

1 MR. GRABIEL: Second.
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion. We
 3 have a second by Julio.
 4 Call the roll, please.
 5 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?
 6 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 7 THE SECRETARY: Sue Kawalerski?
 8 MS. KAWALERSKI: Yes.
 9 THE SECRETARY: Felix Pardo?
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So he's coming right
 11 now. Let's just wait one second.
 12 THE SECRETARY: Sure.
 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We're approving the
 14 minutes, if you're okay.
 15 MR. PARDO: Yes.
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Felix Pardo said,
 17 "Yes."
 18 THE SECRETARY: Javier Salman? Not here yet.
 19 Chip Withers?
 20 MR. WITHERS: Yes.
 21 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I'll abstain.
 23 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I'm sorry?
 25 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?

5

1 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 3 The procedure that we'll use for tonight,
 4 first we'll have the identification of the
 5 agenda item by Mr. Collier. Then we'll go ahead
 6 and have the presentation by the applicant or
 7 the agent. In this case, a lot of it will be
 8 the presentation by Staff. Then we'll go ahead
 9 and open it for public comment, first in
 10 Chambers, Zoom platform and then the phone
 11 line. We'll go ahead and close it for public
 12 comment, any Board discussion, motion, further
 13 discussion, if needed, and a second of motion.
 14 Then we'll have the Board's final comments and
 15 a vote.
 16 Mr. Collier, if you'd please read the first
 17 item into the agenda.
 18 MR. COLLIER: Item E-1, an Ordinance of the
 19 City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida
 20 providing for text amendments to the City of
 21 Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 2,
 22 "Zoning Districts," Section 2-101,
 23 "Single-Family Residential District" and
 24 Section 2-102 "Multi-Family 1 Duplex District,"
 25 and Article 16, "Definitions," to provide

6

1 exceptions to the separation of accessory
 2 structures from the main structure under
 3 certain requirements and provide for open-air
 4 accessory structures with ground area coverage
 5 requirements; providing for repealer provision,
 6 severability clause, codification, and
 7 providing for an effective date.

8 Item E-1, public hearing.

9 MS. GARCIA: Good evening. Jennifer
 10 Garcia, Planning and Zoning Director.

11 If I could have the PowerPoint, please. It
 12 should be just a few slides.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before we proceed --

15 MS. GARCIA: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- let's take note
 17 that Javier Salman has joined us and is
 18 present.

19 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, you mean the late
 20 Javier Salman?

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: No, the current.

22 MR. BEHAR: Not the late, the current.

23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Tardy, possibly.

24 MR. BEHAR: That was bad.

25 MS. GARCIA: But no worries. You haven't

7

1 missed anything yet.

2 As you know, our Single-Family and Duplex
 3 Zoning has building lot coverage maximums, 35
 4 percent for the principal building, and then an
 5 extra 10 percent for accessory structures. And
 6 right now, our Zoning Code is not very clear as
 7 far as what separation you would have for an
 8 accessory structure.

9 So, right now, there's two issues
 10 happening. The first issue is that properties
 11 that have detached garages from their principal
 12 building is not easily accessible from their
 13 house or vice-versa. So whenever they come
 14 forward and ask Zoning, "Can I have a breezeway
 15 to access my garage, so I don't get wet when
 16 it's raining," Zoning says, "Sure, but the
 17 whole thing would have to count against your 35
 18 percent." Once it touches each other and it's
 19 attached, it becomes part of the 35 percent.

20 The other issue is, it's not very clear, as
 21 far what separation means. So sometimes it's
 22 structurally separated. It's counting as a 35
 23 and an additional 10 percent, which, of course,
 24 leaves kind of unusable areas, and it doesn't
 25 really make much sense to have a one inch

8

separation, for example.

And so what we're getting in return are not the best building typologies in our neighborhoods. Also, in duplexes, you're getting kind of boxy, not very innovative, creative building types.

So what we are proposing today, sponsored by a Member of the Commission, is to look at the current Zone, as far as, really, lot coverage, and how we can encourage open air spaces.

So this has two parts to it. The first part is that anything that's attached to the main structure, that's open air, would count as part of the 45 percent and not penalize the 35 percent, if that makes any sense. In addition to that, there's a five-foot separation, so you could have an actual separation of a walkway between the detached structure of the accessory structure and the main structure.

So, this, of course, is the most usable for smaller properties, with the setback requirements, open space requirements. And those are not touching. I should also specify that 45 percent, 35 plus the 10 percent, is not

9

changing in this. It's just allowing the flexibility, as far as having a more creative usable property.

As you can see in the larger example here, if you have enough space, you could actually create a nice courtyard, whereas today, you probably can't, just because you can't attach them. Once you attach them today, it has to count against the 35 percent. So it's a little more limiting. So this is a way to encourage more outdoor space in our single-family, duplex properties.

And here's some images of the idea behind this and what we could try and encourage single-family and duplexes to do, to have courtyards, to have those open spaces, those loggias, to be able to make more usability of the people's properties.

As you can see, the courtyard -- again, and some of this is taken from Alys Beach, which is in the Panhandle. All of our open space requirements would still be required. This is not going beyond the 45 percent maximum ground coverage that we have today.

And so I have our esteemed City Architect

10

here, Juan Riesgo. He discussed this with the Board of Architects. In general, it was very well received. They're very excited about the flexibility to be able to do better site planning for our properties.

So if you have any questions as it relates to architecture, he's here to answer that.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

Juan, would you like to come up and give a little bit of an overview of your discussion with the Board of Architects?

MR. RIESGO: Absolutely.

Juan Riesgo, City Architect.

Any question specifically for me or would you like for me to just --

MR. BEHAR: No. My question, and just to be clear, we're not changing the overall 35 plus 10 lot coverage allowed? We're still keeping that?

MR. RIESGO: The maximum lot coverage is going to stay at 45 percent. The only thing we're doing is giving the applicant the ability to connect --

MR. BEHAR: With a roof --

11

MR. RIESGO: A roof structure and open air. In South Florida, outdoor living is a must, and a lot of projects are coming to us asking for this, and we can't grant it, because right now the Code actually penalizes you, when you attach it, because then it reverts back to the 35 percent, and so people start making the houses smaller, and people complain. The residents don't want that.

So we thought this made a lot of sense, from an architectural perspective, because, again, we're not increasing the lot coverage. The maximum is always going to be 45 percent. We're just allowing the applicant or the architects to do a nicer scenario in the backyards with regard to open air structures, loggias, pergolas, trellises.

What's happening is, everybody is detaching -- everybody wants 35 percent and they also want the 10 percent, so they design the main house and they design these auxiliary structures that are detached, that don't make any sense. A lot of times, we're having issues with aesthetics, because since the element is not connected to the house physically, they

12

changes the design on the accessory use and then we get into a combative discussion about aesthetics and architectural style. "I want a modern thing in the backyard. It's a foley. It's not connected."

And so it creates a lot of controversy on our side, at the Board level, and we felt, based on projects that we've seen that have been really successful with this concept, that it's appropriate, and I think it's something that's not derogatory for the City. I think we're not changing the intent of the Code, which is the maximum lot coverage stays at 45 percent. We're just giving them another avenue to make a better backyard. That's really it.

MR. BEHAR: And you're right, at the end, it's going to look much better, because it's going to be more cohesive.

MR. RIESGO: Absolutely. And that's what we want. That's the intent. And, again, we're running into roadblocks, because once people detach the structure, they feel compelled sometimes to do something different aesthetically and that creates conflict and discussions and conflicts between the Board and

13

the applicants.

And so we're trying to see what the answer is here, and we feel that this is the logical answer, is just how we calculate the square footage, how we look at it, but in general, the big picture doesn't change. 45 percent --

MR. BEHAR: It just cannot be enclosed? From the main structure to the accessory cannot be enclosed?

MR. RIESGO: Correct. Only covered. Yeah, it can't be air-conditioned.

MR. BEHAR: Right.

MR. RIESGO: But, again, in South Florida, people love trellises, gazebos, pergolas.

MR. BEHAR: Absolutely.

MR. RIESGO: You know, covered areas where they can barbecue and not be exposed to rain, not be exposed to the hot sun, but it creates a really attractive space. I mean, you saw the photographs that Jennifer presented. Outdoor space in South Florida is a must. I mean, I think everybody wants it and I think we should have that provision to allow the applicants to do it, because it provides, in our opinion, better aesthetics.

14

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Does the roof line have to be continuous?

MR. RIESGO: Not necessarily, as long as they -- again, they integrate roof materials, they can step it up, down. You know, we leave that up to the designer, the architect.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.

MR. RIESGO: There's no mass increase. There's no -- it allows for more flexibility and creativity, in our opinion. It incentivizes, again, these pergolas, these louvers, these covered spaces, gazebos. And at the end, it's up to the discretion of the Board, in terms of design and mass, anyway. So I don't see a problem moving forward, because they have the ability to critique the connection, the look, the aesthetics, the materiality, the height. So they still, at the end of the day, can have input into that, with regards to mass.

