

Page 5

1 MR. BEHAR: None.  
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Swearing In. Everyone  
 3 who speaks today must complete the roster at  
 4 the podium with Jill. We ask that you print  
 5 clearly, so the official records of your name  
 6 and address will be correct.  
 7 And now, with the exception of attorneys  
 8 who are presenting tonight, all persons who  
 9 will speak on agenda items before us this  
 10 evening, please rise to be sworn in.  
 11 If you're speaking, please rise to be sworn  
 12 in.  
 13 MR. WU: Are any of you folks going to speak?  
 14 None of you will speak?  
 15 MR. BEHAR: Well, you may want to clear  
 16 that up.  
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, the public  
 18 hearing -- yeah, just so everybody is clear,  
 19 the public hearing was closed last time, but if  
 20 you are here, in the event the public hearing  
 21 does get reopened, and I'm not insinuating that  
 22 it will be reopened, but in the event that it  
 23 does, you should rise and be sworn in now.  
 24 (Thereupon, all participants were sworn.)  
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Thank you.

Page 6

1 And in deference to those present, we ask  
 2 that all cell phones, pagers and other devices  
 3 be turned off at this time.  
 4 And we will now proceed with the agenda.  
 5 Our first item on the agenda is the approval of  
 6 the minutes of September 14th, 2016.  
 7 MR. BEHAR: I make a motion for approval.  
 8 MR. BELLIN: Second.  
 9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have a motion and a  
 10 second. Any comments or changes to the  
 11 minutes?  
 12 Seeing none, Jill, if you'll call the roll,  
 13 please.  
 14 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?  
 15 MR. BELLIN: Yes.  
 16 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?  
 17 MR. PEREZ: Yes.  
 18 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?  
 19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.  
 20 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 21 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 22 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?  
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.  
 24 Okay. Next item is any changes to the  
 25 agenda. So we know Marshall -- Board Member

Page 7

1 Bellin will need to recuse himself for Items 5,  
 2 6 and 7.  
 3 Let me think. What's the Board's  
 4 consensus? Do we want to defer 5, 6 and 7 to  
 5 the end, so Marshall can stick around for the  
 6 other four items or do you want to hear those  
 7 first tonight?  
 8 MR. BEHAR: My preference would be, if it's  
 9 possible, let's do that, but, you know -- so  
 10 either he stays -- recuse himself and come  
 11 back --  
 12 MR. BELLIN: That's what's going to happen.  
 13 I'll recuse myself and come back.  
 14 MR. BEHAR: Or we take care of 5, 6 and 7  
 15 now, and then you recuse yourself, you don't  
 16 have to come back afterwards,  
 17 MR. BELLIN: You mean, take care of the  
 18 other ones?  
 19 MR. BEHAR: Yeah.  
 20 MR. BELLIN: 5, 6 and 7 are the ones that I  
 21 have to recuse myself for. So you want to push  
 22 those to the end?  
 23 MR. BEHAR: Correct.  
 24 I mean, I don't know the other -- how  
 25 complex it will be, how long it will be.

Page 8

1 MR. BELLIN: My concern is, the people will  
 2 be sitting here, and I'd rather have them get  
 3 this over with first, as opposed to have them  
 4 sit there through the whole meeting.  
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So you're okay with  
 6 walking down the street or whatever it is  
 7 you're supposed to do, and then coming back?  
 8 MR. BELLIN: Well, I'm just going to go  
 9 outside, and --  
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 11 MR. BELLIN: Okay.  
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right.  
 13 MR. BEHAR: Any -- Frank or Albert?  
 14 MR. PEREZ: I'm okay with it.  
 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You're good?  
 16 Okay. So we'll stick with the agenda as  
 17 printed.  
 18 All right. So as Marshall is exiting the  
 19 Chambers, I'll read 5 through 7 in, for the  
 20 record.  
 21 Item Number 5 -- let me think -- all three  
 22 of these items were continued from the  
 23 September 14, 2016 Planning and Zoning Board  
 24 Meeting.  
 25 Item Number 5 is an Ordinance of the City

1 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting  
 2 an amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the  
 3 City of Coral Gables Comprehensive Plan  
 4 pursuant to Zoning Code Article 3, "Development  
 5 Review", Division 15, "Comprehensive Plan Text  
 6 and Map Amendments", and Small Scale amendment  
 7 procedures, Section 163.3187, Florida Statutes,  
 8 from a "Residential Multi-Family Medium  
 9 Density" to "Commercial Mid-Rise Intensity" for  
 10 the property legally described as all of Block  
 11 15, Coral Gables Section "L", known as 20 and  
 12 42 Navarre Avenue, 33, 43, and 47 Alhambra  
 13 Circle and 2001 Galiano Street, Coral Gables,  
 14 Florida; providing for severability, repealer  
 15 and an effective date. That one is for Local  
 16 Planning Agency Review.

17 Item Number 6 is an Ordinance of the City  
 18 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting  
 19 a change of zoning pursuant to Zoning Code  
 20 Article 3, "Development Review", Division 14,  
 21 "Zoning Code Text and Map Amendments", from  
 22 Multi-Family 2 District to Commercial District  
 23 for the property legally described as all of  
 24 Block 15, Coral Gables Section "L", known as 20  
 25 and 42 Navarre Avenue, 33, 43 and 47 Alhambra

1 Circle and 2001 Galiano Street, Coral Gables,  
 2 Florida; and providing for severability,  
 3 repealer and an effective date.

4 Item Number 7 is a Resolution of the City  
 5 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting  
 6 mixed use plan review pursuant to Zoning Code  
 7 Article 4, "Zoning Districts", Division 2,  
 8 "Overlay and Special Purpose Districts",  
 9 Section 4-201, "Mixed Use District", for the  
 10 mixed use project referred to as "33 Alhambra"  
 11 on the property legally described as all of  
 12 Block 15, Coral Gables Section "L", known as 20  
 13 and 42 Navarre Avenue, 33, 43 and 47 Alhambra  
 14 Circle and 2001 Galiano Street, Coral Gables,  
 15 Florida; including required conditions; and  
 16 providing for an effective date.

17 Mr. Trias, Good evening.

18 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
 19 provided a memorandum dated October 19th that  
 20 describes the review process and describes the  
 21 updates.

22 As you said, for the benefit of the  
 23 citizens, this project was reviewed July 13th  
 24 by the Planning and Zoning Board, and it was  
 25 continued, and now we are going to review it

1 again after the continuance.

