

1 So I think this is more appropriate for  
 2 this area than it would be a normal  
 3 circumstance for a school in a residential  
 4 neighborhood.  
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody else?  
 6 We have a motion and a second. Are we  
 7 clear on what the motion and the second is?  
 8 MR. COLLER: The motion is in accordance  
 9 with the Department's recommendation, with a  
 10 modification of Condition Number 1, regarding  
 11 the number of students, and, further, that  
 12 there be a curb of the existing driveway and no  
 13 fence surrounding this courtyard that we've  
 14 mentioned, I believe is -- Charles, does that  
 15 fit with you --  
 16 MR. WU: I just want to clarify. Is the  
 17 number 390 in the student enrollment to be  
 18 quantified as on campus only? Is that the  
 19 intent?  
 20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: 390 on campus at any given  
 21 time.  
 22 MR. WU: Okay. We got it.  
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Hearing no  
 24 further comment, Jill, if you'll call the roll,  
 25 please.

1 163.3184, Florida Statutes, and Zoning Code  
 2 Article 3, "Development Review," Division 15,  
 3 "Comprehensive Plan Text and Map Amendments" --  
 4 wait a minute. I don't need to read these in.  
 5 We read these in last time and we said,  
 6 therefore, we don't need to --  
 7 MR. COLLER: I made a commitment to you  
 8 that since we were continuing this hearing from  
 9 the previous meeting --  
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Perfect.  
 11 MR. COLLER: -- that you would not have to  
 12 re-read these titles --  
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: As I started going, I  
 14 said, "Wait a minute."  
 15 MR. COLLER: -- since we previously read  
 16 them in.  
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Great. Thank you.  
 18 MR. COLLER: So this is a continuation of  
 19 the previous hearing. The titles have been  
 20 read in, let the record reflect. So we can  
 21 proceed.  
 22 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
 23 If I can have the PowerPoint, please.  
 24 This is the last section of all of the  
 25 different amendments that we have worked on

1 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?  
 2 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.  
 3 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?  
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.  
 5 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?  
 6 MR. PEREZ: Yes.  
 7 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?  
 8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.  
 9 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 10 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 11 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?  
 12 MR. BELLIN: Yes.  
 13 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?  
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.  
 15 All right. Thank you.  
 16 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Many thanks. Have a  
 17 good night.  
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You, too.  
 19 Next item on the Agenda is Number 5. It's  
 20 an Ordinance of the City Commission of Coral  
 21 Gables, Florida requesting an amendment to the  
 22 text of the City of Coral Gables Comp Plan,  
 23 Future Land Use Element, Policy FLU-1.1.3,  
 24 "Table FLU-1 Residential Land Uses," pursuant  
 25 to expedited State review procedures, Section

1 with your leadership and input for the North  
 2 Ponce area, and I think that all of them work  
 3 together, and I believe we have made a few  
 4 changes since the last time you saw this that  
 5 truly make this much more effective.  
 6 As you know, we have been working on this  
 7 area for about two years, with a lot of public  
 8 input, many public meetings, many discussions.  
 9 Hopefully tonight is the last Planning and  
 10 Zoning meeting that we have on this issue. All  
 11 of the information, all of the background  
 12 information, is posted on the web page,  
 13 multiple studies, multiple ordinances, multiple  
 14 reports from meetings, and different ideas that  
 15 I think are beginning to make some sense as one  
 16 overall plan for this very important area of  
 17 the City.  
 18 Today we have two items. We have a  
 19 Comprehensive Plan Amendment, which deals with  
 20 density, and we also have a Zoning Code Text  
 21 Amendment which deals with the requirements for  
 22 development.  
 23 Something I want to point out, we don't  
 24 have a Map Amendment. We have decided that we  
 25 have dropped the area that was a district. We

1 simply are going to recommend to you that all  
2 of these requirements apply to the whole North  
3 Ponce area, which is the area, of course, from  
4 Eighth Street in the north to Navarre to the  
5 south.

6 So that is, I think, the most significant  
7 change. We removed the District and the Map.

8 MS. MENENDEZ: Can I just ask a question in  
9 that regards? You're saying, it's not this  
10 boundary, but the entire North Gables area?

11 MR. TRIAS: It is the entire North Ponce  
12 area and it is described in text form in the  
13 Zoning Amendment.

14 MR. BEHAR: So it becomes the Overlay  
15 District?

16 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

17 Yes, so that is the most significant change  
18 since the last time we saw this.

19 MS. MENENDEZ: Do you have a map that shows  
20 the entire area? Is it this one?

21 MR. TRIAS: Yes. That shows it.

22 MS. MENENDEZ: So you're proposing that  
23 instead of this, which is what got advertised,  
24 it's everything?

25 MR. TRIAS: There was a change -- yes.

1 Yes. We changed the text, so it's everything,  
2 yes. The answer is, yes.

3 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, essentially it's the  
4 Douglas Section, is what we're talking about?

5 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Essentially, yes.

6 MR. BELLIN: Yes.

7 MS. MENENDEZ: But this is the  
8 advertisement that went out or we didn't  
9 advertise? What went out to the residents in  
10 this area?

11 MR. TRIAS: That went out to the residents,  
12 yes.

13 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. So the Infill is only  
14 depicted in this area. You're saying that now  
15 you're allowing for all of the area, as long as  
16 the criteria is met?

17 MR. TRIAS: Yes. We changed that since the  
18 last meeting we had, yes.

19 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. I didn't know that.

20 MR. TRIAS: Well, it's in the text. It's  
21 very clear --

22 MS. MENENDEZ: This text?

23 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.

24 MS. MENENDEZ: All right. It's just that  
25 this map, which was included as part of our

1 package, was confusing.

2 MR. TRIAS: Ms. Menendez, I think you made  
3 a very clear point, and that was the idea that  
4 we had originally, and because of your comments  
5 as a Board, which you had some concerns about  
6 identifying a specific area only, Staff is  
7 recommending that this apply to the whole North  
8 Ponce area, to avoid any kind of appearance  
9 that some specific properties are being  
10 targeted, which was never the intent.

11 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.

12 MR. TRIAS: That's the reason this was  
13 done.

14 MS. MENENDEZ: That makes sense, but --

15 MR. TRIAS: So we have clarified the  
16 regulations that deal with the Infill. I think  
17 that they're very clear. We had included  
18 language to increase the density. And, as I  
19 said, we have expanded the area to include all  
20 properties that are MF-2 within the North Ponce  
21 area.

22 The first request is the Comprehensive Plan  
23 Amendment, and, as you know, currently the Comp  
24 Plan has a maximum density on MF-2 of forty  
25 units per acre or fifty units with the

1 architectural incentive for the Mediterranean  
2 Bonus program. The amendment recommends a  
3 maximum density of sixty units per acre or  
4 seventy-five units per acre with architectural  
5 incentives. So that's the significant change,  
6 and that's in the Comp Plan.

7 In the Zoning Code Text Amendment, which is  
8 the second item, the rules where this change  
9 would apply are written. And the basic rules  
10 are that to be able to take advantage of this  
11 Overlay Zoning, the parcel has to be 20,000  
12 square feet. So only if a parcel is assembled,  
13 is 20,000 square feet, then that extra density  
14 takes place.

15 In addition, there's an FAR requirement  
16 allowance of 2.0 or 2.5 with the architectural  
17 incentives. That's also in the text of the  
18 Zoning Amendment. And if you look at the Staff  
19 report, that is on Page 11.