So we think, again, it's a positive feature. We think it's a good thing moving forward. The Board is fully behind this. Jennifer presented to my Board, I don't know, several weeks ago, a month ago, and everybody

15

was very receptive to it.

We've actually had several architects that have discussed this openly with us and with the Board, and we've had to not be able to agree to it, because it wasn't feasible, because it was actually impacting the square footage of the main house, because it was considered the 35 percent. Once you connect it, you get zapped that 10 percent. You lose that 10 percent. So people were not going for that.

And, again, they're providing the main structure, the pool deck and then a little accessory cabana building, a bathroom, you know, a hundred feet away, that makes no logical sense, from our perspective, again, architecturally, and what we want more than anything is to have the projects be connected and cohesive and complementary to each other, not two distinct forms, and unfortunately we've been getting that, especially in the larger lots down south, the estate lots, you know, where they end up with a lot of accessory structures dotting the backyard and it just -- sometimes it becomes a hodgepodge, you know.

If it's done properly, it can be designed

16

1 in a fragmented sense, but, unfortunately, a
2 lot of architects don't have that capability
3 and we don't end up getting something positive.
4 We get something that's kind of, in some ways,
5 derogatory to the overall scheme.

6 MS. KAWALERSKI: Can you think of any worst
7 case scenario here?

8 MR. RIESGO: No. No. Again, I don't see
9 the downside. We've debated this internally.
10 We've reviewed it internally. We've looked at
11 several projects live in the Board meetings,
12 where architects and owners have wanted this,
13 and we've had our debates, and unfortunately,
14 some of them, you know, wouldn't go forward,
15 because we advised that this was going to
16 happen.

17 You know, the way the Code is written right
18 now, it penalizes you the 10 percent when you
19 connect, and everybody wants a connection. You
20 know, who in South Florida doesn't want a roof
21 to get away from the sun?

22 MR. SALMAN: Mr. Chair, but my question is
23 that you have a minimum separation of five
24 feet, correct?

25 MR. BEHAR: No.

17

1 to us, that's arbitrary and didn't make any
2 sense. Either you connect it, tie it in or you
3 don't.

4 But they were smart. They figured, hey, as
5 long as I show you a one inch separation, I get
6 10 percent. So the argument went round and
7 round and round, until we got to the point
8 where, hey, we have to do something, because it
9 just creates, again, more conflict for us, at
10 the Board level, and we don't have the power to
11 enforce it, because the Code is not reinforcing
12 the concept of what we really want.

13 So I think it's a great idea.

14 MR. SALMAN: I think even five feet is very
15 narrow.

16 MR. RIESGO: I'm sorry?

17 MR. SALMAN: I think even five feet is very
18 narrow.

19 MR. RIESGO: For our detached structure?

20 MR. SALMAN: Yeah.

21 MR. RIESGO: We think it's a minimum,
22 Javier. I mean, I think -- I agree, I mean,
23 maybe more, but we felt -- again, in the Code,
24 we deal with minimums. That's what the Codes
25 typically establish, and then we hope that

19

1 MR. RIESGO: That's a discussion for when
2 you have a detached structure only, the
3 five-foot, because another thing we were
4 combating and fighting with people on, the
5 concept of a detached structure is an inch, in
6 a lot of people's minds, and theoretically and
7 realistically, it is. An inch is a separation.
8 And based on the definition of a detached
9 structure, they were achieving that, but,
10 again, thinking about constructability-wise,
11 you can't build a structure an inch away. You
12 can't put a fascia an inch away from another
13 fascia, because you can't paint it, you can't
14 nail it, you can't maintain it. You can't put
15 a gutter there. So it just created a lot of
16 problems for us, at our point, where we
17 reviewed these things on a weekly basis.

18 So, again, we spoke with the Planning
19 Director. We came up -- we discussed three
20 feet. We ended up with five feet, I think is
21 what we agreed to, that we felt that when you
22 want a detached structure, an auxiliary
23 structure, the minimum has to be five feet. We
24 don't want something two inches away from the
25 main house, when it's not connected, because,

18

1 architects take it to another level and don't
2 do the minimums, but, unfortunately, there's a
3 lot of people that -- you know, it's
4 prescriptive thing and they follow -- as long
5 as they meet the Code, hey, you can't touch me,
6 and that's true, to a certain extent.

7 MR. BEHAR: You're right. Maybe ten feet
8 or something would be more --

9 MR. SALMAN: I think that would be much
10 more -- you know, especially if you're dealing
11 with these overall larger lots in the south
12 part of the City.

13 (Simultaneous speaking.)

14 MR. SALMAN: I mean, we have a wealth of
15 single-family and duplex lots along Le Jeune
16 that would benefit from that, and they'd
17 already have a credit of not having any
18 parking. So that would give them the ability
19 to then have an auxiliary structure.

20 MR. RIESGO: Yeah. On the duplexes, it
21 becomes critical in the garages, you know.

22 MR. SALMAN: They don't have garages.
23 You're not required to have a garage for a
24 duplex.

25 MR. RIESGO: I don't know about that.

20

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What I'd like to do
2 is, before we continue, do we have --
3 MR. RIESGO: They required -- it's
4 required.
5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before we continue, we
6 don't have anybody here in Chambers. Do we
7 have anybody on Zoom for the public?
8 THE SECRETARY: No.
9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Anybody on the phone
10 platform?
11 THE SECRETARY: No.
12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. So let me go
13 ahead and close it for the public. What I'd
14 like to do is go in order, if that's possible.
15 It's hard for the court reporter to go ahead
16 and take notes if everybody is talking
17 together.
18 Chip.
19 MR. WITHERS: I just had a question and I
20 think Jennifer -- I thought I heard Jennifer,
21 in her presentation, saying if someone had a
22 home at 35 percent and a detached structure at
23 10 percent, and they want to put a porte
24 cochere or an open garage on the side, they
25 couldn't do it, but now they can do it? Did I

21

1 misunderstand that?
2 MS. GARCIA: So you can do it today, but
3 once you attach it, it becomes part of that 35
4 percent. So you're encouraging --
5 MR. WITHERS: So they can't do it? If I
6 have a cottage in the back, and it's 10
7 percent, and I have a home and it's at 35
8 percent, and I wanted to put a covered porte
9 cochere on the side, I can't --
10 MS. GARCIA: Well, then you're already
11 maxed out. You're already maxed out, because
12 you already had 10 percent and 35 percent.
13 MR. WITHERS: I'm already maxed out?
14 MS. GARCIA: Right. Exactly.
15 MR. WITHERS: So this doesn't help --
16 because, listen, no one uses those rear garages
17 to put cars in. Maybe they converted them to
18 apartments that they rent or they -- you know,
19 but no one uses those garages. No one uses
20 those garages now.
21 Here we go.
22 MR. RIESGO: This may alleviate that.
23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: There is no power.
24 THE SECRETARY: Yeah, it died.
25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. We're going to

22

1 go ahead and pause just a second so we can have
2 all of it recorded.
3 MR. WITHERS: Okay. Here we go. We're
4 back.
5 So if I already have 10 percent and I
6 already have 35 percent, how does -- how can --
7 MR. RIESGO: Can I respond?
8 MR. WITHERS: Yeah. Yeah.
9 MR. RIESGO: Okay. So, again, thinking of
10 that same concept of the detached garage on the
11 rear of the property or on the side of the
12 property, this concept allows you to attach it
13 and still comply with the 45 percent. Versus,
14 the Code, the way it is today, if the applicant
15 attaches the rear garage to the house, he gets
16 reverted back to the 35 percent. So nobody
17 attaches, like you say, rear garages.
18 Everything is detached. Nobody likes that,
19 because on a rainy day or a sunny day or you've
20 got groceries or whatever, you park in your
21 detached garage in the rear and you want to
22 come to your main structure, you go in open
23 air.
24 MR. BEHAR: What I think he's asking, if
25 you already have the detached structure, 10

23

1 percent, and a house that's 35 percent, you're
2 just going to be allowed to do a connection, a
3 covered connection. You cannot do an
4 additional structure.
5 MR. RIESGO: Correct.
6 MR. BEHAR: You're done. You exceeded --
7 MR. WITHERS: Like a garage on the side to
8 park your car?
9 MR. BEHAR: If you already exceeded -- if
10 you're using the 10 percent and the 35 percent,
11 no more.
12 MR. RIESGO: You're done.
13 MR. BEHAR: That's it. You're done.
14 MR. WITHERS: I could tear the cottage down
15 and --
16 MR. BEHAR: Yeah.
17 MR. RIESGO: Yeah.
18 MR. BEHAR: This is only allowing you to do
19 the connection, a covered connection, from --
20 MR. RIESGO: Yeah, from accessory to main.
21 That's all we're asking for.
22 MR. WITHERS: Without counting the covered
23 condition as part of the -- as part of the -- I
24 get it. Okay. I misunderstood Jennifer.
25 MR. GRABIEL: Is there a limit to the size

24

of the connection?

