

Page 13

1 MR. BEHAR: Well, before we do, I want to
 2 make sure, you know -- I don't have a problem
 3 continuing, because you have told us that
 4 you're going to meet with the neighbors, and
 5 I'm okay, but I believe this is the second time
 6 or third time that we continue.
 7 Let's make sure the next time around --
 8 because I'm sure you have some residents that
 9 have come, and we don't want to keep wasting
 10 their time.
 11 MR. GARCIA SERRA: We agree.
 12 MR. BEHAR: Okay. So next time around --
 13 MR. GARCIA SERRA: Yeah. And indeed, if
 14 there's anyone here that we have not -- in the
 15 audience that we have not met with or talked
 16 with before, and is interested in learning more
 17 about the project or wants to express concerns,
 18 please come and see me once we're finished
 19 here.
 20 MR. BEHAR: And we urge you to do that with
 21 the rest of the neighbors, so you could
 22 hopefully come back to us in a --
 23 MR. GARCIA SERRA: Absolutely. Everybody
 24 that's asked to meet with us, we have met with,
 25 and we've tried to address their concerns.

Page 14

1 MR. BEHAR: Okay. All right. With that,
 2 I'll make a motion to continue.
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: Is there a second?
 4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Second.
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Can you call the roll,
 6 please?
 7 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?
 8 MR. PEREZ: Yes.
 9 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?
 10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
 11 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 12 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 13 THE SECRETARY: Marshal Bellin?
 14 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 15 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 17 MR. GARCIA SERRA: Thank you very much.
 18 We'll see you in April.
 19 MR. WU: And to restate, for the record,
 20 the Villa Valencia case is on the agenda, Items
 21 5, 6 and 7, will be continued to the April 13th
 22 agenda, at this regular meeting time, at six
 23 o'clock.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you, Charles. Can you
 25 take the next item up, please?

Page 15

1 MR. WU: Yes, ma'am.
 2 MR. BEHAR: You want to give them a couple
 3 of minutes for them to --
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Sure.
 5 MR. BEHAR: You know, for the noise.
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: Absolutely.
 7 MR. WU: Madam Chair, if we may, if we can
 8 hear Item Number 10, since that is of some
 9 importance? If you don't mind, we can take
 10 that up-front. And we have people in the
 11 audience.
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Is there any objection from
 13 the Board Members if we take up Item 10 before
 14 any other item?
 15 MR. BEHAR: Not at all.
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: Not at all?
 17 MR. BEHAR: You can go ahead and do that.
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Let's go ahead and do
 19 that.
 20 MR. WU: Item Number 10 is a Presentation
 21 of the Draft Downtown Overlay District. The
 22 Planning and Zoning Division is now seeking
 23 recommendation at this time. The purpose of
 24 this workshop is to present the draft Zoning
 25 Code text amendments and preliminary

Page 16

1 development regulations for the proposed
 2 Downtown Overlay District. The Downtown Overly
 3 District is envisioned as an Appendix to the
 4 Zoning Code, where mandatory illustrative
 5 development standards and street frontage
 6 guidelines will be provided. These Zoning Code
 7 text amendments have been developed in
 8 collaboration with the Coral Gables Business
 9 Improvement District and are intended to be
 10 implemented in conjunction with the upcoming
 11 Miracle Mile and Giralda streetscape projects.
 12 The Downtown Overlay District Zoning Code text
 13 amendment will be scheduled for a presentation
 14 at a future Board meeting as a public hearing
 15 item for recommendation by the Planning and
 16 Zoning Board prior to consideration by the City
 17 Commission at two public hearings.
 18 To restate, the Board is not taking
 19 official action on this item. This is merely a
 20 presentation/workshop to get feedback from the
 21 Board, and any comment we might get from the
 22 public. Thank you.
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.
 24 MR. TRIAS: Thank you.
 25 Madam Chair, I have a brief representation.

1 If I could have the PowerPoint presentation.
 2 Members and Madam Chair, as you know, we
 3 have discussed this already once. This is a
 4 second opportunity to provide input in the
 5 context of a workshop. We have some citizens
 6 who are interested in speaking, I believe.
 7 There's also been a variety of e-mails sent to
 8 you and to others discussing many, many items.
 9 So I wanted to get a chance to maybe explain
 10 better, based on your input from last time,
 11 some of the provisions, and then get your
 12 direction, in terms of whether the ideas are
 13 good or not or whether we can do it in a
 14 different way.
 15 So one of the things that I always like to
 16 do is explain that we go through a very
 17 extensive public notification process in every
 18 project, but in this one, in particular, I
 19 think that given the fact that we're not even
 20 yet at the official public hearing, I think
 21 it's worthy of note that we have posted the
 22 agenda on the web, we have legal advertisement,
 23 we had meetings with the BID Improvement
 24 District, we posted the Staff report on the web
 25 page, we had a variety of follow-up meetings

1 with neighbors and citizens, all of this done
 2 in the last two months, so in February and
 3 March. Because, as you will know, the project
 4 for Miracle Mile and Giralda Avenue, the
 5 streetscape project is way on its way.
 6 In addition, we did make a mailing to all
 7 of the properties within the Overlay, which
 8 basically is the Downtown area, which at the
 9 northern end is Navarre, that's the boundary of
 10 the Downtown, and then some areas that even go
 11 beyond the boundaries of the Central Business
 12 District, all of the way to Malaga. So all of
 13 the property owners have been notified in
 14 writing of this idea.
 15 We've had at least ten meetings with
 16 stakeholders, different meetings, in different
 17 locations, many times at the City Hall and our
 18 Planning Department Offices. We've met with
 19 the BID Overlay Committee, which has been very
 20 helpful, and I want to make clear that they
 21 have been working on these ideas for several
 22 years, since 2015 or so, with the City, but
 23 even before that, on their own.
 24 We also had a chance to talk to you, talk
 25 to the Business Improvement District Review

1 Meeting, talk to the Economic Advisory Board,
 2 and we had, as I said, one Planning and Zoning
 3 meeting already.
 4 Now, I wanted to show this map, which the
 5 Staff prepared since the last time we talked,
 6 because I think it explains one of the
 7 challenges that we have in the big picture.
 8 The year 1964 is important, because that's the
 9 year that the City established minimum parking
 10 requirements.
 11 So if you look at the map, all of the
 12 buildings and those are buildings' frontprints,
 13 what you see depicted in the map, in the light
 14 color, the peach color, all of those are
 15 buildings from before 1964.
 16 What does that mean? Well, that means that
 17 they did not have to provide any minimum
 18 parking requirements. Now, they provided
 19 parking. They provided whatever parking they
 20 were able to provide or the developer thought
 21 was appropriate, but the Code didn't have any
 22 minimum parking requirements.
 23 In '64, those requirements are placed in
 24 the Code, and then the buildings in the red, in
 25 the darker color, are the buildings built since

1 that time. If you look at the map, you will
 2 see that they're much bigger.
 3 And interestingly enough, if you look at
 4 Miracle Mile, you will see that there are no
 5 buildings built since that time along Miracle
 6 Mile, but maybe one or so, and Giralda, the 100
 7 Block, is the same way.
 8 So there's a reason for that, and the
 9 reason is that the kind of dimensions that are
 10 needed to provide parking in an urban setting,
 11 which typically would end up being a garage or
 12 so, make it very difficult to do the small
 13 infill projects.
 14 So what has happened since 1964 is that
 15 we've had fantastic Mixed-Use projects, very
 16 nice, many of them, and some projects that have
 17 made a big difference, but we haven't had any
 18 small scale infill.
 19 Now, what is small scale infill? If you go
 20 back to the 1920s, this is a very good example
 21 of that. This is 2312 Ponce de Leon. It's
 22 still there. It's a three-story building.
 23 It's Mixed-Use. I mean, it was Mixed-Use when
 24 it was built, and it's still Mixed-Use. It's
 25 45 feet. So it's a fairly reasonable

1 proportion. And this is only possible, because
2 it's not providing parking on site.

3 Okay. So this type of scale, this type of
4 building that was built back in the day when
5 Merrick was developing things, was not possible
6 after 1964, because of the parking minimum.

7 So, I mean, if you look at the building
8 next to it, it's a two-story building, so a two
9 to three stories, which if you think in terms
10 of FAR, if you want to think in those terms,
11 that will be a 3.0 FAR.

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Ramon, I have a question.

13 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: When that building was
15 built, were there height restrictions in the
16 City?

17 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: What were the height
19 restrictions at that time?

20 MR. TRIAS: They were fairly high. They
21 were one to one, in terms of -- so, here, it
22 will be a hundred feet, in this road -- in
23 Ponce de Leon.

24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: And in Miracle Mile, I
25 think I read it would be 60 feet.

1 MR. TRIAS: 70 feet is the current.

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Right.

3 MR. TRIAS: Now, in Merrick's time, as I
4 said, he used some proportion of the width of
5 the street, so it was a little bit taller.

6 Now, that really has to do with, at the end
7 of the day, there's so much development one can
8 do without parking, obviously, because there's
9 only so much public parking in the street, et
10 cetera.

11 So, at some point, it is necessary to have
12 a very serious discussion about the provision
13 of parking. However, what we're saying is that
14 one of the ideas is that, on Miracle Mile and
15 on Giralda, given the fact that nothing has
16 happened for a very long time, maybe one of the
17 best strategies would be to have less parking
18 requirements, no minimum parking.

19 We'll still allow parking, and maybe we
20 need to discuss how much and how big the
21 building should be, but certainly that's one of
22 the big ideas that are being proposed in this
23 Overlay.

24 Those are two very small areas, and I'm
25 going over this, because I had a chance to read

1 several e-mails on this topic, that explain
2 that somehow there would be no parking
3 requirements and so on. We're talking about
4 two very targeted areas, related to the
5 streetscape project, where all of the
6 buildings -- practically all of the buildings
7 predate 1964. So if we continue to have the
8 same rules, it is very likely that we will
9 continue to have the same development that we
10 have right now. So that's one issue.

