

CITY OF CORAL GABLES
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY (LPA)/
SPECIAL PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING
VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT
HYBRID FORMAT
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2024, COMMENCING AT 4:02 P.M.

Board Members Present at Commission Chamber:

Eibi Aizenstat, Chairman
Wayne "Chip" Withers
Sue Kawalerski
Felix Pardo
Javier Salman
Robert Behar

City Staff and Consultants:

Jennifer Garcia, Planning Official
Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator
Cristina Suarez, City Attorney
Gustavo Ceballos, Assistant City Attorney
Jill Menendez, Administrative Assistant, Board Secretary
Fenggian/Grace Chen, Principal Planner
Juan Riesco, City Architect

Also Participating:

Peter Kiliddjian, Vice Chairman, Board of Architects
Maria Cristina Longo.

Pursuant to Resolution Number 2021-118, the City of Coral Gables has returned to traditional in-person meetings, However, the Planning and Zoning Board has established the ability for the public to provide comments virtually.

For those members of the public who are appearing on Zoom and wish to testify -- actually, you do not have to be -- since it is not -- it's legislative, you do not have to be visible and be sworn in.

Lobbyist Registration and Disclosure, any person who acts as a lobbyist must register with the City Clerk, as required pursuant to the City Code.

As Chair, I now officially call the City of Coral Gables Planning and Zoning Board Special Meeting on Mediterranean Standards of September 26th, 2024 to order. The time is 4:02.

Jill, if you'd please call the roll.

THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?

MR. BEHAR: Here.

THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell asked to be excused.

Sue Kawalerski?

1

3

THEREUPON:

(The following proceedings were held.)

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I'd like to go ahead and get started, if everybody is okay with that. I'd like to go ahead and call the meeting to order. I'd like to please ask everybody to please silence their phones and beepers, if they have any.

Good evening. This Board is comprised of seven Members. Four Members of the Board shall constitute a quorum and the affirmative vote of four Members shall be necessary for the adoption of any motion. If only four Members of the Board are present, an applicant may request and be entitled to a continuance to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board.

If a matter is continued due to a lack of quorum, the Chairperson or Secretary of the Board may set a Special Meeting to consider such matter. In the event that four votes are not obtained, an applicant, except in the case of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment, may request a continuance or advance the application to proceed to the City Commission without a recommendation.

2

MR. KAWALERSKI: Here.

THE SECRETARY: Felix Pardo?

MR. PARDO: Here.

THE SECRETARY: Javier Salman also requested to be excused.

Chip Withers?

MR. WITHERS: Here.

THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Here.

We will not have swearing in today, as the item is legislative, as I had stated before.

Everyone who speaks today must complete the roster on the podium. We ask that you print your name clearly, so the official records of your name and address will be correct.

Zoom platform participants, I will ask any person wishing to speak on this afternoon's agenda item, to please open your chat and send a direct message to Jill Menendez, stating you would like to speak before the Board and include your full name. Jill will call you when it's your turn. I ask you to be concise, for the interest of time.

Phone platform participants will then follow, as Zoom participants are done. I will

4

ask phone participants to comment on tonight's agenda item, as well, and I ask you to be concise, for the interest of time.

The procedure we'll use tonight is, first, the identification of the agenda item by Mr. Collier -- actually, it will be Madam City Attorney. Mr. Collier is not here -- presentation by Staff, and a -- I'll go ahead and open it for public comment, first in Chambers, then the Zoom platform, and phone line platform.

I'll go ahead and close the public comment. We'll have Board discussion. Then, if there's a motion, discussion, and second of a motion, if applicable, the Board's final comments and a vote.

Before we start, in light of not having a full board on this item, which is such an important issue, I would like the Board's input on a few options. One, we can go ahead, defer, to reschedule the meeting; Two, we can proceed with the meeting and see if there is a recommendation and a vote; and, Three, we can proceed with the meeting and defer recommendation and vote. Absent Board Members

5

will then have the ability to read the transcript and we can continue at a later meeting.

MR. BEHAR: Mr. Chairman, we also have another issue, because we have one of the Board Members who's going to be --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct.

MR. BEHAR: -- departing at 5:30, you said?

MR. WITHERS: Yeah.

MR. BEHAR: So we may not --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: One, two, three --

MR. BEHAR: Four. I don't know that that's really appropriate for such an important matter, and I want to start, because we need to start. We may have to get -- when we get to that point, we may have to reconsider if we continue or -- right?

MR. KAWALERSKI: Uh-huh.

MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, Felix.

MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest Number Three, and even with present company leaving prematurely, although we would not have the quorum -- we would lose the quorum at that time, the quorum would be lost for a vote. The

6

discussion can continue, and we would be able to provide the verbatim minutes to all three members, at that time, depending on how far along we get in the hour and a half that we have before the 5:30 time, and, you know, we can then have that, to be able to conclude the discussion and vote with hopefully all of the members present at the next Planning Board Meeting.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Cristina, let me ask you a question, please. Since we have advertised as a Planning and Zoning Board Meeting, which is quasi-judicial, even though this item is legislative, do we need to -- because of Sunshine Laws, if we lose a quorum, are we allowed to continue?

MS. SUAREZ: So you would not lose the quorum. You would still have four members, if I'm not mistaken, right? We would not lose a quorum.

MR. PARDO: He leaves at 5:30.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But once he leaves at 5:30, we'll have one, two, three, four --

MR. BEHAR: Yeah, you're right. We will have a quorum.

7

MR. PARDO: We will have a quorum.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And we can continue.

MR. PARDO: So it's a matter --

MS. SUAREZ: And just to answer, for the sake of a discussion, if you lost the quorum, you can continue discussion, you just could not take any action.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Right.

MR. PARDO: And the verbatim minutes could be made available to all of the Board Members or they could watch a tape of the discussion --

MS. SUAREZ: That's an option.

MR. PARDO: -- to be able to hit the ground running the next time, and complete it.

MS. SUAREZ: Yeah. I mean, you could also decide that, you know -- when Mr. Withers has to leave, you could decide to maybe conclude this one and then continue it at, you know, a later meeting. All of the options are really available.

MR. BEHAR: But I think, you know, Felix, your recommendation is probably a good one. We could continue. We may not take a vote until we get all seven Board Members present, you know.

8

1 MR. PARDO: Exactly. And I think that
2 would be fair, and, specifically, you know, I
3 would like to hear the input of --

4 MR. BEHAR: Two architects, which to me are
5 -- you know.

6 MR. PARDO: Correct. You took the words
7 out of my mouth, right.

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Right. There's two
9 architects that are missing tonight -- or this
10 afternoon.

11 MR. BEHAR: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: All right. If
13 everybody's okay, we'll go ahead and continue
14 with this matter at this time, okay?

15 MR. WITHERS: Absolutely. Absolutely.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

17 Madam City Attorney, could you please read
18 into the record the agenda item?

19 MS. SUAREZ: Yes.

20 E-1 is an Ordinance of the City Commission
21 of Coral Gables, Florida, providing for text
22 amendments of the City of Coral Gables Official
23 Zoning Code, Article 5, "Architecture," Section
24 5-200, "Mediterranean Standards;" Article 3,
25 "Uses," Section 3-402, "Restrictions related to

9

1 location;" and Article 16, "Definitions;" to
2 enhance the quality of Coral Gables
3 Mediterranean design by requiring a conceptual
4 design review; removing duplicative criteria;
5 relocating inapplicable standards;
6 supplementing existing criteria; and including
7 additional Mediterranean building examples;
8 providing for severability, repealer,
9 codification, and providing for an effective
10 date.

11 MS. GARCIA: So, good afternoon. Jennifer
12 Garcia, Planning Official.

13 And so the memo today actually is just
14 capturing what was discussed at the last
15 meeting two weeks ago. The red lines that are
16 in here should look familiar. They were on
17 your draft from the last -- from the board
18 meeting from two weeks ago, and the ones in
19 purples are the ones incorporated from the last
20 time discussion, right.

21 Some of the comments are from Alex Adams, a
22 member of the public who came and had some
23 comments, additional comments for the Board to
24 consider. There were some clarifications by
25 some of the Board Members here that are

10

1 incorporated into this draft in purple.

2 So, to save time, that's all I need to say.
3 Thank you.

4 MR. BEHAR: You do have a PowerPoint of all
5 of the -- right? You don't?

6 MS. GARCIA: No. This is here for
7 discussion and to get your feedback, remember?

8 MR. BEHAR: I mean, I said the last time,
9 I've got some comments, that I don't know if --
10 then we're not going to be able to put it up to
11 go through, you know, each --

12 MS. GARCIA: We all have the same draft, we
13 can go page by page, if you wish to do it that
14 way.

15 MR. BEHAR: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before we proceed,
17 Jennifer -- I mean, sorry, Jill, do we have
18 anybody that signed up to speak?

19 THE SECRETARY: No one has indicated they
20 wish to speak.

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Nobody in Zoom
22 or phone platform, either?

23 THE SECRETARY: I'll send them a message,
24 but, no.

25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. At this time,

11

1 I'd like to go ahead and close it for public
2 comment.

3 Chip, would you like to start us off?

4 MR. WITHERS: No. I mean, I don't -- I'm
5 not quite sure I totally understand. I thought
6 we were going to go point by point and discuss
7 them as we went through, no?

8 MS. GARCIA: We had also mentioned, some
9 people had some red lines to share with the
10 Board. We can go page by page, if you want to
11 do it that way.

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, I know Felix
13 wanted to go page by page, item by item --

14 MR. WITHERS: No, that's okay.

15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- is what he had
16 stated.

17 MR. WITHERS: I think, if we went through
18 it, it might be easier, rather than me going
19 through mine and then --

20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Agree.

21 MR. WITHERS: I mean, I don't know how you
22 guys feel about that.

23 MR. PARDO: And I think what Robert was
24 intending, by having it up there, then it's
25 easy to go from one -- everybody is looking at

12

1 it. And, also, anybody that's home watching
2 this --

3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Samples.

4 MR. PARDO: -- you know, will understand
5 where we are, you know, where it would be the
6 same thing as this, except page by page, you're
7 going through it.

8 MS. GARCIA: Right. So we had it in the
9 past.

10 MR. PARDO: Right. Would you be able to
11 bring it up or --

12 MS. GARCIA: I can find it and e-mail it
13 to --

14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But we can go ahead
15 and continue while they're looking for it.

16 Felix, do you want to get us going?

17 MR. PARDO: Sure. I'll take a stab at it.

18 So, on the memorandum from Staff, before
19 you get into this thing, there are a few
20 questions that I had. This was the best -- you
21 know, Staff, what they're trying to do is
22 capture the previous meeting, before this
23 particular meeting, and I think that when you
24 look at that, one of the things is, "Some of
25 the criteria" -- this is the second paragraph,

13

1 on the first page, and it says, "Some of the
2 criteria was revised or removed, such as porch
3 balcony depths, and insisted to keep other
4 proposed criteria, such as window design
5 standards and habitable liner requirements,"
6 and if you'll recall, that was where we really
7 got to Page 1, where we were talking about the
8 depth, which is not -- you know, it's not shown
9 anywhere, like the City of Miami does, you
10 know, which is the depth of the liners. And it
11 just so happens that, that particular evening,
12 we had looked at a project that we had
13 recommended approval for, that hasn't gone to
14 the Commission yet, and they had hidden the
15 parking areas, which that was the discussion
16 with that.

17 We don't -- we still don't have, you know,
18 a minimum depth on this, but that's something
19 that is shown here. That's something that
20 should be discussed at some point, trying to
21 establish a minimum depth of the liner that
22 would go in front of the parking areas inside
23 the Mixed-Use buildings.

24 The second thing is that, I thought that it
25 was a little unfortunate, the way it was

14

1 written, Number 5, on the first page, which
2 was, "Prohibited horizontal and vertical
3 sliding windows and doors of the buildings." I
4 think it's almost like a run-on sentence.

5 What we started to discuss was keeping the
6 windows and doors, you know, separate, so you
7 have either (A) horizontal or (B) vertical
8 opening and closing fenestration. And there
9 was a discussion that we had, where we had a
10 difference of opinion of whether you could see
11 or not see. We discussed also, in detail, the
12 Juliet balconies, whether they could be done
13 one way or the other.

14 I know we have the City Architect here and
15 one of the board members from the Board of
16 Architects here today, and I know that they
17 have, in the past, discussed the Juliet
18 balconies and how to do it in such a way that
19 looks symmetrical and it's on the same plane.
20 One of the discussions that we had,
21 specifically, was, you know, whether when
22 you're looking at the fenestration on these
23 especially tall buildings, where you have these
24 sliding doors where there's a difference
25 between the two, it makes it look different,

15

1 and we also discussed specifically that some of
2 the buildings that have been built, although
3 the Board of Architects were blamed for them,
4 they actually got changed during the shop
5 drawing process and they were switched and
6 never went back to the Board of Architects, and
7 they were administratively reviewed by someone,
8 other than a member of the Board of Architects
9 or the City Architect, at that time.

10 Generalizing Option Number 7, as an option
11 for the first three to four stories to be
12 activated with habitable space and consistent
13 with high quality materials, I think high
14 quality materials should be used throughout the
15 buildings. I see that certain developers in
16 this City really go all out to use quality
17 materials, and I don't think it should be
18 limited to three or four stories. I think you
19 could see that all of the way through.

20 And I think that if you're -- this is a
21 bonus that is being provided to not only give
22 great architecture, but also great materials,
23 that are long-lasting, and I don't think that
24 there should be a limit to just the first three
25 or four stories. And I understand that some of

16

the elements that you might be able to look at, you should be able to look at them, but make sure that the quality of the materials throughout looks good. And we see other examples of Mediterranean inspired design, and they use poor materials, and you could see it, whether it's on the second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth story.

So that's the only other comment I have --

MR. BEHAR: Felix, but let me ask you this, we talked about it briefly, and I don't know where you're reading from, because --

MR. PARDO: I'm sorry, the memorandum, the first page --

MR. KAWALERSKI: The previous one, not the current one?

MS. GARCIA: From the last --

MR. WITHERS: The original.

MR. KAWALERSKI: You're reading from the original?

MR. PARDO: From the original one, because that's where we started the conversation.

MR. KAWALERSKI: Right.

MR. PARDO: And, again, these are not necessarily provisions that are in the Code

17

really is not part of the Med Bonus, it's really part of -- you know, more of the Zoning Code itself, not necessarily a Med Bonus, but when you're using the liners, having a prescriptive way of saying you're going to have a minimum of 20 feet is, I think, what we were discussing, where feasible.

And for example, Glenn Pratt's project that came before us that particular evening, he was able to do it, where it was feasible, not all of the way around, and he had a very difficult site. It was not only triangular, but it was also -- it had street facing all of the way around. So that became very difficult for him there, but, you know, we looked at it for what it was.

So, the last comment, that I don't see here, from the previous one, and if you could indulge me, it's the last comment,

Mr. Chairman --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Please.

MR. PARDO: -- it says, "Incorporate an optional requirement to provide the additional open space and reduce the amount to pay to the 0.25."

19

itself. This was what Staff captured, from our previous conversations, and that's what that front page is.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But, Jennifer, you've updated those in what you sent us now?

MS. GARCIA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.

MR. KAWALERSKI: Yes. This is the latest. So that's what we have.

MR. BEHAR: This is more confusing, but --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Because I think that's confusing. I'd rather, if we can, read from what has been updated.

MR. PARDO: Okay. I'll read from what's updated, but what's updated is -- some of these things are omitted, and that's why I didn't feel comfortable with that. In other words --

MR. BEHAR: Because the liner is one example that is in the second, third, and fourth levels, but we also talked about it, which I'm in favor, but where feasible, right?

MR. PARDO: Correct. And if you'll recall, we discussed -- you and I both discussed that, where feasible, which should be in there. And, again, one of the issues here is that this

18

Staff started to address that comment at the last meeting. I still don't understand it. I'm not that smart, but I'd like to be able to understand where the .25 -- how it works.

MS. GARCIA: Yeah, the open space fund.

So, as you know, there is a fund -- like a CIP fund, that the City has, that routinely puts money into it for acquisition of parks, right, open space in our City.

MR. PARDO: Right.

MS. GARCIA: So part of the optional -- remember, these are twelve options that they can do -- six of the twelve, if Multi-Family, or eight of the twelve, if it's mixed-use -- they could have that option. Maybe it's a small site, they can't provide a lot of open space, so they can pay it into a fund that would eventually have open space available by the City in the area.

MR. PARDO: Right.

And Mr. Chairman, I want the Board Members to remember that comment. The reason I want them to remember the comment is because, there's also a sustainability bonus in the Med Bonus scale, and for me, I think that, you

20

1 know, the sustainability should be a
2 requirement, not a bonus for Mediterranean
3 style architecture, you know.

4 And putting money into a park fund should
5 not be one of the -- again, we're getting into
6 check-offs. We're going to check this off.
7 One thing has nothing to do with the
8 Mediterranean style. It has nothing to do with
9 it, and it should not be there. If you want to
10 give -- if someone can't meet their green
11 space, I think we have a different
12 conversation. It has nothing to do with the
13 bonuses. I just want to either, (A) Take it
14 off the table or discuss it during -- you know,
15 when we're looking at the required items, you
16 know, to be able to achieve that bonus.

