

1 MR. GRABIEL: I'd like to move --
 2 THE SECRETARY: Sorry, we need two separate
 3 motions.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Sorry. Thank you.
 5 MR. COLLER: We need one on E-2 first.
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Go ahead, Julio. So
 7 let's do E-1 first.
 8 MR. COLLER: No, E-2.
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Sorry. E-2 and E-3, I
 10 apologize.
 11 MR. COLLER: E-2 first.
 12 MR. GRABIEL: I'd like to move for approval
 13 for Item E-2.
 14 MR. WITHERS: I'll second it.
 15 MR. COLLER: That's in accordance with
 16 Department recommendation?
 17 MR. GRABIEL: Correct.
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: For the remote
 19 parking.
 20 We have a first. Chip went ahead and
 21 second.
 22 Any comments? No?
 23 Call the roll, please.
 24 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
 25 MR. WITHERS: Yes.

73

1 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 2 MR. BEHAR: Yeah.
 3 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiél?
 4 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 5 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
 6 MR. TORRE: Yes.
 7 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 9 The next is E-3, that has to do with the
 10 transfer of development rights. Is there a
 11 motion?
 12 MR. GRABIEL: I move for approval of E-3
 13 also.
 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: With the
 15 recommendation of Staff?
 16 MR. GRABIEL: Right.
 17 MR. WITHERS: Can I discuss -- just a
 18 question. Where are the development rights
 19 coming from, which structure?
 20 MR. COLLER: They identified it in the --
 21 MR. TORRE: 36 --
 22 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: 36 Phoenetia, the
 23 historic landmark -- actually the original
 24 homestead of the Douglas family, for whom
 25 Douglas Road is named after.

74

1 MR. WITHERS: I wanted to get that on the
 2 record.
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So Julio went ahead
 4 and made a motion. Robert second it.
 5 Any further discussion? No?
 6 Call the roll, please.
 7 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 8 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 9 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiél?
 10 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 11 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
 12 MR. TORRE: Yes.
 13 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
 14 MR. WITHERS: Yeah.
 15 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 17 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Thank you very much,
 18 Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. I hope you
 19 have a great evening.
 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 21 Next we have Item E-4 -- let's take --
 22 MR. COLLER: Do you want to take a little
 23 break?
 24 MR. BEHAR: No. No.
 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We can get it going.

75

1 MR. COLLER: Okay. I thought you were
 2 leaning --
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I was, but they're
 4 filing out quickly.
 5 MR. COLLER: Okay. Item E-4, an Ordinance
 6 of the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida
 7 providing for a text amendment to Article 2
 8 "Zoning Districts," Section 2-405 "Residential
 9 Infill Regulations Overlay District (RIR)" of
 10 the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code
 11 to provide a maximum building length of three
 12 hundred feet for all properties seeking
 13 approval pursuant to the Residential Infill
 14 Regulations; providing for severability,
 15 repeater, codification, and an effective date.
 16 Item E-4, public hearing.
 17 MS. GARCIA: Jennifer Garcia, City Planner.
 18 As you may remember, February of last year,
 19 actually, there was a project that brought some
 20 controversy because of the length of it. The
 21 Board actually -- I was hoping that Mr.
 22 Revuelta would be here, as it was his motion
 23 actually to advise the Commission to maybe add
 24 in some kind of limit, as far as the length of
 25 the buildings for this district.

76

1 That didn't move at the time, but now there
2 is a Commissioner -- actually, a Vice Mayor,
3 who wants to sponsor this text amendment. So
4 the text amendment, like you said, is limiting
5 the buildings within this district to be only
6 300 feet in length facing a street.

7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Why 300? Do you have
8 any type of presentation or PowerPoint?

9 MS. GARCIA: I do not, no. No, it's just
10 one sentence.

11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: How long was the one
12 we were arguing about --

13 MS. GARCIA: How long is, what?

14 MR. TORRE: It was from Salzedo to Le
15 Jeune, whatever that length is.

16 MS. GARCIA: Yes.

17 MR. TORRE: What is the length of that? Do
18 you know? Just the comparison --

19 MS. GARCIA: What length was that building?

20 MR. TORRE: Yeah, what would you say that
21 was?

22 MS. GARCIA: I think it was between five
23 and five fifty.

24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What I'd like to do
25 is, before we get into a discussion, let's find

77

1 So 300 feet -- can you do 300, then a 10-foot
2 break, and then do 200 and just call that two
3 buildings and there's 10 feet in between two
4 very close to the same looking buildings?

