

**City of Coral Gables Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting**  
**August 12, 2021**  
**City Commission Chambers**  
**405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL**

**Blue Ribbon Committee Members**

**Chairperson Felix Pardo**

**Board Member Aramis "Mitch" Alvarez**

**Board Member Robert Behar**

**Board Member Willy Bermello**

**Board Member Glenn Pratt**

**Board Member Javier Salman**

**City Staff**

**Assistant City Attorney, Gustavo Ceballos**

**City Clerk, Billy Urquia**

**City Architect, Juan Riesco**

**Public Speaker(s)**

**Tom O'Malley**

**Maria Magdalena Estupinan**

---

Chairperson Pardo: Good afternoon. We're going to bring the blue-ribbon committee -- we're going to start the blue-ribbon committee meeting on today, August 12. Clerk, can you call the roll, please?

City Clerk Urquia: Yes, sir. Chairperson Pardo?

Chairperson Pardo: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Alvarez?

Board Member Alvarez: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Behar?

Board Member Behar: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Bermello?

Board Member Bermello: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Pratt?

Board Member Pratt: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Salman?

Board Member Salman: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Riesco?

City Architect Riesco: Here.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Chair, you have a quorum.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. We just received the minutes of the last meeting of last week. It is a true transcript of the meeting. Is there a motion to approve?

Unidentified Speaker: So moved.

Unidentified Speaker: I make a motion.

Chairperson Pardo: There's a motion to approve. Second?

Unidentified Speaker: Second.

Chairperson Pardo: Second?

Board Member Alvarez: Second.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. Can you call the vote, please?

City Clerk Urquia: All in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

Chairperson Pardo: Opposed? Alright, thank you, Mr. Clerk. So, at the last meeting, we were able to go through the Section 5-201, and we stopped directly at Table 1, so this is a continuation of that meeting. So, that being said -- alright. Table 1. So, Table 1, to the -- I guess to the public, so they understand, Table 1 are what are called required standards. Now, in the formatting, the tables and the bonuses do not coincide with each other. Let me explain for the public. The Level 1 bonuses as exist today have to do with the -- a particular style known as Coral Gables Mediterranean style. And if you adhere to that design concept and approved by the Board of Architects, you are eligible to a maximum of an increase of FAR of .20. So, let's say that normally

you may have an FAR of, let's say, 3.0, you would be allowed to build up to 3.2. In other words, an addition of .20. You would also -- or you are also, in today's Code, allowed to be able to go up one additional story above what is allowed. So, if you're allowed four floors, you would be allowed to go up one floor to a fifth floor if you choose to do that. So, when you look at Table 1, it may be confusing to you because you would think that that has to do with the Mediterranean bonuses, Level One bonuses. They are not related. The way that the Code was written after 1986, what they did is they put in some required standards as thresholds. So, in there there are certain types of elements and then there are certain requirements, at least this is the way that it is written. So, I wanted everyone to understand that since we are trying to be very transparent so the public can follow what we're discussing. Getting to Table 1, the reference one, we have under type -- well, first of all, we have a difference between residential and mixed-use projects. Mixed-use projects have to have a certain percentage of a retail use normally, and normally located on the ground floor. Mixed-use projects can also have other elements at other levels. But that being said, there are two separate categories. The other thing is that when you look at the amount of categories, not in Table 1, but in Table 2, you'll see that it says basically that you have to have a certain amount of the total amount of reference numbers to be able to qualify for the second level of bonus. That being said -- and hopefully you're not too confused; you could follow with us, and we're going to be discussing now the different requirements and also the types to see if they should be changed or not. So, that being said, let's start with Table 1. So, if we start at Level 1 under requirements, we have architectural elements on building façades. I'm going to read it. The similar exterior architectural relief shall be provided on all sides of buildings. No blank walls shall be permitted. Let me see if I can get rid of this. Shall be permitted unless required pursuant to applicable city, state, or federal requirements, such as fire and life safety or other applicable codes. The second paragraph: parking garages shall include exterior architectural treatments compatible with buildings or structures that occupy the same property and/or street. Now, I think Mr. Bermello wanted to add "and which concealed the view of automobiles." I have no objection to that. Does anyone have any objection to that or any other objection to this item number one? Alright.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: If I could add (INAUDIBLE)...

Board Member Behar: Can you speak into the mic?

Chairperson Pardo: No, the mic is on. Turn it on.

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah, we turned them on.

Board Member Bermello: Is it on now? Yeah, there we go. So, the thought is it's not just the view, but it's also the potential for the light emanated from cars on adjoining residential areas. So, it's -- I don't think it needs to be in the Code necessarily. I think by the view should be sufficient.

Chairperson Pardo: The intent is there.

Board Member Bermello: But the -- that's --

Board Member Behar: But it think this makes it clear. It's already -- I believe it's already a requirement, but this just emphasizes that -- reinforces it.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Pratt: If I could add just one thing also to that. One of the things that the Board of Architects generally looks at too is the light that not only comes from the cars, but the light that

is illuminating the garage itself and whether that's also shielded and -- so that it creates a -- or that there should be some thought given to the illumination of the interior of the garage itself.

Chairperson Pardo: Glenn, I think it's in other parts of the Code, including the foot candle levels for spillage and also for minimum foot candle levels in parking garages and parking lots.

Board Member Pratt: Right.

Board Member Behar: I think it's specified that you have to put it on the facade that is -- it'll be pointed away from the exterior of the building, so it's already covered, but this is good to have.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, alright. Let's go on to number two. The Code right now reads architectural relief elements at street level. And I'm requesting that we strike the word "relief" and add the words after elements "and amenities," so it reads "architectural elements and amenities at street level." The word "relief" can be taken literally of just adding a declaration. And by adding architectural elements and amenities, it starts to make sense when you look at the description. So, on the description, if you may -- or if you will. It says on any building façade fronting streets where an adjoining pedestrian sidewalk is located, one or more of the following design features shall be included at the street level: a., display windows or retail display area; b., landscaping and/or; c., pedestrian or architectural features accessible to the public. So, at this -- what I was going to suggest is: a., display windows or retail display in commercial areas, so it would be the only place where you can place them; and b., landscaping and/or -- leaving that as is -- and c., under architectural, it would be to add the word "pedestrian architectural features accessible to the public." Because right now, architectural relief element or ornamentation doesn't go that additional step, I think.

Board Member Behar: I'm okay with this language, the addition of this.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Salman: I am as well.

Chairperson Pardo: Anybody else?

Board Member Bermello: I'm fine.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, let's go on to number three. Now, one of the things that we discussed before were the design standards that are in another section that apply -- that the Board of Architects applies to all projects, which include the 20 elements, which include massing. There's several things there. So, in order not to be repetitious, I requested certain things be struck out. We could leave them in if the committee desires. But for example, in the exclusion from height, that already exists in the Code for every commercial building, as far as the exclusion from height, for air conditioning equipment, elevator shafts, elevator machine rooms. So, in my opinion, this really has -- it's already detailed and described in another part of the Code, and it's being shown here almost like if this were above and beyond for this particular standard or the Mediterranean ordinance component.

Board Member Salman: I agree that the repetition is problematic, but I prefer if you just left it as a reference C section...

Board Member Behar: Well...

Board Member Salman: And that...

Board Member Behar: Let me tell you, I am -- I don't feel as you guys do. I think it needs to be clear in every possible location, and I'm going to you why. Because when I get an interpretation by a reviewer, it says the parapet, it can't go over 100 feet, well, it should not be included. It should

be excluded from that calculations. So, I want to make sure that -- and I'm going through it right now. I'm going through it on a project...

Board Member Salman: Okay.

Board Member Behar: As we speak. I want to make sure that it is clear, and they understand what is excluded from those height. For them to reference another location, Javier, I don't think...

Chairperson Pardo: I have no objection leaving it in.

Board Member Behar: I will leave it in. Personally, I really feel that -- and Glenn, and you...

Board Member Pratt: No, no, I agree. I think it's an important aspect of it. I don't think it's repetitious. Or it may be included in other parts, but I think it's something that...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. We'll leave the entire section...

Board Member Bermello: I feel strongly both ways, but I think probably the most important thing is to make sure that -- and it's beyond the scope of, I think, this committee. But staff is here, and staff can obviously -- I think it's important that where you define building height for the overall Code, every section, that that definition parallels this so that there is no doubt. Imagine that there's another area in the Code where building height is defined, and maybe it's a little different than here. So, I have no issue keeping it here, but I think it's probably more important to make sure that the building height definition...

Board Member Behar: Willy, typically...

Board Member Bermello: Parallels this.



Board Member Behar: Building height is measured to the top of the roof deck, typically, in most municipalities.

Board Member Bermello: Right. But most municipalities also will say excluding for, and then it lists elements like this: elevator machine room, decorative motifs, and in those cases, it may have a maximum height. You know, you can mention a parapet. A parapet can be 10 inches, or it can be 10 feet. So, the parapet -- given what you're trying to hide or -- can be -- for the layperson, they can say, wow, you know, that was the case. So, I just think -- I have no problem in keeping it here. I like it here, kind of the redundancy. Kind of like -- in this case, I think it works because of the issue on style and so much of the architectural style of Mizner deals with elements that are decorative and that go on the roof, you know.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: But I think having a very strong definition of building height and what are the exclusions of that in other parts of the Code will be just as important.

Board Member Behar: And one more. And I wish Ramon or somebody from Planning would be here. This is inapplicable in MX, should also be considered to be put in MF as well. It's not there. One of my comments was, should it be also applied for MX.

Board Member Bermello: Well, it was -- it should be in MF.

Board Member Behar: Because in my notes, in my comments, I put it as in the MX, MX also, correct.

Board Member Bermello: Oh, MX? You're referring to MX?

Board Member Behar: MF.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Board Member Behar: I mean, that's something that I wish Ramon was here to...

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Clerk, can -- is there any way you could reach out to see why Mr. Trias isn't here today?

City Clerk Urquia: I've just sent a message, and I'll get a response for you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. Okay, so we will leave number three as is, and then we will ask Mr. Trias...

Board Member Alvarez: I would like to suggest -- talking about item two, amenities. It refers to the façades fronting the street, and very much interested here on the display windows, et cetera. I would suggest that as an element that is positive, not only positive, desired by commercial institutions and everybody, is number one, and I see you touched on that, the height of the vertical distance and the ground floor to the upper (INAUDIBLE). Number two, recess. I'm not in love with arcades. I think arcades are beautiful to look at, but establishment don't really appreciate it, and they don't prosper very well in arcades. And unless you have an exquisite arcade with very good proportions and very high entrance -- I mean, very high above the ground so you have enough light coming in, it would not be a very pleasant environment. So, I like to propose as an enhancement elements of projecting canopies, whether fabric or solid. I remember that I was very impressed the first time I visited -- it was not Seattle; it was Vancouver -- and they had an incredible collection of protruding elements protecting their windows. I was surprised. They were glass.

They were not solid, and they were sloping to the building, meaning whenever water comes in or snow begin to become water, they'll capture it inside with drainage, not coming in and throwing it into the people walking by. But the presence and the visual effect for the display windows, the protection it offered to the people without enclosing and making it a dark area, even on projects we have done, the façade arcade on Aragon or Colonnade has (INAUDIBLE), big recesses. Never seen success in those stores, only certain type of display -- I mean, only certain type of businesses would be -- feel comfortable with -- attracted to it. But the ones we're talking about is building height from ground to the plinth instead of 88 -- you know, instead of 12 or 13, maybe it could be a floor and a half or two floor levels high, the verticality and the receding -- maybe that window display is two feet, three feet, four feet in, not 10 feet in. And then a projecting canopy for shade and rainy season will be added without creating the canyon of dark surrounding the perimeter of the building on the ground floor.

Chairperson Pardo: Especially if they face north.

Board Member Alvarez: What?

Chairperson Pardo: Especially if they face north, the arcades.

Board Member Alvarez: Oh, you're dead. It's dark.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Board Member Alvarez: It's black.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. Well, what I'd like to do, if you don't mind, Mitch, is there's a reference to arcades and loggias in Table 2. Since these are the standards, and maybe we could add that in label -- in Table 2.

Board Member Alvarez: Well, you are more familiar with the process, but yeah, anywhere that it presents...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Alvarez: Itself the opportunity to indicate it is valuable.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, alright.

Board Member Alvarez: I think the user, the tenant that would make the building successful and activate the building -- street in that area will be very happy to receive such a treatment instead of a dark arcade.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, very good. So noted. We will discuss that in Table 2.

Board Member Pratt: Mr. Chairman?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Pratt: If I could ask Mr. Behar a question. Robert, you we were saying about the -- we were talking about number three in the exclusion from height. You're talking that the inclusion would also for -- in the MF -- that it would apply to both MX and MF?

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Board Member Pratt: And you're taking about the -- it would include all of the things, the A through D, as well as also the roof structures and the four ornamental purposes?

Board Member Behar: Correct. That's -- yes.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I think that's an idea that I could really support too. I think that one of the things that as a designer we find that, especially on the MF properties, that you don't really have the ability to make any type of a decorative feature other than just a treatment -- a roof treatment. And it becomes -- the buildings become very, very flat in terms of -- without having some type of a -- you know, I think we've talked about it before, that a lot of the times we use the towers that we see around as reference points and guide points for making our way around the City and the commercial section. But I think that also applies in the residential component too -- in the multi-family area. I'm not talking about single family.

Chairperson Pardo: Can you just define for the public...

Board Member Pratt: Well, the...

Chairperson Pardo: MF versus MX.

Board Member Pratt: Well, the MX would be a commercial -- would be a mixed-use type commercial product or commercial project. And the MF is the multi-family. Multi-family is defined as buildings larger than duplexes and single family. So -- but I think that the flexibility or the -- allowing roof decorative -- roof features, non-usable areas -- we're not talking about them being usable. They're really architectural features, just as the top of the Biltmore Hotel is an architectural feature that is a roof element. Those are the decorative components that really make architecture much better in terms of the visual appearance and create a lot more visual activity or visual enhancement of the urban environment. So, I think that -- I don't see why should it be limited to the MX and not the MF if...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: It should apply to both.

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: And I thought it did, when it says residential and mixed-use, and they're both checked off. They're not? Well, then maybe we clarify that it should. I mean, the one thing here that kind of caught my eye is the last phrase in the original wording, which says, "except for commercial buildings in the Central Business District where no such structure" -- and referring to the structures above -- "shall exceed one-third of the allowable total building height." And if we're dealing in an area where you have a small building height, you know, the one-third is not an issue. If you're dealing with an area where the building height, you're talking about 16 stories, then the one-third, in my opinion, is excessive. And so I'm wondering why we have that there. I'm wondering why not the 25 feet. You know, I mean, 25 feet in most buildings that we've done up on the roof, you know, maybe you want to make it 30 feet. But to say a third, I think a lot of what the criticisms that we're dealing with here is those things that I think have gotten out of -- really exaggeratedly out of whack. And if you have the ability to do, I don't know, 165-foot-high building and then the roof structure could be a third of that.

