

57

1 two members of the Board who have some
2 expertise are both in favor of it, so
3 that makes me think that that's
4 something I really want to look at.
5 CHAIRMAN KORGE: That's a good
6 suggestion, but before we move any
7 further, is there anybody from the
8 public who signed up to speak on this?
9 MS. MENENDEZ: No.
10 CHAIRMAN KORGE: No. Okay.
11 MR. RIEL: So, just so we're clear,
12 the intention, the way we intended to
13 write this, was that all parking spaces,
14 the maximum percentage was based upon
15 here -- above, required, and additional.
16 I just want to make sure that -- that's
17 what the intent was of these
18 regulations.
19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Say that again?
20 MR. SALMAN: Read it to me in
21 English.
22 MR. RIEL: All parking spaces, no
23 matter what an applicant or developer
24 provides on the property, shall be
25 subject to these percentages.

58

1 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Whether it's
2 required or excess.
3 MR. RIEL: Exactly.
4 MS. MORENO: Yeah. I think all you
5 need to say is, "can be installed," and
6 take out the words, "counted as required
7 parking spaces."
8 MR. RIEL: Okay.
9 MS. MORENO: I'll B, "provided that
10 all of the following are satisfied."
11 MR. RIEL: And it's subject to
12 coming back with additional information
13 regarding those spaces above and beyond
14 the Code, in terms of percentages.
15 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay.
16 MR. RIEL: We're clear.
17 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. Is there a
18 motion, then?
19 MR. SALMAN: So moved.
20 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So moved. Is
21 there a second?
22 MS. MORENO: Seconded.
23 CHAIRMAN KORGE: There's a second.
24 Is there any more discussion on this?
25 We've been moved and seconded.

59

1 No discussion. Let's call the
2 roll, please.
3 MS. MENENDEZ: Javier Salman?
4 Javier Salman?
5 MR. SALMAN: Yes.
6 MS. MENENDEZ: Eibi Aizenstat?
7 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.
8 MS. MENENDEZ: Robert Behar?
9 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
10 MS. MENENDEZ: Jack Coe?
11 MR. COE: Yes.
12 MS. MENENDEZ: Pat Keon?
13 MS. KEON: Yes.
14 MS. MENENDEZ: Tom Korge?
15 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yes.
16 MS. MENENDEZ: Cristina Moreno?
17 MS. MORENO: Yes.
18 (Thereupon, Mr. Behar left.)
19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. The last
20 item is Application Number 02-07-455-P,
21 Change of Land Use, Rezoning and Site
22 Plan Review for the project known as
23 2600 LeJeune Office Building.
24 MR. CARLSON: Good evening. Yes,
25 the last item before you this evening is

60

1 the 2600 LeJeune Office Building.
2 Before I begin my brief PowerPoint
3 presentation, I'd like to point out that
4 you do have updated written comments
5 before you. They are the blue sheets
6 which are at your stations. They
7 include the most current, up-to-date
8 written comments which have been
9 submitted to the City.
10 I do have a --
11 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Before we begin,
12 let me just reflect, in the record,
13 again, that Mr. Behar has recused
14 himself and has left the meeting.
15 Go ahead.
16 MR. CARLSON: Okay, the -- if the
17 people upstairs could put on my
18 PowerPoint presentation, I'd appreciate
19 it.
20 Thank you very much.
21 The applicant is making three
22 requests, which are required to allow
23 this project to proceed forward. The
24 first request they're making is a change
25 of land use from Commercial Use, Low-

61

1 Rise Intensity, to Commercial Use, High-
2 Rise Intensity. The second is a change
3 of zoning from MFSA, which is
4 Multi-Family Special area to C,
5 Commercial, and the third and final
6 request they're making is site plan
7 review of a proposed ten-story-high
8 commercial office project.

9 The change of land use is required
10 to allow the construction of the
11 proposed project.

12 The change of zoning is necessary
13 to correct the existing inconsistent
14 residential zoning to be in compliance
15 with the property's commercial land use
16 designation.

17 And finally, the site plan must be
18 submitted with every zoning application
19 that's submitted to the City.

20 The recommendation. The Planning
21 Department is recommending denial of
22 both the change of land use and site
23 plan for the proposed ten-story
24 commercial office project. However, the
25 Planning Department recommends approval

62

1 of the change of zoning, which would
2 correct the existing inconsistent
3 residential zoning to be in compliance
4 with the commercial land use
5 designation.

6 A little bit of background. The
7 property is located adjacent to the
8 Church of Christian Science complex,
9 which has been identified as a candidate
10 for historic designation. The property
11 is located within the MFSA District
12 boundaries. That district was created
13 with the intent of lowering development
14 within that district. Two-story
15 apartment buildings and a surface
16 parking lot are currently located on the
17 property -- currently occupy the
18 property, and as I previously mentioned,
19 the existing residential zoning is
20 inconsistent.

21 As described in the Staff Report
22 which is provided in your package, there
23 are inconsistencies and
24 incompatibilities with specific
25 Comprehensive Plan objectives and

63

1 policies, which prompts Staff not to
2 support the requested change in land use
3 and site plan.

4 Those concerns include:

5 An incompatible land use with the
6 existing residential property.

7 There lacks a transition between
8 the proposed high-rise commercial
9 project and the existing low-rise
10 residential uses.

11 It establishes a precedent.

12 This would introduce high-rise
13 development within the MFSA District.

14 It is inconsistent with the City
15 Hall setting, which is a low-rise scale
16 and of historic character.

17 Required traffic improvements which
18 have been identified by the Public Works
19 Department, more specifically, at the
20 intersection of Hernando Street and
21 Biltmore Way, have not been addressed.

22 Insufficient landscape
23 improvements -- there exist insufficient
24 landscape improvements, specifically
25 along the north side of Valencia Avenue.

64

1 And finally, historic preservation.
2 This project abuts -- is directly
3 adjacent to the church building and
4 complex.

5 Staff found that the request for
6 change of zoning satisfies the Zoning
7 Code standards for review. It would
8 correct an inconsistent -- existing
9 inconsistent zoning designation. It
10 would provide for the redevelopment of
11 an underdeveloped property, and it would
12 promote and is consistent with some
13 Comprehensive Plan objectives and
14 policies.

15 Staff also found that the request
16 for change of land use does not satisfy
17 Zoning Code standards for review. It is
18 inconsistent, as I specifically said,
19 with specific Comprehensive Plan
20 objectives and policies. It is
21 incompatible with the adjacent
22 residential properties. Insufficient
23 streetscape and traffic improvements are
24 provided, and it would impact the
25 adjoining church complex and historic

65

1 City Hall setting.

2 It is Staff's recommendation that
3 the property be developed according to
4 the existing Commercial Use, Low-Rise
5 Intensity land use, which would allow
6 for a maximum of 77 foot high building
7 height, which would be more compatible
8 with the surrounding properties and
9 uses.

10 In summary, the findings of facts
11 are that the proposed project is not
12 consistent with specific goals,
13 objectives and policies of the City's
14 Comprehensive Plan.

15 The proposed project does not
16 satisfy all Zoning Code standards for
17 Comprehensive Plan map amendments.

18 Proposed height and massing of the
19 project would have an adverse effect on
20 adjacent residential properties and
21 surrounding historic structures and
22 their settings.

23 Requested development bonuses could
24 not be awarded for this project if
25 developed according to the property's

66

1 current MFSA zoning designation.

2 Required traffic improvements are
3 identified that have not been addressed.

4 But, however, the proposed change
5 of zoning would correct an existing
6 inconsistent zoning designation, again
7 to be compatible with the property's
8 current commercial land use designation.

9 In summary, the Planning Department
10 recommends denial of the request for a
11 change of land use and proposed site
12 plan. However, if the Board should
13 choose to support it, an alternative
14 recommendation and conditions of
15 approval are included in the Staff's
16 report for your consideration.

17 Thank you.

18 MS. MORENO: I have some questions.

19 MR. CARLSON: Yes.

20 MR. COE: I have a lot of questions.

21 MR. RIEL: Before you answer the
22 questions, let me just go through the
23 3-D model we typically do.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah, that's good.

25 MR. RIEL: As Staff always does,

67

1 we've prepared a 3-D model, just to kind
2 of orient folks.

3 This is Biltmore Way, City Hall,
4 427, Merrick Park. This is the subject
5 property, right here. This is where the
6 Publix is located, and then this is
7 Miracle Mile.

8 I'm just going to kind of reiterate
9 some of Walter's -- some of the points
10 that he pointed out in Staff's
11 recommendation.

12 Staff is of the opinion that
13 this -- the project scale as proposed
14 right here, I believe, is 117 feet in
15 height. In terms of massing and height,
16 it does not provide a transition between
17 land uses. What I mean by that is the
18 transition of land uses, where you have
19 the single-family, which is noted in the
20 yellow color here, and you have the
21 multi-family development.

22 You see there's really -- although
23 we didn't put these -- development to
24 the north of Biltmore Way, all of these
25 properties are about 35 to 45 feet in

68

1 height. Nowhere on LeJeune Road until
2 you get to Bird, with only one
3 exception, in front of the Youth
4 Center -- I can't think of the building
5 right there -- that's five or six
6 stories in height, but nowhere along
7 LeJeune Road do you see that jump in
8 height, across LeJeune Road as well as
9 down here.

10 Let me just kind of go ahead and
11 pan around. This is the proposed
12 Bacardi -- previous Burger King
13 building.

14 Staff is basically of the opinion
15 that this sets a precedent for high-rise
16 properties jumping across LeJeune Road,
17 in addition to the fact that you have
18 the adjoining church, which you'll see
19 as I pan around here -- it has kind of a
20 pinkish color -- that has low-rise
21 zoning, as well, which allows four to
22 six.

23 This is obviously the Merrick Park,
24 which nothing will be constructed on,
25 then you have kind of the City Hall

69

1 complex.
 2 We're of the opinion that the
 3 low-rise commercial is the appropriate
 4 use for the property, four to six
 5 stories in height with Mediterranean
 6 bonuses, and therefore, that's why we're
 7 supporting the recommendation for the
 8 change in zoning, to make the land use
 9 and zoning consistent, and if the Board
 10 goes in that direction, obviously, and
 11 we suggest you go in that direction,
 12 they would only need to come back as a
 13 by-right review and go to the Board of
 14 Architects if they construct the
 15 building within the parameters of the
 16 Code.
 17 Obviously, if they do a mixed-use
 18 building or some other type of use that
 19 requires a conditional use, it will come
 20 back to this Board.
 21 CHAIRMAN KORGE: How would that
 22 affect the residential -- the current
 23 residential use and any redevelopment of
 24 this residential use?
 25 MR. RIEL: Well, the MFSA District,

70

1 which is this district right here,
 2 allows 60 to 70 feet in height. That's
 3 what the zoning allows. 77 feet is
 4 allowed on this parcel with the
 5 commercial low-rise land use and the
 6 commercial zoning. Staff recommended
 7 the commercial zoning instead of the
 8 commercial limited, because the
 9 commercial limited has very limited in
 10 terms of the height restrictions
 11 adjoining residential.
 12 MS. MORENO: Why is that commercial
 13 and not multi-family?
 14 MR. RIEL: I don't know the answer
 15 to that.
 16 MS. MORENO: Is there any other
 17 property except on Miracle Mile and
 18 Biltmore Way -- on Coral Way and on
 19 Biltmore Way that is commercial, west of
 20 LeJeune?
 21 MR. RIEL: There's this building
 22 right across the street here, this one
 23 right here, the four-story --
 24 MS. MORENO: Right.
 25 MR. RIEL: -- curved one, that

71

1 one is actually -- that's commercial
 2 limited, and the reason being -- it's
 3 right here. The reason it's commercial
 4 limited is because it has single-family
 5 adjacent to it.
 6 MS. MORENO: That's the 401 Miracle
 7 Mile building?
 8 MR. RIEL: Yes.
 9 MS. MORENO: Right, but other than
 10 on Miracle Mile, other than on Coral Way
 11 and Biltmore Way, is there any other
 12 commercial building on LeJeune?
 13 MR. RIEL: No, not -- I mean, and
 14 I'm trying to get down there.
 15 MS. MORENO: There's that Jaycee
 16 Building.
 17 MR. RIEL: JCI building, yes.
 18 MS. MORENO: Right.
 19 MR. RIEL: JCI, which is right
 20 here.
 21 MS. MORENO: Everything else is
 22 either the church or residential, et
 23 cetera.
 24 MR. RIEL: It's duplex. The only
 25 properties that are commercial, with the

72

1 exception of JCI, is this parcel, as
 2 well as the church parcel, on LeJeune
 3 Road, west of LeJeune Road.
 4 CHAIRMAN KORGE: All the others, I
 5 guess that would be --
 6 MS. MORENO: Everything else is
 7 residential.
 8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Everything else
 9 south is zoned residential on --
 10 MR. RIEL: Yes.
 11 CHAIRMAN KORGE: -- the west side
 12 of LeJeune?
 13 MR. RIEL: Yes.
 14 MS. MORENO: And everything north.
 15 MR. RIEL: Well, you have Biltmore
 16 Way, which has high-rise.
 17 MS. MORENO: Right. Other than
 18 Biltmore Way and Coral Way.
 19 MR. RIEL: Right, and the 401
 20 Building.
 21 MS. MORENO: Which is on Coral Way.
 22 MR. RIEL: Yeah. Well, no, it's
 23 right here.
 24 MS. MORENO: Well, it's --
 25 MR. RIEL: Yeah, it's on Coral Way,

