

1 opinion, is not the correct thing to do.
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So required parking.
 3 Is there a second?
 4 MR. GRABIEL: I second.
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Julio second.
 6 MR. TRIAS: So you're saying require
 7 parking for office use.
 8 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 9 MR. TRIAS: It could be done remotely.
 10 MR. BEHAR: Either/or, yes.
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a first. We
 12 have a second. Any further discussion? No?
 13 Call the roll, please.
 14 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?
 15 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 16 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?
 17 MR. TRIAS: Just to clarify it, I'm sorry,
 18 10 feet setback on the first floor, five feet
 19 on the fourth floor.
 20 MR. BEHAR: Correct.
 21 MS. VELEZ: How about the third floor?
 22 MR. TRIAS: No, no third floor.
 23 MR. BEHAR: Second and third is 10 feet.
 24 The fourth floor is five feet --
 25 MS. VELEZ: 10, 10 and 5.

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct.
 2 MR. BEHAR: But you could potential cover
 3 that, you know.
 4 MR. BELLIN: Wait. Wait. Wait. The
 5 fourth floor is a five foot setback?
 6 MR. BEHAR: That's what -- he asked for --
 7 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 8 MR. BEHAR: -- for the five foot additional
 9 setback on the fourth floor.
 10 MR. BELLIN: Additional.
 11 MR. BEHAR: Additional.
 12 MR. BELLIN: So it goes to 15. It's not
 13 five. It's 15.
 14 MR. BEHAR: No. No. No. It's 15.
 15 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right. Right.
 16 MR. BEHAR: No, it's 15, 10 plus five.
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: 10 plus five.
 18 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right. Right. Right.
 19 Right. Correct. Sorry about that.
 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Can you start over
 21 with the roll call, please?
 22 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?
 23 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 24 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?
 25 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.

1 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 3 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez?
 4 MS. VELEZ: Yes.
 5 THE SECRETARY: Jolie Balido-Hart?
 6 MS. BALIDO-HART: Yes.
 7 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 8 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 9 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 11 Thank you so much.
 12 MR. KUPPERMAN: Thank you so much. Please
 13 come over to have lunch and you'll see what's
 14 going on in that street.
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: We have.
 16 MR. KUPPERMAN: It's incredible. Giralda
 17 Under the Stars was 3,000 people. Robert
 18 probably knows one person every 10 square feet.
 19 That's about an acre. Opening night was over
 20 5,000. This is just --
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Good.
 22 MR. KUPPERMAN: It's going to be like
 23 Lincoln Road --
 24 MR. BEHAR: You know what you need to do
 25 there, the other day, it was sunny, maybe add

1 sails or something --
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: Oh, nice idea.
 3 MR. BEHAR: Because let me tell you --
 4 MR. KUPPERMAN: The sun.
 5 MR. BEHAR: The sun.
 6 MR. KUPPERMAN: I know.
 7 MR. BEHAR: It will make it a total --
 8 MR. KUPPERMAN: It's South Florida.
 9 MR. BEHAR: Yeah, but if we provide some
 10 shading devices --
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah.
 12 MS. VELEZ: That's a good idea.
 13 MR. BEHAR: -- it could work very well.
 14 MR. KUPPERMAN: Thank you so much.
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 16 MS. BALIDO-HART: Thank you.
 17 MS. VELEZ: Thank you.
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Craig, will you read
 19 Item Number 6, the next item?
 20 MR. COLLER: Yes.
 21 Public Hearing Item Number 6, an Ordinance
 22 of the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida
 23 providing for text amendments to the City of
 24 Coral Gables, Official Zoning Code, by amending
 25 Article 4, "Zoning Districts," Section 4-201,

1 "Mixed Use District (MXD);" Article 5,
2 "Development Standards," Section 5-604, "Coral
3 Gables Mediterranean Style Design Standards,"
4 and Section 5-1105, "Landscape Requirements;"
5 and Article 8, "Definitions," to clarify what
6 constitutes open space; providing for a
7 repealer provision, providing for a
8 severability clause, codification, providing
9 for an effective date.

10 Item Number 6, public hearing.
11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
12 Ramon.

13 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, this item has
14 been discussed many times, and I would like to
15 clarify, because some of the older language was
16 left over in some of the memos.

