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MR. MENENDEZ: Good afternoon. Welcome to the regularly scheduled meeting of the City of Coral Gables Historic Preservation Board.

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

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

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

Failure to register and provide proof of registration shall prohibit your ability to present to the historic preservation board on applications under consideration this afternoon.
"Lobbyist" is defined as an individual,
corporation, partnership, or other legal entity employed or retained, whether paid or not, by a principal who seeks to the encourage approval, disapproval, adoption, repeal, passage, defeat or modifications, of $A$ :

Any ordinance, resolution, action, or decision of any city commissioner.

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

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

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

I now officially call the City of Coral Gables Historic Preservation meeting of September 16 th , 2020, the time being 4:03 p.m.

Present today are board members Alicia
Bache-Wiig; Bruce Ehrenhaft; Dona Spain; John Fullerton;

Peggy Rolando; Raul Rodriguez; Xavier Durana; Vice Chair Cesar Garcia-Pons; myself, Albert Menendez as the chair. Staff today is Kara Kautz, historic preservation officer; and ElizaBeth Guinn, historic preservation coordinator; Cristina Suarez from the city attorney's office.

Approval of the minutes. MR. GARCIA-PONS: I'll move.

MR. FULLERTON: Second.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So the next item is the approval of meeting minutes of the last meeting which was August -- I'm not sure what that date was.

MR. FULLERTON: 15th
MR. MENENDEZ: August 15. Are there any changes or corrections to the minutes?

MS. KAUTZ: Do you want to start on that? MR. FULLERTON: Sorry, August 19th. MR. MENENDEZ: August 19th, I'm corrected. MR. FULLERTON: Sorry. MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Call for a motion to approve.

MS. SPAIN: So moved.
MR. MENENDEZ: Second, please.
MS. ROLANDO: Second.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Rolando seconds

```
    it. Okay. Do we need to call the roll?
                        THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Menendez?
        MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
        THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
        MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
        THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Durana?
        MR. DURANA: Yes.
        THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Spain?
        MS. SPAIN: Yes.
        THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Fullerton?
        MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
        THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss
    Bache-Wiig?
        MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes.
        THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Rolando?
        MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
        THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr.
    Garcia-Pons?
    MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
    THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Rodriguez?
    MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
    MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Notice regarding ex
        parte communications. Please be advised that this board
        is a quasi-judicial board and the items on the agenda are
        quasi-judicial in nature which requires board members to
```
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disclose all ex parte communications.

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

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

Okay. The next item is deferrals. Do we have any deferrals, Kara?

MS. KAUTZ: No.

MR. MENENDEZ: No, okay. Okay. Swearing in, if any persons in the audience will be testifying today, please raise your right hand to be sworn in. (Thereupon, the persons who would be testifying were duly sworn on oath by the court reporter.)

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Our first item is a Special Certificate of Appropriateness, Case File COA (SP) 2020-010, an application for the issuance of a special
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certificate of appropriateness for the property at 800 Obispo Avenue, a contributing resource within the Obispo Avenue Historic District, legally described as Lots Nine and Ten, Block 29, Coral Gables Section B, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book Five at Page 111 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The application requests design approval for an addition and alterations to the residence and site work. A variances has also been requested from Article Four, Section 4-101(D) and (4c) of the Coral Gables zoning code for the minimum rear setback. Kara, does the staff have a presentation?

MS. KAUTZ: Yes. There should be. Give me one moment to bring it up.

MS. SUAREZ: Kara, I'm going to ask, since we are in the virtual platform, that when each person who is going to be testifying, before they speak, that they be sworn in at that moment so we can make sure that we're seeing the person on video and we make sure that they are sworn in.

MS. KAUTZ: Okay.
MS. SUAREZ: I know we usually, we do it all at once in the beginning, but $I$ think it's important that we do it before each person testifies, and if you're presenting --
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MS. KAUTZ: You need staff --

MS. SUAREZ: Yes. Staff should be sworn in too, so whoever is presenting this item should be sworn in now, please.

MS. KAUTZ: That would be me, but let me get out of this for a second. Okay, go ahead. (Thereupon, Ms. Kautz was duly sworn on oath by the court reporter.)

MS. KAUTZ: Let me pull the screen up. This is a location map of the property in question. It's on the corner of Obispo Avenue and Cortez Street, right at the beginning of the historic district. It starts, Cortez is the eastern boundary.

It was designated in 2008 as part of the Obispo Avenue Historic District. The home was designed by architect Walter Baggesen in 1949 for Mr. and Mrs. Crissey, and interestingly enough, it remained in the Crissey family until the current owner purchased it, so it's one of the longest single family residence.

It was a small home. It had two additions made to it, small additions, in 1963 and also in 1974 . Those additions are supposed to be removed as part of this application.

This is the early permit drawing from the property in 1949, the front elevation facing Obispo, and
this is how the home looked in the listing photos from 2019. It's been virtually, virtually unchanged.

The applicant is requesting a variance for the minimum rear setback, a reduction from the required ten feet to the proposed five foot eight feet. Staff is in support of this variance as the addition is proposed to be one story in height and the existing residence is actually set back much further on the property than is actually required, so there is a bit of a hardship there that they don't have as much room to work with as a normal property would.

This was approved by the board of architects in July 20, 2020. The comments are part of your packet. They were minor in nature, and when it went preliminarily prior to that in March, the reviewers at the time of the board of architects did suggest the reduced rear setback.

We do have a few comments on the rear page and a couple things that $I$ would like the board to discuss, but we can do that after the presentation.

Let me get out of this and turn it over to the architect who is here. Let me make sure that you have -- Nancy, does Alfredo have the ability to share his screen? Is he a co-host?

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Yes, he does, Kara.
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MS. KAUTZ: Okay. We're good to go.
MR. SANCHEZ: Good afternoon, board members, chairman of the board, ladies and gentlemen. Cristina, do I have to be sworn in again?

MS. SUAREZ: Yes, please.
MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Thank you. (Thereupon, Mr. Sanchez was duly sworn on oath by the court reporter.)

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you. Well, again, Mr. Chairman of the Board, members of the board, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the opportunity to present to you this afternoon. I want to go into the presentation of the house.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Excuse me. Could you state your name for the record, please?

MR. SANCHEZ: I'm sorry. Alfredo C. Sanchez, architect, urban designer. I'm also the representative of Miss Betancourt who is the owner of the house. 4200 Alton Road, Miami Beach, Florida, 33140, is my address. Thank you.

Let me share the screen and begin the presentation. Okay. The house as she mentioned, Kara mentioned is at 800 Obispo on the corner of the site. This is some, this is the boundary survey, the existing survey.

You can see that the house, the main body of the house is set back about 50 feet from the sidwalk of Obispo and about 29 feet from the sidewalk of Cortez, so it's heavily loaded towards the west side of the property, on the south side of the property, leaving relatively little room in the back, but this also creates the monumentality of the house and the historic importance of the house.

These are pictures from the listing. This is the view, an aerial view from Cortez Avenue. You can see the areas that were added (inaudible). They start here, very unsensitively added, a flat roof with a bathroom, and also the fact 801 Obispo has a nonhabitable space, garage space, facing the bedrooms from the back.

This is the view from Obispo Avenue, the aerial view, as you can see the house. These are the existing swale trees and these are the trees in the back.

This is the view from the street, Obispo Avenue, the historic view of the house and another view from the side. I think you also saw it from Kara's presentation.

This is the view from the west end of the property looking towards Cortez Avenue. This is the area to be removed as well as that area out in the bathroom,
and you can see the area to be demolished that they never made the roofs right. They added this sort of protection to the door that is really out of context.

This is the view of the house from Cortez Avenue at present. This is the east view of the house, and this is the view of the house from Cortez in the backyard as it exists.

Again, the areas to be demolished, the bathroom and the roof, room here that is disconnected from the house.

This is the original plan by Mr. Baggesen back in 1949, and it was a two-bedroom, one bath as Kara indicates. It was 1,845 square feet. Those are being kept, and you can see the elevation of the house.

These are proposed plans, again, the survey, the setbacks, and the proposed site plan. The yellow is illustrated what is remaining of the house, and in white is the new addition as well as the new driveway to access the house.

Again, as you saw from the photographs, the steps basically have a little thin access to them. The intent is to make a really monumental entrance into the house and create -- give the house the importance that it has and allow for parking of cars and entrance into the house.
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The only variance that is being requested is a setback variance to five feet eight in the back here because of the excessive setback.

This is the tree, existing tree plan, tree disposition. We're removing two trees, an oak tree that is right here over the pool that has been pretty much mangled in trimming, and then this tree that's really been mangled by FPL. We have an arborist's report that's been submitted to the historic preservation department and they have the report.

Again, the landscaping plan proposed for the house, the new landscaping plan.

This is the existing plan. We're removing the bathroom, we're removing that, as $I$ said, and we're keeping the existing house as it was originally. This used to be a sunroom, but they changed it sometime into a family area.

This is the proposed plan. We are closing up this entrance, keeping the sliding glass doors that are very attractive, creating a more stable living room, opening up the house to the yard as you can't really tell the yard is back there anymore.

But now with this opening we'll connect the house to the yard, creating a U-shaped patio, creating a new entrance into the bedroom suite from the main part of
the house, providing an air-conditioning system for this sector, making this a private bedroom, as you can see, this bedroom, and providing a closet, a walk-in closet and a bathroom, laundry room, the master bedroom suite with the master bedroom wash basins, walk-in closet, a shower, a tub, and the bidet and toilet, and providing another bedroom within the setback area from the house with its own bathroom and walk-in closet.

On this side, we will be providing a hallway to be able to access a great room, a family room in the back that opens to the pool. It opens to the internal courtyard.

