

City of Coral Gables City Commission Meeting
Agenda Items E-6 and E-7 are related
May 24, 2016
City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL

City Commission

Mayor Jim Cason

Commissioner Pat Keon

Commissioner Vince Lago

Vice Mayor Frank Quesada

Commissioner Jeannett Slesnick

City Staff

City Manager, Cathy Swanson-Rivenbark

City Attorney, Craig E. Leen

City Clerk, Walter J. Foeman

Deputy City Clerk, Billy Urquia

Public Speaker(s)

Felix Pardo

Agenda Items E-6 and E-7 are related [0:00:00 a.m.]

An Ordinance of the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting Conditional Use Review for a Building Site Determination pursuant to Zoning Code Article 3, "Development Review", Section 3-206, "Building Site Determination" to create two (2) separate single-family building sites on property zoned Single-Family Residential (SFR) District; one (1) building site consisting of Lots 19-21 and one (1) building site consisting of Lots 22-24 on the property legally described as Lots 19-24, Block 15, Coral Gables Section "D", Coral Gables, Florida; generally located on the east side of Red Road between County Club Prado and Valencia Avenue; including required conditions; providing for a repealer provision, severability clause, codification, and providing for an effective date.

City Commission Meeting

May 24, 2016

Agenda Items E-6 and E-7 are related – Ordinances of the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting Conditional Use Review for a Building Site Determination to create two separate single-family building sites on property zoned SFR and providing for a text amendment to the Zoning Code, removing site specific provisions for building sites on Lots 3-9, 19-24, Block 15.

An Ordinance of the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing for a text amendment to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Appendix A, “Site Specific Zoning Regulations”, Section A-38, “Section D” removing site specific provisions for building sites on Lots 3 through 8, inclusive, and 19 through 24, inclusive Block 15; providing for a repealer provision, severability clause, codification, and providing for an effective date.

Mayor Cason: Alright, Items E-6 and E-7.

City Attorney Leen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Items E-6 and E-7 are consolidated for purposes of public hearing, although each should receive a separate vote. Item E-6 is an ordinance of the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting Conditional Use Review for a Building Site Determination pursuant to Zoning Code Article 3, “Development Review”, Section 3-206, “Building Site Determination” to create two separate single-family building sites on property zoned Single-Family Residential District; one building site consisting of Lots 19-21 and one building site consisting of Lots 22-24 on the property legally described as Lots 19-24, Block 15, Coral Gables Section “D”, Coral Gables, Florida; generally located on the east side of Red Road between County Club Prado and Valencia Avenue; including required conditions; providing for a repealer provision, severability clause, codification, and providing for an effective date. Planning and Zoning Board recommends approval by a vote of 6-0. In addition, Item E-7 is an ordinance of the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing for a text amendment to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Appendix A, “Site Specific Zoning Regulations”, Section A-38, “Section D” removing site specific provisions for building sites on Lots 3 through 8, inclusive, and 19 through 24, inclusive Block 15; providing for a repealer provision, severability clause, codification, and providing for an effective date. The Planning and Zoning Board recommends approval by a vote of 6-0. This is on first reading. Both are consolidated for purposes of discussion. There is a quasi-judicial component to this item, so individuals must be sworn in. I’d also like to make one legal interpretation. The lot split portion of this application, the application was filed when the first lot split ordinance, the prior one, was in existence. And

more recently, the Commission has adopted a new lot split ordinance and made some amendments, and that's in effect now. So, the opinion I've given is it doesn't have to be resolved which one would apply because, according to staff, at least based on the recommendation, both are satisfied, based on staff's opinion. Now, the Commission is not bound, obviously, by staff's recommendation, so it may become relevant which one is -- which one applies. The general body of law indicates that the one in existence on the day that you're acting is the one that applies, unless the Commission has indicated otherwise. So, in my opinion, the more recent lot split ordinance would apply, but in applying it, I would consider the fact that this application is in a little bit unique situation. It's the only application, I believe, that this situation applies to, so whatever you do will not set a precedent.

Mayor Cason: Go ahead.

Felix Pardo: Great. Thank you.

Mayor Cason: Does he need to be sworn in?

City Clerk Foeman: Yes, Mr. Mayor. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you will offer today will be truth and nothing but the truth?

Mr. Pardo: Yes, I do.

Mayor Cason: Go ahead.