17 So, Mr. Chairman, those are all of the
18 comments that I had on the transmittal -- the
19 original transmittal that was there, and I know
20 that Staff has floated the 20-foot habitable
21 liner. You know, I don't have an issue with
22 that, but some of these things, I think -- we
23 can't lose focus that we're giving people a
24 bonus, and bonuses -- all bonuses -- are
25 discretionary. So because they're

21

1 discretionary, we can ask for these things, but
2 for the style and to give the Board of
3 Architects and the City Architect the ability
4 to provide more power, to be able to achieve
5 architecturally what we're asking them to
6 achieve, in return for a bonus, I think is
7 important.

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.

9 MR. PARDO: Okay. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Sue.

11 MR. KAWALERSKI: Well, I certainly don't
12 have that level of detail to talk about, but I
13 agree with Felix. It was like, if you provide
14 a bike rack, you know, in the old -- I mean, we
15 can't be arbitrary and throw a bike rack in it
16 and that's part of your requirement. I totally
17 agree, putting money into a fund should just be
18 part of the Zoning Code, if they don't have
19 enough space for green space, not a requirement
20 that they get by for a Mediterranean bonus.

21 MS. GARCIA: And just to clarify, that
22 wasn't to get out of a requirement for green
23 space. It was just in addition to any green
24 space that they have on-site, that's required
25 of them, 25 percent for multi-family and 10

22

1 percent for mixed-use, those would be in
2 addition to that, just to clarify.

3 MR. KAWALERSKI: Right. Right. But that's
4 an arbitrary thing. That has nothing to do
5 with what the building looks like.

6 MS. GARCIA: Yeah, understood.

7 MR. KAWALERSKI: You know, to me, the
8 requirement are, does it look Mediterranean.

9 Okay. That's all I have to say.

10 MR. BEHAR: Thank you.

11 I have several questions, and some of it is
12 going to be for our City Attorney.

13 For example, the Context Analysis -- and
14 that has been modified and I have had some
15 conversation with Jennifer regarding this one,
16 in particular.

17 MR. PARDO: Sorry, Robert, what page are
18 you on?

19 MR. BEHAR: 5. Page 5 of the Development
20 Bonus Standards, Number 1, which is Context
21 Analysis.

22 MS. GARCIA: So it appears that we can have
23 that pulled up on the screen. I think Jill has
24 that ready, the first one.

25 MR. BEHAR: And my question is, because we

23

1 talked about it, contextually is in the
2 surrounding, the existing condition, but you
3 may be in an MX2 zoning and you have one story
4 buildings. To me, I want to make sure that the
5 Context Analysis is based not only on what's
6 there, but what the future development
7 potential is, based on the Zoning, and I want
8 to make sure that the language, as provided,
9 assures that you could do that, because if
10 you're zoned, you know, to be able to do a
11 77-foot building, and you only have a one story
12 building next to you today, it doesn't mean
13 that the uses and the zoning allows you to do
14 that, you know. Otherwise, you're going to
15 prohibit that land owner doing what the zoning
16 allows.

17 MS. GARCIA: Right, and that was the intent
18 of having, "Compatible with the existing and
19 planned context."

20 MR. BEHAR: And the planned context refers
21 to the zoning?

22 MS. GARCIA: Right. Yes.

23 MR. BEHAR: Okay.

24 MS. GARCIA: Future Land Use Map, yes.

25 MR. PARDO: I would just like to add my

24

1 opinion, when Robert is done with this
2 particular point.

3 MR. BEHAR: So I want to make sure that it
4 does state that you also have to consider the
5 existing zoning that is for that particular
6 site.

7 MR. KAWALERSKI: Can I ask a question
8 regarding this context? You know, I'm all for
9 the context and compatibility features, but
10 what if you have an area in the City that has
11 glass buildings -- I mean, nothing
12 Mediterranean at all -- and a project comes in
13 that's Mediterranean and they're asking for
14 bonuses, how does that fit into that? How does
15 a Mediterranean --

16 MR. BEHAR: No, because I think that the
17 Board of Architects will have the authority to
18 approve or not approve the project. That is
19 too specific. And I think the Board -- my
20 concern is that you have a zoning that, you
21 know, is MX1, and you have an existing one
22 story, two story building, and you're going to
23 come in with a building that's going to be
24 taller, are you then not -- because you're not
25 contextually compatible with the existing

25

1 building, you're not allowed to do what the
2 zoning allows?

3 MR. WITHERS: Wouldn't that be picked up in
4 the initial conceptual review? Isn't that the
5 first step, is the conceptual review, before it
6 goes to the Board of Architects? Would that
7 not be discussed at that point?

8 MS. GARCIA: Yes, but not this actual
9 criteria.

10 MR. BEHAR: Right.

11 MS. GARCIA: This criterion will be
12 discussed at the Med Bonus public meeting.

13 MR. WITHERS: Okay.

14 MR. BEHAR: I want to make sure -- look,
15 I'm all for the compatibility, but you cannot
16 take away the zoning and say, "Well, you're
17 zoned for "X," but because you've got a one
18 story building next to you, you won't be able
19 to do that."

20 MS. GARCIA: Right. Again, the intent is
21 existing and planned context of the area.

22 MR. BEHAR: I just want to make sure
23 that --

24 MS. GARCIA: And we clarified it's within
25 one block, right.

26

1 MR. BEHAR: I just want to make sure that,
2 you know --

3 MS. SUAREZ: If that was the intent, it
4 sounds like it's been, you know, incorporated
5 in here with that intent.

6 MR. BEHAR: Because when -- I consulted
7 two, you know, land use attorneys that come
8 here, and they were not --

9 MS. SUAREZ: You're saying that there's a
10 concern that it should be more explicit?

11 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

12 MR. PARDO: There are different ways of
13 resolving these issues. One of them, first of
14 all, when the Board of Architects and the --
15 when the Board of Architects reviews their
16 plans, they're reviewing it according with
17 Section 5-102, which is the Design Review
18 Standards.

19 Forget about the bonuses. First, it's the
20 Review Standards, and in there, specifically,
21 it says, "Architectural compatibility with the
22 neighboring properties and uses."

23 As far as the context is concerned, the
24 zoning, as you say in this particular example,
25 77 feet, and let's say you're near or across a

27

1 waterway or you're across a public
2 right-of-way, and you have two stories,
3 single-family residential, you know, how do
4 you -- how do you work out the compatibility
5 issue there? Because you said, "MX1," but what
6 if it's single-family residential?

7 MR. BEHAR: No. No, that's different.

8 MR. PARDO: No. No. I just want to make
9 sure --

10 MR. BEHAR: Single-family, I concur with
11 you, but if you have -- and I don't know -- you
12 know, if you have an MX1 and you've got an
13 existing one, two-story building next to you,
14 and then you're going to come in with a --

15 MR. PARDO: Right. One of the things that
16 I find excruciating, when I see some of the
17 developments that have been built, is that
18 we'll have an, you know, eight-story building
19 next to -- right across the street from
20 single-family. So I find that wrong.

21 But the other way of contextually is that
22 you have the ability of massing -- that the
23 Board of Architects has the responsibility to
24 look at massing, and you have the ability of
25 stepping down, not taking the rights away --

28

the zoning rights away, and I just want to make sure that everybody understands, there's a difference between the Design Review Standards that the Board of Architects has to make sure that they review as part of their charge, and then the second thing is, the discretionary bonuses.

So we're talking about two different things. If you're allowed four floors, but with the bonuses, you're allowed six floors, when you're looking at the massing of the building, you, on the Board of Architects, have the ability to say, "But wait a minute, you have to step back those two floors, so at least you ameliorate the particular issue of the compatibility and the contextual."

It would be, obviously, wrong to take away the right, and illegal to take away the right, but the Board of Architects has the ability to say, "But wait a minute, how can we make it more compatible?"

MR. BEHAR: But, Felix, you want to make it simpler for them to do the interpretation. You don't want it to be, you know, questionable. You want to make sure what when they look at

29

it, it says, you know, based on this, they're compatible, and that's my point. For the Board to have -- to facilitate the process for them.

MR. PARDO: I will tell you that I respectfully disagree with what has been built recently in the last ten, fifteen years, in the City. Why? Because the Zoning Code, on Le Jeune Road, said that for the first, you know, hundred feet -- I can't remember, a hundred, a hundred fifty feet --

MR. BEHAR: A hundred feet, 45 feet.

MR. PARDO: Right, 45-foot maximum. Gee, why did they put that in? Because across the street, on Le Jeune Road, they're duplexes, but when you have that building behind it stepping down, that makes the compatibility and the contextual component --

MR. BEHAR: Felix, I don't think that's the argument here. I agree a hundred percent.

MR. PARDO: Right, but if you tie the Board of Architects' hands -- if you tie the Board of Architects' hands and you don't allow them to suggest the massing component of it, why have a Board of Architects?

MR. BEHAR: We're not saying to tie the

30

hands. On the contrary, we're trying to make it, you know, I think, clear for them to make that --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So that it's not arbitrary.

MR. BEHAR: Yes. I mean -- you know, and I think that the compatibility is one that you're going to have -- and nothing has to do with single-family, because, you know, if you have a two-story single family in front, you know, you have more options. This is more -- and look at the example I said, MX1 or something to that, and you may have an area -- for example, I'm going to use the Design District by the Collection.

Now it's all built, or pretty much, but you had a zoning that allows you to do up to -- back then, up to whatever, ten stories, 120 feet, whatever, but you had existing one story buildings. So if you go by the wording, you know, here, you've got to look at the -- you know, what's there in the area. You will not give them -- the Board the discretion that says, even though, you know, you've got one story buildings, you could do "X."

31

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Cristina, let me ask you a question. When a project is presented to the Board of Architects, what is -- or maybe Gus is better at answering this. When a project is presented to the Board of Architect, what is their responsibility to look at and not look at? Do they go ahead and look at zoning? Do they look at other items? Or do they look at design?

MS. SUAREZ: Yes. So, Mr. Chair, I would like Gus to answer, since Gus does -- from our office, when we do serve as counsel to the board at their meetings, when there's big projects or special questions, Gus does serve as counsel to the Board of Architects. So I'd like him to give the guidance that he has given over the years.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thanks.

Welcome, Gus.

MR. CEBALLOS: Thank you.

Good afternoon, Chair, fellow Board Members. This is City Attorney Gus Ceballos.

So I've reviewed the most recent Planning and Zoning Meeting, and I think there's a bit of confusion as to what the Board of Architects

32

really can look at. So there is zoning-related items, meaning upzoning, change of Comp Plan, all of those things. Those items are not within the purview of the board.

Now, the question of height and massing, that is a hundred percent within the purview of the board. The best example I gave to the board recently was, if a building is allowed a hundred feet per Code, and with Mediterranean bonus, they can go to 120, when they review whether a property meets Mediterranean bonus, you look at the Mediterranean standards. You apply that section of the Code, and a property could check all of the boxes and meet the criteria and be a Mediterranean bonus -- a Mediterranean style building and meet a criteria for a Level 1 and Level 2 bonuses.

So, now, that building that was 100 feet, now could be 120 feet, but then when the design review of the building happens, which is the second step -- because typically the board will grant the bonus first, and then review the design. At that moment, the board could make a determination that because of the massing and the context, that an 80-foot building is

33

appropriate. Even though, in particular situations, they could do a hundred feet or 120 feet, because of the surrounding neighborhood, because of the context, that they believe the appropriate building here is 80 feet.

Now, it's a little confusing at times, because you're looking at the same -- similar issue, but under two different lenses. So you cannot be looking at it in the lens of zoning and determining whether there's appropriate sewer or right-of-way improvements. Those are items that are handled elsewhere. They're not for the aesthetic review board.

But if, aesthetically, because of the compatibility, the context and the massing, a particular building shouldn't be 120 feet in this area -- maybe if it gets set back, maybe a portion gets pushed back, and the massing changes, that is all within the purview of the board.

MR. KAWALERSKI: How often does that happen, where the board says, "You know, not 120, but 80 is better"? How often does that happen?

MR. CEBALLOS: I can't speak to that. I'm

34

not at every meeting. But I don't think it happens often.

MR. PARDO: Mr. Ceballos, I have a question.

MR. CEBALLOS: Sure.

MR. PARDO: I don't see anywhere where it says aesthetics. It says, "Design review standards." Nowhere does it say aesthetics.

MS. SUAREZ: He meant design.

MR. CEBALLOS: I mean design.

MR. PARDO: I'm sorry. The reason I'm saying that is because that minimizes what the Board of Architects does.

When you're talking about massing, as you just said, those are not aesthetics. We're talking about Design Review Standards, the massing, how you set it back. I mean, for me, I would want to make sure that, from a massing standpoint, for example -- there's a great example, which I will not name, the project, right now, it is a very tall project. It is on a street, and they have all of the massing right on the edge of this street.

Me, I mean I would have said, you still can have your square footage, but you should push

35

the massing back, and that's what the Board of Architects can do, and that's part of the Design Review Standards, which are on these simple pages. It says it specifically, "Building scale and mass, building facade step backs."

I mean, what I would do, the City Architect, I would give this to every board member, to make sure they know that they have that ability to do that, you know, because if they subjectively say, "I'm going to reduce your allowed height, you know, that is given from a zoning standpoint," that is the taking.

MR. CEBALLOS: So let's be clear, you cannot say that. There's a difference. There's a difference in saying, you have a zoning that you can build 100 feet, but I don't think it's appropriate, it needs to be 90. That's a problem.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That is Bert Harris.

MR. CEBALLOS: Now, if you can articulate that because of the Design Review Standards, the compatibility and the massing, this particular building is not appropriate for the neighborhood, for the abutting properties, at

36

1 this particular height, the massing should be
2 revised so that this hundred foot area be
3 reduced to 70, 80, whatever that may be, and
4 move around the design of the building, that is
5 a hundred percent permissible.

6 See how I'm saying the same thing, but in
7 two different ways?

8 MR. PARDO: Right.

9 MR. CEBALLOS: I tried to make that
10 distinction to the board. I've probably
11 presented this before the board maybe five
12 times, at least, but there is a distinction to
13 be made.

14 MR. PARDO: I don't disagree with what you
15 said. The only thing I objected to was the
16 word, aesthetic.

17 MR. CEBALLOS: That's my apologies. I
18 meant, Design Review Standards.

19 MR. PARDO: No. No. No. I'm just saying,
20 it's not aesthetic. What they have to do is
21 very important, and from a contextual
22 standpoint, there's absolutely no doubt, and I
23 think you could have it both ways, as long as
24 the Board of Architects understands what they
25 can and cannot do, and it has to be crystal

37

1 clear.

2 But the massing is one of the largest tools
3 that they have in their tool chest to make it
4 compatible and make us different and a nicer
5 place.

6 MS. CEBALLOS: Agreed.

7 Any other question for me?

8 MS. SUAREZ: I think we're good.

9 MR. KAWALERSKI: You know, I still have a
10 question that hasn't been answered, because
11 we're talking about architectural
12 compatibility. If a project comes in, on a
13 piece of property, where it's surrounding by
14 glass buildings, is that compatible? Would
15 that Mediterranean project be compatible with a
16 sea of glass buildings?

17 MR. PARDO: That would be in the CBD area,
18 which would be the only place where you can --

19 MR. BEHAR: Yeah. No, it wouldn't be
20 compatible, but then you're not going to get
21 the bonuses that you're seeking.

22 MR. CEBALLOS: The quick answer to that
23 would be, up to the Board of Architects. They
24 would make the determination if it was
25 compatible or not.

38

1 MS. SUAREZ: On a case by case basis.

2 MR. CEBALLOS: On a case by case basis, yes.

3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Each individual
4 building, once an individual project comes in.

5 MS. SUAREZ: On a case by case basis.

6 MR. PARDO: And since you're on the
7 subject, to be very specific, the Allen Morris
8 iconic building on Alhambra -- on the Allen
9 Morris project on Alhambra, which is on a very
10 acute angle, it was surrounded by very, you
11 know, Brutalist architecture, and they chose to
12 do something which was iconic today, and use
13 the quality materials, and the massing, and
14 everything else, and basically that was along
15 the lines of the Mediterranean Bonus, and
16 sometimes you're actually providing that, and
17 from -- you have contextual, which you normally
18 would look at, but you have to be careful,
19 because the reason that you're providing this
20 discretionary bonus is specifically to be able
21 to promote a specific style, and in order to
22 have that style, to get those discretionary
23 bonuses there, that's where you try to turn the
24 corner and make the exception.

25 So I think that, when you're promoting

39

1 Mediterranean bonuses for Mediterranean
2 architecture, it's very specific. You would
3 not be providing Mediterranean bonuses for
4 another glass building or another Brutalist
5 concrete building.

6 MR. KAWALERSKI: No, I understand that, but
7 I'm just saying, it becomes, then, subjective?

8 MR. PARDO: Exactly.

9 MR. KAWALERSKI: You have a sea -- aren't
10 we supposed to get very specific here about how
11 to navigate Mediterranean bonuses?

12 MR. PARDO: Well, the problem is that the
13 first subject that was brought up, which was
14 the contextual study, is the most broad of
15 them. As you proceed through the sections,
16 you're going to have much more specific type
17 of, you know, constraints.

18 So the biggest one is -- on the contextual,
19 which Robert brought up, is what happens when I
20 have this type of zoning? You know, am I going
21 to be -- am I going to suffer, because I'm next
22 to something that isn't necessarily going to
23 meet the scale requirement, when I set it up
24 right next to it?