Board Member Behar: No, no, because you're limited to the maximum -- in that case -- to the maximum height, which is the Biltmore, which is 190 feet, right?

Board Member Bermello: I don't know. This is not what this says.

Board Member Behar: I know, but it's not clear -- you're right. It's not clear.

Board Member Bermello: What this says to me is except for -- and it gives me up to a third, and then you could end up with a really bad situation, you know.

Board Member Pratt: No, I think you're right. I think that -- and I think you can easily do something decorate within 25 feet. I would be willing to accept a 25-foot cap, but -- and the one-third would be taken out.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: That's...

Board Member Behar: You know what, that's a great observation, and you know, it makes it clear.

Board Member Bermello: It would make it clear because, I mean, I -- you know, I mean, we all want to crown a building. And particularly, the taller the building is the more you're concerned because it's more of the cityscape. But even then, you know, 25 feet is a pretty good, you know...

Board Member Pratt: No, I agree with that. I think that's a good...

Chairperson Pardo: So we'll strike out the sentence that starts "where no such structure shall exceed" -- in other words...

Board Member Behar: Except.

Board Member Pratt: Except.

Board Member Bermello: Where it says except. You end the sentence at "above the roof," period.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: You eliminate the exclusion.

Chairperson Pardo: Gus, did you get that?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Got it.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so after 25 feet above the roof, period.

Board Member Bermello: That's right.

Board Member Behar: So, it will apply for the MX and MF.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Did you get that, Gus?

Unidentified Speaker: It's applicable to MF and MX.

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Unidentified Speaker: Both, not just MX.

Unidentified Speaker: That's what I was saying.

Unidentified Speaker: All the MFs, right?

Board Member Bermello: Yes, I would say all of them. I mean, it's...

Board Member Behar: Yeah.



Board Member Bermello: All roofs matter.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Okay, alright, moving on to four. Again, these standards, we have bicycle storage shown in other places in the Code.

Board Member Behar: I concur.

Chairperson Pardo: Why repeat something? It makes no -- plus the fact it kind of -- you know, what does this have to do with Mediterranean? It just -- no. Alright, so does anyone have any objection with that? Going on to number five, building façades. Leaving that intact. Does anyone have any objection to that?

Board Member Behar: No.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, going on to number six, building lot coverage. Now, I don't understand -- and I had a question mark for the committee. I guess I'm not smart enough to understand why we would have to -- as a qualification, the sentence, "no minimum or maximum building lot or ground coverage is required." I mean, it seems to me that that's a really good way to get in trouble somewhere, because it seems like it's nullifying any requirement of any type. And also, it's mentioned in great clarity and detail in Table 2.

Board Member Behar: Well, but if you say that -- you don't put a limit, it means that I could cover 98 percent of my lot?

Board Member Bermello: No, not really, not really.

Unidentified Speaker: Do you have open space requirements?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, there's other requirements.

Board Member Bermello: You got setback, side setback, front setback, rear setback. And you know, I'll tell you my feeling on this. I mean, lot coverage is really applicable to non-urbanized areas; you're doing a subdivision, you're doing single-family homes with large, you know -- an acre, or half acre, quarter acre, and you're thinking about impervious versus -- impervious services. Then lot coverage is obviously a consideration. But when you're in an urbanized area, if you have front setback, side setback, rear setback, why does the lot coverage come into play? It's like -- I get it in a single-family home, any one of our districts. But in an urban area, dense urban -- Central Business District, the MF/MX districts...

Board Member Behar: I'm not sure that is. I

Board Member Bermello: I don't...

Board Member Behar: I'm not sure that's referring to those CBD area or anything like that, because in those -- in the urban area, you don't have any basic limitations.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: And I thought this was what that is referring to.

Chairperson Pardo: That's the danger of what I saw in this, because then it conflicts directly with other uses in other parts that are outside of the CBD. And I understand the CBD. The issue here, I think, is that -- I just think that there's no place for this because, number one, I just don't think that this is a requirement. They have it under the...

Board Member Behar: But I look at this more into single family, and I don't do a lot -- you know, single-family, so for me it's a little bit more, you know, difficult to really -- but if -- let's take a lot, a single family that you got an acre lot -- okay? -- and you go do have setbacks. But it means that when I do that, I may be covering 80 percent of the lot.

Board Member Bermello: And you have coverage requirements also, which I think are applicable in this. What I'm saying, Robert, is that the building lot coverage makes absolutely no sense in an urbanized context of multi-family mixed-use because you already have the setbacks that regulate your coverage on those properties. I mean, if you're downtown Coral Gables beyond the setbacks -- and if you want to have broader setbacks, change the setbacks, increase them.

Board Member Behar: Willy, I don't think -- personally, I don't think it applies, again, to those CBD or the commercial. I think -- and I don't know enough about the residential per se because, again, I don't do much residential.

Board Member Alvarez: Do you think that item, particularly number six -- and it's very dramatic. It's a line and an inch. There's no minimum or maximum building lot or ground coverage is required. This is an opportunity to put a little line there and setbacks are encouraged for bonuses or don't mention the bonus word. But somehow put it there as an attraction or consideration so people don't just bypass it and say, "No, no. Disregard it, it's irrelevant." No, this catch an eye. And I may add in the previous line, building façades -- well, these are required standards. It's a good opportunity to put that as required standards. Furthermore, building façades, the vocabulary of the signage of that intended façade is fundamental. In any shopping center project -- and I have done a couple -- the signage vocabulary was determined as mandatory as a quality of the standard of the center. And obviously, you go about the City, and at least not for everywhere in the City, you're going to have the same standard, but you -- for that particular area, for that particular building, it should have a well-studied signage vocabulary presented as much as an architectural design on lighting. And they all go together. Now, I have a concern. You said you're looking through another Table 2. When we discuss that comment I made, and it says item one of Table 2,

arcades, ends up saying awnings or other similar items do not satisfy these provisions. This contradicts the possibility I tried to present. So, this issue of awnings do not satisfy this provision. Well, the fellow who wrote this could have been thinking maybe an old-style fabric canopy that was not kept, something like that in his mind. But as I explained, (INAUDIBLE) opportunities exist now. One of the buildings that we don't particularly feel very happy with it, the Plaza, but I have to respect the canopy they just put in in copper, and they are beautiful. As an architectural detail, they're beautiful just to say that canopies properly applied are valid and should not be excluded with this wording, "awnings or similar items do not satisfy this provision." This is under Table 2, line item number 2 -- excuse me, line item number 1.

Board Member Bermello: So, Mr. Chair, if I could add, maybe a way to address this item is wording that would say something like, aside from complying with all front, side, and rear setbacks, no minimum blah, blah, blah. Because what that does is kind of sets it straight that -- and again, I think this is dealing in areas where the special allowances or the bonuses are going to be in play, which obviously is not single-family duplex areas. We're talking about the multi-family mixed-use commercial zones of the Gables, that they are what really should regulate, which is what has been violated, in my opinion, with the following sections are the front setbacks, are the side or rear setback. So, I would just say that that is what really should be here, I would suggest to the board.

Chairperson Pardo: Does the Committee have any comments about that? Can you read that again, Willy, please?

Board Member Bermello: I would say aside from complying with front, side, and rear setbacks, no minimum or maximum -- now, I'm reading what's in the Code right now. I'm not changing it. I'm just adding a phrase in front of it.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. And it was complying with setbacks.

Board Member Bermello: Which is what we wall would do. I mean, the first thing we would do in any district -- right? -- is, you know, figure out what is the front, side, and rear.

Chairperson Pardo: You only mentioned setbacks.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, the setbacks, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Gus, are you good with that?

Board Member Pratt: No, I'm good with that. I think that because -- and I do support actually leaving number six in, and I'm okay with what Willy is saying, but I do think that it gives the designer a little more flexibility if they don't have to...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Pratt: I mean, there are sites that are -- have certain conditions that...

Board Member Bermello: Otherwise, we're dealing with arbitrary percentages that mean nothing to anyone.

Board Member Pratt: Yes, exactly.

Board Member Bermello: You know...

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, very good. Number seven, on the drive-throughs -- again, this is kind of an unusual -- this is restricted in other places of the Zoning Code. I don't understand why it's in

the Med part as if -- it doesn't make any sense as a -- like a standard, a standard of what. It's already restricted in other places of the Zoning Code, not just Mediterranean, but in everywhere. You cannot do this anywhere because of the restrictions that already exist in the Zoning Code, so why have that here? There's no point of clarity. It's almost -- it's very unusual for this to even be brought up, and it's already covered in the rest of the Zoning Code. Why clutter this? So I don't know if the board members have any comments about that.

Board Member Bermello: I agree with the Chair on it.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I do too. I don't really see a purpose for it.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, alright. We'll strike seven out completely. Okay, number eight, the landscape open space.

Board Member Salman: Actually, it reads really well now after we leave in six.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry, Glenn, can you say that again?

Board Member Salman: Since we left in 6, except for Willie's notation, aside from compliance with front, rear, and side setbacks, and then we can talk about the landscape.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I'm confused.

Board Member Behar: I'm confused, Javier.

Board Member Salman: We've stricken number 7.

Board Member Behar: Right.

Board Member Salman: So, number 8 becomes number 7. It makes sense that it'd be there.

Board Member Behar: Oh, okay, okay, okay.

Board Member Salman: That's all I'm saying.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: Oh, okay, okay. I get it.

Board Member Salman: And no changes to it. I think it's perfect just the way it is.

Unidentified Speaker: Is the public going to ask any questions or...

Chairperson Pardo: Let me entertain this. I'm sorry. Say that again.

Unidentified Speaker: Can I ask a question about just number 8? (INAUDIBLE).

City Clerk Urquia: Sir, if you're going to speak, can you please approach the podium?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Unidentified Speaker: For the record.

Tom O'Malley: My name is Tom O'Mally, and I live at 616 Geronimo Drive. And it's come to my attention from the Planning and Zoning that open landscape and open area have come to mean the same thing, and I was very surprised to learn that. And so there's a certain development that's going on today that I was reviewing with the Planning and Zoning Department. I said, "Where's all the open landscape that's supposed to be here because I don't see it on the plans." As a matter

of fact, I see Chicago cobblestone or bricks where they're supposed to be open landscape. And the answer I received was, open landscape is the same as open. And I said, "How can that be?" And he said, "That's the way it is now." So, we have a paragraph here that talks about open landscape, and that paragraph is not respected. That's what I wanted to share.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. O'Malley. Okay, so can you repeat again, if you don't mind, the comment about number eight?

Board Member Salman: Me?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, sir.

Board Member Salman: My comment was that having deleted number 7, it now leads better following...

Chairperson Pardo: Got it.

Board Member Salman: Number 6. That was my comment.

Chairperson Pardo: I agree. Thank you.

Board Member Behar: No, what I think the gentleman's comment was that, you know, one is open space that doesn't have landscaping, green area, and the other one is landscape. And here, they're combined both, right? And what I understood from the comment is that they're not the same.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, no.

Board Member Bermello: I think they're not the same in certain contexts, and I think in certain contexts, they are the same. And that's...



Board Member Behar: This is the way that it's written, and we agree. What the comment -- the gentleman's comment was is that, you know, it could be paved, but it's considered landscape. And landscape in his eyes are green.

Board Member Bermello: And I think landscape in maybe a single-family residential area should in fact be green.

Board Member Behar: But in an urban area, in a CBD...

Board Member Bermello: But an urban area, CBD...

Board Member Behar: It should be a plaza, maybe that...

Board Member Behar: Well, that's how they can have waterscapes, softscapes, hardscapes. And naturally, my comments to the committee -- there was an add-on to this -- was really to, I think, clarify that for staff, because I think there is confusion as to when it is and when it's not. I think, you know, those projects that provide -- and I realize there may be an issue as to how public is a roof garden. But public roof gardens, I think are a definite benefit in the City Beautiful, again, in certain areas. So, I believe in giving the Board of Architects discretion where those that properly in the correct context, apply waterscapes and hardscapes in addition -- softscapes, I'm referring to landscape. That'd be, in an urban context, be treated as equal. They're just as important. And you know, sometimes providing some green space, making a sidewalk narrower instead of using a tree grate is totally ridiculous, you know, and inappropriate.

Board Member Behar: But is that appropriate?

Board Member Bermello: And it's inappropriate, but you could see how somebody with (INAUDIBLE) is going to say, "No, no. The Code says you got to provide some landscape," and

then you end up with these kinds of, you know, camels. So, one of my suggestions, Mr. Chair, was to add -- and again, this is directed not at the low-density and single-family residential areas, but more at your very urban, multifamily, commercial, mixed-use areas that under landscape, the wording that includes softscapes, hardscapes, and waterscapes at the discretion of the Board of Architects be considered one and the same. I would not say that in a single-family area, where you have a totally different situation. Then you have somebody that's just paving, you know, the front entrance to their house and it looks like you're in another community in South Florida, right? So, that was the wording -- and you're laughing because you know what I'm talking about, right?

Board Member Salman: I know the community you referred to.

Board Member Bermello: You know the community I'm referring to.

Chairperson Pardo: Let me read into the record what you wrote. After locations, it says, "and include both amenitized hardscapes, softscapes, and waterscapes via discretionary review and approval by the Board of Architects. The provision of roof gardens can qualify up to 40 percent of the 25 percent required for residential properties. In other words, 10 percent can be satisfied through roof gardens. Now, that being said, with the roof gardens, if these are public amenities and you have a roof garden, that roof garden is only enjoyed by the residents of the building.

Board Member Bermello: Right., If it's a roof garden that's only for private use, that would not count because then there's no really public amenity. But if you're providing, let's say a restaurant, which is for public use, a public niche or use that is designated on that rooftop area, and that's amenitized, absolutely. The cost involved in waterproofing and amenitizing a roof is 10 times what it would be doing it, you know, at grade. So, and you know, the cities that have done that successfully, urban areas, you know, they become great after hours use for the residents that go to those restaurants or et cetera. So I think that would be, you know, appropriate; again, in certain districts, not everywhere.

Chairperson Pardo: How do the rest of the committee members feel about this?

Board Member Behar: I'm okay -- go ahead, Javier.

Board Member Salman: I have a problem with -- I don't have a problem with roof gardens per se, but they're limited access, even when you have a commercial establishment. You have to go up there and buy something to be able to -- you can't just go and hang around. It's not really a public space. It's really an amenity to a private restaurant or private business.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Salman: It's -- I would not even address that.

Board Member Bermello: And I think also you got to consider what you're taking away from the ground floor.

Board Member Salman: Right. You're actually hurting the public area to (INAUDIBLE) that.

Board Member Bermello: That percentage up on the roof level, which may or not be visible, or people may not know about it. So, you're detracting from the ground plane by giving it on the roof area. So I don't know if that's a good idea.

