

CITY OF CORAL GABLES  
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY (LPA)/  
SPECIAL PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING  
VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT  
HYBRID FORMAT  
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2024, COMMENCING AT 4:02 P.M.

Board Members Present at Commission Chamber:

- Eibi Aizenstat, Chairman
- Wayne "Chip" Withers
- Sue Kawalerski
- Felix Pardo
- Javier Salman
- Robert Behar

City Staff and Consultants:

- Jennifer Garcia, Planning Official
- Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator
- Cristina Suarez, City Attorney
- Gustavo Ceballos, Assistant City Attorney
- Jill Menendez, Administrative Assistant, Board Secretary
- Fenggian/Grace Chen, Principal Planner
- Juan Riesco, City Architect

Also Participating:

- Peter Kiliddjian, Vice Chairman, Board of Architects
- Maria Cristina Longo.

Pursuant to Resolution Number 2021-118, the City of Coral Gables has returned to traditional in-person meetings, However, the Planning and Zoning Board has established the ability for the public to provide comments virtually.

For those members of the public who are appearing on Zoom and wish to testify -- actually, you do not have to be -- since it is not -- it's legislative, you do not have to be visible and be sworn in.

Lobbyist Registration and Disclosure, any person who acts as a lobbyist must register with the City Clerk, as required pursuant to the City Code.

As Chair, I now officially call the City of Coral Gables Planning and Zoning Board Special Meeting on Mediterranean Standards of September 26th, 2024 to order. The time is 4:02.

Jill, if you'd please call the roll.

THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?

MR. BEHAR: Here.

THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell asked to be excused.

Sue Kawalerski?

THEREUPON:

(The following proceedings were held.)

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I'd like to go ahead and get started, if everybody is okay with that. I'd like to go ahead and call the meeting to order. I'd like to please ask everybody to please silence their phones and beepers, if they have any.

Good evening. This Board is comprised of seven Members. Four Members of the Board shall constitute a quorum and the affirmative vote of four Members shall be necessary for the adoption of any motion. If only four Members of the Board are present, an applicant may request and be entitled to a continuance to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board.

If a matter is continued due to a lack of quorum, the Chairperson or Secretary of the Board may set a Special Meeting to consider such matter. In the event that four votes are not obtained, an applicant, except in the case of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment, may request a continuance or advance the application to proceed to the City Commission without a recommendation.

MR. KAWALERSKI: Here.

THE SECRETARY: Felix Pardo?

MR. PARDO: Here.

THE SECRETARY: Javier Salman also requested to be excused.

Chip Withers?

MR. WITHERS: Here.

THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Here.

We will not have swearing in today, as the item is legislative, as I had stated before.

Everyone who speaks today must complete the roster on the podium. We ask that you print your name clearly, so the official records of your name and address will be correct.

Zoom platform participants, I will ask any person wishing to speak on this afternoon's agenda item, to please open your chat and send a direct message to Jill Menendez, stating you would like to speak before the Board and include your full name. Jill will call you when it's your turn. I ask you to be concise, for the interest of time.

Phone platform participants will then follow, as Zoom participants are done. I will

1 ask phone participants to comment on tonight's  
2 agenda item, as well, and I ask you to be  
3 concise, for the interest of time.

4 The procedure we'll use tonight is, first,  
5 the identification of the agenda item by  
6 Mr. Collier -- actually, it will be Madam City  
7 Attorney. Mr. Collier is not here --  
8 presentation by Staff, and a -- I'll go ahead  
9 and open it for public comment, first in  
10 Chambers, then the Zoom platform, and phone  
11 line platform.

12 I'll go ahead and close the public comment.  
13 We'll have Board discussion. Then, if there's  
14 a motion, discussion, and second of a motion,  
15 if applicable, the Board's final comments and a  
16 vote.

17 Before we start, in light of not having a  
18 full board on this item, which is such an  
19 important issue, I would like the Board's input  
20 on a few options. One, we can go ahead, defer,  
21 to reschedule the meeting; Two, we can proceed  
22 with the meeting and see if there is a  
23 recommendation and a vote; and, Three, we can  
24 proceed with the meeting and defer  
25 recommendation and vote. Absent Board Members

5

1 discussion can continue, and we would be able  
2 to provide the verbatim minutes to all three  
3 members, at that time, depending on how far  
4 along we get in the hour and a half that we  
5 have before the 5:30 time, and, you know, we  
6 can then have that, to be able to conclude the  
7 discussion and vote with hopefully all of the  
8 members present at the next Planning Board  
9 Meeting.

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Cristina, let me ask  
11 you a question, please. Since we have  
12 advertised as a Planning and Zoning Board  
13 Meeting, which is quasi-judicial, even though  
14 this item is legislative, do we need to --  
15 because of Sunshine Laws, if we lose a quorum,  
16 are we allowed to continue?

17 MS. SUAREZ: So you would not lose the  
18 quorum. You would still have four members, if  
19 I'm not mistaken, right? We would not lose a  
20 quorum.

21 MR. PARDO: He leaves at 5:30.

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But once he leaves at  
23 5:30, we'll have one, two, three, four --

24 MR. BEHAR: Yeah, you're right. We will  
25 have a quorum.

7

1 will then have the ability to read the  
2 transcript and we can continue at a later  
3 meeting.

4 MR. BEHAR: Mr. Chairman, we also have  
5 another issue, because we have one of the Board  
6 Members who's going to be --

7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct.

8 MR. BEHAR: -- departing at 5:30, you said?

9 MR. WITHERS: Yeah.

10 MR. BEHAR: So we may not --

11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: One, two, three --

12 MR. BEHAR: Four. I don't know that that's  
13 really appropriate for such an important  
14 matter, and I want to start, because we need to  
15 start. We may have to get -- when we get to  
16 that point, we may have to reconsider if we  
17 continue or -- right?

18 MR. KAWALERSKI: Uh-huh.

19 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman.

20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, Felix.

21 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest  
22 Number Three, and even with present company  
23 leaving prematurely, although we would not have  
24 the quorum -- we would lose the quorum at that  
25 time, the quorum would be lost for a vote. The

6

1 MR. PARDO: We will have a quorum.

2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And we can continue.

3 MR. PARDO: So it's a matter --

4 MS. SUAREZ: And just to answer, for the  
5 sake of a discussion, if you lost the quorum,  
6 you can continue discussion, you just could not  
7 take any action.

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Right.

9 MR. PARDO: And the verbatim minutes could  
10 be made available to all of the Board Members  
11 or they could watch a tape of the discussion --

12 MS. SUAREZ: That's an option.

13 MR. PARDO: -- to be able to hit the ground  
14 running the next time, and complete it.

15 MS. SUAREZ: Yeah. I mean, you could also  
16 decide that, you know -- when Mr. Withers has  
17 to leave, you could decide to maybe conclude  
18 this one and then continue it at, you know, a  
19 later meeting. All of the options are really  
20 available.

21 MR. BEHAR: But I think, you know, Felix,  
22 your recommendation is probably a good one. We  
23 could continue. We may not take a vote until  
24 we get all seven Board Members present, you  
25 know.

8

1 MR. PARDO: Exactly. And I think that  
 2 would be fair, and, specifically, you know, I  
 3 would like to hear the input of --  
 4 MR. BEHAR: Two architects, which to me are  
 5 -- you know.  
 6 MR. PARDO: Correct. You took the words  
 7 out of my mouth, right.  
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Right. There's two  
 9 architects that are missing tonight -- or this  
 10 afternoon.  
 11 MR. BEHAR: Okay.  
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: All right. If  
 13 everybody's okay, we'll go ahead and continue  
 14 with this matter at this time, okay?  
 15 MR. WITHERS: Absolutely. Absolutely.  
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.  
 17 Madam City Attorney, could you please read  
 18 into the record the agenda item?  
 19 MS. SUAREZ: Yes.  
 20 E-1 is an Ordinance of the City Commission  
 21 of Coral Gables, Florida, providing for text  
 22 amendments of the City of Coral Gables Official  
 23 Zoning Code, Article 5, "Architecture," Section  
 24 5-200, "Mediterranean Standards;" Article 3,  
 25 "Uses," Section 3-402, "Restrictions related to

1 location;" and Article 16, "Definitions;" to  
 2 enhance the quality of Coral Gables  
 3 Mediterranean design by requiring a conceptual  
 4 design review; removing duplicative criteria;  
 5 relocating inapplicable standards;  
 6 supplementing existing criteria; and including  
 7 additional Mediterranean building examples;  
 8 providing for severability, repealer,  
 9 codification, and providing for an effective  
 10 date.  
 11 MS. GARCIA: So, good afternoon. Jennifer  
 12 Garcia, Planning Official.  
 13 And so the memo today actually is just  
 14 capturing what was discussed at the last  
 15 meeting two weeks ago. The red lines that are  
 16 in here should look familiar. They were on  
 17 your draft from the last -- from the board  
 18 meeting from two weeks ago, and the ones in  
 19 purples are the ones incorporated from the last  
 20 time discussion, right.  
 21 Some of the comments are from Alex Adams, a  
 22 member of the public who came and had some  
 23 comments, additional comments for the Board to  
 24 consider. There were some clarifications by  
 25 some of the Board Members here that are

1 incorporated into this draft in purple.  
 2 So, to save time, that's all I need to say.  
 3 Thank you.  
 4 MR. BEHAR: You do have a PowerPoint of all  
 5 of the -- right? You don't?  
 6 MS. GARCIA: No. This is here for  
 7 discussion and to get your feedback, remember?  
 8 MR. BEHAR: I mean, I said the last time,  
 9 I've got some comments, that I don't know if --  
 10 then we're not going to be able to put it up to  
 11 go through, you know, each --  
 12 MS. GARCIA: We all have the same draft, we  
 13 can go page by page, if you wish to do it that  
 14 way.  
 15 MR. BEHAR: Okay.  
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before we proceed,  
 17 Jennifer -- I mean, sorry, Jill, do we have  
 18 anybody that signed up to speak?  
 19 THE SECRETARY: No one has indicated they  
 20 wish to speak.  
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Nobody in Zoom  
 22 or phone platform, either?  
 23 THE SECRETARY: I'll send them a message,  
 24 but, no.  
 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. At this time,

1 I'd like to go ahead and close it for public  
 2 comment.  
 3 Chip, would you like to start us off?  
 4 MR. WITHERS: No. I mean, I don't -- I'm  
 5 not quite sure I totally understand. I thought  
 6 we were going to go point by point and discuss  
 7 them as we went through, no?  
 8 MS. GARCIA: We had also mentioned, some  
 9 people had some red lines to share with the  
 10 Board. We can go page by page, if you want to  
 11 do it that way.  
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, I know Felix  
 13 wanted to go page by page, item by item --  
 14 MR. WITHERS: No, that's okay.  
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- is what he had  
 16 stated.  
 17 MR. WITHERS: I think, if we went through  
 18 it, it might be easier, rather than me going  
 19 through mine and then --  
 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Agree.  
 21 MR. WITHERS: I mean, I don't know how you  
 22 guys feel about that.  
 23 MR. PARDO: And I think what Robert was  
 24 intending, by having it up there, then it's  
 25 easy to go from one -- everybody is looking at

1 it. And, also, anybody that's home watching  
 2 this --  
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Samples.  
 4 MR. PARDO: -- you know, will understand  
 5 where we are, you know, where it would be the  
 6 same thing as this, except page by page, you're  
 7 going through it.  
 8 MS. GARCIA: Right. So we had it in the  
 9 past.  
 10 MR. PARDO: Right. Would you be able to  
 11 bring it up or --  
 12 MS. GARCIA: I can find it and e-mail it  
 13 to --  
 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But we can go ahead  
 15 and continue while they're looking for it.  
 16 Felix, do you want to get us going?  
 17 MR. PARDO: Sure. I'll take a stab at it.  
 18 So, on the memorandum from Staff, before  
 19 you get into this thing, there are a few  
 20 questions that I had. This was the best -- you  
 21 know, Staff, what they're trying to do is  
 22 capture the previous meeting, before this  
 23 particular meeting, and I think that when you  
 24 look at that, one of the things is, "Some of  
 25 the criteria" -- this is the second paragraph,

13

1 on the first page, and it says, "Some of the  
 2 criteria was revised or removed, such as porch  
 3 balcony depths, and insisted to keep other  
 4 proposed criteria, such as window design  
 5 standards and habitable liner requirements,"  
 6 and if you'll recall, that was where we really  
 7 got to Page 1, where we were talking about the  
 8 depth, which is not -- you know, it's not shown  
 9 anywhere, like the City of Miami does, you  
 10 know, which is the depth of the liners. And it  
 11 just so happens that, that particular evening,  
 12 we had looked at a project that we had  
 13 recommended approval for, that hasn't gone to  
 14 the Commission yet, and they had hidden the  
 15 parking areas, which that was the discussion  
 16 with that.  
 17 We don't -- we still don't have, you know,  
 18 a minimum depth on this, but that's something  
 19 that is shown here. That's something that  
 20 should be discussed at some point, trying to  
 21 establish a minimum depth of the liner that  
 22 would go in front of the parking areas inside  
 23 the Mixed-Use buildings.  
 24 The second thing is that, I thought that it  
 25 was a little unfortunate, the way it was

14

1 written, Number 5, on the first page, which  
 2 was, "Prohibited horizontal and vertical  
 3 sliding windows and doors of the buildings." I  
 4 think it's almost like a run-on sentence.  
 5 What we started to discuss was keeping the  
 6 windows and doors, you know, separate, so you  
 7 have either (A) horizontal or (B) vertical  
 8 opening and closing fenestration. And there  
 9 was a discussion that we had, where we had a  
 10 difference of opinion of whether you could see  
 11 or not see. We discussed also, in detail, the  
 12 Juliet balconies, whether they could be done  
 13 one way or the other.  
 14 I know we have the City Architect here and  
 15 one of the board members from the Board of  
 16 Architects here today, and I know that they  
 17 have, in the past, discussed the Juliet  
 18 balconies and how to do it in such a way that  
 19 looks symmetrical and it's on the same plane.  
 20 One of the discussions that we had,  
 21 specifically, was, you know, whether when  
 22 you're looking at the fenestration on these  
 23 especially tall buildings, where you have these  
 24 sliding doors where there's a difference  
 25 between the two, it makes it look different,

15

1 and we also discussed specifically that some of  
 2 the buildings that have been built, although  
 3 the Board of Architects were blamed for them,  
 4 they actually got changed during the shop  
 5 drawing process and they were switched and  
 6 never went back to the Board of Architects, and  
 7 they were administratively reviewed by someone,  
 8 other than a member of the Board of Architects  
 9 or the City Architect, at that time.  
 10 Generalizing Option Number 7, as an option  
 11 for the first three to four stories to be  
 12 activated with habitable space and consistent  
 13 with high quality materials, I think high  
 14 quality materials should be used throughout the  
 15 buildings. I see that certain developers in  
 16 this City really go all out to use quality  
 17 materials, and I don't think it should be  
 18 limited to three or four stories. I think you  
 19 could see that all of the way through.  
 20 And I think that if you're -- this is a  
 21 bonus that is being provided to not only give  
 22 great architecture, but also great materials,  
 23 that are long-lasting, and I don't think that  
 24 there should be a limit to just the first three  
 25 or four stories. And I understand that some of

16

1 the elements that you might be able to look at,  
2 you should be able to look at them, but make  
3 sure that the quality of the materials  
4 throughout looks good. And we see other  
5 examples of Mediterranean inspired design, and  
6 they use poor materials, and you could see it,  
7 whether it's on the second, third, fourth,  
8 fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth story.

9 So that's the only other comment I have --

10 MR. BEHAR: Felix, but let me ask you this,  
11 we talked about it briefly, and I don't know  
12 where you're reading from, because --

13 MR. PARDO: I'm sorry, the memorandum, the  
14 first page --

15 MR. KAWALERSKI: The previous one, not the  
16 current one?

17 MS. GARCIA: From the last --

18 MR. WITHERS: The original.

19 MR. KAWALERSKI: You're reading from the  
20 original?

21 MR. PARDO: From the original one, because  
22 that's where we started the conversation.

23 MR. KAWALERSKI: Right.

24 MR. PARDO: And, again, these are not  
25 necessarily provisions that are in the Code

17

1 really is not part of the Med Bonus, it's  
2 really part of -- you know, more of the Zoning  
3 Code itself, not necessarily a Med Bonus, but  
4 when you're using the liners, having a  
5 prescriptive way of saying you're going to have  
6 a minimum of 20 feet is, I think, what we were  
7 discussing, where feasible.

8 And for example, Glenn Pratt's project that  
9 came before us that particular evening, he was  
10 able to do it, where it was feasible, not all  
11 of the way around, and he had a very difficult  
12 site. It was not only triangular, but it was  
13 also -- it had street facing all of the way  
14 around. So that became very difficult for him  
15 there, but, you know, we looked at it for what  
16 it was.

17 So, the last comment, that I don't see  
18 here, from the previous one, and if you could  
19 indulge me, it's the last comment,  
20 Mr. Chairman --

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Please.

22 MR. PARDO: -- it says, "Incorporate an  
23 optional requirement to provide the additional  
24 open space and reduce the amount to pay to the  
25 0.25."

19

1 itself. This was what Staff captured, from our  
2 previous conversations, and that's what that  
3 front page is.

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But, Jennifer, you've  
5 updated those in what you sent us now?

6 MS. GARCIA: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.

8 MR. KAWALERSKI: Yes. This is the latest.  
9 So that's what we have.

10 MR. BEHAR: This is more confusing, but --

11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Because I think that's  
12 confusing. I'd rather, if we can, read from  
13 what has been updated.

14 MR. PARDO: Okay. I'll read from what's  
15 updated, but what's updated is -- some of these  
16 things are omitted, and that's why I didn't  
17 feel comfortable with that. In other words --

18 MR. BEHAR: Because the liner is one  
19 example that is in the second, third, and  
20 fourth levels, but we also talked about it,  
21 which I'm in favor, but where feasible, right?

22 MR. PARDO: Correct. And if you'll recall,  
23 we discussed -- you and I both discussed that,  
24 where feasible, which should be in there. And,  
25 again, one of the issues here is that this

18

1 Staff started to address that comment at  
2 the last meeting. I still don't understand it.  
3 I'm not that smart, but I'd like to be able to  
4 understand where the .25 -- how it works.

5 MS. GARCIA: Yeah, the open space fund.

6 So, as you know, there is a fund -- like a  
7 CIP fund, that the City has, that routinely  
8 puts money into it for acquisition of parks,  
9 right, open space in our City.

10 MR. PARDO: Right.

11 MS. GARCIA: So part of the optional --  
12 remember, these are twelve options that they  
13 can do -- six of the twelve, if Multi-Family,  
14 or eight of the twelve, if it's mixed-use --  
15 they could have that option. Maybe it's a  
16 small site, they can't provide a lot of open  
17 space, so they can pay it into a fund that  
18 would eventually have open space available by  
19 the City in the area.