2 The updates of the project, the arcade has  
 3 been re-designed, as requested, to a minimum of  
 4 ten feet clear space. As a result, some of the  
 5 square footage of the live work units has been  
 6 reduced.

7 In addition, the project was re-advertised  
 8 October 7th. The site was posted, also,  
 9 October 7th, and a third courtesy notice was  
 10 sent to property owners within a thousand feet.

11 Staff recommends approval with conditions,  
 12 which were included in the Staff report.

13 That's my presentation.

14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Thank you.

15 All right. So this item was continued. We  
 16 had some changes to the proposed project and  
 17 the plans. At this point, normally we would  
 18 contain it to discussion by the Board Members  
 19 for any additional comments, questions and  
 20 consideration.

21 I do understand that -- is there counsel  
 22 here representing neighbors that was not here  
 23 last time? No, okay.

24 So I think -- I see some familiar faces in  
 25 the audience. I think some or many were here

1 back when we last heard this item and made  
 2 comments and presentations at that time.

3 All right. So we've got some slight  
 4 modifications to the plans. Any Board Members  
 5 have any comments, anything to discuss?

6 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, if I can add, you have  
 7 a communication in the dais from Ms. Rita  
 8 Gross, dated October 16th, for your record.  
 9 Would you please let it into the record? Thank  
 10 you.

11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm sorry, are you  
 13 referring to the e-mail from Ms. Gross?

14 MR. WU: Yes. Yes.

15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay.

16 MR. WU: And the several pages behind it, a  
 17 petition.

18 MR. TRIAS: That e-mail is the only new  
 19 piece of communication that we received, and it  
 20 was provided to you as part of the public  
 21 record, and it includes a petition that is  
 22 signed by neighbors that have opinions over the  
 23 project.

24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Just for the record,  
 25 what are those, Ramon?

1 (Inaudible speaking.)  
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Hold on. Please, if  
 3 you would come up or -- do you know what they  
 4 are, Ramon?  
 5 MR. TRIAS: Maybe the --  
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah, into the  
 7 microphone so that the record can have it,  
 8 please.  
 9 MS. GRANDA: These are petitions --  
 10 MR. WU: Ma'am, can state your name and  
 11 address?  
 12 MS. GRANDA: My name is Magda Granda. And  
 13 good evening. You've seen me here before. My  
 14 address is 49 Majorca Avenue, Apartment 203,  
 15 Coral Gables, 33134.  
 16 This envelope contains a petition signed by  
 17 the residents of the area in opposition to 33  
 18 Alhambra in its present design.  
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.  
 20 MS. GRANDA: You're welcome.  
 21 Who gets those?  
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ms. -- yeah,  
 23 Ms. Menendez does. Thank you.  
 24 Anybody have questions of Staff or the  
 25 Applicant?

1 MR. BEHAR: I have a question for Staff.  
 2 Ramon, they did come back and they made the  
 3 arcade ten-foot wide throughout the entire  
 4 project, correct?  
 5 MR. TRIAS: Yes, that's correct.  
 6 MR. BEHAR: And from what I see here, the  
 7 building is a total of 97 feet? Is that right?  
 8 MR. TRIAS: That's correct. There is an  
 9 illustration of the arcade that was attached to  
 10 my memo, and that illustration shows the  
 11 proposed design -- the revised design.  
 12 MR. PEREZ: That arcade was how wide  
 13 before?  
 14 MR. TRIAS: Well, it had some sections that  
 15 were only six feet wide, so that created some  
 16 difficulties, in terms of the pedestrian  
 17 traffic. So they have re-configured the live  
 18 work units at the ground level to allow for a  
 19 wider arcade frontage.  
 20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah, Ramon, I have a  
 21 question. With regard to the e-mail that was  
 22 submitted by Ms. Gross, I assume you had a  
 23 chance to review it?  
 24 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 25 MR. RODRIGUEZ: And I just wondered if some

1 of her -- the concerns that she lists --  
 2 MR. TRIAS: Which concerns?  
 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: There's some bullet points  
 4 on the first page of the -- well, I think it's  
 5 a one page e-mail with the signatures  
 6 afterward.  
 7 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: The bullet points -- did  
 9 you and the Staff consider some of these points  
 10 in making your determination of, you know,  
 11 making the recommendations with conditions?  
 12 Like, for example, the one that I -- I mean, my  
 13 son went to Coral Gables Elementary, and I have  
 14 some sense of the congestion that exists there.  
 15 I mean, this was a few years ago. For all I  
 16 know, it could have gotten worse. I suspect it  
 17 hasn't gotten any better.  
 18 But did you consider the congestion at  
 19 like, you know, dropping off kids and picking  
 20 up the children, and endangering -- you know,  
 21 certainly the congestion?  
 22 MR. TRIAS: Yes. And, as you know, before  
 23 a project comes to you, there's a very  
 24 extensive review by Staff and many meetings,  
 25 and, then, one of the discussions was that,

1 yes, the school has a lot of traffic; however,  
 2 the entrance to the parking garage is on  
 3 Navarre, which is not by the school.  
 4 So those types of design decisions were  
 5 made through the process, and then the actual  
 6 traffic impact was reviewed by the Public Works  
 7 Staff and by the consultants that deal with  
 8 that traffic.  
 9 So, from that point of view, I believe we  
 10 have addressed or at least reviewed most of the  
 11 issues, and then there are some other bullet  
 12 points that deal with opinions about  
 13 compatibility and so on, which are obviously  
 14 open to interpretation.  
 15 But, generally speaking, the project, as  
 16 proposed, has been reviewed adequately for  
 17 impacts on traffic.  
 18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay.  
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And the height, Ramon,  
 20 they're allowed 97 feet now, and the proposed  
 21 development is at 97, right?  
 22 MR. TRIAS: Yes. The height is not  
 23 changing. That is not part of the request.  
 24 The request changes other things that deal with  
 25 density and FAR, but not the height.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 2 So, yeah, basically it's density and FAR.  
 3 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 5 MR. BEHAR: So they can potentially build  
 6 this same sized project --  
 7 MR. TRIAS: The same height.  
 8 MR. BEHAR: The same height.  
 9 MR. TRIAS: The same height, but not the  
 10 same size. The FAR can only be 2.0, instead of  
 11 3.5, and the number of units will be capped 50  
 12 units per acre, under MF2. And, then, under  
 13 mixed-use, as you know, there's no cap. So  
 14 that is the nature of the request.  
 15 MR. BEHAR: I mean, I do have a problem.  
 16 You said, right now it's a 2.0 FAR, correct?  
 17 MR. TRIAS: That would be the MF2. MF2,  
 18 yeah.  
 19 MR. BEHAR: I mean, we're -- okay. I'm  
 20 concerned about the density, but I know,  
 21 because of the market condition, that tenants  
 22 seem to do smaller units. So the density, even  
 23 though it's a lot -- the FAR is the one that's  
 24 a huge increase here.  
 25 Did we not talk about, and maybe

