

1 allow yellow Tabebuias on the right-of-way,"
 2 and I think this may accomplish it to be
 3 specific.
 4 MR. COLLER: The only thing is, I don't see
 5 anything in the criteria that addresses the
 6 concern that certain people -- that you all
 7 believe that there are certain streets where,
 8 really, it's Oaks and it's this height and it's
 9 this height. So this directs Staff to say,
 10 when you consider the tree, consider those
 11 streets where the species and height
 12 predominate. It doesn't mean that they're
 13 mandated to do that, but it does require them
 14 to consider it.
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Which they do.
 16 MS. CABRERA: Which she does, because she
 17 makes sure that it's appropriate for the
 18 street, that it works well with the other
 19 species, but it does not mean that she wouldn't
 20 allow something else.
 21 MS. BELL-LLEWELLYN: Compatible.
 22 MR. COLLER: The other thing, of course,
 23 now we're putting a minimum of eight feet from
 24 the clear trunk height --
 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- requirement. Which

1 what you're referring to for trees?
 2 MR. WITHERS: So the City would only have
 3 to put a tree a minimum of eight feet, as well?
 4 Is this applicable to City planting?
 5 MS. BELL-LLEWELLYN: Eight feet clear
 6 trunk --
 7 MR. WITHERS: Yeah.
 8 MS. BELL-LLEWELLYN: -- means the foliage
 9 is taller than that.
 10 MS. CABRERA: Yeah. What he's saying is,
 11 does this apply on a City planted tree, and,
 12 yes, it would.
 13 MR. BEHAR: Probably not. Probably not.
 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: All right. We have a
 15 motion and a second. Let's go ahead and call
 16 the roll, please.
 17 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
 18 MR. WITHERS: No.
 19 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
 20 MR. TORRE: Yes.
 21 THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?
 22 MR. REVUELTA: Yes.
 23 THE SECRETARY: Claudia Miro?
 24 MS. MIRO: No.
 25 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?

1 means, if you take a tree that's eight feet,
 2 and you just cut it up all of the way straight
 3 up and plant the trunk, so that it will grow
 4 later -- is that allowed? I'm just curious.
 5 MS. BELL-LLEWELLYN: That would probably
 6 kill the tree then, but -- it would be a dead
 7 tree.
 8 MR. REVUELTA: You would have to plant it
 9 again.
 10 MR. WITHERS: So does the City have to
 11 abide by the same rule of eight-foot clear,
 12 because the Florida One Standard is what, six
 13 feet, on an Oak tree? When they rate their
 14 trees, I think it's six feet, and I think the
 15 City has the Florida One Standards requirement.
 16 Do you know that?
 17 MS. CABRERA: If you're over the street,
 18 but if it's not over the street --
 19 MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry?
 20 MS. CABRERA: If over the street, but if
 21 it's not over the street, there is no clearance
 22 requirements.
 23 MR. WITHERS: If it's in the swale, would
 24 the City have to have them --
 25 MS. BELL-LLEWELLYN: Grade and standards is

1 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 2 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 4 MR. BEHAR: Only took an hour and five
 5 minutes.
 6 MR. REVUELTA: Is four a recommendation?
 7 MR. COLLER: Yes. The minimum vote for a
 8 recommendation is four, which is what you have.
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So we have a four to
 10 two.
 11 MR. REVUELTA: That's right.
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 13 MS. BELL-LLEWELLYN: Okay. Thank you.
 14 MR. WITHERS: Thank you, Guys.
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: The next item, please.
 16 MR. COLLER: Item G-1, an Ordinance of the
 17 City Commission of Coral Gables Florida
 18 providing for a text amendment to the City of
 19 Coral Gables Official Zoning Code by amending
 20 Article 2, "Zoning Districts," Section 2-402,
 21 "Zain/Friedman Miracle Mile Downtown District
 22 Overlay" to promote quality design and to
 23 reduce the size of property required for
 24 Conditional Use review for parcels facing
 25 Miracle Mile, providing for severability,