20 MR. PARDO: Right.

21 And Mr. Chairman, I want the Board Members  
22 to remember that comment. The reason I want  
23 them to remember the comment is because,  
24 there's also a sustainability bonus in the Med  
25 Bonus scale, and for me, I think that, you

20

1 know, the sustainability should be a  
 2 requirement, not a bonus for Mediterranean  
 3 style architecture, you know.  
 4 And putting money into a park fund should  
 5 not be one of the -- again, we're getting into  
 6 check-offs. We're going to check this off.  
 7 One thing has nothing to do with the  
 8 Mediterranean style. It has nothing to do with  
 9 it, and it should not be there. If you want to  
 10 give -- if someone can't meet their green  
 11 space, I think we have a different  
 12 conversation. It has nothing to do with the  
 13 bonuses. I just want to either, (A) Take it  
 14 off the table or discuss it during -- you know,  
 15 when we're looking at the required items, you  
 16 know, to be able to achieve that bonus.  
 17 So, Mr. Chairman, those are all of the  
 18 comments that I had on the transmittal -- the  
 19 original transmittal that was there, and I know  
 20 that Staff has floated the 20-foot habitable  
 21 liner. You know, I don't have an issue with  
 22 that, but some of these things, I think -- we  
 23 can't lose focus that we're giving people a  
 24 bonus, and bonuses -- all bonuses -- are  
 25 discretionary. So because they're

21

1 discretionary, we can ask for these things, but  
 2 for the style and to give the Board of  
 3 Architects and the City Architect the ability  
 4 to provide more power, to be able to achieve  
 5 architecturally what we're asking them to  
 6 achieve, in return for a bonus, I think is  
 7 important.  
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.  
 9 MR. PARDO: Okay. Thank you.  
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Sue.  
 11 MR. KAWALERSKI: Well, I certainly don't  
 12 have that level of detail to talk about, but I  
 13 agree with Felix. It was like, if you provide  
 14 a bike rack, you know, in the old -- I mean, we  
 15 can't be arbitrary and throw a bike rack in it  
 16 and that's part of your requirement. I totally  
 17 agree, putting money into a fund should just be  
 18 part of the Zoning Code, if they don't have  
 19 enough space for green space, not a requirement  
 20 that they get by for a Mediterranean bonus.  
 21 MS. GARCIA: And just to clarify, that  
 22 wasn't to get out of a requirement for green  
 23 space. It was just in addition to any green  
 24 space that they have on-site, that's required  
 25 of them, 25 percent for multi-family and 10

22

1 percent for mixed-use, those would be in  
 2 addition to that, just to clarify.  
 3 MR. KAWALERSKI: Right. Right. But that's  
 4 an arbitrary thing. That has nothing to do  
 5 with what the building looks like.  
 6 MS. GARCIA: Yeah, understood.  
 7 MR. KAWALERSKI: You know, to me, the  
 8 requirement are, does it look Mediterranean.  
 9 Okay. That's all I have to say.  
 10 MR. BEHAR: Thank you.  
 11 I have several questions, and some of it is  
 12 going to be for our City Attorney.  
 13 For example, the Context Analysis -- and  
 14 that has been modified and I have had some  
 15 conversation with Jennifer regarding this one,  
 16 in particular.  
 17 MR. PARDO: Sorry, Robert, what page are  
 18 you on?  
 19 MR. BEHAR: 5. Page 5 of the Development  
 20 Bonus Standards, Number 1, which is Context  
 21 Analysis.  
 22 MS. GARCIA: So it appears that we can have  
 23 that pulled up on the screen. I think Jill has  
 24 that ready, the first one.  
 25 MR. BEHAR: And my question is, because we

23

1 talked about it, contextually is in the  
 2 surrounding, the existing condition, but you  
 3 may be in an MX2 zoning and you have one story  
 4 buildings. To me, I want to make sure that the  
 5 Context Analysis is based not only on what's  
 6 there, but what the future development  
 7 potential is, based on the Zoning, and I want  
 8 to make sure that the language, as provided,  
 9 assures that you could do that, because if  
 10 you're zoned, you know, to be able to do a  
 11 77-foot building, and you only have a one story  
 12 building next to you today, it doesn't mean  
 13 that the uses and the zoning allows you to do  
 14 that, you know. Otherwise, you're going to  
 15 prohibit that land owner doing what the zoning  
 16 allows.  
 17 MS. GARCIA: Right, and that was the intent  
 18 of having, "Compatible with the existing and  
 19 planned context."  
 20 MR. BEHAR: And the planned context refers  
 21 to the zoning?  
 22 MS. GARCIA: Right. Yes.  
 23 MR. BEHAR: Okay.  
 24 MS. GARCIA: Future Land Use Map, yes.  
 25 MR. PARDO: I would just like to add my

24

1 opinion, when Robert is done with this  
2 particular point.

3 MR. BEHAR: So I want to make sure that it  
4 does state that you also have to consider the  
5 existing zoning that is for that particular  
6 site.

7 MR. KAWALERSKI: Can I ask a question  
8 regarding this context? You know, I'm all for  
9 the context and compatibility features, but  
10 what if you have an area in the City that has  
11 glass buildings -- I mean, nothing  
12 Mediterranean at all -- and a project comes in  
13 that's Mediterranean and they're asking for  
14 bonuses, how does that fit into that? How does  
15 a Mediterranean --

16 MR. BEHAR: No, because I think that the  
17 Board of Architects will have the authority to  
18 approve or not approve the project. That is  
19 too specific. And I think the Board -- my  
20 concern is that you have a zoning that, you  
21 know, is MX1, and you have an existing one  
22 story, two story building, and you're going to  
23 come in with a building that's going to be  
24 taller, are you then not -- because you're not  
25 contextually compatible with the existing

25

1 MR. BEHAR: I just want to make sure that,  
2 you know --

3 MS. SUAREZ: If that was the intent, it  
4 sounds like it's been, you know, incorporated  
5 in here with that intent.

6 MR. BEHAR: Because when -- I consulted  
7 two, you know, land use attorneys that come  
8 here, and they were not --

9 MS. SUAREZ: You're saying that there's a  
10 concern that it should be more explicit?

11 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

12 MR. PARDO: There are different ways of  
13 resolving these issues. One of them, first of  
14 all, when the Board of Architects and the --  
15 when the Board of Architects reviews their  
16 plans, they're reviewing it according with  
17 Section 5-102, which is the Design Review  
18 Standards.

19 Forget about the bonuses. First, it's the  
20 Review Standards, and in there, specifically,  
21 it says, "Architectural compatibility with the  
22 neighboring properties and uses."

23 As far as the context is concerned, the  
24 zoning, as you say in this particular example,  
25 77 feet, and let's say you're near or across a

27

1 building, you're not allowed to do what the  
2 zoning allows?

3 MR. WITHERS: Wouldn't that be picked up in  
4 the initial conceptual review? Isn't that the  
5 first step, is the conceptual review, before it  
6 goes to the Board of Architects? Would that  
7 not be discussed at that point?

8 MS. GARCIA: Yes, but not this actual  
9 criteria.

10 MR. BEHAR: Right.

11 MS. GARCIA: This criterion will be  
12 discussed at the Med Bonus public meeting.

13 MR. WITHERS: Okay.

14 MR. BEHAR: I want to make sure -- look,  
15 I'm all for the compatibility, but you cannot  
16 take away the zoning and say, "Well, you're  
17 zoned for "X," but because you've got a one  
18 story building next to you, you won't be able  
19 to do that."

20 MS. GARCIA: Right. Again, the intent is  
21 existing and planned context of the area.

22 MR. BEHAR: I just want to make sure  
23 that --

24 MS. GARCIA: And we clarified it's within  
25 one block, right.

26

1 waterway or you're across a public  
2 right-of-way, and you have two stories,  
3 single-family residential, you know, how do  
4 you -- how do you work out the compatibility  
5 issue there? Because you said, "MX1," but what  
6 if it's single-family residential?

7 MR. BEHAR: No. No, that's different.

8 MR. PARDO: No. No. I just want to make  
9 sure --

10 MR. BEHAR: Single-family, I concur with  
11 you, but if you have -- and I don't know -- you  
12 know, if you have an MX1 and you've got an  
13 existing one, two-story building next to you,  
14 and then you're going to come in with a --

15 MR. PARDO: Right. One of the things that  
16 I find excruciating, when I see some of the  
17 developments that have been built, is that  
18 we'll have an, you know, eight-story building  
19 next to -- right across the street from  
20 single-family. So I find that wrong.

21 But the other way of contextually is that  
22 you have the ability of massing -- that the  
23 Board of Architects has the responsibility to  
24 look at massing, and you have the ability of  
25 stepping down, not taking the rights away --

28

1 the zoning rights away, and I just want to make  
2 sure that everybody understands, there's a  
3 difference between the Design Review Standards  
4 that the Board of Architects has to make sure  
5 that they review as part of their charge, and  
6 then the second thing is, the discretionary  
7 bonuses.

8 So we're talking about two different  
9 things. If you're allowed four floors, but  
10 with the bonuses, you're allowed six floors,  
11 when you're looking at the massing of the  
12 building, you, on the Board of Architects, have  
13 the ability to say, "But wait a minute, you  
14 have to step back those two floors, so at least  
15 you ameliorate the particular issue of the  
16 compatibility and the contextual."

17 It would be, obviously, wrong to take away  
18 the right, and illegal to take away the right,  
19 but the Board of Architects has the ability to  
20 say, "But wait a minute, how can we make it  
21 more compatible?"

22 MR. BEHAR: But, Felix, you want to make it  
23 simpler for them to do the interpretation. You  
24 don't want it to be, you know, questionable.  
25 You want to make sure what when they look at

29

1 hands. On the contrary, we're trying to make  
2 it, you know, I think, clear for them to make  
3 that --

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So that it's not  
5 arbitrary.

6 MR. BEHAR: Yes. I mean -- you know, and I  
7 think that the compatibility is one that you're  
8 going to have -- and nothing has to do with  
9 single-family, because, you know, if you have a  
10 two-story single family in front, you know, you  
11 have more options. This is more -- and look at  
12 the example I said, MX1 or something to that,  
13 and you may have an area -- for example, I'm  
14 going to use the Design District by the  
15 Collection.

16 Now it's all built, or pretty much, but you  
17 had a zoning that allows you to do up to --  
18 back then, up to whatever, ten stories, 120  
19 feet, whatever, but you had existing one story  
20 buildings. So if you go by the wording, you  
21 know, here, you've got to look at the -- you  
22 know, what's there in the area. You will not  
23 give them -- the Board the discretion that  
24 says, even though, you know, you've got one  
25 story buildings, you could do "X."

31

1 it, it says, you know, based on this, they're  
2 compatible, and that's my point. For the Board  
3 to have -- to facilitate the process for them.

4 MR. PARDO: I will tell you that I  
5 respectfully disagree with what has been built  
6 recently in the last ten, fifteen years, in the  
7 City. Why? Because the Zoning Code, on Le  
8 Jeune Road, said that for the first, you know,  
9 hundred feet -- I can't remember, a hundred, a  
10 hundred fifty feet --

11 MR. BEHAR: A hundred feet, 45 feet.

12 MR. PARDO: Right, 45-foot maximum. Gee,  
13 why did they put that in? Because across the  
14 street, on Le Jeune Road, they're duplexes, but  
15 when you have that building behind it stepping  
16 down, that makes the compatibility and the  
17 contextual component --

18 MR. BEHAR: Felix, I don't think that's the  
19 argument here. I agree a hundred percent.

20 MR. PARDO: Right, but if you tie the Board  
21 of Architects' hands -- if you tie the Board of  
22 Architects' hands and you don't allow them to  
23 suggest the massing component of it, why have a  
24 Board of Architects?

25 MR. BEHAR: We're not saying to tie the

30

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Cristina, let me ask  
2 you a question. When a project is presented to  
3 the Board of Architects, what is -- or maybe  
4 Gus is better at answering this. When a  
5 project is presented to the Board of Architect,  
6 what is their responsibility to look at and not  
7 look at? Do they go ahead and look at zoning?  
8 Do they look at other items? Or do they look  
9 at design?

10 MS. SUAREZ: Yes. So, Mr. Chair, I would  
11 like Gus to answer, since Gus does -- from our  
12 office, when we do serve as counsel to the  
13 board at their meetings, when there's big  
14 projects or special questions, Gus does serve  
15 as counsel to the Board of Architects. So I'd  
16 like him to give the guidance that he has given  
17 over the years.

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thanks.

19 Welcome, Gus.

20 MR. CEBALLOS: Thank you.

21 Good afternoon, Chair, fellow Board  
22 Members. This is City Attorney Gus Ceballos.

23 So I've reviewed the most recent Planning  
24 and Zoning Meeting, and I think there's a bit  
25 of confusion as to what the Board of Architects

32



1 really can look at. So there is zoning-related  
2 items, meaning upzoning, change of Comp Plan,  
3 all of those things. Those items are not  
4 within the purview of the board.

5 Now, the question of height and massing,  
6 that is a hundred percent within the purview of  
7 the board. The best example I gave to the  
8 board recently was, if a building is allowed a  
9 hundred feet per Code, and with Mediterranean  
10 bonus, they can go to 120, when they review  
11 whether a property meets Mediterranean bonus,  
12 you look at the Mediterranean standards. You  
13 apply that section of the Code, and a property  
14 could check all of the boxes and meet the  
15 criteria and be a Mediterranean bonus -- a  
16 Mediterranean style building and meet a  
17 criteria for a Level 1 and Level 2 bonuses.

18 So, now, that building that was 100 feet,  
19 now could be 120 feet, but then when the design  
20 review of the building happens, which is the  
21 second step -- because typically the board will  
22 grant the bonus first, and then review the  
23 design. At that moment, the board could make a  
24 determination that because of the massing and  
25 the context, that an 80-foot building is

33

1 appropriate. Even though, in particular  
2 situations, they could do a hundred feet or 120  
3 feet, because of the surrounding neighborhood,  
4 because of the context, that they believe the  
5 appropriate building here is 80 feet.

6 Now, it's a little confusing at times,  
7 because you're looking at the same -- similar  
8 issue, but under two different lenses. So you  
9 cannot be looking at it in the lens of zoning  
10 and determining whether there's appropriate  
11 sewer or right-of-way improvements. Those are  
12 items that are handled elsewhere. They're not  
13 for the aesthetic review board.

14 But if, aesthetically, because of the  
15 compatibility, the context and the massing, a  
16 particular building shouldn't be 120 feet in  
17 this area -- maybe if it gets set back, maybe a  
18 portion gets pushed back, and the massing  
19 changes, that is all within the purview of the  
20 board.

21 MR. KAWALERSKI: How often does that  
22 happen, where the board says, "You know, not  
23 120, but 80 is better"? How often does that  
24 happen?

25 MR. CEBALLOS: I can't speak to that. I'm

34

1 not at every meeting. But I don't think it  
2 happens often.

3 MR. PARDO: Mr. Ceballos, I have a  
4 question.

5 MR. CEBALLOS: Sure.

6 MR. PARDO: I don't see anywhere where it  
7 says aesthetics. It says, "Design review  
8 standards." Nowhere does it say aesthetics.

9 MS. SUAREZ: He meant design.

10 MR. CEBALLOS: I mean design.

11 MR. PARDO: I'm sorry. The reason I'm  
12 saying that is because that minimizes what the  
13 Board of Architects does.

14 When you're talking about massing, as you  
15 just said, those are not aesthetics. We're  
16 talking about Design Review Standards, the  
17 massing, how you set it back. I mean, for me,  
18 I would want to make sure that, from a massing  
19 standpoint, for example -- there's a great  
20 example, which I will not name, the project,  
21 right now, it is a very tall project. It is on  
22 a street, and they have all of the massing  
23 right on the edge of this street.

24 Me, I mean I would have said, you still can  
25 have your square footage, but you should push

35

1 the massing back, and that's what the Board of  
2 Architects can do, and that's part of the  
3 Design Review Standards, which are on these  
4 simple pages. It says it specifically,  
5 "Building scale and mass, building facade step  
6 backs."

7 I mean, what I would do, the City  
8 Architect, I would give this to every board  
9 member, to make sure they know that they have  
10 that ability to do that, you know, because if  
11 they subjectively say, "I'm going to reduce  
12 your allowed height, you know, that is given  
13 from a zoning standpoint," that is the taking.

14 MR. CEBALLOS: So let's be clear, you  
15 cannot say that. There's a difference.  
16 There's a difference in saying, you have a  
17 zoning that you can build 100 feet, but I don't  
18 think it's appropriate, it needs to be 90.  
19 That's a problem.

20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That is Bert Harris.

21 MR. CEBALLOS: Now, if you can articulate  
22 that because of the Design Review Standards,  
23 the compatibility and the massing, this  
24 particular building is not appropriate for the  
25 neighborhood, for the abutting properties, at

36

1 this particular height, the massing should be  
2 revised so that this hundred foot area be  
3 reduced to 70, 80, whatever that may be, and  
4 move around the design of the building, that is  
5 a hundred percent permissible.

6 See how I'm saying the same thing, but in  
7 two different ways?

8 MR. PARDO: Right.

9 MR. CEBALLOS: I tried to make that  
10 distinction to the board. I've probably  
11 presented this before the board maybe five  
12 times, at least, but there is a distinction to  
13 be made.

14 MR. PARDO: I don't disagree with what you  
15 said. The only thing I objected to was the  
16 word, aesthetic.

17 MR. CEBALLOS: That's my apologies. I  
18 meant, Design Review Standards.

19 MR. PARDO: No. No. No. I'm just saying,  
20 it's not aesthetic. What they have to do is  
21 very important, and from a contextual  
22 standpoint, there's absolutely no doubt, and I  
23 think you could have it both ways, as long as  
24 the Board of Architects understands what they  
25 can and cannot do, and it has to be crystal

37

1 clear.

2 But the massing is one of the largest tools  
3 that they have in their tool chest to make it  
4 compatible and make us different and a nicer  
5 place.

6 MS. CEBALLOS: Agreed.

7 Any other question for me?

8 MS. SUAREZ: I think we're good.

9 MR. KAWALERSKI: You know, I still have a  
10 question that hasn't been answered, because  
11 we're talking about architectural  
12 compatibility. If a project comes in, on a  
13 piece of property, where it's surrounding by  
14 glass buildings, is that compatible? Would  
15 that Mediterranean project be compatible with a  
16 sea of glass buildings?

17 MR. PARDO: That would be in the CBD area,  
18 which would be the only place where you can --

19 MR. BEHAR: Yeah. No, it wouldn't be  
20 compatible, but then you're not going to get  
21 the bonuses that you're seeking.

22 MR. CEBALLOS: The quick answer to that  
23 would be, up to the Board of Architects. They  
24 would make the determination if it was  
25 compatible or not.

38

1 MS. SUAREZ: On a case by case basis.

2 MR. CEBALLOS: On a case by case basis, yes.

3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Each individual  
4 building, once an individual project comes in.

5 MS. SUAREZ: On a case by case basis.

6 MR. PARDO: And since you're on the  
7 subject, to be very specific, the Allen Morris  
8 iconic building on Alhambra -- on the Allen  
9 Morris project on Alhambra, which is on a very  
10 acute angle, it was surrounded by very, you  
11 know, Brutalist architecture, and they chose to  
12 do something which was iconic today, and use  
13 the quality materials, and the massing, and  
14 everything else, and basically that was along  
15 the lines of the Mediterranean Bonus, and  
16 sometimes you're actually providing that, and  
17 from -- you have contextual, which you normally  
18 would look at, but you have to be careful,  
19 because the reason that you're providing this  
20 discretionary bonus is specifically to be able  
21 to promote a specific style, and in order to  
22 have that style, to get those discretionary  
23 bonuses there, that's where you try to turn the  
24 corner and make the exception.

25 So I think that, when you're promoting

39

1 Mediterranean bonuses for Mediterranean  
2 architecture, it's very specific. You would  
3 not be providing Mediterranean bonuses for  
4 another glass building or another Brutalist  
5 concrete building.

6 MR. KAWALERSKI: No, I understand that, but  
7 I'm just saying, it becomes, then, subjective?

8 MR. PARDO: Exactly.

9 MR. KAWALERSKI: You have a sea -- aren't  
10 we supposed to get very specific here about how  
11 to navigate Mediterranean bonuses?

12 MR. PARDO: Well, the problem is that the  
13 first subject that was brought up, which was  
14 the contextual study, is the most broad of  
15 them. As you proceed through the sections,  
16 you're going to have much more specific type  
17 of, you know, constraints.

18 So the biggest one is -- on the contextual,  
19 which Robert brought up, is what happens when I  
20 have this type of zoning? You know, am I going  
21 to be -- am I going to suffer, because I'm next  
22 to something that isn't necessarily going to  
23 meet the scale requirement, when I set it up  
24 right next to it?

25 MR. KAWALERSKI: Yeah, and I understand the

40

1 scale and all of that, but that's not what I'm  
2 talking about. We were talking architectural  
3 compatibility. So, for a novice, if I have a  
4 glass building, and there's a project coming in  
5 that wants to be a Med Bonus building, and it  
6 says it has to be compatible, according to  
7 this, if I was on the Board of Architects, I'd  
8 say, "Well, it's not compatible. No, you don't  
9 get the bonus."

