back and the kitchen, that whole area we plan on demolishing, basically cutting the house right there. There's a corner of the dining room, which you'll notice, uh, that's exactly where we'll cut the house and that's where the roof itself, the existing roof kind of blends back together, back into a simple hip roof. And then from there back is where we're planning on doing the expansion.

So the inside of the program was, hey, we need to get larger spaces. We have family that lives out of town that comes and visits. We'd like to get a larger family room. We really want to get a nice, larger, open kitchen. We'd like to get nice terraces. A few things that they needed in the house that they wanted in the house. They love the area, yet this house kind of lacks, so they wanted to see if we can work with it.

So, for the main house, the existing house as you see here that has the three bedrooms, uh, and three bathrooms, we're going to slightly alter that. Um, this is the existing roof configuration, very simple, very clean,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Page 82

but what we're showing you on the corner, you'll notice how the roof braids cleanly for the rest of the house. Um, what we have proposed -- here's a proposed site plan. But, essentially, here's the proposed floor plan.

The program also calls for not only the family room and guest room addition and kitchen, but it also asks for another storage We needed more storage, and this is essentially another garage basically. So we decided to create a tandem storage behind the existing garage and that's where you see the area behind it that's slightly, um, offset from the corner of the garage in the back and it creates more of a flow through, uh, double-car kind of tandem garage. But it won't used as a two-car garage. It'll be used mostly for The front part of the garage would be storage. used as a garage, then the back will be used for storage.

And you'll also notice back down on the -on the south side, uh, by where there's a small
addition of a master bedroom. We reconfigured
those rooms and the old room into a closet and
bathroom area for the master. And then we

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Page 83

added just a simple bedroom. I'll show you now on the elevations. But that bedroom that was added follows the same lines as the house, the same eaves, the same beam height.

Here's a proposed roof plan and what you'll notice essentially from the back part, from the master bedroom, like I said, the actual roof lines up perfectly with the existing house, and existing roof, piggybacks easily onto the existing house. On the north side, the whole addition part, what we decided to do was to create a transitional piece between the existing house roof, which had a beam -- had a beam height of 8 feet, and then it transitions up to 10 feet, which is a new kind of pavilion that we've created, it's a public space, and then it transitions back down to the 8 feet. So, it's almost like a pop-up in the center. I'll show you now on the elevation. But that transitional piece which is a flat roof, we felt that it was the best way to transition the old to the new, number one. And number two, there is a -- there's a nice light, it's a big skylight that kind of transitions the old house from the new house.

Page 84

So when you transition into the house, you feel it through the skylight.

Uh, the front facade which you see on the top existing, middle is the proposed and the bottom is just the color of the proposed. The front facade. We're not proposing any work with the exception of changing the front door. It is written in your report, in the staff report, that we are changing the shutters. All windows and doors are being changed from horizontal sliders to casements, full light. Um, we're replacing the shutters where they exist, on the existing part of the house and we are planning on changing the front door.

Now, the front door, we want it to be impact obviously, want the side lights to be impact, so our proposal is to really mimic -- mimic exactly what's there. So, the side lights are on the sides. And the way they're broken up into four pieces, we'd like to maintain that look. However, go ahead with a side light that's product approved and is impact resistant.

Um, so I know that one of the things the staff report said is that shown on our

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Page 85

rendering on the elevations with regards to the shutters, the decorative shutters, they're a little bit different. We just wanted to avoid that kind of a Home Depot louvered shutter. We wanted to kind of work with staff and you guys possibly if you make suggestions not only in the texture of what it's going to look like, possibly even the color.

This is a facade, the side facade, the side street elevation that you see from Blue Road. Um, and here you'll notice what I was saying in the center. The center portion, you'll see the part that's the actual kitchen and family room area that we're adding. it's transitioned by the flat roof that's right next to it to the left. And as you continue to the right it -- it goes back down to the guest room and it goes back down to the main height, the main beam height of the main house. But we created covered terraces in the front, which is part of the program. So, we wanted to break up that covered terrace into kind of an eating/dining area and then the lower level becomes kind of the outdoor, summer kitchen area.

Page 86

The, um, the rear facade you'll notice also that the -- the guest room that was added towards the back is at the same as the -- as the main roof of the house. And we're trying to kind of place that pavilion that's -- that's 2 feet higher than the rest of the house. We want to kind of sandwich it in the rest of the house, the rest of the structure.

Yeah, okay. This is the north facade, the north elevation, which you'll see the existing part of the garage on the right-hand side.

That's where the existing garage is. There are no windows there currently. To the left of that, we're adding that one, that flat roof area, which we felt was an easier transition from the existing to the new. The roof configurations, when you put them together and you try to work different heights with a separation and -- and a lower height, it really creates a really difficult roof condition. It was, uh, it was very -- it was a very dirty condition, so that's why we felt that the flat roof would be a nice transition.

So here you have an image of the front and you kind of get an idea of what the overall

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 87

massing of the house would be. We wanted the addition itself to maintain that kind of long piece going east/west and try to maintain that green area, that green yard. We like for it to really take advantage of what was existing and not really build into that space at all.

Uh, we do not have a pool proposed, nor a deck or anything like that. Little kids, they want grass; they want to play soccer, with no pool at all right now. At all.

More views of -- of the pavilion and the integration into the house. One of the things that was mentioned in the staff report was the height of that transitional square, that transitions from the old house to the new, mentioning that it was possibly a little bit too high and they wanted for us to lower it. Ι think the way that it works out is that right now, the way that the flat roof portion or the parapet connects to the -- to the higher pavilion, it's only about 18 inches. I still have to put a cricket there. I've got to put some type of waterproofing there to get the water outside. So I need a little bit of meat there to get that water out. And with 18

2.0

Page 88

inches, I'm really at -- almost at the minimum which -- which I really should be to get that water to the sides. So, we felt that keeping it above, almost like if it was a chimney, I think is a better look than if it was lower. So we'd like to keep it. We understand that on the existing side, uh, where it connects to the existing house, it's a little bit higher, but it's still only 3 feet, 3 feet, 2 inches. So it really wasn't that much higher.

Um, a view of the front showing the shutters and the front door. And we're also proposing to take out that large circular driveway that's not a stamped concrete, and doing something simpler with concrete slabs, grass in between or gravel or something in between. And we'd also like to maybe take that brown color that the house has right -- currently. It's just all brown roof, brown shutters, light brown house. So really kind of change it and go with grays, something more reflective, transparent.