20 And if you have any questions, we can go  
21 over it in more detail based on the Text.

22 MR. PEREZ: Just one question, Ramon.

23 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

24 MR. PEREZ: So it's 20,000 square feet  
25 contiguous, doesn't matter what the frontage

1 is?  
 2 MR. TRIAS: Right.  
 3 The distinction is that in the Mixed-Use  
 4 Overlay for Ponce de Leon, there was a  
 5 requirement for frontage on Ponce de Leon.  
 6 Here there's no requirement for frontage in any  
 7 particular place. The requirement is that it  
 8 has to be 20,000 square feet and MF-2.  
 9 MR. PEREZ: Okay. So it doesn't matter if  
 10 it's an irregular lot, it's 20,000 square feet,  
 11 and that's it? It doesn't have to have 150 of  
 12 frontage or 200 of frontage, because I know, in  
 13 the CBD now, for High-Rise, you've got to have  
 14 20,000 square feet and 200. In this case, it's  
 15 just 20,000 contiguous?  
 16 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes.  
 17 And that is, like I said -- if you look at  
 18 Number 4, on Page 11, minimum building site  
 19 area 20,000 square feet, I mean, it's a very  
 20 simple description of the requirement.  
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: Let me ask you, if I may.  
 22 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: This Infill area, are we  
 24 tying it to Workforce Housing?  
 25 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

1 MS. MENENDEZ: But I don't see it anywhere  
 2 here.  
 3 MR. BEHAR: Well, we're not doing that yet,  
 4 and I agree and that's --  
 5 MR. WU: It's not a requirement. If you  
 6 can look at Request Number 1, as Ramon showed,  
 7 the density is increased to sixty dwellings per  
 8 acre or seventy-five dwellings with  
 9 architectural incentives. Additional  
 10 incentives can be considered if we have a  
 11 Workforce Housing component down the line.  
 12 MR. TRIAS: Right. That is -- go ahead.  
 13 MR. BEHAR: Well, I mean, down the line, I  
 14 think, Charles, I would feel more comfortable  
 15 that if we're going through this process, you  
 16 know, we do that from the onset. To leave it  
 17 open for the future -- and I think that, you  
 18 know, part of the whole exercise that we've  
 19 done for the last year is to try to incorporate  
 20 Workforce Housing.  
 21 And I know there's a consultant that has  
 22 come onboard, but we, not yet, have seen  
 23 anything from the consultant. I think, and I  
 24 brought an article that came out in the Miami  
 25 Today a couple of weeks ago, about the City of

1 Miami, how it's working on incorporating  
 2 Workforce Housing -- and the City of Miami goes  
 3 even to the Affordable, which is not what we  
 4 want to do, or at least what I propose to  
 5 recommend, but where -- and this is a project  
 6 that came out, that we did, that we were  
 7 involved with, which is incorporating Workforce  
 8 Housing and market rate houses in the same  
 9 building, same development.  
 10 And I think we should be prepared now to  
 11 look at something that if a developer comes and  
 12 offers us, let's say, for example, like the  
 13 City of Miami, either a five or ten percent,  
 14 they get an additional density to be able to  
 15 allow us to get the Workforce Housing. I think  
 16 we should look at that now. I don't think down  
 17 the line is a good idea, because we will not  
 18 know what that comes back to.  
 19 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Behar, I think that the  
 20 language that we have in the Comp Plan, which  
 21 says, "Additional density may be permitted in  
 22 accordance with any Workforce/Attainable  
 23 Housing Density Program," that that languages  
 24 allows what you're saying.  
 25 Now, just like in the architectural bonus

1 program, we have the details in the Zoning  
 2 Code, and those details were developed through  
 3 many meetings and through years of review. I  
 4 think something similar may take place here.  
 5 Now, if you have some recommendations in  
 6 terms of -- as a Board, if you want to make  
 7 some specific recommendations, you certainly  
 8 can do that. Staff believes that we need to  
 9 get some input from the consultant before a  
 10 final decision is made, but certainly any  
 11 recommendations are welcomed at this point.  
 12 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, I did a little bit of  
 13 some calculations, and what happens is, let's  
 14 take a hypothetical piece of property, 20,000  
 15 square feet. That's .46 acres. At  
 16 seventy-five units per acre, that gives you  
 17 thirty-four units, and you take out common  
 18 area. So you have 50,000 square feet, less the  
 19 common area of 6,000 square feet, gives you an  
 20 average unit size of 1,300 square feet.  
 21 The whole purpose of doing this is to get  
 22 smaller units. So I have a problem with just  
 23 the density and the FAR that's allowed at 2.5.  
 24 If you have a hundred units an acre, using the  
 25 same numbers, you end up with a unit size -- an

1 average unit size of 956 square feet.  
 2 MR. TRIAS: And that may be the result of  
 3 the Workforce/Attainable Housing Program. And  
 4 what we're saying at this point is that Staff  
 5 is not ready to make a final recommendation on  
 6 the numbers for Workforce and Attainable  
 7 Housing, because our consultant has not given  
 8 us a report.

9 MR. BEHAR: Well, but forget about the  
 10 Workforce Housing Program. You know, right  
 11 now, if we go based on Marshall's number, you  
 12 know, we're still back in the same position,  
 13 doing units that are 1,300 square feet, where  
 14 the intent is to do a smaller unit, be able to  
 15 get more affordability to the area, and we're  
 16 not doing that.

17 I mean, if those numbers are correct, we're  
 18 in the same position we were a year ago.

19 MR. TRIAS: I think that there's a  
 20 difference between sixty units per acre and  
 21 seventy-five. I mean, certainly if you believe  
 22 that the number should be different, you can  
 23 make a recommendation.

24 MS. MENENDEZ: Right now it's forty or  
 25 fifty with architectural incentives. They're

1 establishing the program and we are assuming  
 2 that there will be higher density, which the  
 3 result will be smaller units, but we don't have  
 4 all of the information yet to make a  
 5 recommendation on how the program should be.

6 And what I'm saying is, it's not that  
 7 different from the Architectural Mediterranean  
 8 Bonus Program, which took some time to develop  
 9 in the Zoning Code.

10 MS. MENENDEZ: But I'd like to see the  
 11 intensity of what's being proposed. At  
 12 least -- I just don't know why we're rushing  
 13 it, because I see it as a rush, in particular  
 14 if you have this consultant on board and he's  
 15 looking at Workforce Housing, and I think  
 16 everybody would agree that this is a great area  
 17 for it, being right next to the trolley line,  
 18 et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

19 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, if I can add: The last  
 20 Commission meeting, the Commission requested to  
 21 take action today or to move forward without a  
 22 recommendation.

23 MS. MENENDEZ: But, again, I think we've  
 24 taken action on everything related to the North  
 25 Ponce study, except for this Infill.

1 proposing sixty to seventy-five with  
 2 architectural incentives. So they're  
 3 increasing --

4 MR. TRIAS: Twenty-five. I mean, the  
 5 typical project will be fifty, and now we're  
 6 saying it should be seventy-five, basically.

7 MR. BELLIN: Well, I'd like to make a  
 8 suggestion that it be a hundred, because I  
 9 think that gives us the unit size that we  
 10 really need here.

11 MS. MENENDEZ: But, you know, I'm really  
 12 uncomfortable getting into this without really  
 13 looking at something, not just this, but maybe  
 14 drawings, massing --

15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Like a density study.

16 MS. MENENDEZ: -- those types of things,  
 17 because I really think that this section is  
 18 tied to the Workforce Housing issue, and I'm  
 19 not sure why -- unless there's a project in the  
 20 pipeline or something, why we're looking at  
 21 this without connecting the two. Do you see  
 22 what I'm saying?

23 MR. TRIAS: We are connecting the two.  
 24 It's just that we're not connecting it fully.  
 25 We're connecting it in the sense that we are

1 MR. TRIAS: Right.

2 MS. MENENDEZ: So the question is, why is  
 3 there a rush?

4 MR. TRIAS: The Commission has told us to  
 5 get this scheduled in the February 14th  
 6 meeting.

7 MR. WU: 14th meeting.

8 MR. TRIAS: And I intend to do that. So  
 9 the issue right now is simply, let's make the  
 10 best recommendations you can -- a  
 11 recommendation --

12 MS. MENENDEZ: We can just tie it to the  
 13 Workforce Housing. The Workforce Housing is  
 14 going to probably turn out to be what you all  
 15 are saying, that to create the Workforce  
 16 Housing, you need to increase this --

17 MR. BEHAR: The density, you know, allowed.

18 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. But my uncomforness  
 19 (sic) is, you know, those projects work if  
 20 they're next to the transit line -- you know,  
 21 the trolley line, if they have certain  
 22 components to it.

