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MR. TORRE: Good afternoon, everybody, and welcome to the regularly scheduled meeting of the City of Coral Gables Historic Preservation Board. We, the residents of Coral Gables, are charged with the preservation and protection of historic architecturally worthy buildings, structures, sites, neighborhoods and artifacts which impart a distinct historical heritage to 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 commission. Five votes are neccessary to -- I'm sorry. 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 must register with the City of Coral Gables prior to engaging in lobbying activities, presentations before city staff, boards, committees and the city commission. A copy of the ordinance is available in the office of the city clerk.

Failure to register and provide proof of registration shall prohibit your ability to present to the Historic Preservation Board 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 the city personnel during the time period of the entire decision-making process on the action, decision or recommendation which foreseeably will be heard or reviewed by the city commission, a city board or committee, including, but not limited to, quasi-judicial advisory board, trust, authority or council.

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

I now officially call the City of Coral
Gables Historic Preservation Board meeting of October 18th, 2018, to order. The time is 4:07.

Present today to my left, Jan Thomson, Raul Rodriguez. We have Al Silva, Mr. Albert Menendez, Mr. John Fullerton, Mr. Bruce Ehrenhaft, Miss Alicia Bache-Wiig.

Next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes from the meeting held on September 20th, 2018. Is there any changes or corrections? No. If not, is there a motion for approval?

MS. THOMSON: I move.
MR. TORRE: Janice moves. Is there a second?
MR. MENENDEZ: Second.
MR. TORRE: Mr. Menendez. All those in favor, please say aye.

THE COMMISSIONERS: (Collectively) Aye.
MR. TORRE: All those against? Thank you.
Notice regarding ex parte communications: Be advised this board is a quasi-judicial board and items on the agenda are quasi-judicial in nature which requires 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 of 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,

the property at 1106 Tangier Street, legally described as Lot Three, Coral Gables Granada Terrace, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 16, Page 73 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The applicant is also requesting the issuance of an accelerated special certificate of appropriateness and design approval for alterations to the residence and site work. A variance has also been requested from Article Five, Section 5-1409 (B) (1) for the elimination of the required off-street parking.

MS. GUIN: Good afternoon. This is a historic photo of the property under consideration, 1106 Tangier Street. The property is located on interior lots on the west side of Tangier, 50 by 100. The designation was requested by the owner.

The property was cited by code enforcement in August 2017 for a series of issues, including enclosing the garage without a permit and for a lack of off-street covered parking, which we will address if you designate the property with a certificate of appropriateness.

I do want to say up front that that the current owners are not the ones who did the series of alterations without a permit, which they have been working very diligently with code enforcement to try to rectify the situation.

So reading for the record, in Article Three, Section 3-1103 of the Coral Gables zoning code, the criteria for designation of a historic landmark, the local historic landmark must have significant character, interest or value as part of the historical, cultural, archaeological, aesthetic or architectural heritage of the city, state or nation.

For designation, the property must meet one of the criteria outlined in the code. Staff has identified three significant criteria for this property. Historical cultural significance exemplifies the historical, cultural, political, economic or social trends of the community, and also based on its architectural significance, 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, or period, or method of construction.

Here we have another historical photo. We do not have original building permit drawings for this property. We don't have a record of the permits. We've identified that we believe it was built, it definitely was built by 1924, and we'll go through that a little bit quickly how we come to that conclusion, and it may actually be earlier than that.

The property is located in the Coral Gables Granada Terrace up in the Granada section. You can see the blow-up to the side, that red strip. The Granada Terrace section is actually a very small section, about two blocks at the 1100 and 1200 block of Tangier between Mariana Avenue and Venetia Terrace.

So to put some perspective on this property and the Granada Terrace section, we go back and we look at the Coral Gables map of 1922 when Merrick was launching his plan. You can see Section $F$ up at the north, that was the only portion of that area of land that Merrick owned connecting his holdings up to Tamiami Trail, and it was just a lot straight along Granada Boulevard.

So the area in yellow here is what became the Granada section, and records indicate that acquiring the land up in this area was a huge priority for Merrick. So that map, this map is from ' 22 .

By '24, he has amassed a fair amount of that. A lot of the land -- the land in that area was initially platted by, to the Cocoanut Grove Development Company in 1911. They still owned a fair amount of that land. They sold that land to Merrick. There were some private land owners that also sold their land to Merrick, but as you can see, there are areas where private land owners that had not yet sold, and the Granada Terrace section is one
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| 1 | section of that. |
| 2 | That land was held by Emma and Everett |
| 3 | Pierson who were real estate investors, did a lot of work |
| 4 | in Miami at this time. |
| 5 | Now, they were obviously pretty savvy to |
| 6 | develop this knowing that Merrick wanted it, and they |
| 7 | shopped a pretty good bargain at the end. |
| 8 | So the Piersons platted this area in 1925 and |
| 9 | they continued to negotiate, and then that, this little |
| 10 | section was annexed by the city in May of 1926. |
| 11 | The first building permits for this area were |
| 12 | issued in July 1926, and they were for 1112 and 1113 |
| 13 | Tangier, and we see where 1106 Tangier is on this plat |
| 14 | map. However, when you look at the siting for this |
| 15 | property, you notice that it's all the way back along the |
| 16 | rear property line, not at all how the rest of the houses |
| 17 | on, in this area are sited. |
| 18 | But when we go back and we have this sort of |
| 19 | working office map that Merrick's office and the city |
| 20 | later used where they're recording permit numbers, and as |
| 21 | the land sold, and what you see outlined here in the red |
| 22 | is 11 -- there's the blow-up -- 1108 Tangier which was the |
| 23 | initial address of the property. Very soon it was changed |
| 24 | to 1106, and you can see that they have a structure noted |
| 25 | on the property. |

Now, the other properties, 1112, 1113, right next to it, you can see their permit numbers. We know that they were permitted in '26.

So doing some sleuthing and trying to figure out what that meant, you know, why are they showing a building there when they don't show it in other places, there's two other structures like that just a block away on Wallace, again these properties are sited along the rear property line. They don't have building permits. Tax records date to 1924,1923 , and that's the same as the tax records for 1106 Tangier.

You can see the historic photo of 1120 Wallace, so with a little more sleuthing, we determined that these structures that are on this working map are structures that were in place before Merrick acquired the property.

Then here's an aerial photo just to give you a sense of the siting of these properties. See the red arrow points to 1106 Tangier, how it sits on that rear property line and how the structure of the wall actually straddle the property, making it pretty clear that they were built before this area was plotted.

Here we have a current photo of the property. See how it sits all the way to the back, and this area pretty much follows the development pattern that we see
throughout the city. We have the huge investment of constructing in the Granada section by Merrick in the early '20s. As he's acquiring the land, he's throwing everything he's got at developing it.

The Piersons held out. They didn't develop their land until later in the '20s.

Then by 1930, it appears that all the building permits pretty much stopped in this area, picked up again in the '40s. We begin to see that in the aerial photo from '48, and then the area was built out in 1950s.

It was then and continues to be a single family residential neighborhood.

The property was built in the Mediterranean revival style, and we see many of the character-defining features that we see in the later buildings that Merrick and his team designed with the thick masonry walls, the clay-colored stucco, the varied windows, predominantly casements, the rectilinear floor plan, roofs of varying heights. We have the parapets, a porte cochere, projecting bays that has an inset ceramic plaque, the wing walls with the recessed windows.

There again is a view of the front facade as it stands today. Here is the porte cochere that was turned into a garage that has been later enclosed. You see it has those distinctive convex shoulder corner arch,
the Mission-inspired parapets with delineated corners, two-piece barrel tile edging.

The central section was originally a front porch that was enclosed. Inside, though, you -- they still have the original tile from the front porch, so when you walk into the home, you can definitely read from where the front porch was versus the rest of the living space, and here's a close-up of that inset ceramic plaque that was original from the structure. You can see the wing wall jutting out to the south here from what was the front porch area, screened front porch, and then the southern bay that has the shed roof, two-piece barrel tile with these wooden carved outriggers.

Walking towards the back of the property, we're now straddling the back property line. This is the south facade with the side rear door.

Now, there have been several alterations to the property, no additions. As we talked about, the front porch was enclosed, originally a screened front porch. The original tile from the floor still remains. The windows, the original windows were changed out in 1994, and then just recently in 2007 to impact resistant windows. The garage was enclosed.

The shed mansard roof on the southern bay, and I'll show you what I'm talking about there, was clad
in two-piece barrel tile, and then those carved outriggers were added at some point.

The front door opening was widened. The wing walls coming out from the porte cochere and the planter in front of the front porch and the the hood over the front door were removed at some point. The brick patio was added and the house was restuccoed.

Now, in doing a little bit of research, looking to see and verify that these actually were not permitted, the owner that owned the property in the mid-'90s until 2013 advertised that he was running a carpentry building out of this site, and so all evidence points to the fact that that owner is the one that did all of these modifications without a permit.

Here is that sort of shed mansard, unique thing that happens on this roof line on that southern bay. When I first looked at the first historic photo, I was thinking they were in the middle of doing something, but it shows up in both historic photos, and these photos are about ten years apart, so it's just sort of a unique, odd condition that then gets clad with the tile and the outriggers added.

Now, as I said, the home has been restuccoed. This is looking west where the porte cochere sort of juts out. This back piece for some reason wasn't restuccoed so
we get a -- we can see what the original stucco looked like, and we have a road map that if we were to ever have the house restuccoed again, we would ask that it go back to its original texture.

So the home at 1106 Tangier maintains its original massing and many of the character-defining features of the Mediterranean revival style and retains its historic integrity.

In summary, the modest single family residence at 1106 Tangier Street is significant as an early example of the Mediterranean revival style of Coral Gables. Founder George Merrick and his design team felt that this type of architecture harmonized with the South Florida climate and lifestyle and this house exemplifies the building archetype on which Coral Gables was founded.

Built in the early '20s, it was the first home constructed in the Granada Terrace section and predates the platting of the section and the city's acquisition of the subdivision. It is in keeping, however, with the contemporaneous homes built in the Granada section by Merrick's team and it tells another piece of the city's history.

The house is set back along the rear property line, distinguishing it from the other homes on the block that were built in Granada Terrace after it was platted.
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| 1 | The home retains its historic integrity, and |
| 2 | staff is recommending approval for the local historic |
| 3 | designation of the property at 1106 Tangier. Any |
| 4 | questions? |
| 5 | MR. TORRE: I have a question, but it relates |
| 6 | to the construction, so I'll just wait. |
| 7 | MS. GUIN: Okay. |
| 8 | MR. FULLERTON: Do we know who the architect |
| 9 | was? |
| 10 | MS. GUIN: We don't. |
| 11 | MR. FULLERTON: It wasn't anybody on |
| 12 | Merrick's team? |
| 13 | MS. GUIN: It could have been because they |
| 14 | definitely were building in the Granada section at that |
| 15 | time. |
| 16 | MR. FULLERTON: Yes. |
| 17 | MS. GUIN: But we haven't been able to verify |
| 18 | that and there doesn't seem to be any proof. |
| 19 | MR. SILVA: I think your report, ElizaBeth, |
| 20 | stated it very well. I think the house merits designation |
| 21 | based on its architectural merits as well as its kind of |
| 22 | strange history that it predates the platting of that |
| 23 | area, so I'm for designation. |
| 24 | MR. TORRE: Just to be clear, and I think we |
| 25 | talked, the windows do not get locked in. The windows are |
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| 1 | too fast. |
| 2 | MR. FULLERTON: Does the staff think that |
| 3 | house was built so far back because it wasn't platted yet |
| 4 | and the lot might have gone all the way through to the |
| 5 | next street? |
| 6 | MS. GUIN: Yes. That is certainly what it |
| 7 | looks like when you look at those houses on Wallace. |
| 8 | MR. FULLERTON: That really puts it in an |
| 9 | awkward position to do anything. |
| 10 | MS. MEDINA: Right, yes. |
| 11 | MS. GUIN: Exactly, and that's been the |
| 12 | struggle, to try to -- |
| 13 | MS. MEDINA: Right. |
| 14 | MR. FULLERTON: I think you've done -- |
| 15 | MR. TORRE: I'm sorry. |
| 16 | MR. FULLERTON: To take it on. |
| 17 | MS. MEDINA: Yes, but you know, I have a |
| 18 | small son so I definitely need that space, and I bought it |
| 19 | as it is, and you know, I'm trying -- |
| 20 | MS. GUIN: She was unaware -- |
| 21 | MS. MEDINA: Right. |
| 22 | MS. GUIN: -- all the hurdles we had to |
| 23 | cross. |
| 24 | MR. TORRE: No more questions? I'll close |
| 25 | the public hearing. |



MS. GUIN: So we are considering an accelerated special certificate of appropriateness for design approval and alterations to the residence and site work, and they're asking for a variance for the inclusion of off-street parking. Again, this is to comply with current code enforcement citations.

