

Excerpts of 12.14.16 PZB Meeting Minutes

Page 41

1 language in the proposed Ordinance protecting
 2 municipal rights to be able to have their own
 3 standards and own approach to addressing
 4 Workforce Housing, that we believe in the
 5 County objective to try to enhance and increase
 6 Workforce Housing.
 7 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of
 8 the presentation was simply to introduce to you
 9 the consultant and to start you thinking on the
 10 issue and to inform you of the opportunity to
 11 implement some of those ideas in the North
 12 Ponce area.
 13 I gave the consultant a tour today, and I
 14 think he came up with some pretty good ideas
 15 already. So I'm very optimistic that it's
 16 going to be very successful.
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 18 MR. GRAY: I appreciate the opportunity to
 19 work for you.
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All Right. Next items
 21 on the agenda are 6 and 7. They are related.
 22 I'll read them into the record.
 23 Item Number 6 is an Ordinance of the City
 24 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing
 25 for a text amendment to the City of Coral

Page 42

1 Gables Official Zoning Code, Appendix A, "Site
 2 Specific Zoning Regulations", Section A-12,
 3 "Biltmore Section" adding site specific
 4 provisions increasing the maximum permitted
 5 floor area ratio for the property legally
 6 described as Lots 24-38, Block 7, Biltmore
 7 Section; providing for a repealer provision,
 8 severability clause, codification, and
 9 providing for an effective date.
 10 Item Number 7 is an Ordinance of the City
 11 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting
 12 review of the Planned Area Development (PAD)
 13 pursuant to Zoning Code Article 3, "Development
 14 Review," Division 5, "Planned Area Development
 15 (PAD)," for the proposed project referred to as
 16 "Villa Valencia" on the property legally
 17 described as Lots 24-38, Block 7, Biltmore
 18 Section, known as 510-525 Valencia Avenue,
 19 Coral Gables, Florida; including required
 20 conditions; providing for a repealer provision,
 21 providing for a severability clause, and
 22 providing for an effective date.
 23 Who wants to go first?
 24 MR. LEEN: Yes. Mr. Chair, before this
 25 begins, I would just like to mention a little

Page 43

1 bit about the procedure here, because it's
 2 affected by a settlement. There's a lawsuit in
 3 this case, which has been dismissed, and
 4 there's been an Executive Session with the
 5 Commission, and we have reached a settlement as
 6 to the procedure. It doesn't affect the
 7 authority of this Board or the Commission as to
 8 your final recommendation or to the
 9 Commission's final decision. You reserve all
 10 of your governmental discretion, but it does
 11 affect the process.
 12 So we have agreed that this matter will
 13 come before you today. We've agreed that this
 14 Board will act today. Now, if you can't agree
 15 on a recommendation today, it will just go to
 16 the Commission without a recommendation, but
 17 you would act today on that, and this will
 18 be -- this matter will go before the Commission
 19 at its next meeting, for First Reading, and
 20 then to the Commission for Second Reading, at
 21 the meeting after that.
 22 So, otherwise, all of your discretion is
 23 retained.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: May I ask a question?
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Of course.

Page 44

1 MS. MENENDEZ: What was the nature of the
 2 lawsuit?
 3 MR. LEEN: I don't want to get into -- I
 4 will tell you, because, you know, we do things
 5 in the open, but it's not relevant to your
 6 decision today, in my view.
 7 The lawsuit related to an Ordinance that
 8 the City passed, where we made essentially
 9 Assisted Living Facilities a Conditional Use,
 10 and the question in the case was whether the
 11 City did that correctly or not.
 12 My opinion is that we did. The applicant's
 13 opinion was that we didn't. And there was a
 14 lawsuit related to that. And they agreed to
 15 dismiss the suit, and as part of that
 16 agreement, we agreed to this process.
 17 MS. MENENDEZ: Assisted Living Facilities,
 18 you said?
 19 MR. LEEN: Yes.
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: Is that what this project
 21 is?
 22 MR. LEEN: No, but conceivably on this
 23 property there could have been an ALF, and, in
 24 fact, there was an application that was filed
 25 to put an ALF here. That application has been

1 put in abeyance. That was the settlement. The
2 application has been put in abeyance. It's not
3 going to be going in this place, but they're
4 going forward with their application.

5 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

6 MR. LEEN: You're welcome.

7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

8 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, I have a
9 presentation. If I could have the PowerPoint,
10 please.

11 Mr. Chairman, as you well know, this
12 project has been discussed for quite a long
13 time, and it's changed multiple times. This is
14 the latest, and hopefully the last iteration of
15 that process. There's only two items -- that
16 is not the right presentation. Yeah, that's
17 the applicant's presentation. Can I have the
18 other one? Thank you.

19 That's not the one. It's 515 Valencia,
20 please.

21 Thank you.

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Do we need to
23 turn this off, maybe, for --

24 MR. TRIAS: No. You should have two
25 presentations of 515 Valencia. It's the other

1 single-family residential area. The subject
2 property is right next to the 550 Biltmore Way,
3 which is a very tall building, and also right
4 next to Laroc, also a very tall building.
5 However, towards the south, there's some
6 smaller projects.

7 As I mentioned before, the Zoning is MFSA,
8 the Land Use is Mid-Rise Residential, and the
9 two requests are very clearly outlined here.
10 And what I want to do today is update you on
11 some of the changes that have taken place since
12 the last time that this issue was discussed.

13 Now there is a park, a 10,000 square foot
14 open space, towards the east of the project.
15 The density or the number of units has been
16 reduced from 103 to 38. As you know, this Land
17 Use allows 50 units per acre, so it's below the
18 currently allowed density.

19 As a result, the parking garage also has
20 been reduced, from 198 to 89, and so it's not
21 as big and it doesn't have the same impact in
22 the neighborhood. And also the project has
23 been re-designed.

24 In January, you looked at a Site Plan that
25 took the whole property, basically, as a

1 one, the one that I need, and Megan has gone to
2 help you.

3 In any event, I'll start conceptually.
4 There are only two items that are being
5 requested, and one is a Zoning Code Text
6 Amendment, and it has to do with FAR, not with
7 the number of units or height, simply FAR, and
8 the other item is the PAD, which is, as you
9 well know, the design of the project.

10 The project is located at Valencia and
11 Hernando. It's most of that southern half of
12 the block. There's an alley towards the north.
13 And the Zoning of the project is MFSA. MFSA,
14 as you know, many times is attached units, row
15 houses and so on, but it also allows
16 Multi-Family projects like the one that is
17 being proposed here today.

18 The Zoning Code Text Amendment allows for
19 an FAR of 3.0, and that is a Site Specific
20 Amendment. It only affects this area. And --
21 thank you very much.