23 MR. BEHAR: Not necessarily. I think, when  
 24 we looked at -- and, Julio, you used an  
 25 example, you know, a few months back, where,

1 you know, in order to get, I think it was your  
2 daughter or something, back into the City, a  
3 smaller unit was necessary, which we're not  
4 providing that even today with this amendment.

5 I think -- and Marshall is saying a hundred  
6 units per acre. Perhaps it's a hundred,  
7 perhaps it's even more, in order to reduce that  
8 square footage and make the units more  
9 attainable.

10 In my opinion, yes, from what we had before  
11 to where we're getting, it's an improvement. I  
12 think we need to push it a little bit more in  
13 order to provide more attainability of smaller  
14 units.

15 MS. MENENDEZ: But this isn't addressing  
16 Workforce Housing.

17 MR. BEHAR: Well, not yet. Not yet. We're  
18 saying that is going to come. What I was  
19 proposing to do is that, tie it now on the  
20 Workforce Housing, that if a developer  
21 provides, you know, let's say, five, ten  
22 percent of the units, they get an additional  
23 percentage increase of density in the projects.

24 MR. TRIAS: And that is the way that the  
25 plan will be, and if you want to make a

1 recommendation on that, certainly you can, at  
2 this point. From our point of view, we were  
3 just waiting for the consultant to give us the  
4 expertise.

5 Now, I anticipate that it's going to be  
6 exactly what you're saying.

7 MS. MENENDEZ: When is this gentleman or  
8 consultant going to finish this study?

9 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Wu is working on that.  
10 Maybe he can answer that.

11 MR. WU: We expect a first draft in a  
12 matter of weeks, and we're going to reconvene  
13 and -- have a workshop with the Commission and  
14 reconvene with industry representatives and --

15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can I just -- how is it  
16 fair to this Board, who sits home on weekends  
17 and at nights like this and goes through all of  
18 this -- and I've got a couple of points that I  
19 want to get through -- to tell us now that this  
20 needs to get to the Commission on February  
21 14th, yet we expressed concerns previously, we  
22 continue to have concerns tonight, and the  
23 study to which we seem to want to tie this to  
24 won't be done for a couple of weeks?

25 So I'm not sure how that process -- I see

1 no -- that process does not come together, in  
2 my mind, as I sit here right now. So that's  
3 frustrating.

4 It's frustrating that this is not the first  
5 time we've been told that something must get  
6 through us at whatever night it is, and  
7 basically voted up, voted down, don't vote it,  
8 it's going forward with or without you, too  
9 bad. So it's frustrating, because we all take  
10 our volunteer role so seriously here.

11 And, Ramon, when we started on the Infill  
12 District analysis, what properties did we look  
13 at the first time we reviewed this -- or the  
14 first two times? Did we look at basically  
15 three area by Douglas Entrance?

16 MR. TRIAS: Generally, yes, I would say.

17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And then we had some  
18 neighbors here who said, "Oh, I own properties  
19 on Antiquera and Calabria, and we think that  
20 those should be included, too."

21 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. And we had a lot  
23 of discussion, I thought, about it being  
24 appropriate for Infill near the Douglas  
25 Entrance, because that was historically a major

1 entrance to the City, coming down East Ponce,  
2 therefore, close maybe to an employment center,  
3 close to some very intense mass transit, which  
4 is what we just saw in our last application,  
5 between the trolley and the bus stops.

6 And, then, between December and now, if I'm  
7 understanding it correctly, we have gone from  
8 looking at effectively three sites, possibly  
9 adding two more, based on what some members of  
10 the community wanted, to now adding in the  
11 entire North Ponce corridor.

12 MR. TRIAS: And the way that I would  
13 conceptualize this is that it is the transition  
14 between the Mixed-Use corridor on Ponce de Leon  
15 and some of the smaller historic properties  
16 that are likely to remain.

17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But we went through --  
18 I mean, your analysis in Attachment G, which  
19 we've had a couple of times, I mean, went  
20 through a significant analysis of the first  
21 three properties of parcels we were looking at,  
22 and then added in the other two, and now  
23 basically we're told that this needs to get  
24 through this Board tonight.

25 We've now brought in, Lord knows, how many

1 additional acres of property in the entire  
2 North Ponce corridor, which, personally, I  
3 think is hard for me to digest and swallow.

4 MR. TRIAS: And it is a very, very valid  
5 position to be opposed to it and to vote  
6 against it. I mean, I'm just saying that this  
7 is an issue of policy, and the way that I would  
8 explain it is that it's a way to transition  
9 between the very intense corridor that we have  
10 on Ponce de Leon and some of the existing  
11 historic fabric that is likely to remain.

12 There are some parcels that have been  
13 assembled. There are some parcels that require  
14 some different requirements in order to be  
15 effective transitions, and this was the best  
16 way that we could accomplish that.

17 MS. MENENDEZ: But normally those --

18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What transpired since  
19 our last meeting and tonight that has caused  
20 Staff to bring in the entire North Ponce  
21 corridor versus basically what I'm going to  
22 call five blocks worth of properties?

23 MR. TRIAS: The objection from the Planning  
24 and Zoning Board to the fact that it was a very  
25 small area that seemed to target some

1 properties. That was discussed, and that's the  
2 way that I understood it.

3 MS. MENENDEZ: Right, but I think the  
4 intent was to analyze the North Ponce area and  
5 determine what areas do fit what you're trying  
6 to accomplish.

7 MR. TRIAS: And our recommendation is,  
8 looking at the Ponce de Leon corridor, which is  
9 going to be very intense, and looking at the  
10 existing fabric of the historic buildings,  
11 there was a need to have a third element to  
12 this Master Plan, that allow for a transition  
13 between the two.

14 That is a recommendation that is based on  
15 some solid planning theory and I think that you  
16 may agree or disagree or you may want to have  
17 more detail or less detail, but certainly it's  
18 a very valid approach, the fact that MF-2 is an  
19 issue because some of it is going to be in the  
20 corridor for North Ponce, in the context of a  
21 Mixed-Use project, and some of it is not. Some  
22 of it is going to be very small buildings that  
23 are existing there. Some of it is fairly large  
24 buildings in the Mixed-Use corridor.  
25 Therefore, it would be beneficial to have a

1 floating designation, for lack of a better  
2 description, that allows for that transition to  
3 take place, in a orderly fashion, from a  
4 planning point of view.

5 That was our thinking. You may agree or  
6 disagree, but certainly that was our thinking.

7 MS. MENENDEZ: When there's -- I'm sorry.

8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

9 MS. MENENDEZ: When there's a project being  
10 proposed, because from the very beginning I  
11 think some of us thought that perhaps there was  
12 a project being proposed, wouldn't that project  
13 just come before this Board and go through a  
14 Zoning change, if it's a Zoning change, or a  
15 Land Use change?

16 I mean, are we kind of like changing Codes  
17 to a particular property -- I mean, a  
18 particular project or -- I'm just confused and  
19 that's why I originally asked, why only this  
20 area, because I didn't know what analysis was  
21 done to come up with just this area.

22 MR. TRIAS: My original idea was that East  
23 Ponce was a corridor similar to Ponce de Leon.  
24 Different, obviously, but it also required some  
25 specific planning. That was the original idea.

1 And that's why we were trying to focus on that.

2 As we had a chance to listen to your very  
3 valuable input and talk to some of the property  
4 owners, we realized that that strategy was not  
5 the best for the existing conditions that we  
6 had on the ground. I mean, that's something  
7 that evolved through time and certainly evolved  
8 since the last time we discussed it.

