

MR. MENENDEZ: Ms. Russo, what happens if your client doesn't comply with one of the two? I assume it reverts --

MS. RUSSO: If the application -- the vacation becomes null and void, and that is if construction is not started within two years from the date this is approved. So this still goes to the Commission for two readings. So the approval then takes place like thirty days after that.

But in the meantime, the applicant is working with City Staff and the site plan is being reviewed by City Staff, and we'll go before the City Commission. So I'm very hopeful that won't come up.

MR. MENENDEZ: I'm sure your client --

MR. BUCELO: I have no comment. So let's close the Board discussion.

Is there a motion?

MR. PARDO: I'd like to make a motion to approve Staff recommendation.

MR. COLLIER: Did we indicate, was there anybody in the room that's --

THE SECRETARY: Yes.

MR. COLLIER: We did?

57

THE SECRETARY: There was no one.

MR. BUCELO: Thank you.

MR. MENENDEZ: I'll second.

MR. BUCELO: Jill, call the roll, please.

THE SECRETARY: Gonzalo Sanabria?

MR. SANABRIA: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Ignacio Alvarez?

MR. ALVAREZ: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Nestor Menendez?

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Felix Pardo?

MR. PARDO: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Alex Bucelo?

MR. BUCELO: Yes.

Thank you so much.

MS. RUSSO: Thank you very much.

MR. BUCELO: Mr. Collier, can we have the last item, I think?

MR. COLLIER: Mr. Chairman, I believe that Item E-3 and E-4 are related. I just want to confirm that with -- so I'm going to read them both in, but I want everybody to relax, because it's going to take me some time to read these. So bear with me.

Item E-3, an Ordinance of the City

58

Commission of Coral Gables, Florida approving amendments to the text and maps of the City of Coral Gables Comprehensive Plan pursuant to small-scale amendment procedures (Section 163.3187, Florida Statutes), and Zoning Code Article 14, "Process," Section 14-213, "Comprehensive Plan Text and Map Amendments," to 1) modify the required Multi-Family densities and height to allow higher intensity within the "University Station Rapid Transit District Overlay," and to allow Multi-Family High Density within the Mixed-Use Overlay Districts located within the "University Station Rapid Transit District Overlay," 2) include additional properties (6100 Caballero Blvd) within the "University Station Rapid Transit District Overlay" on the Mixed-Use Overlay District Map, and 3) amend the Future Land Use Map from "Commercial Low-Rise Intensity" to "Multi Family High Density" for Lots 1&2, Block 5 and Lots 1 thru 3, Block 6, Riviera Waterways Section, Track "K", Addition to Riviera Waterways Section, and Lot 8, Block 208, Riviera Section 14; from "Multi Family Low Density" to "Multi Family High Density" for

59

Lots 3&4, Block 5, Riviera Waterways Section; from "Multi Family Duplex Density" to "Multi Family Low Density" for Lot 5, Block 5 and the southern portion of Lot 5, Block 6, Singer Subdivision; from "Commercial Low-Rise Intensity" to "Multi Family Medium Density" for Lot 4, Block 6, Riviera Waterways Section; and from "Multi Family Duplex Density" to "Multi Family Medium Density" for Lot 5-A and the northern portion of Lot 5, Block 6, Singer Subdivision; providing for a repealer provision, providing for a severability clause, and providing for an effective date.

Item E-4, an Ordinance of the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing for map and text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code pursuant to Zoning Code Article 14, "Process," Section 14-212, "Zoning Code Text and Map Amendments," by 1) amending Article 2, "Zoning Districts," Section 2-408, "University Station Rapid Transit District Overlay" to a) include requirements for multi-family development and provide regulations for modification and development agreements within the district; b)

60

1 add additional properties (6100 Caballero
2 Boulevard) to the boundary of the "University
3 Station Rapid Transit District Overlay," 2)
4 amending Appendix A, "Site Specific Zoning
5 Regulations," to remove inconsistent Site
6 Specifics, 3) amending Article 14, "Process,"
7 Section 14-204, "Transfer of Development
8 Rights," to expand Transfer of Development
9 Rights (TDRs) receiving sites within the
10 "University Station Rapid Transit District
11 Overlay," and 4) amend the Zoning Map from
12 "Mixed-Use 1 (MX1)" to "Multi Family 4 (MF4)",
13 for Lots 1&2, Block 5 and Lots 1 thru 3, Block
14 6, Riviera Waterways Section, Track "K",
15 Addition to Riviera Waterways Section; and Lot
16 8, Block 208, Riviera Section 14, from "Multi
17 Family 3 (MF3)" to "Multi Family 4 (MF4)" for
18 Lots 3&4, Block 5, Riviera Waterway Section;
19 from "Multi Family 1 (MF1)" to "Multi Family 3
20 Subdivision, from Mixed-Use 1 (MX1) to Multi
21 Family 2 (MF2) for Lot 4, Block 6, Riviera
22 Waterways Section; and from "Multi Family 1
23 (MF1)" to "Multi Family 2 (MF2)" for Lot 5-A
24 and the northern portion of Lot 5, Block 6,
25 Singer Subdivision; providing for repealer

61

1 provision, severability clause, codification,
2 and providing for an effective date.
3 Items E-3 and E-4, public hearing.
4 I think, in ten years that I've been with
5 this Board, I think those are the longest
6 titles I've ever read. So we have a record.
7 MS. GARCIA: Good job.
8 Could I have the PowerPoint? Thank you.
9 So here we are amending the just approved
10 University Station Rapid Transit Overlay
11 District. So, as you know, what was adopted
12 last month was the University Rapid Transit
13 Overlay District, which was north of Caballero
14 and south of Turin, I believe.
15 This is going to -- this is proposed to
16 amend that and to add on what's known as the
17 Gables Waterway property, to cross across the
18 Mahi Canal, over into South Alhambra. This is
19 a quarter of a mile from the University
20 Station, and this is a view looking north. You
21 can see, in yellow, is the property that will
22 be added into the Overlay District.
23 So, today, the Future Land Use Map, as
24 we've just heard, is comprised of many
25 different land uses, including commercial low

62

1 rise intensity, multi-family low density and
2 multi-family duplex, and the zoning is MX1, MF3
3 and MF1.

4 So there are four requests. Two -- the
5 first two requests are dealing with the
6 Comprehensive Plan, and the last two requests
7 deal with the Zoning Map and the Zoning Code.
8 The first request is to change the Future Land
9 Use Map to amend it to change land uses to be
10 multi-family high density, multi-family low
11 density, and to amend the Mixed-Use Overlay
12 District Map to include this as part of the
13 University Station at the Transit District
14 Overlay.

15 The Comprehensive Plan is proposed to be
16 amended for the multi-family medium density and
17 multi-family high density to be a maximum of
18 125 units per acre, again, to mimic the
19 County's maximum density for the RTZ. As we
20 all know, this is an attempt to provide options
21 for the property owner to stay within the City
22 and not go to the County. So a lot of what
23 we're seeing today is similar and in
24 substantial conformance with the RTZ of the
25 County.