1 recollect -- you know, somebody could help me,  
 2 did we not talk about lowering the FAR last  
 3 time?  
 4 MR. TRIAS: Well, there was some discussion  
 5 about the massing, trying to lower it towards  
 6 the neighborhood. Yes, there was some  
 7 discussion on that topic, which would affect  
 8 the FAR.  
 9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Frank, Albert,  
 10 anything?  
 11 MR. PEREZ: No.  
 12 I just have -- I'm fine.  
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Frank, do you  
 14 have any questions or comments or are you okay?  
 15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm -- I mean, you know,  
 16 I'm on record with my concerns. I think I  
 17 would say, I'd be repeating myself.  
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Then anybody  
 19 want to make a motion?  
 20 MR. PEREZ: I'll make a motion to approve  
 21 with Staff recommendations.  
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 23 MR. WU: Can you make sure you speak into  
 24 the mike, please?  
 25 MR. PEREZ: I'll make a motion to approve

1 with Staff recommendations.  
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have a motion to  
 3 approve in accordance with Staff  
 4 recommendations.  
 5 MR. BEHAR: Can I, before I -- where are  
 6 those recommendations again, Staff  
 7 recommendations?  
 8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: On your --  
 9 MR. BEHAR: I know, but I want to see if we  
 10 could --  
 11 MR. TRIAS: They're on the Staff memo,  
 12 which is in front of you. We had an extra copy  
 13 printed, and I have one here.  
 14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: May I see what the --  
 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: This one.  
 16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay.  
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Robert, they start on  
 18 Page -- it's Page Number 24.  
 19 MR. TRIAS: This memo was distributed last  
 20 time, but we made an extra copy for you  
 21 tonight. So if you go to Page 24, that's where  
 22 the recommendations are discussed.  
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: As a follow-up to  
 24 Member Robert Behar's comment, I think we did  
 25 discuss last time reducing the FAR. And,

1 Ramon, you actually do have it as one of our  
 2 conditions to be completed prior to First  
 3 Reading.  
 4 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and that was one of the  
 5 issues that we had talked about and that you  
 6 may want to recommend, and it had to do with  
 7 basically the compatibility towards the North  
 8 Ponce area more than anything else. I mean,  
 9 that was the basic idea.  
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Was that discussed,  
 11 though, with the Applicant in the last two  
 12 months?  
 13 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. The Applicant, as far as  
 14 I understand it, they didn't want to follow-up  
 15 with that recommendation. The only change they  
 16 made was the arcade, as we requested. The  
 17 other changes that we discussed, they did not  
 18 make.  
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Those were discussed,  
 20 and they decided to say, no?  
 21 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have a question with  
 24 regard to the findings. And I just want to  
 25 understand the process a little bit more, and I

1 asked you -- we were talking about that last  
2 time, and I think I got carried away, and I  
3 apologize to you, if I didn't at the time. You  
4 know how I feel about you, because I've stated  
5 it on the record many times.

6 When the Staff is considering whether, for  
7 example, this project advances the objective or  
8 policy of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, do  
9 you do that in a vacuum or do you do it in the  
10 context of trying to find, you know, a solution  
11 or try to get the project in a place where it  
12 advances the objectives, but it reduces  
13 whatever negative impact it could have on the  
14 neighborhood, as well?

15 So is there some horse-trading, you know,  
16 with the developer? Because, you know, that's  
17 my concern. Obviously, you know, I want to do  
18 or I'd like to recommend to the Commission to  
19 do something that I think is in the best  
20 interest of the citizenry.

21 And, by the way, the project, I think, for  
22 whatever it's worth, I mean, at least optically  
23 to me, in my mind's eye, is a beautiful  
24 project, beautifully designed, but I am  
25 concerned about, you know, the density and the

1 amount of units and the impact in the area.  
2 Those were my concerns before, and it's still  
3 my concern.

4 But, you know, I weigh -- I consider -- the  
5 recommendation of the Staff to me is very  
6 significant. So that's why I'm very interested  
7 in how -- what process -- you know, how the  
8 process works.

9 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Tell me about the sausage  
11 making.

12 MR. TRIAS: And I think that's a very valid  
13 question, and most of the time, when we get  
14 here, it appears that this is the first time  
15 that a project has been reviewed. That's not  
16 the case. We actually have worked with this  
17 Applicant for probably three years. I would  
18 say, about three years, right?

19 And during those three years, we had many  
20 meetings that deal with the details of design  
21 and the big picture issues at the same time.  
22 And we have a very competent professional Staff  
23 in Planning, of course, but also in other  
24 departments. So we have Staff meetings with  
25 all of the departments. They provide comments.

1 Now, as a result of that, multiple changes  
2 are made all throughout that time, multiple  
3 changes that deal with access, that deal with  
4 impacts, that deal with the aesthetics. In  
5 fact, before the project gets to you, it is  
6 reviewed officially by the Board of Architects  
7 for aesthetics. So all that takes place.

8 Now, having said all of that, there's also  
9 room for disagreement, and clearly the reason  
10 we're here before you is because even though  
11 Staff may have an opinion and even though the  
12 Board of Architects may like the project, you  
13 are here to look at it objectively.

14 And in terms of the way that I think about  
15 it, I try to think about the big picture first.  
16 And one of the issues about this project, it is  
17 that it is within the Central Business  
18 District. It is within the Downtown. The  
19 official line that we have in the Zoning Code,  
20 that says, south of Navarre, we have Downtown;  
21 north of Navarre, we have something else, which  
22 is North Ponce, in general, in the work that  
23 we've been doing.

24 So because of that, we decided that a  
25 recommendation of approval, with conditions,

1 after a significant re-design of the project,  
2 will be consistent with the idea of the  
3 Downtown development of the City.

4 Now, keep in mind that the Downtown in  
5 Coral Gables is relatively small, if you  
6 compare it to, let's say, Brickell or Miami.  
7 There's no comparison. There's certainly no  
8 comparison. We're talking about 97 feet. 97  
9 feet gives you a very good scale. If I can  
10 make a personal reference. It's very similar  
11 to, let's say, Barcelona, in terms of the scale  
12 and the density, and very similar to Paris, for  
13 example, in terms of the number of stories and  
14 the way that we create high quality urban  
15 zones.