Here is a photo of the house in 2016 when it was for sale, and you can see a lot of these violations are already in place, and $I$ do want to say once again that the owner has been working very diligently to come into compliance.

So when she was cited for not having an off-street parking, she designed a carport, porte cochere, attached to the front, to the front of this, went to the board of architects numerous times, all working together to try and find something that worked with this property, and just couldn't come up with something that everybody was happy with.

At some point somebody brilliant on the board of architects, may have been Nelson, I don't know, suggested that they come to Historic and begin to talk to us about perhaps waiving that requirement because they just couldn't come up with a resolution that everybody was happy with, so that's how the property came to us.

Dona was in agreement that a variance was
certainly warranted for the siting of the house. Enclosing the garage with an enclosed -- the square footage is under 1,000 foot for this, so we don't have any issue with the remaining enclosed and waiving the off-street parking.

Here is the views from the front and the side. It has a large window along the side. See how it's set back?

When this plan, moving forward, keeping the garage enclosed and waiving the off-street parking, the board of architects just had two comments which you can see in your report, that the doors mimic the sort of carriage doors and that they be installed with clear cypress wood, and also making sure that the relief, that the doors were set back so that porte cochere still reads and those rounded corners remain and that detail not be touched.

MR. FULLERTON: They didn't mention putting the wing walls back on, did they?

MS. GUIN: It was mentioned, but it wasn't part of -- the board of architects didn't make that part of the comments.

MR. FULLERTON: Were they aware of it?
MS. GUIN: They were aware of it, and we sort of had that discussion. We're not requiring it as part of


MS SPAIN: That's a question for them.
MS. GUIN: So you all would like to come up. So you have the plans. They're up on the screen.

MS. MEDINA: The big planter, that's from the
-- I have no idea where it is because when I purchased it
-- I mean, I know that it was like that when it was being shown, but I have --

MS. GUIN: Just --
MS. MEDINA: Oh, this?
MS. GUIN: Yes, just --
MR. TORRE: Let me just say this.
MS. GUIN: The other thing that they're asking is putting these back.

MR. TORRE: This is for the architect. If you're doing the wing wall, you're doing the footing, you have to change the structure a little bit as well, if you do that, it might not be that much of a difference, and once you do the wing walls, it's just a suggestion, the planters will -- you're going to have to revise it to put the footings in unfortunately.

MR. GOMEZ: Hi. My name is Rafael Gomez. I'm a contractor, and I've been helping Carolina trying to get all this mess going back and forth, going back and forth with the board of architecture, historical, and she's been trying to come up with an idea to satisfy
everybody.
So if we have to put back the wing walls, I don't think it's that big an issue.

MS. MEDINA: No, no.
MR. TORRE: It's not a big deal.

MR. GOMEZ: As far as the planter, it's just not around. Maybe we can imitate it or buy something similar, I guess.

MR. TORRE: I think --

MR. FULLERTON: It's the front.
MS. THOMSON: Could it be that the owners back in 1927, the ones who originally built this house, just bought some planters like at Home Depot of the day and put it there? I mean, or was it like something that was attached to the structure? In other words, is it that significant, the planters?

MR. TORRE: The point that $I$ was making, if you're going to do the wing walls, the planters aren't that much of an add.

MR. GOMEZ: No.
MR. TORRE: If we were asking, staff was asking to agree to the wing walls, then the planters are just a small, little piece of it. That's my point.

MR. GOMEZ: It's not a big deal. I think we can buy something similar and try to paint something
similar.

Our biggest issue is that we want to comply with code enforcement. I mean, code enforcement has been really nice with us and they understand.

MR. TORRE: The point is you get a legal
square footage that was not legal before, fully legal.
MR. GOMEZ: Right, right
MS. MEDINA: Yes.
MR. TORRE: That's the big piece for us.
MR. GOMEZ: That is the big piece actually.
MR. TORRE: Yes.
MR. GOMEZ: And we proposed a couple of ideas and a couple of ways to do it.

MS. MEDINA: Right.
MR. GOMEZ: And that's why we're here.
MR. TORRE: Right. The variance that we give from the board's perspective is something you get by doing these kind of things. These sort of little back and forths help us to give you that variance.

MR.GOMEZ: Right.
MS. MEDINA: Right.
MR. TORRE: That's the benefit of this process.

MR. GOMEZ: I think we can deal with the wing walls and try to get the planters, we can get the

```
    off-street parking. That would be great for us.
    MS. MEDINA: Okay.
    MR. TORRE: And the house looks great.
    MS. MEDINA: It's beautiful. I love it, so
I'm glad to preserve it as it is. That's really my wish
too.
    MR. GOMEZ: She's been working at it and it's
really beautiful. It's a really small, little cottage,
and it's really quite pretty actually. Anyway, we're
willing to do it.
    MS. MEDINA: Yeah.
    MR. GOMEZ: Okay.
    MR. TORRE: Thank you very much.
    MS. MEDINA: Thank you so much.
    MR. TORRE: All right. Do you have anything
else, ElizaBeth?
    MR. FULLERTON: We have to amend the motion.
    MR. TORRE: Well, public comments, if
    nothing, nobody wants to speak, we'll close the public
hearing, and then you're ready for a motion?
    MS. THOMSON: I have a question.
    MR. TORRE: Go.
    MS. THOMSON: Why would you go to all the
        trouble of closing in that porte cochere for storage?
        That's my question. What is the reason for enclosing
```






THE CLERK: Oh, sorry. Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MS. GUIN: Thank you.
MS. SPAIN: Perfect.
MR. TORRE: We're going to pass this. All
right.
MS. KAUTZ: Aaron, can you put the Powerpoint up on the second application for Castile, please?

MR. TORRE: So we're moving to Case File COA (SP) 2018-018.

This is an application for the issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for the property at 1232 Castile Avenue, a non-contributing resource within the Castile Avenue historic district, being described as Lot Eight and Lot Nine less east 22 feet of Block Seven, Coral Gables Section E, according to the Plat Book Eight, Page 13, of the public records of Miami-Dade County.

The application requests design approval for additions and alterations to the residence and site work.

MS. KAUTZ: I think it's that one. All
right. This is the location map. This is a non-contributing residence within the Castile Avenue Historic District which was designated in 2008. The period of significance for this street was established when the district was created, was 1921 to 1958. This
house was built in 1951.
However, due to the substantial alterations that had occurred prior to the district designation, it was considered a non-contributing resource.

In April of this year, an application was made, COA (SP) 2018-01, for additional alterations to the property, but that never actually reached the board. It was withdrawn due to lack of board attendance. They wanted a full board, and I think there were only six of you available at that meeting, so they withdrew the application to submit it the following month, but instead withdrew the entire application.

So this is a new architect, same owner, but a new architect, new design, new plan, new everything.

All right. I'm sorry. He brought boards. There's a Power Point.

It went to the board of architects and was approved on September 6th. There were two notations which are actually easier to understand in the plan elevation that were drawn on in your staff report that have to do with the covered terrace and a detail around the edges of the opening.

We did have a couple of conditions, but very few at the end of the report, which I'll go over at the end, and no variances have been requested. It's all by
right, so.

MR. POZA: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for having me here. Albert Poza, architect.

The house has a little bit of a history with not only the board of architects, but also the historical board. As it turns out, the first application was withdrawn like staff mentioned. It also -- not only because of the issue of the quorum, the client actually was not very happy in terms of what the numbers cost of the addition was going to be.

It was a lot larger than what is currently being presented. It was not as efficient. It used up a lot of the land, and that with maybe 30,40 percent over budget, the client basically gave up and said, "Forget it," so that's how I arrived.

So the concept of the project is to somehow maintain the existing facade pretty much as it is. All the additions are basically, or any major modifications are basically 50 feet from the sidewalk. The actual area of the work that is proposed to be done is almost the same or just a matter of a couple dozen square feet more than what was actually there already.

Everything that's being removed -- and I'll try to show you some pictures here. When I first arrived
at the house, and staff had to correct me, I really -- you know, the experience that $I$ had working with the city, I would have given any bet, taken on any bet that the rear of the house, a large portion of it was illegal.

It's made out of wood. It's one of those things that you figure this must have been an afterthought, they got caught with something, and somebody legalized it by way of architectural detailing somehow.

But anyway, all that area is basically being removed, so what we're trying to do is to keep the street view of it pretty much the same. Any addition is 50 feet back. The client wants something to be a lot cleaner, more modern that may be normally in Castile, but by the same token, not go overboard

So what I've also did was kind of showing the different possibilities. There's a lot of homes in Castile that in essence really, I guess they're also not contributing. They're nice homes and everything, but they're not helping the nature of the historic element found in Castile, so I just bring that up because we're not really going to be the only non-quaint, non-little house, or non -- yeah, non-little house on Castile.

By the time that everything gets broken up code-wise, zoning-wise and everything else, it's significantly smaller than what the lot would allow, both
in ground coverage and in $F A R$, so, and quite frankly, the client doesn't need anything else other than that, and we're also trying to keep the cost down as opposed to the previous design.

So the concept of the project is to maintain the front as much as possible the way it is now, everything towards the back, and for the back to, little by little, become more modern, more minimalist in terms of compared with other elements in the street and in the house originally as it is currently, you know, if you drive by and see it, so the idea is that the rear of the house kind of embraces the front.

That's where you see some walls that are actually protruding out. You see some, some elements of eyebrow to break up the second floor, the verticality there, two stories straight up, so the board suggests to break that up. The eyebrow kind of has a connotation as a modern detail. I mean, eyebrows have been around since the '30s. They're in just about every Art Deco building. They have a connotation, they're coming back, but it's like fashion. They've been around since the '30s or the '40s.

So that was an element to break up and also to somehow start giving it a more somewhat modern look as opposed to what is currently out there as existing or in
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the other elements of the house as proposed in the front. We try to not do too much in the front and do most of it in the sides and in the back.

So a couple items on the comments, the observations from staff that $I$ want to point out just for clarification.

There is a mention of removal of the existing barrel tile. The proposed is to have a flat concrete tile, but the existing is actually not barrel tile. It's more of a flat, one-sided $S$ tile, so it's like a modified S tile. It's not traditional, you know, barrel tile with one side up and the other side down.

So we're not really removing that element because really nothing to speak of, of any significance, with the existing roof.

So the other thing that's being done with the design as we mentioned earlier is we're projecting the existing ridge a little further back so that the impact of the second floor is not as great on the street level. This makes it appear like if it's a little taller in the front, but hence, the height, total height appears to be less because it's kind of hidden by the extension of the ridge that cleans it up.

It used to have like a multi-level type of a ridge that kind of climbed up. Now it's straight across,
clean and smooth.
Another item that was brought up by the board again is the issue of the second floor height, so we definitely have addressed that in terms of -- and I keep on saying "we" because, believe it or not, the client is an architect herself in Canada. She doesn't have a license here or anything, but $I$ can speak to her as a colleague, as a professor. She doesn't understand concrete block or tie beams, but she knows a little bit about the, you know, the building industry and so forth.

The other item that, on the east elevation that the board or the staff brought up is that it appears as if, and I'm almost paraphrasing, it appears that the foyer area of the roof is being raised. That was actually my mistake. I was allowed to use the previous architect's elevations because he happened to be there, lived there. He did his own elevations for the existing, and on the side view, it was incorrectly, on the east view it was incorrectly drawn like if lower than it actually is.

I corrected it on the front existing elevation. My mistake, $I$ did not do it on the east. There is nothing that's happening to any of the roofs on the existing house other than the extension of the portion over the garage but not on the foyer.

There was also mention on the west elevation,
and I don't know if this was good or bad, but I'm just going to mention it, there's no windows on the west side of the master. You know, neighbors come and go, but the current neighbors are basically young boys with a liking to rock and roll music, and the neighborhood -- or my clients maybe do not have the same liking, so they rather emphasize everything towards the rear and the pool.