10 MR. PARDO: I just want to make sure  
11 there's clarity on this. The reason that the  
12 Med Bonuses were first brought up was because  
13 all of the buildings in the CBD area were glass  
14 buildings or Brutalist architecture, and, then,  
15 the bonuses came in, once a specific building  
16 was built 40 years ago, and that specific  
17 building became the template for other people  
18 to start building that particular style,  
19 because they wanted to achieve the bonuses,  
20 achieve a specific look. And the other  
21 buildings, which were there 40 years ago, are  
22 still there, and -- but you do see more of an  
23 influence, because there are very few more of  
24 those glass buildings that were built from 40  
25 years forward.

41

1 Architects would review the particular design  
2 that's being presented, and in that particular  
3 case, would apply the criteria and make that  
4 determination, in each particular case. It's  
5 not a one size fits all. It's, in each  
6 particular case, they would make the  
7 determination. It's not subjective, it's based  
8 on the criteria, and on the standards.

9 MR. KAWALERSKI: So it doesn't have to be  
10 architecturally compatible is what you're  
11 saying?

12 MR. BEHAR: Not necessarily --

13 MS. SUAREZ: It doesn't have to be the same  
14 design.

15 MR. BEHAR: Yeah, it doesn't have to be.  
16 The board has the authority to say, you know,  
17 that's a glass building, we're not going to  
18 give you the bonus on this, you know. It  
19 has --

20 MR. KAWALERSKI: Look, and I'm not saying  
21 that they shouldn't build a Med style building  
22 next to a glass structure, but should they get  
23 the Med Bonus?

24 MR. BEHAR: Well, but --

25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I think you're talking

43

1 MR. KAWALERSKI: No, I understand why this  
2 came to be. I'm just saying that we're getting  
3 very specific on what needs to be required to  
4 get the Med Bonus, and then we're saying,  
5 "Yeah, but regarding the architectural  
6 compatibility, it's up to --"

7 MR. BEHAR: No, not necessarily.

8 MR. PARDO: It's contextual.

9 MR. BEHAR: Contextual.

10 MR. PARDO: Very different than --

11 MR. BEHAR: -- style or design.

12 MR. PARDO: Yes.

13 MR. BEHAR: You know, design is -- I think  
14 design is going to be very descriptive of what  
15 you're going to be able to do. Contextually is  
16 more of the scale.

17 MR. PARDO: Right. It's more of a  
18 massing -- a massing tool than a detailed  
19 architecture tool. That's the difference --

20 MR. KAWALERSKI: No, and I get where Robert  
21 is coming from and that's not what I'm talking  
22 -- I'm not talking about massing. I'm talking  
23 about look. I'm talking about architectural  
24 compatibility. Isn't that the look?

25 MS. SUAREZ: So, in each case, the Board of

42

1 more about should they build a taller building?  
2 I think your concerns is -- if you're talking  
3 about the Med Bonus, to me, you're talking  
4 about adding more FAR or more height. I think  
5 what Robert or what's being said is,  
6 compatibility between the design, if it's a  
7 glass structure next to a Mediterranean  
8 building --

9 MR. KAWALERSKI: I'm not talking about  
10 massing. I'm not talking about additional  
11 height. I'm talking about the look. You're  
12 nodding. I think you know what I'm saying.

13 I don't care if there's a Med --

14 MR. KILIDDJIAN: And I don't know if I have  
15 the answer.

16 Peter Kiliddjian. I sit on the Board of  
17 Architects. I'm here today --

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you state your  
19 name and address, please?

20 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Peter Kiliddjian, 1330  
21 Northwest 84th Avenue, PPKS Officer.

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

23 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I sit on the board. I'm  
24 here today -- I'm the co-chair. Judy is the  
25 chair. She's not here today.

44

1 I don't know if I have the answer for you,  
2 but the way that I see it, the entire City is a  
3 Mediterranean-based City. So, in the larger  
4 context, any Mediterranean building is  
5 contextual in the City. The ones that are  
6 glass boxes are not contextual. So it would  
7 not be inappropriate to have a Mediterranean  
8 building in an area where there is Brutalist or  
9 glass boxes. I don't know if that helps.

10 MR. BEHAR: You said it would not be --

11 MR. KILIDDJIAN: It would not be -- no, it  
12 wouldn't be appropriate to give a Mediterranean  
13 bonus to a non-Med building that's, you know --

14 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Just to be clear,  
15 because if you're going to -- let's say, on  
16 Alhambra, where it's the most examples of the  
17 glass buildings and Brutalist, if you come in,  
18 the Allen Morris, which is a good example of  
19 Mediterranean, that building, even though it's  
20 incontextually in that area, would get the  
21 bonuses?

22 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Yes.

23 What I'm saying is -- and taking it a step  
24 further, the context can be further out than  
25 just a block, when you're speaking of such

45

1 go with, based on George Merrick's vision, -  
2 was to have Mediterranean.

3 MR. KAWALERSKI: Why have this in there  
4 about architectural compatibility if the whole  
5 City is Mediterranean and it's a given? Why  
6 even consider that?

7 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Because context is, both,  
8 language, massing, proportional --

9 MR. PARDO: Style.

10 MR. KILIDDJIAN: It's more than just -- I  
11 understand your point, and it's a good point,  
12 right, if we're next to a glass building, but  
13 there are other things. There's building  
14 typology, there is massing, there is  
15 proportions, things like that. So it's just  
16 not one aspect of the building, it's several  
17 aspects.

18 MR. RIESCO: Juan Riesco, City Architect.

19 I think that's part of the value that we  
20 add to cities, is also the distinction and  
21 building types and typologies and styles and  
22 looks. I don't think -- we understand that  
23 this City is based on the Mediterranean style,  
24 and that is our core standard, and I think we  
25 want that, but I think there's also viability

47

1 large buildings.

2 MR. KAWALERSKI: Well, not according to  
3 this. It's a block, according to this.

4 MS. GARCIA: Immediate context.

5 MR. BEHAR: But, Sue, the point is -- and I  
6 think that example is, on Alhambra, you've got,  
7 you know, some glass buildings and you've got  
8 some Brutalist buildings, and then you've got a  
9 beautiful Mediterranean building that today  
10 will also get the same bonuses, these bonuses.  
11 So it could be adjacent, you know, to a glass  
12 building, but if contextually, it's  
13 appropriate, I think that's --

14 MR. KILIDDJIAN: It's contextual within the  
15 City, because we are a Mediterranean-based  
16 City.

17 MS. GARCIA: Yeah. If I could, so we're  
18 talking about the proposed building massing  
19 shall be compatible with the existing and  
20 planned context, period. Analysis is within a  
21 block, as to the immediate context. So the one  
22 block is not your context, if you're going to  
23 be compatible with the existing and planned.  
24 It's the plan as for the entire City, and as we  
25 know, our planned architecture style we want to

46

1 to differences, and buildings like the glass  
2 structures that are time dated buildings, that  
3 were built in the '80s or the '70s, whenever  
4 they came about. The Brutalist style was also  
5 a period of building that was prevalent at that  
6 time, and it was built, and it's a time stamp  
7 of that particular era, and I think that's part  
8 of the beauty of the City, that there is  
9 viability in versatility, that things that are  
10 different are good and it's not all the same  
11 cookie cutter style. I think that would be  
12 something that would be derogatory, to a  
13 certain extent, coming from a profession where  
14 creativity --

15 MR. KAWALERSKI: And by the way, I'm not  
16 saying don't build Mediterranean next to a  
17 glass building. That's not what I'm saying.  
18 I'm saying, should that Mediterranean project  
19 get the bonus, if it's not compatible with the  
20 glass buildings and the Brutalist buildings all  
21 around it?

22 MR. BEHAR: Well, you've got to look at  
23 each case, and the building that is being  
24 proposed.

25 MR. PARDO: I have, I think, a good

48

1 example, which I think the architect will  
2 agree, the Luminare Building. The Luminare  
3 Building is a classic building by Roney Mateu,  
4 very small building, there, right on Ponce.

5 (Simultaneous speaking.)

6 MR. PARDO: Directly across the street --  
7 unfortunately, Julio Grabiell isn't here, but  
8 when he designed The Colonnade Building, which  
9 is Mediterranean, and it saved and preserved  
10 the original Colonnade building, that is  
11 directly across the street, if we did it -- if  
12 we go backwards in time, when Roney Mateu came  
13 in to the Board of Architects and showed them  
14 what he was doing with The Luminare Building,  
15 which was specifically selling types of  
16 furniture which are very contemporary, very  
17 cutting edge type of furniture, that building  
18 really made a statement. It has won numerous  
19 architectural awards, and on top of that, it is  
20 directly across the street from someone that  
21 did take advantage of the bonuses. Roney  
22 Mateo's building did not take advantage of any  
23 bonuses, because it was never intended to be  
24 that way.

25 The diversity of that type of architecture,

49

1 MR. BEHAR: You could do it.

2 (Simultaneous speaking.)

3 MR. KAWALERSKI: Look, I've got no issue  
4 with what you're saying. I'm saying, if that's  
5 the case, let's just eliminate the  
6 architectural compatibility component of this  
7 thing, because it doesn't matter in the end.

8 MR. PARDO: No, it does. It does. I think  
9 it's a very, very important tool that the Board  
10 of Architects absolutely a hundred percent  
11 needs.

12 MR. KAWALERSKI: Why, because they can  
13 make --

14 MR. RIESCO: I think there's various  
15 components to compatibility, I think is the  
16 issue. Compatibility is not just, I look like  
17 this guy. There's compatibility in terms of  
18 massing, there's compatibility in terms of  
19 scales, there's compatibility in terms of  
20 materiality, architecturally.

21 MR. KAWALERSKI: This says,  
22 "Architectural," not scale, not height. This  
23 says, "Architectural." Maybe I'm  
24 misinterpreting architecture. I think it's the  
25 look, isn't it?

51

1 which is really just great architecture, I  
2 think that's a perfect example. You have a  
3 bonus to promote Mediterranean.

4 MR. RIESCO: Correct. Yes.

5 MR. PARDO: Bingo. And on top of that, it  
6 was also preserving a historic jewel, and,  
7 then, across the street, you have a very low  
8 key, award winning contemporary building, that  
9 I don't find offensive. In fact, I think it's  
10 aesthetically incredibly good, you know, in my  
11 opinion, but they didn't ask for a bonus.

12 MR. RIESCO: Correct.

13 MR. PARDO: Now, there had been -- there  
14 have been mistakes made over the years, don't  
15 need to name them, but, for me, I think the --  
16 as you once said, the cat is out of the bag.  
17 You get Med Bonus for Med architecture, and  
18 that was the theme and the problem that we had  
19 in the CBD area, that that wasn't being  
20 addressed all of the time.

21 So I think, contextually, they can coexist.

22 MR. BEHAR: And you could still do another  
23 Luminare building today, if you're not asking  
24 for the bonuses.

25 MR. RIESCO: Correct.

50

1 MR. BEHAR: No.

2 MR. PARDO: Sue, I'll give you one last --

3 MS. GARCIA: No.

4 MS. SUAREZ: Remember, we need to speak one  
5 at a time, for the court reporter, please.

6 MR. PARDO: Okay. So let me give you one  
7 last example. I was just in Boston.

8 At Boston University, they built a  
9 technical building, which is completely out of  
10 place. I mean, I looked at it. Immediately  
11 the name that came to me was vomiting drawers.  
12 You know, it looks like it had vomiting  
13 drawers. Contextually, it is very misaligned  
14 with that area, that one block area. It would  
15 fail miserably, but they got it approved. They  
16 built it. The scale is so out of scale, and  
17 the detailing, et cetera, in my opinion -- you  
18 know, the architect, I'm sure, is a genius, but  
19 in my opinion, it's so out of place, that I had  
20 to drive around, get out of the car, and walk  
21 through it and look at it, to see what the  
22 redeeming values were. That's my personal  
23 opinion.

24 But if they were on the Board of Architects  
25 reviewing that buildings there, contextually,

52

1 being a contemporary building, not because it's  
2 a contemporary building, a Mediterranean  
3 building or any other style, it just out of  
4 scale, out of place, and that's part of what  
5 this contextual component is, which is a key  
6 tool that they need in their tool box.

7 MR. BEHAR: You know, look, we do have  
8 something very close at the Douglas Metrorail  
9 station. We've got buildings that are 36-story  
10 buildings. Are they out of context? Yes, they  
11 are. You know, we know that. You know, that's  
12 more -- it doesn't matter the style. You know,  
13 it's the massing, the proportions of the  
14 building, you know, and I think -- I'm not  
15 concerned, because I think the board will have  
16 all of the tools necessary to be able to say,  
17 if it's, you know, architecturally compatible  
18 or not.

19 Am I not -- don't you --

20 MR. RIESCO: No, I think the board  
21 understands that and is well equipped in that  
22 regard and does that on a weekly basis with the  
23 projects, you know, based on the constraints  
24 that we have and the zoning issues and whatever  
25 things are allowed, but we're looking at the

53

1 missed the argument. You have a good point,  
2 but this isn't something that you're checking  
3 off to get that bonus. This is a prerequisite  
4 that you have to go in there, and this is one  
5 of the things, at the very beginning, which it  
6 wasn't written like this, you know, a long time  
7 ago, when they first started doing this.

8 MR. KAWALERSKI: Well, you know, I have to  
9 say, and -- thank you, Gus, wherever Gus  
10 went --

11 MR. WITHERS: He's right behind there.

12 MR. KAWALERSKI: -- for letting us know  
13 what the Board of Architects can do, because in  
14 the past couple of meetings, it was very clear  
15 that -- it sounded like the board was being  
16 handcuffed in certain areas, and I really hope  
17 that every member does now understand that they  
18 do have the purview to do what they're supposed  
19 to do, okay, because I know that Felix had  
20 brought that up initially. This has been  
21 brought up in a number of meetings. And maybe,  
22 Gus, you need to let them know, for the sixth  
23 time, that they have this purview, because  
24 obviously some people felt uncomfortable on  
25 that board going there.

55

1 aesthetics of the building, the mass of the  
2 building. And, remember, we walk a fine line  
3 every day between property rights and design,  
4 and that's our charge. That's what our  
5 challenge is, you know, how do we make this  
6 better, while allowing the applicant to do what  
7 they are allowed to do?

8 And so we've got to be careful in how we  
9 steer that, but the board is very well --

10 MR. BEHAR: I think my original question is  
11 answered, when Jennifer says, "Planned  
12 surrounding area." That means that takes into  
13 consideration the zoning.

14 MS. GARCIA: Correct. Well, the Zoning  
15 Master Plan, Comprehensive Plan, all of those  
16 together, yes.

17 MR. PARDO: And I'm sorry, I just realized  
18 something. We've been discussing this. I  
19 think it's a very good discussion, you know,  
20 very, very important, but this that we're  
21 discussing now is the prerequisite. In other  
22 words, you're not getting any bonus for this.  
23 This is not part of the check-offs.

24 MR. BEHAR: Right.

25 MR. PARDO: So, I'm sorry, I missed it. I

54

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Do you want to  
2 continue, Robert?

3 MR. BEHAR: Yes. My next one is one of the  
4 comments that we brought up earlier about  
5 Juliet balconies. If we prohibit -- you know,  
6 I guess, Item Number -- I got it on Page 30,  
7 "Horizontal or vertical sliding windows and  
8 doors are prohibited on the exterior of the  
9 building facade." If you do that, then you're  
10 not going to be able to do Juliet balconies,  
11 right? Because the intent of the Juliet  
12 balcony is that you could open up a sliding  
13 glass door. If you take that away, you won't  
14 be able to do a Juliet balcony.

15 MR. PARDO: I think, recently, the Board of  
16 Architects allowed a Juliet balcony with a  
17 certain detail that you requested.

18 MR. RIESCO: Yeah. It was actually a window.

19 MR. KILIDDJIAN: It was actually a fixed  
20 panel at the Juliet balcony level and a  
21 casement window.

22 MR. PARDO: Right.

23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So it had a railing?

24 MR. RIESCO: Oh, yes. It had the railing  
25 height, with a fixed window --

56

1 MR. BEHAR: And you have a glass panel in  
2 front of the --

3 (Simultaneous speaking.)

4 MR. RIESCO: And still get the sensation of  
5 the Juliet balcony.

6 THE SECRETARY: I'm sorry, one speaker at a  
7 time, please, so the reporter could --

8 MR. RIESCO: Yeah. So, again, the window  
9 in this particular project had a component that  
10 went up to the guardrail height, and that was a  
11 fixed panel. So that's not operable. It's  
12 solid. The railing sits in front of that.

13 And, then, above the railing, was a  
14 casement window. So you can open the window,  
15 and the perception of the Juliet balcony is  
16 still there, without the bottom portion of it,  
17 and that's kind of the concession we made as a  
18 design alternative to the concept of the Juliet  
19 balcony, because I think the board, in unison,  
20 feels that sliding doors are not appropriate on  
21 a Med building, and that's the reason.

22 MR. PARDO: And I think Judy expressed the  
23 same thing previously, but the point is that a  
24 Juliet balcony, as far as the depth is  
25 concerned, is basically not quite, you know, an

57

1 MR. RIESCO: At that particular moment,  
2 that could have been something that --

3 MR. KAWALERSKI: Because we keep mentioning  
4 The Paseo and how the shop drawings got  
5 changed, but there are numbers of projects that  
6 went through the Board of Architects, went  
7 through Planning and Zoning, sliders, and they  
8 get a Med Bonus. So how do we protect that  
9 from actually happening?

10 MR. RIESCO: I think there's been a  
11 progression over the years, because I sat on  
12 the board for eleven years and I've experienced  
13 the prior administration and what the thought  
14 process was, and now I'm the City Architect,  
15 and I understand the push back from the  
16 community, and the fact that we really want Med  
17 Buildings, and the fact that we're changing the  
18 Code to align ourselves more with the Med  
19 Bonuses and the Med style buildings.

20 So there's been a progression over the  
21 years, and, yes, have we made mistakes,  
22 absolutely, you know. I think that's obvious.  
23 It's built, and it's happened. But I think  
24 we've learned from them, and I think we're  
25 progressing to the point we're making the

59

1 issue, but you aesthetically can still get  
2 exactly what you need to get.

3 MR. RIESCO: Yeah. The intent of a Juliet  
4 balcony is not to step out into it, it's to  
5 open and experience the outdoor apartment in.

6 MR. KAWALERSKI: Juan, are you familiar  
7 with The Venera project, that's now called The  
8 Standard?

9 MR. RIESCO: Venera, the one in front of  
10 the big park, the curved building?

11 MR. KAWALERSKI: Yeah. Yeah.

12 MR. RIESCO: Yes.

13 MR. KAWALERSKI: That has Juliet balconies.  
14 Are you familiar with this project?

15 MR. RIESCO: Am I, what?

16 MR. KAWALERSKI: Are you familiar with that  
17 project?

18 MR. RIESCO; Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, I  
19 remember The Venera. It was like four or five  
20 years ago, I think?

21 MR. KAWALERSKI: Yeah. That got a Med  
22 Bonus. Doesn't that have sliding doors?

23 MR. RIESCO: Probably.

24 MR. KAWALERSKI: Yes, it does and it got a  
25 Med Bonus.

58

1 buildings better and more in tune with, I  
2 think, what we all want.

3 MR. KAWALERSKI: Is there something in here  
4 that we can prevent a shop drawing from being  
5 changed after it goes through the process?

6 MR. RIESCO: Well, that's already been  
7 addressed. There was a time when the City  
8 Architect, Staff, did not review shop drawings.  
9 It only went to building and structural. And  
10 so now we've made that adjustment, and now it  
11 comes to the City Architect Staff, and we all  
12 review it.

13 And what my Staff typically does, or if I  
14 review -- I typically handle the larger  
15 projects personally, because they're more  
16 complex, but my Staff is also trained in the  
17 fact that, you know, we get a shop drawing for  
18 windows, we've got to go to back to the BOA  
19 approved record archived drawings, see what's  
20 on there. If it's a sliding door on there, our  
21 hands are tied. If the board made the  
22 concession or made the whatever or missed it or  
23 did it intentionally, I'm not sure, but -- you  
24 know, that's the procedure we have in place  
25 today.

60

1 So that issue of somebody approving a shop  
2 drawing or changing it, should not happen,  
3 because everything is based on the prior  
4 approval that's already in place.