22 And, as you can see, the location, towards
23 the north and towards the east and towards the
24 west, there are some Multi-Family buildings.
25 Immediately to the south is mostly a

1 building. If you look closely, the eastern
2 most area of the property is open space. This
3 was the elevation back in January. This is the
4 current project. Again, the open space is on
5 the east, and, as you can see, the parking
6 garage is much smaller.

7 Now, the massing of the project is simpler.
8 It used to be more involved, in terms of
9 design. So now it's a simpler massing of the
10 project, but that has the trade-off of
11 additional open space.

12 So basically those are the changes that
13 have taken place recently as a result of your
14 discussion and discussions with the neighbors
15 and discussions among the Commissioners.

16 The review time line, the DRC meeting took
17 place back in July 2014, some time ago, as you
18 can see, and through that time, the project has
19 evolved. The preliminary design was approved
20 by the Board of Architects in November. The
21 last Neighborhood Meeting took place, also, in
22 November. And here we are, at the Planning and
23 Zoning Board meeting in December, which is part
24 of the time line of the settlement that the
25 City Attorney explained.

1 Staff has reviewed the project. Every
2 department has had a chance to review the
3 project at DRC, also at two Staff meetings, and
4 provided comments, which were incorporated into
5 the project.

6 Letters were sent to property owners within
7 1,000 feet, and that is the map that shows the
8 area that was notified in writing. Letters
9 were sent twice.

10 The property was posted three times, and
11 the last time, I want to say, that because of
12 the weather, some of the notices were lost, so
13 it was re-posted again today, just in case, but
14 the property was posted properly, at the right
15 time, and we also had postings at the website
16 and the legally required newspaper
17 advertisement that took place for this meeting
18 tonight.

19 As I described before, the Zoning amendment
20 is a Site Specific amendment, and it deals with
21 FAR. The request is 3.0. The project is
22 slightly less than 3.0, but it's very close.
23 It's 2.9 and change.

24 Staff has reviewed that request for
25 compliance with the Comp Plan, and we believe

1 that it complies, and Staff recommends approval
2 of the Zoning Code change, because the
3 Standards of Review have been satisfied.

4 Now, in terms of the PAD, and the PAD is
5 the actual Site Plan, the PAD is 1.04 acres. A
6 PAD needs to have at least an acre, so it does
7 comply with that requirement. The FAR is 2.97,
8 and that is, again, the change that they're
9 requesting. The units is 38, which is less
10 than the allowable density, and the parking is
11 89.

12 Now, the height of the building is 44 feet
13 to the parking garage, and the typical height
14 that we talk about, which is to the upper story
15 that is liveable, is 131. It is 131, because
16 the Site Specifics allow 150 in this area, so
17 they're within those requirements. The very
18 top of the roof is 147 feet.

19 Staff recommends approval, with conditions.
20 The conditions are explained in detail in the
21 Staff report. They deal with the typical
22 requirements of making sure that the project is
23 built as proposed. There are some traffic
24 issues, and we have our Staff person from the
25 Public Works Department here, in case you have

1 additional questions on that topic.

2 There's some landscape and streetscape
3 design issues that we require final approval by
4 Staff, and they relate mostly to the park, the
5 final design of the park. There's a bike lane
6 on Valencia Avenue. There's street lights.
7 There are some Silva cell planters. There's
8 recess windows and recycling facilities.

9 There's a proposal to have a residential
10 permit for the parking zone, to provide parking
11 for guests on-site, reimburse the City for the
12 loss of on-street parking, which is typical,
13 provide bicycle parking, provide electric
14 vehicle charging stations, and also coordinate
15 with the neighbors during construction,
16 compliance with Public Art and other
17 requirements, such as LEED certification, that
18 are typical of all projects.

19 In addition, there's an additional
20 condition that has been discussed with the
21 applicant, which is to prohibit short-term
22 rentals. And Staff believes that that's also
23 an appropriate condition.

24 So Staff recommends approval, with
25 conditions, and if you have any questions, I

1 believe the applicant has a presentation and
2 then we'll be happy to help.

3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you, Mr. Trias.
4 We'll hear from the applicant.

5 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Good evening, Mr. Chair,
6 Members of the Board. My name is Mario
7 Garcia-Serra, with offices at 600 Brickell
8 Avenue. I'm here today representing Valencia
9 34 Development, LLC, the owner of the property
10 located at 501, 515 and 525 Valencia Avenue.

11 I'm accompanied by my client, Matthew
12 Peller, the principal of Valencia 34
13 Development, Hamed Rodriguez, our project
14 architect, and Jenny Rogers, our landscape
15 architect, Juan Espinosa, our traffic engineer,
16 and Javier Avino, my co-counsel on this
17 project.

18 It has in deed been a long and storied
19 review process for this property. We initially
20 started the process in the Summer of 2012. We
21 first appeared before this Board in September
22 of 2015. After some initial comments from this
23 Board, we came back in January of 2016, and
24 encountered objections from neighbors.

25 We then tried to address those concerns,

1 and kept on continuing the application, as you
2 may remember, from month to month to month,
3 until the month of June 2016, when, to the
4 credit of both, this Board, and my client, we
5 decided to take a breather, and take a step
6 back, reevaluate the project, and continue
7 speaking with our neighbors.

8 Over those last six months, we have gotten
9 to know our neighbors well, and they're
10 literally on a first name basis with them.

11 The revised project that is before you
12 tonight is a product of that considerable
13 effort with those neighbors who had expressed
14 objections previously. I'm happy to report
15 that the vast majority of those previous
16 objectors are now supportive of this revised
17 project, because we heard their concerns
18 regarding density, traffic and lack of open
19 space, and responded to them.

20 What was once a 104-unit rental
21 development, with no open space on the ground
22 floor, is now is a 38-unit ultra luxury
23 condominium development, with a prominent
24 corner park, over 10,000 square feet, which
25 will be a public park for the use of everyone.

1 While the process has been longer than my
2 client ever anticipated, and the project is
3 very different from the original proposal, it
4 is a project which we are confident will work
5 and which will be welcomed by and provide a
6 considerable benefit for the neighbors.

7 With that said, I'll start our presentation
8 that we have up here on the screen, which is
9 also available on the television screens. Some
10 of it is repetitive of what the Planning
11 Director already presented, so we'll go through
12 that relatively quickly, and then I'll ask
13 Hamed also to go through the plans.

14 The site is probably edged in your memory,
15 but just to repeat it, it is on the northwest
16 corner of Valencia Avenue and Hernando, about a
17 little over an acre in size. Right now three
18 residential buildings exist on the property,
19 totaling about 34 units.

