

CITY
OF
CORAL GABLES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MEETING

405 Biltmore Way,
Coral Gables, Florida
Thursday, 4:05 p.m.,
July 18, 2019.

PARTICIPANTS:

BRUCE EHRENHAFT, Chairperson
JOHN FULLERTON, Board Member
CESAR GARCIA-PONS, Board Member
XAVIER DURANA, Board Member
RAUL R. RODRIGUEZ, Board Member
MIKE SARDINAS, Board Member
JANICE THOMSON, Board Member

DONA SPAIN, Historic Preservation Officer

KARA KAUTZ, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer

GUSTAVO J. CEBALLOS, Assistant City Attorney

YESENIA DIAZ, Administrative Assistant

1 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. Good afternoon.

2 Welcome to the regularly scheduled meeting of the City of
3 Coral Gables Historic Preservation Board.

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

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

15 Any person who acts as a lobbyist pursuant to
16 the City of Coral Gables Ordinance Number 2006-11 must
17 register with the city clerk prior to engaging in lobbying
18 activities or presentations before the city staff, boards,
19 committees, and/or the city commission. A copy of the
20 ordinance is available in the city -- office of the city
21 clerk. Failure to register and provide proof of
22 registration shall prohibit your ability to present to the
23 Historic Preservation Board on applications under
24 consideration this afternoon.

25 "Lobbyist" is defined as an individual,

1 corporation, partnership or other legal entity employed or
2 retained, whether paid or not, by a principal who seeks to
3 encourage the approval, disapproval, adoption, repeal,
4 passage, defeat or modifications of: A, any ordinance,
5 resolution, action or decision of any city commissioner.

6 B, any action, decision, recommendation of
7 the city manager, any city board or committee, including,
8 but not limited to, quasi-judicial advisory board, trust,
9 authority, or council.

10 Or C, any action, decision, or recommendation
11 of city personnel during the time period of the entire
12 decision-making process on the action, decision or
13 recommendation which foreseeably will be heard or reviewed
14 by the city commission or a city board or committee,
15 including, but not limited to, quasi-judicial advisory
16 board, trust, authority or council.

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

20 I now officially call the City of Coral
21 Gables Historic Preservation Board meeting of July 18th,
22 2019 to order. The time is 4:08 p.m.

23 Present today are board members, to my right,
24 Javier Durana, John P. Fullerton, Cesar Garcia-Pons,
25 Albert Menendez.

1 MS. SPAIN: He's not here.

2 MR. EHRENHAFT: To my left -- I'm sorry, he's
3 not here.

4 MS. SPAIN: Right.

5 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. Alicia Bach-Wiig is
6 also not here. I'm sorry.

7 So to my left is Raul R. Rodriguez, Mike
8 Sardinas and Janice E. Thomson.

9 I believe that there were written requests
10 for excused absence from Miss Bach-Wiig and --

11 MS. SPAIN: Also Mr. Menendez.

12 MR. EHRENHAFT: -- and Mr. Menendez.

13 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

14 MR. EHRENHAFT: So may we have a voice vote
15 for the two requested absences? All in favor?

16 MS. SPAIN: I think we need a motion.

17 MR. EHRENHAFT: We need a motion.

18 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

19 MR. EHRENHAFT: I'm sorry.

20 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: So moved.

21 MR. EHRENHAFT: Is there a second? Okay.

22 MR. FULLERTON: Second.

23 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. All in favor?

24 THE BOARD MEMBERS: Aye (collectively).

25 MR. EHRENHAFT: No opposed? Okay. Motion

1 passes. Okay, okay.

2 Staff present today from the Historical
3 Resources and Cultural Arts Department are the department
4 director, Dona M. Spain, who is the city historic
5 preservation officer, department assistant director, Kara
6 Kautz, who is the city assistant -- assistant historic
7 preservation officer, and administrative assistant,
8 Yesenia Diaz.

9 The next item on the agenda is approval of
10 the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, June 20,
11 2019. Are there any changes or corrections? Okay.
12 Hearing none, is there a motion to approve?

13 MS. THOMSON: I move that we approve the
14 minutes from the last meeting.

15 MR. EHRENHAFT: Is there a second?

16 MR. FULLERTON: I second.

17 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

18 MR. FULLERTON: Second.

19 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. No discussion? Okay.
20 Hearing no further discussion, we may now call the roll.
21 Can we do that by voice vote, or?

22 MS. SPAIN: I think you can do it by voice
23 vote. What do we normally do?

24 MR. EHRENHAFT: Oh, I did it. I'm sorry.
25 Excuse me, yes. All right.

1 MS. SPAIN: You can do it by voice vote,
2 right? Yes.

3 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

4 MR. CEBALLOS: Yes, you can.

5 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay, all right. So all in
6 favor? Everybody is?

7 THE BOARD: Yes (collectively).

8 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay, all right, for the
9 record, okay. Thank you.

10 Now we have to discuss the notices regarding
11 ex parte communications. Please be advised that this
12 board is a quasi-judicial board and the items on the
13 agenda are quasi-judicial in nature which requires board
14 members to disclose all ex parte communications.

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

21 If anybody has any made contact with a board
22 member, when the issue comes before the board, the member
23 must state on the record the existence of the ex parte
24 communication, the party who originated the communication,
25 and whether the communication will affect the board

1 member's ability to impartially consider the evidence to
2 be presented regarding the matter. Okay. Are there any
3 deferrals today?

4 MS. SPAIN: No. I believe there's a request
5 for a deferral.

6 MR. GUILFORD: Yes. All right. Good
7 afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the board. For the
8 record, I'm Zeke Guilford, offices at 400 University
9 Drive.

10 I have the great pleasure today to be
11 representing Southeastern Investment Group which is for
12 the designation of 333 Catalonia. We are asking for a
13 deferral to the next meeting. Our expert is unavailable
14 to make it here today. I was just officially retained
15 approximately two weeks ago, the architectural firm of
16 Chisholm Architects was last Thursday.

17 We would like just a month to get our hands
18 around this designation and be able to fully understand it
19 and have our expert here to, to present our case.

20 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

21 MS. SPAIN: Totally up to the board. The
22 historic significance determination on this came in, in
23 February and -- no. Came in on February. I issued the
24 determination in March, and so.

25 MR. GUILFORD: Let me just, let me just kind

1 of follow up. Dr. Zakharia is right here. He's the
2 president of Southeastern Investments.

3 He's a very elderly gentleman. He really has
4 a hard time understanding the designation and what this
5 means, so it's kind of taking him a long time to kind of
6 figure out what all this means to him, so like I said, he
7 just retained us and the architectural firm, and I think
8 it's important that Bob Chisholm is here.

9 Bob has extensive knowledge in historic
10 preservation. He was part of the group that restored the
11 Biltmore Hotel. I believe, if I'm not mistaken, he was on
12 a committee that created the Art Deco District in Miami
13 Beach. He has great knowledge of historic preservation.

14 So we ask that, that this matter be deferred
15 to the next meeting.

16 MS. SPAIN: So I think that's probably a good
17 idea. I would hate to have this tainted in any way
18 because we're going forward when they're requesting a
19 deferral, so.

20 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

21 MS. SPAIN: We'll schedule it for next month.
22 Gus, what do I do about the letters that have come in, in
23 favor of or against the designation?

24 MR. CEBALLOS: They can just be brought in
25 the next meeting and we'll ask the board, though, that

1 someone does need to make a motion and second it, and then
2 vote it on to defer the item.

3 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

4 MR. GUILFORD: And Mr. Chair, if I can ask
5 one thing, if I could get a copy --

6 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

7 MR. GUILFORD: -- of those letters from
8 staff, that would be fantastic. Thank you.

9 MR. FULLERTON: I move deferral.

10 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Second it.

11 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Do we have a discussion on
12 that? Can I ask a question?

13 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes, of course.

14 GARCIA-PONS: So just to clarify, this
15 designation was at the request of the owner?

16 MS. SPAIN: No. This, in 2003, the city
17 commission passed an ordinance requiring any demolition in
18 the city, even for those properties that are not
19 historically designated, to be reviewed by the historic
20 preservation officer.

21 And so there is an application form that
22 people fill out that comes to our office. We do the
23 research, and if we deem the property significant, we're
24 required within 60 days to bring it to the Historic
25 Preservation Board for designation unless we agree upon a

1 deferral.

2 So I already agreed upon the deferral till
3 today, and I don't have a problem with another month.

4 MR. EHRENHAFT: Thank you. Okay.

5 MR. FULLERTON: We have a motion and a
6 second.

7 MR. EHRENHAFT: I have a motion.

8 MR. FULLERTON: And second.

9 MR. EHRENHAFT: And a second.

10 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: We just need a vote.

11 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay, right. So Jessie, can
12 we have a roll call on this, please?

13 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Sure. Miss
14 Thomson?

15 MS. THOMSON: Yes.

16 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Fullerton?

17 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

18 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Durana?

19 MR. DURANA: Yes.

20 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Garcia-
21 Pons?

22 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.

23 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Sardinias?

24 MR. SARDINAS: Yes.

25 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Rodriguez?

1 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

2 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

3 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

4 MR. GUILFORD: Thank you very much,
5 appreciate it.

6 MS. SPAIN: Okay. So for those people that
7 are here and also the people that are watching on TV, the
8 next meeting is August the 15th, and it starts again at
9 4:00.

10 MR. EHRENHAFT: Thank you.

11 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: That clears the room.

12 MR. EHRENHAFT: In the order of the agenda,
13 yes. Okay. Then we can proceed to Section Seven of the
14 agenda, special certificates of appropriateness.

15 The first one that we have before us is for a
16 public hearing on Case File COA (SP) 2017-003, Revised.
17 The address of the property is 516 Navarre Avenue.

18 This is an application for issuance of a
19 special certificate of appropriateness for the property at
20 516 Navarre Avenue, a local historic landmark legally
21 described as Lots Eight and Nine, Block 14, Coral Gables
22 Section B, according to the plat thereof as recorded in
23 Plat Book Five at Page 11 -- 111 of the public records of,
24 excuse me, of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

25 The application requesting design approval

1 for additions and alterations to the residence and site
2 was approved with conditions on April 20, 2017.

3 A variance was approved from Article Four,
4 Section 4-101 (D) 4 b of the Coral Gables zoning code for
5 the overall set-back.

6 The application requests design approval for
7 revisions to the approved certificate of appropriateness.

8 MR. CEBALLOS: Pardon my interruption. I
9 don't believe that any of the speakers have been sworn in
10 yet, so if we can go ahead and do that.

11 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

12 MS. KAUTZ: If you're speaking, whoever is
13 speaking needs to rise and be sworn in.

14 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

15 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Please raise
16 your right hand. Do you swear to tell the whole truth and
17 nothing but the truth?

18 THE AUDIENCE MEMBERS: I do (collectively).

19 MS. KAUTZ: Can you pass the Power Point,
20 please? Can you skip to the second item, please? The
21 second item, not slide.

22 So in 1935, Permit Number 4954 was issued for
23 the construction of the residence at 516 Navarre Avenue.
24 The architects were the firm of Paist and Steward, and it
25 was a transitional building shifting away from

1 Mediterranean revival.

2 In November of 2016, the property was listed
3 as a local historic landmark. As Bruce mentioned earlier,
4 in April of 2017 a special COA was issued for additions
5 and alterations to the residence and also site work on the
6 property.

7 One of the conditions of that approval was
8 that the perimeter wall and gates and walkway and driveway
9 would be excluded from that approval and would require
10 further board review, so this is coming back to you now
11 for that review of the wall, gates, paver walkways, paver
12 driveways.

13 And then at the same time, they're also
14 asking for the construction of a pool house attached to
15 the rear of the property and a covered terrace at the
16 southwest corner of the residence. They're all in there
17 together. This -- oops. No, I'll do it.

18 So the location map of the property. This is
19 a photo from the 1940s, shortly after it was constructed,
20 and this is the presentation. I'll hand this over to you.

21 No variances that have been requested with
22 this application. The board of architects did review the
23 proposal on May 23rd with no comments. We had a couple
24 little comments that we'll address at the end of this
25 presentation, so I'll turn it over to the owner.

1 MR. CABRAL: Good afternoon. My name is
2 Dagoberto Cabral, and I'm the owner.

3 MS. KAUTZ: Before you start, forward,
4 backward.

5 MR. CABRAL: Okay. Thank you. This is a
6 project that when we purchased the home, it actually
7 became historical while we were purchasing the home, and
8 all the modifications that we've made and all the
9 architecture that we've made has always been with the
10 assistance of the Coral Gables historical board, so we've
11 always tried to maintain the original look.

12 When we came the first time, the wall that we
13 had designed, we weren't properly designed correctly
14 because we were jogging them back onto the property, so
15 the board asked us to come back and redesign.

16 And then in that time, we, we designed a pool
17 house in the back that was, that it's going to observe for
18 the pool area, a gym and some storage, and that's why
19 we're here, and I brought Hamed. He is my architect, and
20 he'd like to explain a little bit more on the project.

21 MR. HAMED RODRIGUEZ: Good afternoon, members
22 of the board.

23 MR. EHRENHAFT: Good afternoon.

24 MR. HAMED RODRIGUEZ: My name is Hamed
25 Rodriguez. Our office is at 275 Minorca Avenue.

1 So this house was previously approved when we
2 did this the first time, and what we did is all of the new
3 additions, we set it back so that the original house would
4 stand proud of what we were doing and it was a good
5 solution.

6 What we're here for today is the pool house,
7 and we, we still complied with the lot coverage just, just
8 under, and the question at hand is, is, you know, we're
9 seeking your approval on that.

10 And we're also seeking your approval on the
11 front wall which what we did there is rather than have any
12 jogs going back and making it a bit busy, we redesigned it
13 and presented it again to the board, and what they asked
14 us to do was to have a couple of piers have some scores to
15 pick up some of the elements of some of the scores on the
16 front, but not all of them, just key, key columns, and
17 you'll see that when you see the elevations.

18 So really that's what we're here for is that
19 front wall with the articulation of the lower wall, the
20 piers and the metal, and also the placement of the, of the
21 rear. As you could see -- let's see.

22 MR. CABRAL: This is forward.

23 MR. HAMED RODRIGUEZ: Yeah. Right. There
24 you could see that we're wrapping around the corner a bit
25 so it doesn't stop abruptly on a picket fence, and let's

1 see here, and also you can see how we set back the new
2 addition in relationship to the original house.

3 Here you could see the front. We're keeping
4 the front gate, and that's the one that has the piers with
5 the scores, and it's aligned with the front door, and on
6 each side, just because it's limited parking, we have one
7 rolling gate on each side for, for parking.

8 There's the other view, so this would be the
9 east side, and you can see how we wrap around the corner
10 so even the neighbors doesn't have a fence. You would
11 still get that same articulation on the sides.

12 And then there on this corner you could see
13 what we did with the guest house is we just made an
14 extension of the, of what's the master bedroom on the
15 other side of the guest house, so we have a covered --
16 it's an, it appears like a trellis, but it's a covered
17 area, and that's a private area there off of the master
18 bedroom, so we created a little bit of separation for, for
19 a little water feature that the client can put there.

20 There you can see a little, a little bit more
21 of the space, so now rather than it being a tight space
22 which we were considering before, we're going to take full
23 advantage of the set-back that we're allowed and create a
24 more comfortable space between the two.

25 And this is just to show some existing

1 pictures of all the other detached accessory buildings on
2 the other properties. They're all similar as being five
3 feet, or actually less than five feet from the property
4 lines, so we're at five feet.

5 And this is another neighbor, and this is
6 the, this is in the back, and you can see the back of the
7 other neighbors' accessory buildings.

8 MR. CABRAL: All three neighbors.

9 MR. HAMED RODRIGUEZ: Yeah. All three
10 neighbors have accessory building much like this, and we
11 had one ourselves which we couldn't keep because it was
12 structurally unsafe, and that's what we're asking for your
13 approval.

14 MS. KAUTZ: All right. Could you put the
15 Power Point back up? The only comments that we had
16 regarding the wall are that there are very few perimeter,
17 front perimeter walls and fences on this street, and it's
18 proposed, the piers are proposed to be five feet tall, and
19 we thought that this might be a little bit overwhelming to
20 the street and recommended an overall height of the fence
21 and piers at four feet.

22 And then the number at the west and the east
23 elevations you see on both sides flanking the spacing of
24 the piers seemed like there were more than was necessary,
25 so that maybe they could eliminate one or two to make them

1 a longer space so it's not so busy.

2 But regarding the pool house, it does -- it
3 is in keeping with the proposed additions that were
4 already approved.

5 The only comment we had is the square windows
6 to the rear of the -- those three square windows don't
7 really have anything to do with the historic house at all,
8 and maybe those get changed to be more in keeping with
9 what's on the house.

