Exhibit B

CITY OF CORAL GABLES
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
2010 JUN 14 AM 10:06

CITY OF CORAL GABLES
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING
VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT
CORAL GABLES CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
405 BILTMORE WAY, CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 2010, 6:05 P.M.

Board Members Present:
Tom Korge, Chairman
Eibi Aizenstat, Vice-Chairman
Robert Behar
Jack Coe
Jeffrey Flanagan
Javier Salman

City Staff:
Patrick G. Salerno, City Manager
Eric Riel, Jr., Planning Director
Elizabeth M. Hernandez, City Attorney
Maria Alberro Menendez, Assistant City Manager
Kevin Kinney, Parking Director
Fred Couceyro, Parks & Recreation Director
Scot Bolyard, Planner
Jill Menendez, Administrative Assistant
Catherine Cathers, Arts & Culture Specialist

Public Speakers:
Rick Holmes
Joel Lehman
Jean Field

THEREUPON:

The following proceedings were had:

CHAIRMAN KORGE: All right, so we've got a quorum. Let's get rolling. Will you call the roll, please?

MS. MENENDEZ: Eibi Aizenstat?

MR. AIZENSTAT: Here.

MS. MENENDEZ: Robert Behar?

Jack Coe?

MR. COE: Here.

MS. MENENDEZ: Jeff Flanagan?

MR. FLANAGAN: Here.

MS. MENENDEZ: Pat Keon?

Javier Salman?

Tom Korge?

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Here.

The first item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of the meeting of May 12th, 2010. Do I have a motion of approval?

MR. FLANAGAN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Second?

MR. COE: Second.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Any discussion?

Hearing no discussion, no objections --

MR. COE: Call the question.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Call the roll, please.

MS. MENENDEZ: Jack Coe?

MR. COE: Yes.

MS. MENENDEZ: Jeff Flanagan?

MR. FLANAGAN: Yes.

MS. MENENDEZ: Eibi Aizenstat?

MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

MS. MENENDEZ: Tom Korge?

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yes.

The next item on the agenda is -- I'd better look at the agenda -- Application Number 00-09-092-P, Planned Area Development Site Plan Review.

MR. RIEL: Mr. Chairman, if I could, just for a matter of the record, I just want to note a change on the agenda, the deferral of the Gulliver Academy application.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: My apologies. That was deferred. I didn't read down far enough. Okay.

MR. COE: That's deferred to July 14.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: To July 14th.

MR. RIEL: To July 14th, and there's a letter I'd like to enter into the record from the applicant.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay.

MR. COE: Some kind of conflict with co-counsel, that was the reason for this?

MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

MR. COE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: You've given us a copy of the letter from Laura Russo, dated June 3rd? Is that the letter?

MR. RIEL: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is Application Number 05-10-105-P, Change of Land Use.

MR. RIEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is a request for a change in land use from Commercial Use, Mid-Rise Intensity, to Commercial Use, High-Rise Intensity, for three City-owned properties, that will allow for the future development of the properties at their highest and best use.

These properties are currently used as a City parking lot and garage -- this references Property Number 1, which is Parking Lot Number 6 -- and Scot, if you could just indicate it. Property Number 2 is Garage Number 4, the 300 Block of Andalusia. Property 3 is Garage

d5f40859-f70c-4e6b-9e95-055ee75f40cb

Number 1, the 200 Block of Andalusia.
MR. COE: These are municipal garages? Are these municipal garages, Mr. Riel?
MR. RIEL: These are all City-owned properties.
MR. COE: Municipal garages are what we're talking about?
MR. Riel: Yes. Yes.
This change will allow the City the flexibility to develop the property as a future mixed-use development that could allow any of the following uses: Retail, office, public parking, multi-family residential, public open space, and/or other public uses.
No change in zoning is being requested, because all the properties have the proper Commercial zoning designation. In terms of changing the land use, it again allows more flexibility in terms of greater opportunities for development. It's designed as an infill development. It promotes mixed-use, which is consistent in the Central Business District. It allows for quality construction that will allow for integration of a variety of land uses and densities in one development.