16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: But, excuse me for  
17 interrupting, the number of stories would stay  
18 the same? Without any change in Zoning, they'd  
19 still be able to build a 97 --

20 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right.

21 Yeah. So from that point of view, the site  
22 -- what I'm saying is that it is compatible  
23 from that point of view. The request -- you  
24 are correct, the request is to have additional  
25 units. And there the issue is, is it better to

1 have more people Downtown or not.  
 2 Now, some people believe that more people  
 3 means more traffic, and, therefore, object to  
 4 any kind of project, you know, on those terms.  
 5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Could you give me a number,  
 6 and maybe it's here somewhere, but, again, just  
 7 point it out to me, if it is here, what they're  
 8 allowed to do now, in terms of square footage,  
 9 and if you can ballpark the units, as opposed to  
 10 what they're asking to do.  
 11 MR. TRIAS: Right now it's 56 units, in  
 12 terms of 50 units per acre, and it's on Page 8.  
 13 If you look at the memorandum, it has the  
 14 currently permitted square footage and units.  
 15 And they're requesting 189. So it's a  
 16 significant change.  
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Triple.  
 18 MR. TRIAS: Okay. And that is the issue  
 19 that is really before you, whether that change,  
 20 those additional units, achieved through the  
 21 additional FAR and the fact that mixed-use  
 22 developments within the Central Business  
 23 District -- and that's a factual statement, the  
 24 fact that this is within the Central Business  
 25 District. Once you do a mixed-use project

1 look for that young professional, who is coming  
 2 and wants to live and work in Coral Gables,  
 3 doesn't want to have roommates. I can give you  
 4 the perfect example. My daughter just  
 5 graduated from college. She's living in a  
 6 three-bedroom condo here in the Gables.  
 7 There's a person in each bedroom. So you have  
 8 three people.  
 9 What we intend is to have three people in  
 10 three bedrooms. You can say, well, that's  
 11 triple the density, but, no, you have the same  
 12 number of people and the people is what  
 13 creates, you know, the movement, the pedestrian  
 14 traffic, et cetera. So I don't think you can  
 15 really look at density, because of the number  
 16 of one bedrooms that we have, versus two and  
 17 three.  
 18 And as far as the FAR, I believe we're  
 19 actually allowed 2.5 with the Med bonuses.  
 20 We're at 3.5. We've looked at that. Being  
 21 commercial, the developer wanted to stay within  
 22 the rights of the 3.5 commercial designation.  
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Guilford, I was  
 24 doing some math calculations.  
 25 MR. GUILFORD: Yes, sir.

1 within the Central Business District, then the  
 2 density goes away. So that's how that happens.  
 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. Thank you.  
 4 MR. BEHAR: I know your answer, but let  
 5 me -- where's the Applicant's legal  
 6 representation?  
 7 We asked, when you were here last time in  
 8 July, to look at the FAR and the density, at  
 9 least the FAR, which, you know, I'm glad that  
 10 Mr. Flanagan was able to point that out. No  
 11 effort was taken into working with the FAR at  
 12 all.  
 13 MR. GUILFORD: For the record, my name is  
 14 Zeke Guilford, with offices at 400 University  
 15 Drive, representing Alhambra.  
 16 Let me start with the density first. This  
 17 is a unique project, because it has the  
 18 majority -- and I've just given a quote, not  
 19 the live work units -- 84 percent are either  
 20 studios or one bedrooms. To give you something  
 21 to compare that to, last month, I believe, The  
 22 Henrys came through here, it had 36 percent.  
 23 And just to, again, compare two bedrooms, we  
 24 have 14 percent, they had 55 percent.  
 25 So, really, what we're doing is trying to

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If you take what's  
 2 currently permitted and you do the total square  
 3 footage divided by the number of units, I got a  
 4 little over 2,000 square feet per unit.  
 5 MR. GUILFORD: Correct.  
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And then when I do the  
 7 same math calculation on what you're asking,  
 8 and the number of units, I get about 903 square  
 9 feet.  
 10 MR. GUILFORD: Correct.  
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So that goes to your  
 12 statement that the thought is to go for smaller  
 13 units. And while you do have -- you've got  
 14 three people living in three apartment versus  
 15 three people living in one unit.  
 16 MR. GUILFORD: Correct.  
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 18 MR. BEHAR: I mean, One, you're right, if  
 19 you had an average of 2,000 square foot per  
 20 unit, you would have more bedrooms, which is  
 21 what Mr. Guilford tried to explain. When you  
 22 actually look at the size of the unit, you take  
 23 the overall gross area and you really take  
 24 about 85 percent of that. That is the usable,  
 25 because the rest is common areas, hallways and

1 all.  
 2 So your average apartment unit is somewhere  
 3 in the 750 to 800, average, based on the  
 4 percentages.  
 5 So I could see where, you know, to your  
 6 point, where you're trying to get a smaller  
 7 unit, more suitable for the younger  
 8 professionals to live and work in the Gables.  
 9 And I don't have too much of a problem with  
 10 that. But the FAR is probably one of my most  
 11 concerns, in going from the 2.5 to the 3.5, you  
 12 know.  
 13 MR. GUILFORD: Sure.  
 14 MR. BEHAR: And I was going to say, if  
 15 there's any re-consideration from the  
 16 Applicant?  
 17 MR. GUILFORD: Well, let me -- I think that  
 18 question ought to be answered by the developer.  
 19 Dean, can you come up here?  
 20 MR. WARHAFT: Dean Warhaft, Florida East  
 21 Coast Realty, TWJ Alhambra, L.L.C., 100 South  
 22 Biscayne.  
 23 MR. BEHAR: He was up. He stood up.  
 24 He was sworn in, yes.  
 25 MR. COLLER: I couldn't see over there.