11 In addition to that, we are having some
12 development ideas that apply in the larger area
13 of the Downtown. Now, what are those ideas?
14 To make it as simple as possible, I tried to
15 summarize it in a couple of slides, and they're
16 very interesting, because, for example, in the
17 Downtown, which most people think that
18 Mixed-Use and living Downtown and residential
19 Downtown is a good idea, the reality is that
20 residential is only allowed in the large
21 projects, which are the Mixed-Use projects. So
22 what we're saying is, residential should be
23 allowed also in the smaller project. So that's
24 one idea.

25 The other idea is that the no minimum

1 parking ratio for small buildings shall be
2 applied for Miracle Mile and Giralda.

3 And we're having some technical
4 difficulties, I think, with the PowerPoint.
5 They're doing some updates in the computer, so
6 unfortunately it's not -- yeah. But we knew
7 that, so we have a backup plan.

8 All right. So in addition to the parking
9 issues, as it relates to Miracle Mile and
10 Giralda, we're also proposing some standards of
11 transparency, meaning glass, at the ground
12 level, to encourage good pedestrian quality
13 Mixed-Use development at the ground level. So
14 that's a new idea.

15 Another new idea is that we're having some
16 pedestrian-oriented signage, which was a
17 request of the BID for a very long time, and I
18 think it fits right in with the idea of
19 enhancing the quality of life at the pedestrian
20 level.

21 And a related concept is that we believe
22 that it will be good to have liners, and what a
23 liner is, is a habitable space, like, let's
24 say, a residence or an office, at the very
25 front of a parking garage. So what happens is

1 that then you don't have the big parking
2 garages overlooking the streets. So that is
3 proposed for what we're calling primary
4 streets.

5 Primary streets would be Miracle Mile,
6 Giralda, Ponce de Leon, the key streets that
7 you will identify with the high quality
8 pedestrian environment. Right now we don't
9 have that rule, so right now we have a lot of
10 buildings where the parking garage simply just
11 goes all of the way to the facade, and that
12 creates a less lively city than a building with
13 a liner would.

14 Now, in the actual -- in the special
15 areas -- in the two special areas of the plan,
16 which is Miracle Mile and Giralda, we have
17 those special regulations.

18 Now, much has been said about the six
19 stories and the 77 feet or so. That's what's
20 allowed now. I mean, what we're saying is that
21 one of the reasons why you don't see buildings
22 like that is because it's very difficult, it's
23 physically not possible, in terms of dimensions
24 and so on, to do those types of buildings and
25 provide the very high level of parking that is

1 currently required.

2 So that's an item of discussion that I
3 think we need to think about, in terms of how
4 large a building would be appropriate without
5 having required parking.

6 Now, I am not saying that there should be
7 no parking. I'm just saying that the minimum
8 parking requirements should not apply in those
9 locations, and we can discuss that further, and
10 I would like your direction and your ideas on
11 that topic.

12 We're also saying that there will be no
13 driveways or parking garage entrances fronting
14 Giralda, for example. I mean, that makes
15 sense. There's alleys, and that allows for a
16 better pedestrian environment. And there's
17 some special extended hours of operation, and
18 some expedited outdoor dining approvals,
19 meaning pre-approved where you can have
20 restaurant and so on activities.

21 MR. BEHAR: Before you go on too far --

22 MR. TRIAS: Yes, sir.

23 MR. BEHAR: For example, the entrances to
24 the parking, I agree in principle with you, but
25 what happens if you don't have an option? If

1 you're in the middle of the block, mid block
2 site, you have no option, because not every
3 property has access to the alleys, right?

4 MR. TRIAS: There are very few that don't.
5 I mean --

6 MR. BEHAR: And if you do, let's say, for
7 example -- you know, you have a project,
8 substantial amount of units or retail or
9 commercial, 100 percent of that entrance will
10 be through the alley -- to the parking will be
11 through the alley?

12 MR. TRIAS: That's the goal, and clearly if
13 there's an exception, that that's impossible,
14 you can get a variance for that. I mean, that
15 would be a hardship.

16 MR. BEHAR: In the ideal world, you're
17 right, and I will agree with you, because
18 that's the correct way to do it in an urban
19 environment. Just, you know, you have to make
20 a provision not to just limit it to that.

21 MR. TRIAS: Okay. But I don't think there
22 are too many places where that takes place, and
23 we can explain that in more detail, and maybe
24 we can identify the locations where we need to
25 relax that requirement.

1 MR. BELLIN: Excuse me, Ramon.

2 MR. TRIAS: Yes, sir.

3 MR. BELLIN: I don't see how you could
4 allow access to a parking garage from Miracle
5 Mile, with the amount of traffic, pedestrians.
6 You know, if you have access, it has to be from
7 the alley.

8 MR. TRIAS: Right.

9 MR. BEHAR: But this is not only for
10 Miracle Mile. This is the Downtown core,
11 right?

12 MR. TRIAS: No. No. No. No.

13 MR. PEREZ: Miracle Mile.

14 MR. TRIAS: No.

15 Yes, let me clarify. The prohibition, a
16 hundred percent prohibition, is for Miracle
17 Mile and Giralda.

18 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Then I'll take it back.
19 If it's Miracle Mile, you cannot have, you
20 know, any entrances.

21 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right. Right.

22 MR. BEHAR: But I'm seeing here, it says,
23 Downtown Overlay, so I'm thinking more about --

24 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah, but he specified it.

25 MR. TRIAS: That's part of the issues that

1 -- again, we don't need to make any decisions
2 tonight, and we need to make sure that we
3 verify that what we're saying is what the
4 proposed language says.

5 But, I mean, the big picture idea is,
6 Miracle Mile and Giralda have alleys, so,
7 therefore, that's where cars belong.

8 MR. BEHAR: Okay.

9 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, I have another
10 question.

11 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

12 MR. BELLIN: Can we clarify when parking
13 will be required? Is there a threshold that
14 you reach when parking is required?

15 MR. TRIAS: What I'm proposing is that the
16 large projects, the large parcel projects,
17 20,000 square feet and above, still the same
18 rules apply.

19 MR. BELLIN: Parking is required.

20 MR. TRIAS: Parking is required, just like
21 it is now.

22 Now, we are working on some shared parking
23 ideas and it's evolving and so on, in some
24 ways, but what I'm thinking is -- keep in mind,
25 all I'm saying here is that what has not

1 you don't need to provide parking anyway.

2 MR. TRIAS: That's true, and that is what
3 we have now. What we have one is 1.45. But
4 1.45 appears to be one-and-a-half stories and
5 sometimes it could be that. Generally it
6 becomes one story, because it's much easier to
7 -- I mean, if you do any more than one story,
8 then you have to provide the two stairs, the
9 elevators and so on.

10 So, realistically, what we have now is very
11 good, and if the community chooses to keep it
12 like that, no changes need to take place. And
13 I'm not making any judgments on that. However,
14 what we heard was that there was an interest in
15 encouraging some smaller scale infill and
16 encourage residential at the smaller scale.

17 For example, you could do a small
18 three-story building, where you do a restaurant
19 downstairs, and maybe four apartments above.
20 That sounds like a very nice idea. And then
21 you provide four parking spaces for the units
22 above.

23 Well, that's not allowed by the Code now.

24 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Why don't we have you
25 finish your presentations and then we'll get

1 happened in the City is the small scale
2 increment. That has not happened. And it has
3 not happened, because of the way the Code is
4 designed. The Code is designed to basically
5 encourage the large scale project.

6 Yes.

7 MR. PEREZ: The 20,000 square feet, is that
8 to be contiguous or could it be -- because, in
9 some cases, there's 20,000 feet that's not
10 contiguous, but owned by the same owners. How
11 would you treat it then?

12 MR. TRIAS: It has to be contiguous and it
13 has to be --

14 MR. PEREZ: Contiguous.

15 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And there's also a
16 minimum width of the lot in the frontage.

17 But what I'm saying is, I am not going to
18 propose a change of the parking requirements
19 for the larger projects. I don't think that's
20 a good idea.

21 I think it's a good idea to relax some of
22 the parking requirements for the small
23 projects, for the ones that are the 2,500 feet
24 and above, in terms of the --

25 MR. BELLIN: If your FAR is less than 1.45,

1 into either the public input or questions.

2 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. I'm almost finished.
3 The current Overlay, as you know, is relatively
4 small.

5 The other thing we're proposing is a change
6 of the boundary, and that boundary can be
7 discussed and fine-tuned.

8 And the Land Use Map remains the same.
9 Okay, and I want to make it clear, we're not
10 enhancing the development rights. We're simply
11 saying, whatever the Comp Plan says, you can do
12 that, which is generally what the policy should
13 be.

14 In addition to that, like I said, we have a
15 few maps, that, for example, require -- along
16 Le Jeune and Douglas Road require a setback to
17 have wider sidewalks. For example, that's the
18 map on the right.

19 And then we have a definition -- or a map
20 that defines or, rather, depicts the primary
21 frontage, the alley, some of the language --
22 some of the issues that we're trying to create
23 that hierarchy between the places that are
24 really, really pedestrian and the places that
25 should be left for the automobile.

1 In terms of design code, there are changes
2 that apply throughout, very few, very few, but
3 we are proposing that for the large scale
4 projects, there should be a step back at 45
5 feet or three stories. And that is the
6 proportion -- just to give you an example of
7 what that means, 45 feet is the --

8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Excuse me, Ramon. What do
9 you call large scale?

10 MR. TRIAS: The 20,000 square feet. I'm
11 speaking technically when I say these things,
12 but thank you for reminding me, because I need
13 to be clear.

14 And then what happens is, what is 45 feet?
15 45 feet is the cornice line of City Hall. So,
16 basically, before you get to the roof tile,
17 that very nice stone line right there, that's
18 45 feet. And we think that's a very good
19 dimension, that has a great historic precedence
20 in Miracle Mile to create the scale of
21 buildings throughout. So that's one idea.

22 And then the other idea, which we discussed
23 last time in some detail, is that in Giralda
24 and Miracle Mile, there will be a 20-foot step
25 back at 45 feet and a 10-foot step back from

1 the alley. And that's a discussion that we can
2 have, and I think some of you were not here at
3 the meeting last time, but that came from some
4 very expert members, to give us some additional
5 ideas on that.