10 For you two, I spoke to zoning after we
11 drafted up this staff report, and the connection, in order
12 to have this be considered an addition to the house with
13 that trellis, the door leading into this space needs to be
14 under that trellis so you're under a covered walkway all
15 the way through, so you're just going to have to change,
16 shift the door.

17 MR. CABRAL: Yeah, we can do that.

18 MS. KAUTZ: I mean, it's fairly easy.

19 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: You could put it here,
20 yeah.

21 MS. KAUTZ: You could put it on the side
22 somewhere.

23 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Yeah. There's a way to
24 do that.

25 MS. KAUTZ: That was just for them to know.

1 Otherwise we have no issues with it.

2 MR. CABRAL: And the windows --

3 MR. FULLERTON: Isn't there a spa or water
4 feature or tub or something against that wall?

5 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: It's a hot tub, yeah.

6 MR. CABRAL: Yeah, but there's room on the
7 the side.

8 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: There is some room on
9 the side --

10 MR. CABRAL: Yeah.

11 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: -- on the west side of
12 it to accommodate that.

13 MR. SARDINAS: Yes.

14 MS. KAUTZ: It is just the way the zoning
15 code reads. To be an addition, it has to be all under
16 cover so you can walk without being out from under the
17 cover.

18 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Are you accepting the
19 recommendation of staff --

20 MR. CABRAL: Yes.

21 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: -- with regards to the
22 fence?

23 MR. CABRAL: Yes.

24 MR. SARDINAS: And the windows?

25 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: And the windows?

1 MR. CABRAL: Yes.

2 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: We'll make them more in
3 keeping with the other ones.

4 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Is there -- the drawings
5 that we have don't show a low wall at the front gate. Is
6 that something different?

7 MR. CABRAL: I think the low wall doesn't
8 show where the rolling gate is.

9 MR. GARCIA-PONS: It doesn't show anywhere.

10 MR. FULLERTON: No.

11 MR. CABRAL: Oh, I'm sorry.

12 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: There was a revised,
13 right.

14 MS. KAUTZ: Do I have the right one?

15 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: No.

16 MR. CABRAL: The one that --

17 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: I guess that did not get
18 replaced. This is the correct one.

19 MR. FULLERTON: Is the rendering correct?

20 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Yes, the rendering is
21 correct, so we could come back with all the changes
22 include, make sure the low wall is in there this time.

23 MR. GARCIA-PONS: You may not need to come
24 back.

25 MS. KAUTZ: All right. If you all want to

1 see it quickly, pass it.

2 MS. KAUTZ: We thought --

3 MR. EHRENHAFT: But staff could
4 administratively review that, could they not?

5 MS. KAUTZ: We can, yes. If you're okay with
6 that, we can do that.

7 MS. THOMSON: I have -- could I ask a
8 question?

9 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Yes.

10 MS. THOMSON: I have a question on those
11 square windows in the back. They're in the back of the
12 property, and I would assume that you designed small
13 square windows high up for privacy inside for changing?

14 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Right. What happened
15 was we first received a comment from the board of
16 architects to add some windows in the back, so we didn't
17 disagree with it and we figured let's get some light in
18 there and keep some privacy, so that's why they're high
19 and they're not like the other windows.

20 So the width might be like some of them, but
21 the height is not, and that's exactly why we did that.

22 MS. THOMSON: Okay. Is that a problem? I
23 don't see a problem with that.

24 MS. KAUTZ: I mean, it kind of distinguishes
25 it from the existing house. It's just kind of foreign, so

1 it's up to you all if you want to accept that or not.

2 MS. THOMSON: Yeah.

3 MS. KAUTZ: I understand the reasoning behind
4 that.

5 MS. THOMSON: Okay.

6 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

7 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Do you have the height of
8 the existing planters at the building?

9 MR. CABRAL: They're existing.

10 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Do you have the height of
11 them?

12 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: They are approximately
13 18 inches.

14 MR. CABRAL: They were from the original.

15 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Right.

16 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Would there be any
17 opposition to lowering the base of the wall to 18 inches
18 if you're going to lower the entire fence a little bit?

19 MR. CABRAL: I don't have a problem.

20 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Not at all.

21 MS. KAUTZ: That might work.

22 MR. CABRAL: I think that would be nice.

23 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yeah, so we keep the lanter
24 height and then --

25 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: That is correct.

1 MR. CABRAL: We, I think we just said that
2 it's 18, but if it's 24 --

3 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: We'll match it.

4 MR. CABRAL: Whatever.

5 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Yeah.

6 MR. EHRENHAFT: So then the length of the
7 metal element would simply be --

8 MS. KAUTZ: What's, yeah, what's left over.

9 MR. EHRENHAFT: -- what's left over?

10 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Yes, what's left over.

11 MR. GARCIA-PONS: The windows in the back,
12 you said that you don't have an issue with changing the
13 proportion of them --

14 MR. CABRAL: I don't.

15 MR. GARCIA-PONS: -- making them more
16 vertical either way?

17 MR. CABRAL: I don't, no, I don't have an
18 issue.

19 MS. THOMSON: But my question is why would
20 you even bother to do that?

21 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Right. It's just, it's the
22 a standard proportion of the windows, and if the client
23 doesn't mind to have a vertical proportion, I would prefer
24 it I think in order to fit into the context, but if --

25 MS. THOMSON: Okay.

1 MR. GARCIA-PONS: -- you don't --

2 MS. THOMSON: No. I was just questioning
3 because as a woman who probably would -- you'd invite me
4 over to your house to go swimming. You know, I need to
5 change into my bathing suit --

6 MR. CABRAL: Right.

7 MS. THOMSON: -- because I come from work,
8 and I don't want these long windows that the neighbors
9 behind can look in and see me changing.

10 MR. GARCIA-PONS: But we're not asking them
11 to lower them. We're asking to change the proportion so
12 it could be the same height, just a different proportion.

13 MS. THOMSON: Oh, I'm not understanding that
14 one.

15 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Well, if we made it a
16 different proportion and didn't lower it, that means we're
17 going with a skinnier window which I think may look
18 stranger.

19 MS. KAUTZ: Yeah. It's the square that threw
20 me off, but if they're -- if they want to lower it, fine.
21 Again, it's not a deal breaker for me.

22 It can be theoretically a distinction between
23 the old and the new if they're really strongly wed toward
24 it, or it can look like it's the same house which is what
25 I would do, because that would make me crazy.

1 MR. SARDINAS: On Sheet A 3.2, if you look at
2 the existing east side -- west side elevation, sorry,
3 you'll see that there's actually a small window which has
4 a slightly vertical proportion. I mean, even something
5 like that would be --

6 MS. KAUTZ: On the existing?

7 MR. SARDINAS: On the existing.

8 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Right, which is the
9 bathroom window.

10 MR. SARDINAS: Right.

11 MS. THOMSON: Bathroom window.

12 MR. CABRAL: That was the existing, yeah.

13 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Right. So that one is a
14 little more narrow, and I'll check it to see if it's --
15 you know, so we can match something like that. That would
16 do the trick.

17 MR. SARDINAS: The issue is the proportion.
18 It doesn't necessarily have to be a full length window.

19 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Right.

20 MS. SPAIN: It's more proportionate.

21 MR. CABRAL: You make a lot of sense because
22 what we're trying to do is accomplish the look that was
23 originally there and that is the original look that was
24 there, so I think it's more square now. That was a little
25 bit more rectangular and that was designed in 1934, so if

1 we match that, I think that would look nice.

2 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Okay.

3 MR. FULLERTON: Speaking of windows, I'm a
4 little surprised there aren't more communication between
5 the master bedroom and the pool room with the pool itself
6 because the pool window on the pool wall of the bedroom
7 and it looks like there's maybe a small window from the
8 pool house itself with the door.

9 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Yeah. He wants that big
10 TV. So the idea is you kind of look through all of this
11 glass that we put on the side, the double doors and the
12 side lights to take a view out at not only the hot tub,
13 but the pool.

14 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

15 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: We were there.

16 MR. CABRAL: I think the reality is that when
17 we open the doors to the master bedroom, we really feel
18 like if we were inside our room, so that's kind of like
19 the feel that we have there.

20 And then I agree, would that be like our view
21 to the pool without killing at least a decent size TV at
22 least.

23 MR. FULLERTON: Well, it's obviously your
24 choice, but it just occurred to me this would be nice.

25 MR. CABRAL: Right. There actually was a

1 door next to the TV when we had originally designed it,
2 but trust me, we broke our brain with that one. It was
3 tough.

4 MR. FULLERTON: Are we ready for public --

5 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

6 MR. FULLERTON: -- comment?

7 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes. So is there anybody in
8 the audience who wishes to speak in favor of this case?
9 Please come forward, so, and to the microphone and state
10 your name and address for the record.

11 MR. CEBALLOS: For or against.

12 MR. EHRENHAFT: Is there anybody who wants to
13 speak in opposition? Okay. Hearing none, this now closes
14 the public hearing portion of this case. Okay. No
15 further board discussion, right? Okay.

16 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Make a motion.

17 MR. EHRENHAFT: Chair will entertain a
18 motion.

19 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'd like to make a motion
20 accepting staff's recommendation with the additional
21 recommendation that the low wall at the front fence match
22 the planter height.

23 MR. SARDINAS: I second that.

24 MR. EHRENHAFT: All right. If there's no
25 further discussion, we may now call the roll.

1 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Fullerton?
2 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
3 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Durana?
4 MR. DURANA: Yes.
5 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Sardinias?
6 MR. SARDINAS: Yes.
7 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Garcia-
8 Pons?
9 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
10 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Raul?
11 MR. RAUL RORIGUEZ: Yes.
12 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Thomson?
13 MS. THOMSON: Yes.
14 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
15 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
16 MR. CABRAL: Thank you very much.
17 MR. HAMED RORIGUEZ: Thank you so much.
18 MR. EHRENHAFT: Kara, when people were sworn,
19 the entire audience was sworn --
20 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.
21 MR. EHRENHAFT: -- before the meeting, right?
22 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.
23 MR. EHRENHAFT: So we don't have --
24 MS. KAUTZ: Unless anyone is new that walked
25 in.

1 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

2 MR. EHRENHAFT: All right, okay. I mean item
3 by item. MS. KAUTZ: We just do it once at the beginning.

4 MR. EHRENHAFT: All right. Then the next
5 special certificate of appropriateness is for public
6 hearing on Case File COA (SP) 2017-001, Revised.

7 The address is 2125 Santa Maria Avenue --
8 Street.

9 MR. FULLERTON: 41.

10 MR. GARCIA-PONS: 41.

11 MR. RAUL RORIGUEZ: 4125.

12 MR. EHRENHAFT: 41, I'm sorry, 4125 Santa
13 Maria Street. Does any member of the board have any ex
14 parte communication or site visits to disclose at this
15 time --

16 MR. FULLERTON: No.

17 MR. EHRENHAFT: -- with respect to this
18 property?

19 MR. FULLERTON: No; drove by.

20 MR. SARDINAS: No.

21 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay, all right, okay. Kara,
22 go ahead, presentation by staff.

23 MS. KAUTZ: Okay. Did you read all this, or
24 no?

25 MR. EHRENHAFT: No, I didn't.

1 MS. KAUTZ: Sorry.

2 MR. EHRENHAFT: All right. I'm sorry.

3 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Here.

4 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes. I need an agenda copy,
5 right?

6 MS. KAUTZ: All right. I'll do it.

7 MR. EHRENHAFT: I'm sorry.

8 MS. KAUTZ: Ready? An application for the
9 issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for
10 the property at 4125 Santa Maria Street, a contributing
11 resource within the Santa Maria Street Historic District,
12 legally described as Lots 9 and 10, Block 96, Coral Gables
13 Country Club Section Part Five, according to the plat
14 thereof as recorded Plat Book 23, Page 55 of the public
15 records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

16 The application requesting design approval
17 for additions and alterations to the residence and site
18 work was granted approval with conditions on February 16,
19 2017.

20 Revisions requesting design approval for
21 changes to the proposed elevations were approved again on
22 September 21st, 2017.

23 This application requests design approval for
24 revisions to the approved certificate of appropriateness
25 to include a perimeter fence with gates and the demolition

1 of the existing roof structure.

2 This is the site map. It's located on the
3 curve of Santa Maria Street, backs up to the golf course.
4 Photograph from the 1940s. This property was constructed
5 in 1946, so this would have been shortly after its
6 construction, designed by Steward and Skinner, the
7 architectural firm, for Mr. and Mrs. Coulton Skinner.

8 It was designated as a contributing resource
9 within the Santa Maria Street Historic District in
10 November of 2007.

11 Presentation. When the COA was granted
12 approval in February of 2017, it was with multiple
13 conditions, and one of those conditions that the perimeter
14 wall and gates would require a separate certificate of
15 appropriateness. Staff determined this item would return
16 to the board for review.

17 The current proposed revision requests design
18 approval for that fence and gates, the demolition of the
19 existing roof structure, and also for the replacement of
20 the second floor with a concrete slab. No variances have
21 been requested.

22 This item did go to the board of architects
23 this morning with no comments, but they did only review
24 the perimeter fence as the application. I'll turn it over
25 to the architect.

1 MR. PORTUONDO: Good afternoon. My name is
2 Rafael Portuondo, Portuondo-Perotti Architects, and one of
3 the things that you saw earlier was that this is the
4 original house in the 1940s, and then what you have also
5 seen in the next picture is there's been a lot of
6 additions that have been added onto this house, and one of
7 the things that the owners -- Claudio and Marketina
8 (phonetic) are in the audience with us today -- one of the
9 things that they said which was sort of shocking was that,
10 "We want to restore it to the original intent, which means
11 we're going to knock down the carport," which was a great
12 idea.

13 "And we're going to" -- in the sort of a
14 corner of the garage, there was like laundry rooms and
15 bathrooms and things that were added.

16 So the whole facade was going to be restored
17 to its original intent.

18 One of the good things about the process is
19 that we actually found the original surrounds around their
20 front door were buried into, into the construction of the
21 carport, and once we removed the carport, the whole house
22 took a completely different look about it.

23 This was the carport from the side. This is
24 actually the sort of loggia, portico.

25 But one of the things that you can also see

1 about this house is that it's also that old slump brick.
2 Right? So one of the things that happened during the,
3 during the additions to the house was that on the corner
4 between the carport and the garage, that was the old slump
5 brick wall which we're actually going to be bringing back.

6 So the room that's now going to be facing
7 that old slump brick wall is going to be the dining room,
8 and I'll show you that shortly.

9 One of the things that I think is important
10 about the house is that not only have there been additions
11 to the front of the house, but there's also been additions
12 to the back of the house, and I would say that in terms of
13 historic authenticity, I would say that the front of the
14 house is the most important.

15 This is actually the rear of the house, and
16 the prior architects that were working on this house just
17 collided things into it and it wasn't really thought
18 through very well, so the rear of the property was
19 basically demolished.

20 And what we tried to do in terms of the floor
21 plan was to look at the intent of the design of the
22 original house and try to mirror it and actually reinforce
23 the idea that the new architecture can actually be, you
24 know, compatible with the old intent.

25 So the car -- this was like a little covered

1 terrace that was basically slammed right into that little
2 mansard window that went into the parapet wall that
3 slammed into the family room, and those little, that
4 little light that's coming there is a collision of roofs
5 which was a mess.

6 This was the family room that was added onto.
7 The side of the house with mechanical.

8 So we come back to the intent of the house.
9 One of the things that, that I brought up today to the
10 board of architects was not only the wall, but the other
11 reason that we're here, and I mentioned it to the board of
12 architects, was that we're going to be looking at the
13 roof, and one of the things that's important about the
14 roof is in doing some of the demo work, one of the things
15 that we have found, and we actually went through this with
16 historic, was that the porch on the right-hand side is
17 basically rotted out. The columns are rotted. The beams
18 are rotted. The tongue and groove is rotted.

19 And so that, with historic, we're going to be
20 actually demolishing and reconstructing to match existing.

21 One of the things that we're doing with the
22 contractor is we're going to be taking it down in certain
23 sections, but we're keeping the complete section so that
24 we know exactly what to do in terms of the reconstruction.

25 The columns were actually wood columns, and

1 by accident the contractor was moving some stuff around
2 and the bottom of column was rotted out, so he bumped into
3 it and basically it just fell off the plane.

4 So you can see, there's not really a pointer,
5 but if you look at the drum of the stair, it's on axis
6 with the pediment on the front, and you see how the house
7 is now like a wing that actually mirrors one side of the
8 house with the other.

9 So what we've tried to do is mirror the
10 living room side with this right-hand side, to the new
11 addition which is on the left-hand side and having it so
12 that it actually creates a sort of wedge facing the golf
13 course.

14 The same thing occurs on the second floor.
15 Kara correctly said that we, as we've demolished the
16 house, we've noticed that that there are certain things
17 that the owner would like to upgrade, so we had wood
18 joists on the floor and we've changed it now to concrete
19 slabs, and that's already in the permitting process.