63

1 So the zoning is proposed to change to MF4,
2 MF3 and MF2, and the Zoning Code Text
3 Amendments involve new standards related just
4 to multi-family development, limiting the
5 height to 120 or 150, with a 10 percent
6 additional open space, which is consistent with
7 what was adopted for the mixed-use standards.
8 The density would be the same, at 125 units an
9 acre, for the MF4 and the MF2 properties. A
10 ten-foot setback on the waterway for all
11 buildings, both, multi-family and mixed-use, an
12 upper story step back along the waterway,
13 across from single-family of 25 feet. A
14 50-foot setback when you're abutting
15 single-family, with, of course, landscape
16 there, and then some minor changes involving
17 architectural changes, landscape, and design,
18 to be consistent with the site plan approval
19 process.

20 The development agreement would be reviewed
21 by City Staff, and Commission, as part of the
22 expedited review process, as allowed with this
23 Overlay, and then some various clarification.

24 The University Station, as proposed today,
25 would be designated all entirely as a TDR

64

receiving area -- I'll get to that in a second, and -- then some removal of inconsistent site specifics requirements is also part of this text amendment to the Zoning Code.

To compare, we have the RTZ of the County on the left column. The middle column is the Overlay Mixed-Use zoning that you should be familiar with, and then, on the right side, is what's proposed, as far as the multi-family zoning, all within the Overlay District. So it would be the same expedited review of City Staff and City Commission. Similar heights of 120 as the maximum height, with no additional Med Bonus, just the 150, if they provide an extra 10 percent of additional open space.

The density will be matched at 125 units an acre. The FAR would be capped at 3.5 FAR, with the option to receive TDRs, for a maximum of 4.375 FAR. The open space will remain the same, at 25 percent of the lot area, would be open space, and then the setbacks would be 10 feet. It would be the same as any other multi-family, on the front, and on the waterway side, as well, with a 50-foot landscaped requirement on the setback, when you're

65

abutting single-family and duplex. And, then, an additional step back for waterways, if you're abutting the waterway, if you're across the waterway from single-family or duplex.

And the uses for multi-family would just be residential. It wouldn't include any commercial uses. The design would remain the same, as Mediterranean style would be required, and as we know, the County would -- if the project went to the County, the City would not see those impact fees, those building permit fees, art in public places payments. So that would be a difference with the Overlay Mixed-Use Zoning and the Overlay Multi-Family Zoning, compared to the County, on the left.

So this is kind of showing what we're trying to avoid, which on the left side is the existing RTZ project that's in Douglas Station. I believe it's called The Cascade. Not a lot of windows, kind of a harsh public realm, and on the right side, is Coral Gables, more landscape, bump outs, windows and doors facing the streets, more park buildings.

So this is the first hearing for this expansion of the Rapid Transit Overlay

66

District. It would have to go, of course, to First Reading and Second Reading before the City Commission.

There was notice sent out within fifteen hundred feet of the entire Overlay District.

Staff has reviewed this, and we believe it to be consistent with the Comp Plan, as far as encouraging development near Metrorail and near transit corridors, and we recommend approval.

Thank you.

MR. BUCELO: Thank you.

MR. ALVAREZ: Can you go back two slides?

MS. GARCIA: Yes.

MR. ALVAREZ: You went over one real fast. What is that?

MS. GARCIA: This is a map that's showing the radius of the mailing.

MR. BUCELO: The notice.

MR. MENENDEZ: The notice.

MR. BUCELO: Thank you so much.

Jill, let's open up the public comment. Anyone in the Chamber?

MS. SECRETARY: No one in Chamber, but we do have someone on Zoom. One moment.

MR. BUCELO: Okay. Perfect.

67

THE SECRETARY: Roberta, can you please open your camera?

MS. NEWAY: I'm trying to. It says I cannot open it because it's disabled by host. Can you hear me?

THE SECRETARY: Yes. Can you try again, ma'am?

MS. NEWAY: Okay.

Okay. Now -- okay, you can see me and probably my kitty cat who just walked right by the screen.

Good evening. I am Roberta Neway. I live at 1236 South Alhambra Circle --

THE SECRETARY: Roberta, can you wait a moment, please? Can you be sworn in.?

MS. NEWAY: Okay.

MR. COLLIER: Yes, she should be sworn in. Hold on.

(Thereupon, the participant was sworn.).

MS. ROBERTA: I do.

MR. BUCELO: Thank you.

THE SECRETARY: Thank you.

MS. NEWAY: Okay. I'm Roberta Neway, 1236 South Alhambra Circle, 33146. I live less than two blocks from the proposed overlay, and I

68

1 walk, mostly I bike, I drive, by the South
2 Alhambra side on an almost daily basis, usually
3 sometimes more than once a day.

4 And to me, this Overlay is the best way to
5 ensure that development harmonizes with the
6 established neighborhood, and to ensure that
7 impact fees are used in such a way that we, the
8 residents, benefit from the development in some
9 way.

10 Please vote yes on these two items, and
11 thank you for your time. That's it.

12 MR. BUCELO: Thank you so much.

13 MS. ROBERTA: You're welcome.

14 THE SECRETARY: I just sent a message
15 confirming there is no one else wishing to
16 speak. No, no one's raised their hand or sent
17 a message.

18 MR. BUCELO: And no one on the phone line?

19 THE SECRETARY: No.

20 MR. BUCELO: Let's close the public comment
21 and let's open it up for Board discussion.

22 Mr. Pardo, can I go with you again?

23 MR. PARDO: Sure.

24 MR. BUCELO: Thank you.

25 MR. PARDO: So if you could go back to the

69

1 exhibit that shows the Overlay distance. How
2 is the Overlay distance related to the Metro
3 station itself? Did you take the radius from
4 the doors that open or from the furthest point?

5 MS. GARCIA: Sure. So on GIS, there's a
6 point for each property. We took that point,
7 and -- a quarter mile from that point.

8 MR. PARDO: No. No. If you could look at
9 your exhibit, the one that has the distance,
10 the radius distance, from the station itself.

11 MS. GARCIA: Uh-hun. This one.

12 MR. PARDO: Right.

13 MS. GARCIA: Right.

14 MR. PARDO: Okay. So that red point there,
15 is that -- are those the doors going into the
16 station or is that the furthest southwest
17 corner or edge of that station?

18 MS. GARCIA: So that's the center that GIS
19 gives you as far as the center of the building.

20 MR. PARDO: Okay. So that is basically
21 where the doors are to go into the station.

22 MS. GARCIA: Right. Sure. I mean, it's a
23 GIS thing.

24 MR. PARDO: Is that a yes or --

25 MS. GARCIA: So if you zoom into the

70

1 building, I mean, the doors going in, there's
2 not really doors. There's the openings that
3 you walk through.

4 MR. PARDO: The entrance. The entrance to
5 the --

6 MS. GARCIA: Right, which is on the north
7 side of the building.

8 MR. PARDO: Right. So the question then
9 becomes, that I see it just makes it to the
10 waterway.

11 MS. GARCIA: To the south side, yeah, to
12 that corner.

13 MR. PARDO: Correct.

14 So I need to understand the waterway that's
15 shown dashed in the packet that we have, that
16 would be, I guess, maybe the next exhibit on
17 your slides, your PowerPoint.