20 Here is another perspective, just looking
21 towards the north from the aerial view.

22 Here are some pictures of some surrounding
23 properties, the Aloft Hotel that's under
24 development about a block away, the smaller
25 existing apartment buildings on the south side

1 of the building -- on the south side of the
2 street, excuse me, the Biltmore II Condominium
3 there, you see on the lower right, you see the
4 Segovia Tower in the background on the picture
5 on the lower left. The 550 Biltmore Way Office
6 Building, which is immediately to our north,
7 the David William that's further west, and then
8 here we get to the pictures of the actual
9 buildings that exist on the site.

10 As I told you, three buildings, all
11 constructed late 1940s to early 1950s, none of
12 which have been found to be historically
13 significant, all of which, unfortunately, are a
14 bit, let's say, outliving their utility, and
15 are not really the sort of residential unit
16 that we come to expect in Coral Gables, nor the
17 quality of design.

18 Here we have a comparison side by side of
19 the original proposal that came to this Board
20 on the left, and the proposal that is before
21 you tonight. The big changes, of course, are
22 the reduction in density. We went down from
23 103 units, which were rental, to 38 units,
24 which is below the 50 units that would be
25 permitted with architectural bonuses on this

1 property today, and only four units more than
2 the 34 units that presently exist; 34 units,
3 which as I mentioned before, are somewhat
4 outdated and with no parking on-site.
5 Everybody parks on the street. The project, of
6 course, would have off-street parking available
7 for all of its residents and visitors.

8 The height roughly stays the same. I think
9 we had a reduction in one floor in the new
10 plan, but a slight increase in the amount of
11 line feet. It's still below the 150 feet
12 maximum that is permitted by the Code.

13 One thing that stayed the same was the FAR.
14 Our old proposal had a 3.0 FAR. Our new
15 proposal has a 3.0 FAR, and that is the subject
16 of one of our requests, the request to amend
17 the Site Specific regulations, so as to permit
18 a 3.0 FAR here.

19 When we were proposing it before, it was
20 being proposed with the intent of being able to
21 realize a sufficient amount of density of
22 rental apartments, so as to make a rental -- a
23 truly managed luxury rental apartment building
24 possible. That is no longer what we are
25 seeking, but the 3.0 FAR is now justified by

1 other characteristics of this property.
 2 When we went down to that density, which is
 3 almost equivalent to the density that exists on
 4 the project, on the property today, we needed
 5 to increase the average unit size, and make
 6 this a sort of ultra luxury product, in order
 7 to achieve the market and make it viable, that
 8 we thought that the residents wanted, and which
 9 we think is successful.

10 In other words, the overall, you know,
 11 comment from the neighborhood has been to try
 12 to keep the density as close to what exists
 13 today, which is 34, and we're at 38. We can't,
 14 with a 2.0 FAR that we're permitted, get the
 15 sort of unit that is actually going to sell and
 16 be able to move and sort of address that ultra
 17 luxury market that we're hoping to. There's
 18 that issue.

19 There's also the issue of the fact that now
 20 almost a quarter of our site is going to be
 21 dedicated as a park. So as to justify that,
 22 the park dedication, we still need to, again,
 23 have sufficient sized units, even though we're
 24 not getting the number of units that we may
 25 have originally proposed at one point at that

1 time, but sufficiently sized units so as to be
 2 able to make this an economically viable
 3 project.

4 With that said, I will now move on to the
 5 aerial photograph that sort of calls out the
 6 other buildings that are in the area, because
 7 aside from the justification of the 3.0 FAR
 8 that I just mentioned to you, as far as market,
 9 being able to keep the density count, and,
 10 accordingly, the traffic count down to
 11 acceptable levels, there's also the issue of
 12 what there is in the area and whether it's
 13 compatible.

14 And if you look to the east with Laroc, to
 15 the north with the 550 Biltmore Way project, or
 16 to the west with the Biltmore II, or further
 17 west with the David William, you will see that
 18 we're compatible, in height, with the heights
 19 that are proposed for those buildings. We are
 20 below, in most cases, the density of those
 21 other buildings. And, with regards to FAR,
 22 which is what we're asking from you tonight, we
 23 are at or below the FARs that surround us to
 24 the north and to the west.

25 To the north, you'll see that the 550

1 Biltmore Way is approximately at 4.3; to the
 2 west, the Biltmore II and the 700 Biltmore,
 3 between 3 and 4 FAR.

4 So what we're looking for, we think is --
 5 from an FAR perspective, we think is justified
 6 not only by the relatively low density count
 7 that we have here, by the dedication of the
 8 park, but also with the compatibility of the
 9 buildings that are surrounding us and the
 10 existing development that already exists there.

11 Sort of emphasizing the point of, it may be
 12 hard to look at, because you have a copy within
 13 the materials provided to you, with the
 14 compatibility of surrounding buildings and so
 15 forth. We did these cross-sections, looking
 16 north, south, west and east, from different
 17 points, and we put the proposed building in
 18 there. You'll see that it is consistent,
 19 compatible with, sort of serves as a transition
 20 from the other buildings' relative height and
 21 density and FAR in the area.

22 With that said, I'll now hand this over to
 23 Hamed, to give you a sort of relatively quick
 24 run through of the plans of the new proposed
 25 project.

1 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Excuse me, Counselor. Can
 2 I ask you a question?

3 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Sure.

4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: And I might not have
 5 understood what you said. I just want to be
 6 clear. This project, it's not a rental?

7 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: No. This a condominium
 8 project.

9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay.

10 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Yes.

11 MR. HAMED RODRIGUEZ: Good evening, Members
 12 of the Board. My name is Hamed Rodriguez,
 13 architect for this project, with office at 3250
 14 Mary Street.

15 One of the other things, most of you know,
 16 and I'll say this for folks in the audience, is
 17 that the FAR is noted as one thing, but the
 18 fact that the parking garage has reduced in
 19 size, that parking garage is not counted in the
 20 FAR, so the overall massing is actually less
 21 than an equal FAR building of more units,
 22 because the parking would require more mass.

23 This first floor here will show you the
 24 lobby, the drop-off. Of course, to be noted,
 25 in the other slide -- let me back up -- here it

1 shows you the amount of green space that's
2 devoted not only to the park, but the building
3 was purposefully set back as much as possible,
4 the garage much further back than it was on
5 previous designs. Not only is it smaller, but
6 it's set back, with pedestrian amenities along
7 Valencia.

8 Right in front of the park, we're proposing
9 some public spaces here, the lobby here,
10 drop-off. This would be a through paseo type
11 of driveway into the garage or out through the
12 alley. It will be completely concealed, with
13 seating here, terrace seatings and a nice green
14 belt, making its way back to the park.