Mr. Pardo: For the record, my name is Felix Pardo. My office location is 255 University Drive, in Coral Gables. Mr. Mayor, Commissioners, thank you very much for the opportunity for you to look at this particular project. Normally, I would, based on my involvement in the community, I would never come before this Commission for a lot split. I'm actually here, in my mind, because I am correcting a mistake that was made many, many years ago. In 1940, the

people that owned the property which abuts these six lots that face El Prado, they bought that property on El Prado and they had six lots and they built one house there, and that was in 1940. In 1960, the people that owned those lots then bought the lots that were abutting them, but facing 57th Avenue. There were six lots there, and that was in 1960. Apparently, there's always been a chronic issue of people driving by on 57th Avenue and dumping on vacant lots because it's the easiest and most convenient way for someone to do something that is illegal like that. So, what those owners did, apparently, was they put up a chain-link fence, and they put the chain-link fence up to avoid that type of situation, not because they were going to expand their very, very large home that faced El Prado, but the thing was that they put the fence up to control the dumping. So, a few years after that, fast-forward another 18 years after 1960 when they purchased those lots, they tried to sell off the lots that were on 57th Avenue. They never expanded their property on El Prado toward the west, in other words, toward 57th Avenue. So, a very young Zoning administrator made the determination that because there was a chain-link fence around it, although it was done without a permit and there was no record and there still is no record of a permit, he made the determination that all of the property, from El Prado to 57th Avenue, was one lot. They couldn't sell the six lots that they had on 57th Avenue within -- back in the day, within less than two months, they were already before the Commission and they had to then separate the two lots. We also had an interim Planning director and it was just a series of bad determinations. And lo and behold, it goes before the Commission and the Commission tried to do the best they could for the owners. And what they did is, they split the two, one from the other. In other words, the Prado lots from the ones on 57th. Unbeknownst to them, by doing that, they literally tied all six lots. Although, by zoning regulation, they would have been able to build three homes on those six lots. The lots are only 25 foot, 110 foot deep. With two -- and these are all platted lots from the beginning of time in the City. So, when you have a 50 foot by 110 foot, you have a legal buildable lot. So, they would have had three buildable lots, but they made a mistake. So, now go forward somewhere a long time, there were two folio numbers issued. Three -- the northern three have a folio and the southern three, abutting southern three have a separate folio. My client -- my dear friends and my client, purchased thinking that they had two buildable lots. In fact, the two houses that abut the undeveloped lots to the north are on

50-foot-wide lots by 110 foot deep. So, they only wanted to build two 75 foot by 110 foot lots, develop that and put two single-family homes on them. The title company missed it. Everybody missed this because everybody assumed that because of the folio numbers, that these were two buildable sites. And unbeknownst to them...

Vice Mayor Quesada: Quite a unique situation there.

Mr. Pardo: It is a unique situation.

Vice Mayor Quesada: Yeah.

Mr. Pardo: It's a very unique situation. So, what happened was they're purchasing -- they're thinking that they could build a single-family home on a 75 foot by 110 foot deep lot. It would be compatible with the lots that are facing on both sides, the non-City side and on the City side because they're actually bigger than the ones that are abutting because they're 75 foot wide. Facing 57th Avenue is very different than facing El Prado. I spoke with the owner of the original house that was built in 1940 that lives there now. He is an architect, and he said that he had absolutely no objection to this application. In fact, during the history of going through this entire process for almost a year, we have not had any objectors come to see or call me. We did receive one email of someone that is further north than us, and they are actually abutting the existing 50 foot lots. So, we're asking for two 75-foot lots. So, the only condition that was set when we went before the Planning Board, which was approved unanimously, was that mathematically we develop no more than what would be allowed if this were a single lot. Mathematically, if you have -- the smaller the lot, the more square footage you could put on it. We had no objection to that. I spoke with my client. He said he had no problem whatsoever with that. So, we literally lots 476 square feet -- in other words, we can't develop more than a combined 6,100 square feet. We could live with that condition. City Attorney has already addressed the other condition and we're willing to move forward. If the Commission has any questions, I'd be more than happy to try to address those.

Mayor Cason: If we approve this today, does this fix the legal mess with the folios and...

Vice Mayor Quesada: It would.

City Attorney Leen: We don't control what the County does, but my understanding is it would make it consistent.

Mayor Cason: So...

Mr. Pardo: It would make it consistent. We would not have to go back to the appraiser's office.

City Attorney Leen: Yeah.

Vice Mayor Quesada: You wouldn't?

Mr. Pardo: No, we would not because they got it right. The two folio numbers have the three lots...

Vice Mayor Quesada: Got it.