5 MS. GARCIA: Right.

6 MR. TORRE: Is that going to accomplish
7 anything?

8 MS. GARCIA: I think her intent here is to
9 limit the building development and have open
10 space.

11 MR. TORRE: But this doesn't do a lot of
12 that. I mean, there's no other requirements to
13 change the building design from one to the
14 other. You could just say, I'm going to do two
15 buildings, 250 and 250, and just call it a day
16 and nothing's happening.

17 MS. GARCIA: I think that was a very
18 special project that had specific --

19 MR. TORRE: No, I know, but this is trying
20 to fix it. I'm not sure this is doing much.

21 MR. BEHAR: And, actually, you could have
22 two buildings, right, abutting each other, with
23 no separation of 10 feet, and you're going to
24 accomplish the same thing. I'm not sure -- I
25 see the intent, and I think it could be good.

79

1 out -- is there anybody here from the public,
2 Jill, that's signed up?

3 THE SECRETARY: No.

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Anybody on Zoom or on
5 the phone platform?

6 THE SECRETARY: No.

7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: At this time, I'd like
8 to go ahead and close it for public comment and
9 open it up.

10 MS. GARCIA: So, to answer your question,
11 the 300 actually came from the City of Miami.
12 They have various similar regulations. They
13 require a break. I don't think they actually
14 use the word, link the building. And then
15 looking at past developments in the District
16 that are using the RIR, the Residential Infill
17 Regulations, they're all within that 300 feet.
18 All is, there's two of them.

19 MR. COLLER: I'm sorry, you need to lien
20 into your microphone.

21 MR. TORRE: Sorry.

22 To put things in context, the building was
23 about 500 feet?

24 MS. GARCIA: I believe so.

25 MR. TORRE: I'm going by my recollection.

78

1 The City of Miami has an open to the sky paseo
2 requirement, I believe, that then dictate --
3 and I believe the County also does it, and you
4 have to have a separation, but I don't know how
5 much can we impose, but --

6 MR. TORRE: I guess the condition is, if
7 the two parcels are owned by the same group of
8 individuals, then the additional requirements
9 may make a difference, but if you have two
10 different owners, and you make one carve out a
11 piece of it, and the other one may carve out a
12 piece of it, just to create this huge
13 courtyard, you're kind of --

14 MR. BEHAR: Venny, that's simply
15 circumvented. You have one entity that owns a
16 parcel and the other entity -- and the same
17 developer, and you don't have to adhere --

18 MR. TORRE: I see what you're saying.

19 MR. WITHERS: You just change your name.

20 MR. BEHAR: That's it.

21 MR. WITHERS: You guys are the expert on
22 how you -- I mean, I really -- I remember you
23 talking about Codina's building, and, you know,
24 the streetscape is so important, you know. We
25 don't care as much about 50, 60, 70 feet, as we

80

1 do walking down and seeing a blank wall. Is
2 there a way to architecturally clean it up, to
3 make it step back? Maybe every hundred feet it
4 has to setback 10 feet or something like that?

5 MS. GARCIA: Well, it's already a
6 requirement, in the Med Bonus, that it has to
7 be setback -- I think, if a building facade is
8 longer than 150, at 100 intervals, there has to
9 be some kind of vertical relief.

10 MR. BEHAR: I mean, I don't really think
11 there is some provision requirements that will
12 dictate that the building has the
13 articulation -- you know, breaking of the
14 facade. I understand the intent is not to have
15 the long 500 -- you know, the whole block, I
16 think it's like 500 feet from side to side.
17 How do we break it, you know, architecturally,
18 to be able to maybe read as two building, with
19 a break in the middle, you know?

20 MR. TORRE: Can I interrupt? I hope I'm
21 not going to take too much time from everybody,
22 but think this is important, because if we're
23 going to fix this -- and it's a very important
24 area, right? This is the North Ponce area. I
25 think we need to go back to why this

81

1 that didn't do the necessary -- you know, I did
2 have a project that I was abutting the back
3 with Miami-Dade County, okay, so there was no
4 opportunity to create a paseo. What are you
5 going to do, you know, the bridge to nowhere?