1 down to a matter of the requirements for  
 2 building this type of a project and the public  
 3 givebacks that are all part of the conditions  
 4 of the development and how it all works  
 5 together with the unit count and not making the  
 6 units too small for them to be comfortably  
 7 occupiable.  
 8 And so when you're working with that blend,  
 9 and yourself, as an architect, I'm sure you  
 10 understand this very well, that when you're  
 11 trying to find that right blend of comfortable  
 12 space for an individual, plus the community  
 13 space, both within the development itself and  
 14 also for the public at large, like with the  
 15 increase in the colonnade area that we did,  
 16 which then reduced the FAR for the building --  
 17 so there was not a huge reduction, but there  
 18 was some, where we didn't try and take that FAR  
 19 back some place else in the building.  
 20 Sorry.  
 21 So in working with Staff, as we go through  
 22 this process and as we have for actually almost  
 23 four years, we will continue to do that,  
 24 hopefully with an approval here, hopefully with  
 25 an approval at Commission, and then all of the

1 MR. WARHAFT: I had my hand up, and I'm an  
 2 attorney.  
 3 I'm sorry, could you repeat the question?  
 4 MR. BEHAR: When you were here last time,  
 5 when the application was here last time --  
 6 MR. WARHAFT: Yes.  
 7 MR. BEHAR: -- we asked if there's any  
 8 possibility of re-considering your FAR.  
 9 Obviously, you know, you came back today with  
 10 the same. Is there any possibility that maybe  
 11 that FAR could -- you know, maybe make the  
 12 building more efficient, so the FAR is not at  
 13 3.5, it's lower, and you still get the -- and  
 14 the architect may be able to answer that --  
 15 get, you know, the density, but the FAR is done  
 16 differently?  
 17 MR. WARHAFT: Well, at this point, we're  
 18 not comfortable reducing the FAR. What I will  
 19 say with regard to that is that we are in the  
 20 Central Business District. Our property is  
 21 within the Central Business District, which I  
 22 think is a key element to the project as a  
 23 whole and what we're trying to create for the  
 24 community.  
 25 And the issue that we have is that it comes

1 way through permitting and building the  
 2 building.  
 3 So we are ready and willing to continue to  
 4 work with everybody at the City and with the  
 5 community to try and develop a quality project.  
 6 Originally the building was, you know, 197  
 7 feet, and through the North Ponce Charrette, we  
 8 actually -- I stood before Commission, I spoke  
 9 to Commission, we spoke about the project. As  
 10 a result of that, we reduced the building to  
 11 the 97 feet.  
 12 So our willingness continues, and we are  
 13 willing to continue to work with the City, but,  
 14 at this point, a complete re-design is  
 15 extremely difficult.  
 16 MR. BEHAR: No, I don't mean a complete --  
 17 and we appreciate the effort that you've made,  
 18 because you're right. I mean, this building,  
 19 at one point, it was much taller and you  
 20 reduced it significantly.  
 21 And what I unfortunately -- you know, you  
 22 are correct. You fall within the CBD, and that  
 23 allows you to go much, much higher, even, you  
 24 know -- but, you know, you're asking for some  
 25 Zoning changes that give us a little bit of

1 power to do something differently.  
2 I know you are within the CBD, and this is  
3 one of those rare conditions that you do have  
4 CBD, but yet the Zoning designation doesn't  
5 match.

6 MR. GUILFORD: Yes.

7 Mr. Behar, one thing to follow up on Dean's  
8 comment is, some of the things we're doing as  
9 part of the trade-off is, we're preserving the  
10 two-story structure as historic. So that is  
11 going to require maintenance through  
12 perpetuity. We're creating a public park. So  
13 I think those are some of the things we're  
14 looking at as trade-offs for the additional  
15 FAR.

16 MR. WARHAFT: Thank you.

17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is that the open park part  
18 of the open space landscape that's  
19 referenced --

20 MR. GUILFORD: Yes.

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I mean, and I don't mean to  
22 be argumentative --

23 MR. GUILFORD: No, absolutely. I won't  
24 take it that way.

25 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. We're just talking

1 here. Why should I credit that -- because  
2 you're proposing 16.7 and what's currently  
3 required, I think, is a minimum -- 16.7  
4 percent, and what's required presently is a  
5 minimum of 25 percent. So you're actually --  
6 you know, you're giving less, so that this park  
7 is less than what the Zoning requires now.

8 I mean, I don't necessarily view it as a  
9 positive right now. So I'm giving you an  
10 opportunity to address it.

11 MR. GUILFORD: I think -- and I don't have  
12 the numbers in front of me, but I know we meet  
13 the Code as far as landscaping, but, again,  
14 we're not arguing. I would rather have the  
15 architect answer, who actually did the design  
16 of the landscaped open space.

17 MR. PRATT: Glen Pratt, Bellin & Pratt  
18 Architects, 285 Sevilla Avenue.

19 No, the landscaped -- well, all of the open  
20 space and the landscape is all a cumulative  
21 total that's based on the arcade, it's based on  
22 the open space itself, it's based on a number  
23 of things.

24 And so in the space -- I didn't quite  
25 follow your question or I didn't hear your

1 question that you asked.

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm sorry. My question --  
3 counsel just made the point, in response to,  
4 you know, short of justifying the FAR where it  
5 is now or what -- I'm sorry, the FAR that is  
6 being by this project, and as I understood,  
7 what he said is that one of the things that he  
8 claimed that the project was doing was creating  
9 this public space, this park, as a  
10 justification for the greater FAR or one of the  
11 justifications.

12 And my question to him was, as I read this,  
13 what's currently permitted is a minimum of 25  
14 percent or 12,192 square feet should be used  
15 for landscape and open space, and what you have  
16 now, even with this park, is 16.7 percent or  
17 8,167 square feet.

18 So I don't -- I just don't understand why  
19 that should be a positive. I mean, that, to  
20 me, is -- you know, it's less than what's  
21 currently permitted.

22 (Inaudible speaking.)

23 MR. BEHAR: Clear that, because I believe  
24 that's a misunderstanding.

25 MR. TRIAS: Let me clarify that issue.

1 It's 25 percent for MF2. So the current  
2 requirement, at MF2, without changing the  
3 Zoning, is 25 percent.

4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay.

5 MR. TRIAS: Now, the permitted, which is  
6 the next line, the next column, if the changes  
7 of Zoning take place, is 10 percent. So  
8 they're providing more than would be permitted;  
9 however, it's less than MF2. That's why it's a  
10 little bit confusing.

11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Right.