A better shot of that pavilion, of the kitchen and family room area, the covered terrace. Here we wanted to create some nice

composition of columns, almost like they were 1 floating, very simple and not -- not ornate. This is the existing dining room structure area 3 4 where on the right-hand side, you'll see 5 that -- kind of that transitional square piece that comes out with the parapet. I think it 6 7 blends okay. There's a garden there. a planter there. I think it transitions okay. 8 9 We're also working on the interiors. But on the bottom right, you'll see the covered 10 11 terrace. 12 With regards to, um, the comments in the staff report, uh, one of the -- the third 13 14 comment they mentioned was a new -- no new windowsills to be added to the existing 15 16 structure. We're okay with that. We wouldn't 17 add any new windowsills or any ornamentation 18 whatsoever. 19 And the last thing was a suggestion of 2.0 lowering the height of the connector piece on 21 the south elevation, which we discussed. 22 I'm here to answer any questions. 23 CHAIRMAN TORRE: I have a couple, just 24 clarifying questions. Page A-13 is existing, 25 uh, obviously it is. So the main door is

- currently existing and your elevation shows per 1 proposed the same door. Is that door staying? MR. BRAVO: No. It's a new door. We're 3 4 replacing the door and the side lights. 5 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Okay. I'm -- I'm going to ask a bunch of questions, so let me just 6 7 continue. Um, obviously the roof's going to be white or gray? 8 MR. BRAVO: Gray. 9 10 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Gray. Okay. Um, okay. 11 And the metal columns with the old, uh, I don't 12 what the right -- architecture for that, in the front are staying from histor -- for historical 13 14 reasons?
- 15 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.
- 16 CHAIRMAN TORRE: And you're asking them to keep those?
- 18 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.
- DEALERMAN TORRE: Okay. Because in the back I know you are using square columns and not -- so that goes away. That only happens in the front. So, the questions that I have -- and by the way you -- you always bring good work, so it's not to be cri -- critical. I just want to -- I'm trying to find the more --

what style exactly this is tending to be, 1 because the house is tended to try to go modern a little bit, but in some cases, it can't. 3 4 case in point, those columns that you have in 5 the front, you're asking for shutters and you're putting shutters, which is great. 6 that's helping to go more toward traditional. But then that door doesn't look to me like it 8 9 falls in line with those aspects of -- of the 10 architecture. The lights don't look like they 11 fall in line with that aspect of the 12 architecture. 13

So, what I would like to try to do is just the smaller details that would make this house be either a little more traditional or stay within some form of style that can be applied throughout and it doesn't leave -- it looks a little contrived right now with -- with different things that are going on.

Um, so grass in between pavers looks to be modern. And again, I -- I'm trying to say pick -- pick a style a little bit and try to stay towards it and let's see how -- and I'm having a dialogue with you so, see where -- MR. BRAVO: I understand.

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN TORRE: -- where that can end 1 it -- So, again, the shutters, I think we can find a way to make those look very nice. 3 4 I think the color you picked is great. 5 The door, I would ask that they match more towards the shutters, so maybe something a 6 little bit more traditional but yet, clean or -- but I -- I wouldn't pick the 8 9 Italian-esque looking doors, for your choice. I -- I wouldn't pick the -- the lanterns 10 11 as my choice to match what you're trying to do. 12 And then I would revisit the patterns on the -- the -- I'm so glad you took away 13 14 that circular driveway. That was one of the 15 first things I was very happy about. But then, you know, again try to con --16 17 contrive something that continues to repeat 18 itself as a standard traditional or 19 semi-traditional look or, for example, the 20 steps. You know, if you put a bullnose on the 21 steps versus just putting that edge to edge, it 22 continues to be more traditional versus that 23 modern look. 24 MR. BRAVO: Agree. 25 CHAIRMAN TORRE: So, stuff like that

2.0

Page 93

adds -- adds a look that at some point you'll recognize it's -- it's just more stylish, in my view.

MR. BRAVO: Yeah, I think this house had over the years -- it's been changed it seems and -- and the shutters were there and the shutters were original and the shutters are staying. So, that's part of one of the conditions and that's fine. But yet, um --

CHAIRMAN TORRE: But I think you're modernizing the house when you're sort of dealing with something that maybe virtue of the historic nature of this, you're forced to do something else.

MS. KAUTZ: It was kind of a transitional house to begin with. It was '49, um, so the iron work is original. The slump -- it's got a slump brick, um, basic like ledge front, um, that we're asking to be retained. It had the big open side lights, with the single door. Um, we're asking them to maintain those features. There's not a lot of overt detail on this house and I think it was transitioning towards being modern. So I think that that's what they picked up on and then took it. Whether or not

Page 94 it should be reined in a little bit then, you 1 know. 3 CHAIRMAN TORRE: That -- those are my --4 my sort of feelings about --5 MR. BRAVO: Yeah, I think the tendency of our client also was to go more towards the 6 contemporary, um, their taste. However, they're living in a traditional home and they 8 9 purchased a traditional home. 10 CHAIRMAN TORRE: But -- but I don't think you can -- I mean, you don't have to go 11 12 ultra-conservative. 13 MR. BRAVO: Right. 14 CHAIRMAN TORRE: But you can have this 15 sort of semi-contemporary look that still gives you that feeling of clean lines without --16 17 again, bullnose makes a big difference. You 18 can use the highest quality material, but if 19 you put it corner to corner, it just feels 2.0 If you do a bullnose, it feels modern. 21 traditional. That's just -- that's simple. 22 Right? 23 MR. BRAVO: Yeah. 24 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Stuff like that. 25 um, the door, I -- I would say the first thing

Page 95 is I -- I wouldn't want to see a house -- a 1 door -- a main door is always very important to That looks like an Italian type of line. 3 4 I would say more something different there that 5 could still be --MS. KAUTZ: Like a panel? 6 7 CHAIRMAN TORRE: -- considered. Yeah, a panel. It still could be beautiful. It could 8 9 still be colored. But I -- I just think it 10 looks very Italian-esque or one of these things you buy at the -- Doors Galore here or 11 12 whatever. 13 MR. BRAVO: We're okay with it. 14 CHAIRMAN TORRE: I'm not saying that that's what it is. 15 16 MR. BRAVO: Yeah. CHAIRMAN TORRE: But it just looks too 17 18 like that. 19 MR. BRAVO: That's fine. 2.0 CHAIRMAN TORRE: And then the -- the 21 driveway, I'm a little bit more hesitant to try 22 to again, not over-conservative, but just keep 23 some -- something that doesn't over-modernize it. That's all. 24 25 MR. BRAVO: Understood.

Page 96 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Would it help if the side 1 lights, the mullions being white, which is sort of how it was originally? 3 4 CHAIRMAN TORRE: If you look at the 5 existing picture on A-13. MS. KAUTZ: Yeah. 6 7 CHAIRMAN TORRE: I think that's the door they have. And I think that's --8 9 MS. BACHE-WIIG: The original photo, or the one from the 40's, seems like there's a 10 11 dark door, then the side lights, the mullions 12 are white. Second page of the staff report. CHAIRMAN TORRE: And Kara, you feel 13 14 strongly about leaving those four column things 15 in the front at this point? They're significant to this house to have those? 16 MS. KAUTZ: Yeah, there's -- there's --17 CHAIRMAN TORRE: I don't know what this 18 19 house was like but --MS. KAUTZ: There's -- I mean, if you look 2.0 21 at the original photo of the features that are 22 salient on there, they'd be the shutters, 23 they'd be the slump brick, they would be the iron columns. 24 25 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Okay.