Chairperson Pardo: Getting back to the comments that Mr. O'Malley made, which I think are very specific. There is a sentence at the end of -- after C. It says, "The total area shall be based upon the total lot area." Then it says, "This landscape area can be provided at least at street level, within the public right-of-way, planter boxes, planters, and other ground-floor locations." Now, there we go again. We're going into the public right-of-way. You know, we're looking at property that doesn't belong to the develop -- to be able to comply with landscaping that may be required by Public Works or by somebody else, like, you know, you have to put in street trees. You have to

do this; you have to do that. All of a sudden, you're counting that area there. Right now, you know, we have a very modest -- in my opinion -- a very modest amount, 5 percent, for non-residential property, 10 percent -- and by the way, it can be used on site using other things, such as planter boxes and other mechanisms. So, by going 5 percent on non-residential, 10 percent for mixed-use and 25 percent in residential areas, I just -- you know, I'm a proponent of hardscape, but there's nothing like seeing that green area. When I run in the morning, I don't run through the commercial district in Coral Gables. I run through the residential districts. And one of the things that I like about running through the residential districts, which include multi-family high-rises, is that they have green space there. I agree with Willy about, you know, the roof areas, having a special condition there. I think that there should be flexibility for showing that in such a way -- Miami Beach, for example, if you have a roofed area, there are certain areas or certain times where you could actually count it toward -- for public, but you have to have a hundred percent public accessibility. So, they actually address the concern you have, Javier.

Board Member Salman: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: You know, so I think right now to be able to move on, I would like to be able to leave it the way it is, and then be able to revisit this because this same issue not only occurs in this particular section of the Code, but this same issue occurs for regular zoning that is not taking advantage of any Mediterranean bonus. So, the percentages are identical. Again, they're being repeated, but there is nothing here that is talking about specifically the bonus areas. This is just, in my opinion, a repetition. I did not strike it out. I put on there an arrow and I wrote down their board with a question mark, and I wanted to hear what everybody had to say. And also, before the end of this meeting, I want to let both Willy and Robert know that I'm going to read into the record two suggestions that they have made independently about two different subjects that should be considered that isn't necessarily under the purview of this committee as what the committee was asked to do, which is specifically the Mediterranean ordinance. One has to do with less density and height, and I think -- and the other one has to do with styles other than Mediterranean and people earning bonuses for great architecture, not good architecture, great architecture. I want to

read that into the minutes at the end of this meeting. But I think that some of the confusion here is that when you look at these standards, you think that someone discovered America, they didn't. They're repeating it, they're taking it from another section in the Code that causes great confusion, especially when other sections of the Code are amended or changed, and then they forget that they have it stuck in the Mediterranean one. I would like to be able to move on. We're making great progress. Leave it as is. And then possibly look into the suggestion of the roof areas and also a clearer definition, but I think that has to do with the other sections where landscape is discussed specifically in other sections of the Code, very specifically. That definition should be there, and I think that Mr. O'Malley's comments are very relevant, that you can't go a hundred percent without having anything that's green, and it has to be done in such a way, even though -- even if you're in the CBD or in your residential area. So, these percentages are there for a reason. Right now, I think from a proportion standpoint, I think it's something that we should be discussing, but I think this is one of those amenities that we should look at, but also not close our eyes to some of the taller, bigger buildings that have the potential of having these recreational areas up on top. For example, if the City is building a parking garage, a dedicated parking garage, why not have recreation on top of the parking garage? That's not a new idea. But you know, that's something that we could count toward our parks and our master plan competence -- compliance rather. So, I think, you know, that this is a very good subject, but I think it's one of the subjects that I'd like to tack on into the record at the end of this meeting today.

Board Member Bermello: So, the only thing I would you bring to bear is that you can have in two properties, one mixed-use, one that's dealt with in a residential fashion, similar density, and one has more than twice the requirement for landscape open space, and they're both in a urban area. So, if -- part of the reason why I think it's important to provide staff and the Board of Architects with certain discretion and with clarity as to what is landscape open space is to provide the language (UNINTELLIGIBLE). If the Chair believes that maybe this is best done in a different section, I have no problem with that. But I know that there is always a struggle with staff looking at this issue and what it is and what it's not. And I think the level of appropriateness comes to bear, you know. Again, in single-family areas, without a doubt, the green wins. But in an urban area,

you know, the plaza, I believe wins. And even how you deal with street trees is very different than you would trees in a swale area. It just changes totally. And so that's kind of like the concept.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, and...

Chairperson Pardo: I'm with you.

Board Member Behar: I agree with Willy's comment because I think that it will also enhance the building, the massing of that. So there -- I think there is some benefit that I think that the project will be able to make good from. You know, I'm okay leaving it for now, but I think we definitely revisit this because I think there's a lot of potential to create. You know, maybe the percentages is different, maybe there's an incentive, maybe it's something that if you do on a rooftop, you know, or somewhere where it's visible and the public benefit at the end, I think it's a good idea to do that.

Chairperson Pardo: And at the end of the day, it's a public benefit.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: And I think that Mr. O'Malley hit the nail on the head. And I think this is a concern. And the concern is, you know, are we providing something that makes it pleasant? You know, are we walking through Mitch's projects at -- project at the Merrick Shops -- Shops of Merrick? You know, are we walking through a subway in New York? You know, what is the impression that we're giving people? So if we're promoting great architecture, you know, we should really look at the landscape interpretation for the Code itself, which is another story for another day.

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Chair, really quick. Mr. Trias will not be able to join the meeting today.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

City Clerk Urquia: However, Ms. Suramy Cabrera, the Development Services Director, is available and she's already connected on Zoom and watching the meeting, so any questions you may have.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, thank you. So going on, we'll leave 8 for now, if the committee is okay with that. Number 9 on the lighting of the street and the Public Works Department, again, this is a standard. I truly don't understand the relevance of why it's even mentioned here. Street lighting, et cetera, the approval of the Public Works Department. Public Works has the right in every project to request street lighting and do it based on their standards, et cetera, so it's just kind of confusing for me why this is a standard here. That's the only reason that I brought this up. It just -- it seemed like it's unnecessary because it already gets done and it's not getting done because this paragraph is in these "standards."

Board Member Behar: I agree. It doesn't belong, so I'm okay taking it out, striking it from there.

Chairperson Pardo: Is there anyone else have --? Okay. And on the parking garages.

Board Member Behar: This is one that I think that if I read this -- and if you want to go ahead and read it for the record, then I'll give you my comments.

Chairperson Pardo: I'll read it for the record. I just pushed the wrong button. We're very lucky I don't work at Turkey Point.

Unidentified Speaker: I only have one clarification.

Board Member Behar: Mine is only one too.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry?

Unidentified Speaker: Let's see if it's the same one.

Chairperson Pardo: Let's see. I had a copy -- there are two documents. There you go.

City Clerk Urquia: That one?

Chairperson Pardo: I think so. There you go. Thank you. Reminds me of the old joke, I used to be young and stupid and I'm not young anymore. Okay, here it is. Sorry about that.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Behar wanted to add something to this item, no?

Board Member Behar: I did.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: I did.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, I'm sorry, Robert. What number were you at?

Board Member Behar: We're at number 10.

Board Member Salman: Let's see if it's the same one.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, here we go. Sorry about that. Ground floor parking as a part of a multi-use building shall not front on a primary street. ADA parking is permitted on the ground floor. Ground floor parking is permitted on secondary/side street and shall be fully enclosed within the structure and/or shall be surrounded by retail uses and/or residential uses. Ground floor parking



is permitted on alley frontages. Parking facilities shall strive to accommodate pedestrian access to all adjacent streets and alleys.

Board Member Behar: My comment there, Mr. Chair, is that it says ground floor parking as part of a multi-use permit should not front a primary street. I think that you may have instances where you only have a primary street. And my -- what I propose to do is "may front on a primary street if it's concealed from view by use of a liner or habitable space." So, you never really see the parking, but you're allowed to have it on a front street -- on a primary street.

Board Member Salman: Yeah. I'm thinking a similar thing where you're doing like an apartment building in the North Ponce area where you have a locked in site and you're on a primary street. And because of setbacks, you want to take advantage of some of that space for parking or a portion of it anymore.

Board Member Behar: You mean as long as you conceal it.

Board Member Salman: You could have it. That's good. I have a clarification. I think the ground floor off-street parking would probably be more clear if we added the word "off-street."

Board Member Behar: Well, but parking inside the building is a require -- this is not...

Board Member Bermello: Well, that's off-street, not necessarily, right?

Unidentified Speaker: It's assumed that it's off-street. It's a garage.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: I think that...

Board Member Behar: We're talking about the garage. It's not off-streert. I mean...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, it's ground floor parking as part of a multi-purpose...

Board Member Behar: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Mixed-use building.

Board Member Salman: But what you're talking about is parking that you want to put into the setback or visible from the green area that's screened.

Board Member Behar: Well, there may be instances where you have only a primary street...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: And you know, you could put parking there. You don't have to take it up to anywhere else, as long that it's concealed by -- not screened, but it has to be something more like a liner unit or a habitable space.

Unidentified Speaker: By a usable space.

Chairperson Pardo: Miami Beach does...

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Unidentified Speaker: Not just an (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: Miami Beach does that.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Unidentified Speaker: Is what he's trying to say.

Board Member Bermello: Do we have the definition for --? I mean, we know what liner is. But in the Code, is there a definition?

Board Member Behar: Of habitable space?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I think it's defined as habitable space.

Board Member Salman: Or usable space.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE) where they use it on a liner, which is like three feet deep.

Board Member Behar: No, no, no, habitable space.

Board Member Pratt: No, no, that's not a liner.

Board Member Behar: Habitable.

Board Member Salman: And I can tell you exactly where.

Chairperson Pardo: City of Miami.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: So you're not talking about having a window dressing that you have like a you -- (INAUDIBLE) actually habitable space.

Board Member Behar: I see your point. You do a display window; that's a liner.

Board Member Bermello: Display window and that's a liner.

Board Member Behar: So you need a habitable space. Habitable space is not going to be, you know, five foot.

Board Member Bermello: So, the word "liner" and "habitable" go together in your suggestion -- right? -- which is the way that I'd like to see it.

Board Member Behar: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: I would like to have this applied not only to residential on mixed use; I'd like for this to apply for government properties, so as the City redevelops its parking facilities, City needs to comply and set the standard more than the private sector. I mean...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: I have an issue with that.

Chairperson Pardo: Shall -- okay.

Board Member Behar: I mean, if you want to add off-street parking, I'm okay with it. But then if I'm doing a parking garage, it's parking that belongs in that development.

Board Member Salman: I'm thinking of other types of projects where you have a building, and you have a site -- an open area next to it that may contain parking and that you would have to have it screened.

Unidentified Speaker: No, this is talking about parking garages though. This is structured parking.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, there's a structured parking. This is structured parking.

Board Member Salman: This is not on-site parking.

Unidentified Speaker: Alright.

Board Member Bermello: And it's dealing with frontage on a primary street.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Board Member Behar: And I think those are the conditions.

Board Member Salman: And I think Robert's point is that you may be limited on a particular site where you only have street access from one side.

Board Member Bermello: That's correct.

Chairperson Pardo: So, it'll be...

Board Member Salman: I think that's what he's trying to say.

Board Member Bermello: So, you'll have a driveway, obviously, and maybe an exit, which (INAUDIBLE) will be together nearby. But I agree with this.

Chairperson Pardo: Do you mind if I take a stab at this?

Board Member Bermello: No, go ahead.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so we'll call this ground floor parking. Okay, we're going to call this ground floor on-site parking.

Unidentified Speaker: This is only for (INAUDIBLE), multiuse?

Board Member Pratt: No, it's for both residential and mixed use.

Chairperson Pardo: For both? Okay, okay. Ground floor on-site parking as part of the multi-use building shall not front on a primary street. ADA parking is permitted on the ground floor. Onsite ground floor parking is permitted on secondary side streets and shall be fully enclosed within the structure and/or shall be surrounded by retail uses and/or residential uses...

Board Member Behar: But this is...

Chairperson Pardo: As a...

Board Member Behar: This is the wording. I think something very simple, which you know, it says shall not -- strike that out -- and say, "May front on a primary street, if it's concealed from view by the use of a liner or habitable space." Okay, and it doesn't -- I mean, I think that may...

Board Member Bermello: I think that encapsulates the concept -- right? -- that you're going to -- you're not going to see the parking from the street.

Board Member Behar: I would strike out "shall not" and say "may front."

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, let's start this again.

Board Member Pratt: But before you do, if I could just -- I mean, one thing that you mentioned that I think is something that I would support too, is that you mentioned instead of residential units, you mentioned residential uses, which I think is -- on the ground level, there could be lobbies, it could be better residential components that -- and to limit it to just residential units...

Board Member Behar: No, but I used habitable space.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: That would qualify, right?

Chairperson Pardo: What I read was in -- it's in the existing section now.

Board Member Pratt: No, but there is...

Chairperson Pardo: It says residential units.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I know, but you mentioned...

Chairperson Pardo: And it should be uses.

Board Member Pratt: It should be uses.

Board Member Behar: Yes, uses.

Board Member Bermello: Uses, correct. Because I mean, if you -- (INAUDIBLE) is if correct. If you had a residential lobby on the street level that takes you...

Board Member Pratt: And the whole idea is to...

Board Member Behar: Yeah, you're right, you're right.

Board Member Pratt: Animate the ground plane and to...

Board Member Behar: I agree.

Board Member Bermello: That's correct.

Chairperson Pardo: With a gym or something.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, it could be -- so long as it's...

Board Member Behar: It's concealed. The intent here is to conceal the parking.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. So, why don't we start this again? We'll say on-site ground floor parking as a part of a multi-use building may front on a primary street if said parking is concealed from view by the use of retail or residential habitable space.

Board Member Bermello: I think if you say liner habitable space it will...

Board Member Behar: Yes.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I think because...

Board Member Bermello: (INAUDIBLE) whatever use...

Board Member Pratt: You're not permitted to have retail.



Chairperson Pardo: Do we have a definition?

Board Member Behar: Yeah, I may not be able to do a retail in a residential.

Chairperson Pardo: No, but what I'm asking is, do we have a definition of liner in the Code now?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: If I may, the Chair, just a quick tidbit. The second portion of this section already says, I think, everything you already want to say, so why not strike the entire first section and just have it apply to the entire ground area regardless of what street it faces. That make sense?

Board Member Behar: Well, that's -- the second portion says ground floor permitted on a secondary street, not on a primary street.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Strike that. What I'm saying is strike that and it achieves your same goal without...

Chairperson Pardo: No, because what's going to happen, Gus, is you're going to then now have to put a liner on a side street or on a...

Board Member Salman: Alley.

Chairperson Pardo: Alley.

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: You don't want to go that way because you're going to eat up that ground floor that way, plus the fact you're adding uses that don't make any sense necessarily on an alley.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: But that's exactly what that says. That says that it is required to be enclosed on a secondary street or a side street.

Board Member Behar: But enclosed by what?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Ground floor parking is permitted on secondary/side streets and shall be fully enclosed within the structure or shall be surrounded by retail uses and residential uses, so it sounds to me exactly what you guys want to do. You just want to also include the primary frontage.