Mr. Pardo: Contiguous and...

Vice Mayor Quesada: I got it. So, in other words, it would be bringing it to be consistent with what the appraiser's already done.

Mr. Pardo: Correct. And on top of that, another mistake that was made was that when the Commission approved that, the second portion of this, which is very important, they basically removed all development rights on those lots, whether it was one lot or not because they

considered it the rear of the Alhambra site, which then you can't comply with setbacks. You can't comply with frontage. They basically deemed it, unbeknownst to them, an undevelopable site.

Vice Mayor Quesada: Okay.

Mayor Cason: Just regarding the two different standards that we -- actually, the one about the ownership, whether it was in 1977, that they didn't make it either, so that's on either of those two that they did on the other, so...

Mr. Pardo: Mr. Mayor, we had to get four out of six. We have four out of six.

Mayor Cason: So, you got four out of six.

Commissioner Keon: Yeah, I don't think...

Mayor Cason: So you don't really need to address that.

Commissioner Keon: That any of that's a problem. I mean, I think it's a shame that you had to go through the amount of time, and I understand the expense...

City Attorney Leen: And can I make a...

Commissioner Keon: That you had to go through for that, yeah.

City Attorney Leen: I didn't mean to interrupt you. I just wanted -- they did go through a time expense. The reason why ultimately staff probably couldn't deal with this administratively, although they often try to with these sort of historical anomalies, will try to, maybe through City Attorney opinion, or through action of staff administratively, but there was Commission action

here and that was the issue. And so, even if we had tried to give an opinion, it could cause an issue in the future for them. So, it's just better for there to be subsequent Commission action addressing this issue.

Commissioner Lago: I just want to make one point also in reference to what Mr. Pardo was saying before. If you -- just to be clear. If you look at 57th Avenue, Red Road, and you look at all the homes that are facing 57th Avenue -- I'm looking at your presentation. I think it's page 2 of 18, and it's worth mentioning and just making sure that everybody's aware of it. All the homes are the same lot size...

Mr. Pardo: Yes, they're...

Commissioner Lago: Of what you're requesting.

Mr. Pardo: Fifty footers.

Commissioner Lago: You're not asking anything out of the norm.

Mr. Pardo: Exactly.

Commissioner Lago: It's a situation which is clear, not only just for a few homes. It's for block after block after block after block.

Mr. Pardo: I think that today -- back in the day, you could do it, but today -- then when you throw in because these are on septic tank. There's no sewer available, so therefore, because on septic tank and because the HRS requirements have become stricter, I don't think you would be able to build today on a 50 foot by 110 foot lot unless you've got some type of variance from the State of Florida. So, therefore, the 75 -- they have never wavered from trying to build more than the two lots. And with the 75 foot, it would be more than compatible. It'd also give us the

ability -- because 57th Avenue, there is a state road -- it gives us the ability -- I'm not a big fan, but in this particular case, I think it's a safety issue. We've already gotten an off-the-record okay from State DOT of putting a circular drive there because when you see the people that live immediately abutting us, they have to back onto 57th Avenue. Traffic light is right there. State of Florida just designated a bicycle path. It's just like a disaster waiting to happen. That's why with a circular drive and going out, you know, with your headlights out toward 57th Avenue will be a safer condition.

Commissioner Lago: Let me ask you just one last question in regards to your -- to page number 4 of your presentation, the conceptual site plan. I know that this is not tied to this application, but I want to talk -- I want to have someone from staff make sure that the lot coverage, that there's sufficient green space being taken into account. I mean, again, the design is a pretty design. I mean, it's not to my taste, but again, that's up to your taste. But what my concern is I don't want to build every last square footage, you know, to the point where there isn't one blade of grass left.

Mr. Pardo: No, and Commissioner Lago, you make a very good point. But please keep in mind that staff also has listened very carefully to the Commission in the past in saying all these lots -- when you put that mathematically, all those lots and you put them together, we reduced this 476 square feet. That means that's more green area. The other thing is we also preserved four trees...

Commissioner Lago: That was my next question.

Mr. Pardo: On the site. We preserved four specimen trees. We hired a very good -- a very dear friend and a very good landscape architect, Mariano Corral. He went out, met with City staff for as far as the trees are concerned, and we were able to save not three, but four of the trees.

Commissioner Lago: And you're also setting the property back, you know, extensively, which is...

Mr. Pardo: That's correct.

Commissioner Lago: Out of context with the other homes, not in a bad way, in a good way, obviously.