5 MS. GARCIA: In addition to that, Number 12  
6 now prohibits those types of windows and doors,  
7 just to be clear.

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, Jennifer, one of  
9 the discussions that we had the last time that  
10 we were here was the fact of how much space you  
11 need in a balcony to go ahead and do a French  
12 style door, to open up, as opposed to a sliding  
13 door.

14 And I think one of the discussions we also  
15 had was, if you have a building that's ten  
16 stories high, do you really see that division  
17 line?

18 MR. RIESCO: And to further that  
19 discussion, there's also terraces and balconies  
20 that are inset really deeply. A lot of people  
21 are now requiring big terraces, outdoor spaces,  
22 for outdoor kitchens, for families, whatever.  
23 The dynamic has changed, where now we're  
24 getting into the larger units, four bedrooms,  
25 five bedrooms, larger families living in these

61

1 bifold in a closet, but it's a nice French  
2 door, framed glass. It looks just like a  
3 French door.

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So that would qualify  
5 under the Mediterranean --

6 MR. BEHAR: That would not comply.

7 MR. RIESCO: That's one of the discussions  
8 that we've had internally. We haven't, I  
9 think, finalized that directive yet.

10 MR. PARDO: The reason is because it's all  
11 on the same plane.

12 MR. RIESCO: Correct. When it opens up,  
13 you know, you can have a 20-foot wide opening,  
14 which is beautiful, on a nice 10-story  
15 building, where you could have a view of the  
16 Biltmore --

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That makes sense. To  
18 me, that makes sense. And the discussion --

19 MR. RIESCO: We're working with that.  
20 Again, the board is very capable and very on  
21 top of new products, new strategies, dealing  
22 with this issue of the Med style and how can we  
23 incorporate modern, new technology, new  
24 materiality, new products and incorporate it  
25 into these buildings and still have achieved

63

1 multi-story buildings. So we've had that  
2 discussion internally, hey, you know, the  
3 concept of a sliding door, the Nana door,  
4 everybody likes the big openings. You know,  
5 nobody wants a little six-foot door, open the  
6 door and I'm in my terrace that's 30 feet wide,  
7 and I only have a six-foot opening. I want to  
8 open up the entire facade to create this  
9 indoor/outdoor space.

10 So we're struggling with it and we're  
11 trying to make criteria that would help us, you  
12 know -- for example, on a deep balcony that's  
13 fifteen, twenty feet deep, that's really not  
14 perceivable from the edge of the building.

15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But how do you  
16 handle -- let's say you've got twelve feet  
17 interior, how do you handle that door, that  
18 swing on a twelve-foot door, to be able to open  
19 up with the space?

20 MR. RIESCO: Well, like I said, there's now  
21 a product called a Nana door, that's a complete  
22 opening. I don't know if you've been familiar  
23 with that. It's a French door.

24 MR. BEHAR: A folding door.

25 MR. RIESCO: It's a folding door, like a

62

1 that look, without compromising the scenario  
2 of, you know, a typical sliding door on a Med  
3 building. How do we solve that problem?

4 So we, at the board, work with this stuff  
5 weekly, on project per project, and we try to  
6 always push the envelope and get these guys,  
7 the architects, you know, to work on that  
8 concept of, hey, it's easy to just put a  
9 sliding door, you know, draw it in and plop it  
10 in the computer and be done with it. How does  
11 that sliding door affect the integrity of the  
12 look of the building? And that's our charge.  
13 That's how it comes back together at the end.

14 MR. KAWALERSKI: Well, that's good you  
15 bring that up. Should that sort of thing be in  
16 here? I mean, this is addressing sliders, but  
17 what about technology where it's on the same  
18 plane?

19 MR. RIESCO: And, again, I think that's  
20 something that happens at the board level on a  
21 weekly basis, that may or may not make it to  
22 the Code until six months from now, a year from  
23 now, you know, because we're always getting new  
24 products, new stuff, and we're trying to  
25 analyze the pros and cons and the benefits --

64



1 MR. PARDO: What you're doing now is, in  
 2 the prerequisite, you're trying to eliminate  
 3 the use of a particular product, because of a  
 4 look, how it alters the facade.  
 5 MR. RIESCO: Correct.  
 6 MR. PARDO: And I think, also, Staff may  
 7 have said that you are able to use them, as  
 8 long as they're not seen from the street level  
 9 or something like that.  
 10 MR. RIESCO: And that's another discussion,  
 11 but, again, I'll give you the example of the  
 12 horizontal sliding windows. I think the board  
 13 has taken a position and a posture on that, and  
 14 said, hey, you know, absolutely, we've seen the  
 15 buildings with the horizontal rolling windows.  
 16 Definitely, it's not a productive look,  
 17 especially for a Med building.  
 18 On a modern building, on a modern design --  
 19 MR. PARDO: All bets are off.  
 20 MR. RIESCO: -- it's no a brainer. We can  
 21 do that, we can do fixed storefronts. You  
 22 know, we can go on all of those avenues, but on  
 23 a Med building, that's asking for Med bonus, in  
 24 our opinion, right now, that's something that  
 25 we have definitely identified and said, hey,

65

1 that's not appropriate.  
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What I'm hearing is  
 3 that we need to give more discretion to the  
 4 Board of Architects, as opposed to defining it  
 5 specifically, no this, no this, no this.  
 6 MR. RIESCO: Well, we don't want to be a  
 7 prescriptive Code, either. We don't want to  
 8 tie people's hands and say, hey, do A, B, C and  
 9 that's it. We want creativity. We want  
 10 architects to push the envelope, to come up  
 11 with ideas and to impress us and say, hey,  
 12 guys, this is what we want to do, and then let  
 13 these guys make the final call, but we don't  
 14 want to tie their hands.  
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct.  
 16 MR. RIESCO: Because then we're going to  
 17 get redundancy and mediocre work --  
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Agreed.  
 19 MR. RIESCO: -- because nobody's pushing  
 20 the envelope.  
 21 MR. BEHAR: Juan --  
 22 MR. RIESCO: We need to be real careful on  
 23 how we handle this, because we don't want to go  
 24 down the rabbit hole and get into a dead end,  
 25 and, then, all of a sudden, --

66

1 (Simultaneous speaking.)  
 2 MR. RIESCO: That's one thing we don't  
 3 want. I have learned that in 35 years of  
 4 practice, that you don't want to do that.  
 5 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Yeah, it's very hard to  
 6 codify good architecture.  
 7 MR. RIESCO: Yes.  
 8 MR. BEHAR: Juan, you just mentioned fixed  
 9 storefront, right, but the example that I  
 10 brought up here, which is the Allen Morris new  
 11 building on University --  
 12 MR. RIESCO: Yeah, Ponce Park.  
 13 MR. BEHAR: On Ponce, which is a very nice  
 14 building, I think it went through, but that has  
 15 fixed storefront, right?  
 16 MR. RIESCO: Fixed storefront windows in  
 17 the units or --  
 18 MR. BEHAR: In the building, yeah, I mean,  
 19 which I think is great. I think, what they  
 20 did, they set it back.  
 21 MR. RIESCO: It's casement, because we  
 22 pushed fixed casements, not --  
 23 MR. BEHAR: This, at least from the  
 24 rendering, it doesn't look to be fixed  
 25 casements.

67

1 MR. RIESCO: And again, Robert, that may be  
 2 on the design, in the preliminary, but there's  
 3 also the next tier, which is the construction  
 4 documents, which I personally am involved in  
 5 all of those projects, and I review for that  
 6 type of stuff. I look really carefully at it.  
 7 And if the board approves something that,  
 8 again, is not on the plan --  
 9 MR. BEHAR: By the way, I have no issues  
 10 whatsoever. I think it's great, okay.  
 11 MR. PARDO: And by the way, you know,  
 12 easily, my daughter in Chicago lives in a  
 13 Midtown town row classic skyscraper, and it has  
 14 storefront, built seventy years ago, and it has  
 15 the storefront and then it has a Hopper window  
 16 down below, and that building looks like it was  
 17 designed yesterday. It's a classic, to say the  
 18 least. So what I'm saying is that --  
 19 MR. RIESCO: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.  
 20 MR. PARDO: -- I agree with the BOA in the  
 21 prerequisites of saying, look, you know, don't  
 22 use this. Whether you want to give them the  
 23 option of using it around the back side, where  
 24 you can't see it --  
 25 MR. RIESCO: No. No. That's something

68

1 that's applicable more to residential work,  
2 smaller scale, and it's a resident and it's not  
3 a developer that's building a monster, a  
4 300,000 square foot building.

5 MR. PARDO: Right. Right. Right.

6 MR. RIESCO: We give a little bit more  
7 leeway to our residents in regards to windows,  
8 for example, but that's a great example where  
9 we do that. You know, we understand the  
10 casement window is a superior product, in terms  
11 of the looks and the aesthetics, but it's also  
12 more expensive and more costly.

13 So, on a resident level, there's a  
14 different dynamic than a commercial project.  
15 So we do allow that, on a residential, on the  
16 rear sides of the houses, on the side yard,  
17 where it's not seen from the street. We try to  
18 work with that, because we know that there's a  
19 big difference between a \$50,000 window package  
20 and a 25,000 window package, and some residents  
21 can't get to that \$50,000 level.

22 So we, you know, negotiate, to a certain  
23 extent, and I think that's very reasonable, as  
24 long as we don't compromise the public realm,  
25 which is the front of the house.

69

1 depth, which a lot of the platted lots in the  
2 Gables are a hundred feet. Then you will not  
3 be able to do the liner, the setbacks and get a  
4 garage that is --

5 MR. KILIDDJIAN: But this is also part of  
6 the six or eight out of twelve, right?

7 MS. GARCIA: Yes.

8 MR. KILIDDJIAN: So it's one that you may  
9 not have to check. I think that --

10 MR. BEHAR: But the example of Glenn's  
11 project --

12 MR. PARDO: Glenn's project, that just came  
13 in, the Alhambra Circle one.

14 MR. BEHAR: You know, he did a great job.

15 MR. PARDO: He basically had a site that  
16 was almost --

17 MR. RIESCO: Next to Gables Elementary? 33  
18 Alhambra?

19 MR. PARDO: Yes. It's very tough to do it  
20 all of the way around.

21 MR. RIESCO: Four fronts --

22 MR. BEHAR: I think, we're -- you don't  
23 need to check it off, but where feasible, you  
24 do it, and I think he did it where it was  
25 feasible for him.

71

1 MR. PARDO: Right.

2 MR. RIESCO: So, again, we try really hard  
3 to see both sides of the equation.

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.

5 MR. RIESCO: But on commercial products,  
6 it's different. There's a lot more scrutiny  
7 and there's a lot tighter reigns on that,  
8 because we understand that it's a for profit  
9 project, and it's not somebody's personal  
10 residence.

11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Robert.

12 MR. BEHAR: My next comment is, on Bonus 1,  
13 Level 1 requirements, Number 2, where it says,  
14 "Any storage of vehicles or off-street parking  
15 that is above grade should occur behind  
16 habitable space provided" --

17 MR. PARDO: What page are you on?

18 MR. BEHAR: 15. At least -- 15.

19 What I'm saying is to add, "where  
20 feasible," just to make sure, because this  
21 specifically says, "Any storage of vehicles or  
22 off-street parking must occur behind habitable  
23 space."

24 All I'm saying, "where feasible," because  
25 you have a lot which is a hundred foot in

70

1 MR. RIESCO: And, again, I think that's up  
2 to the discretion of the board and the design  
3 and the inherent features of the site, the  
4 project.

5 MR. BEHAR: But have you read the language  
6 here? It says, mandatory, that you have to do  
7 it. This is my point.

8 MR. PARDO: No, where feasible, I think  
9 should be added.

10 MR. BEHAR: Yeah. This is mandatory. All  
11 I'm saying is to add, where feasible. That  
12 gives the option that Glenn bought in.

13 MR. PARDO: Right, a hundred percent.

14 MR. BEHAR: Okay.

15 MS. GARCIA: So I have to ask, again, so if  
16 they move forward with the Board of Architects  
17 and it's not feasible, do they check that off  
18 and get a point for that? Because if you add  
19 the word, when feasible, then they're going to  
20 have that as one of their criteria that they  
21 meet?

22 MR. RIESCO: Right. If it's not feasible  
23 for them, they don't check that one off.

24 That's the reason why we do what we do. We  
25 don't require all twelve. You're only required

72

1 eight. So you can negotiate with your client  
 2 your budget, your issues, and say, "Hey, I can  
 3 do these eight, but I can't do that one."  
 4 MS. SUAREZ: Right, if it's not feasible --  
 5 MR. RIESCO; Any time you buy a property --  
 6 MR. KILIDDJIAN: And I agree with him. The  
 7 hundred foot property, it's impossible to do  
 8 it. I agree with you a hundred percent.  
 9 MR. BEHAR: But then you don't --  
 10 MS. SUAREZ: You wouldn't be able to  
 11 satisfy that. You're not required to satisfy  
 12 that one.  
 13 MR. BEHAR: Will you be able to get all of  
 14 the other eight? You may not be able to do it.  
 15 MS. SUAREZ: Then you would not be able to --  
 16 MR. BEHAR: Then you can't get the bonus.  
 17 MS. SUAREZ: Right.  
 18 MR. RIESCO: That's why the architect makes  
 19 the big bucks. He's got to figure out the  
 20 problem. But, again, Robert, maybe the real  
 21 answer there is, this property of a hundred  
 22 foot depth is not appropriate for this one  
 23 commercial building, where I need to put a  
 24 parking garage. I think --  
 25 MR. BEHAR: Juan, with all due respect,

73

1 that comment, to me, is -- you know, really, on  
 2 a hundred foot property, that you're in, in  
 3 most of the Gables, it's not appropriate to do  
 4 a commercial project?  
 5 MR. RIESCO: A parking garage, where you  
 6 need depth to be able to park cars 90 degrees  
 7 on both sides of the driveway. You can do it,  
 8 Robert. You can do a lot of things.  
 9 MR. BEHAR: Then it means that you're going  
 10 to do a one story, because you won't be able to  
 11 circulate on the garage, right? I mean --  
 12 MR. KILIDDJIAN: But, again, you could do  
 13 the garage without the liners. You just don't  
 14 check that mark. I guess -- I don't know if  
 15 you've put one of your projects through these  
 16 12 to see --  
 17 MR. RIESCO: It's not one of the criteria  
 18 that can help me, so I don't use it. I use the  
 19 other eight that will help me. I mean, that's  
 20 just part of the strategy.  
 21 MR. KAWALERSKI: But, Jennifer, I think you  
 22 have a good point. That was a good question.  
 23 MR. RIESCO: Yeah, you don't add, "Where  
 24 feasible." You just don't use it.  
 25 MS. GARCIA: The concern is that, if you

74

1 have the entire block, and you can only line a  
 2 portion of that block, we can add something in  
 3 that says, "For the front street," for example.  
 4 MR. BEHAR: On the primary street or  
 5 something --  
 6 MR. RIESCO: Maybe that's the answer.  
 7 MR. BEHAR: But you cannot say completely  
 8 off, because --  
 9 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, you guys are all  
 10 talking at once, and --  
 11 MR. RIESCO: I'm sorry about that. I just  
 12 had a Board of Architects' meeting that was  
 13 five hours long and there was a level or  
 14 arguing, so I'm sorry. I'll back off a little  
 15 bit.  
 16 But I think maybe that's the answer.  
 17 Maybe, if you have a site that's an island,  
 18 like Glenn's project, that has four facades,  
 19 maybe we add verbiage that says, two frontages,  
 20 one frontage. You know, we understand that  
 21 there's a front and there's a back, and people  
 22 have front faces and back -- you know, so not  
 23 everything could be beautiful on all sides. So  
 24 apply the same mentality --  
 25 MR. BEHAR: And the last comment is, like

75

1 the back of house, you know, if you have only  
 2 one street, and there may be only one street,  
 3 you have no choice, but you have to put that  
 4 FPL vault right in the front. So there was a  
 5 section here that talked about back of house,  
 6 towards the back of the property. If you have  
 7 an alley, I think it's --  
 8 MR. RIESCO: A no brainer.  
 9 MR. BEHAR: A no brainer, but if you don't  
 10 have an alley, you have no choice.  
 11 MR. RIESCO: But I think, Robert, what  
 12 we're trying to get at is to get the  
 13 architect's attention to these things, like  
 14 transformers, double detector check valves.  
 15 You know, all of the infrastructure stuff  
 16 that's required in projects, arbitrarily gets  
 17 delegated to engineers, and all of sudden, I'm  
 18 walking down a sidewalk, and I'm looking at  
 19 these beautiful painted red backflow  
 20 preventers, and the only reason it's there is  
 21 because the draftsman for the engineer who did  
 22 the piping put it there.  
 23 MR. BEHAR: Not necessarily.  
 24 MR. PARDO: Not always. Sometimes --  
 25 MR. RIESCO: No, I know not always, but

76

1 trust me, I do this on a daily basis, I'm  
2 reviewing these things, and I talk to the  
3 architects, in hindsight, because some of these  
4 projects have gotten ahead of me or were here  
5 before I was, and I ask them, "Why did you guys  
6 decide to put the backflow preventer there?"

7 For example, the Venera project has that  
8 issue. I was filming, walking a sidewalk on  
9 that project, and I ran into the backflow, and  
10 I said, who, in their right mind, would put a  
11 backflow in the middle of a sidewalk? And  
12 nobody thought, it could be recessed, it could  
13 be alcoved, it can be put in the service dock,  
14 where the service -- so there's ways around it.

15 I know we have to negotiate with the Fire  
16 Department people, and, again, we do it daily  
17 in my office. I'm constantly talking to the  
18 Fire Department and trying to figure out, hey,  
19 can we move this? Can we screen it a little  
20 bit? You can set it back and recess it. Can I  
21 do it vertically instead of horizontally?

22 You know, there's always five ways to skin  
23 the cat, but to notoriously allow people who  
24 don't pay attention to that -- and that's  
25 something that has come to the forefront in the

77

1 never --

2 MR. BEHAR: You can't negotiate with them.

3 MR. RIESCO: No. No. FPL is very tough to  
4 negotiate with. I do it, again, weekly. I  
5 have to make that call to the engineer, you  
6 know, why here, can we -- we just went through  
7 it on The Village. Jennifer and I went through  
8 it on The Village project with an ATT  
9 switchgear box, that's a monster, that's  
10 six-foot tall, and they want to put it right in  
11 the front of the building. No.

12 "Can we find a better -- on the corner,  
13 where there's a garage or something, that's a  
14 service entrance, an alley, a driveway,  
15 something, to get it off the main presence of  
16 the building?"

17 So there's things that we can do, and,  
18 again, we try very hard, and I know my board  
19 does it very good. On a weekly basis, they are  
20 all over these things. There's a lot of  
21 information in this Code that you guys have  
22 brought to light, that I think is great  
23 ammunition for them to use moving forward, but  
24 these things are discussed all of the time in  
25 our board meetings, and I want to give you guys

79

1 last five or six years, again, that has come  
2 before me, because I'm the City Architect, and  
3 everybody comes to me and says, "Hey, I've got  
4 a problem. How do I fix it?" So we try to  
5 figure these things out. So these things are  
6 on our radar now.

7 My Board of Architects, "Like guys, ask  
8 them where the equipment is, ask them where the  
9 switchgear is, where is the meter, where is the  
10 transformer, where is" -- you know, because,  
11 again, you know, we're looking at projects  
12 twenty minutes, half an hour, sometimes 45  
13 minutes.

14 MR. PARDO: Do you know where the David  
15 Williams --

16 MR. RIESCO: Yes.

17 MR. PARDO: -- FPL transformer is?

18 MR. RIESCO: No. No. No. I don't know.

19 MR. PARDO: It's on top of the roof.

20 MR. RIESCO: On top of the roof?

21 MR. PARDO: On top of the roof.

22 MR. RIESCO: Wow.

23 MR. PARDO: And they had problems there.  
24 To get to that, it was absolutely unbelievable.  
25 The problem is that today, with FPL, you would

78

1 that comfort level.

2 I know that you have issues with buildings  
3 that have been built and that don't look great  
4 and have problems, but I think the awareness is  
5 there, and I think that's the most important  
6 thing that we've done, is bringing this thing  
7 to light and say, "Guys, we need to pay  
8 attention to these things that keep recurring,"  
9 and we're fixing them. You know, we're working  
10 on it really hard, on a weekly basis, and these  
11 guys are all over that.