Board Member Bermello: No, this is -- I think this -- Mr. City Attorney -- is a little different. This -- we're not -- we're making it compare -- a difference between the secondary and the primary street. On the primary street, we're saying, we don't want to see the cars. We want it very pedestrian, and we may -- and you may have parking on a primary street as long as it's hidden from view totally by liner habitable space. And whether it's residential or retail...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I'm simply asking the question, how is that different than what it currently reads for secondary side streets?

Board Member Bermello: Because secondary side streets says that you can, in fact, have parking fronting on it, not shielded...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That's not what that says.

Board Member Bermello: Not screened -- I'm sorry?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That's not what that says.

Board Member Bermello: Well, the way I read it, ground floor parking is permitted on secondary side streets -- is permitted -- and shall be fully enclosed within the structure. Now fully enclosed within the structure...

Unidentified Speaker: Is a wall.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, to me, it means that there are columns, that there's a roof over it. You know...

Board Member Salman: Inside of a building. It's not on-site, again.

Board Member Bermello: It's -- there's -- it's sprinklered, but I could still see the parking. That's what that tells me.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay. Then as long as we make distinction, I think...

Board Member Bermello: You know, that -- I mean, do you all read it like that?

Board Member Pratt: That's my...

Board Member Salman: Yes.

Board Member Pratt: Interpretation too, yeah.

Board Member Bermello: That's the way I read it.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, I agree.

Board Member Bermello: And I think we're putting another layer on the primary streets.

Board Member Salman: I like Glenn's comment of changing the word "units" to "uses." I think that gives us a little bit more...

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: I think residential units should go out and put...

Board Member Salman: Residential uses.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, just residential uses, I think, covers it.

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Board Member Salman: Just say retail and residential uses.

Board Member Behar: And I mean, if you want to add, you know, "from said parking," I'm okay. Put the intent is that on a primary, as long as it's concealed, you could do it.

Chairperson Pardo: Gus, you okay?

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Because we leave this table, could I take you back to an earlier item and see if there's an idea that maybe you would find acceptable 2 you? Going back to the

landscape, what I would like to consider is adding a couple of phrases on items B and C. So, C says 25 percent for residential properties.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: My suggestion is to add for MF2 residential properties. And the suggestion on Item B, where it says 10 percent for mixed-use properties, it will be 10 percent for mixed-use and MF4 residential properties, making a distinction in terms of the density and the size of lots between the two versus applying the same percentages to the two.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Bermello: And my past experience, it creates a tremendous hardship on the latter, on the MF4 versus the MF2. So, that's...

Board Member Behar: I like -- on B, the MF4.

Board Member Bermello: That was -- that is a simple way of addressing it.

Board Member Behar: Can you repeat the A again, the 5 percent?

Board Member Bermello: So, A, I'm not touching at all.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: I'm leaving it the way it is. B would read "10 percent for mixed-use and MF4 residential properties." I guess they have a semicolon, ";and," and then you go to item C.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: Item C would say, "25 percent for MF2 residential properties." So, it's clear, it's cross-referenced back to the two zoning districts, and there's no doubt.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Just for clarification, your proposal would eliminate all of the residential under C, only MF2.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Board Member Bermello: So, the way that it would read is that the 25 percent -- or you could put "and other" -- and other residential properties.

Unidentified Speaker: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: MF2 and other residential properties.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I believe MF2 would fall under the category of residential properties.

Board Member Bermello: Right. But I'm thinking -- you're thinking to make it applicable to any other residential zoned district, and I would say, yes, that makes sense. In other words, the 25 percent would apply and flow down from MF2 down all the way to your largest lot, single family. Is that kind of clear, or no?

Chairperson Pardo: For residential properties and MF2?

Board Member Bermello: Yes, correct, the 25 percent; and the 10 percent for the mixed-use and the MF4.

Unidentified Speaker: So what you're basically saying is...

Board Member Bermello: So, mixed use will be all your MX districts, right.

Unidentified Speaker: Is excluding the MF4 from the 25 percent requirement?

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

Unidentified Speaker: That's what he's trying to do.

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay, but then we don't need to include MF2 under C, is my question.

Board Member Bermello: No...

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE) all the residential property.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: All residential properties fall within C.

Unidentified Speaker: Perfect.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Except MF4, which is now under B.

Board Member Bermello: That's fine. Yeah, that's the same thing.

Board Member Salman: I see.

Board Member Bermello: Would that be amenable to the Committee?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, the MF4 is a high rise or a high-intensity use.

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, that's 8. Alright, Willy, are you okay? Willy, are you alright with that?

Board Member Bermello: Yes, perfect.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, any other concerns about that from the committee? Alright. Okay, so that takes care of Table 1.

Board Member Behar: Let's go through 11. Let's just go for the purpose of this -- why it's been eliminated. Right, because you're eliminating number -- you're proposing to eliminate number 11, the porte-cocheres.

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, I'm sorry. I was looking at yours.

Board Member Behar: No, mine...

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Salman: Porte-cocheres and drive-throughs.

Board Member Behar: I agree with taking it out. I already took it out.



Board Member Salman: They're removing porte-cocheres and drive-throughs?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, 11. So, it would be to take out the reference to the porte-cocheres where, again, they're excluded from these areas, and there could be some exception somewhere where the applicant goes before the Commission and asks for a special, you know, case. This doesn't -- this won't happen normally, but when it does on these predictor streets, et cetera, that's up to the applicant and the Commission to make that decision.

Board Member Behar: I'm good with deleting it from this table.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: Did you have a problem with simply putting a pre-fix and saying, "Unless approved by the City Commission."

Chairperson Pardo: No, that's already as -- that -- the mechanism is there.

Board Member Pratt: Is already in place.

Chairperson Pardo: Gus? The mechanism is there for an applicant to apply for basically a variance to either the...

Board Member Bermello: Porte-cochere.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Just to me, it seems that there may be a difference between a porte-cochere that's intruding into your property's setback as opposed to a porte-cochere that's intruding into the public right-of-way.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, but these are limitations specifically to Ponce, Southwest 8th Street, Bird Road, Miracle Mile...

Board Member Salman: Alhambra Circle.

Chairperson Pardo: And Alhambra Circle from Douglas to Le Jeune.

Board Member Salman: That's more of a traffic issue.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, I mean, I...

Board Member Salman: (INAUDIBLE) side entrance.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, I don't have a problem.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. So...

Board Member Bermello: You want to delete that then?

Chairperson Pardo: Right. Because...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. Let's go ahead and delete it.

Chairperson Pardo: You know, if you recall the Hyatt...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, they can do it at Commission anyway.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. The Hyatt has one on Alhambra right now.

Unidentified Speaker: Yep.

Chairperson Pardo: But that was approved directly by the Commission.

Board Member Behar: Well, the Allen Morris, whatever, that has one; it was approved by Commission.

Chairperson Pardo: By Commission.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: In other words, they were able to prove and satisfy, and the Commission has the ability to do that, so the precedent is there. So, if we take this off here, that'd be great. Sidewalks and pedestrian access. All buildings, except accessory buildings, shall have their main pedestrian entrances oriented toward adjoining streets. Pedestrian pathways or sidewalks shall be provided from all pedestrian access points and shall connect to one another to form a continuous pedestrian network from buildings, parking facilities, parking garages, entrances, and other structures. Wherever responsible pathways shall be separated from vehicular traffic. Now, I think that should be addressed on Table 2. And everything else that's in this section is already addressed in other parts of the Code. Because, for example, your front door has to -- whether it's a high-rise or whether it's a single-family residence, it has to be facing that street where you're getting your address. I mean, it's already there. When you also look at the pedestrian pathways and sidewalks, you know, of all these -- all this connectivity, I think it can be addressed on Table 2 to include some design features for qualifications. And the other thing is -- that I find rather disturbing is that last sentence in the second paragraph, where it says, "Wherever possible, pathways shall be

separated from vehicular traffic." Now, when you combine the vehicular traffic with the pedestrian experience, you know, what I've seen recently in some projects -- I mean, it's pretty appalling. There's no redeeming value to it. So, you either make them do it where you separate and make it safe and make it a pleasant experience, or you don't. That's why under these required standards, there's no beef to it. There's no meat, where you say, "Well, you know, this is doing something for us." And I just think it's unnecessary, in my opinion, but it has to be addressed, I think, in Table 2, as part of the pedestrian amenities and those kind of things. And I personally have done that, and that's where you give people the incentive to earn something for good design. And that's why I wanted to strike it from here but put it as an incentive in Table 2.

Board Member Bermello: You know, when I read this, I -- and to me, it seemed to me this is something we would do all the time everywhere.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly, for every design. But I think (INAUDIBLE) ask for it (INAUDIBLE) the City architect will ask...

Board Member Bermello: Why give, you know, anything special for, you know, what you do by nature?

Chairperson Pardo: And the way I'm looking at this section, it's a standard. It's a standard of what -- where does it go -- you know, these buildings will have this as a basic standard, and there's no watermark here. This is already in the Code. It's like frivolous to have it in there.

Board Member Behar: I agree. It don't need to be here. I would strike it out.

Chairperson Pardo: Perfect. Does anyone have a concern with that?

Board Member Salman: No.

Board Member Pratt: No.

Board Member Bermello: We're good.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so now the next one. I'm sorry, but structural soil, I mean...

Board Member Behar: Well, that is so important.

Chairperson Pardo: So, again, I would strike that.

Unidentified Speaker: Move on.

Chairperson Pardo: Unless the City architect is -- okay. Then the last one, windows on Mediterranean buildings. Mediterranean buildings shall provide a minimum window casing depth of four inches. I mean, back in 1986, the reason that they put this in was basically because of the glass boxes. They were trying to -- instead of having a clear face -- because you may not remember or not know -- oh, I'm sorry. Thank you, Mr. Clerk, for keeping me honest here. Let's see. I'm trying to catch up here. Thank you, sir. Alright, so the reason it was done is because of the glass boxes, and it was just one sheet of glass. It was curtain wall coming out. So, they said, "You know what, this is how we get rid of it. Let's depress it four inches." Then people like Mitch said, "Well, let's do something a little bit better." So, on his bank building there on the circle -- if you look at his fenestration -- the windows are set back substantially where the articulation is superb, and it's a lot more than four inches. The reason I want to take it out is I don't think that this formula is a good idea. But I did bring up the term of windows, which I did not use the term fenestration and articulation, and I should have, but I didn't, trying to keep it into a very simple language. But I think that the four inches is...

Board Member Behar: And not for this table. I don't think it's needed.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Board Member Behar: Not for this table.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, right. I would like to have someone earn a bonus for doing something special. So I don't know how you all feel about that, but I think that this was put in there -- so you understand -- to defend 1986. It was an answer to the curtain wall.

Board Member Bermello: I agree, Mr. Chair, with removing it the way you've stricken it.

Board Member Behar: If this goes, it goes in what I'm proposing in the third, you know, bonus.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Board Member Behar: Not here.

Unidentified Speaker: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so believe it or not, we're through Table 1. Now, I'm not going to criticize this, but the way this is written, if you remember the first statement I made into the record this evening was about the Level 1 bonuses, Level 2 versus Table 1, Table 2. You know, one really doesn't have to do with the other. So, the Level 1 bonus, clearly for the record, states standards for Coral Gables Mediterranean styles -- I'm sorry. Let me read it the way it is now. Standards for all types of architectural design. Bonuses are available up to .2 floor area ratio, and up to a maximum of one story. The allowable stories -- for all types of architectural designs and building. The allowable stories are subject to the subject property application comprehensive plan map designation and the height is regulated by the Zoning Code. The allowable stories and heights are as follows. Number one, I think that they missed the target completely. This is all that first bonus, that Level 1 bonus of .20 or 0.2 floor area ratio bonus, and up to the one story of height was

specifically written for the Coral Gables Mediterranean style, keeping in mind, what I said before, what I'm going to read into the record and what was discussed a little earlier. So, once we do that, this is a straight shot. You do a Coral Gables Mediterranean style, and the Board approves it, you get a .2 FAR and up to one floor. So, the table below this -- which is not called a table or identified as a table anywhere -- it talks about the different types of zoning, and then what the minimum building site area is, and then what the additional floors are. So you know, in 1986, a floor was identified specifically as 12 feet, not 13.5 feet. Clear as a bell, 12 feet, and there was a reason. Because of the way the Zoning Code was written, somewhere, somehow, it went from 12 feet to 13.5 feet. So, that being said, that additional floor, when you look at this, gives you the aggregate total for the lot size versus the zoning, so if you have a 10,000 square foot lot that's MF2 and you add one story, which is 13.5 feet, you can get up to another height.

Board Member Behar: Can you go -- can we go back to C, because I think we're in the height, but I do have a problem putting Coral Gables Mediterranean style. Because you could do this and achieve, you know, these whatever number, eight items, and it doesn't have to be tied to a Coral Gables Mediterranean style.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Behar: Right, because what you -- going back -- go up a little bit. And your standard for -- it used to say "all style of architecture design." Why are we have to, you know, put this directly on Coral Gables Mediterranean style? You don't have to have, again, a Mediterranean style building, and you have to incorporate these X number of items that make the project better, and you will achieve .2.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, the Level 1 bonus is specific.

Board Member Behar: But is it -- all two tables are supposed to be for Mediterranean style. But what I guess I'm trying to explain is that you could do on any building, and yet, it's not in Mediterranean style.

Chairperson Pardo: Well...

Board Member Behar: It might not -- because you add in there "Coral Gables Mediterranean style," it's not part of the original language that was part of this. Why do we have to be specific at Mediterranean -- Coral Gables Mediterranean style to this?

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so...

Board Member Bermello: I think what you're saying, Robert, is that the Level 1 is something we expect of everyone across the board, these are minimum standards to be met, and regardless of what the style, if you meet these, you end up with receiving the .2 and the extra story. Is that -- that's your point?

Board Member Behar: Yes, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: But it's not that way.

Board Member Bermello: To get the following incentives or allowances, you must be -- in other words, this would apply also to Spanish Mediterranean.

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: But it also would apply to...

Board Member Behar: Any style.



Board Member Bermello: Any. But the next table is only for -- is that -- that's the concept?

Chairperson Pardo: No. Well, let me clarify. This is why a lot of the confusion -- and this is -- you know, words mean things. So, the Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural style, which is Section 5-202 -- we've been concentrating on 501. In here, it says specifically, "A, the Coral Gables Mediterranean Architectural Design. All applications for development approval shall be required to satisfy all of the following." So, the Coral Gables Mediterranean Architecture Design is there now and is shown under a definition, clumsily, this way. In my opinion, this should have been put at the beginning, because the problem is, as I said, there's tremendous confusion because you look at those standards and you read the standard, there's nothing relevant there. I mean, the reason that this ordinance was put on the book and bonuses were put there, was that because they were trying to get away from the glass boxes, the brutal architecture that was being designed back in the 80s, and then it was being done in such a way to be able to create a Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural style revival. That was the crux of this entire bonus component.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, Felix, but if we use a couple of examples -- for example, and we're going to use the -- Mitch's building on the circle. To me, that's not really a Mediterranean style building, okay. It's a transitional building. It doesn't have the cupolas, doesn't have those elements that you will see, and the same thing with Glenn's building on Ponce. But those buildings incorporate all of these components, all of the elements that we're asking for. So, I don't see the need to include specifically Coral Gables Mediterranean style.