18 MR. BUCELO: Yes.

19 MR. PARDO: One more.

20 Okay. So when you look at this, after
21 where it says, "Mixed-use," if you look at the
22 Future Land Use Map and you look at the dashed
23 line, the radius just touches the Mahi
24 Waterway, correct?

25 MS. GARCIA: Well, on the south side of

71

1 that, where it abuts US-1, yes.

2 MR. PARDO: Right.

3 So my question is, looking at this from a
4 Master -- from a Future Land Use and Zoning
5 Map, adopting -- I guess this is a compromise
6 with the County?

7 MS. GARCIA: Right.

8 MR. PARDO: Okay. So can you walk us
9 through the compromise, on that particular
10 section that abuts the single-family
11 residential, going down the waterway?

12 MS. GARCIA: So, as you know, the County
13 adopted the subzone. The subzone includes a
14 thirty-foot setback when you're within a
15 hundred feet of single-family.

16 MR. PARDO: The fifty feet.

17 MS. GARCIA: We're proposing fifty feet,
18 yes. The County has thirty feet in their --

19 MR. PARDO: Thirty feet.

20 MS. GARCIA: -- subzone, right. We're
21 proposing fifty feet. Yeah, fifty feet is our
22 standard --

23 MR. PARDO: In other words, the width of a
24 traditional single-home --

25 MS. GARCIA: Exactly, yes.

72

1 MR. PARDO: All right. So my question is,
2 you know, what are the people that are
3 immediately south, on the Mahi Waterway, going
4 to be looking at from the closest single-family
5 home, a fifty-foot buffer area, correct?

6 MS. GARCIA: The buffer area will be
7 abutting their property.

8 MR. PARDO: Correct, for fifty feet.

9 MS. GARCIA: Right.

10 MR. PARDO: And, then, after fifty feet,
11 what do they see or what can they see, based on
12 the Land Use Map, in other words, height-wise?

13 MS. GARCIA: As far as height-wise, that
14 would be the proposed.

15 MR. PARDO: Sure.

16 MS. GARCIA: So that would be what's
17 determined today to be 120 feet.

18 MR. PARDO: I'm sorry, can you say that
19 again?

20 MS. GARCIA: 120 feet.

21 MR. PARDO: So they have 50 feet of
22 landscaping, and then 120 feet up?

23 MS. GARCIA: On the Caballero side. On the
24 South Alhambra side, it would be 77 or 97 feet.

25 MR. PARDO: Okay. Is there any way --

73

1 MS. GARCIA: That would be medium density.

2 That will be medium density.

3 MR. PARDO: You don't have a laser pointer?

4 Okay. Thank you.

5 Show us the Alhambra side.

6 MS. GARCIA: So this is the Alhambra side
7 along here, right.

8 MR. PARDO: That's 97 feet?

9 MS. GARCIA: This light blue is your medium
10 density.

11 MR. PARDO: That's the buffer area?

12 MS. GARCIA: The buffer area would be the
13 low density, for like here, the pinkish color.

14 MR. PARDO: That tiny little trip there,
15 that's 50 feet at the scale?

16 MS. GARCIA: Right.

17 MR. PARDO: Okay. And, then, the lighter
18 brown or tan or whatever?

19 MS. GARCIA: 97 feet.

20 MR. PARDO: 97 feet?

21 MS. GARCIA: Correct.

22 MR. PARDO: Okay. And, then, after that --

23 MS. GARCIA: The darker brown would be 120.

24 MR. PARDO: How many feet?

25 MS. GARCIA: 120.

74

1 MR. PARDO: 100?

2 MS. GARCIA: 120.

3 MR. PARDO: 120 feet?

4 MS. GARCIA: Yes.

5 MR. PARDO: Okay. And, then, it's the
6 reverse, you have a buffer area there, which is
7 a little bit larger than the fifty-foot?

8 MS. GARCIA: Correct.

9 MR. PARDO: That's on the South Alhambra
10 side?

11 MS. GARCIA: This is Caballero -- yes,
12 South Alhambra, again, it's just that -- sorry,
13 that's 50 feet of the low density and then the
14 medium density here and the 120.

15 MR. PARDO: Okay. And just so I
16 understand, the County -- comparing that now
17 with the County, can you walk us through
18 exactly what you did now, instead of saying --
19 for example, instead of 50 feet, it would be 30
20 feet, you know, and then the heights, please.

21 MS. GARCIA: Yeah. Yeah. The County would
22 be here, would be 30.

23 MR. PARDO: 30 feet.

24 MS. GARCIA: As well as here it would be 30
25 feet.

75

1 MR. PARDO: Right.

2 MS. GARCIA: Other than that, they don't
3 have a cap. It will just be 150, the highest
4 building within a quarter mile, which is 150.

5 MR. PARDO: Would be 150 --

6 MS. GARCIA: Right.

7 MR. PARDO: -- instead of 97 feet.

8 MS. GARCIA: Right, and then 120.

9 MR. PARDO: And then 120.

10 MS. GARCIA: Right.

11 MR. PARDO: Through the Chair --

12 MR. BUCELO: Yes.

13 MR. PARDO: -- I need to take my time to
14 understand this, to make sure we can compare it
15 with the County option versus what the City has
16 negotiated.

17 MR. BUCELO: Okay.

18 MR. SANABRIA: I have a small --

19 MR. BUCELO: Let him finish and then --

20 MR. PARDO: I'm sorry.

21 MR. BUCELO: Go ahead.

22 MR. PARDO: So on the back side -- on the
23 back side, going up on the property that
24 Ms. Russo described, okay, there you would also
25 have 50 feet of the buffer -- landscaped buffer

76

1 abutting the back of the residential on the
2 other side, correct?
3 MS. GARCIA: Along here?
4 MR. PARDO: Where it says, commercial
5 low-rise --
6 MS. GARCIA: No, because that's not
7 single-family. That's multi-family, the back.
8 MR. PARDO: Correct, but you would have a
9 50-foot buffer there?
10 MS. GARCIA: No.
11 MR. PARDO: There's no buffer?
12 MS. GARCIA: Right. It's not abutting
13 single-family. It's adjacent -- sorry, it's
14 not abutting or adjacent to single-family.
15 This right here is multi-family low density.
16 MR. PARDO: Right. So there's no buffer
17 there?
18 MS. GARCIA: Correct.
19 MR. PARDO: Okay. And is there any buffer
20 on the corner there, to the right, the furthest
21 most --
22 MS. GARCIA: No, I'm sorry, it's because we
23 haven't changed that. There is a rear setback
24 along Madruga of 15 feet. Sorry.
25 MR. PARDO: Okay.