15 Typical floors. Here we have a challenge
16 on this corner here, so this area, on these
17 first few floors, are the units themselves,
18 luxury units, private elevators, and this
19 continues until we get to the pool podium. So
20 this podium back here is completely covered
21 with aesthetic activity, beautiful pool,
22 trellises, a terrace area, seating area. So,
23 you know, what other buildings would look down
24 on this, they would see nothing more than a
25 lovely public space.

1 And then here is your typical plan, where
2 these units are set up in a quadrant here, and
3 we've got them set up, once we get to the
4 typicals, as three bedrooms plus, four bedrooms
5 plus den, and this one here, in this corner,
6 we're looking at possibly borrowing from one to
7 create a five-bedroom plus den. Again, that
8 configuration would be adjusted to the market.
9 But the average square footage is, on average,
10 they're, on the low end, in the high 2,000 for
11 the smaller ones, and 3,500, approximately, for
12 the average, and then the penthouses are 5,500
13 square feet. There's two penthouse units,
14 which are these right here.

15 And there's a lot of public entertaining
16 space. And what we tried to do is to focus the
17 public space or the viewing spaces off of the
18 living rooms and the balconies to the east and
19 to the west, so that we can preserve smaller
20 window sizes immediately to the south, because
21 of the lower scale of density on that site.

22 A lot of roof line here, so it makes the
23 building very attractive from all angles, as
24 you can see here. We've also paid attention to
25 this -- this is a carry over from before, which

1 we've paid attention to, is that we have double
2 louvers. So, from the garage, at no point will
3 any light be transmitted through the garage,
4 whether it would be headlights or whether it
5 would be lights in the garage itself. So it
6 will have a double baffle (phonetic)
7 immediately in the back, and then it will have
8 decorative grill work in the front.

9 This would be the east facade here,
10 overlooking the park, and this would be the
11 west facade, overlooking the pool podium area.
12 And then we're taking some of the architectural
13 language to create the elements at entry points
14 to the park.

15 This would be the alley side. So we
16 preserved much of the same aesthetics that we
17 did on Valencia, on the alley side, as well.
18 So from no point will the building facade have
19 a blank view. As a matter of fact, even the
20 garage is set back a bit, so that if you're
21 coming eastbound from Valencia, you would
22 actually see fenestration and penetrations on
23 that wall.

24 Again, here, this is a blowup of the amount
25 of green space that wraps the building entirely

1 around. There's actually more green space, in
2 little areas along the alley, as well. Here's
3 the circulation path for pedestrian and
4 vehicular. And here -- thank you.

5 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: That was the
6 architectural segment of our presentation. Now
7 I'll just briefly talk to you about traffic.

8 The biggest thing we've done for traffic,
9 of course, is reduce the unit count. We went
10 down from 103 to 38, only four units more than
11 what exists now. We have a traffic engineer
12 here, of course, but it's a de minimus impact
13 on traffic.

14 That said, what the neighbors told us is
15 that traffic, as it exists today, is still an
16 issue, especially during the morning and
17 evening rush hours. And so even though we have
18 no impact on the traffic volume, we know that
19 the existing situation is difficult, so we want
20 to do our part to try to improve that
21 situation.

22 One thing that we're trying to do is slow
23 down traffic, and we're proposing these
24 landscaped medians along Valencia, so as to at
25 least slow down the traffic that is cutting

1 through, and aside from that, we also want to
 2 make it safer for pedestrians to use the
 3 immediate area.
 4 So here we'll go through a series of three
 5 slides that take you from Segovia west, to Le
 6 Jeune, and we're proposing it will be somewhere
 7 in the range of 75 or 100 thousand dollars
 8 worth of pedestrian safety improvements. So
 9 things such as putting the automatic flashing
 10 signal crosswalk signs with the timer countdown
 11 and so forth, on the different intersections,
 12 including the ones crossing Le Jeune, which my
 13 understanding is, and based on my own
 14 experience, I know it's somewhat difficult.
 15 Other things, such as the traffic circles,
 16 which exist already, inserting reflectors and
 17 new landscaping in those areas in order to
 18 improve them, and they take you, as I said,
 19 from Segovia, on the west, to Le Jeune, on the
 20 east, Biltmore Way on the north, and then
 21 Valencia on the south. There's copies provided
 22 in your records, too, that you can take a look
 23 at, if you'd like, to get some more detail.
 24 The park, here's an initial rendering plan,
 25 and rendering of the park that we have proposed

1 on the east end of the property, approximately
 2 10,000 square feet. That is sort of the plan
 3 that we have come up with, after consultation
 4 with City Staff, with the Board of Architects,
 5 with a certain amount of input from the
 6 neighbors, but one thing I can tell you, almost
 7 everyone that you speak to on the park sort of
 8 has a slightly different opinion as to what
 9 they think is appropriate in the park.
 10 I think ultimately what will need to be
 11 done, and perhaps could be part of the
 12 recommendation of this Board is, just as the
 13 City has a planning process and a public
 14 meeting process with the other recent
 15 acquisitions that they've had for parks in the
 16 City, that the same thing happen here, so that
 17 we try to get a consensus as to what they want
 18 to see in the park, how active or how passive
 19 it should potentially be, but that is the idea
 20 at least right now.
 21 It's significant, 10,000 square feet.
 22 Think of it as two single-family -- two typical
 23 single-family home sites in Coral Gables, at a
 24 very prominent location.
 25 Here's the rendering that we have of the

1 project right now. From the east side, it
 2 shows the park there in the foreground. We've
 3 now come to a point where we now feel that we
 4 have the strong support of Staff and a clear
 5 majority of the neighbors to convert what are
 6 three unremarkable aging buildings, which are
 7 not representative of the typical style or
 8 quality of Coral Gables apartments, into a low
 9 density, ultra luxury building, which will
 10 enhance property values, improve the traffic
 11 situation, and bring a much needed neighborhood
 12 park to the area.
 13 My client has done right by the
 14 neighborhood, and we feel it's time now to move
 15 forward. Staff is recommending approval, with
 16 conditions. We're in agreement with all of
 17 those conditions. I believe one of the
 18 neighborhood groups will bring up an additional
 19 condition that they're looking for, that we're
 20 in agreement with, and we would ask that you
 21 follow the Staff recommendation and recommend
 22 approval of this project.
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Are you in agreement with
 25 the condition of the short-term leasing?