Chairperson Pardo: I disagree, and I'll tell you why. In 1986, there was a vacuum that existed in commercial design. And then this vacuum started to produce buildings that weren't well articulated. There are some buildings that exist there that were built in that era, built in the 70s, that are superb buildings. But this all started specifically with the Bank of Coral Gables on Ponce and Almeria. So, in order to create an incentive to be able to do a specific style -- and I'm not disagreeing with you, Robert, conceptually -- I'm just saying that when you look at this section,

it's a very specific section. This section has existed in the Code since 1986. Unfortunately, some people that altered this Code over time have strategically taken out certain parts. Now, right now the charge of this blue-ribbon committee is specifically about the Coral Gables Mediterranean ordinance. It's not about the great design ordinance; it's not about any other style ordinance. It's about the Coral Gables Mediterranean ordinance. Now, that being said, I feel that we should reward great architecture without a doubt. But if we take out this incentive -- and the only thing I added here was that it says here all -- Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural design, all applications for development approval shall be required to satisfy all of the following: Number one, include design elements -- and instead of saying, the way it says now, of the existing following buildings, it said nothing. It was stripped out completely. Therefore, you get people that do mediocre stuff, add some gingerbread here and there, and voila, they get .2 FAR bonus and a floor of height. So, when these different buildings were put in there, it doesn't come with any type of examples, so I tried to add one thing. The Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural character and the detailed description of the above buildings shall be contained within an illustrative document entitled "Coral Gables Mediterranean Architectural Style Guide," available at the Coral Gables Historic Resources Department, as adopted by resolution of the City Commission. Adherence to the principles -- wait a minute -- of the design element shall form the basis of judgment in determining the appropriateness of new construction or restoration in the Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural style. Now, that is a .2 FAR increase and a one-story increase. Table 2 -- not the "standards" of Table 1 -- (INAUDIBLE) almost irrelevant when you think of it and you look at it for bonuses. When you look at the second part, which are the public amenities, which is very specific, not only can you achieve .2, but you could achieve up to .3 there.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, but -- let's see -- let's go back to the other table. Again, if I -- let's say that an applicant wants to do -- an architect wants to do a contemporary building. Forget about incorporating -- I'm not going to get the .2. I'm not going to incorporate any of these requirements. Then we're going to get not a good project, you know. If you're not giving me -- if we're going to do a contemporary building, for lack of a better word, a transitional, and I'm not getting -- you know, because it's not a Mediterranean building, I'm not going to this. So, then we're going to end

up with a worst project. You know, I think that we should -- every project should be -- have the incentive, the motivation to be able to achieve these. That's the way I read it, unless, you know, from the board.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, Glenn, I was going to ask you for your comment on this.

Board Member Pratt: No. And I think that the idea, Felix, was that the Medit -- or the bonuses, the reason why they were broken into separate sections or into individual components, was that if you -- it encouraged developers to add additional things and to create nicer urban amenities and nicer, you know, ground plain features and just to enhance the building itself without having to go the full Mediterranean design. And I think that that's an important part of it. I agree with Robert. I think that there should be something in there that not all development needs to be or should be, or not all property owners or developers really wish to do full Mediterranean buildings. And there should be some structure in the Code that allows them to receive -- or puts some incentive in there for them to do something above just minimal, which I think is what the Level 1 does. And I mean, I don't think it needs -- but I don't think there needs to be the word "Mediterranean" within that. I think that those development incentives are independent of Mediterranean design.

Board Member Bermello: I would say that the word "Mediterranean" is already in there, when you say all architectural styles. So, I -- I mean, I agree with the concept, which obviously is -- withholding what is currently there, which is every developer is incentivized to comply with all of the -- regardless of what the style is: transitional, you know, modern.

Board Member Behar: But you have to comply. You have to do this.

Board Member Bermello: You have to comply with this and...

Chairperson Pardo: But they...

Board Member Bermello: But you don't...

Board Member Behar: Don't limit to Mediterranean.

Board Member Bermello: You don't allow...

Chairperson Pardo: Wait a minute.

Board Member Bermello: Anyone to, you know, bypass this.

Chairperson Pardo: Let's go to Table 1, okay, if we're saying that Table 1 gives you the ability to do .2 -- forget about Mediterranean architecture, although this is called Mediterranean standards, Coral Gables Mediterranean Style Design Standards, et cetera. So, under elements, so all the façades -- none of the façades can be blank, okay. So, the building façades fronting the streets, adjoining, the pedestrian sidewalks, et cetera, must have display windows, et cetera, right? Up to now, there's no mention of any style.

Board Member Bermello: Right, because I think this applies to all -- Table 1 applies to all styles.

Board Member Behar: To all styles.

Board Member Bermello: All styles. We're not saying...

Chairperson Pardo: I call this generic. It could be any style.

Board Member Pratt: Right, it's the baseline.

Chairperson Pardo: But up 'til now also, it hasn't provided any incentive for great architecture. These are just -- when you read the words -- look carefully at the words of this Table 1. The Table

1 is a blue herring, in my opinion, because you're looking at development categories or types and requirements. The requirement is you can't have any blank walls. The requirement is that on the building façades, you know, you have to have display windows or retail whatever, and then landscaping pedestrian -- again, nothing there as far as coming up with something tangible that has to be provided by the applicant.

Board Member Behar: Or Felix, you go at the end, and when you add -- when you're adding Coral Gables Mediterranean style specifically, then you're focusing on that style in order -- so if I'm doing a transitional building...

Board Member Bermello: You don't have to comply with this.

Board Member Behar: I don't have to comply with this, so...

Chairperson Pardo: And you're right, and you're right. And the whole -- the point I'm making is that the intent of this particular incentive -- and again, I said it before, that I wanted to read into the record because it's a different thing. There is a design chapter that is not written or exists in the Code; it just doesn't exist. And that chapter does not include other styles, including contemporary, et cetera.

Board Member Behar: But it says all type of architectural design, the way it's written with any modification. Let me ask, in your opinion, the building on Ponce, is that --? That, to me, is different than the Biltmore and is different than a lot of the other buildings.

Board Member Bermello: Which building are you talking about now?

Board Member Behar: Mitch's building.

Board Member Bermello: Oh, the Regions Bank?

Board Member Behar: Yeah. Okay, that to me, when you look at it, doesn't have...

Board Member Bermello: Well, it's not a Mediterranean. I mean, maybe...

Board Member Behar: Not Mediterranean.

Board Member Bermello: But it's great design.

Board Member Behar: Oh, no. Willy, and that's the point.

Board Member Bermello: It's contemporary, but it pays homage to the intent, and that's why we all love it. That's why we talk about.

Board Member Behar: But Willy, that project was entitled to get .2 because it incorporated every one of those components.

Board Member Bermello: I'm agreement with you.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, let's...

Board Member Bermello: I'm not disagreeing with you.

Chairperson Pardo: Let's go back to Glenn and Tom Spain's building, at 5555 Biltmore, great design. Absolutely great design. It's right there with Mitch -- Mitch's building, but they're different. So, my question is, did you get a bonus for that design?

Board Member Pratt: No.

Board Member Behar: But that was a different time.

Board Member Pratt: That was before...

Chairperson Pardo: No, wait, wait, wait. I'm trying to make a point. Did you get a bonus for that design?

Board Member Pratt: No.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Did you get a bonus for the Regions Bank design you did on the circle?

Board Member Alvarez: I probably did, but I can't remember.

Chairperson Pardo: So you plead the fifth. Here's the point I'm trying to make.

Board Member Alvarez: We were -- I don't think we were so intent on the bonuses numerically. I think we were intent in -- I remember we struggled with the parking, and the parking was a big issue. And we managed to present a case -- and it's difficult to remember all the details. I remember I was heavily involved in the zoning at the time dealing with this, the parking conditions. And the way the building -- that the areas were counted and the way -- maybe they allocated some, what you would call shared parking spots, because there were other parking available to do the (INAUDIBLE). The parking was a consideration or benefit. Maybe the bonuses were obtained in relation to the parking.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

My memory fails. This is...

Board Member Behar: You know, maybe you were limited by the parking and the FAR you could do best in your parking, so that might not have been a concern back then.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Alvarez: But we wanted to present a case that even if the ornamentation or the style in itself was representing the pure Mediterranean style acknowledged, it was intended to have the components; basically, the arcade, the way the corners turn. We'll do cupolas instead of the arcades with light. They would not do the arcade, and were favorably positioned. We had a good light on it. The connection -- pedestrian to the building in both sides, the drop-off. We improved the alley and made it into a nice arrival place, instead of a cargo place, things of that nature, you know, improving the character and quality. Basically, inspired by those that provided bonuses if it was designed strictly as Mediterranean. But I don't remember the proportion or the ratio of floor, how that was handled. I can't remember that.

Board Member Behar: Can I ask the City Attorney a question? Gus, if you were in a position representing a developer, and you say, look, this says to me that if I do a transitional building, I don't have to -- and I'm not getting the .2 -- I don't have to incorporate any of these requirements.

Chairperson Pardo: Standards, standards.

Board Member Behar: Or standards.

Chairperson Pardo: The Table 1 standards.

Board Member Behar: Because if I'm not getting .2, I don't have to incorporate any of these requirements -- standards in the project. Well, and I could tell you, you're going to -- we're going to get...



Chairperson Pardo: So, you mean to tell me, Glenn, that the Board of Architects now doesn't -- you don't discuss Mediterranean style? You don't -- you know, when you give a Mediterranean approval now for the additional FAR and bonus, you don't hold them to any particular style?

Board Member Pratt: No. We have a review and the applicant -- you know, Robert will tell you, or any of the people that present before the Board of Architects, they have to identify with multiple documents and documentation how the project complies with the requirements of the Code, with the requirements of the table, and identify the use of the materials, all of the elements that go into making the -- or complying with the requirements for the Code. So -- and the Board of Architects reviews all of that, yes. That's all a part of what...

Board Member Behar: They do, and you have to provide examples and prove that you're going to meet Level 1 and you're meeting level 2 in order to get your bonuses.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Pratt: And it's not just not on, say the front elevation, it's -- we look at all elevations because -- or all -- you know, the entire building and the entirety of the project.

Chairperson Pardo: So there is a reference to these eight buildings. There is a reference to the elements of the eight buildings.

Board Member Pratt: In terms of their -- the essence of those eight buildings, because obviously, you can't reproduce a lot of the details in today's world, the same type of precast elements or the same, you know, roof tile, or the same type of things that that the buildings that are used as reference. It's more of a generalization of what is -- what do those elements create in terms of the sense of the appropriateness of the design, and that -- are those -- is that same sense of appropriateness being created in the project that's being presented. Because you can't make the Mediterranean building or none of us can make a project out of just those elements that are

represented of what goes to create goes. It would be -- it's more of looking at the project in totality and seeing if it -- if aesthetically, which is what the Board is charged with doing, is just -- we're not -- the BOA is not charged with reviewing the zoning, essentially. It's charged with reviewing the aesthetics of the project and if it complies with meeting the aesthetic requirements that are generated by the examples in the Code.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, you know, here's the issue. And I'm all for rewarding great architecture. But let's say if (INAUDIBLE) came in to Coral Gables to do a very contemporary commercial design and he complies with all the zoning regulations, and he asked for a Mediterranean bonus where it could look like something on Bayshore Drive or something on Brickell. You have someone with an incredible reputation, an incredible resume. And would you be able to say, "No, it doesn't comply with -- for the Med bonuses for the .2," although the Table 2 has the (INAUDIBLE). Now, what I'm saying is -- and I said it early on at the beginning of our meeting today -- and that is that I think that there is room, but it should be outside of this particular section articulated specifically for other styles. But once you dilute that, why call it Mediterranean? Why not call it another section?

Board Member Pratt: Well, no, I agree with you on that point. I think that there should be incentives for doing great architecture regardless of what the style is. And I think that if you -- if a developer -- there should be an incentive that gives an extra or something additional to the development standards that are identified for creating good urban buildings and good urban environments. If the developer wants to make a Mediterranean style building, they should be -- receive something even beyond what is the...

Board Member Behar: The .2. But that's...

Board Member Pratt: Exactly.

Board Member Behar: That (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Pratt: Exactly.

Maria Magdalena Estupinan: Mr. Pardo, I'm sorry. I don't want to interrupt. I'm just confused, and I would like to clarify because you are arguing...

Chairperson Pardo: Wait. I haven't recognized you yet because we're in the middle of a discussion.

Ms. Estupinan: But that's my point. I'm lost and I would like to kind of clarify so I can follow you. And I would appreciate it. If you don't allow me, that's fine. You tell me, and I'll...

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, I think this is an important topic. We need to complete our discussion and then convey to the public what we're doing. We're right now in the middle of cooking this.

Chairperson Pardo: I agree. We're in the middle of a discussion right now, and if you could be patient...

Ms. Estupinan: No problem.

Chairperson Pardo: And...

Ms. Estupinan: Will I be able to...

Chairperson Pardo: We're going to see based on the time.

Ms. Estupinan: I see.

Chairperson Pardo: We're in the middle of a...

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Discussion now, which is really crucial to...

Ms. Estupinan: No, no, it is. That's why...

Chairperson Pardo: This blue-ribbon committee.

Ms. Estupinan: I wanted to explain to you...

Chairperson Pardo: Right. And I understand...

Board Member Alvarez: But you're not part of this board, ma'am.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, and that's the thing. This is...

Ms. Estupinan: No, but I am part of Coral Gables.

Board Member Alvarez: No, but...

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no.

Ms. Estupinan: No, I understand.

Chairperson Pardo: No, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait.

Ms. Estupinan: I asked -- I asked...

Chairperson Pardo: I think -- wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait.

Ms. Estupinan: I do understand, but I asked very respectfully.

Chairperson Pardo: No, excuse me, excuse me.

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Address the Chair; don't address anybody else on this committee.

Ms. Estupinan: But he...

Chairperson Pardo: Excuse me.

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Let's be civil about this.

Ms. Estupinan: I haven't (INAUDIBLE)...

Chairperson Pardo: No, you're not.

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: This gentleman said one thing, which is very specific. You're not part of this committee. We're in the middle of a deliberation and a discussion.

Ms. Estupinan: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: Everybody that's sitting here in this audience, the same as the people that are on Zoom, wait their turn to be able to be (INAUDIBLE). The Chair does not have to recognize anyone to speak from the public, just so you know.

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Attorney, am I correct about that?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That is correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so that being said and that being established, if you don't mind, if you could please have a seat. We're in the middle of a discussion. We don't want this to get out of hand right now because...

Ms. Estupinan: Of course not.