20 So the other thing that we've presented today
21 at the board of architects was the perimeter -- the front
22 wall, and what we ended up doing is we -- on the center
23 line where the front door is, you see the sort of a
24 pedestrian gate. On the left-hand side you see, closer to
25 the garage doors, you see a vehicular opening but not

1 necessarily with a vehicular door. It's, at this point
2 it's just an open driveway.

3 But the rhythm in regards to the spacing of
4 the columns is actually about every ten feet on center.

5 One of the things that if you're familiar
6 with the area, you'll see that the house to the left which
7 is actually like a really cool historic house, kind of
8 neo-Classical, has the same concrete walls, concrete
9 columns with low, sort of a low wall with the wrought iron
10 on the top. The house across the street has something
11 very similar, so this is actually contextually engaging
12 the neighboring houses.

13 The one thing that we did differently than
14 the other two was since we have the slump brick and since
15 we have certain details that mimic brick, we've actually
16 clad the columns with brick with the intent that we
17 would actually paint them white or paint them a color to
18 match the existing context of the house.

19 So there you see kind of lightly, but you see
20 the gate, the columns and the rhythm of the wrought iron
21 in between.

22 One of the things that we're also prepared to
23 discuss today and we actually have drawn it, the house
24 today has existing trusses, so the ceilings on the second
25 floor are approximately eight feet high.

1 One of the things that we also -- we didn't
2 demo the house prior to starting, but we realized that the
3 space in between the rafters is actually quite small, so
4 one of the things that we wanted to discuss today, knowing
5 that we're here with an ad valorem to a historic
6 preservation house, is we wanted to change it from trusses
7 to rafters, so we would go from eight-foot ceilings to
8 approximately nine foot six, almost ten-foot ceilings. It
9 would still spring from the eight foot, but it would give
10 rooms a little bit more importance and a little bit more
11 grandeur rather than just having the eight-foot ceilings.

12 One of the things that I wanted to discuss
13 today as well is this. We're here to discuss it up front.
14 One of the concerns I think that historic has had in the
15 past is that owners and stuff have knocked down roofs and
16 stuff and then asked for forgiveness after.

17 We think that this is actually something that
18 is worth the expense, and the owners really want to have
19 the improvement of their house with the higher ceilings.

20 The existing rafters are just basically
21 conventional ceilings, so we think that by having taller
22 ceilings, by going with, you know, tongue and groove and
23 actually doing something, it's more in keeping with the
24 style of the house. I think that would be a great thing
25 for the owners, and I'm pushing it because I think it's

1 the right thing to do.

2 One of the things that I drew in this
3 drawing, and it's very hard to see, so if you have your
4 drawings in front of you, the existing house is a sort of
5 three and twelve pitch. Not affecting the pediment on the
6 main facade, we actually are proposing to raise it to a
7 four and twelve pitch, and then you can see the difference
8 is about five inches or four inches.

9 So you can see at the top where the ridge
10 line is, you can see on the bottom of the ridge line is,
11 it's almost insignificant in regards to the perception
12 from the street. That's my opinion, and I'm sure there's
13 others that are going to discuss it differently.

14 The other thing that we did as an attached
15 structure is on the far right is Claudio's office which
16 has a breezeway connection which is outdoors so he can get
17 away from the kids and the yelling of the house which is a
18 good thing, so it's really a smaller object piece in the
19 house, and it's actually complementary to the front
20 garden.

21 On the top you can see the existing roof
22 pitch on the upper right-hand side, and on the bottom you
23 can see -- the top is the three and twelve and bottom is
24 the four and twelve.

25 One of the things that we also did was we

1 showed -- this is not the existing condition. This is the
2 proposed three and twelve on the second floor and the
3 proposed four and twelve on the -- the proposed three and
4 twelve on the top, and the proposed four and twelve on the
5 bottom.

6 And one of the things that we're also
7 thinking that would only really affect the bedrooms,
8 because we know that in between the bedrooms and hallways
9 and laundry rooms, there's no need to actually have
10 exposed rafters, so those ceilings are going to be kept
11 basically flat at the eight feet, so the master bedroom,
12 the children's bedrooms are the ones that are going to be
13 actually having the ability to do, you know, coffered
14 ceilings or vaulted ceilings. Having a four-sided pitch
15 on each room I think would be an improvement to the house.

16 When we've presented in other historic
17 venues, and one of the things that comes up is, a lot of
18 times is, "Wow, I'm really glad the owners are spending
19 the extra money to improve the house," and I think that is
20 one of those things that is an opportunity, because right
21 now in terms of the loggias and porticos, we have to
22 demolish that anyway. We have to replace the wood slats
23 because it was actually not plywood. It was actually like
24 tongue and groove nailers. We have to replace that. We
25 have to remove the tile.

1 So at the end of the day when it's all said
2 and done, and the only thing left on the trusses, in a
3 very expensive way, is an opportunity to upgrade the house
4 to something that's nicer on the interior, so that's one
5 of goals that we have today.

6 We also wanted to be able to discuss the fact
7 that we know we're in ad valorem and we know that if it's,
8 if it's a necessity to actually not count that in the ad
9 valorem, we would be okay with that as well, so it's part
10 of a discussion that I know we're going to have.

11 One of the things that I added to the
12 presentation because it's important to note is you can
13 start to see a lot of the -- this is the loggia which is
14 on the front of the house, and you can start to see the
15 wood rot, the rotted tongue and groove, the rotted beams,
16 and this is something that actually, it's kind of a
17 no-brainer at this point because we met with historic and
18 they agreed that it's got to be replaced and it's got to
19 be taken care of, and like I said before, we're going to
20 take care of it matching the historic house.

21 More of the same. So I just want to make a
22 point that is clear because it's a discussion that we know
23 that we have to repair a lot of the termite-ridden wood,
24 and Dona, rightly so, said to me, at least in the meeting
25 that we had at the site, is, "You don't have to demolish

1 the trusses, you can just sandwich them and reinforce
2 them," and the answer is yes to that and I'm aware of
3 that. In other words, it's something that I'm aware of.

4 But the fact is that even scissoring the
5 rafters and going through all that expense, there's an
6 opportunity to upgrade the house to do something special.
7 I'm aware that in this particular case, that there are
8 important houses, and this is where, this becomes
9 personal, and personal might not be historic, so this is
10 going to come down to, you know, difference in philosophy.

11 If this would be the living room in the
12 Biltmore or something that's important, and you would say
13 there's the important historic crown mouldings and these
14 other things, I would say that I wouldn't be standing here
15 today even though the ceilings were eight feet, but I
16 think that this is an opportunity that we've seen what's
17 wrong with the house. We've seen the amount of money we
18 have to put into repairing it, and it's going to be a
19 little bit more, and we're going to get a benefit out of
20 it.

21 So the intent is that the owners have gone to
22 the point where we're restoring the house to the original
23 intent. We're knocking down architecture. We are
24 removing square footage, and we now come to the point
25 where we're seeing the house raw, and there's an

1 opportunity here to do something that the owners can
2 benefit from, and I don't think it's a big to-do. I think
3 it's actually something that's easy to solve, and I'm here
4 to have a discussion and to fight for them for the
5 additional height inside the house. So having said
6 that --

7 MS. SPAIN: So can I just ask a question
8 about the concrete floor? And just remember, the interior
9 of a single family home is not designated as historic, so
10 we don't have, you know, purview over you replacing a
11 wooden floor.

12 How are you structurally going to handle
13 that? Because I think in this house, the slump brick is
14 actually structure. It's not a facing the way it is
15 normally seen. Is that right?

16 MR. PORTUONDO: Yes. So when we went to the
17 house, one of the things that's kind of interesting is
18 that the slump brick is actually two layers thick. Right?
19 So there is -- let's say that the wall is 16 inches. The
20 first layer of slump brick, we're not touching, so our
21 structural engineer is removing the inner layer of the
22 slump brick and we're actually pouring columns that are
23 going to be flush with the house, flush with the existing
24 inner layer of the slump brick.

25 MS. SPAIN: So you're cutting a place

1 vertically for the column to go?

2 MR. PORTUONDO: Correct, right. So it's not
3 going to affect the exterior. We're not going to be
4 touching the slump brick. We're not going to be doing
5 anything like that.

6 The one thing that's good about this house is
7 that it's actually a masonry, it's actually a block
8 construction, so doweling in and creating columns on the
9 golf course side is fairly easy to do. We have got a
10 number for doing the concrete work and everything. We
11 came out to like 25 grand, so it's worth the upgrade for
12 them.

13 MS. SPAIN: Okay. Well, that's good because,
14 you know, that was a concern that, you know, you set the
15 concrete --

16 MR. PORTUONDO: Right.

17 MS. SPAIN: -- and everything else. So the
18 Secretary of Interior standards which is what we're guided
19 by, the federal standards, Number Six is, "Deteriorated
20 historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced.
21 Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement
22 of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the
23 old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities,
24 and, where possible, materials.

25 "Replacement of missing features shall be

1 substantiated by documentary, physical and/or pictorial
2 evidence."

3 Staff is recommending against taking the roof
4 off and replacing it. It's going to be a different slope.
5 It's going to be a different height.

6 I don't think it's in keeping with the
7 Secretary of Interior standards, and I just have a problem
8 with that.

9 I think there may be a way to, I'm not a
10 structural engineer, but there may be a way to increase
11 the ceiling height and keeping that existing roof in
12 place, which I would prefer. I don't know if anyone has
13 any comments on that.

14 MR. PORTUONDO: I have a comment on that.
15 So --

16 MS. SPAIN: Well, I know you do.

17 MR. PORTUONDO: Okay. So I'm sorry.

18 MS. SPAIN: No, that's all right.

19 MR. PORTUONDO: No, that's okay.

20 MS. SPAIN: Go ahead.

21 MR. PORTUONDO: So one of the things that
22 we're actually discussing today, we would like to actually
23 raise the roof pitch from three and twelve to four and
24 twelve because it would just give us a little bit more
25 height.

1 MS. SPAIN: I understand that, but you know
2 it's a historic fabric of a contributing structure in a
3 historic district, and it's going to change the roof
4 height, and that's not something that we've ever done
5 before in my memory.

6 MR. PORTUONDO: Having said that, we don't
7 have a problem keeping it at three and twelve. Right?

8 So at that point, salvaging and trying to
9 repair the roof the way it exists, I would say that it's,
10 it's better since we're not going to be changing the
11 exterior, and we're not going to be changing the look from
12 the street, that we can remove the trusses responsibly
13 where we can do it a section at a time.

14 You have to remember this. We're removing
15 the tile. We're removing the planking. We have to
16 restrap the trusses.

17 So there's a lot of -- and we have to repair
18 if we keep it, so we're going through this expense, and
19 which the other option would be we keep the roof pitch the
20 way it is, we upgrade the tile, we upgrade the plywood,
21 but we have the benefit of having slightly higher ceilings
22 inside the house.

23 MS. SPAIN: But can you accomplish that with
24 the existing trusses the way they are?

25 MR. PORTUONDO: No, because the existing

1 trusses have a bottom cord.

2 MS. SPAIN: I understand that.

3 MR. PORTUONDO: Right, so --

4 MR. FULLERTON: With the same pitch, you
5 probably, you could get the height.

6 MR. PORTUONDO: Right. The thing is one of
7 the things that we have to do and we know that we have to
8 create an A frame, which is smart, which is the way to do
9 it so that the trusses don't open up, we can do that with
10 either, you know, a tension bar or something that's fairly
11 significant in regards to concealing those in some of the
12 secondary rooms like laundry room, closets and stuff like
13 that.

14 But one of the things that we feel, since
15 this has do with the interior of the house and since we
16 feel strongly that it's not something that is
17 architecturally significant in terms of flat eight-foot
18 ceilings, we have the opportunity at this point to
19 actually do something special, to actually have, you know,
20 vaulted ceilings inside the house, and we're not going to
21 be -- let's say that we were to say we can save the top
22 cord of the truss. Right?

23 We would then have to figure out a way of
24 engineering them, which would be probably more expensive
25 than buying new rafters, setting them in place, having

1 them engineered ahead of time, and doing it the right way.

2 So I can't tell you that I can guarantee that
3 a two-and-a-half-by-six is going to hold the forces of the
4 house, but what we've done is we've designed it in such a
5 way that -- we haven't done our engineering work yet
6 because we want to get through today's meeting and make
7 sure that we do it the right way, have approval, but we
8 would do it in a way where the owner would gain the
9 ceiling height in the rooms, and the city gains the fact
10 that it's a new structure.

11 It has longevity attached to it, and it's
12 going to hold in a hurricane.

13 So you know, there's certain things that one
14 would want to do at this point to make sure the house is
15 as safe as it could be.

16 So I do understand the ad valorem part of it,
17 but one of the things that in the ad valorem part of it,
18 which I'm not an expert, that's why I'm discussing this in
19 an open forum, is we might not take the ad valorem.

20 In other words, let's say that we had to
21 spend money to repair the trusses and that repair would
22 give the house longevity. We would rather forego that
23 portion of the ad valorem in order to gain a better house
24 in terms of hurricane safety and height, and I'm not sure
25 in the historic board how that's discussed.

1 So we've worked with tax abatements where
2 we've reinforced walls. We've reinforced strapping.
3 We've reinforced all these things.

4 But this is a point in time where we feel
5 that we can do something better for the house, not only in
6 terms of the esthetics, not only in terms of the
7 integrity, but also in terms of design, and like I said
8 before, the higher ceilings are going to be occurring in
9 the bedrooms. Right?

10 So it's really, if you look at the floor
11 plan, and maybe I should have done a diagram, but let's
12 say that -- it would be the large room to the right is the
13 master bedroom. The long room in the front that's
14 parallel to the street is a bedroom. The room at the end
15 of the hallway is a bedroom, and the room in front of the
16 golf course is a bedroom.

17 And so those are the rooms that would be --
18 the rest of the poche, bathrooms, closets and things would
19 stay with the flat roof.

20 MR. FULLERTON: The bottom corner of the
21 trusses is always inside the building. The exterior top
22 cords of the trusses is what is visible on the outside, so
23 if you replace that top cord with a rafter that goes from
24 the outside into the inside, there's no difference. You
25 don't see it from the outside at all.

1 MR. PORTUONDO: I agree.

2 MR. FULLERTON: So I see no -- I think we're
3 talking a lot about nothing. I don't think it's germane.
4 We don't know what's going on inside them.

5 The only thing you're asking for is to change
6 the slope and to raise it a little bit. That's the issue
7 that I think we need to talk about, not whether you have
8 high ceilings in the bedrooms or not.

9 MR. PORTUONDO: Right. So our goal would be
10 if we could raise it six inches, that would be ideal, but
11 our other goal would be that we would be able to have
12 taller ceilings in the bedrooms.

13 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So one of the initial --
14 and I had sort of two questions regarding the roof. One
15 of them is if you're willing to go from four to three and
16 keep it aesthetically from the street so that it doesn't
17 change the roof lines at all, I think that would make more
18 sense as far as what you're trying to do.

19 I also agree with John that I don't mind the
20 inside being rafters versus trusses. I think there may be
21 some sort of acceptable area perhaps in the areas that are
22 not to be opened up, but perhaps we can keep the structure
23 of the roof there so that we have at least the remnants of
24 what was there.

25 It's still going to be hidden underneath the

1 new roof. It doesn't matter. Maybe keep the edges as
2 something that you can share with the side rooms, but you
3 can get at least, in my mind, the bedroom clean, the
4 master bedroom.

5 I'm not really quite sure how this is going
6 to work over here, but you know, I think I agree with John
7 that I think the esthetics from the exterior, if you're
8 willing to go down to three on twelve, works because my
9 concern was also that roof line when it comes out to the
10 porch, would we have to lower the columns if it sprung
11 from the same area if it's on a four on twelve, or would
12 the porch actually be on three and twelve on the main
13 roof?

14 MS. SPAIN: I think the porch is independent?

15 MR. PORTUONDO: Independent, right.

16 MR. GARCIA-PONS: But it doesn't share a roof
17 line?

18 MR. PORTUONDO: No, no for example, they
19 share the masonry wall, but they're independent like
20 there's rafters.

21 MR. GARCIA-PONS: If I look at your
22 elevation, it looks like it's the same roof that goes from
23 the ridge to the --

24 MR. PORTUONDO: Yes, it's the same, yes, in
25 the same -- it's contiguous.

1 MR. GARCIA-PONS: If it was four, that means
2 it would be four all the way.

3 MR. PORTUONDO: No. It would crease at the
4 three and twelve.

5 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Okay. That's not drawn on
6 the drawings. You haven't shown the crease from three to
7 four.

8 MR. PORTUONDO: That's a good point.

9 MR. GARCIA-PONS: But that would also be an
10 additional --

11 MS. SPAIN: That would be another issue.

12 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Correct, which is why again
13 if you're looking -- if you're willing to go down three on
14 twelve, that issue is resolved because --

15 MR. PORTUONDO: It goes away.

16 MR. GARCIA-PONS: It goes away. Those are
17 two things I had concerns about. I have a couple
18 questions on the wall.