77

1 MS. GARCIA: It's not part of what's being
2 changed today. It's already adopted.
3 MR. PARDO: Okay.
4 MS. GARCIA: So along here --
5 MR. PARDO: Along there --
6 MS. GARCIA: Along here, on Madruga, for
7 these three properties here, there will be a
8 fifteen-foot setback on the rear.
9 MR. PARDO: How much?
10 MS. GARCIA: Fifteen feet; one five.
11 MR. PARDO: Fifteen feet. And what is the
12 height there?
13 MS. GARCIA: Also 120.
14 MR. PARDO: 120?
15 MS. GARCIA: Yes.
16 MR. PARDO: Okay. And if it was the
17 County, there would be zero setback there?
18 MS. GARCIA: Correct.
19 MR. PARDO: And what about the height?
20 150?
21 MS. GARCIA: Right. I say, 120, but they
22 have the ability to provide more open space to
23 be able to have the same at 150. 120 is the
24 first, I guess, base height. If they provide
25 more open space, an extra 10 percent open

78

1 space, then they can have an additional 30
2 feet.
3 MR. PARDO: More open space. 10 percent?
4 MS. GARCIA: Yes, additional, beyond their
5 base requirement. So for multi-family, the
6 base requirement is 25 percent. They have to
7 provide 35 percent open space.
8 MR. PARDO: Okay. Volumetrically, if you
9 were applying the limits of what the City has
10 negotiated, versus what the County would allow
11 on the Rapid Transit use, have you done any
12 calculations as far as what the square footage
13 of this project would be?
14 MS. GARCIA: Square footage volumetrically
15 or square footage as far as the ground floor?
16 MR. PARDO: Correct, volumetrically, as far
17 as --
18 MS. GARCIA: Well, the County has no limit
19 of FAR.
20 MR. PARDO: Right. Are we talking about
21 300,000 square feet?
22 MS. GARCIA: I mean, it's hard to say.
23 It's whatever you can fit within 150 feet.
24 They have no FAR cap and they have no cap
25 requirements. So they can fill that thirteen

79

1 stories with square footage.
2 MR. PARDO: Okay. So the reason I ask is
3 because you're before us here asking for a --
4 MS. GARCIA: Amendment.
5 MR. PARDO: Right, for an amendment, and,
6 then, you know, we're looking at a certain size
7 of project that eventually will be built. So
8 let's say, if it's, whatever, 300,000 square
9 feet, and, then, if we would use the County's
10 ordinance, then it could be 500,000 square
11 feet.
12 So the reason I ask these questions is
13 because, Caballero is a very, very small
14 street, which already has impact from a
15 tremendous amount of development that is there.
16 South Alhambra doesn't have as much of an
17 impact from traffic -- from additional traffic,
18 because they're on the, let's say, leeward
19 side, if you will.
20 So my question is, when you look at these
21 changes of the Comp Plan, do you ever think
22 about the possibility of requesting a wider
23 right-of-way to be able to handle the traffic
24 more? Do you ever consider the instalation of
25 traffic signalization to be able to handle the

80

existing issue and then the future issue of that development?

MS. GARCIA: So the Comp Plan usually only delas with building height. So building height, we do take it into account, in a best case scenario, where we're not pinned into the corner like we are right now for this. We do take into account the width of the right-of-way.

As I'm sure you know, historically, George Merrick, allowed higher heights on those more civilian streets, because he wanted to create that nice outdoor room, with taller buildings on wider boulevards.

MR. PARDO: Correct.

MS. GARCIA: So typically we do. This is a unique condition that we're kind of being pinned in a corner.

MR. PARDO: No, I understand that, but what I'm saying is, right now there may be an opportunity to be able to widen that right-of-way, to be able to soften the impact of the additional square footage that's going in. I understand that we always say, well, you know, with rapid transit, the rapid transit

81

line is there, and it's going to cure all of these traffic issues. We know that it may not necessarily cure all of the traffic issues.

So I am asking that question, because that is part of the consideration of changing the Master Plan, which is the ceiling of what you're trying to do. So if you -- the ceiling is based on the infrastructure that we provide, and that infrastructure that we provide, one of the components is traffic.

I understand that US-1 is, you know, at a Level F, and I get that all day, but my question is, are we doing anything to try to alleviate the situation or is it just going to become just worse? So that's a first question.

So then the second question is, we already discussed heights, we discussed buffers, and then we discussed the difference between what the County has -- you know, has as part of their arsenal and what we've been able to negotiate as a City.

Were you part of the negotiations?

MS. GARCIA: Yes.

MR. PARDO: Okay. And the City Manager, I would think?

82

MS. GARCIA: Of course, yes.

MR. PARDO: Was there anyone else from the City, just the two of you negotiating with them?

MS. GARCIA: Legal.

MR. PARDO: I'm sorry?

MS. GARCIA: Legal, our City Attorney.

MR. PARDO: Right, from legal, okay.

So were any limitations or restrictions or? Conditions that are part of this particular plan, right, and, specifically, to protect the residents that already live around this area, could you share that with us?

MS. GARCIA: Sure. So, I mean, I think, they, the County, would want this to mimic what they are allowing right now tee for tee. As we all know, FAR is very important to kind of contain and keep our development in check. So that wasn't as much of a concern with the County.

But density, as you can see, was the same. We shared our concern as far as setbacks, especially on US-1, where we're requiring a twenty-foot setback, as well as along the frontage for multi-family and then abutting

83

single-family. That, we felt, was very important, to be able to retain and keep in the City, right, apart from any County development that wouldn't have those kinds of setbacks in the most important areas, along US-1, with all of the traffic, and along the frontage for multi-family.

MR. PARDO: How many units would they be allowed now with the Coral Gables plan, if you will, compared to the County plan? How many --

MS. GARCIA: The same density, 125 units an acre.

MR. PARDO: The same density.

MS. GARCIA: Right.

MR. PARDO: Right.

MS. GARCIA: So the same number of units.

MR. PARDO: So, number-wise, are we talking about, acres times 125 --

MS. GARCIA: We can check how many acres there is. I can't remember what the acreage is, off the top of my head, but we can check that.

MR. PARDO: Are we talking about, you know, 600 units or 500 units? I know there's a difference between the one, and two and three

84

1 bedrooms, right?

2 MS. GARCIA: Yes. If you look at this --
3 as soon as they went to the County, they would
4 incorporate the entire property extent into the
5 subzone of the County, whereas we're proposing
6 to have those reliefs and buffers with the
7 count of the low density next to duplex and
8 single-family. So I think the calculation is
9 actually less per Coral Gables than it is for
10 the County.

11 MR. PARDO: And it's also a receiving site?

12 MS. GARCIA: For FAR, but that wouldn't
13 translate to units.

14 MR. PARDO: Only FAR.

15 MS. GARCIA: Correct.

16 MR. PARDO: Right. And the amount of cars
17 that would fit on here would be, again, not
18 necessarily as the many required as normally,
19 because of the mass transit that is available
20 within the quarter of a mile?

21 MS. GARCIA: Correct. Yes. The County has
22 no requirements for residential. We do have
23 some requirements. We are reducing that
24 substantially, but still there's less
25 requirements, of course, with the County, with

85

1 the zero requirement.

2 MR. PARDO: And how much of a commercial
3 component is there from a square footage
4 standpoint?

5 MS. GARCIA: They have no minimum with the
6 County. It's just two uses.

7 MR. PARDO: Two uses?

8 MS. GARCIA: Right. So what we're
9 proposing is only multi-family.

10 MR. PARDO: That's what you're proposing?

11 MS. GARCIA: We're proposing all
12 multi-family, but if they went to the County,
13 they have to provide some kind of commercial
14 use to meet their standards.