17 The only request here tonight is to deal
18 with the issue of ground level -- ground level
19 open space. We're not increasing the
20 percentages, none of that; ground level open
21 space, as it applies to Commercial, Mixed-Use
22 and Industrial Districts. That's also
23 something that I want to clarify, because we
24 need to correct a couple of mistakes in the
25 language.

1 MR. BEHAR: Excuse me to interrupt you, but
2 we have discussed MF-1 and MF-2. And MFSA was
3 not going to be a part --

4 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right.

5 MR. BEHAR: That's what you've taken away
6 from this?

7 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right. And that's what
8 the slide shows, and that's what we need to
9 correct in the language.

10 So the slide shows Commercial and
11 Industrial, and Mixed-Use, which is your
12 typical larger project, the kind of project
13 that comes before you and you get a chance to
14 review and approve and look in great detail.

15 And the definitions that we are adding is
16 the paseo definition, that is amended, so that
17 if it's to count as open space, it needs to be
18 open to the sky.

19 That's basically it.

20 And we've had some very successful designs
21 by some very good architects. One of them is
22 sitting here today. But there are other
23 architects sitting here today that have done
24 just as well with open space, the coordination
25 of open space and greenery, et cetera, at the

1 ground level, and the design of the buildings.

2 So the problem has been that the Code is a
3 little bit vague, and it allows for open space
4 to be placed in upper stories. Well, that
5 doesn't really help, I think, the high quality
6 pedestrian environment that we're trying to
7 create.

8 So, in multiple areas in the Code, we have
9 added the word, ground level, ground level, to
10 make it very clear that that's what open space
11 should be. That's really the main thing.

12 Again, there's some leftover language that
13 applies to some of the Residential District.
14 That is not the intent. The intent is
15 Commercial, Mixed-Use, Industrial.

16 And here, as you can see, we revised the
17 paseo. We realized the open space definition,
18 to include ground level, and the paseo
19 definition, to explicitly say that it had to be
20 open to the sky to count as open space.

21 There are some other clarifications, in
22 terms of some definitions, but generally it's a
23 very straight-forward amendment. We may have
24 some other amendments in the future, perhaps.
25 It's simply, I think, is going to have a big

1 impact in terms of the way that the larger
2 projects are designed.

3 I don't know if anybody wants to speak on
4 this item. Is there anybody?

5 THE SECRETARY: We have two speakers.

6 MR. TRIAS: Two speakers. Very good.
7 Thank you very much.

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
9 At this time, if you would please call the
10 people.

11 THE SECRETARY: Barbara Tria.

12 MS. TRIA: Hello, again. I have to first
13 apologize. I didn't realize that this was on
14 the agenda today, so I have quickly reviewed
15 it. I did see it come up --

16 MR. COLLIER: Could you put your name and
17 address back on the record?

18 MR. TRIA: I'm sorry, Barbara Tria, 2309
19 Ponce de Leon Boulevard --

20 MR. COLLIER: Thank you.

21 MR. TRIAS: -- a commercial property that I
22 own in the Gables.

23 When I first read the parameters, I was
24 having trouble envisioning, if I owned a chunk
25 of property, much like we were just discussing

1 on the larger parcels that can be developed or
 2 remain to be developed, how do I satisfy the
 3 requirements, with much of the green space
 4 being mandated to be open to the sky, and
 5 particularly thinking about our Downtown, our
 6 urban area, Miracle Mile, the properties that
 7 front on Miracle Mile, on Ponce de Leon
 8 Boulevard, and I reflected back upon the 55
 9 Miracle Mile development, which has the 10
 10 Aragon Residences above three floors of
 11 offices, and then the ground floor retail.

12 I don't know, and I'm not holding that out
 13 as a measure of the desire development moving
 14 forward in the Downtown area, but I do think
 15 that, as a commercial real estate professional,
 16 your ground floor is your most valuable asset
 17 and where a proper -- a private property owner
 18 typically generates most of the revenue that is
 19 possible for that. And to mandate on -- it's
 20 just curious to me, to mandate and limit the
 21 way I can satisfy -- if I'm a developer, how I
 22 satisfy a green space requirement by making it
 23 only open to the sky, on the ground floor, I
 24 think takes away the reason we all love an
 25 urban Downtown.