73

1 I'm sorry.
 2 MS. MORENO: That's on Coral Way.
 3 MR. RIEL: Yes.
 4 MS. MORENO: I frankly am not
 5 prepared to support changing it from
 6 residential to commercial. Everything
 7 west of LeJeune is residential. Why am
 8 I putting commercial on those poor
 9 people who live just west of that
 10 building?
 11 MR. RIEL: And Staff, obviously,
 12 when we do recommendations to the Board,
 13 we do a lot of analysis. You know, I
 14 can tell you, I personally went out to
 15 the property a number of times. Given
 16 the fact that you have high-rise across
 17 LeJeune, you know, and it allows 70 feet
 18 in multi-family, anyway, I felt that 77
 19 feet, you know, in terms of --
 20 MS. MORENO: I'm happy for them to
 21 have the feet in multi-family, but --
 22 MR. AIZENSTAT: But it's on
 23 LeJeune.
 24 MS. MORENO: LeJeune has been a
 25 bright line separating the commercial

74

1 from the residential, and you're
 2 allowing commercial now to encroach on
 3 the residential aspects of LeJeune.
 4 That is our most sacred part of our
 5 community, making that -- keeping that
 6 residential aspect west of LeJeune.
 7 And as I said, there's nothing
 8 commercial except those, you know, few
 9 buildings on Coral Way and on Biltmore
 10 Way, and then that Jaycee building,
 11 which is an anomaly, because of a
 12 specific desire to bring the Jaycees
 13 International there. Everything else
 14 has remained residential, historically.
 15 I really am concerned about changing
 16 that. It's -- that street has been like
 17 a barrier between our commercial and our
 18 residential.
 19 MR. AIZENSTAT: Which street are
 20 you talking about?
 21 MS. MORENO: LeJeune.
 22 MR. RIEL: LeJeune. You know,
 23 Staff, when we've gone through -- we did
 24 the incompatible land use changes for
 25 the public properties. Pretty much,

75

1 Staff has used the Comp Plan as a
 2 guiding in terms of the appropriate land
 3 use on the property. Although I might
 4 agree that, you know, it should be
 5 multi-family and might have less impact,
 6 I just feel commercial is appropriate,
 7 given the land use in this location.
 8 MR. AIZENSTAT: I would suggest --
 9 MS. MORENO: Well, but we can
 10 change the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
 11 MR. RIEL: You can absolutely do
 12 that. Absolutely, you can. Absolutely.
 13 MR. AIZENSTAT: See, for me, I
 14 mean, I'd rather Eric finish his
 15 presentation and --
 16 MR. RIEL: I'm finished. I'm
 17 finished.
 18 MR. AIZENSTAT: Oh, you're
 19 finished. Okay.
 20 MR. RIEL: Yes.
 21 MR. AIZENSTAT: Then let the next
 22 side also do their presentation and
 23 see --
 24 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Would the
 25 applicant like to make a presentation at

76

1 this time?
 2 MS. RUSSO: Good evening,
 3 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. For
 4 the record, Laura Russo, with offices at
 5 2655 LeJeune Road. I am here this
 6 evening representing Valencia Investors,
 7 LLC, the owner of the subject property,
 8 and here this evening on behalf of
 9 Valencia Investors is Otto Boudet
 10 Murias, and I am here with the
 11 architects, Javier Font and Patrick
 12 Valent, of Behar Font, and what I'd like
 13 to do before I address Staff's
 14 recommendation, you know, Staff's
 15 report -- needless to say, we
 16 respectfully disagree with some of
 17 Staff's recommendations and conditions,
 18 and what we'd like to do is, I'd like to
 19 have the architects take you through the
 20 project quickly, just to give you an
 21 idea of what we're talking about and
 22 what the project is about, and then
 23 address the six issues that Staff has
 24 placed with respect to the three
 25 applications, the change in land use,

77

1 the change in zoning and the site plan
2 approval.
3 Patrick?
4 MR. VALENT: Can you all see this,
5 the site plan?
6 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.
7 MR. VALENT: Can you hear me okay
8 without a mike? Perfect. I'm going to
9 take a few minutes. I'm Patrick Valent,
10 with Behar, Font & Partners, and --
11 MS. RUSSO: Hold on, we need the mike.
12 MR. VALENT: I could speak loudly,
13 if you want.
14 MR. RIEL: No, you're going to
15 need the -- to get on the record --
16 CHAIRMAN KORGE: For the TV.
17 MR. RIEL: -- you're going to need
18 to speak through that mike.
19 MR. VALENT: Patrick Valent, with
20 Behar, Font & Partners.
21 I just want to take a few minutes
22 to walk you through some of the key
23 elements of the architecture here,
24 starting with the site plan here.
25 As you can see from the site plan

78

1 here, we're basically wrapping the
2 LeJeune and Valencia side with arcades,
3 and we've taken the Valencia side down
4 from two curb cuts to one curb cut, and
5 basically, we've been focusing a lot of
6 our efforts on the pedestrian side here.
7 So, basically, we have the main focal
8 point on the Valencia/LeJeune side,
9 that's where the main entrance point is,
10 and we have arcades.
11 As you can see here, we have the
12 arcade --
13 MR. RIEL: I think you're going to
14 have to move the stuff, because I'm not
15 sure folks at home watching this, it's
16 being picked up.
17 MR. VALENT: How's that? Is that
18 better?
19 MR. RIEL: Here we go.
20 MR. AIZENSTAT: Oh, they found it. They
21 found it.
22 MR. VALENT: Patrick Valent, with
23 Behar, Font & Partners.
24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Is it off?
25 MR. COE: You need to turn the mike

79

1 on.
2 MS. ALFONSO RUIZ: The bottom.
3 MR. AIZENSTAT: Just tap it. It's
4 on.
5 MR. COE: Laura's a high-priced
6 technician.
7 MR. VALENT: Better now? Okay.
8 Let me just walk you through some
9 of the key points here when we designed
10 the project. We have arcades that wrap
11 along Valencia and LeJeune, and we've
12 taken those arcades and wrapped them all
13 the way around towards the church site.
14 We've had several meetings with the
15 church group, and this was a result of
16 those meetings, and the plans you have
17 in front of you are the final result of
18 those meetings.
19 Also, it is important to note that
20 we have Board of Architects' approval,
21 Mediterranean approval, DRC. We've gone
22 through several rounds with the City
23 Staff.
24 So, basically, this is the end
25 result here, and as I mentioned, we've

80

1 reduced the project on Valencia from two
2 curb cuts to one curb cut, and we've
3 wrapped the arcade on all three sides.
4 Put the elevation up here, Javier.
5 Another key element that we want to
6 point out here is -- as there was a lot
7 of talk about, you know, how the
8 transition is being made between the
9 residential and the various sides, all
10 four facades have a transition and have
11 a step-back. So we didn't just do the
12 step-back on the Valencia or LeJeune
13 side; we also did a step-back on the
14 church side and on the alley side. So,
15 if you look at the various elevations,
16 all four elevations, you'll see that
17 step-back.
18 So we transitioned from the arcade
19 and the pedestrian pedestal level, which
20 is about 45 to 50 feet, and then we
21 stepped back approximately 10 to 15
22 feet, depending on which facade, and
23 that creates an even better transition.
24 So, basically, you know, that's how
25 we're transitioning from the residential

81

1 to the commercial development.

2 Aside from that, there was some
3 comments that we noticed on the
4 streetscape plan. We have met with the
5 Planning -- I'm sorry, with the Public
6 Service departments. We have addressed
7 the streetscape along Valencia, and
8 there was a quite a bit of discussion
9 about whether that streetscape should go
10 along -- across the street or should it
11 go to the west, so --

12 MR. AIZENSTAT: That was actually
13 my -- Isn't that a public parking garage
14 or something? What's in back of the
15 building?

16 MR. VALENT: Right here?

17 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah.

18 MR. VALENT: That's a public
19 parking lot.

20 MS. RUSSO: It's the City's surface
21 parking lot. It's a --

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: Why did you not
23 extend the off-street to that?

24 MR. VALENT: It was basically -- we
25 know that we had to have further

82

1 discussion on whether -- it was asked to
2 go to the south, and we weren't sure
3 that was the right thing to do, because
4 right now there's quite a few curb cuts
5 on the existing properties.

6 MS. RUSSO: We're willing to do
7 either.

8 MR. VALENT: Right.

9 MS. RUSSO: And I think part of it
10 was, did it make more sense to go west
11 and continue or --

12 MR. AIZENSTAT: I mean, one thing
13 for me would be to go -- I'm sorry to
14 interrupt you.

15 MS. RUSSO: Uh-huh.

16 MR. VALENT: No, that's okay.

17 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- would be
18 actually to go back into the surface
19 parking lot.

20 MS. RUSSO: To go west, on the
21 north side, versus just south on that
22 side.

23 MR. VALENT: We actually suggested
24 that to Staff, and they were agreeable.
25 We met with Alberto Delgado, Public

83

1 Works, and the Public Services, and they
2 said another meeting would be necessary
3 to finalize that. We're willing to go
4 either way, to the south or to the west,
5 so either way works for us.

6 And as I mentioned, we did have
7 quite a few meetings with the group from
8 the church. There was quite a bit of
9 discussion on that transitional area,
10 the alley to the rear, so much so that
11 one of the previous submittals actually
12 had a courtyard that was located within
13 this little alley place; it was improved
14 with fountains and water features and
15 whatnot. At the very end, it was taken
16 out. There was discussions on whether
17 that would be the right place for a
18 courtyard, with loitering or whatever,
19 so the final result of those meetings is
20 in your package. That went back to the
21 Board of Architects and received
22 approval. So this site plan and floor
23 plan you have is a result of quite a few
24 meetings with the church group.

25 And that's basically it, to wrap

84

1 up. We're going to talk a little bit
2 more about the transitional, the
3 comments on setting precedents and on
4 the transition, and we have some other
5 boards we're going to present on that,
6 as well.

7 MS. RUSSO: And what I'd like to do
8 is take the comments in reverse order
9 and start with the historic
10 preservation.

11 As Patrick told you, we did meet
12 with the church members. We met with
13 church representatives. But we also met
14 with the City's Historic Preservation
15 Department, as we were in the midst of
16 coming up with the design of this
17 building, to see what were some of the
18 issues that the Historic Preservation
19 officer and Department had, because the
20 historic or the actual -- originally,
21 the only building on the church that is
22 targeted for designation is the building
23 immediately to the north, which is a
24 rectangular building. It seems now that
25 perhaps the other buildings that are on

85

1 there now, the church reading room, and
2 what I would call the Neoclassical
3 building on Biltmore, too, may also be
4 eligible for historic preservation.

5 So we met with Kara Kautz and with
6 Simone Chin, listened to some of their
7 concerns and issues, implemented that
8 into the design, but at no point were we
9 ever asked to come back to the
10 Department, nor were we asked to go back
11 to the Historic Preservation Board, so I
12 find that comment a little disingenuous.
13 It's almost like saying you didn't do
14 something, but we weren't asked to do
15 it, and we met with the property owners
16 to the north, but we would be more than
17 happy to, you know, take these plans and
18 present them.

19 With respect to Number 5, the
20 insufficient streetscape improvements,
21 as Patrick indicated to you before, from
22 Day One, I advised the client and Staff
23 advised the client that there's always
24 additional streetscape, whether it's
25 done across the street or whether it's

86

1 done to the west. When you're coming in
2 for a change in land use, change in
3 zoning, you're going to have to do more
4 than just your side of the property.

5 The big issue here was not that we
6 didn't want to do it, but what made more
7 sense, to extend it across the City
8 surface parking lot up to the Laroc, you
9 know, or to do it across the street, or
10 to do some combination -- excuse me,
11 some combination of both.

12 On the south side, as you know, on
13 the corner immediately south, is a
14 condominium building, with certain curb
15 cuts already established. It is a
16 condominium building. It probably won't
17 be redeveloped for decades.

18 To the west of that are a couple of
19 older, lower rise -- two-story older
20 apartment buildings that also have curb
21 cuts. So we thought, if the City wanted
22 us to do the south side, we would, but
23 we know we're going to do the south or
24 the west, so it's not that we don't want
25 to do it: we just don't know which ones.

87

1 So, with respect to Number 5, we're more
2 than happy to do any additional
3 streetscape improvement.

4 With respect to Number 4, required
5 traffic improvements, as part of the
6 submittal to this project, we submitted
7 a traffic report. After that report was
8 reviewed by Public Works, there were
9 three issues that were raised. Our
10 traffic engineer, who is here,
11 Mr. Richard Garcia, addressed them in a
12 technical memo to Alberto Delgado, who
13 was fine with all but one of the issues.
14 We went and did even more research, and
15 it has to do with the intersection at
16 Biltmore and Hernando, and it turns out
17 that the actual traffic impact of the
18 additional square footage is minor. I
19 think it's nine seconds and .3 seconds
20 at your peak periods.

