

1 CITY OF CORAL GABLES  
2 LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY (LPA)/  
3 PLANNING & ZONING BOARD MEETING  
4 VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT  
5 WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 13, 2025, COMMENCING AT 6:00 P.M.

6 Board Members Present at Commission Chamber:

7 Eibi Aizenstat, Chairman  
8 Robert Behar  
9 Felix Pardo  
10 Sue Kawalerski  
11 Alex Bucelo  
12 Javier Salman

13 City Staff and Consultants.

14 Fengqian "Grace" Chen, Principal Planner,  
15 Jill Menendez, Administrative Assistant/Board Secretary  
16 Craig Collier, Special Counsel  
17 Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator  
18 Craig Southern, Planning Official

19 Also Participating:

20 Laura Russo, Esq., On behalf of the Applicant  
21 Gillian Gaggero Gazzolo  
22 Debra Register

23 EXCERPT OF ITEM F-1

24 THEREUPON:

25 (The following proceedings were held.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Jimenez.

Next item, please.

MR. COLLIER: All right. This is Item F-1.

An Ordinance of the City Commission granting Conditional Use approval for a Building Site Determination, pursuant to Zoning Code Article 14, "Process," Section 14-202.6, "Building Site Determination," and Section 14-203, "Conditional Uses," to separate -- excuse me, sir -- sir --

MR. BEHAR: Excuse me, sir.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We're still conducting a meeting.

MR. BEHAR: Excuse me, can you guys go outside, please?

MR. COLLIER: Let's see if I can pick up where I left off.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: I'm sorry. He says there was no tree on that property --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Sir --

MR. BEHAR: Sir --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Sir, please, we're trying to conduct a meeting. Afterwards, we'd be glad to listen, please. Thank you, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: No problem. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Go ahead.

MR. COLLIER: -- "Conditional Uses," to separate one existing building site into two single-family building sites on property zoned Single-Family Residential (SFR) District, legally described as 1/2 of Lot 9, all of Lots 10 and 11, and the west 25 feet of Lot 12, Block 233, Revised Plat of Coral Gables Riviera Section, Part 13 (1154 Alfonso Avenue), Coral Gables, Florida; one building site consisting of the east 50 feet of Lot 9 and all of Lot 10 (west parcel), and the other one building site consisting of all of Lot 11 and the west 25 feet of Lot 12 (east parcel); including required conditions; providing for a repealer provision, severability clause, and an effective date.

Item F-1, public hearing.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

Do we have the applicant?

MS. RUSSO: Good evening, Mr. Chairman,

Members of the Board. For the record, Laura Russo, with offices at 2334 Ponce de Leon Boulevard.

I am here this evening representing Gillian Gaggero Gazzolo and her husband, Alvaro Gazzolo. Only Gillian is here this evening. They are the owners and residents of the property at 1154 Alfonso Avenue. They've lived there for 26 years, raised their family there, and they have been Coral Gables residents for the past 35 years.

For those of you that may not be familiar with Alfonso Avenue, I know certain of you on the Board are, it is located a few blocks south of Hardee Road, and 1154 Alfonso is located west of Maynada Street, and just north of the Maynada Bridge, and it is abutted by the Mahi Waterway on its south side. This property measures 225 feet wide by 160 feet deep.

If I could ask them to cue up the -- there we go.

So this is a view of the subject property, looking at it from Alfonso Avenue, and this is a view of the property from the Mahi Waterway, looking at it from across the waterway.

The property, as I said, is a 36,000 square foot property. The applicants are proposing to separate the property into two building sites; one site to consist of 20,000 square feet, and the other site to consist of 16,000 square feet, and here would be the division of the property.

The average building site in the immediate area is 12,300 square feet, and within a thousand linear feet, it increases a little bit more, to 12,685 feet. The average street frontage of the surrounding properties within the perimeter is 92 feet. And, here, you can see very faintly, but you should have it in your package, the map that shows the 1,000 linear feet.

So, the Zoning Code allows for a new house -- if this house were to be -- the existing house, to be demolished, a new house could be built there, following the Zoning Code, of a size of 11,950 square feet, would be allowed at this residence -- at this property. To give you an idea, it would be way out of scale and character for the surrounding neighborhood, since they are much more smaller

5

building sites.