Page 69

1 repeater, codification, and an effective date.
 2 Item G-1, public hearing.
 3 MS. GARCIA: Good evening, Jennifer Garcia,
 4 City Planner.
 5 So this is a sponsored text amendment from
 6 the Commission, and they're interested in
 7 lowering the requirement of requiring a
 8 Conditional Use process. A Conditional Use
 9 process is what you're used to. All of the
 10 applications you see are a Conditional Use. It
 11 requires DRC, Planning and Zoning Board
 12 recommendation, and Commission for approval.
 13 So, right now, the requirement for Miracle
 14 Mile, a property on Miracle Mile, and, really,
 15 anywhere City-wide, if you're over 20,000
 16 square feet, you're required the Conditional
 17 Use process, which requires, again, DRC,
 18 Planning and Zoning Board, Board of Architects
 19 in between there, and also Commission approval
 20 to get approval. So this is lowering that
 21 requirement just for the four blocks that are
 22 Miracle Mile.
 23 So there was a change to some of the
 24 language, that I printed off for each of you.
 25 There's one extra copy over there. If you go

Page 71

1 Conditional Use process, can't deprive that
 2 property owner of what they're allowed to
 3 build, which is 3.0 FAR or 3.5 with Med Bonus.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Can you tell us, how
 5 does this come about?
 6 MS. GARCIA: Well, there's some proposed
 7 developments on Miracle Mile, and the
 8 Commission felt that -- a Commissioner, in
 9 particular, felt the Commission should have
 10 more input on those properties on Miracle Mile.
 11 So that's kind of what spurt this.
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: By not having to come
 13 before the Planning and Zoning Board, that
 14 gives more power to the Commission?
 15 MS. GARCIA: No, it's just making less,
 16 quote/unquote, by right, and I should actually
 17 go back a little bit. Miracle Mile is required
 18 to have remote parking. That's the only place
 19 in the entire City that you're required to have
 20 remote parking. And if you remember, remote
 21 parking is also a Conditional Use. So that's
 22 why the Commission felt that it was reasonable
 23 to request that the minimum lot size to require
 24 Conditional Use could be reduced to 10,000
 25 square feet, because, in reality, if you're

Page 70

1 to Page 2, that's kind of the bulk change, in
 2 my opinion, and that's just clarifying that
 3 whatever conditions the Commission imposes,
 4 that wouldn't deprive the property to be less
 5 than what they're allowed to have, which is 3.5
 6 FAR.
 7 MR. REVUELTA: Is this Ordinance 2022 --
 8 MS. GARCIA: Yes.
 9 MR. REVUELTA: -- what we're supposed to be
 10 looking at?
 11 MS. GARCIA: Yes. It's Item G-1. It
 12 should be printed on the corner.
 13 MR. TORRE: I'm sorry, say again what you
 14 just said about the FAR? I didn't quite
 15 understand.
 16 MS. GARCIA: So, right now, you can develop
 17 on Miracle Mile with a maximum 3.5 FAR or 3.0
 18 FAR if you're doing Med Bonus. So this is
 19 language that I think is red in your -- is it
 20 red or the purple?
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Blue.
 22 MS. GARCIA: The new language -- it's blue?
 23 Okay. There you go. Okay. It's blue. That
 24 clarifies that whatever the Commission imposes,
 25 as far as conditions, as part of the

Page 72

1 developing a property that's 10,000 feet or
 2 more, you're going to request the remote
 3 parking anyway.
 4 MR. BEHAR: You're saying that we're going
 5 to lower, you know, to 10,000 and you will
 6 require Conditional Use?
 7 MS. GARCIA: Yes.
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But they don't have to
 9 come to the Planning and Zoning.
 10 MR. BEHAR: Are we not making it --
 11 MS. GARCIA: No, but they would have to go
 12 to the Planning and Zoning Board, because
 13 that's part of the Conditional Use process.
 14 MR. BEHAR: Are we not making it more
 15 difficult?
 16 MS. GARCIA: You're making -- the thought
 17 is that they're already difficult to get
 18 something approved, because of the remote
 19 parking requirement, which is also already
 20 requiring a Condition Use. So you're adding in
 21 an additional review, additional fees, but
 22 they're going through the same process,
 23 because, as you know, most of these projects
 24 have an accompanying requests that just kind of
 25 travels with the project.