6 And what I'm proposing is also that -- to
7 remember that along Miracle Mile and the
8 primary streets, there will be that liner,
9 along the front, so you're not able to have
10 parking all of the way to the front. So that
11 also discourages the parking garage feel that
12 you would have otherwise.

13 If these things are not implemented, let's
14 say, and Miracle Mile were to be developed with
15 large scale projects of 20,000 square feet, the
16 current Code allows 70 feet, but it will be --
17 parking will be a major component of that. So
18 the kind of fine scale and pedestrian activity,
19 I think will be lost, unless we make some of
20 these changes.

21 So that's the end of my presentation, and I
22 think some citizens may want to speak, and if
23 you have any questions, I may speak afterwards.

24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: May I?

25 MR. TRIAS: Yes. You can ask the Chair.

1 MS. MENENDEZ: Sure, go ahead.

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: All right. And I read the
3 materials that you submitted carefully, which I
4 found very helpful, but I have -- first of all,
5 I'd like you, at some point, to address --
6 there was a concern that was raised in lot of
7 the e-mails that were circulated regarding
8 safety, and I would like you to address
9 whatever you have to say about that.

10 But my other comment is that if we were
11 starting from scratch and we were evaluating
12 how to zone, you know, Miracle Mile and
13 Giralda, what I find a lot of -- assuming that,
14 you know, for example, safety wasn't really a
15 problem -- I'm not seeing that as an issue, and
16 I'm going to hear from the residents a little
17 bit more about that -- but assuming that wasn't
18 an issue, to me it sounds, it would be
19 aesthetically pleasing to have, you know, some
20 of what you're suggesting; however, you can't
21 ignore the fact that after '64, we have had a
22 lot of high rises, and so we have a lot of
23 density in the area.

24 See, my concern is density. So we're not
25 making these decisions and not planning in a

1 vacuum. We're planning given the development
2 that has taken place in '64 and all of these
3 large buildings that presently exist in the
4 Downtown area. So, you know, I'd like your
5 input on why shouldn't I be concerned and why
6 shouldn't the citizens be concerned that
7 with -- because what we're really talking about
8 is, if you do away with the parking
9 restriction, everybody who develops is going to
10 develop a 77-foot building.

11 Do you agree with that? I mean, for the
12 most part.

13 MR. TRIAS: I don't think so. I think most
14 people would want to provide some parking and
15 that will limit the number of stories; however,
16 we may want to have some regulations on that.
17 I mean, I've been thinking about it today.

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I guess I'd like you to
19 address, you know, a concern that I would have,
20 which is the, you know, density issues, in
21 light of the fact that we're not making these
22 decisions from scratch, if you will. We're
23 making decisions with, you know, the City and
24 the Downtown area as we find it today, and from
25 '64 to now we've had a lot of high rises. In

1 the last few years, we've had a lot of
 2 development in the City of Coral Gables, and
 3 I'm just concerned on density issues. So how
 4 would you address that?
 5 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. What I would say is that
 6 we're talking about four blocks on Miracle Mile
 7 and one block on Giralda. So it's not the
 8 whole Downtown. There's not a huge change in
 9 terms of what will be possible.
 10 Now, it's already allowed, I mean, in terms
 11 of the dimensions and the number of stories.
 12 It's just not likely to happen, because of
 13 other issues.
 14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well, it's already allowed,
 15 but as a practical matter, it's not going to
 16 happen, because it's not economically feasible
 17 unless you remove the parking restriction.
 18 MR. TRIAS: Exactly. And it's not only the
 19 economics, it's really the physical design.
 20 It's just not possible to do ramps and to do
 21 those kinds of things with small buildings.
 22 You just can't do it, even if you had all of
 23 the money in the world to invest in the
 24 project.
 25 So the only density change that we are

1 proposing is that we're saying that residential
 2 should be allow in the small buildings, in the
 3 buildings that are less than 20,000 square feet
 4 in the parcel. Right now that's not the case.
 5 Right now we have commercial --
 6 MR. BELLIN: I'd like to ask Frank, what is
 7 your objection to the density issue?
 8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I just -- you know, being a
 9 resident that lives fairly close by to
 10 Downtown, and I -- you know, I drive to work
 11 every day, and I work Downtown. I work in 255
 12 Alhambra. And I've seen a lot of development.
 13 And I see the impact of -- I mean, I've been in
 14 Downtown Gables, essentially in the same place
 15 -- I moved buildings, but not too far away from
 16 where I was, in 2004, and I've seen, you know,
 17 just a much greater amount of traffic in the
 18 area. And I'm just concerned that we've had an
 19 awful lot of development over the last few
 20 years.
 21 And, you know, everybody has, you know,
 22 their concerns. One of my concerns is just
 23 density.
 24 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: Can I suggest we take public

1 input, because I think we're going to continue
 2 engaging -- you brought up a good point, that I
 3 would love to also get into, and I think that
 4 we're just going to get out of hand here, in
 5 the sense of timing.
 6 MR. TRIAS: Sure. Thank you.
 7 MS. MENENDEZ: So if I may suggest, if
 8 nobody has any opposition, if we could move
 9 forward with the public hearing.
 10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Let's do it.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: Let's call the first
 12 speaker, please.
 13 Thank you.
 14 THE SECRETARY: Judith Weissel.
 15 MS. WEISSEL: I waive.
 16 THE SECRETARY: Okay. Gordon Sokoloff. Is
 17 that you? You waive?
 18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: He's not here.
 19 THE SECRETARY: He's not here? Okay.
 20 Thank you. Thank you.
 21 Deborah, I'm sorry, is it England?
 22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I think she was
 23 here on the other item.
 24 THE SECRETARY: Okay. Thank you.
 25 Gus Fonte. Gus Fonte.

1 MR. FONTE: Any of these?
 2 Gus Fonte --
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It works, if you want
 4 to use it.
 5 MR. FONTE: It works? Perfect.
 6 So I think --
 7 MS. MENENDEZ: Can we have your address,
 8 please?
 9 MR. FONTE: My address is 2100 Ponce de
 10 Leon Boulevard, Coral Gables, Florida 33134,
 11 Suite 1111.
 12 So I am the BID, the Chairman of the
 13 Overlay Committee. We've been working on this,
 14 gees, probably like eight years, nine years.
 15 What you're getting now is where we've come,
 16 and at the point that we've gotten to.
 17 The idea behind this was always to have it
 18 -- once the streetscape was coming online, when
 19 the parking garage developments were coming
 20 online, to sort of have this be the Overlay
 21 that puts everything together.
 22 The plan has always been, in our vision, to
 23 add more residential units, in smaller building
 24 components. As Ramon explains, it's very
 25 difficult to do that now because of the

1 requirements. So that's kind of where we're
2 looking, more that than the large scale
3 developments.

4 Part of the reason that we felt eliminating
5 or tried to eliminate some of the parking
6 restrictions, is that if you don't have the
7 cars going to the residences, you won't have
8 the residents using the cars.

9 So if you build an apartment -- and they
10 have to be small scale. You're not going to do
11 a 40, 50, 60-unit apartment building without
12 parking, but if you do a four-unit, a six-unit,
13 you can do those feasibly, and have them as
14 rental, without having parking, without
15 burdening the area with additional car traffic.

16 That has been one of our goals from the
17 beginning with this, obviously to have some
18 signage changes, which are also in there. I
19 mean, there's a whole host of other items, that
20 are non-development, included in the Overlay,
21 street furniture, signage, awnings, window
22 treatments, glass for the storefronts.

23 So the development is just a portion of it.
24 Obviously it's a hot button portion. But this
25 is something that's been given from our end and

1 and helps us to have a lively Downtown, and
2 having those residential -- residential
3 population, without relying on cars, would be a
4 big help.

5 So I support the proposed relaxing of the
6 parking requirements, and I think getting
7 smaller buildings through that would be a huge
8 thing. You know, the thing that I like least
9 about the big new developments that go up is
10 just, they're massive, and part is, you know,
11 you get these huge parking garages, that have
12 the -- you can see from the street, and it's
13 just not as beautiful as what you get with just
14 a single small building. So --

15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

16 THE SECRETARY: Maria (sic) -- I'm sorry, I
17 can't make this out -- Fogle.

18 MS. FOGLE: Good evening, everybody.
19 Marina Fogle, Executive Director of the
20 Business Improvement District.

21 So I am here, you know, in support of the
22 Overlay. As you may know, for almost 20 years,
23 the BID has been honored to be an integral part
24 of this community, whose central mission is
25 promoting commercial vitality to Miracle Mile

1 with the City, I'd say, a good eight years of
2 planning, to get to where we are now. So I
3 urge you to look at it with open minds and
4 support our work on this.

5 Thank you.

6 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

7 THE SECRETARY: Barbara Tria.

8 MR. TRIA: I commented at the last meeting,
9 so --

10 THE SECRETARY: Thank you.
11 Kenneth Garcia.

12 MR. GARCIA: Hello, Kenneth Garcia, 20
13 Alhambra Circle, Number 8, Coral Gables,
14 Florida 33134.

15 My wife and I own property, and I reside
16 within a block of the proposed Overlay
17 District, and we actually sold our car several
18 months ago. We get around by bike. And I
19 think the biggest obstacle to density is
20 traffic. And when you allow a more pedestrian
21 friendly development, that doesn't rely on
22 things like parking, you alleviate some of that
23 traffic.

24 I think, having the residential close to
25 Downtown or in Downtown, helps the businesses

1 and throughout Downtown Gables.

2 Today the BID continues to fulfill its
3 mission and vision with initiatives such as the
4 \$21,000,000 streetscape project, which finally
5 will break ground in June 2016. And that
6 project will take approximately 18 months to
7 complete.

8 As you know, the Business Improvement
9 District set forth the original vision in place
10 for the Downtown Coral Gables streetscape
11 project. The Downtown Coral Gables Overlay
12 study will in turn be the software that
13 activates our streetscape, which is the
14 hardware, to make the Downtown Coral Gables a
15 truly world class destination.