6 So I think -- I like the intent. I think
7 we need to maybe look at it, where there's more
8 specific requirements to achieve, you know, the
9 massiveness of a continuous building.

10 MS. GARCIA: So it requires the building
11 separation --

12 MR. BEHAR: I don't know if it's a
13 separation or -- I mean -- Jennifer, for me,
14 right now, you know -- and it might be my fault
15 for not reading the whole, but it needs to be
16 something that gives the developer a greater
17 opportunity.

18 MR. TORRE: Okay. Let's put logic here.
19 The one that -- let me go back. To assemble
20 something this large from Salzedo to Le Jeune,
21 two sides, 500 feet, you've got to put an
22 assemblage of 20 properties, 30 properties.
23 Between the one that got assembled or done, was
24 there one family that controls --

25 MS. GARCIA: I think it was one -- I think

83

1 Residential Infill Regulation really happened,
2 what was the intent that we're trying to
3 accomplish.

4 MR. BEHAR: To bring more density to that
5 area.

6 MR. TORRE: Density. And they did it in
7 these huge swaths of big, you can go ahead and
8 just do this block to block and we're going to
9 give you all of this, the extra density, and
10 there was no reason for dividing it up, at the
11 time, just go at it, go for it block to block.

12 MS. GARCIA: I think that that came out to
13 where maybe we should have limited it --

14 MR. TORRE: Right, but there was a
15 short-sided view saying, just go at it with
16 density, and there was no, hey, cut the block
17 up or have these other incentives. So, at this
18 point, we're sort of trying to fix the problem
19 that --

20 MR. BEHAR: But, you know, Venny, there are
21 requirements, that you have to have -- every
22 250 feet, you have to have a paseo. That is in
23 the Code today. There are provisions, you
24 know, that have to -- make you break it up. It
25 may be that one project, you know -- you know,

82

1 it was less than 20 properties.

2 MR. TORRE: It's still a substantial amount
3 of properties to assemble.

4 MS. GARCIA: Yes.

5 MR. TORRE: Was there one family that owned
6 everything? How did that one come to be,
7 because I'm asking, what is the likelihood that
8 somebody is going to assemble, reality, Salzedo
9 to Le Jeune again or anything like that?

10 MR. GRABIEL: The Coral Gables --

11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It will happen.

12 MR. COLLIER: We need to speak into the
13 mike, because the court reporter is listening
14 on Zoom, and if you don't speak into the mike,
15 it's really hard for her to hear.

16 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Was the project that
17 we're talking about, was that in the Crafts
18 Section?

19 MS. GARCIA: No. It's in the RIR. No,
20 it's just limiting to multi-family districts.
21 Her concern is not the mixed-use districts,
22 because, I mean, you want to create that wall,
23 that living room wall, you know, and create
24 that space in the ground. It's more of a
25 letting these buildings have that density, that

84

1 was part of the policy that the Commission set
2 however many -- five years ago, six years ago,
3 I think, now, but to also allow these buildings
4 to kind of fit the context better, because
5 those prior buildings, although they're only
6 two and three stories tall, they are very
7 small. You know, they're on 50-foot wide lots.
8 This would allow the new development, taking
9 advantage of the extra density fill, to fit in
10 the context more, the fine great urbanism.

11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I think what I'm
12 hearing is that this is just not enough to
13 accomplish what is intended.

14 MR. TORRE: Or to do something that could
15 be done well considering some of these things
16 could really screw things up. I mean, if you
17 do one or two of these, from one block to the
18 other, do two, it would be a mess. Why not
19 take an architectural approach to this and
20 really get into the fix, besides just putting
21 300 feet on there?

22 MR. BEHAR: And if you want to break down
23 the scale, which is not -- then you're going to
24 have to, you know, maybe take that separation
25 all of the way through, at least in the actual

85

1 building, because, you know, right now the
2 way -- the 300 feet, if you have 500 feet,
3 you're probably saying, okay, 300 feet, and
4 then I'm going to do the other building the
5 other 200. So you're not -- at the end of the
6 day, you have not really accomplished what the
7 intent -- you know, I don't have an answer
8 tonight.