Page 97 MS. KAUTZ: I mean, those are the -- those 1 are the decorative elements of this transitional house. 3 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I like the fact that 4 5 you're bringing the cement tile back. CHAIRMAN TORRE: 6 Great. MR. EHRENHAFT: When I was reading the 7 staff report, I noted that it had been proposed 8 9 that -- that the, you know, the barrel top be removed, but that it was going to be replaced 10 with white flat cement tiles and that was what 11 12 was proposed. And when I look at A-8, which is 13 the front elevation, that's what you've got. 14 But then you get all the way back to A-11, which is labeled -- mislabeled east. It's the 15 north elevation. Then they're gray. 16 It -- it 17 seems like, you know, it's -- it's mixed. 18 But --19 MR. BRAVO: We never had the intent to 2.0 have a white roof. There's a tremendous amount 21 of foliage around the area, and we knew it wouldn't last. 22 So... 23 MR. EHRENHAFT: I'm just saying that it 24 said that, the staff report read the roof tile

is proposed to be replaced with white, flat

- cement tile, to match what was originally in the home.
- MS. KAUTZ: Yeah, that's because it's drawn that way, on the renderings.
- 5 MR. EHRENHAFT: So, I mean...
- 6 MS. KAUTZ: I know Don -- I know Dona's
 7 okay with gray roofs, so I don't think that
 8 would be like a deal breaker.
- 9 MR. EHRENHAFT: I'm just asking --
- MS. KAUTZ: Yeah, but it's not consistent in the renderings. I -- I get where you're going.

MR. EHRENHAFT: Yeah. And I'd still like 13 14 to go back, if I could, to that transitional 15 height of the transitional part. I understand 16 you want some height because of, uh, the 17 skylight. Is that correct? In this space? Ι 18 mean, it -- I mean, it would seem like you 19 could -- could lower it and still have the 20 scuppers, and have -- have water still spill 21 out onto the roof. But what bothers me, or 22 what caught my attention was that if you look 23 at A-8, which is the front rendering, one could see from the front of the house it -- it's kind 24 25 of disturbing me that I see the top edge of

that parapet, where all the rest of it is 1 2 just -- Can you see here? It looks -- it looks strange. You know? If you go to A-8. 3 4 Directly above the left-hand side of the 5 windows, you can see the -- the height of the -- the parapet is really evident from the 6 7 street. But it doesn't -- all it does is stick up just as a -- as a straight -- straight line 8 9 interrupting the rest of the roof.

> MR. BRAVO: Well, that parapet, we're not sure if you'll see it from the street. Um, it's set back from the street probably 60 feet, more possibly. We know that that -- we know the main -- the -- the high portion that the family room and the kitchen area, that is like 45 set off from the front of the house. then plus the setback itself. So I can imagine that's about 60 to 70 feet from the facade, which I don't think that in perspective you'll ever -- ever perceive it. You're seeing that on a two-dimensional drawing. It's the way it's drawn. It's drawn correctly with the heights. However, I don't think it'll ever be perceived that way. If you look at it in three dimensions, you'll notice that's kind of

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	sandwiched	in	± 747	atruaturea
_	Sandwiched	T11	LWU	SCIUCLUIES.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

And really, I don't think it's going to be anything that's really going to stand out terribly. The height difference between the existing house and the highest portion of that parapet is, like I said, 3 feet 2 inches. So T measured that today. It's chimney height. could lower it a little bit and we can work with it. I just -- I wouldn't like to lower it lower than the eave of the higher roof structure. I would not want to do that. like to create a little bit more important, something that is clearly a, um, a transitional structure as opposed to just more of a mundane just horizontal line going across. I mean, if I had to lose a transom, if I had to lower the ceiling and the skylight, not a big deal. I think that, that structure itself, the fact that it's different, it stands out a little bit better and I -- I kind of liked it.

MR. PARSLEY: On A-9, I like the proportions. It works the way you've got it.

MR. EHRENHAFT: I like it from the perspective where you can see it, but it -- it looked to me from the front of the house --

Page 101 1 MR. FULLERTON: Yeah, but I think he's right. I think it --MR. EHRENHAFT: -- standing above the roof 3 line on -- on the left-hand side above the 4 5 garage, and it just -- it looks funny. Okay. Thanks. 6 7 MR. FULLERTON: I think you've made a -- a fairly ordinary looking house look pretty nice. 8 9 MR. BRAVO: Thank you. 10 MR. FULLERTON: I like what you've done to 11 it. (Inaudible). 12 THE REPORTER: I can't hear you. MR. FULLERTON: I say, I think he's taken 13 14 a fairly ordinary looking house -- I don't even 15 know what it's contributing in the area personally. But, uh, he improved it a great 16

deal. It looks really much better.

MR. BRAVO: Thank you.

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN TORRE: I would ask -- I'm not going to be able to make a motion, but I would ask that the motion can carry that -- that door really looked a little bit more like what's already there. The shutters and those wrought iron columns and the door should play at least a symbolic part as -- as a combined element.

Not something that -- the door just looks 1 out -- out of place. That's my -- and maybe the light fixture, even though I think that's 3 4 tough to put in place, what is right and what is wrong for you. But it just, that's -- those 5 are -- and the other stuff, I -- again, I 6 7 looked at the details. But if you want to do some nice bullnoses on the stairs, that would 8 9 be great. 10 MR. BRAVO: Okay. 11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Are these lights that 12 you're suggesting or is it just proforma? MR. BRAVO: Pardon me? 13 14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Are the lights what you 15 are suggesting or are they really just 16 proforma? MR. BRAVO: No, these are just lights that 17 we put on the images. We haven't selected the 18 19 light fixture yet. It's leaning more along the 20 contemporary side, if you noticed. But it's 21 not the light fixture by any means. We'd have 22 to shop it out with our client and price it 23 out. So, no, it's not the definitive light 24 fixture we're open to really honestly going 25 with something more --

Page 103 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Could you work with staff 1 on the lighting maybe? MR. BRAVO: Of course. Absolutely. 3 4 CHAIRMAN TORRE: I'm not suggesting you 5 don't make it contemporary, but maybe --MR. BRAVO: Yeah. 6 7 CHAIRMAN TORRE: -- less obvious than it 8 is. 9 MR. BRAVO: Yeah. CHAIRMAN TORRE: Any further questions 10 11 for -- because I want to ask anybody else in 12 the audience to speak or not. If not, I'm going to close the public hearing, so we can 13 14 have discussions on the board. 15 MR. FULLERTON: Have you looked at the --16 the, uh, conditions for approval, Pedro? 17 MR. BRAVO: Yes, I did. 18 MR. FULLERTON: All of -- I know you don't 19 want the connector piece changed. What about 2.0 the other ones? 21 MR. BRAVO: Um, with the exception of the shutters that we'd say we can work with staff, 22 23 or work with you guys, I was okay with the other ones. I mean, that's -- my comment about 24 25 the side lights in the front door were