It's not really a big issue, I don't think, because it's so far back on the property, and it's indented. You really couldn't even tell from the street if there are windows there or not.

And a couple -- another item that the staff had commented, I failed to, in the version that you have which was an early-on version -- by early-on I mean that since then I've gone ahead and continued working, and what I think is not going to be at all, you know, problematic, if at all, and that is that the carport columns do emphasize the little reveal that the board wanted to do, so they're not completely rectangular like I've drawn in your package. They actually do have a cut-out edge, the one-and-a-half-inch column, so that reveal is true. It's not a stucco reveal. It's actually implied in the structure and hence it will be also in the stucco, so that has already been addressed.

Commenting on the recommendations of the
board, if -- you know, with all due respect, but I just want to comment, on Number One on the last page, they talk about to be consistent to add the stucco bands in the rear.

Part of, like I said, in the concept is as you go to the rear, make it a little bit cleaner, a little bit more modern, and just following somewhat, you know, what historical wants you to do is whatever you add, try to be somewhat respectful of the historical portion, although it's non-contributing, but in essence in some respects it is because it is part of the street.

So as you go to towards the rear, I have eliminated the stucco bands to be true to the concept of making it a little bit more modern, so if we have to have a couple, half dozen windows with a stucco band on the rear, so be it. I would prefer as the architect not to have them.

Number Two, it says to use clear glass. I know that in historical, you know, situations, clear glass is basically a must.

In this situation, I don't think it really is worth it in terms of there's other houses on the, you know, in the neighborhood, and even just the nature of this architecture, that having some sort of a gray tint -the clear glass nowadays is the latest Florida energy
code. It is extremely difficult to make your AC calculations work, if any of you have been working on them, extremely difficult.

In fact, a lot of the companies, you have to be very careful with, they'll sell you clear glass, and it's clear glass, but a very high reflectense. It is probably worse than having a tint without the reflectense. It almost appears to be a little greenish, a little something because of it's reflective.

So if possible, I'd rather have just a regular everyday gray tint.

So other than that, everything else, you know, obviously you'll get materials as the construction drawings are finished up and so forth. I'll meet with staff to make sure those are okay, and I don't want to bore you with all the boards and everything else. If you have any specific questions, I'll ask -- or I'll answer them, and I had one -- and I just did it basically to cover the bases.

I -- because, "Gray tile, historic district, oh," you know, that feeling, but I went around. There's actually about five or six houses that currently have gray tile, same type of gray flat tile along Castile, so again, it is not going to be the first one with gray tile. There's others that have gray tile. So with that, I'm
open to your questions.
MR. TORRE: Is the door to be painted any particular color?

MR. POZA: Pardon me?
MR. TORRE: The door's any particular material or color that would accentuate the door, the front door?

MR. POZA: The front door is probably going to be -- you know, haven't gotten into that detail yet, but I would imagine it's going to be, could be wood with the glass insert, but there's no -- I'm open to any suggestion whatsoever.

MR. TORRE: Let me back up. Does the staff have any problems with the flat tile?

MS. KAUTZ: With the what?
MR. TORRE: Did you make any -- the flat tile, Did you make any -- you're okay with it.

So the things that I'm really losing, I think you're making the house a little Art Deco. Is that a fair statement?

MR. POZA: Not really.
MR. TORRE: Not really?
MR. POZA: I just mentioned that because --
MR. TORRE: The back is going to look like that.

Mr. POZA: When you, nowadays when you think of an eyebrow, you think of, you know, ultra modern, super-duper, you know, minimalist, concrete, and -- you know.

MR. TORRE: The original --
MR. POZA: The eyebrow, eyebrow has been around longer than most of us, you know, so it's nothing new.

MR. TORRE: The ridge on the back and the caps, there's some Art Deco feeling with that.

But, so one of the points of the board is this house doesn't have a contextual specificity that needs to happen because $I$ think the street is so random that we're not trying to match anything, so I think that design-wise, in my opinion, we shouldn't be playing board of architects as much as sometimes we do. I think we should let the architect do his thing. It doesn't seem to have a problem historically. I think we should let them have some freedom.

MR. POZA: If I may just interject something. It didn't go by, the first time, the board of architects. There was several issues, and they were all resolved, and they were, the last time around, they were -- everything that they wanted was implied, not exactly how they wanted, but they were --

MR. TORRE: What I'm trying to tell the board, I think we should continue to look at this from a historical, contextual and other things, and not try to play board of architects too.

MS. KAUTZ: Typically what we view as a non-contributing residence is not to necessarily look -we do look at the architecture because it's important how it blends and all that.

But we look at more of the impact on the district as a whole, which is why, you know, we were noting that the front facade from the street level is relatively unchanged. It's already been altered, and the massing will generally stay the same till you do the addition way further back.

So in that, in that perspective, the streetscape doesn't really change all that much except for the addition.

So we were looking a lot at what happens in the overall district. There are two-story residences already. It's not like it's all one-story other, so that's where we're coming from.

MR. TORRE: But Kara, two points. The front entrance does have a more ornate look now, and the barrel tile gives it more of a Mediterranean and now you're basically going to clean it up, but which I have no
problem, but it does have --
MS. KAUTZ: That is exactly why it isn't historic.

MR. POZA: Yeah. That ornate wing type thing plus the arch wasn't part of the original house as the photographs that staff showed. That was added at some point.

MR. FULLERTON: I've lived on that street for 25 years now. I go by this house a lot. When that front alteration was made and finished, I thought it was one of the nicest things that had been done in the neighborhood in a long time.

So I'm surprised that you want to take that away from it, because it's really, I think it's very effective, but that's your decision.

MR. POZA: Yeah. It was following through on the client's request and to make it -- to clean it up, make it a little bit more updated.

MR. FULLERTON: I don't see how it could be too much cleaner, honestly, but I'm not, as our chairman says, I'm not -- anyway.

MR. TORRE: Unless there's more questions, we'll close the public hearing. Actually, I'm going to ask is there anybody in the audience that wants to speak? If not, we'll close the public hearing. Thank you.

MR. POZA: Thank you.
MR. TORRE: Comments?
MR. SILVA: Venny, I agree with you in terms of the historical massing and how it fits into the neighborhood. I think it's fine, it's respectful, doesn't change the front facade, just the addition to the rear.

I kind of agree with your arguing point about playing board of architects, especially on the rear addition. I think that $I$ don't have an issue letting the architect proceed, you know, as he wishes in terms of, you know, windows and the sill.

MR. TORRE: There's four comments from staff. Do you want to make comments?

MR. SILVA: Well, the other two, I agree. Having to come back for the pool and the materials, I think that makes sense. That's what we normally require.

MS. KAUTZ: Which I believe that is the standard administratively, but.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: So are you suggesting we remove One and Two from the motion?

MR. SILVA: Yes, that's fine.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is there a motion?
MR. TORRE: Yes. Go ahead.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: I would just move to accept as -- to approve with the conditions Three and Four.

last time, so Miriam?
MS. RAMOS: Hi, everyone. Good evening. So promises made, promises kept, I promised I'd come back to you and report on how we're going to look at and address the demolition by neglect issue that's been creeping up lately.

We had a meeting, staff, and look, a lot of the things that we brought up as challenges, you all brought up as challenges. Right?

The big hammer is the foreclosure of properties based on liens, and that has a plethora of issues that come with it, not the least of which is that we inherit the problem, and so on a particular property that may be of interest where it might make sense, you know, a Merrick that had been owned by a private owner, sure, but for us to take on property after property after property, I don't know that we even could be -- could finance that, and that we would be in the business of rehabbing these properties.

So the other part of that is some of these are actually homestead properties, so the idea of the city coming and foreclosing on homesteaded properties, on private homes is a whole other conversation.

So those big issues are there, those challenges are there, things we're talking about, but we
as staff came together and talked about some things we could do to maybe hold the hands of those people from the beginning, make the consequences evident, and try to get ahead of the game rather than at the end; you know, do a little, and then have to have the hammer at the end which has all these issues, versus doing more at the beginning so that we never get to that.

So what we have essentially done for the moment as our first kind of out of the box, is code enforcement sets a number of different notices. First is your warning typically, and then you get your notice of violation. Then you get summoned to come to the code enforcement board meeting if you don't comply. Obviously if you comply, then the problem is resolved.

And so one of things that we are instituting as we speak is to have very prominently displayed, simply worded, bold language on all of those notices, not just one or the other, but on all them, that states three main things.

One is that not only are you subject to substantial fines, but the city may not mitigate those fines, and that's huge because we have always had a policy that as long as you comply, we work with you and we mitigate, typically not to zero, but to something reasonable.

So we're saying to them from day one, you know, that's going to be a difficult conversation to have if you don't hold up your end of the bargain.

The second is advising them that if they let this structure demolish by neglect, they're going to be required to build a structure that is a replica of the prior structure, and $I$ think most people, at least the ones we've come across lately, had no idea that that was the case.

So now the cost of doing business analysis of, "Oh, well, I'll just let this thing fall apart, I'll mitigate the fine, and I'll build my dream home," are gone because you're going to have to build exactly the same thing you had before, and then once you do that at your cost, then you're going to lose your tax exemption because it's no longer a historic property.

So we're going to make those very real facts that have always existed very prevalent from day one in the hopes of getting them on board from the beginning.

The other thing $I$ think would be effective, and I'm going to talk to the code enforcement board in November about it, is oftentimes when they have a property that they're concerned about usually that could be unsafe, they have, aside from time to comply, and the running fine, they have a reporting, come every 30 days and report

yeah.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: And the one you're proposing will be much larger?

Ms. RAMOS: Well, the wording on it will be much larger, so it will say, you know, "Your roof is in disrepair," whatever the violation is, minimum standards, blah, blah, blah, but this language will be very prominently displayed in a box, you know, something that eye would go to.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Where will you have this posted?

Ms. RAMOS: It's posted on the property. All code enforcement warnings, NOVs, and summonses are posted on the property, and they're also mailed, certified mail.

MR. TORRE: Is there a follow up by code compliance on a standard, regular basis following that? What is their procedure?

Ms. RAMOS: So typically what happens is, well, if you comply, then you're done.

MR. TORRE: What's going on?
MS. RAMOS: Right. If you come, they typically give you a number. They'll find you guilty, or not.

I mean, maybe you're not guilty, but 99 percent of the time they'll find you guilty. We prove our

roof is starting look bad, when it's not to the point where it gets demo'd by neglect, but it's one violation --

MR. TORRE: Violation of code for not taking caring of the house?

MS. RAMOS: But that happens to be a historic property, and that if it's not taken care of, it will result in a demolition by neglect.

MR. TORRE: What I'm looking for is something that triggers an alarm six months later, saying this is the ones that are taken care of.

The ones that are coming out of the lists, somehow we maybe somebody gets to see those, and then those become the focus point of the alarm so that the ones that are really becoming problematic start to rise up to a list, and then basically they start to show up as these three houses are becoming problems.

MS. SPAIN: One thing they've also done in code enforcement is they've assigned one person to the historic department that will be the person that we call so it's just one guy, which is very helpful because then they get to know the historic properties.

And that notice that you're putting them on and posting, is that going to go to every notice even if it isn't historic, that says if this is a historic property, or are --


MS. RAMOS: Not in the past, but that's one of the things we're trying to fix, is better communication between code and historic.

MR. TORRE: Again, once, twice, three months later is not a problem, but once you start getting to the eighth, ninth month, then you know something is going to happen with this house.

MS. SPAIN: And typically the time that they give them to come into compliance can be, in my view, shortened on historic properties so that the fines starts earlier, and if they have to give extensions, they can give extensions, but $I$ want to be really on top of it.

Now I'm getting the code enforcement board agenda sent to me every month so I can look through it and check it if historic properties show up at the board if I have to, so $I$ think this is a better -- and you know, we're good about changing if there's something to be changed.

MR. TORRE: A few months back he called me, there's a gentleman, an older gentleman who has a hole in the roof and he can't take care of it, and it's one of those people that just don't have the means to do it, and I'm not sure where those things go, but basically they get to the point where some of those people, you know, they are in no position to fix it, and then we have to


remittance of these fines?