15 MR. PARDO: So it would be a very small
16 component? Most of it would be residential?

17 MS. GARCIA: Right, I assume.

18 MR. PARDO: Okay.

19 MR. SANABRIA: Mr. Chairman, I would like
20 to have some comments, too, if you don't mind
21 to defer for a while. It's been rather --

22 MR. PARDO: I'm sorry, I was trying to be
23 as thorough as possible.

24 (Simultaneous speaking.)

25 MR. BUCELO: I think you're asking all of

86

1 the questions.

2 MR. PARDO: I apologize for that. I would
3 like to be able to come back --

4 MR. SANABRIA: Thank you. I know. That's
5 okay.

6 MR. BUCELO: Mr. Sanabria, please.

7 MR. SANABRIA: Yes. I have a question,
8 Attorney, Craig. When we make a motion, is it
9 going to be separate per E-3 and E-4 or is it
10 going to be --

11 MR. COLLIER: Yes, and the voting
12 requirements are different, too. So the
13 Comprehensive Plan item, there needs to be a
14 minimum of four, I think --

15 MS. GARCIA: Yeah.

16 MR. COLLIER: -- and if it's less than four
17 in favor, then it's deemed denied, but then it
18 goes on to the Board. You'll recall, maybe
19 some of you were here -- actually, I don't know
20 if any of you were here, but we changed the
21 Code, so we wanted to make sure that this
22 Board's determination, even if it's a tie vote,
23 would be deemed a denial. So it moves on to
24 the City Commission with a recommendation of
25 denial, if that should be the case.

87

1 MR. SANABRIA: My question is --

2 MR. COLLIER: And then the second item would
3 be separately voted. Again, then, if it's a
4 tie vote, it goes with -- as a zoning item, it
5 goes as no recommendation.

6 MR. SANABRIA: Okay.

7 MR. COLLIER: Or potentially a
8 recommendation of denial, if it --

9 MR. SANABRIA: Okay. Now, again --

10 MR. COLLIER: Yes.

11 MR. SANABRIA: -- the question that I pose
12 before you is this, there's two items, Item E-3
13 and Item E-4.

14 MR. COLLIER: Yes.

15 MR. SANABRIA: So my question to you
16 specifically regarding a motion is, can those
17 two items be lumped together on a motion to
18 approve or they have to be separate, each one?

19 MR. COLLIER: No, it has to be a separate
20 motion, motion on E-3 and then a motion on E-4.

21 MR. SANABRIA: Okay. Now, another thing,
22 for Staff recommendation and for everybody here
23 to know, as far as disclosure is concern, I see
24 the property owner consent letters as an
25 attachment, but there is no property owner's

88

1 name. It's the attorney for the property
2 owner. And I would like this to be, in the
3 future, clarified, so we know the actual name
4 of the property owner or the company.

5 So to avoid any kind of conflicts that we
6 don't know we may have, that's one of the
7 potential issues that could simply be fixed.
8 So, please, in the future, when you request a
9 property owner consent letter, have the owner's
10 name in the printed letter, even though the
11 attorney can still send the letter, but he has
12 to identify the property owners, okay?

13 MS. GARCIA: Okay.

14 MR. SANABRIA: That's it.

15 MR. COLLER: That's fine, but in this case,
16 I did review the letter. The attorney is
17 well-known to the City, represented that he was
18 the -- represented the owner of the property,
19 but we can certainly ask him to include their
20 name.

21 MR. SANABRIA: We need to have it. Not ask
22 him -- Mr. Coller, I differ with you and I'm
23 allowed to speak as well -- I differ with you.
24 We don't need to ask him to put it in. We need
25 to have that name available, in case there's a

89

1 conflict. It could be somebody that some of us
2 may have done business with. So it's a very
3 clear cut requirement --

4 MR. COLLER: Well, that's a good point.

5 MR. SANABRIA: -- that from now on, when
6 you have a property owner consent letter, it's
7 fine that the attorney signs it on behalf of
8 the owner, but we need to have the name of the
9 actual owner and company, et cetera, not an
10 LLC. That's it. Thank you, sir.

11 MR. COLLER: Very fair.

12 MR. BUCELO: Ignacio.

13 MR. ALVAREZ: Thank you, Chair, .

14 I remember, at my first meeting, this issue
15 came up and we took our rulers and we were
16 arguing -- I think I brought up the question,
17 okay, ends at Caballero, that's it, right?

18 And, now, because it touches a little bit
19 of the land on the corner of Caballero, that
20 whole piece is now covered in the RTZ or is it
21 that they're going to RTZ to add that piece,
22 because if I recall my first meeting, it ended
23 at Caballero?

24 MS. GARCIA: Right. So this is a proposal
25 to amend the boundary to include that property.

90

1 MR. ALVAREZ: For the County? In the
2 County?

3 MS. GARCIA: Well, the County right now is
4 talking with the property owner. We're trying
5 to get ahead of that, by amending them to our
6 RTZ.

7 MR. ALVAREZ: And when you negotiated with
8 the County, was the property owner part of
9 those negotiations?

10 MS. GARCIA: Yes.

11 MR. ALVAREZ: So he's on board with these
12 changes?

13 MS. GARCIA: Yes. He has a consent letter.

14 MR. ALVAREZ: Okay. So let me ask you this
15 question, does the Live Local Act also apply to
16 this property? They can do pretty much -- make
17 a deal with us or go Live Local and build a
18 monster or go with County RTZ and build -- and
19 be worse?

20 MS. GARCIA: Right. So the property right
21 now, most of it is zoned MX1, which would allow
22 for a Live Local application to apply there.
23 Once they're zoned to be MF4 and MF2, that
24 would no longer today meet the qualifications
25 for a Live Local Act application.

91

1 MR. ALVAREZ: So, basically, the decision
2 for the Board is, take this or else we're going
3 to look at the pictures on the left?

4 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chair --

5 MR. BUCELO: By all means.

6 MR. PARDO: One of the things during that
7 first meeting was that the County version -- in
8 other words, the County version was there, but
9 it was not disclosed to the Board Members at
10 that time.

11 MR. ALVAREZ: Your first meeting. I'm
12 taking about my first meeting.

13 MR. PARDO: No, I'm talking about the first
14 meeting on this.

15 In this case now, I think we all clearly
16 know that we have Live Local at the State
17 level --

18 MR. ALVAREZ: Right.

19 MR. PARDO: -- the County component, and
20 then now the City negotiated one. So you're
21 correct, but the difference is that now it's
22 been delineated very carefully, and I'm -- I
23 had the same issue. That's why I asked -- the
24 first question was the radius component,
25 whether if it's just touching. It's not

92

1 written that way. It's written basically where
2 the 1,500 --

3 MR. ALVAREZ: Right, but now they're saying
4 that they went back to amend the RTZ.

5 MR. PARDO: Because I think it's more -- in
6 that particular project, it's more going from
7 this City one to Live Local. Is that correct?

8 MS. GARCIA: I'm not following that.

9 MR. PARDO: In other words, the one on
10 Caballero --

11 MS. GARCIA: Uh-huh.

12 MR. PARDO: -- the difference there is that
13 getting that particular property owner onboard,
14 where he's barely, you know, right there, is
15 that he could still exercise Live Local.

16 MS. GARCIA: Sure. Of course, yeah.

17 MR. PARDO: But Live Local has the
18 double-edge sword that you would have to have
19 affordability, as a major component, of forty
20 percent of the units.