And then we're expanding the kitchen to be able to have a larger kitchen that is adequate for the proposed house.

We'll have the mechanical equipment for the pool and the air conditioning set from the setback line in this area right here, and again extending the one step to allow better entrance into the house.

If you have any questions, I can address those as we move along.

The roof plan, this is the existing roof plan of the house. The shaded areas are going to be removed as part of the improvements, and the proposed roof plan I'm going to show later, and you can see how the roof, the
whole hip ends, except here it's a gable end that's not being touched, and this is the proposed roof plan.

The roofs will integrate into the existing roof so that they flow with the existing roof and they don't create conditions that will create leaks or difficult situations, and again, they will be all hips, as you can see.

This roof will be higher than the existing garage roof, but we'll put a brick and pick up that water in there. None of the other parts of the roof will be, will be impacted except to be able to make the connections as you can see here and here, and this is the proposed roof plan of the house.

This is the existing and proposed elevations. You can see the front elevation on Obispo, and I have to apologize, the bricks didn't show. It shows more, a little lighter on the lower elevation, but that's the existing elevation on there.

All the elements will be kept except we will be replacing the windows as to provide new windows. The windows are all gone.

The house, the electrical system doesn't work on the existing house. The plumbing doesn't work, the air conditioning doesn't work, so (inaudible) make sure that the house meets code.
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This is the proposed elevation with the bedroom that's facing the Obispo side, and of course the aerial view of the room in the back, but that roof can hardly be seen when you're standing on the sidewalk out on the street, so this is the proposed elevation.

We're leaving all the elements of the existing elevation including this shelf, the concrete shelf as is, and of course, all the shutters that are on the house.

This is the side elevation as it exists. That's the area to be removed, and this is the interior side as it will be once it is constructed. You can see the gazebo, the master bedroom suite, the area where the mechanical equipment is going to go, and then the existing part of the house, the additional (inaudible) added from.

This is the south elevation, the rear elevation of the house. This is what you see now. As you can see, the house is fully divorced from the yard.

This room does not connect to the house at all. I think it was an art studio or an exercise room, so if you want to go into this room, then you got to go out of the house.

This is the proposed south elevation. The great room will open to the proposed pool. You know, the transition space will open also to the back, to the
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proposed pool, so that when you come into house, you will have contact with the back of the house, so that's the rear elevation.

Then this is the walk-in closet and a window for the bathroom in the back.

This is existing elevation on the Cortez side. This is the areas in the back, going to be demolished. You can hardly see in reality unless you walk back, and this below is the proposed elevation on Cortez Avenue.

At the request of the board of architects, we added the windowsill projections and we added a reveal to be able to identify that this part of the house is totally different from the old part of the house. No shutters will be provided on this part of the house as part of the renovation.

And Miss Kara requested interior elevations which were not provided initially, I think because of the pandemic and the change and all that. I think there was a loss of communication.

This is where the existing house terminates now. When they constructed this bathroom, they built a door here and it's kind of awkward, so we're taking this window back to the original design of the house in 1949 that existed.

This is a set of doors and fixed windows in the hallway to make it an attractive hallway so you can see the outside.

This is the master bedroom that will open into the pool area, and this is the view of the new addition on the west side. This is the hallway again, fixed glass so you can see the outside as you walk through the great room, and then the great room opens also into the $U$-shaped patio and the gazebo.

There was a question regarding, Miss Kara Kautz, the elevation of the pool deck. The house presently is two feet above the existing grade, and we're, of course we're keeping the new addition at two feet.

We're lowering the deck one foot four inches from the existing grade, and actually we're raising the grade here like four inches, so it will be 10 and 12 inches between the proposed pool deck and the existing grade.

And this drawing shows a drainage proposal for the house. There will be a fully trenched drain along the internal part of the patio to pick up this water and putting a French drain with a catch basin on the edge of the property within this area here. My civil engineers designed it, and it will work. We looked at it and it worked.

These were the board of architects' comments. It's in your package, and sort of if you've seen them, pretty much, and this is the zoning department. The only thing that is pending is the variance for the rear setback.

With that, my presentation is concluded unless -- well, I'm sorry.

I have the proposed finishes. The existing roof tiles will be replaced for the whole house. They will be white flat. The walls will be textured stucco with painted white. The solid wood shutters will either be restored where required or be painted in the same color. The fascias will be white.

On the windows, it was requested that they be clear glass. I had gray color, but we will provide clear glass, and I accept and we accept all the requirements, conditions stipulated by -- the exterior doors will be white and pavers will be, pavers -- this is just -- yeah.

The roof tile. This is the casement windows, the garage door, and then there will be pavers on the entrance. It will be all pavers on the entrance.

That concludes my presentation unless you want me to go through the comments for the variance, although they were included in your, in Miss Kara's report, and I leave that up to the board, and I'm open to
answer any questions that may arise from my presentation. Thank you.

MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Sanchez. Is there anyone who would like to speak in favor of this case, anybody in the audience, or anyone in the audience who would like to speak in opposition of this case?

Okay. Then I'll open it up for discussion. Mr. Fullerton?

MR. FULLERTON: I think this is a well-thought-out plan, and I applaud you for not wanting to move the house closer to Obispo Street with that 50-foot setback you have there.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you.
MR. FULLERTON: We've seen something like this before, and I think there's never been a better reason to give you a variance because you've preserved that beautiful setback and a 30, almost 30-foot setback along Cortez, which is monumental. I mean, there are very few setbacks like that for a house of this nature. Anyway, nice job.

My only critique would be it would be nice if all the plans that you present were all oriented in the same direction.

MR. SANCHEZ: I know. I have to apologize.
I don't draw on Auto-CAD, and I have to rely on the lady
who draws on Auto-CAD. I have to apologize for that.
MR. FULLERTON: It's a small, it's a small
comment, but it would help because each page I had to decide where I was looking, but.

MR. SANCHEZ: Sorry.
MR. FULLERTON: Nice job. Thank you very much.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, thank you,
Mr. Fullerton.
MR. MENENDEZ: Does anyone else have any comments?

MS. ROLANDO: Yes. This is Peggy Rolando. I concur with Mr. Fullerton. I very much like that you kept the scale and presence of the house and didn't try to -and made it very, that your addition makes it very liveable but not overwhelming.

I did have a question about the steps up to the front porch. I could not tell what you were doing there, if you were adding steps. It was a little unclear to me.

MR. SANCHEZ: Right.
MS. ROLANDO: Could you walk me through that?
MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. I'm going to respond if I may. The house now, if you look at the photograph -- and let me go back. Can you see the photographs?
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MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. If you look at the photographs now, the house is two feet above the sidewalk, and that created this hump here that, you know, it's a pretty big hump so you really can't -- it doesn't really make any sense to preserve that hump.

With the elevations, $I$ can add an additional step and eliminate the hump and create an area for an entrance, for access to the house, that is more in keeping with the original intent to have this huge long series of steps here.

So basically what I'm doing is I'm removing that hump, removing this and that railing -- I guess they put it for Mrs. Crissey who was over a hundred, a hundred years old -- and providing a single step to be able to enter the whole entrance of the house from this, this area here without having that hump that really it creates -- it doesn't really go with the house in reality. It's just a mound they made there that doesn't really make any sense.

MR. FULLERTON: So basically --
MS. ROLANDO: -- so how --

MR. FULLERTON: I'm sorry.
MS. ROLANDO: Go ahead, John.
MR. FULLERTON: I was just going to say, so basically you've achieved a solution which regrades the
front yard so that it's more flat.

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, sir, and creates one step, an additional step.

MR. FULLERTON: More, right.
MR. FULLERTON: More, right, which, and also will make that entrance -- you know, the steps now lead to the grass which is kind of, you know, anti-climatic, so you're leading into a nice entrance area that will make it very -- and the board of architects agreed and they were happy with that solution.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

MS. ROLANDO: Okay. Thank you.
MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, thank you, ma'am.
MR. MENENDEZ: This is Mr. Menendez.
MS. KAUTZ: The material on the front porch, is it brick also?

MR. SANCHEZ: Well, the facade has some kind of veneer, brick veneer attached to it, and of course we're putting a note in the drawings that none of that will be touched except to remove the railings that were put for the hurricane shutters that are really ugly, and of course we'll be repainting it and providing new windows.

The floor of the entrance is probably a floor they added sometime later. It's really small pavers, and

I will be changing that, providing an attractive flooring material, either brick to match, you know, the thin bricks to match the existing entrance or maybe travertine or something that will be more in keeping with the house, so maybe --

MS. ROLANDO: Are the burglar bars going to be removed and discarded?

MR. SANCHEZ: I'm sorry. I did not understand you.

MS. ROLANDO: Yes. The burglar bars on the window, are they going --

MR. SANCHEZ: Oh, those are going to be removed and given away or sold for -- given to somebody who can take them away and take them to a recycling facility. They will be removed.

We are providing brand-new impact windows so there will be no need for any of those bars.

You can understand that Mrs. Crissey was an older woman and she was concerned with her safety and security, so, and even the metal grates on the front door will be taken out so there will be no metal grates on the house.

MS. ROLANDO: Okay, okay.
MR. SANCHEZ: Absolutely not.
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Sanchez?

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, sir.
MR. MENENDEZ: I really like what you've done with the addition --

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you.
MR. MENENDEZ: -- and making the entrance a grander entrance for the home. Staff has 11 conditions --

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, sir.
MR. MENENDEZ: -- items that they want, that they need incorporated into the this approval.

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, sir.
MR. MENENDEZ: Do you have a problem with any of these?

MR. SANCHEZ: No, sir, not at all. I
mentioned it earlier and $I$ had written to Mrs. Kara Kautz that $I$ had no issue with the requirements. As a matter of fact, I started meeting them for this presentation, so there's no issue with the required conditions that are provided as part of her recommendations.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MS. ROLANDO: Kara, you had, in the report had asked that the board discuss the parking court. What is your, the interest there or concern there?