12 MR. WARHAFT: But if I may, the fifteen  
13 percent, it's more than would be required under  
14 the change.

15 MR. TRIAS: Right.

16 MR. WARHAFT: But, in addition to that,  
17 there's also a tremendous -- and I don't have  
18 the square footage in front of me, but there's  
19 also a tremendous amount of square footage with  
20 the paseo that we're providing that doesn't  
21 currently exist. So there's additional square  
22 foot, besides open space --

23 MR. BEHAR: But you're taking that into  
24 consideration to get to your number. That's  
25 already there.



1 Let's get the architect to clarify. Are  
 2 you taking the arcade and the plaza square  
 3 footage into your --  
 4 MR. PRATT: Yeah. Well, the paseo is a  
 5 part of the open space or a part of --  
 6 MR. BEHAR: If you were to add the paseo  
 7 that you have throughout the entire project and  
 8 the plaza, what square footage do you get? It  
 9 looks to me that the combined of those, you're  
 10 approximately 12,000 or so.  
 11 MR. PRATT: Yeah. I believe that's  
 12 correct.  
 13 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Because I see one at  
 14 8,965 and 2,940. It's 11,909. So just a  
 15 little bit less than that.  
 16 And I think this is what, you know, Frank  
 17 is saying, is that you were required that, but  
 18 you're providing 8,100, right?  
 19 MR. PRATT: I don't have the numbers in  
 20 front of me, but --  
 21 MR. Warhaft: If I may. Just so that I can  
 22 finish, and I think this will partially  
 23 answer -- or maybe hopefully fully answer the  
 24 question.  
 25 In addition to the paseo and the green

1 space for the park that's in the northwest  
 2 corner, the other thing that's on the site,  
 3 that becomes important, is the historic  
 4 building, which we're the ones that actually  
 5 went to the Historic, before we ever went  
 6 anywhere with this project, and it got  
 7 designated at our own behest.  
 8 So you've got a 2,000 square foot building,  
 9 in addition, that becomes part of the historic  
 10 fabric of Coral Gables, because we actually  
 11 went out of our way to do that at the very  
 12 beginning of this entire process.  
 13 So just to finish the train of thought and  
 14 also what our attorney was starting to talk  
 15 about with the historic building, in addition,  
 16 it also created significant complications with  
 17 the circulation of the building and the  
 18 parking, in order to be able to provide  
 19 everything adequately.  
 20 So all of those things are kind of blended  
 21 factors, and I know it's all shades of gray as  
 22 to how much weight one would provide to one  
 23 piece or the other, but, you know, this has  
 24 obviously been a multi-year process of going  
 25 through this, and I know now we're sitting here

1 in one night trying to have a conversation  
 2 about it. So I apologize for interrupting.  
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Let me interject with  
 4 one question, if I could. If that building was  
 5 not incorporated into this project, what would  
 6 have happened with the building?  
 7 MR. Warhaft: If the building wasn't  
 8 incorporated into the project, the circulation  
 9 of the building would be completely different,  
 10 Number One.  
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Or you would have liked  
 12 to -- normally you would have demoed the  
 13 building, right?  
 14 MR. WARHAFT: Right.  
 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So what happens in  
 16 Coral Gables when you go to demolish a  
 17 building? What's the first step you need to  
 18 take?  
 19 MR. WARHAFT: We would go to Historic  
 20 and --  
 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. And you would  
 22 have gotten, probably, the same determination  
 23 that you got anyway.  
 24 MR. WARHAFT: I don't know the answer to  
 25 that.

1 (Simultaneous speaking.)  
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I don't want  
 3 undue reliance on you going there first, when  
 4 it would have happened probably no matter what.  
 5 MR. GUILFORD: Mr. Chair, if I can just  
 6 clarify.  
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you, Mr.  
 8 Guilford.  
 9 MR. GUILFORD: Yes. We received a letter  
 10 from Historic Preservation saying that the  
 11 building was significant. When it went to  
 12 Historic Preservation, we did not fight the  
 13 designation. We said we would incorporate it  
 14 into the project.  
 15 Because of our incorporation, it has  
 16 created structural issues, it's created parking  
 17 issues, it's created a lot of other issues, had  
 18 the City would -- if the would City would have  
 19 let us tear it down.  
 20 MR. BEHAR: Look, let me go back -- and I  
 21 should have done this -- let me commend the  
 22 architect for doing a fantastic job, because,  
 23 you know, you and I have something in common,  
 24 that we have a client that comes to us and we  
 25 try to put everything in that one bag that they

1 ask for, and you're doing a great job trying to  
 2 lay out the building, even breaking out the  
 3 massing of the project.  
 4 I think the problem is that we're pushing  
 5 the architect to do a lot in this site, and  
 6 there's so much room that he could work with,  
 7 and he's done a fantastic job from what this  
 8 came. And I remember, maybe not four years,  
 9 but two or three years ago, it was a taller  
 10 building. I think they've done a great job and  
 11 I commend you for it, for doing what you're  
 12 doing today.  
 13 I think that what you're trying to do with  
 14 the open area, the plaza, the garden facing  
 15 more of the residential, I think creates a  
 16 little buffer, and you've set the building  
 17 back, because even the entrance to your garage  
 18 I think it's not at the property. I think you  
 19 set it back.  
 20 I just think that, you know, if there's  
 21 anything we can try to work for, a little bit  
 22 of the FAR, and a little bit of the density. I  
 23 don't have a problem, because I agree with  
 24 Mr. Guilford about the density, trying to get  
 25 smaller units, to allow more.

1 will continue to work with the community.  
 2 MR. BEHAR: Okay.  
 3 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, and that is one  
 4 of the conditions of approval that we have  
 5 listed for you, exactly that process. So if  
 6 you want that to happen, you could keep that  
 7 condition.  
 8 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, we have a motion, I  
 9 believe.  
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We do, but we don't  
 11 have a second yet. We've been having  
 12 discussion.  
 13 MR. BEHAR: I mean, I will second the  
 14 motion, if it could have a friendly amendment,  
 15 is that the Applicant, before going -- when are  
 16 you scheduled to go -- when will you be  
 17 scheduled to go to Commission? And at the end  
 18 of the day, the Commission will do whatever,  
 19 you know, decision. When will you be scheduled  
 20 to go to Commission?  
 21 MR. GUILFORD: Actually, I believe that's  
 22 the way the condition is written. It says, "To  
 23 be completed prior to the City Commission First  
 24 Reading."  
 25 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. If you look at Page 25