21 What you have currently is
22 apparently not the best designed street,
23 on Hernando and Biltmore, in the
24 intersection, but the impact of our
25 request is minimal to that intersection.

88

1 With respect to Number 3,
2 inconsistency with the City Hall
3 setting, I respectfully disagree with
4 Staff, and I disagree because when you
5 look at the land use -- and I'm going to
6 ask Patrick to put a land use map up --
7 which is what we're talking about here,
8 the City Hall has high-rise land use
9 immediately to the west of it, and if
10 you look in your packets, you have the
11 land use map, and it's the map with all
12 the colors. What we call the brown
13 building and blue building, if you
14 recall, the City bought the blue
15 building. The blue sits on high-rise
16 and the brown building sits on high-rise
17 land use now. Right now, the City owns
18 it, but if the City found itself in a
19 need to sell the blue building, and the
20 person who owned the brown building
21 bought it, or somebody else in the
22 future came, until that land use is
23 changed, the City is sitting surrounded
24 by high-rise.

25 What the City also didn't put in

89

1 their Staff Report is that on our block,
2 the block that has the church on the
3 northeast corner, our property is on
4 the -- I'm sorry -- yes -- well, the
5 intersection, the north corner -- we're
6 on the south. We have the Laroc, which
7 is a high-rise, 13-story condominium,
8 residential condominium building, on the
9 corner of Valencia and Hernando, and to
10 the north of that, which most of you --
11 I think it's a strip of stores, the
12 Design Store, and there's a Roche
13 Bobois, et cetera, that's all high-rise
14 land use, and then if you continue to
15 the west, you have high-rise land use.

16 And so, you know, with all due
17 respect to Staff, I argue that we're not
18 setting the precedent. The precedent
19 was set with the Laroc, in terms of the
20 height, and at that time, when it was
21 done, in the '80s, the entire strip,
22 Valencia to the north, was all
23 site-specific high-rise, 150 feet, all
24 the way past the David William, and so
25 on our block, that pattern of

90

1 development has already been set with
2 the 13-story high-rise. So we're not
3 adding a high-rise to our block: that
4 high-rise already sits there.

5 So whether this building is there
6 or not, the Laroc is a condominium, it's
7 not a single-owned building, so it's not
8 going to go anywhere for the longest
9 time, and it's actually in -- further
10 in, toward the west, where you would
11 think you would want less development,
12 less height and less intensity.

13 I argue that our location on
14 LeJeune, where you have approximately
15 42,000 cars trafficking on a daily
16 basis -- about 22,000 go northbound,
17 about 20,000 go southbound on a given
18 day -- that that particular corner,
19 which to the east has the Publix, and
20 for those of you -- you see that Publix
21 is a high-rise land use site, but it has
22 as-of-right development for 16 stories.

23 The property immediately to the
24 south of that is developed as a
25 high-rise for 13 stories, and the

91

1 property to the south of us is currently
2 nonconforming. It does not meet the
3 MFSA, and it is a condominium, so it's
4 not going anywhere, and it is a
5 condominium building at four stories,
6 which I believe serves as the buffer.
7 You have -- Valencia is actually the
8 true buffer, and then from Valencia
9 south, you have your higher intensity or
10 your higher density, and you have an
11 alley, and then to the south of the
12 alley you have your single-family.

13 So it's actually serving as -- the
14 buffer is Valencia, the south side of
15 Valencia, and then your single-family,
16 which is south of the alley, that
17 bifurcates on an east-west basis.

18 MR. AIZENSTAT: Is it single -- I'm
19 sorry to interrupt you. Is it
20 single-family or is it duplex zoned?

21 MR. COE: Multi.

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: I thought that
23 was --

24 MS. RUSSO: On that -- Well, what
25 becomes on the north side of -- if you

92

1 were looking -- I don't know if you
2 have it in front of you, if you have --

3 MR. VALENT: We have a board here.

4 MR. AIZENSTAT: No, I'm talking
5 about --

6 MR. VALENT: North?

7 MS. RUSSO: Look at Valencia. On
8 the south side of Valencia, you have
9 MFSA zoning and it's residential, low
10 density.

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.

12 MS. RUSSO: Then you have an alley
13 that runs perpendicular to LeJeune that
14 bifurcates the block, and to the south
15 of the alley, facing -- which I believe
16 is what, Sevilla? On the north side of
17 Sevilla are single-family.

18 MR. AIZENSTAT: Those yellow --

19 That looks like low density to me. Am I
20 wrong? I'm looking at this.

21 MR. COE: That's low density.

22 MS. RUSSO: Yes, but I'm saying to
23 you -- This is our property.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.

25 MS. RUSSO: I'm saying, this is the

93

1 actual transition.
 2 MR. AIZENSTAT: Understood.
 3 MS. RUSSO: These properties are
 4 low-density. They form -- and this one
 5 here on the corner is nonconforming and
 6 won't change any time soon.
 7 You then have -- these properties
 8 are allowed to go 35 feet --
 9 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.
 10 MS. RUSSO: -- because they're
 11 adjacent to the single-family. They're
 12 separated by an alley.
 13 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right, but --
 14 MS. RUSSO: So the transition --
 15 and these are single-family, the yellow
 16 is.
 17 MR. AIZENSTAT: Is it single-family
 18 or is the yellow low-density?
 19 MS. RUSSO: The yellow is single-
 20 family.
 21 MR. CARLSON: It's low-density,
 22 multi-family.
 23 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.
 24 MS. RUSSO: The yellow?
 25 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

94

1 MR. CARLSON: Well, the yellow, the
 2 light yellow, which is on the south side
 3 of Valencia, is low-density
 4 multi-family.
 5 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right. That --
 6 MS. RUSSO: Okay.
 7 MR. AIZENSTAT: That's what I'm
 8 saying. So you're actually going
 9 through even a further --
 10 MS. RUSSO: So it's the light
 11 yellow versus the yellow yellow for
 12 single-family.
 13 MR. VALENT: That's your first
 14 buffer, is the multi-family, then it
 15 gets into single-family.
 16 MR. AIZENSTAT: That's what I'm
 17 saying, I mean, so your building up here
 18 buffers as you go along.
 19 MR. VALENT: Exactly. That's what
 20 this exhibit is meant to show you. We
 21 basically were showing this east-west
 22 corridor here, showing the precedence or
 23 the line is already created, and then we
 24 put the blocks in. You can see we
 25 inserted in the maximum height you could

95

1 go with multi-family.
 2 MR. AIZENSTAT: I mean, as far as
 3 the buffer, I mean, I do agree that
 4 Valencia should be it, not the alley
 5 that is between the church and --
 6 between the church and the property. In
 7 other words, there's an alley that runs
 8 between the church and the property.
 9 MS. RUSSO: And that alley was
 10 vacated in the '60s.
 11 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right, but --
 12 MS. RUSSO: Right. There used to
 13 be an alley that ran --
 14 MR. AIZENSTAT: That's not a good
 15 buffer --
 16 MR. VALENT: You're talking about
 17 this alley here.
 18 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- to use that.
 19 Right. That's not a good buffer.
 20 MR. CARLSON: There's no alley now.
 21 MS. KEON: There's no alley anymore.
 22 MR. AIZENSTAT: It's been vacated.
 23 MS. RUSSO: It's been vacated up
 24 to -- Show them to where.
 25 Basically, the alley --

96

1 MR. VALENT: To this point, right
 2 here.
 3 MS. RUSSO: And then it runs south.
 4 MR. VALENT: It turns right here
 5 and goes like that.
 6 MS. RUSSO: So that --
 7 MR. AIZENSTAT: It's still an open
 8 space.
 9 MS. RUSSO: What used to be and
 10 what visually --
 11 MR. VALENT: It is. It's not
 12 developed.
 13 MS. RUSSO: -- looks like an alley,
 14 is actually church property.
 15 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay, because it's
 16 an open space to me, and to me, that
 17 should not be used as a buffer line
 18 between, let's say, your property and
 19 the church. If you're going to use a
 20 buffer line, it should be more Valencia,
 21 that runs -- as opposed to that alley.
 22 MR. VALENT: Well, basically, we --
 23 That was one of the reasons why, as I
 24 mentioned, we stepped back the building
 25 there. We really didn't want to have a

97

1 wall there, and that's what we did. It
2 just wasn't appropriate to do a solid
3 wall. We see some -- the Laroc, for
4 instance. We really wanted to bring
5 this in. You can see the buffer here.
6 It's even greater on that side than it
7 is on the Valencia side.

8 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right. I see that
9 you stepped it up, too.

10 MR. VALENT: Well, you can see that
11 it's quite -- quite extensive on the
12 north side there, and we felt that it
13 was appropriate to do it on the north
14 and on the west side, because that
15 abuts, you know, that residential side.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: It -- I don't know,
17 is the City-owned parking lot -- what's
18 that zoned? Is that --

19 MR. CARLSON: That has MFSA zoning,
20 as well, and the land use designation is
21 multi-family, medium-density.

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay. I'm sorry to
23 interrupt.

24 MS. RUSSO: So, currently,
25 incompatible use and land use

98

1 designation, because it's being used
2 for, you know, City purposes and it's
3 being used for commercial parking for
4 both City Hall and for the -- you know,
5 the areas -- for the commerces, you
6 know, the businesses in the area.

7 MR. VALENT: If I could just finish
8 that point one more time. I think your
9 point was very well made, that we feel
10 that the precedence is already set
11 there. You have the David William, you
12 have Laroc. You have -- as you can see
13 from this aerial, which we didn't
14 create; that's existing. That line of
15 tall buildings is already created there.
16 Then beyond that, you have multi-family
17 to the south and then you have
18 single-family. So we feel that we
19 transition, and it's important to note
20 that we're not going high-rise in the
21 sense of 190 feet. We're not asking for
22 190 feet. We've come down significantly
23 from 190. 117 is mentioned. So it
24 transitions from the high-rise, 190, to
25 our 117, to 45.

99

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: Laroc is how tall?

2 MR. VALENT: We believe
3 approximately 140 to 150 feet.

4 MS. RUSSO: It was built with 13
5 stories prior to the days of
6 Mediterranean, when the height of a
7 high-rise building was 150 feet.

8 MR. VALENT: But more importantly,
9 it goes straight up, too. I think it's
10 important to note the shape of the
11 Laroc. It really -- it just goes
12 straight up. There are no vertical
13 breaks.

14 So we have a lower height and quite
15 a few -- actually two levels of vertical
16 breaks in these facades.

17 MS. RUSSO: And in the concurrency
18 review, what you have here is property
19 with an existing land use designation of
20 commercial, so the request to go to
21 high-rise is to add extra square footage
22 to the property, and in the concurrency
23 review, which is your level of services,
24 whether your water, your sewer, your
25 traffic -- there are -- you know,

100

1 basically, all levels of services are
2 okay with the additional building, the
3 additional stories, you know, the
4 ten-story request that we're making.

5 You know, traffic, which everyone
6 perceives, but the traffic that is being
7 generated and the difference between the
8 low-rise and what we're requesting as a
9 ten-story, 117 building, is minimal.
10 And so we -- excuse me.

11 (Inaudible comments)

12 MS. RUSSO: Show -- Another point
13 is that this basically is sort of the
14 terminus of Miracle Mile. There was a
15 comment, you have the 401, which is at
16 the end of Miracle Mile, across the
17 street. You have this property.

18 MR. VALENT: Right in here. See,
19 coming right here. That's the
20 commercial district, at the end there.
21 We definitely think that it will really
22 help Miracle Mile, help the businesses.
23 This type of element is appropriate.

24 MS. RUSSO: Right, and while the
25 church property is currently being used

101

1 as a church, it does have also the
2 commercial land use designation, and at
3 some time in the -- you know, in the
4 future, which is the whole purpose of
5 the land use designation, is for future
6 development, it will at some point be a
7 commercial developed property.

8 So, based on the foregoing, we
9 respectfully request the change in land
10 use, which would allow the ten-story
11 building that we're requesting, the
12 change in zoning, which would correct
13 the incompatibility, which would match
14 the zoning to the land use, and site
15 plan approval, which would keep the
16 project at the requested 10 stories and
17 117 feet. So, although it would be
18 under a high-rise category, it would
19 actually be limited to the 117 feet and
20 ten-story building that Mr. Valent
21 showed you.

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: Are the people from
23 the church here?

24 MS. RUSSO: Yes, they are here.

25 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay. I just

102

1 wanted to know.

2 MR. RUSSO: Their legal
3 representative is here, in case you want
4 to ask him questions.

5 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah, but I'm
6 sorry, I've interrupted you a couple of
7 times --

8 MS. RUSSO: That's okay. No, no,
9 no, that's fine. That's all right.
10 I've concluded my presentation. Our
11 traffic engineer is here and the
12 architects, and needless to say, we're
13 prepared to answer any questions or
14 concerns that you may have.