9 And like I said, you may agree or disagree.  
10 Certainly, if you have some more input, I'll be  
11 happy to forward the ideas to the Commission.

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'd like to understand what  
13 exactly occurred that the Commission is asking  
14 the Board to make a decision with incomplete  
15 information. I kind of view that superficially  
16 as irresponsible, without knowing more, but how  
17 does that happen? Was there a vote on the  
18 Commission and they said that they -- I mean,  
19 is it one person that came to you, you know? I  
20 mean, how does that happen? Exactly what  
21 occurred?

22 MR. TRIAS: I mean, it was part of the  
23 public record, and it was part of the public  
24 meeting discussion, and what happened is that  
25 -- what I would encourage you to think is that

1 Zoning has some limited abilities to predict  
 2 the future. I mean, what we're doing is we're  
 3 dealing with Zoning. We're not dealing with a  
 4 Site Plan, for example. We're not dealing with  
 5 a project, which may come afterwards. And if a  
 6 project comes afterwards, you get to review it  
 7 in much more detail.

8 So the different tools that we have do  
 9 different things, and it's very frustrating for  
 10 all of us, for me, also -- as an architect, I  
 11 would like to have all of the answers at the  
 12 very beginning, but through my experience in  
 13 this field, I realized that there's so much  
 14 that you can get from Zoning, there's so much  
 15 that you can get from the Comp Plan.

16 From the Comp Plan, we can set the  
 17 densities. That doesn't tell you how the  
 18 project is going to look or how the project is  
 19 going to function, but it tells you something.  
 20 It tells you something valuable. So that's  
 21 what we're doing with the Comp Plan.

22 With the Zoning Code, what we're setting up  
 23 is some basic numbers, 20,000 square feet, 2.0  
 24 FAR or 2.5 with Med Bonus. We have some  
 25 landscape requirements also included. So those

1 consideration, and there's -- and this area is  
 2 a perfect for that study.

3 So I'm just not sure why we're not waiting  
 4 for the Workforce Housing study to be completed  
 5 so that this area can be looked at and we can  
 6 decide what is the best -- based on the study,  
 7 what are the best locations to consider  
 8 Workforce Housing.

9 MR. TRIAS: And that's a very, very  
 10 reasonable recommendation.

11 MR. BEHAR: For the record, I do not have  
 12 any project in this area. All right. I want  
 13 to make sure that is out there.

14 I like what this has done, where you've  
 15 taken it. I will commend you for it, because I  
 16 think it may simplify the process.

17 My problem is, I don't feel that we're  
 18 giving enough incentive to start providing  
 19 Workforce Housing. Not Affordable, Workforce  
 20 Housing. I don't think that we're doing that  
 21 yet.

22 Would I have liked to have had the report  
 23 from the consultant, yes. What I would suggest  
 24 is that perhaps some numbers could be added, if  
 25 this is going to Commission, based on

1 are the different tools that we have.

2 Now, in terms of the affordable housing  
 3 component, you're correct. You know, we don't  
 4 have all of the information on that, and that  
 5 is something that I think is aspirational to  
 6 some extent, in the sense that we believe we  
 7 will have a very well thought out and  
 8 professional recommendation from our  
 9 consultant.

10 Now that's just one part of the discussion.  
 11 Certainly your opinion on affordable housing is  
 12 equally valuable. So if you believe you have a  
 13 plan that you want to recommend, please go  
 14 ahead and certainly we can incorporate it.

15 MS. MENENDEZ: I guess the only -- I mean,  
 16 the good thing is, is that it's a Conditional  
 17 Use, as I understand it, and it would have to  
 18 come before this Board and ultimately get  
 19 approved by the Commission, right?

20 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right.

21 MS. MENENDEZ: Every single application.

22 The only concern I have is that now we've  
 23 switched from one little area to the entire  
 24 area. We have a Workforce Housing study out  
 25 there being, you know, put together for

1 experience that we, the three of us, deal with  
 2 similar types of projects, I feel comfortable  
 3 that I could make a recommendation, before the  
 4 end of tonight, of something that is going to  
 5 go to Commission for them to consider.

6 Something that we could always come back, once  
 7 we have that report, but, you know, we could  
 8 always modify if it comes back to us. I'm not  
 9 sure this will come back to us.

10 So, personally, I would like -- if I'm  
 11 going to move this forward to Commission, I  
 12 want to have some input in that.

13 MR. TRIAS: But it comes back to you,  
 14 because the Affordable Housing Program would  
 15 have to be an amendment to the Zoning Code. I  
 16 mean, that's the intent.

17 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, I would like to come up  
 18 with real numbers, a density number, an FAR  
 19 number, and have the Affordable Housing,  
 20 whatever you want to call it, Workforce  
 21 Housing, tied. If you decide to take advantage  
 22 of what's here in the Overlay District, you  
 23 have to provide Workforce Housing, and I think  
 24 we should put a number to it right now, so it's  
 25 very clear, when it goes to the Commission,

1 what we're looking to achieve.  
2 MS. MENENDEZ: Well, I'm uncomfortable  
3 putting a number, just a number. You know,  
4 normally, when you put up a number, you do a  
5 study. You just don't pick a number, as I see  
6 it.

7 MR. BELLIN: I think that the number  
8 that -- when we had the little meeting, which I  
9 don't think you were there for, the Affordable  
10 Housing component is ten percent.

11 MR. BEHAR: Five to ten percent. That's  
12 typically the number.

13 MR. BELLIN: Yeah, but I think what we  
14 talked about was ten percent.

15 MR. BEHAR: Because I was there at the same  
16 meeting, where the consultant was there --

17 MR. BELLIN: Yeah. That's what I would  
18 suggest.

19 MR. BEHAR: And, for example, the City of  
20 Miami is doing, if you -- and not to say that  
21 we're going to follow that -- if you do a five  
22 percent, you get a fifty percent increase. If  
23 you do ten percent, you get a hundred percent  
24 increase, both -- in the density, not in the  
25 FAR. Again, I'm not proposing to put those

1 numbers.

2 I would like to make sure that -- put  
3 something in place, and not to disagree with  
4 Marshall, I don't want to put that if you're  
5 doing it. Only if you take and you incorporate  
6 Workforce Housing, then you get the bonuses,  
7 the additional bonuses.

8 MR. BELLIN: That's what this says.

9 MR. BEHAR: Okay. If not, this is what it  
10 is.

11 MR. TRIAS: That's what it says. That's  
12 what it says, and the program is going to come  
13 back to you later. I mean, one of issues that  
14 we dealt with, with this overall strategy for  
15 North Ponce, is that we've dealt with different  
16 aspects of it at different points. So the last  
17 aspect of this, which is still not complete, is  
18 the details of the Attainable Housing  
19 component.

20 Now, what we are bringing to you today sets  
21 the stage for that. It allows for that to  
22 happen. Now, we don't have that last piece  
23 yet, true. We don't have the consultant's  
24 recommendation. That's true. We could wait, I  
25 suppose. That would be one option. But the

1 Commission has preferred to tell us to bring  
2 this to them as soon as we can. That's what  
3 they said.

4 I mean, I'm not saying it's the best  
5 approach, but certainly it's an approach that  
6 allows us to get there and my hope is that we  
7 can get that consultant information soon  
8 enough, so you can review it and have some real  
9 data to make a recommendation for the very last  
10 component. The very last component is the  
11 affordable or the attainable housing component.

12 MS. MENENDEZ: But it affects this. It  
13 affects this whole area. I just don't think  
14 it's ready to be voted on today. I mean, my  
15 colleagues might disagree, but I think that the  
16 study that's being done is a very big component  
17 of this area. That's how I view it.

18 So, as a matter of fact, I'd like to make a  
19 motion that it be deferred until such time that  
20 the Workforce study gets completed and it be  
21 incorporated into this area.