Mr. Pardo: That's correct.

Commissioner Lago: But how -- I see that you have supposedly a pool, correct?

Mr. Pardo: That's correct. And we meet and exceed all the requirements that the present Zoning Code has in place, in other words, as far as...

Commissioner Lago: Open space.

Mr. Pardo: Open space. We're well under the FAR. We comply with all of those things.

Mayor Cason: Okay. Do we have any discussion?

Commissioner Keon: Yeah. I just -- the only thing -- and I know it's the site plans that are provided for us here, it's -- you know, I had the same issue, and I think we talked about the same issue that I had asked before is about the size of garage doors. But you know, I think aesthetically, they have said that, you know, it should be no more than a third of the frontage of a house, and that the garage doors should set back from the entrance so the prominent feature on the street is not a garage door, to enhance the aesthetics of the home, and the street and the city and more reflective of how we want to build in the City of Coral Gables. Mr. Pardo and I had that discussion and he said he -- it was his intention to do that.

Mr. Pardo: Exactly. And one of the things about the comment Commissioner Keon just made is that when you look at the design that you have here, believe it or not, based on the process that exists today, we had to go through the DRC Committee twice. This is on a lot -- just on the lot split. There is a place in time that the Commission and staff would want to tie something to a site plan, but be careful what you wish for because when you tie it to a site plan, every time you have any significant change to the site plan, you got to then clog up the Commission and the Planning Board with that.

City Attorney Leen: We addressed that. In the more recent lot split ordinance, the Commission indicated that it wanted a site plan with elevations. I issued an opinion on this. We did include in the final -- or we're including -- I think it's been signed already, but we're including in the final version of the ordinance a statement that obviously the Commission can, when it's imposing its conditions, give instructions or exceptions as it believes appropriate. But the general rule is that you apply a site plan. There will be circumstances where you'll have a lot that may need to be split, where there's no plans to build anything and maybe not for a long time either. So, I could see that there would be circumstances where you probably legally cannot require a site plan.

Commissioner Lago: But you have to have some discretion because, like I mentioned before in reference to the design, I'm not a fan of what -- Commissioner Keon made my point for me without having to make it. I'm not a fan of having the garage being so prominent. You know, I prefer to have it recessed. But when you look at the size of the lot -- I live on a lot that has access to San Amaro and Urbino, so my garage is hidden on Urbino and it's -- you never see the garage door.

Mr. Pardo: Because you have the corner.

Commissioner Lago: See, again, that's...

Mr. Pardo: Right.

Commissioner Lago: Again...

Mr. Pardo: That's an advantage.

Commissioner Lago: I feel privileged. That's an amenity that I have.

Mr. Pardo: I agree.

Commissioner Lago: When you talk about this lot, you don't have that amenity here.

Mr. Pardo: Exactly.

Commissioner Lago: You're kind of -- you're in a tough situation here.

Mr. Pardo: And the other thing that I did was once the Planning Board came up with the determination of limiting us to 6,100 square feet, I went back and redesigned both houses. And then what I did is I spoke with my client. I said, you know, really, to soften the garage truly, we need to have -- it's a two-car garage, but we truly need to have two separate doors. That makes all the difference in the world. When you have two separate doors, versus one 16-foot-wide door, I know that it's easier to drive in and back out, but we've done that already with these.

Commissioner Lago: And what I would like to also see from staff, if they could at one point -- I mean, I'm not going to hold you to the exact amount, but I'd -- I'm pretty sure that these lot sizes runs from probably Bird Road -- maybe even further. It probably runs...

Mr. Pardo: The entire -- all the way to the trail.

Commissioner Lago: All the way to the trail.

Mr. Pardo: Right.

Commissioner Lago: All the way from 57th Avenue, it runs all the way to 8th Street, so it's...

Mr. Pardo: Yep.

Commissioner Lago: Pretty much 90 plus percent are single lots like this, not even double lots.

Mr. Pardo: Yeah. Well, they're double lots. They're...

Commissioner Lago: I mean -- you know what I mean.

Mr. Pardo: Because they're 25, correct.

Commissioner Lago: But they're not...

Mr. Pardo: They're 50-foot lots. Absolutely.

Commissioner Lago: This is basically the common footprint.

Mr. Pardo: That's correct. And to be quite honest, nobody would be able to build on 125 foot wide by 110 foot. This is not the problem. You know, it's just not.