15 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, let's take
16 questions from the Board.

17 MR. SALMAN: I think we should
18 listen to the public first and then we
19 can --

20 CHAIRMAN KORGE: You want to listen
21 to the public first?

22 MR. SALMAN: Yeah.

23 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah, I would.

24 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. Good
25 enough. We'll reserve questions for

103

1 later.

2 MS. RUSSO: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Will you --

4 MR. RIEL: They need to be sworn
5 in.

6 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I'm sorry?

7 MR. RIEL: They need to be sworn
8 in. We have eight people that are --
9 seven or eight people that signed up.

10 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Whoever is here to
11 testify, would you stand up to be sworn
12 in, please?

13 (Thereupon all who were to speak
14 were duly sworn by the court reporter.)

15 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay, would you
16 call the first name?

17 MS. MENENDEZ: Talbot Trammell.

18 MR. TRAMMELL: Mr. Chairman and
19 Members of the Board, I'm Talbot
20 Trammell. I represent the church, and
21 you mentioned a few minutes ago about
22 the alley.

23 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.

24 MR. TRAMMELL: The alley is a fee
25 simple interest owned by the church.

104

1 They refer to it as an alley at times,
2 but it's not alley legally at all, and
3 hasn't been for 48 years, not used by
4 the public, it's blocked off, and
5 concerning the setback, there's a zero
6 setback from our property to theirs, as
7 I understand it.

8 And I heard that they had the
9 right, if it's a Mediterranean bonus
10 situation, to have a zero setback,
11 and -- but we've had no discussions with
12 them concerning the setback. The only
13 reason I mention that is, in here in the
14 Staff Report, it appears that we had
15 discussed -- it implies that we had
16 discussed, perhaps, that. We've had
17 many discussions with them and they've
18 been very nice, and Mr. Behar and Ms.
19 Russo and their representatives have
20 agreed to make the plans of our 18
21 spaces like we want them, and the
22 entrance specifically, and we sure
23 appreciate that, and they put that in
24 the last plan and that's the one that's
25 been filed and we're happy with that

105

1 aspect of it, so that's where we stand.
2 We filed a report that we have no
3 objection to the application. We don't,
4 but obviously, we hadn't gotten into the
5 setback/buffer thing, and we'd like to
6 have as much as we could in the way of a
7 setback, if that's possible, but that's
8 our position.

9 Our church hasn't discussed
10 anything except the features of the
11 parking garage that we would have, and
12 we're happy with those and that was our
13 main concern.

14 Do you have any questions?

15 MS. MORENO: I'm sorry, but you
16 have an objection here in the blue
17 paper. Can you explain to me what that
18 is?

19 MR. TRAMMELL: An objection? No, I
20 don't.

21 MS. MORENO: It says, "The Church
22 objects to the site plan because it
23 illegally puts the Church's entrance to
24 its parking area on the alley and not on
25 Valencia Avenue to be used jointly with

106

1 Valencia Investors' users."

2 MR. TRAMMELL: Thank you so much.
3 That was a good question. When we sold
4 them the property, as a condition of the
5 sale, they agreed to give us an
6 easement, which was recorded, giving us
7 18 spaces, and in the easement, they
8 were supposed to give us a joint
9 entrance to the parking garage. We
10 didn't know where the garage was going
11 to be built, we didn't know where the
12 entrance would be, but if it was a joint
13 drive to the garage, we knew that our
14 drive would be just as good as theirs,
15 it would be just as pretty and just as
16 safe and have as big a turn radius and
17 everything, and so that was in there.

18 When the plans came out, they had
19 two separate entrances. They had theirs
20 on Valencia and they had ours on the
21 alley. The plans aren't too well marked
22 about the entrance and exit on the
23 alley, and after thinking about it, we
24 were willing to do that if it could be
25 made safe and wide, because the turning

107

1 radius, when you're coming down the
2 alley and you're about three -- there's
3 a zero foot setback, or not much
4 setback, and you have to make a turn
5 around, the entrance is too narrow, but
6 they've corrected that. Mr. Behar and
7 them said they would do it, and they
8 did, and we thank them for doing that,
9 and they've made -- we're happy with the
10 entrance now.

11 But then I said that if you or
12 someone doesn't approve the site plan
13 and we don't get what we've agreed, we
14 want to reserve our objection to not
15 being on Valencia, where it's just as
16 good as theirs, and so -- yes, sir.

17 MR. AIZENSTAT: So the way the site
18 plan is now, you'll remove your
19 objection if that's the case?

20 MR. TRAMMELL: Yes, sir, that's
21 correct.

22 MS. MORENO: Did I understand you
23 to say that you sold this property to
24 them, the church did?

25 MR. TRAMMELL: Yes, we did.

108

1 MS. MORENO: Thank you.

2 MR. SALMAN: And that's the only
3 condition of sale?

4 MR. TRAMMELL: Sir?

5 MR. SALMAN: That was the only
6 condition of the sale, was that access
7 agreement that you have?

8 MR. TRAMMELL: No, it was -- They
9 paid -- There were many conditions of
10 the sale. We got paid cash --

11 MR. SALMAN: Good for you.

12 MR. TRAMMELL: And there was a
13 regular real estate contract.

14 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I think what Mr.
15 Salman is asking --

16 MR. TRAMMELL: The price was six
17 million dollars or something.

18 MR. SALMAN: But what I'm saying,
19 there's no contingent -- there's no
20 contingent issue?

21 CHAIRMAN KORGE: It's not
22 contingent on rezoning.

23 MR. RIEL: No, I believe that's --

24 MR. TRAMMELL: No, No, sir, it
25 wasn't. They bought it as is. It

109

1 wasn't conditional.
 2 MR. RIEL: That restriction, I
 3 think, is dated back 10 or 15 years, has
 4 that been, for the 18 spaces?
 5 MR. TRAMMELL: No, it's --
 6 MR. CARLSON: No, that -- that
 7 was agreed --
 8 MR. RIEL: It was part of the sale?
 9 Okay.
 10 MR. CARLSON: -- in order to buy it.
 11 MR. TRAMMELL: In 2005, when we
 12 sold them the property, that's when they
 13 gave us the easement. It was part of
 14 the sale. At the closing, they gave us
 15 this grant of easement, which is in the
 16 court file.
 17 MR. RIEL: Time flies.
 18 MR. TRAMMELL: And, you know, said
 19 they'd give us --
 20 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah.
 21 MR. RIEL: Time flies.
 22 MR. AIZENSTAT: So the way -- so,
 23 according to the site plan that you
 24 have, you're okay with your 18 parking
 25 spaces, where they sit and so forth?

110

1 MR. TRAMMELL: Yes, sir. Is
 2 this --
 3 MS. RUSSO: Show him the site plan.
 4 MR. VALENT: I'm sorry, what was
 5 the question?
 6 MR. AIZENSTAT: According to the
 7 site plan, if the gentleman was
 8 satisfied --
 9 MR. TRAMMELL: Yes, sir. Where is
 10 the first --
 11 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- with the parking
 12 spaces and the site plan itself.
 13 MS. RUSSO: He wants to see the
 14 site plan.
 15 MR. VALENT: Right in here. This
 16 is the alley.
 17 MR. TRAMMELL: This is the alley.
 18 MR. VALENT: This is it.
 19 MR. TRAMMELL: Yes, sir. We've
 20 approved this site plan, and they filed
 21 it at the last minute, but --
 22 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay. I just
 23 wanted --
 24 MR. TRAMMELL: -- it's in there
 25 now, and thank you. That was our main

111

1 concern about the thing.
 2 MR. VALENT: And we did go to
 3 Public Works with this.
 4 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay. That's what
 5 I wanted to make sure.
 6 MR. TRAMMELL: And the Board of
 7 Architects, too.
 8 MR. VALENT: Everyone.
 9 MR. TRAMMELL: Okay. Thank you.
 10 MR. AIZENSTAT: I'm just going to
 11 ask you a different question, it might
 12 not pertain to this, but how do you feel
 13 about your property having a historic
 14 designation?
 15 MR. TRAMMELL: Well, I'm not
 16 authorized to speak to that, because the
 17 membership would be the one that would
 18 give that thought, and I can't tell you.
 19 I really can't answer that.
 20 MR. AIZENSTAT: Because that would
 21 limit you to what you can do with your
 22 property down the road.
 23 MR. TRAMMELL: Yes, sir.
 24 MR. AIZENSTAT: That's why I ask
 25 that.

112

1 MR. TRAMMELL: Yes, sir, it would.
 2 MR. AIZENSTAT: You're pretty
 3 content with the sale of the other land.
 4 MR. TRAMMELL: Yes, sir. No,
 5 that's a big thing, and it's an issue in
 6 our church and some people feel strong
 7 in one way --
 8 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay.
 9 MR. TRAMMELL: -- or another way,
 10 but I just can't speak to that. We
 11 haven't discussed that in --
 12 MS. MORENO: No official position
 13 yet.
 14 MR. TRAMMELL: If you want to ask
 15 me -- but I'm not here to tell you what
 16 I think.
 17 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Thank you very
 19 much. Call the next speaker, please.
 20 MR. TRAMMELL: Thank you guys.
 21 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you for your
 22 time.
 23 MR. TRAMMELL: Thank you.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: Stanley Davidson.
 25 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Please state your

113

1 name and address for the record.
 2 MR. DAVIDSON: My name is Stanley
 3 Davidson.
 4 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Your address,
 5 Mr. Davidson?
 6 MR. DAVIDSON: My office number is
 7 2655 LeJeune Road.
 8 About two and a half years ago, I
 9 was approached by a real estate man who
 10 was trying to sell me this property,
 11 with the understanding they were going
 12 to be converted to a commercial zoning.
 13 I met with my architect, we drove
 14 through the property, looked at it, and
 15 we decided this property is ideal for it
 16 to stay the way it is, as a residential
 17 property, and we declined to consider
 18 the purchase of it, on the basis of
 19 converting it.
 20 MR. RIEL: Mr. Davidson, you're
 21 going to need to speak up a little bit.
 22 MR. DAVIDSON: All right. We
 23 declined to consider buying it with the
 24 idea of converting it to a commercial
 25 zoning.

114

1 The property -- the people that
 2 bought it paid a tremendous amount of
 3 money for it, with the idea to convert
 4 it to a high-rise, and it will change
 5 the neighborhood completely. It would
 6 be a precedent for many other requests
 7 for a zoning change for commercial, and
 8 I'm all against it. I would much rather
 9 that it remain residential, the way it
 10 is. Even a high-rise residential
 11 condominium is not as objectionable as a
 12 commercial building in this area, as
 13 residential as it is.
 14 Certainly, for the owners, they
 15 couldn't possibly claim any hardship,
 16 because they knew exactly what the
 17 zoning was when they bought it. I would
 18 much rather that it remain residential,
 19 the way it is, but however, if it would
 20 be changed to commercial, it certainly
 21 shouldn't go over six stories, including
 22 the bonus for Mediterranean, and it
 23 certainly should have at least 15 feet,
 24 as the Planning Board recommended, 15
 25 feet setback from LeJeune, 10 feet

115

1 setback from the alley, and 10 feet
 2 setback from Valencia.
 3 We certainly agree with the
 4 Planning Board to deny their request.
 5 Thank you.
 6 MR. AIZENSTAT: Can I ask you
 7 something? First, when you talk about
 8 the setbacks, for example, the setback
 9 from LeJeune --
 10 MR. DAVIDSON: The setback on
 11 LeJeune is recommended at 15 feet.
 12 MR. AIZENSTAT: It's 15 feet.
 13 Isn't it today that we would like to do
 14 a zero setback, with spaces and stores,
 15 or am I wrong?
 16 MR. CARLSON: Currently, the
 17 required -- the required setbacks for
 18 the property without Mediterranean
 19 bonuses would be 10 feet on the north,
 20 which would be adjacent to the church
 21 property, and 15 feet from LeJeune,
 22 which has been designated as the front
 23 of the property.
 24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay.
 25 MR. CARLSON: And then along

116

1 Valencia and along the alleyway, they
 2 can go to zero, but at a certain height
 3 there's a step-back.
 4 MR. AIZENSTAT: And how do they
 5 have it?
 6 MR. CARLSON: Well, they have --
 7 They're requesting a zero setback on the
 8 north, adjacent to the church property.
 9 They're going from 10 feet to zero.
 10 They're requesting going from 15 to 10
 11 along LeJeune, and I believe they're
 12 meeting the setbacks on Valencia and on
 13 the alleyway.
 14 MR. AIZENSTAT: The other buildings
 15 that are on LeJeune, that are recently
 16 constructed, for example, where the
 17 Burger King was going to go in or where
 18 City National -- what setbacks do those
 19 buildings have?
 20 MR. CARLSON: I can't -- I would
 21 not --
 22 MR. SALMAN: Zero.
 23 MR. RIEL: Those are zero.
 24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Those have zero
 25 setbacks.