(Thereupon, Mr. Salman arrived.)
MR. RIEL: And again, provides for infill redevelopment of the properties, basically, within a ten-minute walk, which is kind of the norm, in terms of the flexibility of mixed uses, and then, for sure, not least, increases the choices available to public parking.
And Scot --
We have -- If you look in your packet, Attachment D, we have an illustration which Scot has on the board there, as well. It basically shows the location of each of the properties, an aerial. The existing land use, the proposed land use. And there's no change in the Commercial designation, so obviously, there's no exhibit indicating the same.
If you note, the properties predominantly are surrounded by High-Rise as well as Mid-Rise uses.
What Staff did is kind of give you an idea in terms of what the parameters of the development would be. We did a preliminary zoning analysis, which is on Page 5 in your packet. It lists the -- you know, the property, the total site area. Those

properties are available for Mediterranean bonuses under either of the categories, and it's within the Traffic Concurrency Exception Area District.
The properties do meet the minimum 200-foot frontage, 20,000 square foot minimum, to go to a High-Rise, and again, they're allowed Mediterranean bonuses.
(Thereupon, Mr. Behar arrived.)
MR. RIEL: The proposal for change in land use would allow up to 190 feet. That's with Mediterranean bonuses. Currently, the properties are allowed up to 100 feet.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Excuse me for interrupting. I just want to note for the record that both Javier Salman and Robert Behar have arrived. I'm sorry.
MR. RIEL: And I just want to clarify, the intent will allow the flexibility of the City to go to that height. You're not looking at a site plan this evening. It's just a change in land use. It allows the ability, when the City determines to develop the parcels, to be able to go up that height, and it allows additional flexibility, again, in terms of the mixing of

uses.
MR. COE: Could I ask a question, Mr. Riel? I'm a little bit confused by this.
Now, you have, on Parcels -- well, Items 2 and 3, two municipal garages. The underlying land is owned by the City?
MR. RIEL: Yes.
MR. COE: And the structure is owned by the City?
MR. RIEL: Yes.
MR. COE: Is it the City's intent, down the road, to sell off the land?
MR. RIEL: There's no -- I mean, there's no development scenario at this time. There's no proposal.
MR. COE: If this is rezoned to High-Density, High-Rise, is the City going to build a structure and then lease it? Or are they going to lease the land and have somebody build a structure with a 99-year lease? What are we talking about?
MR. RIEL: That's something that's going to be determined later. This is just -- The request before you is a change in land use. The City is the property owner and, obviously,

d5f40859-f70c-4e6b-9e95-055ee75f40cb

will be the regulator, as well. Any development of that parcel will come through this Board and will go to the City Commission.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: I guess the question --

MR. COE: Hold on. Hold on a second. How many parking spaces in each of the garages currently exist?

MR. RIEL: If you look on Page -- Property Number 1, which is 2100 Salzedo, has 104 existing spaces. The 300 Block of Andalusia has 354, and the 200 Block has 282.

MR. COE: Now, when we go from Mid-Rise to High-Rise, and there's a building 11, 12, 13, 14 stories, whatever is under the Mediterranean bonus, are those existing parking spaces preserved and the developer then will have to have additional parking spaces to meet City parking requirements? Or is it all lost, the municipal parking spaces?

MR. RIEL: Again, the future use of the property is subject to the City. I mean, it could be a -- I mean, it could be all the uses I listed. It could be residential, it could be office, it could be primarily a public parking garage, it could be a private-public

partnership. That has not been determined at this time. This just allows the future flexibility.

MR. COE: Well, wouldn't it make more sense, then, for the City to come up with this rezoning when it has more definite ideas of how the property is going to be developed, rather than speculating now and allow some development that may never take place?

My great concern is that we're going to use the existing parking spaces, that, you know, people are told, "Well, don't worry about parking on Miracle Mile. It's not the place to park. We're going to go to parallel parking eventually. That's going to lose parking spaces. Go use the garages."

Is there going to come a time when the garages aren't going to exist for the public at large? That's my concern.

MR. RIEL: And I can't answer that. Again, this is not a development proposal. It's just a change in land use.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Right. Well, I guess the question he's really getting at is, why do we need a change in land use at this time? Is

there some other development occurring, maybe, in the Legislature that's --

MR. RIEL: It's just to allow the flexibility when the Commission does decide how the design should proceed forward.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yeah, but that doesn't answer the question. You could, when the Commission decides to do something with the property, at that time, come with a change in land use, as well as the development proposal.

MR. RIEL: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: But you're not doing that.

MR. RIEL: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Instead, you're coming with a change in land use now, and the simple question is, why now? Why not wait? I think that's what Jack's asking. Why not wait until you're ready to do something with the property, build on the property or sell it or whatever the City plans to do? What's the reason?

MR. RIEL: Again, just to allow flexibility, to go up on that hundred-foot window.