1 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Yes. In deed, that
 2 condition was brought during -- or that request
 3 was brought up during our last general
 4 neighborhood meeting, and we're agreeing to a
 5 condition that basically prohibits, and it will
 6 be incorporated in the condominium documents,
 7 any short-term or transient sort of leasing on
 8 this property.
 9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Just a comment and a
 10 question. You know, I live near the area. And
 11 I'm not a realtor, I'm a lawyer, but my sense
 12 is that there's a need for three, four
 13 bedrooms -- certainly four-bedroom units and
 14 five-bedroom units, you know, in condominiums.
 15 Did you do any kind of study or did your group
 16 do any kind of study in order to determine --
 17 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: My client has a good
 18 amount of real estate experience. He's been in
 19 the industry now over 20 years in South
 20 Florida, and indeed, it's looking at his own
 21 situation, the situation of many clients and
 22 friends, he does feel that there is a need for
 23 what is essentially homes in the sky. Let's
 24 call them, a single-family product, but in a
 25 condominium type building, especially as the

1 topic that you were talking about earlier, as
2 housing prices get more expensive, those young
3 families, young professionals that would
4 otherwise perhaps want a single-family home or
5 perhaps people coming from overseas, simply
6 cannot find in their price range the home that
7 meets their needs. They could potentially find
8 that here, in this development.

9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah. Just, for the
10 record, my sense is that there is a need and
11 whenever I -- speaking for myself, I think the
12 Board does the same, all of the Members of the
13 Board, evaluating whether to provide a
14 favorable Zoning change, favorable for the
15 person requesting it or the party requesting
16 it, is what is that party giving back to the
17 City. And, in this case, I see that -- in my
18 opinion, anyway, I don't know if anybody else
19 has a differing opinion, but I think there's a
20 value to the availability of four-bedroom
21 condominiums, five-bedroom condominiums and
22 even three bedrooms. I don't think they're
23 that plentiful in this area.

24 One other question regarding parking. How
25 did you determine the number of parking spaces?

1 Because, by my calculations, you know, it's a
2 little more than two per unit, and you have
3 some four-bedroom and some five-bedroom units.
4 How was that determined?

5 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Correct. The way it
6 works, we use the City Parking Requirements,
7 and the City Parking Requirements require one
8 space for every one bedroom, but that's not
9 applicable here, then 1.5 spaces for every
10 two-bedroom, which I think is also not
11 applicable here, right, and then 2.25 for every
12 three-bedroom and more. So it's 2.25 parking
13 spaces that we've provided for every unit, and
14 we're slightly above -- we're three of four
15 parking spaces above what is required.

16 So that 2.25 ratio is factoring in, Number
17 One, how many people could potentially be
18 living there on the site, as well as a factor
19 for visitors. And these sort of units, we also
20 expect that many of them will have some young
21 children, what won't be driving. A lot of them
22 will have also domestic staff that will be
23 using public transportation to get --

24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: How many of the 89 are
25 reserved for visitors?

1 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: That's going to be a
2 product -- the City, unlike other cities, does
3 not have a visitor parking requirement. It has
4 a general requirement that we meet of 89. Then
5 how many of those will be assigned to
6 condominiums and how many of them will be
7 visitor spaces is really a product of how many
8 spaces are assigned as part of the purchase
9 prices.

10 In other words, I think, Matthew, you were
11 contemplating probably about two parking spaces
12 for every unit --

13 MR. PELLER: Yes.

14 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: An average of at least
15 two per unit. So then that .25 that we're
16 providing per unit, that's not being used, you
17 add that together, and it would probably be the
18 pool that will be available for visitor
19 parking.

20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You know, the reason I'm so
21 curious about the parking is because it seems
22 that you had an option to have more parking
23 spaces, by making the parking garage a little
24 bit bigger. Was that ever concerned? You
25 know, it just seems --

1 MR. PELLER: It's Matthew Peller, 515
2 Valencia.

3 So what I'm seeing is a societal change in
4 how people are living, and so I don't think --
5 I think, in ten years, I think the concept of
6 the garage will be alien. I don't think you'll
7 even have garages. I mean, you're talking
8 about, Uber has transformed the entire
9 environment, because people that -- I know I
10 was speaking to Suzanne Amaducci today, and
11 some of the staff that work at Bilzin Sumberg,
12 they don't even have cars, and they use Ubers
13 and they commute with Uber. They go on the
14 Metromover.

15 So I don't think it's important that we
16 have more spaces. And for those people that
17 have multiple cars, now they're building, you
18 know, car storage units. I think there's one
19 on Bird Road that's being proposed. So I don't
20 want to overpark. I certainly don't want to
21 underpark, either. But, as we've said, I think
22 the people that work there, in the household,
23 the nurses or maids, domestic staff, won't have
24 cars. There's plenty of public transportation
25 in that area. And I think that if people come

1 to visit, I think they'll come in an Uber and
 2 they'll leave in an Uber. So that was the
 3 rationale.
 4 Of course, we follow what the Code
 5 requires, you know, two and a quarter, I think.
 6 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Right.
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. We'll open up
 8 the public hearing. Jill, I'm assuming we have
 9 some cards.
 10 THE SECRETARY: Paul Savage.
 11 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, would you like a time
 12 limit on the speakers?
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm sorry?
 14 MR. WU: Would you like a time limit on the
 15 speakers?
 16 MR. BEHAR: Two minutes.
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: How many speakers do we
 18 have, Jill?
 19 MR. SECRETARY: We have three additional on
 20 this item.
 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What?
 22 MS. MENENDEZ: No, there's four in total.
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So if you'd keep
 24 them brief, a few minutes, if we would, please.
 25 MR. SAVAGE: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 2 MR. SAVAGE: Good evening, Members of the
 3 Board. My name is Paul Savage. I'm an
 4 attorney, with offices at 2121 Ponce de Leon
 5 Boulevard, here in Coral Gables, Suite 900.
 6 I'm here representing Valencia Grande
 7 Condominium Association, which is about three
 8 lots down to the west of this location.
 9 You may remember me from many, many
 10 hearings that we've had. I think Mario and I
 11 have been at more than we want to remember.
 12 But I have an irrepressible smile on my face
 13 tonight, because this is the first night that
 14 I'm able to come before you and lend our
 15 support or say that we are in support of this
 16 iteration of the project.
 17 A typical fact pattern, a case I may have
 18 in another jurisdiction, might involve an
 19 appeal from a Planning and Zoning Board,
 20 through the City Commission, into the Circuit
 21 Court Appellate Division, that Craig Leen
 22 mentioned earlier in his discussion. I
 23 prevailed there, come back down, and still the
 24 developer and the City Government pretend that
 25 I didn't win in Court, and they still won't

1 change the project.
 2 So that's the kind of tough life that I
 3 typically lead, and so I'm so pleasantly
 4 surprised when I have a developer, who actually
 5 takes the time and makes a dramatic change,
 6 like this developer did in this case, where we
 7 were at a project of 108 units, and we're now
 8 down to 38 units. In terms of the density, the
 9 impact, the traffic, all of the things that
 10 come with all of those additional cars and
 11 people on the street, which is really what my
 12 clients were concerned with, all of that has
 13 been drastically reduced in this latest
 14 version.
 15 So it was a very long and hard fought
 16 process, but now we're finally able to come on
 17 board and support this project. And I just
 18 want to thank the Members of this Board,
 19 because we've had some pretty hot and heavy,
 20 you know, arguments here. I want to thank our
 21 Planning and Zoning Staff, who we've had
 22 meetings with here, we had meetings at their
 23 office, and also I want to thank my opposing
 24 counsel, and I want to thank the developer
 25 himself, who came and met with my clients.