9 We need to look at it, study it, you know,
10 and then maybe come up with a solution that
11 will -- maybe, you know, you have to create a
12 break of "X" amount of open to the sky. That
13 way you dictate that you have to have two --
14 instead of one building, two independent
15 buildings. That gets complicated sometimes,
16 because then your parking starts getting
17 inefficient, and so, you know, this is not that
18 simple. It's creating, you know, a 300-foot
19 maximum, because -- especially in some of the
20 lots in the Gables.

21 Remember, the majority of the lots are only
22 a hundred foot in depth. So you don't have the
23 flexibility, when you've got to put liner
24 units, in most cases, and you've got to do --
25 you're really going to start taking away the

86

1 development right that that property has, in my
2 opinion.

3 MS. GARCIA: That is a concern that legal
4 had brought up, as far as what impact this has,
5 as far as the taking of property rights.
6 However, she still wants to move forward,
7 because she feels like this is a good fix for
8 the issue of having the long buildings in a
9 neighborhood context that has the short end of
10 the --

11 MR. BEHAR: Without taking any property,
12 you know, specifically, I could tell you that
13 it is -- yes, you're going to be taking
14 development rights from the property owners,
15 and I think that, you know, without doing it
16 correctly, the analysis, I think we're going to
17 set ourselves, as a city, in a little --

18 MR. TORRE: Like a Bert Harris?

19 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

20 MR. WITHERS: Well, I mean, if you have
21 like individual front doors along the way,
22 like, you know, some of the developments of
23 townhomes, I don't think that was 300 feet, but
24 that's necessarily --

25 MR. BEHAR: But that's not intended for the

87

1 townhome. That's intended for RIR.

2 MR. WITHERS: That's right. That's the
3 difference, yeah.

4 MR. BEHAR: Okay. You would never have --
5 I don't think you would ever have a kind of
6 project that is 500 feet long.

7 MR. WITHERS: No.

8 MR. TORRE: A hundred feet high, what does
9 that give you, how many floors?

10 MR. BEHAR: Really, like -- because there's
11 a hundred feet to the top of the architecture,
12 parapet and all, so you only really get nine
13 stories.

14 MR. TORRE: Well, what if you were to have
15 some kind of green space off-setting that joint
16 building and allow somebody to actually pop up
17 a little, just a smaller amount, take you up,
18 does it help anything? When you give that
19 square footage to the top, just so you can
20 carve out some space on the ground, is there
21 any place to carve out or force a carve out, to
22 give more space?

23 MS. GARCIA: I mean, this was a direct
24 motion from this Board early last year, a
25 discussion of limiting the building height --

88

1 I'm sorry, the building length.
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That was from Luis.
 3 MS. GARCIA: Yes, Luis made that motion.
 4 MR. BEHAR: But with more -- I mean, I
 5 think the intent is there. I think that just
 6 limiting it to 300, with no guidelines, no -- I
 7 think it's where I'm having a difficult time
 8 being able to support something like this. I
 9 don't -- again, I don't have the answer
 10 tonight, and it's something that I would
 11 definitely, you know, start thinking about, and
 12 see what would be the right solution for this.
 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What I'm hearing is
 14 that basically there's a work -- in other
 15 words, somebody can work around this very
 16 easily, if you're doing a 300 -- doing a 300
 17 and 200 and you still accomplish the same
 18 thing.
 19 MS. GARCIA: But your Building Code, it's
 20 still going to require some kind of building
 21 separation for fire, depending on how many
 22 openings you have.
 23 MR. TORRE: The thing is, when you start
 24 assembling, the more you assemble, why not just
 25 keep assembling? If there's no reason to stop