MR. RIESGO: Not now. I think that's up to the Board's discretion, and the design and the overall site plan, and, you know, where the pool is and -- you know, all of those things are looked at and vetted by the Board.

If they feel that the connection is too wide, I'm sure they'll make a comment, "Hey, bring it back narrower. Tone it down. Lower it." You know, if we feel it's impinging on the neighborhood, discuss it, at that point.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Chip, are you done with your comments?

MR. WITHERS: I'm done. Thank you.

Mr. Pardo.

Thank you for patiently waiting.

MR. PARDO: So I've been walking around -- a little bit around the City.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: If you would speak up into the microphone, please. Thank you.

MR. PARDO: Is this on?

MS. KAWALERSKI: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yeah.

MR. PARDO: Okay. I've been walking around the City recently, and -- different parts of

25

the City. I've got to tell you, I'm very, very, very disappointed on many of the projects that I've seen. Residences, that I've seen, that the bulk, the mass, is so enormous, and, in fact, many of the residents have told me that they are kind of taken aback by these, what they call, not me, shoe box designs, this enormous mass. It's not, you know, modern or whatever, just have absolutely no push and pull, no interest in it. I've seen it myself. Maybe you guys have a different opinion, but it's really altering, in a very negative way, the City, I think, the residential areas.

In the graphics that Staff came up with, they show this U-shaped, very usable, very friendly, you know, very somewhere else kind of thing, or here, but one of the things about that particular proposed open air accessory structure is that, although you have a swimming pool inside of this U-shape, let's say, and it looks fantastic and all of this stuff, the mass gets pushed to the outside, towards the front.

When you have an accessory building that has that additional 10 percent, you have a natural push and pull and you have a

26

separation, where you have green space, most of the time, and usable areas.

I remember that I designed for my brother-in-law an outside gazebo, which was absolutely spectacular, and I turned it at an angle, and it had the swimming pool, and it looked fantastic, like a garden, much better than this. And from a massing standpoint, on the outside, it paid homage to the rest of the buildings and houses that were in that neighborhood. This doesn't do this.

What this is, is simply adding more massing to things. I personally think it's a really bad idea, and the reason I think it's a bad idea is because many of the lots are fifty by a hundred in the north part of the Gables. This is putting two pounds in a one pound bag. Visually it looks like two pounds in a one pound bag.

I remember that this has been -- and people, when they bought their properties, the Zoning Code said, "This is it."

Now, for certain people to say, "I want more," they could ask for anything else, but the thing is, now we're getting into a point

27

where someone can obtain a variance, because it's a self-imposed type of thing, and they can't go to the Board of Adjustment and get that, so, therefore, now they just want to change the Code. This changing of the Code changes the massing, the breaks between this.

Now let me give you another example. For example, when you take a City block and some of the areas here in the City, and let's say that a certain block is peppered with these little two-story apartments buildings, they have set backs in between them, and they have trees that grow in between them. Some developers now can take all of those little apartments, tear them down, and now build one large thing, under a PAD, Planned Area Development.

You lose something. It doesn't matter how nice you do the architecture. You lose something, which means green space, the heat index that we get from the heat island effect, which is very real, and we're just not thinking that way.

So the problem I have with this is that, this was not haphazardly put in there of the 35 or 10 percent. It was put in there by really

28

smart people, a long time ago, to make sure that we kept it that way. Those limitations are there for a reason.

One of the problems that they have with the larger areas, estate areas, are, these are areas that were annexed afterwards. They were working under the Miami-Dade Zoning Code. That's not a fair comparison.

I think that one of the things that we have to do is be very, very careful on how we change the future of just our residential areas. Putting two pounds in a one pound bag is never a good idea. And I think, visually, this is one of the problems that I have with this. The charm that you have, even if it's a larger lot, when you have that push and pull, and even a separate building, which used to be a garage, and then it became an in-laws quarters, which is allowed by Code, what is not allowed by Code is to rent it out to somebody else that's not part of your family. That's what's not allowed.

I just find it distressing walking through these areas, that some of the architecture, the mass is so enormous, the height is so enormous,

29

that it's just transforming those neighborhoods into something else. I don't think it's part of Coral Gables, and I disagree with you a hundred percent.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

Sue.

MS. GARCIA: Sorry, Chair. I just wanted to clarify things. This is not going to decrease any requirement for -- 40 percent open space requirement that they have in the Code. This is only just being able to attach an accessory structure.

MR. PARDO: I'm sorry Jennifer. I understood that perfectly. The thing that I'm talking about is separating masses. When you separate a mass, it usually looks smaller or more compatible or more human in scale. When you add and attach the mass, it doesn't. I don't care how many arches you put in it, it's different.

MS. GARCIA: Right.

MR. PARDO: You could take a house, on a very long lot, and make it look completely different. In this particular case, what you do with separate buildings -- I mean, this has

30

been going on for a long, long time. Franklin Lloyd Wright did it very successfully and he always separated things with other buildings, other structures. We have examples over and over very successfully done.

He also is very careful with the height issue, to maintain that the massing didn't look as bad as possible. In this particular case now, we're adding more massing and we're adding more height, and it almost -- it almost looks like your 25-foot setback in the front is less, when you put these bulky buildings in front of it, and it doesn't matter how much decoration you put on it. It's like putting lipstick on a pig sometimes.

MS. GARCIA: Right. So the way that this is written today, it's not proposed as a by right thing you can do. The hands are in the Board of Architects. They can approve or not approve something based on the massing. So we did take that into account with the language proposed.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

Sue.

MS. KAWALERSKI: I have an issue with size.

31

You know, to Julio's point, like how big can these things be? Because I can imagine a house, and then a pool, and then a structure on the opposite side of the pool, and somebody says, "I want to connect to that thing on the other side of the pool," and all of a sudden, you have this roof structure where, from above, you've got no backyard anymore, it's a giant roof, which becomes a livable space.

You can live in an open air environment like that. You can put a kitchen in there. All of a sudden, you're expanding your living space.

And I know you said, "Well, the Board of Architects won't allow that to happen," well, you know, we've heard that before, too, okay, and then we end up with these kinds of structures that we're seeing all over.

So without limitations that it has to directly attach to, there can't be any interference in between -- I mean, there are all kinds of options, I think, that if we were going to pass this, need to be in there, to protect it, and not just leaving it to the Board of Architects, who with a very, you know,

32

savvy person in front of them, can convince them that that roof over it is perfectly fine.

So you take a drone above it, and all of a sudden, it's nothing but a giant gigantic roof. So I've got a real problem with this.

MR. RIESGO: Okay.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, Sue.

Julio.

MR. GRABIEL: Well, same point. Sorry. I'm concerned with not having a limit to the size of the connector. I mean, we all see it, as architects, as the main residence, the adjacent residence, and the hallway covered walk, whatever, but, again, if it can be made as wide as the main residence, then you end up with too much square footage.

MS. GARCIA: So the limitation would be the height. They can't go beyond the 25 feet maximum height. The limitation would be the actual ground coverage, right. So they can't have too much of that.

It can be enclosed today. What you're saying, like if they have an open air structure that's as wide as the building, they could do that today. They probably wouldn't, because

33

it's not, you know, usable space, enclosed, a bedroom, a kitchen, whatever. It's open air. This is not going beyond that 45 percent lot coverage.

So that would be the limitation that they would have for the size of any attached open air structure, it would be how much they're going to be able to cover their property, and, of course, balancing that with the 40 percent open air landscaped area.

MR. GRABIEL: So to connector is limited to the same lot coverage?

MS. GARCIA: Correct.

MR. RIESGO: Yeah.

MR. GRABIEL: Okay. I'm fine with that.

MS. GARCIA: Yes.

MR. RIESGO: That's still there.

MR. GRABIEL: I'm fine.

MR. RIESGO: That has not changed, and thought I explained it.

MR. GRABIEL: In addition to?

MR. RIESGO: Yeah. You still have that control. We haven't increased any of that. It's still the same parameters, with the exception of we're allowing some flexibility in

34

the connectors. And, again, that -- the amount of flexibility is dictated by the discussion that occurs at the Board level during the design review.

And if the Board feels or is compelled to say, "Hey, this is too big, too wide, too imposing, too massive, too large," I'm sure that comment will come up. It comes up now, as Jennifer stated.

You have the ability to take the back of your house, put a covered terrace from one end to the other. That's something that's allowed by Code, by right, now. If you want to use that as part of your 35 percent, you can do that, but most people are savvy and they want air-conditioned space, and so they want to try to make the air-conditioned space more usable than the covered terrace, so that that gets reduced to a certain extent, but it's still part of the program. Nothing has changed with that regard.

I don't think, honestly, that adding the -- the allowance of a connector piece, at the rear of the property, that connects an accessory structure to the rear of the property, is going

35

to impact the mass of the front of the house. I think that's already said and done during the design of the house and that should be addressed by the Board, in terms of what you stated, Mr. Pardo, the height, the mass. And the Board, again, looks at that, vets that, discusses that, and, you know, at the end, we hope that we have a design that's contextual, that's within scale, but we also understand that applicants want higher ceilings. Nobody wants a house with an eight-foot beam anymore. That's a dinosaur in today's world, based on my experience attending these meetings on a weekly basis.