1 MR. BEHAR: It seems to me that we're
 2 making it more difficult for every property
 3 that comes in, in Miracle Mile, and I would
 4 like to hear maybe from, you know -- from an
 5 attorney, to see what, but it seems to me that
 6 this, what it does, creates more obstacle to
 7 develop on Miracle Mile.

8 MS. GARCIA: Yes. I mean, you can
 9 definitely see it that way. The Commission
 10 sees it as an extra set of eyes, that they can
 11 be able to see more projects on those four
 12 blocks of Miracle Mile, but definitely you can
 13 see it -- the other point of view is that
 14 you're requiring an additional requirement.

15 MS. MIRO: Which Commissioner, you said,
 16 brought it forward?

17 MS. GARCIA: Commissioner Anderson.

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Do you have further
 19 presentation or --

20 MS. GARCIA: No, that's it. I'm here to
 21 answer any questions.

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

23 Before we go ahead and bring an attorney or
 24 somebody that would like to speak on it, do we
 25 have any speakers on this item?

1 The fact that you're confused, Mr. Behar, I
 2 mean, it's like we're both coming at this
 3 probably from opposite views. You're not sure
 4 what it is and I'm not sure what it is, but,
 5 anyway, so here's my panic button.

6 The reality is, if you think of your own
 7 shopping, that if you go to a place and you
 8 can't park or it's so hard to park that you're
 9 losing time on other things you have to do,
 10 you're going to be less likely or even unlikely
 11 to return, because people in their stressed
 12 daze don't have extra time to remote park. If
 13 that adds forty minutes while you're walking to
 14 and from your remote park or whatever, at some
 15 point, you say, "Okay, I'm going somewhere
 16 else. I don't have the extra time."

17 So my panic button is, anything that
 18 approves remote parking is basically poison to
 19 the prosperity of Miracle Mile, and I really
 20 view this as a panic button, because nobody --
 21 the developers now, forgive the expression
 22 here, we live -- thanks to Citizens United,
 23 developers can contribute most to the political
 24 campaigns, and if we -- Plato had philosopher
 25 kings. We live in an era and an epic of

1 THE SECRETARY: Yes, we do.

2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Can you call the first
 3 person, please?

4 MR. HOLMES: Greetings. It's good to see
 5 you all.

6 THE SECRETARY: Sorry, can you state your
 7 name and address?

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Could you state your
 9 name?

10 MR. HOLMES: Thank you very much.
 11 My name is Rip Holmes. I'm a Miracle Mile
 12 property owner.

13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Can you state your
 14 physical address, please --

15 MR. HOLMES: 35 Sidonia Avenue, Coral Gables.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- for the record.

17 MR. HOLMES: I'd offer to joke with you
 18 all, but I'm one of the few people with an
 19 inexpensive apartment. I may have the least
 20 expensive apartment in Coral Gables. It took a
 21 long search.

22 So, anyways, I'm confused, like I think you
 23 are. I didn't do my homework on this item,
 24 and -- so I'll just express my panic, because I
 25 don't even know what the item is proposing.

1 developer kings, because they control the
 2 contributions, unlimited donations to PACs, and
 3 so there's only so much I can say, and at the
 4 end of the day, if you're talking -- with our
 5 friend here, Venny Torre, who is partially a
 6 developer, you have to say, are you going to
 7 end up squeezing yourself out of parking?

8 And I think that if you go very far with
 9 this remote parking -- first of all, there is
 10 no remote parking. The only parking that can
 11 be done for remote is to raid --

12 MR. BEHAR: But --

13 MS. HOLMES: Wait a second. Let me just
 14 finish.

15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Excuse me, let me just
 16 state that the remote parking is G-2, the next
 17 item.

18 MR. BEHAR: It's coming up. This is not.
 19 This is something else.

20 MR. HOLMES: These are two divorced items?
 21 They're separate? They're not connected?

22 MR. BEHAR: Mr. Chair, can I?

23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Sure. Please.