1 There's diversity of storefronts. There's
 2 diversity of shopping opportunities that
 3 satisfy the requirements that those living in
 4 our Downtown environments have.

5 If you go to New York City, some of the
 6 most desirable locations for people to go are
 7 on the upper levels, you know, where you have
 8 different sight lines that people don't see
 9 every day.

10 So while we don't see it currently in our
 11 market -- I guess, perhaps, the one place you
 12 do see it is if you go to Juvia over on Lincoln
 13 Road, right. That's a fantastic outdoor area,
 14 where it happens to be a restaurant, and the
 15 view corridors that are attainable from that
 16 space are now open to the public, because of
 17 the business being located up there, not
 18 necessarily green space.

19 But, you know, I'm a little unclear as to
 20 the heavy-handedness or the seemingly
 21 heavy-handedness of the requirements, 28 shade
 22 trees per acre, 35 feet of shrubs per -- I have
 23 to look and see what it is. I don't know how
 24 we get there, these requirements, and maintain
 25 private property ownership objectives and

1 encourage the development.

2 So I just -- it's a disconnect for me. I'm
 3 all for open space and green space, but I think
 4 you're limiting the design concepts and the
 5 possibility of providing alternate solutions
 6 for what we define as green space with all of
 7 these requirements.

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

10 THE SECRETARY: Jorge Navarro.

11 MR. NAVARRO: Good evening, Board Members.

12 For the record, Jorge Navarro, with offices at
 13 333 Southeast 2nd Avenue. It's great to be
 14 here before you this evening.

15 I just wanted to take a moment to highlight
 16 some of the design guidelines and suggestions
 17 that we had discussed in the past. You know,
 18 we commend the City for their efforts to try to
 19 improve the ground level open space, but we
 20 also think that there should be some
 21 flexibility built in. Depending on the size of
 22 your properties, you could have issues, you
 23 know, complying with these requirements. I
 24 think the larger properties are probably -- are
 25 in a better position to provide additional

1 ground level open space.

2 But one of the things that we had discussed
 3 was perhaps requiring a percentage to able to
 4 -- to be still provided on the upper levels,
 5 still, you know, encourages the increase of
 6 ground level open space, but also allows you to
 7 provide these amenity decks. And one of the
 8 thing that I know that's been pushed are these
 9 green roof concepts and these sustainable roof
 10 concepts, with solar panels and vegetation, and
 11 I think what that does is, it helps you to
 12 provide amenities for the residents, as opposed
 13 to more the area that you acquire on the
 14 ground, the less that you may be able to
 15 provide on the upper levels, and it may
 16 indirectly result in some additional increases
 17 in the building envelope.

18 So that's one of the suggestions that we
 19 still wanted to kind of re-study and present
 20 and see if that would be something that could
 21 be considered, as well as also there are some
 22 projects that I'm currently working on. I know
 23 there's other people that probably are in the
 24 same position, that either have Site Plan
 25 approval or that are going through a

1 conditional Site Plan approval process, and
 2 we've already invested a large amount of time
 3 and resources in designing these plans, and
 4 what we'd like to do is -- and we've seen that
 5 it's been done in other jurisdictions that have
 6 either Art in Public Places or additional open
 7 space requirements, is to at least vest these
 8 projects for a period of time, so that they can
 9 go in, and if they get a building permit, let's
 10 say, in three years from the date that they get
 11 their Site Plan approval, they can still take
 12 advantage of this and not have to go back to
 13 the drawing board and it could, you know,
 14 completely rechange everything that you're
 15 drawing.

16 So those are just some of the items I hope
 17 you consider here this evening. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 19 Anybody else, Jill?

20 THE SECRETARY: No more speakers.

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: No more speakers?
 22 At this time, I'll close it to public
 23 comment and open it up for the Board.

24 Robert.

25 MR. BEHAR: I agree with both speakers, and

1 I think there's a lot of information that I
 2 think we went through. I remember that it was
 3 not carried through as the suggestions. For
 4 example, I made a point, in the past, that
 5 there should be some flexibility to put
 6 something in the upper level, in order to
 7 reduce the massing of the building. That was
 8 one of the comments that I made in the past.

9 Perhaps, you know, we've got to set a
 10 minimum on the ground floor, but allow some
 11 percentage of that open space to take place on
 12 the upper floor, again, to relieve the massing
 13 of the project.