So a ten-foot tie beam is a no-no in today's world. If you're in real estate and you're developing your property or your home for your family, your kids, you want a higher ceiling. So we do look at that. We do allow nine-foot beams, ten-foot beams. Sometimes, in some of these designs, one of the popular themes nowadays is to have the great room. The great room has been introduced back into equation. That started many years ago, and now people want the large living area, kitchen as

36

one large open space.

That creates massing problems for us. We deal with this all of the time. And we discuss that with the applicants, hey, you know, it's creating a room that's probably like the size of this room, you know, 30, 40 feet long, that has a living space, a dining space and a kitchen space all under one volume, under one ceiling. You can't have a nine-foot ceiling for a space this long. The proportionality of the space is awkward. So you do have to go up.

Now, again, I understand the massing discussion, and I think the Board understands the massing discussion, and we try to refine the design as much as possible to address that, but we also want the applicants and the residents and the homeowners to get the product that they expect and want, and I think that's a viable discussion that we wrestle with every week. And how do we address that? You know, it's part of the BOA meetings on Thursdays and sometimes we win, sometimes they win, and that's part of the negotiation, and that's part of our job here at the City, is to try to get something that's compatible with the

37

neighborhood, in terms of mass, but also is productive for the homeowner, that they can enjoy their space and their home.

And, you know, that's -- that would be my response to the issue of -- your statement about this particular discussion today, connecting an accessory structure to the main house is going to trigger a larger mass in the front of the house. I'm not sure -- I can understand your position, I get it, but I don't know if that's a direct result of this discussion and this allowance of connecting the structures.

Yes, it's going to create more roof area in the backyard. Yes, it's going to create maybe a little bit less green area, but I think that the positive side is that it creates a more unified property for the homeowner.

MR. PARDO: Juan, do you remember, about 20 years ago, when Don Slesnick, you know, was championing against McMansions? Do you remember that?

MR. RIESGO: I remember discussions about that, yeah, absolutely.

MR. PARDO: So the McMansions are alive and

38

well now, because I see them all over the place in the City of Coral Gables and specifically in lots that are no more than a hundred by a hundred, and it's just gotten to the point where people were very upset about these McMansions.

They're very upset about the type of architecture and massing that's going up right now, and people expect or deserve this? No, I think they expect and deserve to play under the rules when they bought. Changing the rules during the game isn't the right thing to do.

Me, with four balls, you walk, and three strikes you're out. That's the rule.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Felix, what I'd like to do is, I'd like to continue with the process and then we'll have a final discussion. If not, it takes away time from other members.

MR. PARDO: Sure. I'm sorry. It's that, I'm sorry, he was addressing me, and therefore --

MR. RIESGO: Yeah. Yeah. And my response was --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I understand. I understand.

39

Julio, are you --

MR. GRABIEL: I'm done.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. Javier.

MR. SALMAN: Is there an attachment to this item with regards to the specific wording that you're going to be using?

MR. RIESGO: Yeah.

MS. GARCIA: Yeah. So it's in the Staff report, on Page 3 and Page 4, of your Staff report.

MR. SALMAN: Okay.

MS. GARCIA: So it's under single-family --

MR. SALMAN: May I have a copy of it, because I can't find it on the --

MS. GARCIA: Yeah. I think Arceli has one.

MR. RIESGO: Can I give him mine?

MR. SALMAN: I'll hold my comments until I get a chance to read this.

Robert.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Robert.

MR. BEHAR: Yeah. I see this, and I respectfully disagree with the comments from my fellow Board Member and architect -- and by the way, I did study Franklin Lloyd Wright pretty

40

1 good, and a lot of this, it goes back to the --
2 more than anything else, the prairie houses,
3 where he did have connectors, open connector
4 covered areas.

5 I don't see this as a McMansion or
6 anything. I see this as a way to go from an
7 existing structure or -- a structure that is
8 the accessory, to the main house.

9 Sue has a valid point. Maybe we do have
10 some limitation on the width of these elements
11 that do the connection. I don't think that the
12 width of the house, the main house is
13 appropriate, so maybe a limitation of how wide
14 could this be is the correct condition for
15 something like this.

16 I don't see it as an adding anything more
17 than a convenience to go from a detached
18 whatever, garage, whatever, to the main house.
19 I see this as -- and I don't see this, you
20 know, in any way, shape or form -- you know,
21 compare it to some of the houses that, you
22 know, Felix has brought up. I think this is
23 good. I think that it's probably time where --
24 this should have been done a long time ago.
25 It's time that we do it today.

41

1 My only -- and I don't know, at the end,
2 I'm going to -- you know, the width that we
3 should limit these connectors, for lack of a
4 better word, to have. I would not want to see
5 them the width of the principal structure.

6 MR. RIESGO: Yeah. Of course not. I don't
7 think anybody would.

8 MR. BEHAR: But right now, I don't see that
9 there's a limitation. Yes, it's up to the
10 Board, but I think there, we need to be a
11 little bit more prescriptive, if we have to.

12 MS. GARCIA: So, typically, porches or
13 loggias, you know, are typically eight or ten
14 feet deep, you know.

15 MR. BEHAR: Look, I'm thinking -- and I'm
16 going to throw -- I'm thinking maybe you cap it
17 at twelve to fifteen feet in width, because an
18 accessory structure, a garage, let's say --
19 what used to be a garage, used to be like 20
20 feet minimum, I think, or 22 feet. I don't
21 want it the whole width. Maybe we limit it to,
22 you know, 60 percent of that, and that's where
23 I came up with a number, just to a connector,
24 so it doesn't look like a massive connector.

25 MR. RIESGO: Right. We concur with that.

42

1 We agree with that wholeheartedly. I don't
2 think that's something that's been overlooked,
3 but, again, we don't want a prescriptive Code.
4 We don't want to tell people what to do. We'd
5 like to, I think, let the architects present
6 their cases, and then we review it, and then we
7 say, "Hey, this is a great idea. It's
8 beautiful" or "This is terrible. It's too
9 massive. You need to tone it down. You need
10 to scale it down."

11 So I don't think that's --

12 MR. SALMAN: I think, in a matter of
13 helping you, if you went and added the purpose
14 for the structure, it would be -- go a long way
15 to helping the Board basically decide whether
16 it's an appropriate connection. You know, we
17 can get into the nitty-gritty of the width and
18 whatnot, but if you say its primary purpose is
19 for a pedestrian connection between an
20 auxiliary structure and the main structure, and
21 limit it to one story high -- I don't know why
22 you would want two stories -- but that would go
23 a long way to controlling its size, and give
24 you the power to be able to -- or give the
25 Board the power to be able to reject things

43

1 which are obviously not designed for a primary
2 purpose of a walkway connection.

3 MR. RIESGO: I think there's two things at
4 play here. One item or one issue in the
5 discussion is what you just said, a pedestrian
6 connector, a way for me to walk from A to B and
7 be covered and protected.

8 The other option is, using that covered
9 space as a usable space, as a barbecue area, as
10 a gazebo, a place where you can lay out -- like
11 in the photographs that she showed. These are
12 living spaces, that you can use outdoor, that
13 can be used for recreation as part of the pool,
14 that's covered, that's protected.

15 So if you limit the width of a connector to
16 five feet, then you can't use it.

17 MR. BEHAR: You're right. You're
18 absolutely correct.

19 MR. RIESGO: And is that what we want? Do
20 we want little hallways in the backyard that
21 are four or five feet wide? No. I think the
22 concept here is to promote livability and
23 enjoyment of the backyard and to give people
24 the ability to use the space for an activity, a
25 function, a sit down, a lounge chair. I want

44

1 to have my drink next to the pool.

2 MS. KAWALERSKI: Now I'm totally confused,
3 because I thought this was about just
4 connecting structures.

5 MR. RIESGO: That's why I'm bringing it up.

6 MR. SALMAN: That's the way it was
7 presented. I mean, that's the way it came
8 across.

9 MR. RIESGO: I'm taking it to the level
10 where I think we need to discuss, that's the
11 reason we're here.

12 MS. GARCIA: Right. So this diagram,
13 remember, we're trying -- the concern we get
14 from residents is, they can't get to their
15 garage. That's the concern we hear about.

16 We also hear the concern that people can't
17 have courtyards, and that's why I had those
18 images of U-shaped buildings, that have
19 courtyards and had loggias and have porches
20 facing these courtyard areas.

21 MR. RIESGO: You might want to put the
22 images again. It might be helpful to look at
23 the sketches.

24 MS. GARCIA: Sure. If I could have that
25 PowerPoint.

45

1 open air accessory structures in Single-Family
2 Residential and Multi-family 1 Districts may
3 include one or two story breezeways, loggias,
4 porches and other open air structures. Loggias
5 are not usually something you walk through.
6 The breezeway is. Porches are not. So it's a
7 variety of different open air areas.