MS. HERNANDEZ: And --

MR. RIEL: Right now, there's limitations

in terms of the maximum height on the property. You can only go to a hundred feet. So what we'd like to do is --

CHAIRMAN KORGE: We got that. But that doesn't answer the question.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Right, but --

CHAIRMAN KORGE: It's a simple question.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Right, and just so that you will remember, several years ago, we did go out to RFP. Every single one of the -- First of all, many applicants did not apply, because they could not rebuild the parking garages for the City and at the same time produce a retail or a market that would give them the necessary revenue in order to make up for the investment.

The City is just -- you know, we're not aware of any plans right now to go out to RFPs. What we're just doing is moving forward the land use, because we know that it was not a successful venture in the past. You will recall that all three projects basically failed and the developers went away.

So that's the only answers we have. We can't give you -- You keep asking questions. All we can give you is the history, what's

d5f40859-f70c-4e6b-9e95-055ee75f40cb

happened, and, you know, what's here before you.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Would The City's ability to develop this property in the future be impaired if the change in land use were proposed at the same time that the City has decided, however tentatively, what it wants to do with the property?

MR. BEHAR: Well, the only thing I could think of is, if in fact you're going to go out at a future date for an RFP and you still have to get the approval --

MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

MR. BEHAR: -- of the rezoning --

MS. HERNANDEZ: It scares away people.

MR. BEHAR: It really does.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah.

MR. BEHAR: You know, I think you're going to have a better turnout and be more successful --

MS. HERNANDEZ: More competitive.

MR. BEHAR: -- if everything is in place already.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

MR. AIZENSTAT: And we have had, in the

past, people come before us asking for a change of land use without having specific plans of what they're doing with that property; have we not?

MR. COE: Well, except this is City-owned property. I don't care how we're doing it for privately owned property. My great concern is, is this really a public -- serving a public purpose --

MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

MR. COE: -- to do this at this time? To me, you know, it says, well, sometime down the road, five years, 10 years, 50 years, we may want to do something with this. No one has answered the question, "Why now?" And I am seriously worried that down the road, we're going to lose all the public parking spaces that we have, because I know what's going to happen. When they build a high-rise, you're going to have parking for -- whether it's condos, apartments, offices or whatever, you're going to have parking to meet the needs of the tenant, not the public at large, and so these hundreds of parking spaces which are now public parking spaces in municipal garages are going

to be gone, and that is my great concern. It's going to -- You know, if it's five, 10, 15 years from now, the history of all this is lost. I see no reason at this time to do what we're doing.

MR. BEHAR: Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that when this RFP went out, you know, whatever, four or five years ago, whenever that went out, part of the requirement was that the developer had to incorporate the same number of spaces that were on the site in the new development?

MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

MR. SALMAN: That's correct.

MR. RIEL: That's correct.

MR. COE: Is that -- But I don't see that here, and you didn't answer it that way when I asked you.

MR. RIEL: And again, there's not a development proposal. Let me just make a couple comments. By increasing the ability to build above a hundred foot, it allows the flexibility to provide more public parking --

MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

MR. RIEL: -- mix of uses, different types

of uses. There's a severe limitation in terms of the hundred foot, given the size of the parcels and based upon the experience that we had with the RFPs, you know, 10 years ago.

Also, as you know, Hometown Democracy is on the agenda for the voters in November.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: That's the issue.

MR. COE: This November, yes.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: That's why you're doing it early.

MR. RIEL: And the Hometown Democracy issue, obviously, any change in land use will be required to go to the voters. So this will allow that flexibility. There's no proposal as of this date to develop the parcels or remove the parking or anything --

CHAIRMAN KORGE: We know that. We understand that. So it's really the Hometown Democracy Act, that you don't want to have to be faced with a referendum, if it passes in the future. If we can legally change it now, you'd rather do it now.

MR. RIEL: Right.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: That's what I was asking you before, what's the reason. That's the real

reason.
MR. RIEL: And also -- I mean, again, it's to allow the development, the ability to -- the flexibility, but yes, the Hometown Democracy issue is one of those.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: So just a couple of questions about the change itself, assuming we would agree to the change. I'm looking at the outlines of Properties 1, 2 and 3, and just based on the color differential, I see that like Property Number 1, it looks as if the whole rest of that block should all be the same. You've got a gap in there for -- I guess some Mid-Rise would still be in part of the block. Do you see what I'm saying?
MS. HERNANDEZ: Uh-huh.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Why -- I mean, is that not a change because you need the owner to apply for that?
MR. RIEL: Yes. It's held by private -- It's privately owned. It's not under the City's ownership.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. That answers the question for all of this.
MR. AIZENSTAT: That answers the question,