89

1 at 20,000 feet, you want to keep going and
 2 going. So, by doing that, you're promoting a
 3 larger, larger, larger project.
 4 Once you start in a block, you have to keep
 5 going, right? So how do you fix that, so it
 6 does not become a mess? And I'm not sure this
 7 300 does it, which is what you're saying, which
 8 is what we're all saying.
 9 MS. GARCIA: The thought was not to limit
 10 the square footage, because I think that would
 11 be arguably a taking, because you could have a
 12 property that's in the middle of the block,
 13 that's fronting both streets, but fronting both
 14 streets is not more than 300 feet, so that they
 15 can least park it effectively and they wouldn't
 16 have that same impact on both of those streets
 17 as they would as a long building facing one
 18 street. That was the thought behind the -- I
 19 believe, the discussion between -- it was about
 20 limiting the building length on the street.
 21 MR. BEHAR: Well, I think that we need to
 22 look at it, because it may be that you limit,
 23 let's say, above -- if you allow nine stories
 24 and a hundred feet, above, let's say, the third
 25 floor, no more than "X" amount of continuous

90

1 massing -- because what I see on the issue is,
 2 if you have half of the block and you have the
 3 alley in the back -- because, typically, our
 4 depth is like 230 feet from street to street.
 5 MS. GARCIA: In this area, yes.
 6 MR. BEHAR: Right? So if you have a
 7 twenty-foot alley, you're going to have a
 8 hundred and a hundred, so --
 9 MS. GARCIA: Well, this street doesn't have
 10 an alley, remember. So that each lot has a
 11 depth of 110 feet --
 12 MR. COLLIER: I'm thinking there are --
 13 MS. GARCIA: 125 is the North Ponce Area.
 14 MR. COLLIER: Right, but -- I don't want to
 15 -- I have thought there were some cases that
 16 you do have an alley, but, then, you also
 17 have -- you're putting more restrictions,
 18 because we did a Zoning change a while back,
 19 that you had to put the liner units, right?
 20 MS. GARCIA: Yeah, that's still a
 21 requirement of the RIR.
 22 MR. BEHAR: So if I only have half of the
 23 block, I'm going to restrict the development
 24 completely, because if I've got to put a liner
 25 unit -- I can't even park the building. This

91

1 is -- I think that we need to really think
 2 about this and find a solution that is going to
 3 work for properties that may not go from block
 4 to block. I think this is assuming that you
 5 have, you know, from block to block, and you
 6 have access and all. What about if you only
 7 have half the block? Then what do you do,
 8 right?
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I think it needs to be
 10 tweaked, is what I'm hearing.
 11 MR. BEHAR: I am -- and this is just
 12 without giving more consideration, I'm more in
 13 favor of saying, okay, the envelope of the
 14 building, above the third floor -- and just to
 15 throw out a floor -- has to be limited, because
 16 for the first three stories, you're going to
 17 have -- most likely, you are going to have
 18 units on the ground floor, and you're going to
 19 have the movement in and out, and you're going
 20 to have the parking behind it. Above the third
 21 floor is when you're going to see the
 22 continuous facade.
 23 MR. TORRE: I think what was a shock for us
 24 was to see a project built 500 feet long, one
 25 project. I'm not sure how to take that back or

92

1 to change it, but it was the project that was
2 500. How was that project built?

3 MR. BEHAR: But, you know, Venny, if that's
4 the case --

5 MR. TORRE: I think this is kind of back to
6 that, right?

7 Yeah, these chairs kind of only work one
8 way. How do they sit here for twelve hours,
9 these Commissioners? I can't sit here for two
10 hours.

11 The idea was that, I think, 500 feet was
12 just a shock of a building, and I'm not sure
13 how many buildings you've done that are 500
14 feet, either on Laguna or by Bird Road. I
15 mean, 500 feet, as a project, is a very large
16 project.

17 So I think this is trying to cut the
18 project down. I'm not sure that's successful,
19 but it's just a building. Whether you slice it
20 this way or that way, you could -- you would
21 be, you know, 500 feet.

22 MR. GRABIEL: Maybe design a building that
23 is a thousand --

24 MR. TORRE: This wouldn't be so bad then,
25 right?

1 Right. I cross --

2 MR. WITHERS: You know, there's a lot of
3 articulation and heights and you've got some
4 towers that are seven stories, some that are
5 four stories. So maybe the articulation of
6 height -- again, I'm not an architect. I just
7 visually --

8 MR. BEHAR: No, I would tell you -- and,
9 again, I'm trying to visualize -- in a
10 residential building, more than like 150 feet
11 from the elevator, it's a long way.

