


City Commission
June 3, 2008

Gables Waterway



Change of Land Use

Change of Zoning

PAD Review


Site Plan Review

Conditional Use Special Location Review

Overview of presentation

- Project location
- Authority, review and responsibilities
- Overview of applications
- Staff recommendation
- Basis for recommendation
- Public notification and input
- 3-D Model

Project Location



Authority, review and responsibilities

Application under review (pgs 5-6)

- Property is under single ownership and includes two parcels of land separated by a public right-of-way (South Alhambra Circle)
- Both parcels of land are proposed to be developed as a single, unified project
- The largest parcel, which represents the majority of the property, is a proposed PAD project consisting of multi-family residential and commercial office uses.
- The second “out parcel” is significantly smaller and is proposed to be developed “as-of-right” as commercial office use only

**Applications are subject to
“Archived” Zoning Code
(Ord. No. 1525) since
application submittal and
Board of Architects
preliminary approval
predated new Zoning Code**

Authority, review and responsibilities, cont.

Review responsibilities for all development projects

- **Building & Zoning Department evaluates projects per Zoning Code**
- **Planning Department evaluates projects per Comprehensive Land Use Plan**
- **Other departments evaluate projects per their respective responsibilities - DRC**
- **Boards and Commission evaluate projects per their designated authority, per Zoning Code, City Code, et.al.**

Authority, review and responsibilities

Summary of review process

1 - Application(s) submitted / sufficiency review



2 - DRC review & comments (11.28.05, 2.09.05)



3 - Board of Architects prelim. review, bonuses (12.21.06, 12.20.07, 1.17.08)



4 – Building & Zoning Dept. review / Preliminary Zoning Analysis (4.11.08, 4.18.08)



5 - Planning Department review / CLUP analysis (throughout process)



6 – Planning & Zoning Board review & recommendation (5.14.08)



7 - City Commission consideration and approval (public hearings) (tbd)



8 - Board of Architects final review / BZD Final Zoning Analysis (tbd)



9 – Building permit (tbd)

Authority, review and responsibilities, cont.

Review/approval authority and responsibilities

- Zoning Code Section 25-5(f)
 - Planning and Zoning Board may recommend to the City Commission that adopted projects shall be in accordance with the submitted/revised plans
- Zoning Code Sections 9-5 (c)
 - Regulatory authority and responsibilities for review and recommendation of proposed PAD site plans
- Zoning Code Sections 28-6(a)
 - Regulatory authority and responsibilities for review and recommendation for Conditional Use Special Location Review for the award of Mediterranean architectural bonuses

Authority, review and responsibilities, cont.

- **Changes in land use**
 - Require review and recommendation by the Local Planning Agency (Planning and Zoning Board) and
 - Consideration and adoption in ordinance form by the City Commission (two public hearings)
- Proposal is considered a “small scale” amendment according to Department of Community Affairs (DCA) thresholds
 - No state required impact analysis is necessary and DCA review between the Commission’s 1st and 2nd readings is not required
 - State/regional review can be requested by the City Commission if desired

Authority, review and responsibilities, cont.

- Zoning Code Section 25-5(a)
 - Before adoption of any amendment to the CLUP, the PZB shall provide a recommendation after holding a public hearing at which the proposed amendment is presented.
- Staff's comprehensive evaluation of the CLUP Goals, Objectives and Policies is provided on **pgs 14-31.**

Authority, review and responsibilities, cont.

- **Proposed change of zoning designation and PAD site plan**
 - Review and recommendation by the Planning and Zoning Board
 - Consideration and adoption in ordinance form by the City Commission (two public hearings).
- **Proposed conditional use special location review**
 - Review and recommendation by the Planning and Zoning Board
 - Consideration and adoption in resolution form by the City Commission (one public hearing).

Authority, review and responsibilities, cont.

- **12.21.06 - Project received preliminary Board of Architects (BoA) approval, pursuant to previous “Archived” Zoning Code, Ordinance No. 1525**
- **12.20.07 - Project received additional BoA approval**
- **01.17.08 - Project received BoA approval of Mediterranean bonuses**
- **04.15.08 – Preliminary Zoning Analysis concluded application can proceed forward to PZB for consideration**

Authority, review and responsibilities, cont.

Preliminary Zoning Analysis by BZD

For PAD – 4.18.08

City of Coral Gables
Building & Zoning Department / Preliminary Zoning Analysis
Gables Waterway
April 11, 2008 PAD review
Revised April 18, 2008

Chisholm Architects / 305-661-2070 T / 305-661-6090 F

REVIEWED UNDER CODE PRIOR TO JANUARY 9, 2007

Mandatory for re-review: Provide written responses to all comments. Avoid generic responses such as "see plan". If project is over in FAR areas being reduced are to be highlighted or hatch to indicated amount and area of reduction. Provide new reduced set and new disk for recalculation of FAR..