what?
CHAIRMAN KORGE: For all three of these, because you see all three of these -- like Andalusia, on the second one, it's all but two lots. One or two lots at the end would be --
MR. AIZENSTAT: Right, no, I see that, but by going the extra height, you're actually allowing for the additional -- Wouldn't you be allowing for the additional parking to be in place?
MS. HERNANDEZ: Uh-huh.
MR. AIZENSTAT: To where at the height that it is now, you can't have it.
MR. RIEL: Mr. Chair, if I could, I believe the City Manager would like to make a couple of comments.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Sure.
MR. SALERNO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members. There was a concern mentioned by one Board member earlier that by doing this, somehow there's a concern about, well, we don't know what's going to be developed there or whatever. This is a land use plan change, and theoretically, land use plan changes are supposed to be considered absent site plans,

absent elevations, absent design issues. So this is just providing the City flexibility.
Cities across the State of Florida today are going through this process. Private developers are going through this process across the State of Florida today. The City is doing this to protect a valuable resource and asset to this community, because if that amendment passes, there is going to be an extended period likely of uncertainty, court challenges, interpretations, et cetera, that are going to follow this, perhaps, for years, before it becomes established law on this matter.
We have a need today for additional parking. If we did nothing, the City could, today, decide to tear down that parking garage and put a residential -- and put some other type of development. So this action here doesn't preserve a single thing, as far as parking, because the City has that right today. It could tear down one garage. It could tear down both garages. It could tear down one and build one twice as big on the other site.
So I just don't want anybody to be

concerned that this, somehow, is an action that somehow gets interpreted as reducing parking. It is nothing but the contrary, frankly, because it will give us greater ability and flexibility to add more parking. And the question was -- Let's say there was additional office development associated with this. Well, that's going to have to be met on site, in addition to whatever our parking needs are. So, if we have public parking needs of 350, okay -- this is theoretical, because we don't have plans -- but if you had 350 today and the parking director says, "You know, I really would like to have 500 spaces in that area," what that's going to mean is, any other potential review, is that we would have 500, and there might be additional office development, and they'll meet their own needs on top of that. So it doesn't reduce anything. It frankly gives further flexibility.
I think, as the City Attorney mentioned before, the City went through a process, an RFP process. It wasn't successful --
MS. HERNANDEZ: At all.
MR. SALERNO: -- because the economics --

d5f40859-f70c-4e6b-9e95-055ee75f40cb

MR. BEHAR: Didn't make sense.
MR. SALERNO: -- were such that it didn't make sense. We're trying to solve problems that will facilitate adding more parking in the downtown. That is what is behind this. We're not looking at this as an opportunity to sell land or whatever. Parking is important. This is to facilitate that. This is to not put the City in limbo for several years, potentially, after the fact, and not be able to look at those opportunities.
These are assets of the City that need to be protected, and it would be imprudent on our part to have not brought this item forward. That's why cities, as I said, all across the state, are doing this now, because they don't want to be in limbo.
MR. BEHAR: Not only that. I mean, this gives the flexibility where you're going to be able to get a private-public partnership --
MR. SALERNO: Absolutely.
MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.
MR. BEHAR: -- which is the only way that you're going to see any major development take place.

MR. SALERNO: You all know that we are not flush with cash today. Most cities or counties are not flush with cash today. We need to look at these opportunities, to explore and let us leverage our asset with the private sector, in partnership, and develop something that's even better than we have today.
Those garages, they're both old. One is exceedingly old and needs to be replaced, and this is just prudent -- a prudent planning and business practice to take this step today. If we don't proceed, you'll be foregoing -- in my opinion, we could be facing a situation where it has significant financial consequences of us not acting today.
Any other questions from members?
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Any other questions or discussion?
MR. BEHAR: I do like to ask Mr. Riel another question.
The only thing that bothers me a little bit is the fact that we're -- it's sort of a spot zoning, because you're only going for the land that is owned by the City. You're not taking, for example, on Property Number 1, the adjacent