1 My daughter, I am looking -- I got the  
 2 paperwork here, that happens to be -- is  
 3 looking for an apartment in the Gables. She  
 4 doesn't want to move out of the Gables. So I'm  
 5 looking at various options, and at the end of  
 6 the day, the reason you do smaller units is for  
 7 price point, you could be able to rent them  
 8 out.  
 9 So I'm not opposed, but I think that 189  
 10 units is pushing that envelope, you know, much  
 11 more than I feel comfortable, you know, doing.  
 12 MR. WARHAFT: What I would say is this, is  
 13 that we -- and maybe I'll say it a little bit  
 14 differently than before. We have continued to  
 15 work with the City, and we will continue to  
 16 work with the Staff in order to create the best  
 17 project, whatever that work requires.  
 18 So I can't give you an answer tonight with  
 19 regard to FAR and how that impacts the overall  
 20 modeling of the building, because, obviously,  
 21 there's more to modeling a building than just  
 22 in a set of plans, and the same thing for the  
 23 density.  
 24 So the only thing that I can promise you is  
 25 that we will continue to work with Staff and we

1 of the Staff report, there are some conditions  
 2 to be completed prior to the first City  
 3 Commission meeting, and (B) the Applicant shall  
 4 continue to explore opportunities to reduce  
 5 building mass and bulk and create a transition  
 6 to residential properties to the north.  
 7 So that condition is there. If you believe  
 8 that it should be kept, then you have that  
 9 option, and Staff is recommending that you keep  
 10 it.  
 11 MR. BEHAR: I would definitely -- for me, I  
 12 would keep that condition, if this was to go  
 13 forward. I would definitely -- my vote would  
 14 be predicated on that condition.  
 15 MR. TRIAS: And that's Staff  
 16 recommendation. And the project has not been  
 17 scheduled yet for the Commission, so I cannot  
 18 give you a date, but certainly we have time to  
 19 work with Staff -- with the Applicant to  
 20 resolve the issue.  
 21 MR. PEREZ: But who does the Applicant work  
 22 with on exploring the reduction of mass and  
 23 bulk? Is that an item that now needs to go  
 24 back to BOA? Do they work with your Staff?  
 25 MR. TRIAS: They work with my Staff first,

1 and then we'll make a determination if BOA  
 2 needs to review it. Probably they will have to  
 3 review it, and I think that -- because there  
 4 will be some changes in the aesthetics of the  
 5 building. That's my intuition at this point.  
 6 MR. PEREZ: I have one point of clarity,  
 7 Ramon. On Item 14, on the Applicant's legend,  
 8 just to clarify, the MXD is 125 units per acre,  
 9 but in the CBD, MXD has no limitation on  
 10 density.  
 11 MR. PRATT: That's correct. Yes, sir.  
 12 MR. BEHAR: So MXD, outside of the CBD, has  
 13 125 units per acre.  
 14 MR. PRATT: Correct.  
 15 MR. BEHAR: I'll go ahead and second the  
 16 motion, if it's a friendly amendment -- well,  
 17 your motion was to keep the Staff's condition  
 18 and to work it out, do some -- continue to  
 19 work -- correct me if I am wrong, the Staff  
 20 recommendation is that the Applicant continues  
 21 to work with Staff prior to going to  
 22 Commission.  
 23 MR. TRIAS: Yes. That is the motion right  
 24 now on the floor, yes.  
 25 MR. BEHAR: To try to reduce the massing

1 and everything that we did.  
 2 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 3 MR. PEREZ: And incorporating the --  
 4 expanding the width of the arcade to ten feet.  
 5 MR. BEHAR: Well, that was already done.  
 6 MR. TRIAS: That's done already. That  
 7 already happened.  
 8 MR. BEHAR: Just for clarity, Glen, what is  
 9 the dimension in the garden area between the  
 10 property line and the edge of the arcade? I  
 11 don't see anything there. It looks somewhere  
 12 around 30 feet.  
 13 MR. PRATT: Actually, it's about 40 feet.  
 14 MR. BEHAR: Okay.  
 15 MR. TRIAS: If you could speak into the  
 16 mike, please.  
 17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. I have a question  
 18 about that, because maybe you can educate me on  
 19 how this process works. Why wasn't this done  
 20 before? I mean, we had some time from July  
 21 until now, and I'm not -- I mean -- I mean, if  
 22 what you're asking for is a recommendation by  
 23 this Board, based upon the fact that you're  
 24 going to -- or a condition that you're going to  
 25 continue to work together to reduce the mass,

1 why didn't you work together and reduce the  
 2 mass before now?  
 3 I mean, we had from July, August,  
 4 September, October --  
 5 MR. TRIAS: We did. We did. The Applicant  
 6 chose not to do it, and what happens is that  
 7 sometimes they need an extra push, and that's  
 8 where we are.  
 9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I understand. Okay.  
 10 MR. BEHAR: And the only way we're going to  
 11 get them to do something is by us pushing to do  
 12 that. If not, you know, they're not going to  
 13 do anything.  
 14 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, just to clarify, there  
 15 are three motions required. The first one is a  
 16 Comp Plan change, which requires no conditions.  
 17 The second one is the Zoning Map change, which  
 18 requires no conditions. The conditions pertain  
 19 to the third motion.  
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Got it. Thank you for  
 21 that reminder.  
 22 MR. BEHAR: And let me ask, maybe from the  
 23 City Attorney, there's only four of us. For us  
 24 tonight here, what does it require -- how many  
 25 votes are required to go forward? Is it --

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Four.  
 2 MR. COLLER: Charles, you want to review  
 3 the new rule that's --  
 4 MR. WU: A motion requires four votes to  
 5 move forward. Any votes less than four may  
 6 move forward without a recommendation. If  
 7 there's a tie vote and the Applicant does not  
 8 choose for continuance, also the application  
 9 moves forward without a recommendation. So you  
 10 need a unanimous vote to move forward with a  
 11 recommendation.  
 12 MR. BEHAR: So bottom line, no matter what,  
 13 this application is going to go forward.  
 14 MR. TRIAS: The application will go  
 15 forward. The issue is, if four people vote for  
 16 it, it goes forward with a recommendation,  
 17 approval or denial. Anything else than that it  
 18 just simply goes forward without  
 19 recommendation.  
 20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: So it would require four no  
 21 votes to go forward with a recommendation not  
 22 to do it. It would require four yes votes  
 23 for --  
 24 MR. WU: Correct.  
 25 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Anything other than that is

1 going to go forward with no recommendation from  
 2 the Board.  
 3 MR. TRIAS: That is correct. Yes.  
 4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So as to  
 5 Item Number 5, which is -- let's go back and do  
 6 these one at a time. Item Number 5 is the Comp  
 7 Plan change. We'll need a motion and a second  
 8 on that. That takes it from Multi-Family  
 9 Medium Density to Commercial Mid-Rise.  
 10 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion for  
 11 approval.  
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Motion to approve  
 13 Number 5.  
 14 MR. BEHAR: And Mid-Rise is the one that  
 15 allows you 97 feet.  
 16 MR. TRIAS: That's correct, yes.  
 17 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion for that  
 18 approval.  
 19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: How is that different from  
 20 what you have now? I don't understand. You're  
 21 allowed 97 feet now. So what does this change?  
 22 MR. TRIAS: It allows for the Commercial  
 23 Zoning to be requested and it allows for the  
 24 mixed-use to be requested, which gives the  
 25 additional density. That's the reason.