22 MR. BELLIN: But before we vote on that,  
23 isn't there a component that Dade County is  
24 going to require that the Workforce Housing be  
25 incorporated in developments?

1 MR. WU: No. That's been -- actually,  
2 Craig, you can speak to it. I believe that's  
3 been --

4 MR. COLLER: Well, the County didn't  
5 require the mandatory Workforce Housing, but  
6 they are asking the cities to address it.  
7 Addressing it may mean that we don't have a  
8 need for it or we've accomplished it or we  
9 intend to implement something, but there was --  
10 the original mandatory Workforce Housing did  
11 not pass.

12 MR. BELLIN: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. We have a motion  
14 on the floor.

15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'll second it.

16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have a second.  
17 Yeah.

18 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: I'd just --

19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It is a public hearing  
20 item. Yeah, you're right.

21 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, you might want to open  
22 the public hearing.

23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We will. Hold on.

24 Ramon, let me back up. On the last  
25 meeting, we spent some time discussing, there's



1 a parcel on the south side of Santillane --  
 2 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: -- east of the  
 4 commercial buildings on Ponce that we had  
 5 talked about reviewing to have that included in  
 6 the Infill rather than the Mixed-Use. It's  
 7 still in the Mixed-Use rather than the Infill.  
 8 So I wasn't sure if some analysis had been done  
 9 or if -- because it's an existing apartment  
 10 building right now.  
 11 MR. TRIAS: Right. That one, yes. I mean,  
 12 I think that what I advised the Commission is  
 13 that the boundaries of the Mixed-Use District  
 14 may be altered depending on the projects that  
 15 are proposed. At this point, I do not  
 16 recommend any more changes to the boundaries.  
 17 I simply don't recommend it, because we don't  
 18 have any projects, and until we have a project  
 19 that is trying to -- and a project may also  
 20 include rezoning for all I know.  
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.  
 22 MR. TRIAS: It may include multiple things.  
 23 So that would be a better strategy than to try  
 24 to anticipate or speculate on the possibilities  
 25 of one or two parcels. That is my

1 recommendation.  
 2 And a related aspect to this is that the  
 3 Infill, is that other -- the Infill regulation  
 4 before you today is that additional level of  
 5 regulation that allows for some other solution  
 6 for the MF-2 properties, short of rezoning or  
 7 short of the Mixed-Use District.  
 8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. We have a motion  
 9 and a second on the table. We need to open up  
 10 the public hearing. Jill, do we have any  
 11 cards?  
 12 THE SECRETARY: Yes, we have two.  
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 14 THE SECRETARY: Mario Garcia-Serra.  
 15 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Good evening, Mr. Chair,  
 16 Members of the Board, Mario Garcia-Serra, with  
 17 offices at 600 Brickell Avenue, representing  
 18 two different clients here this evening, the  
 19 Alliance Starlight Companies, and FIPRO, both  
 20 companies own property within the North Ponce  
 21 area, parcels of considerable size. None of  
 22 these parcels are the subject of any proposed  
 23 project.  
 24 We have been involved in the whole North  
 25 Ponce planning efforts --

1 MS. MENENDEZ: What blocks are those, I'm  
 2 sorry?  
 3 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Where the properties are?  
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.  
 5 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: There's one at 100  
 6 Calabria. There's another one at -- I believe  
 7 the number of the property is 20 Santillane,  
 8 and then -- those are the Alliance properties.  
 9 And then the FIPRO properties face Douglas  
 10 Road. One, I think the address is 910 and the  
 11 other one is 1210 Douglas Road. Those are the  
 12 four sites that I represent.  
 13 And we've been involved in the process from  
 14 the beginning. As you know, it's been a long,  
 15 probably about a two-year sort of planning  
 16 process that we've been involved in. Part of  
 17 the reason why we have not come forward with  
 18 any project in any of these Infill areas is  
 19 because of the fact that no regulations have  
 20 actually been adopted yet or recommended. It's  
 21 sort of been a floating target as to where this  
 22 is going to happen.  
 23 With that said, many of these properties  
 24 that my clients own are either vacant, which I  
 25 think is crazy, when you think of a place like

1 this, Coral Gables, and this location has  
 2 20,000, 30,000 square feet of land that is  
 3 vacant and not developed, with all of the needs  
 4 that there as far as housing, and, you know,  
 5 trying to locate housing in close proximity to  
 6 work centers and transit areas and so forth. A  
 7 lot of them are very underutilized. Even with  
 8 the permitted density that they have now, they  
 9 are at a lower density, but it just doesn't  
 10 make sense to re-develop to that higher density  
 11 because of the numbers.  
 12 So there's two different sorts of  
 13 objectives that I think are being, you know,  
 14 sought here. One is re-development, just plain  
 15 re-development. In other words, seeing new  
 16 development in places where it is appropriate.  
 17 And Number Two is trying to address the  
 18 Attainable/Affordable Housing issue. But I do  
 19 think that the two are distinct.  
 20 One thing that was being lost in the  
 21 conversation, but I think you guys found it  
 22 towards the end, is the fact that indeed the  
 23 boundaries now that Staff is proposing is sort  
 24 of the entire North Ponce area, but the way to  
 25 look at this is as a sort of assignable Overlay

1 District, similar to how Mixed-Use can be  
 2 assigned as an Overlay District for particular  
 3 sites in the City, the idea would be to have  
 4 this Residential Infill Overlay District that  
 5 can be assigned, also.  
 6 And what does that mean? That means that,  
 7 let's say this were to be adopted by the City  
 8 Commission, it doesn't mean that any project  
 9 there that can start. Any project that is  
 10 proposed is going to have to go through the  
 11 Conditional Use Overlay assignment process,  
 12 which is what Ms. Menendez was talking about,  
 13 that requires Development Review Committee,  
 14 Board of Architects, the Planning and Zoning  
 15 Board, and then ultimately the City Commission.  
 16 So this is sort of laying out the framework  
 17 or the tool by which you could possibly do an  
 18 Infill project, but not actually permitting any  
 19 Infill project to happen.  
 20 Where I think the City Commission is coming  
 21 from is not a place of, you know, just let's  
 22 railroad this through somehow. I think they  
 23 sincerely want to be able to adopt all of the  
 24 North Ponce regulations at one point in time,  
 25 and more or less at the same point in time.

1 right direction, and it's a Planning effort  
 2 that's been going on for so long and it's a  
 3 Planning effort that's been repeated so many  
 4 times, because there have been many other North  
 5 Ponce studies that really didn't lead to  
 6 anything. This is the one that we think has  
 7 the more promise, and this is a step -- at  
 8 least a step in the right direction to keep us  
 9 going.  
 10 Like I tell you, I can take out the aerial  
 11 photographs, but you look at 100 Calabria, you  
 12 look at the Santillane property, you know,  
 13 where large vacant tracks that have been that  
 14 way now for decades, and it's just not  
 15 something that should be accepted anymore. We  
 16 need to find a way to move forward, whether it  
 17 be just for the sake of giving you a little  
 18 more incentive to redevelop, or whether it's  
 19 for the sake of giving you a lot of more  
 20 incentive, in order to try to address the  
 21 Affordable/Attainable Housing issue, both of  
 22 which I think can be accomplished, but I would  
 23 say, let's try to at least get one done tonight  
 24 so as to be able to move forward.  
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