MS. KAUTZ: It's not really much. It's not like a concern per se. The board of architects was fully in favor of it.
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In the past we haven't been a huge fan of parking courts directly in front of historic properties just because it's a little bit distracting. MS. ROLANDO: Why pave your front yard? MS. KAUTZ: Right. So I just wanted to make sure that you guys were really okay with that.

One of the comments that we did have is that if you guys do decide to approve it and allow it, that the driveway entrance be aligned with the front door. Right, I was just looking for feedback to make sure you all were okay with it.

MR. FULLERTON: Which driveway? There are two.

MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
MS. KAUTZ: The easternmost driveway. It's slightly skewed to the west.

MR. FULLERTON: Right.
MS. KAUTZ: It just would make more sense -MR. FULLERTON: Yeah.

MS. KAUTZ: -- if it were on it.
MS. ROLANDO: I'm not following. Could you --

MS. KAUTZ: See where his hand is moving right there?

MS. ROLANDO: You would want the driveway
there?

MS. KAUTZ: Well, that is a driveway.

MR. MENENDEZ: That is a driveway.
MS. ROLANDO: Oh.
MS. KAUTZ: It's like a circular driveway where his hand is. There's a west and an east entrance point, so they would shift it slightly, the eastern one slightly to the east so it's on access with the front door at least. It's just off center, and that would make sense.

MS. ROLANDO: Okay.
MS. KAUTZ: I think, Albert, I think Cesar had wanted to speak and Dona also.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Cesar?
MR. GARCIA-PONS: Thank you, Kara and Albert. So I have two questions, one for staff, and then one for Mr. Sanchez.

So Kara, looking at the zoning criteria that's I think required to get the zoning variance, are these, are all of these elements necessary that the answer is yes, or can they be no and still be approved? You're on mute.

MS. KAUTZ: I'm sorry. Typically they all have to be in the affirmative.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: But do they, but I mean
typically, or do they have to be?
MS. KAUTZ: The code reads that, "They shall
find the following apply."
MR. GARCIA-PONS: Then a separate question. As others, I'm amenable to approving the project.

It's just really an interpretation of one of the questions, and in fact, it is the interpretation where at Number Four, where it says that literal interpretation of provisions of the zoning code are required. What, I would love to hear staff's opinion on that.

MS. KAUTZ: So the board of adjustment and the historic preservation board follow the same criteria to grant variances, and both Dona and ElizaBeth can jump in if they would like to.

Historic preservation staff and board gives this criteria a little bit of leeway with considerations to the existing historic house on the property, so yes, they could do an addition without it, but we ask them specifically to keep it to one story and to also keep the view from Cortez on the east elevation, to keep that unhindered as well, so.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I a hundred percent agree. Right?

It's just, you know, we get caught all the time on making votes because of what we're required to do,
and I just want to make sure that we're all clear that there is room for interpretation when we all are getting towards a result that we need, which is why I asked if it had to be yes in that particular case, and if that is city staff's rationale, I just want to make sure that whenever we as professionals make decisions, we're making it with our best professional opinion.

MS. KAUTZ: I understand, and I appreciate that, and you know, we, we, we try to help the property as much as we can and the property owners of historic houses, so that's, that's how we've interpreted that section of the code.

MS. SPAIN: And also, if $I$ can jump in, it's been interpreted that when they're talking about "other properties" in the same zoning district, that's been interpreted to mean other historic properties because that's part of the zoning of the properties, and so you would want the historic property to have all the benefits of being historic, and we've interpreted that in the past as "Other historic properties."

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Thank you, Dona. I appreciate that.

MS. KAUTZ: And the board of architects, just as an FYI, the board of architects has the ability now under the zoning code to a rear setback of five feet as
opposed to ten feet just with a signature for historic properties, so that technically could have been done in this case had they done so.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: I appreciate that. So then two quick questions for Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, sir.
MR. GARCIA-PONS: One of them has to do with the back setback, and not really the setback because I agree with what's been done, but the question of the height of the pool deck and the grade. It sounds like you've reduced that to some amount. Can you rephrase that?

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, sir.
MR. GARCIA-PONS: Because I'm not sure I got that number.

MR. SANCHEZ: The house now is basically at 12.65 elevation, which is about two feet from the existing grade.

The deck will be seven and a half inches below that, so the difference between this area here now and the deck is one feet four inches. It's not two feet. It's one feet four inches because we have that step going down.

I went again today to the property, and the house next door has about a four-inch height difference
between their lot and mine, and we're going to be providing, raising it about four inches and providing the drainage and retaining that water within the property.

So basically the difference of the deck in the proposed grade and the deck will be about a foot, maybe like ten inches, maybe a little less.

That is not -- and if I may add with your permission, we're providing also a (inaudible) for privacy for the pool so that the pool will be that high and we'll provide that privacy with the use of landscaping. Thank you.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: I appreciate it. The question had to do with I think would there be a requirement for a fence or something because of the height difference, but clearly there is not.

MR. SANCHEZ: No, there is not.
MR. GARCIA-PONS: The second question, and I think I'm going to go back to one of the conditions that we were just talking about which is the front carport and the circular driveway, you know, I for one am not in favor of a circular driveway.

You know, if you can go back to the photograph that shows the existing house from the front with that one sidewalk.

MR. SANCHEZ: Sure.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: There is a character that exists -- the photograph, please.

MR. SANCHEZ: I'm sorry. Pardon me.
MR. GARCIA-PONS: That's okay. There's a character of that corner which is very, it's going to be very different, but having a driveway of a certain width happening right there, it really becomes the entrance, the pedestrian entrance into the site, is not only are there going to be two vehicular entrances where there are currently only one, but there also will be not a real pedestrian entrance. It will be more of a -- there's no way to walk in the site.

So you know, talking about or listening to a lot of the conversations we've been having over several months which talk about the character of the site as part of the historic property, you know, there is on that particular corner a really interesting relationship between the pedestrian access from the sidewalk and the vehicular access from the sidewalk, and making this parking forecourt on the site is I think inconsistent with that.

So I am of the opinion that -- I think we should discuss it further, but I don't agree with the intent of what's being done.

MR. SANCHEZ: I respect your opinion, and let
me tell you that $I$ thought about it. There's -- I think your opinion regarding, your comment regarding the green area of the house is an important comment, and you can see that, if you can see the picture, I'm not incurring in any of this area here which really is the area that basically creates the monumentality of the house, this corner here. I'm keeping it to this area here.

So that is one thing that $I$ think is
important that I've been conscious of as $I$ was doing it.
The other thing regarding the pedestrian entrance, I understand. I have a pedestrian entrance and sort of divide that and create that.

The other issue here, and $I$ think it's an important issue, is the fact that we cannot add a two-car garage. Okay? So the only way to come in here is through here and only one-car garage, and it's very, very uncomfortable now.

So being able to add the second entrance I think creates a much more usable house, number one.

Number two is it also enlightens the entrance to this part of the house. It creates a more monumental entrance to be able to come in.

The landscape will mitigate a lot of the, quote unquote, harshness that some of the brick paving may create, but this sector here will not be impacted. It
will be kept totally green. The landscape will be provided in the area, and I will be able to provide that. The other thing is I could not add a two-car garage besides I could not add a second story, so we have to deal with that, with that issue that is provided, and I respect your opinion.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Thank you. Mr. Sanchez -MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, sir.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: -- I just want to be clear that my comment wasn't about the landscape. It was about the driveway, so I --

MR. SANCHEZ: I understand, I understand.
MR. GARCIA-PONS: Excuse me. I just want to be clear as to what my intention was, is you can accommodate the same thing by having a parking area or a plaza or hardscape in front of it without having the second driveway, so I just want to be clear for my fellow board members that that was my intent.

MR. SANCHEZ: I understand.
MR. GARCIA-PONS: And the fact that there is no existing or currently designed pedestrian entrance I think is a problem.

MR. SANCHEZ: Okay, and I understand and I respect your opinion. I think a pedestrian entrance can be added relatively easy.
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I had the issue of me staying clear, I had to stay clear of some of the --

MS. SPAIN: Tell them to be quiet. I'm up next.

MR. SANCHEZ: I'm sorry. The storm drains, and it's got to be away ten feet, and then again, $I$ respect your opinion and your understanding and your comment.

By code, given that we have a 100-foot-wide site, I'm allowed to provide that entrance, not that -you know, that's just a side comment.

So my intent was to have a major entrance to the house and be able to allow in and out. You know, this is a very, very constrained area as far as the parking area, and I think this green space preserves the intent that you're mentioning, not to the degree that you may think and want, and I respect that.

But I think it respects that we can approach to the house and creates that entrance that I think is so important so that we don't walk into the grass as we're going out and we create that.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Thank you, Mr. Sanchez. Albert, when we close to just discussion, I'd like to speak again.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Durana, do you have any comments?

MR. DURANA: Hello? No. I'm good, I'm good with the design. I mean, I agree with what John said.

I mean, you know, they kind of, you know, played ball with Historic on the addition and everything, so I'm good with everything they're asking for.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. KAUTZ: Albert, Dona was waiting. I'm sorry.

MR. MENENDEZ: Oh, I'm sorry.
MS. SPAIN: That's okay. I'm being very patient. It's not in my nature.

I was actually -- my two comments were exactly what Cesar said. I was wondering about the pool deck, so I'm good with that.

And I also am not comfortable with a vehicular driveway on access with the front door. I'm actually fine with the autocourt, but $I$ think there should be a pedestrian walkway going to that court somehow in the location, and that should probably be on access to the front door.