16 And that's basically our objective, to make
17 Downtown Coral Gables a world class
18 destination.

19 While streetscape addresses the physical
20 improvements to the area, the Overlay addresses
21 the Zoning regulations to the area. It is the
22 quality of the visitor experience that will
23 keep the people engaged in our Downtown, the
24 mix of shops, restaurants, businesses, art,
25 culture, activities, and events are what

1 convince people to live, work, patronize
 2 businesses and return regularly to sustain the
 3 Downtown.
 4 Just as the physical condition to the
 5 buildings and streetscape change over time, so
 6 do the interests, tastes and consumer behaviors
 7 of people. In fact, trends in retail and
 8 dining, arts and entertainment change much more
 9 rapidly than physical changes. And it is
 10 critical that the Code regulating both,
 11 physical environment and the uses, are
 12 periodically updated, to keep in pace with a
 13 changing society and competing destinations.
 14 And we know, it is a challenge, you know,
 15 to keep a balance between both, and many people
 16 have been talking about the overdevelopment,
 17 but, in reality, within the Downtown, no
 18 development has taken place over probably ten,
 19 fifteen years, and we have reached the point
 20 where finally streetscape is becoming a
 21 reality.
 22 I know there are many different components
 23 to this Overlay, but I urge you strongly, like
 24 I mentioned the last time, you know, time is of
 25 the essence. We're bringing, you know, to

1 break ground, and before we know it, we will
 2 have an additional area, which we want to
 3 activate, in terms of the extra sidewalks, the
 4 restaurants will be able to have outdoor
 5 dining.
 6 The same thing with Giralda, we're
 7 proposing that to be a pedestrian friendly
 8 place, you know, to be able to close it
 9 eventually, but in order for us to be able to
 10 activate that, we need to have specific rules
 11 in place, and that will take time, in terms of
 12 what type of furniture, hours of operation, how
 13 are you going to be able to utilize it, until
 14 what time are you going to be able to serve
 15 your patrons outside, if you're a restaurant,
 16 will you be able to only use the outside until
 17 9:00 p.m.
 18 You know, then, what is the point of doing
 19 the streetscape? You know, we need to be able
 20 to activate until twelve o'clock. We want to
 21 create this to be, you know, a vibrant
 22 Downtown.
 23 There's such potential in our Downtown.
 24 Our residents, the majority of them live like
 25 outside -- like two or three blocks outside,

1 with the exception of the first block on
 2 Miracle Mile, which is Aragon, but other than
 3 that, you know, 50,000 people come in daily to
 4 work to the Downtown, Monday to Friday, 9:00 to
 5 5:00.
 6 After five o'clock and on the weekends, you
 7 know what, it's challenging for our businesses,
 8 and we need to have those people living in the
 9 Downtown to really have a world class Downtown.
 10 So we urge you to support this project, to
 11 really vet it out with whoever you want.
 12 I also -- last comment that I want to make,
 13 last time we were here, you know, they
 14 insinuated that this project had been kept, you
 15 know, probably from residents or merchants or
 16 our own members. I've gone back, and if you're
 17 familiar with our website, shopcoralgable.com,
 18 we have all of the information there.
 19 First, for streetscape, we have
 20 shopcoralgables.com/streetscape, all of the
 21 history throughout, everybody that we've worked
 22 with throughout the years. I think it's been
 23 probably 15 years. For the last seven, it has
 24 been our highest priority.
 25 And with Overlay, the same thing,

1 shopcoralgables.com/overlay, you will see a
 2 brief -- and it's not a brief history. I put
 3 this together, and you'll be able to see it.
 4 The streetscape -- the Overlay Steering
 5 Committee was formed in 2011, the formal
 6 Committee, and throughout, these have been all
 7 of the meetings that we've had with our board,
 8 with our merchants, with the City.
 9 It is now, you know, between the
 10 negotiations back and forth, that we have a
 11 proposal now, that we're, you know, sending out
 12 to the different boards, and eventually we're
 13 hoping that it will be going to Commission for
 14 final approval. Then we hope that that will
 15 take place soon.
 16 I will be happy to share all of the
 17 information. You know, we sent quarterly --
 18 now, since I started, we send monthly
 19 communication to our members, and by members, I
 20 mean, all of the property owners and merchants,
 21 in terms of -- and they're highlighted by date.
 22 Every time that I have given presentations,
 23 every board meeting, which we meet once a
 24 month, we have the Overlay Committee. Gus is
 25 here, who is our chair. We had Burton Hersh

1 before. That they come and report to our
 2 board.
 3 Anybody can attend those meetings. You
 4 know, we're considered a governmental entity.
 5 So anybody can attend our meetings. Anybody
 6 can request our documents. And every month we
 7 have been, you know, updating or providing
 8 updates to our members.
 9 So with that, if you need any additional
 10 information, I am available. I will be happy
 11 to provide you with any information you so
 12 request.
 13 Thank you very much.
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you.
 15 THE SECRETARY: Jorge Kuperman.
 16 MR. KUPERMAN: Good afternoon. Jorge
 17 Kuperman, 137 Giralda Avenue. I'm an
 18 architect. That's where I have my practice.
 19 I'm a member of the Business Improvement
 20 District Board of Directors, and also a member
 21 of the Overlay Committee.
 22 I think that you heard this evening
 23 Mr. Garcia speaking about this initiative with
 24 his wife, and that's almost a vision of why the
 25 streetscape needs this Overlay. The

1 streetscape, without the Overlay, is not going
 2 to be the same thing. It's going to be
 3 visually appealing, but the City, the Mile,
 4 will still die at 6:00 or seven o'clock in the
 5 evening. We need life. We need these living
 6 units, young couples with bikes, not cars, so
 7 one thing doesn't come with the other.
 8 You heard me probably using the same
 9 arguments during the Giralda initiative that we
 10 discussed last month. I believe that one,
 11 without the other, is not the same thing. I
 12 really encourage you -- I don't want to repeat
 13 myself again -- to please support this
 14 initiative.
 15 There are large numbers of years' work on
 16 this organization, on streetscape, and Overlay.
 17 Marina likes to say, the hardware and the
 18 software, and I think it's a great analogy. One
 19 really needs the other one. Please support it.
 20 Thank you.
 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 22 Scot, how many more speakers do we have?
 23 Two more?
 24 THE SECRETARY: Two more.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. I'm going to allow

1 it.
 2 THE SECRETARY: J.R. Holmes.
 3 MR. HOLMES: Good evening. I don't
 4 think -- first of all, let me try and put this
 5 thing in focus.
 6 MR. COLLER: Could we get your name and
 7 address? I'm sorry.
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes. Thank you.
 9 MR. COLLER: I apologize.
 10 MR. HOLMES: Thank so much. No, I
 11 appreciate it.
 12 Jackson Rip Holmes. I own 256 Miracle
 13 Mile.
 14 You're being asked to -- I'm exaggerating
 15 slightly here, but only slightly -- to end
 16 Coral Gables as a suburb with this Overlay
 17 District.
 18 Now, the City's boundary obviously stretch
 19 many, many miles, but we're talking about its
 20 main street. So imagine the scenario, somebody
 21 visits the Mayor two or three years from now.
 22 This thing has been approved. The building
 23 height is where they want it, 77 feet, six
 24 floors.
 25 And the Mayor says to this important

1 visitor, "Coral Gables is a suburb." And, as
 2 you know, the Mayor's office looks out on the
 3 main street of Coral Gables, and you see
 4 six-story buildings there.
 5 And the visitor says, "What do you mean
 6 it's a suburb? Look at those buildings. That
 7 doesn't look like a suburb to me."
 8 And then the Mayor says, "Well, the
 9 Planning Board, back in 2016, approved this.
 10 It has to be good. It's a suburb."
 11 And the guy says, "I don't know what you
 12 define as a suburb, but six-story buildings on
 13 your main street is not my definition of a
 14 suburb."
 15 And what I submit to you is -- I doubt -- I
 16 don't know any of you, really, individually,
 17 but I doubt that any of you, when you signed up
 18 to be on the Planning and Zoning Board, did it
 19 with the intention of ending the suburb status
 20 of Coral Gables, and I doubt that any of you,
 21 when you talk to your children and the people
 22 that you love, want to claim as a legacy of
 23 your volunteer service on this Board that you
 24 voted to end Coral Gables as a suburb, but
 25 that's what they're asking you to do.

1 And there's also all kinds of tricky tricks
 2 here --
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: Mr. Holmes, we are an
 4 Advisory Committee. We don't give final
 5 approval. So if you can focus on your
 6 comments --
 7 MR. HOLMES: Nonetheless you vote --
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: -- if you can just focus
 9 your comments -- excuse me, sir --
 10 MR. HOLMES: If you vote it down, I think
 11 that's going to end the --
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Excuse me, sir. Can you
 13 please let me finish, please?
 14 Just please limit your comments to the
 15 project, to what's being proposed, so we can
 16 focus on that.
 17 MR. HOLMES: Well, this is what's being
 18 proposed.
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.
 20 MR. HOLMES: And it's done with a lot of
 21 flowery language, and I'm really glad when the
 22 -- that an oath was administered for people to
 23 tell the truth here, because I'm having trouble
 24 with whether or not you're getting the truth
 25 from the Planning Director, from the Director

1 of the BID.
 2 She said that she sent out all of these
 3 notices. The notices haven't gone out. I put
 4 out public records requests, whatever notices
 5 she sent to merchants, nothing has come back.
 6 Is she telling the truth?
 7 He's all over the map on this parking. He
 8 told me, and I'm saying this under penalties
 9 for perjury, that the reason they want this new
 10 Overlay District, because we already have one,
 11 is so the developers don't have to provide
 12 parking. That's what he told me. I'm on
 13 camera. I will take this to the grave. That's
 14 what he told me. And now he's telling you
 15 something different.
 16 I think that you need a straight answer on
 17 that. Will the developers -- this needs to be
 18 in writing. If we go through what you have,
 19 and what was given to you last time, I don't
 20 think what he said today is in there. So why
 21 is he changing this? And can you trust what
 22 he's saying?
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Does that conclude
 24 your comments?
 25 MR. HOLMES: No. There's a couple more,