117

1 MR. RIEL: Most definitely zero.
 2 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right. So I don't
 3 see why this one --
 4 MS. KEON: The church -- but the
 5 church is set back.
 6 MR. AIZENSTAT: No, no, I'm not
 7 talking about the church setback. I'm
 8 just talking about the LeJeune setback.
 9 MR. SALMAN: What is the setback of
 10 that church?
 11 MR. DAVIDSON: The LeJeune setback
 12 is recommended 15 feet, but the height
 13 is also a problem.
 14 MR. AIZENSTAT: And another
 15 question, if I may ask you. I was a
 16 little confused at the beginning. You
 17 currently -- your office is currently on
 18 LeJeune or you currently live there?
 19 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes, on the east
 20 side of LeJeune, not on the west side.
 21 MR. AIZENSTAT: On the other side
 22 of LeJeune --
 23 MR. DAVIDSON: Right.
 24 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- which is where
 25 the City National Bank building is?

118

1 MR. DAVIDSON: Right.
 2 MR. AIZENSTAT: And then you were
 3 talking about something that you looked
 4 into buying this property?
 5 MR. DAVIDSON: It was offered to me
 6 and I declined to buy it --
 7 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay.
 8 MR. DAVIDSON: -- because I didn't
 9 want to have it converted. The idea
 10 was, it was offered to me with the idea
 11 to convert it to a commercial zoning,
 12 and my architect thought it would be
 13 incompatible with the neighborhood and I
 14 agreed with him and we declined to buy
 15 it.
 16 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 17 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Let's call the
 18 next witness, please.
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: Maggie Manara.
 20 Henry Pino.
 21 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Please state your
 22 name and address for the record.
 23 MR. PINO: Yes. Good evening.
 24 Henry Pino, 232 Andalusia Avenue, Unit
 25 370. I own my office there, and have

119

1 been there for like five years.
 2 I've looked at the project, and I
 3 think the project really does a lot for
 4 the area. I think that there's a
 5 precedent set there, especially since
 6 there's a commercial parking space area
 7 that's been there for years now, and I
 8 really don't have a problem with the
 9 project. I think it does -- it does
 10 revitalize the area quite a bit from
 11 what's there right now.
 12 MR. AIZENSTAT: And your office is
 13 how close?
 14 MR. PINO: About two blocks away.
 15 We're right next to the Chocolate
 16 Fashion Bakery that's on Andalusia
 17 Avenue. Yeah, right there.
 18 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 19 MR. PINO: Thank you.
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: Nita Yeung.
 21 CHAIRMAN KORGE: State your name
 22 and address for the record.
 23 MS. YEUNG: Nita Yeung.
 24 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Address?
 25 MS. YEUNG: My office address is at

120

1 4104 Aurora Street, in Coral Gables. My
 2 family owns duplexes on the 2900 block
 3 of LeJeune, and we support this project.
 4 MR. AIZENSTAT: And you -- I'm
 5 sorry, the telephone rang. Can you say
 6 that again?
 7 MS. YEUNG: My family? My family
 8 owns duplexes on the 2900 block of
 9 LeJeune.
 10 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay.
 11 MS. YEUNG: And we support this
 12 project.
 13 MR. AIZENSTAT: You support it?
 14 MS. YEUNG: Yes.
 15 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay, thank you.
 16 MS. YEUNG: Thank you.
 17 MS. MENENDEZ: Henry Paper.
 18 MR. PAPER: Good evening,
 19 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. My
 20 name is Henry Paper. I live at 600
 21 Biltmore Way. That's two blocks to the
 22 west of this property.
 23 By way of just a little background
 24 on myself, I'm an attorney. I've
 25 practiced for many years, appeared

121

1 before many boards, State and Federal
2 agencies. Along with my partners, we
3 own a significant amount of land in this
4 City, including almost the whole north
5 side of the 700 block of Valencia
6 Avenue.

7 I'm very familiar with this
8 property -- with this project, and for
9 all the reasons that have been expressed
10 earlier tonight by counsel for the
11 applicant and architect for the
12 applicant, we echo our support for this
13 project. I don't want to belabor the
14 point, take a lot of your time, but I
15 think everyone on the Board is very
16 familiar with this site. I know I am.
17 I go past it multiple times every day.
18 It's clearly not a residential site.
19 The zoning has not kept pace with the
20 character of the surrounding properties,
21 pretty much all high-rise.

22 I don't have a particular dog in
23 this fight. I just care about this City
24 and love the City and like to see the
25 City prosper. You know Coral Gables has

122

1 become a very prominent and well-known,
2 prestigious corporate address around the
3 country. We have a lot of multi-
4 national corporate residents in this
5 town, and to continue to attract them,
6 you need new office product.

7 Our properties are not commercial.
8 I would support it even if they were
9 commercial. I think that the request
10 only does good things for the City, and
11 I think that the proposed office use is
12 not too intense for the site. It
13 provides a very well-reasoned and
14 balanced transition between the very
15 intense commercial activity in the
16 Central Business District and the less
17 intense activity to the south in the
18 residential district.

19 I think the office use -- if you're
20 looking at a commercial use for this
21 site, office is an excellent selection.
22 You know, it's quite benign and clean.
23 Pretty much in the evenings after six or
24 seven o'clock, there's no activity going
25 on in office space. Weekends, there's

123

1 no activity in the office space, as
2 opposed to what you have at a commercial
3 use over here. Parking requirements for
4 the office are less intense than retail.

5 So I think, for those reasons, and
6 for the reasons previously expressed, we
7 support the application and we hope you
8 do, too.

9 Questions? Thank you very much.

10 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Thank you.

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

12 MS. MENENDEZ: George Prendes.

13 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Please state your
14 name and address for the record.

15 MR. PRENDES: My name is George
16 Prendes. I hold offices at 7600 Red
17 Road. I'm a property owner of various
18 residential property in the Valencia
19 block. I have familiarized myself with
20 the project, and rather than standing
21 here and talking about all the positive
22 things that everyone else has spoke
23 about, I'm all in agreement (sic) for
24 the project. I think it's not only good
25 for the City but it's good for the area.

124

1 Being the use that it's presently
2 having, I think that this is a very good
3 project, and I think that you should all
4 consider approving the application.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Any more?

7 MS. MENENDEZ: No more speakers.

8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: No more? Okay.

9 We'll close the public hearing portion
10 and go to questions for the applicant.

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: Can I ask a
12 question?

13 CHAIRMAN KORGE: And for the City,
14 too, but why don't we start with the
15 applicant?

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: On the bottom
17 floor, what do you propose to do on the
18 first floor of the property?

19 MR. VALENT: The ground floor is --
20 The ground floor will also be office.
21 The offices are split on two sides, on
22 both sides of the lobby, so it will be
23 office use.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: So it will all be
25 office?

125

1 MS. RUSSO: And there's no retail
2 use.
3 MR. AIZENSTAT: So there's no
4 retail, there's not going to be any
5 restaurants, loud noise?
6 MS. RUSSO: No restaurant, no
7 retail use.
8 MR. VALENT: No.
9 MS. RUSSO: Strictly office.
10 MR. AIZENSTAT: For the neighbors
11 or anything like that?
12 MR. VALENT: Not at all.
13 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Somebody needs to
14 explain to me, because I'm still
15 confused about the height limits
16 surrounding the property. Looking at --
17 I see, from your presentation, the paper
18 presentation, I see it's on Block Number
19 6, I guess, and I'm having trouble
20 figuring out, what are the -- Putting
21 aside this particular project, all
22 around it there are height limitations.
23 What are they?
24 MR. CARLSON: Can I walk you
25 through them?

126

1 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I would appreciate
2 that very much.
3 MR. CARLSON: All right.
4 Currently, the subject property, as
5 a low-rise commercial site, would be
6 allowed four to six stories, up to 77
7 feet.
8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Do this for me.
9 MR. CARLSON: Okay.
10 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Just --
11 MR. CARLSON: I just started --
12 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Biltmore Way, you
13 know -- Start from Biltmore Way and work
14 your way south --
15 MR. CARLSON: Okay.
16 CHAIRMAN KORGE: -- so I understand
17 what all these colors mean.
18 MR. CARLSON: Okay. On Biltmore
19 Way to the north, which is the church
20 property, that also has a commercial
21 low-rise intensity land use designation.
22 That allows four to six stories, six
23 stories with Mediterranean bonuses, up
24 to 77 feet. As I said, the subject
25 property is the same. You go to the

127

1 west of the property, that is
2 residential use, multi-family,
3 medium-density. Okay, that's a medium
4 density. It's an MFSA zoning
5 designation, and because it's adjacent
6 to low-rise -- or excuse me, low-
7 density, which is across the street to
8 the south, that's limited to 60 feet in
9 height.
10 So the brown properties all along
11 the north side of Valencia, from the
12 subject property all the way to Hernando
13 Street, that's allowed to go to 60 feet.
14 MS. RUSSO: But for the fact that
15 it's already developed with the Laroc,
16 and you have --
17 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes, what's there?
18 MS. RUSSO: In other words, that's
19 at 150, so -- and the Laroc being a
20 condominium, not a single-owned
21 apartment building, in order for a
22 condominium to be terminated, you would
23 need every single owner in there to
24 agree, and then that building could be
25 taken down.

128

1 So the fact that the height
2 limitation is 60, it --
3 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I know where the
4 Laroc is, but where exactly is the Laroc
5 in relation --
6 MS. RUSSO: The Laroc is -- the
7 only thing separating our project from
8 the Laroc is the City's surface parking
9 lot.
10 (Thereupon, Mr. Coe left.)
11 MR. CARLSON: And so if the City's
12 surface parking lot were to be
13 developed, it would have to -- it would
14 be limited to 60 feet. If anything else
15 on the north side of Valencia Avenue was
16 to be developed, it could only go to 60
17 feet.
18 Across the street -- again, heading
19 south, across the street on the south
20 side of Valencia, that's low-density
21 multi-family.
22 MR. AIZENSTAT: That's the light
23 beige?
24 MR. CARLSON: That's the light
25 beige, and because it's adjacent to

129

1 single-family, it's limited to 35 feet
2 in height.

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: Well --

4 MR. CARLSON: So on the south side
5 of Valencia -- In the MFSA district,
6 when an MFSA district abuts a
7 single-family or duplex-zoned property,
8 it's limited in height to 35 feet, and
9 this all along here abuts those zoning
10 districts, so on the south side of
11 Valencia, the highest you can go is 35
12 feet.

13 On the north side of Valencia, the
14 highest you can go is 60 feet, and then
15 when you go south of -- actually, onto
16 Almeria Street, which is south of the
17 low-density, that's single-family and
18 that's subject to the single-family
19 development provisions.

20 So what you have is the existing
21 church at 77 --

22 MS. RUSSO: But now go west,
23 because west of the existing church you
24 have high-rise at 150, with bonuses to
25 190.

130

1 MR. CARLSON: But we're going
2 around the southern side.

3 MS. RUSSO: Take the existing
4 church site and go west.

5 MR. CARLSON: But as you asked,
6 going south from Biltmore, it's 77 for
7 the church site, it's 77 for the subject
8 site, it's 60 for the north side of
9 Valencia, it's 35 on the south side of
10 Valencia, and then it's the
11 single-family south of there --

12 MS. RUSSO: Which is 29.

13 MR. CARLSON: -- which is 29.

14 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So why is -- If
15 everything surrounding it to the north
16 and west is 60 feet or higher, why would
17 we impose a 35-foot requirement right on
18 LeJeune, across the street from the
19 35-foot -- or what size -- what height
20 requirement are we setting there? You
21 want to set what height requirement --
22 the City, the Staff, wants to set it at
23 what height?

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: 77.

25 MR. CARLSON: We want -- our

131

1 recommendation is the same height as
2 what the church is, which has the same
3 land use designation. The church can go
4 four to six, 77 feet. That's the same
5 land use designation which the subject
6 property has, and we're recommending the
7 same height.

8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So, Ms. Russo, why
9 should that be higher than everything
10 else around it?

11 MS. RUSSO: Because even though
12 Mr. Carlson keeps telling you that to
13 the west of the subject property is 60
14 feet, I'm telling you, that's on a map
15 without looking -- if you go right
16 outside and you look --

17 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I understand.

18 MS. RUSSO: -- the reality is that
19 that development pattern is -- is --

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: There.

21 MS. RUSSO: -- is there. The
22 precedent has been set. When the Laroc
23 was built in the '80s, it was determined
24 that this whole corridor on the north
25 side of Valencia was high-rise.

132

1 So whether we even discuss it going
2 to the west of Hernando, I'm taking --
3 my position is that our block is a
4 unique block. If you just look at Block
5 6, you start out with the fact that you
6 have the church property at 77. You go
7 west and you have high-rise, potentially
8 up to 190, and you have the proper
9 frontage there. You go south and you
10 already have 130 -- I mean, a 150-foot
11 high-rise and then you have a surface
12 commercial parking lot, and so we're
13 saying 10 stories is a transition, and
14 what makes it particularly different
15 from the south is the fact that we're on
16 LeJeune and we're commercial, and
17 LeJeune is not that wide. LeJeune is
18 only a 60-foot right-of-way, and then
19 immediately east of us we have the
20 potential, which is already under
21 consideration, of Publix going 16
22 stories as-of-right on their site, and
23 to the south, Mr. Davidson's building,
24 which is a 13-story, 150 -- a
25 150-foot-high building.