1 The Preservation District has gone through, the  
 2 Mixed-Use District has gone through without it  
 3 being necessarily tied to this  
 4 Attainable/Affordable Housing study, and now  
 5 they're looking at the Infill.  
 6 And like I mentioned before, the Infill is  
 7 not just to address the Attainable/Affordable  
 8 Housing issue. Hopefully it does and hopefully  
 9 it can, within the boundaries of that study,  
 10 with the aid of the study that is done.  
 11 There's also sites that are just justified to  
 12 be re-developed on their own and need the  
 13 Zoning regulations and incentives in order for  
 14 them to be re-developed, not necessarily just  
 15 addressing the Affordable Housing issue.  
 16 That's pretty much all of the comments that  
 17 I have.  
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: So you favor this?  
 19 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Everything that has been  
 20 put forward by City Staff, I've been supportive  
 21 of, even though it doesn't cover all of the  
 22 properties necessarily, nor does it, you know,  
 23 provide for the densities or the FARs that my  
 24 clients really think would be what would be  
 25 necessary, but at least it's a step in the

1 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, if I can add one  
 2 clarification, the Mixed-Use First Reading did  
 3 include similar language for bonus density for  
 4 Workforce/Attainable Housing in the First  
 5 Reading, and it was part of Ramon's  
 6 presentation that was known that we have that  
 7 bonus density in the future and the Workforce  
 8 Housing study is not yet done.  
 9 So a similar discussion did occur at the  
 10 Commission level, in a similar fashion here.  
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: But that was the result, I  
 12 think, of our comments. That wasn't proposed  
 13 when we saw it.  
 14 MR. WU: Correct.  
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: Right, because I remember  
 16 bringing that up, the fact that, you know, it  
 17 wasn't in there, and here we have a study being  
 18 done, and I would think that it should be part  
 19 of it, but, again, I have mixed feelings.  
 20 I've put in a motion, because I do think  
 21 that one should wait for the study, but I  
 22 understand that the Conditional Use is a method  
 23 of looking at the project and studying it,  
 24 so --  
 25 MR. BEHAR: You know, Maria, I would have

1 preferred if we had that. And with Mario's --  
 2 Mr. Garcia's explanation, I feel a little bit  
 3 more comfortable that that comes at a later  
 4 time, and as far as the Affordable/Workforce  
 5 Housing Program, you know, as that develops, it  
 6 comes back to us.

7 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. All I'm saying here is  
 8 that you're setting up the stage for everything  
 9 to take place. Everything is not ready yet.  
 10 That's true. But you are setting up the stage  
 11 correctly. You're doing the Comp Plan change,  
 12 and you're doing the Zoning change that allows  
 13 you to finalize it, once we have the bonus  
 14 program for Affordable Housing/Attainable  
 15 Housing.

16 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, what is the study  
 17 that's being done going to tell us?

18 MR. TRIAS: It's going to make  
 19 recommendations as far as the density, and I  
 20 think that the recommendations will have data  
 21 that back it up. And what happens is that --  
 22 what the consultant said very clearly is that  
 23 if you simply raise the density, that's not  
 24 going to do it. You need to raise the density  
 25 within a program such as the one that Mr. Behar

1 side, how does the massing of the building, how  
 2 does the parking and the traffic and so on,  
 3 actually fit within that overall strategy.

4 It's complex. There are many moving parts.  
 5 I don't think, at any point, any of us knows  
 6 all of the answers, and that's basically where  
 7 we are. We're at 90 percent of the way there,  
 8 I think. We've done most of the issues that  
 9 deal with the existing buildings, with the  
 10 Mixed-Use and so on. We're missing that last  
 11 ten percent, which is the Affordable Housing  
 12 Bonus Program.

13 MR. PEREZ: What's the expected turnaround  
 14 time for that report, again?

15 MR. WU: I've tried to answer that. We're  
 16 still gathering data. For example, it's very  
 17 difficult to gather, and I shared this with  
 18 Board Member Marshall today, is that to get  
 19 good rental data on all apartments and all  
 20 condos. So first we have to crack that nut, to  
 21 see where you can get Coral Gables rental data  
 22 and Coral Gables area rental data.

23 We also have to get salary median  
 24 information from our employers, and we have a  
 25 good base from our City employees. We're also

1 was explaining, five percent or ten percent, if  
 2 it's affordable and so on.

3 That's really what's missing. I mean, I  
 4 don't think there will be any new idea or  
 5 anything that is going to shock anyone as far  
 6 as what the outcome of this is going to be. I  
 7 think we know what the likely scenario is going  
 8 to be, generally. We have some general idea of  
 9 the densities -- you have some -- and they're  
 10 all reasonable. What we need is the data to be  
 11 able to support it, and we're missing that  
 12 data.

13 That's going to come soon. In order to be  
 14 able to achieve that, we have to change the  
 15 Comp Plan, which is one of the changes, and we  
 16 also need to have the regulations in the Zoning  
 17 Code, which, as you have explained, is a  
 18 Conditional Use.

19 All of the Overlay District's that we have  
 20 are Conditional Uses. So they have very, very  
 21 high standard of review, and they are very  
 22 project specific. They allow you to do that  
 23 transition that I was talking about, the fact  
 24 that through the Conditional Use process, one  
 25 can see what properties are next on either

1 gathering from the HR department. So to answer  
 2 the earlier question, what is the report going  
 3 to tell us? (A) it's going to tell us  
 4 demographics, what is our target population of  
 5 trying to target this Workforce Housing. (B)  
 6 is going to tell us supply. (C) it's going to  
 7 tell us demand. If there's a payment in lieu  
 8 of, how much to charge, and who is going to  
 9 enforce this program, because the City Manager  
 10 has told the consultant, the City does not have  
 11 the expertise to enforce this program.

12 So it's going to be quite a complex study.  
 13 It's going to be very comprehensive, and we  
 14 hope this completed study can sustain any  
 15 challenges, because you need to have a housing  
 16 study that if we enforce, and is challenged, we  
 17 have the data and the analysis to back it up.  
 18 So it is quite complex.

19 We've got one of the best housing study  
 20 consultants on board, and I think he's got his  
 21 arms around him. We have a first initial  
 22 meeting with industry representatives, and  
 23 we'll continue moving forward.

24 MR. PEREZ: So, in essence, there's still  
 25 no confirmed time, date, as to when it is going

1 to be turned around?  
 2 MR. WU: We don't have that yet. No,  
 3 because he was just signed on late last year.  
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Let me ask a question. The  
 5 scope of services or the whole study itself is  
 6 to determine whether Coral Gables is going to  
 7 consider Affordable Housing or is it to set up  
 8 the parameters for Affordable Housing?  
 9 MR. WU: The latter.  
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: So it's to set up the  
 11 parameters to allow for Affordable Housing?  
 12 MR. WU: Yes.  
 13 MS. MENENDEZ: So the density issues, it's  
 14 going to get into location, perhaps, or the  
 15 requirements for putting up a development?  
 16 MR. WU: We're not going to get into  
 17 location per se, but we might identify ideal  
 18 locations where Workforce Housing are likely to  
 19 occur, and all of that will be part of the  
 20 study, because identifying the supply and  
 21 demand location is going to be part of that  
 22 information.  
 23 So I would just say, we're not there yet,  
 24 but I think in a matter of -- we will keep you  
 25 updated.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Can we  
 2 continue with the public hearing?  
 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Any other speakers?  
 4 THE SECRETARY: Oscar Herrera.  
 5 MR. WU: Mr. Attorney, do we need to swear  
 6 in for legislative action? He's not been sworn  
 7 in yet.  
 8 MR. COLLER: I don't know. How did we do  
 9 it the last time --  
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It's legislative, but  
 11 the definition, I think, of what is legislative  
 12 and what's not --  
 13 MR. COLLER: Why don't we just swear him  
 14 in, in an abundance of caution?  
 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think that's smart.  
 16 (Thereupon, Mr. Oscar Herrera was sworn.)  
 17 MR. WU: If you can state your name and  
 18 address, for the record.  
 19 MR. HERRERA: Sure.  
 20 Good evening, Members of the Board. My  
 21 name is Oscar Herrera. I'm a resident in Coral  
 22 Gables, 1110 Country Club Prado, and I'm  
 23 addressing you on behalf of the property  
 24 located at 105 Calabria.  
 25 I'm addressing you as a citizen. I'm not