MS. RAMOS: Well, what the notices say
that --

MR. EHRENHAFT: There are scenarios that may not be mitigated, but the scenario that you just suggested, that they give up on it and they sell it to somebody else, but if there were significant fines that then accrued, but then you remit it to the new owner, it takes the teeth out of people having a motivation to fix things and prevent deterioration.

MS. RAMOS: Assuming they can sell it, which is a big "If."

MR. EHRENHAFT: Right.
MS. RAMOS: Right, because if they let it deteriorate too much, somebody is not going to want to buy it.

MR. EHRENHAFT: Right, yes.
MS. RAMOS: So it's a dare. We have to say
"may" because we don't know. Every circumstance is different, and Venny just said, you know, we have situations where we truly have an elder person, and somehow they're able to get money to fix it, and then you're going to hit them with a full fine.

So we need to give ourselves wiggle room, or if you have a new, good buyer that's going to do the right
thing, you want to be able to mitigate the fines, but the idea is to tell the public, generally speaking, we're not going to be happy or willing to mitigate those significantly.

MR. EHRENHAFT: I think there's a difference between somebody who has a problem and they haven't got the means to fix it, and maybe there can be ways to guide them to look for how they can get the resources to fix something, rather than somebody else who is going away and intentionally leaving --

MS. RAMOS: And that's the person who won't have their fines mitigated.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Can you do something with tax, you know, taxes that are being, that --

MS. RAMOS: The one -- well, unless they let -- you mean the taxes exemption?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MS. RAMOS: Only if it loses its historic designation, which is what we don't want.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: No, I understand, but I mean, some things is that is if you don't fix this ckk -MS. RAMOS: No. That's outside of the Coral Gables taxes, Miami-Dade County, Florida statute, but we're thinking, and if you have other ideas, please call me.

the homeowner for the process -- for the project being discussed today.

For Case File COA (SP) 2015-018, revised for 4730 Santa Maria, I am the contractor of record for that project. Thank you.
(Thereupon, Mr. Torre left the room.)
MR. SILVA: All right. So moving along, our next item is Case File COA (SP) 2018-17.

This is an application for the issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for the property at 931 Valencia Avenue, a vacant parcel of land previously designated with 927 Valencia Avenue, legally described as Lot 20, Block Nine, Coral Gables Section A, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book Five, Page 102 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The application is request for design approval for the construction of a new two-story residence, two-story auxiliary structure, and site work.

MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. Location map of the property, it was designated with the property at 927 Valencia to the east in 2015.

In 2016, the property was sold, and the owner received a legal opinion from the city attorney's office that, determining that this property was a separate building site.

Last year an application came to you all for a new residence that many of you had issues with. At the same time, the application came forward for an addition to 927. That application was scrapped.

A new architect was hired, and this is the result of that new application.

No variances have been requested with the application. It was approved by the board of architects on August 16 th of this year with one comment that basically just said, "Nice."

There are a couple of staff recommendations that we'd like to discuss at the end of the presentation, but I'll hand it over to the architect.

MR. DE LEON: I was expecting you to say more.

MS. KAUTZ: No. You're in charge.
MR. DE LEON: Good afternoon, board members. My name is Nelson De Leon. I'm with Locus Architecture, Inc.

So I'm going to take you through the entire presentation and our design, and then staff did have a few comments that's part of their conclusion that $I$ thought that they were going to mention now, but what I'll do is I'll just indicate how we're addressing each of those comments that they have.

MS. KAUTZ: Push it to the right.
MR. DE LEON: So the site is vacant. All of you saw this I believe sometime earlier in the year.

MS. SPAIN: You can look there.
MR. DE LEON: You know, I grew up in the era of pencils so technology is not my thing. I think John can probably relate to that unlike these young guys like Albert and Alex.

MR. FULLERTON: I know. They don't know.
MR. MENENDEZ: We're just smart.
MR. PARSLEY: That's a shout-out.
MR. DE LEON: You're familiar with the concept so I wanted to go briefly over it.

The neighborhood is actually quite nice. There's quite a few homes from the '20s that were very well done. There's a few homes from the '30s, one of which is directly across the street with the red door, and then there's a couple homes that were built throughout the '60s, '70s and '80s.

So the property being historically
designated, we felt that giving it a nod back to the '20s style Spanish architecture, the Spanish style, maybe a little bit of Spanish eclectic kind of look was the direction we wanted to take, so we took a lot of cues from many, many homes that we have in the Gables, so a lot of
this design is generated to give somebody driving down the street the impression this home could have been there for eight years, nine years.

So I'll go through the whole thing and then come back to the street elevation.

So this is just a figure around so that you can see the relationship of solid white layer on the house and some of that transparency we're trying to get done.

One of those things was the carport. I think the carport allows the sight line to go all the way to the back so to give the house from the street a very narrow profile.

This is the, our project is on the left. On the right is the existing historic house with the proposed two-story addition and one-story additions.

On our site, we actually shifted our mass to balance out the the mass with the proposed house and left more of the openness to the west side and the back side, and part of that is just because the neighbor on the west side is a large driveway, several cars, but if you have big trees there so that greenery can be a nice focal point from our house looking toward the west.

This is the -- our actual zoning sheet with all the set-backs, all of the area calculations, additional area diagrams that also just break it down.

This is strictly a code sheet so that the city reviewers understand what's green and what's solid.

The layout of the house is traditional, but on the first floor we modernized it in the sense that great rooms and open rooms have become really popular, so on the back end of the house is the great room. The front of the house has a study.

And then the side entrance was something that is quite common in a lot of the 1920s houses, so we thought it would be nice to enter that little covered porch that has an arched opening to the carport and the arched opening to the street.

So the entrance is a small foyer, the stairs directly in front of you, and then you have a study in the front and then the great room in the back.

And then to kind of break up the mass a little bit, $I$ didn't want the room to be just one giant room. We kind of tucked the dining room off to the side so that's an arched nook so that it feels like its own room but it's visually completely open to the great room.

And then a little covered area in the back and the detached garage which has a guest house above, and then the main house itself is three-bedroom, two-bath, and this is our architectural sheet with all the dimensions, roof plan.

This has the elevations with the garage, so this is exactly how you would see it if you were standing on each of the property lines, and then we prepared per the request of Historic an elevation showing the garage portion of the roof so you can see clearly the house, and then a separate sheet which just has the elevation of the garage by itself from all four views.

And this is another view of the front, and then I'll leave this one up because this kind of captures the house from several angles.

So staff had a few comments, one of which was they felt that the house maybe had a little bit too much going on. They requested simplification.

In looking at a lot of these '20s homes, you know, you see a lot of elements that appear quirky if you see them on a flat drawing, may appear quirky, but the combination of those elements that produce a really very interesting homes that have a lot of not only texture, but they have a lot of layering, so that's kind of the direction we're going with this.

We're trying to, to rather than strip the house down, make it a little bit more interesting and maybe add more details than homes that are being built now would have.

They did indicate that the wood outriggers at
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the front, which you'll see on the main elevation may be projected too far, and $I$ certainly don't have an issue with bringing that roof line back maybe from two feet to 16 inches or so.

I do feel we do need some overhang, and there is an awning proposed above the double doors on the second floor balcony that did not show on the rendering, but $I$ certainly think that we wouldn't lose anything architecturally by reducing that overhang. I'm okay doing that.

We initially had a couple of small windows that were set within a deep wall niche, and again, we don't have any issues $I$ think simplifying that and not making them a feature with the recessed kind of element to hide them.

MR. PARSLEY: Where were those shown on here?
MR. De LEON: If you look at the bottom right, there's a little window on the second floor, and you could see probably on your rendering, there's a highlighted arch and an expanded surround on that window, so initially the idea was to set that back and kind of like with maybe more of a Spanish eclectic, if you look at the Moorish architecture and the horsehoe shaped entablature, maybe recess that back. That's kind of what I was thinking with that.
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But at the end of the day, simplifying that $I$ don't think would impact, you know, the design in any way. The shutters will be functional in the sense that they'll have the hardware that a real shutter has, except they'll have a tie clip so they won't, they won't be operable, but for all practical purposes, they'll look exactly as operable shutters will.

The roof is a two-piece barrel tile, and we'll have that noted on the drawings.

And then we're aware that the pool, the awnings, they're required special permitting, so that's fine.

And then the last item is the materials, which we really don't have them other than I am really fond of brick pavers --

THE COURT REPORTER: You're really fond, I'm sorry, really fond of what?

MR. De LEON: Brick pavers.
THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
MR. De LEON: So I think the driveway would more likely be a paver material, and that's it for my presentation unless you have any questions.

MR. FULLERTON: The small window you were talking about, is that the one, the one in the back there in the back corner, that little decorative small window?

MR. De LEON: Yes, yes.
MR. FULLERTON: And staff wants to you remove that?

MR. De LEON: Well, not the window itself, but I think the surround.

MS. KAUTZ: If you all remember the last
proposal that came for this property, this is such a vast improvement. It's a lovely design with the detached garage. I mean, it's lovely.

Our -- we reviewed it, sort of among ourselves in staff, and the term we all sort of came up with at the same time was sort of it looks a little bit too storybook because there's so many elements that are on it, so we were just, you know, wanting a little bit of simplification, so that was maybe one of the features that could be -- the windows could stay, but the recessed little niche could be gone, you know, and for the projecting -- the outriggers and the projecting balconies and the window below that has the champered edge, it would be just like a lot that's happening on the elevation, so we wanted it to be simplified.

It's up to you guys, if you want to ignore that suggestion.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: This is such an improvement.
MS. KAUTZ: Oh, no doubt.

off the stucco --

MR. De LEON: Yes.
MR. PARSLEY: -- and not just stuck on?
Because that's where they look fake.
MR. De LEON: Sure. They are timber wood, so it's the actual shutter. The only thing to make them operable is if you remove the tie clip. The tie clip basically, just a little locking mechanism that keeps the shutter in place.

But the decorative tie-backs, the actual hinges, those are all part of an actual shutter system.

MR. PARSLEY: So it has that little shadow line behind it?

MR. De LEON: Exactly. You just pull it off the wall --

MR. PARSLEY: Yes.
MR. De LEON: -- and the tie-back actually keeps it off the wall an inch and a half or so.

MR RODRIGUEZ: And they are wood?
MR. De LEON: No. I would recommend composite because it's the exact look but we don't have to deal with mold, we don't have to deal with maintenance issues of warping.