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

13 Felix.

14 MR. PARDO: Just going back for a minute,  
15 you know, after the prerequisites, we're going  
16 to Level 1. You have to get six out of twelve.  
17 Why not ten out of twelve, eight out of twelve?  
18 Why six out of twelve? Because I think what's  
19 happened is, this is the same number that has  
20 been used in the past --

21 MS. GARCIA: Correct.

22 MR. PARDO: -- but now it's been refined,  
23 and refined and refined, where you can get --

24 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I think it is six for  
25 Multi-Family and eight for mixed-use.

80

1 MR. PARDO: You're a hundred percent  
2 correct.  
3 MS. GARCIA: You're correct, that --  
4 MR. KILIDDJIAN: And the credit is not the  
5 full credit. So it's incremental.  
6 MR. PARDO: Okay. If you feel comfortable  
7 with that.  
8 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Yeah, it's incremental.  
9 And that's to Robert's point, I mean, that's  
10 one box you don't check, but you're checking  
11 all of the other boxes.  
12 MR. PARDO: You've taken a lot of the  
13 things out of the boxes that were --  
14 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Yeah, but a lot of things  
15 have been put in the prerequisites, which were  
16 not there before. So you're starting off with  
17 a much better building to begin with.  
18 MR. PARDO: Correct.  
19 MR. KILIDDJIAN: I think Juan is right, the  
20 tools that have been implemented in this round,  
21 and it's taken a while, but I think the  
22 buildings are going to start off at a better --  
23 you know, at a better baseline.  
24 MR. PARDO: I agree with you, and on the  
25 next page after Robert was, on sustainability,

81

1 I don't think it should be a bonus element. I  
2 think it should be more like what the City of  
3 Miami, City of Hollywood, Miami Beach does,  
4 where it becomes, you know, if you have a  
5 project of a certain size, you know, you must  
6 do it, but I don't think that --  
7 MR. BEHAR: Isn't that part of the Code  
8 already, of the Florida Building Code, that  
9 have you have to have --  
10 MR. PARDO: There are certain elements of  
11 sustainability that are there, but I know what  
12 Staff is looking for is more of, when you look  
13 at all of the elements, Robert, there are more  
14 of a green -- you know, qualifying for green  
15 capability.  
16 MR. BEHAR: But I think, in the County, for  
17 example, every building has to be, minimum, is  
18 it a Silver certification, you know, building?  
19 MR. PARDO: I don't think so. I don't  
20 think so. And the reason I'm almost sure --  
21 MR. BEHAR: I think it is, because --  
22 MR. PARDO: -- that it's not in the Florida  
23 Building Code, that it has to be in the Zoning  
24 Code, is because we have, you know, 150  
25 jurisdictions in the State of Florida which use

82

1 the Florida Building Code.

2 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Yes. So, I think, for  
3 example, that (R) requires -- the  
4 sustainability is in the zoning element, if  
5 you're in the redevelopment district.

6 You know, there are parts -- there are some  
7 areas that have it already in the --

8 MS. GARCIA: But it's based on the size of  
9 the property that triggers LEED or comparable  
10 designation.

11 MR. PARDO: Right. Well, the point I'm  
12 trying to make is, I'm just saying,  
13 sustainability doesn't look Mediterranean. You  
14 know, I'm just saying --

15 MR. RIESCO: I would agree with that.

16 MR. PARDO: -- pull that out of here and  
17 put it somewhere else and still achieve what  
18 you want to achieve, like everybody else does.  
19 And like I said, you know, all of the different  
20 jurisdictions have their own different things,  
21 but, I mean, for me, I want to see something  
22 physically that helps the building look more --

23 MR. BEHAR: I don't think it's a  
24 prerequisite. I think it's a -- listen, the  
25 truth of the matter, in all of your components

83

1 that you're using in a building today, you're  
2 going to be a hundred percent or 95 percent  
3 there.

4 MR. PARDO: Right, but, you know, you go  
5 through it all of the time, and the thing is  
6 that, for example, you know, we're doing a  
7 building and then, you know, we're complying,  
8 we have people that will certify the building  
9 to a certain level, et cetera, but normally  
10 what happens is, there's a threshold, as you  
11 said, the size of the building, which you have  
12 a bigger carbon footprint, then you go from  
13 there.

14 And what I'm just trying to say is that one  
15 thing has nothing to do with the other.

16 MR. RIESCO: I concur with your analysis  
17 also.

18 MR. PARDO: I don't think it belongs --

19 MR. RIESCO: It shouldn't be a part of a  
20 Med Bonus requirement. It's a different  
21 animal.

22 MR. BEHAR: It should -- we're going to be  
23 in agreement. It should not be there.

24 MR. PARDO: Twice. Twice.

25 MR. RIESCO: Yeah. Yeah.

84

1 MR. BEHAR: And once with Juan.  
 2 MR. RIESCO: Yeah. No, I agree a hundred  
 3 percent, wholeheartedly.  
 4 MR. PARDO: And, then, one of the things  
 5 that I didn't quite understand is the next one,  
 6 Number 7, on Page 16, "Each Multi-Family zoned  
 7 property shall provide at least 20 percent of  
 8 the required ground level landscaped open area  
 9 percentage based upon total lot area, as  
 10 publicly accessible."  
 11 What is average size of the required ground  
 12 level landscaped area, if you can?  
 13 MS. GARCIA: So Multi-Family usually is a  
 14 requirement of 25 percent open space.  
 15 MR. PARDO: So, for example, let's say that  
 16 we have a 100 by 200 feet, which is 20,000  
 17 square feet. 20,000 square feet, times 25,  
 18 5,000 square feet. 20 percent of that, which  
 19 is 1,000 square feet, has to be accessible to  
 20 the public. That's on 100 by 200 feet, which  
 21 is a pretty good size, you know, average.  
 22 Okay. So if you reduce that by, what,  
 23 half, that's 500 square feet for public access.  
 24 Can you explain what the open area, as publicly  
 25 accessible means?

85

1 MR. PARDO: And now what we're saying is,  
 2 there's going to be public accessibility, you  
 3 know, to this minimized, you know --  
 4 MS. GARCIA: As an option, sure.  
 5 MR. PARDO: As an option.  
 6 MS. GARCIA: Right. In areas that don't  
 7 have a lot of open space.  
 8 MR. PARDO: What I'm trying to figure in my  
 9 mind is, what is the design ramification of  
 10 putting that in there? In other words, you  
 11 know, one thing is to say, I did the formula,  
 12 another thing is to, you know, put it to test.  
 13 I don't see the advantage.  
 14 MR. RIESCO: Is the intent maybe that you  
 15 don't fence it or enclose it or that's not  
 16 allowed in Multi-Family?  
 17 MS. GARCIA: As well. Multi-Family usually  
 18 has limited access to parks, right. There's a  
 19 lot of people living in the same area, and they  
 20 only have one large park, so it's allowing your  
 21 neighbors to use the front area for  
 22 (Unintelligible) --  
 23 MR. PARDO: The point I'm trying to make  
 24 is, one of your typical buildings -- you say,  
 25 what, ten feet is your front setback?

87

1 MS. GARCIA: Right. So 25 percent, in our  
 2 Zoning Code, is a requirement for Multi-Family,  
 3 for it to be open space.  
 4 MR. PARDO: Right.  
 5 MS. GARCIA: 20 percent of that space needs  
 6 to be in the front yard. So what this is  
 7 saying is that the 20 percent that's already  
 8 required to be in the front yard would be  
 9 publicly accessible.  
 10 MR. PARDO: Okay. Because it doesn't give  
 11 you the location, and this is the point I'm  
 12 trying to get to. Back in the day, you know,  
 13 we had green -- is it something I said?  
 14 MR. WITHERS: Yeah. Just go on.  
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Felix, if I may,  
 16 before you continue, I just want to make note,  
 17 for the record, that Chip Withers had to leave  
 18 and we are now one, two, three, four Board  
 19 Members here. Thank you.  
 20 Continue.  
 21 MR. PARDO: Thank you.  
 22 So, back in the day, our setbacks were  
 23 larger, and now our setbacks have become  
 24 minimized.  
 25 MS. GARCIA: Uh-huh.

86

1 Okay. So now I'm doing the calculation.  
 2 Now I've got 10 feet, times 200 feet, that's  
 3 2,000 square feet. So, by the time you put the  
 4 driveways in, to have access to the parking  
 5 structure and everything else, what is the  
 6 public benefit to providing this, because it's  
 7 almost like it becomes almost like a base  
 8 number? In other words, you already have --  
 9 what I'm trying to say is, how is this  
 10 providing, you know, that Mediterranean  
 11 component for a Level 1 or a Level 2? You  
 12 know, what is it?  
 13 And the reason I struggle with this is, you  
 14 know, be careful what you wish for. Our  
 15 setbacks now are so minimal that the people  
 16 that are occupying these buildings don't have  
 17 any green space. So, therefore, now the big  
 18 thing is, well, we're going to give them more  
 19 height, if they give us a park. Then the parks  
 20 are minimized, but the height isn't.  
 21 So what I can't wrap my head around is, I  
 22 can't understand how this has become an  
 23 incentive for the style of the architecture,  
 24 unless you said, "Well, there have to be, you  
 25 know, fountains. It has to be an improvement."

88

1 MR. RIESCO: I think the intent maybe is  
2 for the larger projects, maybe, that 20 percent  
3 is more applicable, because you mentioned 100  
4 by 200, and that's a small -- that's the size  
5 of a big house in the Gables.

6 MR. PARDO: Right.

7 MS. RIESCO: A hundred by two hundred is  
8 not, in my opinion, a commercial property or --  
9 you know --

10 MR. BEHAR: But that's a 20,000 square foot  
11 lot.

12 MR. RIESCO: Right. Right.

13 MR. BEHAR: So you could do the 20,000.

14 I think the intent is, when you say, "The  
15 park," to provide more green space, you know,  
16 to leave it open, and I think one example is  
17 the one building on Valencia here, that they  
18 did a green space on the corner.

19 MR. RIESCO: Yeah.

20 MR. BEHAR: The idea is to leave that open  
21 for the public, not necessarily the 100 by 200  
22 straight setback in front of the building.

23 MR. RIESCO: Right. The proportions of  
24 that park are really nice and is a nice --

25 MR. PARDO: Right.

89

1 point for my project, here's my 20 percent park  
2 area, green space," whatever you want to call  
3 it, I think the Board, at that point, would  
4 pounce and say, "Hey, what's happening there?  
5 Is it just sod? Are you doing fountains? Are  
6 you doing a trellis? Is it a covered space?  
7 Is it an open space? Is it a sitting space?"

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We had something  
9 similar to that just happen, which was, I  
10 think -- part of it was with Publix and that  
11 park.

12 MR. PARDO: On the back side, on Salzedo.

13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct, and part of  
14 it was, was it to be open space, was it not to  
15 be open space, did it have statutes, did it not  
16 have statutes.

17 MR. RIESCO: Correct.

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: By the same token, I  
19 think, when we start looking at parks and  
20 what's the use and the programing, you know, we  
21 have a Parks and Recreation Department that  
22 also gives input to the City.

23 MR. RIESCO: Correct.

24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I just don't know if  
25 that's within our purview to state what that

91

1 MR. BEHAR: And to me, it makes sense,  
2 because you provide a little, you know, pocket  
3 park for the community, for the City.

4 MR. PARDO: Right. You're getting to my  
5 point. The point is that, if you say it's not  
6 just, you know, grass and some shrubbery there,  
7 because not much more can go in there, but now  
8 if you say, well, we're going to put benches,  
9 we're going to put --

10 MR. RIESCO: I think that's the intent, and  
11 that's how we amplify the look, and the  
12 Mediterranean, and a trellis, a seating area --

13 MR. PARDO: Juan, that's not here.

14 MR. RIESCO: I know. I know. I know. I  
15 understand.

16 MR. PARDO: Now, if you're saying, we're  
17 going to provide the benches and we're going to  
18 provide, you know, the hardscape and we're  
19 going to provide the fountains and things like  
20 that -- I know that was the original intent.

21 MR. RIESCO: And, again, Felix, I would say  
22 that this scenario, if brought to us from an  
23 applicant on a substantially large project or  
24 larger project than 100 by 200, where they  
25 would dedicate and say, "Hey, I'm using this

90

1 park should be, as far as whether it should be  
2 a passive park, an active park or a dog park.

3 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, the biggest  
4 problem I have with this is that, when I look  
5 at the computations, et cetera, there's -- if  
6 you add a fountain, and you have it in the  
7 right style, and you have the right design, it  
8 could be very complementary to Mediterranean  
9 architecture. Right now there's nothing.  
10 There's nothing that you're getting back, that  
11 augments and enhances the style of architecture  
12 that you're promoting. That's my problem.

13 MS. GARCIA: So we can add, you know, "Make  
14 sure you have improvements such as seating or  
15 fountains or" --

16 MR. RIESCO: Fountains, trellises --

17 MR. PARDO: Please, please, not bicycle  
18 racks, not this, not that. You know, it's  
19 not -- no, it's not intended at anyone. What  
20 I'm saying is that, for God sake, if --  
21 although I am -- you know, one of the positive  
22 things that you do see at The Plaza is that you  
23 see amenities at the ground level --

24 MR. RIESCO: A lot.

25 MR. PARDO: -- that are substantial, that

92

1 do enhance. So that is something that you can  
2 codify, to give an improvement and a check-off,  
3 but it should be complementary, not a technical  
4 thing, such as a bicycle rack --

5 MR. RIESCO: Right.

6 MR. PARDO: -- or just a bench. No, it has  
7 to be seating, things that are --

8 MR. RIESCO: -- contributing to the  
9 Mediterranean ambiance.

10 MR. BEHAR: No, to the public realm. I  
11 mean, because, at the end of the day, you want  
12 to do something that's beneficial, you know, to  
13 the neighborhood, not necessarily -- because,  
14 you know, the style of fountain should not  
15 be -- you know, I prefer -- and by the way,  
16 typically, in a 20,000 square foot lot, you  
17 don't have that many options to provide a park.  
18 You know, that happens on the larger projects.

19 MR. RIESCO: That's the point. It has to  
20 be a larger project.

21 MR. PARDO: But that urban component, many  
22 years ago, with the Bank of Coral Gables, on  
23 Almeria, we provided some little areas, just  
24 enough push and pull, where it gives you and it  
25 enhances that.

1 MR. PARDO: And, you know, you have your  
2 parallel parking and you have your landscaping  
3 there. So now you provided, you know, a  
4 beautiful fountain, which is illuminated at  
5 night. Now you're walking your dog at night,  
6 you know, and you see this, and this is  
7 something that is open to the public and  
8 someone could sit down and catch their breath  
9 or just enjoy the evening. If you do it in the  
10 right style, you feel like it's part of the  
11 architecture.

12 So not just taking a piece of artwork and  
13 just sticking it there. What you're doing is,  
14 you're incorporating elements that are part of  
15 this particular open space, that enhances the  
16 quality of that architecture. So it should be  
17 compatible --

18 MR. BEHAR: But, you know, Felix, not  
19 necessarily -- I think that each little park  
20 should not have a prescriptive that you have to  
21 do this. Because look at what happened, you  
22 know, in a time in Coral Gables, every building  
23 had a copula, okay. You know, I don't think --  
24 I think that the park should be -- each park  
25 should be -- you know, has its own identity.

1 If you walk through the streets of Granada,  
2 and you see these little elements throughout  
3 there, there's absolutely no doubt -- and we're  
4 talking about centuries and centuries and  
5 centuries of development, which from one people  
6 to another people, it just augmented the  
7 architecture and complemented it.

8 This doesn't say that, and it should say  
9 it. Not just, you know, an improvement, but  
10 something for the Board of Architects to see  
11 and say, "This is what we're looking for," to  
12 be able to make it a better and a complementary  
13 type of thing, and this is at the ground level  
14 scale, which is extremely important.

15 MR. RIESCO: Absolutely, the landscape.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Felix, should that  
17 park be compatible with the building or should  
18 that park be compatible with the neighborhood?  
19 Which, to me, when a developer donates or gives  
20 a park or does a park, it's meant to be used by  
21 the surrounding neighborhood, because it's  
22 lacking green space or it's lacking a park.

23 MR. PARDO: But, also, you're -- say you're  
24 walking down the public sidewalk.

25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.

1 MR. PARDO: I want to be clear, this is not  
2 a park.

3 MR. RIESCO: Yeah, it's not a park. A  
4 publicly accessible area, which means that it  
5 can't be contained, it's open to the sidewalk.

6 MR. PARDO: The reason I gave you the  
7 description of walking down the public  
8 right-of-way sidewalk is because this is where  
9 you have the ability of going into the  
10 property, to make it accessible to the public,  
11 making it wider and making it more of a true  
12 paseo, not a hallway down the middle of a  
13 building, you know, and I think that's  
14 important. And, you know, I don't have to  
15 explain it to you, you know exactly that these  
16 elements just enhance the architecture and they  
17 could be compatible with it.

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But if that's the  
19 case, then should the Board of Architects at  
20 the time that they're looking at the building,  
21 also be looking at the design of that green  
22 space, before it goes further?

23 MR. PARDO: Well, I mean, the architect has  
24 already provided a design for the Board of  
25 Architects.



1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Right, but at what  
2 stage? At what point does that park get looked  
3 at?

4 MR. RIESCO: I think, at the BOA level.

5 MR. PARDO: At the very beginning.

6 MR. RIESCO: Yeah, we're very comfortable  
7 with that and we expect that. We don't want  
8 somebody to just show a site plan and not show  
9 anything there. We want to see what the intent  
10 is, what is the use, what's the activity, what  
11 are you trying to do here.

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I'm okay with that.

13 MR. RIESCO: And I think that's, again,  
14 what the board does.

15 MR. PARDO: And, you know, that could be  
16 easily incorporated into the grand entrance of  
17 the building.

18 MR. RIESCO: Absolutely. Absolutely.

19 MR. PARDO: I mean, it could be done in so  
20 many different ways, sum and scale, but I think  
21 it's important to be very specific about the  
22 improvement that is made to enhance, you know,  
23 that experience.

24 MS. GARCIA: Yes, we can add that in.  
25 Yeah.

1 item is there for the project that doesn't  
2 have the ability of the open space because of  
3 the site constraints?

4 MS. GARCIA: No. No. No. They still have  
5 to meet their open space requirement.

6 MR. RIESCO: They still have to do this?  
7 So this is in excess of that?

8 MR. GARCIA: Yeah.

9 MR. PARDO: And, again, I just don't see  
10 the checking off of this element to enhance,  
11 you know, for a Med Bonus.

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What do you think the  
13 reason that it was put there in the first place  
14 was?

15 MR. PARDO: I don't want to --

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You've been around the  
17 City a long time.

18 MR. PARDO: No, I don't want to go there.  
19 I think, you know -- for me, one of the  
20 subjects that has been continually an issue for  
21 me is the PAD, right. So the PAD was put in  
22 for a certain reason, which was specifically  
23 the Douglas Entrance project. And, then, for  
24 dozens of years, it wasn't touched.

25 Now a PAD is used for everything, and,

1 MR. PARDO: Okay. And, then, the open  
2 space fund, which is the next one.

3 MR. RIESCO: The open space fund?

4 MR. PARDO: Fund. In other words, you  
5 know, here's a check and check it off. I don't  
6 think -- you know, again, that doesn't enhance  
7 the architecture in any way, shape or form, you  
8 know, stroking a check to put it into a fund,  
9 you know, and God knows if or where it was  
10 used.

11 I feel like this -- like impact fees, you  
12 know, every time we pull a permit, we pay  
13 hundreds of thousands, millions sometimes, for  
14 impact fees. We don't know where the money is  
15 going. Where is the improvement? Where is the  
16 enhancement? Where is the offset? So I don't  
17 think that this should be an item. I think  
18 Staff could come up with a better item than  
19 this, in my opinion, and I think that, you  
20 know, contributions, you know, for things like  
21 this, you know, that could happen, you know, at  
22 the Commission level, but that has nothing to  
23 do with the Board of Architects or the style of  
24 the building or the bonuses, in my opinion.