Page 104 addressing that already. But we'd like to have 1 something that's impact resistant and -- and work with the geometry that's there and work 3 4 with the color. But -- but we're okay with 5 that with the exception of number four. The other three we're okay with. 6 7 MR. FULLERTON: So, I'll move approval of these, uh, the application, with staff 8 recommendations. 9 10 MR. MENENDEZ: I second. 11 MS. KAUTZ: Staff recommendations one, two 12 and three or --13 MR. FULLERTON: One through three. 14 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Is anybody adding my 15 friendly amendment? I will forced to vote a 16 Even though it'll pass but -- I guess not. 17 MS. KAUTZ: Was there a second to your 18 motion? 19 CHAIRMAN TORRE: There was. 2.0 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes. 21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: The motion is with conditions one through three. 22 23 MS. KAUTZ: Mm-hmm. 24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: But not four. 25 MR. EHRENHAFT: Correct.

	Page 105
1	MR. SILVA: Does it include Vinnie's
2	comments as well? To work with staff on the
3	fine details?
4	MR. FULLERTON: Yeah, the working with
5	staff comments, of course, yes.
6	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman?
7	CHAIRMAN TORRE: I'm reading the
8	conditions for one more one more time. Go
9	ahead. Do you have a question?
10	MR. RODRIGUEZ: No.
11	CHAIRMAN TORRE: I'm I'm going to ask
12	one last time before I put the vote. The
13	door's not it's not in the motion.
14	MR. FULLERTON: No.
15	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Okay.
16	MR. FULLERTON: Proceed.
17	MS. KAUTZ: Wait, wait. Say that
18	again? The what?
19	CHAIRMAN TORRE: The conditions are staff
20	approve staff recommendations.
21	MS. KAUTZ: But Alex confirmed that he was
22	amenable to working with staff to
23	incorporate
24	CHAIRMAN TORRE: As long as you are going
25	to request my request.

	Page 106
1	MS. KAUTZ: Yes.
2	MR. EHRENHAFT: Whatever that is, yes.
3	MS. BACHE-WIIG: That works for me.
4	MR. FULLERTON: I'll accept that.
5	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Thank you very much.
6	Go ahead, Jessie.
7	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
8	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
9	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Silva?
10	MR. SILVA: Yes.
11	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Menendez?
12	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
13	THE SECRETARY: Ms. Bache-Wiig?
14	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
15	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Parsley?
16	MR. PARSLEY: Yes.
17	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Rodriguez?
18	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
19	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Fullerton?
20	MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
21	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Torre?
22	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Yes.
23	MR. BRAVO: Thank you.
24	(Agenda item concluded.)
25	CHAIRMAN TORRE: This is Santa Maria

	rage ro,
1	that all right. So, Case File COA (SP)
2	2018-008. An application for the issuance of a
3	Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the
4	property at 4412 Santa Maria Street,
5	contributing resource within the Santa Maria
6	Historic District, legally described as the
7	south 15 feet of Lot 22 and all of Lot 23 and
8	Lot 24, less the south 15 feet of Block 93,
9	Coral Gables Country Club Section Part 5, as
10	recorded in Plat Book 25 uh, Plat Book 23,
11	Page 55, of the Public Records, Miami-Dade
12	County. This application request is on
13	approval for the addition and alterations to
14	the residence and also site work.
15	MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.
16	So moving up Santa Maria Street to the
17	north. This property is on the west side, um.
18	Again, it's a contributing residence within the
19	Santa Maria Historic District. It was designed
20	in 1941 by William Shanklin, traditional style
21	that plays on the Florida Pioneer Village found
22	throughout the street. It has undergone
23	alterations over the years, but does retain its
24	historic integrity.

This is a 1940's photograph of the home.

	Page 100
1	Um, this was, um, uh, the application I'm
2	sorry. The application, um, requests site
3	approval for additions to both the south and
4	the west of the home. Interior and exterior
5	renovations and some site work. It was
6	approved without comments by the Board of
7	Architects. Again, there are no variances, uh,
8	in conjunction with the application.
9	Staff has four minor comments at the end
10	of the report, but I'm going to turn it over to
11	the architect's office so they can walk you
12	through.
13	You're you're reading it? Okay.
14	I correct myself. The owner is giving the
15	presentation. Very rare that we have an owner
16	give a presentation, so
17	SPEAKER: Um, can you forward documents?
18	MS. KAUTZ: Sure.
19	MR. BAJANDAS: Good afternoon. My name is
20	Ricardo Bajandas. I am the owner with my wife,
21	Giovanna. Unfortunately, my architects skipped
22	town, so I'm here making the presentation.
23	Um, as stated, we're looking for a
24	Certificate of Appropriateness. The street
25	address, 4412 Santa Maria Street. Uh, these

2.0

Page 109

are pictures of the existing home. You'll see the, um, front in the lower center. Uh, the southern part of the house is on the lower left. The northern part of the house is on the lower right. The rear pictures, again, same orientation. Center is the, uh, the top center is the most western part. With the top right, the, uh, northern part and the top left, the southern part, as it exists now.

These are our home and surrounding homes. It gives you an indication of character of the street and those houses that surround or immediately abut our house.

This is a picture of the front of the house. This is as -- as was shown before, this, uh, the main section from column to column is the original part of the home.

Again, the rear, better picture of the rear with, um, the -- the main part of the house again being the -- uh, what you see from the top portion of the house, and then the both sides were additions after the original construction.

This is the footprint of the house as proposed. Uh, the intention of the design was

Page 110

to better utilize the lot area. The, uh, the spaces -- the spaces, uh, both in the rear and on the side yard. You can see from the existing plan that the, um, the design, uh, encompassed the pool area, but kind of left the western side of the property almost unusable. That's where the drain field is. And the way that it was cut off, and how the rest of the house is cut off from the side yard, it's very hard to use. This is again, uh, a more descriptive, uh, drawing of the existing residence.

The upstairs, as it exists currently with the roof lines as they currently exist. And then, this the, uh, more descriptive view of the design of the house, as proposed. On the left side is the master bedroom suite. It's got a den in between that connects the -- the original existing house to the new part of the house. And on the right side, that primarily remains the same, except that the garage is, uh, shows a little bit more of a detached format than it originally was, uh, in order to accentuate the main part of the house and to make it appear as if it was not so much of an

addition, as it appears currently.

2.0

Again, uh, the new upstairs, which has a new walk-out patio out back. Uh, it converts three bedrooms into four bedrooms and shows the new roof line, both of the, uh, the main a -- new addition on the left-hand side and a little bit of a reconfiguration of the roof line on the northern side.