24 MR. BEHAR: When it comes to that other
 25 item, you could speak on that item. This is --

1 we're dealing with something else right now.
 2 When G-2 comes, you could speak on that, and
 3 that's what you're referring to, the remote
 4 parking. We're not discussing --
 5 MR. HOLMES: I hope that your optimism is
 6 correct. I'd like to believe that these two
 7 items are completely separate.
 8 MR. BEHAR: This is an item that is not --
 9 right now we're not dealing with remote
 10 parking, so let's keep it --
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You're welcome to
 12 speak. I'm not going to tell you're not
 13 welcome to speak. We always encourage people
 14 to speak.
 15 MR. HOLMES: No, I hear you. So I'll
 16 surrender to the fact that I'm confused and
 17 I'll sit down and I'll wait for the next item.
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir.
 19 Mr. Holmes, you're always welcome to speak.
 20 MR. HOLMES: Thanks.
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Do we have a next
 22 person?
 23 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: I can sign-in, if you'd
 24 like.
 25 THE SECRETARY: Were you sworn in?

1 Miracle Mile, which were approved last year.
 2 And so, now, there are some projects that are
 3 coming along or perhaps considering moving
 4 forward with the Overlay District Regulations
 5 as they were adopted last year, and now this
 6 possibility of a Site Plan -- of an additional
 7 Site Plan review process has come.
 8 Now, keep in mind, as Jennifer mentioned
 9 already, and I think Mr. Holmes was alluding
 10 to, one of the changes that happened last year
 11 for Miracle Mile was the requirement that all
 12 properties fronting Miracle Mile have to remote
 13 park. So because of that remote parking
 14 requirement for all properties along Miracle
 15 Mile, they already are going to go through a
 16 Conditional Use approval process for the
 17 purpose of getting the remote parking approved.
 18 So it will ultimately come to this Board, and
 19 then ultimately the City Commission.
 20 Now what's proposed is, aside from the
 21 Conditional Use review of the remote parking, a
 22 Conditional Use review of the Site Plan, all
 23 right. So, when I first hear that, of course,
 24 I get some concerns as to, will this lead to
 25 ultimately maybe opening up the door to further

1 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Sure. I don't think
 2 attorneys have to be sworn in, but I'll --
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Attorneys don't.
 4 MR. WITHERS: Oh, I know those are the
 5 people that should be sworn in. I don't know
 6 where we went wrong on that one.
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Jill, just to be
 8 clear, in Chambers, we don't have anybody else
 9 signed up?
 10 THE SECRETARY: No.
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Sorry about that.
 12 Thank you.
 13 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: That's quite all right.
 14 By the way, good evening, Mr. Chair,
 15 Members of the Board. Mario Garcia-Serra, with
 16 offices at 600 Brickell Avenue, here tonight
 17 because I do represent several entities that do
 18 own property along the Mile, and I think we
 19 sort of have to put in context -- it's good for
 20 the discussion -- what the Mile has experienced
 21 over the last year, because, if you remember,
 22 this Board was part of it back last year.
 23 There were significant amendments done to this
 24 Overlay District, which brought down height,
 25 took away the ability to utilize TDRs along

1 reductions in the maximum permitted floor area
 2 or height or whatever it might be. And so, you
 3 know, I'll throw out there that, those
 4 revisions that are on the revised version
 5 presented to you, some of them, I think, come
 6 from some suggestions that I have made to try
 7 to protect those properties and the development
 8 rights of those properties from being deprived
 9 of any futher floor area or height as part of
 10 this new Conditional Use Site Plan review
 11 process. That's one thing I think you could
 12 potentially do to grant some assurance to
 13 property owners along the Mile. You could also
 14 maybe try to exempt projects that are already
 15 going through the process right now. You know,
 16 there's a host of things.
 17 But, certainly, where I'm coming from,
 18 where I think most property owners on the Mile
 19 are coming from is, we already went through a
 20 pretty grueling process last year with regards
 21 to amendments to the Overlay District. Let's
 22 not make this an additional grueling process of
 23 Site Plan review for properties along the Mile.
 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 25 Jill, do we have nobody else in Chambers?