14 With what we're calling in here -- and, you
 15 know, that 75 percent of any plaza, courtyard,
 16 arcade, loggia only count for the open space.
 17 So I think that 75 percent may be not enough.
 18 I think that -- and we talked about it.

19 The other point I noticed is that you're
 20 saying that the paseo has to be open to the
 21 sky, correct?

22 MR. TRIAS: To count for open space, yes.

23 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Now, correct me if I am
 24 wrong, in a building in the CBD or MXD, most
 25 likely most of those buildings will be longer

1 than 250 feet.

2 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

3 MR. BEHAR: And I believe the Code requires
 4 that if it's 250 feet, you're required to
 5 provide a paseo.

6 MR. TRIAS: Right.

7 MR. BEHAR: A mid block paseo.

8 MR. TRIAS: That's a requirement, yes.

9 MR. BEHAR: You're required to do a mid
 10 block paseo and have some certain sizes,
 11 depending on the size of the property, yet the
 12 paseo that you're asking or you -- you know, on
 13 either side, open to the sky, I think that's
 14 going to dysfunction that property.

15 I think it's -- it's been asked, an
 16 additional requirement that may not be --

17 MR. TRIAS: True.

18 MR. BEHAR: -- you know, be necessary. I
 19 think that we're posing paseos open to the sky,
 20 so it means there's a setback. The only way I
 21 could see it, set back on either side of the
 22 paseo, an infill lot, and, then, if the
 23 property is larger than 250, I'm still going to
 24 have to provide a paseo in the middle of that.

25 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And those are the issues

1 that ideally we can deal with more detail as we
 2 have a consultant helping us through the Zoning
 3 revisions that are coming up soon. I mean,
 4 that's a better way to do it than to be doing
 5 it piecemeal like it appears that we're trying
 6 to do here.

7 I mean, I think the Code needs some
 8 language that requires ground level open space.
 9 I think, right now, it's a little bit too
 10 vague. However, what is the perfect language?
 11 What is the ideal language? That's something
 12 that is debatable and certainly we need to
 13 think about it.

14 MS. MENENDEZ: Do we have a definition for
 15 landscaped open space?

16 MR. TRIAS: I think we have an open space
 17 definition. I don't think it says,
 18 "Landscaped."

19 MS. MENENDEZ: Do we know what type of
 20 landscaping we are looking to put in the
 21 landscaped open space?

22 MR. TRIAS: Well, we have urban open space
 23 as a definition, which means it can be paved
 24 with bricks, pavers or similar material, and it
 25 has landscape features. So the other thing

1 that counts as open space, as you know, is
 2 arcades, for example, in buildings. Arcades
 3 are part of the building, and they're not open
 4 to the sky, right. So if you want to -- yes.
 5 MR. BEHAR: But you only count 75 percent.
 6 You're proposing to count 75 percent of that.
 7 MR. TRIAS: Well, what I'm saying is,
 8 perhaps we need to think about those issues
 9 more carefully and maybe count a hundred
 10 percent. I mean, I think -- my view on this is
 11 that this applies mostly to Downtown buildings.
 12 I mean, that's what most of this debate will
 13 take place. And Downtown buildings tend to
 14 have more building than they have open space,
 15 certainly.
 16 It's a better Downtown if you have arcades
 17 and activity at the ground level, like some of
 18 the speakers have said, clearly. So that, to
 19 me -- those are important issues. And I think
 20 it's -- we have a very good Code. Coral Gables
 21 has a very good Code, has had a very good Code
 22 for a very, very long time. It's a little bit
 23 confusing, because it has many moving parts,
 24 but I don't think we should dismiss the fact
 25 that we are getting some real quality buildings

1 already.
 2 So the issue is, how do we improve what we
 3 have, how do we make it better? I think one
 4 safe way to make it better is to emphasize
 5 ground level open space. I think most people
 6 would agree that that's --
 7 MR. BEHAR: And you're right. I will
 8 personally agree with that. But what
 9 percentage of that requirement needs to happen
 10 at the ground level? I know that today it's
 11 very vague and practically nothing.
 12 MR. TRIAS: Right.
 13 MR. BEHAR: And we've seen some projects in
 14 the past that have been developed, and, you
 15 know, let me use the project 2525 Ponce --
 16 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 17 MR. BEHAR: -- you know, which does have an
 18 arcade, but it's very massive, you know. I
 19 agree with certain percentage of it --
 20 requiring certain percentage of the open space
 21 at the ground level, but my concern is, not
 22 everything has to be provided at the ground
 23 level or should be required. And I think one
 24 of the speakers, you know, mentioned something
 25 very similar to that.