1 All of that is really above and beyond the
 2 call of duty and different than many of my
 3 other cases. So I just wanted to make those
 4 remarks, and thank everyone involved, and we
 5 wish them the best of luck as they develop this
 6 project.
 7 The park, on the east side, is a great
 8 addition. That's a full size 10,000 square
 9 foot lot. Also, the setback on Valencia
 10 itself, which is new, I saw, tonight, that the
 11 architect described, also a very nice addition
 12 to the street.
 13 Finally, I do have a condition that I want
 14 to add to Item Number 7, which is the Site Plan
 15 approval or Planned Area Development, which is
 16 a prohibition against short-term rentals, and
 17 we've asked that this be enforced by way of
 18 their condominium documents. Mario has agreed
 19 to this, and the Planning Director, Mr. Trias,
 20 says he has no problem adding it.
 21 I'm going to hand this to the Clerk. Can
 22 you pass this down?
 23 Thank you, sir.
 24 As he's passing that down, you'll see that
 25 it's just some language adding to all of the

Page 77

1 other conditions that Ramon has put. I've
 2 added another one, saying, "In your condo docs,
 3 please prohibit short-term leasing or a bed and
 4 breakfast." I candidly can't imagine that
 5 occurring in this extra-luxury product, and it
 6 may run afoul already, I would hope, of Coral
 7 Gables law already, but just in case, we don't
 8 want, you know, short-term leasing going on.
 9 We like the condominium product. We want
 10 permanent residents and alike.
 11 So with that one condition, which they've
 12 graciously agreed to, we are in support of this
 13 project. And I probably went over two minutes,
 14 but I --
 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. You're more than
 16 fine. Thank you very much.
 17 MR. SAVAGE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 18 THE SECRETARY: Jose Navia.
 19 MR. NAVIA: Good evening, Members -- can
 20 you hear me -- Members of the Board. My name
 21 is Jose Gelabert Navia. I'm an architect, but
 22 I'm not speaking as an architect. I'm speaking
 23 as a neighbor. I live at 600 Biltmore Way.
 24 And I came in support of the project
 25 before, when it was more units and it was

Page 78

1 rentals. So, obviously, now, in terms of
 2 concerns that, frankly, I didn't have, in terms
 3 of traffic, it's more than adequate right now.
 4 I think this is going to be a great addition.
 5 Certainly my property values are going up as a
 6 result of the project, and I welcome this, as I
 7 did the other project.
 8 So I'm speaking to you on behalf of the
 9 project, but I also wanted to add, if we still
 10 have our -- this is not anything to do with the
 11 project as presented, but as I was listening to
 12 the consultant talking about affordable housing
 13 in Coral Gables, good luck. This process in
 14 here has basically said that the City wants no
 15 rental, that the City wants no assisted living,
 16 that the City just wants ultra expensive
 17 housing, so we become more of a rich person's
 18 ghetto, and I think this is tragic, because
 19 there's a number of people, elderly people, who
 20 would like to live in our community, who cannot
 21 live on our community.
 22 I think the provision for the short-term
 23 rentals is also thinly disguised to keep other
 24 people out. And living in a building where I'm
 25 probably the youngest person in the building,

Page 79

1 but it's one of the few places that people can
 2 still afford to live, and most of the elderly
 3 have chosen that building. I wish there were
 4 more options for young professionals and I wish
 5 there were more options for elderly people, but
 6 it seems that there is no real will from the
 7 community here, from the administration, or,
 8 unfortunately, the Boards, to have those people
 9 here.
 10 But the project itself, you know, I think
 11 it's going to be very successful and I
 12 appreciate their patience, because I certainly
 13 couldn't have had it. Thank you.
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 15 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson.
 16 MS. ANDERSON: Good evening, and thank you
 17 for your patience and time in listening to all
 18 of us. And full disclosure, I'm a member of
 19 the Sustainability Board, and I have
 20 participated on the Le Jeune and Segovia
 21 Neighborhood Association, with the Bacardi
 22 Building, and traffic studies and the needs
 23 that were met by that project in this
 24 neighborhood.
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could we get your name

Page 80

1 and address, for the record, please?
 2 MS. ANDERSON: Name and address? Rhonda
 3 Anderson, 2715 Hernando Street. So I'm on the
 4 street that runs north and south from this
 5 project. I'm here to submit our approval of
 6 the project, in our family unit, and make a few
 7 comments to you all about things that we'd like
 8 to see in these projects. The setback is
 9 tremendous. I hope you take these comments and
 10 use them in future projects, as well, where
 11 setbacks aren't being used.
 12 The traffic calming that has been proposed
 13 here, with the median, was something that was
 14 actually originally recommended as part of the
 15 Bacardi project, but never finished as part of
 16 the Bacardi project. So, yes, that is very
 17 needed.
 18 The other thing that's needed, and this
 19 developer is willing to do, is the up-lighting
 20 of the circle in that area. It used to have
 21 palm trees. Very recently it had a -- I think
 22 it's a Bridalveil tree added to it, but when
 23 you drive that street at night, you cannot see
 24 that tree. In order to do so, this developer
 25 has recommended up-lighting and is willing to

1 do so.

2 I think the traffic study, though, does

3 need to be reevaluated after the median is

4 placed in, and we'll see where the traffic is

5 at that point, if there's additional needs to

6 slow down traffic with speed tables. So that

7 would be my recommendation on traffic.

8 With regard to the short-term leasing issue

9 and the need for affordable housing, I know you

10 all are considering the North Gables. My

11 family members used to have apartment buildings

12 up in that area, and they're historic buildings

13 at this time -- they no longer own them -- but

14 there is ample opportunities in that area in

15 which I think you could consider putting in

16 more affordable units. We have efficiencies,

17 we have one bedrooms, and they were very viable

18 for the young folks and people that needed a

19 place to start out.

20 With regard to the park, we're very happy

21 with the park. We'd ask for you to have an

22 open mind and allow the neighborhood -- the

23 people in the neighborhood to contribute what

24 they would like in the park. I live in an area

25 where I see a lot of the people walking.