8 MR. BEHAR: I do think, when I see some of
9 the examples, the width is important, too. I
10 don't have a problem with the exhibit all of
11 the way in the right, which is a two-story. If
12 it's appropriate, I don't have a problem with
13 that, but I do have some concerns of how
14 wide -- I see the middle bottom, you know,
15 image, and that is more than a, let's say,
16 connector.

17 I do -- maybe it's not 15, maybe it's a
18 little bit more, but it's not -- you know, it's
19 got to be some type of balance, in my opinion.

20 MR. SALMAN: Yeah, it can't be the width of
21 the building that it's connecting, one way or
22 the other, and it should be limited to some
23 proportion of it, whether it's half or
24 two-thirds or even -- and that the cover be
25 limited.

47

1 MS. KAWALERSKI: No. I mean, we saw
2 this -- we saw it. We know what you're talking
3 about. But I mean, this is presented as let me
4 get to my garage without getting wet, and that
5 I get. That's what I thought we were talking
6 about. Now we're talking about, oh, let's put
7 lounge chairs out there and a barbecue grill
8 and have it all covered, and then you look from
9 above and it's all a roof.

10 MR. RIESGO: Okay. If that's -- if we want
11 to limit it to a walkway, that's why -- here's
12 the view.

13 MS. GARCIA: Right. So these are the
14 courtyard images, mostly of Alys Beach that
15 have -- right, that have loggias and open rooms
16 facing these courtyard areas.

17 MS. KAWALERSKI: Yeah. Well, it should be
18 presented -- if it's a loggia, it's a loggia.
19 If it's a walkway, a connector, that's what --
20 but now you're expanding the whole thing to
21 let's fill the whole backyard with a roof.

22 MS. GARCIA: Yes. On Page 4 of your Staff
23 report, under Accessory Use Building or
24 Structure, the underlined portion is the
25 proposed language, and it goes into attached

46

1 MR. RIESGO: Yeah.

2 MS. GARCIA: Yeah, there's still a
3 limitation of 10 percent. That's the
4 limitation. The limitation is the open air
5 requirement, the ground coverage requirement,
6 the 10 percent accessory open air structure.
7 So there's limitations, yeah.

8 MR. RIESGO: That's all they get.

9 MR. BEHAR: Oh, because that's going to be
10 -- then I'm getting confused here, because you
11 allow a 10 percent accessory, and you have your
12 main structure. This is just to be able to
13 connect from one to the other, and does not
14 count towards the accessory square footage?

15 MS. GARCIA: It counts against your 45
16 percent, yes.

17 MR. BEHAR: Oh, it counts towards --

18 MS. GARCIA: Yes. We're not increasing
19 that.

20 MR. SALMAN: If you already have both,
21 then you can't have this, right?

22 MR. RIESGO: Yeah. You're still contained.
23 (Simultaneous speaking.)

24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Guys, everybody can't
25 talk at the same time.

48

MR. COLLIER: For people that haven't spoken on the record, they should identify themselves, I am, so and so, from the department, something like that.

MS. REDILA: For the record, Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator. So, really, nothing is changed here. The only change here is that now those accessory structure, it's 10 percent -- limited to 10 percent, now be attached, but it would still be limited to 10 percent. That's it.

MR. BEHAR: Oh, then this is simple.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Javier.

MS. KAWALERSKI: Okay. What if somebody has a 35 percent primary and a 10 percent accessory?

MR. SALMAN: They're done.

MS. KAWALERSKI: Then they can't have anything any more?

MS. GARCIA: That was Chip Wither's comment and that was correct. You're maxed out at 45 percent, 35 plus 10. So if you have that condition right now that Mr. Withers brought up, you can't attach. Sorry.

MR. RIESGO: I thought I explained that,

49

but I guess I didn't properly, but that's what we're doing. We're not increasing the 45 percent. We're not increasing mass. We're working within the constraints that we have. We're just allowing the connector piece, so it doesn't penalize you back into the 35 percent. That's all. It's still the same, at the end of the day.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: All right. Javier, are you done?

MR. SALMAN: I have no further questions for this witness.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: A couple of questions I'd like to ask. How do you handle an open kitchen today?

MR. RIESGO: How do you, what?

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: How do you handle an open kitchen? Let's say I want to do an open kitchen in my yard.

MR. RIESGO: An outdoor kitchen?

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Outdoor kitchen.

MR. RIESGO: That's the term that we have in our business right now, and the answer is, very carefully. Again, we review the project. We look at the location, the position, where it

50

sits, you know, is it concealed from the neighbor, is there an issue with the barbecue and the smoke? I mean, we look at all of those things and we determine, hey, it's accessible or it's not.

MS. GARCIA: And if it's attached to the main structure, it counts against your 35 percent. If it's detached, it's counting against your extra 10 percent, if that's what your question is, how is it calculated? It's calculated today, it's calculated in the future, if this gets approved.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What I'd like to is recognize and welcome Commissioner Fernandez for coming in. Thank you. Welcome. Let's continue.

MR. RIESGO: Okay. Yeah, when it comes to the calculations, I leave that up to Zoning. We only look at the aesthetic aspect of this thing. And, again, if it's a positive looking concept, then we go with it.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: In Florida, we have a lot of wind driven rain. So if you go ahead and you want to do a point to connect from Point A to Point B, how do you handle the part

51

where, if it's too high, you've got rain coming in there and it defeats the whole purpose of what you're trying to do?

MR. RIESGO: That's a very good point. Then, again, we discuss all of the time, some people want to have a 10-foot, 12-foot tie beam, and it's only a five-foot wide walkway, and I say, "Guys, in the driving rain, you're going to soaked here. You're not protected. You're fully exposed, because that driving rain comes in at 45 degrees, we're not doing a whole lot here."

So, again, those are things that we talk about. Those are the things that look at, in terms of, also, the width of the overhang, you know, sometimes increases the roof mass too much, so we work on that. "Hey, tone down the overhang. Bring it back in a little bit. Lower the beam," to make it more in sync with the scale of the home.

You know, a lot of these things happen with existing properties, not new construction, so we have to deal with existing eight-foot beam heights, we have to deal with existing six-inch overhangs of these older homes that have the

52

1 concave, you know, stucco overhangs. So, you
2 know, a lot of architects come in with crazy
3 idea and dreams, and somehow it gets whittled
4 down to something that we feel is productive
5 and acceptable, from a design standard.

6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I mean, Sue makes a
7 very valid point, as you take this area, you
8 make it 10-foot wide or 12-foot wide, and then
9 you start sticking furniture under there.

10 MR. RIESGO: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And I understand
12 you're limited to your 35 and your 10, but then
13 you start creating other outdoor areas that
14 maybe would not be intended within the Code to
15 be there.

16 If I take an area -- if I take a walkway
17 and I'm 12-foot wide, 10-foot high, and I start
18 creating a lot of arches or somehow closing
19 that area more and more, is that allowed?

20 MR. RIESGO: Again, that's something we'll
21 look at, in terms of the vocabulary of what the
22 existing house is, what the proposed addition
23 is. If they coincide and it's acceptable to do
24 arches, then we recommend that. If it isn't,
25 then we'll say, "Hey, you know, come up with

53

1 another vocabulary that" -- but, I think, as
2 far as percentage of enclosure, is that what
3 you're alluding to?

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.

5 MR. RIESGO: That people are going to
6 enclose these things later? I mean, that's an
7 ongoing battle in this City with everything and
8 anything, whether it's a Code change or
9 whatever. I mean, we deal with the stuff with
10 Code Enforcement all of the time, where people
11 take existing gazebos in the backyard and all
12 of a sudden they're air-conditioned and
13 enclosed and they have a dance floor, you know.

14 MS. REDILA: But once it is enclosed, we'll
15 take a look at it, and it will be part of the
16 FAR calculation or building area calculation,
17 and once it's enclosed, it will be part of the
18 35, and not the 45 now. So there are other,
19 you know --

20 MR. RIESGO: No. I know what he's
21 referring. It's the percentage of opening and
22 how enclosed the structure is. It's open air.
23 It's not air conditioned. The only thing that
24 triggers you into the 35 percent rule is the
25 air conditioning, and it's livable space.

54

1 MR. BEHAR: I think that should be up to
2 the Board, I mean, because then we're going to
3 be very --

4 MS. GARCIA: Prescriptive.

5 MR. RIESGO: Prescriptive.

6 MR. BEHAR: -- prescriptive. I think now
7 we're --

8 MR. RIESGO: That's kind of our posture,
9 also. That's why I'm trying to defend the
10 idea, because I think it's a good concept. I
11 think it's a beautiful space. I think it's a
12 great backyard to enjoy your home, and our
13 temperature, our climate, lends itself to
14 outdoor living, and I think it's a positive
15 feature, that doesn't change anything in the
16 Code today, in terms of square footage.