1 MR. TRIAS: Yes. There could be a
 2 percentage that is required at the ground level
 3 and the rest of it is optional, could be at the
 4 ground level or not. I mean, that's one way to
 5 address that issue.
 6 MR. BEHAR: Because in the MXD, that you do
 7 have the step back --
 8 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 9 MR. BEHAR: -- right, and in some cases, to
 10 Mr. Navarro's point, where you could have some
 11 roof areas that could be, you know, considered
 12 part of that open space, as well.
 13 MR. TRIAS: I mean, what we're saying right
 14 now is, for example, in the Mixed-Use District,
 15 the requirement is 10 percent of the total area
 16 of the building site shall be provided as open
 17 space; and we're saying, as ground level open
 18 space. Ten percent is not a huge number.
 19 So some people believe the number should be
 20 higher than ten percent. And at that point, if
 21 it's all at the ground level, then it really
 22 becomes an issue.
 23 I would have to advice the Commission on
 24 that topic. I mean, there's a point in which
 25 certainly there are diminishing returns in

1 terms of urbanism.
 2 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, for me the problem
 3 becomes, in Commercial Mixed-Use, the
 4 percentage is very small. It's 10 percent.
 5 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 6 MR. BELLIN: But when you get to the
 7 Multi-Family 2, the percentage goes to 25
 8 percent.
 9 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And I'm sorry to
 10 interrupt, but my recommendation is to take out
 11 the MF-1 and MF-2 requirements from this.
 12 That's the old language that we had. At this
 13 point, I think we only should include the
 14 Commercial and the Mixed-Use under this.
 15 MR. BEHAR: And that's why I started at the
 16 beginning, to make sure that was not included
 17 in that, Marshall.
 18 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Yeah. No, because
 19 you're right, Marshall. That's a very good
 20 point.
 21 MS. VELEZ: Yes.
 22 MR. BELLIN: Okay. And also the size of
 23 the property really has a bearing on the
 24 percentages of open space. If you had a
 25 hundred thousand square feet, and, you know,

1 you're looking at a 10 percent, you're looking
2 at 10,000, you know, the park in the corner or
3 whatever it is. It just seems like there ought
4 to be some kind of a sliding scale where --

5 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.

6 MR. BELLIN: -- where the larger the
7 property, the less the percentage is.

8 MR. TRIAS: The other thing that I always
9 try to emphasize is that in this City we have
10 the process of the Board of Architects, which
11 is a very intensive design review, that makes
12 projects better. Most cities don't have that.
13 We need to keep that into account.

14 The Zoning Code -- the Zoning language is
15 very unsophisticated compared to the
16 discussions that take place at the Board of
17 Architects. So this is not the only tool we
18 have, and I think that that's what makes the
19 difference, in terms of quality, in Coral
20 Gables.

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Julio.

22 MR. GRABIEL: I always use the same
23 example, because I suffered it. The Colonnade
24 building, when we designed that building, there
25 was a minimum requirement for green space on

1 the ground floor. So the only way we could do
2 it and still keep the arcade was putting those
3 stupid planters between column and column,
4 which actually obliterate the use of the
5 arcade, because you can't walk over it, you
6 know. I'm hoping that some day somebody's
7 going to come along and repave that area.

8 So my concern is that, I agree with the
9 speaker that the ground floor is the most
10 important one. I just don't want the open
11 space requirement to be so large that it will
12 affect the possibility of good development.

13 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.

14 MR. GRABIEL: And I don't know what
15 percentages. I don't know if 10 percent is
16 sufficient, but I would be weary of doing
17 something that would not allow for big -- and
18 we -- Downtown is an urban space.

19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yeah.

20 MR. GRABIEL: We're building to the edges
21 and everybody wants to maximize the ground
22 floor space, and, yes, we talk about arcades,
23 and in principle arcades are great, but arcades
24 only work when there is an overall Zoning plan
25 that allows for arcades to be continuous in the

1 same size.