1 There's a tremendous amount of dogs in the

2 area. The density in this building and other

3 buildings is not going to allow folks to have

4 yards anymore, and so having an incorporated

5 park, with a public element, and a dog park

6 element in it, is necessary.

7 It may end up being a smaller area for

8 dogs, because it helps them learn how to

9 interact with each other and with human beings.

10 And for those folks that don't want to take

11 up their time to get up here individually and

12 speak on the dog park element, I've asked them

13 to stand up, to give you all some idea of those

14 who came here tonight and wanted to express

15 their opinion, that there is a need in the

16 neighborhood for that purpose.

17 So if you could stand up now, those that

18 were able to make it here.

19 MS. MENENDEZ: The developer stood up.

20 MS. ANDERSON: Yeah. And the developer is

21 willing, obviously, to make that part of the

22 park. So I'd ask you to have an open mind.

23 Not everybody that I spoke to said, "Yes, we

24 want a dog park." I spoke to people all of the

25 way to the Youth Center and back, and they

1 said, "Excellent. We can have something within

2 walking distance, because it's so hard to get

3 to a dog park, and we'd like to have something

4 in our area."

5 So thank you for your time and your effort

6 on this project. Have a good night.

7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

8 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, if I could ask a

9 question. Do we understand if this design of

10 the park is final or is yet to be fine-tuned?

11 Can we clarify that, for the record?

12 MR. TRIAS: The design of the park is not

13 final, and we agree with the recommendation to

14 follow the typical process of neighborhood

15 input to finalize the design.

16 MR. WU: Okay. Thank you.

17 THE SECRETARY: Lisa Anderson.

18 MR. WU: Ms. Anderson, were you sworn in

19 earlier? We have sworn in speakers earlier in

20 the meeting.

21 Anybody else, who would like to speak, that

22 have to be sworn in, please be sworn in now.

23 Lisa, you're the only one. Please be sworn

24 in by the clerk.

25 (Thereupon, Lisa Anderson was sworn.)

1 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

2 MR. WU: Thank you.

3 MS. ANDERSON: I'm just adding --

4 MR. WU: Your name and address.

5 MS. ANDERSON: Lisa Anderson. Same as

6 before, 2715 Hernando Street. I'm adding an

7 addendum, because I'm the person who takes the

8 dogs to the dog park --

9 MR. WU: Get closer to the mike.

10 MR. COLLER: Can you speak into the mike?

11 MS. ANDERSON: Sorry. Yeah.

12 I'm the person in the house who takes the

13 dogs to the dog park, and it is a concern to

14 find safe dog parks. And so, if not, I have to

15 go to Coconut Grove or to Tropical Park. So it

16 would be really great to have a dog park in the

17 neighborhood I could actually walk to, and that

18 is safe, because a lot of them have had

19 chemical contamination over the past couple of

20 years, and have been closed down to be

21 rehabilitated.

22 So to be able to walk the dogs, instead of

23 drive my dogs somewhere, would be excellent,

24 especially on the weekends. That was just my

25 addendum.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 2 MS. ANDERSON: Thank you.
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's it?
 4 Okay. No more cards. We'll close the
 5 public hearing, and open up for discussion
 6 amongst Board Members.
 7 Oh, sorry, yes.
 8 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: No need for rebuttal,
 9 Mr. Chair, but just to confirm that the
 10 condition that was proffered by Mr. Savage
 11 regarding the short-term and transient rentals
 12 is acceptable to us.
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 14 MR. BEHAR: I have a question for the
 15 applicant. This park, once you have final
 16 design, it will be open? It will not be gated?
 17 The neighborhood will have full access to the
 18 park all of the time, correct?
 19 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Correct. We will be
 20 proffering --
 21 MR. BEHAR: Yeah, because you have a couple
 22 of gates, and then you have an entry feature.
 23 I just want to make sure that it's not going to
 24 be locked or it's not going to prevent the
 25 neighborhood to use the park.

1 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: We'll be proffering a
 2 public easement in favor of the City and the
 3 general public, so that park is like any other
 4 City park. You know, in some of others -- I
 5 think the official rule on City parks is that
 6 they're open from dawn to dusk. So, you know,
 7 after dusk, you're not supposed to be there.
 8 MR. BEHAR: Whatever rules apply to that.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Are you saying that's going
 10 to become a City park, maintained by the City,
 11 or your client is going to maintain it?
 12 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: In all likelihood, we're
 13 going to maintain it. In all of the
 14 discussions that we've had up until now, we'd
 15 be maintaining it. And there have been -- you
 16 will notice there are some recommended
 17 Conditions of Approval in the Planning Staff
 18 recommendations asking us to realign the
 19 principal entrances to the park to corners to
 20 the northeast -- yeah, to the northeast and the
 21 southeast corners of the park, and so it will
 22 have to be a continuing sort of planning
 23 process, with input from the public, to come to
 24 the final design.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody else?
 2 MR. BELLIN: Mario, I have a question. Has
 3 this been reviewed by Fire?
 4 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Yes. This was reviewed
 5 by Fire as part of the City's internal review
 6 of the revised plans.
 7 MR. BELLIN: Okay. And it complies with
 8 the separation for the fire stairs, because it
 9 looks like it's awful close?
 10 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: I wish I was an expert
 11 in the area. Hamed, maybe --
 12 MR. HAMED RODRIGUEZ: We checked.
 13 Yeah, we did the diagonal. We made sure
 14 that the fire stairs -- they actually return
 15 back into these vestibules, in order to meet
 16 that distance.
 17 MR. BELLIN: Yeah. So you changed the
 18 location of the doors to do that, and then --
 19 MR. HAMED RODRIGUEZ: We did that, to meet
 20 that, because it was that close.
 21 MR. BELLIN: Okay. I know. It looks like
 22 it.
 23 MR. BEHAR: I also want to start by, I want
 24 to commend your client, the developer, for
 25 listening to the neighborhood and to all of the

1 neighbors and making a significant change,
 2 modification, to the previous project.
 3 In some aspects, I agree with Mr. Navia's
 4 comment on the smaller units, but this is a
 5 great product for this area, and I do
 6 commend -- the need is there. I do commend the
 7 developer for making those changes and
 8 listening to the neighborhood.
 9 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Thank you.
 10 MR. BEHAR: I'm in full support of the
 11 project, and once we go through the Board, you
 12 will be -- I'm ready to make a motion for
 13 approval of the project, with conditions.
 14 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: I think a lot of credit
 15 has to be said for my client, Matthew Peller,
 16 because so many other clients in that same
 17 position would have said, "Come hell or high
 18 water, you go in there and you do what you have
 19 to do to get this project approved," but
 20 instead, we took six months off, talked to
 21 everybody, and it really came to a point where
 22 we can get up here and have a project that's
 23 really supported by everybody.
 24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: If I can add, you know, I
 25 second the comments by my colleague. And, I

1 mean, I've only been on the Board about a year
2 and a half. I often take a critical view of,
3 you know, folks who come in here and want
4 Zoning changes that are advantageous to them.
5 I'm a capitalist. I think everybody should
6 make a buck. But I'm also looking to see how
7 the City benefits.