21 MS. GARCIA: Yes. You have to comply with
22 all of the --

23 MR. ALVAREZ: But he's able to build much
24 bigger.

25 MR. PARDO: Without a doubt. Without a

93

1 doubt.

2 MR. ALVAREZ: So, basically, it's take this
3 or else.

4 MR. PARDO: Yeah.

5 MR. BUCELO: Mr. Menendez.

6 MR. MENENDEZ: So I think we've touched on
7 a lot of concerns here, all very valid. I
8 share all the same concerns that Mr. Pardo and
9 Mr. Sanabria and Mr. Alvarez. More so on what
10 Mr. Alvarez was saying and what I was going to
11 talk about was, when we were trying to figure
12 out in that meeting how far, you know, the RTZ
13 would stretch, I remember that, on the other
14 side, on, I guess, the South Alhambra side of
15 the Mahi Canal, it seemed like it maybe touched
16 a point. I don't even know if it got there.
17 But now we're asked to encompass it in our
18 Overlay.

19 My concern is -- and I know that the
20 developer's going to the County and asking for
21 for an extension of the RTZ. Are there any
22 guardrails to stop these extensions to the
23 RTZs? Like that's what I'm -- I mean, that's
24 what I'm concerned about, right, because, you
25 know --

94

1 MR. ALVAREZ: That was my same question.

2 MR. MENENDEZ: Right. Sure, we can do this
3 one, and, then, you know, across the street,
4 there's, you know, more commercial property,
5 and then they're -- we're just going to have to
6 keep expanding the overlay, until all of US-1
7 in Coral Gables is RTZ Overlay -- Coral Gables
8 RTZ Overlay. So that's my one big concern.

9 I guess my question is, Number One, does
10 the owner of the property on the Caballero side
11 own the property on the south Alhambra side?
12 Is it all one lot?

13 MS. GARCIA: Yes. It's one folio.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: All right. But half of the
15 folio falls into the RTZ and the other half
16 doesn't. So I guess my question is, if I have
17 one square meter in the RTZ, and I have a
18 thousand square meters out, does that like --
19 just because one square meter of my property is
20 in the RTZ, and it's one folio, now the whole
21 thing is RTZ?

22 MS. GARCIA: From my understanding, they
23 don't require that the entire property be
24 within a quarter mile.

25 MR. MENENDEZ: So long as a piece of it --

95

1 MS. GARCIA: Right, and for that reason,
2 that's why they have a range within their CDMP,
3 the County -- their Comprehensive Plan at the
4 County, and they have a range.

5 MR. MENENDEZ: Which is 50 --

6 MS. GARCIA: Which is a little less than a
7 quarter, a little more than a quarter mile.

8 MR. PARDO: But the difference is, it goes
9 back to Live Local.

10 MR. MENENDEZ: Right.

11 MR. PARDO: Forget about the County.

12 MR. MENENDEZ: I agree. I agree, and I
13 think Live Local -- look, I live in this area,
14 and --

15 MR. BUCELO: It's hard to develop Live
16 Local.

17 MR. MENENDEZ: Right. I think it's -- just
18 given the property values here, it's hard to
19 develop Live Local, because of the
20 affordability, the 40 percent affordable
21 housing. You can't get the money, you know,
22 unless they raise the amount that the developer
23 can charge per doors. So that's the only way
24 that Live Local really becomes a little bit
25 more attractive to developers here in Coral

96

Gables.

MR. ALVAREZ: But the possibility is there.

MR. MENENDEZ: But the possibility is there and I get it. My biggest concern is, one dispensation this time, and then it's another time, and then it's another time, and then, you know, the RTZ Coral Gables Overlay is to 57th Avenue, right, and it all started at Denny's, so to speak. So I guess there's not much we can do now. That's my biggest concern.

You know, I know that the residents have come out and some are against and some are for, but, again, my biggest concern is just that expanding, you know.

MS. GARCIA: Right.

MR. MENENDEZ: We do it this time, and then it's the next time, and then it's the next time.

MR. ALVAREZ: Where is the Denny's?

MS. GARCIA: It becomes multi-family. If there's any consolation --

MR. MENENDEZ: I guess, it's in front of Ponce.

MR. ALVAREZ: You've got UPS, you've got restaurants.

97

take advantage of the overlay without including their entire property within the overlay district. A quarter mile is just the rule of thumb for walkability.

MR. MENENDEZ: Got you.

MS. GARCIA: For a five-minute walk.

That's where the quarter mile comes from and that's probably why in the County CBMP, they have a range, actually, on feet and not in quarter mile, and I think the Board probably should expect some expansions of the RTZ in the future, in the next twenty something years, right.

Things change. South Miami is growing intensely. We may need to look at that part of Coral Gables, to make sure it's not going to be incorporated into something that we can't have control over.

MR. MENENDEZ: Got you.

MR. COLLIER: I just wanted to point out that the County has, from time to time, added property with other RTZs, and the process is, the property owner requests a Commissioner, and the Commissioner sponsors an ordinance, and the ordinance goes to public hearing, and citizens

99

MR. MENENDEZ: That's all covered by our overlay, correct?

MS. GARCIA: Right.

MR. MENENDEZ: That's all covered, and then you've got Ponce, and then you get to single -- right. So I'm not so concerned going to the north, but to the south, you know, it's a commercial district, and what are we doing like to safeguard from that?

Because, again, I get it, this one seems logical, because half the property is in the overlay and half of it isn't. It's not that big of a dispensation, even though there are single-family homes, like Mr. Pardo was saying, you know, on the leeward side of South Alhambra, let's call it, that are going to be less affected as opposed to the Caballero side, which is already affected by the other project that's there.

So, again, that's my one concern about just this overlay expanding beyond what we've approved -- what we approved this year and last year.

MS. GARCIA: Well, a couple of things, just to be clear. We're not allowing a property to

98

have the right to speak at those hearings and -- speak either in favor or objection, and that's the process from the County.

So, unfortunately, we don't have quite the control that we would like to have. It's really up to the citizens to register their concern.

MR. MENENDEZ: Yeah. I understand, and I think that that was the issue that we ran into last July, when the citizens came here, given the -- when -- you know, when this was first proposed, and I think that the miscommunication was that this was the wrong forum, that this was already beyond our control, that the developer -- it was, I guess, on the previous project, on The Mark, that, you know, this was out of our control, and at that point, they were dealing with the County, but yet the citizens -- the residents in Coral Gables expected Coral Gables to do something about it, and at that point, there was kind of a miscommunication, which is why I think the Board wanted to adopt this overlay, but -- yeah. I mean --

MR. COLLIER: I want to make one other

100

comment.

The application is, actually, by the City on this. The letter that we received from the attorney was a concern that I expressed, because the department viewed this as actually more of a restriction on that property, and in an abundance of caution, we wanted to make sure that that property owner was consenting to what the City wanted to do. So that's why that letter appeared, for the record, because we didn't want to do -- we wanted to make sure, if we were doing that, we didn't have somebody come out and say, "Wait a minute, you're making -- you're taking away zoning rights from us."

MR. MENENDEZ: Right.