25 MR. RIESCO: I'm assuming this particular

1 therefore, variances are not required. So you  
2 don't have to go to the Board of Adjustment for  
3 variances, because you're using a PAD. The PAD  
4 was put in specifically to be able to do  
5 something like redo the Douglas Entrance and  
6 save it the way it was, but now it's become  
7 like a normal thing.

8 So what was the reason? That was the  
9 reason, on that specific subject. What is the  
10 reason here? I think that we have an issue in  
11 the City that has to do with a lack of parks  
12 that we have, but that's a different issue.  
13 That should be an issue that should be a  
14 discussion by the Commission, you know, and the  
15 Parks and Recreation Board or whatever, but I  
16 don't think this has anything to do with the  
17 style or the architecture, Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But when a check is  
19 written for that, to check that off, where does  
20 the funds go?

21 MS. GARCIA: So there is a Parks  
22 Acquisition Fund that it would go into, and it  
23 would probably be earmarked that it came from  
24 Med Bonus criteria, to be --

25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What could it be used

1 for?

2 MS. GARCIA: -- used adjacent to

3 Multi-Family or Mixed-Use districts. That's

4 the intent.

5 MR. PARDO: And, again, the question is,

6 what did you do to improve that and make it a

7 better Mediterranean style building?

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But aren't you, then,

9 using those funds to improve other

10 neighborhoods or other areas that actually need

11 it?

12 MR. PARDO: I agree conceptually with what

13 you're talking about, but it's like

14 sustainability. One thing has nothing to do

15 with the style of the architecture. It has

16 nothing to do with it. The previous one, if

17 you do the improvements, et cetera, then you're

18 talking about something completely different.

19 MR. BEHAR: I understand, and, you know, it

20 doesn't improve the --

21 MR. RIESCO: Indirectly, it does.

22 MR. BEHAR: But it does indirectly.

23 MR. RIESCO: It improves the City, the

24 overall context, the broader context. I think

25 that's the answer. If that's valid or not,

1 that's what it's doing. Again, there's an

2 improvement down the road somewhere, maybe

3 across the street --

4 MR. BEHAR: It may not be project specific.

5 MR. RIESCO: -- not specific to this guy --

6 MR. PARDO: But we're not talking about the

7 style of architecture.

8 MR. RIESCO: Agreed. Agreed.

9 MR. PARDO: Remember, Med Bonus, what's the

10 outcry? Med Bonus for Med architecture.

11 MR. RIESCO: Correct.

12 MR. PARDO: Now it's like, you know, put

13 money in a fund and you get to check this off.

14 It has nothing to do with the style of the

15 architecture.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But it's a vehicle to

17 get funds --

18 MR. PARDO: Without a doubt.

19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- in areas where it's

20 needed.

21 MR. RIESCO: Kind of like the art in public

22 spaces. You charge one percent, and gets put

23 into a fund, and that gets put somewhere. It

24 may not be on your project, it may not be on

25 your block, but it amplifies and beautifies the

1 City.

2 MR. PARDO: I'm glad you said that. We

3 have a tree fund in this City. I know the

4 amount of money that's in the tree fund. My

5 question is, where are the trees going?

6 Where's the accountability for that?

7 So the point is, here, we're discussing --

8 it's the same thing as if we put something for

9 additional trees, wait a minute, what does that

10 have to do with the style of architecture?

11 Nothing. I mean, this is -- the Board of

12 Architects is looking for, give me tools, to be

13 able to make sure that the architecture is

14 really good and it's really Mediterranean

15 inspired, et cetera, et cetera. It has nothing

16 to do with, you know, putting money away to do

17 something somewhere, which God knows where, and

18 it goes back just the same as the impact fees.

19 MR. KAWALERSKI: Yeah, I agree. I mean,

20 writing a check is simple, but it doesn't do

21 anything for this project.

22 MR. RIESCO: Again, I guess, it's not a

23 requirement. It's one of the ones that you may

24 or may not use. It gives somebody an

25 alternative, that may not have any other

1 options. I don't know. Again, I'm not

2 justifying it. I think I understand your point

3 -- I don't think, I do understand your point,

4 but --

5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, point

6 well-taken. Let's move on.

7 MR. PARDO: Okay. The next page, the

8 sidewalks, plazas and courtyards -- page 17,

9 Number 9, the Sidewalks, Plazas and Courtyards,

10 a minimum of 25 percent, it kind of trails off.

11 Did you mean to say -- can you say of what --

12 25 percent of what?

13 MS. GARCIA: So we can add back in, the

14 total ground level paving area, if that's

15 needed. That's fine.

16 MR. PARDO: So it says, "Sidewalks, plazas

17 and courtyards, minimum of 25 percent," of the

18 lot area, of the required --

19 MS. GARCIA: Well, you can and the area

20 that was crossed out. It says of total ground

21 level paving surface.

22 MR. PARDO: Oh, it should not have been

23 crossed out.

24 MS. GARCIA: Yes, you can see that, right?

25 Yeah.

1 MR. PARDO: Okay. So it should have stayed  
2 in there?

3 MS. GARCIA: We can put that on.

4 MR. PARDO: Got it.

5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So that was a  
6 strike-out.

7 MR. PARDO: Yes. The strike-out wasn't  
8 intentional.

9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Striko, instead of a  
10 typo.

11 MR. RIESCO: Now, this is right-of-way or  
12 is this public property -- private property?

13 MR. PARDO: Private property.

14 MR. RIESCO: Private property, right?

15 MR. PARDO: Yes.

16 MR. RIESCO: So why is Public Works the  
17 decision-making factor and BOA?

18 MS. GARCIA: I think this is everything.  
19 This is sidewalks; sidewalks, plazas and  
20 courtyards. Plazas and courtyards are  
21 typically impact property. Sidewalks are  
22 outside.

23 MR. RIESCO: That's why I'm asking.

24 MR. PARDO: I agree with the City  
25 Architect. I think it should be a co-approval.

105

1 MS. SUAREZ: I think it's probably there  
2 for the sidewalks.

3 MR. RIESCO: It sounds -- we actually have  
4 a requirement for a material board. They have  
5 to have physical samples of what they're  
6 proposing.

7 MR. PARDO: That's right.

8 MR. RIESCO: So, again, that's already  
9 included in the deal. We have that.

10 MR. BEHAR: It's already there.

11 MR. PARDO: Yeah, but the way this is  
12 written --

13 MR. RIESCO: No, I know. That's why --

14 MR. PARDO: This is what happens when you  
15 add things, and you add things, and add things.  
16 You make one change, and, then, all of a  
17 sudden, it doesn't make sense later on, and  
18 then somebody makes a wild interpretation.

19 MR. RIESCO: Yeah, I know. That's why I  
20 mentioned it.

21 MR. PARDO: And by the way, the reason the  
22 City has Coral Gables beige sidewalks is not  
23 because of a civil engineer, it's because of  
24 the original architects that designed the City.

25 So if you go down to Number 10, Public Art,

107

1 MR. RIESCO: I mean, if it's a plaza, if  
2 it's a courtyard, it's mine, it's in my domain.  
3 If it's in the right-of-way, I give it up to  
4 Public Works all of the time. I don't  
5 necessarily agree with it, but I have no  
6 choice.

7 MR. PARDO: And the reason I don't, either,  
8 is because, you know, here we go again, street  
9 lighting -- you know, all of these different  
10 things -- come on. I mean, it's just -- we  
11 have the BOA. I don't think anyone in Public  
12 Works is going to say, "No, we don't want to  
13 hear their opinion." I think that's the best  
14 thing we could do, is add them in there to it.

15 MR. RIESCO: So that should be under the  
16 jurisdiction of the BOA, pavement, hardscape.

17 MR. PARDO: Back in the day, it was in  
18 there.

19 MR. BEHAR: And, typically, it is. I  
20 think, when you go in for -- you know, for a  
21 project, you're showing --

22 MR. PARDO: You're right.

23 MR. BEHAR: -- you know, all of the plazas  
24 and everything. You know, I think that's the  
25 BOA.

106

1 so when you look at public art, we have the Art  
2 in Public Places already there, right? So why  
3 would you add public art there, as one of the  
4 needed requirements, when it's already part of  
5 the statutes that we have to comply with public  
6 art?

7 MS. SUAREZ: Can I chime in --

8 MR. RIESCO: I think the logic is, the Art  
9 in Public Places domain is the artwork, and the  
10 Board of Architects' domain is the context  
11 around the artwork and where it goes and how  
12 it's situated and how it's placed. I think  
13 that's the logic.

14 MS. SUAREZ: And just to be clear, the Art  
15 in Public Places requirement is payment of the  
16 Art in Public Places fee, and so an applicant  
17 can seek a waiver of the fee by then including  
18 the artwork in their project, which has to go  
19 through the process for including the artwork on  
20 the project, but you can just pay the fee and  
21 not have the public art on your project.

22 So this would be if you -- I guess, you  
23 know, to satisfy that one, it would be public  
24 art incorporated into your project.

25 MR. RIESCO: Which is the design --

108

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You wouldn't be  
2 allowed to use the fee as a checkmark?  
3 MS. SUAREZ: Right. I think that's what  
4 the intent of that is, unless, Jennifer, was a  
5 different -- this is the existing language, as  
6 well, to be clear.

7 MR. PARDO: Right. I mean, once you see,  
8 public, it seems like all bets are off there.

9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would this be like  
10 what you were saying about artwork or a  
11 fountain or something that blends better into  
12 the project?

13 MR. RIESCO: It would be integrated.  
14 That's what we want. We're trying to get  
15 cohesion between the art in public places and  
16 the BOA.

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Because if they want  
18 to use this, even if they want to pay for art  
19 in public places and they use this checkmark, I  
20 assume they also have to use public art within  
21 their project?

22 MR. RIESCO: Oh, yeah.

23 MR. PARDO: Let me just jump off for a  
24 minute, expanded sidewalks, widths beyond the  
25 property line; you mean, within private

109

1 property, correct?

2 MS. GARCIA: Where?

3 MR. PARDO: If you look at (B) --

4 MS. GARCIA: Oh, again, existing language.  
5 So I guess within the private property --

6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Expanded sidewalk  
7 widths may be within the right-of-way or  
8 something?

9 MR. PARDO: Within the private property  
10 line? Where is this supposed to be?

11 MS. GARCIA: I think it's within the  
12 private property line. I'm assuming that's  
13 what it means.

14 MS. SUAREZ: We can go back and see, you  
15 know, the context for this, because it's  
16 existing language.

17 MS. GARCIA: Right.

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you review that,  
19 so we can see what the intent is?

20 MR. PARDO: Widths within the private  
21 property line.

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What the intent is  
23 and --

24 MR. PARDO: Because I would think that, you  
25 know, if they could look at the sidewalks

110

1 outside or -- what do you call it -- not a  
2 bicycle lane, we called it a --

3 MR. KAWALERSKI: Mobility lane.

4 MR. PARDO: -- mobility lane, right, you  
5 know, where do you draw the line of saying this  
6 is part of the things that belong to this  
7 building?

8 MR. RIESCO: And maybe the intent there is  
9 maybe like a plaza or something internal to the  
10 property that kind of bleeds out into the  
11 public area.

12 MR. PARDO: Well, (G) is there. It says,  
13 "Water features, fountains or similar water  
14 features, ground and/or wall-mounted." But,  
15 anyway, I just wanted to make sure, because  
16 then the bottom paragraph, "Above amenities  
17 shall be consistent in design and form with the  
18 City of Coral Gables Public Works Manual, in  
19 addition to the Board of Architects' approval."

20 MS. GARCIA: Yeah. I mean, they're already  
21 reviewing this.

22 MR. PARDO: No. No. The way that it says  
23 it is, these -- you know, the last thing I need  
24 is for someone to say, "Okay. You know, we  
25 have a concrete pole. This is going to be the

111

1 concrete pole, and it's in the manual, you  
2 know" You could have it in the manual.

3 MS. GARCIA: Oh, I see.

4 MR. PARDO: You need to have BOA say yes or  
5 no.

6 MR. RIESCO; Right. Yeah.

7 MR. PARDO: Let's help out the civil  
8 engineers with --

9 MR. BEHAR: You don't want the engineers  
10 making all of the decisions.

11 MR. RIESCO: That's the fear. I hate to  
12 say it, but that's the reality. They look at  
13 things differently, with different criteria,  
14 and so do we. We look at it, again, from the  
15 perspective of the aesthetics and not the  
16 technical --

17 MR. PARDO: Right, but here, you're looking  
18 at it to be able to give --

19 MR. RIESCO: And, again, going back to Item  
20 B, should we say, instead of expanded sidewalk,  
21 expanded pavement, so we don't -- I'm not sure  
22 if a bigger, wider sidewalk is better than  
23 pavers or something more decorative or more  
24 ornate.

25 MR. BEHAR: But --

112

1 MR. RIESCO: No? You know, I don't know if  
2 I want to look at a 20-foot wide sidewalk in  
3 front of a building. I'd rather see a 10-foot  
4 sidewalk, that's the right-of-way, pedestrian  
5 area, and then there's pavement that's  
6 contributing to the aesthetics of the building  
7 and the site, the project, the look. Again,  
8 I'm just worried about the word sidewalks,  
9 because that implies the Coral Gables beige  
10 standard sidewalk, with the score lines at five  
11 feet. And do we want to look at that when it's  
12 30 feet wide? Is that a positive thing or is  
13 that something that's just there?

14 You know, that's my perspective on that. I  
15 think the word, pavement, opens it up to  
16 interpretation. It could be concrete. It  
17 could be pavers. It could be some other  
18 material that would be conducive to a nicer  
19 product.

20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Are you allowed today  
21 to put pavers within the sidewalk on a project?

22 MR. RIESCO: On a public right-of-way?

23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: On the public  
24 right-of-way.

25 MR. RIESCO: No, we don't -- that's

113

1 typically Public Works' domain.

2 MR. BEHAR: Yeah, that's very difficult --

3 MR. RIESCO: I would love to do that, but  
4 they wouldn't allow me, and they win all of the  
5 time.

6 MR. BEHAR: Yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So if a project has a  
8 driveway or something that protrudes out, for  
9 example, on residential areas, if you could do  
10 pavers --

11 MR. RIESCO: We're allowed to do it in  
12 residential with covenants.

13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct, with  
14 covenants and insurance.

15 MS. SUAREZ: It's a Public Works review  
16 process.

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. But in  
18 commercial, you're not allowed to do it?

19 MR. BEHAR: I think you're allowed to do  
20 it.

21 MS. SUAREZ: It's Public Works --

22 MR. RIESCO: Probably the same thing,  
23 right, a covenant that they have to write.

24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So, then, if you're  
25 allowed to do it, are you saying that if you

114

1 have pavers in the approach and you have pavers  
2 in the driveway, the part that's the  
3 sidewalk --

4 MR. RIESCO: Has to go through.

5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- has to go through?

6 MR. RIESCO: I think that happened at  
7 Gables Village. I think we had that same  
8 discussion at Gables Village, where they had  
9 pavers in the driveway and we recommended  
10 pavers in the approaches. So now we have a  
11 paver, five or six feet of concrete, and then  
12 pavers. I said, no, make it all paver, and you  
13 can't do that, it's got to be concrete, blah,  
14 blah. So I lost that battle.

15 MS. SUAREZ: Essentially, it would be  
16 subject to Public Works' review, yeah.

17 MR. PARDO: So the next item, on Number 11,  
18 on the pass throughs, the only mention is --  
19 there's no mention of height, and one of the  
20 things about these, you know, buildings and the  
21 paseos and all of this stuff is, you know, you  
22 feel like you're in a dungeon sometimes, right.

23 MR. RIESCO: That, again, Felix, is under  
24 the purview of the board. The board is all  
25 over that, when they look at the projects.

115

1 (Simultaneous speaking.)

2 MR. RIESCO: I mean, again, other projects  
3 that are built, and you're right, they have  
4 eight-foot ceilings on these paseos and they  
5 look terrible, but I can tell you that, in  
6 today's world and going back maybe four or five  
7 years, that's been heavily scrutinized by the  
8 board.

9 MR. PARDO: Yeah, because people are seeing  
10 what was built.

11 MR. RIESCO: And the height and the scale  
12 and what the ambiance is there, and so we work  
13 on that. I don't know if you want to dictate  
14 that here or maybe give a minimum, but it's  
15 well under the scrutiny of the board.

16 MR. PARDO: So, let's see, the last item --

17 MR. RIESCO: Yeah, that's part of that,  
18 that strategy. The proportional analysis is in  
19 another part of the Code. When you have an  
20 opening in a building, there's a certain width  
21 and height proportions and relationship that  
22 has to be maintained.

23 So, again, I think that's inherent already,  
24 but if you want to fine tune it some more --

25 MR. PARDO: The only thing here, Number 12,

116

1 which is the last item before Level 2, is that  
2 when applicable, complete the undergrounding of  
3 existing and new overhead utilities, et cetera.

4 I want to bring up Publix for just a  
5 minute. Undergrounding was required. But then  
6 the question became, adjacent to the building,  
7 three blocks down. You know, it gets to the  
8 point -- I remember those people were  
9 shell-shocked, because it was not just adjacent  
10 to their property, it was like going down the  
11 street.

12 MR. RIESCO: That's Public Works --

13 MR. PARDO: No. No. This is -- it says,  
14 "Underground utilities." This is one of the  
15 things you can check off, underground  
16 utilities. "When applicable" -- complete one  
17 of the few things that has nothing to do with  
18 the style of architecture, that I agree with,  
19 because you want to get those wires down and  
20 all of that, right.

21 So it says, "When applicable, complete the  
22 undergrounding of the existing and new overhead  
23 utilities along all public realm adjacent to  
24 the building site." I think that's the way it  
25 should be written. But how did we request so

117

1 the nature of the beast here in the City.

2 MR. PARDO: One of the things is that --

3 MR. RIESCO: We don't control that. That's  
4 a negotiation that's done.

5 MR. PARDO: Even on Glenn Pratt's project,  
6 there was an issue of a bulb out --

7 MR. RIESCO: I'm not saying it's right or  
8 wrong.

9 MR. PARDO: -- whether, you know, that was  
10 required at the last -- not the last minute,  
11 but, you know, at the end, and they were kind  
12 of squirrely about it, because they didn't  
13 know what it was going to cost.

14 MR. RIESCO: Uh-huh. It's a huge impact.

15 MR. PARDO: Right. So one of those things  
16 that, you know, when you're working, you know,  
17 with the developer, when you're working, you  
18 know, with the applicant, you know, kind -- in  
19 my opinion, it's kind of (unintelligible).

20 And by the way, like I said, I was in  
21 Boston recently, all of their mobility lanes  
22 are green. Every single one is painted green.  
23 And I don't think we have a standardized yet  
24 here. But just so you know, Boston has them  
25 green everywhere. I took pictures.

119

1 much more from Publix on the undergrounding  
2 there?

3 MS. GARCIA: Because that was a public  
4 benefit that was suggested by Staff. So they  
5 had a PAD, and they were going to have the  
6 south side of the street that didn't have any  
7 windows or doors facing the street --

8 MR. PARDO: Now I understand.

9 MR. RIESCO: Which Publix are we talking  
10 about?

11 MS. GARCIA: The one over here.

12 MR. RIESCO: On Le Jeune?

13 MS. GARCIA: Uh-huh.

14 MR. BEHAR: But there are some cases where  
15 projects -- Public Works requires that the  
16 utilities extended beyond --

17 MR. RIESCO: Yeah, like watermains, fire  
18 lines. That's done all of the time.

19 MR. BEHAR: But, Juan, I did a project that  
20 the watermain extension was a mile away, and  
21 that's the burden of the developer?

22 MR. RIESCO: Yeah.

23 MR. BEHAR: Really?

24 MR. RIESCO: That's the price you pay for  
25 building big projects. You know, that's just

118

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, that's what  
2 we -- if I recall, the last meeting we had, we  
3 were talking about standardizing -- suggesting  
4 to the Commission to standardize a mobility  
5 lane.

6 MR. RIESCO: Mobility is the bike lane?

7 MR. PARDO: Yeah, the bike lane.

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We were thinking about  
9 mobility, because, in today's society, it's  
10 more than bikes. You've got scooters, you've  
11 got anything else.