25 MR. KAWALERSKI: Yeah, and I understand the

40

scale and all of that, but that's not what I'm talking about. We were talking architectural compatibility. So, for a novice, if I have a glass building, and there's a project coming in that wants to be a Med Bonus building, and it says it has to be compatible, according to this, if I was on the Board of Architects, I'd say, "Well, it's not compatible. No, you don't get the bonus."

MR. PARDO: I just want to make sure there's clarity on this. The reason that the Med Bonuses were first brought up was because all of the buildings in the CBD area were glass buildings or Brutalist architecture, and, then, the bonuses came in, once a specific building was built 40 years ago, and that specific building became the template for other people to start building that particular style, because they wanted to achieve the bonuses, achieve a specific look. And the other buildings, which were there 40 years ago, are still there, and -- but you do see more of an influence, because there are very few more of those glass buildings that were built from 40 years forward.

41

MR. KAWALERSKI: No, I understand why this came to be. I'm just saying that we're getting very specific on what needs to be required to get the Med Bonus, and then we're saying, "Yeah, but regarding the architectural compatibility, it's up to --"

MR. BEHAR: No, not necessarily.

MR. PARDO: It's contextual.

MR. BEHAR: Contextual.

MR. PARDO: Very different than --

MR. BEHAR: -- style or design.

MR. PARDO: Yes.

MR. BEHAR: You know, design is -- I think design is going to be very descriptive of what you're going to be able to do. Contextually is more of the scale.

MR. PARDO: Right. It's more of a massing -- a massing tool than a detailed architecture tool. That's the difference --

MR. KAWALERSKI: No, and I get where Robert is coming from and that's not what I'm talking -- I'm not talking about massing. I'm talking about look. I'm talking about architectural compatibility. Isn't that the look?

MS. SUAREZ: So, in each case, the Board of

42

Architects would review the particular design that's being presented, and in that particular case, would apply the criteria and make that determination, in each particular case. It's not a one size fits all. It's, in each particular case, they would make the determination. It's not subjective, it's based on the criteria, and on the standards.

MR. KAWALERSKI: So it doesn't have to be architecturally compatible is what you're saying?

MR. BEHAR: Not necessarily --

MS. SUAREZ: It doesn't have to be the same design.

MR. BEHAR: Yeah, it doesn't have to be. The board has the authority to say, you know, that's a glass building, we're not going to give you the bonus on this, you know. It has --

MR. KAWALERSKI: Look, and I'm not saying that they shouldn't build a Med style building next to a glass structure, but should they get the Med Bonus?

MR. BEHAR: Well, but --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I think you're talking

43

more about should they build a taller building? I think your concerns is -- if you're talking about the Med Bonus, to me, you're talking about adding more FAR or more height. I think what Robert or what's being said is, compatibility between the design, if it's a glass structure next to a Mediterranean building --

MR. KAWALERSKI: I'm not talking about massing. I'm not talking about additional height. I'm talking about the look. You're nodding. I think you know what I'm saying.

I don't care if there's a Med --

MR. KILIDDJIAN: And I don't know if I have the answer.

Peter Kiliddjian. I sit on the Board of Architects. I'm here today --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you state your name and address, please?

MR. KILIDDJIAN: Peter Kiliddjian, 1330 Northwest 84th Avenue, PPKS Officer.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

MR. KILIDDJIAN: I sit on the board. I'm here today -- I'm the co-chair. Judy is the chair. She's not here today.

44

1 I don't know if I have the answer for you,
2 but the way that I see it, the entire City is a
3 Mediterranean-based City. So, in the larger
4 context, any Mediterranean building is
5 contextual in the City. The ones that are
6 glass boxes are not contextual. So it would
7 not be inappropriate to have a Mediterranean
8 building in an area where there is Brutalist or
9 glass boxes. I don't know if that helps.

10 MR. BEHAR: You said it would not be --

11 MR. KILIDDJIAN: It would not be -- no, it
12 wouldn't be appropriate to give a Mediterranean
13 bonus to a non-Med building that's, you know --

14 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Just to be clear,
15 because if you're going to -- let's say, on
16 Alhambra, where it's the most examples of the
17 glass buildings and Brutalist, if you come in,
18 the Allen Morris, which is a good example of
19 Mediterranean, that building, even though it's
20 incontextually in that area, would get the
21 bonuses?

22 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Yes.

23 What I'm saying is -- and taking it a step
24 further, the context can be further out than
25 just a block, when you're speaking of such

45

1 large buildings.

2 MR. KAWALERSKI: Well, not according to
3 this. It's a block, according to this.

4 MS. GARCIA: Immediate context.

5 MR. BEHAR: But, Sue, the point is -- and I
6 think that example is, on Alhambra, you've got,
7 you know, some glass buildings and you've got
8 some Brutalist buildings, and then you've got a
9 beautiful Mediterranean building that today
10 will also get the same bonuses, these bonuses.
11 So it could be adjacent, you know, to a glass
12 building, but if contextually, it's
13 appropriate, I think that's --

14 MR. KILIDDJIAN: It's contextual within the
15 City, because we are a Mediterranean-based
16 City.

17 MS. GARCIA: Yeah. If I could, so we're
18 talking about the proposed building massing
19 shall be compatible with the existing and
20 planned context, period. Analysis is within a
21 block, as to the immediate context. So the one
22 block is not your context, if you're going to
23 be compatible with the existing and planned.
24 It's the plan as for the entire City, and as we
25 know, our planned architecture style we want to

46

1 go with, based on George Merrick's vision, -
2 was to have Mediterranean.

3 MR. KAWALERSKI: Why have this in there
4 about architectural compatibility if the whole
5 City is Mediterranean and it's a given? Why
6 even consider that?

7 MR. KILIDDJIAN: Because context is, both,
8 language, massing, proportional --

9 MR. PARDO: Style.

10 MR. KILIDDJIAN: It's more than just -- I
11 understand your point, and it's a good point,
12 right, if we're next to a glass building, but
13 there are other things. There's building
14 typology, there is massing, there is
15 proportions, things like that. So it's just
16 not one aspect of the building, it's several
17 aspects.

18 MR. RIESCO: Juan Riesco, City Architect.

19 I think that's part of the value that we
20 add to cities, is also the distinction and
21 building types and typologies and styles and
22 looks. I don't think -- we understand that
23 this City is based on the Mediterranean style,
24 and that is our core standard, and I think we
25 want that, but I think there's also viability

47

1 to differences, and buildings like the glass
2 structures that are time dated buildings, that
3 were built in the '80s or the '70s, whenever
4 they came about. The Brutalist style was also
5 a period of building that was prevalent at that
6 time, and it was built, and it's a time stamp
7 of that particular era, and I think that's part
8 of the beauty of the City, that there is
9 viability in versatility, that things that are
10 different are good and it's not all the same
11 cookie cutter style. I think that would be
12 something that would be derogatory, to a
13 certain extent, coming from a profession where
14 creativity --

15 MR. KAWALERSKI: And by the way, I'm not
16 saying don't build Mediterranean next to a
17 glass building. That's not what I'm saying.
18 I'm saying, should that Mediterranean project
19 get the bonus, if it's not compatible with the
20 glass buildings and the Brutalist buildings all
21 around it?

22 MR. BEHAR: Well, you've got to look at
23 each case, and the building that is being
24 proposed.

25 MR. PARDO: I have, I think, a good

48

example, which I think the architect will agree, the Luminare Building. The Luminare Building is a classic building by Roney Mateu, very small building, there, right on Ponce.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. PARDO: Directly across the street -- unfortunately, Julio Grabiell isn't here, but when he designed The Colonnade Building, which is Mediterranean, and it saved and preserved the original Colonnade building, that is directly across the street, if we did it -- if we go backwards in time, when Roney Mateu came in to the Board of Architects and showed them what he was doing with The Luminare Building, which was specifically selling types of furniture which are very contemporary, very cutting edge type of furniture, that building really made a statement. It has won numerous architectural awards, and on top of that, it is directly across the street from someone that did take advantage of the bonuses. Roney Mateo's building did not take advantage of any bonuses, because it was never intended to be that way.

The diversity of that type of architecture,

49

which is really just great architecture, I think that's a perfect example. You have a bonus to promote Mediterranean.

MR. RIESCO: Correct. Yes.

MR. PARDO: Bingo. And on top of that, it was also preserving a historic jewel, and, then, across the street, you have a very low key, award winning contemporary building, that I don't find offensive. In fact, I think it's aesthetically incredibly good, you know, in my opinion, but they didn't ask for a bonus.

MR. RIESCO: Correct.

MR. PARDO: Now, there had been -- there have been mistakes made over the years, don't need to name them, but, for me, I think the -- as you once said, the cat is out of the bag. You get Med Bonus for Med architecture, and that was the theme and the problem that we had in the CBD area, that that wasn't being addressed all of the time.

So I think, contextually, they can coexist.

MR. BEHAR: And you could still do another Luminare building today, if you're not asking for the bonuses.

MR. RIESCO: Correct.

50

MR. BEHAR: You could do it.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. KAWALERSKI: Look, I've got no issue with what you're saying. I'm saying, if that's the case, let's just eliminate the architectural compatibility component of this thing, because it doesn't matter in the end.

MR. PARDO: No, it does. It does. I think it's a very, very important tool that the Board of Architects absolutely a hundred percent needs.

MR. KAWALERSKI: Why, because they can make --

MR. RIESCO: I think there's various components to compatibility, I think is the issue. Compatibility is not just, I look like this guy. There's compatibility in terms of massing, there's compatibility in terms of scales, there's compatibility in terms of materiality, architecturally.

MR. KAWALERSKI: This says, "Architectural," not scale, not height. This says, "Architectural." Maybe I'm misinterpreting architecture. I think it's the look, isn't it?

51

MR. BEHAR: No.

MR. PARDO: Sue, I'll give you one last --

MS. GARCIA: No.

MS. SUAREZ: Remember, we need to speak one at a time, for the court reporter, please.

MR. PARDO: Okay. So let me give you one last example. I was just in Boston.

At Boston University, they built a technical building, which is completely out of place. I mean, I looked at it. Immediately the name that came to me was vomiting drawers. You know, it looks like it had vomiting drawers. Contextually, it is very misaligned with that area, that one block area. It would fail miserably, but they got it approved. They built it. The scale is so out of scale, and the detailing, et cetera, in my opinion -- you know, the architect, I'm sure, is a genius, but in my opinion, it's so out of place, that I had to drive around, get out of the car, and walk through it and look at it, to see what the redeeming values were. That's my personal opinion.

But if they were on the Board of Architects reviewing that buildings there, contextually,

52

being a contemporary building, not because it's a contemporary building, a Mediterranean building or any other style, it just out of scale, out of place, and that's part of what this contextual component is, which is a key tool that they need in their tool box.

MR. BEHAR: You know, look, we do have something very close at the Douglas Metrorail station. We've got buildings that are 36-story buildings. Are they out of context? Yes, they are. You know, we know that. You know, that's more -- it doesn't matter the style. You know, it's the massing, the proportions of the building, you know, and I think -- I'm not concerned, because I think the board will have all of the tools necessary to be able to say, if it's, you know, architecturally compatible or not.

Am I not -- don't you --

MR. RIESCO: No, I think the board understands that and is well equipped in that regard and does that on a weekly basis with the projects, you know, based on the constraints that we have and the zoning issues and whatever things are allowed, but we're looking at the

53

aesthetics of the building, the mass of the building. And, remember, we walk a fine line every day between property rights and design, and that's our charge. That's what our challenge is, you know, how do we make this better, while allowing the applicant to do what they are allowed to do?

And so we've got to be careful in how we steer that, but the board is very well --

MR. BEHAR: I think my original question is answered, when Jennifer says, "Planned surrounding area." That means that takes into consideration the zoning.

MS. GARCIA: Correct. Well, the Zoning Master Plan, Comprehensive Plan, all of those together, yes.

MR. PARDO: And I'm sorry, I just realized something. We've been discussing this. I think it's a very good discussion, you know, very, very important, but this that we're discussing now is the prerequisite. In other words, you're not getting any bonus for this. This is not part of the check-offs.

MR. BEHAR: Right.

MR. PARDO: So, I'm sorry, I missed it. I

54

missed the argument. You have a good point, but this isn't something that you're checking off to get that bonus. This is a prerequisite that you have to go in there, and this is one of the things, at the very beginning, which it wasn't written like this, you know, a long time ago, when they first started doing this.

MR. KAWALERSKI: Well, you know, I have to say, and -- thank you, Gus, wherever Gus went --

MR. WITHERS: He's right behind there.

MR. KAWALERSKI: -- for letting us know what the Board of Architects can do, because in the past couple of meetings, it was very clear that -- it sounded like the board was being handcuffed in certain areas, and I really hope that every member does now understand that they do have the purview to do what they're supposed to do, okay, because I know that Felix had brought that up initially. This has been brought up in a number of meetings. And maybe, Gus, you need to let them know, for the sixth time, that they have this purview, because obviously some people felt uncomfortable on that board going there.

55

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Do you want to continue, Robert?

MR. BEHAR: Yes. My next one is one of the comments that we brought up earlier about Juliet balconies. If we prohibit -- you know, I guess, Item Number -- I got it on Page 30, "Horizontal or vertical sliding windows and doors are prohibited on the exterior of the building facade." If you do that, then you're not going to be able to do Juliet balconies, right? Because the intent of the Juliet balcony is that you could open up a sliding glass door. If you take that away, you won't be able to do a Juliet balcony.

MR. PARDO: I think, recently, the Board of Architects allowed a Juliet balcony with a certain detail that you requested.

MR. RIESCO: Yeah. It was actually a window.

MR. KILIDDJIAN: It was actually a fixed panel at the Juliet balcony level and a casement window.

MR. PARDO: Right.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So it had a railing?

MR. RIESCO: Oh, yes. It had the railing height, with a fixed window --

56

MR. BEHAR: And you have a glass panel in front of the --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. RIESCO: And still get the sensation of the Juliet balcony.

THE SECRETARY: I'm sorry, one speaker at a time, please, so the reporter could --

MR. RIESCO: Yeah. So, again, the window in this particular project had a component that went up to the guardrail height, and that was a fixed panel. So that's not operable. It's solid. The railing sits in front of that.

And, then, above the railing, was a casement window. So you can open the window, and the perception of the Juliet balcony is still there, without the bottom portion of it, and that's kind of the concession we made as a design alternative to the concept of the Juliet balcony, because I think the board, in unison, feels that sliding doors are not appropriate on a Med building, and that's the reason.

MR. PARDO: And I think Judy expressed the same thing previously, but the point is that a Juliet balcony, as far as the depth is concerned, is basically not quite, you know, an

57

issue, but you aesthetically can still get exactly what you need to get.

MR. RIESCO: Yeah. The intent of a Juliet balcony is not to step out into it, it's to open and experience the outdoor apartment in.

MR. KAWALERSKI: Juan, are you familiar with The Venera project, that's now called The Standard?

MR. RIESCO: Venera, the one in front of the big park, the curved building?

MR. KAWALERSKI: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. RIESCO: Yes.

MR. KAWALERSKI: That has Juliet balconies. Are you familiar with this project?

MR. RIESCO: Am I, what?

MR. KAWALERSKI: Are you familiar with that project?

MR. RIESCO: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, I remember The Venera. It was like four or five years ago, I think?

MR. KAWALERSKI: Yeah. That got a Med Bonus. Doesn't that have sliding doors?

MR. RIESCO: Probably.

MR. KAWALERSKI: Yes, it does and it got a Med Bonus.

58

MR. RIESCO: At that particular moment, that could have been something that --

MR. KAWALERSKI: Because we keep mentioning The Paseo and how the shop drawings got changed, but there are numbers of projects that went through the Board of Architects, went through Planning and Zoning, sliders, and they get a Med Bonus. So how do we protect that from actually happening?

MR. RIESCO: I think there's been a progression over the years, because I sat on the board for eleven years and I've experienced the prior administration and what the thought process was, and now I'm the City Architect, and I understand the push back from the community, and the fact that we really want Med Buildings, and the fact that we're changing the Code to align ourselves more with the Med Bonuses and the Med style buildings.

So there's been a progression over the years, and, yes, have we made mistakes, absolutely, you know. I think that's obvious. It's built, and it's happened. But I think we've learned from them, and I think we're progressing to the point we're making the

59

buildings better and more in tune with, I think, what we all want.

MR. KAWALERSKI: Is there something in here that we can prevent a shop drawing from being changed after it goes through the process?

MR. RIESCO: Well, that's already been addressed. There was a time when the City Architect, Staff, did not review shop drawings. It only went to building and structural. And so now we've made that adjustment, and now it comes to the City Architect Staff, and we all review it.

And what my Staff typically does, or if I review -- I typically handle the larger projects personally, because they're more complex, but my Staff is also trained in the fact that, you know, we get a shop drawing for windows, we've got to go back to the BOA approved record archived drawings, see what's on there. If it's a sliding door on there, our hands are tied. If the board made the concession or made the whatever or missed it or did it intentionally, I'm not sure, but -- you know, that's the procedure we have in place today.

60

1 So that issue of somebody approving a shop
2 drawing or changing it, should not happen,
3 because everything is based on the prior
4 approval that's already in place.

5 MS. GARCIA: In addition to that, Number 12
6 now prohibits those types of windows and doors,
7 just to be clear.

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, Jennifer, one of
9 the discussions that we had the last time that
10 we were here was the fact of how much space you
11 need in a balcony to go ahead and do a French
12 style door, to open up, as opposed to a sliding
13 door.

