

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES **REGULAR MEETING – APRIL 7, 2010**

The regular meeting of the Bal Harbour Village Architectural Review Board was held on Wednesday, April 7, 2010, in the Bal Harbour Village Hall Council Chambers (655 – 96th Street, Bal Harbour, Florida).

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL: The meeting was called to order at 11:09 a.m. by Acting Chairman Giorgio Balli. The following were present:

Giorgio Balli
Christopher Cawley
Jaime Schapiro

Also present:

Daniel Nieda, Building Official
Ellisa L. Horvath, CMC, Village Clerk
Johanna M. Lundgren, Village Attorney

Absent:

Paul Buzinec
James Silvers

As a quorum was determined to be present, the meeting commenced.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Board.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: *A motion was offered by Mr. Cawley and seconded by Mr. Schapiro to approve the minutes from the March 3, 2010 Regular Meeting. The motion carried (3-0).*

4. HEARINGS: Ms. Lundgren explained the procedures for the quasi-judicial process. No disclosures were made by the Board. Those planning to speak at the hearing were sworn in by Mrs. Horvath.

LAWRENCE R. SPIRA TRUST – 236 BAL BAY DRIVE: Mr. Nieda reviewed his staff recommendation, which is summarized as follows:

“Due to the unusual nature of this application, I will refrain from generating comments as the proposed work consists of aesthetic modifications in an attempt to generate construction cost reductions. The work remains compliant with the Zoning Code of Ordinances and recommend that the Attorney for the Spira Trust and Architect of Record present the merits of the proposed revisions to the Architectural Review Board who may use its discretion to grant a full or partial approval to the revisions sought by the applicants at this time.”

David Swimmer, Spira Trust Attorney, addressed the Board and introduced those in attendance.

Daniel Sorogon, Architect, reviewed the changes. Mr. Nieda requested clarification regarding the glazed tiles. Mr. Sorogon reported that a flat tile would be used, either in glossy or matte.

Mr. Swimmer was sworn in. He discussed a dispute with the roof tile manufacturer and requested approval of both glossy and matte tiles. He clarified that if the dispute is resolved, then they would go with the original plan for glossy tiles, but if not, then the white flat matte would be used.

Mr. Balli recommended keeping the perimeter wall on the side, at least up to the front of the house, since chain link fence is not permitted. Mr. Nieda agreed that a chain link fence is not allowed in the front yard. Mr. Sorogon will eliminate the chain link fence and provide only landscaping there. Mr. Balli discussed the front wall ending in nothing, which he felt was detrimental to the overall house. He spoke in favor of the elimination of the glass railings on the house.

Mr. Cawley spoke in favor of the landscaping plan.

Mr. Nieda discussed the railing pickets. Mr. Sorogon explained that they would be painted to look like stainless steel and displayed the color to be used.

The applicants left the meeting for discussion. The applicants returned to the meeting.

Mr. Schapiro reviewed Sheet A-8.1 and noted that the large arch on the left side of the Right Elevation was the only opening in that style. He recommended changing it to be more in line with the other arches. Mr. Sorogon explained that was the original arch that was in the house and explained that it would only be noticeable from the side. Mr. Schapiro agreed to bring the wall/arch down and remove the side columns to make it a simple arch opening.

Mr. Sorogon clarified that instead of using the money for the wall, they proposed to use larger/thicker landscaping, which would hide the wall anyway. Mr. Sorogon will keep the wall in the front.

Mr. Cawley noted that the plant material is a native hedge, so it would be large and easy to deal with. Mr. Nieda explained that thick landscaping, not opaque, could be a condition of the Certificate of Occupancy.

Mr. Balli discussed the wall/gate in the front and the sides ending in nothing and strongly recommended keeping the wall for the aesthetics, security, etc. of the house.

Brenda Spira, Spira Trust Co-Trustee, clarified that the wall was more for aesthetics, not security. She doesn't think the use of a hedge versus a wall would take away from the house.

Mr. Cawley thinks that the hedge would create a dense screen. He suggested adding some trees on the south side, for protection from sun.

Mr. Schapiro spoke in favor of the use of only one type of balcony railing (the metal pickets). Mr. Sorogon displayed the concept of a grid of perfect squares.

A motion was offered by Mr. Schapiro and seconded by Mr. Cawley to grant a Final Certificate of Appropriateness, subject to the following conditions: revise the glass rail balconies to picket rails, provide a single arch on the Right Elevation (Sheet A-8.1) on the left hand side, address the landscaping comments, provide a solid landscape hedge as proposed that creates the appearance of the wall continuing behind the planting to be approved by the Building Official prior to issuance of the CO, provide white cement roof tiles (flat is allowed, but glossy is preferred), and delete the chain link fence in the front. The motion carried (3-0).

5. OTHER BUSINESS: None.

6. ADJOURN: There being no further business, *a motion was offered by Mr. Balli and seconded by Mr. Cawley to adjourn. The motion carried (3-0), and the meeting adjourned at 11:46 a.m.*

Attest:


Ellisa L. Horvath, MMC, Village Clerk


James Silvers, Chairman