This slide gives you a real idea. This is an actual 11,880 square foot house, also located on a waterway, a different portion of a waterway, and it is on a 37,000 square foot lot, and you can see, that's a rather massive property.

Here is another example of a house that has been built way out of character for the property. It's on South Alhambra. Some of you may remember when Anthony Abraham did all of the Christmas decorations. This is across the street, south, and there is a house, on six lots, and it now is about -- let's see, it's almost a 30,000 square foot site, and the house is 10,475 feet, and it's about three times larger, both, in property and in size and square footage, than all of the surrounding homes in the area.

The granting of this request, of our proposal, for this lot separation, would end up with two properties substantially larger than the majority of the homes in the area, 20,000 and 16,000 square feet, and, also, proposed homes at 5625 feet and 5948 feet.

6

So there's a lot of discussion about the Board of Architects. This house was reviewed by the Board of Architects. The architect, Antonio Rodriguez, of Cad Studio Architecture, designed two homes, one for each of the building sites, and he presented these designs to the Board of Architects numerous times; May 1st, June 12th, July 10th, and final approve was received on July 17th.

Alvaro and Gillian had originally intended to only demolish the eastern portion of their lot, to bring it into conformity with the Zoning Code, and then renovate the balance of the house. However, when the architect started reviewing the original plans, the house was built in 1948, but in 1980, it was doubled in size, and so the house has four different foundation slabs, two different electrical systems, two air conditioning systems, two septic systems. So, in essence, it's two houses under the cover of one house. So a structural engineer, who reviewed it, recommended that it be demolished.

This is the front of the replacement home. So this is the western parcel, 20,000 square

7

foot parcel. This is the front of the home, and this is the back of the home.

The residence on the eastern parcel, which is the 16,000 square foot parcel, which is this, and this is the waterway view of that parcel.

So, now, the Zoning Code criteria for lot separation are numerous, as you guys probably know. One of the first things is that the lot size that are being proposed or the building sites being proposed have to be equal to or larger than the majority of the neighborhood. This application complies with that criterion.

The other criterion is unusual circumstances. It has to be a through block, two facings, different zonings on the block. Again, this application complies. We have double facing, the Mahi Waterway, which is a platted waterway, and Alfonso Avenue, on the front.

The other criterion is that it maintains open space, neighborhood compatibility, visual attractiveness, and this complies. The open space requirement for both homes that are being proposed exceeds the required open space that

8

the City requires for single-family homes. There will be no canopy trees that are going to be removed on the eastern parcel, and on the western parcel, that has the existing home, there are two beautiful Japanese Orange Blossom trees, that are actually going to be moved to the front of the property. So there is no demolition of any -- or removal of any trees.

The following criterion requires that two of the following three be complied with; One, that the street or water front be equal to or greater than the majority within a thousand linear feet. That average is 92. We are proposing 100 and 125; that the building sites would not result in any existing structures becoming non-conforming, as it relates to setbacks, lot area width, ground coverage, et cetera; and the voluntary demolition of any portion of a house within the last ten years would negate that criterion. So we know, right now, we're going to propose demolition. We do not meet that criterion.

The last criterion, the subject property has been owned by the current owner continuously for a minimum of ten years. As I

9

stated earlier, they've owned this house for 26 years and have lived there and will continue to live on the western parcel.

Gillian and Alvaro held a neighborhood meeting on May 1st and showed their neighbors their proposals for their homes, and I want to show you that they have immediate neighbor support, and I've listed the neighbors, not just told you, with their permission, and some of them had wanted to be here, but Sabater is out of town, someone else has school starting tomorrow. As you know, tomorrow is the first day of public schools, so they didn't want to spend their time here, when they're trying to get their kids ready, and one of the neighbors is still on vacation.

But as you can see, we have support on the west, immediate west, support on the immediate east, support on the north, and support across the waterway, and these are the people that are going to be impacted by the new homes, they're going to be impacted by the construction, and we have their support.

And here is a visual, a rendering, of the two homes side-by-side. So, just to be clear,

10

the one on the right-hand side is the western parcel, because they're facing north, and the one on the left is the eastern parcel. So, on behalf of -- and this is the view from the waterway.

So, on behalf of Gillian and Alvaro, I respectfully request your recommendation for approval for this lot separation proposal --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

MS. RUSSO: -- and I'll be happy to answers any questions, after you've heard from Staff.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

Next we'll go ahead and call the City.