1 The request doesn't affect the height.  
 2 That we know. It does affect the density and  
 3 the FAR.  
 4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: All right.  
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have a motion.  
 6 MR. PEREZ: I'll second.  
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have a second. Any  
 8 additional discussion?  
 9 Seeing none, Jill, if you'll call the roll,  
 10 please, on Item Number 5.  
 11 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?  
 12 MR. PEREZ: Yes.  
 13 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?  
 14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No.  
 15 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 16 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 17 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?  
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.  
 19 Next item is Number 6. This is the Zoning  
 20 change. This takes it from MF2 to Commercial.  
 21 MR. TRIAS: And the nature of the request  
 22 is that once that happens, then the mixed-use  
 23 can be requested. That is why all of these  
 24 things are taking place.  
 25 MR. WU: Again, this does not require any

1 conditions. It's just a map change.  
 2 MR. BEHAR: Which is the one that will  
 3 require the conditions to be --  
 4 MR. WU: Number 7.  
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Number 7, the  
 6 mixed-use.  
 7 MR. TRIAS: The mixed-use.  
 8 MR. PEREZ: I'll make a motion for Number  
 9 6.  
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have a motion.  
 11 MR. BEHAR: I'll second it.  
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have a second. Any  
 13 further discussion?  
 14 Seeing none, Jill, call the roll, please.  
 15 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?  
 16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No.  
 17 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 18 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 19 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?  
 20 MR. PEREZ: Yes.  
 21 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?  
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.  
 23 Item Number 7 is the mixed-use approval of  
 24 the project. This is the one that can have  
 25 conditions.

1 MR. PEREZ: So is Number 7 the one that  
 2 I --  
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That you initially  
 4 approved, right.  
 5 MR. BEHAR: Well, there's already a motion  
 6 made on that --  
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. But just so  
 8 we're clear on the record, let's go ahead and  
 9 move it again if you would.  
 10 MR. PEREZ: So I'll make a motion with  
 11 Staff's recommendation --  
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 13 MR. PEREZ: -- for Number 7.  
 14 MR. BEHAR: I'll second it.  
 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have a motion and a  
 16 second on Number 7. Do we have any further  
 17 discussion?  
 18 Hearing none, Jill, call the roll, please.  
 19 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?  
 20 MR. PEREZ: Yes.  
 21 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?  
 22 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No.  
 23 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 24 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 25 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And with the  
2 understanding that the Applicant is going to do  
3 more than explore the opportunity, because  
4 exploring is a very broad, and -- so I'm going  
5 to suggest and recommend strongly that we do  
6 more than explore. And with that, I will vote,  
7 yes.

8 MR. TRIAS: Thank you. The project goes  
9 forward without a recommendation.

10 MR. GUILFORD: Thank you all very much.

11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

12 Next item on the agenda is Item Number 8.  
13 It's an Ordinance of the City Commission of  
14 Coral Gables, Florida providing for a text  
15 amendment to the City of Coral Gables Official  
16 Zoning Code, Article 4, "Zoning Districts,"  
17 Division 4, "Prohibited Uses," Section 4-411,  
18 "Parking in residential areas," amending the  
19 provisions for loading and unloading of  
20 commercial vehicles within residential  
21 districts and within a specific distance of  
22 residential districts; providing for repealer  
23 provision, severability clause, codification  
24 and providing for an effective date.

25 Mr. Trias.

1 areas right next to residential and we believed  
2 that that would be a good idea, to limit the  
3 hours of operation within close proximity to  
4 residential.

5 Certainly, if you think there's a better  
6 dimension, we could review that.

7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I don't know that a  
8 hundred is good or bad. I just wasn't sure  
9 where that number came from.

10 MR. TRIAS: It's basically just to limit  
11 the impacts on neighborhoods.

12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So is it a hundred feet  
13 from the residential district or is it  
14 properties that are located within a hundred  
15 feet?

16 MR. TRIAS: A hundred feet from the  
17 district, from the line of the -- which is  
18 typically the property line.

19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I mean, it could  
20 theoretically cut a commercial property, let's  
21 say, in half.

22 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So the half closest to  
24 the residential.

25 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

1 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, this is a minor  
2 change that re-arranges some text in the Code  
3 and adds one minor provision.

4 MR. COLLER: Mr. Chairman, you might want  
5 to wait two minutes to allow -- there we go.

6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

7 MR. TRIAS: We are re-arranging some of the  
8 text that limits the hours of operation for  
9 commercial vehicles, places it somewhere else  
10 in the Code, and then we're adding that in  
11 addition to -- this being applicable to  
12 Single-Family Zoning also area within a  
13 hundred feet of that Zoning will be affected by  
14 this.

15 So we're expanding slightly the application  
16 of this requirement.

17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. It's a public  
18 hearing item. We'll open the public hearing.

19 Anybody wish to speak on Item Number 8 on the  
20 agenda?

21 Seeing none, we'll close the public  
22 hearing.

23 Ramon, where did the hundred feet come  
24 from?

25 MR. TRIAS: There may be some commercial

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So they could still  
2 load and unload, they just have to do it --

3 MR. TRIAS: They have to do it farther away  
4 from the house.

5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Anybody have any  
6 comments, thoughts?

7 Anybody want to make a motion?

8 MR. BELLIN: I'll make a motion to approve.

9 MR. PEREZ: Just to be clear, so what  
10 exactly is it that they're requesting, the  
11 distance?

12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. The change,  
13 right, Ramon -- the change is just the distance  
14 of being --

15 MR. TRIAS: That is the only change, yes.

16 MR. PEREZ: And what is it now?

17 MR. TRIAS: Zero. Right now it's only  
18 residential districts. So we're saying, within  
19 a hundred feet, we also apply the same  
20 requirements.

21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: How hard is it going to  
22 be to enforce? Are you going to take a tape  
23 measurer and do a hundred feet? Is there any  
24 thought to making it, if the property is within  
25 a hundred feet, that way it's easier to say,