Here you see, uh, the -- the top two drawings are the existing, as the house exists today. You see the -- the middle section shows the demolition, uh, notes. And then the -- the lower section is an elevation of how it's intended to be after construction. Same here. This is the, um, existing southernmost part of the house, with the lower portion being the new design.

This is, again, the top portion of the existing house and the bottom portion, the new design, um, with the new patio upstairs, the new portion of the house, the rear master bedroom the furthest to the right, the den in the middle with windows floor to ceiling, and then the left side stays mostly as it were -- was, it is currently now.

1 Here, you see a mass scene with the orange being the existing condition of the residence 2 and the blue showing the new addition, uh, with 3 4 the connective features. That's the front, 5 which again, the main portion of the house, the original portion of the house remains mainly 6 7 unchanged, with the exception that there is a, uh, entry door, you'll see on the left side of 8 9 the house, facing south. Same here. orange, your existing conditions. With the 10 11 blue, the new additions part of the house. 12 There is, uh, the walk-out space, again, upstairs. There's a -- a, uh, um, a, um, I 13 14 guess patio area, where the, um, um, the --15 SPEAKER: The covered pavilion. 16 MR. BAJANDAS: -- the covered pavilion. 17 Sorry. Which is right off of the master bedroom suite. And, there is the, uh, 18 renderings with the existing trees, as it would 19 look from the street. Uh, different view, 2.0 21 again with existing trees. Same from the rear, 22 with the pavilion and the, um, new gate. 23 one -- one distinctive element of the back is that the wall that is there now would be 24 25 replaced with a half wall and a part of, um, a

Page 113 railing, to allow a little bit more visibility 1 of the -- of the golf course. Little bit different view of the same elements, and you 3 4 get a little bit better view of the pavilion. 5 Um, we have noted the four conditions of the conditioned approval by the um, uh, 6 7 department staff. And we are amendable to all those recommended changes, um, with the 8 9 exception of some clarity on the issue of the, uh, restuccoed addition to be a different 10 11 texture. I'm not sure exactly what they mean, 12 if they can give some clarity on, um, that point. The rest of those are fine. 13 14 MS. KAUTZ: So, all that means is that, 15 um, the existing portions of the house aren't 16 to be re-stuccoed. If there's patching --17 MR. BAJANDAS: Right, we're not. 18 MS. KAUTZ: -- work to be done, that's 19 fine. 2.0 MR. BAJANDAS: Yeah, yeah. 21 MS. KAUTZ: Um, and then the addition, we ask that, um, the stucco be slightly different 22 23 texture. 24 MR. BAJANDAS: Okay. 25 MS. KAUTZ: Um, because I think you're

Page 114 fairly smooth. You're -- you're --1 MR. BAJANDAS: Right. It's not -- it's 3 not gonna be much notable. Yeah. 4 MS. KAUTZ: So just -- it'll be -- it, 5 yeah. It'll be like, a little bit. There's enou -- I think there's enough distinction in, 6 7 um, other aspects of the additions that distinguish them. You -- you -- you did some 8 9 very subtle variations of --MR. BAJANDAS: Yeah, one of the --10 MS. KAUTZ: -- some subtle things that I 11 12 think, um, I think it'll be fine. MR. BAJANDAS: One of the things that the 13 14 architect did try to do was that he didn't make 15 any of the additions flush --16 MS. KAUTZ: Right, right. 17 MR. BAJANDAS: -- with any of the sides, 18 so that it's clear that it's a different --19 that it's an --2.0 MS. KAUTZ: We like that. 21 MR. BAJANDAS: -- addition or separate 22 part of the house. 23 MS. KAUTZ: Yeah, we like that. MR. BAJANDAS: I'll be happy to ask --24 25 answer any questions I have the ability to

Coral Gables Historic Preservation Board June 21, 2018 Page 115 1 answer. MR. PARSLEY: So the pool's coming back to 3 us and the front gates are coming back to us? 4 They're both --They will -- they will come to 5 MS. KAUTZ: staff for a separate Certificate of 6 Appropriateness, um, as a standard. 7 MR. PARSLEY: And landscape plans, if any 8 9 are required? It says there's new landscape 10 area, new landscape plan. Do those come back? 11 MS. KAUTZ: Um, if you want them to. 12 Typically we do that administratively, unless you ask for it. She'll probably ask me for it. 13 14 She's a landscape architect, that's why. 15 MR. BAJANDAS: Okay. The pool itself will 16 actually -- we need to make it a little bit 17 smaller, because it's much, too big for the 18 area in the back and almost -- today it almost 19 encompasses the full back yard it's a little 2.0 bit ridiculous in terms of -- of the size 21 compared to it. So we just want to shorten it 22 up a little bit. 23 MR. PARSLEY: Well, well, you have some nice little niches for courtyards off the 24

study. Um, in the -- in the front area, you

25

Page 116 have, um, the existing living room walking down 1 in there. You ought to take some time and, uh, look to develop those as -- as little garden 3 4 rooms instead of just a sodded -- a few little 5 bushes on the foundation. MR. BAJANDAS: Sure. Yeah. 6 7 MR. PARSLEY: I -- I would recommend that. Do I need to see it? No. 8 9 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Kara, you -- you look at shop drawings for railings and -- and -- and 10 11 garage doors, right? That's part of --12 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. CHAIRMAN TORRE: -- you do that anyway? 13 14 MS. KAUTZ: Mm-hmm. MR. SILVA: I think that -- that rear 15 16 elevation is a significant improvement over 17 what's there now. That -- that addition, kind 18 of covered terrace addition is coming down. And the one you're replacing it with I think is 19 much more in character with the house. Um, so 2.0 21 I -- I appreciate that. I think that's --22 MR. BAJANDAS: Yeah. 23 MR. SILVA: -- that's an important facade on the -- on the house as well --24 25 MS. KAUTZ: Mm-hmm.

Page 117 1 MR. SILVA: -- especially on these Santa Maria homes. 3 MR. BAJANDAS: Yeah. 4 MR. SILVA: I know the golf course 5 facade --(Crosstalk) 6 7 MR. BAJANDAS: We've, um, we've tried to buy two or three different historic homes. 8 9 we really appreciate this street in the area. 10 And we -- our desire is to keep it consistent 11 with the street. We live there, members of the 12 club, board member of the club. The whole area is very important to us. So we understand 13 14 the -- and appreciate the comments from the 15 Historic Board. 16 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Anybody else from the 17 audience want to speak on -- on this site? 18 (No response) 19 CHAIRMAN TORRE: We'll close the public 2.0 hearing. Thank you very much. 21 MR. BAJANDAS: Thank you very much. 22 CHAIRMAN TORRE: All I can do is nudge you guys. I have to sit here and wait. 23 24 (Crosstalk) 25 MS. KAUTZ: This is the quietest you guys

have ever been. 1 MS. BACHE-WIIG: I'll echo, um, Alex's comments. I think it's a real enhancement to 3 4 the property and to the view, to the golf 5 course. Um, I think that adding that railing on that wall, to not have it be so bulky, you 6 7 know, is a positive. And just echoing Mr. Parsley's comments about softening the hard 8 9 edges on that, which I guess you're just not 10 showing the landscaping now but, you know, in 11 the future, do that. 12 MR. SILVA: I agree. 13 MR. BAJANDAS: Just, uh, one comment. As -- as a member --14 15 MS. KAUTZ: Excuse me. 16 MR. BAJANDAS: -- of the club, the -- the constant comment we get is how bad that wall 17 18 looks. So that was the first thing that was 19 on -- that we asked for when we met with the 2.0 architect, was to get rid of or soften the 21 wall. 22 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Anybody else? MS. KAUTZ: Yeah, you guys are quiet. 23 24 CHAIRMAN TORRE: More comments? 25 MR. SILVA: I hit my quota for motions.