lots, whatever they are, 5 through 11 -- you're not taking the whole block in consideration, because -- and that's what is the only thing that's bothering me a bit here. Obviously, that's owned by somebody else, but shouldn't the --
MS. HERNANDEZ: Right. They're not the applicant.
MR. BEHAR: They have to apply.
MS. HERNANDEZ: Every applicant has to apply for its own --
MR. AIZENSTAT: Let them apply.
MR. FLANAGAN: But from a planning consistency standpoint, I would have -- When I first looked at these -- and you look at the color on the map and you see that you are kind of horseshoeing -- at least on the Salzedo one, you're horseshoeing around about four or five parcels, and then on the 300 block of Andalusia, you neglected the westernmost two lots.
MS. HERNANDEZ: Uh-huh.
MR. FLANAGAN: Even though they're under private ownership, the City could have talked to the property owner and filed an application

on their behalf, to achieve the planning consistency of those blocks. As it sits today, on the Salzedo one, I mean, there's a very definitive line between the east half of those blocks that abut Ponce and the west half of those blocks that abut Salzedo.
So everything on the north side of Alhambra was High Density, but it looks like there's a very definitive reason for keeping the east half different from the west half. I'm not -- The 300 block of Andalusia, I think that makes sense, but I think the entire block should be brought in, including those two lots on the west, because it completes the north-south, and then I'll tell you my thought, you know, when you look at the 200 block of Andalusia, I think it's inappropriate, because it's like a sore thumb sticking down.
MR. SALERNO: Let me add -- if I could just add something to that. How we arrived at this was a request by me to the Planning Staff to look at all City-owned properties in the Downtown. I don't know the exact number. It was in excess of 20 --
MR. RIEL: 39.

MR. SALERNO: 39. Eric remembers. So I asked for a comprehensive review of City-owned properties. Out of 39, Eric came forward and said there are three that he would support and recommend, that made sense. And we did have a discussion about other private properties that should be considered, and the City has had a practice, and Eric had told me that he does not recall the City ever taking administrative actions, you know, to change the land use on somebody's property that they didn't request.

Now, certainly, I mean, we have tens of thousands of parcels in this City, and every person, you know, they can -- they need to represent their own interests and so forth, and it doesn't mean that they can't come back later, if it made sense, and they have that time frame.

If they so choose to not protect their interest, perhaps, or it's -- you know, that's up to them. We can't look after the tens of thousands of individual parcel owners and make this their land use decisions, and we haven't.

MR. BEHAR: We're not asking you to do that --

MR. SALERNO: Right.

MR. BEHAR: -- but I think it's inappropriate, you know, with all due respect, to be able to -- Were these adjacent property owners notified that we're going to go through this process?

MR. SALMAN: Yes.

MR. RIEL: They received notice of the land use change.

MR. SALERNO: They received notice. Everybody received notice, yes.

MR. SALMAN: I got notified.

MR. SALERNO: Everybody received notice that was in the appropriate distance, and they would have been notified, but we --

MR. COE: If they don't care, they don't care.

MR. SALERNO: But we -- but we needed to take care of and make sure -- so out of 39 properties, Staff came forward and said there's three that they would recommend to take action on. So we're talking about, you know, a very small percentage of those that, from a variety of criteria, they looked at, you know, and came up with these three as appropriate.

And like I said, there are significant financial consequences of inaction. This is not a decision that no action doesn't have a consequence. This has a consequence, financially, to the City. No action is just -- it's not a --

CHAIRMAN KORGE: It's an action, too.

MR. SALERNO: It's an action in a way that has financial consequences, and that's what --

MR. BEHAR: Let me be clear, I am in support, okay?

MR. SALERNO: Yeah, I know, you want to make it perhaps even further, and I agree with you.

MR. BEHAR: I agree, you know, with Mr. Flanagan. I think that from a planning standpoint --

MR. SALERNO: Absolutely.

MR. BEHAR: -- it should be consistent.

MR. SALERNO: And they will have that opportunity in the future, and you will have that to consider, whether or not other folks, because -- so you'll have that opportunity in the future, if that -- if that goes forward, but the City hasn't had a practice of

administratively rezoning -- rechanging the land use on properties --

MR. SALMAN: That it doesn't own.

MR. SALERNO: -- that it doesn't own. That's been the City's practice.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: I agree with Robert, but maybe it would be worthwhile, personally, to reach out to the landowners, if you can identify them.

MR. SALERNO: We could do that.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: And just talk to them about it, tell them how we feel about it. It seems to me highly likely that they would want -- if it's not going to cost them a lot of money, they would want to make an application, a timely application, too, because it increases the usage -- it will increase the value in the long term for the property owner, and it fits with better planning, which is the reason we're involved with it.