19 MS. SPAIN: So when Kara and I were out
20 there, the rear of the home, and Ralph, you need to
21 correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe the back facade of
22 the house had been removed. The back wall had already
23 been removed when we were out there. Is that right?

24 MR. PORTUONDO: No.

25 MS. SPAIN: It was going to be?

1 MR. PORTUONDO: You pointed.

2 MS. SPAIN: Going to be.

3 MR. PORTUONDO: But we were reprimanded early
4 enough that we were able to salvage it.

5 MS. SPAIN: Okay.

6 MR. PORTUONDO: So Dona is right. When we
7 saw what was left, and the wall was basically very
8 fragile --

9 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Which wall? Could you
10 point on the --

11 MR. PORTUONDO: Can I point?

12 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Can you describe where it
13 is?

14 MS. SPAIN: For some reason.

15 MR. PORTUONDO: Okay. So you see where the
16 octagon is?

17 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.

18 MR. PORTUONDO: You see that kind of dark
19 wall that goes between the one room on the golf -- on the
20 left-hand side?

21 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Uh-huh.

22 MR. PORTUONDO: It looks like it's where the
23 closets are in the hallway.

24 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yep.

25 MR. PORTUONDO: It's the wall that, close to

1 the center line of of the drawing.

2 MS. KAUTZ: The horizontal line?

3 MR. PORTUONDO: The horizontal line, that's
4 the exterior wall of the, of the existing historic house.

5 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Got it.

6 MR. PORTUONDO: You're actually pointing at
7 the right wall.

8 MS. SPAIN: It's actually, now it's a shell
9 of a building, and I'm sure it's going to be beautiful
10 because he does really good work.

11 Having said that, it may not be the same, you
12 know, if you take off that roof. It's against the
13 Secretary of Interior standards, so it's not something
14 that I think is a good practice to do. I don't think it's
15 a good precedent that we're setting to allow someone to do
16 that, and we're against it.

17 I don't have an issue with the concrete floor
18 on the interior. I can't have an issue. That's not up to
19 us. I think the fence in front will be lovely. It's only
20 the roof that concerns me.

21 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I would agree, that's a
22 -- I would like to see if we could explore because the
23 bedrooms outside of that are outside. You could do
24 anything you want, correct, out here?

25 MR. PORTUONDO: Correct.

1 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Right. So we're talking --

2 MR. PORTUONDO: So Cesar, the only thing that
3 would be relevant to your request, and I can, I can study
4 that, is that from the wall that you were pointing to, to
5 the front is one space.

6 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Span.

7 MR. PORTUONDO: It's a span. Right? So I
8 would say this, that the way I would rephrase it would be
9 we would do rafters that whole wing. We would have one
10 rafter coming up to the point, but we would have a
11 secondary rafter that would take you back to the eight
12 feet.

13 It's going to be really, really difficult to
14 have, to keep the trusses and do the rafters in some, in
15 that area right there.

16 So that's why I'm thinking that the better
17 way of handling it would be to do the rafters in the
18 boomerang, and then we would actually drop, you know,
19 within the rafters, areas like closets and stuff.

20 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'd love to hear what the
21 rest of the board has to say. I think, I think I could be
22 amenable to --

23 MS. SPAIN: Just to the bedroom, you're
24 talking?

25 MR. GARCIA-PONS: -- holding the things that

1 are going to be hidden anyway, and then letting the
2 bedroom be what it needs to be, but it's splitting the
3 baby.

4 MR. EHRENHAFT: So you're talking about
5 keeping the existing pitch.

6 MR. GARCIA-PONS: We're looking at Sheet --

7 MR. EHRENHAFT: A rafter that's designed in
8 some manner that it allows more interior height?

9 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Only in the, I'm going to
10 call it the right side of the property, on the south side,
11 like the master bedroom area, from the central line to the
12 right, let that be the new room. Right?

13 I can see totally this room taking over with
14 the rafters, but once you get to the octagon, the spaces
15 that are not going to be seen, the rafters aren't going to
16 be seen anyway, would it be possible to save the roof in
17 here so that we can have again the remnant of the original
18 roof within that section?

19 I would love also to maybe highlight it at
20 some particular piece so that you can see it from the edge
21 at some point, but it's not a full solution either way.

22 MS. SPAIN: So you're saying only in the
23 master bedroom portion?

24 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Correct.

25 MR. PORTUONDO: If, if -- so one of the

1 things that I'm trying to solve is how to manage the
2 bedroom heights with the closet heights and everything
3 else.

4 So one of the other things is that I know
5 this and I know that I'm fighting for something, right, is
6 -- and I understand everything that everyone is saying,
7 and I still feel that if it's possible to actually keep
8 the opportunities for the bedrooms to have higher
9 ceilings. By doing what you're saying, the front bedroom
10 doesn't have that option.

11 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Correct.

12 MR. PORTUONDO: And I think that one of the
13 goals for the family would be that all the kids have an
14 opportunity to have higher ceilings.

15 MS. SPAIN: What's the height of the ceiling
16 now?

17 MR. PORTUONDO: It's about eight feet.

18 MR. FULLERTON: That's minimal. That's way
19 below a standard of the house in that location.

20 MS. THOMSON: Nowadays.

21 MR. FULLERTON: Of course.

22 MR. PORTUONDO: But remember this --

23 MR. FULLERTON: And we're not -- the historic
24 community I don't think is paying anything for that in
25 terms of losing the quality or the feel of the house. The

1 house remains exactly the same.

2 MS. SPAIN: I have no problem with them
3 getting higher ceilings. I have a problem with them
4 taking the roof off to get them.

5 MR. FULLERTON: They're going to put the same
6 roof back on. Is that correct?

7 MS. SPAIN: Well, that's what he said
8 originally, but then when we looked at the drawing, it was
9 a different slope, so.

10 MR. FULLERTON: Well, yes.

11 MR. PORTUONDO: So, okay, so I want to make
12 it really, really clear. I'm here showing you the
13 existing slope to have a discussion on the four and
14 twelve, so, and I'm going to also agree with you that
15 there's a line missing in the pitch.

16 But so if the intent is to redo the house,
17 the eaves and everything associated with it to match
18 existing, we're not going to vary it. We're not going to
19 veer from that. No one is saying that.

20 We're actually going to be putting everything
21 back. We're going to document everything and put it back
22 the way it exists.

23 So having said that, one of the things that
24 we're also -- one of the things that could help the
25 discussion is we can do it in, maybe we have to do it in

1 sections.

2 MS. SPAIN: I would -- if, in fact, the board
3 is going to allow this, which I would be against, but if
4 you are going to allow it, I think you should require it
5 to be in sections.

6 MR. PORTUONDO: Right, and I think it's smart
7 to do it in sections.

8 MS. SPAIN: But I'm not comfortable with it
9 in any way.

10 MR. PORTUONDO: Only because that way we can
11 hold the integrity of the house together while we're
12 working on other sections of the house.

13 And so one of the things that you haven't
14 seen, but when you go there, a lot of times what happens
15 in remodelings is that by the time you repair it, you've
16 spent all the money for repairs than it would have to do
17 it new.

18 There's a lot of termite damage in the roof.
19 I'm not saying that it's structural, but it has to be
20 repaired. By the time you remove all that to replace it,
21 replace the rafters in between, it's just smarter just to
22 do it all at once.

23 Now, "all at once" might not mean "all at
24 once." "All at once" might be the master bedroom first
25 and the children's wing second, so with the intent that at

1 the end of the day, when you drive by the house, you're
2 not going to -- you're going to look at it and there's not
3 going to be any difference.

4 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'd love to hear from the
5 board.

6 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: If you're doing it in
7 sections, how do you keep the roof line the same, the same
8 level from one section to the next?

9 MR. PORTUONDO: Okay. So one of the things
10 we're going to need to do is shore it up, and the one
11 thing that's happening that's good is we're going, we're
12 going to be doing a concrete slab.

13 Now, I don't know the timing of it. There's
14 a high probability that we're going to have to do some
15 sort of hangers or posts and beams that are going to hold
16 the trusses up in place while other things are being
17 removed. Right? So it's up to our engineers and
18 ourselves to make sure that we actually shore the house up
19 properly.

20 We can do -- for example, we can shore up the
21 children's wing and then remove the master bedroom,
22 install the master bedroom. Then we take care of the
23 children's wing.

24 So in other words, we're not going to, like
25 Dona said, we're not going to demolish the whole house,

1 all the trusses in one shot. We can do the master bedroom
2 first and then the children's wing second.

3 That way we can actually -- I'm not
4 concerned, our structural engineers are not concerned at
5 all on removing everything because the house, the beams
6 and everything is in really good shape, but if it makes
7 sense sequencing it for historic so that the perception is
8 that it's being done a section at a time, that's fine too.

9 MS. SPAIN: So it's --

10 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: But the end result is
11 you're still are raising the roof line.

12 MR. PORTUONDO: I think the way the questions
13 are being asked, we're probably shying away from raising
14 the roof line, but the reason we drew it both ways is
15 because we wanted to have this discussion.

16 MR. GARCIA-PONS: He's requesting that we
17 raise it, but he's willing to not raise it. Maybe --

18 MR. PORTUONDO: The interior height is more
19 important than raising the roof pitch.

20 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: And why is -- maybe I'm
21 dense. Why is doing it in sections different from just
22 doing it all together at once?

23 MR. PORTUONDO: There is none, but there's a
24 perception in the room that --

25 MS. SPAIN: It's not a perception. I just

1 worry bad things happen when roofs come off historic
2 homes, so I would prefer not to take an entire roof off a
3 historic home.

4 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: So we just have the
5 sequencing of the changes, not the actual change.

6 MS. SPAIN: I'm concerned about the change.
7 I do not think we should allow a historic fabric of a
8 contributing property in a historic district to be removed
9 so that they can get higher ceilings and help with the
10 closet height.

11 I have a concern with that. I don't think
12 that that's appropriate to do to a historic home.

13 MR. SARDINAS: Has the roof structure been
14 evaluated --

15 MR. PORTUONDO: Yes.

16 MR. SARDINAS: -- for --

17 MR. PORTUONDO: It has.

18 MS. SPAIN: And have you submitted that?

19 MR. PORTUONDO: No, but I don't have a
20 problem discussing it. The roof is repairable as a truss.
21 In other words, we could take them down one at a time and
22 we can do whatever.

23 So that's, I just want to make it clear that
24 that's not the issue, right, because, you know, it's been
25 there for how many years and it could last another -- and

1 so I would be foolish to tell you that the roof is getting
2 ready to fall when it's really not.

3 Having said that, we have to repair rafters,
4 bottom cords. We have to restrap it. We have to change
5 all the plywood on the top. We have to do a lot of things
6 that would actually remove a lot of what's existing.

7 Having -- getting to that point and having
8 the ability to upgrade it at that point would be something
9 that the owners and myself would like to have, to be able
10 to do.

11 One of the things that a lot times happens
12 when we do historic houses and a lot of times -- and
13 there's a different approach to it.

14 For example, we're doing a house in Miami
15 Beach in Morningside. We're doing the exact same thing,
16 and one of the things that historic commission was, "Thank
17 you to the owner for expending the extra money to do
18 something that's better for the house."

19 That's one philosophical approach which is
20 not the one that we have here today, but I understand
21 both. Right?

22 So one of the things that we're trying to do
23 is to give the house a little bit more character and give
24 the house a little bit more longevity.

25 One of the things that comes up as a comment,

1 and I don't know how to deal with it sometimes, is that
2 historic is not necessarily responsible for the interiors
3 of the house. Right? So I didn't think this was going to
4 become an issue or a topic of discussion.

5 MS. SPAIN: It's only because you're removing
6 the roof. If you were able to get higher ceilings without
7 removing the roof, then you wouldn't even be at the board.

8 MR. PORTUONDO: Yes, but so to clarify that,
9 we have to remove the tile. We have to remove the
10 plywood. We have to remove the planking on the roof. We
11 have to repair the trusses.

12 So in essence, we're going to be spending a
13 lot of money to get us back down to zero. Since we're
14 going to be spending a lot of money to get us back down to
15 zero, we want the opportunity to actually upgrade the
16 house.

17 And so like I said before, if it was
18 something that was of significance, I wouldn't be standing
19 here today, and I understand everything that Dona is
20 saying, like I understand it, so it's not like I don't
21 understand.

22 But I also want to let you know that if, to
23 get to the point where we need to get to have and we have
24 to spend X amount of dollars and with a little bit more,
25 we can improve the quality of life for the house, I think

1 that would be a home run for everybody.

2 MS. THOMSON: Okay. So after all this talk,
3 you can still raise the ceilings inside without raising
4 the roof, or you need to raise the roof to raise the
5 ceilings?

6 MR. PORTUONDO: We can keep -- we can do
7 conventional framing which is rafters, not trusses, and we
8 can gain --

9 MS. THOMSON: Okay.

10 MR. PORTUONDO: -- about nine, yeah.

11 MS. THOMSON: Okay. So if you retain the
12 original roof --

13 MR. PORTUONDO: Roof pitch.

14 MS. THOMSON: -- line --

15 MR. PORTUONDO: Right.

16 MS. THOMSON: -- pitch, that also would keep
17 the original proportion?

18 MR. PORTUONDO: Yes.

19 MS. THOMSON: Okay. I think that's, that's
20 important.

21 MR. FULLERTON: What is the roof material,
22 concrete?

23 MR. PORTUONDO: It's a white cement tile.

24 MR. FULLERTON: Cement, flat cement tile?

25 MR. PORTUONDO: Flat cement.

1 MR. FULLERTON: Those are not significant. I
2 mean, we change those all the time.

3 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I have a question about the
4 fence when we're done with the roof.

5 MR. PORTUONDO: I motion we talk about the
6 fence.

7 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I'll just ask a question
8 about the fence. The vehicular gate isn't shown on the
9 drawings anywhere?

10 MR. PORTUONDO: At this point the owner
11 doesn't need a vehicular gate.

12 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So you're not going to get
13 permission for a vehicular gate, and if you want one, you
14 have to come back.

15 MR. PORTUONDO: If we do, we have to come
16 back for sure.

17 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'm ready to make a motion
18 unless you guys, somebody else wants to jump in and make
19 one.

20 MR. PORTUONDO: Go for it.

21 MR. EHRENHAFT: I think before that we have
22 to ask if there's anybody in the audience that wants to
23 speak in favor or against the matter that's before us.
24 Okay.

25 MR. FULLERTON: So close the public hearing?

1 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yeah, close the public
2 hearing then.

3 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'd like to make a motion
4 to approve the request with accepting the first staff
5 recommendation, and then as far as the roof is concerned,
6 not approving the four and twelve, but approving the three
7 on twelve with the ability to change the roof structure
8 above the master bedroom area and maintain the existing
9 roof structure on the rest of the residence.

10 MS. THOMSON: I second it.

11 MR. EHRENHAFT: Any further discussion?

12 MR. FULLERTON: I want to just put in there
13 that whether -- if you're agreeable to replacing the roof
14 at the requested pitch, that's the three and twelve, and
15 we're able to do it with rafters rather than trusses in
16 certain --- in one area, why not the whole thing? Why not
17 let the architect and the owners decide where they can use
18 rafters and where they can use trusses?

19 I don't see, as long as it doesn't change the
20 outside, that it makes a whole lot of difference, so I
21 would say take that provision off here.

22 MS. SPAIN: Okay, and I would say that
23 there's a motion and a second, and so unless you're
24 willing for that amendment --

25 MR. GARCIA-PONS: It's discussion, so I'm

1 letting him discuss.

2 MS. SPAIN: Okay.

3 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: You can accept.

4 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I understand.

5 MR. FULLERTON: So that's my input.

6 MS. THOMSON: Should someone amend the
7 motion?

8 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I have to accept it.

9 MR. FULLERTON: No, she --

10 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I would have to accept it.

11 MR. FULLERTON: The seconder has to accept
12 the first, I believe.

13 MS. THOMSON: I seconded it.

14 MR. FULLERTON: Yes. You have to accept the
15 modification if you want to.

16 MS. THOMSON: I accept the modification.

17 MR. FULLERTON: Then you -- right.

18 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So is there any other board
19 discussion from any of the board members regarding the
20 trusses or that?

21 MR. SARDINAS: No.

22 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So staff.

23 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

24 MR. GARCIA-PONS: The trusses, other than our
25 fear of taking the roof off a building that can damage --

1 MS. SPAIN: And it's historic fabric. It's a
2 removal of historic fabric which is not appropriate
3 according to the federal guidelines that we are guided by.

4 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So the difficulty is for me
5 the historic fabric as seen from the street versus what is
6 interior.

7 MS. SPAIN: I understand. I actually liked
8 the compromise of having it over the master bedroom. I
9 think that makes a fair amount of sense because they can
10 get the grandeur in the master bedroom and the other areas
11 of the house can remain with the historic fabric intact,
12 for me.