1 THE SECRETARY: No, no one else.
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Do we have anybody on
 3 Zoom?
 4 THE SECRETARY: No.
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Anybody on phone
 6 platform?
 7 At this time, I'll go ahead and close it
 8 for public comment; open it up for Board
 9 discussion.
 10 Luis.
 11 MR. REVUELTA: I think if the Commission
 12 wants to review smaller sites, because they
 13 have the concerns that they want to see and
 14 they want a Site Plan review, I have a
 15 difficult time voting against the will of the
 16 Commission on this. Right now it's 20,000
 17 square feet. So if you have a smaller
 18 property, you have to go through that grueling
 19 process, like Mario was pointing out, but the
 20 Commission probably has their reasons for
 21 wanting to review and have their say in the
 22 oversight.
 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Claudia.
 24 MS. MIRO: I want to listen to more
 25 comments.

1 say, that's what we want. I'm not sure from
 2 the business side or from the people who
 3 develop continuing to add layers and delays to
 4 have ultimately the Commission decide what
 5 comes and goes is the best way forward.
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 7 Chip.
 8 MR. WITHERS: Yeah, I kind of tend to agree
 9 with Venny on this one, but I don't -- maybe
 10 Staff -- I don't -- maybe I need a little more
 11 explanation. I mean, what is the concern? I
 12 mean, at the end of the day, like I got tied up
 13 on that tree issue, at the end of the day, what
 14 are we trying to accomplish five or ten years
 15 from now? What's the long-term play on this?
 16 MS. GARCIA: The Commission wants people to
 17 see more projects on Miracle Mile. I think
 18 that's --
 19 MR. WITHERS: More projects?
 20 MS. GARCIA: Uh-huh.
 21 MR. WITHERS: And this is the way to
 22 stimulate projects, they think?
 23 MS. GARCIA: No. They want to have input
 24 on more projects.
 25 MR. REVUELTA: More review.

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Venny? Would you like
 2 to ask any questions?
 3 MR. TORRE: Sure. You know, I go to some
 4 of the things that I bring up once in a while,
 5 which I think goes back to something Chip has
 6 said in the past, and it's about what's by
 7 rights and what's not by right in the City, and
 8 that's a discussion that comes up quite a bit,
 9 build by what's right, build by what's right.
 10 At the end of the day, we keep removing the
 11 by rights away and we keep giving more and more
 12 of the final say to the Commission, which I'm
 13 not saying is good or bad. I'm just saying,
 14 the trend has been, the projects that are
 15 approved, good, bad or indifferent -- some of
 16 them have been very controversial -- have been
 17 reviewed by Conditional Use by the Commission.
 18 I'm not sure that a final word by the
 19 Commission is the ultimate best solution for
 20 the City -- maybe it is, maybe it's not -- but
 21 what we keep doing is taking away the by
 22 rights, to the point where it's almost designed
 23 by Commission here.
 24 So this debate that opens the floor for the
 25 whole citizenship to come up. Some people may

1 MR. WITHERS: Oh, they want to see
 2 visually. They don't want to see more
 3 projects, they just want to see more project?
 4 MS. GARCIA: Yes. Yes. They want their
 5 fingerprints on more projects.
 6 MR. WITHERS: And why? Are they not happy
 7 with the projects now? I mean, I wasn't -- I
 8 didn't read the minutes --
 9 MS. GARCIA: I'm not sure if there are any
 10 that have really been done in the last few
 11 years, besides the one that's, you know, by
 12 right on the corner of Le Jeune and Miracle
 13 Mile.
 14 MR. WITHERS: So what was the impetus from
 15 Commissioner Anderson? Were you privy to those
 16 discussions at the Commission Meeting,
 17 because --
 18 MS. GARCIA: I think the concern is that
 19 even though remote parking is required, that
 20 the Commission can't really get involved at the
 21 Site Plan part of that aspect. So she wants
 22 to --
 23 MR. WITHERS: So this is Site Plan review?
 24 MS. GARCIA: Yes.
 25 MR. WITHERS: Because Conditional Uses, to