1 entirely familiar with the processes that take  
 2 place before the Board, which are very complex,  
 3 from what I can hear. But, at the same time, I  
 4 just want to express an opinion regarding what  
 5 I've noticed, and it had do with the changes  
 6 that took place between the last proposal and  
 7 the proposal that is being presented for your  
 8 consideration.  
 9 Last time around, the proposal included a  
 10 portion that it was south of Eighth Street,  
 11 north of East Ponce de Leon, and the only  
 12 clarification that was requested from us, as an  
 13 owner of a property in that location, was just  
 14 making sure that if -- the clarification that  
 15 was presented and was corrected today,  
 16 regarding the fact that the specifications were  
 17 not applicable for properties that had minimum  
 18 area, you know, the existing specifications  
 19 would remain and be applicable to those  
 20 properties.  
 21 That was the only clarification that we  
 22 expected was going to take place, and it has  
 23 taken place from what I can see.  
 24 Today, I noticed that the entire east  
 25 area -- rather, the area that is north of East

1 Ponce de Leon Boulevard has been removed, and,  
 2 well, I wonder why that is the case. It seems  
 3 that there's only two block that are south of  
 4 Eighth Street and north of East Ponce de Leon,  
 5 and it would seem to be effective to take that  
 6 area into consideration, to make a wholistic  
 7 decision, from a Planning perspective.  
 8 So I don't quite understand why that area  
 9 was removed in the proposal that is being  
 10 proposed to you. And there might be reasons  
 11 that have to do with architectural matters or  
 12 urbanistic matters or what have you, but I'm  
 13 just trying to understand, as a citizen, what  
 14 is driving that decision.  
 15 MR. BELLIN: That wasn't removed. It's  
 16 included.  
 17 MR. HERRERA: Fair enough. My apologies.  
 18 MR. BELLIN: A whole lot more was also  
 19 included. So that wasn't taken away. It was  
 20 given to all of the rest of the properties in  
 21 the Douglas section.  
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So you saw previously a  
 23 dotted line around a few parcels up by Douglas  
 24 Entrance?  
 25 MR. HERRERA: That is correct.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What has happened since  
 2 that last meeting is, that dotted line now  
 3 encompasses all of the North Ponce. So from  
 4 Navarre north to Eighth, from Le Jeune over to  
 5 Douglas, everything is now in, not just those  
 6 few parcels that I think you were used to  
 7 seeing with a dotted line around it.  
 8 MR. HERRERA: Thank you for the  
 9 clarification. Clearly, I rest my case. A  
 10 lack of preparation for this meeting on my  
 11 part.  
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Don't worry. We were  
 13 surprised ourselves, at least I was, because I  
 14 didn't read the text. I looked at the map.  
 15 MR. HERRERA: Clearly I rest my case. So  
 16 I'm glad to see that that is the case. It's  
 17 clearly a more efficient way of addressing, you  
 18 know, the best and highest use of the area. So  
 19 thank you for your time, and once again, let  
 20 this be an opportunity to thank you for the  
 21 volunteering time that you devote to the City.  
 22 All right. Thanks a lot.  
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.  
 24 Do we have any other speakers, Jill?  
 25 THE SECRETARY: No.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No other speakers? All  
 2 right. Seeing none, we'll close the public  
 3 hearing.  
 4 We still have a motion and a second. It's  
 5 open for discussion, if anybody has any more.  
 6 MR. COLLER: Do you have a date in mind as  
 7 far as when this deferral or is it to a date  
 8 uncertain?  
 9 MR. WU: Well, it sounds like they wanted  
 10 the housing study to be completed to come  
 11 together, so --  
 12 MR. COLLER: So it would be to a date  
 13 uncertain.  
 14 MR. WU: Uncertain.  
 15 MR. COLLER: Yeah.  
 16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 17 MS. MENENDEZ: And hearing that the scope  
 18 of the services that this gentleman is doing,  
 19 this study on Workforce Housing deals with the  
 20 parameters to set it up, because what I  
 21 understood you told me was, this is something  
 22 that they're seriously considering. They're  
 23 not looking at a study to consider Workforce  
 24 Housing, but, rather, a study that's to set up  
 25 the parameters for Workforce Housing. So based

1 on the latter, I really think that we should  
 2 wait for that study to be completed.  
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It seems like the  
 4 results of the study could also go directly  
 5 into Marshall's comment about the density and  
 6 the FAR.  
 7 MR. TRIAS: That is the main issue, the  
 8 main issue that is going to be incorporated  
 9 into the Zoning Code, that is going to come out  
 10 of the study, the density.  
 11 In addition, there will be some management  
 12 recommendations on how to actually manage the  
 13 program, but that's not really a Zoning, per  
 14 se.  
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.  
 16 MR. TRIAS: And that's the only thing that  
 17 is missing. And what I'm saying to you is that  
 18 we are allowing for that to happen with this --  
 19 the two documents before you, and it's up to  
 20 you to make a recommendation.  
 21 MR. GRABIEL: Are you saying that this, as  
 22 we have right now, will not preclude  
 23 incorporating any recommendations from that  
 24 study?  
 25 MR. TRIAS: It's actually even more than

1 that. It makes it mandatory to come up with  
 2 those recommendations, because it comes in the  
 3 Comp Plan. The Comp Plan says that that's  
 4 going to happen.  
 5 So those are the tools that you're going to  
 6 have to approve anyway at some point.  
 7 MR. GRABIEL: Am I correct in thinking that  
 8 the parking ratio will also be looked at?  
 9 MR. WU: That was part of the  
 10 recommendations that came up with the meeting  
 11 with the --  
 12 MR. GRABIEL: I don't see how we can  
 13 increase the density and increase the number of  
 14 apartments and not reduced the parking  
 15 requirements.  
 16 MR. WU: It will be looked at.  
 17 MR. GRABIEL: Because it won't fit. I  
 18 mean, the sandwich is just --  
 19 MR. WU: It's a menu of things the  
 20 consultant will look at.  
 21 MR. GRABIEL: That's going to be looked  
 22 at --  
 23 MR. TRIAS: There will be some design and  
 24 planning ideas that are going to be in the  
 25 Zoning Code, density and related issues, such

1 as parking. There will also be some management  
2 recommendations. That's the best way that I  
3 can explain what the outcome will be from the  
4 study.

5 MR. BELLIN: I think the study should be,  
6 as you said, mandatory as part of the approval,  
7 being able to take advantage of what the  
8 Overlay District offers. If you don't provide  
9 the Workforce Housing as recommended by the  
10 consultant, then you can't take advantage of  
11 it.

12 MR. TRIAS: And the way the consultant  
13 explained it is that that extra density had to  
14 be mandatory as part of the Attainable Housing  
15 Program. If you simply change the density  
16 without the program, it won't work.

17 MR. BELLIN: No. The two have to be tied  
18 together.

19 MR. TRIAS: So that's why we're  
20 recommending some changes of density up to  
21 seventy-five, which is a reasonable density,  
22 from a design point of view, and then the  
23 additional density, which is the one that  
24 several of you have discussed, that's the one  
25 that is missing, and that's the one that is

1 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, what you're  
2 saying is true, as long as you have the 20,000  
3 square feet.

4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, there's some  
5 limiting factors, right. But what I hear  
6 Marshall saying is, his understanding -- and  
7 you'll correct me and you'll restate it -- is  
8 that you only get to take advantage of the  
9 Infill, of any increase in density than what's  
10 there today if you have Workforce Housing.

11 MR. BELLIN: That's right.

12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And that's not what  
13 this does.

14 MR. BELLIN: But that's what I'm suggesting.

15 MR. BEHAR: No. No. No.

16 MR. TRIAS: You're correct. You're  
17 correct. That's not what it does, to  
18 seventy-five.

19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So we continue  
20 to have confusion on the Board. So there's  
21 significant confusion.