Commissioner Keon: Mr. Pardo, I normally don't like to see lot splits anywhere in Coral Gables, but I think in this case it really makes sense to conform with the neighborhood or even improve the neighborhood by having the 75-foot lot. So I think it would be an asset to have two

new properties there. But also on Country Club Prado, it would be a benefit and probably raised the assessed value of that home down the line if -- whenever it sells just by having a buffer zone too from Red Road. So I think it would not only help Country Club Prado and the neighbors on either side by not having so much of the traffic noise come through there.

Mayor Cason: And as you say, this is basically fixing a snafu.

Mr. Pardo: That's correct. And to be quite -- your comment, Commissioner Slesnick, is on point because the architect that owns the home abutting the back was thrilled that finally it's not, you know, a place where people -- and people still dump, believe it or not. As soon as they bought the property, someone dumped over the fence, which was just wild.

Commissioner Lago: One last thing, and going off what Commissioner Slesnick said, just to put it on the record, what is the setback -- the rear setback of the property as per the Code?

Mr. Pardo: It's ten feet.

Commissioner Keon: Ten feet.

Commissioner Lago: Ten feet.

Mr. Pardo: Ten feet for the single-story element. And we scaled it back, and in fact, the only thing that this gentleman who's known for several years, the only thing he asked me for was that the balcony not overlook or face his pool. I gave him my word that we would change that. So, what we did is we also, you know, moved one -- you know, we just inverted the two designs and he was extremely happy and very appreciative.

Mayor Cason: Great. Now, do we have any speaker cards? This is...

City Clerk Foeman: No, Mr. Mayor.

City Attorney Leen: Mr. Mayor, one legal point. Commissioner Keon raised this issue. She asked -- so, if, for example, you were to modify the garage as was requested, it's up to the Commission how that's evaluated. So, for example, you could allow that to be modified between first and second reading and you could approve it. You could allow it to be modified in the future and you could direct who would approve that. It could be the City architect. It could be Planning and Zoning. It could be the Board of Architects. And then you could either say that it has to come back to you or not. You have tremendous discretion.

Mayor Cason: Well, this has to come back to us any rate. We can vote on the second...

Commissioner Keon: Well, it's whether or not -- it's going to come back to us on second reading, but he may not have the ability to provide you with elevations at that time.

Mayor Cason: Right, yeah.

Commissioner Keon: I mean, I'm fine for it to go to the Board of Architects, but I really would like to...

Mr. Pardo: Yeah.

Commissioner Keon: For Mr. Trias -- you know, we have talked about, you know, design aesthetics and whatever, and I know there's a thing in the works. But to remind -- you know, this is the second instance that this has -- you know, that we've had this discussion now over, you know, the aesthetics of the front of houses and with, you know, garages being on the street and the front doors being recessed, where we have said that the front door is not the prominent feature on a house for aesthetic reasons, and that you need to move them back. The front entrance needs to be the more prominent feature, and they can't take up the whole front of the

house. You know, it's a really busy street. It's a difficult street to -- you know, and we don't need to make it worse. If anything, by design, we should begin to make it better. So, I really would like you, when this goes to the Board of Architects, to ensure that you have that discussion. Mr. Pardo is a very good architect. He sat on the Planning and Zoning Board. He is well aware of what we like to see in this City, and I know that he will do a good job.

Mr. Pardo: Thank you.

Commissioner Lago: And by the way, just to add one more point to that and Director Trias and I have had several discussions about this because we have an issue right now in the City in reference to a neighboring property where their balcony is basically overlooking someone else's property.

Mr. Pardo: And that's what the neighbor said.

Commissioner Lago: And you know, we need to really make sure -- and I'm happy you addressed that and you took that into consideration -- obviously, with the guidance of Mr. Trias and staff that that never happen again.

Mayor Cason: And we passed that in an ordinance.

Commissioner Lago: Yeah. As long as the design community starts understanding that more and more, and you know, we can (INAUDIBLE)...

Mr. Pardo: We turned the balcony in such a way that we're literally looking inside the property overlooking our own pool, not somebody else's.

Commissioner Lago: It just saves an adversarial type situation between two, you know, residents.

Mayor Cason: Alright.

Commissioner Lago: It's not a good position to be in.

Mayor Cason: We'll close the public hearing now since we had nobody else who wanted to speak. And any more discussion? Do we have a motion?

Vice Mayor Quesada: Wait a minute. Hold on real quick. I just want to say to staff, the PowerPoint presentation, obviously, I guess we're not going to go through it, but I saw it. It's the best PowerPoint presentation I've seen so far. It's like summarized down. It's nice. It's easier to follow now. You may not know this, but we recently changed some of the elements to clarify some of the language because we had too many double negatives in there. It's very confusing for everyone.