133

1 MR. RIEL: Mr. Chair --
 2 MS. RUSSO: So, you know, even
 3 though our category that we're asking
 4 for is a hundred -- I mean, is
 5 high-rise, our site plan request
 6 specifically is limiting us to 10
 7 stories, which is -- you know, the
 8 problem here is, the City has a mid
 9 range that is only six to eight, so
 10 anything above eight to 16 automatically
 11 is considered high-rise. So our request
 12 is for 10 stories and 117 feet.
 13 MR. AIZENSTAT: Your 10 stories
 14 includes your bonuses?
 15 MS. RUSSO: 10 stories, using all
 16 bonuses. I mean, you know, it's 10
 17 stories, 117 feet.
 18 MR. AIZENSTAT: Tops?
 19 MS. RUSSO: Tops.
 20 MR. SALMAN: Six, period, end of
 21 story.
 22 MR. VALENT: Top, maximum.
 23 MS. RUSSO: Maximum.
 24 MR. SALMAN: Six, period, end of
 25 story. Never again, no more than 117.

134

1 MR. VALENT: No more.
 2 MS. RUSSO: Excuse me?
 3 MR. SALMAN: No more than 117?
 4 MS. RUSSO: No more than 117.
 5 MR. SALMAN: Except for your
 6 parapets and other stuff.
 7 MR. VALENT: Yes. That is our
 8 finished roof slab height.
 9 MR. RIEL: Mr. Chair, I just want
 10 to remind the Board, if you recall, we
 11 did an MFSA study, which included Bird,
 12 Biltmore Way, Segovia. That area was
 13 designated as a transitional zone. When
 14 we went back and redid the Zoning
 15 Code -- that was in advance of the
 16 Zoning Code. The intent was to
 17 transition off of Biltmore Way, as you
 18 go back off of Biltmore Way, to
 19 transition down to single-family.
 20 Staff is of the opinion that
 21 LeJeune Road is the dividing line.
 22 Although, you know, the applicant
 23 indicates that Laroc is down the street,
 24 that's kind of an anomaly. That was
 25 developed under the site-specific

135

1 standards --
 2 MR. AIZENSTAT: But it's there.
 3 MR. RIEL: -- in the early '80s.
 4 MS. RUSSO: And to the west.
 5 MR. RIEL: I understand that, but
 6 it was developed in the early '80s,
 7 under site-specific, which allowed 13
 8 stories. But also note, the Laroc is
 9 also set back. It's not, you know, 10
 10 foot from the road, as well, so -- I
 11 mean, when we did the MFSA and the
 12 transition zone, we realized the Laroc
 13 was there. It's been there 25 years.
 14 It's not going to go anywhere. We
 15 understand that. And that was taken
 16 into consideration when we looked at the
 17 MFSA zoning district.
 18 MS. RUSSO: But that whole
 19 corridor -- I mean, just to -- you know,
 20 again, respectfully, we disagree, but if
 21 I take the corridor, he says Laroc, and
 22 then I continue, my father lived in the
 23 600 Biltmore Way, and that was the whole
 24 block. I mean, 600 Biltmore Way is 13
 25 stories before Mediterranean, but it

136

1 also was the whole block north of
 2 Valencia. It wasn't just, you know, the
 3 south half on the Biltmore side. It was
 4 the whole block, and if you continue
 5 going west, that pattern goes on. Then
 6 you have the David William.
 7 So what I'm saying is, I think the
 8 development pattern is already
 9 established. The precedent is there,
 10 and on this block, more than anything,
 11 it's more evident. It's right there
 12 next to us. And it's on a calmer part
 13 of the block. I mean, if anything, you
 14 would think the more intense use and the
 15 intense height should be on LeJeune,
 16 where you have 40,000 cars going by
 17 daily, not on Hernando, where you have,
 18 you know, much less traffic.
 19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, that implies
 20 that where the church property is
 21 located, putting aside historical
 22 considerations, that would end up at a
 23 similar height at some point.
 24 MR. AIZENSTAT: It could.
 25 MS. RUSSO: It could.

137

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah.
 2 MS. RUSSO: I mean, the request
 3 would have to come before you. It
 4 wouldn't be an automatic thing. The
 5 request would have to come before you.
 6 MR. AIZENSTAT: The way I look --
 7 MS. RUSSO: And I think that
 8 depends on what, you know, are the
 9 ultimate plans -- what the ultimate
 10 plans are for the church. Whether or
 11 not there's historic designation, I
 12 mean, I think, you know, like all
 13 things, you have to take it, you know,
 14 on its own merits, when and if that
 15 comes before you. It may never come
 16 before you, because, you know, the
 17 church may embrace the historic
 18 designation. The church may not.
 19 MS. MORENO: Ms. Russo, I was on
 20 this Board when this area came before
 21 us, on an emergency basis, because of
 22 the concern of the neighborhood of
 23 overdevelopment, and the MFSA was
 24 adopted as a response to the fact that
 25 the buildings that were there were

138

1 high-rises, the David William and the
 2 600 and the Laroc and all of those.
 3 The intent at that point was to
 4 provide incentives by creating the
 5 townhouse area and all of that, to avoid
 6 further development of this area, and
 7 this project goes against all of that,
 8 in addition to which it's not
 9 residential. It's commercial.
 10 MS. RUSSO: But I think --
 11 MR. AIZENSTAT: But --
 12 MS. MORENO: Everything west of
 13 LeJeune is residential.
 14 MS. RUSSO: Yeah, but this was
 15 already -- in other words, the
 16 request -- this property already has a
 17 commercial land use designation that
 18 some Board, you know, one of your
 19 predecessors, made a determination that
 20 that was the appropriate land use for
 21 the site. We did not make that request.
 22 So, already having the land use
 23 designation of commercial, which makes
 24 this an unusual block and I think very
 25 different -- I understand exactly what

139

1 you're saying, as you proceed further
 2 west. I think it's an entirely, you
 3 know, different situation when you're on
 4 LeJeune Road and you already have a
 5 commercial --
 6 MS. MORENO: There's not a single
 7 commercial building on LeJeune Road
 8 except for the Jaycee building at the
 9 corner of University and the 401 Miracle
 10 Mile building. That's it. Everything
 11 else -- that little strip of Biltmore
 12 Way that has some stores. Everything
 13 else is residential, either duplex or
 14 small apartment buildings. There's
 15 nothing commercial west of LeJeune Road.
 16 You would be creating --
 17 MS. RUSSO: Until you go south.
 18 South of Bird Road, there is.
 19 MS. MORENO: South of Bird Road is
 20 different. This has been, historically,
 21 the Coral Gables residential district.
 22 I love your project. I can't support it
 23 where it is.
 24 MR. AIZENSTAT: See, I feel the
 25 opposite. I feel that as a commercial,

140

1 as what it is, I think it would be
 2 better twofold, and one is, we wouldn't
 3 have the traffic that the residential
 4 would bring. If you look at today's
 5 environment and what's going on, I don't
 6 know if I would support another
 7 residential project there. There's so
 8 many residential projects. By one
 9 token, they're not doing -- One of my
 10 concerns would have been actually if
 11 they're doing commercial, if they're
 12 doing restaurants or bars or anything
 13 down below that might impact --
 14 MR. RIEL: But understand, if the
 15 applicant gets approval of the site plan
 16 and has commercial zoning and they
 17 decide to put a restaurant in and they
 18 meet the parking requirements, they will
 19 be approved for a restaurant.
 20 MR. AIZENSTAT: That might be
 21 something --
 22 MR. RIEL: And there are a whole
 23 host of other commercial uses that are
 24 intense.
 25 MS. RUSSO: I can proffer no

141

1 restaurant, no retail, and that could be
2 a condition that we would put in the
3 declaration of restrictive covenant.

4 MR. AIZENSTAT: And to me, with
5 traffic, if they've done -- I don't know
6 the traffic. If they have done their
7 traffic and the City is satisfied with
8 their traffic -- unfortunately, we don't
9 have the City Staff here from Traffic to
10 talk about it, but if they have done
11 their traffic to where the City is
12 satisfied, and I've got a commercial
13 area to where I don't have traffic at
14 night there, I don't have traffic on the
15 weekends, meaning it brings in more
16 traffic, I'm okay with the City's
17 recommendation to make it commercial.
18 It makes sense to me.

19 As far as the building itself, I
20 think what you physically see there is
21 totally different than what I'm looking
22 at on paper, and if I look at it that
23 way, it makes sense to me. It's stepped
24 back. I see the buffers. I see the
25 buffer zone as Valencia and not, quote,

142

1 unquote, what would have been that alley
2 between the properties. I mean, that --
3 I'm sorry, you know, that's the way I
4 feel.

5 MR. SALMAN: The Biltmore Way
6 corridor -- correct me if I'm wrong --
7 was always intended to be a high-rise
8 corridor.

9 MR. RIEL: Yes.

10 MR. SALMAN: I mean, from Day One.

11 MR. RIEL: Yes.

12 MR. SALMAN: From the day Merrick
13 laid it out.

14 MR. RIEL: It dates back to 1929,
15 yes.

16 MR. SALMAN: Exactly.

17 MR. RIEL: Because we did the
18 analysis as part of the MFSA.

19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I'm sorry, which
20 corridor are you saying?

21 MR. RIEL: The Biltmore Way.

22 MR. SALMAN: The whole Biltmore Way
23 corridor. It was always --

24 MR. RIEL: It was changed. It was
25 residential, though, at one time --

143

1 MR. SALMAN: Yeah.

2 MR. RIEL: -- but it still had the
3 height of 190 feet. It switched to
4 commercial.

5 MR. SALMAN: That's correct, and I
6 just want to state that for the record.

7 Also, the MFSA issue was a reaction
8 to the growth of housing on the north
9 side of Valencia --

10 MR. RIEL: Correct.

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.

12 MR. SALMAN: -- where we were going
13 to be blocking a lot of people's views,
14 and it was -- but they were building
15 pretty much as-of-right in many
16 respects, and what they had -- what they
17 suffered was pretty much a downzoning of
18 their situation because of this new --
19 and I wasn't necessarily in agreement
20 with the whole process, by the way.

21 You have a very unique property. I
22 think you're abutting a much taller
23 building already across the street,
24 because the way the whole zoning is set
25 up, instead of zoning across streets,

144

1 we're zoning back to back, and there's a
2 whole series of issues that we can't fix
3 because they're all underlying, but the
4 reality is that this becomes the last
5 possible place you're going to be able
6 to build a high-rise, on that end of
7 that corridor, from -- going south. I'm
8 looking at going south. And you have
9 two that would bracket the whole area
10 around the City Hall, the one on the
11 800 -- or, excuse me, the 401 --

12 MS. RUSSO: The 401.

13 MR. SALMAN: -- Building, which
14 eventually will probably be redeveloped
15 as it reaches its life cycle, and this
16 site, and they are far enough away from
17 the City Hall not to be a visual
18 nuisance to them.

19 Likewise, I like the fact that
20 you're not going to be putting any kind
21 of intense retail use on the ground
22 floor, so that it would be a quiet
23 neighbor to the residents along
24 Valencia.

25 The duplexes that are there, you

145

1 know, ladies and gentlemen, those were
2 all built as pretty much land banks, I
3 mean, a way to be able to pay for the
4 taxes and eventually be developed for
5 their intended use. Now their intended
6 use has changed, because of the new
7 MFSA, so they're sort of stuck there,
8 into their relative density, but
9 initially that was designed to be and
10 intended to be of a higher density than
11 what is currently allowed, and that's
12 why you have the alleyway separating
13 that from the single-family residential,
14 and that was -- that was not a mistake.
15 If you go to the next block, they're
16 back to back.

17 MS. RUSSO: They're back to back.
18 MR. SALMAN: Okay. Again, that's
19 not a mistake. There's underlying logic
20 to the plan.

21 And you're right, this is a unique
22 site, and I think that the request to
23 repair the zoning to the higher -- to
24 the high-rise intensity for the
25 commercial is logical and one that I

146

1 would support.

2 So I don't see any reason why -- I
3 don't think you're asking for anything
4 that's not illogical (sic).

5 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Pat, would you --

6 MS. KEON: I would have to agree
7 with Cristina. I think that LeJeune
8 Road, in this community, for -- I've
9 lived here for 35 years. I'm going to
10 tell you, for those 35 years and for a
11 very long time, LeJeune Road is the
12 bright line between the commercial
13 development and the residential
14 community, and despite that you may have
15 that development along Biltmore Way and
16 you have that -- but it's limited to
17 Biltmore Way. It doesn't -- most of it
18 is a half of a block. This is not
19 Biltmore Way. This is Andalusia and
20 Valencia. It's not Biltmore Way.

21 I think that you have some
22 protection for this residential area by
23 having that whole corner done as
24 low-rise, and it does step back, so you
25 don't have canyons, and you don't have

147

1 that sense going down LeJeune, you don't
2 have that sense coming up Biltmore Way.
3 It does gradually go up high and then it
4 comes back down again, which is an
5 entirely different look than if you sat
6 at that height all along.