1 please.
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. You have two minutes,
 3 please.
 4 MR. HOLMES: Thank you.
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah, I'm going to -- well,
 6 we just had two speakers, so that's why, but
 7 we're going to limit --
 8 MR. BEHAR: I suggested that.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.
 10 MR. HOLMES: I believe that a parking study
 11 is needed for this proposal, to find out what
 12 are the ramifications of having this no parking
 13 requirement. First, we don't even know how
 14 extensive it is, because he told me one thing
 15 and today he's telling you a different thing,
 16 but then he interlaced his comments today
 17 several times, just saying, "We need to reduce
 18 the parking requirements."
 19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Excuse me, Mr. Holmes. I
 20 would ask, just like the Vice Chair mentioned,
 21 if you limit your comments --
 22 MR. HOLMES: But I --
 23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Excuse me. Let me finish
 24 -- and not about the veracity of any of the
 25 Staff and whether they're telling you the truth

1 or not. Just focus on what your comments --
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: What you want to tell us.
 3 MR. HOLMES: So I submit that we need to
 4 have a parking study.
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you.
 6 MR. HOLMES: I think that the merchants
 7 still have not been directly informed. The
 8 Business Improvement District has an e-mail
 9 list. Why haven't they sent them notices? Why
 10 were notices only sent to property owners for a
 11 public meeting with the Planning Department
 12 just before your last meeting? Why are they
 13 being excluded?
 14 Why aren't you given a chance to know what
 15 the merchants, who have the most -- who suffer
 16 the most under this thing, have to say?
 17 I submit to you, this is very troublesome,
 18 and I recall the election of 2001, when all of
 19 this massive development resulted in three
 20 Commissioners being voted out and replaced with
 21 slow growth Commissioners.
 22 The people of Coral Gables don't really
 23 want this.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you, sir.
 25 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Mr. Holmes.

1 THE SECRETARY: Joseph Kohl.
 2 MR. KOHL: Hi, good evening. I'm Joseph
 3 Kohl, a business owner at 1571 Sunset Drive, at
 4 Dover, Kohl and Partners. We're town planners.
 5 Every day of my life, I spend many hours
 6 wrestling with the issues of parking and
 7 congestion, and I wanted to speak in favor of
 8 the proposed ordinance, especially when it
 9 comes to -- I think it's great in total, but I
 10 think specifically on this issue of small
 11 buildings.
 12 Small buildings and small increments of
 13 development are basically an endangered
 14 species, because we've made the approval
 15 process so complicated, developers are
 16 basically forced to say, "We need to push
 17 things to the limit, because of the cost -- the
 18 soft cost of getting a project built."
 19 Our office is in a historically designated
 20 building in Coral Gables. We're in the other
 21 Downtown, the one closer to South Miami, and we
 22 have no parking in our office. And we have --
 23 we occupy the entire second floor, so that's
 24 about 3,000 square feet, and we have about
 25 fifteen employees.

1 And when we moved in there, we had
 2 reservations, because we had no parking easily
 3 available, but what we found is that there were
 4 plenty of parking spaces in the other buildings
 5 in the neighborhood. So for those of us that
 6 decided to park, we can get parking.
 7 But I think the real cool effect that it
 8 had was that folks that lived within maybe a
 9 ten or fifteen, twenty-minute walk started
 10 walking to work, where before they had been
 11 driving, because the parking was convenient.
 12 And then our employees started using more
 13 transit. Again, because parking was not so
 14 easy for us or it cost a little bit more, it
 15 actually enduced our employees to use transit
 16 and to bicycle and to walk. And so I think
 17 that had an amazing effect. So it really kind
 18 of teaches us that issues of parking and issues
 19 of traffic congestion are two separate things.
 20 So if our building had 15 parking spaces
 21 for each of us to park in, we would probably
 22 drive to the office more, adding those car
 23 trips to Sunset Drive and Red Road and the
 24 other streets. And the fact that we're a small
 25 business, a small increment, our parking needs

1 tend to get reduced, but also the system in
 2 general can basically take that load.
 3 Thank you.
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you.
 5 Okay.
 6 MR. BEHAR: Close the public hearing.
 7 MS. MENENDEZ: I close the public hearing.
 8 And I open it up for our Board Members to start
 9 their questions or discussions.
 10 Does anybody want to start?
 11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: How about the issue that I
 12 asked you about, Ramon, the safety issue?
 13 Several of the -- safety, you know, crime and
 14 safety, those concerns -- that's not something
 15 that I'm saying I'm particularly concerned
 16 with, but I am mindful that a lot of the
 17 residents voiced that concern.
 18 Have you looked into that? Do you have any
 19 thoughts?
 20 MR. TRIAS: What I had a chance to review
 21 is some e-mails that made a connection between
 22 larger buildings and crime. I don't see that
 23 connection in Downtown Coral Gables. I can't
 24 explain the logic behind it. Frankly, you
 25 know, we certainly have experts in the City

1 that deal with policing and can give you more
 2 information. But I didn't understand that
 3 concept.
 4 MR. BEHAR: Let me -- I'm going to get
 5 going. First and foremost, I want to commend
 6 everybody, all of the business owners, that the
 7 Planning Department has been working on this,
 8 and I'm disappointed it's taken so long for
 9 this to come to us, to the City. I think it's
 10 something that is needed. I think that every
 11 good quality city has to have some residential
 12 in the Downtown core. I think this is
 13 something that -- and I like what you're
 14 proposing of limiting the height in some of
 15 these buildings, but it is fundamental, to keep
 16 those businesses alive, to have units there.
 17 It is just going to enhance the quality of life
 18 in that area.
 19 To the issue of safety, the way I see this,
 20 Frank, when you put a residential unit in these
 21 areas, you're bringing eyes on the streets.
 22 You have people that live there, that are going
 23 to provide a more active environment, to keep
 24 that safety at a better. Not what happens now,
 25 because I think one of the speakers, come

1 eleven o'clock at night, everybody leaves. If
 2 you have residential there, you're going to
 3 keep it for a longer period of time.
 4 I think this is a great idea, okay. I'm
 5 surprised one of the speakers, which my
 6 understanding, he has property in this area,
 7 would only benefit him to have the opportunity.
 8 I am in favor of the density to Miracle
 9 Mile, density to Giralda. I think it's
 10 fantastic.
 11 And you mentioned that there's a step back
 12 possibility that you're proposing. I think we
 13 need to look at that. I think 45 feet, as you
 14 mentioned, is a good height, because normally
 15 it relates to the City Hall, but it's something
 16 that in a human scale, based on the width of
 17 the street, is appropriate.
 18 My concern is, because the properties on
 19 Miracle Mile, that back up to the alley, the
 20 depth of those properties, if you start putting
 21 ten feet on the back side, twenty on the front
 22 side, what are you left over? Because if
 23 you're going to want to bring some quality
 24 residential, you should have a minimum depth,
 25 so you have quality residential. Let's not

1 lose sight that in ten years to bring quality,
 2 you know, residential units to the Mile and to
 3 Giralda.
 4 The traffic, I am not concerned. It
 5 doesn't -- on a small project like that, I'm
 6 not very concerned. If the projects get
 7 bigger, then there should be a threshold, where
 8 the parking should -- must be provided or at
 9 least on a reduction basis, so you don't do 60
 10 units with no parking. That's not going to
 11 work. So that needs to be worked out a little
 12 better.
 13 But, overall, I think I will commend you
 14 again, and the property owners of Miracle Mile
 15 and anybody putting this together. I think
 16 it's a fantastic idea, and I'm in support of
 17 it.
 18 MR. TRIAS: Thank you.
 19 MR. WU: Madam Chair, can I ask a question
 20 of Mr. Behar?
 21 Since you have some concerns about the step
 22 back, as you are aware, the step back in the
 23 back, we are proposing, so we can allow some
 24 openings to the rear. Do you have a
 25 counter-proposal for us to consider, in terms

1 of the front and back to make this work?
 2 MR. BEHAR: The ten feet in the back will
 3 allow you, you know, to have some opening, but
 4 at the end of the day, the alley is a public
 5 thruway, so you could have openings, but I
 6 think the step back in the front, you're not
 7 going to have -- and, again, it depends on the
 8 particular site.
 9 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. What I would suggest is
 10 that we could test this architecturally a
 11 little bit more, and see what the right
 12 dimension is. We have done some of that work.
 13 I think we're close. But you're right, we need
 14 to come up with that one.
 15 MR. BEHAR: It would be, I think, great to
 16 have three stories, which it gives you -- 45
 17 feet gives you a good line of sight, and then
 18 we step it back, whether it's ten feet, fifteen
 19 feet, but I don't think -- twenty may be too
 20 far back.
 21 MR. WU: Okay. Thank you.
 22 (Thereupon, Chairman Flanagan entered the
 23 Chambers.)
 24 MR. BEHAR: But that's something that could
 25 be worked out, and I'm sure a good compromise

1 will come out of it.
 2 MR. WU: Thank you.
 3 MR. TRIAS: The related idea to the step
 4 back at twenty was to have terraces and
 5 activities at that rooftop. So, you know, we
 6 can fine tune that a little bit more and
 7 explain it better in the final document.
 8 MR. BEHAR: Thank you.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: I have some -- no, go ahead.
 10 No, no, you first.
 11 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, I don't know if
 12 everybody understands that you can't have
 13 residential units in a C Zone. You can only
 14 have it if you have 20,000 square feet, which
 15 there probably are not many properties on
 16 Miracle Mile now that qualify as, you know,
 17 having 20,000 square feet.
 18 I don't see what the objection is to having
 19 more people live Downtown, that can eat in the
 20 restaurants and shop on the Mile and do
 21 whatever they want to do.
 22 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. I think that what we're
 23 doing is, we're making it possible, within the
 24 allowed heights and dimensions of the Comp
 25 Plan, because right now it's just not possible