	Page 119
1	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Albert?
2	MR. MENENDEZ: I think it's great. I
3	think it's a big improvement over what's there.
4	I walk by there every day, so. I, uh, commend
5	you for going the distance.
6	MS. KAUTZ: And?
7	MR. MENENDEZ: And with that and with
8	that okay. Well, I motion to approve.
9	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Second?
10	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Wait. With conditions?
11	MR. MENENDEZ: With the conditions
12	stipulated by staff.
13	MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.
14	MS. BACHE-WIIG: I'll second.
15	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Perfect. Any further
16	discussion?
17	(No response)
18	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Jessie, go ahead.
19	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Parsley?
20	MR. PARSLEY: Yes.
21	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Fullerton?
22	MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
23	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Rodriguez?
24	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
25	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

	Page 120
1	MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
2	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Silva?
3	MR. SILVA: Yes.
4	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Menendez?
5	MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
6	THE SECRETARY: Ms. Bache-Wiig?
7	MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
8	THE SECRETARY: Mr. Torre?
9	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Yes.
10	MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Thank you.
12	MR. BAJANDAS: Thank you all.
13	(Agenda item concluded.)
14	CHAIRMAN TORRE: Rafael, what have you
15	done to this board to deserve always being
16	last? Is there something I don't know?
17	MR. PORTUONDO: Today's my anniversary.
18	MR. SILVA: Happy anniversary.
19	MS. KAUTZ: Better be a good gift if you
20	had to sit here.
21	CHAIRMAN TORRE: All right. Let's go to
22	the last one for today. This is Case File COA
23	(SP) 2015-005 Revised. An application for the
24	issuance of a Special Certificate of
25	Appropriateness for the property at 4209 Santa
1	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Page 121

Maria Street, a Local Historic Landmark and a contributing structure within the Santa Maria Street Historic District. This is legally described as Lots 11, 12 of Block 96, Coral Gables Country Club Section Part Five, according to the Plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 23, at Page 55, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The application requesting design approval for addition and alterations to the residence which were -which was approved with conditions on June, 18, The revision requests design approval 2015. for modification of previously approved shutters and the installation of louvers in lieu of screen doors.

MS. KAUTZ: All right. So a few months back this came to you as a discussion about the, um, the modifications to the window shutters, um, on the residence. And at that time the louvers were starting to be discussed. Uh, you all made a motion to defer the item to take them both together, um, which is why we're back here.

So, um, I'm gonna turn over to the architect and I'll more to say. Sorry. We're

still in Santa Maria. Now on the other side of 1 the street. This is the site, 1940's photo that you guys have seen before. And that's 3 4 your presentation, so front, back. Mm-hmm. 5 MR. PORTUONDO: Thank you. Rafael Portuondo, Portuondo Perotti Architects. 6 7 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry? Rafael Portuondo, 8 MR. PORTUONDO: Portuondo Perotti Architects, 5717 S.W. 8th 9 10 Street. 11 Um, one of the things that -- that I 12 think, um, I just want to, uh, clarify is that, 13 um, when one goes through a design process and 14 one gets conflicted between life safety and 15 historic, um, one of the things that I did was I made sure that I took care of life safety. 16 17 And the mistake that I made was that I didn't go back to historic to make sure that what 18 19 other decisions I was making were the correct 2.0 ones. Um, one of the things that I've always 21 taken pride in is that whenever I have a design 22 dilemma, that I don't give up for the fact that 23 it was a life safety issue, that I really fought for something beautiful. And I believe 24 25 that what we did was something beautiful.

2.0

Page 123

So, um, you -- I wanted to thank you for going by the house the other day. Um, it's actually a project I'm really proud of. Um, they're a great couple and they've been instrumental to make sure that the inside of the house and the outside of the house is quite beautiful.

Um, it's still the same house in terms of the house that you saw yesterday. The issue that we have is the -- the louvers on the -- on the back edge of the golf course. Um, when we were doing our fences and perimeter, uh, one of the things that came up was the fact that the screen enclosure wouldn't act as a life safety barrier. So one of the things that we ended up doing was, um, going to talk to Manny. And we came up with different solutions, some of them that I didn't like and some of them that I thought were more appropriate to the style of the house.

One of the reasons why it came back -- it came back as a life safety issue is because the screens themselves don't act as a fence. So we don't have a fence in the back yard. So one of the things that we ended up was in talking to

2.0

Page 124

Manny, a typical fence has to be 48 inches high. And I thought that something that was 48 inches high, when you're sitting in a chair on a golf course, wouldn't work. The other thing that came up was that it still had to have separation no more than 4 inches because it had to act as a fence. So I didn't actually know what to do. So I started to research different types of shuttering systems. And we looked at wood ones, but the wood was too thin; they wouldn't hold up. It had to have an NOA. So we ended up finding a product with NOA.

One of the things that I thought was actually when one goes through a design process, one is constantly looking to improve. So I've always taken the opportunity to do something that's better than what I originally thought I was doing. So some of the things that I thought were for the positiveness was the fact that, if you look at the -- this, those sort of black squares on the top, are actually the actual screen doors. Uh, one of the things that -- that you start to look at in terms of the louvers on the back was that they're proportionately narrower. So it

2.0

Page 125

actually looks more like -- historically like a shutter, like a louvered shutter door composition.

So in taking the pictures, one of the things that -- that it does is, the lower rail of the louvers is 30 inches and one of the -- and I'm gonna kind of go -- and I'm gonna come back to this. But one of the things that I always thought in terms of beauty is that sort of transparency and the light that comes through the louvered doors. I've always loved and have seen in Coral Gables those old scre -- those old, uh, louvered -- metal louvered porches. Like, I've always thought those were the coolest things ever. So when we saw this product, I thought this was -- this was actually along the lines of what I've always seen to be historic in Coral Gables.

My -- my uncle, which is Desi Arnaz's house, which is a house that's on Alhambra, is actually a house that had, uh, jalousie windows. And I remember going into that and saying, wow, it was just such a strong statement. But there's also houses on the golf course and on some of the interior houses that

2.0

Page 126

had sleeping porches that were actually metal louvered porches. So I've always seen that as something that is typical of Coral Gables and typical of that.