13 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Right, and so I would agree
14 as well, so I'm going to reject your amendment, then take
15 a vote if you want and see how it plays. If it doesn't
16 pass, we'll do it again.

17 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

18 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Do you need to second again
19 if you accept this amendment?

20 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes, I think you do.

21 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Or not?

22 MR. FULLERTON: We need advice from our
23 counsel.

24 MR. CEBALLOS: So we've withdrawn the
25 amendment. Is that true?

1 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I have not withdrawn it.

2 MR. FULLERTON: I have withdrawn my
3 suggestion, I guess.

4 MR. GARCIA-PONS: No, no. You kept it. I
5 have not accepted it. I have not accepted the friendly
6 amendment.

7 MR. FULLERTON: Okay.

8 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So we're back to the
9 original as the maker of the motion.

10 MR. CEBALLOS: Understood.

11 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Does the second --
12 supposedly the person who seconded the motion --

13 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Do we have an
14 opportunity for discussion?

15 MR. GARCIA-PONS: But before we do that, does
16 the seconder have to change --

17 MR. CEBALLOS: Just for the purpose of
18 consistency, since she accepted the amendment, I would
19 just ask her if she would amend, since she's already, she
20 already initially accepted the initial motion, so I don't
21 imagine that being a concern.

22 MS. THOMSON: Yes.

23 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. So we're done.

24 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So we're back to the
25 initial, to the original motion. All right? Because

1 that's what was on the floor.

2 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Can we have discussion
3 on the motion? Because I would prefer what he was, what
4 John was proposing.

5 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Okay. I'm already --

6

7 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: I mean, I would be
8 willing to vote against the amendment --

9 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Right.

10 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: -- on the motion on that
11 basis.

12 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Right, so let's call -- I
13 think we should call a vote, and if it doesn't pass, we'll
14 try again.

15 MS. SPAIN: Yes. I agree.

16 MR. FULLERTON: Call the vote.

17 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay, so.

18 MR. FULLERTON: Call the vote.

19 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. Call the vote then,
20 please.

21 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Rodriguez?

22 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: No.

23 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Sardinias?

24 MR. SARDINAS: No.

25 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Garcia-

1 Pons?

2 MR. GARCIA-PONS: The answer is yes, right,
3 if it's my motion? Yes.

4 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Thomson?

5 MS. THOMSON: Yes.

6 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Fullerton?

7 MR. FULLERTON: No.

8 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Durana?

9 MR. DURANA: No.

10 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

11 MR. EHRENHAFT: No.

12 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Okay. So is anybody
13 willing to make another motion?

14 MR. FULLERTON: I like the original.

15 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: John, why don't you make
16 your motion?

17 MR. FULLERTON: I don't think I can do it as
18 well as you do.

19 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'm not making it.

20 MR. FULLERTON: Well, I move approval of the
21 applicant's proposal to do the work outlined in his
22 presentation except that the roof will be three and twelve
23 pitch rather than four and twelve pitch, and the materials
24 used for construction will be rafters and trusses as
25 they're required, but the architect has I think the skill

1 and knowledge to use them appropriately in the places that
2 you need them and without regard to whether they're
3 trusses or -- I'm getting confused on this thing I think.

4 But I think, I think to achieve the goal of
5 improving the interior spaces under that roof --

6 MR. CEBALLOS: My apologies, but could we
7 clarify that motion, make it a little more simple?

8 And frankly, if I could, if we can -- I would
9 suggest that we avoid discussing the materials that are
10 being used inside, the structural techniques and things of
11 that nature. I don't think that that is within the
12 purview of the board.

13 I would simply approve something, maybe a
14 three/twelve that you had originally suggested.

15 MR. FULLERTON: Well --

16 MR. PORTUONDO: Rafters instead of trusses.

17 MR. FULLERTON: Yes. I move that the
18 application be approved with rafters as appropriate for
19 the use rather than trusses and with the pitch of three
20 and twelve rather than four and twelve, and I think that's
21 it.

22 MR. GARCIA-PONS: And the front wall.

23 MR. FULLERTON: And it does not include the
24 front wall.

25 MR. GARCIA-PONS: We are approving the front

1 wall.

2 MR. FULLERTON: We are approving the front
3 wall. Sorry, okay. That's as best, as well as I can do I
4 think.

5 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: I'll second the motion.

6 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. Call the vote.

7 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Durana?

8 MR. DURANA: Yes.

9 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Thomson?

10 MS. THOMSON: Yes.

11 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Rodriguez?

12 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

13 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Fullerton?

14 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

15 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Garcia-

16 Pons?

17 MR. GARCIA-PONS: No; doesn't matter.

18 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Sardinias?

19 MR. SARDINAS: Yes.

20 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

21 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes. Okay. The motion
22 passes.

23 MR. PORTUONDO: Thank you very much.

24 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. Now we need to go on
25 to the -- not. Okay.

1 The next item on the agenda, it's public
2 hearing on Case File COA (SP) 2019-009, located at 112
3 Alhambra Circle.

4 Case file, it's an application for the
5 issuance of a special certificate of appropriateness for
6 the property, the aforementioned 112 Alhambra Circle, a
7 local historic landmark legally described as Lots One and
8 Two, Block 22, Coral Gables Section L, according to the
9 plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book Eight at Page 85 of
10 the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

11 The application requests design approval for
12 the restoration of the building and interior and exterior
13 alterations.

14 MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. So this is the
15 location map of the property. You can see it's outlined
16 in yellow. This is a fiche photo from the 1920s.

17 This building was constructed circa 1924 or
18 1925, know as the Cla-Reina or La Palma Hotel.

19 It's significant as one of the first hotels
20 to be constructed in the city and one of the few to still
21 remain standing. It was designed by H. George Fink and is
22 an exceptional Mediterranean revival style building.

23 It was made a historic landmark very early in
24 1986.

25 Just a little bit of background, the property

1 as it is now has sat vacant for quite a few years and also
2 gutted. The property was placed on the market after a
3 previous owner had overstepped the limit of allowable
4 demolition, forcing the whole structure to be brought up
5 to current code, and that previous owner was not able to
6 do those alterations.

7 A permit for structural repairs and
8 enhancement has already been issued on the property and
9 the current owner is proposing restoration of the
10 building's character-defining features and interior and
11 exterior alterations.

12 Note that with the exception of the iron
13 fence that you see on the Galliano Street elevation, work
14 in the courtyard is not included in the scope of work in
15 the COA.

16 A lot of people are here to speak on this.
17 We did have a bunch of staff comments at the end. No
18 variances have been requested with the application.

19 The board of architects reviewed and approved
20 the project in February and had one notification regarding
21 an arched window which is now not part of this proposal.

22 I had something else to ask you. Oh, did any
23 of you go to visit the site for the mock-up to go look at
24 the windows?

25 MR. EHRENHAFT: I did.

1 MS. KAUTZ: You did. No one else?

2 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I did, but I didn't see the
3 window. I went to the site.

4 MS. KAUTZ: Okay, okay. So I'll turn it over
5 to whomever is leading the show.

6 MR. GUILFORD: Good afternoon again. Zeke
7 Guilford with offices at 400 University Drive.

8 It gives me great pleasure today to be
9 representing 112 Alhambra Circle, LLC, and whose
10 principals are Pepe Ortega and Mark Schwartzberg.

11 I think it's great what these gentleman are
12 doing. They're taking a true Mediterranean gem of Coral
13 Gables and restoring it back to its original state.

14 You know, as Kara kind of said as just an
15 aside, I was there probably a couple of years ago having
16 lunch in the restaurant and we ate in the courtyard and I
17 looked around, and the whole rest of the property was
18 vacant and deteriorating.

19 So I think it's great what these guys are
20 willing to do.

21 What I'm going to do now is turn it over to
22 Jorge Kuperman to kind of walk you through our changes.

23 At the end we would also like to talk about,
24 well, something you already heard about last time, raising
25 the roof of this building, and I think it's very important

1 that this occurs, but I'm going to let Jorge walk you
2 through and then we'll discuss that item.

3 MR. KUPERMAN: Thank you so much. Good
4 afternoon, Mr. Chair, members of the board, staff. Jorge
5 Kuperman, JSK Architectural Group with offices at 137
6 Giralda Plaza.

7 Cla-Reina, the original name of the property,
8 was built between the years of 1924 and 1926. It's one of
9 the first hotels in Coral Gables, one of the few still
10 remaining in place.

11 It's an excellent example of
12 Mediterranean-Revival-inspired architecture that was
13 characteristic of the City of Coral Gables during the
14 1920s. It was designed by architect Henry George Fink for
15 Miami Estates, the company, the owner back in those years.

16 Some other examples of the Fink architecture
17 studio can be seen on the screen, still buildings in place
18 today with great historic value, Citizen Bank, Ponce de
19 Leon Junior High School, Alhambra Water Tower, and of
20 course the architecture studio of the firm right on Ponce
21 de Leon.

22 I would also like to add some enrichment of
23 this property which is going on right now. There is an
24 application being developed to designate the building and
25 place it in the national archives of historical places

1 which I think it's even a great value for the building and
2 the City of Coral Gables.

3 A few photos of the different transformations
4 of the building from Cla-Reina in the 1920s to Solana
5 Hotel in the 1930s, and then being the La Palma in the
6 '70s and later days of the '80s.

7 During our historical research, we found a
8 publication named Arts and Decoration magazine which was
9 issued in 1925, this specific issue, and already named the
10 building and on the development bottom right-hand side is
11 what we believe one of the original photos, partial photos
12 of the main entrance along Alhambra Circle, and below it
13 says, "The Cla-Reina apartment hotel was open for the
14 season. It is built in the Spanish manner around a large
15 patio planted in trees and shrubs."

16 A layout survey, just to get you in
17 perspective, on, along the top is the main entrance on
18 Alhambra Circle. On the left facing west is the access to
19 the courtyard by means of the gates most of you have seen
20 going into the courtyard, and the bottom is the alleyway
21 with steel staircase.

22 This photo we don't believe it's from the
23 early days for some things that doesn't match the original
24 drawings from Fink on a previous photo that we showed you,
25 but we still think it's an important factor to be taken

1 into consideration.

2 So with that, I'd like to go over the four
3 main items of our certificate of appropriateness request.

4 Restore the main entrance following the
5 intended design of Mr. Fink, which was, as we're going to
6 see in the following slides and in your materials, as a
7 thoroughfare fair or breezeway connecting Alhambra Circle
8 with the courtyard, obviously appropriate architecture
9 back in this those days, no air-conditioning.

10 The second item that we are going to be
11 asking is a change and replacing the windows and doors to
12 make them more in compliant with the level of alteration.
13 The building currently is going into a level of alteration
14 Three.

15 Basically all of the supporting system of the
16 building are being replaced, mechanical, electrical,
17 plumbing, as well as the structure of the perimeter.
18 That's being permitted. It's going on right now, and even
19 though it's a Level Three of alteration, the property
20 owners were allowed to downgrade their wind resistance to
21 a Category One hurricane, that's between 81 and 105 miles,
22 with the caveat that in case of a higher speed hurricane,
23 the building will need to be vacated. It will need to be
24 evacuated.

25 I wanted clarify that for the next items that

1 we're going to be presenting to you.

2 The third item is to restore the building
3 elements such as lanterns, mouldings, exterior decorations
4 and railings which we're going to be also seeing in the
5 next few slides, and lastly, miscellaneous items affecting
6 the exterior of the building in -- not affecting the
7 building in shape, form or color, and always as per, for
8 per building code and the standards of the state.

9 This is an original building that shows
10 within the red area the main entrance from Alhambra Circle
11 going through in the upper direction through this
12 breezeway, and on the bottom right-hand side corner you
13 can see the original title block of the office of
14 Mr. Fink, and that's the top, which is the area connecting
15 with the courtyard, once again the bottom and the top.

16 The reason we wanted to show that is to come
17 back to, on the bottom left-hand side corner, that's the
18 way that the building has been looking up to recently.
19 That was as a result of a certificate of appropriateness
20 issued probably back in the '80s.

21 We do not believe that is an attractive or an
22 appropriate way of treating the enclosure of this lobby,
23 mainly probably contradict what Mr. Fink had in his mind
24 of making it thorough-breezeway, back in those days
25 physically. Nowadays, it would be impossible to have it

1 open for the modern AC and other elements.

2 Another item that we're going to be talking
3 to you in later slides is the center element, the attic
4 vent, and we're going to be going more into detail on
5 that, but as a synopsis of what you see there are the
6 different elements that will be restored.

7 I should have said that we got some
8 additional drawings to your package. With your
9 permission, I would like to distribute if that's okay with
10 staff as well.

11 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

12 MR. KUPERMAN: Okay. Yeah, we got them for
13 you as well. Thank you, Vizano (phonetic).

14 So the existing north elevation actually we
15 wanted to emphasize that depiction with an existing
16 entrance photo and to go into what is our idea.

17 There is a product going on, it's a
18 completely frameless glass. It's an inch and a half
19 thick. The recent NOAA, it resists 175 miles and creates
20 complete transparency. The middle photo is the
21 residential. The bottom photo is kind of commercial. I
22 think it was an automobile dealership, and obviously
23 that's not the idea and the best environment.

24 But on the drawing we can see how we have an
25 attempt to recreate Fink's transparency while the place is

1 going to be air-conditioned and enclosed. That is the
2 courtyard elevation. The top drawing is the current
3 condition, and the bottom once again is the transparent
4 glass that would allow to have an air-conditioning area
5 while permits the transparency.

6 Once again, on the access from Alhambra,
7 that's the staircase going to upstairs, and then to the
8 right-hand side we are showing how do we intend to attach
9 these transparent element. It's going to be recessed a
10 couple of feet beyond, and in so doing, that will enhance
11 existing columns that you see there as opposed to the
12 current condition that they basically attach the center
13 leaf of those doors to the column.

14 In this case, as you see in the middle
15 section, it will be pushed back a couple of feet, and in
16 so doing it really enhance and expose those three columns.
17 On the right-hand side we see the floor plan where we
18 intend to position this enclosure.

19 From the back, from the courtyard, same
20 thing. The photo depicts exactly that corner. We
21 couldn't get an exactly dead-center photo, but we see the
22 exit and also the side which also will be enclosed as to
23 allow the transparency while creating the air-conditioning
24 area and enclosure and obviously hurricane-proof.

25 The next element that I wanted to talk to you

1 about is the windows. Some of you saw the mock-up, and we
2 do have a current window and we do have some samples that
3 we'd like for you to touch and see such as the mountings.
4 It's a key element because it describes the prairie style
5 of the windows.

6 The mountings will be mounted from the
7 inside, and those are extremely close to the current
8 depiction and we believe that is an absolute
9 interpretation of the prairie style of the original
10 windows.

11 Now, you see two depictions in here. The one
12 on the left is the actual mock-up currently at the job
13 site. The right-hand side is a revised proportion as
14 suggested by staff by moving the mountings inwards on each
15 leaf and the relocation of the muntins as to recreate more
16 closely the historical original windows.

17 So once again, the left one is the mock-up.
18 The right-hand side is our interpretation of staff's
19 suggestion by moving inwards the mountings and relocating
20 the muntins.

21 We completely agree and we believe that
22 brings more the proportion of the historical style.

23 This is existing condition of the view from
24 the west elevation with the access to the courtyard, and
25 this is our render of how we intend to look like with as

1 close as possible color.

2 Most all of the elements are being restored
3 and kept. Nothing is being changed between what exists
4 and what we propose.

5 The east elevation has the peculiarity.
6 Along the top you see what exists right now. Obviously
7 this building did not have the building that right now
8 exists along the east, which means that an exterior wall
9 didn't have any required separation.

10 Today there is a separation and the need of
11 compliance with fire, and for that we got two possible
12 responses that we're going to present to you because we
13 don't know who is going to occupy the building. We don't
14 know whether the level of protection for the building is
15 in terms of fire sprinkler is going to be depending on the
16 use, so we created two possible opportunities.

17 The one in the middle compliant with the code
18 separation which only allows 50 percent of the openings on
19 each level, the first and the second level, and -- excuse
20 me. The one in the middle is the one that is going to be
21 protected if the tenant such as an assembly or a large
22 number of occupants will require the presence of
23 protection such as fire sprinklers.

24 The bottom suppose unprotected building, in
25 which case we need to reduce the windows to 50 perscent.

1 So we wanted you to have both cases because we
2 don't know what the tenant is going to be.

3 This is a view of the alleyway and that
4 balancing type of New York style egress staircase, and we
5 wanted to enhance the current condition and the fact that
6 we are planning to restore it completely, make it
7 functional from a structural perspective as well as its
8 appearance.

9 Now, the issue of the vents, in the bottom
10 left-hand side corner, you got two depictions of those
11 lattice from inside of the space. They are wood right
12 now.