The wood, if you go on the catalog and you look at the profiles for wood, and they're composite.
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MS. KAUTZ: We actually brought a sample, not from Nelson, but from an another architect actually yesterday, and the composite, they're not plastic, they're not vinyl, but they have the weight of a wood shutter and have the graining of a wood shutter and they feel and act like a wood shutter, so we would be okay with that.
MR. EHRENHAFT: How are they contrasted with the wood, the beams that are the outriggers, you know, that are under the soffits, I mean.
MS. KAUTZ: Are they going to be a different color? Are the shutters going to be a color?
MR. De LEON: Yes. They'll have, it will be a subtle tone, but they will have, they will have a tone to them.
MS. KAUTZ: But the shutters will be a color as opposed to --
MR. EHRENHAFT: It will be contrasting materials. Is one going to feel --
Ms. KAUTZ: No.
MR. SILVA: Markedly --
MS. KAUTZ: No.
MS. SPAIN: Not at all.
MS. KAUTZ: They were actually pretty, they were pretty, pretty --
MS. SPAIN: I don't know.
```
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MS. KAUTZ: Yeah. I mean, they were really very true to what a wood shutter would be.

MR. De LEON: That's like on your house.
MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MR. De LEON: Those are composites.
MS. SPAIN: Yes, my old house.
MR. EHRENHAFT: Thank you.
MR. FULLERTON: You were responsible for the old home.

MS. SPAIN: Not the new one he built now, so.
MR. SILVA: Nelson, it's a great project. It's very well composed. We had talked at the last meeting about possibly flipping it. I'm glad you didn't. I think this massing works better on this site when you look at the old house, so great job.

MR. De LEON: Thank you.
MR. FULLERTON: Yeah. I think commendations are in order that you thought about the house next door and you reacted to it in a way that is good for both.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Are you also designing the one next door?

MR. De LEON: No. That's the original architect that they worked with on this same property.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I think it's a great addition to the street and everyone will benefit.
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MR. De LEON: Thank you, and I actually thank my client who is here because, you know, we -- you need to have support from your client to do the right thing sometimes, so I'd like to thank her for acknowledging that and letting us produce what we've done.

MR. PARSLEY: I think it's sensitive to the property that is immediately adjacent. It's really nice.

MR. SILVA: Is there anybody else in the public that likes to speak for or against this item? Then I'll close the public meeting. Any further discussion or motions?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'll move to approve.
MR. PARSLEY: I'll second.
MS. KAUTZ: Great.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: But not with all these staff recommendations.

MS. KAUTZ: Three through Seven?
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Pardon?
MS. KAUTZ: Three through Seven?
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. Motion to approve with staff conclusions, recommendations Three through Seven.

MR. SILVA: All right. So we have a motion, and a second?

MR. EHRENHAFT: Second.


MR. SILVA: Yes. Thank you. All done.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Congratulations.
MS. THOMSON: Thank you.
MR. SILVA: Okay. The last item on the agenda today is Case File COA (SP) 2015-18, an application for the issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for the property at 4730 Santa Maria Street, a contributing resource within the Santa Maria Historic District, legally described as Lots 16 through 23, Block 92, Coral Gables Country Club Section Five, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 23, Page 55 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The application requests -- the applicant requests design approval for additions and alterations to the residence.

I'm sorry. The application requesting design approval for additions and alterations to the residence was approved with conditions on December 17th, 2015. This revision requests design approval for deviations from the approved certificate of appropriateness.

MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. The location map, this is at the far end of Santa Maria Street. This is how the property looked in the 1940s, late 1940s. That was actually in the early 1950s.
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In May of 2017 one of those conditions was satisfied. They came back to you all for hardscape, landscape and the perimeter fence and wall. The current proposal requests revisions from, deviations from the approved set of plans, some of which are already implemented. Those are noted in the staff report.

I did want to note that only those revisions that were outlined in the letter of intent are up for review at this point, so if there's anything that is not on that list, it is not included in this application.

I know that the staff report is probably a little bit confusing, the things that we're okay with, the things we're not okay with. I'll let them go through their presentation and then we can discuss them at the end.

The board of architects did review this revision set with notations that are in your staff report, the drawings. They involved the shutters, some of them being eliminated. It involved ommitting a slab on the side of the house. Those were partially addressed within the set.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Joseph Bartoszek, and I'm the designer working on the house. I don't know if it's best -- you all have the site plan to work with, and maybe we can go through the observations because we could be be here an awful long time as we discuss this, so I can get my reactions from those observations.

Number One is the fountain in front of the house. Originally the plan, that was not a fountain. That was for flowers and vegetation, and as we looked at the house and we looked at the plan, the walkways did not change their direction. They just changed a bit their shape. Instead of being round, we made one of them square, and that would be in the northeast corner.

So the northeast corner, you still have the large tree there, and that on access with the front door and the front gate, the fountain, so the staff had no problem with that fountain, and we would work with them as to the design. It's very simple, just 18-inch high, covering probably keystone with just a matched corner, so this is very, very simple.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I'm sorry to interrupt. I think that is me with my battery. May I request a recess, Chairman, to plug in?

MR. SILVA: We'll take a break.

THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. Thank you. I'm sorry to interrupt.

MR. SILVA: Let's take a five-minute break.
(Thereupon, a brief recess.)
MR. SILVA: Okay, all right. We have
everyone back, so let's begin again. You were taking us through staff's observations.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Right. I think the change that we need to do is Number Two, which is the exterior fence facing Blue Road, and the changes that we did there were $I$ believe mostly a result when the planting along Blue Road and the trees were taken down, there was a lot of scrub bushes and trees there and trees, and when that was taken down and our wall was started to be built, which was going to be four feet high from the back to about the front of the house, and then the pickets were going to start at the front of the house and start and go around the house to the front and then all the way to the other side.

That area, let me just see if I can -- there we go. Okay. When that was done, from both the inside and the outside of the house, we realized at that point how high the crown of Blue Road is and just the elevation of the street and the side area.

When you're in the house and you're standing
in the house looking at Blue Road, you're looking at the wheels of trucks. It's that high of an elevation. This house is somewhat elevated.

So in the yard, the four-foot wall -- I'll
give you -- those are photos that show basically the four-foot wall, and the project supervisor and the owner is here. They can speak also if you have questions.

And there are two young children where easily somebody standing on one side of the Blue Road side can basically lean over and pick up a child, and that was a major concern of theirs.

So at that point the request was made to do the columns at six feet, and from the four-foot to the six feet, do metal pickets so that the fence along Blue Road would be six feet high.

We also -- the staff made an observation that says this alteration has already been implemented on the site. The only part that's been implemented is the solid wall from the front of the house towards Santa Maria on the Blue Road side. The columns are still at the existing height that they were meant to be, and everything else was, you know, built as it was.

So if you had been driving by the site the last two months, you've seen the wall and you've seen what we propose as far as solid condition, and what we're
asking for is to actually add then the iron pickets as you see on the drawing that's up, and that's the bottom elevation.

It's, as you can see by the photos that I passed around, that four-foot wall even from you're standing on Blue Road, you're basically looking, there's a covered terrace at the back elevation of that bottom, you're -- you see under the window. I mean, it's not a condition where the street is lower than the house, and also the property is higher in the back and lower in the front.

So really at that back of the property along Blue Road, you're really almost like on a hill looking down into the property, so because of those items and especially because of security, they want the higher wall because it really is, as you could see in the photos, someone could lean in and basically just pick up a child. Someone could hop over the fence very easily also.

And as you know, that street, though it's quiet, you know, part of the day, between seven and ten and four and seven, it's a very heavily trafficked roadway.

So what is important or what I thought was important was the top elevation still shows that whole front elevation along Santa Maria is symmetrical, that you
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still have across the whole front pickets, and those are at the four-feet height.

So we're addressing the busy street one way. We're addressing Santa Maria as -- and which I think is a very nice entryway for everyone entering into the street to drive down, and then as you go around the corner to Alegriano, it stays pickets, and then it becomes solid pickets through the drive court area, but that's basically to hide the drive port for the neighbors so they're not looking basically at a driveway.

So I think that probably describes I think that issue as best as I can.

MR. FULLERTON: I have a quick question. From the photographs, it appears they were taken from the inside of the wall. Is the height of the wall less than four feet on the outside of the wall?

MR. BARTOSZEK: I believe it is.
MR. FULLERTON: Well, you're allowed to go four feet from the outside because that's what you're guarding people against for a pool or anything like that. It has to be four feet.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Well, okay. I mean, I cannot guarantee that. I'm not sure actually what the contractor has done, but it would still be stepping like it shows on the drawing because the street is on a slope.
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vegetation behind it, but the intention is not to build a wall of vegetation behind that. I mean, you're going to have vegetation to probably try to stop the noise, but there's no intention to build a wall, and then $I$ believe there's also height requirements with the vegetation behind the wall.
So it's not like we're going to build 12 feet high of, you know, against trees to kind block it, plus there's only 25 feet between the wall and the property, so it's not -- we don't have a huge yard. It's not like the front yard.
MR. FULLERTON: Is the solid wall already built?
MR. BARTOSZEK: The solid wall is built.
MR. FULLERTON: I know it's on Blue Road.
MR. BARTOSZEK: On Blue Road.
MR. FULLERTON: On the other side.
MR. BARTOSZEK: On the other side it was also built the way that it was intended.
MR. FULLERTON: Okay.
MR. BARTOSZEK: So everything is intended as it was. It's just that the extension was along Blue Road from the front of the house to basically almost the front of the property.
MR. SILVA: So right now, so right now the
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only thing you've built not in compliance is just that you did two extra bays of walls?

MR. BARTOSZEK: Of the solid.

MR. SILVA: Along Blue Road.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Yes.
MR. FULLERTON: But you're putting pickets on top.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Well, that's what we're requesting, to put the pickets along the top of that whole section.

MR. FULLERTON: How about the back side section?

MR. BARTOSZEK: The back side is going to be, that is $I$ believe a chain link fence, and that's going to be covered with hedges.

MR. MENENDEZ: And what's the transition when it takes the curve and it hits the fence on Santa Maria?

MR. BARTOSZEK: We had a problem because there was a telephone pole, so we had to kind of jog around that, yeah, and is that wall with aluminum, or is that just aluminum fencing?

MS. LOREDO: Aluminum.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Aluminum, okay.
THE COURT REPORTER: Ma'am, can you state your name, please?


|  | Page 87 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MS. LOREDO: That is aluminum, four feet. |
| 2 | MR. MENENDEZ: No. I'm talking about the |
| 3 | corner of Santa Maria and Blue Road. |
| 4 | MS. LOREDO: And Blue. |
| 5 | MR. MENENDEZ: And Blue Road. |
| 6 | MS. LOREDO: Okay. |
| 7 | MR. MENENDEZ: Because you have two different |
| 8 | fences, and they're going to be different heights, |
| 9 | correct? |
| 10 | MS. LOREDO: Yes. |
| 11 | MR. BARTOSZEK: Right there, the walls, and |
| 12 | then there's basically the pickets go up, not -- you know, |
| 13 | they're stacked and they work their way up to try to make |
| 14 | that transition. |
| 15 | There's really no other way to do it because |
| 16 | you got a four-foot wall continuous, so you know, you |
| 17 | can't change it with the wall, so you really have to do it |
| 18 | with pickets, and the pickets basically waterfall down to |
| 19 | come down to the four-foot height. |
| 20 | MR. MENENDEZ: And that's the same column on |
| 21 | Santa Maria? |
| 22 | MR. BARTOSZEK: Yes, that's the column. |
| 23 | That's the original height of the columns. |
| 24 | MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. |
| 25 | MR. BARTOSZEK: So that's the big issue in |
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all of these. I think that's the biggest one of the most concern to the homeowner. Okay.

If $I$ continue on with that list basically which they have given us, because as I said, there are some minor changes all over the site, the outdoor shower and fountain, we just asked to work with staff with that. That's at the back of the house between the pool and the back of the house at a corner.

So the gazebo is an issue with the staff with myself. The staff had talked about why couldn't it be centered on the pool where it would direct access from the living room across the pool in the backyard, but what the intention was that that was never going to be a focal point of the backyard.

If you look at the site plan, actually if you look at that elevation, you'll see the gazebo is next to the covered, the covered terrace in the back, so if you look at the bottom elevation, you'll see the gazebo there, and then to the right, that's where the covered terrace, the roof-covered terrace, and to the left is the pool area which then the living room is behind that.

So if we go to the site plan of the pool deck. Okay. If you look at that site plan, you'll see how the gazebo is thrown off to the side. That side part of the yard is actually the Blue Road corner, is going to
be the area where probably there will be a jungle gym set up, so there was a desire where somebody could sit in the shade to watch the children.