12 MR. WITHERS: A mile.

13 MR. BEHAR: So you're not -- I mean, 300
14 feet, to me, would be like, then you're going
15 to have two buildings within the site. I'm
16 trying to think, you know, how far can you walk
17 and be, you know -- to me, the problem, again,
18 is, as I'm visualizing it, it's above a
19 certain, you know, floor, because for the first
20 three floors, you're going to use the
21 example -- you know, you could have 500 feet,
22 but it could be articulated, where it looks
23 like, for the most part, you're required to
24 have residential uses on the ground floor.

25 So you could have movement within that

1 MR. GRABIEL: You can design a building
2 that's a thousand feet long and still make it
3 work. I mean --

4 MR. TORRE: Correct.

5 MR. GRABIEL: -- a good example is Bath,
6 the England, the rows of townhouses which are
7 thousands of feet in length and it's
8 incredible, and it's all broken up. I mean,
9 you see each unit.

10 I don't have a solution, but I don't have a
11 problem with it 500 feet, as long as within
12 those 500 feet, there is a break on the facade
13 that makes it interesting or, for the City, it
14 creates a great facade, but I don't have a
15 solution.

16 MR. TORRE: Is it not an architectural
17 solution that should be prescribed than more
18 than just a --

19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Instead of Code --

20 MR. TORRE: Yeah, a more architectural type
21 of solution.

22 MR. WITHERS: Was it in Giralda, the 200
23 Block of Giralda, on the north side -- you know
24 what I'm talking about?

25 MR. BEHAR's:

1 facade, so it's not a continuous, you know, 500
2 foot facade. As you get up, is when you have
3 the issue, I think.

4 MS. GARCIA: But what the sponsor is
5 wanting is to have more moments of landscape,
6 and you can only get that when you're limiting
7 the building frontage on any street, because
8 you're going to allow more -- what looks like
9 side setbacks, more landscape visible from the
10 sidewalk.

11 MR. BEHAR: I propose that we table this
12 until we could find maybe a more specific
13 requirement, without -- carefully not taking
14 away development rights from property owners.

15 MR. COLLIER: What is the time sensitivity?
16 Are they expecting the Board to make a decision
17 tonight?

18 MS. GARCIA: I'm not sure, actually. I
19 don't think this is relative to any project,
20 per se. I don't think this is being rushed.

21 MR. COLLIER: Well, I mean, the Board has
22 three options, approve, deny, defer. But the
23 thing is, if you're going to defer it, what
24 input are you -- do you want to ask that the
25 City Architect appear and see if he might have

1 a solution? Maybe that would be an option, to
2 request the City Architect to appear before the
3 Board, to get his take on the issue?

4 MR. TORRE: There are enough things in the
5 Code to provide for such things, in terms of up
6 and back --

7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Break, screens, so
8 forth.

9 MR. TORRE: -- that I think the Code
10 already does in many other ways. Why couldn't
11 the Code try to do something for this
12 particular problem, the same way it does for
13 others? I think there are ways to accomplish
14 what I think everybody here is trying to do.

15 MS. GARCIA: I think those ways were
16 incorporated in a project that brought this to
17 your attention last year.

18 MR. TORRE: To add to that, whether it's
19 green space must be every 200 feet, and that
20 green space must be setback 20 feet -- so it
21 could be --

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That's how you can
23 accomplish it.

24 MR. TORRE: Right. I mean, there should be
25 certain things, that simply enough can be

1 you taking away from each one of those owners
2 their rights or is their rights only considered
3 what their lot is, but not massed together?

4 MR. COLLIER: It's unclear, because I think
5 that when you look at -- the question is, what
6 was the expectation of a property owner. I
7 mean, it would be somewhat speculative. Well,
8 I'm one of thirty property owners, and I might
9 have thought that at sometime I could have
10 gotten into an agreement with my other 29
11 property owners to assemble a property. It may
12 be -- there might be a property owner out there
13 that does have the sufficient property, that
14 they could take advantage of it. That's a
15 possibility, and there might be an issue.
16 That's a possibility.

17 MR. BEHAR: And that's what I'm concerned,
18 that that owner -- and it may be, you know,
19 one, two or ten, that does have a large parcel,
20 that we're going to be affecting.

21 MR. COLLIER: And the Board could take the
22 position, well, we think that this can be
23 addressed architecturally and we don't need
24 this particular regulation, and that could be
25 your recommendation for the Commission.