Maybe you can just slide the vehicular driveway further to the east somehow, but for some reason it bothers me to have ride-on access and have it be cars
going on access up to the front door, so those are my only comments.

I think it's a very nice design and I certainly appreciate the variance requirement. It's so much better than a two-story addition, and I have to compliment you on the efficiency of the design.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you.
THE COURT: Miss Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Hi. I have two comments, and so one of them is $I ' m$ in agreement with Cesar and with Dona about the pedestrian access, and $I$ think would it help alleviate that in and out if, like Dona mentioned, if we made that, you know, the one that's in front of the garage, that entrance, like a car and a half, you know, maybe so that you get more.

I don't know if it's allowed by zoning, but I guess we can get a variance on that, but you know, I agree? I think we need to squeeze that access in the center to be pedestrian, that would be my suggestion, and open up the entrance for the cars so that it really would make it easier to come in and out if you close it, you know, for pedestrian on the other one.

So that, that's something that $I$ think is important.

And then just, it's just a question for Kara.

Kara, if we're adding an additional step to the front, the material for that step, would it be like matching the existing paver that's there, or would it be different since it's not original to the house?

MS. KAUTZ: That was the question I asked when $I$ asked about what material that would be.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Okay.
MS. KAUTZ: And Mr. Sanchez indicated that they were going to change the material entirely from that porch. I believe that's what he said.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: I see. Okay. Sorry, I didn't catch it. Okay.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Rodriguez?
MR. RODRIGUEZ: I think it's a wonderful proposal. I'm very familiar with the house. I live down the street from there, walk by there many times. I think it's a great addition, and $I$ would be -- I'm willing to support the proposal as presented with the conditions that staff has recommended.

MR. MENENDEZ: Kara, I guess there's some board members who have an issue with the driveway. Is there something that we can do there to --

MR. FULLERTON: May I make a suggestion?
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Ferguson, go ahead.
MR. FULLERTON: I'm Mr. Fullerton.

MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Fullerton. I'm sorry.
MS. KAUTZ: Maybe Mr. Ferguson has a better suggestion.

MR. FULLERTON: Thank you, "Mr. Melendez." Well, I was looking at the dimensions here, and the driveway from Obispo to the garage is a nice scale, ten feet wide.

Then the turn-around area, well, if you come in and wanted to turn around go back out to the street, that 22 feet is a very tight radius. I wonder if you moved the outbound over to, over to the right toward Cortez and then make that one that's on access with the front door a real --

MS. SPAIN: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: -- pedestrian entrance.
MS. SPAIN: That was my suggestion. I think that makes a lots of sense, John.

MR. FULLERTON: That way you're not losing too much of the landscaping area. You're putting more distance between the two driveways and you are creating a real pedestrian entrance, not just a car entrance.

The other thing I would suggest is possibly taking that last step you're adding to the front step and pull it out almost flush with the cross-driveway and make it a pre-stoop, or you know, a small raised area in the
same, the same materials as what's on the steps to differentiate as an arrival, a pedestrian arrival area and make it kind of a part of the ceremony of entering the house. Did that make sense to anybody?

MS. SPAIN: That makes a lots of sense.
MR. SANCHEZ: May I speak?
MR. MENENDEZ: Kara, would staff be amenable to a solution like that?

MS. KAUTZ: Yeah, I think so. The only, the only -- it will have to be run by the landscape services division to see how far you need to stay off the two existing oak trees in the swale.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: And from Cortez. Albert, I think Mr. Sanchez wants to speak.

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, go ahead.

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. I fully agree. Let me add to what Mr. Fullerton is saying.

I was concerned with the storm, storm drain cover that's there. I'll try and shift it as much as I can to stay clear of the drain cover. I'll go talk to -it's kind of difficult now because nobody -- you can hardly talk to anybody because of the COVID, but I'll see if $I$ can shift it to the right and do that. I think it's a good idea.

My concern initially was staying clear of the
storm drain. I have to be ten feet away from the trees, I was trying.

Regarding the step, I have no issue with that. I think it's a good idea, but I want to make sure I can provide two steps. Usually when you do a landscape design, one steps tend to be a tripping hazard, so I think that providing two steps may be a good solution, and I'll try and make sure that $I$ can work it out with the grades, and I'm certain it will probably work out, so.

MR. FULLERTON: Yeah, I understand your concern about a tripping hazard, but if it's a different material, it might help that a little bit. You know, if there's a material on the driveway which is lighter or darker than the step, then you kind of announce what's going on there before you get there, but you're right, you've got to be careful.

MR. SANCHEZ: I got to be careful, yeah, but I agree with you, that's a good idea. I hadn't thought of that, and I welcome that suggestion. That's very good, right.

MR. FULLERTON: Thank you.
MR. SANCHEZ: And of course, separating the two entrances $I$ think is a valid comment. I have no issue with that at all.

MR. FULLERTON: Thank you.

MR. SANCHEZ: No, thank you.
MR. FULLERTON: I'll send you a bill.
MR. MENENDEZ: Kara, is that something that could be, if the board decided to approve it with those conditions, is that something that would have to come back to the board, or is that something you could approve administratively?

MS. KAUTZ: Whatever you all are comfortable with. I'm fine doing it administratively, but if you all want to see it again, that's fine too.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Mr. Garcia-Pons, you wanted to speak again?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: I did, but it's been resolved.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I'm good to go.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Would somebody like to make a motion?

MS. KAUTZ: Can I ask one question before you do that?

MR. MENENDEZ: Sure.
MS. KAUTZ: Because I'm looking at this plan. If the driveway is shifted to the east, right, so you move it almost to the edge of where that parking --

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

MS. KAUTZ: -- spot is, so you're eliminating any additional court. It's just going to be a circular driveway with the pedestrian in the center. Is that what we're going for?

MR. FULLERTON: Yeah, that's the only question I have about not having a place for more cars to park, but.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Albert, if I may, I think everyone is kind of right, and I think Mr. Sanchez will be able to see it.

If we align the driveway to the eastern edge just like it is now, a straight shot back, you can still have a square parking court like it is now, and then that sort of center, you know, walkway becomes just a pedestrian walkway, so it's not going to be different at all.

It's just a straight shot up on the east side, ten feet. It should work out perfectly.

MR. SANCHEZ: I'll address it, I'll address it.

MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Sanchez?
MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. I want to make a request to the board, if I may, and to the staff.

You know, COVID has really put a tax on this whole project as far as, you know, delays because of the

COVID condition. Would the board accept -- well, I guess I have to bring it back next month, right? Is that what you're indicating?

MR. MENENDEZ: No, no, no, no.
MS. SPAIN: No. You should be able to handle that with staff, I mean, as far as I'm concerned.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you. I appreciate it. Thank you very much.

MR. MENENDEZ: Dona, you want to make the motion?

MS. SPAIN: Oh, I can do that. I'd like -- I think it has to be two motions, one for the variance and one for the design.

MS. KAUTZ: Yes, but in the meantime, can you, Mr. Sanchez, can you unshare your screen, please, so I can see who is speaking and seconding and all that?

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry.

MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.
MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you.
MS. SPAIN: Okay. So I'd like to make a motion to approve the certificate of appropriateness for the 800 Obispo Avenue incorporating the comments of staff and also altering the design of the court, the forecourt by shifting the driveway to the east and allowing for a pedestrian walkway centered on the front door. Is that
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```
    right? Did I get everything?
```

    MR. FULLERTON: Yes, yes.
    MS. SPAIN: Okay.
    MR. MENENDEZ: John, do you want to second?
    MR. FULLERTON: I'll second, yes, please.
    MR. MENENDEZ: Can we have the roll?
    MS. KAUTZ: Can you call the roll, please?
    MR. GARCIA-PONS: Call the roll.
    THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Rolando?
    MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
    THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss
    Bache-Wiig? Miss Bache-Wiig?
    MS. BACHE-WIIG: Yes, yes. Sorry.
    THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr.
    Garcia-Pons?
    MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
    THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Menendez?
    MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
    THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Rodriguez?
    MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
    THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Fullerton?
    MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
    THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Spain?
    MS. SPAIN: Yes.
    THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Durana?
    MR. DURANA: Yes.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

Mr. Ehrenhaft? Somewhere? Okay.
MS. ROLANDO: Can't hear.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?

MR. EHRENHAFT: Can you hear me?
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Yes, I can
hear you now.
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Okay.
MS. KAUTZ: And we need a second motion for the variance, please.

MS. ROLANDO: Go ahead, Dona.
MS. SPAIN: No, no, that's okay; please.
MS. ROLANDO: You were on a roll.
MS. SPAIN: Go ahead, go ahead, Peggy. This is yours.

MS. ROLANDO: I move that we approve the proposed variance reducing the rear setback from ten feet to five eight, five feet, eight inches.

MS. SPAIN: I second it.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Who said that?
MS. SPAIN: Dona.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Okay. Miss
Spain?
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MS. SPAIN: Yes.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss
Bache-Wiig?
MS. BACHE-WWIG: Yes.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr.
Garcia-Pons?
MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: Yes.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Rolando?
MS. ROLANDO: Yes.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Rodriguez?
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
MS. KAUTZ: Thank you.
MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Sanchez.
MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, thank you. Thank you for your generosity, and I appreciate the work of staff and they've done a great work, job working with me, and I want to thank you for approving the project. Thank
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you very much, nice seeing you.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. The next item is the Standard Certificate of Appropriateness for Case File COA (ST) 2020-111, an application for the issuance of a standard certificate of appropriateness for the property at 617 Alcazar Avenue, a contributing resource within the Alcazar Avenue Historic District, legally described as Lot 18 and the west half of Lot 17, Block 19 , Coral Gables Section B, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book Five, Page 111 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The application requests design approval for the installation of an $S$-tile roof.

MS. KAUTZ: Thank you. Doreen, can you swear in the applicant, please?

THE COURT REPORTER: Oh, yes, yes. Who is going to be speaking, please? Who am I swearing in? MR. GAMEZ: Ma'am, I think there's a few of us. We also have our roofer who is also joining us, so there's probably three of us that need to be sworn in. (Thereupon, Mr. and Ms. Gamez and Mr. Espinosa were duly sworn on oath by the court reporter.)

MS. KAUTZ: Okay. So we are going to give a brief intro. Thank you. Let me share my screen again. So this is the location map again of this
property on Alcazar between Segovia and Casilla.
This was designated in 2007 as part of the Alcazar Avenue Historic District as a contributing residence, designed in 1925, Permit Number 1485 in the city. It was designed by Architect H. George Fink who you all are familiar with, and there's a sister house to this residence just next door to the west that was permitted one month later.

In 1993, a substantial addition was made to the residence. The home currently -- this is a 1940 s photo of the house as it was, had true barrel tile originally. This is a photo of the home as it is now, and it currently has an S-tile roof.

Included in your packet were minutes from the May 2018 historic preservation board meeting where we had a discussion with the board, staff did, regarding roof material and being consistent as we are with windows to put back on the roof what would have been originally on the house. Those minutes were included in your packets, and this was sort of a joint discussion that happened between the historic preservation board and also the board of architects.

So what's transpired recently, which is why I'm bringing this to you all, is the board of architects wasn't meeting during, during the COVID crisis. They were
-- most things were being signed off administratively by
Carlos Mindreau, and he did, in fact, sign off on this.
It never went to the board for their discussion, so he did
approve this.
When it came to us, because we've had this,
this understand with the board, we weren't comfortable
signing, signing off on the application, so we were
bringing it to you all for your review and input.
So unless the applicant needs it, I'm going
to stop sharing my screen unless you want me to keep it up
for any reason.
MS. GAMEZ: No. We'll be permitted to share
the screen later. We can --
MS. KAUTZ: Sure.
MS. GAMEZ: Thank you.
MS. KAUTZ: Do you need to do that now, or do
you want to --
MR. GAMEZ: No -- yes, I suppose, if you
don't mind.
MS. KAUTZ: Sure.
MR. GAMEZ: That would be great.
MS. KAUTZ: Nancy, can you enable them to do
that, please?

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Who needs to be enabled? I'm sorry.

MS. KAUTZ: Gamez.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: It doesn't allow me to click on his -- there you go.

MR. GAMEZ: Can you hear me now?
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Yes.

MR. GAMEZ: Okay, my apologies. I apparently have to be in the center of it.

So what I said was simply good afternoon to Chairman Menendez, Vice Chair, and all distinguished members of the board, staff. We certainly appreciate you all being here today, and a salutation as well to Madam Assistant City Attorney. Thank you all for being present and affording us this opportunity to speak.

We are the applicants, and I'm going to have my wife, obviously is going to be doing a presentation that we prepared, and there may be some comments in the middle of that provided by our roofer, Mr. Espinosa who is also present, and then I'll do some concluding comments at the end.

So I thank you all very much and appreciate your attention today.

MS. GAMEZ: Thank you all. I'm just going to briefly -- there we go. So I know that there was a picture that was shown, but just, I have a few more pictures of the home that I included just so you can see
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different angles of the home. Some of the pictures were taken last year and others were a few days ago.

So as you can see that we do have the $S$-tile currently. I believe that the roof had been done almost 20 years ago, and that is the reason that our roofer, Mr. Espinosa, now has recommended that we use the same material.

Here is from the permit application exactly the areas of the roof that are to be done. As you can appreciate from the pictures I showed you in this sketch, certain areas of the roof are flat, others are pitched. The pitched areas that are to have the tile, it's my understanding, and then flat portions only on the ML corner, $I$ believe it's part of the perimeter that faces the, faces the street or at least the perimeter of the flat roof.

This permit application was submitted in June I believe, the end of June, and we have been working with Miss Kautz to try to resolve these issues.

We have been notified that I guess the BOA had approved this and then the delay, so we're here to bring this attention, to your attention for your consideration because we do have the current $S$-tiles.

So here is just a little drawing of what the S-tile roof looks like. That's the color that we
selected, so that's what it would look like as a whole. These are two different homes on our street, on Alcazar. I put these here so that you can see the different roofs that are currently on our street.

I also went ahead and I had obtained -- I submitted a public records request so I can have a better understanding of the other roofs that had been approved for $S$-tile in the last six years, although now I understand this policy really has been discussed in the last two.

This is another home just down the street from ours. These are all under the historical designation. Here is 633, also down the street from ours. This one is 600 Alcazar which is on the corner of Alcazar and Segovia, so we have the two images there. This is another home on our street that also has an $S$-tile, another one.

And then I have also included some photographs of other historically designated homes which have been approved for $S$-tiles in the recent years which also have historic designations. You can see the landmark plaque on this home on North Greenway just a few blocks from our home.

Here is another one on Coral Way, Sagua
Avenue, another one that has the landmark plaque. This
one is on Segovia Circle, and we have another back on North Greenway, one on Obispo, and then Casilla, Castille, Alhambra Circle, Greenway again, another one on Obispo, another one on Greenway, Palermo, Coral Way.

And then we have some more recent ones on different streets here, different images that $I$ was able to obtain showing each of the homes with the S-tiles that have been approved and installed in the last few years.

So I just -- Saint Philip's I believe had applied for one of those, a golf course down the street. I think the Biltmore also had one.

But that, you know, from the homework that we did, we're not the only home certainly that has been recently approved for an S-tile, and in a particular -- on our street, as you can see there, there's a number of them, so the look is consistent with the other homes in our street and in the area.

MR. MENENDEZ: Is there anyone who would like to speak in favor of this case? Anyone who would like to speak in opposition to this case?

Kara, what is the policy regarding the S-tile?

MS. KAUTZ: So again, like I said, since that discussion occurred in May of 2018, there were, there have only been, let's see, one, two -- let me just count fast.

One, two -- there were ten permits issued for $S$-tile roof. Of those, four were noncontributing residences within districts.

Of the six that were, two of them Carlos approved prior to the board of architects meeting again, after the historic preservation board. He signed off on them administratively so they were never seen by the board of architects.

One of them was a compromise that occurred with the owner where the house was required to be a two-piece barrel tile and the garage structure was allowed to be an S-tile.

One of those, as you mentioned, saint Philip's, Historic never got an opportunity to review that tile. It was not brought to us.

And on the fifth one, it was an addition that was matching the existing house so they were just tying into an existing roof.

There is one on Castille that was issued in 2019, and I can't explain it. I wasn't part of that application or the sign-ff on it so $I$ don't know what the story was behind it. I didn't go to the board of architects at that time, so $I$ don't know the answer to that.

So technically one has been issued since that
discussion was had, so.
MR. MENENDEZ: Is this an entire re-roof of
the existing dwelling?
MS. GAMEZ: Yes.
MR. GAMEZ: Yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MS. KAUTZ: In the past, I think Dona wanted
to say something, but in the past there have been
instances, and $I$ shared this earlier with, I believe Peggy
called me and asked me a question, they, the board has
reviewed $S$-tile on historic homes, but the ones that we've
taken to the board and where the board has allowed it,
there have been very specific instances where the
homeowners are elderly and on a very fixed income and
didn't have the financial means to accommodate this roof,
a barrel tile roof.