17 MR. BEHAR: I agree with you, that it's a
18 positive thing and it's a connection. I'm just
19 worried about some of the abuse that will
20 happen with it.

21 MR. RIESGO: That is a different
22 discussion. Yeah, I agree.

23 MR. BEHAR: You can't.

24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: How to do that, is it
25 subjective, is it not subjective when it comes?

55

1 Is it written in the Code that says, your
2 walkway can't be more than "X" amount wide,
3 period? It can't be more than a percentage? I
4 think there has to be just a few more
5 definitions in there, to me.

6 How did this come about? Was this
7 sponsored by a Commissioner?

8 MS. GARCIA: I just want to clarify
9 something. If they propose to enclose it with
10 Zoning, Zoning will say, "I'm sorry, you are at
11 the maximum square footage allowed for your
12 property."

13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: When you go ahead and
14 do your roof line, that's going towards your 35
15 and your 10?

16 MS. GARCIA: If you're going to go ahead
17 and do what, sorry?

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: If you're connecting
19 your roof line. You've got a 35 percent and
20 you've got a 10 percent. Now you're connecting
21 it.

22 MS. GARCIA: But, yeah, you can't do that,
23 right, because you're beyond the 45 percent.

24 MR. RIESGO: You can't do it now.

25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What I'm concerned

56

1 about is existing properties that have this and
2 now want to connect it. If they built it at a
3 35 and a 10 --

4 MR. RIESGO: You can't do it.

5 MS. GARCIA: This won't help you.

6 MR. BEHAR: You can't do it.

7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.

8 MR. PARDO: You don't have to worry about
9 that. They're just going to tear all of these
10 little detached areas down and then add to it.
11 I mean, that's what, you know, they're going to
12 do.

13 The other thing is that, I mean, we're
14 having the same problem when you came before us
15 with the three-story thing. Remember, we
16 started talking about the three-story, and then
17 all of a sudden, someone had a refrigerator, a
18 jacuzzi up there. I mean, I don't understand
19 what is driving these changes, you know, by
20 Staff. We have so many bigger fish to fry.

21 It is amazing to me that, first it's, let's
22 try to make a third store on a two-story
23 limitation of the house. I don't think it's
24 fine. I really don't. I find it really
25 offensive, because I go through this City and I

57

1 see all of the these beautiful homes on North
2 Greenway, and they have exactly what you're
3 describing, except they were built in 1926.
4 Beautiful homes. They have larger properties,
5 but they have these connections, and all of
6 these things, and they're not the gross ones
7 that are being built today.

8 Well, I want a 12-story -- you know, maybe
9 what we should do is limit the height, and if
10 they want to have a higher height, let them go
11 to Doral and build it there. I mean, you know,
12 there's a certain amount of character and charm
13 and with these shoe boxes that are being built
14 in this City, we're losing that charm. It's
15 not just the big commercial buildings. We're
16 talking about now the City and the
17 neighborhoods and the scale.

18 I think that when you only have 25 feet,
19 you increase another four or five feet to the
20 height of a tie beam, it makes a big difference
21 on the perception.

22 MR. RIESGO: No, but we're not increasing
23 it to a 25-foot tie beam height.

24 MR. PARDO: No. I'm giving you that as an
25 example.

58

1 MR. RIESGO: Okay. Okay.

2 MR. PARDO: And what I'm saying, Juan, and
3 you know it -- I mean, you live in a beautiful
4 home, you know.

5 MR. RIESGO: Of course. Of course. I
6 mean, I understand.

7 MR. PARDO: And the whole point is, you
8 just go around the corner, almost on the
9 intersection of North and South Greenway, and
10 you have some of the most beautiful homes,
11 about four or five of them in a row.

12 MR. RIESGO: And that's kind of my point.
13 I live in a historic house. My living room has
14 an 11-foot ceiling.

15 MR. PARDO: I know you do.

16 MR. RIESGO: I love it. It's the most
17 beautiful space in my house. Everybody that
18 goes there is in awe, 'cause other houses next
19 to me are eight-foot ceilings, nine-foot
20 ceilings, maybe a ten. So the concept of a
21 higher ceiling to us is acceptable. It depends
22 on how you carve it out and how you design it.

23 And I agree, some houses that have been
24 built in the prior years, may have not
25 addressed that properly, but it's something

59

1 that we look at extensively at the Board level
2 and we try to vet that as much as possible.

3 MR. PARDO: And I mean, recently. I mean,
4 these are homes that have been built recently,
5 and it's just, you know, concerning to me,
6 because we're taking away the character. The
7 other thing is, we're incentivizing people to
8 just knock down houses, that really are
9 beautiful, you know, so they can put up these
10 monstrosities that don't have the charm.

11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But, Felix, we're here
12 today just to talk about the connection between
13 the 10 to the 35. I'm not disagreeing with
14 you, please. I don't disagree with you. I
15 actually agree with you.

16 MR. PARDO: Technically, you're correct,
17 but it's -- one thing is to discuss the usable
18 separation, all right, between these things. I
19 get that all day, and that's fine, but we are
20 going into a prescriptive Code.

21 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So if I may, this
22 came about from a resident --

23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Could I ask you to
24 state your name, for the record, please?

25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Ariel Fernandez.

60

1 This came about from a resident who reached out
2 to me. Their property --

3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Could I ask you to
4 please state your name, for the record?

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just did.

6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Oh, I apologize. I
7 did not hear it.

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No problem.

9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: The resident lives
11 in a 5,000 square foot lot. Their house has
12 maxed out. They wanted to build a terrace that
13 they could use with their family for their
14 barbecue in the back of the house. So it would
15 fit under their 45 percent; however, it could
16 not be attached to their house. So they had to
17 have it separate. So, on a rainy day, all of a
18 sudden, that area is no longer usable, because
19 it has to be separate to the house.

20 So I reached out to Staff and I said, "Is
21 there a way for us to find where, if it is an
22 open space, it can be attached to the house, so
23 that it can be usable space?" At the end of
24 the day, the livelihood and the ability of our
25 residents to use their properties in the best

61

1 way they can should be our end goal.

2 And I agree with Mr. Pardo, we want to make
3 sure that this also doesn't open up for the
4 mega mansions that we're seeing in the City
5 that are transforming our historic areas into
6 areas where you don't even recognize them
7 anymore. You know, that house that was built
8 right off Bird Road, that looks like it doesn't
9 fit in Coral Gables, I've heard about it many
10 times. So this is just finding a way where
11 residents now have an ability to use their
12 backyards or whatever space they have, in a way
13 where it connects to their house, and they
14 don't have to have the separation.

15 This resident ended up having to have, I
16 think it was a three-inch separation at the
17 house, between their house and their terrace,
18 so that it wasn't attached. So all of a
19 sudden, rainy days, you can't walk out there.
20 So that's the reason this came about.

21 Now, I've been listening on the way here to
22 the discussion. I think there's a lot that
23 needs to be considered, potential changes that
24 we can make to it to make it better, and ensure
25 that it doesn't open the door for additional

62

1 other ways that it can be taken advantage of,
2 and make sure that it really gets to the grass
3 roots of making sure that it helps the
4 livability of our residents.

5 So I'll take any questions anybody has.

6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I actually have a
7 question for you.

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sure.

9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That example that you
10 gave, which was the 5,000 square foot, and now
11 the structure in the back, where they're maxed
12 out, how do they attach it, if we allow this?
13 Doesn't it count against their --

14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: They're already
15 under construction. This would no longer work
16 for them. So, in their case, they're already
17 -- their plans are approved. They're moving
18 forward the way it is. I'm just looking for a
19 solution for future residents, who will be in
20 the same situation.

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So it doesn't help
22 that individual?

23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It does not.
24 They're already under construction. It's not
25 going to change things for them. So they never

63

1 even asked for this. I just met with Staff and
2 tried to say, hey, let's find a solution that
3 works for others, so that they don't find
4 themselves in the same situation.

5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

6 MR. PARDO: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I'd
7 like to address the Commissioner.

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, sir.

9 MR. PARDO: The way this was presented to
10 us does not address the specific issue that you
11 came up with. The point I'm making is that, if
12 this is changed, the way that it's been
13 proposed to us, it will lead to the possibility
14 of, again, abuse of things, and that's -- you
15 know, I've said it over and over again, one
16 thing is to write the formula, but you have to
17 test it. You have to have the ability to test
18 it, under certain circumstances, before you fly
19 it, and the problem is that hasn't been tested
20 under that situation.

21 The way I see it right now is just going to
22 increase massing and do all of the things that
23 aren't necessary, and it could be easily fixed,
24 and, again, this is not what was presented to
25 us, where it could stay, for example -- and I

64

1 think maybe the other Board Members, the
2 architects, may agree, is that maybe you limit
3 it to the back 50 percent distance from the
4 front property line, where these attachments
5 would occur, and then all of a sudden, your
6 massing can change completely.

7 So it could be done that way, if that seems
8 to be --

9 MR. BEHAR: But what would happen if you
10 have a --

11 MR. SALMAN: Corner lot.

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Side yard.