One of the things that -- that I also looked at, this is George Rosington Smith (sic), which is a sort of -- it was a house that I looked at that was actually comparable in terms of eaves and details and things, the white, the roof, with, uh, the style of house that we have.

So, um, I started to research. I started to research for Manny Lopez. So in order to prove to Manny that this could work, right?

Um, and we ended up looking at different historical types. And the conclusion that I came to was the louvered windows were in the warmer climates and the solid shutters were in the -- in the northern climates in order to keep the heat into the house. It -- it didn't matter to me at that point it was just an interesting observation. But one of the things that did come up was the fact that we were looking at louvers that were actually in keeping with the historical context of Coral

Page 127

Gables. And when you look at shutters like these on windows and you looked at these here where you have the transparency of the indoor/outdoor, I just thought it was a beautiful thing. And I -- and I thought it was contextually appropriate.

Um, so in -- in doing that, one of the things that I ended up doing was, um, making the system work. So one of the things that I always look at is, once you make a design decision, is it -- is the decision consistent throughout? So, uh, if I needed to make decisions based on life safety and -- and the decisions that have to do with a 4-inch object, has to have an NOA, has to have this, has to have, uh, a wall that's -- that's 48 inches high, but the wall that's 48 inches high is absorbed into the louvers, so you don't have to -- you don't have to designate a 48-inch high wall.

Um, so in -- in doing all of that, um, I thought we did a great job. But at the end of the day, Manny Lopez is not historic and that's -- from the day that I tried to solve a life safety issue, till the day that I met with

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 128

Kara, I can honestly tell you that I haven't had a good night's sleep since that day.

So, um, I'm here just to let you know that even though I was dealing with a life safety issue, I never gave up the intent of design. It was never a compromise to the house. It was never looked at as, oh, you know, so, um, I think that from that day on, I think every time I've talked to Kara, I've always started it off by saying I'm really, really sorry. And this is like a lesson for me, because sometimes when you're working on a job and you're trying to get the CO, you're trying to do this, um, you don't always dot your I's and cross your T's. But I just want to let you guys know that in no circumstance was something done to actually take a shortcut in any way. So, um, that's really, uh, what I wanted to say, so.

CHAIRMAN TORRE: Did -- did we throw up the French shutters last time?

MR. PORTUONDO: The French shutters was out of the question. Was that -- are you -- Venny, you -- you bring a good point. And so we all -- and so I also met with Dona, Kara, ElizaBeth, and Carlos Mindreau who's here in

Page 129

the audience today. So one of the things that we concluded with Dona was that she was okay with the louver, the louvers -- the louvers on the back and she was okay with the shutters on the house except the four shutters in the front.

So one of the things that I think I showed most of you, it's actually a -- it's actually not a very good drawing. So, the -- the existing shutters broke, the -- the new shutters are broken up into three. There were -- there were a couple things that were, uh, mistakes from our end in terms of the design, which was the -- the shutters that we ordered actually matched the door; they didn't match the opening. So they looked smaller than they should have looked like on the side of the house.

The second thing that I think, um, and I'm agreeing with is -- I'm agreeing with Dona in that it fell short of what it should have been. So the bottom part of the shutter, which is actually solid, is actually sill height. The horizontal louver of the next piece of that shutter goes to the transom, to the bottom of

2.0

Page 130

the transom with -- which has a horizontal, uh, rail. And then the upper portion of the shutter is actually arched to match that. So it's actually a three-part, um, it's gonna make a three-part uh, shutter, which in many ways are like that type where -- I'm assuming that behind there, there's a door with a transom and then it breaks down into different sections of the shutter. So it actually reinforces that as a design intent of the house. Um, so, um, that's basically that.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Are these shutters decorative or are they actually operable?

MR. PORTUONDO: They're operable. And the good thing about them is that, for example, if you wanted to, there's two parts to these shutters, a lower section and the upper section. So here I -- I actually closed the bottom section and left the top section open. So let's supposing you're sitting in a chair, in your bathing suit, you don't want the golfers to come and see you, that was actually something that was actually a good thing with this system, right? And then I have another image right here that you don't notice the

bottom section because the bottom section's 1 So at that point it actually opens up 3 all the way. So you can -- you actually 4 control the privacy within the covered terrace. 5 MS. KAUTZ: The four on the front, are they going to be operable or are they going to 6 7 be faux? Yeah, that's right. 8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: 9 MS. KAUTZ: That was your question? 10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: That's what I meant, the front ones. 11 12 MR. PORTUONDO: I'm sorry. Um, they're 13 gonna be -- we're actually -- something else 14 that was, uh, we're actually adding hinges to 15 all the shutters of the house and they're gonna 16 be operable. Now, the fact that they're gonna 17 use them for --18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: For hurricanes. 19 MR. PORTUONDO: -- you know, for 2.0 hurricane, they're not because all the windows 21 are product -- or our product approval's in there, but they're -- we're adding the hinges 22 23 and we're adding, um, the S curve on it. And 24 part of going back to the Board of Architects was that we had to show them the hinges and we 25

had to show them everything else. 1 It's actually on the drawings. But at that -- at this scale and with this projector, you can't 3 see them. But part of -- of -- of working 4 5 with, uh, Historic was to make sure that the hinges were on and that was a prerequisite from 6 7 Dona. MS. KAUTZ: You also as part of the 8 9 deferral recommended or required that they go back to Board of Architects with the louvers 10 because they had not seen them before. Um, 11 12 they did on -- what was the date -- on, uh, March 1st, um, and their -- one of their 13 14 comments was add hardware to the shutters, um. 15 And they had another comment to add, uh, 16 cladding the -- the structural columns between 17 the louvers. And staff, our end, actually

MR. MINDREAU: Good evening. For the record, my name is Carlos Mindreau. I'm the city architect.

recommended against that. So they did not

incorporate that second, which is fine. We're

Um, members of the board, I'd like to say that my comments, um, are gonna be strictly

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

good.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 133

architectural. I believe that the historic relevance of the project is well-handled by the Historic Preservation Board and the staff.

I happened to be present at the meeting that, uh, Dona, Kara, uh, Ralph, myself, and the owners of the property were present, uh, when we were reviewing the particular research at hand and the project in general.

Um, architecturally speaking, uh, I think that the project, uh, from the golf side is superb. It's delicate. It's -- the proportions of the overall -- the existing house, the original historic house, and the addition even though it's significant, uh, are just in beautiful symphony with each other. Uh, as you approach the house from Santa Maria, the entry court takes such a great deal of prevalence in the overall scheme that the historic house is really where you go. addition, significant as it is, um, takes a -takes a step back to the history of the -- of the building. Uh, I think this is superbly done, typical to, uh, Ralph Portuondo's projects. The detailing is, you know, I -- I can't tell you enough, is subtle and

1	beautifully	carried	out.