I can only think of three, three instances where that happened, and in those cases the historic preservation board required that the starter course closest to the eave of the roof be a two-piece starter course so that if you're standing from the street, that edge will read as if you're tricking everyone to thinking it's in a barrel tile.

And in the last instance that was brought to the board, a restrictive covenant was put on the property
stating that any future re-roof, regardless of who the owner was, would have to be a true barrel tile.

And I think that Peggy and Dona wanted to speak.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, Dona.

MS. SPAIN: I just wanted to say that the reason that that was taken in 2018 to the historic board is because the board of architects had decided that every Mediterranean home, old Spanish home in Coral Gables, regardless of whether they were historically designated or not, should have true barrel tile, and so they were requiring it.

And at that time historic preservation board was not requiring true barrel tile if there was already S-tile on the home, so we, the historic board would then be in a situation where the non-historic properties in the city would have the true barrel and the historic properties would have $S$-tile, so that's why staff brought it, it was because of this policy that the board of architects was putting into place requiring true barrel tile on all Mediterranean homes.

Now, they're not meeting now. They haven't met since -- I don't know if they've started up again, but they didn't, they haven't met because of the quarantine, and $I$ think Carlos is not adhering to that policy.

So you know, these people are in the middle, you know, of having a home with S-tile where in the past we have allowed that, so I don't know what the board wants to do about it, but $I$ just wanted to explain why we felt it was important to have the policy be that -- and it's always better to have the true barrel tile anyway.

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes. Kara, this home
originally had --
MS. KAUTZ: Yes, yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: -- the barrel tile?
MS. KAUTZ: In the '20s, yes, and S-tile didn't exist in the '20s, so.

MR. MENENDEZ: And then at some point there was a re-roofing and it changed?

MS. KAUTZ: Yes.
MR. GAMEZ: If I may add one item, there was, there was a significant modification to the house. MR. MENENDEZ: We can't, we cannot hear you, Mr. Gamez.

MR. GAMEZ: Forgive me. I'm sorry. I was just going to add, Chairman, that there was also an addition to the house that was done as well, which is an extension of the carport as well, so none of that was on the original structure from 1925. All of that is new.

And then the other aspect is the connecting,
what we call the "pasillo" in our house which connects the main house to those, back in 1925, the garage which has now become an in-laws quarters for my 90-year-old mother, so those are all new additions that have been added to the home since the building of 1925.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Miss Rolando, you had something to say?

MS. ROLANDO: Yes. I, when $I$ was previously on the historic preservation board, we -- and it was for about six, seven years, we had a rather strict protocol that to require the true barrel tile, and when there were deviations, it would, it would be only on the parts of the home that were not visible from the street.

I still remember our chair at the time, Venny Torre, saying, "A Mediterranean revival house with S-tile is like a polyester tuxedo."

The detail, you all have a spectacular home, and obviously it's a well-loved house and well used, and I think it would be undermining the integrity of the home when you have the opportunity to replace the $S$-tile, that really doesn't look that great, with true barrel tile.

You know it's going to be a decision of the board, but it's, it's an additional expense, but it is not a crippling one, and you --

MR. GAMEZ: Miss Rolando, if I could, our

Internet seems to be popping in and out. I missed the last comment that you made; if you could go back and say that one more time, please.

MS. ROLANDO: Sure. I apologize.
MR. GAMEZ: No, you don't have to apologize. It's AT \& $T$ that we need to get in line.

MS. ROLANDO: Sure. We recognize it's an additional expense. The S-tile clearly is cheaper.

But when you have a home that is as important, and the additions to your home that you've described have been thoughtful and tasteful, so you've done the right things with your home.

So it's up to the board, but I would strongly recommend that we maintain the policy of the board of architects and historic preservation and continue the policy of, if the home is being re-roofed, and it's a historic home, to require the true barrel tile, so.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes.
MS. ROLANDO: So you have a much more authentic product when -- and it's in keeping with the integrity and the tradition of the home.

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes. My concern is that if we do not follow what our standard is, we will create a precedent for anything coming in the future.

MS. ROLANDO: I agree. We'll have requests
every other meeting for deviations or exceptions.

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes. Mr. Rodriguez, what do you think? Can't hear you. Unmute yourself. MS. ROLANDO: Raul, please unmute. MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. I'm just looking for the button.

Everything that has been said, I personally think that an S-tile on a beautiful historic home is -- I won't say the word. It does not fit well and it certainly is not in keeping with the tradition of the architects that Coral Gables is known for.

My only concern -- and I'm in complete support of everything that's been said. My concern is that we have a board of architects which either administratively has approved an $S$-tile.

MS. SPAIN: Yes.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: And in fairness here, and I
feel very badly for the homeowner --
MS. SPAIN: Right.
MR. GAMEZ: Thank you.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: -- and the other board is saying something else, and there yet has not been -- the two boards have not reconciled and agreed on a policy going forward, so that is a concern. It's a matter of fairness.
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MR. MENENDEZ: I agree with you that we all need to be on the same page, whatever the decision is, and it's unfortunate that, you know, one hand doesn't know what the other is doing at this point.

MS. SPAIN: Yes. I have to say I'm surprised that Carlos approved the S-tile because I think he was there when the whole board of architects said they wanted the Mediterranean buildings to have barrel tile, so I don't know what happened there.

MS. KAUTZ: To his credit, he is reviewing almost every permit that goes through, so.

MS. SPAIN: I'm sorry, he's swamped.
MS. KAUTZ: So, you know, it's human error, I'm sure.

MS. SPAIN: Yes.

MS. KAUTZ: And not -- and nothing malice or nothing like that.

MS. SPAIN: No. He's great.
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: Well, this is really a dilemma, I think, and unfortunate for the owner.

But I went up and down that street several times trying to compare, and $I$ saw an awful lot of $S$-tile on old homes, and it's a shame that so much of that has gone on, and it puts these people in kind of an
unfortunate situation. Unless, unless we can get on the same page that you've been talking about and we can make it known that everybody who has a historic home has to do this, that's one thing.

If it goes, gets through the cracks and some people have to do it and some people don't, we're setting the city up for a legal firestorm, and I don't want to help do that, but I'm not sure what the alternative is or what the answer is.

MR. MENENDEZ: Kara, what can we do as a board to basically cement this as a standard going forward?

MS. KAUTZ: I mean, we can definitely take any, any recommendation that you all make back to the board of architects. They've only had to date one meeting, a Zoom meeting last week, last -- it was a couple weeks ago, I think, and there's one coming up tomorrow actually.

But when they convene again, and Carlos is actually retiring at the end of the month, so whomever takes his position to make sure that if they are reviewing things administratively, that they either, if they don't agree, then it gets sent to the board of architects, much as we do in this case, we defer to you all, and just make sure that they're aware of that policy and that they
started that policy.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MS. KAUTZ: I'm happy to have that discussion with the entire board of architects and staff over there because it is, I mean, it is unfortunate this happened, and I'm sorry for them.

MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: I too am troubled. After the discussions that we had two years ago, my understanding was that in situations where a structure might have only a partial re-roof, perhaps a garage building or an attached garage that was the only portion that needed re-roofing, at that point, if it were historic and especially for an older home from the ' 20 s, that true barrel tile would be required on the portion that was being done.

And I think as Kara mentioned, that a
covenant would be added requiring that at such time that the remainder of the home be done, then the true barrel tile had to be, had to be put on the portion that was not being re-roofed at that time, and I think that if the true barrel tile, an exception is made, then it undermines the policy that was taken, you know.

So my feeling is that the decision that the board had made and echoing what the board of architects had done previously, requiring the $S$-tile -- requiring
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true barrel tile would be undermined and then you will have an unending series of exceptions being requested. I don't know, so that's that's my concern.

MR. FULLERTON: Does anybody think there's a possibility that some of the roofs could be done with the barrel tile, that suggestion that was made earlier, that maybe the ones that are seen from the street are true barrel and the rest are not, just to mitigate the problems for this owner?

I don't know how you would put together an S-tile and a true barrel at the edges. Maybe there's a standard way to do that. I've never seen that. That would be one possibility.

But I wonder if there's -- as I looked at that house several times, I had a hard time seeing the upper roofs in detail. Maybe it's because my vision is getting worse, but the lower roofs are definitely something that maybe should, could be a barrel, real barrel tile. The rest of them might be $S$-tile.

And again, $I$ say there are a lot of other S-tile, but this doesn't mitigate the requirement for historic truth, but there's a lot of $S$-tile in the neighborhood, and I don't know. It's -- I don't have anything better to offer.

MR. MENENDEZ: Any other board members have
any more discussion?

MS. KAUTZ: Cesar.
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Garcia-Pons?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: You know, this is a great discussion. I was going to move it towards like new business to talk about the bigger picture as opposed to for this applicant, but you know, I think, John, before we go to a compromise position, $I$ think we should probably go to a motion either way. We probably have -- I think, I think that's where the board is trying to go.

But I would like -- and I do want to have this conversation afterwards, but $I$ would like to focus maybe this conversation on this applicant and then have a larger conversation in a few minutes because they're very similar but a little bit different, so that's just my recommendation to the chair, if we can do that.

MR. MENENDEZ: Does anyone want to put forward a motion then?

MR. FULLERTON: Well, I move -- go ahead.
MR. MENENDEZ: Go ahead, John.
MR. FULLERTON: No, you go, whoever that is. I would say let's approve as it's been presented.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: With the S-tile?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes.

MR. MENENDEZ: Do I have a second?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I second because I think it's the only fair thing we can do under these circumstances, but $I$ think our next discussion is there has to be a firm policy going forward with no exceptions.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Let's worry about this applicant right now, and then afterwards we can deal with the future.

So we have a motion by Mr. Fullerton and a second by Mr. Rodriguez. I guess we need the roll call.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Spain?
MS. SPAIN: Oh, man. I'm normally such a hard ass when it comes to roof tiles, but $I$ feel so badly for these people that are in this situation with Carlos approving it, and I'm sure they thought they were on their way, "One more signature and off we go."

Okay, I'm going to say yes, shockingly I'm going to say yes.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Durana?
MR. DURANA: I'm going to say yes also, but I would really hope that Mr. and Mrs. Gamez, I think from a resale standpoint and from an authentic, I think your house will look a lot better with the true barrel. I know it's an extra expense, but maybe you can, you know, look at that number again and see because it's just, it would make the house look a lot better.