MR. SOUTHERN: Good evening, Planning & Zoning Board. Craig Southern, again, Planning Official, with the City of Coral Gables.

If we could please have the Staff PowerPoint presentation brought up, please.

All right. We're going to try to go through this and just be concise. As previously mentioned, the subject property is at 1154 Alfonso Avenue. It's a conditional use request and a building site separation.

If you take a look at our location map here, as previously indicated by the

11

applicant's agent, the subject property lies south of Alfonso Avenue, and north of the Mahi Waterway. The existing subject property has 36,000 square feet, has 225 feet of frontage, and 160 feet of depth. It's a -- as you can see on the slide, it consists of the east 50 feet of Lot 9, all of Lots 10 and 11, and the west 25 feet of Lot 12, within Block 223 of the Coral Gables Riviera Section Part 13.

The site currently contains a 3913 square foot, two-story residence, that was built in 1948, along with a pool, patio, and existing boat house.

If you take a look, you'll see the Future Land Use and the Zoning Map designations, which is similar to all of the surrounding properties. Currently, it has single-family low density Future Land Use Map designation, and a Single-Family Residential Zoning District. You'll take a look at the existing survey right now of how the property currently looks.

So, on to the request, if you take a look at the proposed building site separation, the applicants request a conditional use approval

12

1 under Section 14-202.6 (F) of the Zoning Code,  
2 for a building site determination to demolish  
3 the existing residence and to divide the  
4 subject property into two single-family  
5 building sites. The west building site would  
6 consist of 20,000 square feet, with a 125-foot  
7 frontage, and it would be the east 50 feet of  
8 Lot 9 and all of Lot 10. The east building  
9 site would consist of 16,000 square feet, 100  
10 feet of frontage, all of Lot 11, plus the west  
11 25 feet of Lot 12.

12 So what is being proposed new, a 5625  
13 square foot two-story residence is proposed on  
14 the west building site, along with improvements  
15 to the existing pool, patio, and boat house. A  
16 new 5948 square foot, two-story home, is  
17 proposed on the east building site. The  
18 combined proposed floor area of 11,575 square  
19 feet remains under the 11,950 square feet  
20 maximum that's allowed for the existing unified  
21 lot as is in its current configuration.  
22 Individually, each proposed building site, if  
23 approved, would still comply with the maximum  
24 allowable floor area ratio for both, the west  
25 and east building sites.

13

1 building sites are at 20,000 square feet and  
2 16,000 square feet.

3 We'll take a look at the proposed  
4 elevations, from both, the front and the rear.  
5 Here is the west building site, the front  
6 elevation; the east building site proposed  
7 front elevation.

8 As previously mentioned, this has gone  
9 through the whole entirety of the review  
10 process within the City. It went to the  
11 Development Review Committee March 21st of  
12 2025, this year; the Board of Architects had  
13 four separate meetings, and the Board of  
14 Architects approved it last month, on the 17th.  
15 The mandatory neighborhood participation  
16 meeting was conducted on May 1st. And, now,  
17 tonight, we are at the Planning & Zoning Board,  
18 looking for a recommendation to the City  
19 Commission. This would require two City  
20 Commission hearings.

21 So public notification within the thousand  
22 foot radius, a total of 297 mailed  
23 notifications were sent out twice, during that  
24 May neighborhood participation meeting, and,  
25 then, previously, before the Planning & Zoning

15

1 This may look slightly overwhelming, but  
2 this is the building site information. This  
3 table basically compares the proposed building  
4 sites with the applicable Zoning Code  
5 requirements for a single-family residence.  
6 This analysis shows the subject property can be  
7 developed as proposed and meet the requirements  
8 of the Zoning Code.

9 Once again, as previously indicated, the  
10 cumulative floor area ratio that's permitted  
11 currently, right now, of 11,950 square feet,  
12 what is being proposed would be the combined  
13 proposed floor area, if you add both proposed,  
14 west building site, east building site, would  
15 equal 11,573 square feet.

16 As previously mentioned in the applicant --  
17 the applicant's agent's PowerPoint, it meets  
18 all of our Zoning Code requirements, our site  
19 development standards, and is also -- it meets  
20 and exceeds the average, which the lot area  
21 average within that thousand square feet  
22 area -- let's see if I've got that here --  
23 we'll get to it here in a second, but it  
24 actually -- the averages is between 12,685 to  
25 15,714. So you can see that the proposed

14

1 Board. City Staff has received a collective of  
2 ten letters of support from residents in the  
3 surrounding neighborhood.