2.0

The history of the house as you walk through the interior of the house, the history of the house is very prevalent. But the execution of the details of the -- of the programming that it has is extremely crisp and actually it's far into the history, but it blends in and -- and speaks to it so delicately that it's really beautiful.

I wanted to say these things, uh, from the architectural point because I think it was -- it's important. Um, I really do believe that staff will handle the historic aspects well.

If you have any questions for me, I'd be happy to answer them.

CHAIRMAN TORRE: I think we're gonna close the public hearing. And if anybody else has questions? For Mr. Portuondo, for staff? If not, we'll leave it for deliberation. Thank you.

MS. KAUTZ: All right. Can I -- may I ask? I just have one question. And I forgot to ask you this the other day. The -- the louvers as they are installed now, are they fixed in place?

	Page 13:
1	MR. MINDREAU: Yes.
2	MS. KAUTZ: Okay. That was one of the
3	conditions of zoning, that they actually be
4	fixed in place and not be operable. Um, I
5	mean, they can move this way, but the panels
6	themselves have to be fixed in place if they
7	MR. EHRENHAFT: They do not swing like
8	doors, is what you're saying.
9	MS. KAUTZ: Correct. They have to be the
10	pool barrier and if they're allowed to free
11	swing, then it so, that's all I wanted to
12	say. They're already fixed.
13	MR. SILVA: Just out of curiosity if if
14	you wanted to make them swing, could you input
15	a closer just like a gate, like a a
16	self-closer?
17	MR. PORTUONDO: Well, one of the things
18	that
19	MR. SILVA: Or is that the deal?
20	MR. PORTUONDO: we looked into was
21	one of the things that I was looking into was
22	not to make it more complicated than I've
23	already made it, so.
24	MR. SILVA: Understood. Understood.
25	Perfect.

Page 136 1 CHAIRMAN TORRE: They got a lot accomplished with what they had to do. 3 MR. FULLERTON: Yes, I'd like to, uh, 4 thank you, uh, for, uh, inviting us over there 5 to see the place, because it's actually one of the most beautiful homes I've seen in Coral 6 7 Gables that I, uh, echo Mr. Mindreau's comments, because it's beautifully, beautifully 8 handled. 9 10 MR. PORTUONDO: Thank you. 11 MR. FULLERTON: And I don't want you to go 12 walk out of here with a great big head, you know, but really it is a lovely, lovely --13 14 MR. PORTUONDO: I -- I'm humbled being here today, I gotta tell you. 15 16 MR. FULLERTON: No, every -- every part of 17 it was, uh, beautifully thought out and --18 MR. PORTUONDO: Thank you, John. 19 MR. FULLERTON: So I'd like to, um, uh, 2.0 make the motion to approve it. 21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Second. 22 CHAIRMAN TORRE: We've got motion. 23 have a second. Any further discussion? 24 (No response.) 25 CHAIRMAN TORRE: All right.

Page 137
1 MR. PORTUONDO: Thank you. And again,
2 sorry for
3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: We haven't voted yet.
4 MR. PORTUONDO: Okay. That's true. Like
5 I said, thank you, because it's my
6 CHAIRMAN TORRE: You haven't been punished
7 enough.
8 MR. PORTUONDO: Yeah.
9 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Just kidding.
10 All right. Jessie, go ahead.
11 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Rodriguez?
12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
13 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
14 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
15 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Silva?
16 MR. SILVA: Yes.
17 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Menendez?
18 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
19 THE SECRETARY: Ms. Bache-Wiig?
20 MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
21 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Parsley?
MS. KAUTZ: He he left. Absent.
23 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
25 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Torre?

Page 138 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Yes. 1 MR. MENENDEZ: Now you can get a good 3 night's sleep. 4 MR. PORTUONDO: Thank you. And I --5 again, sorry for the -- for the whole thing. 6 BOARD MEMBER: I'm tired of searching for 7 those shutters for another beautiful mid century project. That -- those can go on 8 9 anything. 10 MR. PORTUONDO: Yeah, it's really -- it's 11 just got a way which is --12 BOARD MEMBER: Yeah, I was amazed. 13 MR. PORTUONDO: So, uh, thank you guys 14 and --15 BOARD MEMBER: Thank you. 16 MR. PORTUONDO: -- have a great evening. MR. FULLERTON: Motion to --17 18 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Well, let's see if staff 19 has anything else. No, one second. 2.0 MR. FULLERTON: All right. 21 MS. KAUTZ: Um, I don't have anything. 22 CHAIRMAN TORRE: You have nothing? 23 MS. KAUTZ: I've got nothing. 24 CHAIRMAN TORRE: I've got nothing. 25 MS. KAUTZ: It's been that kind of week.

Page 139 I've got nothing else. 1 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Well, I like it. all, you guys did a lot of good work. 3 So I 4 think we should always give you the compliment 5 when you --6 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. 7 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Not that you never. 8 always do good work. But there's a lot of stuff that went in it. 9 MS. KAUTZ: I -- but again, that city plan 10 11 designation was always -- phenomenal. 12 Phenomenal. 13 CHAIRMAN TORRE: These agendas, when you 14 have six things to do, I can only imagine how 15 much -- how much work you guys put in when it's 16 six, seven items on the agenda. It's crazy. 17 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. 18 CHAIRMAN TORRE: We have something. 19 MR. PORTUONDO: I just want to thank 2.0 Carlos for coming and waiting patiently for 21 this last on the agenda. 22 CHAIRMAN TORRE: There you go. 23 MR. PORTUONDO: I actually wanted to be last because I didn't want to -- if there was 24 25 gonna be a show, I didn't want to put it front

Page 140 of everybody. 1 CHAIRMAN TORRE: All right. 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You know, you might want 4 to publish that report. 5 MS. KAUTZ: I told Carlos to give it to the Board of Architects as reading as a 6 homework because it's set. CHAIRMAN TORRE: Yeah, that should be --8 that should be available. 9 10 MS. KAUTZ: It's -- it's a great resource. 11 MR. EHRENHAFT: They should bind it and 12 make it publicly available, even if it's at 13 cost, you know? 14 MS. KAUTZ: Well, she has to go to grad school and submit it first, because it's 15 16 totally worthy of something. I don't know 17 what, but, yeah. 18 CHAIRMAN TORRE: All right. With that 19 being said, motion for adjournment? 2.0 MR. FULLERTON: I move that. 21 CHAIRMAN TORRE: Those in favor? (Board members respond "aye.") 22 23 MR. SILVA: Thank you all. 24 (Thereupon, the meeting concluded at 25 6:24 p.m.)

	Page 141
1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF FLORIDA)
4	COUNTY OF BROWARD)
5	
6	I, LILLIAN GADOMSKI, Professional Court
7	Reporter and Notary Public, certify that I was
8	authorized to and did stenographically report the
9	foregoing proceedings, and that the transcript is a
10	true and complete record of my stenographic notes.
11	
12	Dated this 5th day of July, 2018.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	LILLIAN GADOMSKI
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	