1 to do the small buildings.
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: They're proposing 2,500
 3 square feet. I mean, 25 -- 2,500 square feet,
 4 to allow residential.
 5 MR. TRIAS: Right. That's the minimum.
 6 MR. BELLIN: But it's not allowed now.
 7 MS. MENENDEZ: I know that, but that's what
 8 they're proposing. They're proposing that.
 9 MR. BELLIN: That's why I think it's a good
 10 proposal.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.
 12 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 13 MR. BELLIN: And it should be supported.
 14 MR. TRIAS: I think what Mr. Bellin was
 15 saying is that we may be under the
 16 misimpression that somehow residential is
 17 something that is easy to do Downtown all over
 18 the place, and that's not the case. That can
 19 only be done in 20,000 square foot parcels or
 20 larger.
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. And I support that
 22 small building concept with the no parking. It
 23 concerns me, when you go up to 77 feet and no
 24 parking. I think others have mentioned that.
 25 That's what's concerning to me, because without

1 doing a parking analysis and without seeing
 2 what the impact would be if, in fact, everyone
 3 would take advantage of the new regulations or
 4 the new -- you know, what you're able to do,
 5 you might cause a parking issue in other areas.
 6 And so, in that regards, I'm not very
 7 comfortable with the 77 feet, in saying no
 8 parking is necessary.
 9 I also had some other --
 10 MR. TRIAS: If I could speak to that.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: Sure.
 12 MR. TRIAS: I agree with you on that. I
 13 think that right now we have a 1.45 FAR, which
 14 in all practical sense, is one story. I think
 15 that probably what we're going to have is that
 16 45-foot dimension, which within our proposal,
 17 is three stories, fairly high stories, and that
 18 may be the new threshold, maybe up to three
 19 stories, no parking beyond that, some parking
 20 required for residential.
 21 I mean, there's some ways to get to that
 22 point.
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: Right, but it's not only the
 24 three-story, it's also the square footage,
 25 because you can have it, you know --

1 MR. TRIAS: Up to 20,000. And that's the
 2 thing. Right now we're saying, okay, anything
 3 less than 20,000, let's change the rules.
 4 Maybe we need to have two or three categories,
 5 because, really, you're right, 25,000 square
 6 foot is not the same as 19,000.
 7 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.
 8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Maria, can I add something
 9 to what you're saying?
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: Sure.
 11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Was it ever considered --
 12 because I share the concern that Maria just
 13 articulated, was it ever considered to have the
 14 maximum height, let's say, at 45 feet, if
 15 you're going to change -- if you want the
 16 waiver of the parking requirement, you can only
 17 go up as high as 45 feet?
 18 MR. TRIAS: And that's what I was getting
 19 at. We can have that as a rule of waiving
 20 parking, and then the 77 feet is what's allowed
 21 by the Comp Plan, so that could be fine, if you
 22 provide parking beyond the 45. For example,
 23 that's one option.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: As far as the boundary lines
 25 of the new Downtown District, this is new,

1 right, because these boundary lines do not
 2 exist?
 3 MR. TRIAS: Right.
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: What we had -- I'm not sure
 5 it still exists -- is the CBD, okay -- and it
 6 seems as though the CBD is being extended
 7 through this new Downtown Overlay District,
 8 which brings it closer to the residential areas
 9 to the south and also to the north.
 10 I would suggest strongly that we advise
 11 those areas, that are adjacent to this new
 12 proposed boundaries, of what you're proposing,
 13 because you're introducing no parking for
 14 three-story, you know, 45 feet high buildings,
 15 and that's going to have an impact, I would
 16 imagine, because unless everybody can come up
 17 with all of the transit solutions, everybody
 18 gets on a bike, everybody gets on the trolley,
 19 what happens to those customers going to these
 20 retail places and restaurants? I mean, unless
 21 they get on the bus, they get on the trolley,
 22 you're going to have parking require -- or
 23 you're going to have parking needs.
 24 MR. BELLIN: Maria, the parking issue is
 25 only with respect to Miracle Mile. If we

1 extend the CBD, the parking -- let's say, for
2 argument sake, you do an office building or you
3 do a Mixed-Use building, that's not on
4 Miracle Mile, you've got to provide parking for
5 that building.

6 MS. MENENDEZ: No, that's not what it says
7 here. "Proposed regulation," on Page 5, "In
8 the general to Downtown area," it says, "No
9 minimum parking requirements for buildings less
10 than three stories and 45 feet high." That's
11 much more than what's allowed today.

12 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

13 MR. BELLIN: Is that the intention?

14 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, that would be it.

15 MS. MENENDEZ: That's more than what's
16 allowed today.

17 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. But you're correct, in
18 terms of the maximum height with -- Miracle
19 Mile and Giralda are special within the overall
20 Downtown.

21 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah. What they've done is,
22 they've separated the Mile and Giralda --
23 Miracle Mile and Giralda from -- they have
24 things in common, but they don't. They're
25 separated in some areas.

1 But they're proposing to allow no parking
2 for up to 45 feet all of the way to Palermo.

3 MR. BEHAR: No parking up to 45 feet.

4 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.

5 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. What I'm saying is that
6 the best use of our time today is to test those
7 ideas and then we'll come back.

8 MS. MENENDEZ: I think that's a wonderful
9 idea. I think it does have to be tested. I
10 don't think we should just arbitrarily decide,
11 we need to extend this line, let's allow no
12 parking for up to this amount. I think you
13 need to test it, you know.

14 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And my conversation with
15 our Parking Director today was exactly that,
16 that conceptually it may be workable, and
17 there's some need to refine the way to
18 implement it and to manage the public resource,
19 which is very limited, of public parking.

20 So I intent to continue that conversation.
21 He's here tonight, if you want to ask him any
22 questions.

23 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, the Land Use on Miracle
24 Mile now is 150 feet, but you can't build 150
25 feet, and we have spoken about this. You can't

1 go to 150 feet because of other --

2 MR. TRIAS: Because of the existing
3 Overlay.

4 MR. BELLIN: -- conditions -- because of
5 the existing Overlay.

6 Somebody who owns property on Miracle Mile
7 asked me, if this thing goes through, doesn't
8 it take away my development rights?

9 MR. TRIAS: No. We are not taking. We are
10 not adding. The development rights are the
11 same. What's changing is the development
12 standards, meaning the parking requirements,
13 some issues related to the buildings and so on.

14 But the actual land zone is the same.
15 Zoning is the same. We're not proposing any
16 changes.

17 MR. BELLIN: But if the Land Use is 150
18 feet, shouldn't we be changing the Land Use, to
19 be consistent with whatever the Overlay
20 District says?

21 MR. TRIAS: That's a theoretical question
22 at this point, because even though that's the
23 Land Use, the existing regulations, with the
24 Overlay, don't allow it.

25 I mean, maybe the attorneys can give us

1 better advice on how to fix that inconsistency.

2 MR. COLLER: The Comp Plan provides a
3 maximum. That's why it's prospective. You can
4 always Zone to a much less height or density
5 than the maximum provided under the Comp Plan.
6 You don't have to reach the maximum allowed in
7 the Comp Plan, because the Comp Plan is a
8 forward looking document.

9 If you went to the max today, you'd have
10 nothing else to plan. So that's the whole
11 concept of why your Zoning can be less than
12 what the Comp Plan provides for, and gives for
13 another day, someone else down the road, when
14 there may be a need to increase density, then
15 you have the opportunity to do that.

16 MR. BELLIN: If the intention is to keep
17 buildings lower, why does the Comp Plan -- and
18 I'm not arguing the point, I'm just asking you,
19 why does the Comp Plan say you can go to 150
20 feet?

21 MR. COLLER: Because the Comp Plan -- the
22 Comprehensive Plan is a forward looking
23 document. It provides an outside envelope,
24 that some day in the future may be achieved in
25 certain places, and at that time would be

1 appropriate.
 2 You don't necessarily have to bring
 3 everything down to what the Zoning is, because
 4 then the Comp Plan is the Zoning Code. So it's
 5 not inappropriate. You can certainly reduce
 6 the Comp Plan to three stories, if that's your
 7 desire, but the fact that the Comp Plan
 8 provides that doesn't mean that you can't --
 9 you have to go to the maximum in a rezoning
 10 request, that somebody might say, where they
 11 might argue, "Okay, well, the Zoning Code says
 12 100 -- the Comp Plan says 150 feet. I'm
 13 entitled to 150 feet."
 14 No, you're not. That's the maximum.
 15 You're entitled to what the Zoning Code
 16 provides for and what's appropriate in the
 17 area.
 18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Ramon, I have a question.
 19 Have you --
 20 MR. COLLER: Sorry that I couldn't give you
 21 a better answer.
 22 MR. BELLIN: It just seems to me to be
 23 confusing. If you can never get to 150 feet,
 24 period, that's the way it is. So why is it
 25 there? Why don't we do something about it, to

1 making efforts to get better utilization in our
 2 off-street facilities.
 3 Obviously, if you recommend this, and this
 4 went to Commission, we would have to consider
 5 modifying how we manage the public facilities.
 6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have another question.
 7 You're recommending that we go to three stories
 8 and 45 feet in height in other areas, not
 9 Miracle Mile and Giralda, and those places, you
 10 go up as high as 77 feet -- and I also think it
 11 would be a good idea to have more residential
 12 in the Downtown area. But my question is, why
 13 can't you accomplish that goal of having more
 14 residential, and, therefore, a more active
 15 Downtown and more patrons for our businesses,
 16 with a maximum of 45 feet, with no parking
 17 requirement?
 18 And, then, a related question is, what's
 19 the different -- why have you deemed it
 20 appropriate to have a different recommendation
 21 for Giralda and Miracle Mile than you do for
 22 the rest of Downtown in that regard?
 23 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and the recommendation
 24 for Giralda and Miracle Mile was simply to
 25 allow to what's -- to make it possible to build

1 make it consistent with what you can build
 2 there?
 3 MR. WU: Well, what you can do is just
 4 suggest, as part of an eventual motion, is to
 5 suggest to the City Commission to consider the
 6 Land Use at that time. So I think we've taken
 7 your comments to heart.
 8 MR. BELLIN: Okay.
 9 MR. TRIAS: Yes, sir.
 10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Ramon, I have a question.
 11 Have you done any study to determine the usage
 12 in our parking garages we presently have? I'm
 13 assuming, if this goes through, anything like
 14 this -- let's say that buildings up to 45 feet
 15 don't have to have parking, that it will
 16 make -- it might put a strain on our existing
 17 availability of parking garages. I don't know
 18 that.
 19 I'm just asking, has that been looked at?
 20 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. I'm going to defer to
 21 the expert on that topic, Mr. Kinney, who is
 22 the Parking Director.
 23 MR. KINNEY: What I would tell you is,
 24 right now, our garages are not near capacity,
 25 and we have development planned, and we are

1 what's allowed right now, which is the 77 feet
 2 and so on, but that may not be the best
 3 approach.
 4 I mean, listening to the conversation and
 5 listening to some of the Staff earlier today,
 6 I'm beginning to think that probably some
 7 intermediate size, like the 45 feet, may be
 8 better, in terms of the threshold for limiting
 9 the parking.
 10 I also want to have a better understanding
 11 of the implications of that in the public
 12 parking garages, from further discussion with
 13 our Parking Director, and be able to bring all
 14 that to you in a more complete form, once it
 15 goes to an official public hearing for action.
 16 Today's discussion, really, was for our
 17 benefit, to be able to see what your priorities
 18 are.
 19 Now, in addition, on Monday, we have a
 20 public meeting scheduled at the Museum, Monday
 21 at six o'clock, Monday the 14th, so we have
 22 additional opportunities for public input and
 23 discussion. I think this is a very important
 24 subject. I think I want to -- we need to
 25 hear -- we need to hear from the citizens,

1 because they're the ones experiencing some of
2 the challenges of growth and some of the
3 challenges with traffic and so on.