4 Briefly, we'll let you know that two times  
5 we went -- as previously mentioned, letters to  
6 the property owners for the Neighborhood  
7 Participation Meeting and for this Planning &  
8 Zoning Board Meeting. The property has been  
9 posted three times, for the DRC Meeting, the  
10 Board of Architects meeting, and this Planning  
11 & Zoning Board Meeting. This item has also  
12 been posted twice on the City website, for the  
13 DRC, this Planning & Zoning Board Meeting.  
14 It's been advertised once in the newspaper, and  
15 has been sent out to e-mailed subscribers for  
16 this Planning and Zoning Board Meeting.

17 So Staff's recommendation is approval with  
18 conditions. As previously indicated, all  
19 conditional uses for building site  
20 determination must satisfy at least two of  
21 three items; so the street frontages, similar  
22 to the neighborhood, and the property owners  
23 have owned the property for more than ten  
24 years. They comply with those components. But  
25 due to the voluntary demolition due to the

16

1 current property, it's straddling what would be  
2 the proposed lot lines.

3 The existing structures not falling into  
4 non-conforming, they will have to obviously  
5 demo the structure, so they would not satisfy  
6 that, but they do satisfy two of the three  
7 requirements.

8 So Staff has attached three conditions of  
9 approval. These three conditions are  
10 traditionally attached to any approval for a  
11 conditional use for a building site  
12 determination. This is pursuant to Section  
13 14-202.6 (G). I'll try to briefly read the  
14 three of them.

15 The first one, the new single-family  
16 residence, both of them, constructed on  
17 separate building sites, shall meet all  
18 applicable requirements of the Zoning Code, and  
19 no variances shall be required or requested,  
20 which is currently the case.

21 Number Two, the plans depicting the site  
22 plans and elevations of the residence on the  
23 separated building sites and submitted as a  
24 part of the Conditional Use application, shall  
25 be made part of the approval, with any

17

1 instructions or exceptions provided by the City  
2 Commission. Any changes to the plans are  
3 subject to Section 14-203.10 of the Zoning  
4 Code.

5 And, finally, the third condition, a bond  
6 shall be required, as determined by the  
7 Building Official, if necessary, to ensure  
8 timely removal of any non-conformities as a  
9 result of the building site separation  
10 approval.

11 So, once again, City Staff, Planning &  
12 Zoning Staff, is recommending approval for this  
13 Conditional Use building site determination,  
14 with the three conditions.

15 If you have any questions, the applicant  
16 and Staff is here.

17 MR. BEHAR: I do have a question for Craig.  
18 One of the conditions, separate building sites.  
19 Are they required to replat or because the  
20 original -- they're putting the different lots  
21 based on Part of 9 and 10 and 11, so they don't  
22 need to replat?

23 MR. SOUTHERN: Yeah, there's no platting  
24 component with a building site determination.

25 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Thank you.

18

1 MS. KAWALERSKI: And I just have a  
2 question. What's on the west side of Lot 9 and  
3 what's on the east side of Lot 12?

4 MR. SOUTHERN: Can we pull the PowerPoint  
5 back up, please?

6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before we go into  
7 questions, is there anybody -- Jill, do you  
8 have anybody for public comment?

9 THE SECRETARY: We do.

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: One person?

11 Sue, would you be okay if we take public  
12 comment from this one person and then we'll get  
13 into the questions?

14 MS. KAWALERSKI: Sure. Absolutely.

15 MS. REGISTER: I wasn't sworn in, by the way.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Please raise your  
17 hand. Go ahead.

18 MS. REGISTER: Do you want my name first?  
19 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)

20 MS. REGISTER: Yes, I do.

21 My name is Debbie Register. I live at 1240  
22 Placetas Avenue. I was not able to attend the  
23 neighborhood, so that's why I came tonight.

24 I am in support of dividing this property,  
25 and the only reason is, it's 100 feet and 125.

19

1 If it was less than 100, I would not have  
2 agreed.

3 It's a little too modern, but it's not as  
4 modern as the modern boxes we're getting. So  
5 as far as the architectural design, I'm okay,  
6 but I know that's not part of yours.