Putting it in the middle of the yard kind of cuts that little backyard in two, and kind of then gives you just two separate zones, so it was always meant to be in that corner and never meant to be a focal point. It was just meant to be an object within that.

And the pool deck as you can see is quite large. You know, the pool is big. It's 28 by 40 , but there's a very, very large pool deck, so the idea also was to end that pool deck with at least a little bit of a structure so you create more of a little bit of a room, that it just doesn't bleed out at that point.

So it's also blocking the house behind our property which is the side of the person on Blue Road. It's a pretty -- not a very attractive ranch house and it's the worst probably elevation of it, so again there will planting eventually, but it's not -- it's an unusual home. It really has three front yards and one back elevation, so that would be --

MR. PARSLEY: Is the planter next to the gazebo, is that already built?

MR. BARTOSZEK: It's being laid out right now. It was in the original plan. There was always a
center stair behind the pool that took you down to the lawn, and there was a gazebo -- I mean a planter on each side.

The planters just changed their dimension from the first scheme to the second scheme, but they were both -- it was always there.

MR. PARSLEY: I think it's a little awkward, so let me see. I'm looking out from the house through the stone and the pool, and you've got the L-shaped planter on the left that touches the gazebo, and you've taken the space inside the gazebo, kind of half inside the planter, half out.

Why couldn't you make that a T instead of an L and sort of block that whole one side of the gazebo instead of having that little bit of leftover space?

MR. BARTOSZEK: Oh, to frame out the yard, to frame out the yard in that area?

MR. PARSLEY: Yes.
MR. BARTOSZEK: I mean, there's nothing to stop anyone from doing that.

MR. PARSLEY: Yes.
MR. BARTOSZEK: I mean, it would provide a nicer edge to the gazebo certainly if you're in it, and then the other two sides are fully free of -- you know, just a yard. That would be I think a fine suggestion, you
know, in that, so if you would like, if that's what you care to do, I don't have any objection to doing something like that because it does provide a nicer buffer edge from the gazebo looking into the other half of the yard.

MR. PARSLEY: You're not half --
MR. BARTOSZEK: You're not half in the planter and half out of the planter. I understand. Okay. So that covers the planter and the pool deck. Like I said, they're basically just shrunk in size.

The walkway at the front facing Alegriano and Santa Maria, all that was done was the one that was at the corner of Santa Maria and Alegriano in the front yard, that went from a circle to a square. There's still, the intention is still to be a large tree planted in the center of that.

But the new AC compressor for the garage, that is on the Alegriano side of the house, and if you can see that drawing, you'll see the AC compressors are lined up along that, the roof edge, the roof edge there, in a vertical position.

As we were developing the house, it was decided to air condition the garage, so we needed to put another compressor in. The wall had been built as per the initial plan, but if we would have put another compressor in that area, no one could walk in that area basically to
service the compressors.
So the idea was to build out that little notch to put the last compressor in.

A mention was made that the wall would probably interfere with the window, but we have a photo. I'll pass that up. So basically they built that wall.

MS. KAUTZ: You need to speak into the microphone.

MR. BARTOSZEK: As you can see, the wall is lower than the sill of the window, so it really doesn't -it's not going to hit the sill. Yes, it's going to be under part of the sill, but I think that with landscaping it can be, you know, screened, but it's the solution to do that without knocking down the whole northern wall of that guard.

The only other solution would be to knock down the northern wall and to bring that forward toward Alegriano for the last AC compressor to fit in.

Number Eight was the dining room. There was a wall around a terrace which is also on the slide that I have up, and that's to the, it would be the east, the northeast corner.

And when that wall was built, we found out that it was put too high. You could see the window ledge of the dining terrace. It's still over -- it shrunk, 36
inches in height, so it was like at 48, so if you were sitting in that terrace, you would be looking at a wall.

So that was really a dimension mistake that was built, and we discovered that it was far too high, and I think now if you go by the house, it looks correct.

Number Nine, that is a small storage building that is constructed in this -- okay. To the left of the garage, you have a walled-in area. That's for trash and for garbage cans, and then right behind that is a square area or a rectangular area that has a roof on it.

We do have a notation from zoning when the initial permit was given because they required us to make that smaller. It couldn't be as large as we wanted it, so we shrunk it and we made it with a flat concrete roof, but now as you're walking, you see the top of the flat concrete roof and it's really very ugly.

So the solution was to put just a small gabled roof or hip roof above it using the same tile as what is on the house, and that way it looks -- I mean, it's like between a doll house, doll houses and shed sizes. It's a smaller building, but it's just to give that the character that it deserves because as you walk by, it's really unsightly.

You see that area? It's as you walk from the driveway porch behind the garage, so as you walk behind
the garage, to your right you have a walled-in area for garbage cans, and then the next, the area between the garbage can area and where all the equipment is. The equipment is also behind a wall, so it's that area in between.

It was meant for like bicycle storage and things like that, so it wasn't meant to be a really big storage unit to put, you know, like lawn mowers and things in. It was just meant to put the kids' bikes and things like that, so it's not changing the shape. It's not changing -- the only thing, it's changing the height because it will have a roof on top of it.

MR. SILVA: Do you have a drawing elevation?
MS. LOREDO: Yes.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Let's see the elevation. MS. LOREDO: You see --

MR. BARTOSZEK: Yeah, the bottom elevation to the left, you'll see that small structure with the roof, so to the left of the small structure you have the garbage area, and to the right of the small structure you have the mechanical equipment area behind a wall.

So if you could imagine, right now it's just missing that little bit of a wall, but it's kind of in between that five-foot and six-foot height zone where you're looking at the top of it.
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MS. LOREDO: Also what you can see from the street.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Oh, there. That now on the right-hand side, so it's the same width as the garbage area and the mechanical equipment area behind it.
MR. SILVA: But before the wall was that same height?
MR. BARTOSZEK: It was a wall the same height, but it had a concrete top so that the things inside were protected, but it was really just the wrong height because you could see onto it and it was just, it looked a bit --
MR. MENENDEZ: And what's the size of it?
MR. BARTOSZEK: It's like -- let's see the dimensions. It's probably four or five feet by I think nine.
MS. LOREDO: By ten.
MR. BARTOSZEK: By ten.
MR. SILVA: I mean, I prefer to see that roof than just that wall.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Yes. It was because it was a higher wall so it was not -- it was, it's a higher wall than the walls around it so you basically saw a box.
MR. SILVA: Yeah, you saw a box.
MR. BARTOSZEK: And it was almost, you know
-- I mean the description of it, some people told me it was a bit mausoleum like because it was just this concrete box kind of sitting in between those two areas.

And like -- at this time I'll just cover one of the other comments because we have it in that photo. Well, you can see. Later on comment -- well, we'll get to it.

MR. SILVA: Yes, Let's keep in order.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Okay, keep them in order, okay.

Number Ten are the two landings of the family room which is, the family room is facing Blue Road. The elevation is the bottom of the slide.

And originally they were two landings that had stairs on three sides of them that you basically went up to a terrace, but because of the setback, we're not allowed to have a terrace in that area, and because of Blue Road being so high, I was looking for an idea for a screening element so that when you were inside the house, you didn't basically -- you know, it was also going to be something that would stop your eye.

So the landings I changed into what you see basically now where you've got a curved stair that goes off the inner side of each of those landings, basically facing each other.

just --

MR. BARTOSZEK: The terrace didn't go away. MS. LOREDO: The home is there.

MS. KAUTZ: No, there's nothing there, and the wrought iron is a distinctive feature of the house and it should be, you know, on the historic part of the house.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Well, it's also on the back.
MS. KAUTZ: Yes, I know, but I mean, you don't want to keep adding more features that were on the historic part to confuse the issue. That's our point.

MR. FULLERTON: So the wrought iron is there or not?

MR. BARTOSZEK: Well, it's not there. That's proposed, and like $I$ said, it's also done as an element when you enter that room because you've got -- you know, it's ten-food wide glass, two doors with two side drapes on each side, so they're moving drapes. There's probably going to be, you know, covers over the window, but it is just an element.

And it's also done because, as you know, like when your eye stops and it then continues on, it makes it feel bigger, so we have a 25 -foot side yard, so that's something for the eye to stop and then to continue on basically into the rest of the yard.

I mean, I think it's, it's a nice -- you

Page 99
know, because that's a very similar, plain elevation. There's not -- there's just those doors there, you know, and the fireplace is articulated on the wall. It's just popping up through the roof, so there's not a lot going on through that that faces Blue Road.

MR. SILVA: This one, I guess we should probably all chime in to go, but on this one I kind of agree with staff. I think that the simpler previous version was more in keeping with the existing spirit of the house, and it's a cleaner elevation, and you already have that wall on Blue Road. I don't think we need another enclosure. Those are my thoughts.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I agree. I almost think that that railing gives it more of a commercial look, almost like coming out, you know, you're going to --

MR. BARTOSZEK: It feels like a porch. It feels more like a porch this way.

I think with the stairs going all the way around, it's going to look more like a landing.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I think it feels more like a landing now, and then you're getting like ushered to the side, almost like a side exit.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Right.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Whereas the other one was, you know, you open the doors, there is a landing, but your
eye continues back.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Yes.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: I think the railing, just that visual --

MR. BARTOSZEK: I mean, that's not a change that affects, you know, against -- I had it originally. I just thought it would be like a little -- because again, when the trees were taken down, you just saw Blue Road. All of a sudden, Blue Road got really in your face, and the first set of doors -- it's gone. The first set of doors, you have access in the house when you were living there and walking down the gallery, and then you look across the family room, you're looking down those doors. You know, it's a real -- there's a relationship to the outside 50 feet.

But it doesn't -- you know, that's something that $I$ can certainly live with.

MR. PARSLEY: I agree with what's been said over this side of the table, and I would say treated with landscaping up against --

MR. BARTOSZEK: The wall.
MR. PARSLEY: -- the fence, because I think the railing height doesn't do anything except when you're sitting, but when you're walking and coming into the room and your access with those windows, you want something
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other than Blue Road to be your view.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Right.
MR. PARSLEY: So I would -- I could see treating that as a separate side garden.

MR. BARTOSZEK: It was always meant to be a secret garden, but they couldn't put a patio, so if you couldn't put a patio, I thought the access on three sides was kind overkill, but it's not -- you know, it's something that, it's a little more modern, you know, look, so I think it's fine.

MR. PARSLEY: Right.
MR. BARTOSZEK: So we note that. I'll be happy to change that.

The next one is shutters, is 11 and 12, and I'm just going to go back to the original. The original house had a panel above the louver which is what we would stay, keep with on the original house, the one third panel, the two thirds louver.

What was drawn on the last submission for the new section was all louver, but in the time, because we've been discussing the house and its decorative details, the owners had wished -- they don't really like the louvered shutters that much, so I, on this submission, changed it to a one third panel over a two third panel and got rid of the louvers.

|  | Page 102 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | But that's where the objection came up, I |
| 2 | believe, is perhaps they looked too similar compared to |
| 3 | before. |
| 4 | MS. KAUTZ: Right. Wasn't the board of |
| 5 | architects looking for a full panel? |
| 6 | MR. BARTOSZEK: It was for a full panel, but |
| 7 | then in this scheme it was changed. The old house was |
| 8 | paneled with louvers. |
| 9 | MR. SILVA: But we had already approved this. |
| 10 | MS. KAUTZ: You approved, it was approved |
| 11 | with full louvers. |
| 12 | MR. MENENDEZ: Right. |
| 13 | MS. KAUTZ: Right. |
| 14 | MR. MENENDEZ: Exactly. |
| 15 | MS. KAUTZ: And they then went to the board |
| 16 | of architects with full panels, no louvers. The board of |
| 17 | architects flat-out rejected that entirely. |
| 18 | MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. |
| 19 | MS. KAUTZ: And then sent them to you guys. |
| 20 | MS. LOREDO: I'm sorry. |
| 21 | MR. MENENDEZ: But we had already approved it |
| 22 | one way. |
| 23 | MS. KAUTZ: Right. |
| 24 | MR. MENENDEZ: So I don't know why it should |
| 25 | come back. |
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MS. LOREDO: They didn't. They say that this is something that the historical board has to review, is what they told me, to review it with you.
MS. KAUTZ: Yes, HP to finalize the shutters.
MS. LOREDO: Yes, no, but with you, not that they didn't approve it. They say that this is something that you need to decide.
MS. KAUTZ: The notes that you took said that they did not want to see full panels.
MS. LOREDO: Yes.
MR. BARTOSZEK: On the new windows?
MS. KAUTZ: Correct.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Okay.
MS. KAUTZ: They did not want to see full
panels, so maybe "reject" is too strong a word. They didn't want them.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Okay. So I mean, you can go back, if the existing has -- well, I mean, you go back I guess to the full shutter.
MS. KAUTZ: Correct, which is what they approved, period.
MR. MENENDEZ: We approved that already?
Mr. BARTOSZEK: You approved it previously.
MR. MENENDEZ: Right.
MR. BARTOSZEK: I didn't see -- you know to,
```
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me the full panel, my fear is when you're looking at the house, you're not going to be able to tell what is old and what is new. The house is pretty similar on some of the elevations, so my fear was people are going to wonder what in the world are those louvered shutters doing with the other ones?