13 The original drawings of Fink specify what we
14 believe -- it's not noted on the drawings -- clay pipes,
15 sticking out of the facade. Somehow they didn't build it
16 like that. There are no records back in those days.
17 As-builts were not required.

18 The problem that we see with that, on the top
19 right-hand side corner is evidently some user in the past
20 needed to stick -- excuse me for the word -- those
21 galvanized hoods to avoid water intrusion, we believe.
22 Otherwise these openings are not protected.

23 We don't like the hood. We don't want to
24 have it. We're going to remove it, but we have the
25 problem of the water intrusion. Staff recommends and we

1 are okay with that to replace those lattices, but the left
2 and the middle top photos, we tried to play a little bit
3 with that original photo that I showed you originally, and
4 we believe that the original built element is a precast
5 element that mimics a lattice but not exactly a wood
6 lattice.

7 We are willing to entertain your wishes, but
8 the wood lattice we believe it doesn't belong there even
9 though it's probably from the '80s, so item for discussion
10 I guess.

11 This is a view from inside the courtyard, and
12 the intention is just to show you the elements before and
13 after, what's intended, and once again you can see that
14 basically all of the elements are being kept. Openings
15 are being replaced.

16 Another view of the courtyard. In this case
17 it's the north elevation. Additional elevations of the
18 courtyard. All of these materials are repetitive from the
19 materials you have in your hands.

20 That brings us to the two last slides. These
21 component I believe -- are they in the original packages?
22 I think they are. If not, they're in the ones that we
23 just handed to you.

24 Currently the building, as it was explained
25 before, it's being upgraded to level of alteration Three,

1 and about four inches thick of concrete is being built on
2 the inside. Basically --

3 MS. KAUTZ: Can I just clarify something
4 really quick? This discussion was not included in your
5 application package.

6 MR. KUPERMAN: Correct.

7 MS. KAUTZ: And we don't believe that it's
8 appropriate to be discussed at this time. We have not had
9 a chance to evaluate it. There's no existing versus
10 proposed elevations or sections.

11 MS. SPAIN: It hasn't been advertised.

12 MS. KAUTZ: So it hasn't been advertised.
13 It's not part of this application.

14 MR. KUPERMAN: That is correct. I just
15 wanted to bring to members for discussion or potentially
16 adding if it is possible. I leave it up to you.

17 I was saying that currently the building is
18 being upgraded structurally speaking to absorb the
19 solicitation of Category One hurricane, but the roof is
20 not. The roof is open web joist.

21 That section that you see in there shows our
22 intention to replace those wood joists without changing
23 the elevation. We do not need ceiling height. We are not
24 intending to change the slope. We are not intending to
25 change the appearance. Nothing will be changed.

1 Our intention is to replace with open wood
2 joists as a means to reinforce the building and give value
3 to the building. They are putting a lot of money on it,
4 on all of the vertical envelope of the building. It's
5 only logical to do that on the horizontal.

6 We are not touching the towers which is the
7 most important element along the facade. This roof is not
8 being seen from the street. You see that parapet and you
9 see that 45-degree element that was included as the only
10 way to support that parapet nowadays.

11 The reinforcement of the concrete doesn't go
12 above the parapet because the roof didn't permit to absorb
13 that solicitation, but if we change the roof to open web
14 joist, we will not need to do the 45 degrees which
15 otherwise we'll have to, and actually some of you do know
16 that that will increase the diaphragm of the building and
17 will be able to absorb the solicitation of a much higher
18 category of a hurricane.

19 That basically concludes my presentation. I
20 just wanted to mention that we completely agree with staff
21 recommendation.

22 In about five years, this building will turn
23 100 years. I believe that this is an incredible
24 initiative from a group of investors that will hopefully
25 extend the life of this building to another 100 years,

1 brings a lot of value to the population of Coral Gables,
2 and I think it's a great initiative.

3 We are looking for your support and giving us
4 an approval of the certificate of appropriateness in front
5 of you. I'm open for any questions or ideas.

6 MS. KAUTZ: So if they are agreeable to
7 staff's conditions, I don't really need to go through all
8 of them, but somehow I missed the east elevation, changing
9 the window openings, so those, the openings on the east
10 elevation should remain as is regardless.

11 So I don't know if you need to sprinkle the
12 building. I don't know what needs to happen, but those
13 openings should remain.

14 MS. THOMSON: Yeah. I was going to ask that
15 because when he mentioned -- are we not supposed to talk?

16 MS. KAUTZ: No, no, no.

17 MS. THOMSON: Okay. When you mentioned about
18 fire protection in there and it was going to change the
19 windows?

20 MS. KAUTZ: I missed that entirely reviewing
21 and writing the staff report, so.

22 MS. THOMSON: Yes. I always thought fire
23 protection was required now.

24 MS. KAUTZ: Can you go put the Power Point
25 back up, please?

1 MS. THOMSON: I forget what page it was on.

2 MR. EHRENHAFT: That's a question of changing
3 the number of fenestrations in it?

4 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. Originally, originally on
5 this elevation, those were both loggias. They were open
6 air, upper, upper and lower floor, and in the past they've
7 had windows put in, so the enclosing of it is not the
8 issue. It's this difference between the proposed and then
9 the may be proposed that are on the screen.

10 So what's the middle elevation is what should
11 remain regardless.

12 MS. THOMSON: Okay. The middle one should
13 remain?

14 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

15 MS. THOMSON: Okay.

16 MS. KAUTZ: With the number of openings, with
17 the number of openings and all that.

18 MR. KUPERMAN: If I may, the problem with the
19 middle elevation is that it doesn't comply with the 50
20 percent required of enclosing openings on a property that
21 is adjacent to another property.

22 MS. KAUTZ: Is there another -- it exists
23 that way now, so I'm not sure what the issue is.

24 MS. SPAIN: Is this a -- I'm sorry. Is this
25 a requirement that you've been told by the building

1 officials?

2 MR. KUPERMAN: Yes.

3 MS. SPAIN: Recently?

4 MR. KUPERMAN: Yes.

5 MR. FULLERTON: It's because it doesn't have
6 the appropriate set-back from the building --

7 MR. KUPERMAN: Correct.

8 MR. FULLERTON: -- next to it.

9 MS. SPAIN: No, that's not true.

10 MR. FULLERTON: No?

11 MS. SPAIN: Because the building next to it,
12 there was a restrictive covenant in place that was filed
13 -- so nice that I've been here for 23 years -- and that
14 came up when we were reviewing the high-rise next door, so
15 they went to the board of rules and appeals.

16 We need to have a discussion with Manny Lopez
17 because I don't believe it's necessary to change those
18 windows based on that because it's historic.

19 MR. KUPERMAN: I can tell you we don't want
20 to. We don't want to change it. We are just doing it to
21 comply.

22 MS. SPAIN: No, I totally understand, and was
23 that Manny that said that?

24 MR. KUPERMAN: Yeah.

25 MR. TORRE: Let me interject.

1 MR. KUPERMAN: Yeah.

2 MR. TORRE: I was involved with this. I
3 actually went to the meeting of the board of rules and
4 appeals, and they basically ruled that it needed to be
5 reduced, the board of rules and appeals did.

6 So there's a report by the board suggesting
7 that's what happened, so Manny wanted to make sure that
8 the board read that.

9 MS. SPAIN: But Manny went to that, right?

10 MR. TORRE: Yeah. His intent was to leave
11 them. He was in a sense overridden. He wanted to just
12 make sure this didn't let -- stay behind.

13 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: What's on the other side
14 of the elevation? Are there openings with no windows
15 originally? Is it just --

16 MR. TORRE: So let me just give you the
17 history.

18 MR. CEBALLOS: Pardon my interruption.

19 MR. TORRE: Dona tried to protect this issue
20 from going this way. Right?

21 MR. CEBALLOS: Mr. Torre --

22 MR. TORRE: I'm sorry. I should have
23 introduced myself for the record.

24 MR. CEBALLOS: -- pardon my interruption.

25 Although, although I don't think -- I think everybody up

1 here knows what your name is, if you can, for the record,
2 please.

3 MR. TORRE: I will put it on the record.

4 MR. CEBALLOS: Thank you.

5 MR. TORRE: My name is Venny Torre. I'm
6 representing the owners of Number 208 Andalusia.

7 The staff did the right thing. When the
8 building was being built, she asked the building to go
9 back further than was required. That was done.

10 However, the building itself sits on the
11 property line.

12 MS. SPAIN: This building does, this existing
13 building does.

14 MR. TORRE: This building does, correct, so
15 the building itself has holes, openings, on the property
16 line. The definition of it being more or correctly
17 separated, it is correctly separated. They didn't want to
18 accept that only because the building sits on the property
19 line.

20 MS. SPAIN: Then why am I just hearing about
21 this now? I'm sorry.

22 MR. TORRE: That's a good question.

23 MS. SPAIN: Okay.

24 MR. TORRE: So the owners would prefer to
25 keep it open, and they would like to revisit the

1 situation.

2 MS. SPAIN: I would like to revisit the
3 situation.

4 MR. TORRE: Yeah.

5 MS. SPAIN: I would like to have a
6 conversation with Manny Lopez --

7 MR. TORRE: Okay.

8 MS. SPAIN: -- and if necessary go back to
9 the board of rules and appeals because that was the whole
10 point of requiring the new building going in, and Manny
11 was part of that.

12 MR. TORRE: Yeah. I mean, ideally you
13 obviously get as much light as possible and that was the
14 intent, and we were distraught --

15 MS. SPAIN: Wow.

16 MR. TORRE: -- about that ruling.

17 MS. KAUTZ: What's the -- why are there two
18 proposed?

19 MR. TORRE: The bottom is if we're meeting
20 the new code --

21 MR. GARCIA-PONS: It's a new case.

22 MR. TORRE: -- the requirement as the board
23 of rules says, we have to go by what the bottom elevation
24 shows.

25 MS. SPAIN: Wow.

1 MR. FULLERTON: Sorry, but can't you get
2 fire-protected glass? I know it's costly.

3 MR. TORRE: If they want, I believe it was
4 \$19,000 a window, something to that effect.

5 MR. FULLERTON: Piece of cake.

6 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Dona, did you say there was
7 a covenant in place for the building next door that
8 maintains that open space in perpetuity?

9 MS. SPAIN: Yes, and the whole point of that
10 was because La Palma was at the property line, so we
11 thought that was taken care of.

12 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Right.

13 MS. SPAIN: And it's funny because both Manny
14 and I, having been here for so long, remembered that when
15 that building came in, and he called me and said, "Listen,
16 we need to make sure they put that back because we don't
17 want La Palma to be in violation." You know, I'm really
18 concerned.

19 MR. KUPERMAN: Dona, if I may, when I became
20 aware of that exactly thing you're saying --

21 MS. SPAIN: Right.

22 MR. KUPERMAN: -- we went, myself present and
23 measured it. I -- we used the formula employed the
24 building code.

25 MS. SPAIN: Right.

1 MR. KUPERMAN: And it gave me 50 percent only
2 openings on each of the levels, so if you count that by
3 square footage, that brings us to the depicted --

4 MS. SPAIN: I totally understand. You know,
5 I would like to have a conversation with Manny and see
6 what we can do about that because it would be a shame
7 to --

8 MR. KUPERMAN: We would love to keep it.

9 MS. SPAIN: -- to block up those windows.

10 MR. FULLERTON: Well, in truth --

11 MS. SPAIN: It's a code issue. I can't do
12 anything about it.

13 MR. FULLERTON: -- I worked with Manny on
14 those windows.

15 MS. SPAIN: Oh, that's right.

16 MR. FULLERTON: Yeah, and he and I agreed
17 that whatever happened in the future, the building that
18 would be built adjacent to it would have to comply with
19 the fire requirements, set-back requirements.

20 MS. SPAIN: So you were part of that too.
21 Oh, well.

22 I mean, regardless of what happens now, I'm
23 going to talk with Manny and see what we can do to keep
24 the windows.

25 And I have to say, I am thrilled that these

1 owners purchased this building. I'm just absolutely
2 thrilled. It stayed vacant. We were all worried about
3 it. You know, buildings that are left vacant, bad things
4 happen, and they're doing such a good job. I'm really
5 very, very happy.

6 MR. EHRENHAFT: Great.

7 MR. GUILFORD: If I can suggest this for the
8 board, is let's go ahead and we'll make an -- if you all
9 would make a motion on the COA. I think we have one
10 clarification we have to make on a window and Jorge will
11 get to that.

12 We will obviously deal with the board of
13 rules and appeals on the windows, and obviously from what
14 staff has said, we will come back with an additional COA
15 regarding the roof and how it's put together, if that's
16 all right.

17 MS. SPAIN: If you could.

18 MR. FULLERTON: Dona, is there any mitigating
19 factor due to the fact that it's a historic building?

20 MS. SPAIN: I need to find out. You would
21 think there would be --

22 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

23 MS. SPAIN: -- you know.

24 MR. FULLERTON: I would think so, some
25 work-around.

1 MR. KUPERMAN: On a different subject, I
2 wanted to clarify for the record. We are fully in
3 acceptance of the recommendations.

4 There is one item that we need to clarify.
5 One of the recommendations says to -- the change of the
6 window should be casement I think on the upper floor.
7 They're going to be fixed. They're not going to be
8 casement, so that's, I'd like to clarify that.

9 MR. GUILFORD: We will make it casement
10 style.

11 MS. SPAIN: But it looks --

12 MR. GUILFORD: But just, they'll be fixed,
13 fixed so it looks --

14 MS. SPAIN: It looks as if it's --

15 MR. GUILFORD: -- like a casement window but
16 they'll be fixed, so we just didn't want to make sure that
17 there is some miscommunication that they wanted true
18 casement and we were planning on fixed, so that's the only
19 item, we just needed clarification of that.

20 MS. SPAIN: As long as it looks like a true
21 casement.

22 MS. KAUTZ: So are they casement, or they're
23 going to be fixed windows?

24 MR. KUPERMAN: They're going to be fixed,
25 casement style.

1 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Is that every window?

2 MR. KUPERMAN: Yes.

3 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Every second floor window
4 on every elevation?

5 MR. KUPERMAN: Yes.

6 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So the little dash lines
7 that shows that it opens is incorrect?

8 MR. KUPERMAN: Yes, correct, correct. On the
9 existing you mean, right?

10 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Correct.

11 MR. KUPERMAN: Yes.

12 MR. GARCIA-PONS: No, on the proposed.

13 MR. KUPERMAN: Which? Bottom line is every
14 window.

15 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Every window on the second
16 floor is going to be fixed?

17 MR. KUPERMAN: Correct. I'd like to ask once
18 again to staff if there is any interest on replacing those
19 vents for clay pipes?

20 MS. KAUTZ: Well, you know, we looked at
21 those, those photographs with a loupe and got really in
22 there.

23 MR. KUPERMAN: Yeah, I know.

24 MS. KAUTZ: And I honestly, the condition of
25 the latticework vents the way they are now, I have a

1 really hard time believing that someone would have
2 replaced concrete grills at some point --

3 MR. KUPERMAN: Okay.

4 MS. KAUTZ: -- and put in a wood lattice.

5 MR. KUPERMAN: Okay.

6 MS. KAUTZ: I mean, it doesn't make sense
7 that that would have happened, so I would suggest that
8 they are original.

9 MR. KUPERMAN: I understand, and we are in
10 acceptance. My concern is how to protect water intrusion.
11 We don't want those hoods and I --

12 MS. KAUTZ: Oh, no, no, I agree, I agree, but
13 how would having the lattice be out of concrete versus out
14 of wood affect water intrusion?

15 MR. KUPERMAN: I agree. It's just a matter
16 of materials.

17 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. I mean, I think that --

18 MR. GUILFORD: And the board -- and again, we
19 need, we know we need to come back for COA for the roof,
20 but if there's any like initial feedback you can give us
21 one way or the other, it would be appreciated. We know
22 it's not part of this COA, but any comment you would have
23 would be appreciated.

24 MR. FULLERTON: The only thing I remember
25 about the structure of that building were those cupolas up

1 on top being all frame, and they were falling apart when
2 we were working on that building 30 years ago, 20 years
3 ago. How are they bearing up?

4 MR. TORRE: I can clean it up for you. The
5 structural restoration project that is being done by way
6 of Francisco Cuella includes the restoration of the
7 towers, double framing the inside, triple framing some
8 studs, double framing roofs. All the inside will be
9 beefed up, hurricane clips, hurricane straps.

10 MR. FULLERTON: Yeah.

11 MR. TORRE: On and on and on.

12 MR. FULLERTON: So it will remain framed?

13 MR. TORRE: Yeah. Those just have to be made
14 to withstand the wind, so those are being from the inside
15 of those little --

16 MR. FULLERTON: Yes, okay.

17 MR. TORRE: -- and so forth. To clarify
18 something that maybe it's a construction matter that
19 brings this up, the vents will be, in fact, closed by the
20 concrete behind it, so one suggestion may be to take them
21 down carefully when we are doing the construction and then
22 replace them back neatly.