Chairperson Pardo: This committee is right now in the middle of a very interesting conversation, and we need to get it to the point where we can move on. Because if you recall, there's a moratorium now in the City, and we need to move on to be able to get our work done. So, if you would be patient, I really appreciate that you could take a seat. And if we have the time, we will open it up to the public, not just to you, but to everyone on this.

Ms. Estupinan: No problem.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Estupinan: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, so...

Board Member Behar: Back to the...

Chairperson Pardo: So -- and again, I truly -- you know, I understand. And it's not that I don't understand. The point I'm trying to make is that why do we have the examples of those buildings there? One thing is to say there is a certain amount for this type of style building, which was the intent from the very, very beginning, and how it was established. And at some point, it was expanded to the point that some of the buildings that go up today aren't necessarily great architecture. They almost look like cookie cutter, whatever, and it really is a shame, in my opinion. Because I think if you have a certain limit and you're allowed to go up one more floor, two more floors, three more floors, and increase the FAR up to .5 and you're giving me something mediocre, I think that's why we're here. And the thing is that I want to reward all styles of architecture, but I have a real understanding problem that this is the Mediterranean standard. And I do believe also that Table 2 -- which we haven't quite gotten there yet -- on Table 2, those amenities not only apply to Mediterranean, but they apply to all architecture. And again, it has -- in my opinion, it has to be addressed as a separate section, as an alternative to a particular style. I don't have a problem with that. And adopting even the same table of Table 2 for these pedestrian amenities, I don't have a problem with that. But I think that has to be an extension of what this blue-ribbon committee was asked to do. Now, if you're saying, we're going to give bonuses to any style of architecture, contemporary, whatever, and we'll go up to whatever the height restriction is, I think we have a big issue that we have to understand what it is. The premise of this chapter, when it was originally written and approved by the Commission, was that it was for a specific style. Now, that style doesn't have to be as traditional as one thinks. But let's say, if you're saying, "Well, we're going to do a glass box and it's going to be very contemporary and it's going to look great," and we're going to give you a bonus on top of that. It looks like we went backwards instead of forward. So, I'm all ears.

Board Member Behar: Mr. Chairman, I respectfully disagree.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Behar: And I think the -- what you're proposing, in my opinion, you're setting it up for somebody to come in and says, "If I'm not getting the .2 bonuses, I will do a glass box that allows whatever the zoning permits me to do and I will do that." And I think -- on the contrary, I think this will promote to go back to the 1986 and get to those glass box. I think that the Board of Architects reviews the project and says, "Okay, you want to get these bonuses on any style, you have to comply, and you have to show me why it does." But if I'm not -- if you're not giving me the opportunity to get that .2, then I don't have to. The way I read it, you don't have to adhere or comply with any of these requirements. That's the way I see it. I'm not an attorney, but I am sure an attorney will say, "Hey, you know, you're not getting .2, means you don't need to comply with any of that." And we want every building to incorporate these requirements. And I think the way that it was written I think applies to all styles, not just Coral Gables Mediterranean style.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, two points. Number one, I agree with what Mr. Behar is saying regarding the incentive for all styles to comply with these requirements. Number two, I think it's been pretty clear that if you want to have point FAR and have the additional level beyond the Table 1, it has to be Mediterranean. There's no -- as far as I know, there's no other option. So that has been, in my opinion, very, very, very, very clear. So, I don't see an issue there. I saw more on the things that later, you know, we -- I think should be taken out because they are the result of why people are so upset and why I personally don't like some of the things that have been done lately, which have to do with the issue of encroachments and lack of, you know, open space along the public rights-of-way and the public realm. But I think the concept of a two-step or a two-tier which says anything, any style in the Gables has to comply with this, and we provide you with this incentive as an incentive to not end with what happened before 1986, as an incentive for people not doing blank, unimaginative walls just because they did .2 less or one less story. So, we're saying we want quality, and that's the .2. But if you want .5, then there's no discussion. It has to be...



Board Member Behar: I agree.

Board Member Bermello: Mediterranean.

Board Member Pratt: And I think we're all in agreement.

Board Member Bermello: And I think we're all in agreement with that.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, if you -- again, if you at Table 1, the standards. The standards say nothing as FAR as the quality of anything. Think about it. If you can indulge me for a minute. The elevations, they can't be blank. I don't think the Board of Architects would even allow that to happen, but it's here under requirements. The building façades fronting the street adjoining the pedestrian side -- you know, there's nothing there that says -- it's not talking about fenestration. It's not talking about massing. It's not talking about any of these things.

Board Member Bermello: Could I ask the question maybe in reverse? Why would you give the .2 -- if none of these things are that good or necessary, why would you give .2 and the extra floor to Mediterranean and not to any other style?

Chairperson Pardo: The original concept -- when we did the Bank of Coral Gables, the original concept was that it cost that much more to do something like that. That particular building goes back to the original style of the founding of this City. So therefore, if it costs 20 percent more to build -- it was given as an incentive to be able to equalize compared to someone doing a curtain wall cube, which is what they were doing at that time. Now, again, I'm not...

Board Member Bermello: Again, I don't know about 1986, I was quite younger there, and didn't have any gray hair. I had a lot of hair. I don't know if that made me less wise, but I can tell you today, if I do a building with punch-out walls, a punch-out windows, and give it the decoration, add some, you know, barrel tile and some trims and corbels and outlookers and, you know, it's

going to cost much less than if I do a super duper curtain wall that would cost me \$150 a square foot. I mean, the price differential is not even in the stratosphere. I don't think -- I -- you know, now that may not be the case for what some people call transitional, okay, but I don't think it should be a cost issue. I think maybe it should be an issue of appropriateness more than cost, because the cost can fluctuate all over the place.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, you know...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, I have -- I spent today half an hour with a client who was trying to tell me to take more glass out of a building because of the cost of glass. And by the way, they're correct. But I'm trying to educate them as to how that solved the wrong thing in that situation. I think this issue is that -- and I think this is what we're trying to say that we want to hold every architectural style to get it up to a certain level, and that Level 1 is a hurdle. That if you want that additional story and that additional .2, you have to meet this standard. And to take that away or to make that only to one style means that everything else is going to reduce in mediocrity. I don't want to take that risk.

Board Member Behar: I don't either.

Board Member Bermello: Personally, you know, I don't want to be associated with, "Oh, you are the one that was responsible for us being able to get now this crappy stuff in here." Imagine. So, that's my concern, Mr. Chair. And -- because our actions here today will, you know, have repercussions, so that's my concern with the first level. The second level, I'm 100 percent...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: It's got to be Spanish Mediterranean. And we can add all the bells and whistles as to what it must comply with. I get it. I know that a lot of people have questions about the eight or so examples, and maybe there should be more illustrative guidelines, a little more

specific. And I realize it's not an issue of element. We all have discussed that elements don't make a design style. It's a lot of the composition, you know, the massing, the articulation, not just the ornamentation. So, but I think we would be making a mistake if we limit that first level of, let's say we're striving for excellence, to just one style.

Chairperson Pardo: Would you -- would the committee mind -- I think this is a discussion that obviously is extremely important. But if you don't mind what I wanted to do, just momentarily, if you don't mind, is simply jump to Table 2. Why? Because these are the amenities that we were talking about from the (INAUDIBLE). And what I'm trying to do is not -- don't take it the wrong way. I'm not trying to ignore this. This is...

Board Member Behar: No, because I strongly feel -- I mean, you know how I feel about this. I don't think we should be doing it, and I agree with Willy. This is going to come back in the future and say, "Oh, you were responsible for getting mediocre building because you took that incentive from all the other styles."

Chairperson Pardo: I'm not disagreeing with the argument. Okay, I understand it. What I wanted to do, if you don't mind, if the Committee doesn't mind, is get to Table 2, which is the table that has to do with public realm standards. Is everybody okay with that just for the moment? Okay, so under Table 2, the first one, arcades and/or loggias. Willy, you brought up...

Board Member Bermello: Adding some elements, like canopies...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Trellises, and awnings. And I think Mitch made a comment earlier, which is totally correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. I wanted to add Mitch's comment in there to your comment. Hold on for one second.

Board Member Behar: Mr. Chair, I have a question. How long -- how late do you think we're going to go on tonight?

Chairperson Pardo: One more hour, Mr. Behar.

Board Member Bermello: I have a problem. I'm chairing a webinar, a workshop at 7:30.

Chairperson Pardo: What time do you have to leave, sir?

Board Member Bermello: I would need to leave here by 7 o'clock.

Board Member Behar: I think 7 o'clock would be a good stopping point for me too.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Behar: Last night I went to 9:45 in the same seat.

Chairperson Pardo: You slept here.

Board Member Behar: In the same chair.

Board Member Pratt: I was here at 9 o'clock this morning until 1:30.

Unidentified Speaker: I was with you,.

Board Member Pratt: On the BOA.

Board Member Behar: I saw you leave a little bit before.

Chairperson Pardo: I did. I had to go pass out, I think.

Board Member Pratt: I got all of two hours in the office today so...

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, sorry about that.

Unidentified Speaker: So, we agree to go to 7?

Board Member Behar: 7.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry?

Board Member Behar: 7 o'clock?

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, 7.

Board Member Salman: Everybody's in agreement?

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. Okay, so number one, the arcades and the loggias. We added -- or I added what's in red there, which are Willy's comments about limitations of encroachments on corners of buildings may be required to control view corridors and ground stories, building bulk and massing, and must respect the established setbacks and must not encroach into the setbacks or public right-of-way. Awnings or other similar items do not satisfy these provisions. Let's -- based on the comments that Mitch made earlier tonight, let's add verbiage to...

Board Member Alvarez: Yeah, just say awnings shall be encouraged.

Board Member Behar: What is similar items?

Board Member Bermello: I had three; canopies, trellises and awnings.

Board Member Alvarez: Encourage, yeah. Awnings shall be encouraged.

Chairperson Pardo: I think the word awnings -- can we put like a material type?

Board Member Alvarez: Well, you can word it better than I did.

Board Member Bermello: It could be a fabric. It could be metal, but...

Board Member Salman: I think the initial objection was to one of just canvas awnings. I think the initial objection was just canvas awning, as I recall.

Board Member Bermello: And what is the objection?

Unidentified Speaker: They get dirty and deteriorate quickly. It's Florida.

Board Member Bermello: I know, except, you know, in a retail sense, they still work. They add to the animation. They make it -- they're lively; they can add cover. It's great for the retail environment, you know, as opposed to a loggia, frankly, kills retail. And you know, if you want to have a dead street, add a lot of loggias, and the retail won't -- just doesn't survive. So -- but again, I can see where an arcade and a loggia does make sense. And that's why, you know, we have a great Board of Architects. So, my thinking of the awnings is usually the developer and the architect will discuss what is the material.

Chairperson Pardo: Could we change the word --? I think, maybe Mitch would agree, instead of using the word "awnings," use the word "canopies."

Board Member Bermello: I think canopy also or trellis. They're different, but they -- there are times that a trellis is the appropriate...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Element.

Board Member Behar: Let me ask a question. If you have an overhang or you have a -- I don't want to say a canopy, but if you have a slab that is...

Chairperson Pardo: A cantilever.

Unidentified Speaker: An eyebrow.

Board Member Behar: A cantilever that is giving you the protection, but it's not creating the colonnade. So -- and the retail are not -- you know, have a clear view.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: What is that? Is that a similar item?

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, to me, a roof overhang, I mean...

Board Member Behar: Because I agree; arcade/loggia are terrible for retail, terrible, especially that we have to do them 12 feet -- what is the depth, 10 feet?

Board Member Pratt: I think it's 10.

Board Member Behar: 10 feet.

Board Member Bermello: 10 feet.

Board Member Behar: So by the time that, you know...

Board Member Bermello: You don't see it.

Board Member Behar: You can't see it.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. So, I think if we add -- if we change the word to canopies...

Board Member Bermello: I think canopies will be -- I mean, if what you're trying to get out - away from the traditional awning...

Board Member Alvarez: A complement to that should be the façade line on the retail storefront should be receding -- I couldn't tell you whether it's two or three or four feet. But you don't want a flat wall coming down and then a door opening, and then just the awning. You need to make the effort of...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Alvarez: (INAUDIBLE) to it.

Chairperson Pardo: Can we change that last sentence instead of being a negative, making it into a positive?



Board Member Alvarez: This is not a setback. The structure will still be...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Alvarez: (INAUDIBLE) with no setback. But the presence of the line where the storefront touches ground should be receding.

Unidentified Speaker: Exactly.

Chairperson Pardo: So how about canopies shall be encouraged?

Board Member Alvarez: Yeah, shall be encouraged.

City Architect Riesco: Why don't you just take out the negative? Take out the "do not" and leave it alone. Say awnings and other similar items -- which can imply canopies, trellises, so you don't limit it to certain typologies.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, it could be a trellis, a...

City Architect Riesco: Leave it open-ended, and again, let the Board of Architects...

Board Member Behar: I agree with that.

City Architect Riesco: Make the determination.

Board Member Alvarez: Let me add another little bit of salt here. It will give an opportunity for those designers that really are very intent in creating a style manifestation of the -- all architecture. Those elements would provide them tools to present that case much better than a little arcade or other insignificant pieces, you know. The way you handle that, it could be through (INAUDIBLE),

it could be exquisitely detailed and move the sense -- the style by the sense of what it looks in not just the present, but also -- by the same token, if you choose not to be strictly -- what's the word? -- you know, if you don't want to be strict with the style of the architecture to Mediterranean by making things like that, it can still be a little more simple, but it would achieve a lot for this environment.

Board Member Behar: I think Juan is correct. I think if you take away, the "do not."

City Architect Riesco: That's it. Leave it alone.

Board Member Behar: I think that -- and then again, it's going through the Board of Architects for approval.

City Architect Riesco: Yeah, you have an architect designing it, and you have a board reviewing it.

Chairperson Pardo: So, it will say -- Juan, it would say...

City Architect Riesco: Awnings and other similar items satisfy these provisions.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Perfect.

City Architect Riesco: Period.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

City Architect Riesco: And leave it open-ended for the architect to choose whether it's an awning, whether it's a canopy, whether it's a trellis. Who are we to dictate that?

Chairperson Pardo: Shall satisfy.

City Architect Riesco: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: There you go.

Unidentified Speaker: Turn the negative into a positive.

Chairperson Pardo: Gus, you good there?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I'm good.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, number two, building rooflines.

Board Member Bermello: Can you read the entire item, please? Because I -- do you mind?

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry?

Board Member Bermello: Can you read the entire item?

Chairperson Pardo: The one we just did?

Board Member Bermello: Yes, please.

Chairperson Pardo: Arcades, loggias, or covered areas constructed adjacent, parallel, and/or perpendicular to buildings to provide cover and protection from the elements for pedestrian

passageways, sidewalks, and other walkways thereby promoting pedestrian passage/use. Limitations of encroachments on corners of buildings may be required to control view corridors and ground stories building bulk and massing and must respect the established setbacks and must not encroach into setbacks of public rights-of-way. Awnings or similar items shall satisfy these provisions.