8 Like I said before, I see a real benefit to
9 the City, not only in the park, the
10 availability of these four-bedroom,
11 five-bedroom units, and I commend, you know,
12 your whole team, yourself, the developer. And
13 I think, you know, these things need to be
14 said, because we'd like to see other -- or,
15 certainly, I would, and I think other Members
16 of the Board would like to see others take the
17 same approach that you guys have taken, which
18 is to find a win-win for everybody.

19 I mean, I'm also impressed by the fact that
20 not a single person came in here and
21 complained, and you seem to have taken the time
22 to get everybody on board. I've run into Mr.
23 Savage quite a few times. I don't think I've
24 ever seen him be in support of anything. I'm
25 impressed by that.

1 But, look, I'm repeating what folks have
2 already said, but I really think it's important
3 to make these points, and I'm delighted that
4 you guys have taken the time and spent the
5 money and done this the right way, and you
6 should all be commended for it.

7 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Thank you. I think it
8 is a testament to, when you have reasonable
9 people on both sides of an issue, if they get
10 together, and with respect and well-mannered,
11 and they talk to each other, you'll figure it
12 out, even if it takes some time, but you get
13 there.

14 MS. MENENDEZ: I also want to thank you,
15 because I think that we all shared some
16 concerns, and you all certainly have met them,
17 in particular with the intensity of the
18 development, and I wanted to also publicly
19 thank you.

20 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Thank you.

21 MR. BEHAR: If there's no more comments,
22 I'm going to make a motion to approve with the
23 conditions.

24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'd like to say one more
25 thing. I hope that the developer makes a whole

1 lot of money and does great, because, you know
2 what -- no, because everybody should benefit
3 and everybody should hear about it, that, you
4 know, you can do things the right way and still
5 do very well, and I sincerely mean that.

6 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Hopefully it will be an
7 example of how other things can be done.

8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. We had a
9 motion to approve with conditions.

10 MS. MENENDEZ: I'll second it.

11 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, the first motion is
12 just a Site Specific change. So that is just a
13 legislative matter. The second action is where
14 the condition resides. So if you could
15 separate your motions, please.

16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Wu is right. We
17 need a motion for Item Number 6, which is
18 changing the Site Specifics.

19 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion on Item
20 Number 6.

21 MS. MENENDEZ: I'll second it.

22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Any discussion on 6?
23 Hearing none, Jill, if you'll call the
24 roll, please.

25 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?

1 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.

2 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?

3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

4 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?

5 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

6 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?

7 MR. BELLIN: Yes.

8 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?

9 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.

10 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?

11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.

12 Now we need a motion on Number 7.

13 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion for
14 approval, with conditions, on Item Number 7.

15 MR. BELLIN: I'll second it.

16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And that was with the
17 conditions that had been requested and had been
18 added and agreed to?

19 MR. BEHAR: Correct.

20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.

21 MR. BEHAR: All of the conditions presented
22 to us today.

23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Perfect. All right.
24 Any further discussion on that?

25 Jill.

1 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?
 2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
 3 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 4 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 5 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?
 6 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 7 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?
 8 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 9 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 11 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?
 12 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 13 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Thank you very much.
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you, Mario.
 15 Thank you to the applicant.
 16 MR. BEHAR: Only took two years, Mario, but
 17 you did it.
 18 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Two years that we were
 19 here. Four in total.
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Items 8 through 15 are
 21 related. I guess we'll read them into the
 22 record, and then take action separately, if we
 23 get there. And, also, just so everybody knows,
 24 Member Rodriguez needs to leave at 8:15.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: 8:50?

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: 8:15. He has a flight
 2 tonight.
 3 MR. BEHAR: And I have to leave just about
 4 the same time, as well.
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Well, I have a very simple
 6 question.
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: One second. Thank you,
 8 everybody.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: I have a question of the
 10 Staff that might end this whole thing.
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Once --
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Or at least defer it.
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ramon, Maria has a
 14 question.
 15 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: The portion that we
 17 discussed in length the last time and we even
 18 heard testimony from the public regarding the
 19 infill portion, Staff was going to take a look
 20 at a larger area, or at least study it.
 21 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 22 MS. MENENDEZ: Has that been done?
 23 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. I didn't see the
 25 results in this report. Do we have something

1 separate or --
 2 MR. TRIAS: Megan is going to make that
 3 presentation. She did an analysis of the whole
 4 area, of each of the buildings, so --
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. All right.
 6 MR. TRIAS: -- I think it's sufficient for
 7 you to -- but if you need more, certainly we
 8 can do more.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.
 10 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I need to read these
 12 in, right?
 13 MR. COLLER: Yeah, I think you should read
 14 them in.
 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. We'll be a
 16 while.
 17 Item Number 8 -- and it looks like we have
 18 seven items -- an Ordinance of the City
 19 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting
 20 an amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the
 21 City of Coral Gables Comprehensive Plan
 22 pursuant to Zoning Code Article 3, "Development
 23 Review," Division 15, "Comprehensive Plan Text
 24 and Map Amendments," and Small Scale Amendment
 25 procedures, Section 163.3187, Florida Statutes,

1 providing for the "North Ponce de Leon
 2 Boulevard Mixed-Use Overlay District;"
 3 providing for severability, repealer and an
 4 effective date. Legal description is on file
 5 with the City. That's under Local Planning
 6 Agency review.
 7 Item 9 is an Ordinance of the City
 8 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting
 9 an amendment to the text of the City of Coral
 10 Gables Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use
 11 Element, Policy FLU-1.1.3, "Table FLU-4, called
 12 Mixed-Use Land Use," pursuant to expedited
 13 State review procedures, Section 163.3184,
 14 Florida Statutes, and Zoning Code Article 3,
 15 "Development Review," Division 15,
 16 "Comprehensive Plan Text and Map Amendments;"
 17 amending the "MXOD, Mixed-Use Overly Districts"
 18 Land Use Classification to provide that a
 19 Mixed-Use Overlay District may be permitted as
 20 an overlay in the Multi-Family Medium Density
 21 and the Multi-Family High Density Land Uses;
 22 providing for severability, repealer and an
 23 effective date. That's also Local Planning
 24 Agency review.
 25 Item 10 is an Ordinance of the City