MR. COLLIER: So that's how that letter started in the first place. They're not an applicant. They're not seeking to do this. This is something that the City is doing, really, to try to protect us somewhat. So I just want to explain what that original rationale was for that letter, which is a little unusual. You don't typically see that.

MR. PARDO: Mr. Collier, based on what you

101

just said and based on your experience in zoning, years, were you part of this negotiating team?

MR. COLLIER: I believe there were other people that were part of the negotiating team that were involved. I will say that, this is a great thing, I'm hoping, for the City, that we provide an alternative and that we make it attractive for the applicants, so that we get some kind of control.

There's no guarantee, obviously, but I think the City is trying to make it attractive enough for the developer, saying, hey, you know, it's a lot easier to have hearings here than at the County. So we can -- we have more flexibility, as far as the timing, and things of that nature. So we're trying to provide something to encourage them, come to the City.

And, of course, with regard to neighbors, I think they're better off having all of the elected representatives actually be within their area, where, as you know, before the County Commission, there's only one Commissioner that represents that district, whereas in the City, all of the Commissioners

102

are --

MR. MENENDEZ: I have one follow-up. Sorry.

As far as like the -- if there's a gap between a property in the RTZ, let's say -- again, if the side of the lot on Caballero is in the RTZ and the other side isn't, right, once you're outside of the RTZ, you're outside of the RTZ? Is that fair to say?

MS. GARCIA: For the County subzone, from my understanding in talking with the County --

MR. MENENDEZ: Yes, with the County.

MS. GARCIA: -- if it happens to be in the RTZ radius, that they'll incorporated the entire property, even though it's straddling the quarter mile.

MR. PARDO: I beg to differ, for one reason, and that is that, for example, there's spacing restrictions that exist in the County, let's say, fifteen hundred feet, but it says to the building, specifically to the building, not if you -- you have to touch the property.

It's a very defined separation between those points, but, still, I don't think that's what the argument tonight is about. This is a

103

game of chicken, and this is a game of chicken of, what do you want it to be, and right now the 800 pound gorilla on the other property is not the rapid transit component of it, it's the Live Local Act.

Now, there are negatives to the Live Local Act, and that is that there's a perception that if you're trying to build apartments that are very exclusive, et cetera, forty percent of them have to have a certain -- so that investor will have to take it on the chin for thirty years, and, then, after thirty years, then they can market it any way they want.

So not only do you have to meet the revenue amounts for the limitation of that rent, but when you're in areas such as Coral Gables, it's extremely high, but it's still very hard to justify, compared to, you know, higher end type of things. So that's the negative.

The key question here is, is this the best deal we can get, basically, for that?

MR. COLLIER: See, I thought the 800 pound gorilla you were referencing was the County.

MR. MENENDEZ: Right.

MR. PARDO: Correct, because I think, at

104

1 the end of the day, you know, what you're
2 looking at is to try to mitigate the impact on
3 the residential areas. I think that ship has
4 sailed, in many respects, as far as traffic and
5 congestion and that type of thing. None of
6 them are positives.

7 MR. ALVAREZ: So there's no planned
8 development right now? This is just to get
9 ahead of it? Did I understand you --

10 MR. BUCELO: Yeah, being proactive, I
11 think, at this point.

12 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

13 MR. PARDO: Right.

14 MR. MENENDEZ: So when there is a
15 development --

16 MR. BUCELO: They have an option to come
17 with the City, instead of going to the County.

18 MR. MENENDEZ: And we'll have to go through
19 this whole thing again,

20 MR. PARDO: And the positive is, what
21 you're trying to do is say, okay, you could go
22 Live Local and build this, but you're going to
23 be building forty percent for lower. So there
24 is an incentive there.

25 MR. BUCELO: Or the same thing, where you

105

1 can come with us, and deal with us, instead of
2 having to deal with the County.

3 MR. MENENDEZ: I have one question, I
4 guess. How many Live Local buildings are in
5 Coral Gables?

6 MR. COLLIER: How many --

7 MR. MENENDEZ: Live Local -- how many
8 buildings have --

9 MR. BUCELO: Zero.

10 MR. COLLIER: Jennifer, I don't think
11 there's been a Live Local application within
12 the City of Coral Gables yet? Have you seen
13 one?

14 MR. BUCELO: Oh, there's one on Eighth
15 Street, correct.

16 MR. COLLIER: There is one, on Eighth
17 Street, right. Yes.

18 MR. MENENDEZ: Eighth Street and --

19 MR. BUCELO: And Ponce.

20 MR. PARDO: And Galiano.

21 MR. BUCELO: Yeah.

22 MS. GARCIA: Yeah, between Ponce and
23 Galiano.

24 MR. MENENDEZ: Okay. And that's the only
25 one?

106

1 MS. GARCIA: Correct.

2 MR. SANABRIA: Mr. Chairman?

3 MR. BUCELO: Yes.

4 MR. SANABRIA: Thank you.

5 One thing that we have not mentioned yet,
6 even though we have mentioned a lot of very
7 valuable information, is that we have
8 jurisdiction over the Mahi Canal, as the City's
9 purview. Would you confirm that, Jennifer?

10 MS. GARCIA: Yes, we do.

11 MR. SANABRIA: Okay. That's an important
12 factor in the influencing of this development,
13 for everybody to know, that is a little bit of
14 a leverage on this.

15 Now, darned if you do, darned if you don't.
16 If we don't do anything and let the County RTZ
17 take over, which it can and it will, because I
18 have worked, like I said before, disclosed, on
19 three other RTZ properties outside of the City
20 of Coral Gables. Even now, as I speak to you,
21 I'm still working the final details on one.

22 And I can tell you, the County likes to
23 have total control of these developments, total
24 control. They don't want to give anything away
25 to any city. So we're lucky that we are at

107

1 this stage where we are. It may not be a
2 perfect baby, but it's our baby, in the sense
3 that we have some jurisdiction on the Mahi
4 Canal, and we should approve this, so we can go
5 forward.

6 If we don't do anything and complain about
7 density, complain about traffic, complain about
8 this, complain about that, we're going to be
9 powerless to do anything, because the County
10 overrules our situation, because of the RTZ
11 1,500 feet diameter.

12 So I'd like to move forward with this as
13 being a viable option, an alternative, even
14 though it's not to everybody's best taste, but
15 it's the best that we can do.

16 So when you're ready, Mr. Chairman --

17 MR. BUCELO: Any more Board discussion?

18 MR. PARDO: I have another point.

19 The site plan approval process, Jennifer,
20 how much influence can there be on the site
21 plan approval process, specifically to create
22 more of a buffer at site plan approval, and
23 making sure that, you know, certain components
24 of the site plan will try to mitigate the
25 negative impact from the building itself or the

108

1 buildings themselves?
 2 MS. GARCIA: So the site plan approval is
 3 going to be a public hearing, unlike the
 4 County. The County doesn't require a public
 5 hearing for the site plan approvals for these
 6 kinds of project. But this will go straight to
 7 Commission, from Staff to Commission, at a
 8 public hearing, with mailed notice to the
 9 neighbors, who can come in and weigh in on
 10 their concerns and their opinions, and be able
 11 to be heard by the Commission.