Legal Description:	Lots: 1,2,3,4, (68,359.5 sq. ft.)	Block – 5
	Lots: 1,2,3,4, (78,008.5 sq. ft.)	Block – 6
	Riviera Waterway PB – 46 Page – 47	
	Lot: 5 (18,847 sq. ft.)	Block – 5
	Lots: 5, 5A (20,150 sq. ft.)	Block – 6
	Singer Subdivision PB – 68 Page - 19	
	Parcel A (4250 sq. ft.) Riviera waterway PB – 46 Page - 47	
	Tract K - Addition to Riviera Waterway (10,725.5 sq. ft.) PB – 59 Page – 93	
Total Land area as per survey:	200,341 sq. ft.	
Land Use Designation: Plate 11 of 18	Residential (Multi-Family) Low Density (20 units / Acre 4 Stories) / Existing – Lots 3&4/Blk 5	

Preliminary Zoning Analysis by BZD

For Commercial Bldg. – 4.11.08

City of Coral Gables
Building and Zoning Department
Preliminary Zoning Analysis
Gables Waterway
Lot 8 -Blk 208 Office Building
April 11, 2008

Legal Description:	Lots: 8 Block: 208 (8,040 sq. ft.) Second revised plat of Coral Gables Riviera Section Part 14 Pb: 28 Page: 32	
Land Use Designation:	Low Rise Intensity Commercial (4 stories: FAR 3.0)	
Use District:	"CB"	
Site Specific:	Riviera Section Part 14 (4-89) No site specific (no second revised plat in code)	
Overlay District:	Mediterranean	
Central Business District:	No	
Required Zoning:	"CB"	
Setbacks(height 72'-0") Front: US1 & Alhambra Circle (17'-0")	Required 15'-0" for 25'-0" +1'-0" for each 25'-0"	Proposed 0'-0" Arcade
Rear:	N/A	
Interior Side (12'-0")	0'-0" for 35'-0" / 10'-0" + 1'-0" for each 25'-0"	12'-0"
	Setback area 4936 / Encroachment area 4,060 x 25% = 1,015 required arcade for front setback relief: Arcade sq. ft provided: 2,610	
Height permitted:	3 Stories – 45'-0" + 2 stories with MED 5 stories - 72'-0"	
Height Proposed: Established heights: US1 – 9.45 + 9.19 = 9.32' South Alhambra – 8.2 + 9.75 = 8.98'	5 Stories – 72'-0" Top of rotunda - 90'-0"	
Site Area:	8,040 sq. ft.	

Requested applications (pgs 1-2)


The request is for one development proposal, known as Gables Waterway, which includes 5 separate applications:

1. Change of Land Use from “Commercial Use, Low-Rise Intensity” to “Residential Use (Multi-Family) Low Density”, “Residential Use (Multi-Family) Duplex Density” to “Residential Use (Multi-Family) Low Density”, and “Commercial, Low-Rise Intensity” for Parcel “A’
2. Change of Zoning from “CL”, Commercial Limited (“CA”, Commercial) to “MF2”, Multi Family 2 District (“A-13”, Apartment), “MF1”, Multi Family 1 Duplex District (“D-10”, Duplex) to “MF2”, Multi Family 2 District (“A-13”, Apartment), and “CL”, Commercial Limited (“CA”, Commercial) for Parcel “A’.
3. PAD review pursuant to Zoning Code Article 9, “Planned Area Development”, Section 9-1 thru 9-10
4. Site plan review for entire proposed project
5. Conditional Use Special Location Review to allow Mediterranean architectural bonuses adjacent to “SFR”, Single Family Residential (“R”, Residential) and “MF1”, Multi Family 1 Duplex District (“D”, Duplex) zoned property.


Project Application

1. Change of Land Use

- from “Commercial Use, Low-Rise Intensity” to “Residential Use (Multi-Family) Low Density”
- “Residential Use (Multi-Family) Duplex Density” to “Residential Use (Multi-Family) Low Density”
- “Commercial, Low-Rise Intensity” for Parcel “A’ (no land use currently assigned).




Change of Land Use map




Project Application (cont.)

2. Change of Zoning

- from “CL”, Commercial Limited (“CA”, Commercial) to “MF2”, Multi Family 2 District (“A-13”, Apartment)
- “MF1”, Multi Family 1 Duplex District (“D-10”, Duplex) to “MF2”, Multi Family 2 District (“A-13”, Apartment)
- “CL”, Commercial Limited (“CA”, Commercial) for Parcel “A” (no zoning currently assigned).




Change of Zoning Map (Current Zoning)




Project Application (cont.)