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MS. SPAIN: It would make a huge difference on the house, I'm telling you.

MR. DURANA: A very big difference, and I'm a contractor also, and I also have a, you know, real estate license.

MR. FULLERTON: It will be a change in price.
MR. DURANA: Yeah, but I'll approve it
obviously because of the same reason reason that, you know, I don't think it's fair for them right now, especially there's not a clear policy, you know, on that from the city, so next.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Ehrenhaft?
MR. EHRENHAFT: I too, as a matter of
fairness to this applicant, will say yes but I'm concerned that this not be allowed to set a precedent, and my "yes" is predicated on exploring a discussion afterwards to draw a hard line in the sand.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Fullerton?
MR. FULLERTON: I wish I could have made that motion anonymously, but yes, $I$ vote in favor of it.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Rolando?
MS . ROLANDO: No.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss Rolando, I'm sorry.

MS. ROLANDO: No.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr. Rodriguez?
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, for the reasons stated earlier.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Miss
Bache-Wiig? You're on mute.
MS. BACHE-WIIG: Sorry. I feel the comments before me, I think I would really encourage the homeowners to think of it as an investment to go with the barrel tile and to really think of it as this being a crown on top of this beautiful historic home.

And so with that said and based on the fact that we're going to have a conversation about, like previously stated, we're going to draw a hard line in the sand, I'm going to say yes, so that is my vote.

MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Menendez?
MR. MENENDEZ: No.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: Mr.
Garcia-Pons?
MR. GARCIA-PONS: No.
MS. KAUTZ: Okay. Motion passes. You may proceed.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay.
MR. GAMEZ: Thank you all.
MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you, Mr. and
Mrs. Gamez.
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MR. GAMEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Vice Chair. Thank you, members of the board. Thank you for your -- thank you, thank you.

MR. MENENDEZ: Thank you. Okay. I think that ends all the items. New business.

MS. KAUTZ: You had one discussion item, so if we do that one first because there is, there is someone in the meeting for that.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Discussion item, potential designation of 430 Minorca Avenue as a local historic landmark and a Coral Gables cottage.

MS. KAUTZ: Okay. So let me pull my screen back up.

So this is, this is the -- we've brought items to you in the past, discussion items for historical significance determinations, but you know, correct me if I'm wrong, Dona, but this is the first time $I$ think we've done a designation request as a discussion item for you all.

And what we're looking for here is some direction on if you all would like us to prepare a designation report to bring forward.

This is not for designation at this time or at this meeting. It's merely that we're sort of on the fence about this one.
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This is the location of the property. It's between Le Jeune, and Hernando on Minorca. It was built in 1925 by Burton Miche for the architect.

It sits on a 55/100 lot. This is a photo from 1940. You can see, you know, it's got many of the characteristics of a Mediterranean Revival residence.

The application came to us for designation for this property. It's a new owner, and in the past the previous owner had done some alterations to the property which included enclosing the back and front porch, the sleeping porch.

They converted the garage and an existing servants' quarters within the garage structure to a guest cottage without a permit. It was done sometime around 1978, we believe, and has been that way since.

The entire house was re-stuccoed. All of the existing protruding windowsills were removed and quite a few of the windows were either re-sized, re-configured, moved, or changed shape.

So the applicants who -- the owner, the
current owner was trying to investigate ways to utilize the cottage designation in order to keep the garage as a guest quarter because once you are designated as a cottage, I think you have to be a landmark and a cottage, and then you can use your garage as living space without
having it connect back to the house.

So this is the house from the street. I
literally lived next door to the right of this house for almost ten years, and $I$ never saw what it looked like, so I was actually excited to go visit the site because I've never seen it.

So this is from the street. So this is the front entry that you see on the right-hand photo. It's kind of recessed there. It has pecky cypress details. There's, you know, an entry stoop there.

To the right is what was the enclosed, is now the enclosed porch.

So this is the front facade on the left.
This is that column detail. It has been shortened. The column is still there, the opening is still there, but the opening has been shortened.

So this is, you can see some of the east facade on the bottom photograph, and this is what the east facade looks like now.

So if you can see the existing vents at the top, typically, always, the windows in the '20s would have lined up beneath those, so you can see where the windows have been shifted, obviously turned into circle windows. You can see the stucco texture is different as well.

So this is the carport side looking down
towards the enclosed garage. This is part of the plan on the right-hand side of your screen, looking at the side of the carport.

There is, there was some openings within the carport that have been enclosed. The carport is there. It's gorgeous. It has a really nice, really nice hip detail that you don't see very often.

These are the chimneys. It retains its feature. You can see the pecky cypress in the photo there as well; barrel tile roof.

This is that wall that's outlined in red down below, and you can see the shifting of the windows above.

This is just the walkway between the house and the cottage.

This is part of the rear elevation where, you can see where it is on the elevation on the right.

Looking at the back of the house, some changes to the windows. Again, notice the vents. You can see where the spacing was.

This is the garage, the north elevation of the garage, and you can see the cracks in the stucco where the opening currently -- or was previously, not currently.

And then this is looking at that elevation. That, the door that you're looking straight at right now is actually, there was a small servants' quarters attached
to the garage. Now that's the entry to the entire garage space.

So, that's it. So the reason I'm bringing this to you is, again, just to get some feedback, if you would like us to prepare a full, full designation report and bring it back to you with the knowledge that it's been altered, because the owner is interested in being a cottage as well.

So we just, we went around and around about it. ElizaBeth can attest to this. We talked about it a lot.

I wanted input on whether or not you all felt it had been too altered to bring forward for the full designation.

MS. SPAIN: Kara, has the owner been cited by code enforcement for using the garage?

MS. KAUTZ: I don't believe so. I think that they were just trying to do some modifications to the structure and it was caught in the zoning.

MS. SPAIN: Oh, I see. Well, I think that you should do a designation report and bring it back, you know, and then we'll see if you do a full report. That's my view. I don't know about anybody else.

MR. FULLERTON: I second that motion.
MS. SPAIN: Is that a motion? I can make it
a motion.

MS. KAUTZ: Cesar, you wanted to say something too?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Ye. It was a question really, and this is just, if we -- if this cottage does not get designated and they come for a renovation of some kind, what protections do we have as a board to keep it more in line with the original intent of the house?

MS. KAUTZ: So either it's designated as a landmark and alterations come before this board, or it is not.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Okay.
MR. FULLERTON: And if it's not, does that mean they have to take the maid's quarters or the in-laws' quarters out?

MS. KAUTZ: They, they -- the way the code reads is that it has to be attached to the main house, so they would have to do some sort of physical attachment between the garage structure and the existing house to make that part of the house, essentially.

There is a carport so they do have a covered parking space.

The architect has just popped up, so he is here. He is the one that made the application for the owner, so.

But yes, you can, you can attach it back to the house and have that be living space.

MR. FULLERTON: So they would be in compliance with the carport. It wouldn't be making them in -- out of code compliance by --

MS. KAUTZ: No. You need one covered parking space, so the carport would accommodate that.

MR. FULLERTON: Okay. I just wanted to make that clear.

MS. SPAIN: Well, yeah, but they would have to adjoin what used to be the garage to the house in order to make it -- to maintain it as a living space.

MR. FULLERTON: But isn't there a connection already -- I thought that --

MS. SPAIN: No, I don't think there is, and it may not be in compliance as far as the floor elevation, you know. I mean, if it was -- I can't imagine it was done by raising the floor level.

MR. FULLERTON: Oh, oh.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is there a motion?
MR. GARCIA-PONS: Second.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Do we need a motion on this?
MS. KAUTZ: Cristina, is just a verbal direction okay, or do you want them to make a motion?

MS. SUAREZ: I think verbal direction would
be okay if there's consensus.

MR. MENENDEZ: I think most people want to see a designation report, so why don't we do that? MS. KAUTZ: Okay, okay, can do. MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. So any old business? Kara?

MS. KAUTZ: No, I'm sorry, no. MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. New business, let's talk about this barrel tile, S-tile thing.

I think what happened today should not have happened, and I think that it needs to be made clear. If the policy is barrel tile, then we need to make the policy barrel tile and we need to make the board of architects and whoever else needs to know, they need to be clear, and we need to make it clear. So what does everybody else think?

MS. BACHE-WIIG: Can I ask a question? Could it be as simple as putting it on, you know, you know, when you go to get an application for re-roofing? I mean there's criteria there, I think, attached, and maybe it has to be up front and center so that it's not questioned, it's just clear to whoever.

MR. MENENDEZ: It's going to come before the historic board anyway if it's a historic property, so.

MS. SPAIN: Well, not if it's just for -- if
we make a policy that any re-roof on an old Spanish has to be true barrel tile, then Kara can just sign off of it. It doesn't have to come before us. If that's the policy, then it can be signed off by staff.

MR. MENENDEZ: I thought it was policy already.

MS. ROLANDO: Me too.
MS. SPAIN: Well, I think it was. I don't
know what happened, but you know.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay, well.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Do we need to coordinate this policy so we don't have the situation where one hand says one thing and the other --

MS. SPAIN: Right, that's right.
MR. MENENDEZ: Well, that's why we're talking.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah, but we need to talk to the board of archtects.

MS. SPAIN: That's right.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: They have to agree with our policy or else we're going to have the situation we had today.

MS. SPAIN: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: Well, I don't think they have to agree with it. They just have to know it, know what it
is.

MR. MENENDEZ: If the policy is set, that's the policy. It doesn't get approved by the board, historic board if it's not barrel tile. That's the policy.

MS. BACHE-WIIG: But where is that policy written? Where can somebody find that policy, I guess is my question?

MR. MENENDEZ: Well, that's why, that's why we're here. We need to make it clear. I don't know if it needs to be in the code, in the building code. I don't know where it needs to be, but it needs to be somewhere.

MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Chair, I think Cesar -- Cesar is the only one who raises his hand consistently to be called on.

MS. SPAIN: I tried to, I tried to. I had my hand raised forever.

MS. KAUTZ: He gets missed a little bit. I think he's waiting.

MR. MENENDEZ: So Mr. Garcia-Pons?