14 And I think one of the discussions we also
15 had was, if you have a building that's ten
16 stories high, do you really see that division
17 line?

18 MR. RIESCO: And to further that
19 discussion, there's also terraces and balconies
20 that are inset really deeply. A lot of people
21 are now requiring big terraces, outdoor spaces,
22 for outdoor kitchens, for families, whatever.
23 The dynamic has changed, where now we're
24 getting into the larger units, four bedrooms,
25 five bedrooms, larger families living in these

61

1 multi-story buildings. So we've had that
2 discussion internally, hey, you know, the
3 concept of a sliding door, the Nana door,
4 everybody likes the big openings. You know,
5 nobody wants a little six-foot door, open the
6 door and I'm in my terrace that's 30 feet wide,
7 and I only have a six-foot opening. I want to
8 open up the entire facade to create this
9 indoor/outdoor space.

10 So we're struggling with it and we're
11 trying to make criteria that would help us, you
12 know -- for example, on a deep balcony that's
13 fifteen, twenty feet deep, that's really not
14 perceivable from the edge of the building.

15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But how do you
16 handle -- let's say you've got twelve feet
17 interior, how do you handle that door, that
18 swing on a twelve-foot door, to be able to open
19 up with the space?

20 MR. RIESCO: Well, like I said, there's now
21 a product called a Nana door, that's a complete
22 opening. I don't know if you've been familiar
23 with that. It's a French door.

24 MR. BEHAR: A folding door.

25 MR. RIESCO: It's a folding door, like a

62

1 bifold in a closet, but it's a nice French
2 door, framed glass. It looks just like a
3 French door.

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So that would qualify
5 under the Mediterranean --

6 MR. BEHAR: That would not comply.

7 MR. RIESCO: That's one of the discussions
8 that we've had internally. We haven't, I
9 think, finalized that directive yet.

10 MR. PARDO: The reason is because it's all
11 on the same plane.

12 MR. RIESCO: Correct. When it opens up,
13 you know, you can have a 20-foot wide opening,
14 which is beautiful, on a nice 10-story
15 building, where you could have a view of the
16 Biltmore --

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That makes sense. To
18 me, that makes sense. And the discussion --

19 MR. RIESCO: We're working with that.
20 Again, the board is very capable and very on
21 top of new products, new strategies, dealing
22 with this issue of the Med style and how can we
23 incorporate modern, new technology, new
24 materiality, new products and incorporate it
25 into these buildings and still have achieved

63

1 that look, without compromising the scenario
2 of, you know, a typical sliding door on a Med
3 building. How do we solve that problem?

4 So we, at the board, work with this stuff
5 weekly, on project per project, and we try to
6 always push the envelope and get these guys,
7 the architects, you know, to work on that
8 concept of, hey, it's easy to just put a
9 sliding door, you know, draw it in and plop it
10 in the computer and be done with it. How does
11 that sliding door affect the integrity of the
12 look of the building? And that's our charge.
13 That's how it comes back together at the end.

14 MR. KAWALERSKI: Well, that's good you
15 bring that up. Should that sort of thing be in
16 here? I mean, this is addressing sliders, but
17 what about technology where it's on the same
18 plane?

19 MR. RIESCO: And, again, I think that's
20 something that happens at the board level on a
21 weekly basis, that may or may not make it to
22 the Code until six months from now, a year from
23 now, you know, because we're always getting new
24 products, new stuff, and we're trying to
25 analyze the pros and cons and the benefits --

64

MR. PARDO: What you're doing now is, in the prerequisite, you're trying to eliminate the use of a particular product, because of a look, how it alters the facade.

MR. RIESCO: Correct.

MR. PARDO: And I think, also, Staff may have said that you are able to use them, as long as they're not seen from the street level or something like that.

MR. RIESCO: And that's another discussion, but, again, I'll give you the example of the horizontal sliding windows. I think the board has taken a position and a posture on that, and said, hey, you know, absolutely, we've seen the buildings with the horizontal rolling windows. Definitely, it's not a productive look, especially for a Med building.

On a modern building, on a modern design --

MR. PARDO: All bets are off.

MR. RIESCO: -- it's no a brainer. We can do that, we can do fixed storefronts. You know, we can go on all of those avenues, but on a Med building, that's asking for Med bonus, in our opinion, right now, that's something that we have definitely identified and said, hey,

65

that's not appropriate.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What I'm hearing is that we need to give more discretion to the Board of Architects, as opposed to defining it specifically, no this, no this, no this.

MR. RIESCO: Well, we don't want to be a prescriptive Code, either. We don't want to tie people's hands and say, hey, do A, B, C and that's it. We want creativity. We want architects to push the envelope, to come up with ideas and to impress us and say, hey, guys, this is what we want to do, and then let these guys make the final call, but we don't want to tie their hands.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct.

MR. RIESCO: Because then we're going to get redundancy and mediocre work --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Agreed.

MR. RIESCO: -- because nobody's pushing the envelope.

MR. BEHAR: Juan --

MR. RIESCO: We need to be real careful on how we handle this, because we don't want to go down the rabbit hole and get into a dead end, and, then, all of a sudden, --

66

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. RIESCO: That's one thing we don't want. I have learned that in 35 years of practice, that you don't want to do that.

MR. KILIDJIAN: Yeah, it's very hard to codify good architecture.

MR. RIESCO: Yes.

MR. BEHAR: Juan, you just mentioned fixed storefront, right, but the example that I brought up here, which is the Allen Morris new building on University --

MR. RIESCO: Yeah, Ponce Park.

MR. BEHAR: On Ponce, which is a very nice building, I think it went through, but that has fixed storefront, right?

MR. RIESCO: Fixed storefront windows in the units or --

MR. BEHAR: In the building, yeah, I mean, which I think is great. I think, what they did, they set it back.

MR. RIESCO: It's casement, because we pushed fixed casements, not --

MR. BEHAR: This, at least from the rendering, it doesn't look to be fixed casements.

67

MR. RIESCO: And again, Robert, that may be on the design, in the preliminary, but there's also the next tier, which is the construction documents, which I personally am involved in all of those projects, and I review for that type of stuff. I look really carefully at it.

And if the board approves something that, again, is not on the plan --

MR. BEHAR: By the way, I have no issues whatsoever. I think it's great, okay.

MR. PARDO: And by the way, you know, easily, my daughter in Chicago lives in a Midtown town row classic skyscraper, and it has storefront, built seventy years ago, and it has the storefront and then it has a Hopper window down below, and that building looks like it was designed yesterday. It's a classic, to say the least. So what I'm saying is that --

MR. RIESCO: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

MR. PARDO: -- I agree with the BOA in the prerequisites of saying, look, you know, don't use this. Whether you want to give them the option of using it around the back side, where you can't see it --

MR. RIESCO: No. No. That's something

68

1 that's applicable more to residential work,
2 smaller scale, and it's a resident and it's not
3 a developer that's building a monster, a
4 300,000 square foot building.

5 MR. PARDO: Right. Right. Right.

6 MR. RIESCO: We give a little bit more
7 leeway to our residents in regards to windows,
8 for example, but that's a great example where
9 we do that. You know, we understand the
10 casement window is a superior product, in terms
11 of the looks and the aesthetics, but it's also
12 more expensive and more costly.

13 So, on a resident level, there's a
14 different dynamic than a commercial project.
15 So we do allow that, on a residential, on the
16 rear sides of the houses, on the side yard,
17 where it's not seen from the street. We try to
18 work with that, because we know that there's a
19 big difference between a \$50,000 window package
20 and a 25,000 window package, and some residents
21 can't get to that \$50,000 level.

22 So we, you know, negotiate, to a certain
23 extent, and I think that's very reasonable, as
24 long as we don't compromise the public realm,
25 which is the front of the house.

69

1 depth, which a lot of the platted lots in the
2 Gables are a hundred feet. Then you will not
3 be able to do the liner, the setbacks and get a
4 garage that is --

5 MR. KILIDDJIAN: But this is also part of
6 the six or eight out of twelve, right?

7 MS. GARCIA: Yes.

8 MR. KILIDDJIAN: So it's one that you may
9 not have to check. I think that --

10 MR. BEHAR: But the example of Glenn's
11 project --

12 MR. PARDO: Glenn's project, that just came
13 in, the Alhambra Circle one.

14 MR. BEHAR: You know, he did a great job.

15 MR. PARDO: He basically had a site that
16 was almost --

17 MR. RIESCO: Next to Gables Elementary? 33
18 Alhambra?

19 MR. PARDO: Yes. It's very tough to do it
20 all of the way around.

21 MR. RIESCO: Four fronts --

22 MR. BEHAR: I think, we're -- you don't
23 need to check it off, but where feasible, you
24 do it, and I think he did it where it was
25 feasible for him.

71

1 MR. PARDO: Right.

2 MR. RIESCO: So, again, we try really hard
3 to see both sides of the equation.

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.

5 MR. RIESCO: But on commercial products,
6 it's different. There's a lot more scrutiny
7 and there's a lot tighter reigns on that,
8 because we understand that it's a for profit
9 project, and it's not somebody's personal
10 residence.

11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Robert.

12 MR. BEHAR: My next comment is, on Bonus 1,
13 Level 1 requirements, Number 2, where it says,
14 "Any storage of vehicles or off-street parking
15 that is above grade should occur behind
16 habitable space provided" --

17 MR. PARDO: What page are you on?

18 MR. BEHAR: 15. At least -- 15.

19 What I'm saying is to add, "where
20 feasible," just to make sure, because this
21 specifically says, "Any storage of vehicles or
22 off-street parking must occur behind habitable
23 space."

24 All I'm saying, "where feasible," because
25 you have a lot which is a hundred foot in

70

1 MR. RIESCO: And, again, I think that's up
2 to the discretion of the board and the design
3 and the inherent features of the site, the
4 project.

5 MR. BEHAR: But have you read the language
6 here? It says, mandatory, that you have to do
7 it. This is my point.

8 MR. PARDO: No, where feasible, I think
9 should be added.

10 MR. BEHAR: Yeah. This is mandatory. All
11 I'm saying is to add, where feasible. That
12 gives the option that Glenn bought in.

13 MR. PARDO: Right, a hundred percent.

14 MR. BEHAR: Okay.

15 MS. GARCIA: So I have to ask, again, so if
16 they move forward with the Board of Architects
17 and it's not feasible, do they check that off
18 and get a point for that? Because if you add
19 the word, when feasible, then they're going to
20 have that as one of their criteria that they
21 meet?

22 MR. RIESCO: Right. If it's not feasible
23 for them, they don't check that one off.
24 That's the reason why we do what we do. We
25 don't require all twelve. You're only required

72

eight. So you can negotiate with your client your budget, your issues, and say, "Hey, I can do these eight, but I can't do that one."

MS. SUAREZ: Right, if it's not feasible --

MR. RIESCO: Any time you buy a property --

MR. KILIDDJIAN: And I agree with him. The hundred foot property, it's impossible to do it. I agree with you a hundred percent.

MR. BEHAR: But then you don't --

MS. SUAREZ: You wouldn't be able to satisfy that. You're not required to satisfy that one.

MR. BEHAR: Will you be able to get all of the other eight? You may not be able to do it.

MS. SUAREZ: Then you would not be able to --

MR. BEHAR: Then you can't get the bonus.

MS. SUAREZ: Right.

MR. RIESCO: That's why the architect makes the big bucks. He's got to figure out the problem. But, again, Robert, maybe the real answer there is, this property of a hundred foot depth is not appropriate for this one commercial building, where I need to put a parking garage. I think --

MR. BEHAR: Juan, with all due respect,

73

that comment, to me, is -- you know, really, on a hundred foot property, that you're in, in most of the Gables, it's not appropriate to do a commercial project?

MR. RIESCO: A parking garage, where you need depth to be able to park cars 90 degrees on both sides of the driveway. You can do it, Robert. You can do a lot of things.

MR. BEHAR: Then it means that you're going to do a one story, because you won't be able to circulate on the garage, right? I mean --

MR. KILIDDJIAN: But, again, you could do the garage without the liners. You just don't check that mark. I guess -- I don't know if you've put one of your projects through these 12 to see --

MR. RIESCO: It's not one of the criteria that can help me, so I don't use it. I use the other eight that will help me. I mean, that's just part of the strategy.

MR. KAWALERSKI: But, Jennifer, I think you have a good point. That was a good question.

MR. RIESCO: Yeah, you don't add, "Where feasible." You just don't use it.

MS. GARCIA: The concern is that, if you

74

have the entire block, and you can only line a portion of that block, we can add something in that says, "For the front street," for example.

MR. BEHAR: On the primary street or something --

MR. RIESCO: Maybe that's the answer.

MR. BEHAR: But you cannot say completely off, because --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, you guys are all talking at once, and --

MR. RIESCO: I'm sorry about that. I just had a Board of Architects' meeting that was five hours long and there was a level or arguing, so I'm sorry. I'll back off a little bit.

But I think maybe that's the answer.

Maybe, if you have a site that's an island, like Glenn's project, that has four facades, maybe we add verbiage that says, two frontages, one frontage. You know, we understand that there's a front and there's a back, and people have front faces and back -- you know, so not everything could be beautiful on all sides. So apply the same mentality --

MR. BEHAR: And the last comment is, like

75

the back of house, you know, if you have only one street, and there may be only one street, you have no choice, but you have to put that FPL vault right in the front. So there was a section here that talked about back of house, towards the back of the property. If you have an alley, I think it's --

MR. RIESCO: A no brainer.

MR. BEHAR: A no brainer, but if you don't have an alley, you have no choice.

MR. RIESCO: But I think, Robert, what we're trying to get at is to get the architect's attention to these things, like transformers, double detector check valves. You know, all of the infrastructure stuff that's required in projects, arbitrarily gets delegated to engineers, and all of sudden, I'm walking down a sidewalk, and I'm looking at these beautiful painted red backflow preventers, and the only reason it's there is because the draftsman for the engineer who did the piping put it there.

MR. BEHAR: Not necessarily.

MR. PARDO: Not always. Sometimes --

MR. RIESCO: No, I know not always, but

76

1 trust me, I do this on a daily basis, I'm
2 reviewing these things, and I talk to the
3 architects, in hindsight, because some of these
4 projects have gotten ahead of me or were here
5 before I was, and I ask them, "Why did you guys
6 decide to put the backflow preventer there?"

7 For example, the Venera project has that
8 issue. I was filming, walking a sidewalk on
9 that project, and I ran into the backflow, and
10 I said, who, in their right mind, would put a
11 backflow in the middle of a sidewalk? And
12 nobody thought, it could be recessed, it could
13 be alcoved, it can be put in the service dock,
14 where the service -- so there's ways around it.

15 I know we have to negotiate with the Fire
16 Department people, and, again, we do it daily
17 in my office. I'm constantly talking to the
18 Fire Department and trying to figure out, hey,
19 can we move this? Can we screen it a little
20 bit? You can set it back and recess it. Can I
21 do it vertically instead of horizontally?

22 You know, there's always five ways to skin
23 the cat, but to notoriously allow people who
24 don't pay attention to that -- and that's
25 something that has come to the forefront in the

77

1 last five or six years, again, that has come
2 before me, because I'm the City Architect, and
3 everybody comes to me and says, "Hey, I've got
4 a problem. How do I fix it?" So we try to
5 figure these things out. So these things are
6 on our radar now.

7 My Board of Architects, "Like guys, ask
8 them where the equipment is, ask them where the
9 switchgear is, where is the meter, where is the
10 transformer, where is" -- you know, because,
11 again, you know, we're looking at projects
12 twenty minutes, half an hour, sometimes 45
13 minutes.

14 MR. PARDO: Do you know where the David
15 Williams --

16 MR. RIESCO: Yes.

17 MR. PARDO: -- FPL transformer is?

18 MR. RIESCO: No. No. No. I don't know.

19 MR. PARDO: It's on top of the roof.

20 MR. RIESCO: On top of the roof?

21 MR. PARDO: On top of the roof.

22 MR. RIESCO: Wow.

23 MR. PARDO: And they had problems there.
24 To get to that, it was absolutely unbelievable.
25 The problem is that today, with FPL, you would

78

1 never --

2 MR. BEHAR: You can't negotiate with them.

3 MR. RIESCO: No. No. FPL is very tough to
4 negotiate with. I do it, again, weekly. I
5 have to make that call to the engineer, you
6 know, why here, can we -- we just went through
7 it on The Village. Jennifer and I went through
8 it on The Village project with an ATT
9 switchgear box, that's a monster, that's
10 six-foot tall, and they want to put it right in
11 the front of the building. No.

12 "Can we find a better -- on the corner,
13 where there's a garage or something, that's a
14 service entrance, an alley, a driveway,
15 something, to get it off the main presence of
16 the building?"

17 So there's things that we can do, and,
18 again, we try very hard, and I know my board
19 does it very good. On a weekly basis, they are
20 all over these things. There's a lot of
21 information in this Code that you guys have
22 brought to light, that I think is great
23 ammunition for them to use moving forward, but
24 these things are discussed all of the time in
25 our board meetings, and I want to give you guys

79

1 that comfort level.

2 I know that you have issues with buildings
3 that have been built and that don't look great
4 and have problems, but I think the awareness is
5 there, and I think that's the most important
6 thing that we've done, is bringing this thing
7 to light and say, "Guys, we need to pay
8 attention to these things that keep recurring,"
9 and we're fixing them. You know, we're working
10 on it really hard, on a weekly basis, and these
11 guys are all over that.