Board Member Bermello: Okay, so here's where I think there's a problem.

Board Member Alvarez: Are you in line 3?

Board Member Bermello: Okay, so...

Chairperson Pardo: No, we're in...

Board Member Bermello: We're talking about encroachments. And the concept of a loggia, an arcade, where you have columns encroaching on the public realm is an issue, which I think is what this is addressing. But once we introduce an awning, an eyebrow, and overhang, trellis, the whole issue is that, that in fact, can be an encroachment.

Chairperson Pardo: Into the public right-of-way.

Board Member Bermello: Into the public realm because it's not putting -- it's just providing overhang for protection, and it's not providing a screen. It's not creating -- so, I think -- that's why I wanted to read it again, because what makes great retail streets is that you can still see the retail. You see the signage. You don't have to get wet. And so, what if you have an awning or a canopy that's protruding 10 feet into the sidewalk, or if you have a -- you know what I'm saying? If you're having an outdoor café, and there's a cover that overhangs into that area and you're outside on a sidewalk having dining? I mean, who wants to get wet when it's raining in South Florida? So -- but it seems to me that -- I think what I wanted to get away was from any encroachments of

buildings, which is what we see on US 1, where you see the colonnade right on top of the roadways. That's what I think is kind of like bad.

Board Member Pratt: But within the context of the paragraph, it's saying it must respect the established setbacks.

Board Member Bermello: Yes, but then when you read the awnings, that's what threw me at the end. So, imagine your building is at the setback, you've complied with the setback of the front of your storefront of the retail is right there. And if you have a canopy that's protruding over the sidewalk, so as you're walking, it covers part of the sidewalk, where if you have a couple of tables and chairs under it, you know, you're having coffee and you're covered from the element...

Board Member Alvarez: That's part of...

Board Member Bermello: That would not -- it seems to me that would be now prohibited here.

Board Member Behar: But see, I see your point and I'm trying to -- but I don't read that there when it says in respect to the setback -- established setbacks. What I see is awning or similar items satisfy this provision is -- maybe it's not an arcade. Maybe it's not a loggia or a covered area.

Board Member Bermello: Because everything above says must -- which I agree with -- must not encroach, you know, your loggia, your columns, the colonnade has to be within your property.

Board Member Behar: And look, there's an example right here on Le Jeune Road, just the City National Bank. There's an arcade and there's canopies that I think project over...

Chairperson Pardo: The awnings.

Board Member Behar: The right-of-way.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Board Member Behar: Right? That's what we don't want to have -- or at least that's what you don't want to have.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Board Member Behar: Right?

Chairperson Pardo: In the public right-of-way.

Board Member Behar: Right. So -- but -- I mean, I'm not reading that, Willy. I'm reading that awnings and other similar satisfy this provision. That is whatever you do, whether it's an arcade, loggia, or covered areas, or an awning or similar items, has to respect the established setback.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, that's...

Board Member Bermello: Oh, for example...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON.)

Board Member Bermello: Robert, if we approve this, immediately Caffè Abbracci would be noncompliant...

Board Member Alvarez: Yeah, but those awnings are...

Board Member Bermello: Just to put it in perspective.

Board Member Alvarez: Into the right-of-way.

Board Member Behar: Oh, okay. I got you.

Board Member Bermello: Just put it in perspective.

Board Member Behar: That's a good example.

Board Member Bermello: Ruth's Chris would be noncompliant. We immediately make a bunch of retail owners that have struggled through a whole pandemic, and we just made them noncompliant for something that they've had for years. That does -- I don't think there's anybody that's come -- that's talked to me that they're upset about, you know, the awnings at Caffè Abbracci or Ruth's Chris, you know. It's -- people are upset about different things, not that. So, that's my concern, that if we do that here, it would make immediately -- I mean, maybe we could grandfather them in, but then, you know, what kind of environment do you have walking down Ponce de Leon or -- so, in areas where you have, particularly, eating establishments, you know -- and then someone will say, "Well, I can't have an umbrella either?" You get into all those, you know...

Board Member Pratt: My take on it, Willy, is that -- I mean, in other parts of the Code where it addresses awnings and awnings are permitted to extend into the setback provided they're canvas or non-ferrous metals -- I think is the wording -- but I think that my take on the change that Juan was suggesting is that it permits the Board of Architects to review the project, and that there may be an instance where awnings or other similar items could be used in lieu of arcades or those other features within the project.

Board Member Bermello: Could we then add some phrase regarding the -- as per the discretion of the Board of Architects in their review?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I think...

Board Member Bermello: Something along those lines.

Board Member Pratt: That's my take on it is really giving the Board of Architects the...

Board Member Behar: The discretion.

Board Member Bermello: The discretion, yeah.

Board Member Pratt: Ability to determine that.

Board Member Bermello: That will be perfect.

Board Member Behar: I read it the same way. Mitch, you were going to say something?

Board Member Alvarez: I just want to say that I think it's important that these awnings be allowed into the right-of-way. If you -- the moment you said they cannot exceed the property line, then you're really making the owner...

Unidentified Speaker: Push it back.

Board Member Alvarez: Set the building back X number of feet. It may be possible...

City Architect Riesco: And also...

Board Member Alvarez: (INAUDIBLE).

City Architect Riesco: I think there's a distinction. Arcades, loggias imply columns...



Board Member Behar: That's correct.

City Architect Riesco: Which are vertical elements that come to the ground. And awnings, canopies, trellises, these are things that project.

Unidentified Speaker: Correct.

City Architect Riesco: They don't have columns. So...

Board Member Alvarez: Yes.

City Architect Riesco: I think there's a distinction there that we need to make because there's a big difference between something that has a column that comes down to the ground and something that's a projection.

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

City Architect Riesco: So...

Board Member Alvarez: That's the famous value of the outdoor café, that you're not taking away from the owner property, but you're allowing him to create the environment.

Board Member Behar: I'm okay with it.

Board Member Alvarez: And maybe it will never -- maybe it happens only under certain conditions with the sidewalk...

Board Member Behar: But you're right. At Caffè Abbracci is an example, you know. That's exactly what they have, right?

Board Member Alvarez: It doesn't mean it has...

Board Member Behar: And it works.

Board Member Alvarez: To go everywhere.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: You're right; I agree.

Chairperson Pardo: We should add "may encroach into the public right-of-way."

Board Member Alvarez: May.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, there you go.

Board Member Behar: I'm okay with it.

Board Member Bermello: And you could say subject to review and approval by the Board of Architects.

City Architect Riesco: By the BOA.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Board Member Alvarez: To be evaluated on condition...

Board Member Behar: It works for me.

Unidentified Speaker: I got it.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Because there will be height clearance issues also and...

Unidentified Speaker: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: All sorts of other things.

City Architect Riesco: Yeah, that's already in the Code. There's already a height issue...

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

City Architect Riesco: A height clearance issue.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly. Alright, so...

Board Member Bermello: A height issue, distance from the curb...

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Because of the curb, you know, it could get...

Board Member Behar: That's a good...

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, all of those.

Chairperson Pardo: Number two, the building rooflines. Incorporation of the horizontal and vertical changes in the building roofline. Would you like to add maybe under the development category or type, add the words multiple building rooflines?

Unidentified Speaker: How about multiple building roof elevations?

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry?

Unidentified Speaker: Multiple building roof elevations.

Board Member Pratt: I don't know. Actually, I think it's pretty clear the way it is.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah. I think the distinction between horizontal and vertical implies a multiple level.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Board Member Pratt: It depends on the size of the building and the site, and there's multiple things that I think...

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah, the idea is not to create a monotonous roof...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Unidentified Speaker: To break it up into pieces so that the scale is lessened.

Chairperson Pardo: And what about shaped parapets included there also?

Board Member Behar: No, I'd leave -- I think the way it is written...

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Behar: Gives enough discretion and...

Chairperson Pardo: Building step back is already -- exists under the design standards; step back, massing, et cetera. It's already there. So, I just wanted to strike it out because it's already there. It's a requirement. Number four, building towers. The use of towers or similar massing to reduce the mass and bulk of buildings. That is not anywhere there. It's not in the 20 there. That's a specific...

Board Member Behar: I think the building tower should be one of the element that is...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: Attributed to the -- I would leave that.

Chairperson Pardo: So -- okay, you'd leave that. Okay.

Board Member Bermello: Wait, if we're going to take building setbacks away, I think there should be some record in maybe the minutes that it was done because we believe that it's already covered elsewhere. And not to give someone the feeling that...

Board Member Behar: It's not required.

Board Member Bermello: That this is not required...

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no.

Board Member Bermello: Or it's not important...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Because it is.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, if you remember, Willy, at the very end of the meeting, the last time, we added that -- specifically for that, we added the words "and Section 5-102 Design Review Standards, A and B," and that was added in there right above Table 1. And if you notice, Table 2 doesn't have that little preface above it. It's above Table 1 under 1. And what that says is, "Applications shall be required to satisfy all the requirements of Articles 2 and 3," which are Zoning and Uses, "and Section 5-102 Design Review Standards, A and B, and in Table 1 required standards," et cetera. And then when you go to Table, 2 that preface of required standards, that's already there. So that's why, Willy, we did take care of that, and that was the last thing we did at the last meeting.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Board Member Pratt: The only thing that -- Mr. Chairman -- I would -- is Robert had a suggestion about adding the sentence that the Board of Architects at its discretion may allow for variations to underlying zoning step back requirements. And I -- and there are -- we're talking about number three.

Board Member Behar: In the building step back.

Board Member Pratt: If we did leave that in there. And I think that -- I support Robert's suggestion, because I think that not all -- it's -- not all designs are a one-size-fit-all, you know. There's...

Board Member Behar: Yeah, I...

Board Member Pratt: There can -- there may need to be some adjustments and sometimes if it's at the discretion of the board, if it's something that the board considers and reviews, and finds that it's acceptable, you know, I think that that would be something.

Chairperson Pardo: So...

Board Member Behar: That's the language in...

Chairperson Pardo: I have no objection to that, the building step back. Instead of being stricken, Gus, if you could add the verbiage "the Board of Architects at its discretion may allow for variations to underlying zoning setback requirements." This is under specifically building setbacks, not setbacks, stepbacks.

Board Member Bermello: Where is it right now, mostly at 45 feet and above? Is that where the setbacks occur?

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Board Member Pratt: Right. That's where the Code says.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. Not setback.

Board Member Bermello: No, the setback.

Board Member Pratt: The stepbacks.

Board Member Bermello: Stepbacks is at 45 feet.

Chairperson Pardo: S-T-E-P, correct, very different. Okay, moving on.

Unidentified Speaker: You all agreed to four, right?

Chairperson Pardo: Under -- we discussed powers. Driveways. Again, the consolidation of vehicular entrances, et cetera. What I wanted to do, if it was okay, if you can indulge me for a minute, I wanted to just go ahead and strike out lighting and landscaping, and I'll tell you why. The lighting of landscaping, I think it's something that, you know, it is an enhancement obviously, but this is something that I don't think merits, you know, the importance of additional height and additional FAR. This is a minor type of thing, but I do want to -- I would like to strike out that, the overhead doors, and the paver treatments. And what I wanted to do, depending on what the committee would like to do, is I'd like to be able to add courtyards and with a minimum size of -- saying courtyards, a minimum of 800 square feet, which was previously 400 square feet. And then also, water features shall include substantial areas and detail for BOA approval, and this would be all under courtyards, so it would be courtyards and...

Board Member Behar: Why don't we go back to --? One at a time. Let's go -- let's deal with the driveways.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: Okay. I mean, I think, when possible, consolidation of vehicular entrance is appropriate. But you may have cases where you cannot do all of them in one.

Board Member Bermello: But still, this is a good incentive. I mean, you know, you can have a project where you have a lot of street frontage and then you decide to put three driveway entrances, curb cuts, and you kind of kill the whole pedestrian continuity. I think forcing or enticing the



developer that says, you know, we got to hide the back of-house, limit the entryways, pinch those as much as possible. As far as the public realm, I think it's...

Board Member Behar: I agree with you on...

Board Member Bermello: It's important.

Board Member Behar: When you reference like that, yes. When possible, you want to do that. What about if your lot is...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, if you only have one street frontage, let's just say you're between two lots, there you got no choices. You know, you're going to have one or -- hopefully, not two, but at least one, right? But I still think it's a good thing to...

Unidentified Speaker: Incentivize.

Board Member Bermello: Incentivize. Unless -- now if you tell me that we have this somewhere else in the Code, and it's already required, no discussion. But if not, I think this is a good thing to have.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, and that -- if that's the case, then what you could do is substitute under pedestrian amenities section where it says freestanding information kiosk. No advertise -- instead of that, add that there.

Board Member Bermello: Where is it? Where?

Chairperson Pardo: Under pedestrian amenities. If you go to the second page, number 10...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: You see it says benches, expanded sidewalk widths beyond the property line.

Board Member Bermello: I think that's talking about something totally different. This is more about site planning the property, proper site planning.

Unidentified Speaker: This is site furniture.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, this is site furniture. This is benches and...

Unidentified Speaker: Planter boxes.

Board Member Bermello: This is more street furniture and (INAUDIBLE).

Unidentified Speaker: Water features, fountains, other similar features.

Board Member Bermello: This isn't a -- you could say it's a pedestrian sensitive approach, but I would not put it in the context of a planter box or public art.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, and then the other thing is that conceptually right now, there is a certain amount of items that if you have X amount of items, you get the bonus. And there's a difference between residential and mixed use. And you know, I would like to ask what the committee feels about instead of doing it by checking off X amount of these items, about providing a fraction of the FAR for a certain amount to be able to get up to the maximum of 3.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, I have a different position there. My feeling is you should do all of them. No, you know...

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, if you do all of them, you get the .3.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, if you get all of them, you get the -- I agree.

Board Member Bermello: You get it. Yeah, and that's...

Unidentified Speaker: Substantial completion, like we talked about, you know. You have to comply with...

Board Member Bermello: You got to do it.

Unidentified Speaker: If you're going to get it, you got to do the work.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, you're going for .3 and an additional floor, I think -- and you -  
- the message is, you've got to do all of these, period, you know.

Chairperson Pardo: And I'm thinking is that it is possible that this would work for larger buildings,  
but not necessarily smaller buildings. So that's why I was...

Board Member Bermello: Which one do you think would not work for smaller buildings?

Board Member Pratt: I think it would work on any project.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, I think this...

Chairperson Pardo: On any project?

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: I think so.

Board Member Pratt: To the extent possible, I think that they could be implemented, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: So -- okay, so in other words, instead of 7 out of 10, or 6 out of 10, depending on what it is...

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Number one, the committee feels that it should be the same for residential and mixed-use.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: And it should be all of them.

Board Member Bermello: All.

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Absolutely.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Unidentified Speaker: That include underground parking?

Board Member Bermello: If you're sending a message, you know, (INAUDIBLE) to the Commission, I think this is a strong message being sent.

Board Member Behar: You need to...