2 MR. TRIAS: And, also, they happen to be at
3 ground level, as opposed to a foot above the
4 sidewalk and so on, which is another one --

5 MR. GRABIEL: Yeah. Well, we don't want to
6 talk about that.

7 MR. TRIAS: -- of the issues.

8 MR. GRABIEL: So I'm not sure how to deal
9 with this, because I see the benefit of open
10 space, but I see that it has to be very
11 carefully designed and drawn, and I'm not sure
12 I understand all of the impact that this will
13 have, positive or negative, on future
14 development.

15 MR. TRIAS: My preference is to use the
16 consultant and ask them to help us with this.
17 That's my preference.

18 MS. BALIDO-HART: I agree with that.

19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So if you want to ask
20 the consultant, which I assume the City hasn't
21 brought him on board yet --

22 MR. TRIAS: The way it's scheduled right
23 now, the Commission will take the item in the
24 December 5th meeting.

25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So, then, why are we

1 discussing this now?

2 MR. TRIAS: We've been discussing this for
3 a while.

4 MS. MENENDEZ: There's a couple here that
5 have to do with the Zoning Code.

6 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Yeah. I mean, this is
7 one of those issues --

8 MS. MENENDEZ: I mean, we have other items
9 that are affected by the same comment.

10 MR. TRIAS: Right. Yeah. And some
11 Commissioners have had a big emphasis on this
12 issue, so that's why we're dealing with it, but
13 my conclusion, after all of these discussions,
14 is that -- it's the same one that I had at the
15 beginning, this is complicated. This is not a
16 simple issue, in a sophisticated Code, like we
17 have, in a very high quality City like we
18 aspire to be. I mean, it's not a simple thing.

19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So what you're looking
20 from us is input at this point?

21 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, input, and if you're
22 ready to proceed --

23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Okay. Now I
24 understand.

25 MR. TRIAS: -- fine. If you're not ready

1 to proceed, then we can table it and continue
 2 working on it.
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Maria.
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Again, my question
 5 concerning open landscape, the definition of
 6 what is landscaped open space, because, on Page
 7 2, you basically allow for the landscaped open
 8 space to be counted if it's on the
 9 right-of-way. Is that correct?
 10 MS. VELEZ: Yeah.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: And if that's the case, are
 12 we looking -- when we say, "Open landscape,"
 13 are we looking at hardscape or are we just
 14 looking at foliage?
 15 MR. TRIAS: Multiple things. All of those
 16 things qualify; arcades, parks.
 17 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Do we always allow
 18 for a right-of-way to be used as part of the
 19 calculation of open space?
 20 MR. TRIAS: No, not always. No.
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. So that's a big plus
 22 in this proposal.
 23 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: Right?
 25 MR. TRIAS: Right.

1 MS. MENENDEZ: Because I'm hearing that
 2 we're reducing it, reducing it, but if you take
 3 into account the adjacent right-of-way, then
 4 you are allowing for a lot more than what's
 5 allowed for today.
 6 MR. TRIAS: And that's an idea that I don't
 7 think is clearly articulated, but I will
 8 recommend that we go down that way, certainly.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: That we do or we don't?
 10 MR. TRIAS: That we do. That we do.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: Oh, because it says here,
 12 this landscaped area can be provided at street
 13 level within the public right-of-way.
 14 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: Planter boxes, planters, et
 16 cetera. So that's why I was asking my question
 17 previously.
 18 MR. TRIAS: And --
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: And if that's the case, I
 20 mean, for me, I'm a visual person and I would
 21 love to see, if we discuss this in the future,
 22 if everyone else agrees, some type of drawing
 23 that would show us the different percentages.
 24 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: You know, we take a typical