1 carved out or -- I'm not trying to break up the
2 property, but I think we do that in the Code
3 many, many different ways and this is just
4 another example.

5 MR. BEHAR: And I think the Board of
6 Architects has a lot of leverage to achieve
7 that. I really -- you know, for us to further
8 impose on something --

9 MR. TORRE: Here's the answer. I don't
10 think this accomplishes everything that it's
11 trying to accomplish, and I think that by
12 approving this, we just haven't solved
13 everything, and I think -- we can approve it,
14 but I don't think it does the trick. That's
15 agreed -- does everybody agree with me?

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Craig, let me ask you
17 a question, if I may. There's a lot of
18 discussion that's been done about property
19 rights and taking away property rights. This
20 mainly deals with massing of properties. An
21 owner that owns "X" amount of square feet, but
22 not the entire project, are you taking away
23 property owner's rights -- if you have 10,000
24 square feet, and there's 20 owners, let's say,
25 that are going to be amassing to do this, are

1 Alternatively, well, we think we need to take a
2 further look at this, and if you want to defer
3 it, and have further consideration on it, or
4 you could just approve it, but say, there needs
5 to be more, because this is not, in and of
6 itself, going to fix the problem that you're
7 trying to address. There might be another way
8 to go.

9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Robert? Venny? What
10 do you guys --

11 MR. TORRE: I think there's inherent
12 problems to this that we're not seeing, and I
13 think, by approving this, we would leave some
14 problems on the table. I'm just of that --

15 MR. BEHAR: I would tell you, I'm not in
16 favor of approving this the way it is right
17 now.

18 MR. TORRE: Not that the intent is wrong,
19 it's just that I think there are inherent
20 issues that we can't see, because the lots are
21 -- you've got to be 20,000 feet, and if you
22 assemble two properties, and the one doesn't
23 work, and the other one doesn't work, you
24 have --

25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: There's three

1 recommendations we can give. One is to approve
2 it as is, one is to go ahead and say come back,
3 or let it be done architecturally.

4 MR. TORRE: I think it doesn't hurt to have
5 a conversation with the City Architect
6 regarding this matter, just to get started.

7 MR. BEHAR: I'm just thinking, you said, if
8 you get two properties -- two 20,000 square
9 foot properties, typically it's going to be 200
10 feet by a hundred. But once I do that, it's
11 400 feet. So I am already --

12 MR. TORRE: -- forced to do two 200s.

13 MR. BEHAR: Yeah. You know, so I think the
14 intent is there. I just don't know that the
15 execution we're looking for is there.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: The mechanics.

17 Do we have a motion?

18 MR. BEHAR: I'm going to make a motion to
19 defer. I would like to get input from the City
20 Architect and maybe we need to look at a way
21 to -- from the City Architect and maybe even
22 the Board of Architects, one of the
23 representatives of the Board, to see how we
24 could make this effective and without taking
25 away development rights from that property

101

1 (Board Members voted aye.)

2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And thank you for the
3 towels or blankets.

4 MR. BEHAR: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

6 (Thereupon, the meeting was concluded at
7 8:00 p.m.)

103

1 owner.

2 I'll make a motion to defer, to try to get
3 input from the City Architect and maybe a
4 member of the Board of Architects.

5 MR. TORRE: I'll second it.

6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a second.

7 Any discussion? No?

8 Call the roll, please.

9 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiél?

10 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.

11 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?

12 MR. TORRE: Yes.

13 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?

14 MR. WITHERS: Yes.

15 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?

16 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

17 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.

19 Do we have any discussion items?

20 MR. BEHAR: None. I'll make a motion to
21 adjourn.

22 MR. GRABIEL: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion to
24 adjourn and a second. Everybody in favor, say
25 aye.

102

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2
3 STATE OF FLORIDA:

4 SS.

5 COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:

6
7
8
9 I, NIEVES SANCHEZ, Court Reporter, and a Notary
10 Public for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby
11 certify that I was authorized to and did
12 stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and
13 that the transcript is a true and complete record of my
14 stenographic notes.

15
16 DATED this 15th day of June, 2023.

17
18 

19
20 -----
21 NIEVES SANCHEZ
22
23
24
25

104