1 me, were always like schools, churches, banks
 2 drive-thrus, it was more of a use than an
 3 underlying Zoning. I mean, so that's why I
 4 don't quite understand what the --
 5 MS. GARCIA: So the Conditional Use is an
 6 approval process.
 7 MR. WITHERS: Right. I understand, but
 8 it's more for the use of the property, right,
 9 Conditional Use?
 10 MS. GARCIA: It's more about adding
 11 conditions to what you're requesting.
 12 MR. WITHERS: Okay. Thank you.
 13 MR. BEHAR: I tend to agree with Mario's
 14 comment -- Mario Garcia-Serra's comment. You
 15 know, we already went through a process that we
 16 took away the maximum of height, that, at one
 17 point used to be, if I remember, like 70 feet.
 18 We lowered it down to 50 feet. We did so much
 19 already, that we're not making it easy to
 20 build, you know, as Venny said, as of right.
 21 We're complicating, you know, the ability to do
 22 something.
 23 A 10,000 square foot site, that you already
 24 have to go through Conditional Use, because of
 25 the remote parking, I think that's more than

1 develop it, put it together and have to go
 2 through the same steps as a 20,000 square foot
 3 lot, would it not then induce people to mass or
 4 put together larger lots, if they have to go
 5 through the process anyway?
 6 For me, I'd rather have smaller projects
 7 coming through the City, which is tough enough
 8 as it is, and have the diversity. That's just
 9 my view on it.
 10 MR. REVUELTA: I have one question. The
 11 Site Plan review, what would that review add to
 12 a 10,000 square foot property that already
 13 doesn't -- is not in the system? Other than
 14 spending that money, what kind of --
 15 MS. GARCIA: What kind of things are the
 16 Commission looking for? I can't answer that.
 17 MR. REVUELTA: But is it -- this Site Plan
 18 review, basically having -- the additional step
 19 is having to go to the City Commission?
 20 MS. GARCIA: Right.
 21 MR. REVUELTA: Which is a political --
 22 MS. GARCIA: Absolutely.
 23 MR. REVUELTA: -- arena.
 24 MS. GARCIA: But they may see it as far as
 25 notifying more extensively for the neighbors,

1 enough. I'm not in favor of adding more layers
 2 to this process. I think that, you know, we're
 3 going to discourage new developments to come on
 4 Miracle Mile, that we need it. We really need
 5 it. You know, it's a beautiful street that --
 6 MR. REVUELTA: Sorry.
 7 MR. BEHAR: It's a beautiful street, that
 8 today we need to add more life to it. So I'm
 9 not favor of this.
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Claudia.
 11 MS. MIRO: I agree with Mr. Behar. I
 12 think -- and also with what Venny said. You
 13 know, I think that there is already a process
 14 in place and adding to that process -- I mean,
 15 I think it's a good process. It's already a
 16 rigorous process, and I really do think that
 17 Miracle Mile, right now, needs to be
 18 revitalized and we want to attract those
 19 businesses. We want that to come to Miracle
 20 Mile. And maybe adding another layer, that
 21 might delay that process or might discourage
 22 some from coming there.
 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: One of the concerns
 24 that I would have is, it would be so difficult
 25 for a person -- for a 10,000 square foot lot to

1 and the business owners in the area to be more
 2 aware of the project.
 3 MR. BEHAR: You know, Luis --
 4 MS. GARCIA: And it's about, the Commission
 5 wants to have their -- you know, put their
 6 fingerprints on the project.
 7 MR. REVUELTA: Well, I think, after
 8 listening to you and Chip and Venny, I think I
 9 would probably have to --
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Anybody that would
 11 like to make a motion on this? Venny?
 12 MR. WITHERS: You started all of this.
 13 MR. TORRE: I didn't start it.
 14 MR. COLLIER: Just a little housekeeping
 15 measure.
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 17 MR. COLLIER: The amendments that were put
 18 on here, I assume, regardless of what the vote
 19 is, which is a recommendation, is going to go
 20 to the Commission. They use the old format.
 21 This is not the Ordinance that's actually on
 22 the agenda. So you just need to make these
 23 changes to the draft Ordinance that's on the
 24 agenda.
 25 MS. GARCIA: Yes. So when this moves