1 development, and we say, okay, with what exists
 2 today, this is what's allowed and this is
 3 what's proposed, and in the proposed, if this
 4 is the legislation you're asking us to review
 5 and recommend on, I'd like to see that
 6 percentage of landscaping on the right-of-way,
 7 what does that mean for the developer -- I
 8 mean, development.
 9 MR. TRIAS: And you get to see that. You
 10 get to see that in every Mixed-Use project that
 11 is before you in great detail, and what I would
 12 say is that most projects exceed the minimum
 13 requirements significantly. I mean, it's not
 14 like people are trying to do the minimum. In
 15 fact, most of the time, it's much more than
 16 that, and most of the time it's enhancing the
 17 sidewalks, with wider sidewalks, let's say, and
 18 an arcade, et cetera, things that are
 19 meaningful, things that really matter to the
 20 City.
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. But if we start
 22 looking at the right-of-way, then what -- you
 23 know, and that's something that the Board would
 24 recommend, then why don't we look at both
 25 right-of-ways, the one across, whatever is

1 affecting the project, so that the City
 2 benefits in that way?
 3 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: So there's lots of ways of
 5 looking at this, but I just wanted to know, in
 6 fact, if the right-of-way was included, because
 7 that is a big percentage.
 8 MR. TRIAS: And what happens, sometimes, in
 9 one of the projects that is going through right
 10 now, the Venera project, you recommended to
 11 expand the --
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. That's what I was
 13 thinking --
 14 MR. TRIAS: -- and they're doing that.
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: -- of, that that's something
 16 that makes sense and maybe that's something, as
 17 a trade off, that we might want to recommend.
 18 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 19 MR. BEHAR: But, Maria, in some cases that
 20 is applicable, in some cases not, because when
 21 you start having to provide the required
 22 parking in front, you're going to take away
 23 from the landscape area --
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. Right.
 25 MR. BEHAR: -- you know, because you are --

1 it's not like you could say, I'm getting rid of
 2 all of the spaces --
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: But it could be a
 4 consideration that perhaps we can somehow word
 5 it so that the developer knows that that might
 6 be a possibility. And if it's feasible --
 7 MR. BEHAR: And if the project is an infill
 8 project, not a corner project, how is that
 9 going to work?
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: That's true.
 11 MR. BEHAR: Right? Because, yes, I agree
 12 with you, if you're on a corner, you could take
 13 advantage of that public right-of-way space,
 14 but if you're an infill, you're going to be
 15 limited.
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: You're going to be limited,
 17 yeah. That's true. You're going to be
 18 limited.
 19 MS. BALIDO-HART: I keep going back to the
 20 same point, which is that this really -- I feel
 21 like we're just taking guesses and stabs in the
 22 dark. Until we have some solid input and we
 23 have a consultant, why don't we reengage and go
 24 down that direction? And, also, to your point
 25 about diagrams, I've mentioned that earlier, so

1 we can visualize concretely and have a better
 2 notion of what we're doing.
 3 MR. TRIAS: That has been my recommendation
 4 all along.
 5 MS. BALIDO-HART: Yes. And it's a wise
 6 one.
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So, Ramon, when you
 8 bring this back to us, would you please bring
 9 us back some diagrams and visuals?
 10 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And what I'm thinking
 11 is, if we're able to wait for the consultant,
 12 they can provide a very good -- I mean, we're
 13 talking about world class people that can
 14 really advice very, very well.
 15 MS. BALIDO-HART: Yes.
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, it's up to you
 17 as to when you want to bring it back, being,
 18 you know, the Director.
 19 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 20 MR. COLLER: Ramon, where are we on this
 21 having to go to the Commission at this point?
 22 Is this an item that has to be --
 23 MR. TRIAS: I think it depends if -- if the
 24 Board wants to table it, we could do that. I
 25 don't think this has to go to the Commission

1 immediately.
 2 MR. COLLER: Okay.
 3 MR. BEHAR: I don't think this is ready, in
 4 my opinion, for us to send it to the
 5 Commission.
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: No.
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That's what I'm
 8 hearing from the Board Members.
 9 MR. TRIAS: Right. Okay.
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And the sentiment that
 11 I'm --
 12 MR. BEHAR: And something else, to make
 13 sure, I like what Mr. Navarro said about
 14 projects that are in the pipeline already
 15 should not be, you know, affected by this.
 16 MS. BALIDO-HART: Right.
 17 MR. TRIAS: Well, we haven't made any
 18 changes.
 19 MR. BEHAR: Well, but -- yeah, but if this
 20 happens in the next 60 days, it should not
 21 affect a project that had gotten a permit but
 22 is in the process of going through the
 23 pipeline.
 24 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 25 MS. BALIDO-HART: Right.