13 MR. BEHAR: I mean --

14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But the reality
15 is, most of our homes, the front yard --

16 MR. BEHAR: Is never an issue.

17 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: About 40 percent
18 of the front of your house is behind the first
19 40 percent of your lot, for the most part.

20 MR. BEHAR: That's actually here. That's a
21 given.

22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Correct. I don't
23 think that will be a major issue. And I
24 apologize for not having been here. I wasn't
25 aware that this was on the agenda today. It

65

1 wasn't until I started watching, that I got in
2 my car and I headed over here. If not, I would
3 have been here for the presentation portion.

4 MR. BEHAR: See, to me the key here is
5 that, no matter what you do, you cannot exceed
6 the 35, plus the 10 percent. You are limited
7 to 45. So we're not giving -- they could do
8 today a 35 percent on the main structure, they
9 could do a 10 percent accessory, one inch way,
10 or in the case of yours, three inches.

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Correct.

12 MR. BEHAR: And they're fine with that.

13 MR. PARDO: Right.

14 MR. BEHAR: All this is doing is keeping
15 the 35 percent -- that 10 percent may be only
16 eight percent, so you could have two percent or
17 whatever it is, to get your connector. To me,
18 you're not adding anything more than is allowed
19 today. You're making it better for the
20 resident. To me, I think this is a very simple
21 mechanism to make a better quality of home than
22 we have today.

23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And Mr. Behar,
24 that was my request. My request was, that we
25 do not increase the 45 percent that's allowed.

66

1 It's was just, let's find a way where it's more
2 usable to the resident. You see many homes
3 where they have a detached terrace out back,
4 all of a sudden, rainy summer days, you can't
5 use your backyard. Whereas, if it was
6 attached, you could go out, you can sit out
7 there, you can watch your ballgame, you can
8 have a barbecue with your family, but if it's
9 not -- and one of the things we had talked
10 about, I'm not sure if it made it in here, was
11 ensuring that there were at least two open
12 sides, correct?

13 MS. GARCIA: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So if it was
15 attached to the home, and it's an L-shaped
16 home, it can be out there, but at least two of
17 the sides needed to be open.

18 MR. PARDO: Right. And the reason I just
19 brought up the suggestion, Robert, about the
20 50 -- you know, pushing it back 50 percent, is
21 to make sure that all of these projects don't
22 get pushed forward, which increases the massing
23 issue.

24 MR. BEHAR: But you have a minimum setback
25 that you've got to adhere to. So you're not

67

1 changing that.

2 MR. PARDO: That's 25 feet on a hundred
3 foot lot.

4 MR. BEHAR: So I could do that. I could do
5 a house, you know, to my front setback. This
6 is, you know, that 10 percent that is on the
7 back naturally, I'm just going to connect it.
8 If I have -- you know, let's say that little
9 structure is eight percent, whatever, I'm just
10 allowed to connect it with a minimum. If the
11 accessory structure is five percent, I could do
12 the covered connector a little bit bigger.

13 You're not deviating from what we're
14 allowing to do today.

15 MR. PARDO: The only difference is that, up
16 to now, we haven't been given the right
17 amounts, you know. I'm not saying the
18 prescriptive amounts, but I haven't been given
19 more information to be able to say, I'm okay
20 with it.

21 MR. BEHAR: Felix, they have. You know, I
22 disagree. They said, 35 and 10. That's it.
23 You're there. What else -- you know, you
24 can't --

25 MR. PARDO: Okay. So you're comfortable,

68

1 because it's just mathematical, 35 and 10?

2 MR. BEHAR: That's what they could do
3 today.

4 MR. PARDO: Exactly, but the massing
5 component has just been completely ignored.

6 MR. BEHAR: No, because they could do --
7 you know what, it could be worse, where in the
8 case that the resident approached Commissioner
9 Fernandez, where they could do it three inches
10 away, to me, that's a worse case, and you could
11 do that today.

12 MR. PARDO: That's correct, but that would
13 be an easy fix, by saying it has to be at least
14 five feet or --

15 MR. BEHAR: Well, but you can't, because
16 now you can't have the cake and eat it too, and
17 impose more regulations than you're allowed to
18 do it today. I think this -- me, I mean, I
19 feel -- originally, I thought of putting a
20 limitation on the width, but the fact that you
21 have percentages to adhere to is going to give
22 you that --

23 MS. KAWALERSKI: You know what, if I can
24 just jump in here for a second. I mean, this
25 was presented, I've got a garage over here and

69

1 I have a house over here, and I want to walk
2 protected from here to there. That's what it
3 was presented as.

4 Now we're talking about, I want to extend
5 my patio. That's what it sounds like.

6 MR. PARDO: Yes, that's what they
7 presented.

8 MS. KAWALERSKI: Okay. It's not connecting
9 to another structure. It's let me add a patio,
10 is that correct or is it attaching two
11 structures?

12 MS. GARCIA: Should I show the diagrams
13 again? So there's the two scenarios.
14 Remember, there's a scenario of a detached
15 building, that you can't get to, without it
16 being attached. If you attach it, it becomes
17 part of the 35, 45 percent, right.

18 MS. KAWALERSKI: Forget the percentages.
19 I'm just trying to look at the visuals, because
20 I'm thinking, man, okay, you want to get to
21 your garage, you don't want to get wet, okay,
22 it's a four-foot wide sidewalk cover to your
23 garage, and now we're talking about a patio.

24 MS. GARCIA: Right, a courtyard, right.
25 Loggias facing the courtyard, with those images

70

1 of the --

2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But, Sue, you're
3 limited to your percentage. So if you want to
4 have a huge outdoor space that's open, like the
5 middle down below, then your house is going to
6 be much bigger air conditioned.

7 MS. KAWALERSKI: I understand, but I
8 thought it was connecting two structures.
9 That's how it was presented, connecting two
10 structures.

11 MR. BEHAR: It is connecting two
12 structures. There's just no limit on the width
13 of that connector. It's all predicated by the
14 percentage.

15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So I think
16 the two variations, one is what I had proposed
17 regarding future construction. The other one
18 is for existing residents, who have a similar
19 situation, so that they can address, I guess,
20 the issue that they're having, whether it's a
21 detached garage or a detached terrace, now they
22 can connect it, as long as they don't pass that
23 45 percent.

24 MS. KAWALERSKI: Got you, but --

25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But it has to

71

1 remain open space.

2 MS. KAWALERSKI: Okay. But in your
3 scenario with your neighbor, they wanted to
4 extend their patio?

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: They just wanted
6 to create a terrace. They did not have a
7 terrace. They just have an open backyard. I
8 think they were in the process of having a pool
9 out there, so they wanted to have an area where
10 they have a barbecue and some chairs to sit
11 down, and in order for them to have that --
12 because of them being I think at 32 or 33
13 percent, in order to attach it to the house, it
14 would have to be, I think it was, like three
15 feet.

16 So in order for them to build something
17 that was usable, it had to be detached from the
18 house, and I think they came up with three
19 inches, because of the separation --

20 MS. KAWALERSKI: They just wanted to attach
21 it to their house?

22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.

23 MS. KAWALERSKI: An awning?

24 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. It was
25 just basically an outdoor terrace, where they

72

1 could have a barbecue and some chairs in the
2 rear of the house.
3 MR. BEHAR: And if we're done, I feel
4 comfortable, I'll make a motion to approve this
5 item.
6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So we have a motion to
7 approve. Is there a second?
8 MR. SALMAN: I would like to second, but
9 with an amendment.
10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Negotiation.
11 MR. SALMAN: I would like to see that this
12 type of a structure as an in-between structure,
13 because what the Honored Commissioner presented
14 was actually an addition that he's trying to
15 get in under the 45 percent, so that it is
16 actually an auxiliary structure now attached to
17 the house, which then, by right, increases the
18 size of the main house by 10 percent, whereas
19 before we had 35 percent for the main house and
20 10 percent for an auxiliary structure, now you
21 have 45 percent for the main house and no
22 auxiliary structure. That's the upshot.
23 MS. GARCIA: Right. 45 percent overall.
24 You're just moving that 10 percent and
25 attaching it, but only if it's open air.

73

1 MR. SALMAN: Define open air being?
2 MS. GARCIA: Open area being loggias,
3 breezeways, porches and other open air
4 structures.
5 MR. SALMAN: So it has to be open on at
6 least two sides?
7 MS. GARCIA: We can clarify that. That's
8 fine.
9 MR. SALMAN: Okay. You need to clarify
10 that. That it should be to promote the
11 movement of air across the space, so you don't
12 have an "L" necessarily. Sorry, for the
13 Commissioner's example, because that may or may
14 not work.
15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: If it's open on
16 three side, which was the initial conversation
17 we had, I think it works out better, because
18 once enclosed in two sides, then you're opening
19 up to a lot of this to different things. I'm
20 okay with it being open on three sides, just to
21 ensure --
22 MR. SALMAN: My position, at least to be
23 open on two sides.
24 MR. COLLER: Guys, for the court reporter --
25 MR. BEHAR: It has to be on two sides.