23 MS. KAUTZ: They're just faux from the
24 outside?

25 MR. TORRE: Yeah, they'll be faux, but

1 they'll be sitting really within a confinement of a space
2 that has block or concrete behind it.

3 The best thing is take them down, pour the
4 concrete, paint, make sure everything is waterproof, and
5 then put them back. Is that fair?

6 MS. KAUTZ: Fine. The only staff comment
7 that I did not -- that wasn't actually a recommendation,
8 it just needed clarification, was that the proposed
9 elevator is shown on a roof plan, but there's no
10 indication of it in elevation, and we wanted to make sure
11 that any -- that there was no elevator tower associated
12 with that that would rise above the height of the parapet.

13 MR. KUPERMAN: There is new technology in
14 elevators that does not necessarily need power --

15 MS. KAUTZ: Right, make sure they're going
16 that way.

17 MR. KUPERMAN: -- that machinery will be
18 moving somewhere -- absolutely.

19 MS. KAUTZ: Okay.

20 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'm sorry. Can I -- I just
21 want to clarify one more time. The elevation facing
22 Alhambra Circle, the second floor windows are fixed?

23 MR. KUPERMAN: Correct.

24 MR. GARCIA-PONS: And on Sheet A 301, is it
25 Detail Number Five? What is it going to be replaced with?

1 MS. KAUTZ: Wait. 301?

2 MR. GARCIA-PONS: It says, "Refer to 301," so
3 I went to 301, and there's a couple. I'm not sure which
4 window.

5 MR. KUPERMAN: Oh, you mean in the comments
6 from staff?

7 MS. KAUTZ: No; in your --

8 MR. GARCIA-PONS: No; in your drawing. I
9 think the first two --

10 MS. KAUTZ: Is it that one? Is it referring
11 to the mock-up?

12 MR. KUPERMAN: Are you referring to the
13 mock-up?

14 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Sorry. Let me -- the
15 elevation that I saw refers to --

16 MR. KUPERMAN: In other words, you think that
17 there is -- you saw an elevation that appears to be an
18 operable window?

19 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Correct.

20 MR. KUPERMAN: For clarification, it's going
21 to be fixed.

22 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Right, and does that --
23 which one does that look like?

24 MR. KUPERMAN: Oh, it's exactly like the
25 mock-up. It's proportionate to the opening.

1 MS. KAUTZ: See, look, it says, "Existing
2 windows to be replaced, impact-graded windows, see 301
3 typical."

4 MR. KUPERMAN: That's right, I think, yes.

5 MS. KAUTZ: And then you go to 301, and I
6 think he's -- I think it's referring to Four. Is that
7 correct, or this?

8 MR. KUPERMAN: On 301, are you referring
9 to --

10 MS. KAUTZ: No. It's your note. What do you
11 refer to?

12 MR. KUPERMAN: It's Number, obviously it's
13 Number Four, yeah, Number Four.

14 MS. KAUTZ: Yeah, right.

15 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So it doesn't appear to be
16 a casement, this one.

17 MR. KUPERMAN: It's just the appearance of
18 the casement but it's fixed. It's exactly --

19 MR. FULLERTON: Just, they're single
20 casements, I guess not, not --

21 MR. KUPERMAN: Exactly, exactly, but these --

22 MR. GARCIA-PONS: But it's shown as two
23 leaves in the window.

24 MR. KUPERMAN: It's actually a photo of a
25 depiction of the product, but the reality, it's going to

1 be fixed.

2 MS. KAUTZ: When they did the mock-up, they
3 did a mock-up of an installation on the ground floor so
4 they were single units, so I think that's -- there's just
5 a confusion in the note.

6 They are supposed to be pairs of casements,
7 in this case pairs of fixed casements.

8 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Right. I understand. My
9 question is I'd like to see the fixed casement version.

10 MR. KUPERMAN: Okay.

11 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Because I don't know what
12 -- that could mean something very different to you than
13 me.

14 MR. KUPERMAN: And there is a mock-up on site
15 currently.

16 MR. GARCIA-PONS: On the second floor?

17 MR. KUPERMAN: No. It's on the ground.

18 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So that's what I'm asking,
19 is we don't have a detail of your fixed second floor
20 windows. It appears in the drawings that they're two
21 operable casements windows.

22 MR. KUPERMAN: I understand your point, yes.

23 MR. GARCIA-PONS: And we don't have an
24 example of what it looks like --

25 MR. KUPERMAN: Correct.

1 MR. GARCIA-PONS: -- now that they're fixed.

2 MR. KUPERMAN: Correct.

3 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So that's a request that I
4 would like to have.

5 MS. KAUTZ: I understand.

6 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Or staff to at least
7 review.

8 MS. KAUTZ: I understand. That's I think is
9 the distinction between having a fixed window versus a
10 fixed casement window because that thickness is what's
11 going to make the difference between the first floor and
12 the second floor.

13 MR. GARCIA-PONS: That is correct.

14 MS. KAUTZ: Yes. I understand.

15 MR. SARDINAS: Yeah, and I think the
16 question, one of the questions along with what Cesar is
17 saying is that the astrogold (phonetic) that you normally
18 find in a casement, what happens when it becomes fixed?

19 MS. KAUTZ: Correct, which I think is what
20 the fixed casement units do.

21 MR. SARDINAS: Correct.

22 MR. TORRE: I'm going to clarify for you, I
23 think. We did a mock-up of the ground floor window and I
24 think it was the most difficult one to cast correctly. It
25 took us about a month and a half to make sure we got all

1 the pieces and made it so we knew we could make it happen
2 because the pieces that we're using obviously are not of
3 historical character. They're made to withstand the
4 hurricane winds.

5 The downstairs windows we think match and
6 look great and will do the job perfectly.

7 The top window will probably be done
8 similarly, and what happens is that there's a middle
9 piece, maybe a two by six, separates the two windows, the
10 two windows coming together, and then we either put a
11 piece the middle vertically to make it look like that
12 piece is the right size and so forth.

13 My proposition is that we do a mock-up for
14 you again and have staff lead us into the right solution,
15 so the way we did the downstairs window, I would want to
16 do the same thing and make sure it's --

17 MS. KAUTZ: Okay.

18 MR. TORRE: -- exactly the way you want it.

19 MS. KAUTZ: But I would like that distinction
20 that it be made that they will be fixed casements versus
21 fixed windows.

22 MR. TORRE: Yeah.

23 MS. KAUTZ: Okay.

24 MR. TORRE: I'm just trying to explain to you
25 what it would look like, but I think staff will lead us

1 and we'll get the right answer.

2 MS. KAUTZ: Yeah, that's fine. Okay.

3 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So did I hear that they
4 accepted all the staff recommendations?

5 MS. KAUTZ: That's what they said.

6 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. So the chair will
7 entertain a motion.

8 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Do we have to do public,
9 or?

10 MR. EHRENHAFT: Oh, that's right. Okay. I'm
11 sorry. Is there anybody in the audience who wishes to
12 speak in favor of the matter before us or in opposition?
13 Okay, all right.

14 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'm happy to make another
15 motion.

16 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

17 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Move approval with the
18 staff conditions with the additional condition that a
19 mock-up of the second floor fixed casement windows be
20 constructed and reviewed by staff.

21 MR. SARDINAS: I second.

22 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. Is there -- okay. No
23 further discussion. Okay, all right. If there isn't,
24 then may we call the roll?

25 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Fullerton?

1 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

2 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Sardinias?

3 MR. SARDINAS: Yes.

4 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Durana?

5 MR. DURANA: Yes.

6 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Garcia-

7 Pons?

8 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.

9 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Rodriguez?

10 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

11 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Thomson?

12 MS. THOMSON: Yes.

13 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

14 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

15 MR. GUILFORD: Thank you very much.

16 MR. KUPERMAN: Thank you so much, appreciate

17 it.

18 MS. THOMSON: We have one more, don't we?

19 MR. FULLERTON: Can we have a five-minute

20 recess?

21 MR. EHRENHAFT: I have a request for a

22 five-minute recess.

23 MS. THOMSON: Yes.

24 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

25 (Thereupon, a brief recess.)

1 MR. EHRENHAFT: So the next matter before
2 this board is Case File COA (SP) 2017-001, Revised.
3 This is an application for the issuance of a special
4 certificate of appropriateness for the property at -- I'm
5 sorry. I misread.

6 MS. THOMSON: Go down.

7 MR. EHRENHAFT: Wrong file, start over. Case
8 File COA (SP) 2017-012, Revised.

9 It's an application for the issuance of a
10 special certificate of appropriateness for the property at
11 927 Valencia Avenue, a local historic landmark legally
12 described as Lots 17, 18 and 19, Block Nine, Coral Gables
13 Section A, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in
14 Plat Book Five at Page 102 of the public records of
15 Miami-Dade County, Florida.

16 The application requesting design approval
17 for additions and alterations to the residence and work
18 site was granted approval with conditions on August 17,
19 2017. Revisions requesting design approval for the
20 landscape mitigation were approved on December 21, 2017.

21 This application requests design approval for
22 revisions to the approved certificate of appropriateness
23 necessitated by deviations from the approved scope of
24 demolition on this historic residence.

25 Does any board member have any ex parte

1 communication or site visits to disclose with respect to
2 this property?

3 MR. FULLERTON: No.

4 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Yes. I drove by the
5 property.

6 MR. FULLERTON: I drove by the property also.

7 MR. SARDINAS: I drive by every day.

8 MR. EHRENHAFT: I did not drive by pursuant
9 to this coming on the agenda, but because I avoid traffic
10 in Coral Way due to the east-west and drove past and saw
11 the present status of the structure.

12 MS. KAUTZ: Obviously location map of the
13 property. Again, this is the pre-demolition site view.
14 This is how the property looked in 1940, and this is the
15 applicant.

16 MS. SPAIN: So this is a real disappointment.
17 You all approved an addition to this property, and they've
18 gone way beyond the scope of the demolition that was
19 approved, way beyond, and I'm really not big on rewarding
20 bad behavior, and this is very bad behavior.

21 So the application before you is requesting
22 to put back what they took down. I'm not exactly sure
23 what we can do about it, but you know, they're now under a
24 red tag, and that's what they're requesting.

25 And maybe we should talk after they get done

1 with their application, but the question is do we allow
2 them to build back what they got the approval for?

3 Or because it's such a reduced now portion of
4 the historic, historic home, they don't have to work
5 around what was there before, should it be a better
6 application and it's a do-over?

7 And I don't know what's appropriate, but I --
8 as they go through, we need to think about it.

9 Typically if a house comes down by owner's
10 neglect, we require it to be put back, so is that the case
11 now? I'm not sure.

12 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: When you say put back,
13 you mean only the four corners of what was there before?

14 MS. SPAIN: Right.

15 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: And nothing else.

16 MS. SPAIN: Well, that's not what our code
17 says. I would very much like to have it be what the code
18 says, and we're speaking to the city attorney about
19 that --

20 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: What does the code say?

21 MS. SPAIN: -- because that's what they have,
22 that's what they have in California. If a home gets, if a
23 historic home gets knocked down or it falls down because
24 of owner's neglect, they've required to rebuild only the
25 historic portion and they're not allowed to do an

1 addition.

2 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: And what does --

3 MS. SPAIN: That's not what our code says.

4 Our code says that if the home is, falls down because of
5 neglect, demolition by neglect, they're required to build
6 it back, but it doesn't -- it's silent on doing an
7 addition.

8 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: But this is more than
9 neglect, though.

10 MS. SPAIN: Oh, no. It's, they just --

11 MS. THOMSON: This is deliberate.

12 MS. SPAIN: -- they tore it down, so I don't
13 know if, Kara, what you want to say about it.

14 MS. KAUTZ: I mean, that's basically what you
15 see in this '40 photo is the only portion that remains.

16 And so that was the question in our office,
17 whether or not because you're not working around an
18 existing structure, is there an opportunity to do
19 something better and that pays more respect to the part
20 that's left.

21 MR. EHRENHAFT: Kara, could you remind us on
22 the front facade, there was to the left --

23 MS. KAUTZ: Yes.

24 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

25 MR. EHRENHAFT: -- another structure, and

1 that was still historic, right?

2 MS. KAUTZ: No. To the left there was an
3 addition that was done in the 1950s --

4 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

5 MS. KAUTZ: -- like a single room --

6 MR. EHRENHAFT: Right.

7 MS. KAUTZ: -- that went parallel to the
8 front facade.

9 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

10 MS. KAUTZ: And that was allowed to be
11 removed.

12 MR. EHRENHAFT: That was able to come down.

13 MS. KAUTZ: It was not significant to the
14 structure.

15 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

16 MS. KAUTZ: This, what you see from this '40s
17 photo is the historic portion of the house. What is
18 remaining are the two roof structures, basically, so.

19 MR. EHRENHAFT: And two side walls to keep
20 the front facade from collapsing.

21 MS. KAUTZ: Two sides walls, front, yes.

22 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

23 MS. KAUTZ: And that's it.

24 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: So all we have now is
25 basically the facade.

1 MS. SPAIN: Yes, that's right.

2 MR. SARDINAS: Are there any plans of the
3 original?

4 MS. KAUTZ: Oh, that's a good question. I
5 can check while they're giving their presentation, but
6 yes.

7 But just as a background, and this was asked
8 of us, there are no previously approved plans because
9 basically what you have in front of you, whatever is shown
10 as bubbled as to be rebuilt was -- it's the same plan.
11 It's just what was existing is now shown to be rebuilt.
12 There's no change to it.

13 But I can -- I'll look for the original
14 plans.

15 MR. GARCIA-PONS: One quick question for
16 staff before the presentation.

17 I wasn't here in 2017. Was the approved COA,
18 were they given any variances, set-backs, anything? It
19 was all by right within the zoning code?

20 MS. SPAIN: I don't believe so.

21 MR. TORRE: Hello, everybody, again. So my
22 name is Venny Torre. My office is at 208 Andalusia
23 Avenue.

24 To respond to your question about existing
25 plans, I'm at a disadvantage because we don't have the

1 plans showing what work was supposed to be done. Is there
2 a possibility that I could use a copy of those plans to
3 provide explanation? Is that a possibility?

4 MS. KAUTZ: I don't understand the question.

5 MR. TORRE: I need to show them what the
6 plans showed for demolition, because right now all you're
7 seeing is what needs to come back. If I'm to explain to
8 you what happened, I would need to show you the approved
9 set of drawings.

10 In other words, what was approved, you don't
11 have in front of you.

12 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: I'd like to see it.

13 MR. TORRE: It puts me in a disadvantage

14 MS. THOMSON: I think we need to.

15 MR. TORRE: Yeah. Okay, All right. I'll do
16 that.

17 So just for the record, my office is a
18 contractor for this project, and I've met with Dona and
19 Kara in the friendliest of ways and had disagreements with
20 staff, and I respect them, love them to death.

21 I have been a hard-core preservationist for
22 as long as I can remember. I believe I'm a very good
23 contractor, conscientious person, and by no way, means or
24 anything like that was this demolition done on purpose
25 with no regards for what was going on and so forth.

1 The way this happened, just so you can
2 understand, is there was several meetings to discuss what
3 the demolition clarified or said had to be done.

4 I was on a cruise in the European continent,
5 got a call, whatever e-mail it was, that said, "We have
6 some discrepancies. We're in the middle of demolition.
7 We really can't seem to make this work. What should we
8 do?"

9 To my detriment, I said, "You guys are going
10 to have to make a call."

11 The call was a bad call, and the right
12 answer, and I take full blame and I've said this to Dona,
13 should have been, "Stop, you're going to have to wait and
14 sort it out when everything" -- that's my call. I take
15 the blame. I completely take the sword on this.

16 So just to let you know, I am not here to
17 defend bad actions or to create track records for further
18 bad actions. I think that what happened is unfortunate
19 and I feel bad about it. I know how they feel and I
20 respect their feelings, so I'm not here to really go
21 against the right answer, which is this should have been
22 stopped. That's my first comment, the way I feel about
23 it.

24 MS. SPAIN: I'm going to add salt to the
25 wound because you were the preservation chair for eight

1 years, and how many times have I -- have you sat there
2 where Bruce is sitting and I said to an applicant, "You
3 should have stopped and called the historic preservation
4 department"?

5 So you know, I understand that you were on a
6 cruise, but there's no reason that this should have
7 happened, and so that's all I'm going to say about it.

8 We can't find the original plans. I
9 apologize. We should have had the designation report, but
10 we don't in our packet.

11 MR. EHRENHAFT: But they exist, or
12 potentially?

13 MS. SPAIN: You know, I remember ElizaBeth,
14 and I don't know whether they exist, but I do remember
15 ElizaBeth in the designation report doing color --

16 MS. KAUTZ: Diagrams.

17 MS. SPAIN: -- diagrams as to what was an
18 addition and what wasn't.

19 MS. THOMSON: So this here -- I'm sorry. Are
20 you talking? This here that we're seeing here, this new
21 front south elevation, this has now been redesigned?