MR. SALERNO: Mr. Chairman, we will do that. We'll follow up, Mr. Chairman. I think it's a great idea. Mr. Behar, same thing. We will do that, absolutely.

MR. FLANAGAN: Can I ask, what's the future

d5f40859-f70c-4e6b-9e95-055ee75f40cb

land use designation of the parking lot -- I guess it would be the zero block of Andalusia, over by the Ross --

MR. SALMAN: That's part of The Palace.

MR. RIEL: High-rise.

MR. FLANAGAN: Part of The Palace?

MR. RIEL: High-rise.

MR. FLANAGAN: That's High-Rise?

MR. RIEL: Yes.

MR. SALMAN: I remember, I was here when they passed it.

MR. SALERNO: Huh?

MR. SALMAN: I was here when they passed it.

MR. RIEL: It was changed to High-Rise to allow the additional flexibility to go up higher for the mixed use.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Are there any more questions or discussion?

MR. FLANAGAN: Does the City not own -- I guess for the 200 block of Andalusia, the City doesn't own those four blocks to the west of the parking garage, which I thought was the back --

MS. HERNANDEZ: I'm sorry?

MR. FLANAGAN: -- which I thought was the back side of the theater?

MR. RIEL: The theater, I know they own --

MR. FLANAGAN: These four lots? It looks like Lots Number 44, 5, 6 and 47?

MR. RIEL: Yes. It's the Miracle Theater.

MR. SALMAN: That's the Miracle Theater. That's the back end of the theater.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Is there a motion, perhaps?

MR. SALMAN: I'd like to make a motion, Mr. Chairman, to approve Staff's recommendation.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: We have a motion to approve the Staff recommendation for a land use change. Is there a second?

MR. BEHAR: Second.

MR. AIZENSTAT: Should we have -- Is there any public input or --

MR. COE: Are you skipping the public?

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Oh, I apologize. You're right. I'm sorry. We'll open it for public discussion.

MR. RIEL: And, Mr. Chair, I also have one thing I need to enter in the record, as well, just, there's a requirement by the Department of Community Affairs -- There's a courtesy informational sheet that Scot has placed up here. Anybody who would like to receive the notice of intent that the DCA publishes, they need to sign that sheet, and the State will notify them of their actions.

CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. Any discussion from the public? Anybody from the public who wishes to make some input on this, please come forward.

Sure, come on up. State your name and address for the record, please.

MR. HOLMES: Thank you. It's great to see you all. I'm honored to be here. My name is Rick Holmes. I own 256 Miracle Mile, which is just in front of one of these garages, and forgive me -- I'm grateful to you, Mr. Coe, and to you, Chairman -- Korge, I guess, for your skepticism, because when I got this, my heart started pounding out of my chest. This kind of issue is something that could actually cause me a heart attack. I'll tell you why. I want to preserve Low-Rise Miracle Mile, I want to preserve parking, and I want to get a

department store in order to do it, in the very two garages, two of the three that you're considering.

It's been a 12-year journey for me. I probably am as far behind now as I was when I started 12 years ago. I think that this is almost the jugular vein, if you will, the life blood of the City, is parking, its future. What happens in 300 and 200 Andalusia, I believe, will determine a whole lot about the future of Coral Gables, including whether Miracle Mile can make it and can stay Low-Rise, our main street of Coral Gables, Low-Rise in the future.

It not only depends on parking. It depends, in my opinion, on whether we can incorporate a department store in any redevelopment of these two parcels.

So I'll flatter myself. The City Manager asked me if I was going to speak in favor of this or not. He knows me well enough to know that my issue is the department store, and then I told him yes, I will, and I'll tell you why I would be in favor of it.

Number one, I thank both of you for

insisting on an explanation, why now, and we're fortunate we have a City Manager and a Planning Director who are honest and forthcoming, and they've given what seems to be a pretty good explanation, "We want to get ahead of the curve on the land use constitutional amendment."

I don't want to go on forever here, you've got a limited time, but I'll just say to you, in the 12-year journey that I've had, trying to bring a department store to these sites, one of the frustrations that I've had is that we don't have a higher limit on what's allowed on these sites.

So, if I were sitting in your position -- and it really is an honor for me to get to see you all, finally. I can see that our community is well served, with some of the high-powered people in the entire county sitting right here in front of me today. Thank you. I would vote yes, but as I said to the City Manager a few minutes ago, my heart is still beating out of my chest, because I don't know what's the plan behind this. The same question that you all started out with, is there some agenda that we're not hearing about? My agenda is, let's

get a department store in there.

Thank you.