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

13 Felix.

14 MR. PARDO: Just going back for a minute,
15 you know, after the prerequisites, we're going
16 to Level 1. You have to get six out of twelve.
17 Why not ten out of twelve, eight out of twelve?
18 Why six out of twelve? Because I think what's
19 happened is, this is the same number that has
20 been used in the past --

21 MS. GARCIA: Correct.

22 MR. PARDO: -- but now it's been refined,
23 and refined and refined, where you can get --

24 MR. KILIDJIAN: I think it is six for
25 Multi-Family and eight for mixed-use.

80

MR. PARDO: You're a hundred percent correct.

MS. GARCIA: You're correct, that --

MR. KILIDDJIAN: And the credit is not the full credit. So it's incremental.

MR. PARDO: Okay. If you feel comfortable with that.

MR. KILIDDJIAN: Yeah, it's incremental. And that's to Robert's point, I mean, that's one box you don't check, but you're checking all of the other boxes.

MR. PARDO: You've taken a lot of the things out of the boxes that were --

MR. KILIDDJIAN: Yeah, but a lot of things have been put in the prerequisites, which were not there before. So you're starting off with a much better building to begin with.

MR. PARDO: Correct.

MR. KILIDDJIAN: I think Juan is right, the tools that have been implemented in this round, and it's taken a while, but I think the buildings are going to start off at a better -- you know, at a better baseline.

MR. PARDO: I agree with you, and on the next page after Robert was, on sustainability,

81

I don't think it should be a bonus element. I think it should be more like what the City of Miami, City of Hollywood, Miami Beach does, where it becomes, you know, if you have a project of a certain size, you know, you must do it, but I don't think that --

MR. BEHAR: Isn't that part of the Code already, of the Florida Building Code, that have you have to have --

MR. PARDO: There are certain elements of sustainability that are there, but I know what Staff is looking for is more of, when you look at all of the elements, Robert, there are more of a green -- you know, qualifying for green capability.

MR. BEHAR: But I think, in the County, for example, every building has to be, minimum, is it a Silver certification, you know, building?

MR. PARDO: I don't think so. I don't think so. And the reason I'm almost sure --

MR. BEHAR: I think it is, because --

MR. PARDO: -- that it's not in the Florida Building Code, that it has to be in the Zoning Code, is because we have, you know, 150 jurisdictions in the State of Florida which use

82

the Florida Building Code.

MR. KILIDDJIAN: Yes. So, I think, for example, that (R) requires -- the sustainability is in the zoning element, if you're in the redevelopment district.

You know, there are parts -- there are some areas that have it already in the --

MS. GARCIA: But it's based on the size of the property that triggers LEED or comparable designation.

MR. PARDO: Right. Well, the point I'm trying to make is, I'm just saying, sustainability doesn't look Mediterranean. You know, I'm just saying --

MR. RIESCO: I would agree with that.

MR. PARDO: -- pull that out of here and put it somewhere else and still achieve what you want to achieve, like everybody else does. And like I said, you know, all of the different jurisdictions have their own different things, but, I mean, for me, I want to see something physically that helps the building look more --

MR. BEHAR: I don't think it's a prerequisite. I think it's a -- listen, the truth of the matter, in all of your components

83

that you're using in a building today, you're going to be a hundred percent or 95 percent there.

MR. PARDO: Right, but, you know, you go through it all of the time, and the thing is that, for example, you know, we're doing a building and then, you know, we're complying, we have people that will certify the building to a certain level, et cetera, but normally what happens is, there's a threshold, as you said, the size of the building, which you have a bigger carbon footprint, then you go from there.

And what I'm just trying to say is that one thing has nothing to do with the other.

MR. RIESCO: I concur with your analysis also.

MR. PARDO: I don't think it belongs --

MR. RIESCO: It shouldn't be a part of a Med Bonus requirement. It's a different animal.

MR. BEHAR: It should -- we're going to be in agreement. It should not be there.

MR. PARDO: Twice. Twice.

MR. RIESCO: Yeah. Yeah.

84

MR. BEHAR: And once with Juan.

MR. RIESCO: Yeah. No, I agree a hundred percent, wholeheartedly.

MR. PARDO: And, then, one of the things that I didn't quite understand is the next one, Number 7, on Page 16, "Each Multi-Family zoned property shall provide at least 20 percent of the required ground level landscaped open area percentage based upon total lot area, as publicly accessible."

What is average size of the required ground level landscaped area, if you can?

MS. GARCIA: So Multi-Family usually is a requirement of 25 percent open space.

MR. PARDO: So, for example, let's say that we have a 100 by 200 feet, which is 20,000 square feet. 20,000 square feet, times 25, 5,000 square feet. 20 percent of that, which is 1,000 square feet, has to be accessible to the public. That's on 100 by 200 feet, which is a pretty good size, you know, average.

Okay. So if you reduce that by, what, half, that's 500 square feet for public access. Can you explain what the open area, as publicly accessible means?

85

MS. GARCIA: Right. So 25 percent, in our Zoning Code, is a requirement for Multi-Family, for it to be open space.

MR. PARDO: Right.

MS. GARCIA: 20 percent of that space needs to be in the front yard. So what this is saying is that the 20 percent that's already required to be in the front yard would be publicly accessible.

MR. PARDO: Okay. Because it doesn't give you the location, and this is the point I'm trying to get to. Back in the day, you know, we had green -- is it something I said?

MR. WITHERS: Yeah. Just go on.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Felix, if I may, before you continue, I just want to make note, for the record, that Chip Withers had to leave and we are now one, two, three, four Board Members here. Thank you.

Continue.

MR. PARDO: Thank you.

So, back in the day, our setbacks were larger, and now our setbacks have become minimized.

MS. GARCIA: Uh-huh.

86

MR. PARDO: And now what we're saying is, there's going to be public accessibility, you know, to this minimized, you know --

MS. GARCIA: As an option, sure.

MR. PARDO: As an option.

MS. GARCIA: Right. In areas that don't have a lot of open space.

MR. PARDO: What I'm trying to figure in my mind is, what is the design ramification of putting that in there? In other words, you know, one thing is to say, I did the formula, another thing is to, you know, put it to test. I don't see the advantage.

MR. RIESCO: Is the intent maybe that you don't fence it or enclose it or that's not allowed in Multi-Family?

MS. GARCIA: As well. Multi-Family usually has limited access to parks, right. There's a lot of people living in the same area, and they only have one large park, so it's allowing your neighbors to use the front area for (Unintelligible) --

MR. PARDO: The point I'm trying to make is, one of your typical buildings -- you say, what, ten feet is your front setback?

87

Okay. So now I'm doing the calculation. Now I've got 10 feet, times 200 feet, that's 2,000 square feet. So, by the time you put the driveways in, to have access to the parking structure and everything else, what is the public benefit to providing this, because it's almost like it becomes almost like a base number? In other words, you already have -- what I'm trying to say is, how is this providing, you know, that Mediterranean component for a Level 1 or a Level 2? You know, what is it?

And the reason I struggle with this is, you know, be careful what you wish for. Our setbacks now are so minimal that the people that are occupying these buildings don't have any green space. So, therefore, now the big thing is, well, we're going to give them more height, if they give us a park. Then the parks are minimized, but the height isn't.

So what I can't wrap my head around is, I can't understand how this has become an incentive for the style of the architecture, unless you said, "Well, there have to be, you know, fountains. It has to be an improvement."

88

MR. RIESCO: I think the intent maybe is for the larger projects, maybe, that 20 percent is more applicable, because you mentioned 100 by 200, and that's a small -- that's the size of a big house in the Gables.

MR. PARDO: Right.

MS. RIESCO: A hundred by two hundred is not, in my opinion, a commercial property or -- you know --

MR. BEHAR: But that's a 20,000 square foot lot.

MR. RIESCO: Right. Right.

MR. BEHAR: So you could do the 20,000.

I think the intent is, when you say, "The park," to provide more green space, you know, to leave it open, and I think one example is the one building on Valencia here, that they did a green space on the corner.

MR. RIESCO: Yeah.

MR. BEHAR: The idea is to leave that open for the public, not necessarily the 100 by 200 straight setback in front of the building.

MR. RIESCO: Right. The proportions of that park are really nice and is a nice --

MR. PARDO: Right.

89

point for my project, here's my 20 percent park area, green space," whatever you want to call it, I think the Board, at that point, would pounce and say, "Hey, what's happening there? Is it just sod? Are you doing fountains? Are you doing a trellis? Is it a covered space? Is it an open space? Is it a sitting space?"

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We had something similar to that just happen, which was, I think -- part of it was with Publix and that park.

MR. PARDO: On the back side, on Salzedo.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct, and part of it was, was it to be open space, was it not to be open space, did it have statutes, did it not have statutes.

MR. RIESCO: Correct.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: By the same token, I think, when we start looking at parks and what's the use and the programming, you know, we have a Parks and Recreation Department that also gives input to the City.

MR. RIESCO: Correct.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I just don't know if that's within our purview to state what that

91

MR. BEHAR: And to me, it makes sense, because you provide a little, you know, pocket park for the community, for the City.

MR. PARDO: Right. You're getting to my point. The point is that, if you say it's not just, you know, grass and some shrubbery there, because not much more can go in there, but now if you say, well, we're going to put benches, we're going to put --

MR. RIESCO: I think that's the intent, and that's how we amplify the look, and the Mediterranean, and a trellis, a seating area --

MR. PARDO: Juan, that's not here.

MR. RIESCO: I know. I know. I know. I understand.

MR. PARDO: Now, if you're saying, we're going to provide the benches and we're going to provide, you know, the hardscape and we're going to provide the fountains and things like that -- I know that was the original intent.

MR. RIESCO: And, again, Felix, I would say that this scenario, if brought to us from an applicant on a substantially large project or larger project than 100 by 200, where they would dedicate and say, "Hey, I'm using this

90

park should be, as far as whether it should be a passive park, an active park or a dog park.

MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, the biggest problem I have with this is that, when I look at the computations, et cetera, there's -- if you add a fountain, and you have it in the right style, and you have the right design, it could be very complementary to Mediterranean architecture. Right now there's nothing. There's nothing that you're getting back, that augments and enhances the style of architecture that you're promoting. That's my problem.

MS. GARCIA: So we can add, you know, "Make sure you have improvements such as seating or fountains or" --

MR. RIESCO: Fountains, trellises --

MR. PARDO: Please, please, not bicycle racks, not this, not that. You know, it's not -- no, it's not intended at anyone. What I'm saying is that, for God sake, if -- although I am -- you know, one of the positive things that you do see at The Plaza is that you see amenities at the ground level --

MR. RIESCO: A lot.

MR. PARDO: -- that are substantial, that

92

1 do enhance. So that is something that you can
2 codify, to give an improvement and a check-off,
3 but it should be complementary, not a technical
4 thing, such as a bicycle rack --

5 MR. RIESCO: Right.

6 MR. PARDO: -- or just a bench. No, it has
7 to be seating, things that are --

8 MR. RIESCO: -- contributing to the
9 Mediterranean ambiance.

10 MR. BEHAR: No, to the public realm. I
11 mean, because, at the end of the day, you want
12 to do something that's beneficial, you know, to
13 the neighborhood, not necessarily -- because,
14 you know, the style of fountain should not
15 be -- you know, I prefer -- and by the way,
16 typically, in a 20,000 square foot lot, you
17 don't have that many options to provide a park.
18 You know, that happens on the larger projects.

19 MR. RIESCO: That's the point. It has to
20 be a larger project.

21 MR. PARDO: But that urban component, many
22 years ago, with the Bank of Coral Gables, on
23 Almeria, we provided some little areas, just
24 enough push and pull, where it gives you and it
25 enhances that.

93

1 MR. PARDO: And, you know, you have your
2 parallel parking and you have your landscaping
3 there. So now you provided, you know, a
4 beautiful fountain, which is illuminated at
5 night. Now you're walking your dog at night,
6 you know, and you see this, and this is
7 something that is open to the public and
8 someone could sit down and catch their breath
9 or just enjoy the evening. If you do it in the
10 right style, you feel like it's part of the
11 architecture.

12 So not just taking a piece of artwork and
13 just sticking it there. What you're doing is,
14 you're incorporating elements that are part of
15 this particular open space, that enhances the
16 quality of that architecture. So it should be
17 compatible --

18 MR. BEHAR: But, you know, Felix, not
19 necessarily -- I think that each little park
20 should not have a prescriptive that you have to
21 do this. Because look at what happened, you
22 know, in a time in Coral Gables, every building
23 had a copula, okay. You know, I don't think --
24 I think that the park should be -- each park
25 should be -- you know, has its own identity.

95

1 If you walk through the streets of Granada,
2 and you see these little elements throughout
3 there, there's absolutely no doubt -- and we're
4 talking about centuries and centuries and
5 centuries of development, which from one people
6 to another people, it just augmented the
7 architecture and complemented it.

8 This doesn't say that, and it should say
9 it. Not just, you know, an improvement, but
10 something for the Board of Architects to see
11 and say, "This is what we're looking for," to
12 be able to make it a better and a complementary
13 type of thing, and this is at the ground level
14 scale, which is extremely important.

15 MR. RIESCO: Absolutely, the landscape.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Felix, should that
17 park be compatible with the building or should
18 that park be compatible with the neighborhood?
19 Which, to me, when a developer donates or gives
20 a park or does a park, it's meant to be used by
21 the surrounding neighborhood, because it's
22 lacking green space or it's lacking a park.

23 MR. PARDO: But, also, you're -- say you're
24 walking down the public sidewalk.

25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.

94

1 MR. PARDO: I want to be clear, this is not
2 a park.

3 MR. RIESCO: Yeah, it's not a park. A
4 publicly accessible area, which means that it
5 can't be contained, it's open to the sidewalk.

6 MR. PARDO: The reason I gave you the
7 description of walking down the public
8 right-of-way sidewalk is because this is where
9 you have the ability of going into the
10 property, to make it accessible to the public,
11 making it wider and making it more of a true
12 paseo, not a hallway down the middle of a
13 building, you know, and I think that's
14 important. And, you know, I don't have to
15 explain it to you, you know exactly that these
16 elements just enhance the architecture and they
17 could be compatible with it.

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But if that's the
19 case, then should the Board of Architects at
20 the time that they're looking at the building,
21 also be looking at the design of that green
22 space, before it goes further?

23 MR. PARDO: Well, I mean, the architect has
24 already provided a design for the Board of
25 Architects.

96

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Right, but at what stage? At what point does that park get looked at?

MR. RIESCO: I think, at the BOA level.

MR. PARDO: At the very beginning.

MR. RIESCO: Yeah, we're very comfortable with that and we expect that. We don't want somebody to just show a site plan and not show anything there. We want to see what the intent is, what is the use, what's the activity, what are you trying to do here.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I'm okay with that.

MR. RIESCO: And I think that's, again, what the board does.

MR. PARDO: And, you know, that could be easily incorporated into the grand entrance of the building.

MR. RIESCO: Absolutely. Absolutely.

MR. PARDO: I mean, it could be done in so many different ways, sum and scale, but I think it's important to be very specific about the improvement that is made to enhance, you know, that experience.

MS. GARCIA: Yes, we can add that in. Yeah.

97

item is there for the project that doesn't have the ability of the open space because of the site constraints?

MS. GARCIA: No. No. No. They still have to meet their open space requirement.

MR. RIESCO: They still have to do this? So this is in excess of that?

MR. GARCIA: Yeah.

MR. PARDO: And, again, I just don't see the checking off of this element to enhance, you know, for a Med Bonus.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What do you think the reason that it was put there in the first place was?

MR. PARDO: I don't want to --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You've been around the City a long time.

MR. PARDO: No, I don't want to go there. I think, you know -- for me, one of the subjects that has been continually an issue for me is the PAD, right. So the PAD was put in for a certain reason, which was specifically the Douglas Entrance project. And, then, for dozens of years, it wasn't touched.

Now a PAD is used for everything, and,

99

MR. PARDO: Okay. And, then, the open space fund, which is the next one.

MR. RIESCO: The open space fund?

MR. PARDO: Fund. In other words, you know, here's a check and check it off. I don't think -- you know, again, that doesn't enhance the architecture in any way, shape or form, you know, stroking a check to put it into a fund, you know, and God knows if or where it was used.

I feel like this -- like impact fees, you know, every time we pull a permit, we pay hundreds of thousands, millions sometimes, for impact fees. We don't know where the money is going. Where is the improvement? Where is the enhancement? Where is the offset? So I don't think that this should be an item. I think Staff could come up with a better item than this, in my opinion, and I think that, you know, contributions, you know, for things like this, you know, that could happen, you know, at the Commission level, but that has nothing to do with the Board of Architects or the style of the building or the bonuses, in my opinion.

MR. RIESCO: I'm assuming this particular

98

therefore, variances are not required. So you don't have to go to the Board of Adjustment for variances, because you're using a PAD. The PAD was put in specifically to be able to do something like redo the Douglas Entrance and save it the way it was, but now it's become like a normal thing.

So what was the reason? That was the reason, on that specific subject. What is the reason here? I think that we have an issue in the City that has to do with a lack of parks that we have, but that's a different issue. That should be an issue that should be a discussion by the Commission, you know, and the Parks and Recreation Board or whatever, but I don't think this has anything to do with the style or the architecture, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But when a check is written for that, to check that off, where does the funds go?