22 MR. TORRE: It's rebuilding everything that
23 was originally to be rebuilt, and then some two or three
24 walls are being rebuilt that were supposed to be part of
25 the existing fabric, so.

1 MS. THOMSON: Okay.

2 MS. SPAIN: I don't believe there were -- my
3 recollection is there were no original plans on this
4 house.

5 MR. TORRE: Let me take you through the
6 process of what maybe drew this problem to happen.

7 First of all, the original house is shown on
8 here, but let's look at D 1.01, if you don't mind. Please
9 turn to that page. It's near the bottom of your packet.

10 MR. GARCIA-PONS: It's the last page.

11 MS. THOMSON: D 101?

12 MR. TORRE: D 1 point -- 1.01.

13 MR. GARCIA-PONS: It's the last page in our
14 packet.

15 MS. THOMSON: Okay. Thank you.

16 MR. TORRE: The left wing, bottom left wing,
17 not historic, was supposed to come out, clearly not a
18 problem.

19 The front room where the chimney is at,
20 clearly supposed to stay, not a problem.

21 The room to the right of that clearly was
22 supposed to stay, not a problem. Do you mind me putting
23 my glasses? Those are shown as hash lines.

24 MS. KAUTZ: You need to put the Power Point
25 up.

1 MR. TORRE: Thank you for that. It's three
2 from the back.

3 MR. GARCIA-PONS: In our set, it's the last
4 page, John.

5 MR. FULLERTON: Thank you.

6 MS. SPAIN: Here. Why don't you flip through
7 it?

8 MR. TORRE: Okay. So left side bottom, front
9 room, right room. To add to that, the roof was to be
10 removed, the entire roof to be removed and replaced. Got
11 that? Entire roof.

12 Floor, entire floor to be removed, the entire
13 house.

14 So what got left is really the back of the
15 house which was supposed to have, the back corner have a
16 roof remain, small roof which is about ten by ten.

17 If you look at the drawings, and there's four
18 architects in front of me, dash lines means removal. If I
19 interpret this correctly, I don't see a lot of walls left.

20 Now, does it mean, and I repeat this every
21 time, I'm going to say it, I shouldn't have stopped the
22 job, I shouldn't have raised my hand? Point taken, well
23 taken.

24 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Was this a demolition
25 plan that was approved?

1 MR. TORRE: Approved by plans, permitted
2 plans.

3 So the second point here is that all the
4 walls had no tie beam. Tie beams are the top section of
5 the house that straps down the roof and holds the house
6 from basically having the roof fall on you. The house did
7 not have a tie beam, so therefore shoring could have been
8 an option and may have solved some of the problems.

9 Now, so to top that off, we had to put
10 columns at all corners, all new sides of the windows,
11 install new tie beams on everything new, and leave behind
12 a few little walls remaining from the existing structure.

13 MS. SPAIN: I have to interject with just one
14 comment. I don't think I've seen a 1920s home with tie
15 beams. It just -- that's a typical condition in these
16 homes, and you know.

17 MS. THOMSON: Venny, with all due respect,
18 and you're my mom's favorite, I want to ask you a
19 question. If you were doing the demolition and you were
20 over in Europe and they didn't stop and they demolished
21 it, wouldn't you have plans? Wouldn't you have the plans
22 that you're supposed to build after you demolish?

23 MR. TORRE: Yes. Plans for reconstruction
24 were attached to this sheet. You don't have it. There's
25 a set of drawings to go along with this D sheet.

1 MS. THOMSON: Why do we not have it? I'm
2 sorry.

3 MR. TORRE: I asked that question when I got
4 up here. I'm at a disadvantage because you can't see the
5 reconstruction of this house.

6 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Well, wouldn't your
7 architect have it?

8 MR. TORRE: He's not present for this
9 meeting.

10 MS. THOMSON: Can we defer this?

11 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Shouldn't he be here
12 then?

13 MR. TORRE: I think you should have the
14 original approval, the construction approval.

15 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: I'm not sure what we can
16 do with this in front of us, to be honest with you. We
17 have, we have a facade, and nothing else is there.

18 MS. THOMSON: We have this.

19 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: And we have a plan.

20 MR. TORRE: I understand, but I do have a lot
21 of clarity because I took the time to understand how much
22 demolition was supposed to happen, and I undertook the
23 time to overlay the structural work on top of demolition.

24 Now, let's stop there for a second. I had --
25 I should have stopped the job, stopped everybody.

1 Going forward, and I'm a -- I believe I'm an
2 expert in construction and remodeling. Reconstructing
3 this would have been a challenge of the highest degree,
4 not to say it couldn't have been done.

5 I fear that leaving four joists, five joists,
6 putting new tie beams underneath it, putting new decking
7 on it really doesn't accomplish much.

8 Back to the question: Should have stopped
9 the job, should have stopped the demolition, but.

10 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: But that, shouldn't that
11 have been considered before they started the demolition or
12 when they came in and made a presentation to us to say
13 there's very little left here that can be salvaged?

14 MR. TORRE: I think there's a disconnect
15 because, again, you don't have the original approval
16 package. I don't have it. I threw it out.

17 There's a disconnect when you approve
18 something and it's very hard to accomplish what you
19 approved, and it's not to say that some of these things
20 aren't challenging, but this one was extremely challenging
21 because when you redo the entire tie beam of this entire
22 back area, there's not much we can do to salvage a lot of
23 things, of blocks that are standing by themselves.

24 So again, it's an unfortunate situation. The
25 crews doing the demolition saw what probably seemed like

1 an inevitable demolition, but they shouldn't have done it.

2 And I'm the guy who took the decision and I'm
3 the one that takes the responsibility, so I'm here to tell
4 you that I apologize and that reconstruction is the only
5 option.

6 In regards to what you're going to see, I
7 tell you that if you're going to put new tie beams, new
8 filled cells every four or five feet and every column at
9 every corner, you have to restucco that property from
10 scratch because there's no way we can blend it in, so
11 therefore, this reconstruction as we stand here will look
12 no different than a reconstruction.

13 We're losing some original pieces. I take
14 the point, well taken, this is a bad example. It's bad on
15 a person who stood here for eight years doing this, but at
16 the end of the day, I think that what really happened is a
17 condition that, it was an impossible situation.

18 MS. SPAIN: You know, if you're having
19 problems with this and you need the designation report and
20 the previous approval --

21 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: I'd like to see that.

22 MS. SPAIN: -- I would suggest that you defer
23 it until next month.

24 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

25 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: I don't see how we can

1 make a decision without that.

2 MS. THOMSON: We can't.

3 MR. TORRE: I agree, and here is the problem,
4 that we're in a red tag situation. We haven't been able
5 to move for two months, and that's okay. That's the way
6 the code works.

7 But there's a disadvantage to the process,
8 and the original situation was, "Let me continue building
9 the back side, let me continue building the position that
10 the board is taking."

11 You may make a different decision currently,
12 and therefore the approval should not count, and I
13 understand that.

14 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: What is the red tag for?

15 MR. TORRE: This condition that we're looking
16 at today, which is basically a deviation from the approved
17 demolition.

18 MR. FULLERTON: If you rebuild the walls to
19 complete the square footage of the original building, does
20 that tie into your ultimate plan? Does that tie into what
21 you're going to do in the future to it?

22 MR. TORRE: Yeah. The house is really large,
23 and by the way, when you build this, you'll see. Do you
24 have -- yeah.

25 The house is quite large, so what happens is

1 that, in the floor plan, the area of this house that we're
2 discussing, in fact, you can go to Page A 20 -- 2.03, if I
3 can help you there a little bit.

4 2.03, the area in question is the somewhat
5 square-ish piece behind the entrance.

6 So while I point to that roof to be rebuilt,
7 that's the new roof, and then right behind that or north
8 of that, you'll see north -- a new tie beam. That's the
9 wall that was supposed to partially remain. To the right
10 of that, you'll see Tie Beam New. To the right of that
11 you'll see Not Tie Beam New.

12 So those are all basically saying tie beams
13 got to be put back, and there's no roof over here, so you
14 have this little square sitting on its own suspending a
15 joist so I can put back the tie beam. That little square
16 was gone or was removed, and the little wall says new tie
17 beams were gone, so basically what you're looking at is
18 this guy right here.

19 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I'm sorry. We were
20 talking about a deferral. Were you going to say something
21 about that?

22 MR. TORRE: Again, I know I'm not supposed to
23 be representing the owner. I am representing the owner.
24 The architects are here.

25 I think the only thing that is a problem --

1 the repair has to happen. We'll figure it out. I think
2 the only problem is we have, we have a red tag.

3 MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I mean, I have -- go
4 ahead.

5 MR. EHRENHAFT: No, go ahead.

6 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I have a question for
7 staff, and this is maybe a bigger-picture question. Does
8 this null and void the COA?

9 MS. SPAIN: You know what, I don't know the
10 answer to that question. I need to do research.

11 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Is there a fine
12 associated with this?

13 MS. SPAIN: Pardon me?

14 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Is there a fine
15 associated or penalty of some kind?

16 MS. SPAIN: I don't believe there's a running
17 fine on this, and I don't -- have you been cited by code
18 enforcement, or just red tagged?

19 MR. TORRE: I think red tagged.

20 MS. SPAIN: There's a flaw in the system
21 there.

22 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I mean, I would be in
23 support of a deferral if somebody wants to move it, but I
24 would ask staff definitely to take a look at the
25 ramifications of this, this kind of incident on the

1 validity of the entire COA, and you know, does that change
2 it so that we can review it anew, and view it maybe in a
3 new light with new thoughts?

4 I don't -- I need to know that is feasible or
5 possible.

6 MS. SPAIN: That's a very good idea. There's
7 an e-mail group that consists of all of the preservation
8 officers from the certified local governments in Florida,
9 and I can send an e-mail out to them seeing if they've
10 ever had the same instance to see what's been done, and
11 also call, call the state office. We'll do that.

12 MR. DURANA: I have a question, though, for
13 the demo, what was approved for demo? Like because when I
14 look at the demo page, it looks like the back of the house
15 was approved for demo.

16 MS. SPAIN: Yes. We went over that. I
17 believe that's a new drawing. I know it says 2017 on it,
18 but I don't -- I think that they used it as a template and
19 they just kept the date, because that's what they did.
20 That's not what was approved.

21 MR. DURANA: Okay.

22 MS. SPAIN: And that even adds to the
23 confusion, so.

24 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I think we should
25 definitely see the originally-approved demo plan.

1 MS. SPAIN: Yes, yes.

2 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Okay, because it --

3 MR. EHRENHAFT: Because I'm totally confused.

4 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Right.

5 MS. SPAIN: Yes.

6 MR. EHRENHAFT: Because my understanding is
7 if you've got an extant historic house and you're
8 incorporating on portions of ground where you've been
9 allowed to demolish, okay, but the portion to the rear, I
10 mean, why are the roofs having to come off?

11 That, you know, I mean is it -- am I
12 understanding that, that the rooms to the rear of the
13 now-existing facade, the ones that are behind that you
14 were discussing --

15 MS. SPAIN: Involved.

16 MR. EHRENHAFT: -- okay, why, why would the
17 roof and the walls not have just remained? You weren't,
18 you weren't building structure on top of them, right, I
19 mean?

20 MR. TORRE: But this is where the problem is.
21 The owners get an approval from the board which is in a
22 sense somewhat schematic. You say, "This is allowed, this
23 is not allowed." You vote on something. You've got some
24 schematic drawings. That's all you have.

25 Then you get to permit. The permit details

1 the structural means to do the stuff. It gets into the
2 ways and means of things.

3 Did you agree to remove the roof originally?
4 I don't know.

5 MS. SPAIN: But the demolition plan did not
6 have that those walls were coming down, and that's what
7 they need to see.

8 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Correct.

9 MR. TORRE: But Dona, I tend to disagree with
10 that, and that's why it's important if you --

11 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: I don't disagree.

12 MR. TORRE: No, no, and that's fine, and I
13 wasn't looking to deal you through this, make a case, get
14 into the specifics on a Power Point showing --

15 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: No, no.

16 MR. TORRE: -- the details why I think some
17 of those walls were coming down.

18 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Anybody else feel how we
19 make a decision without seeing it?

20 MS. SPAIN: I agree.

21 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Yeah.

22 MS. SPAIN: I agree.

23 MR. TORRE: Huh?

24 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: How can we make a
25 decision?

1 MR. TORRE: No, no. I totally agree.

2 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

3 MR. TORRE: I have my work, but I don't have
4 it for you, but I have done the -- unfortunately, I've had
5 to overlay and overlay and do three-D drawings and hire
6 people to do three-D drawings.

7 MS. SPAIN: You don't have to do any of that.
8 All they want to do is see what you got approved --

9 MR. TORRE: Okay, I understand.

10 MS. SPAIN: -- compared to what you did.

11 MR. TORRE: I understand.

12 MS. SPAIN: And we can provide that. That's
13 easy to do.

14 MS. THOMSON: Isn't that registered
15 somewhere?

16 MS. SPAIN: Yes, yes.

17 MS. THOMSON: Okay.

18 MS. SPAIN: We have that.

19 MS. THOMSON: And get it to us.

20 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. So if there's no
21 further discussion, I'll entertain a motion.

22 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: You have to close the
23 public hearing.

24 MR. EHRENHAFT: Right, I have to close the
25 public hearing, of course. Okay. All right.

1 So any further comment from people who are
2 present in the audience? No. Okay, all right. Public
3 hearing is closed. The chair will entertain a motion.

4 MR. SARDINAS: Motion to defer as noted by
5 the board.

6 MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'll second.

7 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. No further discussion.
8 May we call the roll, please?

9 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Rodriguez?

10 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

11 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Sardinias?

12 MR. SARDINAS: Yes.

13 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Durana?

14 MR. DURANA: Yes.

15 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Garcia-
16 Pons?

17 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.

18 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Thomson?

19 MS. THOMSON: Yes.

20 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Fullerton?

21 MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

22 THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

23 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

24 MS. THOMSON: Do we have to make a motion of
25 what we expect to see back from the deferral?

1 MR. GARCIA-PONS: Does staff want to say what
2 you're going to bring back to the next meeting?

3 MS. THOMSON: No.

4 MS. SPAIN: I got it. We'll take care of it.

5 MS. THOMSON: Okay.

6 MS. SPAIN: We'll bring the designation
7 report. We'll bring the construction documents showing
8 the demolition plan and the COA application. We'll do it
9 all.

10 MS. THOMSON: Okay. Thank you.

11 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. Is there any other
12 board item, or?

13 MS. SPAIN: I just have one thing.

14 MR. EHRENHAFT: Go ahead. The one that we
15 have the memorandum, right?

16 MS. SPAIN: Included in your packet --

17 MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

18 MS. SPAIN: -- was a memo concerning the
19 Sidonia Avenue and North Ponce study update, and I'm just
20 going to read it into the record.

21 "On April 19, 2018, the Historic Preservation
22 Board made a motion for staff to present to them the
23 designation report for properties on Sidonia Avenue.

24 "This motion was expanded to include a
25 comprehensive study of the North Ponce portion of the city

1 which would include a detailed report on the city's plan
2 for that area. Staff has starting doing the research. We
3 have not been able to allocate the required resources to
4 complete the request."

5 And I just wanted to let you know, it remains
6 a priority for the office and we will present our findings
7 when complete, but the timeline is not known.

8 Now, I didn't want you to be waiting for that
9 when we just haven't had the ability to complete it.

10 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Is there a possibility
11 that someone may come in with a petition between now and
12 the time you're done?

13 MS. SPAIN: They have on one of the
14 properties. The problem with the Sidonia properties is
15 they don't qualify individually as local historic
16 landmarks, but they possibly would qualify as a
17 contributing structure and a future district.

18 So in the meantime, I'm having to assign
19 significance determination based on the law, and so I'm
20 not -- I just can't save them because at some point in the
21 future we're going to do a study, so I believe that's at
22 least one building.

23 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: That's being demolished,
24 or?

25 MS. SPAIN: Yes, that's being demolished for

1 development.

2 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

3 MS. SPAIN: Okay. That's all I have.

4 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay. Any other discussion
5 items from the board? Anything that anyone want to bring
6 up? Okay. No old business? No new? Okay, okay. I'll
7 entertain a motion to adjourn then.

8 MS. THOMSON: I move that we adjourn.

9 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

10 MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: I second the motion.

11 MR. EHRENHAFT: All right. All in favor, say
12 aye.

13 THE BOARD: Aye (collectively).

14 MR. EHRENHAFT: Okay.

15 MS. SPAIN: Thank you; difficult meeting.

16 (Thereupon, proceedings were adjourned at 6:52 p.m.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I 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 matter.

WITNESS my hand in the City of Miami this 13th
day of August, 2019.

Doreen Strauss

Doreen M. Strauss