7 So I am, you know, in favor of this, and  
8 it's going to be a plus to our neighborhood.  
9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, ma'am.  
11 Do we have any other speakers?

12 THE SECRETARY: No.

13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Anybody on Zoom?

14 THE SECRETARY: No.

15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: On the phone platform?

16 THE SECRETARY: No.

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I'll go ahead and  
18 close it for public comment.

19 Sue.

20 MS. KAWALERSKI: Yeah.

21 The east side of Lot 9, who owns that and  
22 what's there? And on the west side -- or on  
23 the east side of Lot 12, who owns that?

24 MS. RUSSO: If we could put up the  
25 PowerPoint. On my PowerPoint, I had the names

20

1 on the neighbors on either side. On the west  
2 side of the parcel, right, I think it's Rebecca  
3 Garcia, and on the east side of the parcel are  
4 Carmen and Carlos Sabater.

5 MS. KAWALERSKI: Okay. So the homes on  
6 each side -- oh, I got it.

7 MS. RUSSO: Correct. They're owned, and  
8 they know, and they've written letters of  
9 support to the City.

10 MS. KAWALERSKI: Well, if I can just go. I  
11 mean, I'm impressed that, you know, you're so  
12 organized and had a neighborhood meeting on  
13 your own, and the neighbors are all for it, and  
14 I personally think it's fantastic. So you have  
15 a yes vote.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Felix.

17 MR. PARDO: I know that the size of the  
18 property is 225 feet by 160. You're not  
19 splitting it down the very middle.

20 MS. RUSSO: Correct, and that's in order  
21 that -- the City requires that each building  
22 site have a platted lot. So, in order to do  
23 that, you have -- one piece will have 25 feet  
24 more than the other, so that each site has one  
25 platted lot plus.

21

1 It's sort of like Merrick used to do. If  
2 you go up in the North Gables, some houses were  
3 50, some were 75, some were two lots, a 100,  
4 but it's each -- each building site proposed  
5 will have one platted lot.

6 MR. PARDO: The proposed houses, are they  
7 built to the very maximum of the FAR?

8 MS. RUSSO: No, they are not.

9 MR. PARDO: Okay. So do you have the  
10 number of what they're doing?

11 MS. RUSSO: Yes.

12 MR. PARDO: Because right now, if you take  
13 the maximum FAR of both lots, you get a total  
14 of 13,450 square feet; that if they would only  
15 build on one lot, it would be 11,950 square  
16 feet, which means there will be a 12 percent  
17 increase by putting two houses on there.

18 MS. RUSSO: Right. One house, the one on  
19 the 20,000 square foot lot, is being proposed  
20 at 56 -- hold on. I have it here.

21 MR. BEHAR: Actually, why don't you put up  
22 your presentation, the City, because it's  
23 clearly --

24 MR. RUSSO: Yeah.

25 MR. BEHAR: What they're doing is, what

22

1 you're allowed to do in one of 11,900, the  
2 combined two square footages will be a little  
3 bit less than that.

4 MS. RUSSO: Right. And --

5 MR. BEHAR: It was on the City's --

6 MR. PARDO: I'm not as young as you are, so  
7 I couldn't get the numbers that quickly.

8 MR. BEHAR: Thank you. Thank you for that.

9 MS. RUSSO: But, also, one of them is built  
10 a lot less than what could be. One of them  
11 could be built to 7000. You're right, the  
12 total could be 13, if they maxed out both  
13 houses.

14 MR. PARDO: Right.

15 MS. RUSSO: And so they are reducing them,  
16 so that they are both under what one could be  
17 all by itself.

18 MR. PARDO: I think it's important to  
19 understand, because most people don't  
20 understand that, in just an example that, it's  
21 a 12 percent increase of the square footage  
22 that you're allowed, and, obviously, the  
23 homeowner is not speculating, at least on one  
24 of the two houses, you know, so, therefore, by  
25 not going to the complete maximum, it's more

23

1 compatible with the neighborhood.

2 Then, the other -- yes, sir.

3 MR. SOUTHERN: I just -- as Staff, I just  
4 wanted to clarify. So the existing site is, at  
5 this very moment in time -- the maximum FAR  
6 permitted is 11,950.

7 MR. PARDO: That's what I said.

8 MR. SOUTHERN: Yeah. And with that split,  
9 they're actually going to be less. Even after  
10 splitting, they're going to be at 11,573.