3. **PAD review**
- pursuant to Zoning Code Article 9, “Planned Area Development”,
 - Section 9-1 thru 9-10 (entire property excluding a portion of Lot 8 and a portion of the area designated as University Waterway, Block 208, Second revised Plat of Coral Gables Riviera Section Part 14).



Project Application (cont.)


4. **Site plan review**
- for entire proposed project
 - (including PAD parcel and commercial parcel located on southwest corner of South Alhambra Drive / U.S.1 intersection).



Project Application (cont.)

5. Conditional Use Special Location Review

- to allow Mediterranean architectural bonuses adjacent to “SFR”, Single Family Residential (“R”, Residential) and “MF1”, Multi Family 1 Duplex District (“D”, Duplex) zoned property.



Planning Department recommendation

The Planning Department based upon the complete findings of fact contained within the Staff report recommends denial of the five (5) applications referred to as “Gables Waterway”
(pg 2)

Basis of recommendation (pgs 2-5)

- Staff recommends denial of the 5 applications.
- While the applications meet many City objectives, Staff cannot support due to **inconsistencies, incompatibilities, and insufficiencies.**
- Recommendation of denial based on professional planning practices and principles, and application's ability to meet CLUP Goals, Objectives and Policies (GOPs), purpose and intent of Zoning Code, and Zoning Code.

Basis of recommendation (cont.)

Inconsistent CLUP GOPs

- Objectives and policies determined to be inconsistent include transitional use, transitional massing, project size and density, parking, traffic, project phasing, marine operations, and attainable housing.
- CLUP analysis, including relevant GOPs, inconsistencies, and suggested potential remedies provided in Staff Report **(pgs 14-31)**.


Basis of recommendation (cont.)

1. Incompatible transition of uses (pgs 15-18)

- Project does not provide adequate **transition of uses**
- Project does not allow for effective transition between uses along **Caballero Boulevard**, and is not consistent with professional planning practices of requiring a **transitional land use** between the existing single-family residential use and proposed multi-family residential use
- The existing land use pattern fulfills that objective and provides the transitional **duplex use** between the existing single-family residential use and multi-family residential use

Basis of recommendation (cont.)

Incompatible transition of uses



Basis of recommendation (cont.)

2. Incompatible transition of massing (pgs 15-18)


- Project does not provide adequate **transition of massing**
- Project does not provide adequate transition in **height and scale** from U.S.1 back to the existing single-family and duplex uses
- 5 story height of residential building across from **Jaycee Park**, and proposed reduction of both the required **front and rear setback** of the project's multi-family residential structures would impact adjoining properties and single-family residences located across the canal

93' Clock Tower




Basis of recommendation (cont.)

Incompatible transition of massing




Basis of recommendation (cont.)




Basis of recommendation (cont.)



Basis of recommendation (cont.)




Basis of recommendation (cont.)



Basis of recommendation (cont.)

Incompatible transition of massing



Basis of recommendation (cont.)

3. Excessive project size and density (pgs 18-21)

- Project's size and density are **inconsistent with scale and character** of the surrounding neighborhood
- Applicant's proposed mitigation **does not support the award of requested site development bonuses**
- Proposed project with bonuses (setback relief, building height and additional residential units) results in increased project size, loss of open space and existing tree canopy, and insufficient transition and buffering between uses which are **inconsistent with the scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood**
- Would **encourage further incompatible redevelopment**
- Preliminary Zoning Analysis indicates the 20% on-site landscape open space required for a PAD has not been met and the **applicant requires credit for off-site landscaping**

Basis of recommendation (cont.)

Comparison of Allowed/Existing and Proposed Development


<i>Category</i>	<i>Currently allowed as-of-right</i>	<i>Proposed PAD and commercial building</i>	<i>Change</i>
Multi-family residential units	22 units	95 multi-family units (99 units permitted w/ architectural bonuses)	+ 73 multi-family units
Commercial development	188,590 sq. ft.	89,513 sq. ft.	-99,077 sq. ft.
Total development (sq. ft/FAR)	Maximum 279,186 sq. ft./ 1.3 FAR (likely limited by various regs (setbacks, parking, etc.)	279,443 sq. ft./1.3 FAR (up to 528,992 sq. ft. permitted w/ architectural bonuses)	+ 257 sq. ft. (proposal permits up to +249,806 sq. ft.)

Required Code Variations and Setback Relief

<i>Category</i>	<i>Required</i>	<i>Provided</i>	<i>Variance</i>
On-site landscaping	40,070 sq. ft. (20% of site)	39,398 sq. ft.	-672 sq. ft.
Setbacks*: Front Rear (waterway)	17-25 ft. 35 ft.	0-10 ft. 0-6 ft.	varies varies

Basis of recommendation (cont.)

Required setback relief



Rear setback
required 35' vs
proposed 0'-6'

Front setback
required 17'-25' vs
proposed 0'-10'

Basis of recommendation (cont.)