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: There should be some
 2 key point or decisive area.
 3 MS. BALIDO-HART: Yes. We've talked about
 4 that before.
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct.
 6 Any other comments?
 7 MR. BELLIN: Let me just mention that when
 8 you go to the Board of Architects for
 9 preliminary approval, that's when the clock
 10 starts running.
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I think that was the
 12 comment you made last time.
 13 MR. BELLIN: It is, because that's when
 14 you're grandfathered in.
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct.
 16 MR. BELLIN: And they wanted to change it
 17 to on final approval. So that means you've got
 18 to do the completeness of the drawings --
 19 MR. TRIAS: The policy continues to be the
 20 preliminary approval.
 21 MR. BELLIN: Okay.
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. So you've got
 23 an idea, Ramon?
 24 MR. TRIAS: Okay.
 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And I think what we're

1 really asking for is some visual examples --
 2 MR. TRIAS: Sure.
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- to give us an idea.
 4 MR. TRIAS: I understand. I understand.
 5 We'll get back to this.
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Thank you.
 7 MR. COLLER: So were going to defer to a
 8 date certain.
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We're going to defer.
 10 Do you need a motion to defer?
 11 MR. COLLER: Yes.
 12 MR. TRIAS: Just defer to some time.
 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Do you need a
 14 motion --
 15 MR. TRIAS: We'll readvertise.
 16 MR. BEHAR: Motion to indefinite.
 17 MR. COLLER: Well, do we want a date
 18 certain to avoid readvertising?
 19 MR. TRIAS: Frankly, I'd prefer not to do
 20 that, because I can't --
 21 MR. COLLER: Okay. So then motion to a
 22 date uncertain. That's fine.
 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Robert, did you make
 24 that motion?
 25 MR. BEHAR: I'll make the motion.

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is there a second?
 2 MS. BALIDO-HART: Second.
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Jolie second.
 4 Any other discussion?
 5 Call the roll, please.
 6 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?
 7 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 8 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 10 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez?
 11 MS. VELEZ: Yes.
 12 THE SECRETARY: Jolie Balido-Hart?
 13 MS. BALIDO-HART: Yes.
 14 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 15 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 16 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?
 17 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 18 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 20 Item Number 7, Craig.
 21 MR. COLLER: Item Number 7, an Ordinance of
 22 the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida
 23 providing for text amendments to the City of
 24 Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, by amending
 25 Article 5, "Development Standards," Section

1 5-1409, "Amount of Required Parking," to
 2 establish provisions for charging stations of
 3 electric vehicles; providing for a repealer
 4 provision, providing for a severability clause,
 5 codification and providing for an effective
 6 date.
 7 Item 7, public hearing.
 8 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 9 This items requires electrical vehicle
 10 charging stations. We gave you some background
 11 information on this, and basically some cities
 12 have done this. It seems to be a trend. We
 13 are requiring a percentage of off-street
 14 parking to be equipped with charging stations.
 15 And, basically, all of the large projects will
 16 also have certain technical requirements for
 17 the charging capability, and we have some
 18 standards and definitions.
 19 Basically what we're talking about is when
 20 a project has twenty or more off-street parking
 21 spaces, require -- a minimum of two percent of
 22 the required off-street parking shall be
 23 reserved for electrical vehicles. That's
 24 basically the main idea.
 25 So two percent of the parking is going to

1 be electrical, and then there are some
 2 definitions that deal with the technical
 3 expectations of different charging stations.
 4 This is fairly typical language in this
 5 industry, and I suppose it's the current
 6 language. I don't know what the future will
 7 be, but this will be acceptable as of today.
 8 We also have some definition for electric
 9 vehicle charging station.
 10 Staff has reviewed the amendment and
 11 recommends approval.
 12 Thank you very much.
 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 14 Are there any --
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: I have a question. Do we
 16 allow these charging, not stations so much, but
 17 do we allow it for residential, like these
 18 charging apparatuses for electrical vehicles,
 19 that you know of?
 20 MR. TRIAS: They're allowed. They're not
 21 required.
 22 MS. MENENDEZ: No, right. I know that.
 23 MR. TRIAS: But they're allowed, yes.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: Is there any incentives tied
 25 to those, like reduced permits or things like