11 MR. PARDO: Right, which is great. So, you  
12 know, the reason is, most people don't  
13 understand that, but I think that's important.

14 The other thing is that, unfortunately,  
15 over time, the Code has been changed over and  
16 over again, and my concern and my specific  
17 question to our City Attorney is, I think one  
18 of the most important components has always  
19 been, if there's something straddling the  
20 property. This Board has gone -- over the  
21 years has wrestled with that, and it used to be  
22 mandatory that you could not straddle, let's  
23 say, a fence, a gazebo or anything like that.

24 MR. COLLIER: Or a barbecue pit.

25 MR. PARDO: A barbecue pit. That was the

24

1 last one.  
 2 And the thing is that, you know, my  
 3 concern, if you could address if is,  
 4 establishing a precedent.  
 5 MR. COLLIER: Well, I think your City  
 6 Council has established a precedent by changing  
 7 the Code and not requiring this as an  
 8 impediment to separating building sites.  
 9 MR. PARDO: It's still one of the  
 10 requirements, if they can't meet the other two.  
 11 MR. COLLIER: Right, but if they meet the  
 12 other two, then they're not going to have a  
 13 problem with the straddling of the sites. So  
 14 they've created the precedent. They've changed  
 15 the Code, and they're following the Code.  
 16 MR. PARDO: Okay. Those are all of my  
 17 questions.  
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.  
 19 MR. BUCELO: I'll be brief. I just have a  
 20 few comments. I have no questions.  
 21 I think it's a great proposal. I think --  
 22 I'd rather, personally, see two different  
 23 properties than an 11,000 square foot mass. So  
 24 I'm echoing your thoughts, I'm a yes vote, as  
 25 well.

25

1 the record, please?  
 2 MS. GAGGERO GAZZOLLO: Yes. Gillian Gaggero  
 3 Gazzolo, 1154 Alfonso Avenue. I'm the owner  
 4 and applicant.  
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.  
 6 Is there a covenant that exists?  
 7 MS. GAGGERO GAZZOLLO: Yes, there is. And  
 8 prior to even starting this, going through DRC,  
 9 it's my understanding, in speaking to the City  
 10 Attorney, that there's a simultaneous  
 11 procedure, that when the Commission votes --  
 12 that they vote in approval, they vote to  
 13 release the covenant.  
 14 MR. PARDO: Do you mean a unity of title?  
 15 MS. GAGGERO GAZZOLLO: And they've done this  
 16 before.  
 17 MR. PARDO: Unity of title?  
 18 MS. RUSSO: Excuse me?  
 19 MR. PARDO: Is it a covenant or a unity of  
 20 title?  
 21 MS. GAGGERO GAZZOLLO: No, it is not. This  
 22 is a restrictive covenant.  
 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: From when was that  
 24 done or do you know what --  
 25 MS. GAGGERO GAZZOLLO: My understanding, it

27

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Javier.  
 2 MR. SALMAN: I'll let Mr. Behar go first.  
 3 MR. BEHAR: Thank you.  
 4 Listen, I agree with the comments. I don't  
 5 have a problem. I think I would rather see two  
 6 houses, smaller houses, than one big one. So  
 7 I'm in support of the application.  
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Javier.  
 9 MR. SALMAN: I think that this is a perfect  
 10 lot split application. I've rarely seen one.  
 11 And, you know, I've lived long enough, and I  
 12 was here long enough to see one. So I'm  
 13 certainly in favor of this and I'm ready to  
 14 make a motion on that.  
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, I'd like to ask  
 16 a few questions, if I may, before that.  
 17 Is there a covenant that exists on the  
 18 property today?  
 19 MS. RUSSO: No.  
 20 There's a covenant?  
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Can you -- may I ask  
 22 you to come up, please?  
 23 MS. RUSSO: Come up. You have to say --  
 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.  
 25 Could you state your name and address, for

26

1 was done in 1980, when they did the --  
 2 MR. SALMAN: The addition.  
 3 MS. GAGGERO GAZZOLLO: -- the addition to  
 4 the house, and there's a whole story, but I  
 5 don't have facts to back it up. So I'm not  
 6 going to say any more, but that's what I  
 7 understand.  
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I appreciate it.  
 9 MR. COLLIER: That was also a change,  
 10 because --  
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Understood.  
 12 MR. COLLIER: -- because the City Council --  
 13 if they're going -- since they're the ones that  
 14 have the ability to release the covenant, since  
 15 they're approving the lot split, and they're in  
 16 a position to release the covenant.  
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Are you under  
 18 any contract or agreement to sell the property  
 19 currently?  
 20 MS. GAGGERO GAZZOLLO: No.  
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. So your intent  
 22 is to live on one and --  
 23 MS. GAGGERO GAZZOLLO: Absolutely. We love  
 24 Coral Gables. We want to stay right where we  
 25 are.