MR. BEHAR: Mr. Holmes, I've got a question for you. You say you own a shop that is on Miracle Mile, in front. What type of store is that?

MR. HOLMES: Thank you for asking. I'm going to brag to you for a second. My family, as far as I know, is the oldest property-owning family on Miracle Mile. My grandfather lucked into meeting the founder of the City, who helped him choose which property to buy. We used to own 10 stores. When my mother died, a bunch were sold off. We now own four.

To answer your question, Mr. Behar, I have Massage Envy in my particular location. The stores that I share with my sisters, we have Agonagona, a women's clothing, we have Gables Gyms, and we have a bridal store.

MR. BEHAR: And the reason I'm asking, you said that you are in favor of a department store?

MR. HOLMES: Yeah. I think that what we need to do -- Thanks for asking me. The Village of Merrick Park came here. They

certainly awoke all of us on Miracle Mile as to what we could have done and should have done and didn't do, and they brought in spectacular department stores -- fortunately, high-end department stores, Neiman Marcus, Nordstrom. What a grand-slam home run.

I made it my mission to say, how can Miracle Mile try and keep up with what we could have done and should have done already? And I've talked to every major department store ever since, and I may even have to run for City Commission if I can't get a job with the City that I'm trying to get right now as assistant economic sustainability director. Why? Because Coral Gables -- You all as planners can really appreciate this. We, hopefully, will forever be a small suburb, residential community, where rich people or want-to-be rich people like you and me can raise our children and not be afraid of crime and this and that. So let's keep our main street, Miracle Mile, Low-Rise. That gives the suburban feel that we want our community to remain. But in order to do that, we've got protect our property owners on Miracle Mile from these pressures to build

up, up, up, up, up. How do you do that? Anchor them with a department store.

Ask yourselves right now -- forgive me, thank you for letting me talk -- do you shop on Miracle Mile? The answer might be, "I'd like to, I try to, but I don't really shop there. If I've got to get something quick, I go to Dadeland, I go to a department store," this and that and the other. I want Miracle Mile to be a place where you can say, "Hey, I've got to get some socks." Run down to Miracle Mile, go to the Macy's, that I've talked to for there.

I want it to continue to have the anchor, the power, the attraction that you, sitting there right now, can say, "Well, you know, I don't really shop on Miracle Mile," but you'll say, "Oh, yes, I do, because there's a department store there." I want us to anchor Miracle Mile.

MR. BEHAR: That could be a double-edged sword, because you could kill the small shops that exist there, when you bring a department store. I mean, that's my concern, because there is a charm to Miracle Mile, and if you bring a -- if you brought a big department

d5f40859-f70c-4e6b-9e95-055ee75f40cb

store in, there's a lot of places that may not be able to compete with the department stores.
MR. HOLMES: Well, that's always a concern, but if you look at the history of retail, I mean, the places that took over from the main streets, you know, decades ago, are the malls. Ask your small retail at the malls. They're doing fine. They're paying two, three times the rent of places on Miracle Mile.
So, although I understand your concern, the whole history of retail goes against your concern, because the stores --
CHAIRMAN KORGE: You know, I think we're --
MR. HOLMES: -- the stores that make it, make it malls that are anchored by department stores.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: I think we're kind of straying a little bit --
MR. HOLMES: Yeah, yeah.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: -- from our issue. Do you have anything else to add about the change in land use, at this time? You support it?
MR. HOLMES: Well, I would just do what I think your instincts are. I would say, "I vote yes, but with many caution flags. We're going

to keep watching this."
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. Thank you.
Is anybody else from the public here to speak on this particular application?
None?
Well, we still have a motion on the floor. It's been seconded. Is there any discussion among the Board for that motion, further discussion?
MR. FLANAGAN: We're doing these as a group, all together?
CHAIRMAN KORGE: I'm sorry? Do you want them divided or would you prefer to just do it as a group?
MR. SALMAN: I would do them as a group.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: I'd prefer it as a group, but if there's an objection, I'll --
MR. FLANAGAN: If I'm the only one, then that's fine.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay, we'll do it as a group. Do you have an objection to one particular one you want to express?
MR. FLANAGAN: I'm just having a very hard time with the 200 block of Andalusia.
MR. AIZENSTAT: With which one?