22 MR. BEHAR: No. No. My understanding is  
23 that this will allow that all of the properties  
24 with a minimum of 20,000 square feet take  
25 advantage of up to seventy-five units per acre

1 tied to the Attainable Housing Program.

2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I want to make sure  
3 we're all clear.

4 MR. BEHAR: Yeah.

5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So this takes the whole  
6 North Ponce area up to possibly seventy-five  
7 units under the Infill scenario?

8 MR. BELLIN: I can tell you, at seventy-five --

9 MR. TRIAS: As a Conditional Use --

10 MR. BEHAR: Yes, as a Conditional Use.

11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So it takes every  
12 property -- the minimum, it takes it all up,  
13 but if you want to go more than seventy-five,  
14 then you need to comply with this yet to --

15 MR. BELLIN: No. The Workforce Housing  
16 component is a condition of the Overlay  
17 District.

18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's not what this  
19 says.

20 MR. WU: No.

21 MR. BEHAR: No. No. No.

22 MR. BELLIN: That's what I'm suggesting.

23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So I think that  
24 goes to maybe the point of the member that made  
25 the motion.

1 and a 2.5 FAR.

2 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

3 MR. BEHAR: At a future date, when the  
4 program is in place, the Workforce/Affordable  
5 Housing, if you want to increase the density  
6 and possibly the FAR, you'll have to abide by  
7 the rules and regulations in place at that  
8 time.

9 MR. TRIAS: That's a perfect explanation.

10 MR. COLLER: And to the Board, I just want  
11 to direct your attention --

12 MR. BEHAR: And I am comfortable with that,  
13 you know, because if not, this makes -- if I  
14 don't do Affordable Housing right now, this  
15 makes no sense to do this. Then what are we  
16 doing this for? This, what it's doing, is  
17 allowing you to do a little bit more units, not  
18 a lot, because your own calculation only gave  
19 you thirty units on a 20,000 square foot site.

20 MR. BELLIN: In a practical sense, what  
21 happens is, if you have to build seventy-five  
22 units that you get per acre, if you have to  
23 build those units and your average size is  
24 1,300 square feet, you will never be able to  
25 have a unit built.

1 MR. BEHAR: Well, Marshall, what you're  
 2 saying is even going back to less -- bigger  
 3 units still. If your analogy is what I'm  
 4 understanding, if you don't take advantage of  
 5 this, your unit size is going to 1,700 square  
 6 feet.  
 7 MR. BELLIN: That's why nothing gets built.  
 8 MR. BEHAR: But then you want this to take  
 9 place and if you do, you know, Workforce  
 10 Housing, you're going to be able to increase  
 11 the density and the units may be less, you  
 12 know, square footage.  
 13 MR. TRIAS: It's a complex set of  
 14 incentives, but I think that's what this area  
 15 requires, because --  
 16 MR. BEHAR: If you don't do this, Marshall,  
 17 your unit sizes will be larger. This is  
 18 allowing you to do more density.  
 19 MR. BELLIN: What I'm saying is, you set  
 20 the density at "X" and I'm suggesting it be a  
 21 hundred units an acre, and in order to get  
 22 that, you will have to provide that Workforce  
 23 Housing component then or you can't take  
 24 advantage of it and it goes back to whatever it  
 25 is --

1 MS. MENENDEZ: Marshall, you're coming up  
 2 with that number that this gentleman, the  
 3 consultant, is studying right now.  
 4 MR. BELLIN: It doesn't matter, because the  
 5 unit size is what's important. That's what's  
 6 going to drive this whole thing. There's going  
 7 to be no development if the units are too big  
 8 to --  
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: I think we're jumping ahead  
 10 of the guy. We won't need the guy.  
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Let me suggest this --  
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: I mean, what I'm hearing,  
 13 you know, Marshall say is, let's just approve a  
 14 hundred, you know, per acre.  
 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. That's what I'm  
 16 getting to.  
 17 MS. MENENDEZ: Why do we need the  
 18 consultant? We got it resolved.  
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Let me suggest, we have  
 20 a motion to defer, with a second pending. If  
 21 that passes, we don't need any more  
 22 conversation about legislating from the dais.  
 23 If it doesn't, then we can go from there. Is  
 24 that okay?  
 25 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, to clarify, we have two

1 items. I just want to know if the motion  
 2 included both items, 5 and 6?  
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: To both items, Maria,  
 4 Items 5 and 6?  
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Wait.  
 6 MR. WU: Just for the record.  
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Which is the Mixed-Use  
 8 and the Infill.  
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: The Mixed-Use -- no, my  
 10 concern is the Infill.  
 11 MR. WU: Which is Number 6.  
 12 MR. TRIAS: There's a Comp Plan Amendment  
 13 and there's a Zoning Amendment. Those are the  
 14 two items.  
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: No, the Infill is Number 7.  
 16 MR. WU: But Number 5 is the Comp Plan  
 17 Amendment that talks about the density.  
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: I have Number 6, 7 and 8. I  
 19 don't know -- let me see what 5 is.  
 20 MR. BEHAR: 8 is adjournment.  
 21 That's an old one.  
 22 MS. MENENDEZ: Oh, this is an old one.  
 23 It's that they gave me this map. This is what  
 24 I was guiding myself from, this map.  
 25 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, for all practical

1 purposes, it's the same item. It's just so  
 2 that --  
 3 MR. COLLER: I think you have to do both,  
 4 because one is a Comp Plan Amendment and the  
 5 other one is --  
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. And they're both the  
 7 Infill, right?  
 8 MR. BELLIN: Maria, I just want to make a  
 9 statement that the hundred units an acre is not  
 10 an arbitrary number. We work backwards. We  
 11 know what the unit size has to be to be --  
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: I'm not saying it was  
 13 arbitrary. What I'm saying is that if we put  
 14 that into this legislation, we don't need the  
 15 consultant, because we've already determined  
 16 how many units per acre are needed.  
 17 MR. BELLIN: Yeah, but we haven't  
 18 determined the percentage of Workforce Housing,  
 19 what that component is. If he comes up and  
 20 says it's fifteen percent in order to get to a  
 21 hundred units, that's what it's going to be.  
 22 So you have to provide the fifteen percent or  
 23 the twelve, whatever that percentage is, in  
 24 order to be able to take advantage of this, and  
 25 that's what he's going to tell us.

1 He's not going to tell us the density.  
 2 What does the density have to do with anything,  
 3 really?  
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: But we don't know that.  
 5 MR. BELLIN: He's going to tell us what  
 6 component has to be achieved to get the  
 7 Workforce Housing to where it should be.  
 8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can we dispose of the  
 9 motion that's on the floor? That may or may  
 10 not put an end to the discussion.  
 11 Jill, call the roll, please.  
 12 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?  
 13 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.  
 14 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?  
 15 MR. PEREZ: Yes.  
 16 THE SECRETARY Frank Rodriguez?  
 17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.  
 18 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 19 MR. BEHAR: No.  
 20 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?  
 21 MR. BELLIN: No.  
 22 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?  
 23 MR. GRABIEL: No.  
 24 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?  
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.

1 All right.  
 2 MR. WU: So motion to defer passes five to  
 3 four --  
 4 MR. BEHAR: Four, three.  
 5 MR. WU: Four, three.  
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That was on 5 and 6,  
 7 the last items on the agenda, unless we have  
 8 anything else from Staff.  
 9 MR. TRIAS: No, sir.  
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 11 MR. BEHAR: We'll be back.  
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's adjournment.  
 13 We're done. Thank you all and have a good  
 14 evening.  
 15 (Thereupon, the meeting was concluded at  
 16 8:05 p.m.)  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

1 CERTIFICATE  
 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 6th day of February, 2017.  
 17  
 18  
 19 SIGNATURE ON FILE  
 20 \_\_\_\_\_  
 21 NIEVES SANCHEZ  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25