74

1 MR. SALMAN: On two sides.
2 MR. BEHAR: Because three sides, then you
3 don't have a connector. Then it's not
4 connected.
5 MR. SALMAN: Okay. And that's my
6 additional --
7 MR. BEHAR: I'll accept your friendly
8 amendment.
9 MR. SALMAN: And then I will second.
10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion. We
11 have a second.
12 MR. PARDO: Robert --
13 MS. KAWALERSKI: You know what, discussion.
14 I think this has to be rewritten. I mean, we
15 talked -- it has to be rewritten.
16 MR. PARDO: I was going to say the same
17 thing, because I know that the intent is right.
18 I don't have a problem with the friendly
19 amendment component of it, but I think we've
20 got to get this right. I mean, I don't want
21 Staff to use their imagination on this. I
22 think Staff should look at the transcript, get
23 it right, do it the right way, put in the
24 caveats that have been discussed here, and then
25 come back and then get it approved.

75

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, any other
2 discussion? No? We have a motion. We have a
3 second. Let's go ahead and call the roll,
4 please.
5 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?
6 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
7 THE SECRETARY: Sue Kawalerski?
8 MS. KAWALERSKI: No.
9 THE SECRETARY: Felix Pardo?
10 MR. PARDO: No.
11 THE SECRETARY: Javier Salman?
12 MR. SALMAN: Yes.
13 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
14 MR. WITHERS: No.
15 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
16 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
17 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?
18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
19 MR. COLLER: Okay. So it's recommended for
20 approval with the amendment that it has to be
21 open air on two sides.
22 MR. BEHAR: Two sides.
23 MR. COLLER: Two sides.
24 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, point of order.
25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, sir.

76

MR. PARDO: We have approved things before and then we don't see a follow-up. I would like Staff to give us the final resolution, the one that is being -- that will be going to the Commission for approval, so we could read it. I don't think we should just be reading our verbatim minutes. I think we should actually look at how it turns out, you know, and that's the importance --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I agree with you, but then it doesn't come back to us for a vote on how it's going to the Commission. At that point, it's going to the Commission for their vote and their discussion.

MR. PARDO: Right, but what I'm trying to say is that somebody has cleaned this up right now, and I don't think it's quite fair to this Board, or any Board, for that fact, because, you know, I'm -- I don't want them to say, you voted against this, and then, all of a sudden, it was written differently or the other way around.

MS. KAWALERSKI: And this is what I've been bringing up at every meeting for the past five meetings, that we have to see what it is,

77

because I don't know what this is. I mean, what we talked about right now is not in here. If it is, it's so vague, it's left to subjective interpretation, and I'm not comfortable with that.

MR. BEHAR: But, Sue, isn't it then at the purview of the Commission, they're the Elected Officials, to make a determination and if they see fit to bring it back to the Planning and Zoning Board, then that's when it comes back to us, to review it or tweak it or go further, but, to me, if we do a vote and that vote passes, how do you move forward?

MR. PARDO: No. No. I'm not saying to come back to us. I would like to see what the sausage, you know, looks like at the end of the day.

MR. BEHAR: Well, the good thing is, in this particular kitchen today, we have the sus chef here, that is going to be able to go to the Commission Meeting and say this is what the Board intended to be, and if there's a misconception or whatever, it could be clarified, and I think Commissioner Fernandez, since he's here, he sees what our intent

78

clearly was for this item.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And I think his intent is the same, to be honest with you, the way I see it. His intent is the same.

MS. GARCIA: And to address the concern, we did hear you, and we have been, for every single e-mail, including a recap, at the end of the e-mail, that sends links to the legistar item that has the cover memo, that has the draft ordinance, resolution, whatever it is, so that you guys can see what the Commission is seeing. So we took that into account.

MS. KAWALERSKI: In this past e-mail?

MS. GARCIA: Yes. We sent it on Friday.

MS. KAWALERSKI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It was there.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: If I may, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, ir.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I will say, being here is a different experience than what we get at the Commission. A lot of times, we do not get the comments. So all we get is, there was a seven-zero vote, there was a four-three vote, and being here presents us with the opportunity

79

to really understanding what the will of this Board is, and I think it's important. I think this is -- this is the most important Board in this City, following the Commission, and the participation of each Board Member and the comments of each Board Member can really enhance the legislation that we pass in the Commission, to ensure that our residents are getting the best services from our City.

So I agree with you. I mean, I'd be open to deferring the item and sending it back when it comes to the Commission, to ensure that it is properly vetted. You know, I appreciate the votes in support and the concerns that you all have voiced today, and I'll commit to ensuring that it comes back to this Board for another look at the final piece of legislation.

MR. PARDO: Commissioner Fernandez, I just want to make a point. What you said now has been my concern, which is, hey, they voted, you know, four to three to approve, but it gets lost in the weeds, because you don't have the verbatim transcripts. You don't have the discussions. You could, if you had enough hours in the day, go through our entire, you

80

1 know, one hour discussion on this item.

2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: They do have minutes.
3 Doesn't the Commission --

4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Unfortunately, we
5 don't get them on time. So a lot of times,
6 things go to the Commission and the verbatim
7 minutes have not been submitted on time.

8 MR. PARDO: Exactly.

9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So, at times we
10 do, and at times we don't, and I'll make a call
11 to the appointee to the Committee to get an
12 idea of what was actually discussed and what
13 came up during conversation or I'll just have
14 to refer back to the video. At least the City
15 is doing a pretty good job of posting the
16 YouTube videos. It is live. It is always
17 available for residents to watch, and for us to
18 watch, and that's extremely helpful, but the
19 transcripts do take some time to actually come
20 through, so we sometimes -- if a vote is taken
21 today, and this goes up in a Commission meeting
22 next week, there isn't enough time for us to
23 actually receive that.

24 MR. PARDO: And that is the problem,
25 Mr. Chairman, because, you know, we're assuming

81

1 they have this, and it's not necessarily there,
2 and this is on this one small item. Sometimes
3 it's big projects that we review, and that's
4 not fair to them, and, you know, it's almost
5 like dealing with, you know, buying a used car.

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I thank you for
7 your time.

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you,
9 Commissioner.

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I thank you
11 all for your service to our City and for your
12 dedication to this Board.

13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

14 All right. Let's move on. The next agenda
15 item, please, Mr. Coller.

16 MR. COLLER: Item E-2, an Ordinance of the
17 City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida,
18 providing for text amendments to the City of
19 Coral Gables Official Zoning Code Article 10,
20 "Parking and Access," Section 10-109, "Remote
21 Off-Street Parking and Payment-in-Lieu,"
22 Section 10-111, "Share Parking Reduction
23 Standards," Section 10-112, "Miscellaneous
24 Parking Standards," Article 14, "Process,"
25 Section 14-204, "Transfer of Development

82

1 Rights," to address the applicability of these
2 provisions to projects utilizing provisions of
3 the Live Local Act, Chapter 2024-188, laws of
4 Florida; providing for repealer provision,
5 severability clause, codification, and
6 providing for an effective date.

7 Item E-2, public hearing.

8 MS. GARCIA: Jennifer Garcia, Planning and
9 Zoning Director.

10 If I could have the PowerPoint, please?

11 So this is the long-anticipated PowerPoint
12 that we've been talking about for a few months
13 now about Live Local. So I'll be going through
14 the snippets of the Act, both from 2023 and for
15 2024, the last year glitch bill.

16 As you know, this is preemptive bill by the
17 Florida State Legislature, and it was signed
18 into law by the Governor back in 2023. It was
19 signed in March 2023, and effective July 1st of
20 2023. And, then, a year later, they came
21 through with the glitch bill, State Bill --
22 sorry, Senate Bill 328, and that changed some
23 elements, added some more preemptions.

24 So, a preemptive bill is basically the
25 State's way of preempting certain aspects of

83

1 municipalities. So it's, throughout the whole
2 act, a municipality must authorize, must
3 consider, must do this. So I'm going through
4 the Act.

5 So a city must authorize a development if
6 it has 40 percent affordable housing, and
7 that's between 30 percent and 125 percent of
8 AMI addressed in the income, and that is also
9 only in our mixed-use districts, as it applies
10 to Coral Gables. It's also in the commercial,
11 industrial districts, which we don't have in
12 Coral Gables anymore. We only have mixed-use
13 districts.

14 So looking at the map in Coral Gables, all
15 of the red is our mixed-use districts. So you
16 see that along Eighth Street, you see it down
17 Ponce de Leon, you see a big chunk of it in our
18 Downtown, as well as a couple of blocks on
19 Biltmore Way. Going south, the map on the
20 right side is the former Industrial District,
21 the Design and Innovation District and pockets
22 of mixed-use along US-1, and then the small
23 urban center that's next to -- south of Miami.

24 So affordability is defined by Florida
25 State Statutes, monthly rents not exceeding 30

84