So I was just trying to match the one third, two thirds, with both, but if we go back to the all shutter, I guess, all louvered, that's fine.

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Yes, so that would be 11 and 12 are taken care of.

13 is we just added -- as we were in construction in the garage, it was, now that we're air-conditioning the garage -- you'll see it on this elevation. The building is in the way, but you'll see it behind the dotted.

We added a single leaf French door to exit the garage on the side, so we still have the two windows and now there's a door next on one of the windows.

And then along with that, there's a new -staff didn't have a problem with that.

And Number 14, staff didn't have a problem. There's a window on the bottom elevation. To the left of the four columns on the first floor, there's a window, a
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casement window added, and that was not there before, so that was added in as we were working on it.

MR. MENENDEZ: You've already made these -MR. BARTOSZEK: That has been added, that door has been added.

MR. MENENDEZ: So why have so many
alterations been done, and they come to us after they've been done?

MS. LOREDO: The door is not done, installed yet.

MS. KAUTZ: That window --
MS. LOREDO: The other window.
MS. KAUTZ: Yes. The window is in place. The window has already been put up.

MS. LOREDO: Not the door.
MR. MENENDEZ: You've got 14 that's been done, 15, 16, Eight, Two, they've already been done on site, and then they come here when they've already been done.

MR. BARTOSZEK: 16 is the removal of a one-foot high transom over the French doors, so in essence all that we did was we took the old part of the house and made that as seven-foot high with all the rest of the doors and windows of the old part of the house because the original plan had that seven plus one, is eight, and that was the only unique thing to the old part of the house. So we wanted it to be -- you know, there should be a recognition between the old room and then the new addition.

MR. SILVA: I get it.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Yes. I mean, some things had to be done in construction. I mean, $I$ know it's too late, but we kept on doing changes. They all came bundled together.

MR. SILVA: I think while this specific item is not an issue with staff, probably not with us either, I think the larger issue is that we shouldn't be making these changes in the field --

MR. MENENDEZ: Before they come to us.
MR. SILVA: -- before they come to us.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Okay. Well, yeah, in the garage case, there was a new opening put on that wall. In this case, the opening was there. It was just shrunken one foot because we eliminated the transom because already the one-foot transom looked kind of tight, and with the seven-foot door, it looked even stranger because next to it we had the full height.

So I understand that, so, and then while the same thing is happening with, to the right of those four columns, there used to be a louver in that wall, and
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instead there is a window, and that window, that window $I$ believe came originally from maybe the kitchen area. It was somewhere else in the house. That is no longer there, so it was just a matter of putting that window in that place.

MS. THOMSON: So what I'm hearing is it says that the owners of the property would like to make some changes of previously approved plans, and this is what you were saying. "I'm requesting the approval for the revision of the following," and some of these things have already been done.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Correct. I understand they've been done, but it's not like -- well, the worst one was building the wall along Blue Road.

MR. SILVA: Right. We're going to have to revisit the wall.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Yes. The wall I'm sure we'll be talking about more, but these other ones are in the back of the house.

MS. THOMSON: Yeah.
MR. BARTOSZEK: No one sees them because there's two wings, so the only people seeing the window change in the kitchen and louver to the window are the people who live in the house, just like the shower. Those are the only people who see this outdoor shower. No one
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in the public will ever see it because the house is a U-shape and you cannot get far enough on Blue Road to look at this.

MR. PARSLEY: I think we're talking about the process.

MR. BARTOSZEK: I understand.
MS. THOMSON: Yes, the concept of it.
MR. BARTOSZEK: But I mean, I don't know if anyone comes to the board every time they change one window.

MS. KAUTZ: No. They come to us.
MR. SILVA: Right. Staff has to approve things administratively.

Mr. BARTOSZEK: Okay.
MR. SILVA: Something reasonable like --
MR. MENENDEZ: Because if not, we can just say no, we don't approve it.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Okay.
MR. MENENDEZ: And then you've got to knock it down.

MS. SPAIN: Typically people follow the plans. It's really simple. It's not like a suggestion of what you might do if you want to, and all the time people decide halfway through doing stuff that they want to do something else? I understand that, but what you should do
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is stop, revise the plans, come talk to us, and if we need to take it to the board, we will.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Well --
MS. SPAIN: But that didn't happen. I have a real problem with stuff done --

MS. THOMSON: Yes.
MS. SPAIN: -- in the field that isn't according to the plan, and then you ask for forgiveness. I mean, the wall was a big one.

MR. BARTOSZEK: The wall, that is the big one.

MS. THOMSON: I do too.
MS. SPAIN: But the others are issues too, so I have to put my two cents' worth.

DR. RICON: Hi. I'm Mercedes Ricon, the owner, so I think, I know Mr. Torre isn't here, but obviously as an owner, I don't control everything that the contractor does or that his crew does, so I think this is a conversation not to have with me or with Joseph, but really have with Mr. Torre, because again, I'm not on the site every day. I don't know what they do on the site every day or not every day, nor does Joseph.

I wish the anger would be not directed toward us, because again, we are -- I just pay the bills when I get them, and they're a lot, believe me.

MR. BARTOSZEK: I understand your
frustration, but $I$ also understand -- I mean the wall was a big one, but nothing else was, you know --

MR. SILVA: We just have two more.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Yes.
MR. SILVA: And then two more things, and actually staff is recommending against these, so let's finish the list and then we'll go back.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Yes. The other are, again are again shutters and that is at -- okay, okay. The bottom elevation, you have two small windows on the second floor that staff is requesting that shutters are not put there, and that's fine with me. It could just be eliminated. That's no big deal.

The question we have is the window that is all the way to the left on the second floor is new construction. It's not the existing residence, so we believe that that didn't fall -- the guidelines were that if it was a new opening in the old building, you didn't put a shutter on it, but the window that's all the way at the end on the left is a new-built, you know, a new part of the building. That's an addition completely.

And there's one on the opposite side of the house which $I$ believe is noted in the next note which is, it's again on the bottom elevation, it's to the right of
the trellis. That also was new construction. It wasn't -- but it's again, it's one shutter to one side of the window because it's a mirror window.

So if there's an objection to putting a shutter like that on the window, we can remove it, but it's, you know, it's -- those are, that's the new part of the building.

So I believe that covers. The other things that, that we would like to cover with staff is at the bottom of that page, which is a proposed trellis which is drawn on that, the garage doors where we submit a submittal to staff, you know, and then the front door replacement, and that's one of the -- we have a sticking point there between the owners and administration.

MR. MENENDEZ: That's a beautiful front door.
MR. BARTOSZEK: It's a beautiful front door, but we we want to replicate it so that it's hurricane proof, and now it's an in-swing door which is falling apart.

MR. SILVA: So that's not part of this application?

MR. BARTOSZEK: No, but we would like to handle it with staff as just a replacement, staff says we can just replace the door. I mean, I've gone through two shop drawings with the company where I keep on marking up
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to make sure the pilasters are correct.
I mean, we're not going to do something modern in the opening. We are trying to replicate what is there, and for the owners, they spent a significant amount of money on the house. This is an east-facing door. It's the only thing that does not meet code, or will not meet code.

You know, and they have a wood floor on the inside. The threshold leaks right now, so again, how much should be done to replace -- you know, the surround is rotting a bit also, and they want to have, you know, the pin system in-swing door that will not fly open in a hurricane, and to do that -- you know, we're taking the lattice glass that pops on the inside, that we're making sure that we want to save, pop the lattice glass back in.

So it's a matter of, you know, you know, if they cannot get their credit on their insurance because of this opening, but they are doing renovation to the entire house.

MR. SILVA: Right, so those things, it's difficult for us to judge anything about them because we haven't gotten the information as part of the application, so I'm not sure --

MS. SPAIN: Do you have a photograph, a close-up photograph of the door?
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I think that the condition that you all put on the approval last time they were here is for staff to go out and inspect the door to see whether it could be, it could remain, so ElizaBeth and $I$ went out to the home, and we believe that they should keep that door. At least when we went out there, it had not, had not fallen into disrepair.

MR. BARTOSZEK: You've agreed to the door to be replaced, but not the surroundings.

MS. SPAIN: I'm talking about -- well, I don't know how you can replace the door --

MR. MENENDEZ: The system.
MS. SPAIN: The system. I mean, I'm not sure that you can replace that door with the surrounding and remain --

MR. BARTOSZEK: Well, that's the question. So don't you have to replace the transom and the two side lights?

MS. SPAIN: I'm saying you don't have to replace anything.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Well, the door is literally falling apart, and the door is not the style that's on the photograph also. That's like a ten-panel door, has nothing to do with a Colonial house.

MR. PARSLEY: You're trying to just replace
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the brown portion, not the white frame.
MR. BARTOSZEK: No. We are -- the owner would like everything to be replaced so that that becomes hurricane compliant.

MR. MENENDEZ: So is this an active site now, an active construction site now?

MR. BARTOSZEK: Yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Because for many months it was inactive.

MR. BARTOSZEK: There was work being done in on the inside.

MR. MENENDEZ: No. It was inactive. I live around the corner so I know.

So was anything done to protect the door to preserve the door?

MR. BARTOSZEK: No, because I'm -- not that I've done myself, and the contractor should have probably done that if that was what the case was, but the intention of the client is to, because it's a non-hurricane-proof door and they want the whole opening to become hurricane compliant.

MR. PARSLEY: Okay, but there is the option with the netting, the hurricane netting, where you can bolt it on. I know, putting up shutters, it's easier than shutters.