12 MR. RIESCO; Right.

13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But it should be  
14 standardized, so one project doesn't have it  
15 green, the other one has it yellow or so on and  
16 so forth. You know, it should be looked at.

17 MR. RIESCO: So, Felix, I guess your  
18 question is, is the sentence correct the way it  
19 is or do you want to modify it?

20 MR. PARDO: No, no, I think it's correct  
21 the way it is.

22 MR. RIESCO: Me, too.

23 MR. PARDO: But I wanted to ask Staff,  
24 because of, you know, a couple of recent  
25 applicants, where, you know, they --

120

1 MR. RIESCO: -- extended beyond the site,  
2 the building site?

3 MR. PARDO: Well, I mean, by the time it  
4 gets here, it becomes a condition, and then,  
5 you know, the applicant is flatfooted because  
6 they --

7 MR. RIESCO: -- didn't anticipate it --

8 MR. PARDO: Yeah, and they were -- I don't  
9 know if it was a reasonable reason for them to  
10 have heartburn or not, but they were definitely  
11 not happy. And the point is that I want to  
12 make sure, after Staff explained that because  
13 of the PAD, they could ask, you know -- and I  
14 get it, you know. Now I understand. So the  
15 wording here is consistent with that. And  
16 Mr. Chairman, that basically is Level 1.

17 On Level 2, I promise, I have just a few  
18 comments. And one of the things that we didn't  
19 discuss prior to is the -- we kind of discussed  
20 it the last time, and that was the Best  
21 Practices Manual, on Page 6, Number 1.

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Page 6 or Page 19,  
23 Number 1?

24 MR. PARDO: Page Number 6, Number 1, which  
25 is the prerequisites table.

1 MR. PARDO: So I'd like to jump forward to  
2 Page 24 of the Coral Gables Mediterranean  
3 Architecture Design (A). So I said that --  
4 like I said publicly the last time, that there  
5 should be pictured examples and put on the  
6 City's website of each one of these examples.

7 MS. GARCIA: Yes. I'll still provide the  
8 same website,

9 CoralGables.com/MediterraneanDesign. All of  
10 these pictures, of all of these buildings, will  
11 be there, if not plans accompanied with them,  
12 elevations, to be able to help architects.

13 MR. PARDO: Perfect. Thank you very much.

14 MR. KAWALERSKI: You know, also, the last  
15 time, Brett Gillis, a resident, had a  
16 suggestion for including another building or  
17 two as good examples.

18 MR. RIESCO: That we looked at?

19 MS. GARCIA: Yes. So that was discussed  
20 with the Board of Architects. They reviewed  
21 that, and mentioned other images, like he said,  
22 to take out and remove --

23 MR. RIESCO: Yeah, We went through that  
24 whole list and we vetted the Brett Gillis  
25 projects, the projects that were there, and I

1 So, in here, it says, on the upper  
2 right-hand portion of the page, "Precedence  
3 appropriate to the proposed building shall be  
4 referred visually as provided in the Best  
5 Practice Manual or documented in the Historic  
6 American Building Survey." I think that --  
7 that it should be online, not only for the  
8 applicant, the owner, the Board of Architects,  
9 everybody -- the public.

10 MR. BEHAR: It is online.

11 MS. GARCIA: Yeah. It's on  
12 CoralGables.com/MediterraneanDesign. You'll  
13 find it there.

14 MR. PARDO: It is there?

15 MS. GARCIA: Yes.

16 MR. PARDO: And, then, also --

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before we continue, if  
18 we can, for the record, let's show that Javier  
19 Salman, Board Member, has joined us. I thank  
20 you for coming.

21 MR. PARDO: Were you able to put up all of  
22 your shutters?

23 MR. SALMAN: Luckily, I don't have to, but  
24 I was at a Commission Meeting, and so it went  
25 long.

1 think we came to the conclusion of, this is the  
2 final list. Yeah. I don't recall if Brett's  
3 project made it or not. I know they looked at  
4 it and they discussed it. Do you remember?

5 MS. GARCIA: Palm Beach --

6 MR. RIESCO: There was a Palm Beach  
7 project.

8 MS. GARCIA: What's it called?

9 MR. RIESCO: The Palm Beach Town Hall? Is  
10 that it?

11 MS. GARCIA: No. No. No. It's not on  
12 here.

13 MR. RIESCO: No, it's not in there. We did  
14 look at it. Javier, we did review it and  
15 said --

16 MR. SALMAN: Juan, can you, as an  
17 architect, come in with your own example for  
18 review?

19 MR. RIESCO: You can do whatever you want  
20 as an applicant, yeah.

21 MR. SALMAN: Yes, exactly. These are just  
22 suggestions, but the architect might find  
23 something different he can come in with, so --

24 MR. RIESCO: Absolutely, you can bring in  
25 whatever you feel is appropriate, and the board

1 will judge it and you'll hear the answer.  
 2 MR. SALMAN: Right.  
 3 MR. KAWALERSKI: But regarding the examples  
 4 of Brett Gillis, I mean, we should get back to  
 5 him or, you know, acknowledge what he  
 6 suggested. Do you know if that was included?  
 7 MS. GARCIA: Yeah. So that was the same  
 8 list that we had gone through back in May, I  
 9 believe, at the Board of Architects.  
 10 MR. RIESCO: Yeah, that was months ago.  
 11 MR. KAWALERSKI: Okay. And they're  
 12 included in here?  
 13 MS. GARCIA: Not all of them are included,  
 14 because the board did not feel comfortable with  
 15 all of them.  
 16 MR. RIESCO: Right.  
 17 MR. KAWALERSKI: I think he only suggested  
 18 two.  
 19 MR. PARDO: Could you be kind enough to  
 20 write him a response?  
 21 MR. RIESCO: Sure.  
 22 MR. PARDO: You know, coming from the BOA,  
 23 through Staff, you know, because he did take  
 24 the time to do that, and I think it's  
 25 important.

1 And the other thing is that, the only  
 2 objection I have is the San Sebastian  
 3 Apartments. I know that they're simplified.  
 4 They are historic. The proportions are there,  
 5 that is part of the history of the cardboard  
 6 college. As you know, the University of Miami  
 7 was literally on the site of what is today the  
 8 Coral Gables War Memorial Youth Center, and the  
 9 housing was that.  
 10 MR. RIESCO: Right.  
 11 MR. PARDO: And I think that it may not be  
 12 the most ornate, it may not have been, you  
 13 know, blessed at that time, but I think that  
 14 the historical context of that building is  
 15 extremely important, as simple as it is. You  
 16 know, it doesn't have the push in and out, et  
 17 cetera, but it does have several --  
 18 MR. RIESCO: The board looked at that and  
 19 had that discussion and we understand  
 20 historically the significance of the building,  
 21 but I think the board looked at it from an  
 22 aesthetic perspective and the characteristics  
 23 of what's there, and deemed it that it  
 24 wasn't -- I don't know if to say, appropriate,  
 25 but we felt there was other projects or

1 buildings that were more impactful, in terms of  
 2 showing someone what we expect and what the  
 3 City wants, and we felt that the San Sebastian  
 4 wasn't up to par, in terms of design --  
 5 affinity or design aesthetics, wasn't at the  
 6 top of its game.  
 7 Again, that was a decision collectively by  
 8 the board. We voted as a board, and some  
 9 people --  
 10 MR. PARDO: Keep in mind that that building  
 11 survived the 1926 hurricane, but the cardboard  
 12 college did not.  
 13 MR. RIESCO: Yeah. I would be happy to  
 14 discuss it with the board again, but we went  
 15 through that, and we vetted it, and everybody  
 16 voted.  
 17 MR. PARDO: And the reason, as minimalist  
 18 as it is, based on the times and the whatever,  
 19 in all sincerity, I think it's also going to be  
 20 important in the future to be able to preserve  
 21 that building historically. I think that's  
 22 something that maybe the board was not  
 23 calculating that.  
 24 MS. GARCIA: Not historical --  
 25 MR. PARDO: And I also had a separate

1 conversation, after the meeting, with the Chair  
 2 and --  
 3 MR. RIESCO: Historical?  
 4 MR. PARDO: No, no, with the BOA Chair, and  
 5 she truly believed that it was something that  
 6 it wouldn't hurt to have on the list. That's  
 7 my opinion. Everybody else here is --  
 8 MR. RIESCO: No, and, again, we've had this  
 9 discussion at the board level, during meetings.  
 10 You know, we have projects that come in, at a  
 11 residential scale, that are historically  
 12 designated, and -- I want to say this in a  
 13 proper way, without hurting anybody's feeling,  
 14 but some historical projects are significant  
 15 and important because of the historical value  
 16 of what happened there, and some projects are  
 17 aesthetically important, and I think the charge  
 18 of the board, again, is always aesthetics and  
 19 what it conveys and what it portrays and what  
 20 it looks like, and we felt that the San  
 21 Sebastian didn't really meet that standard.  
 22 Again, it was a mixed vote. It wasn't  
 23 unanimous. We voted. I think it was four to  
 24 three or five to two, I forget what the vote --  
 25 I have a record of it -- but we debated it, we



1 discussed it thoroughly, we brought up the  
2 issue of the historical significance of the  
3 building and it should be there, but  
4 aesthetically, what does it convey to a  
5 developer or architect that's trying to  
6 understand the essence of Mediterranean design,  
7 and we felt that that particular project did  
8 not meet that standard, and so based on the  
9 list that we had, we felt that that one was not  
10 at that level. So we opted not to vote for it,  
11 but I can always go back to the board and  
12 reiterate.

13 If you feel that that's significant, then I  
14 would be happy to entertain another discussion.  
15 That's not a problem, but that's what  
16 transpired.

17 MR. PARDO: And as you said, you know,  
18 these are examples which are, I think,  
19 important to everyone. They're examples. And  
20 I just -- you know, I could just envision some  
21 time in the future someone saying, "You know  
22 we're going to knock it down, and even the BOA  
23 threw it in the garage can." So it's going to  
24 be on you, Juan.

25 MR. RIESCO: No, we didn't throw it in the

129

1 garbage can. We just felt it wasn't to the  
2 level of the other projects. It's a different  
3 program --

4 MR. PARDO: And again, once you put it into  
5 the proper perspective with the cardboard  
6 college, I think you're right.

7 MR. RIESCO: Yeah. I mean, we did our job.  
8 We looked at it. We vetted it. We talked  
9 about it. We argued about it. And at the end  
10 of the day, a decision was made and it didn't  
11 pass. It didn't make the vote, so that's all I  
12 can tell you at this point. But I'd be happy  
13 to do it again, if that's important to you.

14 MR. PARDO: I appreciate it.

15 MR. RIESCO: It's not like we missed it.  
16 That's what I'm trying to tell you. You know,  
17 we did focus on it.

18 MR. PARDO: I got it.

19 In Level 2 bonuses, on Page 19, do you have  
20 any example on (A), on the minimum open space?  
21 It says, "The total square footage received  
22 from the building lot coverage increase is  
23 provided as publicly accessible street level  
24 open space and" -- do you have an example of  
25 that?

130

1 MS. GARCIA: We can provide that.

2 MR. PARDO: Yeah, because for me, it was  
3 difficult to understand.

4 MS. GARCIA: Yeah. So, basically, right  
5 now, there's no maximum building lot coverage,  
6 and we felt like that's kind of unfair. There  
7 should be some kind of benefit for the public,  
8 to be able to maximize your building to the  
9 setbacks. So, in exchange, we're trying to  
10 allocate some of that land, right, for the  
11 public, but, yeah, we can provide that study,  
12 that's fine.

13 MR. PARDO: Thank you.

14 And, then, the minimum square footage --  
15 (B), "The minimum square footage of open space  
16 shall be 400 square feet," how is that  
17 determined? It just so happens that 400 feet  
18 was done in the original one 40 years ago. Was  
19 that like pulled out of there kind of thing?

20 MS. GARCIA: I think 400 square feet is  
21 also the minimum amount for open space -- maybe  
22 it's 500, actually, now that I'm thinking about  
23 it. It's four or five hundred. So we can  
24 double-check and make sure it's consistent with  
25 the minimum open space.

131

1 MR. PARDO: I'm just trying to understand  
2 where the number came from, you know, and how  
3 it's applied.

4 On Page 25, (B), The Multi-Family  
5 residential density bonus, it's 25 percent.

6 MS. GARCIA: That's the existing language  
7 right now that's taken out of the -- I think it  
8 was Table 3 and put in as a standard provision  
9 in the Code.

10 MR. PARDO: Okay.

11 MS. GARCIA: So the language is the same.

12 MR. PARDO: And, then, (C), Exclusion from  
13 height --

14 MS. GARCIA: That's also right now in -- I  
15 think it's being relocated from one of the  
16 tables in the Code.

17 MR. PARDO: So talking about the CBD, the  
18 last three lines there --

19 MS. GARCIA: Uh-huh.

20 MR. PARDO: -- it seems like it says,  
21 "Shall exceed a height of more than 25 feet  
22 above the roof. Such exclusion shall be  
23 subject to the provisions that no structure  
24 shall exceed a height of more than 25 feet  
25 above the roof, except for mixed-use buildings

132

1 in the CBD, where no such structure shall  
2 exceed more than one-third of the allowable  
3 total height."

4 MS. GARCIA: Right. Because right now,  
5 that's existing language in the Med Bonus.

6 MR. PARDO: Right. So let's talk about  
7 that for a minute.

8 What is the tallest building in the CBD  
9 today?

10 MR. BEHAR: Actually, it's the Codina  
11 Building, 200 --

12 MS. GARCIA: -- 5 feet.

13 MR. BEHAR: 205.

14 MR. PARDO: 205.

15 MS. GARCIA: It's not there yet, though,  
16 but, yes, it will be.

17 MR. BEHAR: It's pretty close.

18 MR. PARDO: Yeah.

19 So if you do the math, the additional  
20 height is --

21 MR. BEHAR: One-third.

22 MR. PARDO: That's a lot.

23 MR. BEHAR: 80 feet.

24 MR. RIESCO: 75 feet.

25 MR. PARDO: I think that's a mistake. I

133

1 adding a third on top of this, I find it  
2 offensive. I don't want to be -- I could tell  
3 the joke, but I'll get in trouble.

4 MR. KAWALERSKI: Say it.

5 MR. PARDO: But I don't want to be on Krome  
6 Avenue and be able to see the top of one of  
7 these buildings in Coral Gables. It's  
8 ridiculous. There's no need for it,  
9 architecturally and proportionally.

10 Robert, am I missing something?

11 MR. BEHAR: No. When you analyze it like  
12 that, one-third of the total height may be more  
13 than you need to -- I don't know what that  
14 number is, but, before, it was 25 feet, right?

15 MS. GARCIA: No. Right now, that one-third  
16 language is already in the Med Bonus. It's  
17 already allowed.

18 MR. BEHAR: I mean, I don't know, I wish  
19 Javier and Peter could opine, based on this, as  
20 architects. What exactly can you, then, do  
21 within that one-third of the distance, you  
22 know, height?

23 MS. GARCIA: Architectural features,  
24 towers. It's not habitable space.

25 MR. PARDO: A copula.

135

1 don't say you made a mistake. I say, this  
2 Board should consider that. I mean, that is --  
3 in my opinion, that's unbelievable. See, and  
4 this is -- again, nothing personal, but, I  
5 mean, this is like, well, we copy, we paste, we  
6 copy, we paste, but let's think about what it  
7 looks like.

8 You take a 200-foot high building -- 205,  
9 and then you add another one-third on top of  
10 it, you're going to minimize the Biltmore.

11 MS. GARCIA: I think the calculation was  
12 that it would still be underneath the Biltmore,  
13 which is, I think, at 315 feet or somewhere  
14 around there.

15 MR. PARDO: I'm sorry, let's throw in there  
16 now, just for conversation, Live Local Act.  
17 How is that going to look, with a third on top  
18 of that?

19 MS. GARCIA: Live Local Act can only go up  
20 to the maximum height that we have in the City,  
21 though.

22 MR. PARDO: Within a mile.

23 MS. GARCIA: Within the City, yes.

24 MR. PARDO: Within the jurisdiction. But I  
25 think that the proportion of taking this and

134

1 MS. GARCIA: A very tall copula.

2 MR. BEHAR: I mean, do you need to be  
3 one-third? I mean, I don't know. Honestly,  
4 me, no. To answer, you don't need to have --

5 MR. RIESCO: So this is only an exception  
6 for the CBD.

7 MS. GARCIA: Correct.

8 MR. PARDO: Yes.

9 MR. RIESCO: The normal requirement is a  
10 maximum of 25 feet above the roof line.

11 MS. GARCIA: Right. That height is very  
12 limiting.

13 MR. PARDO: Think about this one. So now,  
14 in the CBD area, you have Alhambra, you have  
15 Miracle Mile, you have Ponce. Those are the  
16 three widest arteries in the CBD area. Now  
17 you're going to be on the interior lots,  
18 interior right-of-ways, which are substantially  
19 smaller.

20 What, on earth, are you accomplishing by  
21 putting something that's disproportionate, on  
22 top of a building, which makes absolutely no  
23 sense?

24 MR. KAWALERSKI: Why was this in here to  
25 begin with?

136

1 MS. GARCIA: The Board of Architect is  
2 going to review it, so if it seems absurd, if  
3 (unintelligible) and it's a third and it looks  
4 like it's out of proportion, I'm assuming the  
5 Board of Architects --

6 MR. RIESCO: Yeah, we'll chime in at the  
7 right-of-way.

8 MR. PARDO: But wait a minute. Wait a  
9 minute. No. No. No. I think that it should  
10 be limited to what it is everywhere else.

11 MR. RIESCO: 25 feet.

12 MR. PARDO: Why would it be different in  
13 the CBD? Is it to stroke somebody's ego? I  
14 don't get it.

15 MR. RIESCO: No, I think that's just a left  
16 over sentence from years gone by.

17 MR. PARDO: No. I think, this is why we're  
18 here, right?

19 MR. RIESCO: I know that's not something  
20 that we discussed or requested or --

21 MR. PARDO: I mean, the 25 feet of this  
22 area -- if you look at Allen Morris' new  
23 project --

24 MS. GARCIA: Allen Morris' project, if you  
25 count above the 114 feet -- how much was it?

137

1 MS. LONGO: I think -- I don't recall, but  
2 107 or 109.

3 MS. GARCIA: Okay. I thought it was 115,  
4 but the top --

5 MR. KAWALERSKI: Yeah. Yeah.

6 MR. SALMAN: With everything on top of  
7 it --

8 MS. GARCIA: No, it's 186 or something,  
9 yes, with the architectural features.

10 MR. RIESCO: It goes to 186?

11 MS. GARCIA: Yes, for the tower.

12 MR. BEHAR: No, that's not 190 at all.

13 MR. PARDO: No way, no how.

14 MS. GARCIA: Proportionally, it goes high,  
15 yes.

16 MR. RIESCO: I remember that was a  
17 discussion.

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: In order to move  
19 forward, whatever it is --

20 MR. RIESCO: I agree with Felix on this  
21 one.

22 MR. PARDO: I'm recommending it's 25 feet,  
23 end of story.

24 MR. KAWALERSKI: Yeah, let's get through  
25 it.

139

1 MR. SALMAN: I think it's 143 total or  
2 something like that.

3 MS. GARCIA: No, it's 190 total -- 180  
4 something total.

5 MR. BEHAR: Which would be, the one on  
6 Alhambra --

7 MR. SALMAN: The new one.

8 MR. PARDO: The new one that's going up.  
9 (Simultaneous speaking.)

10 MR. SALMAN: No, we're talking about the  
11 one on Ponce and University.

12 MR. RIESCO: Isn't that the 10 stories?

13 MS. GARCIA: Yeah, the new one.

14 MS. SUAREZ: So the court reporter can't  
15 take this down if everyone's talking over each  
16 other.

17 MR. BEHAR: No, guaranteed that's -- he  
18 came originally at 190 and we rejected and went  
19 back.

20 MR. KAWALERSKI: Right.

21 MR. RIESCO: The 10 stories --

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I thought it was 109  
23 or something.

24 MR. KAWALERSKI: Like 130, isn't it? You  
25 know, don't you?

138

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. That's your  
2 recommendation.

3 MR. PARDO: The third is out the door.

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Felix --

5 MR. PARDO: I have one last comment --

6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So the recommendation  
7 is 25 feet right now.