MR. BEHAR: Which one?
MR. FLANAGAN: Property Number 3.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Number three?
MR. FLANAGAN: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Why do you have a problem with that one?
MR. FLANAGAN: It's mid-block, nothing else --
MS. HERNANDEZ: Number 3?
CHAIRMAN KORGE: That's the garage behind the Miracle Theater.
MR. SALMAN: Miracle Theater, right.
MR. FLANAGAN: And then the balance of the block on the west end, which is City property, is included.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, I mean, I have a problem with all of these little holes here, but --
MR. BEHAR: I have a problem with the holes.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: But we're not going to fix that today.
MR. FLANAGAN: But why can't we advertise and come back and include the holes?
MR. AIZENSTAT: Because the people --

MS. HERNANDEZ: You can't force the land use on somebody that, you know --
MR. SALMAN: We can't force it.
MR. FLANAGAN: But we don't know that they --
MR. AIZENSTAT: But they were noticed. We have a Board member that sits with us that is right near this property that was noticed.
MR. RIEL: We sent out over 1,500 notices, a thousand feet of each of these properties.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: I will just note that most people don't pay attention to them, and I think if you follow up -- excuse me, I think if you follow up individually, you'll get a different response from those people --
MR. RIEL: As the Manager indicated, we will do that --
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yeah.
MR. RIEL: -- but, you know, I disagree with you. I did get a lot of calls in the office and did get a lot of questions on this, on these applications.
MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, and you get objections and --
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. Not from the right

people, I guess.
MR. RIEL: Not from the neighboring property owners.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Any more discussion?
Hearing none, we'll call the roll on this motion.
MS. MENENDEZ: Eibi Aizenstat?
MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.
MS. MENENDEZ: Robert Behar?
MR. BEHAR: Yes.
MS. MENENDEZ: Jack Coe?
MR. COE: Yes.
MS. MENENDEZ: Jeff Flanagan?
MR. FLANAGAN: Yes.
MS. MENENDEZ: Javier Salman?
MR. SALMAN: Yes.
MS. MENENDEZ: Tom Korge?
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yes.
MR. RIEL: Your recommendation goes to the Commission at their July 13th meeting.
MR. AIZENSTAT: Eric, let me ask you a question. If any of the property owners that are adjacent here want to come forward now and apply, what type of fee would they have with the City in doing so?

MR. RIEL: A change in land use fee, I believe, is $10,000, and then the advertising, which is another $5,000.
MR. SALMAN: Advertising.
MR. AIZENSTAT: The 10,000 and the 5,000?
MR. RIEL: Yeah. That's basically to cover the cost for the advertising, the notice, staff time and so forth.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: Is it legal to waive those fees, in this circumstance?
MR. RIEL: We have not waived them for private property owners. It sets a really bad precedent.
MR. FLANAGAN: If you do that, where do you start and where do you stop?
MR. AIZENSTAT: If they would have come now, at the same time, how would that have worked?
MR. RIEL: Well, the issue is that the Code only allows two amendment cycles a year, for changes in land use. City-initiated applications aren't subject to that twice a year. So they would have to wait until August.
MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay.
MR. RIEL: In all likelihood, they could go

through the process in advance of Hometown Democracy, however. It's dependent on the application.
MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN KORGE: The next item on the agenda is Application Number 05-10-104-P, Change of Land Use and Change of Zoning for two City-owned applications -- properties.
MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.
MR. BOLYARD: Good evening, Chairman, Members of the Board. For the record, my name is Scot Bolyard, with the Planning Department.
The item before you is for a change of land use and a change of zoning for the property located at 4650 Alhambra Circle. The proposed change of land use is from Residential Use, Single-Family, Low Density, to Parks and Recreation, and the proposed change of zoning is from Single-Family Residential District to Special Use District.
The size of the property is just under half an acre, at .48 acres. The surrounding uses are one and two-story single-family residences. The proposed change of land use and change of zoning are required to provide for the

property's future intended use as a green space or neighborhood park.
The Parks & Recreation Department has agreed to conduct neighborhood meetings with surrounding property owners to present and provide for public input and comments for future development plans at the property.
Staff, based on analysis of the application, recommends approval of the proposed changes, based on the following findings of fact: That the future development of the property will be subject to Zoning Code regulations for S, Special Use District designated properties, which includes, but not limited to, restrictions on setbacks, height, landscaping, and floor area ratio. Any placement of structures on the property requires conditional use public hearing review before the Planning & Zoning Board and City Commission. The application is in compliance with and furthers the goals, objectives and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, and this proposal would provide for the redevelopment of vacant land to allow for future development as a green space or neighborhood park.

d5f40859-f70c-4e6b-9e95-055ee75f40cb