MS. GARCIA: So there is a Parks Acquisition Fund that it would go into, and it would probably be earmarked that it came from Med Bonus criteria, to be --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What could it be used

100

for?

MS. GARCIA: -- used adjacent to Multi-Family or Mixed-Use districts. That's the intent.

MR. PARDO: And, again, the question is, what did you do to improve that and make it a better Mediterranean style building?

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But aren't you, then, using those funds to improve other neighborhoods or other areas that actually need it?

MR. PARDO: I agree conceptually with what you're talking about, but it's like sustainability. One thing has nothing to do with the style of the architecture. It has nothing to do with it. The previous one, if you do the improvements, et cetera, then you're talking about something completely different.

MR. BEHAR: I understand, and, you know, it doesn't improve the --

MR. RIESCO: Indirectly, it does.

MR. BEHAR: But it does indirectly.

MR. RIESCO: It improves the City, the overall context, the broader context. I think that's the answer. If that's valid or not,

101

that's what it's doing. Again, there's an improvement down the road somewhere, maybe across the street --

MR. BEHAR: It may not be project specific.

MR. RIESCO: -- not specific to this guy --

MR. PARDO: But we're not talking about the style of architecture.

MR. RIESCO: Agreed. Agreed.

MR. PARDO: Remember, Med Bonus, what's the outcry? Med Bonus for Med architecture.

MR. RIESCO: Correct.

MR. PARDO: Now it's like, you know, put money in a fund and you get to check this off. It has nothing to do with the style of the architecture.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But it's a vehicle to get funds --

MR. PARDO: Without a doubt.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- in areas where it's needed.

MR. RIESCO: Kind of like the art in public spaces. You charge one percent, and gets put into a fund, and that gets put somewhere. It may not be on your project, it may not be on your block, but it amplifies and beautifies the

102

City.

MR. PARDO: I'm glad you said that. We have a tree fund in this City. I know the amount of money that's in the tree fund. My question is, where are the trees going? Where's the accountability for that?

So the point is, here, we're discussing -- it's the same thing as if we put something for additional trees, wait a minute, what does that have to do with the style of architecture? Nothing. I mean, this is -- the Board of Architects is looking for, give me tools, to be able to make sure that the architecture is really good and it's really Mediterranean inspired, et cetera, et cetera. It has nothing to do with, you know, putting money away to do something somewhere, which God knows where, and it goes back just the same as the impact fees.

MR. KAWALERSKI: Yeah, I agree. I mean, writing a check is simple, but it doesn't do anything for this project.

MR. RIESCO: Again, I guess, it's not a requirement. It's one of the ones that you may or may not use. It gives somebody an alternative, that may not have any other

103

options. I don't know. Again, I'm not justifying it. I think I understand your point -- I don't think, I do understand your point, but --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, point well-taken. Let's move on.

MR. PARDO: Okay. The next page, the sidewalks, plazas and courtyards -- page 17, Number 9, the Sidewalks, Plazas and Courtyards, a minimum of 25 percent, it kind of trails off. Did you mean to say -- can you say of what -- 25 percent of what?

MS. GARCIA: So we can add back in, the total ground level paving area, if that's needed. That's fine.

MR. PARDO: So it says, "Sidewalks, plazas and courtyards, minimum of 25 percent," of the lot area, of the required --

MS. GARCIA: Well, you can and the area that was crossed out. It says of total ground level paving surface.

MR. PARDO: Oh, it should not have been crossed out.

MS. GARCIA: Yes, you can see that, right? Yeah.

104

MR. PARDO: Okay. So it should have stayed in there?

MS. GARCIA: We can put that on.

MR. PARDO: Got it.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So that was a strike-out.

MR. PARDO: Yes. The strike-out wasn't intentional.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Striko, instead of a typo.

MR. RIESCO: Now, this is right-of-way or is this public property -- private property?

MR. PARDO: Private property.

MR. RIESCO: Private property, right?

MR. PARDO: Yes.

MR. RIESCO: So why is Public Works the decision-making factor and BOA?

MS. GARCIA: I think this is everything. This is sidewalks; sidewalks, plazas and courtyards. Plazas and courtyards are typically impact property. Sidewalks are outside.

MR. RIESCO: That's why I'm asking.

MR. PARDO: I agree with the City Architect. I think it should be a co-approval.

105

MR. RIESCO: I mean, if it's a plaza, if it's a courtyard, it's mine, it's in my domain. If it's in the right-of-way, I give it up to Public Works all of the time. I don't necessarily agree with it, but I have no choice.

MR. PARDO: And the reason I don't, either, is because, you know, here we go again, street lighting -- you know, all of these different things -- come on. I mean, it's just -- we have the BOA. I don't think anyone in Public Works is going to say, "No, we don't want to hear their opinion." I think that's the best thing we could do, is add them in there to it.

MR. RIESCO: So that should be under the jurisdiction of the BOA, pavement, hardscape.

MR. PARDO: Back in the day, it was in there.

MR. BEHAR: And, typically, it is. I think, when you go in for -- you know, for a project, you're showing --

MR. PARDO: You're right.

MR. BEHAR: -- you know, all of the plazas and everything. You know, I think that's the BOA.

106

MS. SUAREZ: I think it's probably there for the sidewalks.

MR. RIESCO: It sounds -- we actually have a requirement for a material board. They have to have physical samples of what they're proposing.

MR. PARDO: That's right.

MR. RIESCO: So, again, that's already included in the deal. We have that.

MR. BEHAR: It's already there.

MR. PARDO: Yeah, but the way this is written --

MR. RIESCO: No, I know. That's why --

MR. PARDO: This is what happens when you add things, and you add things, and add things. You make one change, and, then, all of a sudden, it doesn't make sense later on, and then somebody makes a wild interpretation.

MR. RIESCO: Yeah, I know. That's why I mentioned it.

MR. PARDO: And by the way, the reason the City has Coral Gables beige sidewalks is not because of a civil engineer, it's because of the original architects that designed the City.

So if you go down to Number 10, Public Art,

107

so when you look at public art, we have the Art in Public Places already there, right? So why would you add public art there, as one of the needed requirements, when it's already part of the statutes that we have to comply with public art?

MS. SUAREZ: Can I chime in --

MR. RIESCO: I think the logic is, the Art in Public Places domain is the artwork, and the Board of Architects' domain is the context around the artwork and where it goes and how it's situated and how it's placed. I think that's the logic.

MS. SUAREZ: And just to be clear, the Art in Public Places requirement is payment of the Art in Public Places fee, and so an applicant can seek a waiver of the fee by then including the artwork in their project, which has to go through the process for including the artwork on the project, but you can just pay the fee and not have the public art on your project.

So this would be if you -- I guess, you know, to satisfy that one, it would be public art incorporated into your project.

MR. RIESCO: Which is the design --

108

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You wouldn't be allowed to use the fee as a checkmark?

MS. SUAREZ: Right. I think that's what the intent of that is, unless, Jennifer, was a different -- this is the existing language, as well, to be clear.

MR. PARDO: Right. I mean, once you see, public, it seems like all bets are off there.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would this be like what you were saying about artwork or a fountain or something that blends better into the project?

MR. RIESCO: It would be integrated. That's what we want. We're trying to get cohesion between the art in public places and the BOA.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Because if they want to use this, even if they want to pay for art in public places and they use this checkmark, I assume they also have to use public art within their project?

MR. RIESCO: Oh, yeah.

MR. PARDO: Let me just jump off for a minute, expanded sidewalks, widths beyond the property line; you mean, within private

109

property, correct?

MS. GARCIA: Where?

MR. PARDO: If you look at (B) --

MS. GARCIA: Oh, again, existing language. So I guess within the private property --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Expanded sidewalk widths may be within the right-of-way or something?

MR. PARDO: Within the private property line? Where is this supposed to be?

MS. GARCIA: I think it's within the private property line. I'm assuming that's what it means.

MS. SUAREZ: We can go back and see, you know, the context for this, because it's existing language.

MS. GARCIA: Right.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you review that, so we can see what the intent is?

MR. PARDO: Widths within the private property line.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What the intent is and --

MR. PARDO: Because I would think that, you know, if they could look at the sidewalks

110

outside or -- what do you call it -- not a bicycle lane, we called it a --

MR. KAWALERSKI: Mobility lane.

MR. PARDO: -- mobility lane, right, you know, where do you draw the line of saying this is part of the things that belong to this building?

MR. RIESCO: And maybe the intent there is maybe like a plaza or something internal to the property that kind of bleeds out into the public area.

MR. PARDO: Well, (G) is there. It says, "Water features, fountains or similar water features, ground and/or wall-mounted." But, anyway, I just wanted to make sure, because then the bottom paragraph, "Above amenities shall be consistent in design and form with the City of Coral Gables Public Works Manual, in addition to the Board of Architects' approval."

MS. GARCIA: Yeah. I mean, they're already reviewing this.

MR. PARDO: No. No. The way that it says it is, these -- you know, the last thing I need is for someone to say, "Okay. You know, we have a concrete pole. This is going to be the

111

concrete pole, and it's in the manual, you know" You could have it in the manual.

MS. GARCIA: Oh, I see.

MR. PARDO: You need to have BOA say yes or no.

MR. RIESCO: Right. Yeah.

MR. PARDO: Let's help out the civil engineers with --

MR. BEHAR: You don't want the engineers making all of the decisions.

MR. RIESCO: That's the fear. I hate to say it, but that's the reality. They look at things differently, with different criteria, and so do we. We look at it, again, from the perspective of the aesthetics and not the technical --

MR. PARDO: Right, but here, you're looking at it to be able to give --

MR. RIESCO: And, again, going back to Item B, should we say, instead of expanded sidewalk, expanded pavement, so we don't -- I'm not sure if a bigger, wider sidewalk is better than pavers or something more decorative or more ornate.

MR. BEHAR: But --

112

MR. RIESCO: No? You know, I don't know if I want to look at a 20-foot wide sidewalk in front of a building. I'd rather see a 10-foot sidewalk, that's the right-of-way, pedestrian area, and then there's pavement that's contributing to the aesthetics of the building and the site, the project, the look. Again, I'm just worried about the word sidewalks, because that implies the Coral Gables beige standard sidewalk, with the score lines at five feet. And do we want to look at that when it's 30 feet wide? Is that a positive thing or is that something that's just there?

You know, that's my perspective on that. I think the word, pavement, opens it up to interpretation. It could be concrete. It could be pavers. It could be some other material that would be conducive to a nicer product.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Are you allowed today to put pavers within the sidewalk on a project?

MR. RIESCO: On a public right-of-way?

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: On the public right-of-way.

MR. RIESCO: No, we don't -- that's

113

typically Public Works' domain.

MR. BEHAR: Yeah, that's very difficult --

MR. RIESCO: I would love to do that, but they wouldn't allow me, and they win all of the time.

MR. BEHAR: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So if a project has a driveway or something that protrudes out, for example, on residential areas, if you could do pavers --

MR. RIESCO: We're allowed to do it in residential with covenants.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct, with covenants and insurance.

MS. SUAREZ: It's a Public Works review process.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. But in commercial, you're not allowed to do it?

MR. BEHAR: I think you're allowed to do it.

MS. SUAREZ: It's Public Works --

MR. RIESCO: Probably the same thing, right, a covenant that they have to write.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So, then, if you're allowed to do it, are you saying that if you

114

have pavers in the approach and you have pavers in the driveway, the part that's the sidewalk --

MR. RIESCO: Has to go through.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- has to go through?

MR. RIESCO: I think that happened at Gables Village. I think we had that same discussion at Gables Village, where they had pavers in the driveway and we recommended pavers in the approaches. So now we have a paver, five or six feet of concrete, and then pavers. I said, no, make it all paver, and you can't do that, it's got to be concrete, blah, blah. So I lost that battle.

MS. SUAREZ: Essentially, it would be subject to Public Works' review, yeah.

MR. PARDO: So the next item, on Number 11, on the pass throughs, the only mention is -- there's no mention of height, and one of the things about these, you know, buildings and the paseos and all of this stuff is, you know, you feel like you're in a dungeon sometimes, right.

MR. RIESCO: That, again, Felix, is under the purview of the board. The board is all over that, when they look at the projects.

115

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. RIESCO: I mean, again, other projects that are built, and you're right, they have eight-foot ceilings on these paseos and they look terrible, but I can tell you that, in today's world and going back maybe four or five years, that's been heavily scrutinized by the board.

MR. PARDO: Yeah, because people are seeing what was built.

MR. RIESCO: And the height and the scale and what the ambiance is there, and so we work on that. I don't know if you want to dictate that here or maybe give a minimum, but it's well under the scrutiny of the board.

MR. PARDO: So, let's see, the last item --

MR. RIESCO: Yeah, that's part of that, that strategy. The proportional analysis is in another part of the Code. When you have an opening in a building, there's a certain width and height proportions and relationship that has to be maintained.

So, again, I think that's inherent already, but if you want to fine tune it some more --

MR. PARDO: The only thing here, Number 12,

116

1 which is the last item before Level 2, is that
2 when applicable, complete the undergrounding of
3 existing and new overhead utilities, et cetera.

4 I want to bring up Publix for just a
5 minute. Undergrounding was required. But then
6 the question became, adjacent to the building,
7 three blocks down. You know, it gets to the
8 point -- I remember those people were
9 shell-shocked, because it was not just adjacent
10 to their property, it was like going down the
11 street.

12 MR. RIESCO: That's Public Works --

13 MR. PARDO: No. No. This is -- it says,
14 "Underground utilities." This is one of the
15 things you can check off, underground
16 utilities. "When applicable" -- complete one
17 of the few things that has nothing to do with
18 the style of architecture, that I agree with,
19 because you want to get those wires down and
20 all of that, right.

21 So it says, "When applicable, complete the
22 undergrounding of the existing and new overhead
23 utilities along all public realm adjacent to
24 the building site." I think that's the way it
25 should be written. But how did we request so

117

1 much more from Publix on the undergrounding
2 there?

3 MS. GARCIA: Because that was a public
4 benefit that was suggested by Staff. So they
5 had a PAD, and they were going to have the
6 south side of the street that didn't have any
7 windows or doors facing the street --

8 MR. PARDO: Now I understand.

9 NMR. RIESCO: Which Publix are we talking
10 about?

11 MS. GARCIA: The one over here.

12 MR. RIESCO: On Le Jeune?

13 MS. GARCIA: Uh-huh.

14 MR. BEHAR: But there are some cases where
15 projects -- Public Works requires that the
16 utilities extended beyond --

17 MR. RIESCO: Yeah, like watermains, fire
18 lines. That's done all of the time.

19 MR. BEHAR: But, Juan, I did a project that
20 the watermain extension was a mile away, and
21 that's the burden of the developer?

22 MR. RIESCO: Yeah.

23 MR. BEHAR: Really?

24 MR. RIESCO: That's the price you pay for
25 building big projects. You know, that's just

118

1 the nature of the beast here in the City.

2 MR. PARDO: One of the things is that --

3 MR. RIESCO: We don't control that. That's
4 a negotiation that's done.

5 MR. PARDO: Even on Glenn Pratt's project,
6 there was an issue of a bulb out --

7 MR. RIESCO: I'm not saying it's right or
8 wrong.

9 MR. PARDO: -- whether, you know, that was
10 required at the last -- not the last minute,
11 but, you know, at the end, and they were kind
12 of squirrely about it, because they didn't
13 know what it was going to cost.

14 MR. RIESCO: Uh-huh. It's a huge impact.

15 MR. PARDO: Right. So one of those things
16 that, you know, when you're working, you know,
17 with the developer, when you're working, you
18 know, with the applicant, you know, kind -- in
19 my opinion, it's kind of (unintelligible).

20 And by the way, like I said, I was in
21 Boston recently, all of their mobility lanes
22 are green. Every single one is painted green.
23 And I don't think we have a standardized yet
24 here. But just so you know, Boston has them
25 green everywhere. I took pictures.

119

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, that's what
2 we -- if I recall, the last meeting we had, we
3 were talking about standardizing -- suggesting
4 to the Commission to standardize a mobility
5 lane.

6 MR. RIESCO: Mobility is the bike lane?

7 MR. PARDO: Yeah, the bike lane.

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We were thinking about
9 mobility, because, in today's society, it's
10 more than bikes. You've got scooters, you've
11 got anything else.

12 MR. RIESCO; Right.

13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But it should be
14 standardized, so one project doesn't have it
15 green, the other one has it yellow or so on and
16 so forth. You know, it should be looked at.

17 MR. RIESCO: So, Felix, I guess your
18 question is, is the sentence correct the way it
19 is or do you want to modify it?

20 MR. PARDO: No, no, I think it's correct
21 the way it is.

22 MR. RIESCO: Me, too.

23 MR. PARDO: But I wanted to ask Staff,
24 because of, you know, a couple of recent
25 applicants, where, you know, they --

120

MR. RIESCO: -- extended beyond the site, the building site?

MR. PARDO: Well, I mean, by the time it gets here, it becomes a condition, and then, you know, the applicant is flatfooted because they --

MR. RIESCO: -- didn't anticipate it --

MR. PARDO: Yeah, and they were -- I don't know if it was a reasonable reason for them to have heartburn or not, but they were definitely not happy. And the point is that I want to make sure, after Staff explained that because of the PAD, they could ask, you know -- and I get it, you know. Now I understand. So the wording here is consistent with that. And Mr. Chairman, that basically is Level 1.