4. **Potential off-site parking encroachment (pgs 21-23)**
- Parking generated by the project could **encroach into the surrounding neighborhood** if left unmanaged
 - **No overflow parking management plan**, including short term meters, residential parking permits, directional signage and enforcement measures is provided to ensure that parking does not spill over into the surrounding residential neighborhood.
 - No plans provided for the proposed **vehicle connection** between the underground parking areas that would allow and encourage on-site vehicular circulation


Basis of recommendation (cont.)

Potential off-site parking encroachment



Basis of recommendation (cont.)

Internal vehicle connection



Basis of recommendation (cont.)

5. Traffic (pgs 23-26)

- Traffic generated by project would **negatively impact the surrounding neighborhood** if not fully mitigated
- City's traffic consultant concludes that **additional traffic improvements are necessary** to mitigate the impact of the project
- Based upon the CLUP objective requiring the **protection of residential neighborhoods** and controlling through traffic

Basis of recommendation (cont.)

6. Project phasing (pgs 26-32)


- Project is proposed to be developed in various phases, which if left unplanned and/or unchecked, could result in significant **impacts to the surrounding neighborhood**
- **No assurances provided** that the project fulfills the PAD objectives and purpose if the project is not built-out and all proposed phases constructed
- A **projected timeline is necessary** for each phase of the project and for the build-out of the entire project
- No proposed use of **proposed interim surface parking lot** or plan has been submitted providing details showing vehicular entrances, paving/curbing, landscaping, lighting and pedestrian circulation

Basis of recommendation (cont.)

- 1. Phase 1: Interim surface parking lot and commercial building (outparcel)**
- 2. Phase 2: Commercial & parking structure along Caballero / U.S. 1**
- 3. Phase 3: Commercial & parking structure along Alhambra / U.S. 1**
- 4. Phase 4: Residential & parking structure along Caballero**
- 5. Phase 5: Residential & parking structure along Alhambra**


Basis of recommendation (cont.)

Phase 1: Interim surface parking lot and commercial building (outparcel)




Basis of recommendation (cont.)

Phase 2: Commercial & parking structure along Caballero / U.S. 1




Basis of recommendation (cont.)

Phase 3: Commercial & parking structure along Alhambra / U.S. 1




Basis of recommendation (cont.)

Phase 4: Residential & parking structure along Caballero



Basis of recommendation (cont.)

Phase 5: Residential & parking structure along Alhambra




Basis of recommendation (cont.)

7. Lack of marina facilities operation plan (pgs 28-31)

- Project will result in **increased use of existing marina** situated along **ecologically sensitive canal habitat**, which, if left unmanaged, could negatively impact the canal and surrounding single-family residential neighborhood
- **No operational plan provided** for the renovation and use of the existing 25 boat berths that are proposed to be assigned to owners of new residential units
- Marina is located at the end of a canal utilized primarily by the existing single-family residential neighborhood through which the canal courses, and serves as an environmentally sensitive manatee habitat
- Application **does not sufficiently address the servicing of vessels** at the marina to ensure there is minimal impact on the surrounding residential neighborhood and existing manatee habitat along the waterway

Basis of recommendation (cont.)

Lack of marina facilities operation plan



Basis of recommendation (cont.)

8. Attainable housing not addressed (pgs 14-31)

- Project **does not provide any attainable housing**
- Provision of attainable housing within the City is a **State and regional mandate**, and as such is being pursued in accordance with the **City of Coral Gables Workforce / Affordable Housing Study** (April 2006), which includes the promotion of inclusionary zoning
- Planning Staff has the ability, in advance of a formal citywide program, to require major residential developments receiving increases in density, changes in zoning, changes in CLUP, PAD, MXD and/or conditional use reviews or **“discretionary reviews,”** to dedicate a portion of their units to attainable housing.
- Applicant has not addressed or included attainable housing units within the proposed development

Conclusion

1. **Incompatible** with surrounding neighborhood
2. **Inconsistent** with CLUP & Zoning Code
3. **Insufficient** information for comprehensive analysis

Public notification / comments

(pg 31 and Attachment D)



Notice

Type	Explanation
Neighborhood meeting completed	Completed 01.28.08
Courtesy notification mailed to all property owners within 1,500 feet of the subject property	Completed 04.23.08
Newspaper ad published	Completed 04.28.08
Posted property	Completed 05.01.08
Posted agenda on City web page/City Hall	Completed 05.09.08
Posted Staff report on City web page	Completed 05.09.08


- 1,500 foot mailing radius
- 733 notices mailed on 04.23.08
- New public comments provided

Applicant responsibility

The Applicant is charged with the responsibility and burden of presenting information, evidence, testimony, findings, etc. that substantiate that its applications satisfy all applicable provisions of the CLUP, the intent of the Zoning Code, and the Zoning Code



3-D Model





The end