7 So I would have to strongly agree
8 with the argument that Cristina has
9 proffered and could not support this --
10 that height at this place, although it's
11 a beautiful building. It's a beautiful
12 building, and you deserve all the credit
13 in the world for your design capability,
14 because it's beautiful. I really think
15 we have a very ominous obligation to
16 ensure that we protect the residential
17 community that exists here west of
18 LeJeune Road.

19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Are you saying
20 that you're opposed to even the Land Use
21 Plan change proposed by the Staff?

22 MS. MORENO: I am. I would propose
23 changing the Comprehensive Land Use Plan
24 to residential.

25 MS. KEON: I mean, I would even --

148

1 MS. MORENO: The MFSA.

2 MS. KEON: Right. I mean, I --
3 that would be my preference, but to
4 leave it as low density, so then I know
5 it's no more than four stories or
6 whatever. I could live with that and I
7 could support that, which is --

8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Is it four
9 stories?

10 MS. RUSSO: It's four stories and
11 up to 77 feet with bonuses.

12 MS. KEON: I mean, I could live
13 with what's there, knowing that that is
14 also the designation of the church, so
15 if the church ever sells, that will
16 remain that, also, so you have that
17 gradual tapering from that four or five
18 stories, whatever, back into where then
19 it does go up, it undulates and it comes
20 back down as it goes into the
21 residential neighborhoods, and the fact
22 that Laroc is there, you know, one
23 mistake does not make for another.

24 MR. SALMAN: If this project were
25 to be casting shadows on single-family

149

1 residences, I would suggest that you
2 might have a stronger point, but
3 honestly, your concern with regards to
4 canyons is not going to happen here.
5 MS. MORENO: You start with this
6 one, and the next thing, we're going to
7 get --
8 MS. KEON: The church will go next,
9 and it will keep going.
10 MS. MORENO: And it will keep on
11 going, all down LeJeune. "We're across
12 the street from commercial, there's
13 already precedents." You know, it will
14 be commercial buildings from Coral Way
15 to Bird Road, all along LeJeune.
16 MR. AIZENSTAT: Well, I see -- I'm
17 sorry.
18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I'm a little
19 concerned. I mean, we -- I have a
20 strong recollection of that whole
21 moratorium area --
22 MS. MORENO: Uh-huh.
23 CHAIRMAN KORGE: -- and we went
24 through this in excruciating detail.
25 There were compromises --

150

1 MS. MORENO: Yeah, people crying
2 and people fighting here.
3 CHAIRMAN KORGE: It was pretty
4 contentious, but compromises were made,
5 and I don't know, I mean, just undoing
6 that, even if it seems logical -- I
7 mean, it doesn't sound like it's, you
8 know, out in left field somewhere, and
9 the design is superb, I mean, there's no
10 question about that. I don't know. I
11 mean, just undoing that political
12 compromise, I don't know that's a wise
13 thing to do, I mean, and I don't think
14 that the owner should be surprised. You
15 know, this wasn't something that
16 happened 30 years ago. It was highly
17 contentious. It slowed down the Zoning
18 Code rewrite, because we had to address
19 that before we could finish up the
20 rewrite. I mean, I -- you know, in a
21 perfect world, maybe it should have been
22 designated for a higher rise commercial
23 use, but that wasn't the compromise. I
24 don't --
25 MR. SALMAN: This is a boundary

151

1 property for that area, for that
2 designated area.
3 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, the whole
4 issue was that boundary area in there.
5 MS. MORENO: Yeah, right, that was
6 the issue.
7 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I mean, those were
8 the issues.
9 MS. MORENO: And the result was
10 that MFSA area. That was the result of
11 all that brouhaha that we had here.
12 MR. SALMAN: It was a brouhaha. It
13 was silly.
14
15 MR. AIZENSTAT: You see, to me,
16 everything which I read from the
17 objections is noise and traffic. By
18 going commercial, I think you're helping
19 that out, with this specific property.
20 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, I don't
21 think changing to conform to the
22 Comprehensive Land Use Plan as
23 low-intensity or low-density
24 commercial does any violence to the --
25 what we did in the moratorium area,

152

1 because that was there in the moratorium
2 area when we made all those other
3 changes to the MFSA. So conforming to
4 the Comprehensive Land Use Plan doesn't
5 concern me, but changing the
6 Comprehensive Land Use Plan now to a
7 higher intensity of use, I mean, I don't
8 know that I'm prepared to do that at
9 this time, myself.
10 MR. AIZENSTAT: Let me ask you a
11 question, Eric. One of the Board
12 members had to leave, and we're also
13 missing, obviously, Robert, who had to
14 recuse himself. How does that affect
15 the vote or --
16 MR. RIEL: Well, it depends on how
17 you vote.
18 MR. AIZENSTAT: No, no, no, I don't
19 mean by that. What I'm saying is --
20 MR. SALMAN: But they would have a
21 right to appeal, won't they?
22 MR. RIEL: Well, if you go -- if
23 you go for -- you need to have four
24 votes for a recommendation, whatever
25 that motion may be. So, for instance,

153

1 if you have two-three or three-two, it
2 goes forward with a no recommendation,
3 with the indication that three
4 parties --
5 CHAIRMAN KORGE: However I vote,
6 it's going to be no recommendation.
7 That's clear already, right? I mean --
8 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right. That's why
9 I'm saying -- because from what I'm
10 hearing, I mean, you're already
11 missing --
12 MS. KEON: Two.
13 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So, I mean,
14 getting to the point that you're driving
15 to --
16 MS. RUSSO: But it could be
17 three-three. It could be a three-three,
18 which would still go --
19 MR. RIEL: That option goes to the
20 applicant. If they want to postpone
21 their request until the next meeting,
22 they can certainly do that. That's up
23 to them.
24 CHAIRMAN KORGE: And I'm not sure
25 that how we vote really is going to

154

1 make it --
2 MS. RUSSO: We'll move forward,
3 only because, you know, with the next --
4 with the missing Board member, you could
5 still end up with the three-three or
6 four-two, but, you know, either way, we
7 prefer to move forward.
8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Move forward?
9 MS. RUSSO: Please.
10 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So, if there's no
11 further discussion, what we should do, I
12 guess, is first take the proposal of the
13 Comprehensive Land Use Plan change, and
14 take a motion one way or another on
15 that, which would be, I guess, the
16 applicant --
17 MR. SALMAN: Well, actually, we
18 need four votes --
19 MS. KEON: Yeah.
20 MR. SALMAN: -- because there's two
21 issues for two different bodies.
22 MR. AIZENSTAT: You need two votes.
23 MR. SALMAN: No, it's four votes.
24 MS. RUSSO: I think you need to
25 vote on three different things.

155

1 MS. KEON: Three different.
2 MR. SALMAN: Correct, three.
3 MR. RIEL: You need three motions.
4 MR. SALMAN: But we are acting --
5 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, first, we're
6 a Local Planning Agency --
7 MR. SALMAN: Local Planning Agency.
8 MS. RUSSO: Right.
9 MR. SALMAN: And then also Planning
10 and Zoning.
11 CHAIRMAN KORGE: For a change of
12 land use from Commercial Use, Low-Rise
13 Intensity, to Commercial Use, High-Rise
14 Intensity. That's the request of the
15 applicant.
16 MS. MORENO: I move that we deny
17 that request.
18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Is there a second
19 for that motion?
20 MS. KEON: I'll second.
21 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Any discussion on
22 that motion?
23 Let's call the roll on that,
24 please.
25 MS. MENENDEZ: Eibi Aizenstat?

156

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay, just to be
2 clear, she voted to deny?
3 MS. MORENO: Deny.
4 CHAIRMAN KORGE: A motion to deny.
5 MR. AIZENSTAT: So I like it, so I
6 would vote --
7 CHAIRMAN KORGE: No.
8 MR. SALMAN: No.
9 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right. Okay, I
10 just wanted to be clear. Thank you.
11 No.
12 MS. MENENDEZ: Pat Keon?
13 MS. KEON: Yes.
14 MS. MENENDEZ: Cristina Moreno?
15 MS. MORENO: Yes.
16 MS. MENENDEZ: Javier Salman?
17 MR. SALMAN: No.
18 MS. MENENDEZ: Tom Korge?
19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yes.
20 Now we're convening as the Planning
21 and Zoning Board for review of a change
22 of zoning from MFSA to --
23 MR. RIEL: Commercial.
24 MS. RUSSO: Commercial.
25 CHAIRMAN KORGE: -- Commercial.

157

1 Can we even do that with a denial
2 of a --
3 MR. RIEL: Yes.
4 MS. RUSSO: Yes.
5 MS. MORENO: Yes.
6 MR. RIEL: Yes, you can. Staff is
7 recommending you change the zoning to be
8 consistent with the land use.
9 MS. RUSSO: Staff is recommending
10 approval of Number 2.
11 MS. KEON: Yes.
12 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. Well,
13 before we go down that road, how do you
14 feel about that, changing it, now that
15 it's just low-rise? Would you still
16 prefer that?
17 MR. SALMAN: You'd still want the
18 commercial.
19 MS. RUSSO: Well, yes, I would
20 still like the inconsistency corrected.
21 CHAIRMAN KORGE: You would like it
22 to be consistent.
23 MS. RUSSO: Absolutely.
24 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay.
25 MR. AIZENSTAT: I'd like to make a

158

1 motion that we move toward the Staff
2 recommendation on that.
3 MR. SALMAN: I'll second it.
4 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Second. Any
5 discussion on that?
6 MS. KEON: Let me make sure. Will
7 you clarify for me what this commercial
8 is? This is low-rise?
9 CHAIRMAN KORGE: It's low-rise.
10 MS. KEON: Four-story, as is shown
11 currently on the land use map that's in
12 this?
13 MS. MORENO: Yes.
14 MR. RIEL: The height is regulated
15 by the Commercial Low-Rise Intensity,
16 which allows four floors --
17 MS. KEON: Okay.
18 MR. RIEL: -- up to six with
19 Mediterranean bonuses, and the permitted
20 height would be 77 feet, is a Commercial
21 zoning.
22 MS. MORENO: Eric, can't we request
23 a change in land use to this
24 Multi-Family Special area?
25 MR. RIEL: You could certainly do

159

1 that.
2 MS. MORENO: Okay. Now, should I
3 have done that as the Local Planning
4 Board before this?
5 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yes.
6 MR. RIEL: Well, what's unique
7 here, you have a change in land use.
8 You had a motion for denial. It's
9 three-two, so that's a no recommendation
10 to go forward.
11 If the Board wants to go in that
12 direction of changing the land use from
13 Commercial Low-Rise to another, I would
14 suggest that motion be made now --
15 MS. MORENO: Okay.
16 MR. RIEL: -- before you act upon
17 the zoning.
18 MR. AIZENSTAT: Well, we have a
19 motion and a second, so how do you --
20 MR. RIEL: Right. You obviously
21 need a motion and second, if that's the
22 intent of the Board.
23 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, I'm not
24 going to change my vote on the first
25 one, so if you still want to -- if you

160

1 want me to reopen the Local Planning
2 Agency as a courtesy to you, I'll do
3 that, if nobody objects, and we'll go
4 vote, the way you want, but I'm not
5 going to change my vote. I'm not going
6 to --
7 MR. AIZENSTAT: What?
8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Do you want to
9 reopen the Local Planning Agency?
10 MS. MORENO: I just want it to be
11 clear that we're not forced to change it
12 to commercial because the Land Use Plan
13 says it's commercial. You also have the
14 option of changing the Land Use Plan to
15 Multi-Family Special Area.
16 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I certainly
17 understood that.
18 MS. MORENO: Okay.
19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I presume
20 everybody else did. So we have a motion
21 for Item Number 2, the change of zoning
22 from MPFA, Multi-Family Special Area, to
23 C, Commercial, to correct the
24 inconsistency, and there's a second for
25 that motion. Is there any discussion on

161

1 that motion?
 2 No discussion? We'll call the roll
 3 on that, please.
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Cristina Moreno?
 5 MS. MORENO: No. As I indicated, I
 6 would prefer to change the Land Use
 7 Plan.
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: Javier Salman?
 9 MR. SALMAN: Yes.
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: Eibi Aizenstat?
 11 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Pat Keon?
 13 MS. KEON: Yes.
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: Tom Korge?
 15 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yes.
 16 MR. RIEL: That goes forward as an
 17 approval, four-one. So we need a motion
 18 on the site plan.
 19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Pardon me?
 20 MR. RIEL: We need a motion on the
 21 site plan.
 22 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yes, on the site
 23 plan review, which --
 24 MS. MORENO: I make a motion to
 25 deny the site plan review, consistent

162

1 with our refusal to change the
 2 intensity, which I believe is a
 3 prerequisite.
 4 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.
 5 MR. RIEL: Yes, it is.
 6 MS. KEON: I'll second it.
 7 CHAIRMAN KORGE: There's a motion
 8 and a second. Is there any discussion
 9 on that?
 10 No discussion? We'll call the
 11 roll.
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Javier Salman?
 13 MR. SALMAN: No.
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: Eibi Aizenstat?
 15 MR. AIZENSTAT: No.
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: Pat Keon?
 17 MS. KEON: Yes.
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: Cristina Moreno?
 19 MS. MORENO: Yes.
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: Tom Korge?
 21 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yes.
 22 MR. RIEL: That motion goes forward
 23 with no recommendation, as well.
 24 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yes.
 25 MS. RUSSO: Thank you.