12 MR. PARDO: So that goes back to what
 13 Mr. Sanabria was saying, as far as being able
 14 to --

15 MR. SANABRIA: Has the purview --

16 MR. PARDO: Exactly, which includes all
 17 sorts of things, including the Mahi Canal.

18 MR. SANABRIA: Yes, sir. That's correct.

19 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chair, can we have a
 20 five-minute break?

21 MR. BUCELO: Absolutely.

22 MR. SANABRIA: Can we just make a motion
 23 now, please?

24 MR. MENENDEZ: I'll move to approve.

25 MR. SANABRIA: I move to approve.

109

1 MR. MENENDEZ: I moved to approve.
 2 MR. SANABRIA: No, I moved it before you
 3 moved it.
 4 (Simultaneous speaking.)
 5 MR. COLLIER: We need a motion to approve on
 6 E-3, in accordance with the department
 7 recommendations.

8 MR. MENENDEZ: I make --

9 MR. SANABRIA: We make a co-motion to
 10 approve. Stop jumping the gun, okay, Nelson.
 11 Let's all do the proper thing here, thank you.

12 MR. BUCELO: We have a motion and a second.

13 MR. SANABRIA: Thank you. No, no, he can
 14 co-motion.

15 MR. BUCELO: We need a second.

16 MR. ALVAREZ: I second.

17 MR. BUCELO: There we go. Mr. Alvarez
 18 seconds.

19 MR. SANABRIA: On E-3, as per the City's
 20 recommendation.

21 MR. PARDO: Discussion.

22 MR. BUCELO: Discussion, yes.

23 MR. PARDO: Discussion.

24 I asked about the amount of units.

25 MS. GARCIA: Yes. I have that. Thank you.

110

1 So with the County RTZ, they would apply the
 2 same regulations for the entire property, which
 3 is 4.8 acres, at 125 units an acre, would be
 4 600 units. The whole property had the same
 5 zoning regulations.

6 MR. PARDO: That's including the projects
 7 that have already been developed?

8 MS. GARCIA: No. No. That's just for the
 9 amendment that we're doing today, right, along
 10 Caballero and South Alhambra.

11 MR. PARDO: 600.

12 MS. GARCIA: With the City's kind of a tier
 13 effect of the higher intensity and density
 14 being toward US-1 and then transitioning down
 15 as you go south, to single-family, duplex, it
 16 would total up to be 300 and -- sorry, 537,
 17 more or less, units per acre -- sorry, units
 18 total. Units total.

19 MR. PARDO: I got a little confused. Six,
 20 what?

21 MS. GARCIA: 600 units with the RTZ, and
 22 then 537 units with the City, because of the
 23 change in the density as it tiers down.

24 MR. PARDO: Okay. So you're looking at
 25 about a 15 percent reduction in units.

111

1 MR. BUCELO: Any other comments?

2 MR. PARDO: That's it.

3 MR. SANABRIA: We have a motion.

4 MR. BUCELO: Call the roll, please.

5 THE SECRETARY: For E-1 (sic), we have a
 6 motion made by Mr. Sanabria, second by Mr.
 7 Menendez, is that correct?

8 MR. MENENDEZ: No, Mr. Alvarez.

9 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Alvarez, sorry.

10 Okay. Ignacio Alvarez?

11 MR. ALVAREZ: Yes.

12 THE SECRETARY: Alex Bucelo?

13 MR. BUCELO: Yes.

14 THE SECRETARY: Nestor Menendez?

15 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

16 THE SECRETARY: Felix Pardo?

17 MR. PARDO: Yes.

18 THE SECRETARY: Gonzalo Sanabria?

19 MR. SANABRIA: Yes.

20 MR. ALVAREZ: Now we've got E-4.

21 MR. BUCELO: Do we have a motion on E-4?

22 THE SECRETARY: It's 5.

23 MR. BUCELO: I mean, E-5, I apologize. Is
 24 it 4 or 5?

25 MR. ALVAREZ: Motion to move.

112

1 MR. MENENDEZ: Second.
 2 MR. COLLER: Oh, wait a minute. I made a
 3 mistake. I said E-3. It was E-4 that that
 4 motion was, right?
 5 MR. SANABRIA: Correct.
 6 MR. SANABRIA: It's E-3 and E-4 are the
 7 ones that we're voting on. E-5 is another
 8 one -- I'm right.
 9 MR. COLLER: Right, E-3 and E-4. That was
 10 correct.
 11 MR. BUCELO: We voted on E-3.
 12 MR. SANABRIA: I'm right.
 13 MR. COLLER: We voted on E-3.
 14 MR. BUCELO: So we have a motion on E-4.
 15 MR. COLLER: This is E-4.
 16 MR. MENENDEZ: I second the motion.
 17 MR. COLLER: My confusion, sorry.
 18 THE SECRETARY: I'm sorry, who made the
 19 motion for E-4?
 20 MR. BUCELO: Mr. Alvarez made the motion,
 21 and Menendez seconded.
 22 Any final comments?
 23 Jill, call the roll, please.
 24 THE SECRETARY: Nestor Menendez?
 25 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.

113

1 THE SECRETARY: Felix Pardo?
 2 MR. PARDO: Yes.
 3 THE SECRETARY: Gonzalo Sanabria?
 4 MR. SANABRIA: Yes.
 5 THE SECRETARY: Ignacio Alvarez?
 6 MR. ALVAREZ: Yes.
 7 THE SECRETARY: Alex Bucelo?
 8 MR. BUCELO: Yes.
 9 MR. COLLER: Done in accordance with
 10 Department recommendations, correct, on that
 11 item?
 12 MR. BUCELO: Correct.
 13 MR. PARDO: Correct.
 14 MR. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 15 MR. ALVAREZ: Yes.
 16 MR. SANABRIA: Mr. Chairman, whenever we're
 17 ready.
 18 MR. BUCELO: I think we have --
 19 MR. SANABRIA: We have the discussion item
 20 when that comes up, let me know.
 21 MR. BUCELO: Discussion items --
 22 MR. ALVAREZ: No discussion items.
 23 MR. BUCELO: There's no discussion items.
 24 MR. SANABRIA: Mr. Chairman, on discussion
 25 item, I'd like the Board Staff and the attorney

114

1 to clarify and specify when is the next
 2 election for Chair and Vice Chair. At the next
 3 meeting, I'd like to have the information
 4 clarified for all of our sakes of information.
 5 MR. BUCELO: I think we also have a Board
 6 Member that needs to go to the rest room, so
 7 either we adjourn or we --
 8 MR. ALVAREZ: Motion to adjourn.
 9 MR. MENENDEZ: Second.
 10 MR. BUCELO: All in favor?
 11 (Board Members voted aye.)
 12 (Thereupon, the Board Meeting was adjourned at
 13 8:05 p.m.)

115

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
 2
 3 STATE OF FLORIDA:
 4 SS.
 5 COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:

6
 7
 8
 9 I, NIEVES SANCHEZ, Court Reporter, and a Notary
 10 Public for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby
 11 certify that I was authorized to and did
 12 stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and
 13 that the transcript is a true and complete record of my
 14 stenographic notes.

15
 16 DATED this 23rd day of February, 2026.

17
 18 

19
 20 -----NIEVES SANCHEZ-----
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

116