1 forward to the Commission with whatever
 2 recommendation comes from tonight, it will be
 3 the one that is printed in front of you right
 4 now with those changes.
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Perfect.
 6 MR. WITHERS: So I will vote for denial.
 7 I'll make a motion to deny it, I guess.
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So Chip is making a
 9 motion to deny as presented.
 10 MR. TORRE: I'll second it.
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a second by
 12 Venny.
 13 Any discussion?
 14 Call the roll, please.
 15 THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?
 16 MR. REVUELTA: Yes.
 17 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
 18 MR. TORRE: Yes.
 19 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
 20 MR. WITHERS: Yes.
 21 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 22 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 23 THE SECRETARY: Claudia Miro?
 24 She stepped out.
 25 Eibi Aizenstat?

1 payment in lieu, and a payment in lieu is,
 2 you're paying out of the requirement, that you
 3 can pay out of your requirement as much as you
 4 want. Those are three options, as far as
 5 providing parking or meeting the parking
 6 requirements.
 7 So back when this was amended last, which
 8 was last year -- it was part of the Zoning Code
 9 update -- the intent was that there would be a
 10 fee associated with each remote parking space
 11 that you're remote parking. And, then, in
 12 addition to that fee, if you decide to pay out
 13 of the requirement, then you pay again, and
 14 that's, you're out of the requirement for life.
 15 Now, when that was drafted in the Zoning
 16 Code update, for whatever reason, it wasn't as
 17 clear as what the intent was. So now that
 18 we're starting to get more remote parking
 19 requests, we're looking at this and we're
 20 making some changes, according to what the
 21 intent originally was.
 22 So I have Kevin Kinney here, our Parking
 23 Director, for any questions.
 24 MR. KINNEY: Mostly to answer questions, I
 25 would say. I think Jennifer --

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. Thank you.
 2 Next item on the agenda, please.
 3 MR. COLLER: Item G-2, an Ordinance of the
 4 City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida
 5 providing for text amendments to the City of
 6 Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 10,
 7 "Parking," Section 10-109, "Payment in Lieu and
 8 Remote Off-Street Parking," to clarify remote
 9 parking processes and fee structure, providing
 10 for severability, repeater, codification, and
 11 an effective date.
 12 Item G-2, public hearing.
 13 MS. GARCIA: Thank you.
 14 Jennifer Garcia, City Planner. I have a
 15 few slides that they should have. Perfect.
 16 And this is also in your Staff report, as well.
 17 So, right now, there are three ways to park
 18 cars. Option one is the way that we're most
 19 likely used to, that you park it on-site. You
 20 meet your minimum parking requirements on-site.
 21 Another option is the remote parking. So
 22 the remote parking is when you're parking all
 23 or an amount of parking -- amount of spaces
 24 remotely, within a thousand feet, okay.
 25 And then the third option you have is the

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you state your
 2 name and position?
 3 MR. KINNEY: Kevin Kinney. I'm the Parking
 4 Director for the City of Coral Gables.
 5 Just a minor couple of minor tweaks to what
 6 Jennifer said. Yes, is a payment in lieu,
 7 although we do not give applicants carte
 8 blanche on deciding how many spaces they can
 9 buy out of. That is something, in the City
 10 Code, once you go over 25 spaces. It does have
 11 to be reviewed, and if the system can't handle
 12 somebody buying out of a hundred parking
 13 spaces, it won't be allowed. So it is an
 14 option, but it has to work in the system.
 15 And since we had some conversation about
 16 Miracle Mile, I will just mention -- and
 17 Jennifer mentioned, also -- that we have
 18 prohibited development of parking on Miracle
 19 Mile, and one of the reasons we can do that
 20 comfortably is, within a hundred feet of
 21 Miracle Mile, I have 3,000 parking spaces
 22 available, and, currently, even at peak, we are
 23 not hitting 50 or 60 percent occupancy. So
 24 there is capacity there.
 25 We still review any request for remote