4 And, also, let's keep in mind that there's
5 a traffic plan, a traffic plan that is being
6 prepared, a mobility plan, at the same time, by
7 Public Works, and, you know, if you want a
8 presentation on that, we can provide that next
9 time.

10 MR. PEREZ: So my comment is short. I just
11 want to -- like Robert, I want to, you know,
12 applauded the BID and the Staff for all the
13 work that they've put into this, because my
14 interpretation of this exercise -- and although
15 it's continuing to be worked on and massaged,
16 et cetera, but my interpretation of this is
17 that it's going to give, finally,
18 flexibility -- to responsible developers and
19 responsible real estate people, the flexibility
20 to do just that, to do responsible projects.

21 And what I mean by, "responsible projects,"
22 is, just because, let's say, for whatever
23 reason, the City would sit there and say,
24 Mr. Developer, build 77 feet in height and
25 deliver no parking; I, for one, being a real

1 arrive at a finished product soon, because,
2 again, I think it would give the tools to
3 people that really want to take the risk and
4 not only acquire bricks and mortar in this
5 City, but putting monies to work and attracting
6 people to a City that has a lot of the valuable
7 tools to make it a thriving urban area.

8 So, again, my comment is just to
9 congratulate you guys.

10 MR. TRIAS: And thank you.

11 And, again, to clarify, that's exactly the
12 point that we're trying to make. We're not
13 saying, no parking. What we're saying is, no
14 minimum parking requirements. There's the
15 flexibility to provide the right parking -- the
16 right amount of parking by the developer, based
17 on the size of the building that they choose to
18 do. Right now that doesn't exist.

19 I think that's consistent with the current
20 parking theory, in the sense that the 1964 idea
21 of having all of these minimum parking
22 requirements, that you add upon each other and
23 so on, it's really not effective, when you're
24 dealing with a Downtown, where you want to
25 maximize the pedestrian quality.

1 estate person, if I had that opportunity, I
2 wouldn't do it, because what it boils down to
3 is marketability and how, in essence, well that
4 building or that project will perform, be it
5 multi-family, be it office, be it retail, once
6 it's done.

7 So I do think that given this kind of
8 flexibility, that I can keep referring to, it
9 gives a designer or an architect or a real
10 estate person, the ability to sit there and
11 say, where is my property located? Do I take
12 advantage of not delivering parking, because
13 I'm in close proximity to a parking structure?
14 Do I deliver more parking, because I'm not in
15 close proximity to a parking structure?

16 Again, my comment is, I think this is a
17 step in the right direction, that needs it.
18 Let's face it, Downtown Coral Gables has the
19 bones, has the layout to be a lot more than
20 what it is today, and without a plan such as
21 this, I'm of the opinion that it's never going
22 to become what it could be.

23 So, again, I just want to applauded the BID
24 and the Staff for finally taking the initiative
25 and putting this to work, and hopefully we can

1 Yes.

2 MR. BELLIN: In the Downtown Overlay
3 District, do you limit it to 77 feet --

4 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

5 MR. BELLIN: -- period?

6 What about the new parking garages?

7 MR. TRIAS: Along Miracle Mile and along
8 Giralda. However, the rest of the Land Use
9 height still applies in other areas in the
10 Overlay. So nothing changes significantly --

11 MR. BEHAR: Marshall, are you referring to
12 the new parking garages that's going to come
13 out of Andalucia?

14 MR. BELLIN: They're going to 150 feet.

15 MR. BEHAR: Or more.

16 MR. TRIAS: But those are on the other side
17 of the alley.

18 MR. BELLIN: Yeah.

19 MR. TRIAS: Okay. So that's not what we're
20 saying.

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Not to be argumentative,
22 rather to stimulate discussion, I'd like to
23 hear from, you know, my colleagues on the Board
24 that favor the project, and how they feel about
25 limiting the height of buildings without a

1 parking requirement to 45 feet?
 2 Because, again, I'm very interested in what
 3 they have to say on that issue.
 4 MR. PEREZ: Well, why would you limit it?
 5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well, I'm concerned about
 6 density. I mean, I'm not saying -- again,
 7 we're at the point where we're discussing. I'm
 8 not necessarily saying that I favor one thing
 9 or another or -- you know, we're just here
 10 discussing it. It's a workshop.
 11 So I'd like to hear from -- I know that
 12 Robert, as well, whose opinion that I respect,
 13 as well as yours, and I'm just interested in,
 14 would -- could the goals be met with a 45-foot
 15 restriction on -- you know, not having the
 16 parking requirement?
 17 MR. BEHAR: Frank, my opinion, it's not
 18 just the 45 feet. It has to do with the size
 19 of the property also, because it's not just one
 20 factor. You have to, in my opinion, take
 21 consideration -- you know, if you have a 20,000
 22 square foot piece of property, and you're
 23 limited to 45 feet, but I could do, I don't
 24 know -- in 20,000 square feet, I could probably
 25 do 60 units, you know.

1 So 45 feet, not necessarily, should be the
 2 cap or the boundary. You've got to look at
 3 both, because, you know, if I take a piece of
 4 property, 20,000 square feet --
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm sorry, am I hearing
 6 -- and, of course, I was late. I had a client
 7 hearing down south.
 8 But were you saying 45 feet maximum height
 9 or 45 feet would allow for a parking waiver?
 10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Right. The 45 feet. I
 11 know that now you're raising another issue,
 12 which I also -- I agree with you.
 13 MS. MENENDEZ: Parking.
 14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I agree with you, but I'm
 15 talking about the height.
 16 You spoke very highly of, you know, this
 17 proposal, and I'm just interested, do you think
 18 that the goals -- you know, the goals of the
 19 proposal could be met if we had a restriction
 20 of 45 feet in height to get the parking waiver?
 21 Because I think, to me, that -- I'm not for
 22 anything, I'm just, again, stimulating
 23 discussion, but it seems like an interesting --
 24 MR. BEHAR: I would think that, you know,
 25 if you go to 45 feet on a small property, you

1 may not need to provide any parking. You know,
 2 if you had a -- because you're proposing up to
 3 2,500 square feet.
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.
 5 MR. BEHAR: You may not need to provide any
 6 parking, but you know you're going to do maybe
 7 three or four units maximum.
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.
 9 MR. BEHAR: Okay. But if you're going to
 10 do --
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: A hundred.
 12 MR. BEHAR: Then, you know, I don't think
 13 you should have no reduction, like I said
 14 before -- I mean, no parking, maybe you have a
 15 reduction.
 16 So if you have a parking garage accessible
 17 to you within, you know, half a block, maybe
 18 instead of providing no parking, you provide
 19 one per unit or something that will reduce the
 20 required, but not totally eliminate the
 21 parking.
 22 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah. Yeah. I have a
 23 concern with that same thing that you both
 24 gentlemen are talking about, the whole concept.
 25 I like the height idea, but that width, if you

1 don't kind of like figure out the density
 2 maximum, you know, then you might not be
 3 helping anybody.
 4 MR. BEHAR: And, Albert, you referred to
 5 something of quality development. You're
 6 right, but unfortunately we cannot leave the
 7 door too open.
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah.
 9 MR. PEREZ: I mean, but there's protocol in
 10 place to avoid that. I mean, there's still a
 11 design process that needs to take place, that
 12 monitors the abuse of what you're referring to.
 13 I get you.
 14 MR. TRIAS: Right.
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: But if it says, no parking,
 16 some people will take advantage of that. It
 17 doesn't matter how well they design it.
 18 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, the idea that I
 19 had was to do the review process, and perhaps
 20 we need to have some criteria that talks about
 21 the maximum area and so on where parking needs
 22 to be reviewed, and allow for some flexibility.
 23 I think the real problem is when you have
 24 very high numbers, for example, restaurants, in
 25 some Mixed-Use projects and then they're not

1 possible because of that, when the reality is
 2 that restaurants, for example, are the ones
 3 that really benefit from public parking.
 4 So in this case, a development scenario
 5 could be, you have a restaurant downstairs, and
 6 you don't provide parking for that. And then
 7 you have four units above, and you provide
 8 parking for that. So that could be a realistic
 9 scenario by a developer, I think, and an
 10 appropriate scenario, in terms of the way the
 11 Downtown operates.
 12 MR. BELLIN: For restaurants now, you don't
 13 provide parking. The restaurants on Miracle
 14 Mile doesn't require any parking.
 15 MR. TRIAS: Right, if you have less than
 16 1.45 FAR.
 17 MR. BELLIN: Yeah, but the restaurant
 18 generally is one story.
 19 MR. TRIAS: If you have a one story -- you
 20 can have one story buildings now and not
 21 provide parking. True. But that's it. I
 22 mean, if you have any kind of additional
 23 stories, then that doesn't work anymore.
 24 MR. BELLIN: Then it doesn't.
 25 MR. TRIAS: And that's what I'm saying.