28

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.  
 2 For me, I've always been against lot  
 3 splits. Laura knows this.  
 4 MS. RUSSO: I know that. I know that very  
 5 well.  
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And just as one Board  
 7 Member, while I understand that the Commission  
 8 can undo the covenant, the covenants were put  
 9 in place for a reason.  
 10 As far as the unusual circumstances, such  
 11 as multi-family facing -- I'm sorry, multiple  
 12 facing --  
 13 MS. RUSSO: Multiple facing, uh-huh.  
 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct. I'm not so  
 15 sure the intent was -- if waterway is one of  
 16 the facing. I'm not sure. I can't tell you  
 17 that, but, to me, it doesn't meet that  
 18 requirement, because of that, and the fact that  
 19 there is a house built across it, as Felix had  
 20 stated before. I understand it's not one of  
 21 the determinations.  
 22 You have the votes, you have the support,  
 23 but, for me, a lot split -- it's a nice design.  
 24 Don't get me wrong.  
 25 MS. GAGGERO GAZZOLO: Thank you.

29

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It's a very nice  
 2 design. I have no issues with it. My only  
 3 comment would be, to Laura, that when the  
 4 project goes to the BOA for four times and then  
 5 it's stated that the BOA approved it with no  
 6 comments, I think there were a lot of comments  
 7 along the way to get it to that point.  
 8 MS. RUSSO: There actually were a lot of  
 9 comments, but they had to do with the  
 10 architecture and trying to get one to be more  
 11 Florida vernacular, which is the western  
 12 parcel, which is the parcel that Gillian and  
 13 her husband will live in, and the other parcel,  
 14 to make sure that they were different enough,  
 15 and that -- they particularly wanted the  
 16 Florida vernacular. They had a different  
 17 style. And so the architect and Gillian very  
 18 willingly worked with the Board of Architects  
 19 to come up with the style that the Board felt  
 20 was more compatible with the neighborhood.  
 21 So it wasn't that they didn't have  
 22 comments. You know, they did.  
 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Understood.  
 24 MR. PARDO: It doesn't look like a  
 25 development where you have, you know, Model A,

30

1 Model B next to it --  
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Or they're both not  
 3 the same.  
 4 MR. PARDO: Yeah. That's what it is.  
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I appreciate it.  
 6 If anybody would like to make a motion.  
 7 MR. SALMAN: Through the Chair.  
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, sir.  
 9 MR. SALMAN: I'd like to make a motion that  
 10 we approve this item in conformance with the  
 11 Staff recommendation and the conditions set  
 12 forth by Staff be adopted as part of this  
 13 approval.  
 14 MR. BEHAR: I'll second it.  
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion. We  
 16 have a second. Any discussion? No?  
 17 Call the roll, please.  
 18 THE SECRETARY: Sue Kawalerski?  
 19 MS. KAWALERSKI: Yes.  
 20 THE SECRETARY: Felix Pardo?  
 21 MR. PARDO: Yes.  
 22 THE SECRETARY: Javier Salman?  
 23 MR. SALMAN: Yes.  
 24 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 25 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

31

1 THE SECRETARY: Alex Bucelo?  
 2 MR. BUCELO: Yes.  
 3 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?  
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: No, but thank you very  
 5 much.  
 6 MS. RUSSO: Thank you. I understand. I  
 7 take no offense.  
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It's a beautiful  
 9 design.  
 10 MS. RUSSO: Thank you.  
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And I wish you all the  
 12 best.  
 13 MS. RUSSO: Thank you very much. It's much  
 14 appreciated.  
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.  
 16 \* \* \* \* \*  
 17 (Thereupon, the meeting was concluded at 8:30  
 18 p.m.)

32



C E R T I F I C A T E

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

STATE OF FLORIDA:

SS.

COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:

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

DATED this 14th day of August, 2025.



-----NIEVES SANCHEZ-----