8 MR. BEHAR: That may not be sufficient,  
9 depending on the project, but I agree with you,  
10 one-third is excessive. But maybe 25 feet, for  
11 other projects, may not be sufficient.

12 MR. SALMAN: Honestly, it should be a  
13 function of the right-of-way in front of it and  
14 the lot area that they have, because -- I mean,  
15 25 feet may be nothing, if you have an entire  
16 block, but it would be pretty significant if  
17 you have a 50 by 100 foot lot, you know.

18 MR. PARDO: In my opinion, I think the BOA  
19 should help Staff in coming up with a right  
20 proportion and a right maximum on the thing. I  
21 don't have a problem with that, but I think  
22 one-third is absurd.

23 MR. SALMAN: I completely agree.

24 MR. PARDO: Okay.

25 MR. SALMAN: All I'm saying is, it should

140

1 be tied -- it should go back to the Board of  
2 Architects to come up with a formula based on  
3 the frontage and the lot area that they're  
4 looking at developing, so that it works out as  
5 a function and nobody has to break their head  
6 about it.

7 MR. RIESCO: That's fine.

8 Yeah, I think it's a product of the  
9 building, the design, the mass.

10 MR. SALMAN: Juan, I'm talking about  
11 frontage and the footprint of the building  
12 working together to achieve that maximum, all  
13 right, and it needs to be some sort of  
14 function.

15 MR. PARDO: And, then, the last page, 27,  
16 Article 16, why was that added, the term,  
17 "Precedent means a building structure  
18 element -- "

19 MS. GARCIA: Not everyone knows what a  
20 precedent means. It's mentioned a lot in our  
21 tables, so we had to define it, so that they  
22 understand it's an example of a building that's  
23 used for -- by an architect to -- whatever the  
24 definition is. "A building structure element  
25 of a design that's used by an architect." Not

141

1 it is to say, you know, precedent as used in  
2 the Zoning Code.

3 MS. SUAREZ: This is in the definition  
4 section. So that's why it's -- this would be  
5 plugged into the definition section of the  
6 Zoning Code.

7 MR. PARDO: No, I understand, but what I'm  
8 trying to say is that it's an architectural  
9 historic precedent, correct, or am I incorrect?

10 MS. GARCIA: Architectural precedent. I'm  
11 not sure using the word historic, if they're  
12 not a historic buildings, because that are  
13 plenty of buildings that are in here that are  
14 not historic.

15 MR. PARDO: You just said that the Coral  
16 Gables Mediterranean architectural design, all  
17 applicants who -- shall be required to satisfy  
18 all, include the proportional systems as  
19 defined in the Best Practices -- where is the  
20 word used, precedent, there?

21 MS. GARCIA: It's used, I think, in the  
22 prerequisites, if I remember correctly.

23 MR. PARDO: Where is that?

24 MS. GARCIA: Mediterranean precedence,  
25 Number 2 on Page 6, under the prerequisite. It

143

1 everyone knows what a precedent is.

2 MS. SUAREZ: It wasn't previously defined,  
3 so now it's defined.

4 MR. PARDO: Right, but I think it's -- when  
5 you look at the way it's used legally, it's --  
6 and you look at this definition, it's kind  
7 of -- you know, maybe there should be  
8 another --

9 MS. GARCIA: Architectural precedent, you  
10 mean?

11 MS. SUAREZ: Yeah. I think the definition  
12 defines that it is. It's not -- we're not  
13 talking about a legal precedent. We're talking  
14 about a building structure element of design  
15 that is used by an architect as an example or  
16 guide," so that it's clear now.

17 MR. PARDO: So the precedent, you mean, are  
18 the examples that you have there?

19 MS. SUAREZ: Yes.

20 MR. PARDO: Right? The pictorial ones --

21 MS. GARCIA: Yes.

22 MR. PARDO: Okay. In my opinion, I think  
23 it should be architectural historic precedence,  
24 you know, for the definition, you know, and --  
25 or -- you know, and maybe the way to simplify

142

1 should be highlighted. It's precedence --  
2 Mediterranean precedence appropriate for the  
3 proposed building. It uses the word,  
4 precedence, throughout this section.

5 MS. SUAREZ: So this is an area that, when  
6 we were reviewing these changes and we were  
7 going through them and making changes, we saw  
8 that there was a need to define the term, so  
9 this would provide a definition for the term.

10 MR. PARDO: Yeah. I'm reading that,  
11 "Precedence appropriate for proposed buildings  
12 shall be referenced visually as provided in the  
13 Best Practices Manual." That's --

14 MS. GARCIA: So it's up to the board.  
15 They'll have a sheet or a board that has their  
16 different precedence, their example buildings,  
17 that they're using details and designs from, in  
18 the proposed building.

19 MR. PARDO: No, I understand. I'm just  
20 saying, when you look at the definition, you  
21 look at -- you know, you look at this -- I  
22 mean, I think there's a leap between the two.  
23 I don't think it's articulated the way you were  
24 intending to use it, in my opinion. I just  
25 think that maybe -- either say -- if you say --

144

1 MS. SUAREZ: Are you concerned about the  
2 term that we're using, precedent, or the  
3 definition?

4 MR. PARDO: No, I'm concerned with, for  
5 example -- here, this is a perfect example, on  
6 Page 6. "Precedence is appropriate based on  
7 the Best Practices Manual," that -- the Best  
8 Practices Manual and the examples of the  
9 buildings on Page 24-A, right, all of those  
10 examples -- I think that's what you're  
11 intending to be the precedent, but when you go  
12 back to the Best Practices Manual and the  
13 Historical American Building Survey, none of  
14 those are precedence.

15 MS. GARCIA: Those examples of those 20  
16 something buildings are going to be in the Best  
17 Practice Manual, and -- diagramed, to show  
18 what --

19 MR. PARDO: You're going to put them in  
20 there?

21 MS. GARCIA: Yes. Correct.

22 MR. PARDO: I missed that, because I've  
23 been asking for that. Okay. So it will be in  
24 the Best Practices?

25 MS. GARCIA: Yeah, just like today.

145

1 using it, to everybody be on the same page.

2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So your concern is  
3 that it's not simplified enough or doesn't  
4 point to a specific --

5 MR. PARDO: I don't think it's clear  
6 enough.

7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.

8 MR. PARDO: I don't think it's clear  
9 enough, and I think it can be made clear, and,  
10 you know, we don't have to throw the baby out  
11 with the bath water.

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, I'm sure Staff  
13 welcomes your input on that.

14 MR. PARDO: Those are all of my comments.

15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

16 Javier, any -- I know you didn't get the  
17 benefit of --

18 MR. SALMAN: I didn't get the benefit of  
19 the previous discussion. So far, the comments  
20 that I've heard are similar to the ones I had.  
21 So I'm assuming that those -- the ones I had  
22 were incorporated.

23 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, if you could  
24 explain to Javier what we're doing for the next  
25 meeting.

147

1 MR. PARDO: So, then, if you go back to the  
2 definition, "Precedence refers to the building,  
3 structures or elements as shown in the Best  
4 Practice Manuals" --

5 MS. SUAREZ: It's not limited to that,  
6 right, Jennifer?

7 MS. GARCIA: Right.

8 MS. SUAREZ: The intent was not to limit it  
9 just to that, because precedence doesn't just  
10 mean the buildings.

11 MS. GARCIA: Yeah. We may not have  
12 everything, all 26 buildings, in the Best  
13 Practice Manual. We will definitely try to,  
14 because right now we only have eight buildings  
15 in there and we're going to add more --

16 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, in order not to  
17 stand this up, I'm going to -- I would like to  
18 just take a look at it and maybe bring it up  
19 the next time, and possibly come up with some  
20 verbiage that both, Staff and the BOA and  
21 Legal, can agree to the thing.

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That's fine.

23 MR. PARDO: I just want it to be simple,  
24 for, you know, the architects and the  
25 developers and land use attorneys that are

146

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: At the next meeting,  
2 since we didn't have enough people here at this  
3 meeting, there were several options that we  
4 decided. One was to go ahead --

5 MR. PARDO: He left at 5:30.

6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: To just go ahead and  
7 cancel the meeting, which we didn't. The other  
8 one was to proceed with the meeting and not  
9 necessarily make a recommendation at this time,  
10 because we didn't have a complete Board, and  
11 the Members that missed, they'd be able to look  
12 at the minutes and see what was talked about.

13 MR. SALMAN: Okay. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You're welcome.

15 The question that I have is, if you look at  
16 Page 6, which would be under -- let me just go  
17 there. Page 6, under the pre --

18 MR. PARDO: Prerequisites.

19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- the prerequisites  
20 table, correct, Item Number 3, "Exclusions from  
21 height, the following shall be excluded,"  
22 everything there is --

23 MS. GARCIA: Has been relocated.

24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- stricked out.

25 MS. GARCIA: That's what we just read

148

1 about, yes.  
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Can we go to  
 3 the --  
 4 MS. GARCIA: That's where the one-third of  
 5 the allowable to -- I'm sorry, total building  
 6 height in the CBD, that's where all of that  
 7 came from. That's why it's struck through.  
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. And can you  
 9 guide me to where you relocated it, please?  
 10 MS. GARCIA: It's in (Unintelligible)  
 11 provision, under C, on Page 26.  
 12 MS. SUAREZ: That's the section we were  
 13 just discussing about the one-third, et cetera.  
 14 That language was already in there, but in a  
 15 table.  
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That language is in  
 17 there, okay. Perfect.  
 18 MR. PARDO: We cleaned it up.  
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yeah. I'm good. I  
 20 mean, everything has been really covered, that  
 21 we spoke about.  
 22 Juan, you know, really, your input, you  
 23 know, coming here, really helped us out to  
 24 clarify a lot, and, honestly, Gus coming here,  
 25 to clarify a lot of misconception that was with

149

1 the Board of Architects, I think shed a lot of  
 2 light. For me it did, and I'm sure for the  
 3 other Board Members.  
 4 MS. SUAREZ: Mr. Chair, if you'd allow me,  
 5 just going back to that clarification that Gus  
 6 made, and I want to avoid further -- or maybe  
 7 perhaps manage expectations a little bit, you  
 8 know, we discussed how it would be appropriate  
 9 for the Board of Architects to look at the  
 10 compatibility and determine that a particular  
 11 design is not compatible at the proposed  
 12 height, but I want to just make it clear, I  
 13 don't think it would be appropriate for the  
 14 Board of Architects to say, you know, in this  
 15 particular location, a hundred foot building  
 16 could never be compatible. It would be, this  
 17 design, that's a hundred foot high, is not  
 18 compatible, this design.  
 19 There could be, perhaps, another design  
 20 that would be. I just want to make sure that  
 21 nuance is clear.  
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It is. Gus made it,  
 23 actually, very clear with his examples and so  
 24 forth. Thank you.  
 25 Any other comments from the Board on this

150

1 at this time?  
 2 Go ahead, Felix.  
 3 MR. PARDO: I was just going to say, I'd  
 4 like to make a motion to continue this meeting,  
 5 to the next appropriate meeting, to be able to  
 6 have any additional comments from the Board  
 7 Members that weren't here for a portion of the  
 8 meeting, and then be able to discuss it and  
 9 then make a motion at that time.  
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You've got all of our  
 11 comments written down and the recommendations  
 12 that were made and the concerns --  
 13 MS. GARCIA: Yes.  
 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. I think  
 15 Jennifer has really been doing a great job of  
 16 keeping track of it, striking out, and keep  
 17 going.  
 18 MR. PARDO: And I think this was a very  
 19 good move, to have a Special Meeting  
 20 specifically for this, because, you know, you  
 21 can't be distracted by other applications or  
 22 other issues. This is too big of a discussion.  
 23 MR. BEHAR: When will the next meeting take  
 24 place?  
 25 MS. GARCIA: October 9.

151

1 MR. PARDO: Two weeks. Are you going to be  
 2 here?  
 3 MR. BEHAR: I may not be here.  
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I may not be here.  
 5 MR. PARDO: Okay. Can we explore the  
 6 possibility of moving that meeting or do you  
 7 need 30 days to do that?  
 8 THE SECRETARY: We advertised.  
 9 MS. GARCIA: We've mailed notice.  
 10 THE SECRETARY: And we mailed notice.  
 11 MR. PARDO: Okay. You mailed notice, okay.  
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You may want to  
 13 continue with the meeting, but you may want to  
 14 move this.  
 15 MR. PARDO: Right. And then what we could  
 16 do is possibly incorporate the other comments  
 17 from the members that were not here, and then  
 18 you guys can catch up --  
 19 MR. BEHAR: Well, I mean, the members that  
 20 were not here today was Julio --  
 21 MR. PARDO: Right.  
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And Chip missed some.  
 23 MR. BEHAR: -- missed some, and Javier.  
 24 MR. PARDO: Missed some, yeah.  
 25 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Then I guess we will

152

1 have to -- I was going to say, I will put on  
2 the table my vote already, just in case I'm not  
3 here, but --

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I don't think you can  
5 do that.

6 MS. SUAREZ: First of all, we don't have a  
7 motion, so you cannot do that.

8 MR. BEHAR: Because otherwise we're going  
9 to be -- when are we going to conclude?

10 MR. PARDO: In November.

11 MR. BEHAR: Wow. That's a long time.

12 MS. GARCIA: So we have some projects that  
13 are in the pipeline, that would be nice to be  
14 able to apply these new Mediterranean related  
15 regulations to.

16 MR. BEHAR: That's why I'm saying, I don't  
17 know if we could wait until November.

18 MR. PARDO: May I make a suggestion? Can  
19 we possibly have a second meeting, as we had  
20 today, in between the two next regular Planning  
21 Board meetings?

22 MR. BEHAR: I'm perfectly fine --

23 MR. PARDO: And, then, that way, we could  
24 bring it --

25 MR. SALMAN: I was going to suggest, why

153

1 So just get a range of the dates from right  
2 now. So it would be after the 17th and before  
3 the next meeting.

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I don't know my  
5 specific -- myself, at this time --

6 MR. BEHAR: Yeah, I'm here on the 16th.

7 MS. GARCIA: I think the 16th has a  
8 Board --

9 THE SECRETARY: Historic Preservation  
10 Board. Unless we have the meeting next door --  
11 unless we have meeting at 427.

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What about the week of  
13 the 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 25th.

14 MR. KAWALERSKI: I'm available.

15 MR. BEHAR: I'm available that week.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Can we go ahead and  
17 possibly leave it up to Staff, because they  
18 have to take a look if the room is available  
19 and so forth?

20 MR. PARDO: What were the dates again?  
21 Mr. Chairman, what were the dates --

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: October 21st, 22nd,  
23 23rd, 24th, 25th, that week.

24 MS. SUAREZ: So we have a Commission  
25 Meeting October 22nd. So that would not be

155

1 don't we just have, at the next scheduled  
2 meeting, coming earlier for it, because I don't  
3 think we got --

4 MR. PARDO: They're not going to be here  
5 for the next meeting.

6 MR. SALMAN: Oh, yeah, that's the next  
7 meeting. So we have to have a Special Meeting,  
8 Okay. Thank you.

9 MR. PARDO: If we have a second -- if  
10 everybody comes up to speed, and then you have  
11 a meeting a month from now, this secondary --  
12 this second, you know, Special Meeting, then we  
13 can tie a bow on this thing.

14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Agreed.

15 MR. PARDO: Do you want --

16 MR. SALMAN: Notice is -- the notice, it  
17 would be two weeks?

18 MS. GARCIA: No. This is just a legal ad,  
19 so, no, not two weeks, but I mean, pretty  
20 close, right, Jill, as far getting it to the  
21 newspaper and having it published?

22 THE SECRETARY: Just an example up there,  
23 if we have a meeting on the 17th, we meet the  
24 deadline for legal ad publishing.

25 MR. SALMAN: That's where I was heading.

154

1 ideal.

2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What about the 24th,  
3 which is a Thursday?

4 MR. RIESCO: I have a BOA meeting on the  
5 24th.

6 MS. GARCIA: The week before, the 15th, is  
7 that available?

8 MR. PARDO: And the 23rd is a Wednesday.  
9 So 23rd or 24th.

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Say that again,  
11 please.

12 MR. PARDO: The 23rd is a Wednesday.

13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I would just like to  
14 confirm exactly when I get back, if you guys  
15 are looking for me to be here on that. I'm  
16 assuming I will, on the 23rd, and that's why I  
17 did that.

18 MR. PARDO: Okay. Or if it makes it easier  
19 for you, the 24th, it's a Thursday and we  
20 can -- and I would suggest that we start at  
21 4:00, and if it only takes an hour, you know,  
22 we get it done.

23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Just a caution, even  
24 the following Tuesday, the 29th, to be safe --


25 MR. PARDO: Right. The 30th is impossible.

156

1 I have a Charter Review Committee on that day.  
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Tuesday, the 29th,  
 3 is -- I put out a text, but I haven't gotten a  
 4 response on my calendar, unfortunately.  
 5 MS. GARCIA: So we can send out some dates,  
 6 and I guess you can check your calendar and  
 7 make sure you're available.  
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Please.  
 9 MS. GARCIA: So somewhere around those two  
 10 or three weeks.  
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yeah. What I would  
 12 ask is, we're not supposed to do a reply to  
 13 all. So if everybody, when Jill puts out the  
 14 dates, if we can just reply to Jill, by  
 15 herself, per the Sunshine Laws.  
 16 THE SECRETARY: Excuse me, so it would  
 17 be -- to check for October 24th --  
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: 24th or possibly the  
 19 29th.  
 20 THE SECRETARY: And for 4:00 p.m., correct?  
 21 MS. GARCIA: Not for the 15th?  
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: No. I never said the  
 23 15th.  
 24 Do we need it at 4:00 p.m. at that point?  
 25 I mean, we've had extensive meetings on this.

1 Is there not a reason that we can't meet at six  
 2 o'clock?  
 3 MR. PARDO: Okay.  
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And finish by the nine  
 5 o'clock, if we had to go that late?  
 6 MR. BEHAR: I don't think it's going to  
 7 take very long.  
 8 MR. SALMAN: I agree.  
 9 MR. PARDO: Six o'clock it is.  
 10 MR. SALMAN: When can we get the minutes  
 11 for the meeting?  
 12 MS. GARCIA: About a week from now.  
 13 THE SECRETARY; Our turnaround time is 10  
 14 to 12 days.  
 15 MR. PARDO: Was this taped?  
 16 THE SECRETARY: Yeah, it's being taped,  
 17 yes. It's being recorded on Zoom, yes. I can  
 18 send you the link tomorrow morning.  
 19 MR. SALMAN: Okay. That's perfect. That  
 20 will help.  
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: To Zoom or YouTube?  
 22 THE SECRETARY: As well, yes.  
 23 MR. SALMAN: Okay. I just want to check it  
 24 against my notes and make sure we covered  
 25 everything.

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: All right. Is there a  
 2 motion to adjourn?  
 3 MR. BEHAR: I make a motion to adjourn.  
 4 THE SECRETARY: Excuse me, I didn't have a  
 5 second on the motion to continue.  
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That is correct. Who  
 7 made the motion to continue?  
 8 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Pardo.  
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Felix.  
 10 MR. BEHAR: I'll second it.  
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a second to  
 12 continue. Everybody in favor say aye.  
 13 (All Board Members voted aye.)  
 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Anybody against? No?  
 15 Motion to adjourn?  
 16 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion.  
 17 MR. SALMAN: Second.  
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Motion by Robert,  
 19 Second by Javier. All in favor say, aye.  
 20 (Board Members voted aye.)  
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, everybody,  
 22 for your time.  
 23 (Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned at  
 24 6:45 p.m.)  
 25 C E R T I F I C A T E

1  
 2 STATE OF FLORIDA:  
 3 SS.  
 4 COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:  
 5  
 6  
 7  
 8 I, NIEVES SANCHEZ, Court Reporter, and a Notary  
 9 Public for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby  
 10 certify that I was authorized to and did  
 11 stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and  
 12 that the transcript is a true and complete record of my  
 13 stenographic notes.  
 14  
 15 DATED this 2nd day of October, 2024.  
 16  
 17  
 18   
 19  
 20 -----  
 21 NIEVES SANCHEZ  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25