|  | Page 115 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | You can get the opening compliant for |
| 2 | hurricanes should you choose to without having to replace |
| 3 | the door, so I don't think, if we say no to this, that |
| 4 | doesn't mean you can't get your -- |
| 5 | MR. BARTOSZEK: And what if we show shop |
| 6 | drawings that duplicates the moldings of this thing? The |
| 7 | house is not a historic home. It's contributing. |
| 8 | MS. KAUTZ: Same thing. |
| 9 | MR. MENENDEZ: That means basically it is, so |
| 10 | it contributes to the neighborhood, and staff has stated |
| 11 | that the door, in their opinion, is in good condition, so |
| 12 | why would it come out? |
| 13 | MR. BARTOSZEK: Well, who would take the |
| 14 | liability if the owners are traveling and the shutters |
| 15 | aren't put up on the opening and a hurricane comes? They |
| 16 | want a fully protected house. |
| 17 | MS. THOMSON: Has it been looked into for an |
| 18 | exact duplicate? |
| 19 | MR. BARTOSZEK: Yes. That's what we've been |
| 20 | -- that's what I've been marking up with shop drawings |
| 21 | with the company. |
| 22 | MS. THOMSON: Okay. |
| 23 | MS. KAUTZ: That portion of this discussion |
| 24 | is not part of this request at all -- |
| 25 | MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. |
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MS. KAUTZ: -- at all, neither are the trellis, neither are the garage doors.
MR. BARTOSZEK: Well, we were hoping those items could be done with staff, not to come to the board. MS. THOMSON: Okay.
MR. MENENDEZ: So you guys would like to see that, see that come back?
MS. KAUTZ: That all depends on what it actually is. We haven't seen it either, so we may bring it back to you anyway.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MR. SILVA: That's the normal process. You submit it to staff for proposal. They review it, and if they think it needs to come to us, they'll send it to us. I think we should follow --
MR. BARTOSZEK: Okay. No, that's fine, that's fine.
With the fountain, with certain items, with the trellis that was off the bathroom that was on the second floor, we were hoping that those items could just be handled with staff because they're not huge elements of the design.
MR. PARSLEY: So take it to staff and they'll decide.
MR. SILVA: So, all right, so I think we've
```
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covered everything.
MR. BARTOSZEK: We are done with this.
MR. SILVA: We've gone through the 19 points.
By my reckoning, we have --
MS. THOMSON: I can't hear him.
MR. SILVA: -- this is our --
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Speak into the mike.
MS. THOMSON: Yes, please.
MR. SILVA: Okay. So as we were going
through, we are in agreement with all of staff's recommendations as to approvals, approvals with conditions, and denials. They list -- you know, they have three categories.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Correct. Are there any other denials that --

MR. SILVA: So we have Number Four which was the gazebo.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Correct.
MR. SILVA: Robert had some comments, so that
falls under staff recommends approval with comments, so we'll take those comments and work with staff on that.

Then the only other place -- so we are falling in line with everything, and the only thing we do still need to discuss is the wall.

Everything else, we agree with staff's
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | recommendations on Nine. We agree with staff's |
| 2 | recommendations on approval with conditions. We agree |
| 3 | with staff's recommendations on approvals as listed in the |
| 4 | recommendations. |
| 5 | The only one we have not discussed in detail, |
| 6 | I believe we can discuss, is that wall. |
| 7 | MS. KAUTZ: And then Robert had an amendment |
| 8 | to Number Five. |
| 9 | MR. PARSLEY: To Number Four. |
| 10 | MR. SILVA: To Number Four and Five. |
| 11 | MR. BARTOSZEK: Yes. The planter is going to |
| 12 | become a T -shape, and then we also have an amendment to |
| 13 | the two landings outside the family room. |
| 14 | MR. SILVA: Well, that's, that's part of |
| 15 | staff's recommendations for denial, leaving it as it was. |
| 16 | That was already recommended, and we're in agreement with |
| 17 | that, so. |
| 18 | MR. PARSLEY: The wall was Number Two? |
| 19 | MR. SILVA: Yes, the wall is Number Two. |
| 20 | MR. BARTOSZEK: So the denials that, so that, |
| 21 | the landings outside the family room we have to come back |
| 22 | to you to show, or? Because they've denied it, so. |
| 23 | MR. SILVA: So we're recommending, we're |
| 24 | recommending denial as well, because I think -- |
| 25 | MR. PARSLEY: Built to the original plans. |
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MR. BARTOSZEK: So I have to bring that back to show you that?

MR. SILVA: No. That's already --
MR. PARSLEY: Approved, the original.
MR. SILVA: Yes. You're building to the original plans except whatever we revised today.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Okay.
MR. SILVA: So let's talk about the wall. Who wants to start?

MS. RICON: Can we speak now?
MR. SILVA: Yes.
MS. RICON: My name is Mercedes Ricon. I am the mother of Dr . Mercedes Ricon. I am the grandmother of Monica who is named after my deceased child, and I am the grandmother of Michael, and I am the grandmother of Matthew.

When we started the house, my daughter did not have any children. Three years later, she had three children.

The way the house is being managed is not up to us. It's up to our GC who is wonderfully talented, but maybe he's busy with other projects. I have no idea.

We would have wanted to be in this house a year ago. We can no longer fit into my house, no longer fit into my house, so I am begging to reallly progress as
quickly as we can so that $I$, my child and my grandchildren can be in that beautiful home that is everything that we dreamed of.

It was the poorest and saddest -- not poorest in value.

DR. RICON: Very neglected.
MS. RICON: But very neglected when we purchased it, and I saw that and I said, "Honey, we have to buy this house because the spirit and the energy are very, and I know that you and my future grandchildren will be protected here."

I respect everything that is said here, but I am worried about the safety and welfare of my grandchildren. That wall, I can bend over from the outside and reach down. It is so low because Blue Road is so much higher than our property.

So we took children with my, pictures of my grandchildren on the inside where you can see that anyone could really just bend over and grab them. Even if they're innocent babies, they'll go with anyone. They won't even scream because all they've learned from the moment -- they almost died when they were born.

We did everything in the world. That's why we haven't been to any of the other meetings, because we've been with nurses, we've been with everyone we could
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be to save my grandchildren, and now thank God they're healthy and the newborn baby is healthy, so that has been so kind.

So I'm asking for your consideration and for your kindness in allowing my children to be safe when it comes to that wall, and allowing -- look what happened in Mexico Beach. The only house left standing is a house that was completely hurricane proof, all the windows, all the doors, everything. People were killed.

And my daughter's husband travels. He's never home, so it's her alone with three babies, and then I try to be with her as much as I can. I have my own home, but I try to be with her as much as I can to help with the children. It is so much work.

I respect Dona Spain and what she does to protect the city and to protect the beauty, the beauty of this city is. My hat goes down to her even though $I$ don't have a hat on.

That door is rotten. The first thing I did when we bought the house was to tell my daughter to please have the house exterminated. There are still termites in the front of the door. If that wood structure that she believes is solid -- which is disconnected from the bottom. There's nothing connecting it from the bottom.

The door which we've been allowed to change,
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that door is -- I don't know if there is fiberglass, I don't know, but there are hairs that come out of the door from every angle.

It's been in the same state when she saw it the first time, and it's in the same state now.

Has it been protected? Of course. We protect the entire property. We drive by it all the time also, and when we really don't see anyone working there, my heart is crushed because she doesn't fit in my house anymore. She does not have one room for those three babies. They do not fit in my house.

I beg everyone, please, if there's anyone working, please hurry up. We want to be in the house and we want it to be finished and we want it to be beautiful. We want it to be one --

DR. RICON: As beautiful as possible.
MS. RICON: -- in Santa Maria. We're working with Joseph, who is one of the most talented interior decorators that I have ever known. He's come up with plans for the house that we could not even envision.

Monica has put her heart into this house. I think we're a great team. Venny is amazing. You know, he's given us ideas that have really made it even more significant.

I want my babies to be safe. I don't want a
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hurricane to come and for me to be in front of you and say my babies, including my baby, have been hurt.

I'm not strong. I'm not able to put shutters. To think of putting these hurricane shutters in the front that close like this and on such a beautiful home, it will take away.

We are willing to reproduce the entire door, make it safe, the entire structure, and this is not the original door, by the way, because we have the original plans. It's not the original door.

When they opened it up from the inside, we could see this big gap where the original door used to be, and then how much smaller they made the door when they replaced it, who knows when, in the '70s, I guess. I could open up the door.

MS. KAUTZ: The door is not part of this application so they're not discussing that today.

MR. SILVA: So the door, we're not, we're not saying no to the door, we're not saying yes to the door, just so everyone is clear on the process.

If you want to change the door, you can work with staff. You submit a proposed revision and they'll review it. If they disagree and feel it needs to come to us, it will come to us.

But we can't evaluate a shop drawing,
something that is not yet created, right? That's just --
MS. RICON: So I'll be very happy to come back. Thank you for offering that, but please consider that the gate along Blue Road --

DR. RICON: The wall.
MS. RICON: The wall. When we, when we actually marked where the proper alignment was, that easement became so large, and there are gardeners parked there all the time, service trucks parked there all the time, I really fear for my grandchildren. I fear for the safety of the home because we are open, and then again, we're alone all the time.

So thank you so much. I know what you do is sacred and important, and we sit on boards that are throughout the country and we know how important what you do is, so thank you, and please consider my beautiful babies. Thank you so much.

MR. SILVA: Thank you. Does anyone else from the public wish to speak to this matter?

If not, we'll close the public hearing and we can keep discussions on the wall. So there's two -- the wall has two components, right?

Number one, the extension of the wall for an additional two bays, and number two, the -- making it higher, essentially, right?
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So in terms of the extension of the wall, I don't necessarily have a problem with that. We already have a solid wall along Blue Road. Extending it another two bays, in my mind, is not the end of the world. Again, that's my opinion.

The raising of the wall $I$ think merits a little discussion. I'm not so sure that that is the only way to handle security. I think there's other options, landscaping. There's other options that I think we would like to discuss. I'd like to hear your all's opinions on the wall with the extension and the raising, both.

MR. PARSLEY: I'll start. I don't have a problem with the extension or raising as long as it is compliant to regular wall heights. They have the right kind of to do it.

And I would like to see a landscape plan or at least staff review a landscape plan on the street trees along Blue Road, you know, work with the city to get something out there, soften it. I think that was --

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Here is the landscape. This is a survey of the trees, the back.

MR. PARSLEY: There's the trees on Blue Road. The trees are in good shape.

Anyway, I don't have a problem with going to six feet. I don't think it's the end of the world. It's
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a busy road.
MR. FULLERTON: I agree with Robert. I think it's a common method of protecting your property. Masonry wall with a fence on top, pickets on top, $I$ don't have any objection to.

MS. KAUTZ: To clarify, the columns are six feet tall. How much are the pickets being added?

MR. FULLERTON: I think they're allowed to go six feet.

MS. KAUTZ: Right, but it doesn't look like from the drawings. I'm curious if it's a full two feet of pickets. There was --

MR. PARSLEY: As long as it's compliant with the building code, they're okay. Then the esthetics of it, I'm okay with.

MR. EHRENHAFT: The wall is four feet.
MR. PARSLEY: We're not here for a variance.
MR. MENENDEZ: Are there columns on the wall now?

MR. BARTOSZEK: The columns are just over four feet. We did not extend the columns to six foot high.

MR. EHRENHAFT: Four feet dimension, right?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: So you have to extend them.
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MR. BARTOSZEK: We would do everything by code. If it's six feet, that would be six feet, the top of the column, and then we would work from there down because the column would have a cap, so if the cap is three to four inches, then that would be one feet eight for the pickets.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Or the pickets can notch around the existing caps if you wanted to.

MR. BARTOSZEK: Yes.
MR. PARSLEY: I've seen that.
MR. FULLERTON: And the masonry wall, four feet from the inside.

Mr. BARTOSZEK: It can be four feet from the outside.

MR. FULLERTON: I'm just saying.
MS. KAUTZ: To establish grade, to establish grade whenever the zoning gets that.

MR. FULLERTON: But if this is an enclosure to protect from the pool, it must be four feet from the point at which you're trying to enter the property, so that would be the established grade.

MR. PARSLEY: From the outside.
MR. FULLERTON: Especially if there's a marked difference between the outside and the inside.

MR. BARTOSZEK: So then I'll tell the
contractor that that's strictly outside, not where the pool is going to be.

MR. MENENDEZ: You need to verify with the building department to not run into any problems.

MR. PARSLEY: Particularly if there's a note on the drawing.

MS. LOREDO: From the outside, from the outside.

MR. FULLERTON: The four feet is --
MS. LOREDO: From the outside.
MS. KAUTZ: It's a visual four-foot screen from the exterior.

MR. FULLERTON: So then whatever picket you're putting on top would be above four feet so you should be protected from the zoning issue or building issue.

MR. MENENDEZ: And then staff would work with you on that to make sure that whatever is chosen is acceptable.

MR. SILVA: So then do we have a consensus on the wall then? Any other opinions?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: If the consensus is that we allow the wall to remain, yes.

MR. SILVA: Well, to remain and be extended.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: To be extended.

```
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    MS. THOMSON: Now, does this establish a
    precedent, like --
    MR. PARSLEY: No.
    MS. THOMSON: No?
    MR. PARSLEY: They have this by right.
    MS. THOMSON: Okay.
    MR. SILVA: Well, well, the only thing that
we're here, again, there were two bays --
    MR. MENENDEZ: That were added.
    MR. SILVA: -- that were added, that they
would be allowed to build by code that was not as per.
That's the only thing we're doing that is out of the
ordinary.
MS. THOMSON: Okay.
MR. PARSLEY: They could have come in with this wall from the beginning --
MR. SILVA: Right.
MR. PARSLEY: -- and we would have said okay because they can do it by right. Anybody can do it.
MS. KAUTZ: But for example, on Santa Maria Street, we don't, we typically don't encourage or you all don't approve a six-foot high wall, so.
MR. BARTOSZEK: We're not asking for Santa Maria.
```

MS. KAUTZ: I know. That's what I'm saying.
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. PARSLEY: Number Nine was the roof. |
| 2 | MS. BACHE-WIIG: Number Nine, we are going to |
| 3 | approve the new roof and trellis. |
| 4 | MS. KAUTZ: Is that it? |
| 5 | MS. BACHE-WIIG: That's it, right? |
| 6 | MR. FULLERTON: Yes. |
| 7 | MR. MENENDEZ: That's it. |
| 8 | MR. BARTOSZEK: Thank you very much. |
| 9 | MR. SILVA: Wait. |
| 10 | MR. BARTOSZEK: Oh, that's right. I'm sorry. |
| 11 | MR. MENENDEZ: We haven't voted. |
| 12 | MR. SILVA: All right. So we have a motion. |
| 13 | MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'll second the motion. |
| 14 | MR. SILVA: You got that, Yessie? All right. |
| 15 | We have a second by Mr. Rodriguez. |
| 16 | THE CLERK: Mr. Fullerton? |
| 17 | MR. FULLERTON: Yes. |
| 18 | THE CLERK: Miss Bache-Wiig? |
| 19 | MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes. |
| 20 | THE CLERK: Mr. Parsley? |
| 21 | MR. PARSLEY: Yes. |
| 22 | THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez? |
| 23 | MR. MENENDEZ: Yes. |
| 24 | THE CLERK: Mr. Ehrenhaft? |
| 25 | MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes. |
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C E R T I F C A T E
    STATE OF FLORIDA)
    COUNTY OF DADE)
    I, DOREEN M. STRAUSS, do here by certify that
    the foregoing pages, numbered from 1 to including 136,
    represent a true and accurate transcription of the record
        of the proceedings in the above-mentioned meeting.
    WITNESS my hand in the City of Miami this 9th
        day of November, 2018.
                Doreen M. Strauss, RMR
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