163

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 2 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Are we done?
 3 MR. RIEL: Just one quick -- I just
 4 want to -- We prepared an attainable
 5 housing summary. The Commission asked
 6 us to try to get the word out. I just
 7 gave you a copy. It's in front of you.
 8 We have nothing else.
 9 CHAIRMAN KORGE: The meeting is
 10 adjourned.
 11 (Thereupon, the meeting was
 12 adjourned at 8:10 p.m.)
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

164

1 C E R T I F I C A T E
 2
 3 STATE OF FLORIDA:
 4 SS.
 5 COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:
 6
 7 I, JOAN L. BAILEY, Registered Diplomat
 8 Reporter, Florida Professional Reporter, and a
 9 Notary Public for the State of Florida at Large,
 10 do hereby certify that I was authorized to and
 11 did stenographically report the foregoing
 12 proceedings and that the transcript is a true and
 13 complete record of my stenographic notes.
 14
 15 I further certify that all witnesses
 16 were duly sworn by me.
 17
 18 DATED this 20th day of August, 2008.
 19
 20
 21
 22 JOAN L. BAILEY, RDR, FPR
 23 Notary Commission Number DD 64037
 24 Expiration June 14, 2011.
 25

August 13, 2008

City of Coral Gables - Planning Department
Letters Received from Property Owners

Application No. 02-07-455-P – "2600 LeJeune Office Building (Change of Land Use, Rezoning and Site Plan Review)

	Date Received	Name and Address	Object	No Objection	Comments (Verbatim)
1.	08 13 08	Consuelo de Marchena 400 Valencia, Apt. # 5 Coral Gables, FL 33134		X	I think this building proposed will help to reduce our property taxes.
2.	08 13 08	430 Valencia LLC Jose Iglesias Coral Gables, FL 33134		X	We need more office space to support the retail on Miracle Mile which is suffering before all stores have to close down.
3.	08 13 08	Ivan Villalobos 400 Valencia Avenue, #4 Coral Gables, FL		X	This will bring great revenue to Coral Gables. This will also take away the eyesore that we have now. We need change in our economy!
4.	08 13 08	Daniel Jose Guerra 400 Valencia Avenue, Apt. # 7 Coral Gables, FL 33134		X	I am in favor of this new project for this location – this proposed building is compatible with the area since there is a much taller building to the west & surrounding. I think this building will be an asset to the City of Coral Gables & will help with our tax (unreadable).
5.	08 13 08	Rolando A. & Hilda B. Iglesias 525 Coral Way, # 304 Coral Gables, FL 33134		X	I am in favor of this project which sits in a very commercial corridor and is compatible with most of the heights of previously approved buildings to the west, we need help to lower our taxes and support the stores and restaurants before they all have to shut down.
6.	08 13 08	Alberto Manrara/ Maggie Manrara 511 Sevilla Coral Gables, FL	X		LeJeune Road is getting too overbuilt with high rises. Impact on traffic and quality of life.
7.	08 13 08	Ernest Limmiatis 845 S. Alhambra Circle Coral Gables, FL 33146		X	
8.	08 12 08	Iloi-Sang Yeung		X	Dear Members of the Planning Board, I am the owner of several residential duplex properties along Le Jeune Road. I do not object to the proposed change in land use and change in zoning applications for the above referenced property. I understand that the project is asking for 10 stories in height and believe this is appropriate especially because of its location on the very trafficked Le Jeune Road. Sincerely, Iloi-Sang Yeung
9.	08 12 08	Barbara V. Hertz 441 Valencia Avenue, Apt. 1001 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		I object because a tall building on that corner will increase traffic, spoil views, and spoil the feeling of community in the area.
10.	08 12 08	Jaclyn Smith 441 Valencia Avenue, #Ph Coral Gables, FL 3334	X		- Obstruction of view to my unit. - Property devaluation because of obstruction of view. - Too large of a tower for such a classic "residential" area.
11.	08 12 08	Dora C. Venegas 441 Valencia Avenue, #402 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		Too much noise and traffic.

August 13, 2008

City of Coral Gables - Planning Department
Letters Received from Property Owners

Application No. 02-07-455-P – "2600 LeJeune Office Building (Change of Land Use, Rezoning and Site Plan Review)

	Date Received	Name and Address	Object	No Objection	Comments (Verbatim)
12.	08 12 08	Frank Panebianco 441 Valencia Avenue, #1201 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		I object because: 1. Must keep that area residential. 2. Increase in traffic. 3. Block view of owners of 441 Valencia East Side (I live on west side). 4. Devalue our property.
13.	08 12 08	Marta P. Manzarbelia 441 Valencia Avenue, #502 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		Too much noise and traffic.
14.	08 12 08	Diana G. Lopez Ona 441 Valencia Avenue, Apt. 301 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		I am worried parking, traffic and noise.
15.	08 12 08	Rogelio & Maria Cisneros 441 Valencia Avenue, #1002 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		Too much noise & traffic & is going to block our view.
16.	08 12 08	Michiko Yazawa 441 Valencia Avenue, 901 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		Obstruction of view and I don't want have more traffic.
17.	08 12 08	Adriana Moreno-Zarate 441 Valencia Avenue, Apt. 701 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		- Obstruction of view to my unit - Property devaluation - Tower to large for our residential area
18.	08 12 08	Hilda R. Bocles 441 Valencia Avenue, #801 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		My view will be very much affected – my property will be devaluated due to the rezoning to commercial from residential. – Traffic and noise will increase with very negative effects.
19.	08 12 08	Alberto C. Garcia-Tunon 441 Valencia Avenue, Apt. 601 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		- The existing "concrete wall" in areas surrounding the proposed project (inc. the incomplete Bacardi Bldg) does not warrant additional construction in the neighborhood. - The "ten (10) story" height of the proposed commercial building, in excess of other buildings in the adjoining area, will seriously compromise the scenery facing CG City Hall. - The proposed building will seriously jeopardize <u>existing</u> traffic and parking problems in both side of LeJeune Avenue
20.	08 12 08	Marta Hernandez 9504 S.W. 89 Place Miami, FL 33176 Owner of: 441 Valencia Avenue, #501 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		That side of LeJeune Road. Is all residential, such tall building for commercial purposes is going to depreciate our properties.
21.	08 12 08	Ivin J. Rand 441 Valencia Avenue, #603 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		Too much noise and too much traffic.
22.	08 12 08	Cesar Badillo and Shayrin Badillo 400 Valencia Avenue, Unit 1 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		I object to changing the zoning from MFSA to Commercial. I live directly across from the proposed project. This project is not at the same scale as the surrounding properties. Approving this change will reduce not only the value of my property but it will diminish our quality of life due to: increased traffic, noise & construction.

August 13, 2008

City of Coral Gables - Planning Department
Letters Received from Property Owners

Application No. 02-07-455-P – “2600 LeJeune Office Building (Change of Land Use, Rezoning and Site Plan Review)

	Date Received	Name and Address	Object	No Objection	Comments (Verbatim)
23.	08 11 08	Manuel Berberian 436 Almeria Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		Too many commercial structures around a residential zone – STOP! This Mayor was elected to stop proliferation of hi rise buildings – what a treason!
24.	08 07 08	First Church of Christ, Scientist P.O. Box 140504 Coral Gables, FL 33114 Talbot W. Trammell Attorney and Agent for the Church 410 Andalusia Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33134		X	The Church does not object to this application because it approves of the Church's parking area in the most recent Site Plan filed, a portion of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A; however, if, and only if, the portion of this most recent Site Plan which applies to the Church's parking area is not approved by the Board of Architects, this Board and the City Commission, the Church makes the following objection. Objection: The Church objects to the Site Plan because it illegally puts the Church's entrance to its parking area on the valley and not on Valencia Avenue to be used jointly with Valencia Investors' users as required by the Grant of Easement that Valencia Investors (Valencia) gave the Church. A copy of the Grant of Easement was recorded in the Official Public Records of Miami-Dade County and is in the City's File on the “2600 LeJeune Office Building” application. Exhibit A is attached.
25.	08 05 08	Ramon Fernandez Miriam Blanco 357 Almeria Avenue, # 505 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		The City is becoming ugly & congested especially if you place a 10 story which will seem like a high rise in that lot which nothing should be taller than City Hall. The Building (Bacardi) seems Taller than Code?
26.	08 04 08	Robert B. Moorman 365 Miracle Mile Coral Gables, FL		X	Go ahead. We NEED more office buildings in Downtown. We need more high rises. Our crooks in City Hall need more payoffs. Brown needs more taxes – He's hungry & thirsty.
27.	08 04 08	Stanley S. Davidson 2655 LeJeune Road Suite 711 Coral Gables, FL 33134	X		I object to the height – it ought to be in accordance with existing “Commercial Use, Low-rise Intensity”. The change would certainly be incompatible with the existing neighborhood and would create a precedent for requests for other incompatible changes. The owners are not deprived of anything since they acquired the property recently while being fully acquainted with existing zoning and its limitations.

2600 LeJeune Office Building

Change of Land Use, Rezoning
and Site Plan Review

08.13.08 PZB Meeting

1

Request

- The applicant is making three requests required for the proposed 2600 LeJeune Office Building, as follows:
 1. Change of land use from "Commercial Use, Low-Rise Intensity" to "Commercial Use, High-Rise Intensity".
 2. Change of zoning from "MFSA", Multi family Special Area to "C", Commercial.
 3. Site plan review of proposed 10 story / 117' high commercial office project.

08.13.08 PZB Meeting

2

- The change of land use is required to allow construction of a proposed 10 story high-rise commercial building.
- The change of zoning is necessary to correct the existing inconsistent residential zoning to be in compliance with the property's commercial land use designation.
- A site plan must be submitted for review with any rezoning application.

08.13.08 PZB Meeting

3

Recommendation

- The Planning Department recommends denial of the change of land use and site plan for the proposed 10 story commercial office project.
- The Planning Department recommends approval of the change of zoning to correct the existing inconsistent residential zoning to be in compliance with the property's commercial land use designation.

08.13.08 PZB Meeting

4

Background

- The property is located adjacent to the Church of Christian Scientist complex, which has been identified as a candidate for historic designation.
- Property is located within MFSA District boundaries.
- Two story apartment buildings and a surface parking lot currently occupy the property.
- The existing residential zoning is inconsistent with the property's commercial land use designation.

08.13.08 PZB Meeting

5

Basis of denial

- As described in Staff's report, there are inconsistencies and incompatibilities with specific Comprehensive Plan objectives and policies which prompts Staff not to support the requested change in land use and site plan, that include the following concerns:
 - Incompatible land use with existing residential properties (lacks transition between uses).
 - Establishes precedent (high-rise within MFSA District).

08.13.08 PZB Meeting

6

- Inconsistent with City Hall setting (existing low-rise scale and historical character).
- Required traffic improvements (intersection of Hernando Street and Biltmore Way).
- Insufficient streetscape improvements (north side of Valencia Avenue).
- Historic preservation (adjacent church building and complex).

08.13.08 PZB Meeting

7

Change of zoning

- The request for change of zoning satisfies Zoning Code standards for review:
 - Would correct existing inconsistent zoning designation.
 - Would provide for the redevelopment of an underdeveloped property.
 - Would promote and is consistent with some CLUP objectives and policies.

08.13.08 PZB Meeting

8

Change of land use

- The request for change of land use does not satisfy Zoning Code standards for review:
 - Inconsistent with specific CLUP objectives and policies.
 - Incompatible with adjacent residential properties.
 - Insufficient streetscape and traffic improvements provided.
 - Would impact adjoining church complex and historic City Hall setting.

08.13.08 PZB Meeting

9

- It is Staff's recommendation that the property be developed according to the existing "Commercial Use, Low-Rise Intensity" land use designation allowing for a maximum 77'-0" building height, which is compatible with the surrounding properties and uses.

08.13.08 PZB Meeting

10

Findings of fact

- Proposed project is not consistent with specific goals, objectives and policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan.
- Proposed project does not satisfy all Zoning Code standards for CLUP map amendments.
- Proposed height and massing of the project would have an adverse effect on adjacent residential properties and surrounding historic structures and their setting.

08.13.08 PZB Meeting

11

- Requested development bonuses could not be awarded if developed according to the property's current "MFSA" zoning designation.
- Required traffic improvements are identified that have not been addressed.
- The proposed change of zoning would correct an existing inconsistent zoning designation to be compatible with the property's current commercial land use designation.

08.13.08 PZB Meeting

12

Conditions of approval

- The Planning Department recommends denial of the request for change of land use and the proposed site plan. However, an alternative recommendation and conditions of approval are included in Staff's report if the Board recommends approval of the applicant's development proposal.