Mr. Pardo: Right, I agree.

Vice Mayor Quesada: So, we've gotten away from that. So, from your perspective, dealing on your side, was it easier to understand that?

Mr. Pardo: It is. I would -- you know, I...

Vice Mayor Quesada: We want to make it clear.

Mr. Pardo: Yeah. I...

Vice Mayor Quesada: Doesn't mean we're going to be easy in granting them.

Mr. Pardo: I don't want...

Vice Mayor Quesada: But we want to make it clear.

Mr. Pardo: Yeah. I truly don't want to put staff on...

Vice Mayor Quesada: No, no. I'm not saying that.

Commissioner Lago: You're not.

Vice Mayor Quesada: It's coming back at us because we're the ones that rewrote it. We'll take it to the City Attorney.

Mr. Pardo: And I think also that I think as a constructive criticism, I think that sometimes the types of applications -- you know, you can't have all applications like one size fits all.

Vice Mayor Quesada: Yeah.

Mr. Pardo: My clients have spent over \$60,000 in applications, and I wanted to say that publicly. In my opinion, since I sat on boards for over 20 years in this City, I've got to tell you, that is over the top. And really, when you consider that this was a special, special circumstance, that was something that it's somehow you can't recover that type of resource. And also, it's taken a long time to get here. But at the same time, you know, there are properties where people go in with lot splits, they have very unusual situations. Site plans should be tied. People should be looking. Egress is a problem, all these different things. Without a doubt, that's where you've got to apply it. But sometimes, staff may not be given the latitude to be able to say which ones go through this process or not. So, I know that it's a difficult task.

Commissioner Lago: Just a point to the statements that you made. We barely ever see lot splits. When was the last lot split we saw?

Mr. Pardo: Exactly.

Mayor Cason: We turn them down.

Commissioner Lago: A year ago? Again, and we turned that one down.

Mr. Pardo: Right.

Commissioner Lago: Again, I'm not going to get into the issues.

Mr. Pardo: Right.

Commissioner Lago: But it's very, very far and few between the lot splits here.

Mr. Pardo: Exactly.

Commissioner Lago: So -- and I don't want people to get the impression that are listening today, oh, the lot splits, you know, it's pervase. It's not. It's -- this is a very rare example...

Mayor Cason: Very rare.

Commissioner Lago: Which, in my opinion, merits -- has merits.

Mayor Cason: Alright, we're going to take two votes, and we'll come back to it next Commission meeting for a second reading. On E-6, do we have a motion?

Commissioner Keon: I'll move it.

Vice Mayor Quesada: Second.

Mayor Cason: Commissioner Keon makes the motion. The Vice Mayor seconds. City Clerk.

Commissioner Slesnick: Yes.

Commissioner Keon: Yes.

Commissioner Lago: Yes.

Vice Mayor Quesada: Yes.

Mayor Cason: Yes.

(Vote: 5-0)

Mayor Cason: E-7, motion?

Commissioner Keon: Move it.

Mayor Cason: Commissioner Keon...

Commissioner Lago: Second.

Mayor Cason: Commissioner Lago seconds. City Clerk.

Commissioner Keon: Yes.

Commissioner Lago: Yes.

Vice Mayor Quesada: Yes.

Commissioner Slesnick: Yes.

Mayor Cason: Yes.

(Vote: 5-0)

Mr. Pardo: Thank you very much.

Commissioner Lago: Thank you, sir.

Commissioner Keon: Thank you.

Vice Mayor Quesada: Mr. Trias, can we get an analysis...

Commissioner Lago: Ramon.

Vice Mayor Quesada: Well, I -- Madam City Manager -- through the Manager, I'd like to see an analysis of some of the points that he raised. Typically, what does it cost an applicant if, you know, in the whole process and the timing of the whole process on a lot split. We did this recently a few months back related to development projects, how long they typically take, commercial projects in downtown. So, if we can get some of that data so we can make a better informed decision to see how we need to improve that process.

Commissioner Keon: Thank you. It seems like a lot of money.

Vice Mayor Quesada: Thank you so much.

Mayor Cason: Thank you.

Vice Mayor Quesada: Huh?

Commissioner Keon: No, it seems like a lot of money.

Vice Mayor Quesada: Yeah.

Commissioner Keon: Sixty thousand, that seems like a lot of money.

Vice Mayor Quesada: And a lot of time.