MR. GARCIA-PONS: We can all appreciate the conversation, and I think Raul mentioned something earlier, which, and just mentioned it now, that we should be coordinated between the board of architects and the historic preservation board, but we don't have to be,
right?

MS. SPAIN: That's right.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Our job is different than their job.

MR. MENENDEZ: Exactly.
MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I'm not saying that we need to do it that way. I'm saying that we can. I am 100 percent in agreement with being in alignment between the two so that all of our residents are, but we don't have to look through the same lens that they do.

So we can at any point, even today, could have made the decision different than what we did, so that's just a comment, and I think we all kind of agree that we want to move towards a barrel tile requirement.

My question would be is there a differentiation between a repair and a replacement? Because if it's a full replacement, I'm 100 percent in agreement it needs to be barrel tile.

If it's going to be a repair, there's usually a number associated with that, and you know, there's a number that used to be 50 percent, which $I$ think is not the right number for this. I'm thinking if it's an S-tile, if a repair is less than 25 percent, then they should be able to repair the roof to match the existing, but I think that's the kind of clarity that we need for us as a board.

And then, as John mentioned, we just need to inform the board of architects of what we're going to be doing, and if they choose to do something differently, that's up to them.

MR. FULLERTON: And that puts the applicant in a very bad position.

MS. ROLANDO: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: Because they lose their ability to negotiate with their roofer if they've already got, you know, something, something planned out as a barrel -- as an S-tile, and now you've got to change it to barrel. It puts them in a bad position.

MR. MENENDEZ: Dona?
MS. SPAIN: I raised my hand.

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, I know.
MS. SPAIN: But the board of architects recommends to the historic board, and it's just a recommendation, so they could recommend the s-tile, and as long as the property owners understand that's just a recommendation and they can be told that the board will require barrel tile, and they, if they don't -- if they want to go to the historic preservation board and wait, staff can sign off on a true barrel tile, or they wait for the board and ask for an $S$-tile, but probably that's not
going to happen.
I mean, people don't want to wait,
particularly during hurricane season, to get a new roof,
so I don't know.
MS. KAUTZ: And we've done that in the past
too. We've said, "You can either go to the board, or if
you do this now, then you're fine."
And like you said, a lot of people don't want
to wait.
MS. SPAIN: Right.
MS. KAUTZ: And it becomes almost like,
"Well, you know, this is our policy, this is what it is,
so."
MR. MENENDEZ: But if the policy is barrel
tile --
MS. KAUTZ: Right.
MR. MENENDEZ: -- why do you need to give
them the option?
MS. SPAIN: Because they always have an
option to go to the board.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Please?
MR. MENENDEZ: Mr. Rodriguez.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. I agree that we should
set a policy and we should inform the board of architects.
I don't want to be in a situation like we were in today
when somehow, somewhere the board of architects authorizes something, the owners think that it's been signed off, and then they --

MS. SPAIN: Right.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: -- and then they have it differently.

I think we need to have a dialogue with the board of architects and try to avoid this situation that these people found themselves in today and make the city look bad.

MS. SPAIN: I agree.
MS. KAUTZ: Well, I really don't want to throw Carlos under the bus entirely here. The building department has been inundated, you know, staff is working from home, so I'm sure that it's just a slip and not something, you know, super-intentional.

And also, $I$ believe that he didn't feel like he had a board to fall back on. Like they always say, "Well, I don't agree with this, but you can go to the board," there was no board, so I feel his hands were a little bit tied, so $I$ don't want to put the full -- you know, he's dealing with a lot here, but you know, we all are with all this.

MS. SPAIN: Yes.
MS. KAUTZ: But I think that he didn't have
that board to fall back on.

MR. MENENDEZ: Cesar?

MS. KAUTZ: It doesn't, it doesn't make it right. It just is the situation.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: So Kara, I think I want to ask Albert's question again, is what can, where can we codify this? Where can we make this a stated policy of the historic preservation board so that it is very clear what we want to do?

And two, where can we then put it so that everybody else knows that's what we want to do? How do we do that?

MS. KAUTZ: I'm going to have to look into that because I don't know what the documents for roof applications are.

MS. SPAIN: Well, I can tell you, for years, roof applications, when $I$ first started working with the city in 1997, the roof applications never went to any board. It went to the building official and that was it. Manny Lopez signed off, and if it was okay for the application for the attachment to the roof, then he signed anything, you know, because he was just looking at the attachment.

And for years $I$ tried to get him at least to go to the board of architects, and no one wanted to go.

Only when Carlos came to work with the city did he require roofing to go to the board of architects.

So all those images of older homes with roofs, they could easily have just been signed off by Manny Lopez, not by the board of architects or the historic board.

So anyhow, I don't know whether you can codify it. The window situation that we're in where we require them to go back to the originals, that's not written anywhere, so I don't know. It should be.

And maybe it's just a hand-out that people get when they go to the board of architects or when they -- you know, something.

MR. MENENDEZ: Peggy?
MS. ROLANDO: It seems to me that we need advice from the city attorney on this because otherwise, as long as it's an informal policy, we're going to be back every meeting, practically, dealing with windows or roof tiles, and you know, it's like Ground Hog Day.

So let's, I think there's -- first of all, we need to codify it as has been said, and then I think we need a big stamp on every application for windows or roof tile, "If your house is built before such and such a date, you're going to have to go back to the original."

And Alicia is right, you know, you can't
expect the roof contractor to be reading through the minutes of our board and know unless they work in City of Coral Gables all the time.

So let's do it right and let's put people on notice. You know, I don't want to say some homeowner is disingenuous if they pretend they didn't know about true barrel roofs or raised mullions, but let's make it clear and so whatever -- so we have legal, formal codification of the requirement. Then we have the stamp on the application, and you know, then we're being fair to the subs, we're being fair to the homeowners and putting their architects and contractors on notice.

But I think we need some direction from the city attorney to tell us exactly what we need to do so we're not facing this same dilemma every other meeting.

MS. SUARZ: Mr. Chair, if I may?
MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, Miss Suarez.
MS. SUAREZ: Yes. So what $I$ can do is I can get together with Kara and we can look at what the actual policy is, if it was informal, what it was.

And my understanding of reading that transcript was that the board of architects had said that for any Mediterranean-style home, not just historic, they were not going to approve the S-tile for roof, so we'll take a look at what that policy was, how it developed, and
we can see how we can, you know, kind of more, better formalize the intent of what seems to be before the board.

MS. ROLANDO: Thank you.

MR. MENENDEZ: Kara, can you get together with the city attorney's office?

MS. KAUTZ: Yes.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. In the meantime, can you write a memo to the board of architects and the city architect stating that, you know, from the board of historic preservation, that we require barrel tile, not S-tile? Because somebody will show up tomorrow morning to get a permit and we're going to have this same issue.

MS. KAUTZ: Well, I already sent a text to Carlos and told him not to approve any more.

MR. FULLERTON: I think there should be some qualification as in line with what is Cesar was saying about percentages and stuff like that.

MS. ROLANDO: Yeah.
MR. FULLERTON: Because you can't just, you know, do the whole -- have everybody required to do barrel tile no matter what.

MR. MENENDEZ: Well, no. I'm just saying to historic, to historic properties, because if you're going to start, if you're going to take a home that's got barrel tile and then you're going to say, "Oh, well, it's 20
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percent, 30 percent $S$-tile," before you know it, it's going to be S-tile every time they --

MR. FULLERTON: No, no. I'm suggesting only if it's a historically designated home and qualifies to be historic and he only wants to repair a portion of it.

MR. MENENDEZ: Right.
MR. FULLERTON: You know, what Cesar was saying before.

MR. MENENDEZ: I agree, I agree.
MR. FULLERTON: Okay.
MR. MENENDEZ: Cesar?
MR. GARCIA-PONS: So I think the letter from Albert is great.

I would also request for staff to add a line to the roof permit itself, I think Alicia mentioned it before, is put it on the permit application, if we could find out if that's possible, that is our role to do so. That way it's in those locations.

And then the third request for staff, if you could bring this back to the next meeting, is, you know, find out where in the code we would be able to put something like this.

And to Peggy's point, the windows, I would love to codify those two things in some part of the code, whether it's our section of the code or the building
permit or wherever, if you could let us know where you would recommend we do that. I would love to be able to have that conversation.

MS. KAUTZ: Okay.
MR. MENENDEZ: Perfect.
MS. KAUTZ: Xavier, did you want to speak?
MR. DURANA: It was kind of going back, I was going to bring up the window thing, but that's fine. I agree.

It's just, you know, the same thing, like either the casement or, you know, the raised mullions, just, it's something that should just get standardized so that everyone -- it just, it eliminates the wiggle room, and I agree.

MR. MENENDEZ: Anything else?
MR. FULLERTON: Old business, we already went through, but.

MR. MENENDEZ: We already went through old and this was new.

MR. FULLERTON: Yes, I know. I just wanted to go back to old business.

MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Go ahead.
MR. FULLERTON: What -- was there anything necessary to be done to the 603 Minorca, that old house moving question?

Fernandez \& Associates Court Reporters 305-374-8868 service@fernandezcr.com

MS. KAUTZ: It will come back to you at a future meeting.

MR. FULLERTON: Oh, okay. I wasn't sure how it was resolved, and I like the new envelopes, by the way.

MS. KAUTZ: Okay.
MR. FULLERTON: New short, new short envelopes.

MS. KAUTZ: Good.
MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. Is there any more business, old or new?

MR. DURANA: I think Bruce has a question.
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes.
MR. FULLERTON: I see Alicia's hand.
MR. EHRENHAFT: Yes. I haven't been acidulous in waving. I missed out on one of the prior conversations.

MR. MENENDEZ: I'm sorry. I wear glasses. It's hard for me to see sometimes.

MR. EHRENHAFT: Well, Kara, is there a possibility -- I know maybe people don't go to the historic preservation website, you know, when they're doing any of this stuff and it's probably best to put language on the permits.

But if $H P$ could, if your department could have something done to the website that also would just
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have some highlighted condensed points about windows and about the tiles, just simple statements, "These are our requirements," that would be another, another point where it's made public and people might see it in addition where it might start to flow through the community. I don't know, just as a suggestion.

MR. MENENDEZ: Alicia?

MR. FULLERTON: So that might come back before us next month? Alicia anymore. She got tired of waiting. Okay. So motion to adjourn?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: So moved.
MR. EHRENHAFT: Second.
MR. MENENDEZ: And we're adjourned.
(Thereupon, proceedings were concluded at 5:59 p.m.)

```
MS. KAUTZ: We'll try our best.
MR. FULLERTON: Okay.
MR. MENENDEZ: Anybody else? I don't see
                            MS. KAUTZ: We'll try our best.
                            MR. FULLERTON: Okay.
                            MR. MENENDEZ: Anybody else? I don't see
```

MR. GARCIA-PONS: So moved.
MR. EHRENHAF I: Second.
R. MENENDEZ: And we re adjourned.
(Thereupon, proceedings were concluded at 5:59 p.m.)
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