On Level 2, I promise, I have just a few comments. And one of the things that we didn't discuss prior to is the -- we kind of discussed it the last time, and that was the Best Practices Manual, on Page 6, Number 1.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Page 6 or Page 19, Number 1?

MR. PARDO: Page Number 6, Number 1, which is the prerequisites table.

121

So, in here, it says, on the upper right-hand portion of the page, "Precedence appropriate to the proposed building shall be referred visually as provided in the Best Practice Manual or documented in the Historic American Building Survey." I think that -- that it should be online, not only for the applicant, the owner, the Board of Architects, everybody -- the public.

MR. BEHAR: It is online.

MS. GARCIA: Yeah. It's on CoralGables.com/MediterraneanDesign. You'll find it there.

MR. PARDO: It is there?

MS. GARCIA: Yes.

MR. PARDO: And, then, also --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before we continue, if we can, for the record, let's show that Javier Salman, Board Member, has joined us. I thank you for coming.

MR. PARDO: Were you able to put up all of your shutters?

MR. SALMAN: Luckily, I don't have to, but I was at a Commission Meeting, and so it went long.

122

MR. PARDO: So I'd like to jump forward to Page 24 of the Coral Gables Mediterranean Architecture Design (A). So I said that -- like I said publicly the last time, that there should be pictured examples and put on the City's website of each one of these examples.

MS. GARCIA: Yes. I'll still provide the same website, CoralGables.com/MediterraneanDesign. All of these pictures, of all of these buildings, will be there, if not plans accompanied with them, elevations, to be able to help architects.

MR. PARDO: Perfect. Thank you very much.

MR. KAWALERSKI: You know, also, the last time, Brett Gillis, a resident, had a suggestion for including another building or two as good examples.

MR. RIESCO: That we looked at?

MS. GARCIA: Yes. So that was discussed with the Board of Architects. They reviewed that, and mentioned other images, like he said, to take out and remove --

MR. RIESCO: Yeah, We went through that whole list and we vetted the Brett Gillis projects, the projects that were there, and I

123

think we came to the conclusion of, this is the final list. Yeah. I don't recall if Brett's project made it or not. I know they looked at it and they discussed it. Do you remember?

MS. GARCIA: Palm Beach --

MR. RIESCO: There was a Palm Beach project.

MS. GARCIA: What's it called?

MR. RIESCO: The Palm Beach Town Hall? Is that it?

MS. GARCIA: No. No. No. It's not on here.

MR. RIESCO: No, it's not in there. We did look at it. Javier, we did review it and said --

MR. SALMAN: Juan, can you, as an architect, come in with your own example for review?

MR. RIESCO: You can do whatever you want as an applicant, yeah.

MR. SALMAN: Yes, exactly. These are just suggestions, but the architect might find something different he can come in with, so --

MR. RIESCO: Absolutely, you can bring in whatever you feel is appropriate, and the board

124

will judge it and you'll hear the answer.

MR. SALMAN: Right.

MR. KAWALERSKI: But regarding the examples of Brett Gillis, I mean, we should get back to him or, you know, acknowledge what he suggested. Do you know if that was included?

MS. GARCIA: Yeah. So that was the same list that we had gone through back in May, I believe, at the Board of Architects.

MR. RIESCO: Yeah, that was months ago.

MR. KAWALERSKI: Okay. And they're included in here?

MS. GARCIA: Not all of them are included, because the board did not feel comfortable with all of them.

MR. RIESCO: Right.

MR. KAWALERSKI: I think he only suggested two.

MR. PARDO: Could you be kind enough to write him a response?

MR. RIESCO: Sure.

MR. PARDO: You know, coming from the BOA, through Staff, you know, because he did take the time to do that, and I think it's important.

125

And the other thing is that, the only objection I have is the San Sebastian Apartments. I know that they're simplified. They are historic. The proportions are there, that is part of the history of the cardboard college. As you know, the University of Miami was literally on the site of what is today the Coral Gables War Memorial Youth Center, and the housing was that.

MR. RIESCO: Right.

MR. PARDO: And I think that it may not be the most ornate, it may not have been, you know, blessed at that time, but I think that the historical context of that building is extremely important, as simple as it is. You know, it doesn't have the push in and out, et cetera, but it does have several --

MR. RIESCO: The board looked at that and had that discussion and we understand historically the significance of the building, but I think the board looked at it from an aesthetic perspective and the characteristics of what's there, and deemed it that it wasn't -- I don't know if to say, appropriate, but we felt there was other projects or

126

buildings that were more impactful, in terms of showing someone what we expect and what the City wants, and we felt that the San Sebastian wasn't up to par, in terms of design -- affinity or design aesthetics, wasn't at the top of its game.

Again, that was a decision collectively by the board. We voted as a board, and some people --

MR. PARDO: Keep in mind that that building survived the 1926 hurricane, but the cardboard college did not.

MR. RIESCO: Yeah. I would be happy to discuss it with the board again, but we went through that, and we vetted it, and everybody voted.

MR. PARDO: And the reason, as minimalist as it is, based on the times and the whatever, in all sincerity, I think it's also going to be important in the future to be able to preserve that building historically. I think that's something that maybe the board was not calculating that.

MS. GARCIA: Not historical --

MR. PARDO: And I also had a separate

127

conversation, after the meeting, with the Chair and --

MR. RIESCO: Historical?

MR. PARDO: No, no, with the BOA Chair, and she truly believed that it was something that it wouldn't hurt to have on the list. That's my opinion. Everybody else here is --

MR. RIESCO: No, and, again, we've had this discussion at the board level, during meetings. You know, we have projects that come in, at a residential scale, that are historically designated, and -- I want to say this in a proper way, without hurting anybody's feeling, but some historical projects are significant and important because of the historical value of what happened there, and some projects are aesthetically important, and I think the charge of the board, again, is always aesthetics and what it conveys and what it portrays and what it looks like, and we felt that the San Sebastian didn't really meet that standard.

Again, it was a mixed vote. It wasn't unanimous. We voted. I think it was four to three or five to two, I forget what the vote -- I have a record of it -- but we debated it, we

128

discussed it thoroughly, we brought up the issue of the historical significance of the building and it should be there, but aesthetically, what does it convey to a developer or architect that's trying to understand the essence of Mediterranean design, and we felt that that particular project did not meet that standard, and so based on the list that we had, we felt that that one was not at that level. So we opted not to vote for it, but I can always go back to the board and reiterate.

If you feel that that's significant, then I would be happy to entertain another discussion. That's not a problem, but that's what transpired.

MR. PARDO: And as you said, you know, these are examples which are, I think, important to everyone. They're examples. And I just -- you know, I could just envision some time in the future someone saying, "You know we're going to knock it down, and even the BOA threw it in the garbage can." So it's going to be on you, Juan.

MR. RIESCO: No, we didn't throw it in the

129

garbage can. We just felt it wasn't to the level of the other projects. It's a different program --

MR. PARDO: And again, once you put it into the proper perspective with the cardboard college, I think you're right.

MR. RIESCO: Yeah. I mean, we did our job. We looked at it. We vetted it. We talked about it. We argued about it. And at the end of the day, a decision was made and it didn't pass. It didn't make the vote, so that's all I can tell you at this point. But I'd be happy to do it again, if that's important to you.

MR. PARDO: I appreciate it.

MR. RIESCO: It's not like we missed it. That's what I'm trying to tell you. You know, we did focus on it.

MR. PARDO: I got it.

In Level 2 bonuses, on Page 19, do you have any example on (A), on the minimum open space? It says, "The total square footage received from the building lot coverage increase is provided as publicly accessible street level open space and" -- do you have an example of that?

130

MS. GARCIA: We can provide that.

MR. PARDO: Yeah, because for me, it was difficult to understand.

MS. GARCIA: Yeah. So, basically, right now, there's no maximum building lot coverage, and we felt like that's kind of unfair. There should be some kind of benefit for the public, to be able to maximize your building to the setbacks. So, in exchange, we're trying to allocate some of that land, right, for the public, but, yeah, we can provide that study, that's fine.

MR. PARDO: Thank you.

And, then, the minimum square footage -- (B), "The minimum square footage of open space shall be 400 square feet," how is that determined? It just so happens that 400 feet was done in the original one 40 years ago. Was that like pulled out of there kind of thing?

MS. GARCIA: I think 400 square feet is also the minimum amount for open space -- maybe it's 500, actually, now that I'm thinking about it. It's four or five hundred. So we can double-check and make sure it's consistent with the minimum open space.

131

MR. PARDO: I'm just trying to understand where the number came from, you know, and how it's applied.

On Page 25, (B), The Multi-Family residential density bonus, it's 25 percent.

MS. GARCIA: That's the existing language right now that's taken out of the -- I think it was Table 3 and put in as a standard provision in the Code.

MR. PARDO: Okay.

MS. GARCIA: So the language is the same.

MR. PARDO: And, then, (C), Exclusion from height --

MS. GARCIA: That's also right now in -- I think it's being relocated from one of the tables in the Code.

MR. PARDO: So talking about the CBD, the last three lines there --

MS. GARCIA: Uh-huh.

MR. PARDO: -- it seems like it says, "Shall exceed a height of more than 25 feet above the roof. Such exclusion shall be subject to the provisions that no structure shall exceed a height of more than 25 feet above the roof, except for mixed-use buildings

132

1 in the CBD, where no such structure shall
2 exceed more than one-third of the allowable
3 total height."

4 MS. GARCIA: Right. Because right now,
5 that's existing language in the Med Bonus.

6 MR. PARDO: Right. So let's talk about
7 that for a minute.

8 What is the tallest building in the CBD
9 today?

10 MR. BEHAR: Actually, it's the Codina
11 Building, 200 --

12 MS. GARCIA: -- 5 feet.

13 MR. BEHAR: 205.

14 MR. PARDO: 205.

15 MS. GARCIA: It's not there yet, though,
16 but, yes, it will be.

17 MR. BEHAR: It's pretty close.

18 MR. PARDO: Yeah.

19 So if you do the math, the additional
20 height is --

21 MR. BEHAR: One-third.

22 MR. PARDO: That's a lot.

23 MR. BEHAR: 80 feet.

24 MR. RIESCO: 75 feet.

25 MR. PARDO: I think that's a mistake. I

133

1 don't say you made a mistake. I say, this
2 Board should consider that. I mean, that is --
3 in my opinion, that's unbelievable. See, and
4 this is -- again, nothing personal, but, I
5 mean, this is like, well, we copy, we paste, we
6 copy, we paste, but let's think about what it
7 looks like.

8 You take a 200-foot high building -- 205,
9 and then you add another one-third on top of
10 it, you're going to minimize the Biltmore.

11 MS. GARCIA: I think the calculation was
12 that it would still be underneath the Biltmore,
13 which is, I think, at 315 feet or somewhere
14 around there.

15 MR. PARDO: I'm sorry, let's throw in there
16 now, just for conversation, Live Local Act.
17 How is that going to look, with a third on top
18 of that?

19 MS. GARCIA: Live Local Act can only go up
20 to the maximum height that we have in the City,
21 though.

22 MR. PARDO: Within a mile.

23 MS. GARCIA: Within the City, yes.

24 MR. PARDO: Within the jurisdiction. But I
25 think that the proportion of taking this and

134

1 adding a third on top of this, I find it
2 offensive. I don't want to be -- I could tell
3 the joke, but I'll get in trouble.

4 MR. KAWALERSKI: Say it.

5 MR. PARDO: But I don't want to be on Krome
6 Avenue and be able to see the top of one of
7 these buildings in Coral Gables. It's
8 ridiculous. There's no need for it,
9 architecturally and proportionally.

10 Robert, am I missing something?

11 MR. BEHAR: No. When you analyze it like
12 that, one-third of the total height may be more
13 than you need to -- I don't know what that
14 number is, but, before, it was 25 feet, right?

15 MS. GARCIA: No. Right now, that one-third
16 language is already in the Med Bonus. It's
17 already allowed.

18 MR. BEHAR: I mean, I don't know, I wish
19 Javier and Peter could opine, based on this, as
20 architects. What exactly can you, then, do
21 within that one-third of the distance, you
22 know, height?

23 MS. GARCIA: Architectural features,
24 towers. It's not habitable space.

25 MR. PARDO: A copula.

135

1 MS. GARCIA: A very tall copula.

2 MR. BEHAR: I mean, do you need to be
3 one-third? I mean, I don't know. Honestly,
4 me, no. To answer, you don't need to have --

5 MR. RIESCO: So this is only an exception
6 for the CBD.

7 MS. GARCIA: Correct.

8 MR. PARDO: Yes.

9 MR. RIESCO: The normal requirement is a
10 maximum of 25 feet above the roof line.

11 MS. GARCIA: Right. That height is very
12 limiting.

13 MR. PARDO: Think about this one. So now,
14 in the CBD area, you have Alhambra, you have
15 Miracle Mile, you have Ponce. Those are the
16 three widest arteries in the CBD area. Now
17 you're going to be on the interior lots,
18 interior right-of-ways, which are substantially
19 smaller.

20 What, on earth, are you accomplishing by
21 putting something that's disproportionate, on
22 top of a building, which makes absolutely no
23 sense?

24 MR. KAWALERSKI: Why was this in here to
25 begin with?

136

1 MS. GARCIA: The Board of Architect is
2 going to review it, so if it seems absurd, if
3 (unintelligible) and it's a third and it looks
4 like it's out of proportion, I'm assuming the
5 Board of Architects --

6 MR. RIESCO: Yeah, we'll chime in at the
7 right-of-way.

8 MR. PARDO: But wait a minute. Wait a
9 minute. No. No. No. I think that it should
10 be limited to what it is everywhere else.

11 MR. RIESCO: 25 feet.

12 MR. PARDO: Why would it be different in
13 the CBD? Is it to stroke somebody's ego? I
14 don't get it.

15 MR. RIESCO: No, I think that's just a left
16 over sentence from years gone by.

17 MR. PARDO: No. I think, this is why we're
18 here, right?

19 MR. RIESCO: I know that's not something
20 that we discussed or requested or --

21 MR. PARDO: I mean, the 25 feet of this
22 area -- if you look at Allen Morris' new
23 project --

24 MS. GARCIA: Allen Morris' project, if you
25 count above the 114 feet -- how much was it?

137

1 MR. SALMAN: I think it's 143 total or
2 something like that.

3 MS. GARCIA: No, it's 190 total -- 180
4 something total.

5 MR. BEHAR: Which would be, the one on
6 Alhambra --

7 MR. SALMAN: The new one.

8 MR. PARDO: The new one that's going up.
9 (Simultaneous speaking.)

10 MR. SALMAN: No, we're talking about the
11 one on Ponce and University.

12 MR. RIESCO: Isn't that the 10 stories?

13 MS. GARCIA: Yeah, the new one.

14 MS. SUAREZ: So the court reporter can't
15 take this down if everyone's talking over each
16 other.

17 MR. BEHAR: No, guaranteed that's -- he
18 came originally at 190 and we rejected and went
19 back.

20 MR. KAWALERSKI: Right.

21 MR. RIESCO: The 10 stories --

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I thought it was 109
23 or something.

24 MR. KAWALERSKI: Like 130, isn't it? You
25 know, don't you?

138

1 MS. LONGO: I think -- I don't recall, but
2 107 or 109.

3 MS. GARCIA: Okay. I thought it was 115,
4 but the top --

5 MR. KAWALERSKI: Yeah. Yeah.

6 MR. SALMAN: With everything on top of
7 it --

8 MS. GARCIA: No, it's 186 or something,
9 yes, with the architectural features.

10 MR. RIESCO: It goes to 186?

11 MS. GARCIA: Yes, for the tower.

12 MR. BEHAR: No, that's not 190 at all.

13 MR. PARDO: No way, no how.

14 MS. GARCIA: Proportionally, it goes high,
15 yes.

16 MR. RIESCO: I remember that was a
17 discussion.

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: In order to move
19 forward, whatever it is --

20 MR. RIESCO: I agree with Felix on this
21 one.

22 MR. PARDO: I'm recommending it's 25 feet,
23 end of story.

24 MR. KAWALERSKI: Yeah, let's get through
25 it.

139

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. That's your
2 recommendation.

3 MR. PARDO: The third is out the door.

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Felix --

5 MR. PARDO: I have one last comment --

6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So the recommendation
7 is 25 feet right now.

8 MR. BEHAR: That may not be sufficient,
9 depending on the project, but I agree with you,
10 one-third is excessive. But maybe 25 feet, for
11 other projects, may not be sufficient.

12 MR. SALMAN: Honestly, it should be a
13 function of the right-of-way in front of it and
14 the lot area that they have, because -- I mean,
15 25 feet may be nothing, if you have an entire
16 block, but it would be pretty significant if
17 you have a 50 by 100 foot lot, you know.

18 MR. PARDO: In my opinion, I think the BOA
19 should help Staff in coming up with a right
20 proportion and a right maximum on the thing. I
21 don't have a problem with that, but I think
22 one-third is absurd.

23 MR. SALMAN: I completely agree.

24 MR. PARDO: Okay.

25 MR. SALMAN: All I'm saying is, it should

140

1 be tied -- it should go back to the Board of
2 Architects to come up with a formula based on
3 the frontage and the lot area that they're
4 looking at developing, so that it works out as
5 a function and nobody has to break their head
6 about it.