Board Member Bermello: Comply, boom.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, okay. So...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, I'd like...

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) like to leave...

Board Member Bermello: I recommend we keep the driveways because it's definitely a plus.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Bermello: For the pedestrian realm and the public realm to have those minimized, consolidated.

Chairperson Pardo: I have no issue whatsoever keeping that and adding lighting, and then this becomes --it's all or nothing.

Board Member Behar: All or nothing is the way to go.

Chairperson Pardo: What about the overhead doors?

Board Member Bermello: You know, one thing about lighting -- and I know this is another topic. I mean, cities are known for their lights and parts of cities, you know; in Paris, City of Lights, Manhattan. So, I think lighting is an important ingredient for the pageantry, nighttime of cities. And I don't know whether it's here or somewhere else, but I think whether uplighting, you know,

a row of date palms or the colonnade on a building, the cupola on the roof, I think all of those are things -- and yeah, how are you going to police it later on? But I think there are things that are very important for -- at ground level and the cityscape.

Unidentified Speaker: I agree.

Board Member Bermello: They add to, you know, what makes the City special.

Unidentified Speaker: And when you don't do it, it's a problem.

Board Member Bermello: I'm sorry?

Unidentified Speaker: And when you don't do it, it's a problem.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, and...

Unidentified Speaker: At Coral Gables Museum, we ended up putting in lighting just to get lighting on the plaza so they could use it, and then we took advantage and lit up a tower and it helped create a public place.

Board Member Bermello: And it's beautiful. Imagine when it's dark. It's, you know...

Board Member Behar: I think it's a must.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, done. Alright, so what about the overhead doors? I mean, it just...

Board Member Behar: I think today you are required to put them 20 feet behind a distance, right?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: But not...

Unidentified Speaker: Not on the plane of the building.

Board Member Behar: Not at the -- yeah.

Unidentified Speaker: The plane of the building. It has to be back.

Board Member Behar: And I think, you know, in some buildings, I would want to close if you have a loading area or something to make sure I don't see into it. So -- but it -- like -- again, today you're require to set it back 20 feet or whatever it is, from the face of the building. I think that's okay.

Chairperson Pardo: So you mean leave it in? What about the paver treatment?

Unidentified Speaker: I -- with regards to the overhead doors, I don't have a problem with -- for vehicular entrances, but I'd like to be able to close up trash rooms and stuff like that. I think we need to just define it because otherwise the prohibition of, you know...

Board Member Bermello: We're leaving the overhead doors, right, or --?

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, paver treatments; leave them in or take them out? That's number 9.

Unidentified Speaker: 9 A, B.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. The only thing I think I'd like to add is not just Public Works. I'd like to add the Board of Architects. No offense, Public Works. They're going to look at other issues.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, they're going to be looking at it at permit level anyway.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: So, you know, as far as their standards.

Unidentified Speaker: Agreed, that's it.

Chairperson Pardo: I think we should substitute completely there Public Works Department and simply state, you know, Board of Architects approval, because when they do go in for their permit, they will have to go to Public Works. Then pedestrian amenities. How many times...

Board Member Bermello: So, it also has minimums. And can we get rid of the minimums? And you know, like if you were incentivizing to amenitize the driveway, which is really what we're trying to do -- right? -- have the entire driveway, not 10 percent of the driveway.

Chairperson Pardo: The percentages are a bad idea.

Board Member Bermello: So get rid of the percentages.

Chairperson Pardo: Get rid of those.

Board Member Bermello: Just say if you're in the Gables, we expect you -- the driveways, they're going to be beautiful.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.



Board Member Bermello: They're going to be amenitized. The sidewalk, you're going to be doing the Coral Gables standard, you know, not 25 percent, the entire thing, right?

Chairperson Pardo: Agreed. Any objection to that?

Board Member Behar: No.

Board Member Pratt: No.

Unidentified Speaker: No.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Unidentified Speaker: None.

Chairperson Pardo: Gus, you got that?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: My only question is, what will the language read then if we remove percentage?

Chairperson Pardo: It will just say drive...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Just simply include paver treatment in all the following locations, driveways and sidewalks?

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: And then the type of pavers shall be determined or shall be approved by the Board of Architects.

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: So, poured concrete color, you know, that doesn't have to be in there. It's already required by Public Works. Okay, and then pedestrian amenities as well -- leave it intact, except freestanding information kiosk. You know, I don't see the applicability anywhere.

Board Member Behar: I've never seen it used correct. I've never seen them used.

Board Member Bermello: Which one?

Board Member Behar: Freestanding.

Chairperson Pardo: The C, freestanding information kiosks. Kind of bizarre. And by the way, have you all ever seen the City of Coral Gables Master Streetscape Plan?

Board Member Pratt: I've seen some versions of it, but I've never seen a final one, and it gets consistently changed.

Chairperson Pardo: If they have that, I think, you know, from an enforceability, does that happen...

Board Member Pratt: We've seen on the -- I know that in some applications we've seen, the Board of Architects have tried to ensure that the master plan is implemented. But the -- Public Works

has changed multiple times on requiring landscape bulb outs and then not requiring landscape bulb outs, and so there's a hodgepodge of multiple conditions.

Chairperson Pardo: I personally would take it out because it - we don't even know what it is.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: We don't know. It's a moving target. I mean, why...

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Put it on there. Does everyone agree to that?

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: To do what?

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: To do what?

Chairperson Pardo: To take out the last sentence of number 10, above amenities shall be consistent in design and form with the City of Coral Gables Master Streetscape Plan.

Board Member Bermello: Again, I haven't -- I'm not familiar with what the streetscape plan says or requires, so pardon the ignorance, but I'll just make a comment. With the additional mobility and different modes of transportation that you see around town, I've also seen in the public realm and the sidewalks, particularly Miracle Mile and surrounding streets, a proliferation of the bicycle racks that are currently being used. And I think before we get too far into the future, we're going

to see like a smorgasbord of all this littering features along our city's sidewalks. And just like we have the Coral Gables Bank and Key Biscayne has the green sidewalks, has an element of continuity, not for this board, but I think maybe for the City architect to -- that there should be some elements of continuity that if you are providing some of these elements, whether it's in the sidewalk area, in the public realm, that it should be consistent and that you shouldn't have 20 different types of trashcans or bicycle racks all over the place. I mean, it looks chaotic. It starts to look like -- and so having elements of continuity with the light posts, and that if a developer is going into that area, that he's going to abide by that. Otherwise, every property owner is going to do whatever the heck they want within that sphere. And you know, even though these can all be amenities, if everybody does something different and puts it out in the front, it can start to look pretty bad.

Unidentified Speaker: I want to go back a second to where we were talking about the City of Coral Gables Master Streetscape Plan. It exists, it's out there. It includes a lot more than just streetscape finishes and furniture and whatnot. It includes signage, public signage for parking and try to get some uniformity, and that was the intent.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, so let's keep it in then.

Unidentified Speaker: It came out of the Communications Board in part, and was worked through with Public Works on a lot of...

Board Member Pratt: I know that I've seen it for the -- down in the Merrick Park area, but I don't know that I've ever seen anything completed up to the North Ponce or generalized through the City. I think that...

Unidentified Speaker: Well, the parking location signs are all the same.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Unidentified Speaker: And they're on different buildings.

Chairperson Pardo: I would like to, if you don't mind, do we want to leave it in there because we don't even know what it is.

Unidentified Speaker: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: I would want to know what it is. I think uniformity in the public realm is an important consideration.

Unidentified Speaker: Is super important. I couldn't agree more.

Board Member Bermello: You know, and...

Unidentified Speaker: We're doing that with umbrellas and street tables and chairs. We're trying to come up with a standard.

Unidentified Speaker: Leave it in.

Unidentified Speaker: So leave it in for now.

Unidentified Speaker: That's what I'd like to do is leave it in.

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, do you think we could make a stopping point here tonight? Is that possible?

Chairperson Pardo: And -- well, I wanted to do something. In all fairness to the public, I know that you and Robert have to leave.

Unidentified Speaker: I've got to also. I can't stay either. I need to leave too.

Board Member Behar: I think e reached a stopping point. We'll deal with number 11, but I -- you know, next time.

Chairperson Pardo: No, what I wanted to do is just -- if the public wants to speak, as long as we have a quorum.

Board Member Behar: I'll stay. I'll stay for the public to speak.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. I mean, we need four people for a quorum, correct, Mr. Attorney?

Unidentified Speaker: I think five.

Chairperson Pardo: Five? Okay.

Unidentified Speaker: Five for quorum?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, if the comments can be very, very brief. You know, we've spent a lot of time and I think that if there was confusion before, I think that a lot of -- there's been a lot of explanation and there shouldn't be.

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Chair, before you guys -- before everyone leaves, just really quick, we had set up the meetings up until today. Do we want to continue scheduled meetings every Thursday?

Board Member Behar: I -- personally, yes.

Unidentified Speaker: Yes.

Board Member Behar: I recommend -- I make a motion that we extend the meetings.

Board Member Bermello: I second the motion.

Chairperson Pardo: Second.

Unidentified Speaker: I agree to extend; however, this next Thursday, I've got a previous commitment. This board was supposed to meet for a month, and I did schedule something for the 19<sup>th</sup>, and I'm not going to be able to be here.

Chairperson Pardo: And I also know that...

Unidentified Speaker: So I'd like to be excused.

Chairperson Pardo: Mitch will not be here either.

Board Member Behar: Well, then we don't meet this coming Thursday. We'll meet the following Thursday.

City Clerk Urquia: Understood. And one more thing, Mr. Chair, would you like to place an item on the August 24 City Commission agenda...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

City Clerk Urquia: Providing an update?

Chairperson Pardo: I'll -- I think it would be good to give a report to the Commission of what our progress has been so far, because at the time that the blue-ribbon committee was initiated, they were talking about 30-day clips on that, and I think that would be important. So, let's take this as a stopping point. And I would like to have the Clerk call anyone that would come up -- and you have to leave? You can leave. Thank you very much. We know that we're not going to have a meeting next week. We'll have it the following Thursday.

City Clerk Urquia: Correct. So, no meeting for Thursday, August 19<sup>th</sup>. The next meeting will be August 26<sup>th</sup> at 4 p.m.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Unidentified Speaker: Perfect.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Mitch. Thanks for being here.

City Clerk Urquia: The first speaker we have is Maria Magdalena Estupinan.

Board Member Pratt: If things can be quick, I'll...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Maria Magdalena Estupinan: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Your name and address for...

Ms. Estupinan: My name is Maria Magdalena Estupinan, 21 Madeira Avenue. I apologize if I interrupted you. It's just that I wanted to clarify because I was confused and maybe the people that were watching were also confused. I keep hearing the word "incentive," and I'm kind of confused



because it's like me going to Harry Winston because I want to buy a diamond and then thinking that Harry Winston is going to cater to me or try to accommodate me. Either I can pay for the diamond, or I can go to -- I don't know -- Zale's maybe or Macy's. So, my point is -- and Mr. Behar kept saying, "Well, you know, we have to give incentive, because then we might have a building glass tower," and no. I mean, we have a set of -- this is what we want. This is Coral Gables. If it doesn't fit you for your purposes, you can go to another city, and that's my point. I do not understand why we have to give them incentives to kind of -- the developer get good architects. If he cannot get a good architect to just do the work here in Coral Gables, they can go to another place. So am I confused that you were discussing that point for over 45 minutes?

Chairperson Pardo: No, a little bit.

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: And I'll tell you...

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Let me explain.

Ms. Estupinan: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: If you don't mind. First of all, there are certain design elements.

Ms. Estupinan: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: For example, under the public realm thing, for example, you're not required to have arcades. You're not required to have loggias. You're not required to have fountains. You're not required to have towers. You're not required to have all sorts of these things.

Ms. Estupinan: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: And they all cost money to do.

Ms. Estupinan: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so that doesn't mean that you can't have a beautiful building that the Board of Architects can improve, but they won't have these public realm improvements.

Ms. Estupinan: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: So, therefore, you create incentives to be able to offset giving someone a bonus for something that is special or unique. So, that's one part of it. The discussion that we were in the middle of has to do with another component of it that we are going to debate, discuss, and hopefully, agree to in the near future.

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: So, the reason that you create the incentive is to be able to provide something that is unique, that is special, that goes beyond good, that it goes to excellent. So, these things, the reason you provide those incentives, those bonuses are very specific to be able to get these things that are not in the Code.

Board Member Behar: That are not required.

Ms. Estupinan: Right. And I follow -- I don't see -- then I would have to kind of look what is in there because why do you have to have an arcade? Why do you have to have this? You see what I'm saying? So, my point -- and it has nothing to do with you gentlemen. Maybe it's just the way

of the City putting that there so they can give incentives to the developers and that is exactly my point. If you have a beautiful building -- I mean, if you are a good architect, you can have a beautiful Mediterranean building. And we're not talking about arcades or this or that. You see what I'm saying?

Board Member Behar: I don't because those are component and element that make the Mediterranean architecture great. And if you don't provide those incentive, the developer may say, "You know what, I'm going to do a building that is flat and I'm not going to provide an arcade that you see in a lot of the Mediterranean cities," in Paris, for example.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: So, that costs a developer money. So, in return, I might -- what I --- my professional opinion is that you do give them those incentives in order for us as a City to get that is going to benefit the public.

Ms. Estupinan: Okay, well, I just, you know, respectfully disagree. I think they can go to another place with their -- if they don't want to comply with Coral Gables look or whatever we're requiring. And as a matter of fact, that would be a blessing right now because we have too much of the benefit. And I thank you so much.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Next.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you for waiting.

City Clerk Urquia: Okay. The next speaker is Mr. Tom O'Malley.

Mr. O'Malley: Thank you, sir. My one comment might be kind of long, so what I would like to know is, can I send you a message, Mr. Chair? And it's an email, so...

Board Member Behar: I think it goes through the Clerk, right?

Mr. O'Malley: Who does -- who would it go to?

City Clerk Urquia: Absolutely, yes. Send the Clerk an email, and then I'll distribute it amongst the board members.

Chairperson Pardo: Distribute it to all the board members if you'd like. But do you have any specific question or concern at this time?

Mr. O'Malley: One other item Sue Kawalerski asked me to bring up is that she doesn't believe that green space, open green space should be allowed to be computed on right-of-way, so there shouldn't be any planters or whatever they may be, that should be placed on a sidewalk or right-of-way.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Mr. O'Malley: And so, she wanted...

Chairperson Pardo: The calculation should -- in Sue's comment to you, the calculation should be within the private lot.

Mr. O'Malley: Correct. Thank you, sir.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Mr. O'Malley.

City Clerk Urquia: That's it, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Anyone on Zoom?

City Clerk Urquia: No, sir.

Chairperson Pardo: Very good, thank you. A motion to adjourn?

Board Member Behar: Motion to adjourn.

Unidentified Speaker: Second.

Unidentified Speaker: Second.

Chairperson Pardo: Second.

Board Member Behar: You all have a great -- and we'll see you in two weeks.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, perfect. Thank you.