1 That's the main issue here, in terms of Miracle
 2 Mile and Giralda, to allow those types of --
 3 MR. BEHAR: I think we're going in the
 4 right direction. I think you need to study it,
 5 and there's got to be some threshold, you know,
 6 that go in place, without restricting too much,
 7 because we do want, like Albert said, to get
 8 the quality development to come into Miracle
 9 Mile, that we need it, you know.
 10 And I think you could come back to us. You
 11 heard us, you know. And then come back with
 12 some proposed amendment that will maybe --
 13 MR. PEREZ: And, listen, let's face it,
 14 there may be some areas in the CBD where maybe
 15 no parking is appropriate. You know, the
 16 parking garages. You know, I didn't submit --
 17 I didn't read the RFP, but I'm not sure how
 18 many parking spaces the City is requiring, but
 19 if it's --
 20 MR. WU: The City will be proposing a
 21 thousand spaces between both garages.
 22 MR. PEREZ: Perfect. If there's an
 23 opportunity for responsible development to go
 24 up next to these thousand spaces, which chances
 25 are they're probably going to go vacant a good

1 portion of the time, why can't a resident lease
 2 a parking space from the City?
 3 The City of Miami does it, in some cases,
 4 depending on where they are and where the
 5 project is located, parking is waived. I'm not
 6 saying to sit there and waive it across the
 7 board, but perhaps, how do you determine a
 8 project being appropriate to waive parking for
 9 obvious reasons, location, accessibility of the
 10 parking structures, et cetera?
 11 And that's something maybe that we could
 12 learn off, the way City of Miami is doing it.
 13 MR. BEHAR: No, I agree. You know, and in
 14 the past we have had these conversations, and
 15 we should do it. You know, I don't want to see
 16 a building have to have an excess of parking.
 17 It will make the building bigger, bulkier,
 18 because you have to provide more parking than
 19 you need.
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.
 21 MR. BEHAR: We don't want to provide much
 22 less, but, you know, there has to be a point
 23 where it's good for everybody.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: I have a question, again, on
 25 this boundary. How did you all determine the

1 south and north boundaries of this new Downtown
 2 District?
 3 MR. TRIAS: The north boundary is the same
 4 boundary as the CBD is, Navarre.
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.
 6 MR. TRIAS: Can I have the map? I mean,
 7 just for the -- and the south boundary goes all
 8 of the way to Malaga, which is where the
 9 Mediterranean Village was recently approved,
 10 and then it goes a little bit -- I mean, you
 11 can see, we went down here, through Malaga, and
 12 through here, in Palermo.
 13 MS. MENENDEZ: But what was the logic
 14 behind it?
 15 MR. TRIAS: The logic is the Land Use, and
 16 you can see that the reds are the high rise and
 17 mid rise Land Uses, and that's why that's here.
 18 I mean, generally speaking.
 19 And this is not like that, so that's why
 20 this neighborhood was not included. And,
 21 similarly, all of these neighborhoods are
 22 residential, and that was not included, either.
 23 So that was the thinking. There's some
 24 discussion about, some property owners would
 25 like to include some specific parcels and so

1 on. Whether that matters or not is an issue
 2 that we could discuss.
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: What we're doing is
 4 extending the CBD District, by doing what we're
 5 proposing. So we should just call it what it
 6 is.
 7 I'm not saying I'm against it. I'm not
 8 saying I'm for it, because I don't think we've
 9 studied it enough to -- at least from my
 10 perspective, to provide an opinion on it or a
 11 recommendation from me, but that's what we're
 12 doing.
 13 Because the parking is the main issue of
 14 the CBD, the advantage of being in the CBD, and
 15 I do think we should notify all affected
 16 property owners, that are now closer to the CBD
 17 District, because that's always been a big
 18 thing in our City.
 19 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: I have a question. Is the
 21 BID going to extend their boundaries to those
 22 lines, as well?
 23 MR. TRIAS: Well, maybe they can answer
 24 that.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: No?

1 MR. TRIAS: No?
 2 Okay. No.
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.
 4 I'm not against it or for it. I just
 5 wanted to know.
 6 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, what real effect does
 7 the extending of the CBD really have? The
 8 building's the same height, the density is the
 9 same. Everything stays --
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: The density is not the same,
 11 Marshall.
 12 MR. BELLIN: It's a C Zone. And in a C
 13 Zone, unless you put an MXD --
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: All of a sudden you don't
 15 have parking requirements for a building that's
 16 45 feet and has a higher density, because they
 17 haven't defined the density. So you, in
 18 essence --
 19 MR. BELLIN: There is no density. You
 20 can't have density. Density is units. You
 21 can't have units in a building that's in a C
 22 Zone and not large enough to put --
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: But that's not what they're
 24 proposing. I read that to you. They're
 25 proposing, no parking for small buildings.

1 MR. TRIAS: And, again, if you disagree --
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: So, in essence, it's an
 3 extension of the CBD, you know, the pluses that
 4 a CBD gives you. And I'm just saying that we
 5 need to analyze the impact, not just
 6 arbitrarily say -- from my perspective, I'm
 7 just one Board Member, say it's fine. That's
 8 my opinion.
 9 MR. TRIAS: I think Ms. Menendez is correct
 10 in the concept, because the reality is, the CBD
 11 has very few benefits, and one of them is the
 12 parking. Another one is the TDR, the historic
 13 TDR and so on. Very few things.
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: I like to live-work concept.
 15 I think that's the ideal thing for an urban
 16 area. And I embrace it. I just want to make
 17 sure we do it right.
 18 MR. TRIAS: Exactly.
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Ramon, switching
 20 gears over to the primary streets and the
 21 shopfront requirement --
 22 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Am I reading this as
 24 though it still will require -- well, it says,
 25 "Commercial use," so basically retail on those

1 primary streets?
 2 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Which includes all of
 4 Ponce?
 5 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I still have a concern
 7 with that, because there are offices and
 8 similar type uses up and down Ponce.
 9 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, let me rephrase that.
 10 It's the storefront requirements, the design
 11 requirements that are there. So you can have
 12 office or any use that is allowed by Zoning.
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So the CO for
 14 commercial use would include office?
 15 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. The main idea here is
 16 that we want to make the ground level as open
 17 and as transparent as possible, to enhance the
 18 pedestrian experience.
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Because I think
 20 the last version had it as requiring retail.
 21 MR. TRIAS: That's not the intent.
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. So that did get
 23 changed?
 24 MR. TRIAS: In some places, like in Miracle
 25 Mile and Giralda, it's different.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. But I think the
2 last version we had, we would require retail
3 all up and down Ponce.

4 MR. TRIAS: And what we need to do is, that
5 map needs to be more precisely drawn.

6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Anybody else
7 have any further discussion at this time?

8 MR. PEREZ: So I just want clarity. So a
9 lot of this, obviously, assumes new
10 construction and new development. So with
11 these boundaries that we're talking about, how
12 does, in essence, an adaptive reuse or an
13 existing building, that, for whatever reason, a
14 real estate person wants to reposition or keep
15 the integrity of, but perhaps add a different
16 use or more FAR allowed by wherever this ends
17 up at, how do you treat parking then?

18 Because right now, anything outside of the
19 CBD, for an existing building, you add any type
20 of square footage, you get dinged on parking.
21 So I haven't gone through this in depth, but
22 does keeping an existing building for
23 renovation or adaptive reuse purposes, has it
24 been addressed in this exercise or the study?

25 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. The same rules would

1 register with me. I apologize if I'm
2 rehashing. But why the 45-foot limit on the
3 other areas, and in Miracle Mile and Giralda
4 you can go up to 77?

5 I understand that presently you can go to
6 70. I understand -- well, at least my
7 understanding is, in Miracle Mile, you can go
8 up to 70.

9 MS. MENENDEZ: But with parking.

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: But with parking.

11 Okay. And as a practical matter, and I
12 think you agree with this, that if anybody, you
13 know, constructs anything, that they're not
14 going to build something if they have these
15 restrictive parking requirements. So if you
16 remove them, it's going to stimulate, you know,
17 somebody to build.

18 Why the difference? You know, why can't we
19 just limit the -- you know, the benefit of not
20 having the parking requirement to a building
21 that is a maximum of 45 feet high? And sort of
22 along with that, you listed some public
23 benefits and the public benefits include
24 economic sustainability, a robust residential
25 population, protection and enhancement of the

1 apply.

2 MR. PEREZ: Okay.

3 MR. TRIAS: So the parking waiver will
4 apply, also.

5 MR. PEREZ: So within these boundaries, if
6 you keep an existing building and you enhance
7 it, and you add allowable FAR, you do not have
8 to add additional parking?

9 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And the issue would be,
10 for example, let's say you have a three-story
11 building and you want to do a change of use at
12 the ground level and place a restaurant
13 downstairs. Right now, that's impossible,
14 because of the very high parking requirements.

15 So that's one of the things you can do.

16 MR. PEREZ: Or if you have an existing one
17 story building, and as per this, you're allowed
18 to go to 45, and the owner wants to take the
19 risk and the cost and the investment of adding
20 a second floor, he can do so, without having to
21 add parking? That's correct?

22 MR. TRIAS: Right. Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody else?

24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Ramon, I asked a question
25 before, and if you answered it, it didn't

1 Coral Gables brand, and the protection and
2 enhancement of the aesthetic principles upon
3 which Coral Gables was founded.

4 Couldn't we have all of that and
5 residential with just a 45-foot, you know,
6 limit when you're going to get the benefit of
7 not having the restrictive parking requirement?

8 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes. And that's the way
9 that I'm inclined to propose it at this point,
10 given the concerns. And, again, that only --
11 the only additional height was for Miracle Mile
12 and Giralda. So the change is not that much,
13 in terms of what the ideas were originally
14 proposed.

15 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Did you get enough
16 comment?

17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. TRIAS: Excellent. Thank you very
19 much. This was very helpful.

20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I understand we have
21 one more item on the agenda for tonight.

22 MR. WU: Yes, sir.

23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that Item Number 8?

24 MR. WU: Item Number 8. And 9 is off the
25 agenda. Item Number 8.