7 MR. RIESCO: That's fine.

8 Yeah, I think it's a product of the
9 building, the design, the mass.

10 MR. SALMAN: Juan, I'm talking about
11 frontage and the footprint of the building
12 working together to achieve that maximum, all
13 right, and it needs to be some sort of
14 function.

15 MR. PARDO: And, then, the last page, 27,
16 Article 16, why was that added, the term,
17 "Precedent means a building structure
18 element -- "

19 MS. GARCIA: Not everyone knows what a
20 precedent means. It's mentioned a lot in our
21 tables, so we had to define it, so that they
22 understand it's an example of a building that's
23 used for -- by an architect to -- whatever the
24 definition is. "A building structure element
25 of a design that's used by an architect." Not

141

1 everyone knows what a precedent is.

2 MS. SUAREZ: It wasn't previously defined,
3 so now it's defined.

4 MR. PARDO: Right, but I think it's -- when
5 you look at the way it's used legally, it's --
6 and you look at this definition, it's kind
7 of -- you know, maybe there should be
8 another --

9 MS. GARCIA: Architectural precedent, you
10 mean?

11 MS. SUAREZ: Yeah. I think the definition
12 defines that it is. It's not -- we're not
13 talking about a legal precedent. We're talking
14 about a building structure element of design
15 that is used by an architect as an example or
16 guide," so that it's clear now.

17 MR. PARDO: So the precedent, you mean, are
18 the examples that you have there?

19 MS. SUAREZ: Yes.

20 MR. PARDO: Right? The pictorial ones --

21 MS. GARCIA: Yes.

22 MR. PARDO: Okay. In my opinion, I think
23 it should be architectural historic precedence,
24 you know, for the definition, you know, and --
25 or -- you know, and maybe the way to simplify

142

1 it is to say, you know, precedent as used in
2 the Zoning Code.

3 MS. SUAREZ: This is in the definition
4 section. So that's why it's -- this would be
5 plugged into the definition section of the
6 Zoning Code.

7 MR. PARDO: No, I understand, but what I'm
8 trying to say is that it's an architectural
9 historic precedent, correct, or am I incorrect?

10 MS. GARCIA: Architectural precedent. I'm
11 not sure using the word historic, if they're
12 not a historic buildings, because that are
13 plenty of buildings that are in here that are
14 not historic.

15 MR. PARDO: You just said that the Coral
16 Gables Mediterranean architectural design, all
17 applicants who -- shall be required to satisfy
18 all, include the proportional systems as
19 defined in the Best Practices -- where is the
20 word used, precedent, there?

21 MS. GARCIA: It's used, I think, in the
22 prerequisites, if I remember correctly.

23 MR. PARDO: Where is that?

24 MS. GARCIA: Mediterranean precedence,
25 Number 2 on Page 6, under the prerequisite. It

143

1 should be highlighted. It's precedence --
2 Mediterranean precedence appropriate for the
3 proposed building. It uses the word,
4 precedence, throughout this section.

5 MS. SUAREZ: So this is an area that, when
6 we were reviewing these changes and we were
7 going through them and making changes, we saw
8 that there was a need to define the term, so
9 this would provide a definition for the term.

10 MR. PARDO: Yeah. I'm reading that,
11 "Precedence appropriate for proposed buildings
12 shall be referenced visually as provided in the
13 Best Practices Manual." That's --

14 MS. GARCIA: So it's up to the board.
15 They'll have a sheet or a board that has their
16 different precedence, their example buildings,
17 that they're using details and designs from, in
18 the proposed building.

19 MR. PARDO: No, I understand. I'm just
20 saying, when you look at the definition, you
21 look at -- you know, you look at this -- I
22 mean, I think there's a leap between the two.
23 I don't think it's articulated the way you were
24 intending to use it, in my opinion. I just
25 think that maybe -- either say -- if you say --

144

1 MS. SUAREZ: Are you concerned about the
2 term that we're using, precedent, or the
3 definition?

4 MR. PARDO: No, I'm concerned with, for
5 example -- here, this is a perfect example, on
6 Page 6. "Precedence is appropriate based on
7 the Best Practices Manual," that -- the Best
8 Practices Manual and the examples of the
9 buildings on Page 24-A, right, all of those
10 examples -- I think that's what you're
11 intending to be the precedent, but when you go
12 back to the Best Practices Manual and the
13 Historical American Building Survey, none of
14 those are precedence.

15 MS. GARCIA: Those examples of those 20
16 something buildings are going to be in the Best
17 Practice Manual, and -- diagramed, to show
18 what --

19 MR. PARDO: You're going to put them in
20 there?

21 MS. GARCIA: Yes. Correct.

22 MR. PARDO: I missed that, because I've
23 been asking for that. Okay. So it will be in
24 the Best Practices?

25 MS. GARCIA: Yeah, just like today.

145

1 using it, to everybody be on the same page.

2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So your concern is
3 that it's not simplified enough or doesn't
4 point to a specific --

5 MR. PARDO: I don't think it's clear
6 enough.

7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.

8 MR. PARDO: I don't think it's clear
9 enough, and I think it can be made clear, and,
10 you know, we don't have to throw the baby out
11 with the bath water.

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, I'm sure Staff
13 welcomes your input on that.

14 MR. PARDO: Those are all of my comments.

15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

16 Javier, any -- I know you didn't get the
17 benefit of --

18 MR. SALMAN: I didn't get the benefit of
19 the previous discussion. So far, the comments
20 that I've heard are similar to the ones I had.
21 So I'm assuming that those -- the ones I had
22 were incorporated.

23 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, if you could
24 explain to Javier what we're doing for the next
25 meeting.

147

1 MR. PARDO: So, then, if you go back to the
2 definition, "Precedence refers to the building,
3 structures or elements as shown in the Best
4 Practice Manuals" --

5 MS. SUAREZ: It's not limited to that,
6 right, Jennifer?

7 MS. GARCIA: Right.

8 MS. SUAREZ: The intent was not to limit it
9 just to that, because precedence doesn't just
10 mean the buildings.

11 MS. GARCIA: Yeah. We may not have
12 everything, all 26 buildings, in the Best
13 Practice Manual. We will definitely try to,
14 because right now we only have eight buildings
15 in there and we're going to add more --

16 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, in order not to
17 stand this up, I'm going to -- I would like to
18 just take a look at it and maybe bring it up
19 the next time, and possibly come up with some
20 verbiage that both, Staff and the BOA and
21 Legal, can agree to the thing.

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That's fine.

23 MR. PARDO: I just want it to be simple,
24 for, you know, the architects and the
25 developers and land use attorneys that are

146

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: At the next meeting,
2 since we didn't have enough people here at this
3 meeting, there were several options that we
4 decided. One was to go ahead --

5 MR. PARDO: He left at 5:30.

6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: To just go ahead and
7 cancel the meeting, which we didn't. The other
8 one was to proceed with the meeting and not
9 necessarily make a recommendation at this time,
10 because we didn't have a complete Board, and
11 the Members that missed, they'd be able to look
12 at the minutes and see what was talked about.

13 MR. SALMAN: Okay. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You're welcome.

15 The question that I have is, if you look at
16 Page 6, which would be under -- let me just go
17 there. Page 6, under the pre --

18 MR. PARDO: Prerequisites.

19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- the prerequisites
20 table, correct, Item Number 3, "Exclusions from
21 height, the following shall be excluded,"
22 everything there is --

23 MS. GARCIA: Has been relocated.

24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- stricked out.

25 MS. GARCIA: That's what we just read

148

1 about, yes.
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Can we go to
 3 the --
 4 MS. GARCIA: That's where the one-third of
 5 the allowable to -- I'm sorry, total building
 6 height in the CBD, that's where all of that
 7 came from. That's why it's struck through.
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. And can you
 9 guide me to where you relocated it, please?
 10 MS. GARCIA: It's in (Unintelligible)
 11 provision, under C, on Page 26.
 12 MS. SUAREZ: That's the section we were
 13 just discussing about the one-third, et cetera.
 14 That language was already in there, but in a
 15 table.
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That language is in
 17 there, okay. Perfect.
 18 MR. PARDO: We cleaned it up.
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yeah. I'm good. I
 20 mean, everything has been really covered, that
 21 we spoke about.
 22 Juan, you know, really, your input, you
 23 know, coming here, really helped us out to
 24 clarify a lot, and, honestly, Gus coming here,
 25 to clarify a lot of misconception that was with

149

1 the Board of Architects, I think shed a lot of
 2 light. For me it did, and I'm sure for the
 3 other Board Members.
 4 MS. SUAREZ: Mr. Chair, if you'd allow me,
 5 just going back to that clarification that Gus
 6 made, and I want to avoid further -- or maybe
 7 perhaps manage expectations a little bit, you
 8 know, we discussed how it would be appropriate
 9 for the Board of Architects to look at the
 10 compatibility and determine that a particular
 11 design is not compatible at the proposed
 12 height, but I want to just make it clear, I
 13 don't think it would be appropriate for the
 14 Board of Architects to say, you know, in this
 15 particular location, a hundred foot building
 16 could never be compatible. It would be, this
 17 design, that's a hundred foot high, is not
 18 compatible, this design.
 19 There could be, perhaps, another design
 20 that would be. I just want to make sure that
 21 nuance is clear.
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It is. Gus made it,
 23 actually, very clear with his examples and so
 24 forth. Thank you.
 25 Any other comments from the Board on this

150

1 at this time?
 2 Go ahead, Felix.
 3 MR. PARDO: I was just going to say, I'd
 4 like to make a motion to continue this meeting,
 5 to the next appropriate meeting, to be able to
 6 have any additional comments from the Board
 7 Members that weren't here for a portion of the
 8 meeting, and then be able to discuss it and
 9 then make a motion at that time.
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You've got all of our
 11 comments written down and the recommendations
 12 that were made and the concerns --
 13 MS. GARCIA: Yes.
 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. I think
 15 Jennifer has really been doing a great job of
 16 keeping track of it, striking out, and keep
 17 going.
 18 MR. PARDO: And I think this was a very
 19 good move, to have a Special Meeting
 20 specifically for this, because, you know, you
 21 can't be distracted by other applications or
 22 other issues. This is too big of a discussion.
 23 MR. BEHAR: When will the next meeting take
 24 place?
 25 MS. GARCIA: October 9.

151

1 MR. PARDO: Two weeks. Are you going to be
 2 here?
 3 MR. BEHAR: I may not be here.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I may not be here.
 5 MR. PARDO: Okay. Can we explore the
 6 possibility of moving that meeting or do you
 7 need 30 days to do that?
 8 THE SECRETARY: We advertised.
 9 MS. GARCIA: We've mailed notice.
 10 THE SECRETARY: And we mailed notice.
 11 MR. PARDO: Okay. You mailed notice, okay.
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You may want to
 13 continue with the meeting, but you may want to
 14 move this.
 15 MR. PARDO: Right. And then what we could
 16 do is possibly incorporate the other comments
 17 from the members that were not here, and then
 18 you guys can catch up --
 19 MR. BEHAR: Well, I mean, the members that
 20 were not here today was Julio --
 21 MR. PARDO: Right.
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And Chip missed some.
 23 MR. BEHAR: -- missed some, and Javier.
 24 MR. PARDO: Missed some, yeah.
 25 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Then I guess we will

152

1 have to -- I was going to say, I will put on
2 the table my vote already, just in case I'm not
3 here, but --

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I don't think you can
5 do that.

6 MS. SUAREZ: First of all, we don't have a
7 motion, so you cannot do that.

8 MR. BEHAR: Because otherwise we're going
9 to be -- when are we going to conclude?

10 MR. PARDO: In November.

11 MR. BEHAR: Wow. That's a long time.

12 MS. GARCIA: So we have some projects that
13 are in the pipeline, that would be nice to be
14 able to apply these new Mediterranean related
15 regulations to.

16 MR. BEHAR: That's why I'm saying, I don't
17 know if we could wait until November.

18 MR. PARDO: May I make a suggestion? Can
19 we possibly have a second meeting, as we had
20 today, in between the two next regular Planning
21 Board meetings?

22 MR. BEHAR: I'm perfectly fine --

23 MR. PARDO: And, then, that way, we could
24 bring it --

25 MR. SALMAN: I was going to suggest, why

153

1 don't we just have, at the next scheduled
2 meeting, coming earlier for it, because I don't
3 think we got --

4 MR. PARDO: They're not going to be here
5 for the next meeting.

6 MR. SALMAN: Oh, yeah, that's the next
7 meeting. So we have to have a Special Meeting,
8 Okay. Thank you.

9 MR. PARDO: If we have a second -- if
10 everybody comes up to speed, and then you have
11 a meeting a month from now, this secondary --
12 this second, you know, Special Meeting, then we
13 can tie a bow on this thing.

14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Agreed.

15 MR. PARDO: Do you want --

16 MR. SALMAN: Notice is -- the notice, it
17 would be two weeks?

18 MS. GARCIA: No. This is just a legal ad,
19 so, no, not two weeks, but I mean, pretty
20 close, right, Jill, as far getting it to the
21 newspaper and having it published?

22 THE SECRETARY: Just an example up there,
23 if we have a meeting on the 17th, we meet the
24 deadline for legal ad publishing.

25 MR. SALMAN: That's where I was heading.

154

1 So just get a range of the dates from right
2 now. So it would be after the 17th and before
3 the next meeting.

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I don't know my
5 specific -- myself, at this time --

6 MR. BEHAR: Yeah, I'm here on the 16th.

7 MS. GARCIA: I think the 16th has a
8 Board --

9 THE SECRETARY: Historic Preservation
10 Board. Unless we have the meeting next door --
11 unless we have meeting at 427.

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What about the week of
13 the 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 25th.

14 MR. KAWALERSKI: I'm available.

15 MR. BEHAR: I'm available that week.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Can we go ahead and
17 possibly leave it up to Staff, because they
18 have to take a look if the room is available
19 and so forth?

20 MR. PARDO: What were the dates again?

21 Mr. Chairman, what were the dates --

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: October 21st, 22nd,
23 23rd, 24th, 25th, that week.

24 MS. SUAREZ: So we have a Commission
25 Meeting October 22nd. So that would not be

155

1 ideal.

2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What about the 24th,
3 which is a Thursday?

4 MR. RIESCO: I have a BOA meeting on the
5 24th.

6 MS. GARCIA: The week before, the 15th, is
7 that available?

8 MR. PARDO: And the 23rd is a Wednesday.
9 So 23rd or 24th.

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Say that again,
11 please.

12 MR. PARDO: The 23rd is a Wednesday.

13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I would just like to
14 confirm exactly when I get back, if you guys
15 are looking for me to be here on that. I'm
16 assuming I will, on the 23rd, and that's why I
17 did that.

18 MR. PARDO: Okay. Or if it makes it easier
19 for you, the 24th, it's a Thursday and we
20 can -- and I would suggest that we start at
21 4:00, and if it only takes an hour, you know,
22 we get it done.

23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Just a caution, even
24 the following Tuesday, the 29th, to be safe --

25 MR. PARDO: Right. The 30th is impossible.

156

I have a Charter Review Committee on that day.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Tuesday, the 29th, is -- I put out a text, but I haven't gotten a response on my calendar, unfortunately.

MS. GARCIA: So we can send out some dates, and I guess you can check your calendar and make sure you're available.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Please.

MS. GARCIA: So somewhere around those two or three weeks.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yeah. What I would ask is, we're not supposed to do a reply to all. So if everybody, when Jill puts out the dates, if we can just reply to Jill, by herself, per the Sunshine Laws.

THE SECRETARY: Excuse me, so it would be -- to check for October 24th --

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: 24th or possibly the 29th.

THE SECRETARY: And for 4:00 p.m., correct?

MS. GARCIA: Not for the 15th?

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: No. I never said the 15th.

Do we need it at 4:00 p.m. at that point? I mean, we've had extensive meetings on this.

157

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: All right. Is there a motion to adjourn?

MR. BEHAR: I make a motion to adjourn.

THE SECRETARY: Excuse me, I didn't have a second on the motion to continue.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That is correct. Who made the motion to continue?

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Pardo.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Felix.

MR. BEHAR: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a second to continue. Everybody in favor say aye.

(All Board Members voted aye.)

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Anybody against? No? Motion to adjourn?

MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion.

MR. SALMAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Motion by Robert, Second by Javier. All in favor say, aye.

(Board Members voted aye.)

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, everybody, for your time.

(Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

159

Is there not a reason that we can't meet at six o'clock?

MR. PARDO: Okay.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And finish by the nine o'clock, if we had to go that late?

MR. BEHAR: I don't think it's going to take very long.

MR. SALMAN: I agree.

MR. PARDO: Six o'clock it is.

MR. SALMAN: When can we get the minutes for the meeting?

MS. GARCIA: About a week from now.

THE SECRETARY: Our turnaround time is 10 to 12 days.

MR. PARDO: Was this taped?

THE SECRETARY: Yeah, it's being taped, yes. It's being recorded on Zoom, yes. I can send you the link tomorrow morning.

MR. SALMAN: Okay. That's perfect. That will help.

CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: To Zoom or YouTube?

THE SECRETARY: As well, yes.

MR. SALMAN: Okay. I just want to check it against my notes and make sure we covered everything.

158

STATE OF FLORIDA:

SS.

COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:

I, NIEVES SANCHEZ, Court Reporter, and a Notary Public for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.

DATED this 2nd day of October, 2024.



-----NIEVES SANCHEZ-----

160